

GAZİ UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING PROGRAMME

**THE COMPARISON OF GAZI UNIVERSITY ELT FRESHMEN’S RECEPTIVE
AND PRODUCTIVE SKILL PERFORMANCES**

MASTER of ARTS

By:

Müzeyyen Nazlı DEMİRBAŞ

Ankara

June, 2011

GAZI UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING PROGRAMME

**THE COMPARISON OF GAZI UNIVERSITY ELT FRESHMEN’S RECEPTIVE
AND PRODUCTIVE SKILL PERFORMANCES**

MASTER of ARTS

Müzeyyen Nazlı DEMİRBAŞ

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Abdülvahit ÇAKIR

Ankara

June, 2011

Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü'ne

Müzeyyen Nazlı DEMİRBAŞ' a ait 'The Comparison of Gazi University ELT Freshmen's Receptive and Productive Skill Performances ' isimli çalışma 17. 06. 2011 tarihinde jürimiz tarafından YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Adı – Soyadı

İmza

Başkan:

Üye (Tez Danışmanı):

Üye:

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the contributions of the following individuals and groups to the development of my thesis:

My supervisor, Prof. Dr. Abdlvahit AKIR has been an excellent mentor and an inspiring example as a professor throughout my thesis. His robust and flexible scaffolding contributed immensely to my development as an independent and confident research assistant. I learnt a lot from his professionalism.

I am greatly indebted to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Pařa Tevfik CEPHE, Dr. Kemal Sinan ZMEN and Dr. Cem BALIKANLI for their invaluable guidance at each stage of this thesis, their generous time, our lengthy discussions regarding the conceptualizing of this study and their advice which helped this study to take on its final shape.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Assist. Prof. Dr. Abdullah ERTAř for letting me reach the source of information related to the preparatory school, Egemen AYDOĐDU for his extremely valuable advice on statistics, Necdet ZKILAVUZ and Murat ZCAN for their patience and help in designing style of pages and Busra DELEN for her support.

My heartfelt thanks go to my lifelong partner, Mustafa Akin GNGR for his endless encouragement, understanding and inspiration throughout this study. I am thankful to him for everything he has done for me.

Last but not least I am grateful to my parents, Feriřtah and Ali DEMİRBAř, and my sister, Nihan DEMİRBAř for their unconditional love, moral and support throughout my life.

ABSTRACT

THE COMPARISON OF GAZI UNIVERSITY ELT FRESHMEN’S RECEPTIVE AND PRODUCTIVE SKILL PERFORMANCES

DEMİRBAŞ, Müzeyyen Nazlı

Master of Arts, English Language Teaching Department

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Abdülvahit ÇAKIR

June – 2011, 112 pages

This study investigates whether the freshmen’s education at the preparatory school affects their receptive and productive skills performances, and whether this effect leads to a meaningful difference between the freshmen’s performances who attend the preparatory programme and those who are exempt from this programme. In light of these questions, this study mainly aims to find out whether there are performance differences among ELT freshmen who have attended the preparatory class and those who have not in terms of receptive and productive skills.

The quantitative research model is employed for this study. First, the problem was identified. Next, the main research question, and depending on it, six sub – category questions were formed. Numerical data were collected by analysing ELT freshmen’s scores in English language skills (reading, writing, listening and speaking) courses in fall and spring terms in 2009 – 2010 academic year. They were processed in Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS 16.00) software. 40% of their mid- term exams and 60% of their final exams were calculated. Results were evaluated in accordance with these scores.

The participants are 260 freshmen in total, 210 of whom are females, while 50 of them are males. While 122 of these freshmen are enrolled in the day programme, 138 of them are enrolled in the evening programme. Upon this admission to the ELT department all new students take an English proficiency exam. Those who got 60 out of 100 in this exam directly attend their freshman year at the ELT department. In our case,

148 students passed this exam. The rest, 112 learners, failed and attended the preparatory school for a year at Gazi University Preparatory School of Foreign Languages. The scores obtained from Gazi University Registrar's Office were analyzed in terms of three dimensions: attendance at the preparatory school, gender and the programme type (day or evening programme). First of all, these dimensions were evaluated in terms of frequencies and percentages. Second, these data were illustrated in tables so that students can be compared in terms of each dimension. Third, the independent samples T test was used since there are independent variables in this study to see the differences between these variables.

It is revealed that in fall and spring terms reading and writing skills, the freshmen who attended the preparatory school are found to be more successful than those who did not attend. Besides, attendance at the preparatory programme is a matter of fact in determining their success in the aforementioned skills. As for listening and speaking skills, the freshmen who attended and who did not attend the preparatory programme are found to be equally successful for both terms. In other words, the preparatory school does not have a crucial role in developing these learners' listening and speaking skills. Suggestions related to the syllabus followed in the preparatory programme, to instructors' effect on the freshmen's performances and to the reliability and validity of the English proficiency exam are provided. Another alternative study may be that the comparison of learners' performances in receptive and productive skills can be carried out in all ELT preparatory programmes of Turkish universities.

Key Words: English language preparatory programme, productive and receptive skills, education type, gender, ELT freshmen.

ÖZET

İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMENLİĞİ 1. SINIF ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN ALGISAL VE ÜRETİMSSEL BECERİLERDEKİ PERFORMANSLARININ KARSILASTIRILMASI

DEMİRBAŞ, Müzeyyen Nazlı

Yüksek Lisans, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi ABD

Tez Danışmanı: Prof. Dr. Abdülvahit ÇAKIR

Haziran – 2011, 112 sayfa

Bu çalışma hazırlık eğitiminin 1. sınıf öğrencilerinin algısal ve üretimsel becerilerine etkisi olup olmadığını ve bu etkinin hazırlık eğitimi alan ve almayan 1. Sınıf öğrencilerin algısal ve üretimsel becerilerdeki performanslarına etki edip etmediğini sorgular. Dolayısıyla, bu çalışma hazırlık eğitimi alan ve almayan 1. sınıf öğrencilerin algısal ve üretimsel becerileri arasında fark olup olmadığını bulmayı amaçlar.

Nicel araştırma modelinin kullanıldığı bu çalışmada, öncelikle problemin durumu belirtilmiştir. Daha sonra, ana araştırma sorusu ve buna bağlı 6 alt soru oluşturulmuştur. Sayısal veri İngilizce Öğretmenliği 1. Sınıf öğrencilerinin 2009 – 2010 öğretim yılı güz ve bahar dönemlerinde temel dil becerileri derslerinde aldıkları notlar incelenerek toplanmıştır. Bu veriler, SPSS 16 yazılım programına kaydedilmiştir. Notlar araştırmacı tarafından verilen değerlerle kodlanmıştır.

210 u bayan, 50 si erkek olmak üzere toplam 260 1. Sınıf öğrencisi bu çalışmaya katılmıştır. Bunlardan 112 si 1. öğretimde, 138 i ise 2. öğretimde okumaktadır. İngilizce öğretmenliği bölümüne kaydolduktan sonra tüm öğrenciler hazırlık okulu tarafından düzenlenen İngilizce yeterlik sınavına girerek, bu sınavda 100 üzerinden en az 60 geçme notunu aldıklarında doğrudan bölüme devam etme hakkına sahiptir. Bu çalışmada 148 öğrenci hazırlığı geçmiş, 112 si ise geçer not alamadığı için 1 yıllık hazırlık eğitimi görmüşlerdir. Gazi Üniversitesi Öğrenci İşleri Dairesi Başkanlığı'ndan

alınan bu notlar, üç farklı boyutta incelenmiştir. Bunlar öğrencilerin hazırlık eğitimi alıp almadığı, cinsiyetleri ve kayıtlı olduğu öğrenim türleridir. Öncelikle, bu üç değişken için ayrı tablolar düzenlenerek, sayısal veri netleştirilmiştir. Ardından, her bir beceri sırasıyla bu üç değişkene göre incelenmiştir. Daha sonra, bu çalışmada birbirinden bağımsız değişkenler olduğu için, bu değişkenler arasındaki farkı ortaya çıkarmak amacıyla ilişkisiz örneklem T- testi deseni kullanılmıştır.

Bulgulara göre, hazırlık eğitimi alan öğrenciler, bu eğitimi almayanlara göre güz ve bahar yarıyılı okuma ve yazma becerilerinde daha başarılı bulunmuşlardır. Hazırlık okulu bu başarıda anlamlı bir fark yaratarak etkisinin önemli olduğunu göstermektedir. Dinleme ve konuşma becerileri için ise, hazırlık eğitimi alan ve almayan öğrenciler arasında anlamlı bir başarı farkı bulunmamıştır. Diğer bir deyişle, her iki grup eşit şekilde başarılı bulunmuştur. Burada, hazırlık okulunun etkisi görülmemektedir. Çalışmanın son bölümünde, hazırlık okulunda takip edilen müfredata, hocaların beceri derslerinde uyguladığı yöntem ve kullandığı kaynaklara ve hazırlık atlama sınavının geçerlik ve güvenirliğine yönelik önerilerde bulunulmuştur. Ayrıca, bu çalışmadan elde edilen sonuçlar, diğer üniversitelerin hazırlık okullarından aynı çalışma sonucu elde edilen bulgular ile karşılaştırılarak alana özgün bir katkıda bulunulabilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İngilizce hazırlık okulu, algısal ve üretimsel beceriler, öğrenim türü, cinsiyet, İngilizce öğretmenliği öğrencileri

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPROVAL OF THE JURY.....	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZET	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
LIST OF TABLES	xi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xii
CHAPTER I	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.0 Presentation.....	1
1.1 Statement of the Problem.....	1
1.2 Purpose of the Study.....	3
1.3 Significance of the Study	4
1.4 Limitations of the Study	6
1.5 Assumptions of the Study	6
1.6 Definition of Some Terms.....	8
CHAPTER II.....	9
REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	9
2.0 Presentation	9

2.1 English around the World.....	9
2.1.1 English as a Foreign Language (EFL)	12
2.1.2 English for Academic Purposes (EAP)	13
2.2 Language Policy and Higher Education in Turkey	14
2.2.1 Governmental Institutions	17
2.2.1.1 The Council of Higher Education.....	17
2. 2. 1. 2 Ministry of National Education (MONE).....	20
2. 2. 1. 3 Student Selection and Placement Centre (SSPC)	20
2.2.2 Academic Institutions	21
2.2.2.1 Preparatory Programmes of ELT Departments.....	21
2.2.2.2 ELT Departments at Turkish Universities	22
2.2.3 Andragogy and Adult Learning	23
2.2.3.1 Characteristics of Adolescence	25
2.3 Trends and Tendencies in Teaching Language Skills	26
2.3.1 Common European Framework (CEF).....	27
2.3.1.1 Common European Reference Levels.....	29
2.3.2 Communicative Language Activities and Strategies of CEF	30
2.3.2.1 Receptive Skills	30
2.3.2.1.1 Overview of Listening Skills	31
2.3.2.1.2 Overview of Reading Skills	33

2.3.2.2 Productive Skills	36
2.3.2.2.1 Overview of Speaking Skills.....	36
2.3.2.2.2 Overview of Writing Skills.....	38
CHAPTER III	42
METHODOLOGY	42
3.0 Presentation.....	42
3.1 Research Design	42
3.2 Research Questions.....	43
3.3 Participants.....	44
3.2.1 Gazi University Preparatory School of Foreign Languages	46
3.2.2 English Language Teaching Department at Gazi University	48
3.3 Data Collection Procedure	51
3.4 Data Analysis Method	51
CHAPTER IV	53
ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA	53
4.0 Presentation.....	53
4.1 Differences between Performances of the Freshmen who have attended and who have not.....	53
4.2 Differences between Performances of Male and Female Freshmen	57
4.3 Differences between Performances of Freshmen in the two Programmes	61

CHAPTER V	66
CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS	66
5.0 Presentation.....	66
5.1 Summary of the Study	66
5.2 Suggestions and Implications for ELT.....	72
REFERENCES.....	73
APPENDICES	81

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: The Freshmen's Gender

Table 2: The Freshmen's Programme Type

Table 3: Attendance at the Preparatory School

Table 4: The Freshmen's Reading and Writing Scores in Fall and Spring in terms of Attendance at the Preparatory Programme

Table 5: The Freshmen's Listening Scores in Fall and Spring in terms of Attendance at the Preparatory Programme

Table 6: The Freshmen's Speaking Scores in Fall and Spring in terms of Attendance at the Preparatory Programme

Table 7: The Freshmen's Reading and Writing Scores in Fall and Spring in terms of gender

Table 8: The Freshmen's Listening Scores in Fall and Spring in terms of Gender

Table 9: The Freshmen's Speaking Scores in Fall and Spring in terms of Gender

Table 10: The Freshmen's Reading and Writing Scores in Fall and Spring in terms of the Programme Type

Table 11: The Freshmen's Listening Scores in Fall and Spring in terms of the Programme Type

Table 12: The Freshmen's Speaking Scores in Fall and Spring in terms of the Programme Type

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CEF	Common European Framework
CEFR	Common European Framework Reference Levels
CLT	Communicative Language Teaching
DM	Direct Method
EAP	English for Academic Purposes
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
ELT	English Language Teaching
ESL	English as a Second Language
MONE	Ministry of National Education
TBI	Task – Based Instruction
SSPC	Student Selection and Placement Centre
SSPE	Student Selection and Placement Examination

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Presentation

This chapter takes a closer look at the importance of this study and replies questions of who participants are and what the goal of this study is. Limitations and assumptions of this study are also briefly covered in this chapter.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

As English has been positioned as the primary language of international communication, nations have been adapting it in their national language education policies to catch up with this trend (Seargeant & Erling, 2011). These nations vary considerably in their settings; ESL or EFL (Graddol, 2006). While countries like India, Singapore, Jamaica, so on are circled in ESL context where English is the key element to commerce, administration and education, Turkey, Greece, Japan, so on are grouped in EFL context where English does not play a significant role in national or social life but in international affairs and education in these countries. They have long adapted different approaches, trends and methods so as to teach English according to aims and needs throughout the history. Each era and century brought its own features, necessities and requirements into the agenda, and relevant ways of teaching and learning English were analyzed and discussed; afterwards, were integrated into education. Today, the world is witnessing a century in which English is used as a global language rather than EFL or ESL, so common necessities, needs, requirements and interests have gathered more importance in terms of deciding on the appropriate approaches to English language teaching and learning. The Common European Framework (2001), for instance, has had a profound impact on foreign language instruction in countries across

Europe including members and non- members of the Council of Europe like Turkey. The main goal of the CEF is to serve as a frame to discover language learning objectives and to set the basis of success standards by analyzing needs of learners in various national contexts (Morrow, 2004).

Zooming in, Turkey has been endeavouring to become a member of the European Union by doing reforms in law, administration, health, society and education. In education field, she has come up with the latest trends in teaching learners from very young to adults, in training teachers and teacher trainees, in integrating new approaches into foreign language instruction, and in providing pre – service and in – service training courses in the Ministry of National Education (MONE) and at universities. These endeavours and courses have been grounded on the CEF since 2005 (Demirel, 2003). Accordingly, foreign language proficiency of people is standardized into certain levels; A1 (breakthrough), A2 (way stage), B1 (threshold), B2 (vantage), C1 (effective operational proficiency) and C2 (mastery). With respect to foreign language instruction and assessment of learners, course books, national language policy, foreign language programmes of universities and preparatory schools have been integrating the CEF into their curriculum in Turkey. Especially, the requirement that preparatory school learners and ELT department teacher trainees of universities are to meet the aforementioned levels according to their levels is of great importance since these learners will be instructors, teachers and teacher trainers in the future.

An example of this requirement can be seen at Gazi University Preparatory School. The students of the ELT department who attend this preparatory school are to fulfil the requirements of B1+ level and are supposed to continue the education in ELT department at B2 level in their freshman year. Also, those who pass the English Proficiency Exam at the beginning of the academic year directly attend the ELT department of the university. As this is the case, it draws attention whether there is a meaningful difference among the ones who attend the preparatory school for a year and the ones who pass the proficiency exam and attend the freshman year in the ELT department in terms of receptive and productive skills according to gender. Among them, listening and reading skills are categorized as receptive skills (Morrow, 2004), while speaking and writing skills are considered as productive skills. The aforementioned research question will guide us to find out whether the program in the

preparatory school really meets the requirements of the CEF, whether the foreign language instruction that they offer at the preparatory school make learners more successful when they start their education in the department, and in what skills the preparatory school helps learners develop more. In doing so, the efficiency of the preparatory school will become clearer, and both teachers and learners will be aware of their level of achievement. Relevant to this study, similar studies have been done throughout years from different perspectives and analyses.

Firstly, Dursun (2007) aimed to investigate the reasons of gender differences in foreign language learning success at university level preparatory classes at Çanakkale 18 Mart University. Secondly, Borçbakan (1999) compared the success of those who attended preparatory school and of those who did not at Bursa Uludağ University Preparatory classes. Lastly, Özdoğan (2002) carried out a similar study in his MA thesis and he intended to find out performance differences between two groups of students who attended and who did not attend preparatory classes at Gazi University ELT Department.

In line with these research topics, learners may have better or less successful performance in their learning owing to different factors. Determining these factors will help teachers and learners evaluate themselves better and review their teaching and learning techniques. Besides, the preparatory schools renew their perspectives, approaches, methods and course books to be able to respond to learners' contemporary needs.

1.2 Purpose of the Study

Determining the foreign language levels of learners in a course or program by assessing them in terms of four skills reveals significant results and implications both for the program and learners. Receptive and productive skills are the combination of listening, reading, speaking and writing skills; therefore, they have been integrated into the language programs depending on the approaches, methods and latest trends. Although there are a lot of preparatory programmes which aim to follow these new trends, Gazi University Preparatory School is among the few which establishes the Common European Reference Levels (CEFR) as the outcomes of their learners. Accordingly, students of the ELT department who attend Gazi University Preparatory

School are thought to fulfil B1+ level and will achieve B2 level when they attend the department. Those who take the proficiency exam at the beginning of the academic year can either pass the exam and attend the department, or fail in the exam and attend the preparatory school for a year depending on their scores. The students of the ELT department study four skills both at the preparatory school and at the department at advanced level. Consequently, the learners who attend preparatory school are expected to be more successful than those who do not as they have completed B1+ level and are ready for B2 level. However, this is not always the case. When their low exam grades and unsatisfactory results are taken into consideration, the questions towards the quality of preparatory school and skill courses in the preparatory school should be inquired. In this regard, the purposes of the study are as follows:

- a) to investigate whether the freshmen's attendance at the preparatory school at Gazi University affect their receptive and productive skills performances
- b) to investigate whether its effect leads to a significant difference between the freshmen's performances who attend the preparatory programme and those who do not attend.

In light of these purposes, this study mainly aims to find out whether there are performance differences among ELT freshmen who attend and who do not attend the Gazi University preparatory school in 2009 – 2010 academic year in terms of receptive and productive skills.

In addition, the aforementioned research question will be analyzed in three dimensions; a) in terms of their attendance at the preparatory school b) in terms of gender c) in terms of programme type.

1.3 Significance of the Study

In a country where English is the most ranking foreign language among the others and where English has started to be taught at the 4th grade, it is not surprising to expect a high level of English proficiency from teachers, teacher candidates and learners. They are supposed to perform well in their communication skills. Their

performance and proficiency levels are dependent on different factors. More importantly, these factors can be listed as curriculum of the language programme, approaches adapted, teachers' level of English, learners' interests, materials used for courses, and so forth. Turkey gives utmost importance to English as a foreign language instruction at private nursery, primary, secondary, high schools and universities. Owing to this fact, preparatory programmes at universities prepare ELT students for both English language proficiency and content knowledge. These two elements complete each other of becoming qualified teachers; thus, being sure of their performances, skills, proficiency levels and content knowledge is important for them. More researches should be done on the performance of teacher trainees and learners in the ELT departments as the results will reveal the efficiency of approaches adapted, course books used, and programmes of preparatory schools and ELT departments. In line with this hypothesis, this study focuses on the performance differences of ELT students in terms of English language proficiency levels; listening, reading, speaking and writing. Learners are grouped into two; those who attend ELT preparatory classes and those who do not so that it can be made clear whether the preparatory programme has a worthwhile effect on ELT students', namely, teacher trainees' language skills who attend the preparatory programme compared to the ones who do not attend the preparatory programme. In this respect, the preparatory programme at Gazi University will be analysed and discussed in terms of successful and less successful parts of the application. The preparatory classes of Gazi University and foreign language instruction at this school will be supported through the findings of the study. A relevant study to this problem was done twice in 1994 and in 2002 when the CEF was not adapted by institutions, and when the preparatory school curriculum and examination system were quite different from that of today. Since then, no other study has been done on this issue; therefore, the results obtained from the previous studies should be compared with this study in order to see whether there have been any changes between the results of the previous studies and those obtained from this study.

1.4 Limitations of the Study

As the title of the study suggests, this study focuses on receptive and productive skills of the students at Gazi University ELT Department. However, speaking and listening skills are studied as separate courses while reading and writing courses are unified into a single course. This situation shows that reading and writing scores of learners are evaluated and assessed through a single exam. Therefore, while analysing the results, these two skills will not be commented on separately, which is one of the limitations of this study.

Another limitation is that although ELT students at the preparatory programme are not officially stated to be at B1+ level, they are considered to have completed B1 level and are expected to be an independent user at B1+ level.

Their gender, instruction type, their mid-term and final scores are taken into account regardless of their age and the high school type which they were graduated from. Since Super High Schools have been converted into Anatolian High Schools without providing the necessary background for those schools, it will not be suitable to consider which type of high school the students come from in this study.

Lastly, the universe of this study consists of nearly 260 students at the ELT department who have been attending sophomore year in 2010 – 2011 academic year. In other words, these students who were unable to pass the English proficiency exam in 2008 – 2009 academic year attended the preparatory programme at Gazi University. Though the results were obtained from the learners last year, the suggestions are made considering the current preparatory programme.

