

Ogur, E., Baştürk, Ş., Gültekin,F., & Şahin, Ş. (2023). Views of foreign students learning Turkish on Turkish instructors. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET)*, 10(3). 1916-1941.

 Received
 : 25.03.2023

 Revised version received
 : 01.05.2023

 Accepted
 : 03.05.2023

VIEWS OF FOREIGN STUDENTS LEARNING TURKISH ON TURKISH INSTRUCTORS

Research article

Erol Ogur (PhD) Bursa Uludağ University, Turkey ogur@uludag.edu.tr

Şükrü Baştürk Bursa Uludağ University, Turkey <u>basturk@uludag.edu.tr</u>

Filiz Gültekin Bursa Uludağ University, Turkey <u>gultekinfiliz@uludag.edu.tr</u>

Şenay Şahin Bursa Uludağ University, Turkey <u>sksahin@uludag.edu.tr</u>

Biodatas:

Erol Ogur working as a Faculty Member Bursa Uludağ University, Faculty of Education, Department of Turkish Education

Şükrü Baştürk working as a Faculty Member Bursa Uludağ University, Faculty of Education, Department of Turkish Education

Filiz Gültekin working as Faculty Member at the Bursa Uludağ University, Faculty of Education, Department of Psychological Counseling and Guidance

Şenay Şahin working as Faculty Member at the Bursa Uludağ University, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Department of Coaching Education.

Copyright © 2014 by International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET). ISSN: 2148-225X. Material published and so copyrighted may not be published elsewhere without written permission of IOJET.

VIEWS OF FOREIGN STUDENTS LEARNING TURKISH ON TURKISH INSTRUCTORS

Erol Ogur ogur@uludag.edu.tr

Şükrü Baştürk basturk@uludag.edu.tr

Filiz Gültekin gultekinfiliz@uludag.edu.tr

Şenay Şahin <u>sksahin@uludag.edu.tr</u>

Abstract

In language teaching, in addition to the curriculum, the use of equipment, the attitudes and views of the instructor/educators and students about one another have a significance of its own. In an attempt to identify and examine the students' views on Turkish instructors in the process of teaching Turkish as a foreign language, this study aimed to reveal the relationship between the views of foreign students learning Turkish in Turkey on their instructors, in terms of gender, age and education level by using the relational scanning design. The data were collected from a total of 415 students who came to the Turkish Teaching Implementation and Research Center (ULUTÖMER) of Bursa Uludağ University in order to learn Turkish in the spring semester of 2020-2021. A triple point questionnaire consisting of 39 items was utilized to identify the views of foreign students towards their instructors. The questionnaire consisted of items related to the interaction of the students with their instructors, the cultural sensitivity of the instructors, the classroom management aa well as the teaching skills of the instructors. Before the questionnaire items were applied, they were presented to the expert opinion and the questionnaire items were finalized in accordance with the feedback of the experts. Participants were informed about the questionnaire form was shared with them. For the analysis of the study and the link of the data, a descriptive analysis was performed for the variables of age, gender and education level. The frequencies and percentages of the answers given by the participants to the questions were established and the χ^2 (chi-square) test was carried out to identify whether there was a significant relationship between the responses of the participants in terms of gender, age and education level. Cramer's V coefficient was utilized to calculate the strength of the relationship between the variables in the chi-square test used. In the statistical analyzes used in the study, the level of significance was accepted as 0.05.

Keywords: Teaching Turkish to foreigners, Turkish instructors, Foreign student views, Ulutömer

1. Introduction

In language teaching, the learner's perceptions of a foreign language are significant. Environmental factors and individual characteristics against foreign language learning, as well as the learners' perspective and perception, can have a positive or negative impact over language learning. Among the elements that comprise the foreign language education process



and its content are the students, instructors, classroom activities, what to learn in a foreign language, for what purpose, in which environment the learning will take place, the tools and equipment to be used and the methods to be selected. Hengirmen emphasized that unless the four basic elements of "Method, Educational Tools, Educational Environment, and Teaching Technique" came together, success could not be achieved, and the lack of any of them would affect language teaching significantly (1993: 31-33).

