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Abstract

The aim of this research is; the analysis of the effect of delivering the introduction activity, which is among the classroom teaching situations, in native language under the guidance of an instructor with usage of video learning object, instead of using a lecturer who uses target language and makes a classical presentation in foreign language teaching process. In this study, eight video learning objects were used. It is a quantitative and experimental study. Data were collected by using multi-subject, AB (mixed) patterns, static test and control group comparatives, pre- and post-test control group model. SPSS 25 statistical program was analyzed by Mann Whitney U and Wilcoxon Signed Ranks tests with partial eta-square and eta-square statistics. According to the results of this study: at A1.2 level, in foreign language teaching processes; instead of a lecturer who uses target language and classical presentation, the instructor guided input activity given by the lecturer with video and learning object prepared in mother tongue is highly effective in developing language skills. In terms of language skill types, while compared to the lecturer who uses classical presentation, instructor guided input activity given by the lecturer with video and learning object prepared in mother tongue does not make a significant difference in other skill type development, it’s highly effective in developing speaking skills. This situation was similar in terms of language skills only in speaking skills. It is expected that the study can give similar results for B2 and lower language skill levels. In addition, it has been proposed to reach at least 30 subjects and to repeat this and other patterns in order to make the generalizability of the study effective.
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1. Introduction

This template, created in MS Word 2007, provides authors with most of the formatting specifications needed for preparing electronic versions of their papers. All standard paper components have been specified for three reasons: 1) ease of use when formatting individual papers; 2) automatic compliance to electronic requirements that facilitate the concurrent or later production of electronic products; and 3) conformity of style throughout a journal paper. Margins, column widths, line spacing, and type styles are built-in; examples of the type styles are provided throughout this document and are identified in italic type, within parentheses, following the example. Some components, such as multi-leveled equations, graphics, and tables are not prescribed, although the various table text styles are provided. The formatter will need to create these components, incorporating the applicable criteria that follow.

Learning is a spiral differentiation or differentiation process that starts with communication, strengthens with interaction and results in skill acquisition (Ülker, 2019) or it is the permanent change that an individual creates in his or her experience and knowledge or behavior (Hoy & Miskel, 2010: p. 125). On the other hand, teaching is the systematic guidance of learning (Şimşek, 2014: p. 6). According to the study of Varış (1994: p. 13) it is emphasized that teaching is “guided, planned, programmed and supported”. In other words, teaching is the planning, implementation and evaluation of the learning-teaching process in line with predetermined goals (Şahin, 2019). One of the sub-disciplines of teaching is language teaching. The sub-discipline of language teaching is divided into two main areas: native language teaching and foreign language teaching. Language teaching is important to gain language skills with a holistic approach. There are four types of skills in language teaching. These are “reading, writing, listening and speaking” (Gültèkin, Melanlioğlu, & Ülker, 2016; Güzel & Barın, 2013: p. 268; Temur, 2016: p. 87).

When the foreign language teaching is looked from the perspective of the system approach with the time axis and the elements and sub-elements of both itself and other systems, some differences can be observed. In the process of foreign language teaching, some of the factors that are the source of differentiation are related to the preference of using mother tongue and target language in teaching process. Looking at the foreign language teaching methods used from past to present, this difference is seen with more concrete data. Accordingly, in six of the foreign language teaching methods in Table 1, while the native language is used in the foreign language teaching process, that is, there is no restriction or prohibition, the use of mother tongue in seven methods is strictly prohibited.

As in the other disciplinary fields, some activities are carried out in the teaching process in the field of foreign language teaching. These learning activities are explained with different expressions and sections in different sources as shown in Table 1. Accordingly, learning activities consist of five chapters and are
Table 1. Foreign language teaching methods or applications and whether or not the mother tongue is used in this case and the bibliography table where the data are available.

| Code | Foreign language teaching method                | Native Language Usage Status | Source                                      |
|------|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 1    | Grammar-translation method                      | Available                   | (Durmuş, 2013: p. 57)                       |
| 2    | Cognitive learning method                       | Available                   |                                             |
| 3    | Group language teaching                         | Available                   |                                             |
| 4    | Elective method                                 | Used when needed            |                                             |
| 5    | Action-oriented method                          | There is no restriction but the target language is considered | (Durmuş, 2013: p. 57)                       |
| 6    | All physical reaction method                    | Used when needed            |                                             |
| 7    | Direct language teaching method                 | Not used                    |                                             |
| 8    | Nozzle method                                   | Not used                    | (Barın, 2004: s.27)                        |
| 9    | Natural method                                  | Not used                    | Yunus Emre Enstitüsü (2019)                |
| 10   | Grammar-translation method                      | Not used                    |                                             |
| 11   | Eclectic method                                 | Not used                    |                                             |
| 12   | Yunus Emre Institute applications               | Not used                    |                                             |

In all 12 of the Universities in Turkey which have foreign language teaching centers from which an opinion has been requested.

explained by different expressions with the same or similar meanings. In this context, the first of the learning activities are defined with concepts such as “introduction, intro or preparation, warming up to learning and motivation”. In the following chapters of this study, the expression used to name the first stage of learning activities will be discussed with the concept of “introduction” chosen by the participants.