1.5 Assumptions of the Study

It can be inferred from the results that there may be some other factors affecting the success of the preparatory programme such as teacher roles, materials, approaches and techniques used by the instructors. However, in this study, it is assumed that the instructors at the ELT Department share similar materials, approaches, principles, and

use common mid-terms and finals for the learners. Likewise, teacher roles are assumed to have no considerable effect in classes in this study.

All students are assumed to do their best in order to achieve these skills in the proficiency exam. Besides, those who attend the preparatory programme and those who do not, are assumed to share similar background in terms of their proficiency skills.

1.6 Definition of Some Terms

EFL: the setting in which people whose first language is not English learn it (Harmer, 2007).

EAP: teaching English to facilitate learners' study or research in that language, which includes teaching both study skills: reading, listening, listening and speaking, speaking and writing, and general English (Flowerdew & Peacock, 2001; Dudley – Evans & St John, 1998).

ELT: teaching of English as a second or foreign language (Johnston, 2002).

Androgogy: 'Any intentional and professionally guided activity that aims at a change in adult persons' (Knowles, Holton and Swanson, 2005).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.0 Presentation

The use of English is of great importance due to many reasons for people all over the world. These reasons vary from economics to education depending on native speaking and non-native speaking countries. Thus, the setting in which English is used in various ways around the world is designed to be introduced at first place. After this point is made clear, English language teaching at universities from the perspective of Turkish higher education is explained in detail. Preparatory classes of English Language Teaching departments at universities are briefly covered. In addition, the scope of this study consists of ELT department freshmen whose ages vary from 18 to 21 at Gazi University. Therefore, the term ‘andragogy’ and the characteristics of adult learners are pinpointed as well.

2.1 English around the World

It is an undeniable fact that English has been spreading globally since the 16th century. Broughton, Brumfit, Flavell, Hill and Pincas (1980) claim that of the 4000 to 5000 living languages, English is by far the most commonly used language. It has been considered as an international language in the world today as it is a language of wider communication both among individuals from different countries and between individuals from the same country, which makes English both a globally and locally used language. Smith (as cited in McKay, 2002), defines the term ‘international language’ as a language that is used by people from different regions, nations and

countries to communicate with one another. He makes three assumptions as for an international language and culture. Briefly, McKay (2002) rephrases these assumptions suggested by Smith (1976) about the global and local use of English as in the following:

- As an international language, English is used both in a global sense for international communication between countries and in a local sense as a language of wider communication within multilingual societies.
- As it is an international language, the use of English is no longer connected to the culture of Inner Circle countries.
- As an international language in a local sense, English becomes embedded in the culture of the country in which it is used.
- As English is an international language in a global sense, one of its primary functions is to enable speakers to share with others their ideas and culture.

(McKay, 2002, p. 12)

Regarding the aforementioned assumptions on global English, it can be put forward that English as an international language is used globally to communicate between countries and to enable people to share their ideas with others. Today, it has been given special status by a lot of countries from American Samoa to Zimbabwe (McKay, 2002). Similar to this statement by McKay (2002), Crystal (2001) emphasizes that totally 2,236,730,800 people in the world use English for different reasons. The American Linguists Braj Kachru (1988) categorized these reasons into three circles. Although this model may not fit for some countries, it has been widely considered as a helpful approach. In the inner circle, English is the primary language of the country as it is in the United Kingdom, Australia, the United States, Canada, Ireland, or New Zealand. The second circle where English as a Second Language (ESL) plays an important part is called the outer or extended circle. It includes countries such as India, Singapore, Malawi, and fifty other territories. The expanding or extending circle, on the other hand, involves countries like China, Japan, Greece, Poland and Turkey where English is considered as the most important foreign language.

Although the number of English users is hard to determine, it is obvious that the number of people who have some familiarity with the language today is increasing

rapidly. McKay (2002) emphasizes that the biggest potential for the continuing spread of English is observed in countries where English is accepted as a Foreign Language (EFL), that is, in the expanding circle.

As it is explained clearly in the aforementioned circles, English is spreading very fast in the world. Such a wide expansion has underlying factors behind it. First of all, English dominates the economic and cultural arenas via its use in international banking and investment affairs and famous literature works. Also, the emergence of USA as the world's leading power has proved that the international commerce such as McDonald's has been led by English language (Harmer, 2007). In other words, English facilitates the process of being sold and used by reaching global markets. Secondly, geographical and historical factors dating from the 19th and 20th centuries strengthen use of English internationally. In those days, Britain became the world's leading industrial and trading nation and the number of English speaking people migrated was increasing to a greater extent. Britain managed to build up an empire in all parts of the world, which resulted in the famous saying 'the sun never set on the British Empire' to be spread all over the world (Ashworth, 1985). During the Industrial Revolution, Britain came up with various origins resulting in new advances in technology and science. Those who wanted to make use of these advances had to learn English before all in order to communicate with inventors and manufacturers. Colonialism, industrialisation and advanced theories about technology and science were initial steps of spreading English. In addition to these steps, today over 85 per cent of international organizations like the Council of Europe, South-East Asian Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization are carried out in English. With regard to this fact, it can be claimed that English is a key factor in enabling nations to negotiate scientific, politic, economic and social affairs in the world. Tourism and travel also foster the current spread of English. Graddol (2006) states that over 10 per cent of labour forces in the world are employed in tourism industry. To illustrate, international hotels, airports, crew and staff use English to inform people coming from abroad. Dissemination of information and publication make use of English as an International Language. As it is suggested by Crystal (2003), 85 per cent of biology and physics papers, 73 per cent of medical papers and over 65 per cent of mathematics and chemistry papers were published in English in 1980. BBC, on the other hand, is a great source of information around the world. These are the evidences

of the needs to know English to be able to access and to make contribution to both printed and electronic information today.

Motion pictures and popular music have contributed into the expansion of English language use, as well. In the mid-1990s, the USA controlled the 85 percent of the world film market and popular music such as songs by Beatles, Eric Clapton, Cat Stevens are all predominantly in English.

Lastly, English in the world has a vital role in pre-school, primary, secondary and higher education through different international programs like Erasmus, Comenius, Fulbright, Leonardo Da Vinci.

As a result of the aforementioned factors, English has gained an unprecedented popularity around the world. From the perspective of teaching English, two models have come out; one is English as a Foreign Language (EFL), the other one is English as a Second Language (ESL). As English is the language of education and international communication rather than the second language of natives, English as a Foreign Language is the appropriate content to teach in Turkey.

2.1.1 English as a Foreign Language (EFL)

Flowerdew and Peacock (2001) see English by far the most widely used language to learn as a second or foreign language.

To start with the second language category, countries like Singapore, Kamala, Manila and Ghana use English as the language of mass media, commerce, administration of official and educational institutions (Broughton, Brumfit, Flavell, Hill & Pincas, 2003). English serves as a passport to social and economic development in these countries. Lectures are delivered in English and people use both English and their mother tongue in their daily lives.

When it comes to EFL, Harmer (2007) uses the term ‘EFL’ for setting in which learners learn English in their own countries and use it with native speakers in global context. Around the world, English has become the most widely used foreign language of wider communication. According to Crystal (as cited in Doğançay – Aktuna, 1998),

its users are increasing to more than one billion. The international status of English in trade, international diplomacy, banking, tourism, popular media and advantages of knowing English led governments to emphasize English Language Teaching in their education policies. Being the lingua franca of the modern world, English provides plenty of advantages and opportunities for people in science, technology, education, academic life and so forth. As an example, English has been integrated into the educational systems of many countries including Turkey in order to reach information networks. Besides, use of English is required in most prestigious jobs; therefore, English instruction plays a vital role in education systems of countries. In countries where English is accepted as a foreign language, English is taught at schools as a foreign language not as an official one; however, it does not play an important role in national or social life. As Kennedy (1986) states, English is used as a tool to access to different cultures or is seen as a part of an educated man's cultural and intellectual growth in EFL settings. In countries such as Brazil, Japan, Spain and Turkey, the medium of instruction and communication is the national language (Kırkgöz, 2008). Average people in society do not need English for social or professional improvement or for their daily lives. EFL learners even have the choice of deciding on what language varieties to learn; American English or British English, which are equally available and acceptable nowadays. As the global lingua franca of academia, English is spoken much more frequently by non-native speakers in many countries, which raises the importance of EFL in academic settings globally (Mauranen, Hynninen & Ranta, 2010). As a non-native speaking country, Turkish is used as the medium of instruction for pre-school, primary, secondary, high school and university education, which results in a much lower level of English compared to students in ESL situations (Dudley – Evans & John, 1998).

2.1.2 English for Academic Purposes (EAP)

The larger field of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) has given way to the birth of English for Academic Purposes (EAP). The field of EAP has developed rapidly in English language teaching and research (Hyland & Hamp - Lyons, 2002). EAP, defined as teaching English to facilitate learners' study or research in that language, has

become an international activity of the scope for 20 years or so (Flowerdew & Peacock, 2001). It includes teaching both study skills – reading, listening, listening and speaking, speaking, and writing – (Dudley – Evans & St John, 1998) and general English. Besides, it aims to make sense on the form and use of academic texts, on the pedagogic applications which can be developed and on the communicative needs of academic groups. It concerns people who are in ESL or EFL setting, who are taught some certain subjects like medicine, engineering, business, in English, and who are in a setting where all tertiary education is in the native language but English is required as auxiliary language (Dudley – Evans & St John, 1998). English in this setting may be taught as a foreign language, i.e. Germany, Brazil, Finland and Turkey or as a second language, i.e. India, Anglophone African countries. Language research and instruction about specific communicative needs and cognitive, social and linguistic demands of groups in academic settings are emphasized in EAP (Hyland & Hamp - Lyons, 2002).

2.2 Language Policy and Higher Education in Turkey

Turkey functions as a bridge between European and Asian continents. She has a young population with 75 million people, 12,223 million whom are registered in compulsory education between 6 -14 ages (Eurydice, 2010). Language of instruction at all levels is in Turkish, the native language. Among the foreign languages – German, French, English and Arabic, English is the most ranking one provided to students from 4th grades in primary level to the end of higher education.

Turkish education system is categorized into 4 levels. Pre-primary education, i.e. the education of children of 3-6 years of age, is optional. It aims to improve very young learners' cognitive, emotional and physical development (Ersöz, 2007). Pre-school education institutions include independent kindergartens, nursery and preparation classes in primary schools. In accordance with data in Eurydice (2010), the enrolment rate in pre-primary education is 26,2 % for 3 – 5 ages, 38,3 % for 4 – 5 ages, 64,4 % for 5 – 6 ages in the 2010 – 2011 academic year.

Compulsory education covers primary and secondary education. To begin with, primary education level, including the education of young learners between 6 - 14 years

of age, is compulsory for all citizens. With the new curriculum introduced by the Ministry of National Education in 1997, 5 year primary schools were linked with 3 year middle schools, resulting in 8 year compulsory primary education (Kırkgöz, 2008). The aim of primary school education is to help students develop cognitively, emotionally and morally in accordance with the principles of national education (Ersöz, Çakır, Cephe, Peker, Özkan, Büge, Özmen, 2006). The schooling rate in 2010 – 2011 primary education is 98 %. Its curriculum is determined by Turkish Board of Education. Secondary education, on the other hand, includes students of 14 to 17 years of age. The 4 year schools at this stage prepare students for either higher education or vocational education. Hence, the secondary education in Turkey is divided into two main parts; general secondary education, and vocational and technical secondary education. As for the first one, General High Schools, Social Science High Schools, Fine Arts and Sports High School, Anatolian Teacher High School, Multi – Programmed High Schools are included in it. On the other hand, the latter consists of Technical and Industrial Vocational High Schools, Technical and Industrial Schools for Girls, Hotel and Tourism Vocational High Schools, Business High School, Health Vocational High Schools, Special Education Vocational High Schools. These schools in general offer 4 years of education to students who have completed their primary education. 61, 2 % is the net enrolment rate in secondary education belonged to 2010 – 2011 academic year (Eurydice, 2010).

As to higher education, it offers further education on specific fields for high school graduates on condition that they pass the Student Selection and Placement Exam (SSPE). The general objective of higher education is to train the manpower according to the needs of the nation. Higher education institutions consist of universities, higher technology institutes and independent private, vocational higher schools as such higher police, military schools and academies. To be more specific, universities cover faculties, which are responsible for 4 year undergraduate education, scholarly research and publications, graduate schools, including health, social sciences and sciences, and vocational higher schools which are two to four year lasting ones. Having graduated from one of the general or vocational and technical high schools, students are to take the university entrance exam renamed as Yükseköğretime Giriş Sınavı (YGS) and Lisans Yerleştirme Sınavı (LYS) carried out by the Student Selection and Placement Centre

(SSPC). Depending on their ranking and performances in the exam, successful students are allocated to higher education institutions by SSPC.

While the curricula of all the pre-schools, primary schools and secondary schools are prepared with the collaboration of MONE and Turkish Board of Education, the educational programmes of universities are prepared by the Council of Higher Education. Among the foreign languages taught in Turkey at all levels of education, English is the only compulsory one for students.

Zooming in the history of language policy in Turkish education system, Kırkgöz (2005) states that introduction of English language into Turkish education system dates back to the Tanzimat Period when the westernization and modernization movements began for Ottoman Empire. Upon the westernization and modernization movements followed by close relationships with Europe and the USA after the foundation of Turkish Republic, English language took a greater and more important place compared to other foreign languages in Turkey.

As there is a growing interest in higher education in Turkey, more money is being spent on it. More and more universities are being opened. More students are registered into different programs every year. Especially due to political, economic, scientific and educational developments and growth globally, the Council of Higher Education let more and more universities be founded all around the country, starting with the establishment of Middle East Technical University (METU) in 1956, the first state owned and English medium university. Bilkent followed METU, becoming as the first private university in Turkey. As of June 2011, Turkey has 153 universities. 102 of them are state ones, whereas 51 are private universities under the supervision of the Council of Higher Education (YOK, 2010). Among them, Boğaziçi and METU are the ones which provide English medium instruction. On the other hand, English language instruction has been made compulsory integrating it into the curriculum by Turkish medium instructed universities. It is taught as a schooling subject for freshmen so as to improve their English language skills for their academic lives. Kırkgöz (2007) acknowledges that the freshmen had the right to choose other foreign languages in universities until 1994 when only English was made compulsory and other foreign languages; German, French and so forth were abolished from the curriculum.

With the 1997 reform movement done in the field of curriculum, MONE in cooperation with The Council of Higher Education decided to widen teaching English at schools at all levels from primary education to higher education. The duration of primary education was extended from 5 to 8 years. What's more, English has been taught as a compulsory subject for Grade 4 and 5 so that students can be exposed to the target language at an earlier age (Kırkgöz, 2007). When higher education is taken into account, teacher training programmes, particularly ELT departments, were renewed in accordance with the needs of nation, schools, and students. More specifically, new courses such as Teaching English to Young Learners, teaching practise applications were added into ELT department curriculum. Therefore, more research and applications in young learners, pre – service teacher education and internships have come out as a result of this innovation. Teacher trainees who can teach English to young learners at private or state schools are instructed via new methods and approaches.

2.2.1 Governmental Institutions

With respect to the education levels stated in this study, governmental institutions cover the Council of Higher Education, the Ministry of National Education, and the Student Selection and Placement Centre. These institutions are explained in order to gain more insight on the regulations, procedures and effects of them. They are on the ground of academic institutions.

2.2.1.1 The Council of Higher Education

The objectives of national education policy were agreed during the National Liberation War, 1919 – 1923 (Barrows, 1990). National, democratic and secular characteristics of the education system were set as the main principles by the Council. Upon these principles, Darülfünun was turned into the first university of Turkish Republic known as İstanbul University. Ankara University was established in 1937, as well. Then, the Council of Higher Education was founded on December, 1981 according to the provisions of Higher Education Law and was defined in the Constitution of 1982 as:

It shall be established to plan, organize, administer and supervise the education provided by institutions of higher education, to orient the activities of teaching, education and scientific research, to ensure the establishment and the development of these institutions in conformity with the objectives and principles set forth by law, to ensure the effective use of the resources allotted to the universities, and to plan the training of the teaching staff. (Barrows, 1990, p. 13).

The main goals of the Council of Higher Education are determined by Basic Law of National Education and by Higher Education Law. Accordingly, students are raised with respect to their interests and skills necessary for the manpower in various units of the country. They are expected to be independent, respectful and scientific, and to think critically. Searching the problematic issues, getting published, conducting surveys and analyzing results that contribute to the field and science is also one of its goals. Besides, welfare and improvement of Turkish society is to be increased by funding studies and producing information and technology worldwide (Eurydice, 2010).

Members of the Higher Education Council are appointed by the president from among the candidates nominated by the Council of Ministers, Chief of the General Staff, and the Interuniversity Board in terms of number of posts being filled, their qualifications, law and priority (Barrows, 1990). The main functions of Higher Education are listed as follows;

- To prepare short and long term plans for the establishment and the improvement of institutions of higher education
- To design programs and to provide facilities for the training of junior academic staff members, and to make sure that the resources allocated for higher education are used efficiently
- To encourage and to promote constant and harmonious co-operation among the universities
- To prepare guidelines for the rate of the growth of the universities which are compatible with the capacity of the latter at maximum efficiency
- To convey proposals for plans regarding the establishment of universities to the Minister of Education for proposal to the Council of Ministers and to the Parliament

- To take decisions, bearing in mind proposals made by the universities, for the establishment, the amalgamation, and the closure of departments, research centres, and similar academic units
- To establish a balanced ratio of the number of posts for senior faculty members in the universities, setting down general principles regarding admissions
- To co-ordinate research activities undertaken by the universities
- To convey to the Minister of Education, for proposal to the Council of Ministers and the Parliament, recommendations for the annual higher education budget, taking into consideration the budgetary proposals made by the universities
- To take measures to ensure equality of opportunity among and within the universities
- To appoint full professors, taking into consideration the recommendations of the universities concerned
- To propose four candidates to the President of the Republic for each vacant rectorate
- To initiate and to take final action with regard to disciplinary procedures concerning rectors; to remove from higher education institutions those members of the teaching staff who have proved inadequate in fulfilling their duties or have acted in ways contrary to the objectives, the main principles, and the envisaged order of higher education
- To appoint deans of faculties, taking into consideration the recommendations of the rectors
- To specify, taking into consideration the recommendations of the Interuniversity Board, the principles concerning the minimum numbers of hours and the duration of instruction for courses in the curricula of institutions of higher education
- To make regulations concerning the horizontal and the vertical transfer of the students from one university to another
- To propose to the Council of Ministers the levels tuition fees for an academic year

(Barrows, 1990, p. 15)

The Council of Higher Education is an autonomous public organization including the Higher Education Supervision Board, the Student Selection and Placement Centre and other related units responsible for planning, development, research, funding and coordination.

2. 2. 1. 2 Ministry of National Education (MONE)

Established on 17th March, 1857, the Ministry of National Education mainly serves for two main goals determined by the Basic Law of National Education. These goals are; to help learners be good citizens by providing them with basic skills and behaviours in accordance with the appropriate national moral sense and to prepare them for upper educational levels by taking their interests, abilities and capacities into consideration (Eurydice, 2010). Besides, to raise students who are respectful and loyal to Atatürk's reforms and principles is another goal of this institution (MONE, 2006).

As for the curriculum, course schedules are prepared for, and the same program is applied in all parts of the country. The renovated curriculum which has been applied since 2005 is based on the cognitive and constructivist approaches. Critical thinking, problem solving skills and use of technological advances are emphasized and supported in the new curriculum with respect to the components of Common European Framework; the language passport, the language biography and the dossier. With this new curriculum, foreign language teaching courses are taught from the 4th grades and English language instruction is given 10 hours weekly in primary level. Likewise, for secondary education level, English is taught for 10 hours per week and for 4 hours for the coming years (Eurydice, 2010).

2. 2. 1. 3 Student Selection and Placement Centre (SSPC)

The Student Selection and Placement Centre (SSPC), established in 1974, was connected to the Council of Higher Education in 1981, responsible for the selection and the placement of students in higher education programs. Also, SSPC provides the administering of examinations nationally and the collection and the processing of

statistical information about the teaching staff and the students enrolled in universities. SSPC holds the Student Selection and Placement Examination (SSPE), or newly named exams (YGS & LYS), a two stage examination system for the selection and placement of students. This new system has been applied since 2008. Students who wish to take place in the related departments of the universities have to get the required points from the examination according to their school types and departments; weighted verbal composite, weighted quantitative composite, V-Q equally weighted composite, foreign language weighted composite (OSYM, 2010). As a result of the points taken from their departments, they are placed into the higher education programs.

2.2.2 Academic Institutions

As this study consists of the freshmen who attended the preparatory programme and then continue in the department, and those who did not, preparatory programmes and ELT departments are of great importance to mention in detail. The regulations, English proficiency exam and curriculum design are discussed as well. With the introduction of the new curriculum, one year preparatory classes of Anatolian high schools, private and super high schools were removed; therefore, English course hours at high schools are increased depending on the type of the high school, and more importance and emphasis are given to the preparatory programmes at universities (Kırkgöz, 2008).

2.2.2.1 Preparatory Programmes of ELT Departments

English preparatory programme in secondary education were removed from the MONE's curriculum in 2005 and foreign language teaching has been widened throughout the programme (Özkanal & Hakan, 2010). Thus, more and more importance has been given to the university preparatory classes since then. In addition, the medium of instruction is in English at ELT departments and preparatory programmes in Turkey so there is also a growing demand for those programmes (Kırkgöz, 2005). Foreign language teaching at universities is usually provided via preparatory programmes. All foundation and most state universities offer foreign language preparatory program which lasts for an academic year. Students who have just been enrolled in university

programs are required to take the English language proficiency exam so as to begin their education in bachelor's degree or graduate degree programs without having to attend one year preparatory program (Eurydice, 2010). The conduction of these exams change from one university to another, but in general students are to be tested in four skills – listening, speaking, reading and writing - , grammar and vocabulary. On condition that they get the passing grade from the exam, they are considered as successful or skilled enough to attend the related department. However, those who cannot get that grade have to continue to the preparatory programme. At the end of the term, they take another exam to finish the preparatory programme. They continue their education in departments after they successfully complete the preparatory program and pass the exam.