The following principles should also be taken into account in foreign language teaching: 1. Functional integrity of listening, speaking, reading and writing skills, 2. Using visual and auditory tools, 3. Using the mother tongue when necessary, 4. Ensuring that the information provided is transferred to daily life, 5. Enabling the students to participate in the lesson more effectively, 6. Taking into account the individual differences, 7. Motivating the students (Demirel, 1999: 31-33).

Various contextual and cultural elements are encountered in the language used in teaching a language as a foreign language, in communication and information exchange. Since the 1980s, the mobilization towards cultural education has led to the addition of sociocultural elements to many foreign language education programs and materials (Valdes, 1990). Foreign language learning is a process that includes learning the foreign culture as well; directly or indirectly, students are exposed to the target culture in their foreign language lessons. In order to ensure the intercultural competence of foreign language learning. Cultural competence is defined as "the human behavior integrated with thoughts, communications, languages, habits, beliefs, values, traditions, courtesy rules, customs, forms of interaction and roles, as well as the expected behavior of a social, religious, ethnic group and transferring all these to the future generations" (Ökten & Kavanoz, 2014: 846-848).

The classroom, which is one of the first terms that comes to one's mind when the word education is articulated, is a social environment created by the teachers and students. Management and administration, in line with this social environment, is sure to augment the quality of educational activities in the environment (Akpmar Dellal & Çmar, 2011:26). Classroom is an organizational structure. The implementation of education targets in the classroom requires the existence of a healthy classroom management process and qualified teacher-student cooperation. Classroom management includes the management of schedules, physical conditions, time, relationships, emotions, and all activities performed in the classroom. The management of teaching activity in the classroom especially is regarded as one of the most important areas of responsibility of the teachers (Eren, 2018: 94). According to Okutan (2006: 5), an effective classroom management is at the center of all the characteristics of a teacher and is a must for effective teaching. According to Çelik (2002: 191), classroom management is "...the process of establishing the classroom rules, enabling an appropriate classroom organization, managing the teaching and time effectively and developing a positive learning climate by controlling student behaviors."

Demirel & Kaya (2003:252) defined classroom management as "the activities of creating, protecting and managing the learning environment in an attempt to achieve the teaching objectives". The people who will achieve all these in the classroom environment are the teachers, who sometimes have to act as an actor and sometimes as an orchestra conductor (Harmer, 1991: 235). Teaching profession is one of the most complex professions in society. Furthermore, while the teachers are academic individuals in the society, on the other hand, they take on the roles of their students' teachers, friends, elder brothers and sometimes their younger siblings in the classroom environment. This characteristic of the teaching profession leads to the transformation of this profession into a complex set of roles. Globalization and rapidly



developing technology have exposed the requirement of the current era within the educational environment. Therefore, the duties of the teacher have been constantly changing as well. In this environment of constant changes, there is a pressure on the teachers, and the changing expectations as a result of the complicated educational life increase the roles of the teachers and make it all the more difficult.

Different student type is another factor that complicates the profession. Stressed-out or unmotivated students, students with learning difficulties, students who are not passive but demonstrate a critical approach, object to events and exhibit provocative behaviors are possible to encounter. In such cases, getting to know the students well has a fundamental role in the learning process. Teachers should be aware of the students who exhibit very different behaviors, identify their interests, and try to communicate with them in diversified ways. In order to do this, it is also essential to establish a flexible and harmonious teaching policy. On the basis of human rights and love-respect in contemporary classroom management, the ideal teachers should be the people who are reliable, full of human love, who can communicate well, who value their students, who avoid double standards, and who can develop disciplinary rules (Aytekin, 2002: 82-85). Therefore, it is of crucial importance for the teachers to be aware of the existence of their students' individual differences, educational rights and right to speak out.

Students' perceptions and beliefs about foreign languages have positive or negative effects on their learning by shaping their goals and motivations. Bromley (1995) stated that learning accelerated when students' positive perceptions were combined with a sense of trust between the teacher and the learner; Bromley further argued that negative perceptions of students negatively impacted students' learning. In the studies done by Cain & Dweck (1995), they revealed that there was a relationship between students' perceptions and motivations and their achievements. Students' perceptions of a foreign language can affect their learning strategies as well. The students with negative perceptions can use less effective learning strategies, which can increase anxiety and negatively affect their learning. Cortazzi & Jin (1999) revealed that students' perceptions, beliefs and attitudes significantly impacted their language learning.

