

## I. INTRODUCTION

## RATIONALE AND EXPECTED RESULTS

A survey was conducted on the 400 students repeating their studies at the School of Foreign Languages, Department of Basic English in November 2010.

The aim of the survey is to explore the factors to which the students attribute their failure, and to obtain data that will shed light on the endeavour to decrease the numbers of repeat students.

The following were foreseen as perceived reasons for failure and the questions in the survey tool were prepared accordingly.

- academic adjustment problems, The following were foreseen as perceived reasons for failure
- social / cultural adjustment problems,
- problems related to the study environment,
- problems concerning study habits,
- problems related to exams,
and / or
- not taking the education offered at the Department of Basic English seriously.

Some of the expected outcomes of the survey are

- if possible, developing or having the University develop solutions to the external factors to which students attribute their failure,
- developing solutions to internal factors to which students attribute their failure without lowering standards and the quality of education,
- having gained an insight into their problems, guiding students in becoming better learners of a language.


## PARTICIPATION

The survey tool was distributed to all of the students repeating their studies, namely, 400 students, and of these, 320 students ( $80 \%$ ) voluntarily participated in the survey. The distribution of these students according to their levels in the Fall Term of the 2010-2011 academic year was as follows:

| Student Numbers | LEVEL |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | BG | EL | IN | UP | TOTAL |
|  | 3 | 168 | 195 | 34 | 400 |
| Responses | 2 | 133 | 156 | 29 | 320 |

TABLE 1: DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS ACCORDING TO LEVELS

## II. THE SURVEY AND PARTICIPANT RESPONSES

The survey tool comprises 3 sections: questions on the demographic background of the participants, their academic and social adjustment during their first year at the DBE and their views and suggestions regarding the issue. This report delivers the student responses to each section respectively and, in its conclusion, offers suggestions in line with the aim of the survey.

## SECTION ONE: Personal Information

The first section of the survey tool focuses on the students' demographic background regarding

- their high school and previous training in English,
- their faculty at METU and its ranking in their university entrance preferences,
- where they resided the previous academic year and
- their academic standing at DBE the previous academic year.


## Background Information Regarding High School and English Training

In September 2009, of the 2814 admissions, $58,35 \%$ were graduates of Anatolian High Schools. $12 \%$ graduates of Science High Schools, 11,66\% graduates of Teacher Training Vocational Schools, 7,53\% graduates of Private Schools, 5,89\% graduates of Public High Schools, and the remaining 4,57\% graduates of various vocational schools.

Approximately $85 \%$ of these students (2399) were DBE students during the 2009-2010 academic year. The respondents of the survey are among these students and their distribution according to their high schools can be seen in Table 2 below.

| TABLE 2: $\quad$ DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS ACCORDING TO HIGH SCHOOL TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid |  |  |  |  |  |  | Anatolian High School | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
|  | Science High School | 145 | 45,3 | 49,0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Teacher Training Vocational School | 16 | 5,0 | 5,4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Other Vocational School | 46 | 14,4 | 15,5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Private High School / College | 23 | 7,2 | 7,8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Public High School | 15 | 4,7 | 5,1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 51 | 15,9 | 17,2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Missing | 296 | 92,5 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 24 | 7,5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

292 of the 320 respondents have indicated the cities in which their high schools were located. As can be seen in table 3 below, the highest accumulation of high schools is in Central Anatolia, and the number of graduates of high schools in metropolises outweighs that in smaller cities.

| Region | Frequency | Percent |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| CENTRAL ANATOLIA | $116(90 / 116$ Ankara $)$ | 39,8 |
| AEGEAN | $51(23 / 51$ İzmir $)$ | 17,6 |
| MARMARA | $50(26 / 50$ İstanbul $)$ | 17,1 |
| MEDITERRANEAN | 27 | 9,2 |
| BLACK SEA | 26 | 8,9 |
| EASTERN | 14 | 4,7 |
| SOUTH EASTERN | 8 | 2,7 |
| TOTAL | 292 | 100,0 |

TABLE 3: DISTRIBUTION OF HIGH SCHOOLS ACCORDING TO GEOGRAPHICAL REGION

## Background Information on Respondents' Previous Training in English

The 2 questions focusing on the respondents' background knowledge in English were as follows:
A.2. ODTÜ'ye gelmeden önceki yabancı dil tecrübeniz nedir?
A.2.a. 4-8 sınıflarda ìngilizce dersi aldınız mı?
A.2.a.i. Yanıtınız evet ise haftada kaç saat?
A.2.b. 9-12 sınıflarda İngilizce dersi aldınız mı?

| EVET | $\square$ | HAYIR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

The questions ask whether the students received English training during their secondary education (years 4-8 and years 9-12) and if so, to what extent.

All respondents answered the first part of the two questions. As for the second part of these questions, which inquires the weekly hours of English instruction, 268 and 271 students respectively provided answers.

70 respondents stated that they had instruction in another foreign language during their secondary education.

| English Training During Years 4-8 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent |
| Valid | No | 27 | 8,4 |
|  | Yes | 293 | 91,6 |
|  | Total | 320 | 100,0 |

TABLE 4.A: ENGLISH TRAINING DURING THE FIRST 4 YEARS OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

| Weekly Hours of English Training During Years 4-8 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
| Valid | 1 | 4 | 1,3 | 1,5 |
|  | 2 | 86 | 26,9 | 32,1 |
|  | 3 | 20 | 6,3 | 7,5 |
|  | 4 | 144 | 45,0 | 53,7 |
|  | 5 | 1 | ,3 | ,4 |
|  | 6 | 3 | ,9 | 1,1 |
|  | 7 | 3 | ,9 | 1,1 |
|  | 8 | 1 | ,3 | ,4 |
|  | 10 | 2 | ,6 | ,7 |
|  | 12 | 2 | ,6 | ,7 |
|  | 13 | 1 | ,3 | ,4 |
|  | 24 | 1 | ,3 | ,4 |
|  | Total | 268 | 83,8 | 100,0 |
| Missing |  | 52 | 16,3 |  |
| Total |  | 320 | 100,0 |  |

TABLE 4.B: INTENSITY OF ENGLISH TRAINING DURING $4^{\text {th }}-\mathbf{8}^{\text {Tth }}$ YEARS OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

| English Training During Years 9-12 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Frequency |  | Percent |  |
| Valid | No | 35 | 10,9 |
|  | Yes | 285 | 89,1 |
|  | Total | 320 | 100,0 |

TABLE 5.A: ENGLISH TRAINING DURING THE SECOND 4 YEARS OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

| Weekly Hours of English Training During Years 9-12 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
| Valid | 1 | 4 | 1,3 | 1,5 |
|  | 2 | 29 | 9,1 | 10,7 |
|  | 3 | 54 | 16,9 | 19,9 |
|  | 4 | 119 | 37,2 | 43,9 |
|  | 5 | 11 | 3,4 | 4,1 |
|  | 6 | 23 | 7,2 | 8,5 |
|  | 7 | 8 | 2,5 | 3,0 |
|  | 8 | 10 | 3,1 | 3,7 |
|  | 10 | 10 | 3,1 | 3,7 |
|  | 13 | 1 | , 3 | , 4 |
|  | 14 | 1 | , 3 | , 4 |
|  | 20 | 1 | , 3 | , 4 |
|  | Total | 271 | 84,7 | 100,0 |
| Missing |  | 49 | 15,3 |  |
| Total |  | 320 | 100,0 |  |

TABLE 5.B: INTENSITY OF ENGLISH TRAINING DURING $9^{\text {th }}-12^{\text {th }}$ YEARS OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

The respondents' answers show that the majority of repeat students (78.25) have received 2-4 hours of English training during years 4-8. Whereas during years 9-12 the contact hours varied between 2-10, the accumulation being around 3-4 hours of English training per week. On average, these add up to roughly 800-850 hours of instruction during secondary education.