There are different reasons for the inclusion of introductory activities in the teaching process. This situation is explained by Yalın’s (2008) study with expressions such as attracting attention, providing motivation, informing the target, determining input behaviors, and establishing relationships between new and old learners. According to the study of Özdemir, Yalın and Sezgin (2010), learning increases when the individual knows what new behavior is expected of her/him. If the teacher shares the student’s learning objectives at the end of the lesson, the learning becomes faster and more permanent. Briefly, the teacher explains at the beginning of the lesson that it is necessary to share the knowledge that this is what you can do with the student at the end of the lesson. In Demirel’s (2009) study the introduction section is described as focusing on developing students’ thinking skills, directing them to critical and creative thinking, attracting their interest and directing them to research.

Another concept used in explaining the introductory section and included in
Table 2 is the concept of motivation expressed by Newby, Stepich, Lehman, Russell, & Ottenbreit-Leftwich (2011). The concept of motivation is also addressed by concept of motive in some studies in the field. Motive is a process that activates the organism and gives energy and direction to behaviors (Selçuk, 2000). In other words, it is “one’s willingness to make an effort to realize an aim” (Çakır, Ulusoy & Karadeniz, 2008: p. 79). Newby et al. (2011), explain motive-motivation with Keller’s ARCS theory. According to Keller’s theory, the motivation of the learner in the teaching process is related to providing attention, helping nurture the interest, giving confidence and making these sustainable. A new concept is added to the theory with the approach that this theory is incomplete in explaining the motivation of the learner in the teaching process. This concept is the letter “V” of the “volition” concept and is represented by its first letter “V”, like the other concepts in the theory. The ARCS theory was then used as the ARCS-V theory. These concepts and their meanings that aim to provide motivation in the teaching process in the ARCS-Theory as compiled in Elearningindustry.com [access: 18.09.2015] are as follows: Attention: the gathering of interest that makes the backbone of this process. Relevance: The level of content and learning requirements that are consistent with the goals of the learner or the educator, appropriate to the learning styles and related to past experiences. Confidence: is a positive perception of the content of the learning and teaching process in terms of being in line with the expectations of the learner or the student. This process represents for the student or the learner: The question what does this content have for me? It is related to faith and trust that it will be useful. Satisfaction: to related to the achievement or rewarding of students during and after learning. Volition is a concept of actions and attitudes regarding continuance of the effort to achieve a goal (Suzuki, 2010). According to Keller (2016, 2017), it is a model that provides opportunities and tools for teachers and learners in this way by suggesting strategies and tactics for identifying problems based on motivation and their solution. The most important contribution of Keller’s motivational-based ARCS model to the field of education is that the model not only includes the determination and classification of motivation elements, but also includes teaching strategies for each category and subcategories (Kavak & Mahiroğlu, 2010: p. 70).

When the studies in the field are examined, it is understood that the academic studies with the scope and prevalence of foreign language teaching methods and

| No | Activities in the teaching process | Sources |
|----|----------------------------------|---------|
| 1  | Introduction, Presentation, Exercise, Feedback, Evaluation | Yalın, (2008, p. 52-58) |
| 2  | Intro or preparation, Development, Result activities | Demirel, (2010, p. 151) |
| 3  | Warming up to learning, Introduction/Presentation, Application, Failure compensation, Evaluation | Özdemir, Yalın & Sezgin, (2010, p. 92) |
| 4  | Motivation, Adaptation, Instruction, Application, Evaluation | Newby et al., (2011, p. 70) |
the reasons of the differences mentioned above in Table 2 about the preferences of using native language and target language are very limited. In this context, when the current foreign language teaching method and the preference of using native language and target language in these methods are examined, it is seen that only the target language is used during the teaching period and the use of the native language is prohibited. However, the project manager and researchers who make this study think differently because of their opinions based on field experience. According to them, this situation should be stretched in favor of the native language, especially at the beginning and intermediate levels, especially because of its contribution to the development of comprehension and acquisition of other skills. In the light of these evaluations, it is considered appropriate and important to present concrete outcomes with an academic study.