In a foreign culture, there is a separation between knowledge and behavior, or between what a person should do and what s/he does (Jiang, 2001: 386). When the individual, who is confronted with different cultures in the classroom s/he is in, cannot adapt to the process: an imbalance is sure to occur in his/her cultural schemes. This will lead to a culture conflict. According to Logie (2004: 175), in order to understand a culture, in the first place, an attitude free from prejudices caused by the cultural differences and a reliable method for the interpretation of the situations heard and watched in the interaction and communication environment with the people of the other culture is required.

Some of the problems experienced by the international students are those caused by the teachers. The fact that most of the students experience such problems also brings forward the qualifications of their instructors (Oyar, 2021: 128). Gün & Şimşek (2020:56) conducted a study based on the idea that instructors had some prejudiced behaviors and attitudes towards the foreign students. As a result of the study, they revealed that foreign language teachers perceived themselves in a passive structure and expected solutions from the official institutions for the problems they stated. Therefore, the teachers, especially those who teach Turkish abroad, have a great responsibility in terms of cultural interaction.

In the studies to be conducted in the field of teaching Turkish as a foreign language, the views and attitudes of foreign students learning Turkish, as well as the views of Turkish teachers, should be taken into consideration. It is simply because one of the most important inputs of the teaching process is the student characteristics. A positive attitude towards a course



or a discipline is a significant source of motivation for the students. In the language teaching process, the fact that the student has developed a positive attitude towards the target language is an input that strengthens the hand of the teachers. Turkish language instructors should act like cultural ambassadors while teaching Turkish. This, combined with other positive attitudes, will provide an important advantage for students to learn Turkish and Turkish culture fondly (Yaşar & Batur, 2021: 24).

Nonverbal communication, as well as verbal communication, is important in the educational environment. A foreign language learner is also in contact with the culture of the language s/he learns, and over time, the student begins to imitate the culture of the language s/he has learned. Nonverbal communication takes place with body language elements such as gestures, facial expressions, eye contact, without the need for words and words. In teaching environments, students and teachers communicate or interact with each other verbally or non-verbally. The effectiveness of teaching depends on the good operation of communication processes. Therefore, foreign language teachers should consider the communication perceptions of the students from different cultures (Berk, 2009:578-579).

When the relevant literature is examined, it is clear that there are no studies available on the views of students towards the instructors in the field of teaching Turkish as a foreign language. In Kalfa & Ceylan's (2020) study, the views of students and teachers on various classroom activities on teaching Turkish as a foreign language were investigated. In the study of Gün and Şimşek (2020), socio-cultural reflections in teaching Turkish as a foreign language became the subject of study from the perspective of the instructors. In their study, Direkçi et al. (2020) also investigated the views of student on cultural transfer in the process of learning Turkish as a foreign language.

Nevertheless, there are various studies on the teaching of English as a foreign language (Liu & Littlewood, 1997; Peacock, 1998; Eslami-Rasekh & Valizadeh, 2004). In majority of the studies in this field, it was revealed that there were inconsistencies between students' views and preferences for classroom activities and teachers' preferences. The reason for this particular state of affairs can suggest the fact that both parties, while coming to the classroom, have unique views and expectations about foreign language education, which may be very different from other individuals.

Due to the lack of such studies, this study aimed to identify the views of foreign students learning Turkish in Turkey towards their Turkish instructors. In this sense, the research question was established as "What is the relationship between the views of foreign students learning Turkish in Turkey towards their instructors in terms of their gender, age and education levels?".

2. Method

In this study, in which the relational screening design was utilized, it was attempted to identify the relationship between the views of foreign students learning Turkish in Turkey towards their instructors in terms of their gender, age and education levels.