2.2.2.2 ELT Departments at Turkish Universities

Teacher education colleges initiated with Gazi Teachers' College and Training Institute for Lower Secondary Education which was established in 1926 – 1927 academic year. Today, the main responsible institution for training teacher trainees is faculties of education at universities. These faculties of education have 4 or 5 year lasting programmes depending on school types; primary teacher education or secondary teacher education.

As far as ELT departments are concerned, teacher trainees have 5 year lasting programme including preparatory class. The structure and programme of teacher education are directed by the Council of Higher Education in cooperation with MONE. ELT programmes prepare teachers for both stages; primary and secondary (Eurydice, 2010).

With the introduction of 1997 reform, ELT curriculum was redesigned for needs of in-service teacher education and for widening in-service teacher training opportunities. At the level of higher education, pre-service teacher education departments were reorganized so as to qualify the teacher education courses and to raise the number of methodology courses being offered (Kırkgöz, 2008). Education programmes as well as ELT departments in general cover three main fields; general

culture: 15 / 20%, field practise: 50 – 60% and professional courses: 25 / 30%. To be more specific, a new course ‘Teaching English to Young Learners’ was introduced into the curriculum of ELT departments to cover the state primary schools’ English teacher demand for Grade 4s and 5s. Besides, ‘special education’ course was added to the program in 2006 – 2007 academic year. Regardless of university types; private or state, the new curriculum has been practised in all faculties of education (Eurydice, 2010).

2.2.3 Andragogy and Adult Learning

The scope of this study consists of ELT department freshmen whose ages range from 20 to 25. While the literature was being reviewed, authors consider the limit of young adults’ age differently. Jekielek and Brown (2005) propose that young adults are between 18 – 24 years and the characteristics of young adults and adults are similar to each other in the learning atmosphere. Bash (2005) and McGrath (2007) defines adult learners as being older than 23. Thus, this study considers the participants as adults and discussions are done according to this assumption.

Andragogy, known as adult learning theory, was introduced to the literature by Knowles (McGrath, 2007). It is defined as a scientific discipline concerned with aspects of adult learning and teaching (McGrath, 2007). ‘Any intentional and professionally guided activity that aims at a change in adult persons’ is described as andragogy according to Knowles, Holton and Swanson (2005). Bash (2005) gives another definition of andragogy in his words;

... the process of teaching adults that emphasizes the role of experience in learning, the value of discussion and experiential learning in course design and session construction, the need for flexibility in helping students to achieve the learning goals of the course, and the challenge of grade anxiety (p. 132).

According to the guiding principles of andragogy, career planning, personal fulfilment and technological advancements raise adults’ learning demands (Knowles & Holton & Swanson, 2005). Brookfield (2006) also argues that an effective adult education programme must meet the needs of adults’ demands to attend the classes

actively and effectively. He suggests approaches such as discussion, role-play, games, small group work and collaborative work.

In terms of principles for adults' learning, adults use their years of experience, language skills and knowledge as a bridge for new learning environments (Knowles, Holton & Swanson, 2005). They are oriented to problem solving. Bain (2004) thinks that problem solving techniques help them learn in a natural atmosphere on condition that the teacher acts as a facilitator. Likewise, Ashwin (2006) proposes that problem solving technique facilitates self-directed learning in the professional domain. They make choices in their real lives so giving them alternatives about what they will do in and out of the class can be encouraged via cooperative learning to assist them to improve their own learning (Brown, 2001).

In addition, motivation and self-environment give way to effective work for adults. Intrinsic motivation resulting from personal fulfilment, self-esteem, quality of life should be taken into consideration by teachers (Knowles, Holton & Swanson, 2005). Therefore, teachers need to have various approaches to address different learning styles and needs of adult learners. In other words, the teacher is expected to be creative and activator enough to combine the newly learnt themes with the already known ones. Jarwis (2001) claims that adult education should be considered as an educational and developmental approach prepared to assist people develop their own lives and communities.

In terms of their learning styles, adults learn largely explicitly by reasoning abstractly while children learn implicitly by using concrete examples of language (Keyser, 2007). On the basis of traditional classroom atmosphere where the superior analytical skills are emphasized, adults make more progress rather than children. However, too much abstract generalization but little real life language use may discourage them from learning (Brown, 2001).

2.2.3.1 Characteristics of Adolescence

Adult learners are self-directed and motivated to learn in and out of the class (Merriam, 2001). He proposes that they take the responsibility for their own learning via critical reflection. In addition, Guglielmino (as cited in Moore, 2010) comes up with the term ‘self-directed learner’ as a result of the Delphi research. In accordance with this term, adult learners are the ones who initiate and persist in learning, who are responsible for their own learning with curiosity and self-discipline, and who can use study skills. Furthermore, a self directed adult learner develops a plan by set his pace for learning and has the tendency to be goal- oriented. A detailed model was put forward by Grow (1991), which consists of four stages of self-directed learning. Stage 1 emphasizes that the learner is dependent on the teacher in terms of providing lectures and getting feedback. In stage 2, the learner is thought to be keen on learning and the teacher is considered as a motivator. The skills and experiences that the learner has in his own capacity make the learner active and the teacher facilitator. This is called stage 3. Lastly, the teacher is seen as a consultant, in Stage 4, who gives cooperative and collaborative assignments.

Adult learners can engage with abstract thought (Harmer, 2007; Broughton, Brumfit, Flavell, Hill & Pincas, 2003). They have their own developed experiences which supply a wide range of activities for teachers to draw on and expectations about the learning process, and they already have their own set learning patterns as they have clear goals and strong motivation. Nevertheless, keeping tasks and activities short and fun are required for adults (Brown, 2001).

The teachers let them use their past experiences by integrating reading, listening, communicative speaking and writing into the learning process (Harmer, 2007). In addition, they prefer the topics related to their professional concerns. Multiple cognitive operations and logical reasoning are used as a way of learning (Keyser, 2007). Thus, the use of multiple sensory inputs may be appealing for them (Brown, 2001). The aim of learning in the classroom may be built on their experiences and real life needs so that they can get more eager to make progress. It is of great importance to provide them with non-threatening learning atmosphere so as to make them participate in the tasks

enthusiastically (Ruetz, 1997). Therefore, naming them kids, talking down to and caretaking them are the vulnerable points to be prevented (Brown, 2001).

2.3 Trends and Tendencies in Teaching Language Skills

Over the past century or so of language teaching, various approaches, methodologies and trends have come and gone. Changes in language teaching trends have resulted from certain reasons like the students' and teachers' needs, political changes in the world, developing and growing needs of the century, the main set goals of learning and teaching language, the goals of nations, so forth. Resulting from the need to read literature and to learn the second language as an academic subject via deductive teaching, Grammar Translation Method (GTM) appeared in 1840s to the 1940s (Cook, 2001). Then, it came to consciousness that second language learning should be like the natural way of first language acquisition through oral interaction, spontaneous use of the target language, and with little or no translation and grammatical rules as of GTM. Under the lights of these notions, the Direct Method (DM) came out at the end of the nineteenth century as opposed to principles and techniques of GTM (Brown, 2001). With the entry of U.S. into World War II, personnel in the U.S. government were needed to work as interpreters or translators so a special training program based on drills and behaviourism, Audio lingual Method hit the spotlight in the 1950s (Richards & Rodgers, 2002). In the 1970s and 1980s, the shift changed from being mechanical, teacher – centred and structural towards learner – friendly, stress lowering, activating students' brains and involving them in the learning process actively atmosphere (Harmer, 2007). Therefore, Community Language Learning, Suggestopedia, Total Physical Response and Silent Way were at the top of the agenda during that period.

Towards the turn of the twentieth century, the relationships among countries, economic and technological advancements, and the innovative steps in educational field as such Erasmus, Comenius and so forth make the meaningful communication and interaction with people around the world be of the essence. The need to use the target language communicatively, fluently, accurately and meaningfully has given birth to

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and Task – Based Instruction (TBI) in EFL and ESL settings. Among the aforementioned approaches and methods, most of them have still been preferred by many schools, teachers and students around the world as well as in Turkey. This preference results in different outcomes of the English Language Teaching in parts of the country. To be clearer, some teachers follow the principles of audio lingual method in their classes, whereas others prefer communicative approach. There is no common basis in terms of providing the similar methodological backgrounds at least in Turkey.

Likewise many countries in Europe, Turkey as well makes learning at least one foreign language compulsory in its education system. On account of its attempt to join the European Union as a member, Turkey has been endeavouring to get successful results in foreign language instruction at schools to be able to build better relationships in various fields and to compete with European countries. Also, the Council of Higher Education and the Ministry of Higher Education are suggesting some certain reforms in the curriculum of schools in Turkey so as to supply parallelism in language teaching between Turkey and other European countries. Therefore, the Common European Framework (CEF) has been on the agenda to provide a common basis for the elaboration of language syllabuses, teaching language skills, assessment and testing of these skills, so on, since.

2.3.1 Common European Framework (CEF)

Language education policy of a country is designed to solve possible communication problems across borders and international area. With the recognition of the Council of Europe on cultural and linguistic diversity of different conventional language education and ways of teaching foreign language competences in the 1980s, CEF hit the spotlight as a means of supplying co-operation among educational institutions of various countries and bringing a common framework of recognition for the language qualifications, language learning objectives and achievement standards (Barenfanger & Tschirmer, 2008).

The CEF has been designed to supply a common basis of the language skills that learners have to learn and of the efficiency for teaching and testing issues. Reducing the barriers to communication and affairs resulting from different education systems in Europe is the main goal of CEF. In other words, the main aim of the CEF was to facilitate ‘mutual recognition of qualifications, and communication concerning objectives and achievement standards’ (Morrow, 2004, p.7). The common basis will enhance the transparency of courses, syllabuses and qualifications by promoting international co-operation in the field of modern languages. On the other hand, the CEF enables specific courses or examinations to be compared and contrasted in terms of similarities and differences with other courses and examinations (Morrow, 2004).

The CEF consists of two dimensions. One of them is the analysis of involvements in language use and language learning. The other one is six levelled communicative proficiency with three bands; A1 and A2 (basic users), B1 and B2 (independent users), C1 and C2 (proficient users) (Little, 2006). The CEF focuses on the performances the students are able to show at various proficiency levels.

Though not being members of the European Union legally, many countries like Russia, Switzerland and Norway are among the members of the Council of Europe as well as Turkey. Thus, this membership played a critical role in terms of promoting foreign language learning via the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) in addition to collaborating mainly culturally and politically (Phillipson, 2008). Just like many countries, Turkey also endeavours to follow the principles of CEFR in its own education system. English language course books for primary and secondary education are based on CEF in Turkey. Some university preparation programs follow the course books designed to meet the requirements of the CEF, as well.

When it comes to language teaching and learning, the CEF does not rely on just one theory. Rather, it emphasizes the construction of a comprehensive model, drawing attention to the different components of language learning, teaching and assessment. The approach suggested in the CEF should be comprehensive, explicit, transparent and effective enough to reach the agreed objectives in accordance with the learners’

communicative needs. Authentic text types for teaching and assessment are offered for communicative purposes and the teacher is expected to facilitate this learning process.

In a nutshell, the CEF is claimed to keep its success and worldwide acceptance through detailed descriptions of levels and the research based on second language acquisition, foreign language instruction and assessment (Barenfanger & Tschirmer, 2008).

2.3.1.1 Common European Reference Levels

Common European Reference Levels (CEFR) consisting of six criterion levels is at the very heart of the framework (Heyworth, 2006). The aim of this criterion is to bring a standardisation in language instruction and proficiency levels. In order to reach this aim, the descriptive scheme and the common reference levels have been designed. In terms of developing an ideal scale for reference levels there are four criteria categorized as description issues and measurement issues. Description issues include context free framework where the scale can also be adapted for any context and language competence based theory. As for the latter, the specific activities and competences based on a measurement theory are to be selected objectively (CEF, 2001). What's more, the number of levels should be adequate enough to make progress in different sectors.

The aforementioned six levels are divided into three wide ranges. A, which consists of A1 (breakthrough) and A2 (way stage level), stands for basic user. A1 user can interact in a simple way like introducing him/herself, asking and answering personal questions via everyday expressions. A2 user can be involved in basic communication like shopping, very basic information, exchange of information on daily affairs. As to the second category, B symbolizes independent user with B1 (threshold) and B2 (vantage) levels. Users in B1 level are expected to understand the main framework of input on daily events and to express his/her opinions, anecdotes and reasons briefly while B2 users can grasp the meaning in specific fields, communicate fluently and accurately, and explain his/her points on abstract or concrete notions. When it comes to the proficiency level, C1 (effective operational proficiency) users can deduce meaning

in longer texts, use the target language communicatively at social, academic and professional levels, and can success well-developed, cohesive and coherent texts. Lastly, C2 (mastery) users can understand aural and visual texts easily, build arguments, and express him / herself in more complex settings (Little, 2007).

2.3.2 Communicative Language Activities and Strategies of CEF

Rather than focusing on one methodology, the CEF encourages and leads effective and communicative language activities (CEF, 2001). Learners are to engage in these interactive activities in which students are considered as producers or receivers. These activities are categorized under four different subtitles; reception, interaction, production and mediation. Students' progress in language learning process is believed to be enhanced via these activities. Besides, some other principles of learning and teaching such as learners' past experiences and their knowledge of scheme to be activated are to be taken seriously for both receptive and productive skills (Allen, 1965). Learners' interests and needs are of great importance as well. Since the research question of this study is related to productive and receptive skills, receptive and productive activities will be analyzed in detail below.

2.3.2.1 Receptive Skills

Listening and reading skills are listed under the term 'receptive skills'. Although the students do not actively produce language items during listening or reading, they are by no means passive as they try to decode the message or meaning from the material. Thus, Harmer (2007) proposes lead – in activities to make students' brains activate to gist the main idea or pick out the detail information out of the text. This outcome can be achieved by helping them recall the previous information, brainstorm on new topics and predict some information from the text. In terms of materials, he claims that authentic ones which native speakers of the target language use and need in their daily lives are considered as a path to succeed the target outcome. Otherwise, the meaning cannot be extracted if we are not completely engaged with the text that we are interacting. Among the descriptions of receptive activities which underlie the global scale at all six levels, listening as a member of a live audience, listening to announcements and instructions,

listening to radio and audio recordings, and understanding interaction between native speakers are categorized under 'reception spoken' (Morrow, 2004). As to reading skill, reading correspondence, reading for orientation, reading for information and argument, and reading instructions are listed under 'reception written'.

2.3.2.1.1 Overview of Listening Skills

Listening is described as an active process which requires the learner to select and interpret information by using the auditory and visual materials (Smith, 2003). As the decoding of the message requires active participation in communication, listening and reading are receptive skills rather than passive (Broughton, Brumfit, Flavell, Hill & Pincas, 2004). It includes the recognition of speakers' sounds, the perception of intonation which information is focused on, and the interpretation of the comments on a topic (Lynch & Mendelson, 2002).

The aim of teaching listening is to teach students the sounds, to interpret the phonetic variables and intonation in a context, and to get the message of the speaker. Understanding the message of the speaker mostly depends on sharing the cultural background with the speaker, being familiar with the topic and the purpose of the communication. Thus, a real like aim is offered before the activities for successful listening comprehension such as listening to the radio; news, a comedy programme, conversations with neighbours, answering the phone, attending a lecture, listening to the arrival and departure announcements at the railway station and so on (McDonough & Shaw, 1993). Then, target behaviours such as listening for general information and specific information, guessing through the titles, pictures, texts, paraphrasing the given texts to the peers in the classroom should be clarified (Demirel, 2003). In this way, the listener deals with guessing, anticipating, checking, understanding, organizing, and so forth, which makes the listener be active during the listening process (McDonough & Shaw, 1993).

Rivers (1981) pinpoints the importance of listening and speaking skills by stating that adults spend 40 – 50% of their time listening to the materials. Communication skills in an average business day are reported in this way; listening

45%, speaking 30%, reading 16% and writing 9%, which displays the significance of listening skill in outside communication (Ruetz, 1996). Likewise, inside the classroom listening and speaking are the most frequently used skills (Brown, 2007).

The role of listening in foreign language instruction was neglected and developed via oral language exercises till the communicative language teaching (CLT) method came out (Vandergrift & Goh, 2009). With the introduction of new instructional frameworks such as communicative approaches in 1980s, listening was affected drastically rather than reading, writing and speaking (Morley, 1991) as cited in Celce – Murcia, 1991. Likewise, teaching foreign language listening means to extract the meaning from texts, then learners' existing listening abilities are tested, which may cause anxiety in listening. Instead, learners are to be taught how to listen by discovering and rehearsing listening processes (Vandergrift & Goh, 2009). Thus, bottom up and top down strategies are used in order to describe different aspects of listening (Hedge, 2000). Alternatively, they propose bottom up and top down approaches to listening, which Lynch and Mendelsohn (2004) think that a competent listener will be able to use both of them. Bottom up processing is considered to be an indispensable part of successful listening (Lynch & Mendelson, 2004). The data in the incoming speech signals is worked out to understand the meaning of the message according to Morley (as cited in Celce – Murcia, 1991). Knowledge of language and the ability to process acoustic signals are used to interpret the sense of the sounds that the speech involves. In other words, the speech is divided into identifiable sounds, and then a structure of words, phrases, clauses, sentences and intonation patterns are established on it (Hedge, 2000). As for top down processing, what has been already known can lead us to guess the form and content of the text and grasp an overall impression of the message (Scriveener, 2005). Regarding this fact, background information, schemata and cultural backgrounds are of great importance for students (Brown, 2001). Even this process is referred as 'inside the head' information (Hedge, 2000). Therefore, contextual guess and prior knowledge play an important role in processing listening. The development of effective strategies for listening gains important since the input gained via listening has a key role in language acquisition (Hedge, 2000). Therefore, designing classroom procedures and appropriate choice of materials should be taken into consideration.

A foreign language should be learnt as it is in the way of a child in natural language development (Demirel, 2003; Allen, 1965). Namely, students will first listen, speak and then read and write in the order of native language acquisition. The sub skills like reference, monitoring, relevance and so on which a native speaker can be expected to own should be taught to the students by familiarizing them with the features of natural conversational speech (Field, 1998). Task – based teaching of listening through the gap activities in the process, Asher’s Total Physical Response and Krashen’s comprehensible input notion are claimed to be appropriate approaches for teaching listening (Cook, 2008). Nevertheless, she advises teachers to make the students produce language via the aforementioned approaches and methods. Additionally, more suggestions are proposed to make the listening teaching effective. To illustrate, suitable authentic, challenging and varied input types should be selected. The learners should be given opportunities to make use of the knowledge and the experience by activating their cognitive and social skills during the tasks. Also, other skills; speaking, reading, writing should be integrated into the listening tasks according to Rost (as cited in Carter and Nunan, 2001). On the other hand, he considers ‘more practise’ as the best approach for listening.

According to the CEF (2001) listening skill self assessment grid, students at B1+ level are able to interpret the general idea of the text on real life topics encountered in school, office, and so on to get the message on radio or TV during aural and oral activities. What’s more, explaining reasons, problems, summarizing and giving opinions, answering questions in detail, completing an interview, checking and confirming information, giving instructions, exchanging information and so on are listed as the descriptors of B1+ Strong Threshold level for listening skill.

2.3.2.1.2 Overview of Reading Skills

Reading is regarded as a successful interaction of conceptual abilities, background knowledge and processing strategies (Haverson, 1991). It is defined as ‘a process of transfer from auditory signs to their equivalent visual signs and of establishing the necessary recognition habits’ (Narayanaswamy, 1972, p. 301). Although being placed third in the hierarchy of communication skills to be developed,

reading is actually an important goal of the language program because learning requires understanding all types of reading materials (Allen, 1965). Reading is to be regarded as part of the language behaviour rather than the learning of a specific skill since practising reading skills are of great importance in the early stages of L2 development (Wallace, as cited in Carter and Nunan, 2001). It has four types; intensive reading, which involves reading slowly and thoroughly by finding the meaning of each word (Carroll, 1972), extensive reading which is described as reading of large quantities of material or longer readings for pleasure, reading aloud, which helps teachers to identify pronunciation problems and to increase speaking speed (Chastain, 1976) and silent reading, (Demirel, 1992).

There are some factors to be taken into consideration for reading skills. To start with the goals of reading skills, learners are expected to fulfil certain goals of reading component at the end of a reading class. Adult learners are to be able to read a variety of texts in English by applying appropriate styles and strategies. These learners are expected to be able to establish schematic knowledge and structure to assist interpreting the texts through a critical view (Hedge, 2000). Specifically, inferring the use of unknown words in the text, understanding implicit and explicit information, distinguishing the main idea and the supportive ideas, and recognizing the communicative value and function of the text are among the aims that should be realized according to Omaggio (1986). The teachers, on the other hand, are expected to focus on various points at different times to establish suitable class design, to promote critical reading, to motivate reading via appropriate texts and tasks, and to set up stress free atmosphere for practicing reading so that these goals can be realized. Hence, it is of great importance for teachers to know their learners' outcomes. For instance, if learners need to know what's happening in the world, then teachers should bring to the class related materials such as news articles, reviews, and so on. If they need to keep in touch, postcards, notes, invitations, letters, messages would be suitable. In the light of these suggestions, it is concluded that no strict or single methodology will be the best for learners (Hedge, 2000).

In order for these aims and sub skills to be realized and developed, first of all reading activities need to be prepared in accordance with the type of the text with which learners will work and the purpose for which they are reading it (Omaggio, 1986).

Secondly, skimming in which learners read the text quickly to get the main idea and scanning in which learners read for detailed or specific information in the text should be practised (Tchudi & Mitchell, 1989). Gap activities such as information, opinion and reasoning are required for communicative purposes as well. A three-phase standard procedure; pre-, while- and post- reading stages has been recommended recently. Besides, decoding the message and relating the information to readers' prior experiences or to their knowledge of world would give way to a more fluent and efficient reading skill (McDonough, 1995). By the way, language proficiency may affect the reading comprehension; therefore, learners' language proficiency levels should be regarded while materials are prepared, and methods and principles are chosen (Devine, 1990). To be specific, as a result of a study conducted to Turkish students enrolled in Dutch schools by Bossers (1991), L1 reading skills are basic for L2 reading skills. Thus, poor readers of L1 will become poor readers of L2, which displays a positive relationship between L1 and L2 reading skills.