Considering the intensity of language training these students received during their first year at DBE on top of the training they had during their secondary education, it is obvious that things have gone wrong somewhere.

## Information on Respondents' Faculties and Preference Ranking

The 3 questions focusing on the respondents' faculties and preference ranking were as follows:
A.3. Fakültenizi ve Bölümünüzü yazınız.

| Fakülte: | Bölüm: |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| A.4. Bölümünüz kaçıncı tercihiniz idi? |  |  |
| A.5. ODTÜ'yü tercih ederken eğitim dilinin İngilizce olduğunu biliyor <br> muydunuz? | EVET | $\square$ |

The distribution of the answers given by 312 respondents to question A. 3 can be seen in Table 6 below.


GRAPH 1: RESPONDENTS' FACULTIES

The distribution of the answers given by 295 respondents to question A. 4 can be seen in Table 7 below.


GRAPH 2: PLACEMENT ACCORDING TO PREFERENCE

|  |  | Faculty |  |  |  |  | Total | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Economics and Administrative Sciences | Architecture | Education | Arts and Sciences | Engineering |  |  |
| Preference | 1 | 18 | 4 | 32 | 22 | 28 | 104 | 35,25 |
|  | 2 | 5 | 1 | 9 | 18 | 17 | 50 | 16,94 |
|  | 3 | 6 | 2 | 8 | 7 | 11 | 34 | 11,52 |
|  | 4 | 4 | 1 | 8 | 15 | 5 | 33 | 11,18 |
|  | 5 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 9 | 24 | 8,13 |
|  | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 11 | 3,72 |
|  | 7-9 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 16 | 5,42 |
|  | 10-13 | 2 |  | 2 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 2,37 |
|  | 14-17 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 3,05 |
|  | 18-20 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 1,69 |
| Total |  | 41 | 11 | 72 | 79 | 92 | 295 |  |

TABLE 6: PREFERENCE ACCORDING TO FACULTIES
Table 8 shows that bout $75 \%$ of the respondents were placed in one of their first four choices, whereas $25 \%$ were placed in departments they most probably did not really prefer.

As for question A.5, 14 respondents have indicated that they were not aware that the medium of instruction at METU is English.

Information on Where the Respondents Resided During the 2009-2010 Academic Year
The following pie chart shows where the respondents were staying during the 2009-2010 academic year.


GRAPH 3: WHERE THE RESPONDENTS RESIDED

## Information on Respondents' Academic Background

The 5 questions in this part of the survey focus on the academic success of the respondents during the 2009-2010 academic year.

There first two questions (A. 8 and A.9) inquire the respondents' fall term and yearly averages.
A.8. 1. dönem not ortalamanız tahminen hangi aralıkta idi?

0-11 $\square$ 24-35 $\square$ 36-45 $\square$
A.9. Yıl sonu not ortalamanız tahminen kaç idi?

The answers of the 297 respondents to question A. 8 can be seen in the table below.

| 1st Term Average |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
| Valid | $12-23$ | 26 | 8,1 | 8,8 |  |  |  |  |
|  | $24-35$ | 217 | 67,8 | 73,1 |  |  |  |  |
|  | $36-45$ | 54 | 16,6 | 17,8 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 297 | 92,8 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | System | 23 | 7,2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 320 | 100,0 |  |

TABLE 7: FIRST-TERM AVERAGES OF THE RESPONDENTS

The answers of the 271 respondents to question A. 9 can be seen in the table below. We understand that 172 of the 276 respondents ( $62 \%$ ) scored a yearly average below 64,49, and 63 of these were 55,00 and lower.

| Yearly Average |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Frequency | Percent |  |  |  |  |
| Valid Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Valid | $49,50-50,00$ | 20 | 6,2 | 7,3 |  |  |  |  |
|  | $51,00-55,00$ | 43 | 13,5 | 15,5 |  |  |  |  |
|  | $56,00-60,00$ | 55 | 17,2 | 19,9 |  |  |  |  |
|  | $61,00-64,30$ | 54 | 16,9 | 19,5 |  |  |  |  |
|  | $64,50 \&$ higher | 104 | 32,5 | 37,7 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 276 | 86,3 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |
| Missing |  | 44 | 13,8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 320 | 100,0 |  |

table 8: yearly averages of the respondents

| The Correlation between $\mathbf{1 s t}^{\text {st }}$ Term and Yearly Averages |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 1st Term <br> Average |  |  | Yearly <br> Average |
| 1st Term Average | Pearson Correlation | 1 | ,$- 128^{*}$ |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | , 037 |
|  | N | 297 | 268 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | ,$- 128^{*}$ | 1 |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) | , 037 |  |
|  | N | 268 | 277 |
| *. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). |  |  |  |

TABLE 9: THE CORRELATION BETWEEN $1^{\text {ST }}$ TERM AND YEARLY AVERAGES
As can be seen in the table below, there is no correlation between the two averages; in fact, the correlation is negative. One, however, would expect a reasonable degree of correlation between the two, if not a very strong one. What this negative correlation tells us is that there is no relationship between the first term and second term grades of these students. Comments on this discrepancy have been provided at the end of this section.

## Information on Respondents' Summer School Experience and If Applicable, EPE Scores

Questions A. 10 - A. 12 inquire whether the respondents took a METU English Proficiency Exam (EPE), and if so, what they scored on it.

| A.10. Haziran iYS'ye girdiniz mi? | EVET | $\square$ | HAYIR $\square$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A.10.a. Yanııınız EVET ise, notunuz kaçtı? |  | $/ 100$ |  |

The answers of the 315 respondents to question A. 10 on the June EPE can be seen in the table below.

|  |  | Frequency | Percent |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | No | 191 | 59,7 |
|  | Yes | 124 | 38,8 |
|  | Total | 315 | 98,4 |
| Missing | System | 5 | 1,6 |
| Total |  | 320 | 100,0 |

TABLE 10: WHETHER OR NOT THE REPONDENTS TOOK JUNE EPE
As can be seen, 124 (around $40 \%$ ) of the 315 respondents were eligible to sit the exam. Of these, 47 ( $39,17 \%$ ) failed to take the second stage. Of those who took the second stage, 35 ( $29,17 \%$ ) scored under 50,00 pts. and $17(14,17 \%)$ under 55,00 . Only 21 respondents ( $17,5 \%$ ) were able to score 55,50 and higher.

| June EPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |  |  |  |  |
| Valid | $14,00-24,00$ | 47 | 37,9 | $39,17^{*}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | $40,50-50,00$ | 35 | 28,22 | 29,17 |  |  |  |  |
|  | $51,00-55,00$ | 17 | 13,7 | 14,17 |  |  |  |  |
|  | $55,50 \&$ higher | 21 | 16,93 | 17,50 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 120 | 96,77 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |
| Missing |  | 4 | , 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 124 | 100,0 |  |

TABLE 11: JUNE EPE SCORES * This group failed the first stage of the exam.
When the correlations of the respondents' yearly total grades and June EPE grades are considered, it can be seen that there is some correlation (about ,20), but not of the magnitude desired, in fact, a very weak relationship.

| Correlations $^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Yearly <br> Average |  |  |  |
| June EPE <br> Score |  |  |  |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | , $199^{*}$ |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | , 042 |
| June EPE Grade | Pearson Correlation | , $199^{*}$ | 1 |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) | , 042 |  |

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
a. Listwise $\mathrm{N}=105$

TABLE 12: CORRELATION BETWEEN YEARLY AVERAGES AND JUNE EPE GRADES
As can be seen in the table below, EPE has a higher discriminatory strength than the achievement exams. Comments on this have been provided at the end of this section.