As it is known, the meaningful learning approach put forward by Ausubel, Novak and Hanesian (1968) regards that “the most important factor in learning is the student’s previous learning”. Being meaningful here; “is the result of the relationship between ideas, events, concepts and objects. If connection between what will be learned and what has been learned cannot be established, meaningful learning cannot be realized” (Bulut, 2019: p.14). This relationship is undoubtedly related to improving the thinking skill of the learner. Senemoğlu (2004) divides the thinking skill of the learner into three as “creative thinking, problem solving and critical thinking”. In order for learning to take place in an effective, meaningful and bond-related manner, some skills of the learner should be emphasized. In the light of these evaluations, it seems appropriate and important to conduct an academic study and at the end of this, to reveal the concrete outputs of this situation.

For this purpose, considering the limitations of the study, it is planned that the teaching process will be aimed at the input efficiency by using a teaching tool and equipment that will be determined according to the differences caused by technological developments. In this context, considering that the differentiation caused by technological changes makes addressing many sensory organs possible and makes the learning effective; the teaching process will be conducted with visual, verbal and textual video film-shaped learning object.

In this context, considering the reason that the differentiation caused by technological changes appeals to many sensory organs and makes learning effective; it is thought to be made in a video format learning object that includes visuals, text and verbal tools. This object is a video film called podcast. Podcast: “It is a reliable source for learning to listen in foreign language teaching, especially it provides correct pronunciation of words and sentences (Suseno, 2015)”. Podcast has historically been described as an audio or video file that can be uploaded to a mobile device or computer via RSS (Really Simple Syndication) feed (Williams, Aguilar-Roca, & O’Dowd, 2016).

These video films are planned to have a duration of about 2 - 5 minutes, taking into account the predictions for the duration of the intro activity. To explain the scope of the concept of learning object in this study with the studies in the
field and to place the scope and data collection process of the study on a healthy basis and the learning objects are explained in this section. Learning objects are any numerical or non-numerical entity that supports learning (Quinn, 2000). “Video viewing can be a valuable resource to expose students to large quantities of input so they can improve their vocabulary and contend comprehension” (Suarez & Gesa, 2019). Currently, computer technology, multimedia technology and network technology are developing very rapidly, which greatly influencing classroom are teaching methods and students’ learning approaches (Mao, Liu, & Zhang, 2018: p. 1161). “The multimedia content used during technology-assisted learning includes instructional content, learning objectives, instructional software and tools, individuals, institutions or events” (Wiley, 2000). It is a collection of 7 ± 2 components including content, application and learning outcome” (Polsani, 2003). According to WORC, (Wisconsin Online Research Center as cited in Sütçü, 2014: p. 41), the Wisconsin Online Learning Resources Center defines learning objects as small learning units with a duration of between two and fifteen minutes.

The conceptual framework of the past studies has been discussed, the findings have been synthesized, the importance of the subject has been revealed and the problem has been explained. In the light of these data, the preferred approach to reveal the question to be searched for and to answer these questions has been tried to be determined by considering the sources.

“In subsequent studies, researchers can focus on assessment research on the effectiveness of design-based research patterns and experimental studies not only for the podcast design process, but also in terms of development, publishing and language teaching” (Yakın, 2018). As stated in this statement in this study: Based on this, the study will focus on the input activity, which is one of the in-class teaching situations in the foreign language teaching process. Student achievement will be analyzed by using experimental research method according to the use of native language and target language. In this process, instead of the lecturer giving the classical presentation, the video will be given in the language of the learner with a film-based learning object and under the guidance of the instructor. Pre-test & post-test results will be analyzed and results and recommendations will be reached. The study focuses on teaching foreign languages: analysis, planning and implementation and evaluation; In this respect, the study is considered important because it will offer guidance by providing up-to-date and comprehensive content for analysis, planning, implementation and evaluation in foreign language teaching.

2. Purpose of the Research

The aim of this research is; the analysis of the effect of delivering the introduction activity, which is among the classroom teaching situations, in native language under the guidance of an instructor with usage of video learning object, instead of using a lecturer who uses target language and makes a classic presen-
tation in foreign language teaching process. In order to achieve this goal, solutions to the following sub-problems were sought:

- Is there a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test total achievement scores of the trainees in the experimental and control groups?
- Is there a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test achievement scores of the trainees in the experimental and control groups according to their language skill types?

3. Methods

The research model, data collection and analysis methods of the study are explained in detail below.