Another factor is the importance of reading skill for learners. First, most foreign language students want to be able to read in their target language for information, career, study purposes and pleasure. Second, frequent exposure to the comprehensible written texts may enhance the process of language acquisition (Richards & Renandya, 2002). What's more, good reading texts surround the learners with good models for writing, initiating discussing, studying the components of language and enriching the vocabulary capacity of learners.

Lastly, the CEF (2001) common reference levels emphasize the reading 'can-do-statements' at B1 level. The learners at the Threshold level, accordingly, are expected to interpret the texts consisting of frequently used words, expressions of everyday or job language, and the description of events, feelings and wishes in personal letters (Morrow, 2004). In addition, learners can understand the routine information and articles.

2.3.2.2 Productive Skills

Productive skills are categorized as speaking and writing skills in language teaching. The language learners are expected to be able to produce an oral and a written fluent tongue by listening or being guided just as in native language acquisition. Thus, productive skills which contain different components of language are also indispensable for receptive skills. Learners need first listening, speaking, reading and then writing in the natural process of language acquisition. Below, speaking and writing skills are analyzed in terms of definitions, aims, roles and teaching methods.

2.3.2.2.1 Overview of Speaking Skills

Via the skills-based models used within the context of a task based approach, speaking has gained considerable importance when compared to the existing approaches (Bygate, 2001). It is an interactive process in which producing, receiving and processing information is involved to build the meaning (Cunningham, 1999). It requires the mastery of sub skills in an overall competence in the spoken language rather than the oral production of the written language (McDonough & Shaw, 1993). Speech production occurs in real time, which makes speaking linear. It consists of utterances depending on the previous utterance, which makes the speaking spontaneous, open – ended and evolving (Thornbury, 2005; Cunningham, 1999). Speaking is an active process which goes hand in hand with listening skill as it is in the natural language development. Although we take the speaking for granted for most of the time, learning it requires developing detailed knowledge of how, why and when to negotiate meaning, and various sub skills such as waiting for one's turn or asking a question. (Burns & Seidlhofer, 2002).

The aforementioned requirements of speaking have provided us with the importance of the latest speaking trends that the communicative and fluent speaking has gained more importance compared to accurate speaking which involves memorization, repetition and drills. Those communicative and fluent speaking activities rely on the learners' interpreting the real information and communicating it in real life contexts (Riggenbach & Lazaraton, 1991). Therefore, the speaking activities intend to improve a

pattern of language interaction close to the daily life within the classroom (Brumfit, 1984). The classroom atmosphere should stress free, appealing and real like as well.

As to the goals of speaking, McDonough and Shaw (1993) claim that speaking is a desire and purpose –driven skill, which means learners communicate something in order to achieve a specific aim. This varies from negotiating, establishing social skills to expressing ideas, opinions, and so forth. Also, learners need speaking in the target language for a numerous reasons like influencing people, winning negotiations, and keeping up rapport in a relationship (Hedge, 2000). Riggensbach and Lazaraton (1991) state that the goal of a speaking course should be to motivate learners to acquire communication skills in and out of the class. Thus, speaking freely in meaningful and purposeful communication rather than in a controlled way of producing sounds, vocabulary, and structure is preferred in general. At all costs, learners need to acquire the knowledge of the way native speakers use the language in their contexts so speaking fluently and accurately in the target language may be challenging for adults (Shumin, 2002). For Burns and Seidlhofer (2002) we speak so as to fulfil social activities and to exchange our wishes, information according to our specific purposes in the related context.

In order for the aforementioned goals to be realized, learners and teachers should follow certain teaching ways and methods. It is worth paying attention to some factors that will help teachers to be more selective and creative in their way of teaching. Firstly, the requirements of producing the speech and negotiating the meaning in speaking skills are quite different from those in writing skills. They need to be sure of learners' aim or to analyse their needs, their relationship with others so that appropriate genre can be adapted, their language to convey the message, and verbal or non verbal signals coming from the listeners (Burns & Seidlhofer, 2002). Secondly, the classroom atmosphere should be comfortable and confident where learners will feel free to speak and take risks during the speaking activities. Besides, interactive group works rather than individual works will both lessen learners' anxiety and socialize them more in task - based activities where communicative performances are displayed (Riggensbach & Lazaraton, 1991). Thirdly, the stages of controlled, guided and free practise are considered necessary for oral fluency. Controlled oral work consists of mini dialogue to be used in pair work to fulfil the communicative criterion. Guided oral work, on the

other hand, provides the learners with general situation and content of the things to be said. Role playing by setting the situation is a useful technique for this level. Learners are able to produce the language naturally in more or less controlled situations. Group works, where less teacher control but more learner centred activities are performed, are claimed to be appropriate and active tool in the classroom (Broughton, Brumfit, Flavell, Hill & Pincas, 1980). Feedback and correction are advised to be provided with the learners beyond the classroom for the moment, and the use of authentic materials in meaningful contexts is supported by Brown (2001).

Lastly, in line with the CEF (2001), B1 learners are required to have some certain abilities in speaking. For instance, unprepared conversation on familiar topics can be performed, and learners at this level can deal with the challenges and living conditions in native speakers' countries. What's more, descriptive feelings, experiences and events can be connected via phrases into the speech. The sub skills of speaking such as reasoning, explaining, narrating a story or a book, and describing someone or something can be achieved at this level.

2.3.2.2.2 Overview of Writing Skills

Writing is regarded as the fourth and last communicative skill (Finocchiaro, 1969) and as an ability to use the language in ordinary writing situations (Lado, 1964). It is considered a communicative act where the interaction occurs between readers and writers (Olshtain, 1991). It is important both inside and outside the school; however, the notion that writing involves self – discovery and meets one's need to communicate makes the writing crucial and indispensable for learners (Tchudi & Mitchell, 1989). It provides opportunities for students to categorize their anecdotes, to understand their world and to share what they believe, think and experience with the audience. Furthermore, those who have never read before start reading to write. It is a combination of imagination, thought, creativity and experiences; therefore, it develops cognitive skills by activating other language skills; reading, listening, speaking. In short, writing which involves a numerous strategies such as establishing goals, categorizing ideas, choosing the appropriate language, drawing an outline, reading, reviewing, and editing is a developing, active and interactive process (Hedge, 2000). However, it is

recognized as the most difficult skill since it requires both organization of ideas and translation of these ideas into readable text (Richards & Renandya, 2002). Thus, specific emphasis should be given to higher level skills of planning and organizing, and lower level skills of spelling, wording and punctuation. With regard to the aforementioned importance and reality, learners should plan their writing tasks according to several factors with the help of their instructors. These factors vary from goals of writing to approaches towards writing.

Zooming in goals for learners to write, those reasons will differ along several dimensions like language, topic and the audience (McDonough & Shaw, 1993). To start with the language dimension, taking notes of conference sessions, of a book, of a phone conversation will shorten the language structure for speed and efficiency. Depending on whom it is written, the topic of the writing is of matter as well. For storytelling, narration can be done. For discussion, persuasion, setting an argument and reasoning may be applied, and for organizations, invitation, letter writing, informative brochures or responses can be used (Raimes, 2002). What's more, the addressees also lead us how to, why to and what to write. Specifically, learners may write to new students to inform about the school, to their friends about invitations, directions, graduations (McDonough & Shaw, 1993). Raimes (2002), on the other hand, questions the goals of writing for learners. These goals are whether learners have to pass an exam related to writing, spelling, grammar and punctuation, whether they need to write just the sentences or choose from the multiple choice responses, whether learners are expected to support or discuss an idea, opinion by organizing opinions with the mastery of the language or not. Consequently, she claims that determining the goals is the first step for safer ground in writing. These goals and needs will guide teachers and learners to successful and meaningful writing via the appropriate approaches and trends, which is the second step to be considered.

In terms of approaches and trends in teaching writing, there are some periods in the history to be remembered. In the early years of 1970s, writing was thought to be one of the goals of language learning; consequently, writing was emphasized during grammar courses via grammar exercises and strictly controlled writing (Reid, 2001). Thus, it was a common view that any learner who knew spelling and grammar could achieve writing as well (Silva & Matsuda, 2002). However, in the latter half of the

twentieth century, teaching writing, writing discourse and writing gained importance as a separate skill within applied linguistics. Highly interdisciplinary composition studies and L2 writing instruction were the focus of new approaches and trends in writing. With the start of the twenty – first century, new pedagogy has been initiated in classes by emphasizing more learner centred courses, considering academic writing as a social communicative skill, enhancing project writing, learners' selection of topics and peer reviewing, and focusing on author – reader interaction. These innovative steps foster success in meaningful communication and in problem solving strategies by forming two major approaches to writing (Reid, 2001). The first one is process approach to writing. Rather than focusing solely on the accuracy, product and grammar, it pays attention to content, fluency, individual voice and revising (Raimes, 2002). Process approach covers four basic writing steps; planning to stimulate thoughts of flow by brainstorming, quick free writing, grouping of terms, drafting to emphasize the fluency, revising to check both the content of ideas and language errors, and editing to get their writing controlled by teachers and peers, and three other external steps; responding where the learner writing is quickly checked by the teacher, evaluating; holistic or analytical and post – writing including displaying texts, publishing them or reading aloud (Seow, 2002). The latter one categorizes writing into controlled, guided and free. The first element of this category dating back to Audio – lingual approach aims to get learners to produce error free writing via dictation and error correction. It requires learners to study on the given material in a strict way (Kroll, 1991). Whereas, guided writing demands learners to produce short texts by answering open – ended or guided questions. The last one, free writing, requires learners to prepare an essay on a given or selective topic by providing them with various stimulus like pictures and texts (McDonough & Shaw, 1993). When it comes to the CEF (2001) B1 level, learners are able to write simple connected sentences or take notes on familiar and interesting topics. Besides, personal letters can be written by exemplifying experiences and impressions.

To sum up, ELT has taken the lead in academic and governmental institutions in Turkey where English is considered and accepted as an important foreign language. Not only English teachers but also English teacher trainees and learners are required to accomplish the criteria according to the CEF. The CEF, which is widely welcomed and applied in educational studies around Europe, is a common framework for language

learning, teaching, and testing. It consists of six basic levels, each of which has sub categories within, ranging from A1 to C2. According to these levels, all university students including Gazi University ELT freshmen are supposed to study the target language considering the aims of CEF. These adult learners are examined in terms of adolescence characteristics and learning styles as well as CEF principles. Later on, trends and tendencies are described in detail revising the history of methods of language teaching from GTM to Task based instruction. Since academic institutions have the tendency to use the CEF and new trends in language teaching, they give primary importance to them.. Finally, receptive and productive skills: listening, reading, speaking, and writing are mentioned briefly in terms of teaching methods, trends, and materials by emphasizing the significance and B1+ level of the CEF for each language skill.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

3.0 Presentation

This chapter consists of all aspects relating to the method of and tool of data collection concerning the freshmen's scores in basic language skills exams for both fall and spring terms. It presents primarily the research design. Next, the universe and participants are explained in terms of the participants' course books, mid terms, finals, English proficiency exams and methods applied by their instructors.

3.1 Research Design

Depending on the focus of the research, various research methods can be used. These are categorized into two; qualitative and quantitative methods. The first one analyzes data collection procedures with numerical data through statistical methods. He adds that logical values are focused on instead of cases and they are assigned to variables in quantitative research so that the data can be processed via precise coding of the data. On condition that these values, numbers are based on contextual background information and clear definitions, they will be very powerful for the point of the research. It is systematic, focused and firmly controlled. Besides, the quantitative data can be questioned for objectivity and generality (Cohen & Manion, 1994). Whereas, the latter focuses on data collection procedures with non – numerical and open ended data through non – statistical methods (Dörnyei, 2007). The data in qualitative research is described by verbal, open and flexible coding. It consists of small sample size.

Considering these research methods and features of them, it can be concluded that this study employs the quantitative research model. Identification of the problem

was determined primarily. Next, a main research question and depending on it, six sub – category questions are formed. Numerical data were collected by analysing the ELT freshmen’s scores in English language skills courses for fall and spring terms in 2009 – 2010 academic year. They are processed in Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS 16) software. The scores are coded with specific values given by the researcher. Then, independent sample t test is employed for analysing the data. The results are displayed via tables from 1 to 12 in detail.

3.2 Research Questions

In this study, the purposes are to reveal the fact that whether the freshmen’s attendance at the preparatory programme affects their receptive and productive skills and to find out performance differences among the freshmen’s receptive and productive skills. On the basis of these purposes, the main research question is as follows:

R. Q. 1. ‘Are there performance differences among ELT freshmen who attended and who did not attend the Gazi University preparatory school in 2009 – 2010 academic year in terms of receptive and productive skills?’

To be able to analyze those skills, each of them needs to be dealt separately just as courses are designed. Therefore, relevant to the main research question, sub – category questions are listed below;

1.1 Is there a meaningful difference in listening skills between ELT freshmen who attended and who did not attend the preparatory school in 2009 – 2010 academic year?

1.2 Is there a meaningful difference in reading skills between ELT freshmen who attended and who did not attend the preparatory school in 2009 – 2010 academic year?

1.2 Is there a meaningful difference in speaking skills between ELT freshmen who attended and who did not attend the preparatory school in 2009 – 2010 academic year?

1.4 Is there a meaningful difference in writing skills between ELT freshmen who attended and who did not attend the preparatory school in 2009 – 2010

academic year?

1.5 Do these results differ according to gender of ELT freshmen?

1.6 Do these results differ according to programme type of ELT freshmen?

These research questions are examined in a quantitative design. The data related to freshmen's gender, programme type and the information whether they attended the preparatory programme or not was gathered through their background information and their scores at Gazi University Registrar's Office system.

3.3 Participants

This study focuses on the freshmen's scores of the basic language skills, which are categorized into two phases; receptive and productive skills. Their freshman year was in 2009 – 2010 academic year at Gazi University ELT department. There are ten classes consisting of day classes and evening classes. They are 260 freshmen in total, 210 whom are females, while 50 of them are males. While 122 of these freshmen are enrolled in the day programme, 138 of them are enrolled in evening programme. These learners took Gazi University English Language Proficiency Exam one year before the time of this study. Those who got 60 out of 100 in this exam attended to the first grade at ELT department. They were 148 in number. The rest, 112 learners, failed and attended preparatory school for a year at Gazi University Preparatory School of Foreign Languages.

Participants' gender is described on the table below through the frequency and percentage.

Table 1 Freshmen's Gender

	N	F
female	210	80,8
male	50	19,2
total	260	100

Of 260 participants in this study, 210 of them, namely 80, 8 are females, while 50 of them, 19,2 are males. Thus, it can be stated that the number of females are fourfold the number of males in this study.

The freshmen in this study are enrolled in either ELT department day programme or ELT department evening programme according to their scores in the university entrance exam. Although they study the same subjects in the same courses, their schedules are different from each other.

Table 2 Freshmen's Programme Type

	N	F
day programme	122	46,9
evening programme	138	53,1
total	260	100

According to table 2, 122 of the freshmen are enrolled in the day programme while 138 of them are enrolled in the evening programme regardless of their gender or

their attendance at the preparatory programme. Namely, more than half of the freshmen study their courses in the evening programme.

When the freshmen are enrolled in Gazi University ELT programme, they are to take the English Proficiency Exam in order to understand whether they have completed B1+ level or not, and whether they are ready for attendance at the department or not. On condition that they get 70 points total in the exam, they may continue their education in the ELT department without having to attend the preparatory programme.

Table 3 Freshmen's Programme Type

	N	F
attended	112	43,1
did not attended	148	56,9
total	260	100

In the light of the data, it is obvious that more than half of the freshmen in this study were successful enough to pass the proficiency exam prepared by Gazi University School of Foreign Languages and did not attend the preparatory programme. However, 112 of them attended the preparatory programme since they could not get the passing grade, 70, in the exam. In accordance with the results, there is a slight difference between the two groups who attended and who did not attend the preparatory programme.

3.3.1 Gazi University Preparatory School of Foreign Languages

This institution consists of four foreign languages departments; English, French, German and Arabic languages. While each of these language departments has one class, English language preparatory programme has six classes at Gazi University. Each

language department has its own syllabus, contents, materials and exams. There are 260 freshmen in this study. 148 of them passed the English Language Proficiency Exam at the beginning of the 2008 – 2009 academic year and attended the ELT department. 112 of them could not pass the exam; therefore, they had to continue their preparatory education for a year. Regardless of the programme type that learners attend at their departments, namely daily classes or evening classes, they are grouped randomly for English language preparatory classes. The departments of learners who are enrolled in this programme range from engineering to medical sciences and tourism. Those whose majors are ELT are categorized different from the aforementioned groups. In ELT preparatory programme, there are 6 classes, each of them with 18 or 19 learners and 12 instructors in total. They have a tight schedule; in other words, they have classes from 9.00 am to 3.00 pm in week days except for Friday. Classes start at 9.00 am and end at 12.00 pm. In other words, they have 27 hours of English language skills courses. They range from reading, writing to listening, speaking and grammar. These courses are taught as separate lessons. To illustrate, 9 hours is allotted as ‘main course’ lessons, where Language Leader is used as course book. Reading, writing, listening and grammar courses are given 6 hours each in a week.

In terms of materials and course books, different course books are preferred for each skill course. For instance, ‘Reading Connection I and II’ are used in reading skill courses. These course books start at intermediate level and finish at upper intermediate level. For writing skill courses, ‘Academic Writing I and II’ from intermediate to upper intermediate level are preferred. As for listening skill courses, ‘Listening Encounter I and II’ from intermediate to upper intermediate level are used in classes. Lastly, ‘English Grammar in Use for Advanced Learners’ is preferred for grammar teaching. There is not a special course book for speaking skill; however, it is emphasized and practised in each skill course in an integrated way.

Instructors at Gazi University Preparatory School of Foreign Languages follow communicative approach and skill based method for ELT classes but they may vary in their choice of techniques and principles. They have their weekly meetings on certain days in a week and they discuss teaching and learning process of their own classes. They may criticize or approve of course books according to unit topics, exercises, applications and order. Each ELT class follows nearly the same order of units and

exercises; therefore, teacher roles do not play a significant role for the results of this study.

Learners who have just enrolled in a department at Gazi University are to take English Proficiency Exam at the beginning of each academic year. This exam is conducted for two days. On the first day, learners take reading, listening, writing and grammar tests in a paper based format. The exam is in multiple choice format. On condition that learners get 70 scores in the exam on the first day, they are allowed to take speaking exam on the next day. Those whose scores are below 70 are to have one year compulsory preparatory programme. Speaking exam is divided into two parts; spoken production and spoken interaction. In the first one, the learner talks about the topic that is given spontaneously for five minutes. In the latter part, pairs are formed and they are given a task based on either information gap or role play. They are to talk or act out according to instructions for 10 minutes. Two instructors are responsible for the speaking exam each year in a class. When two day lasting exam is completed, results are announced in a few weeks according to the criteria. Learners are to pass 70 passing grade in two day lasting exam so that they can attend their major departments.

3.3.2 English Language Teaching Department at Gazi University

ELT department at Gazi University offers four year lasting programme for teacher trainees. Learners who have just passed the university entrance exam and preparatory school English proficiency exam, and those who have had 70 scores in the preparatory school as a result of the mid-term and final exams are to attend 1st grade in ELT department. There are 10 classes at the 1st grade, half of which are daily classes and the rest are from evening classes. These two groups have courses at different hours in a day. However, whether these learners attended preparatory programme or not are not taken into account while classes are being formed. Each class consists of 26 or 27 learners.

Freshmen have 8 courses in each term and these courses vary from English language skill courses to history and educational studies. There are approximately 26 learners in each class and 7 instructors responsible for these skill based courses at the

department. There are 10 classes in total at 1st grades, half of which are daily classes and the rest is evening classes. Although courses are at different hours for each class, skill based courses have a unity and common framework. Unlike preparatory school, classes start according to learners' programme type; daily or evening programme. They have 3 hours courses for each skill. However, reading and writing are united as a course called as 'advanced reading and writing skills I and II' for fall and spring terms. On the other hand, listening and speaking courses are taught as separate courses for each term at 1st grade. They are called as 'Listening and Pronunciation Skill I and II' and 'oral communication skills I and II'.

As it is stated above, skill based courses have a unity and a common framework in terms of the syllabus and course books although they are taught at different hours. Instructors use compiled notes taken from various sources for each skill. As to reading and writing skills course, a book of short stories is used for all classes. Reading and writing activities are done in an integrated way. Different novels are read as a part of homework and they are assigned for the exams. With regard to listening skills, the course book 'Just – upper intermediate' is used. Besides, TOEFL listening skill exercises and authentic materials are used to practise listening skills. Lastly, compiled notes consisting of speaking exercises and the reference book 'Knowing me, Knowing you' are followed for oral communication skills course. By the way, different authentic activities and exercises designed by instructors are practised in the class.

Likewise at preparatory school, instructors follow communicative approach and skill based method in their classes. Cognitive skills are developed via task based, gap and communicative activities. Materials and course books are chosen on this common basis. Essay types and genres such as letters, comparison and contrast paragraphs, and argumentative essays are introduced to learners via authentic materials in writing course. Learners are asked to write these various forms and genres within time. Reading skills, on the other hand, are developed via short stories and authentic reading materials. Certain strategies like how to guess unknown words from the text, reading comprehension, skimming, scanning, cloze test procedure and so forth are taught and practised at the reading course. When it comes to listening skills course, TOEFL exercises and authentic audio materials are used to involve learners in real life activities and tasks in the class. Strategies like filling in the gaps, listening for main and detailed

information, understanding the message in a phone conversation, contents in a lecture, or instructions to use an electronic device, developing pronunciation by writing and pronouncing phonetic alphabet are conducted in this course. It employs authentic listening materials and speech samples used in different discourses in order to be analyzed as communication-oriented classroom activities. Speaking course, on the other hand, offers a variety of different communication-oriented speaking activities such as discussions, individual presentations and other interactive tasks providing opportunity for students to improve their oral competence by developing effective language use both in formal and informal contexts. Task based approach and gap activities are on the basis of this course.

