

**Performance Differences between ELT Freshmen's
Receptive and Productive Skills¹**

Müzeyyen Nazlı Demirbaş

nazlidemirbas@gazi.edu.tr

Suggested Citation:

Demirbaş, M. N. (2013). Performance differences between ELT freshmen's receptive and productive skills. *The Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 9(1), 107-127. <http://www.jlls.org/vol9no1/107-127.pdf>

Abstract

Problem Statement: This study investigates whether the freshmen's education at the preparatory school makes a meaningful difference in the freshmen's performances who attend the preparatory programme and those who are exempt from this programme. Thus, it will lead to analyze the fact that whether the foreign language instruction that is offered 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.

Purpose of the Study: This study mainly aims to find out whether there are 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. 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.

Method: This research employs quantitative design. The data related to freshmen's gender, programme type and the information whether they attended the preparatory programme or not was gathered. Participants are 260 freshmen in total, 210 of whom are females, while

¹ This article is the extended summary of the author's Master Thesis in 2011, and is presented at METU Embracing Challenges Conference, Ankara, Turkey, 31 May – 2 June, 2012.

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. They took Gazi University English Language Proficiency Exam one year before the time of this study. Their mid-term and final scores were gathered separately in addition to their 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 in both terms as it is stated in Gazi University Registrar's Office Regulations. Exam scores of fall and spring terms were compared and commented on as well as the gender and education type.

Findings and Results: It is obvious in this study that their attendance at the preparatory school does not have a considerable effect on 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.

Conclusion and Recommendations: The preparatory school exposed learners to foreign language skills more via various materials and opportunities; however, it needs to update its materials, gain more insight into learners' less successful skills and their needs. Another alternative study, that is, the comparison of learners' performances in receptive and productive skills can be carried out in all English Language Teaching (ELT) preparatory programmes of Turkish universities.

Keywords: English language preparatory programme, productive and receptive skills, ELT freshmen

Introduction

Determining 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 programme and learners. Receptive and productive skills are the combination of four skills - listening, reading, speaking and writing skills (Morrow, 2004); therefore, they have been integrated into the language programmes depending on the approaches, methods and latest trends. Turkey gives utmost importance to English as a foreign language instruction at private nursery, primary, secondary, high schools and universities (Kırkgöz, 2008).

Specifically, 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 research 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 whether there are 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. 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. 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 analyzed through the findings of the study.

A relevant study to this problem was done twice; in 1994 and in 2002 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.

Gazi University 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 day

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 weekdays except for Friday. Classes start at 9.00 am and end at 12.00 pm. In total, they have 27 hours of English language skills courses. These courses range from reading, writing to listening, speaking and grammar. They 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, 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 practiced 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 the 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 soon according to the criteria. Learners are to pass 70 passing grade in two day lasting exam so that they can attend their major departments.

Gazi University English Language Teaching Department

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 the 1st grade in ELT department. There are 10 classes at the 1st grade, half of which are day classes and the rest are evening classes. These two groups have courses at different hours in a day. However, whether these learners attended the 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 in the 1st grades, half of which are day 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; day 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 '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' by Harmer and Lethaby (2007) is used. Besides, TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) 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' (Wingate, 2000) 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 the 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 practiced 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 fulfill 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 then, 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 conducted in the form of interviews. Namely, an instructor interviews each student for 5 – 7 minutes on a given topic spontaneously. These exams are compulsory and are not repeated again for any reason. 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.

Limitations of the Study

As the title of the study suggests, this study focuses on receptive and productive skills of the freshmen 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 analyzing the results, these two skills will not be commented on separately, which is one of the limitations of this study. 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.

Methodology

Aim of the Study

In this study, the purposes are to reveal the performance differences between the freshmen's receptive and productive skills. On the basis of this purpose, the main research question is as follows:

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. This study focuses on the freshmen's scores of the basic language skills, which are categorized into two phases; receptive and productive skills.

Participants

Their freshman year was in 2009 – 2010 academic year at Gazi University ELT department. There are ten classes consisting of day 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.

Data Analysis

The independent samples T test was used for 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 that 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. 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.

Results and Discussion

Differences between Performances

As it is clearly stated in Gazi University Registrars Office Regulations, learners who are enrolled in Gazi University ELT programme are to take the English language 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 skills; 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 1

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
	did not attend	148	60,69	9,26			
Spring	attended	112	64,31	8,04	258	2,218	,027
	did not 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 the 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 significant since $p > .05$ and $t(258) = 0,084$. It is just like the fall term listening scores. Therefore, 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. Hence, a meaningful difference is found out between the programme variables, which shows that their attendance at the preparatory programme does not lead them to higher 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 may not be 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.

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 attended and who did not attend 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 may be considered an effective factor 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 turn out to have a considerable role on determining their success in spring term listening skills although it does 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 $p > .05$, t 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.

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 scores of learners' university entrance exam. This decision reveals both whether learners can be enrolled in a university or not, and which programme type these learners can be enrolled in. Hence, 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 $t(258) = ,345$. To be precise, 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, the programme type may be a determining factor in spring term results, whereas it may not be so 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 may 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, may have a considerable role 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 is a less determining factor 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 plays a more crucial role 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 is not the same in fall term.

Conclusion and Suggestions

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 roles 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 language 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.

References

- 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.
- Gazi University, Registrar's Office (2010). <http://ogris.gazi.edu.tr/>
- Harmer, J & Lethaby, C. (2007). *Just listening and speaking – Upper intermediate*. MC.
- Morrow, K. (2004). *Insights from the Common European Framework*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Öğrenci Seçme ve Yerleştirme Merkezi (2010). <http://www.osym.gov.tr>
- Wingate, J. (2000). *Knowing me knowing you*. Delta: England.

Muzeyyen Nazli Demirbas is a research assistant and a PhD student at Gazi University ELT Department. She works for INGED for over 3 years. Her interest areas are very young learners, online education and syllabus design.

İngilizce Öğretmenliği Birinci Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Algısal ve Üretimsel Becerileri Arasındaki Farklar

Öz

Araştırma Konusu: 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.

Araştırma Yöntemi: Nicel araştırma modelinin kullanıldığı bu çalışmada 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.

Bulgular: 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.

Sonuç: hazırlık okulunda takip edilen müfredata, hocaların beceri derslerinde uyguladığı yöntem ve kullandığı kaynaklara ve hazırlık atlama sınavının geçerlik ve güvenilirliğine 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, İngilizce öğretmenliği öğrencileri