3.1. Research Model and Data Collection Tools

This is a quantitative and experimental research. Data presented in the study was collected by using document analysis, and multi-subject, AB (mixed) patterns, static test and control group comparatives, pre-test and post-test control group model. The AB (mixed) pattern was used to ensure that the groups’ pre-experiment similarity degrees were known and that post-test results were corrected accordingly (Büyüköztürk, 2019; Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003; Karasar, 2004). In the static experimental group, there are 10 randomly assigned samples. The experiment participants are students who attend the A1.2. level Turkish language course at Pristina Yunus Emre Institute. In the control group there are 7 randomly assigned students who attend the A1.2. level Turkish language course at Prizren Yunus Emre Institute. In order to determine the academic achievement of both groups, pre-test and post-test with common questions were applied. Pre-test and post-tests were prepared, implemented and evaluated by two lecturers from Turkey who were tasked by Yunus Emre Institute. In the pre-test and post-test questions, four skill types and six categories of foreign language skills (reading, writing-writing-1 and writing-2-, speaking-reciprocal speaking and independent speaking- and listening-comprehension) were evaluated. Multiple choice and test-type questions were used to assess reading and listening-comprehension skills, and trainees were asked to answer them. For writing and speaking skills, face-to-face interviews and oral exams were used.

In order to increase the internal and external validity of the research, static instructors and control groups were employed as instructors. The research manager ensured the control and coordination of the process. This was evaluated as a positive aspect in terms of the reliability of the study (treatment fidelity). In addition, the creation of the research model and its implementation process were continuously evaluated by the research manager and the researchers, the to-do was handled and the process was controlled. The application environment and subjects were evaluated according to the following reasons: The application environment is in two different cities for the experimental and control groups. The distance between these two cities is 85 km and there is no significant cultural,
social and economic difference between them. The physical environment of the application was arranged according to Yunus Emre Institute standards. In addition, there was no significant difference between the trainees in the control and experimental groups according to age, gender and education level. From the instructors that are tasked in the control and experimental group one is male and one is female. The undergraduate graduation area of the lecturers, university entrance score, demographic regions, and the commencement of the Yunus Emre Institute as instructors on the same date and in the same period and the pre-service education they received from the Institute are similar. In addition, the experimental group consisted of ten people and the control group consisted of seven people. The fact that the total number of members of the groups, both general and group-based, was low was evaluated as reducing the external validity of the study. In order to make generalizations in both this cause and the studies with this type of research model, it was evaluated that it would be appropriate to study the same pattern with multiple and different groups. In order to support the reliability of the study, pre-test and post-test scores were evaluated independently and separately by a third instructor in addition to the researchers. There was no significant difference between the evaluation results. Therefore, the average of the scores given by these three evaluators was used in the analysis.

The symbolic view of the research model is as in Table 3.

The dependent variable of the study is academic achievement. The independent variables are 8 learning objects prepared by the staff of the Yunus Emre Institute in Kosovo. Learning objects have a minimum duration of 2.22 and a maximum of 6.02 minutes. The smallest in digital size is 95, the largest is 410 and the average is 221 MB. The number of words in the target language of the script is at least 327, at most 807, and the average of all is 515. The number of words in the native language the script has is at least 225, at most 586 and the average is 273. Each of the learning objects was used in the introductory activity in a 3-hour learning activity. Learning objects are multimedia content in video movie format with texts, images, videos and audios. Texts in these contents were prepared by lecturers and other staff supporting the project by using the Yunus Emre Institute “Yedi İklim” teaching set which is also used in the course.

Images were taken from Yunus Emre Institute’s Z-book, Turkish teaching portal and other related materials. The native language and the presentation were made by the employees of the relevant institutions; whose mother tongue is

| Groups                     | R                          | Pre-test                                      | Process                                                                 | Post-test                  |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| A. Experimental group      | Random assignment (10 students) | Language level test                           | Performance task: Presentation of introductory activity with a video film under the guidance of instructor in native language. | Language level test        |
| B. Control group           | Random assignment (7 students) | Language level test                           | Traditional method: Introduction activity by instructor presentation in the target language | Language level test        |

Table 3. Symbolic view of the model used in the research.
Albanian or who speak Albanian at native speaker level. This teaching object was used only in the introduction activity of the teaching process. In this process, the presentation was made with a smart board. During the research, no intervention was made to the AB groups except for the pre-test and post-test. The scores of the trainees in the pre-test and post-test were evaluated and recorded by the instructors.

3.2. Data Analysis

It was analyzed whether the trainees caused a significant difference in the total scores of pre-test and post-test and skill-based scores. In the analysis of the data, the Mann Whitney U test was used to determine whether there was any difference between the groups in terms of pre-test and post-test scores for unrelated measurements in SPSS 25 program in order to examine the changes in pre- and post-test measurements of the experimental and control groups.