Learners are to have one mid-term and one final exam for each term. As part of their final exams, learners are asked to fulfil a take home task for each skill. These exams are the same for all classes. In other words, they are prepared and conducted by all instructors. As far as exams of each skill course, they are done according to the syllabus and content of the related course. In other words, advanced reading and writing course exams are conducted in paper based format. Learners are required to answer the comprehension check questions of a text, to guess the unknown words from the text, to write both a comparison and contrast paragraph, and an argumentative essay on one of the quotations from the stories that they read in the class. Listening exams consist of 50% listening strategies and skills, and 50% pronunciation skills. In listening skills part, learners listen to an audio recording twice and are required to answer certain questions related to the listening text. In pronunciation part, learners are to write the phonetic descriptions of symbols. As to oral communication skills exams, they are done as interviews. Namely, each student is interviewed by the instructor for 5 – 7 minutes on a given topic spontaneously. This exam may last for almost a day as the classes may be crowded. These exams are compulsory and are not repeated again. 40% of the mid-term exams and 60% of the final exams are added at the end of each term. As a result, learners from AA to DC+ can pass these courses for each term. Scores are calculated and are reliable only for the related term.

3.4 Data Collection Procedure

The data used for this study were the freshmen's scores in basic language skills courses in 2009 – 2010 academic year. The scores were gathered from Gazi University Registrar's Office. This information taken from the office was used solely for the purpose of this study and not for other purposes. Learners' names were kept secure due to the legacy. Their mid-term and final scores were gathered separately with learners' gender, programme type and the fact that whether they attended preparatory school or not. 40% of their mid-term exams and 60% of their final exams were calculated for each skill course as it is stated in Registrar's Office Regulations. The results were typed in SPSS 16.0 program. The output of the results was transformed into tables since the relation and meaningful difference between learners' gender, their programme types, their attendance at preparatory school, and their scores for each skill course were evaluated together. No questionnaire or interview was conducted to learners as the aim of this study was to understand the meaningful difference between learners' scores who attended preparatory school and who did not. Totally, 260 freshmen from ten classes were involved in this study. As Gazi University ELT department academic year consists of two terms; fall and spring, the results of these two terms were displayed in tables. Namely, exam scores of fall and spring terms were compared and commented on as well as the gender and education type.

3.5 Data Analysis Method

The data gathered were analyzed with respect to the research questions. First of all, learners' gender, programme type and their preparatory school information were put in tables separately and they were evaluated in terms of frequencies and percentages. Second, learners' gender, their preparatory school information and programme types were illustrated in tables so that each dimension can be made clear via comparison of these dimensions. Third, the independent samples t test was used during the evaluation of the data; therefore, t and p values were taken into account for the analysis of the scores of each skill in fall and spring terms separately. The reason for choosing independent samples t test is that there is a dependent variable and a factor which has an effect on that variable. The factor whose effect was analyzed on the dependent variable had two independent dimensions. The scores related to the dependent variable were

independent of each other. These two independent dimensions in this study were the fact that whether learners attended preparatory school or not. Consequently, the dependent variable is their exam scores in each skill. In addition, the gender and education types of learners may affect the dependent variable, thus these dimensions were listed in tables separately. The independent samples t test was used in SPSS 16.00 programme.

As for the symbols, f stands for frequency while p means percentage on the tables below. N is number of participants. X is for mean while sd stands for standard deviation. Degree of freedom is the acronym of S. What's more, t shows meaningful difference between the two independent samples. Lastly, significance of the values is the acronym of p.

In a nutshell, the data gathered from Gazi University Registrar's Office were analyzed in terms of three dimensions: gender, programme type, and attendance at the preparatory school.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

4.0 Presentation

This chapter focuses on the results gathered through the learners' scores of the exams. In the light of these results, their performances for each term and for each skill course are analyzed and discussed depending on the variables; their gender, programme type and the fact that whether they attended preparatory school or not. More insight will be gained in the underlying reasons of the meaningful differences among the scores. The results are analyzed and discussed for each research question by using the independent samples T Test model. First, frequencies of freshmen's gender, programme type and their attendance at the preparatory school are displayed in tables. Second, the freshmen's performance differences in terms of attendance at the preparatory school are listed in tables; 2.1., 2.2., 2.3. . Third, the freshmen's performance differences in terms of gender are shown in tables; 3.1., 3.2., 3.3. . Finally, the freshmen's performance differences in terms of programme type are revealed in tables; 4.1., 4.2., 4.3. .

4.1 Differences between Performances

As it is clearly stated in Gazi University Registrars Office Regulations, learners who are enrolled in ELT programme at Gazi University are to take the English proficiency exam. Those who get 70 or more may continue their education at the department while those who get less than 70 points are to attend the preparatory school regardless of their programme type. Besides, performance differences in this study imply the basic language skill; reading, writing, listening and speaking. Among these skills, reading and writing skills are united in a course. Nonetheless, course contents, syllabus designs and activities are prepared and studied separately for these skills. What's more, the exams are scheduled and evaluated accordingly.

Table 4. The freshmen's Reading and Writing Scores in Fall and Spring in terms

of attendance at the Preparatory Programme

	Prep. Programme	N	X	S	sd	t	p
Fall	attended	112	63,90	9,14	258	2,779	,006
	didnot attend	148	60,69	9,26			
Spring	attended	112	64,31	8,04	258	2,218	,027
	didnot attend	148	61,85	9,04			

The table displays both fall and spring terms results. For the first one, 112 freshmen attended the preparatory school in 2009 – 2010 academic year while 148 did not. It is obvious that more than half of the freshmen in this study did not attend the preparatory school. According to the results of T test, the freshmen who attended the preparatory school ($X = 63,90$) are more successful than those who did not attend ($X = 60,69$) in terms of reading and writing skills in fall term. Besides, the difference among the freshmen's scores in fall term is meaningful as $t(258) = 2,779$ and $p < .01$. In other words, the fact that whether they attended the preparatory programme or not has a vital effect on their reading and writing performances.

As for the latter, 148 freshmen did not attend the preparatory school, whereas 112 attended in 2009 – 2010 academic year. The difference among the freshmen's reading and writing scores in spring term is meaningful as $t(258) = 2,218$ and $p < .05$. Namely, their attendance at the preparatory school plays an important role in determining their success in reading and writing skills. Likewise in the fall term, those who attended the preparatory school ($X = 64,31$) are more successful than those who did not ($X = 61,85$) in spring term reading and writing skills course.

In line with the data from fall and spring terms, those who attended the preparatory programme are more successful than those who did not in terms of their reading and writing skills. Also, the difference in fall term seems to be more significant compared to spring term.

Table 5. The Freshmen's Listening Scores in Fall and Spring according to attendance at the preparatory school

	Prep. Programme	N	X	S	sd	t	p
Fall	attended	112	66,91	10,66	258	1,412	,159
	did not attend	148	64,95	11,35			
Spring	attended	112	70,94	8,58	258	1,736	,084
	did not attend	148	68,78	10,78			

When it comes to listening skills in fall term, those who attended the preparatory programme are as successful as those who did not in listening skills as $p > .05$. Also, it is observed that there is not a meaningful difference between the scores of the freshmen in two variables as $p > .05$ and $t(258) = 1,412$. Consequently, their attendance at the preparatory programme does not have a considerable effect on determining their success in listening skills.

As to the spring term, the freshmen who attended the preparatory programme are as successful as those who did not attend the preparatory programme in spring term listening skills. The difference between the scores of the freshmen in spring term, on the other hand, is not meaningful since $p > .05$ and $t(258) = 0,084$. It is just like the fall term

listening scores. Thus, their attendance at the preparatory school is not effective enough in creating a meaningful difference among the listening exam results.

To sum up, their attendance at the preparatory programme does not lead a considerable difference in their fall and spring term listening skills. Those who attended the preparatory programme are as successful as those who did not in both terms listening skills. The difference in spring term also is more significant than the one in fall term.

Table 6. The Freshmen's Speaking Scores in Fall and Spring according to their attendance at the preparatory school

	Prep. Programme	N	X	S	sd	t	p
Fall	attended	112	73,31	7,98	258	1,834	,068
	did not attend	148	71,26	9,56			
Spring	attended	112	77,22	5,90	258	1,415	,158
	did not attend	148	76,1	6,62			

As far as the scores of speaking exams are considered in fall term, the number of the freshmen who attended preparatory school is 112 , whereas the number of those who did not is 148 just like in the previous skills. To start with the fall term, $p>.05$ and $t(258)= 1,834$ reveal that the freshmen's performances in speaking skills are equal for both variables. Namely, those who did not attend the preparatory programme are as successful as those who did. Thus, a meaningful difference is found out between the

programme variables, which implies their attendance at the preparatory programme does not lead them to more successful results in fall term speaking exams.

In spring term, the results seem to be similar to the ones in fall term. When p is considered, it is clear that $p > .05$ and $t(258) = 1,415$, which means that just like in fall term, the freshmen in spring term are equally successful in their speaking course. Besides, a meaningful relation is not seen between the variables, attended or did not attend via $p = .158$. Accordingly, whether the freshmen attended the preparatory programme or not is not significant in the results of their spring term speaking exams just as in fall term.

In a nutshell, their success in fall and spring term speaking courses is not affected by their attendance at the preparatory programme. Both sides are concluded with equal results. The difference in spring term is found to be less significant than the one in fall term.

4.2 The Freshmen's Performance Differences in terms of Gender

As one of the research questions aims to find out the meaningful difference among the freshmen's performance skills who have attended and who have not attended preparatory program in terms of their gender, each basic language skill is analyzed and discussed on the tables below. Although Gazi University ELT department like other ELT departments in Turkey has fewer males compared to girls, it is worthwhile to learn which group is more successful.

Table 7. The Freshmen's Reading and Writing Scores in Fall and Spring according

to gender

	Gender	N	X	S	sd	t	p
Reading and Writing Fall	female	210	62,56	9,41	258	1,74	,082
	male	50	60,01	8,77			
Reading and Writing Spring	female	210	63,52	8,62	258	2,30	,022
	male	50	60,32	9,67			

The table 3.1. above displays the freshmen's performance differences on the basis of gender. Among 260 freshmen in this study, 210 are females while 50 are males for both terms. There seems to be a meaningful difference in the freshmen's gender in fall term as $p < .01$ and $t(258) = 1,74$. Gender causes a meaningful difference in their success in fall term reading and writing skills. When it comes to their performances for reading and writing skills, it is obvious that females ($X = 62,56$) are more successful than males ($X = 60,01$) in their reading and writing skills in fall term.

As to spring term, females are as successful as males due to the $p > .01$ and $t(258) = 2,30$. Also, it can be claimed that there is a meaningful relation for reading and writing skills between the freshmen's gender in spring term, as well. In other words, gender does not play an important role in determining their success in spring term reading and writing skills.

In brief, it is revealed that females are more successful than males in fall term reading and writing skills , whereas they are as successful as males in spring term reading and writing skills. Besides, gender has a considerable effect on the freshmen's score differences for fall term although it does not lead to the same difference for spring term results.

Table 8. The Freshmen's Listening Scores in Fall and Spring according to Gender

	Gender	N	X	S	sd	t	p
Listening							
Fall	female	210	66,67	10,98	258	2,63	,009
	Male	50	62,13	10,84			
Listening							
Spring	female	210	70,41	9,43	258	2,34	,020
	male	50	66,78	11,48			

According to the table 3.2, males' performances in listening skills are less successful than females in 2009 – 2010 fall term. Since $p < .01$ and $t(258) = 2,63$, X value needs to be considered. ($X = 66,67$) for females and ($X = 62,13$) for males, which reveals that females are more successful in their listening exams in fall. What's more, the relationship between the freshmen's scores in listening skills are proved to be meaningful as $p < .01$ and $t(258) = 2,63$. Namely, the gender plays an important role in the freshmen's success.

For spring term, since $p > .01$ and $t(258) = 2,34$ are shown on the table, it can be concluded that the success of females and males in listening courses are equal. In other words, males are as successful as females in spring term listening exams. As $p > .01$, it is not necessary to focus on X value for their success. Also, p value reveals that there is not a meaningful difference between the freshmen's scores in spring term, which means that the gender, contrary to the fall term, does not play a significant role in the freshmen's listening skills.

To put it in a nutshell, males are less successful in fall term listening exams while they are as successful as females are in spring term. Gender, on the other hand, does not have a considerable effect on determining their success in spring term listening skills although it has in fall term.

Table 9. The Freshmen's Speaking Scores in Fall and Spring according to gender

	Gender	N	X	S	sd	t	p
Speaking							
Fall	female	210	71,92	8,96	258	,803	,422
	male	50	73,06	8,96			
Speaking							
Spring	female	210	76,49	6,26	258	,517	,605
	male	50	77,00	6,66			

Another dimension to pay attention to is speaking skills. $p > .05$; therefore, t value is not necessary to be taken seriously. The value of p displays that females and

males are equally successful in their fall term speaking exams. Besides, $p > .05$ means that the gender does not have an important effect on the success of the freshmen's speaking skills as there is not a meaningful relationship in the factor 'gender'.

Likewise in fall term, spring term results imply that $p > .05$, so both females and males are equally successful in their speaking exams. As $p > .05$, it is not an important factor for this table. The gender does not have a considerable effect in terms of their success in speaking skills since $p > .05$.

In general, it can be claimed that the freshmen do not vary according to their gender in terms of their success in fall and spring term speaking skills. Both females and males are equally successful in speaking skills in 2009 – 2010 academic year.

4.3 The Freshmen's Performance Differences in terms of their Programme Type

OSYM, student selection and placement centre in Turkey, determines the highest and lowest scores every year for each university department in accordance with the results of learners' university entrance exam scores. This decision reveals both whether learners can be enrolled in a university or not, and which programme type these learners can be enrolled in. Thus, Gazi University ELT department has 260 vacancies in 2009 – 2010 academic year and 122 consist of those who are enrolled in the day programme and 138 consist of the evening programme.

Table 10. The Freshmen's Reading and Writing Scores in Fall and Spring according to the programme type

		Programme					
	Type	N	X	S	sd	t	p
Reading and Writing Fall	day programme	122	62,34	9,09	258	,433	,666
	evening programme	138	61,84	9,57			
Reading and Writing Spring	day programme	122	64,84	7,51	258	,345	,001
	evening programme	138	61,20	9,69			

In line with the table 4.1, 122 of the freshmen are enrolled in the day programme while 138 of them are enrolled in the evening programme. The statistics show that $p > .05$ so the freshmen's performances in fall term reading and writing skills do not vary according to the programme type. To be clear, programme type does not lead a meaningful difference among the scores of the freshmen in fall term reading and writing skills. In addition, those who are enrolled in the day programme are as successful as those who are enrolled in evening programme in fall term reading and writing skills. Since $p > .05$, t value is not paid attention.

As for spring term, $p < .05$ and $t(258) = ,345$. Namely, those who are enrolled in the day programme ($X = 64,84$) are more successful than those who are enrolled in evening programme ($X = 61,20$) in spring term reading and writing skills. What's more, as $p < .05$, there is a meaningful difference in the freshmen's success in spring term reading and writing skills. It is obvious that programme type in spring term determines the success of freshmen in reading and writing skills.

In a nutshell, reading and writing skills are affected by the programme type in spring term, whereas they are not affected by the programme type in fall term. Those in the day programme are more successful than those in evening programme in spring term reading and writing exams. However, they are as successful as those in evening programme in fall term reading and writing skills.

Table 11. The Freshmen's Listening Scores in Fall and Spring according to programme type

	Programme Type	N	X	S	sd	t	P
Listening Fall	day programme	122	66,33	11,24	258	,727	,468
	evening programme	138	65,33	10,96			
Listening Spring	day programme	122	71,64	9,48	258	2,981	,003
	evening programme	138	68,01	10,05			

When it comes to listening skills, the freshmen in evening programme are as successful as those in the day programme in fall term listening course, as $p > .05$ and $t(258) = ,727$. Besides, the programme type does not have a leading role in determining their success in fall term listening exams since $p > .05$, which implies there is not a meaningful relation between the scores of the freshmen in fall term listening exams.

For spring term, $p < .05$ and $t(258) = 2,981$, which reveals that the freshmen in evening programme ($X = 68,01$) are less successful than those in the day programme

($X = 71,64$) in listening skills. Programme type, on the other hand, has a considerable effect on their success in listening exams since there is a meaningful difference in their success in listening skills according to the programme types due to $p < .05$.

In short, the values suggest that the programme type does not have a crucial effect on the freshmen's success in fall term listening skills as both sides are equally successful. For spring term, on the contrary, the freshmen in the day programme are more successful than those in the evening programmes. The programme type in spring term plays a vital role in their success in listening skills.

Table 12. The Freshmen's Speaking Scores in Fall and Spring according to programme type

	Programme Type	N	X	S	sd	t	p
Speaking Fall	day programme	122	73,22	7,96	258	1,839	,067
	evening programme	138	71,18	9,67			
Speaking Spring	day programme	122	78,08	6,01	258	3,669	,000
	evening programme	138	75,26	6,34			

Lastly, the freshmen in the day programme are as successful as those in evening programme in terms of fall speaking skills. Since $p > .05$, t is not obligatory to be focused on. What's more, the programme type in their success in speaking skills does not have

an important role. Due to the fact that $p > .05$, there is not a meaningful relation on the basis of the programme type.

As for spring term, $p < .05$ and $t(258) = 3,669$. This result implies the freshmen in the day programme are considerably more successful than those in evening programme for speaking skills. $p < .05$; therefore, it is obvious that there is a meaningful relation between the scores of the freshmen in daily and evening programmes. In other words, the programme type has a considerable effect on determining the success of the freshmen in daily and evening programmes.

Consequently, the values imply the freshmen in daily and evening programmes are equally successful in fall term speaking skills. In contrary to the fall term, the freshmen in the day programme are more successful than those in evening programmes in spring term speaking skills. On the other hand, while the programme type plays a significant role in spring term, it does not have a worthwhile effect in fall term.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

5.0 Presentation

This chapter of the study focuses on discussing the underlying reasons behind the findings, which consists of two parts. In the first part, a summary of the findings is given and these findings are commented on in accordance with the present situation by comparing the results of this study with those of the previous ones. The results are displayed under three variables; attendance at the preparatory programme, gender and programme type. In the latter part, implications for ELT and for further research are explained in detail.

5.1 Summary of the Study

This study has the scope of 260 freshmen in 2009 – 2010 academic year. Of these freshmen, 210 are females and 50 are males. This is the result of the fact that females are more interested in foreign language studies in Turkey than males at school. Therefore, not only at Gazi University but also at other ELT departments, the case is similar.

As for the programme type, 122 freshmen are in the day programme, whereas 138 are in evening programme. This difference results from the scores learners get in the university entrance exam in Turkey. SSPC, student selection and placement centre, decides on the highest and lowest scores for each department every year in line with the norm referenced criteria. In other words, the highest score that learners get may vary depending on the level of the exam. Accordingly, each university department decides on its capacity.

For 2009 – 2010 academic year, Gazi University ELT department has 260 freshmen, 112 of whom attended the preparatory programme at Gazi University School of Foreign Languages, and 148 of whom did not attend the related programme.

Zooming in the findings of the main research question ‘Are there performance differences among ELT freshmen who attended and who did not attend Gazi University Preparatory School in 2009 – 2010 academic year in terms of receptive and productive skills?’, there is not a meaningful difference between the freshmen who attended and who did not attend the preparatory school in terms of their receptive and productive skills in general. The results of each skill are analyzed in each term from the view of attendance at the preparatory programme, gender, and programme type. However, as Gazi University ELT department united reading and writing skills in a course, these skills are analysed together.

One of the aforementioned variables is their attendance at the preparatory programme. To start with reading and writing skills, it is revealed that in fall and spring terms reading and writing skills, the freshmen who attended the preparatory school are found to be more successful than those who did not attend. Besides, attendance at the preparatory programme is a matter of fact in determining their success in the aforementioned skills. This may result from two reasons. The first one may be the quality of the preparatory school syllabus and methods in reading and writing courses. The approaches and methods followed, the materials adapted and the course books preferred may help learners improve their success in these two skills. Then, it can be claimed that preparatory school is successful enough to create a meaningful difference between the freshmen who attended and who did not attend the preparatory programme for fall and spring terms. The preparatory school is successful in teaching English reading and writing skills, which increase learners’ level from B1 to B1+. What’s more, the ones who attended the preparatory programme may be exposed to English language reading and writing skills more than the others who did not attend during their preparation for the university entrance exam. This may be the second one. By the way, as reading and writing skills courses are unified into a single course, which skill course these learners are more successful remains unsolved.

As to listening skills, the freshmen who attended and who did not attend the preparatory programme are found out to be equally successful for both terms. In other words, the preparatory school does not have a crucial role in developing these learners' listening skills. It may be concluded that preparatory school is successful enough to help learners who had to attend the preparatory programme to improve their listening skills at a level equal to those who were more successful in the proficiency exam and who did not attend the preparatory school. The gap between these two groups is filled at the end of the preparatory programme. Thus, the success of the preparatory school requires attention at this point in terms of the methodology of teachers, course books, materials and activities in listening skills. Learners who have finished the preparatory programme graduate with B1+ level. However, there is not a vital relation among the freshmen's listening scores in fall and spring terms. Hence, it is obvious that learners endeavoured a great deal to develop their listening skills on their own. They may be keen on listening to authentic materials like native speakers, radios, TVs, songs, podcasts, and so forth. In line with this data, preparatory programme can be advised to update and enrich the listening materials used in classes, to follow the latest trends in teaching foreign language skills, and to practise more real like activities in classes.