| Descriptive Statistics |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Mean | Std. Deviation | N |
| Yearly Average | 68,2769 | 5,31227 | 105 |
| June EPE Grade | 39,1095 | 15,17320 | 105 |

TABLE 13: MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR YEARLY AVERAGES AND EPE JUNE EPE SCORES

## Question A. 11 focuses on Summer School.



As can be seen in Table 14 below, 270 of the 317 respondents attended Summer School. Of these, $4 \%$ found Summer School extremely beneficial. The distribution of the remaining respondents' perception of the benefit of Summer School can be seen in Table 15. The score ranges of these students have been provided in Table 16 and the correlation between June EPE and August EPE in Table 17.

|  |  | Summer Sc |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
| Valid | No | 47 | 14,7 | 14,8 |
|  | Yes | 270 | 84,4 | 85,2 |
|  | Total | 317 | 99,1 | 100,0 |
| Missing |  | 3 | ,9 |  |
| Total |  | 320 | 100,0 |  |

TABLE 14: NUMBER OF STUDENTS WHO ATTENDED SUMMER SCHOOL

| Summer School Beneficial |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
| Valid | not at all | 57 | 17,8 | 21,0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | barely | 75 | 23,4 | 27,6 |  |  |  |  |
|  | somewhat | 72 | 22,5 | 26,5 |  |  |  |  |
|  | very | 57 | 17,8 | 21,0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | extremely | 11 | 3,4 | 4,0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 272 | 85,0 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |
| Missing |  | 48 | 15,0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  | 320 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 15: PERCEPTION OF SUMMER SCHOOL IN TERMS OF BENEFIT

| August EPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |  |  |  |  |  |
| Valid | $10,00-24,00$ | 145 | 45,3 | $58,7^{*}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $40,00-50,00$ | 35 | 10,9 | 14.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $50,50-55,00$ | 43 | 13,4 | 17,4 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $55,50 \&$ higher | 24 | 7,5 | 9,7 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 247 | 77,2 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Missing |  |  |  |  |  |  | 73 | 22,8 |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 320 | 100,0 |  |  |

TABLE 16: AUGUST EPE SCORES * This group failed the first stage of the exam.

| Correlations ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | June EPE Score | August EPE Score |
| June EPE Score | Pearson Correlation | 1 | ,340** |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | ,001 |
| Summer School EPE Grade | Pearson Correlation | ,340** | 1 |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) | ,001 |  |
| **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). |  |  |  |
| Listwise $\mathrm{N}=98$ |  |  |  |

TABLE 17: CORRELATION BETWEEN JUNE EPE AND SUMMER SCHOOL EPE
It can be seen that there is a significant correlation between the two exams but it is not very strong.

Question A. 12 inquires whether the respondents took September EPE, and if so, what they scored on it.

| A.12. EYLÜL iYS'ye girdiniz mi? | EVET | $\square$ | HAYIR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yanıtınız EVET ise, notunuz kaçıt? |  | $/ 100$ |  |

As can be seen in Table 18 below, $306(97,5 \%)$ of the 314 took the September EPE. Of these, 210 (77\%) failed to qualify for Stage 2.

| September EPE |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
| Valid | No | 8 | 2,5 | 2,5 |
|  | Yes | 306 | 95,6 | 97,5 |
|  | Total | 314 | 98,1 | 100,0 |
| Missing |  | 6 | 1,9 |  |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 |  |  |

TABLE 18: NUMBER OF STUDENTS WHO TOOK SEPTEMBER EPE

The score ranges of these students have been provided in Table 19 and the means of and correlations between all three exams (June, August and September) in Tables 20 and 21 respectively.

| September EPE Score |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
| Valid | $10,00-24,00$ | 210 | 65,6 | $77,2^{*}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | $40,00-50,00$ | 22 | 6,9 | 8,1 |  |  |  |  |
|  | $54,00-55,00$ | 11 | 3,4 | 4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | $55,50 \&$ higher | 29 | 9,1 | 10,7 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 272 | 85 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |
| Missing |  | 48 | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 19: SEPTEMBER EPE SCORES * This group failed the first stage of the exam.

| Descriptive Statistics |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean | Std. Deviation | N |
| June EPE Score | 36,88 | 14,76 | 90 |
| August EPE Score | 40,92 | 15,60 | 90 |
| September EPE Score | 32,52 | 15,55 | 90 |

TABLE 20: MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

| Correlations ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | June EPE | August EPE | September EPE |
| June EPE | Pearson Correlation | 1 | ,361** | ,038 |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | ,000 | ,725 |
| August EPE | Pearson Correlation | ,361 ${ }^{* *}$ | 1 | ,201 |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) | ,000 |  | ,058 |
| September EPE | Pearson Correlation | ,038 | ,201 | 1 |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) | ,725 | ,058 |  |
| **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). |  |  |  |  |
| Listwise N=90 |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 21: CORRELATIONS BETWEEN JUNE EPE, AUGUST EPE AND SEPTEMBER EPE
COMMENTS: It is rather difficult to compute and interpret the correlation data of this particular group of students since they behave unpredictably in different periods during the year.

The Fall and Spring Term averages negatively correlated. That is, those who were successful in the Fall Term were not so in the Spring Term, or vice versa. Their annual average showed a very week relationship with June EPE ( $\underline{r}: 0.19$ or so). The slightly stronger correlation (around $\underline{r}$ : 0.36 ) between June and August EPE is indicative of the earnest students trying to pass in the Summer School.

However, September EPE scores hardly correlate with any measure (about $\underline{r}$ : 0.04 with June and $\underline{r}$ : 0.20 with August). But these correlations are not statistically significant and thus, not valid. It seems that students have not tried hard to perform better in September, or their foundation is poor and/or the way they study is wrong.

## SECTION TWO: Academic and Social Adjustment

The second section of the survey tool focuses on the difficulties encountered by students during the 2009-2010 academic year (i.e. their first year) regarding

- the new social environment,
- their study environment and study habits,
- the programs, materials and academic requirements.


## Social Adjustment

The first set of questions in this section focus on the students' adjustment to the new social environment.


As can be seen in Table 22 below, 129/315 (43\%) of the respondents indicate that they encountered some degree of social adjustment problems during the fall term, and that such problems had some kind of effect on their academic success ( $45,67 \%$ of the respondents). The numbers of those who disagree or strongly disagree are 79 (25\%) and 107 (34\%) respectively. Please refer to Tables 22 and 23 below.

| Adjustment Problems / Fall Term |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
| Valid | strongly agree | 32 | 10,0 | 10,2 |
|  | agree | 50 | 15,6 | 15,9 |
|  | somewhat agree | 47 | 14,7 | 14,9 |
|  | disagree | 79 | 24,7 | 25,1 |
|  | strongly disagree | 107 | 33,4 | 34,0 |
|  | Total | 315 | 98,4 | 100,0 |
| Missing | System | 5 | 1,6 |  |
| Total |  | 320 | 100,0 |  |

TABLE 22: WHETHER THE RESPONDENTS HAD SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT PROBLEMS

| Effect of Adjustment Problems / Fall Term |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |  |
| Valid | strongly agree | 48 | 15,0 | 15,4 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | agree | 51 | 15,9 | 16,3 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | somewhat agree | 38 | 11,9 | 12,2 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | disagree | 52 | 16,3 | 16,7 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | strongly disagree | 123 | 38,4 | 39,4 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 312 | 97,5 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Missing |  | 8 | 2,5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | 320 | 100,0 |  |