Wilcoxon Signed Ranks tests were used for the related measurements to determine whether there was a difference in the scores from pre-test to post-test in the experimental and control groups. For the first two research questions, the data were translated into 100 points. For the effect sizes, partial eta-square and eta-square statistics were examined.

4. Findings

Findings obtained from the data compiled by experimental method to find answers to the questions related to the purpose of the research are given below.

4.1. Is There a Significant Difference between the Pre-Test and Post-Test Total Achievement Scores of the Trainees in the Experimental and Control Groups?

Descriptive statistics regarding the total score of students’ language skills were examined before moving to the sub-problem.

Table 4 shows that the pre-test scores of the experimental group ranged from 50 to 90 and the post-test scores ranged from 65 to 97 and the pre-test scores of the control group ranged from 56 to 88, and the post-test scores ranged from 70 to 94. When the averages are examined, it can be said that the post-test scores in both groups are greater than the pre-test scores and the distribution of the post-test scores in the control group is closest to the average. When skewness and kurtosis coefficients are examined, it is seen that the values vary between −1.55 and −0.36. According to Büyüköztürk (2019: p. 21), the change in the skewness and kurtosis coefficients between −1 and +1 is an indicator of normal distribution of the data. Accordingly, the distribution of data was not normal in both groups.

Mann Whitney U test was used to determine whether there was any difference between the groups in terms of pre-test and post-test scores.

When Table 5 is examined, it is seen that both pre-test and post-test scores do not differ according to the group ($p > 0.01$). According to this finding, especially
Table 4. Descriptive statistics on students’ language skills.

| Measurement | Min. | Max. | Avg. | Std. Dev. | Skew | Kurtosis |
|-------------|------|------|------|-----------|------|----------|
| **Experimental** | | | | | | |
| Pre-total | 50.00 | 89.50 | 72.68 | 14.45 | −0.50 | −1.32 |
| Post-total | 64.75 | 96.75 | 84.85 | 11.69 | −0.76 | −1.11 |
| **Control** | | | | | | |
| Pre-total | 55.50 | 88.00 | 73.50 | 12.53 | −0.42 | −1.55 |
| Post-total | 70.00 | 94.00 | 83.50 | 8.67 | −0.36 | −0.90 |

Table 5. Mann Whitney U test results of pre-test and post-test success scores by group.

| Measurement | Group | N | Mean rank | Mean total | U | p |
|-------------|-------|---|-----------|------------|---|---|
| Pre-total   | Experimental Group | 10 | 8.85 | 88.50 | 33.50 | 0.88 |
|             | Control Group | 7 | 9.21 | 64.50 | | |
| Post-total  | Experimental Group | 10 | 9.75 | 97.50 | 27.50 | 0.46 |
|             | Control Group | 7 | 7.93 | 55.50 | | |

The lack of differentiation of the pretest scores is an indication that the groups were equivalent in terms of the characteristics compared before the training (intervention).

Wilcoxon Signed Ranks test was used to determine whether there was any difference in the scores from the pre-test to the post-test in the experimental and control groups.

When Table 6 was examined, no difference was observed between the pre-test and post-test scores in the control group; in the experimental group however, the difference between the scores before and after the experiment was found to be statistically significant (z = −2.701; p < 0.01; partial η² = 0.60). When the average of the rankings is taken into consideration, it can be said that this difference is in favor of positive rankings, i.e. post-test scores. Therefore, the program is highly effective in developing language skills Büyükoztürk (2019: p. 174).

4.2. Is There a Significant Difference between the Pre-Test and Post-Test Achievement Scores of the Trainees in the Experimental and Control Groups According to Their Language Skill Types?

Descriptive statistics regarding the scores of the students’ language skills types were examined before moving to the sub-problem.

When Table 7 is examined, the distribution of listening, writing-1 skills, writing-2 skills, reciprocal speaking and independent speaking pre-test scores and post-test scores of the experimental and control groups are seen.

When the averages are examined, it can be said that the post-test scores in both groups are greater than the pre-test scores and the distribution of post-test scores in the control group is the closest to the average. When skewness and kurtosis coefficients are examined, it is seen that the values vary between −1.59 and 4.3.
Table 6. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks test results for language skills pre-test and post-test scores.

| Measurement               | Post-total and Pre-total | n | Mean Rank | Mean Total 1 | z   | p         | Partial eta-square |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|---|-----------|--------------|-----|-----------|--------------------|
| **Experimental Group**    |                          |   |           |              |     |           |                    |
| Negative rank             | 1                        | 1.00 | 1.00 | −2.701 | 0.007* | 0.60 |                |
| Positive rank             | 9                        | 6.00 | 54.00 |          |       |         |                    |
| Equal                     | 0                        |     |    |        |       |         |                    |
| **Kontrol Grubu**         |                          |   |           |              |     |           |                    |
| Positive rank             | 7                        | 4.00 | 28.00 |          |       |         |                    |
| Equal                     | 0                        |     |    |        |       |         |                    |

*p < 0.01.