When it comes to speaking skills, it is obvious that those who attended preparatory programme are as successful as those who did not. Besides, their attendance at the preparatory programme does not lead a meaningful relation in terms of their success in fall and spring terms speaking skills. Considering these findings, two possible comments can be done. The first one is that likewise in listening skills, the preparatory school is proved successful in improving learners' speaking skills at B1+ level which is equal to the level of those who did not attend the preparatory programme. However, it is not successful enough to make learners perform better than those who did not attend the preparatory programme. Also, the school may employ innovative trends and applications in teaching speaking skills so that a meaningful difference in the results of those who attend the preparatory programme can be seen. Native speakers or instructors may be hired in order to assist learners improve speaking skills overall. The latter is that learners surround themselves with opportunities to improve their speaking skills. Their self study may cause this finding.

To sum up, the results of this study are parallel with those in Borçbakan (1994) and with those in Özdoğan (2001). Namely, no meaningful difference in overall skills between the ones who attended and who did not attend the preparatory programme has come out.

Another variable is the freshmen's gender. Of 260 freshmen participated in this study, 210 are females while only 50 are males. The effect of gender is analyzed for each skill separately.

The first one is reading and writing skills. In fall term reading and writing skills, females are found to be more successful than males. Males' performances are seen to be as high as females' in spring term reading and writing skills. Gender does not play a crucial role in determining the success of the freshmen in spring term, whereas it does in fall term. This may be due to the fact that females spend more time on reading and writing activities in fall term.

The second one is listening skills. Likewise in reading and writing skills, females are turned out to perform better than males in fall term listening skills. Gender affects this result considerably, as well. This may result from females' interests in songs, artists, singers and music. Also, their auditory sense may be improved more than males. In spring term listening scores, both groups perform well in listening exams and gender does not affect this result. It can be implied that males tried hard to keep up with females in listening skills for spring term and they become as successful as females.

The third one is speaking skills. There found to be no difference in the scores of the freshmen's speaking exams in both fall and spring terms. Gender, on the other hand, is not a vital factor determining the results of the freshmen. As Turkey is included in EFL setting, it is challenging to practise speaking skills in daily life with a native speaker. Learners can practise their oral communication skills mostly with their instructors or friends in limited time. This raises the problem of correct pronunciation, word choice and use of appropriate expressions in foreign language. Therefore, learners without paying attention to the gender have difficulty in speaking skills.

To put it in a nutshell, the results of this study show that in general females and males perform similar in basic skills. However, females are found to be more successful

only in fall term reading and writing skills. Unlike the results of this study, Evren (2007) came up with the results that females are more successful in foreign language skills and they have more positive attitude towards English.

As for the last variable, programme type of the freshmen is analyzed in terms of their performance in four skills. The programme type involves two options; one is the day programme where learners with higher scores are enrolled and pay less annually for their department. The other is evening classes where learners with less higher scores than the first ones and pay annually more than the others.

In terms of reading and writing skills depending on the programme type, the freshmen in the day programme are proved to perform better in spring term while they are as successful as those in the evening programme in fall term. This may be due to the fact that the techniques of instructors in teaching language skills may vary personally although they follow the same syllabus. In addition, those in daily classes may be concentrated on their reading and writing course more than the other group. It is also discovered that the programme type leads to a meaningful difference among the scores of two groups in fall term while it does not lead to such a result in spring term. This may be owing to the fact that either the exams were easier in fall term or the freshmen in the day programme have overqualified in reading and writing skills. In addition, the freshmen may perform in reading and writing skills and exams better as the preparatory program spends more time on reading and writing classes. However, the percentages of listening and speaking skills in preparatory exams are lower, thus, it is normal to come to a conclusion that there may be performance differences in freshmen's reading & writing and listening & speaking performances.

As to listening skills, both groups are found to be equally successful in their fall term listening exams without the effect of gender on their success. It can be inferred that neither the programme type nor their attendance at the preparatory school matter for their success in listening skills. Therefore, the preparatory school may take up more innovative insights in teaching receptive and productive skills. On the other hand, the freshmen in the day programmes have performed better than those in the evening programme in spring term listening exams. It is clear that the first group tried hard, spent more time on free listening activities or participated in courses more

enthusiastically compared to the latter. By the way, the programme type has a worthwhile effect behind this result. Hence, the day programme can be said to improve the freshmen's listening skills more.

Last but not least, the freshmen in fall term speaking skills are found to perform equally well with no respect to the programme type. Namely, whether the freshmen attended the day programme or the evening programme is not a matter for their success in speaking skills. Thus, it can be put forward that the freshmen in both groups endeavour to perform better in speaking classes via their self study. Besides, those in the day programme come out to be more successful than those in the evening programme with regard to the programme type. Accordingly, preferred materials, instructor differences or the freshmen's motivation in daily hours may give rise to this result.

To sum up, it is obvious in this study that their attendance at the preparatory school does not have a considerable effect in overall skills in spite of the fact that it causes some differences in certain terms and skills. Gender, similar to the attendance at the preparatory programme, does not lead to a worthwhile difference in the freshmen's performances overall. Programme type, on the other hand, may be claimed to play a more important role in determining the freshmen's success in receptive and productive skills.

As it is stated in the introduction part, this study has its significance on both the general performances of the freshmen and the efficiency of the preparatory school as the results inform us with the ongoing situation of the preparatory school in teaching language skills at B1+ level. The results of this study can be claimed to respond to the research questions in general and detailed. Therefore, the results of this study have served its aims as an eye opener. The preparatory school has exposed learners to foreign language skills more via various materials and opportunities; however, it needs to update its materials, gain more insight in learners' less successful skills and their needs.

5.2 Suggestions and Implications for ELT

This study has focused on the comparison of ELT freshmen's performances in receptive and productive skills. Their attendance, gender and programme type have been questioned in terms of their effect on the freshmen's performances in receptive and productive skills.

In line with the aforementioned factors, the syllabus of the preparatory programme can be considered and improved by suggesting various unit plans and materials. Also, instructors' effect on the freshmen's performances may be analysed. The materials they use, the principles they follow in classes and content of the exams they conduct may be searched. The percentages of receptive and productive skills in preparatory school can be made equal to each other in freshmen's exams and evaluation. What's more, the reliability and validity of the English proficiency exam conducted at the beginning of each academic year in order to determine learners' levels can be questioned and searched. Another alternative study may be that the comparison of learners' performances in receptive and productive skills can be carried out in all ELT preparatory programmes of Turkish universities.

As it is seen, the preparatory programmes draw greater attention in terms of their regulation, application of the syllabus, materials and efficiency. Consequently, there are many points to look at closer for better results.

REFERENCES

- Allen, H. B. (1965). *Teaching English as a Second Language: A book of readings*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ashwin, P. (2006). *Changing Higher Education; The Development of Learning and Teaching*. (First Edition). Oxon: Routledge.
- Ashworth, M. (1985). *Beyond Methodology: Second Language Teaching and the Community*. (First Edition). Cambridgeshire: Cambridge University Press.
- Bash, L. (2005). *Best Practices in Adult Learning*. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Bain, K. (2004). *What the best college teachers do*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press. ISBN: 0-674-01325-5
- Barenfanger, O. & Tschirmer, E. (2008). Language educational policy and language learning quality management: the common European framework of reference. *Foreign Language Annals*, 41(1), 81 – 101.
- Barrows, L. C. (Ed.). (1990). *Higher education in Turkey; Monographs on Higher Education*. Ankara: Meteksan Printing House.
- Bossers, B. (1991). On thresholds, ceilings and short-circuits: The relation between L1 reading, L2 reading and L2 knowledge. *AILA Review*, 8, 45-60.
- Borçbakan, H. (1999). *Hazırlık Sınıfı Okuyarak yada Atlayarak Birinci Sınıfa Devam Eden Öğrencilerin Ders Başarılarının Karşılaştırılması*. (Unpublished Master's Thesis), Uludağ University, Bursa: Turkey.
- Brookfield, S. D. (2006). Understanding consulting as an adult education process. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 1993: 5–13.
- Broughton, G., Brumfit, C., Flavell, R., Hill, P. & Pincas, A. (1980). *Teaching English as a Foreign Language* (Second Edition). New York: Routledge.
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by Principles; An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy* (Second Edition). New York: Longman.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching* (Fifth Edition). New York: Pearson Longman.

- Brumfit, C. (1984). *Communicative Methodology in Language Teaching: The Roles of Fluency and Accuracy*. (First Edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burns, A. & Seidlhofer, B. (2002). Speaking and Pronunciation. In N. Schmitt (Ed.), *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics* (pp. 211-232). Great Britain: Arnold.
- Bygate, M. (2001). Speaking. In R. Carter and D. Nunan (Eds.), *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages* (pp. 14-21). First Edition. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Carroll, G. R. (1972). The Battle for Better Reading. In H. B. Allen and R. N. Campbell (Eds.), *Teaching English as a Second Language: A Book of Readings* (pp. 178- 184). Second Edition. USA: McGraw-Hill.
- Carter, R. & Nunan, D. (Eds.). (2001). *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages*, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Chastain, K. (1976). *Developing Second – Language Skills: Theory to Practice* (Second Edition). Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company
- Cohen, L., & Manion, L. (1994). *Research Methods in education*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Cook, V. (2001). *Second Language Learning and Teaching* (Fourth Edition). London: Hodder Education.
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Language: Learning, Teaching and Assessment*. Strasburg: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystall, D. (1987). *English Today*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2001). *Languages and the Internet* (First Edition). Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a Global Language* (Second Edition). Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Cunningham, M. A. (1999). Improving adult English language learners' speaking skills. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov>
- Demirel, Ö. (1992). *ELT Methodology* (First Edition). Ankara: USEM Publications.
- Demirel, Ö. (2003). *Yabancı Dil Öğretimi: Dil Pasaportu, Dil Biyografisi, Dil Dosyası* (First Edition). Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
- Devine, J. (1990). A case study of two readers: models of reading and reading performance. In P. L. Carroll, J. Devine and D. E. Eskey (Eds.), *Interactive Approaches to Second Language Reading* (pp. 127-139). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Doğançay - Aktuna, S. (1998). The spread of English in Turkey and its current Sociolinguistic profile. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 19(1). Retrieved from <http://informaworld.com>.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dudley – Evans, T. and ST John, M. J. (1998). *Developments in English for Specific Purposes*. (First Edition). UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Dursun, E. (2007). *An Investigation into Reasons of Gender Differences in Foreign Language Learning Success at University Level Prep Classes*, (Master's Thesis), Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale.
- Ersöz, A. (2007). *Teaching English to Young Learners*. (First Edition). Ankara: EDM Publishing.
- Eurydice. (2010). *National Summary Sheets on Education Systems in Europe and Ongoing Reforms*. (2010 Edition). European Commission.
- Eurydice. (2010). *Organization of the Education System in Turkey 2009/2010*. European Commission.
- Eurydice. (2010). *Structures of Education and Training Systems in Turkey*. (2009/2010 Edition). European Commission.
- Field, J. (1998). Skills and strategies: towards a new methodology for listening. *Oxford ELT Journals*, 52(2), 110 – 118.

- Finocchiaro, M. (1969). *Teaching English as a Second Language*. New York: Hanger and Row Publishers.
- Flowerdew, J. & Peacock, M. (2001). The EAP curriculum: issues, methods, and challenges. In Flowerdew and Peacock (Eds.), *Research Perspectives on English for Academic Purposes*. pp. 177-194. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Graddol, D. (2006). *English Next*. (First Edition). United Kingdom: British Council.
- Grow, G. O. (1991). Teaching learners to be self directed. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 41(3), 125 – 149.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. (Fourth Edition). England: Longman.
- Haverson, W. W. (1991). Adult Literacy Training. In Marianne Celce – Murcia (Eds.), *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language* (pp. 185 – 194). Boston, Massachusetts: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom* (First Edition). Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.
- Heyworth, F. (2006). Key concepts in ELT: The common European framework. *Oxford ELT Journal*, 60(2), 181 – 183.
- Hyland, K. & Hamp – Lyons, L. (2002). EAP: issues and directions. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 1, 1 – 12. Retrieved from <http://www.elsevier.com>
- Jarvis, P. (2001). *Twentieth Century Thinkers in Adult & Continuing Education*. (Second Edition). United States, Stylus Publishing.
- Jekielek, S. & Brown, B. (2005). The Transition to Adulthood: Characteristics of Young Adults Ages 18 to 24 in America. (2005, May). Baltimore, MD: Annie E. Casey Foundation. Retrieved from <http://www.prb.org>
- Kachru, B. B. (1988). The sacred cows of English. *English Today*, 4, 3 – 8.
- Kennedy, C. (1986). The future of English language teaching. *System*, 14(3), 307 – 314.

- Keyser, R. D. (2007). *Practise in a Second Language: Perspectives from Applied Linguistics and Cognitive Psychology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kırkgöz, Y. (2005). English language teaching in Turkey: challenges for the 21st century.' In G. Braine (Ed.), *Teaching English to the World: History, Curriculum, and Practice*, 159-171. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kırkgöz, Y. (2007). English Language Teaching in Turkey: Policy Changes and their Implementations. *RELC Journal*, 38(2), 216 – 228. Retrieved from <http://RELC.sagepub.com>
- Kırkgöz, Y. (2008). A case study of teachers' implementation of curriculum innovation in English language teaching in Turkish primary education. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 24, 1859 – 1875. Available from www.sciencedirect.com
- Knowles, M., Holton, E., & Swanson, R. A. (2005). *The Adult Learner*. (Sixth Edition). New York: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Kroll, B. (1991). *Exploring the Dynamics of Second Language Writing* (First Edition). Cambridge Applied Linguistics Series. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lado, R. (1964). *Language Teaching: A Scientific Approach*. New York: McGraw Hill Inc.
- Little, D. (2006). The common European framework of reference for languages: content, purpose, origin, reception and impact. *Language Teaching*, 39, 167-190. doi:10.1017/S0261444806003557
- Little, D. (2007). The common European framework of reference for languages: Perspectives on the making of supranational language education policy. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(4), 645 – 655.
- Lynch, T. & Mendelson, D. (2002). Listening. In N. Schmitt (Ed.), *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics* (pp. 193-210). Great Britain: Arnold.
- Mauranen, A., Hynninen, N., & Ranta, E. (2010). English as an academic lingua franca: the ELFA project. *English for Specific Purposes* 29, 183 – 190.

- McDonough, S. & Shaw, C. (2003). *Materials and Methods in ELT: a teacher's guide*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- McDonough, S. H. (1995). *Strategy and skill in learning a foreign language* (First Edition). Great Britain: London (u. a.) Arnold.
- McKay, S. (2002). *Teaching English as an International Language: rethinking goals and approaches* (First Edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McGrath, V. (2009). Reviewing the evidence on how adult students learn: An examination of Knowles' Model of Andragogy. *Adult Learner: The Irish Journal of Adult and Community Education*, 99 – 110. (retrieved from www.eric.ed.gov)
- Merriam, S. B. (2001). Andragogy and Self-Directed Learning: Pillars of Adult Learning Theory. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 2001: 3–14. Retrieved December 10, 2008 from Research Starters – Education database.
- Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı. (2006). *İlköğretim İngilizce Dersi (4,5,6,7 ve 8. Sınıflar) Öğretim Programı*. Ankara: Milli Eğitim Yayınevi: Ersöz, A., Çakır, A., Cephe, P. T., Peker, B. G., Özkan, N., Büge, C. ve Özmen, M. Ministry of National Education. (2006). *National Education Statistics; Formal Education (2006 – 2007)*. Ankara: Ministry of National Education, The Presidency of Strategy Development.
- Moore, L. S. (2010). *Study of Effective Approaches for Teaching Adults*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Digital Dissertations. (UMI 3419234)
- Morley, J. (1991). Listening Comprehension in Second/Foreign Language Instruction. In Marianne Celce – Murcia (Eds.), *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language* (pp. 81-106). Boston, Massachusetts: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Morrow, K. (2004). *Insights from the Common European Framework*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Narayanaswamy, K.R. (1972). An Experiment in Reading Comprehension at the College Level. English Language Teaching, *C.I.E Research Monograph No. 7*, Oxford University Press, India

- Olshtain, E. (1991). Functional task for mastering the mechanics of writing and going just beyond. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language* (pp. 207-217). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Omaggio, A. C. (1986). *Teaching Language in Context* (First Edition). USA: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.
- Öğrenci Seçme ve Yerleştirme Merkezi (2010) <http://www.osym.gov.tr>
- Özdoğan, M. (2002). *Performance Differences in the ELT Department between the students who attended prep classes and the one who did not*. (Unpublished Master's Thesis), Gazi University, Ankara.
- Özkanal, Ü. & Hakan, A. G. (2010). Effectiveness of University English Preparatory Programs: Eskişehir Osmangazi University Foreign Languages Department English Preparatory Program. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 1(3), 295 – 305.
- Phillipson, R. (2008). Language Policy and Political Issues in Education (Second Edition). In S. May and N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 255 – 264). Springer Science.
- Raimes, A. (2002). Ten Steps in Planning a Writing Course and Training Teachers of Writing In J. C. Richards and W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in Language Teaching; An Anthology of Current Practice* (pp. 306 – 314). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Reid, J. (2001). Writing. In R. Carter and D. Nunan (Eds.), *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages* (pp. 28-33). First Edition. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* (Second Edition). USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. & Renandya, W. A. (Richards, J. C. and Renandya, W. A.). (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching; An Anthology of Current Practice*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Riggenbach, H. & Lazaraton, A. (1991). Promoting Oral Communication Skills. In Marianne Celce – Murcia (Eds.), *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign*

- Language* (pp. 125-136). Boston, Massachusetts: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Rivers, W. M. (1981). *Teaching Foreign Language Skills*. (Second Edition). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rost, M. (2001). Listening. In R. Carter and D. Nunan (Eds.), *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages* (pp. 7-14). First Edition. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Ruetz, N. (1997). Effective communication; improving reading, writing, speaking and listening skills in the workplace. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.com>
- Scrievener, J. (2005). *Learning Teaching: A guidebook for English language teachers* (Second Edition). Oxford: Macmillan Publishers.
- Seargeant, P. & Erling, E. J. (2011). The Discourse of ‘English as a language for international development’: Policy assumptions and practical challenges. In H. Coleman (Ed.), *Dreams and Realities: Developing Countries and the English Language* (pp. 248 – 268). UK: British Council.
- Seow, A. (2002). The Writing Process and Process Writing. In J. C. Richards and W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in Language Teaching; An Anthology of Current Practice* (pp. 315 - 320). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Shumin, K. (2002). Factors to Consider: Developing Adult EFL Students’ Speaking Abilities. In J. C. Richards and W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in Language Teaching; An Anthology of Current Practice* (pp. 204 – 211). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Silva, T. & Matsuda, P. K. (2002). Writing. In N. Schmitt (Ed.), *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics* (pp. 251-266). Great Britain: Arnold.
- Smith, C. B. (2003). Skills students use when speaking and listening. Retrieved from <http://eric.indiana.edu>
- Smith, L. (1976). English as an international auxiliary language. *RELC Journal*, 7(2), 38 – 43.
- Tchudi, S. & Mitchell, D. (1989). *Exploration in the Teaching of English* (Third Edition). New York: Harper & Row.

- Thornbury, S. (2005). *How to Teach Speaking* (First Edition). Malaysia: Longman.
- Vandergrift, L. & Goh, C. (2009) Teaching and Testing Listening Comprehension. In M. H. Long and C. J. Doughty (Eds.), *The Handbook of Language Teaching* (pp. 395 – 411). Oxford, UK. Wiley-Blackwell Publishing.
- Wallace, C. (2001). Reading. In R. Carter and D. Nunan (Eds.), *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages* (pp. 21-28). First Edition. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Yüksek Öğretim Kurumu (2010) <http://www.yok.gov.tr>

APPENDIX A Common Reference Levels: self assessment grid

	A1	A2	B1	B2	C1	C2
Listening U N D E R S T A N D I N G	I can recognise familiar words and very basic phrases concerning myself, my family and immediate concrete surroundings when people speak slowly and clearly.	I can understand phrases and the highest frequency vocabulary related to areas of most immediate personal relevance (e.g. very basic personal and family information, shopping, local area, employment). I can catch the main point in short, clear, simple messages and announcements.	I can understand the main points of clear standard speech on familiar matters regularly encountered in work, school, leisure, etc. I can understand the main point of many radio or TV programmes on current affairs or topics of personal or professional interest when the delivery is relatively slow and clear.	I can understand extended speech and lectures and follow even complex lines of argument provided the topic is reasonably familiar. I can understand most TV news and current affairs programmes. I can understand the majority of films in standard dialect.	I can understand extended speech even when it is not clearly structured and when relationships are only implied and not signalled explicitly. I can understand television programmes and films without too much effort.	I have no difficulty in understanding any kind of spoken language, whether live or broadcast, even when delivered at fast native speed, provided I have some time to get familiar with the accent.
	Reading I can understand familiar names, words and very simple sentences, for example on notices and posters or in catalogues.	I can read very short, simple texts. I can find specific, predictable information in simple everyday material such as advertisements, prospectuses, menus and timetables and I can understand short simple personal letters.	I can understand texts that consist mainly of high frequency everyday or job-related language. I can understand the description of events, feelings and wishes in personal letters.	I can read articles and reports concerned with contemporary problems in which the writers adopt particular attitudes or viewpoints. I can understand contemporary literary prose.	I can understand long and complex factual and literary texts, appreciating distinctions of style. I can understand specialised articles and longer technical instructions, even when they do not relate to my field.	I can read with ease virtually all forms of the written language, including abstract, structurally or linguistically complex texts such as manuals, specialised articles and literary works.
	Spoken Interaction I can interact in a simple way provided the other person is prepared to repeat or rephrase things at a slower rate of speech and help me formulate what I'm trying to say. I can ask and answer simple questions in areas of immediate need or on very familiar topics.	I can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar topics and activities. I can handle very short social exchanges, even though I can't usually understand enough to keep the conversation going myself.	I can deal with most situations likely to arise whilst travelling in an area where the language is spoken. I can enter unprepared into conversation on topics that are familiar, of personal interest or pertinent to everyday life (e.g. family, hobbies, work, travel and current events).	I can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction with native speakers quite possible. I can take an active part in discussion in familiar contexts, accounting for and sustaining my views.	I can express myself fluently and spontaneously without much obvious searching for expressions. I can use language flexibly and effectively for social and professional purposes. I can formulate ideas and opinions with precision and relate my contribution skilfully to those of other speakers.	I can take part effortlessly in any conversation or discussion and have a good familiarity with idiomatic expressions and colloquialisms. I can express myself fluently and convey finer shades of meaning precisely. If I do have a problem I can backtrack and restructure around the difficulty so smoothly that other people are hardly aware of it.
Spoken Production S P E E K I N G	I can use simple phrases and sentences to describe where I live and people I know.	I can use a series of phrases and sentences to describe in simple terms my family and other people, living conditions, my educational background and my present or most recent job.	I can connect phrases in a simple way in order to describe experiences and events, my dreams, hopes and ambitions. I can briefly give reasons and explanations for opinions and plans. I can narrate a story or relate the plot of a book or film and describe my reactions.	I can present clear, detailed descriptions on a wide range of subjects related to my field of interest. I can explain a viewpoint on a topical issue giving the advantages and disadvantages of various options.	I can present clear, detailed descriptions of complex subjects integrating sub-themes, developing particular points and rounding off with an appropriate conclusion.	I can present a clear, smoothly flowing description or argument in a style appropriate to the context and with an effective logical structure which helps the recipient to notice and remember significant points. I can write summaries and reviews of professional or literary works.
	Writing I can write a short, simple postcard, for example sending holiday greetings. I can fill in forms with personal details, for example entering my name, nationality and address on a hotel registration form.	I can write short, simple notes and messages relating to matters in areas of immediate need. I can write a very simple personal letter, for example thanking someone for something.	I can write simple connected text on topics which are familiar or of personal interest. I can write personal letters describing experiences and impressions.	I can write clear, detailed text on a wide range of subjects related to my interests. I can write an essay or report, passing on information or giving reasons in support of or against a particular point of view. I can write letters highlighting the personal significance of events and experiences.	I can express myself in clear, well-structured text, expressing points of view at some length. I can write about complex subjects in a letter, an essay or a report, underlining what I consider to be the salient issues. I can select style appropriate to the reader in mind.	I can write clear, smoothly flowing text in an appropriate style. I can write complex letters, reports or articles which present a case with an effective logical structure which helps the recipient to notice and remember significant points. I can write summaries and reviews of professional or literary works.