TABLE 23: WHETHER SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT PROBLEMS AFFECTED ACADEMIC SUCCESS
We understand that these problems decrease during the spring term to some extent. The number of those who encountered such problems during this period drops to $79 / 311(23,33 \%)$ and the number of those academically affected falls to 106/309 (35,33\%). Please refer to Tables 24 and 25 below.

| Adjustment Problems / Spring Term |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid |  |  |  |  |  | strongly agree | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
|  | agree | 19 | 5,9 | 6,1 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | somewhat agree | 24 | 7,5 | 7,7 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | disagree | 36 | 11,3 | 11,6 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | strongly disagree | 166 | 20,6 | 21,2 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 311 | 51,9 | 53,4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Missing |  | 9 | 2,8 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 24: WHETHER THE RESPONDENTS HAD SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT PROBLEMS

| Effect of Adjustment Problems / Spring Term |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
| Valid | strongly agree | 26 | 8,1 | 8,4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | agree | 39 | 12,2 | 12,6 |  |  |  |  |
|  | somewhat agree | 41 | 12,8 | 13,3 |  |  |  |  |
|  | disagree | 54 | 16,9 | 17,5 |  |  |  |  |
|  | strongly disagree | 149 | 46,6 | 48,2 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 309 | 96,6 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |
| Missing |  | 11 | 3,4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 320 | 100,0 |  |

TABLE 25: WHETHER SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT PROBLEMS AFFECTED ACADEMIC SUCCESS

## Study Environment

The second set of questions in this section focus on the students' study environment.

| B.5. Uygun bir çalişma ortamım yoktu. | katilıyorum |  |  | katılmıyorum |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| B.6. Çalışma ortamım akademik çalışmalarımı olumsuz etkiledi. |  |  |  | katılmıyorum |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

As can be seen in Table 26 below, 152/312 (48,7\%) of the respondents indicate that they encountered problems of varying degrees as regards study environment. Emphasis has been made on this issue in Section 3 of the survey. Understandably, 156 (50\%) of these students have indicted that this situation affected their academic success adversely. (Table 27)

| Lack of Suitable Study Environment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
| Valid | strongly agree | 58 | 18,1 | 18,6 |  |  |  |  |
|  | agree | 48 | 15,0 | 15,4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | somewhat agree | 46 | 14,4 | 14,7 |  |  |  |  |
|  | disagree | 63 | 19,7 | 20,2 |  |  |  |  |
|  | strongly disagree | 97 | 30,3 | 31,1 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 312 | 97,5 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |
| Missing |  | 8 | 2,5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 26: STUDY ENVIRONMENT

| Effect of Study Environment on Academic Success |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
| Valid | strongly agree | 57 | 17,8 | 18,3 |  |  |  |  |
|  | agree | 54 | 16,9 | 17,4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | somewhat agree | 45 | 14,1 | 14,5 |  |  |  |  |
|  | disagree | 51 | 15,9 | 16,4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | strongly disagree | 104 | 32,5 | 33,4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 311 | 97,2 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |
| Missing |  | 9 | 2,8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  | 320 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 27: STUDY ENVIRONMENT - ACADEMIC SUCCESS

## Academic Adjustment

The third set of questions in this section focus on the academic adjustment problems encountered by the students and their perceptions of the programs, materials and assessment.


As can be seen in Table 28 below, 194/312 (62,1\%) of the respondents indicate that they encountered problems of varying degrees as regards academic adjustment. Of these students, 171 $(54,5)$ have stated that these problems had an impact on their academic success during the Fall Term. This number drops to 155 ( $49,4 \%$ ) in the Spring Term (Tables 29 and 30 respectively).

| Had academic adjustment problems |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |  |
|  | strongly agree | 68 | 21,3 | 21,8 |
|  | agree | 53 | 16,6 | 17,0 |
|  | somewhat agree | 73 | 22,8 | 23,4 |
|  | disagree | 49 | 15,3 | 15,7 |
|  | strongly disagree | 69 | 21,6 | 22,1 |
|  | Total | 312 | 97,5 | 100,0 |
| Missing |  | 8 | 2,5 |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 28: ACADEMIC ADJUSTMENT

| Academic adjustment problems affected Fall Term success |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |  |  |  |  |
| Valid | strongly agree | 67 | 20,9 | 21,3 |  |  |  |  |
|  | agree | 52 | 16,3 | 16,6 |  |  |  |  |
|  | somewhat agree | 52 | 16,3 | 16,6 |  |  |  |  |
|  | disagree | 52 | 16,3 | 16,6 |  |  |  |  |
|  | strongly disagree | 91 | 28,4 | 29,0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 314 | 98,1 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |
| Missing |  | 6 | 1,9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 320 | 100,0 |  |

TABLE 29: ACADEMIC ADJUSTMENT - ACADEMIC SUCCESS

| Academic adjustment problems affected Spring Term success |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
| Valid | strongly agree | 50 | 15,6 | 16,2 |
|  | agree | 50 | 15,6 | 16,2 |
|  | somewhat agree | 55 | 17,2 | 17,8 |
|  | disagree | 71 | 22,2 | 23,0 |
|  | strongly disagree | 83 | 25,9 | 26,9 |
|  | Total | 309 | 96,6 | 100,0 |
| Missing |  | 11 | 3,4 |  |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 |  |  |

TABLE 30: 2010-2011 SPRING TERM / ACADEMIC ADJUSTMENT - ACADEMIC SUCCESS


A striking outcome of the survey is that a large number of students have claimed that they lacked the required study skills for learning a language. To be more precise, 169/315 (53,7\%) students strongly agree that they lacked such skills. An additional $27.9 \%$ say that they didn't have the appropriate study skills, increasing the number to 257 ( $81,6 \%$ ). Please refer to Table 31. Comments on this issue are at the end of this report.

| Lacked Appropriate Study Skills |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
| Valid | strongly agree | 169 | 52,8 | 53,7 |  |  |  |  |
|  | agree | 48 | 15,0 | 15,2 |  |  |  |  |
|  | somewhat agree | 40 | 12,5 | 12,7 |  |  |  |  |
|  | disagree | 19 | 5,9 | 6,0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | strongly disagree | 39 | 12,2 | 12,4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 315 | 98,4 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |
| Missing |  | 5 | 1,6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 31: STUDY SKILLS

## The Program and Materials

The two questions below are on how the respondents perceive the load of the program. The following two tables show the distribution of the answers to these questions. Only $80(25,4 \%)$ respondents indicate that the Fall Term program was too loaded, whereas 255 ( $81,2 \%$ ) say the Spring Term program was too loaded. For the distribution of the answers, please refer to Tables 32 and 33 below. Respondents have also made comments on this issue in Section 3 of the survey.


| Fall Term program too loaded |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |  |
|  | strongly agree | 30 | 9,4 | 9,5 |
|  | agree | 15 | 4,7 | 4,8 |
|  | somewhat agree | 35 | 10,9 | 11,1 |
|  | disagree | 61 | 19,1 | 19,4 |
|  | strongly disagree | 174 | 54,4 | 55,2 |
|  | Total | 315 | 98,4 | 100,0 |
| Missing |  | 5 | 1,6 |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 32: PROGRAM LOAD / Fall

| Spring Term program too loaded |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | strongly agree | 182 | 56,9 | 58,0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | agree | 48 | 15,0 | 15,3 |  |  |  |  |
|  | somewhat agree | 25 | 7,8 | 8,0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | disagree | 17 | 5,3 | 5,4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | strongly disagree | 42 | 13,1 | 13,4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 314 | 98,1 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |
| Missing |  | 6 | 1,9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 320 | 100,0 |  |

TABLE 33: Program Load / Spring
B.13. Program yüklü olmadığı için ciddiye almadım.


