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Abstract
Almost all methods of ELT put in their first place the students’ performance. As part of students’ performance are also the skills such as: reading, writing, listening and speaking. Some methods pay attention more on reading and writing, while some others such as CLT pays more attention on communication (speaking). In this research paper were tested the secondary school students, respectively tenth grade Kosovo students, in order to get information of the correlation between the variables (skills) for students taught with ESA and students taught with CLT. At the same time, it was also seen, which the skills are where the students have shown better results with above mentions methods of ELT.
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Introduction

Within broader framework program of the Curriculum, syllabi are designed by teachers that are employed for the teacher’s needs. The curriculum can be used by the teacher to run it right into material selection and preparation of a syllabus in detail to achieve its goals towards a better performance of their students. According to the Kosovo Curriculum, books can be individually
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designed for a school or class purposes, taking into account, the specific conditions, needs and circumstances of the classroom\textsuperscript{22}. Kosovo English Curriculum suggests that teachers should employ two primary methods of English language teaching: CLT and Learning by Doing. However, MEST distributes free English books for all levels of ELT. This means that the method which is used by the books is ESA.

An investigation was committed to see how the two above mentioned methods are used, and at the same time, what was the correlation between the skills used by these methods.

Furthermore, we intend to see if there is any difference between the two above mention methods regarding the correlations between the skills.

**Teaching Methods**

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) was given to a set of beliefs of not only what to teach but also how to teach. What to teach stresses the language functions rather focusing on grammar and vocabulary.

The aspect of ‘how to teach’ with the CLT is related to the exposure of language in order to be able to use it in different opportunities and also to develop students’ knowledge and skills. In other words, CLT involves students in realistic communication and it develops students’ speaking skill\textsuperscript{23}. However, this does not mean that other skills are not important.


for CLT. Students work on all four skills. Just as oral communication is seen to take place between the speaker and listener, so too is meaning thought to be derived from the written word through an interaction between the reader and writer\(^\text{24}\).

Engage Study Activate (ESA) is a method that could be present in any teaching sequence, whether of fifty or hundred minutes. In the activate phase, students are encouraged to use all and any language they know. Communicative activities (skill) are designed to activate the students’ language knowledge, so too are reading and listening activities (skills)\(^\text{2}\).

**Language Skills**

There are four language skills: speaking, listening, reading, and writing. All of them are important, and all of them should be taught. As examinations usually test reading and writing only, the spoken and listening skills are often forgotten or given very little teaching time\(^\text{25}\). Teacher should make sure that all four skills are taught and that they support each other in all parts of concept of Integrated English Skills. Some methods give priorities to reading and writing some others to speaking and listening. However, at the end of the day, all methods have one goal only, and that is how to achieve better student’s performance/outcome.

---


Receptive skills

Receptive skills are the ways in which people extract meaning from the discourse they see or hear. There are generalities about this kind of processing which apply to both reading and listening. However, there are also significant differences between these two skills\(^2\). A large amount of reading and listening takes place because it will help us to achieve some clear aim. For example, read signs, ring up a technical support company for our computer or washing machine, read instructions, listen to a costumers adviser etc. So, the type of reading or listening, takes place as we have some kind of utilitarian or instrumental purpose in mind. However, it can be pleasurable too. Reading history textbooks, or going to history lectures as well.

Productive Skills

However different in many ways, writing and speaking are the language production processes which have to be gone through whichever medium we are working in\(^2\).

In order to communicate successfully we have to structure our discourse in order to be understandable by our listener or reader. In speech this often involves conversational patterns and use different lexical phrases. In general, fewer formulaic phrases are found in writing compared to speaking, and this is the reason why writing is coherent and cohesive. Moreover, although spontaneous speech may be more chaotic and disorganized than writing, speakers employ a lot of structures from structures that ‘buy time’ to specific markers as ‘firstly, secondly, finally’ etc.
Research Methodology

In order to answer this research question, we used an observation method, which allowed the observation of the implementation of CLT and ESA in classrooms.

We conducted experiments in public schools across urban and rural regions in Kosovo. By employing the CLT method, which we developed in a teaching syllabus, we were able to observe changes in student performance that related to the CLT methods used and which contrasted with other methods such as ESA.

A sample of 610 respondents (students) participated in the experiment. The study was conducted in the school "Hivzi Sylejmani" localized in an urbanized locale of Fushë Kosovo and "Ulpijana" school in the rural periphery of Gadime-Lypjan.

At the end of the academic year, student knowledge is assessed by means of PET (Preliminary English Test), as well as was seen the correlation between the skills of CLT as well as ESA.