APPENDIX B ELT freshmens's midterm and final exam results in fall term

2.00azırlık 1.00ğitimi	Öğretim türü	Cinsiyet	reading&writing 1			listening 1			speaking 1		
			vize	final	ortalama	vize	final	ortalama	vize	final	ortalama
1.00	1	1.00	65	61	62,6	81	42	57,6	76	77	76,6
1.00	1	1.00	48	69	60,6	79	65	70,6	76	77	76,6
1.00	1	2.00	41	64	54,8	75	55	63	72	76	74,4
1.00	1	1.00	45	65	57	83	58	68	74	77	75,8
1.00	1	2.00	55	60	58	71	60	64,4	72	76	74,4
1.00	1	1.00	42	59	52,2	65	80	74	72	74	73,2
1.00	1	1.00	44	58	52,4	63	66	64,8	73	78	76
1.00	1	1.00	70	63	65,8	89	67	75,8	78	82	80,4
1.00	1	1.00	58	54	55,6	81	51	63	70	76	73,6
1.00	1	2.00	45	47	46,2	61	38	47,2	74	76	75,2
1.00	1	1.00	56	68	63,2	70	60	64	83	90	87,2
2.00	1	1.00	81	76	78	83	37	55,4	68	65	66,2
2.00	1	1.00	38	56	48,8	77	63	68,6	73	75	74,2
2.00	1	1.00	50	53	51,8	72	48	57,6	68	72	70,4
2.00	1	1.00	61	52	55,6	62	74	69,2	70	70	70
2.00	1	1.00	78	73	75	83	60	69,2	76	85	81,4
2.00	1	1.00	49	55	52,6	64	39	49	75	78	76,8
2.00	1	1.00	57	57	57	85	51	64,6	68	72	70,4
2.00	1	1.00	46	45	45,4	65	42	51,2	74	76	75,2
2.00	1	1.00	51	60	56,4	82	82	82	78	84	81,6
2.00	1	1.00	56	49	51,8	88	84	85,6	70	70	70
2.00	1	1.00	80	68	72,8	79	80	79,6	70	70	70
2.00	1	2.00	75	71	72,6	83	86	84,8	80	83	81,8
2.00	1	1.00	67	56	60,4	87	61	71,4	70	70	70
1.00	1	1.00	37	60	50,8	69	73	71,4	78	74	75,6
1.00	1	1.00	40	64	54,4	73	60	65,2	79	80	79,6
1.00	1	1.00	57	83	72,6	69	78	74,4	82	79	80,2
1.00	1	1.00	61	74	68,8	71	59	63,8	77	79	78,2
1.00	1	2.00	63	74	69,6	79	76	77,2	83	76	78,8
1.00	1	2.00	58	57	57,4	72	78	75,6	78	74	75,6
1.00	1	1.00	40	62	53,2	70	55	61	75	75	75
1.00	1	2.00	53	62	58,4	74	68	70,4	79	74	76
1.00	1	1.00	30	50	42	76	85	81,4	80	75	77
1.00	1	1.00	57	76	68,4	71	70	70,4	75	71	72,6
2.00	1	1.00	26	58	45,2	69	50	57,6	80	74	76,4
2.00	1	1.00	55	75	67	90	88	88,8	78	69	72,6
2.00	1	1.00	31	60	48,4	58	48	52	80	86	83,6
2.00	1	1.00	29	60	47,6	55	65	61	59	73	67,4
2.00	1	2.00	52	54	53,2	68	48	56	83	84	83,6
2.00	1	1.00	65	76	71,6	84	90	87,6	84	85	84,6
2.00	1	1.00	51	80	68,4	74	77	75,8	80	84	82,4

2.00	1	2.00	89	80	83,6	91	78	83,2	82	80	80,8
2.00	1	1.00	61	71	67	75	72	73,2	83	77	79,4
2.00	1	1.00	27	61	47,4	68	66	66,8	81	74	76,8
2.00	1	1.00	39	50	45,6	67	70	68,8	78	73	75
2.00	1	1.00	55	68	62,8	65	82	75,2	75	70	72
2.00	1	1.00	61	80	72,4	80	74	76,4	76	79	77,8
2.00	1	2.00	54	64	60	59	55	56,6	77	74	75,2
2.00	1	1.00	56	67	62,6	66	61	63	75	69	71,4
1.00	1	2.00	45	64	56,4	57	58	57,6	73	68	70
1.00	1	1.00	35	68	54,8	82	78	79,6	72	76	74,4
1.00	1	2.00	74	81	78,2	84	79	81	60	62	61,2
1.00	1	1.00	66	52	57,6	81	56	66	60	59	59,4
1.00	1	1.00	54	53	53,4	69	59	63	50	59	55,4
1.00	1	1.00	68	76	72,8	79	55	64,6	45	64	56,4
1.00	1	2.00	52	55	53,8	64	38	48,4	55	65	61
1.00	1	1.00	61	76	70	85	77	80,2	50	72	63,2
1.00	1	1.00	57	69	64,2	89	85	86,6	60	63	61,8
1.00	1	1.00	58	81	71,8	90	76	81,6	60	65	63
1.00	1	2.00	65	57	60,2	79	37	53,8	55	62	59,2
1.00	1	1.00	58	70	65,2	70	58	62,8	75	73	73,8
1.00	1	1.00	60	74	68,4	75	56	63,6	60	59	59,4
2.00	1	1.00	83	68	74	77	88	83,6	55	68	62,8
2.00	1	2.00	51	61	57	75	57	64,2	50	58	54,8
2.00	1	2.00	53	50	51,2	79	67	71,8	45	60	54
2.00	1	1.00	71	74	72,8	77	73	74,6	55	67	62,2
2.00	1	1.00	53	65	60,2	63	63	63	45	71	60,6
2.00	1	1.00	78	86	82,8	91	95	93,4	76	78	77,2
2.00	1	1.00	62	48	53,6	80	53	63,8	45	56	51,6
2.00	1	1.00	45	66	57,6	70	47	56,2	60	62	61,2
2.00	1	1.00	60	61	60,6	79	63	69,4	60	63	61,8
2.00	1	1.00	61	74	68,8	84	37	55,8	45	54	50,4
2.00	1	1.00	65	65	65	79	72	74,8	50	68	60,8
2.00	1	1.00	57	55	55,8	82	75	77,8	65	73	69,8
2.00	1	1.00	52	69	62,2	68	60	63,2	55	59	57,4
2.00	1	1.00	57	60	58,8	80	61	68,6	60	63	61,8
2.00	2	1.00	50	67	60,2	47	56	52,4	78	80	79,2
1.00	2	1.00	46	68	59,2	53	39	44,6	80	80	80
1.00	2	1.00	60	74	68,4	72	50	58,8	82	85	83,8
1.00	2	1.00	52	65	59,8	47	83	68,6	83	92	88,4
1.00	2	1.00	74	77	75,8	87	76	80,4	78	86	82,8
1.00	2	1.00	78	84	81,6	73	75	74,2	80	85	83
1.00	2	1.00	64	70	67,6	65	43	51,8	76	76	76
1.00	2	1.00	65	76	71,6	77	82	80	80	85	83
1.00	2	2.00	46	70	60,4	57	51	53,4	74	78	76,4

1.00	2	1.00	42	67	57	55	35	43	71	77	74,6
1.00	2	1.00	48	76	64,8	52	29	38,2	75	72	73,2
1.00	2	1.00	48	68	60	55	45	49	74	81	78,2
1.00	2	1.00	56	75	67,4	61	79	71,8	76	79	77,8
2.00	2	1.00	46	64	56,8	78	72	74,4	90	78	82,8
2.00	2	1.00	62	68	65,6	64	72	68,8	83	85	84,2
2.00	2	1.00	47	70	60,8	71	42	53,6	69	72	70,8
2.00	2	1.00	47	68	59,6	68	75	72,2	82	82	82
2.00	2	1.00	63	62	62,4	45	25	33	73	75	74,2
2.00	2	1.00	63	77	71,4	68	53	59	79	86	83,2
2.00	2	1.00	48	70	61,2	63	49	54,6	78	78	78
2.00	2	1.00	35	60	50	60	45	51	74	76	75,2
2.00	2	2.00	75	76	75,6	60	77	70,2	77	95	87,8
2.00	2	2.00	33	70	55,2	40	30	34	75	80	78
2.00	2	2.00	58	62	60,4	68	77	73,4	75	80	78
2.00	2	1.00	62	72	68	49	74	64	75	80	78
2.00	2	1.00	73	76	74,8	55	61	58,6	78	87	83,4
2.00	2	1.00	40	52	47,2	38	79	62,6	76	80	78,4
2.00	2	1.00	66	74	70,8	91	78	83,2	86	90	88,4
2.00	2	1.00	70	75	73	59	81	72,2	82	84	83,2
2.00	2	1.00	89	81	84,2	71	77	74,6	80	93	87,8
2.00	2	2.00	45	53	49,8	67	54	59,2	78	80	79,2
1.00	2	1.00	30	63	49,8	60	62	61,2	74	76	75,2
1.00	2	1.00	56	75	67,4	61	60	60,4	83	80	81,2
2.00	2	2.00	35	65	53	75	56	63,6	79	79	79
1.00	2	1.00	64	66	65,2	75	72	73,2	84	83	83,4
1.00	2	2.00	42	61	53,4	82	64	71,2	80	74	76,4
1.00	2	1.00	57	60	58,8	59	51	54,2	79	79	79
1.00	2	1.00	78	72	74,4	75	72	73,2	78	76	76,8
1.00	2	1.00	54	71	64,2	76	66	70	81	82	81,6
2.00	2	2.00	42	76	62,4	62	64	63,2	73	74	73,6
1.00	2	1.00	73	72	72,4	73	71	71,8	82	83	82,6
1.00	2	1.00	39	66	55,2	57	70	64,8	76	74	74,8
1.00	2	2.00	38	63	53	76	64	68,8	79	79	79
1.00	2	1.00	29	58	46,4	56	48	51,2	80	73	75,8
2.00	2	2.00	27	50	40,8	61	55	57,4	73	74	73,6
2.00	2	1.00	52	56	54,4	65	57	60,2	71	75	73,4
2.00	2	1.00	78	58	66	67	66	66,4	85	80	82
2.00	2	1.00	31	62	49,6	66	64	64,8	75	75	75
2.00	2	1.00	44	62	54,8	58	56	56,8	70	73	71,8
2.00	2	2.00	54	61	58,2	57	45	49,8	84	80	81,6
2.00	2	1.00	66	67	66,6	74	75	74,6	82	83	82,6
2.00	2	2.00	44	56	51,2	57	58	57,6	76	75	75,4

2.00	2	1.00	58	58	58	70	67	68,2	82	82	82
2.00	2	2.00	47	71	61,4	88	78	82	87	90	88,8
2.00	2	2.00	54	56	55,2	71	63	66,2	73	75	74,2
2.00	2	1.00	64	71	68,2	72	80	76,8	75	78	76,8
2.00	2	1.00	24	60	45,6	51	37	42,6	75	76	75,6
2.00	2	1.00	46	62	55,6	78	80	79,2	88	90	89,2
2.00	2	2.00	60	51	54,6	44	79	65	67	84	77,2
1.00	2	1.00	68	73	71	63	85	76,2	70	68	68,8
1.00	2	1.00	71	63	66,2	47	72	62	61	65	63,4
1.00	2	1.00	76	74	74,8	59	75	68,6	68	71	69,8
1.00	2	1.00	62	75	69,8	82	83	82,6	65	75	71
1.00	2	1.00	69	62	64,8	71	86	80	68	76	72,8
1.00	2	1.00	70	64	66,4	89	82	84,8	72	90	82,8
1.00	2	1.00	80	63	69,8	65	82	75,2	85	83	83,8
1.00	2	1.00	81	79	79,8	64	86	77,2	74	81	78,2
1.00	2	1.00	66	60	62,4	62	85	75,8	62	68	65,6
1.00	2	1.00	66	66	66	58	69	64,6	55	55	55
1.00	2	1.00	78	63	69	56	74	66,8	58	81	71,8
1.00	2	1.00	55	50	52	80	71	74,6	57	68	63,6
2.00	2	1.00	61	65	63,4	60	76	69,6	60	70	66
2.00	2	1.00	58	73	67	30	65	51	60	60	60
2.00	2	1.00	63	50	55,2	59	70	65,6	64	76	71,2
2.00	2	1.00	65	54	58,4	67	76	72,4	58	66	62,8
2.00	2	1.00	69	68	68,4	57	79	70,2	64	67	65,8
2.00	2	2.00	56	74	66,8	64	83	75,4	62	56	58,4
2.00	2	1.00	64	69	67	58	83	73	68	76	72,8
2.00	2	1.00	59	59	59	42	76	62,4	65	73	69,8
2.00	2	1.00	62	60	60,8	49	58	54,4	55	56	55,6
2.00	2	1.00	56	63	60,2	77	84	81,2	63	69	66,6
2.00	2	1.00	63	64	63,6	46	83	68,2	65	67	66,2
2.00	2	2.00	56	65	61,4	30	71	54,6	63	65	64,2
2.00	2	1.00	59	71	66,2	44	29	35	61	69	65,8
1.00	1	1.00	61	62	61,6	67	80	74,8	80	78	78,8
1.00	1	1.00	63	73	69	61	76	70	79	81	80,2
2.00	1	1.00	63	49	54,6	45	51	48,6	60	82	73,2
1.00	1	1.00	63	81	73,8	93	94	93,6	83	85	84,2
1.00	1	1.00	70	63	65,8	54	52	52,8	78	74	75,6
1.00	1	1.00	55	70	64	66	66	66	78	83	81
1.00	1	1.00	68	90	81,2	89	76	81,2	83	85	84,2
1.00	1	1.00	61	79	71,8	71	66	68	78	73	75
1.00	1	1.00	60	74	68,4	66	68	67,2	78	84	81,6
1.00	1	1.00	57	78	69,6	54	44	48	75	83	79,8
1.00	1	1.00	73	73	73	88	80	83,2	78	81	79,8

1.00	1	1.00	71	68	69,2	71	47	56,6	80	87	84,2
2.00	1	2.00	54	71	64,2	61	64	62,8	77	89	84,2
2.00	1	1.00	50	67	60,2	83	52	64,4	75	79	77,4
2.00	1	1.00	57	53	54,6	51	40	44,4	76	71	73
2.00	1	2.00	57	82	72	77	70	72,8	70	77	74,2
2.00	1	1.00	60	48	52,8	59	65	62,6	76	80	78,4
2.00	1	1.00	69	64	66	62	65	63,8	78	75	76,2
2.00	1	1.00	66	64	64,8	67	45	53,8	76	71	73
2.00	1	1.00	68	69	68,6	66	59	61,8	71	71	71
2.00	1	1.00	69	74	72	59	52	54,8	78	80	79,2
2.00	1	1.00	53	77	67,4	78	84	81,6	72	77	75
2.00	1	1.00	62	48	53,6	59	69	65	80	73	75,8
2.00	2	1.00	61	54	56,8	63	80	73,2	55	50	52
2.00	2	2.00	54	63	59,4	73	48	58	47	60	54,8
1.00	2	1.00	46	63	56,2	73	73	73	58	64	61,6
1.00	2	1.00	46	47	46,6	69	76	73,2	65	76	71,6
1.00	2	1.00	43	53	49	67	58	61,6	62	59	60,2
1.00	2	1.00	57	60	58,8	66	60	62,4	60	64	62,4
1.00	2	2.00	54	61	58,2	64	55	58,6	67	74	71,2
1.00	2	1.00	57	60	58,8	68	64	65,6	60	62	61,2
1.00	2	1.00	32	73	56,6	72	92	84	62	55	57,8
1.00	2	1.00	50	62	57,2	68	63	65	63	81	73,8
1.00	2	1.00	46	56	52	60	60	60	58	51	53,8
1.00	2	1.00	63	58	60	56	70	64,4	60	55	57
1.00	2	1.00	62	63	62,6	83	78	80	55	57	56,2
1.00	2	1.00	66	77	72,6	79	72	74,8	61	77	70,6
1.00	2	1.00	68	85	78,2	84	85	84,6	65	72	69,2
1.00	2	1.00	50	69	61,4	71	54	60,8	60	72	67,2
1.00	2	1.00	52	73	64,6	83	68	74	64	77	71,8
1.00	2	1.00	58	72	66,4	82	62	70	67	74	71,2
1.00	2	1.00	69	75	72,6	82	54	65,2	57	70	64,8
1.00	2	1.00	45	84	68,4	76	54	62,8	60	75	69
1.00	2	1.00	81	84	82,8	76	66	70	61	84	74,8
1.00	2	1.00	71	87	80,6	82	65	71,8	65	71	68,6
1.00	2	1.00	74	85	80,6	51	57	54,6	68	76	72,8
1.00	2	1.00	84	83	83,4	90	65	75	67	74	71,2
2.00	2	1.00	41	64	54,8	77	41	55,4	46	60	54,4
2.00	2	1.00	51	70	62,4	76	60	66,4	49	60	55,6
2.00	2	1.00	46	62	55,6	65	38	48,8	47	64	57,2
2.00	2	1.00	60	74	68,4	88	40	59,2	65	79	73,4
2.00	2	1.00	77	75	75,8	82	55	65,8	65	67	66,2
2.00	2	1.00	57	84	73,2	80	60	68	45	63	55,8
2.00	2	2.00	37	61	51,4	67	50	56,8	49	60	55,6

2.00	2	1.00	47	74	63,2	77	68	71,6	49	66	59,2
2.00	2	1.00	43	60	53,2	54	46	49,2	44	52	48,8
2.00	2	2.00	51	64	58,8	52	63	58,6	56	64	60,8
2.00	2	1.00	58	77	69,4	74	44	56	57	63	60,6
2.00	2	1.00	61	78	71,2	58	66	62,8	62	75	69,8
2.00	2	1.00	73	80	77,2	87	65	73,8	65	80	74
2.00	2	1.00	56	77	68,6	76	56	64	50	56	53,6
2.00	2	1.00	57	65	61,8	48	34	39,6	49	61	56,2
2.00	2	1.00	37	63	52,6	75	55	63	47	68	59,6
2.00	2	1.00	55	63	59,8	65	63	63,8	60	70	66
2.00	2	2.00	43	49	46,6	67	58	61,6	70	83	77,8
2.00	2	1.00	35	51	44,6	78	80	79,2	60	64	62,4
2.00	2	1.00	74	62	66,8	88	71	77,8	67	86	78,4
2.00	2	1.00	35	63	51,8	58	66	62,8	57	54	55,2
2.00	2	1.00	21	38	31,2	59	78	70,4	56	56	56
2.00	2	1.00	36	47	42,6	73	74	73,6	63	73	69
2.00	2	1.00	51	52	51,6	69	73	71,4	60	55	57
2.00	2	2.00	41	62	53,6	72	63	66,6	64	67	65,8
2.00	2	1.00	47	49	48,2	72	81	77,4	65	67	66,2
2.00	2	1.00	34	59	49	82	75	77,8	72	83	78,6
2.00	2	2.00	70	58	62,8	74	60	65,6	62	61	61,4
2.00	2	1.00	61	61	61	74	87	81,8	50	67	60,2
2.00	2	1.00	61	55	57,4	60	66	63,6	60	70	66
1.00	1	1.00	66	74	70,8	65	70	68	70	77	74,2
1.00	1	2.00	66	85	77,4	69	39	51	73	76	74,8
1.00	1	1.00	36	71	57	66	69	67,8	68	80	75,2
1.00	1	1.00	57	77	69	64	51	56,2	70	80	76
1.00	1	1.00	60	82	73,2	72	60	64,8	70	80	76
1.00	1	2.00	43	73	61	54	44	48	78	85	82,2
1.00	1	1.00	60	66	63,6	55	44	48,4	70	80	76
1.00	1	1.00	52	70	62,8	70	41	52,6	70	85	79
1.00	1	1.00	48	70	61,2	68	55	60,2	75	80	78
1.00	1	1.00	64	74	70	74	68	70,4	73	80	77,2
2.00	1	2.00	68	63	65	59	42	48,8	65	74	70,4
2.00	1	1.00	30	60	48	58	67	63,4	80	82	81,2
2.00	1	2.00	65	69	67,4	71	57	62,6	75	85	81
2.00	1	2.00	43	80	65,2	67	29	44,2	75	85	81
2.00	1	1.00	43	74	61,6	54	42	46,8	65	75	71
2.00	1	1.00	56	66	62	72	65	67,8	80	85	83
2.00	1	1.00	55	78	68,8	81	74	76,8	68	85	78,2
2.00	1	1.00	54	64	60	60	51	54,6	67	75	71,8
2.00	1	1.00	73	63	67	65	74	70,4	60	70	66
2.00	1	2.00	51	57	54,6	58	59	58,6	68	72	70,4