2.1. Study Group

Data were collected from the students who came to the Turkish Teaching Implementation and Research Center (ULUTÖMER) of Bursa Uludağ University in order to learn Turkish, one of the leading universities in Turkey. Totally 420 students were enrolled in ULUTÖMER in the spring semester of the 2021-2022 academic year, during which the data were collected. Data were collected from a total of 415 students for this study. The participants



participated in the study voluntarily and their personal data were not recorded. Information regarding the gender, age and education level of the participants is presented in Table 1.

		f	%
	Male	235	56.6
Gender	Female	180	43.4
	Total	415	100.0
Age	17-20	185	44.6
	21-24	110	26.5
	25 +	120	28.9
	Total	415	100.0
	Undergraduate	295	71.1
Degree	Postgraduate	120	28.9
8	Total	415	100.0

Table 1: Descriptive statistics on the gender, age and education level of the participants

2.2. Data Collection

A triple point questionnaire consisting of 39 items was utilized to identify the views of foreign students learning Turkish about the instructors. The questionnaire consisted of items related to students' interactions with their instructors, instructors' cultural sensitivity, classroom management and teaching skills. The questionnaire items were prepared by two Turkish Language academicians (two of the researchers) who were experienced in teaching Turkish to foreigners, and who were experts in the field of education programs and teaching. The prepared items were presented to the expert opinion of two academicians who were experts in the field of psychological counseling.

The items approved by the experts were translated into English and French by two academicians who were experts in the fields of English and French teaching, considering that the participants' Turkish competence would not be sufficient enough to understand all the items - in order to enable them to answer the questions in languages they knew better. The translations in question were presented to the expert opinion of two different academicians who were experts in the field of English and French teaching and were examined by these two academicians in terms of intelligibility. The questionnaire items were finalized in line with the feedback of the experts.

The data used in this study were collected in the 2021-2022 academic year. The questionnaire was prepared as an online form with items in all three languages. The data were collected during class hours in the actual classrooms. The participants were informed about the study by the researchers and the link of the questionnaire form was shared. Participants who volunteered to participate in the study answered the questionnaire online.

2.3. Data Analysis

As far as the analysis of the data is concerned, a descriptive analysis was performed for the variables of age, gender and education level. The frequencies and percentages of the



answers given by the participants to the questions were established and the χ^2 (chi-square) test was conducted in order to identify whether there was a significant relationship between the answers of the participants in terms of gender, age and education level. Since the variables (gender, age and education level) in the study were categorical variables, the chi-square test was used to establish whether the difference between the observed frequencies and expected frequencies in the analysis of the data was statistically significant and Cramer's V coefficient was utilized to calculate the strength of the relationship between the variables (Gürbüz and Şahin, 2017). In cases where the degree of freedom is greater than 1 in the chi-square analysis, the expected value should be 5 and above in 80% of the cells (Can, 2017). In cases where this condition was not met, the category merging was used (Büyüköztürk, 2017). In the statistical analyzes used in the study, the level of significance was accepted as .05.

2.4. Ethical Consent of the Research

Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi Research and Publication Ethics Committees (Social and Humanities Research and Publication Ethics Committee) gave permission to the students to collect data at the Ulutömer Bursa Uludağ University on the date of September 30, 2022 and by decision No. 2022-08.

3. Findings and Comments

The descriptive statistics of the responses given by the foreign students learning Turkish to the questionnaire questions about their interaction with their instructors, their cultural sensitivity, teaching and classroom management skills were made and the frequencies and percentages are presented in Table 2.

		Fr	equen	су		%	
		Y	Ŝ	N	Y	S	Ν
	Interaction with instructors						
1	I wait for the teachers who come to the lesson to make the first contact with me.	74	167	174	17.8	40.2	41.9
2	I don't mind if teachers make eye contact with me.	64	63	288	15.4	15.2	69.4
3	I cannot focus enough on the lesson because of the different gestures and facial expressions used by the teachers.	262	109	44	63.1	26.3	10.6
4	I get disturbed when some of the teachers show overly-relaxed manners in the classroom.	219	123	73	52.8	29.6	17.6
5	The openly critical or judgmental attitudes of some teachers affect me negatively.	166	123	126	40.0	29.6	30.4
6	Teachers like to listen to different life stories of students.	27	113	275	6.5	27.2	66.3
	Instructors' teaching skills						
7	Teachers progress slowly in lesson subjects so that different students can better understand the subjects.	30	146	239	7.2	35.2	57.6
8	Teachers can track everyone's attendance time.	18	104	293	4.3	25.1	70.6