Interpretation of correlations - PET testing

Referring to the statistics of tab. 1, we have data regarding the correlations between the variables for the four English skills for the PET urban control group. We can consider that the validity of correlations based on the number of cases, is statistically significant for the sample of 227 respondents, with reliability level .05, where each value is bigger than N (227) = .256, and p <.05. On the other hand, .01 can be counted as confident level where N (227) = .354 and p <.01\(^26\).

These correlations are shown in Table 1, where we can see that most important correlations with reliability of .01, are those of writing and listening skills, where the correlation value is $N (227) = 345$.

On the other hand, statistics show that the correlation between the other skills with the reliability of $p < .05$ might not be with high significance, as it is in our case between the listening and speaking where $N (227) = .309$. The results show that the students who were taught by ESA in urban area do not have a high correlation between reading and speaking, neither between reading and writing skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.345$^*$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.309$^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.309$^*$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab 1. HS-PET Control Group.

According to tab. 2 statistics give us information about the correlations between variables for the four skills of English language PET rural control group for the sample 77 respondents, with the level of reliability .05, where each value that is greater than $N (77) = .304$, with $p < .05$. Furthermore, .01 level of confidence can be calculated where $N (77) = .393$, $p < .01$.

As seen from tab.2 there is no significant correlation with .01 level of confidence. This means that there is not a single skill where the correlation value is $N (77) = .393$.

Statistics show that the correlation between skills neither is statistically significant, nor important, with $p < .05$ reliability.

---
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This result shows that there is not a significant correlation between the results of reading and speaking skills in English language of control groups.

The highest correlation value is realized between the skills of reading and listening with \( N (77) = .436 \), and also between writing and speaking with the value \( N (77) = .549 \), but always where \( p < .05 \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>.436*</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>-.149</td>
<td>.549*</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 2 ULP-PET Control Group

According to statistics of tab. 3, we have data of correlations between variables for the four English language skills for urban experimental PET group. We can consider that the validity of correlations based on the number of cases is statistically significant for the sample, 237 respondents with the level of reliability .05, where each value between skills is greater than \( N (237) = .256 \), \( p < .05 \). Moreover, .01 confidence level can be calculated for each value of \( N (237) > .354 \), \( p < .01 \). The correlations that are important at the level of .01 reliability are those between the skills of reading and listening, and also speaking skills where the correlation value it is \( N (237) = .345 \).

In our case, the correlation between skills of reading and listening with the \( N \) value \( (237) = .328 \) is statistically valid, with the reliability significance \( p < .01 \). The same significance of reliability \( p < .01 \) will be seen at the correlations between the skills of reading and speaking, as well as between listening and writing, and also those of listening and speaking. On the other hand, statistics show that the correlation between other skills
such as reading and writing is not statistically significant with $p < .05$, where $N(237) > .309$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>.328**</td>
<td>.537**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>.496**</td>
<td>.467**</td>
<td>.684**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 3 HS-PET Experimental Gr.

For PET rural experimental group, we can consider that the validity of correlations based on the number of cases has significant correlation / statistically significant for the sample of 69 respondents, for the level of reliability .05.

Value which is considered reliable with 0.5 is any value that is greater than $N(69) = .304$, with $p < .05$. Moreover, the value also worth .01 level of confidence can be calculated where each value $N(69) = .393$, with $p < .01$.

Table 4. shows that there are no correlation that are considered important with .01 level of confidence. This means that, that there are no skills with the correlation value with $N(69) = .393$ and based on statistical data correlation between skills neither is statistically significant, nor is important. Reliability of some skills is only with $p < .05$.

This result shows that there is not a high correlation between students' performance in writing and speaking skills, as well as between speaking and listening skills; due to the fact that the significance of reliability has value of $p < .05$. 
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>-.308</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 4 ULP-PET Experimental Gr.

Conclusion

At first, it was thought that CLT should have better correlation between skills in ELT compared to ESA. In fact, in some cases it happened, but not in all. We came to conclusion that the correlations between skills in ELT were better only in the Experimental urban groups. It means in Experimental rural groups the correlations between skills of CLT were even worse compared to ESA method.

We can also conclude that the correlation between skills does not depend on the method used but it depends on other circumstances. One of the key factors undoubtedly is the teacher (variable). We can see that in the experimental urban group where the teacher was qualified there was a better result in the correlations of CLT. However, in the rural schools, where the teachers were unqualified there was no correlations between skills in CLT. That is why the ESA had better result.

As we said above, in our teaching sequences there always should be one main teaching skill which should be followed by at least one another sub skill. It looks that the teachers in rural area did not pay attention on planning the lesson and did not follow this rule either.
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