2.00	1	2.00	50	75	65	66	36	48	73	85	80,2
2.00	1	2.00	70	78	74,8	76	56	64	68	72	70,4
2.00	1	1.00	70	71	70,6	82	77	79	70	73	71,8

APPENDIX C ELT freshmen's midterm and final exam results in spring term

2.00azırlık 1.00ğitimi	Öğreti m türü	Cinsiy et	reading&writing 2			listening 2			speaking 2		
			vize	final	ortal ama	vize	final	ortala ma	vize	final	ortal ama
1.00	1	1.00	70	51	58,6	77	74	75,2	82	80	80,8
1.00	1	1.00	78	58	66	78	58	66	75	75	75
1.00	1	2.00	54	42	46,8	72	50	58,8	60	85	75
1.00	1	1.00	64	55	58,6	76	57	64,6	84	80	81,6
1.00	1	2.00	77	59	66,2	82	52	64	75	85	81
1.00	1	1.00	73	47	57,4	77	56	64,4	82	70	74,8
1.00	1	1.00	72	49	58,2	82	70	74,8	75	80	78
1.00	1	1.00	75	70	72	74	74	74	50	85	71
1.00	1	1.00	62	56	58,4	67	65	65,8	50	85	71
1.00	1	2.00	64	50	55,6	84	56	67,2	85	85	85
1.00	1	1.00	69	63	65,4	80	75	77	82	85	83,8
2.00	1	1.00	82	82	82	85	70	76	50	85	71
2.00	1	1.00	56	47	50,6	70	57	62,2	75	75	75
2.00	1	1.00	59	54	56	63	56	58,8	86	75	79,4
2.00	1	1.00	58	59	58,6	75	63	67,8	85	75	79
2.00	1	1.00	75	81	78,6	89	86	87,2	56	85	73,4
2.00	1	1.00	60	60	60	74	60	65,6	86	80	82,4
2.00	1	1.00	53	49	50,6	76	55	63,4	60	80	72
2.00	1	1.00	65	58	60,8	70	45	55	86	80	82,4
2.00	1	1.00	85	67	74,2	90	46	63,6	85	85	85
2.00	1	1.00	66	55	59,4	80	78	78,8	85	75	79
2.00	1	1.00	89	80	83,6	81	85	83,4	85	75	79
2.00	1	2.00	77	72	74	80	87	84,2	86	100	94,4
2.00	1	1.00	61	69	65,8	70	59	63,4	60	80	72

1.00	1	1.00	70	75	73	59	59	59	75	78	76,8
1.00	1	1.00	75	69	71,4	69	65	66,6	80	80	80
1.00	1	1.00	80	73	75,8	87	77	81	85	85	85
1.00	1	1.00	65	72	69,2	63	70	67,2	82	86	84,4
1.00	1	2.00	65	69	67,4	78	75	76,2	80	82	81,2
1.00	1	2.00	70	61	64,6	71	65	67,4	85	85	85
1.00	1	1.00	70	65	67	58	66	62,8	74	76	75,2
1.00	1	2.00	65	70	68	62	66	64,4	76	76	76
1.00	1	1.00	70	75	73	66	71	69	78	80	79,2
1.00	1	1.00	65	64	64,4	88	72	78,4	74	76	75,2
2.00	1	1.00	60	72	67,2	41	71	59	76	78	77,2
2.00	1	1.00	65	72	69,2	56	74	66,8	75	75	75
2.00	1	1.00	70	66	67,6	55	52	53,2	80	82	81,2
2.00	1	1.00	55	61	58,6	60	68	64,8	72	75	73,8
2.00	1	2.00	55	57	56,2	40	49	45,4	86	88	87,2
2.00	1	1.00	80	63	69,8	81	75	77,4	78	80	79,2
2.00	1	1.00	80	72	75,2	55	70	64	80	82	81,2
2.00	1	2.00	55	64	60,4	80	92	87,2	90	90	90
2.00	1	1.00	80	59	67,4	55	80	70	82	85	83,8
2.00	1	1.00	75	64	68,4	53	70	63,2	86	88	87,2
2.00	1	1.00	60	59	59,4	77	68	71,6	76	78	77,2
2.00	1	1.00	80	63	69,8	59	62	60,8	76	78	77,2
2.00	1	1.00	60	80	72	54	67	61,8	80	80	80
2.00	1	2.00	65	62	63,2	41	61	53	82	85	83,8
2.00	1	1.00	70	59	63,4	45	68	58,8	76	78	77,2
1.00	1	2.00	50	67	60,2	41	56	50	82	85	83,8
1.00	1	1.00	81	55	65,4	78	54	63,6	84	70	75,6
1.00	1	2.00	77	72	74	89	70	77,6	77	86	82,4

1.00	1	1.00	68	65	66,2	75	68	70,8	70	77	74,2
1.00	1	1.00	53	57	55,4	61	59	59,8	69	70	69,6
1.00	1	1.00	55	55	55	68	88	80	83	82	82,4
1.00	1	2.00	75	63	67,8	64	74	70	70	78	74,8
1.00	1	1.00	61	69	65,8	74	74	74	73	75	74,2
1.00	1	1.00	67	64	65,2	90	82	85,2	74	78	76,4
1.00	1	1.00	68	65	66,2	81	67	72,6	78	79	78,6
1.00	1	2.00	64	58	60,4	73	86	80,8	70	72	71,2
1.00	1	1.00	58	63	61	74	67	69,8	82	85	83,8
1.00	1	1.00	61	71	67	74	60	65,6	70	76	73,6
2.00	1	1.00	68	74	71,6	82	84	83,2	84	87	85,8
2.00	1	2.00	54	50	51,6	61	63	62,2	74	79	77
2.00	1	2.00	69	64	66	70	71	70,6	78	77	77,4
2.00	1	1.00	65	72	69,2	69	72	70,8	80	78	78,8
2.00	1	1.00	66	61	63	76	58	65,2	73	82	78,4
2.00	1	1.00	77	83	80,6	94	98	96,4	83	80	81,2
2.00	1	1.00	55	58	56,8	62	67	65	67	70	68,8
2.00	1	1.00	70	51	58,6	78	67	71,4	67	69	68,2
2.00	1	1.00	64	65	64,6	82	87	85	77	81	79,4
2.00	1	1.00	48	60	55,2	76	68	71,2	40	55	49
2.00	1	1.00	73	74	73,6	80	80	80	79	68	72,4
2.00	1	1.00	66	73	70,2	83	80	81,2	87	82	84
2.00	1	1.00	59	63	61,4	62	55	57,8	75	69	71,4
2.00	1	1.00	73	71	71,8	88	70	77,2	72	83	78,6
2.00	2	1.00	56	60	58,4	48	54	51,6	75	70	72
1.00	2	1.00	69	75	72,6	71	74	72,8	83	78	80
1.00	2	1.00	73	76	74,8	83	76	78,8	90	83	85,8
1.00	2	1.00	66	60	62,4	85	80	82	95	86	89,6

1.00	2	1.00	66	75	71,4	83	86	84,8	86	87	86,6
1.00	2	1.00	72	70	70,8	76	85	81,4	76	75	75,4
1.00	2	1.00	63	64	63,6	73	61	65,8	70	71	70,6
1.00	2	1.00	77	70	72,8	79	83	81,4	93	90	91,2
1.00	2	2.00	73	70	71,2	87	77	81	78	74	75,6
1.00	2	1.00	55	52	53,2	53	66	60,8	80	50	62
1.00	2	1.00	73	78	76	69	73	71,4	82	76	78,4
1.00	2	1.00	62	59	60,2	63	75	70,2	90	75	81
1.00	2	1.00	69	76	73,2	82	69	74,2	75	77	76,2
2.00	2	1.00	62	61	61,4	62	80	72,8	80	95	89
2.00	2	1.00	67	68	67,6	65	70	68	80	80	80
2.00	2	1.00	59	65	62,6	58	71	65,8	73	70	71,2
2.00	2	1.00	77	71	73,4	65	87	78,2	90	78	82,8
2.00	2	1.00	57	58	57,6	59	70	65,6	70	78	74,8
2.00	2	1.00	68	71	69,8	98	91	93,8	90	79	83,4
2.00	2	1.00	62	60	60,8	72	73	72,6	80	80	80
2.00	2	1.00	50	58	54,8	72	93	84,6	87	75	79,8
2.00	2	2.00	69	70	69,6	58	74	67,6	80	86	83,6
2.00	2	2.00	54	58	56,4	50	80	68	88	81	83,8
2.00	2	2.00	62	60	60,8	80	86	83,6	76	80	78,4
2.00	2	1.00	56	63	60,2	82	87	85	75	76	75,6
2.00	2	1.00	78	80	79,2	71	95	85,4	95	82	87,2
2.00	2	1.00	57	70	64,8	73	87	81,4	75	76	75,6
2.00	2	1.00	68	72	70,4	81	95	89,4	95	85	89
2.00	2	1.00	70	77	74,2	75	73	73,8	80	85	83
2.00	2	1.00	74	83	79,4	67	90	80,8	92	87	89
2.00	2	2.00	57	56	56,4	65	60	62	70	76	73,6
1.00	2	1.00	59	56	57,2	52	68	61,6	75	79	77,4

1.00	2	1.00	63	54	57,6	67	78	73,6	72	74	73,2
2.00	2	2.00	51	47	48,6	48	70	61,2	70	70	70
1.00	2	1.00	59	76	69,2	75	85	81	78	76	76,8
1.00	2	2.00	41	52	47,6	64	68	66,4	73	72	72,4
1.00	2	1.00	42	46	44,4	53	60	57,2	73	75	74,2
1.00	2	1.00	70	66	67,6	73	70	71,2	70	75	73
1.00	2	1.00	61	56	58	74	78	76,4	75	78	76,8
2.00	2	2.00	53	59	56,6	72	60	64,8	75	75	75
1.00	2	1.00	72	72	72	73	72	72,4	75	74	74,4
1.00	2	1.00	57	58	57,6	47	68	59,6	76	74	74,8
1.00	2	2.00	58	69	64,6	53	66	60,8	72	73	72,6
1.00	2	1.00	28	54	43,6	64	80	73,6	70	74	72,4
2.00	2	2.00	54	49	51	52	64	59,2	70	60	64
2.00	2	1.00	51	62	57,6	62	60	60,8	70	70	70
2.00	2	1.00	63	62	62,4	73	68	70	72	73	72,6
2.00	2	1.00	62	49	54,2	58	74	67,6	70	73	71,8
2.00	2	1.00	63	57	59,4	52	68	61,6	72	74	73,2
2.00	2	2.00	51	56	54	70	73	71,8	75	87	82,2
2.00	2	1.00	72	71	71,4	74	74	74	73	80	77,2
2.00	2	2.00	43	56	50,8	56	64	60,8	73	72	72,4
2.00	2	1.00	68	55	60,2	80	70	74	79	80	79,6
2.00	2	2.00	83	89	86,6	96	93	94,2	88	93	91
2.00	2	2.00	61	50	54,4	57	65	61,8	68	72	70,4
2.00	2	1.00	66	64	64,8	75	72	73,2	72	78	75,6
2.00	2	1.00	41	58	51,2	42	70	58,8	75	74	74,4
2.00	2	1.00	63	62	62,4	82	80	80,8	76	78	77,2
2.00	2	2.00	60	66	63,6	51	54	52,8	80	85	83
1.00	2	1.00	78	88	84	74	81	78,2	73	65	68,2

1.00	2	1.00	70	67	68,2	55	60	58	78	63	69
1.00	2	1.00	67	63	64,6	61	74	68,8	78	70	73,2
1.00	2	1.00	69	73	71,4	65	60	62	80	83	81,8
1.00	2	1.00	71	65	67,4	63	75	70,2	86	80	82,4
1.00	2	1.00	67	64	65,2	77	67	71	86	80	82,4
1.00	2	1.00	77	73	74,6	64	85	76,6	82	90	86,8
1.00	2	1.00	75	80	78	70	83	77,8	75	88	82,8
1.00	2	1.00	64	64	64	66	52	57,6	80	65	71
1.00	2	1.00	65	64	64,4	47	70	60,8	70	57	62,2
1.00	2	1.00	78	90	85,2	72	82	78	80	75	77
1.00	2	1.00	61	66	64	64	66	65,2	70	67	68,2
2.00	2	1.00	60	67	64,2	75	76	75,6	76	71	73
2.00	2	1.00	62	66	64,4	52	59	56,2	75	70	72
2.00	2	1.00	68	71	69,8	64	84	76	87	80	82,8
2.00	2	1.00	62	72	68	71	80	76,4	70	70	70
2.00	2	1.00	61	67	64,6	52	62	58	78	70	73,2
2.00	2	2.00	66	64	64,8	61	62	61,6	73	65	68,2
2.00	2	1.00	75	70	72	61	60	60,4	75	82	79,2
2.00	2	1.00	71	62	65,6	67	60	62,8	78	70	73,2
2.00	2	1.00	62	66	64,4	59	58	58,4	78	65	70,2
2.00	2	1.00	74	75	74,6	75	85	81	72	80	76,8
2.00	2	1.00	62	66	64,4	73	81	77,8	75	70	72
2.00	2	2.00	63	82	74,4	27	44	37,2	70	65	67
2.00	2	1.00	70	72	71,2	49	72	62,8	80	75	77
1.00	1	1.00	62	61	61,4	77	87	83	80	82	81,2
1.00	1	1.00	83	46	60,8	87	85	85,8	82	86	84,4
2.00	1	1.00	52	27	37	41	42	41,6	76	78	77,2
1.00	1	1.00	89	69	77	97	85	89,8	82	85	83,8

1.00	1	1.00	65	55	59	77	78	77,6	82	85	83,8
1.00	1	1.00	76	58	65,2	72	78	75,6	82	85	83,8
1.00	1	1.00	77	62	68	75	74	74,4	86	88	87,2
1.00	1	1.00	77	66	70,4	86	69	75,8	82	85	83,8
1.00	1	1.00	66	55	59,4	83	85	84,2	86	88	87,2
1.00	1	1.00	72	54	61,2	80	89	85,4	82	85	83,8
1.00	1	1.00	70	62	65,2	80	79	79,4	78	82	80,4
1.00	1	1.00	46	62	55,6	79	82	80,8	86	88	87,2
2.00	1	2.00	55	62	59,2	82	70	74,8	82	84	83,2
2.00	1	1.00	69	67	67,8	76	77	76,6	78	86	82,8
2.00	1	1.00	64	39	49	75	68	70,8	74	76	75,2
2.00	1	2.00	57	68	63,6	72	68	69,6	76	82	79,6
2.00	1	1.00	65	61	62,6	67	77	73	76	80	78,4
2.00	1	1.00	64	65	64,6	72	87	81	82	88	85,6
2.00	1	1.00	73	52	60,4	66	87	78,6	78	80	79,2
2.00	1	1.00	71	66	68	77	77	77	78	82	80,4
2.00	1	1.00	67	49	56,2	59	82	72,8	76	80	78,4
2.00	1	1.00	69	67	67,8	87	66	74,4	76	82	79,6
2.00	1	1.00	63	66	64,8	73	89	82,6	80	85	83
2.00	2	1.00	54	54	54	63	60	61,2	65	70	68
2.00	2	2.00	39	43	41,4	66	47	54,6	73	65	68,2
1.00	2	1.00	64	59	61	56	60	58,4	65	70	68
1.00	2	1.00	57	49	52,2	63	70	67,2	60	75	69
1.00	2	1.00	53	45	48,2	54	52	52,8	67	80	74,8
1.00	2	1.00	55	50	52	60	70	66	74	75	74,6
1.00	2	2.00	41	58	51,2	49	55	52,6	65	80	74
1.00	2	1.00	55	58	56,8	69	65	66,6	60	75	69
1.00	2	1.00	67	57	61	76	80	78,4	67	75	71,8

1.00	2	1.00	62	47	53	52	48	49,6	60	75	69
1.00	2	1.00	53	52	52,4	43	60	53,2	74	75	74,6
1.00	2	1.00	60	56	57,6	68	68	68	74	65	68,6
1.00	2	1.00	73	64	67,6	77	81	79,4	74	80	77,6
1.00	2	1.00	85	61	70,6	76	63	68,2	70	73	71,8
1.00	2	1.00	72	67	69	88	73	79	85	73	77,8
1.00	2	1.00	55	60	58	67	60	62,8	73	75	74,2
1.00	2	1.00	69	54	60	77	82	80	85	80	82
1.00	2	1.00	72	63	66,6	76	60	66,4	85	80	82
1.00	2	1.00	64	59	61	81	69	73,8	76	68	71,2
1.00	2	1.00	66	48	55,2	75	53	61,8	78	72	74,4
1.00	2	1.00	66	51	57	79	74	76	85	90	88
1.00	2	1.00	70	55	61	81	75	77,4	80	83	81,8
1.00	2	1.00	80	60	68	83	57	67,4	78	78	78
1.00	2	1.00	78	68	72	80	65	71	73	70	71,2
2.00	2	1.00	58	49	52,6	74	48	58,4	70	68	68,8
2.00	2	1.00	52	58	55,6	73	46	56,8	70	67	68,2
2.00	2	1.00	52	42	46	53	45	48,2	70	55	61
2.00	2	1.00	57	42	48	70	56	61,6	75	80	78
2.00	2	1.00	54	55	54,6	87	47	63	80	70	74
2.00	2	1.00	59	58	58,4	52	56	54,4	76	78	77,2
2.00	2	2.00	52	53	52,6	63	61	61,8	70	68	68,8
2.00	2	1.00	54	50	51,6	80	67	72,2	70	70	70
2.00	2	1.00	39	33	35,4	72	38	51,6	70	60	64
2.00	2	2.00	55	37	44,2	70	46	55,6	75	75	75
2.00	2	1.00	49	52	50,8	80	58	66,8	70	68	68,8
2.00	2	1.00	62	60	60,8	70	68	68,8	80	85	83
2.00	2	1.00	81	62	69,6	89	74	80	80	75	77

2.00	2	1.00	39	54	48	78	56	64,8	70	60	64
2.00	2	1.00	53	58	56	53	47	49,4	75	65	69
2.00	2	1.00	53	44	47,6	69	43	53,4	70	70	70
2.00	2	1.00	61	51	55	58	73	67	80	75	77
2.00	2	2.00	37	47	43	52	55	53,8	65	80	74
2.00	2	1.00	51	49	49,8	77	74	75,2	65	75	71
2.00	2	1.00	76	59	65,8	73	70	71,2	65	90	80
2.00	2	1.00	49	52	50,8	51	73	64,2	65	70	68
2.00	2	1.00	37	43	40,6	44	60	53,6	60	75	69
2.00	2	1.00	59	66	63,2	51	73	64,2	67	75	71,8
2.00	2	1.00	68	50	57,2	65	67	66,2	65	70	68
2.00	2	2.00	41	51	47	65	64	64,4	60	85	75
2.00	2	1.00	57	70	64,8	66	77	72,6	67	75	71,8
2.00	2	1.00	59	61	60,2	63	65	64,2	80	85	83
2.00	2	2.00	40	53	47,8	76	65	69,4	67	80	74,8
2.00	2	1.00	66	64	64,8	67	71	69,4	65	75	71
2.00	2	1.00	53	58	56	64	70	67,6	74	75	74,6
1.00	1	1.00	70	78	74,8	88	69	76,6	74	75	74,6
1.00	1	2.00	73	72	72,4	70	62	65,2	74	80	77,6
1.00	1	1.00	57	66	62,4	62	75	69,8	78	65	70,2
1.00	1	1.00	61	61	61	74	82	78,8	60	80	72
1.00	1	1.00	76	80	78,4	75	67	70,2	60	80	72
1.00	1	2.00	55	66	61,6	77	65	69,8	60	85	75
1.00	1	1.00	64	64	64	62	78	71,6	74	70	71,6
1.00	1	1.00	66	71	69	77	72	74	74	85	80,6
1.00	1	1.00	68	65	66,2	83	87	85,4	81	80	80,4
1.00	1	1.00	78	80	79,2	61	76	70	74	75	74,6
2.00	1	2.00	60	65	63	53	68	62	60	75	69

2.00	1	1.00	58	58	58	61	76	70	81	75	77,4
2.00	1	2.00	70	70	70	68	70	69,2	78	80	79,2
2.00	1	2.00	61	70	66,4	73	74	73,6	60	75	69
2.00	1	1.00	71	72	71,6	66	89	79,8	81	75	77,4
2.00	1	1.00	72	70	70,8	62	78	71,6	60	80	72
2.00	1	1.00	64	70	67,6	69	84	78	78	80	79,2
2.00	1	1.00	57	55	55,8	65	74	70,4	70	75	73
2.00	1	1.00	63	60	61,2	76	77	76,6	60	60	60
2.00	1	2.00	61	63	62,2	68	81	75,8	70	75	73
2.00	1	2.00	63	61	61,8	97	84	89,2	60	80	72
2.00	1	2.00	74	76	75,2	81	86	84	74	75	74,6
2.00	1	1.00	74	69	71	72	80	76,8	60	80	72