Table 2: Descriptive statistics on questionnaire questions



	Some teachers never assign any homework /						
9	Some teachers never assign any homework. / Certains professeurs ne donnent jamais de	221	123	71	53.3	29.6	17.1
	devoirs.	221	125	, 1	00.0	27.0	17.1
10	Teachers don't frequently give feedback for	163	186	66	39.3	44.8	15.9
10	assignments.	105	180	00	39.3	44.8	13.9
	Teachers encourage students to develop their						
11	pronunciations as their native languages have	40	120	255	9.6	28.9	61.4
	different pronunciation systems.						
12	Teachers do not like students to repeat the same word frequently during the lesson.	182	153	80	43.9	36.9	19.3
	Instructors' cultural sensitivity						
10	Teachers encourage me to wear my traditional	150	100	10.0	10.1		22 0
13	clothes.	179	100	136	43.1	24.1	32.8
	I like it when my teachers wear their						
14	traditional clothes in line with their own	65	112	238	15.7	27.0	57.3
	beliefs and culture.						
15	I think that teachers can eliminate the timid	67	113	235	16.1	27.2	56.6
-	behavior of students from different cultures.		-				
16	Teachers also take time outside of class to get to know students from different cultures.	80	154	181	19.3	37.1	43.6
	Teachers are well-equipped about different						
17	countries and cultures.	45	186	184	10.8	44.8	44.3
	Teachers are patient before making certain						
18	judgments about students from different	18	113	284	4.3	27.2	68.4
	cultures.						
19	Teachers support students to develop their	111	146	158	26.7	35.2	38.1
17	cleaning and self-care skills.		110	100	2017	55.2	2011
20	Teachers encourage students of different	148	120	147	35.7	28.9	35.4
	genders to sit together. Teachers don't care enough about students						
21	from different cultures.	254	104	57	61.2	25.1	13.7
	Teachers do not discriminate against different	~ 1	•••				- -
22	cultures.	64	92	259	15.4	22.2	62.4
23	Teachers are constantly intolerant of some	225	136	54	54.2	32.8	13.0
23	students.	223	150	54	J 4 .2	52.0	15.0
	Instructors' classroom management skills						
24	Teachers are aware of the self-confidence	53	170	192	12.8	41.0	46.3
	problems of different students Teachers encourage timid students to deal						
25	with their timid behavior.	40	154	221	9.6	37.1	53.3
	Teachers make the necessary effort for						
26	students to be tolerant towards each other.	37	119	259	8.9	28.7	62.4
27	Teachers give all students equal time and right	25	103	287	60	210	60.2
21	to speak.	23	105	207	6.0	24.8	69.2
28	I can easily ask the teacher about the subjects	26	86	303	6.3	20.7	73.0
20	that I cannot understand in the lesson.	20	00	202	0.2	2017	1210
29	Teachers often warn students not to disrupt	37	192	186	8.9	46.3	44.8
	classroom discipline. Teachers are disturbed by the know-it-all						
30	attitudes of some students.	135	183	97	32.5	44.1	23.4
0.1	Teachers take the necessary precautions to	01	101	0.50	6.0	21 5	\sim
31	prevent students from disrupting the lesson.	26	131	258	6.3	31.6	62.2



32	Teachers exhibit authoritarian attitudes in lessons.	117	180	118	28.2	43.4	28.4
33	Teachers create their own rules of conduct in the classroom.	83	159	173	20.0	38.3	41.7
34	Teachers wait for students to take turns one by one.	27	149	239	6.5	35.9	57.6
35	It is important for teachers to be meticulous in the entrance and exit times of the lesson.	33	134	248	8.0	32.3	59.8
36	Teachers expect their students to attend class on time.	22	84	309	5.3	20.2	74.5
37	Teachers are meticulous about students' attendance.	25	144	246	6.0	34.7	59.3
38	Teachers allow students to set their own rules in and out of the classroom.	121	159	135	29.2	38.3	32.5
39	Teachers warn students not to use slang words inside and outside the classroom.	86	154	175	20.7	37.1	42.2

Frequencies and percentages for the answers given by the foreign students learning Turkish to the questions about their teachers were identified. The bivariate chi-square test was used to establish whether there was a significant relationship between the students' gender and the distribution of their answers. The results are illustrated in Table 3.