Table 7. Descriptive statistics about students’ language skills types.

| Group            | Skills            | Min. | Max. | Avg. | Std. Dev. | Skew  | Kurtosis |
|------------------|-------------------|------|------|------|-----------|-------|---------|
| **Experimental Group** | Pre reading | 44.00 | 96.00 | 68.80 | 17.59 | −0.29 | −0.91 |
|                   | Post reading      | 60.00 | 95.00 | 83.00 | 10.06 | −1.16 | 2.58 |
| **Control Group**  | Pre reading       | 36.00 | 80.00 | 66.86 | 15.44 | −1.59 | 2.47 |
|                   | Post reading      | 68.00 | 90.00 | 75.71 | 8.04  | 0.92  | 0.17  |
| **Experimental Group** | Pre listening  | 56.00 | 100.00 | 85.90 | 14.39 | −1.08 | 0.58 |
|                   | Post listening   | 75.00 | 100.00 | 91.00 | 8.43  | −0.56 | −0.47 |
| **Control Group**  | Pre listening    | 56.00 | 88.00 | 75.43 | 12.09 | −0.47 | −0.95 |
|                   | Post listening   | 72.00 | 100.00 | 88.57 | 10.69 | −0.80 | −0.98 |
| **Experimental Group** | Pre writing 1      | 50.00 | 100.00 | 78.00 | 14.76 | −0.61 | 0.26  |
|                   | Post writing 1    | 70.00 | 100.00 | 90.00 | 14.14 | −0.88 | −1.39 |
| **Control Group**  | Pre writing 1      | 50.00 | 100.00 | 71.43 | 19.52 | 0.29  | −1.45 |
|                   | Post writing 1    | 70.00 | 100.00 | 85.71 | 9.76  | −0.28 | 0.04  |
| **Experimental Group** | Pre writing 2      | 46.67 | 100.00 | 65.33 | 18.27 | 0.83  | −0.42 |
|                   | Post writing 2    | 53.33 | 100.00 | 76.00 | 17.56 | −0.41 | −1.59 |
| **Control Group**  | Pre writing 2      | 33.33 | 100.00 | 77.14 | 21.03 | −1.77 | 4.08  |
|                   | Post writing 2    | 66.67 | 100.00 | 85.72 | 10.49 | −0.76 | 1.45  |
| **Experimental Group** | Pre reciprocal speaking  | 46.67 | 100.00 | 66.00 | 18.71 | 0.58  | −0.77 |
|                   | Post reciprocal speaking | 53.33 | 100.00 | 77.33 | 20.17 | −0.06 | −1.88 |
| **Control Group**  | Pre reciprocal speaking | 50.00 | 93.33 | 74.76 | 15.14 | −0.44 | −0.57 |
|                   | Post reciprocal speaking | 73.33 | 100.00 | 84.28 | 10.31 | 0.43  | −1.35 |
| **Experimental Group** | Pre independent speaking | 30.00 | 90.00 | 71.00 | 16.63 | −1.83 | 4.21 |
|                   | Post independent speaking | 70.00 | 150.00 | 93.50 | 22.86 | 1.77  | 4.33 |
| **Control Group**  | Pre independent speaking | 60.00 | 90.00 | 80.00 | 10.00 | −1.40 | 3.00  |
|                   | Post independent speaking | 60.00 | 95.00 | 83.57 | 11.80 | −1.55 | 2.57 |

According to Büyüköztürk (2019: p. 21), the change in the skewness and kurtosis coefficients between −1 and +1 is an indicator of normal distribution of the
data. Therefore, it can be said that the distribution of the data is not normal in both groups. Mann Whitney U test was used to determine whether there was any difference between the groups in terms of pre-test and post-test scores of language skills.

Table 8 shows that pre-reading ($p > 0.73$) and post-reading ($p > 0.08$) scores, pre-listening ($p > 0.07$) and post-listening ($p > 0.81$) scores do not differ. Likewise, pre-writing-1 ($p > 0.46$) and post-writing 1 ($p > 0.31$) scores, pre-writing 2 ($p > 0.18$) and post writing 2 ($p > 0.88$) scores were not differentiated. This applies to the scores of the pre-reciprocal speaking ($p > 0.26$) and the post-reciprocal speaking ($p > 0.55$) and the pre-independent speaking ($p > 0.16$) and the post-independent speaking ($p > 0.37$) and scores were not differentiated. According to this finding, especially the lack of differentiation in pre-test scores is an indication that the groups were equivalent in terms of the characteristics compared before the training (intervention) (Büyüköztürk, 2019: p.165).