This question inquires whether the respondents took the courses seriously or not because program was not loaded.

| Didn't take the courses seriously due to loose program |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
| Valid | strongly agree | 47 | 14,7 | 15,3 |  |  |  |  |
|  | agree | 34 | 10,6 | 11,0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | somewhat agree | 72 | 22,5 | 23,4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | disagree | 37 | 11,6 | 12,0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | strongly disagree | 118 | 36,9 | 38,3 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 308 | 96,3 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |
| Missing |  | 12 | 3,8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 33: WHETHER THE COURSES WERE TAKEN SERIOUSLY
As can be seen in Table 33 above, 155/308 (50.3\%) respondents disagree with the statement whereas $47(15,3 \%)$ respondents strongly agree with it. It is understood that most of the students took the courses seriously although they found the Fall Term program somewhat loose.

| B.14. Program 1. dönem aşırı derecede hızlıydı. | katılıyorum |  |  | katılmıyorum |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| B.15. Program 2. dönem aşırı derecede hızlıydı. | katiliyorum |  |  | $\xrightarrow{\text { katılmıyorum }}$ |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| B.16. Program 1. dönem aşırı derecede zordu. | katiliyorum |  |  | katılmıyorum |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| B.17. Program 2. dönem aşırı derecede zordu. |  |  |  | katılmıyorum |  |
|  |  |  | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

The questions above focus on the speed and the difficulty level of the program. When we compare the respondent perception of the speeds of the Fall and Spring Term programs, we see that 203/311 $(65,3 \%)$ of the respondents perceive the Fall Term program as somewhat loose (Table 34) whereas the Spring Term program is perceived as tight by 237 ( $75,7 \%$ ) respondents (Table 35). These answers correlate with the answers given to questions B. 11 and B. 12 (program load).

| The Fall Term program was too fast |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | strongly agree | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |  |  |  |  |
|  | agree | 31 | 9,7 | 10,0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | somewhat agree | 28 | 8,8 | 9,0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | disagree | 56 | 15,3 | 15,8 |  |  |  |  |
|  | strongly disagree | 147 | 45,5 | 18,0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 311 | 97,2 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |
| Missing |  | 9 | 2,8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 320 | 100,0 |  |

TABLE 34: SPEED OF THE PROGRAM / Fall

| The Spring Term program was too fast |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Frequency | Percent |
| Valid Percent |  |  |  |  |
| Valid | strongly agree | 160 | 50,0 | 51,1 |
|  | agree | 68 | 21,3 | 21,7 |
|  | somewhat agree | 29 | 9,1 | 9,3 |
|  | disagree | 19 | 5,9 | 6,1 |
|  | strongly disagree | 37 | 11,6 | 11,8 |
|  | Total | 313 | 97,8 | 100,0 |
| Missing |  | 7 | 2,2 |  |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 |  |  |

TABLE 35: SPEED OF THE PROGRAM / Spring

Similarly, when we compare the respondent perception of the difficulty level of the Fall and Spring Term programs, we see that $229 / 314$ ( $72,9 \%$ ) of the respondents perceive the Fall Term program as somewhat easy (Table 36) whereas the Spring Term program is perceived as difficult by 255 ( $81,2 \%$ ) respondents (Table 37). These answers correlate with the answers given to questions B. 11 and B. 12 (program load) and B. 14 and B. 15 (program speed).

| The Fall Term Program was too difficult |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | strongly agree | 22 | 6,9 | 7,0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | agree | 19 | 5,9 | 6,1 |  |  |  |  |
|  | somewhat agree | 44 | 13,8 | 14,0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | disagree | 70 | 21,9 | 22,3 |  |  |  |  |
|  | strongly disagree | 159 | 49,7 | 50,6 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 314 | 98,1 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |
| Missing | System | 6 | 1,9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 320 | 100,0 |  |

TABLE 36: DIFFICULTY LEVEL OF THE PROGRAM / Fall

| The Spring Term Program was too difficult |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Frequency | Percent |  |  |  |  |  |
| Valid Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Valid | strongly agree | 125 | 39,1 | 40,1 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | agree | 78 | 24,4 | 25,0 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | somewhat agree | 52 | 16,3 | 16,7 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | disagree | 30 | 9,4 | 9,6 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | strongly disagree | 27 | 8,4 | 8,7 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 312 | 97,5 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Missing | System | 8 | 2,5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | 320 | 100,0 |  |

TABLE 37: DIFFICULTY LEVEL OF THE PROGRAM / Spring

The following set of questions focuses on grammar and vocabulary load and the difficulty level of the materials used to teach language skills.


The respondents' perception of the program components in terms of difficulty can be summarized as follows:

1. $234 / 313(74,8 \%)$ agree that the grammar load made the program difficult. The number of those who strongly agree is 81 .
2. $253 / 315(80,3 \%)$ agree that the vocabulary load made the program difficult. The number of those who strongly agree is 108.
3. $230 / 313(73,5 \%)$ agree that the level of the reading material made the program difficult. The number of those who strongly agree is 50 .
4. $216 / 313(69,0 \%)$ agree that the level of the listening material made the program difficult. The number of those who strongly agree is 58 .
5. $188 / 313(60,0 \%)$ agree that the writing material made the program difficult. The number of those who strongly agree is 57 .

The respondents find the vocabulary component too loaded and this is followed by grammar. Surprisingly, the writing component is rated as easier than the other components. This may be because the students perceive writing as a set of discourse patterns to be memorized. That this only serves minimally to the development of the writing skill is observed in student EPE paragraphs: the patterns are usually there, but what is in between is often full of language mistakes and meaningless.

Please refer to Tables 38-42 below for the distribution of the responses and the related graphs.

| The grammar load made the program difficult for me |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
| Valid | strongly agree | 81 | 25,3 | 25,9 |  |  |  |  |
|  | agree | 74 | 23,1 | 23,6 |  |  |  |  |
|  | somewhat agree | 79 | 24,7 | 25,2 |  |  |  |  |
|  | disagree | 49 | 15,3 | 15,7 |  |  |  |  |
|  | strongly disagree | 30 | 9,4 | 9,6 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 313 | 97,8 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |
| Missing | 7 | 2,2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 38: GRAMMAR LOAD


| The vocabulary load made the program difficult for me |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Frequency | Percent |  |  |  |  |
| Valid Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Valid | strongly agree | 108 | 33,8 | 34,3 |  |  |  |  |
|  | agree | 77 | 24,1 | 24,4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | somewhat agree | 68 | 21,3 | 21,6 |  |  |  |  |
|  | disagree | 25 | 7,8 | 7,9 |  |  |  |  |
|  | strongly disagree | 37 | 11,6 | 11,7 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 315 | 98,4 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |
| Missing |  | 5 | 1,6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 320 | 100,0 |  |

TABLE 39: VOCABULARY LOAD


The level of the reading material made the program difficult for me

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | strongly agree | 50 | 15,6 | 16,0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | agree | 72 | 22,5 | 23,0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | somewhat agree | 108 | 33,8 | 34,5 |  |  |  |  |
|  | disagree | 57 | 17,8 | 18,2 |  |  |  |  |
|  | strongly disagree | 26 | 8,1 | 8,3 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 313 | 97,8 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |
| Missing | 7 | 2,2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 320 | 100,0 |  |

TABLE 40: READING


The level of the listening material made the program difficult for me

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | strongly agree | 58 | 18,1 | 18,5 |  |  |  |  |
|  | agree | 66 | 20,6 | 21,1 |  |  |  |  |
|  | somewhat agree | 92 | 28,8 | 29,4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | disagree | 60 | 18,8 | 19,2 |  |  |  |  |
|  | strongly disagree | 37 | 11,6 | 11,8 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 313 | 97,8 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |
| Missing |  | 7 | 2,2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 320 | 100,0 |  |

TABLE 41: LISTENING


| The writing material made the program difficult for me |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
| Valid | strongly agree | 57 | 17,8 | 18,2 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | agree | 54 | 16,9 | 17,3 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | somewhat agree | 74 | 23,1 | 23,6 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | disagree | 73 | 22,8 | 23,3 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | strongly disagree | 55 | 17,2 | 17,6 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 313 | 97,8 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Missing |  | 7 | 2,2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 320 | 100,0 |  |  |

TABLE 42: WRITING


Question B. 23 focuses on the effect of the respondents' English background on their success.
B.23. Geçmiş İngilizce bilgime dayanarak programı ciddiye almadım.

$29,3 \%$ of the 314 respondents state that they relied on their previous knowledge and thus, did not take the education in the Department of Basic English seriously. This is surely not a negligible percent. Had these students taken the courses seriously, they might have passed, which would mean 4-5 fewer classes this academic year. Please refer to Table 43 below for the distribution of the answers.

| Relying on my English background, I didn't take the courses seriously |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
| Valid | strongly agree | 36 | 11,3 | 11,5 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | agree | 18 | 5,6 | 5,7 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | somewhat agree | 38 | 11,9 | 12,1 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | disagree | 47 | 14,7 | 15,0 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | strongly disagree | 175 | 54,7 | 55,7 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 314 | 98,1 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Missing |  | 6 | 1,9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## TABLE 43: EFFECT OF ENGLISH BACKGROUND

## The Achievement Exams

The following two questions focus on the achievement exams, the first inquiring the perception of the respondents on whether the content of the achievement exams matched the items covered in the syllabus, and the second inquiring the respondents' perception of the difficulty level of the achievement exams.


As can be seen in Table 44 below and the related graph, over $50 \%$ of the respondents think that there was a match between the exams and the syllabus. $18 \%$ believe the contrary, which might be because these respondents lacked awareness of what was being covered in class. Overall, it seems that only $50 \%$ were aware of what was being covered and that the achievement exams were in strictly in line with this material.

| The achievement exams tested items that were not in the syllabus |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
| Valid | strongly agree | 55 | 17,2 | 17,5 |  |  |  |  |
|  | agree | 33 | 10,3 | 10,5 |  |  |  |  |
|  | somewhat agree | 61 | 19,1 | 19,4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | disagree | 65 | 20,3 | 20,7 |  |  |  |  |
|  | strongly disagree | 100 | 31,3 | 31,8 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 314 | 98,1 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |
| Missing |  | 6 | 1,9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 320 | 100,0 |  |

TABLE 44: CONTENT OF ACHIEVEMENT EXAMS

$64,2 \%$ of the respondents say they found the exams difficult. The reasons for this can be attributed to the respondents' lack of appropriate study skills, their not taking the program seriously, or their falling behind the rest of the students due to varying factors. The distribution of the responses are in Table 45 below.

| I found the achievement exams difficult although items in the syllabus were tested |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
| Valid | strongly agree | 43 | 13,4 | 13,7 |
|  | agree | 83 | 25,9 | 26,5 |
|  | somewhat agree | 75 | 23,4 | 24,0 |
|  | disagree | 70 | 21,9 | 22,4 |
|  | strongly disagree | 42 | 13,1 | 13,4 |
|  | Total | 313 | 97,8 | 100,0 |
| Missing | System | 7 | 2,2 |  |
| Total |  | 320 | 100,0 |  |

TABLE 45: DIFFICULTY LEVEL OF ACHIEVEMENT EXAMS


## The English Proficiency Exam (EPE)

Questions 26 through 32 focus on EPE, the first two being questions on the exam in general.

| B.26. İngilizce Yeterlik Sınavı genel olarak zor değildi ama süre yetersizdi. | katilıyorum |  |  | katılmıyorum |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| B.27. İngilizce Yeterlik Sınavı genel olarak bana zor geldi. |  |  |  | katilmıyorum |  |
|  |  |  | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

It seems that the opinion on the time allocation is somewhat equally distributed. 52,9\% of the respondents find the time allocated as insufficient in varying degrees whereas $47,1 \%$ think enough time is given to answer the questions.

| In general, EPE was not difficult but the time allocated was not enough |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Frequency | Percent |  |  |  |  |
| Valid Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Valid | strongly agree | 45 | 14,1 | 14,5 |  |  |  |  |
|  | agree | 51 | 15,9 | 16,5 |  |  |  |  |
|  | somewhat agree | 68 | 21,3 | 21,9 |  |  |  |  |
|  | disagree | 71 | 22,2 | 22,9 |  |  |  |  |
|  | strongly disagree | 75 | 23,4 | 24,2 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 310 | 96,9 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |
| Missing | 10 | 3,1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 320 | 100,0 |  |

TABLE 46: EPE TIME ALLOCATION


When it comes to the difficulty level, $87,2 \%$ of the respondents say the exam was difficult in general. This is not surprising as these students took the exam 1-3 times and failed.

| In general, I found EPE difficult |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
| Valid | strongly agree | 125 | 39,1 | 39,9 |  |  |  |  |
|  | agree | 85 | 26,6 | 27,2 |  |  |  |  |
|  | somewhat agree | 63 | 19,7 | 20,1 |  |  |  |  |
|  | disagree | 25 | 7,8 | 8,0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | strongly disagree | 15 | 4,7 | 4,8 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 313 | 97,8 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |
| Missing |  | 7 | 2,2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 47: EPE DIFFICULTY


The following five questions focus on the difficulty level of the components of the exam. 314 respondents answered the first two questions and of these 245 answered the remaining three questions. This is because some students could not qualify to take Stage 2 (listening, note-taking and writing).
$81,5 \%$ of the 413 respondents found the "Language Use" component was difficult and $86 \%$ found the "Reading" component difficult. The distribution of the answers have been provided in Tables 48 and 49.

The percentages of the respondents who found the "Listening", "Note-taking" and "Writing" components difficult are respectively $79,2 \%, 74,6 \%$ and $74,3 \%$. The distribution of the answers have been provided in Tables 50,51 and 52.

These responses indicate that the "language Use" and "Reading" sections are found the most difficult.
B.28. İngilizce Yeterlik Sınavının "Language Use" bölümü bana zor geldi.


| I found the "Language Use" section of EPE difficult |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
| Valid | strongly agree | 121 | 37,8 | 38,5 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | agree | 87 | 27,2 | 27,7 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | somewhat agree | 48 | 15,0 | 15,3 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | disagree | 41 | 12,8 | 13,1 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | strongly disagree | 17 | 5,3 | 5,4 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 314 | 98,1 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Missing |  | 6 | 1,9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 48: EPE LANGUGE USE DIFFICULTY

B.29. İngilizce Yeterlik Sınavının "Reading" bölümü bana zor geldi.


| I found the "Reading" section of EPE difficult |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
| Valid | strongly agree | 119 | 37,2 | 37,9 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | agree | 93 | 29,1 | 29,6 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | somewhat agree | 58 | 18,1 | 18,5 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | disagree | 28 | 8,8 | 8,9 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | strongly disagree | 16 | 5,0 | 5,1 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 314 | 98,1 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Missing | System | 6 | 1,9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 49: EPE READING DIFFICULTY



| I found the "Listening" section of EPE difficult |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
| Valid | strongly agree | 87 | 27,2 | 35,5 |  |  |  |  |
|  | agree | 44 | 13,8 | 18,0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | somewhat agree | 63 | 19,7 | 25,7 |  |  |  |  |
|  | disagree | 27 | 8,4 | 11,0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | strongly disagree | 24 | 7,5 | 9,8 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 245 | 76,6 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |
| Missing |  | 75 | 23,4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 320 | 100,0 |  |