Table 8. Mann Whitney U test results of pre-test and post-test success scores by group.

| Measurement         | Group            | N   | Mean Rank | Rank Sum | U     | p    |
|---------------------|------------------|-----|-----------|----------|-------|------|
|                     | Experimental     |     |           |          |       |      |
| Pre-Reading         | Group            |     |           |          |       |      |
|                     | 10               |     | 9.35      | 93.50    | 31.500| 0.73 |
|                     | 7                |     | 8.50      | 59.50    |       |      |
| Pre-Listening       | Experimental     | 10  | 10.85     | 108.50   | 16.500| 0.07 |
|                     | Control Group    | 7   | 6.36      | 44.50    |       |      |
| Pre-Writing-1       | Experimental     | 10  | 9.75      | 97.50    | 27.500| 0.46 |
|                     | Control Group    | 7   | 7.93      | 55.50    |       |      |
| Pre-Writing-2       | Experimental     | 10  | 7.65      | 76.50    | 21.500| 0.18 |
|                     | Control Group    | 7   | 10.93     | 76.50    |       |      |
| Pre-Reciprocal      | Experimental     | 10  | 7.85      | 78.50    | 23.500| 0.26 |
| Speaking            | Control Group    | 7   | 10.64     | 74.50    |       |      |
| Pre-Independent     | Experimental     | 10  | 7.65      | 76.50    | 21.500| 0.16 |
| Speaking            | Control Group    | 7   | 10.93     | 76.50    |       |      |
| Post-Reading        | Experimental     | 10  | 10.75     | 107.50   | 17.500| 0.08 |
|                     | Control Group    | 7   | 6.50      | 45.50    |       |      |
| Post-Listening      | Experimental     | 10  | 9.25      | 92.50    | 32.500| 0.81 |
|                     | Control Group    | 7   | 8.64      | 60.50    |       |      |
| Post-Writing 1      | Experimental     | 10  | 10.00     | 100.00   | 25.000| 0.31 |
|                     | Control Group    | 7   | 7.57      | 53.00    |       |      |
| Post-Writing 2      | Experimental     | 10  | 7.95      | 79.50    | 24.500| 0.28 |
|                     | Control Group    | 7   | 10.50     | 73.50    |       |      |
| Post-Reciprocal     | Experimental     | 10  | 8.40      | 84.00    | 29.000| 0.55 |
| Speaking            | Control Group    | 7   | 9.86      | 69.00    |       |      |
| Post-Independent    | Experimental     | 10  | 9.90      | 99.00    | 26.000| 0.37 |
| Speaking            | Control Group    | 7   | 7.71      | 54.00    |       |      |
Wilcoxon signed-rank test was used to determine whether there was any difference in the scores from the pre-test to the post-test in the experimental and control groups.

When Table 9 was examined no difference was observed in the control group.