TABLE 50: EPE LISTENING DIFFICULTY

B.31. İngilizce Yeterlik Sınavının "Note-Taking" bölümü bana zor geldi.


| I found the "Note-Taking" section of EPE difficult |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
| Valid | strongly agree | 90 | 28,1 | 36,9 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | agree | 39 | 12,2 | 16,0 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | somewhat agree | 53 | 16,6 | 21,7 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | disagree | 32 | 10,0 | 13,1 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | strongly disagree | 30 | 9,4 | 12,3 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 244 | 76,3 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Missing |  | 76 | 23,8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 320 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 51: EPE NOTE_TAKING DIFFICULTY

B.32. İngilizce Yeterlik Sınavının "Writing" bölümü bana zor geldi.


| I found the "Writing" section of EPE difficult |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
| Valid | strongly agree | 70 | 21,9 | 28,6 |  |  |  |  |
|  | agree | 57 | 17,8 | 23,3 |  |  |  |  |
|  | somewhat agree | 55 | 17,2 | 22,4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | disagree | 42 | 13,1 | 17,1 |  |  |  |  |
|  | strongly disagree | 21 | 6,6 | 8,6 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 245 | 76,6 | 100,0 |  |  |  |  |
| Missing | System | 75 | 23,4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 320 | 100,0 |  |

TABLE 52: EPE WRITING DIFFICULTY


## SECTION THREE: Respondents' Views and Suggestions

There are four questions in this section. As can be seen in Tables 53-56 below, fewer participants responded to these questions. ( $21,3 \%, 41,3 \%, 21,9 \%, 45,3 \%$ respectively)

Question 1 asks students to explain in 1-2 sentences the social / cultural adjustment problems they encountered. As can be seen in Table 53 below, 13 major problems have been cited. 47,1\% of the respondents state that the totally new environment was a major problem.

| TABLE 53: |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
| Valid | I am a foreign student | 7 | 2,2 | 10,3 |
|  | No acquaintances / totally new environment | 32 | 10,0 | 47,1 |
|  | The student and teacher profile did not match my expectations | 2 | ,6 | 2,9 |
|  | A big city | 3 | ,9 | 4,4 |
|  | I was bored | 1 | ,3 | 1,5 |
|  | Departure from family | 5 | 1,6 | 7,4 |
|  | Difficulty in social adaptation to people from all over the country | 5 | 1,6 | 7,4 |
|  | I had personal problems | 4 | 1,3 | 5,9 |
|  | Difficult to adapt to the social status gaps | 1 | ,3 | 1,5 |
|  | Didn't like Ankara | 1 | ,3 | 1,5 |
|  | I was outcast | 1 | ,3 | 1,5 |
|  | Social activities took most of my time | 5 | 1,6 | 7,4 |
|  | Couldn't find a suitable friend | 1 | ,3 | 1,5 |
|  | Total | 68 | 21,3 | 100,0 |
| Missing | System | 252 | 78,8 |  |
| Total |  | 320 | 100,0 |  |



Question 2 asks students to explain in 1-2 sentences, the academic adjustment problems they encountered. As can be seen in Table 54 below, 20 major problems have been cited. These have been grouped under three categories, namely, problems attributed to causes stemming from

- the student himself/herself,
- the teacher,
- the institution,
and the total frequencies and percentages for each category have been indicated in the table.
$44 \%$ of the 132 respondents attribute the academic adjustment problems to themselves whereas 27,3 to the teachers. $36,4 \%$ put the blame on various reasons that can be attributed to institutional practices.

| TABLE 54: ACADEMIC ADJUSTMENT PROBLEMS |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | THE STUDENT (total) | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
|  | It was the first time I was learning English | $\mathbf{5 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 , 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 4}$ |
|  | Exam anxiety affected me | 15 | $\mathbf{4 , 7}$ | 11,4 |
|  | I relied on my previous knowledge | 1 | , 3 | , 8 |
|  | I was afraid to ask the teacher questions | 2 | , 6 | 1,5 |
|  | I underestimated the challenge at the beginning | 1 | , 3 | , 8 |
|  | I was unwilling | 11 | 3,4 | 8,3 |
|  | I didn't know how to learn English | 5 | 1,6 | 3,8 |


| Valid | THE TEACHER (total) | 36 | 11,3 | 27,3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | The teacher was not strict enough | 5 | 1,6 | 3,8 |
|  | The teacher failed to attend to our needs | 4 | 1,3 | 3,0 |
|  | The teacher couldn't address our level | 1 | ,3 | ,8 |
|  | The teacher spoke English | 3 | ,9 | 2,3 |
|  | The teacher demotivated us | 11 | 3,4 | 8,3 |
|  | The teacher was bad | 12 | 3,8 | 9,1 |
|  | THE INSTITUTION (total) | 48 | 15,1 | 36,4 |
|  | The approach to teaching English was different | 10 | 3,1 | 7,6 |
|  | I couldn't benefit from the lessons | 4 | 1,3 | 3,0 |
|  | The lessons were challenging | 15 | 4,7 | 11,4 |
|  | My initial placement was wrong | 5 | 1,6 | 3,8 |
|  | There was no time to internalize what was taught | 1 | ,3 | , 8 |
|  | The rules were strict | 7 | 2,2 | 5,3 |
|  | The system was wrong | 6 | 1,9 | 4,5 |
|  | Total | 132 | 41,3 | 100,0 |
| Missing |  | 188 | 58,8 |  |
| Total |  | 320 | 100,0 |  |

Academic Adjustment


Academic Adiustment

Question 3 asks students to explain in 1-2 sentences, the problems they encountered related to their study environment. As can be seen in Table 55 below, only 70 students responded to this question and they cited 8 major problems. These have been grouped under two categories:

- the environment itself,
- other.

The total frequencies and percentages for each category have been indicated in the table.
The most common complaint is that dormitories cannot offer a healthy study environment. Student also complain about afternoon classes.

| TABLE 55: PROBLEMS RELATED TO THE STUDY ENVIRONMENT |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
| Valid | THE ENVIRONMENT (total) | 48 | 15 | 68,5 |
|  | The dormitories are very bad in terms of study environment | 35 | 10,9 | 50,0 |
|  | We couldn't find a place to study in the library after 3:30 | 4 | 1,3 | 5,7 |
|  | The study halls are insufficient | 8 | 2,5 | 11,4 |
|  | SAC was very crowded | 1 | ,3 | 1,4 |
|  | OTHER (total) | 22 | 6,9 | 31,5 |
|  | Afternoon classes are not beneficial | 13 | 4,1 | 18,6 |
|  | My house was very far | 6 | 1,9 | 8,6 |
|  | Pressure at home | 1 | ,3 | 1,4 |
|  | I couldn't get along with people in the dorm | 2 | ,6 | 2,9 |
|  | Total | 70 | 21,9 | 100,0 |
| Missing |  | 250 | 78,1 |  |
| Total |  | 320 | 100,0 |  |



Question 4 asks students if they could have been more successful under different conditions / given different opportunities and to make suggestions. Nearly half of the students who participated in the survey responded to this question making 24 major suggestions which have been grouped under four categories related to

- the program,
- the exams,
- the teacher,
- and other.

The total frequencies and percentages for each category have been indicated in Table 56 below.
The most common suggestion under the Program category is ensuring a balance in terms of tightness between the Fall and Spring Term programs (26,9\%), followed by decreasing the number of daily contact hours ( $6,2 \%$ ). It can easily be inferred that the latter group of students had a 6 -hour/day program last year.

As for the category Exams, $25,5 \%$ of the respondents suggest that more practice be done towards EPE. The distribution of the responses for all four categories have been provided in Table 56 below.

| TABLE 56: SUGGESTIONS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
| Valid | THE PROGRAM (total) | 78 | 24,3 | 53,9 |
|  | There should be fewer hours of class per day | 9 | 2,8 | 6,2 |
|  | The first term was too loose, second term too tight | 39 | 12,2 | 26,9 |
|  | More time should be spent on reading | 6 | 1,9 | 4,1 |
|  | This much time shouldn't be spent on grammatical details | 4 | 1,3 | 2,8 |
|  | The Summer School program was bad | 2 | ,6 | 1,4 |
|  | New material shouldn't be covered the MT week | 1 | ,3 | ,7 |
|  | BG students need more time | 3 | ,9 | 2,1 |
|  | We should be taught how to use the language | 3 | ,9 | 2,1 |
|  | EL and INT group programs should be more challenging | 1 | ,3 | ,7 |
|  | Effective teaching of vocabulary is necessary | 2 | ,6 | 1,4 |
|  | Students should be placed in Summer School according to their levels | 1 | ,3 | ,7 |
|  | More weight should be given to listening | 7 | 2,2 | 4,8 |
|  | THE EXAMS (total) | 45 | 14,1 | 31,1 |
|  | Mid-Terms questions should be multiple choice | 4 | 1,3 | 2,8 |
|  | Exams should be easier | 2 | ,6 | 1,4 |
|  | Practice towards EPE is insufficient | 37 | 11,6 | 25,5 |
|  | Success shouldn't be evaluated through a single exam. | 2 | ,6 | 1,4 |
|  | THE TEACHER (total) | 13 | 4,1 | 8,9 |
|  | Teachers should force the students to do homework and to study | 5 | 1,6 | 3,4 |
|  | Personal learning styles are not taken into consideration | 2 | ,6 | 1,4 |
|  | Teachers should attend more to the needs of unsuccessful students | 5 | 1,6 | 3,4 |
|  | Strict attendance should be taken | 1 | ,3 | ,7 |
|  | OTHER (total) | 9 | 2,8 | 6,2 |
|  | We are to blame for our failure | 1 | ,3 | ,7 |
|  | The difference in dormitory conditions should be eliminated | 2 | ,6 | 1,4 |
|  | Study environments should be provided | 5 | 1,6 | 3,4 |
|  | Support should be provided in terms of adjustment to university | 1 | ,3 | ,7 |
|  | Total | 145 | 45,3 | 100,0 |
| Missing |  | 175 | 54,7 |  |
| Total |  | 320 | 100,0 |  |

Suggestions


## III. CONCLUSION

As mentioned in the introduction of this report, the major expected outcomes of the survey are

- if possible, developing or having the University develop solutions to the external factors to which students attribute their failure,
- developing solutions to internal factors to which students attribute their failure without lowering standards and the quality of education,
- having gained an insight into their problems, guiding students in becoming better learners of a language.


## THE STUDENT PROFILE

The METU intake of students has been going through a change in the past few years.

- In terms of the university entrance score ranges, students preferring METU are no longer in the top 2000-5000 range, but in lower ranges. Previous studies indicate a strong correlation between academic success and entry scores. This applies to success at DBE as well.

The reasons why such students are less successful may lie in their study habits. Therefore, one remedy could be improving students' learning by providing training in study habits.

- Standards in language training have fallen drastically in Anatolian High Schools over the past few years. Over $90 \%$ of METU admissions are graduates of schools other than private high schools, where language training is still conducted as required. Elsewhere, including Anatolian High Schools - over 50\% of METU's intake - students receive between 2-5 hours of language training per week for 7-9 years (over 700-800 hours in total) on paper, but in reality, the training they receive seems to have no effect on the improvement of their language skills. In other words, a vast majority of students enter METU either at the beginners or elementary level.

Since students who need to repeat the year mostly start at these levels, measures need to be taken to increase the success of such students. One such measure could be extending the duration of education within the academic year and providing more time for students' adjustment, internalization, self-study and autonomous learning.

## EXTERNAL FACTORS

The most prevailing external factor seems to be that the dormitories do not offer suitable study environments for DBE students. Having pinpointed this problem earlier, the DBE has already started work with the concerned persons within the university to solve the problem.

Another significant external factor is the impact of the totally new environment on students who come from different parts of the country. Difficulty in adjustment to the new culture and environment usually results in difficulty in following the program during the first weeks of instruction. When this happens, a student usually gets lost at the very beginning and making up for that loss becomes nearly impossible.
$\checkmark$ A thorough orientation / integration program might help minimize adjustment problems encountered at the beginning, and thus, contribute to student success.

## INTERNAL FACTORS

- In terms of academic adjustment, around $60 \%$ of the respondents claim that they encountered problems in varying degrees, and half of this group say these problems affected their success adversely. As the pace of the intensive language training program at DBE is fast by its nature, students who face adjustment problems tend to get lost at the beginning, particularly in lower groups.

Among the answers given to the open-ended question related to academic adjustment, 3 answers come to the forefront: challenging lessons, different approach language training, not knowing how to learn English and demotivation induced by teachers.

The 'different approach' should be something desirable as the 'usual approach' (intensive grammar teaching) in primary and secondary education proves to be futile. What needs to be done is to raise student awareness regarding the objectives and benefits of the institution's approach, which will go hand-in-hand with learning how to learn English: students are trained to 'solve' multiple choice questions throughout secondary education; now, they will need to engage in something different. The remedies lie in changing the students' mindset and sensitizing teachers:
$\checkmark$ The initial orientation / integration program mentioned above may include such awareness raising on the outset in order to minimize academic adjustment problems.
$\checkmark$ Teachers should be sensitized regarding the negative impact of their attitude on students, which most probably is unintentional.

- In terms students' study skills, as mentioned earlier, 80 percent of the respondents admit that they lacked, in varying degrees, the appropriate study skills.


## V Introducing ways of helping students improve their study skills and sensitizing them about their learning styles are suggested remedies.

- In terms of the program, materials and exams,
$\rightarrow$ students mainly complain about the difference in load and speed between the two semesters. It is worth mentioning here that about $50 \%$ of the respondents say they relied on their previous knowledge in the first few months and didn't take the courses seriously due to the looseness of the initial stages of the program.
$\rightarrow$ In terms of student perceptions of level of difficulty of materials, the components of the program are ranked as $1^{\text {st }}$ Vocabulary, $2^{\text {nd }}$ Grammar, $3^{\text {rd }}$ Reading, $4^{\text {th }}$ Listening and $5^{\text {th }}$ Writing. Here, it should be noted that the most difficult skill, Writing, is perceived as the easiest among the five. (For remarks on this, please refer to page 21 of this report.)

These perceptions may either stem from students' prior beliefs regarding language learning or from the curriculum itself. Considering language needs at tertiary education, Reading, Listening, Writing and, of course, Speaking are skills that students need to develop in order to be able to cope with their courses in their fields. Grammar should be seen as a tool.

## V Solutions to the above problems are being sought by the DBE Administration.

$\rightarrow$ The Summer School program is another area of concern. Nearly half of the students who attended Summer School express that they did not benefit from it. This may be due to the variability of levels of enrolled students: some are at the end of the 'road' to success whereas others are way behind.

V A remedy could be introducing levels with suitable materials at different instructional paces to the Summer School program.
$\rightarrow$ Considering student perceptions of the exams, only $50 \%$ were aware of the fact that the achievement exams and the syllabus matched, and over $60 \%$ thought the exams were difficult. (For details, please refer to pages $26 \& 27$ of this report.)

As mentioned earlier, it is not surprising that $87,2 \%$ of the respondents say EPE was difficult in general as these students took the exam 1-3 times and failed.

For a healthier insight on perceptions regarding EPE, please refer to the study titled Perceptions of Freshman Students regarding EPE.