**Table 9. Wilcoxon signed-rank test results for pre-test and post-test scores of language skills types.**

| Study Group      | Skill type      | Analysis title       | n  | Mean Rank | Rank Sum | z   | p      | Partial Eta squared |
|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|----|-----------|----------|-----|--------|---------------------|
| **Experimental Group** |                 |                      |    |           |          |     |        |                     |
|                  |                 | Negative Rank        | 1  | 4.50      | 4.50     | −2.134 | 0.033  |                     |
|                  |                 | Positive Rank        | 8  | 5.06      | 40.50    |       |        |                     |
|                  |                 | Equal                | 1  |           |          |       |        |                     |
|                  |                 | Negative Rank        | 2  | 4.75      | 9.50     | −1.543 | 0.123  |                     |
|                  |                 | Positive Rank        | 7  | 5.07      | 35.50    |       |        |                     |
|                  |                 | Equal                | 1  |           |          |       |        |                     |
|                  |                 | Negative Rank        | 1  | 2.50      | 2.50     | −2.209 | 0.027  |                     |
|                  |                 | Positive Rank        | 7  | 4.79      | 33.50    |       |        |                     |
|                  |                 | Equal                | 2  |           |          |       |        |                     |
|                  |                 | Negative Rank        | 0  | 0.00      | 0.00     | −2.023 | 0.043  |                     |
|                  |                 | Positive Rank        | 7  | 3.00      | 15.00    |       |        |                     |
|                  |                 | Equal                | 5  |           |          |       |        |                     |
|                  |                 | Negative Rank        | 2  | 5.25      | 10.50    | −1.436 | 0.151  |                     |
|                  |                 | Positive Rank        | 7  | 4.93      | 34.50    |       |        |                     |
|                  |                 | Equal                | 1  |           |          |       |        |                     |
|                  |                 | Negative Rank        | 0  | 0.00      | 0.00     | −2.585 | 0.009* | 0.58               |
|                  |                 | Positive Rank        | 8  | 4.50      | 36.00    |       |        |                     |
|                  |                 | Equal                | 2  |           |          |       |        |                     |
| **Control Group** |                 |                      |    |           |          |     |        |                     |
|                  |                 | Negative Rank        | 1  | 2.00      | 2.00     | −2.047 | 0.041  |                     |
|                  |                 | Positive Rank        | 6  | 4.33      | 26.00    |       |        |                     |
|                  |                 | Equal                | 0  |           |          |       |        |                     |
|                  |                 | Negative Rank        | 0  | 0.00      | 0.00     | −2.401 | 0.016  |                     |
|                  |                 | Positive Rank        | 7  | 4.00      | 28.00    |       |        |                     |
|                  |                 | Equal                | 0  |           |          |       |        |                     |
|                  |                 | Negative Rank        | 0  | 0.00      | 0.00     | −2.041 | 0.041  |                     |
|                  |                 | Positive Rank        | 5  | 3.00      | 15.00    |       |        |                     |
|                  |                 | Equal                | 2  |           |          |       |        |                     |
|                  |                 | Negative Rank        | 0  | 0.00      | 0.00     | −1.826 | 0.068  |                     |
|                  |                 | Positive Rank        | 4  | 2.50      | 10.00    |       |        |                     |
|                  |                 | Equal                | 3  |           |          |       |        |                     |
|                  |                 | Negative Rank        | 0  | 0.00      | 0.00     | −2.375 | 0.018  |                     |
|                  |                 | Positive Rank        | 7  | 4.00      | 28.00    |       |        |                     |
|                  |                 | Equal                | 0  |           |          |       |        |                     |
|                  |                 | Negative Rank        | 0  | 0.00      | 0.00     | −1.342 | 0.180  |                     |
|                  |                 | Positive Rank        | 2  | 1.50      | 3.00    |       |        |                     |
|                  |                 | Equal                | 5  |           |          |       |        |                     |

*p < 0.01.
between: pre-reading and post-reading scores, pre-writing 1 and post-writing 1 scores, pre-writing 2 and post-writing 2 scores and lastly between pre reciprocal and post reciprocal scores. In the experimental group, the difference between post-independent speaking and pre-independent speaking has been found to be statistically significant ($z = -2.585; p < 0.01; \text{partial } \eta^2 = 0.58$). When the mean ranks are taken into consideration, it can be said that this difference is in favor of positive rankings, i.e. post-test scores. Therefore, it was found that the program was highly effective in improving language skills Büyüköztürk (2019: p. 174).

5. Results and Discussion

In this study, the following results were obtained regarding the effect of the use of the video under the guidance of the teacher, prepared in the mother tongue in the introduction activity of the foreign language learning process in the target language according to the presentation of the teacher in the target language:

● According to the statistical analysis based on pretest and posttest measurements, posttest scores are higher than pretest scores.

● Score group closest to the average is, the last test score of the group taught with the video in the mother tongue. The pretest and posttest scores of both groups are normally distributed and the skewness and kurtosis coefficient is between −1.55 and −0.36.

● The fact that both the pre-test and post-test scores of the groups did not differ by the groups ($p > 0.01$) shows that they are equivalent in terms of the characteristics compared before the training (intervention).

● While there is no significant difference in the other group, in the group that was educated with the video prepared in mother tongue the statistical difference ($z = -2.701; p < 0.01; \text{partial } \eta^2 = 0.60$) between the pre-test and post-test scores is meaningful.

According to the results of this study: at A1.2 level, in foreign language teaching processes; instead of a lecturer who uses target language and classical presentation, the instructor guided input activity given by the lecturer with video and learning object prepared in mother tongue is highly effective in developing language skills.

In terms of language skill types, while compared to the lecturer who uses classical presentation, instructor guided input activity given by the lecturer with video and learning object prepared in mother tongue does not make a significant difference in other skill type development, it’s highly effective in developing speaking skills.

There is no strict rule for proper sample size in experimental studies. On the other hand, it would be advantageous for the researcher to make the study in groups of 30 - 40 people, generalization of the results, availability of strong statistics (Büyüköztürk, Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz, & Demirel, 2012: p.197). It is expected that the study can give similar results for B2 and six language skill levels. In addition, it is recommended to reach at least 30 subjects and to repeat
this and other patterns in order to make the generalizability of the study effective.
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