Table 3. Distribution of the views of foreign students learning Turkish about their teachers by gender and results of the chi-square analysis

			Some	etimes	Y	es	N	lo		Jf	
	Item		f	%	f	%	f	%	χ2	df	р
	1	Male	94	40.0	101	43.0	40	17.0	.35	2	,83
	1	Female	73	40,6	73	40.6	34	18.9	.55	Z	,05
	2	Male	38	16.2	165	70.2	32	13.6	1.54	2	.46
		Female	25	13.9	123	68.3	32	17.8	1.34	2	.40
	3	Male	60	25.5	26	11.1	149	63.4	.22	2	.89
Interaction	5	Female	49	27.2	18	10.0	113	62.8	.22	Z	.09
with teachers	4	Male	69	29.4	39	16.6	127	54.0	.48	2	.78
	4	Female	54	30.0	34	18.9	92	51.1	.40	Z	.70
	5	Male	69	29.4	68	28.9	98	41.7	.76	2	.68
	5	Female	54	30.0	58	32.2	68	37.8	.70	Z	.08
	6	Male	62	26.4	154	65.5	19	8.1	2.26	2	.32
	0	Female	51	28.3	121	67.2	8	4.4	2.20	Z	.32
	7	Male	84	35.7	137	58.3	14	6.0	1.30	2	.52
	/	Female	62	34.4	102	56.7	16	8.9	1.50	Ζ	.32
	8	Male	62	26.4	166	70.6	7	3.0	2.68	2	.26
	0	Female	42	23.3	127	70.6	11	6.1	2.08	Ζ	.20
Teachers'	9	Male	62	26.4	46	19.6	127	54.0	3.92	2	.14
teaching skills	9	Female	61	33.9	25	13.9	94	52.2	3.92	L	.14
teaching skins	10	Male	100	42.6	47	20.0	88	37.4	6.80	2	02*
-	10	Female	86	47.8	19	10.6	75	41.7	0.80	Ζ	.03*
	11	Male	71	30.2	143	60.9	21	8.9	62	2	.73
	11	Female	49	27.2	112	62.2	19	10.6	.62	2	.13
	12	Male	88	37.4	50	21.3	97	41.3	1.99	2	.36



			Female	65	36.1	30	16.7	85	47.2				
Teachers' cultural sensitivity Male fremale 41 10 22.8 59 32.8 80 44.4 14.9 15 57.3 38 16.2 17.8 1.99 2 .37 Male 70 29.8 130 55.3 35 14.9 199 2 .37 I5 Male 85 36.2 111 47.2 39 16.6 1.8 3.77 2 .15 I6 Male 85 36.2 111 47.2 39 16.6 1.8 3.77 2 .15 I7 Male 102 43.4 109 46.4 24 10.2 .95 2 .62 I8 Male 60 25.5 165 70.2 10 4.3 .102 .95 2 .62 I8 Male 63 35.0 64 35.6 53 29.4 .139 2 .49 I9 Male 72 30.6 83 35.3 94 400.5 8 24.7 .139 2 .49 Pemale 84 26.7 64 35.6 68 37.8 .95 2 .62 I9 Male 72 30.6 83 35.3 80 44.0 .53 .29.4 .139 2 .49 Pemale 84 26.7 64 35.6 68 37.8 .95 2 .62 Male 72 30.6 83 35.3 80 44.0 .58 .24.7 .139 2 .49 Male 72 30.6 83 35.3 80 44.0 .53 .29.4 .139 2 .49 Male 70 29.8 40 17.0 .125 53.2 .82.7 2 .01* Female 42 23.3 106 58.9 32 17.8 .197 2 .37 Male 70 29.8 40 17.0 .125 53.2 .82.7 2 .01* Male 70 29.8 40 17.0 .125 53.2 .82.7 2 .01* Remale 66 36.7 98 54.4 16 8.9 .28 .27 .2 .01* Remale 66 36.7 98 54.4 16 8.9 .28 .27 .2 .01* Male 60 27.1 14 7.8 .100 55.6 .8.27 .2 .01* Male 60 27.1 12 .7 .7 .1 .7 .0 .7 .2 .0 .2 .2 .22 Male 60 27.0 .7 .8 .13 .2 .3.7 .2 .0 .1* Remale 68 37.7 .1 .7 .7 .1 .7		10								25	2	0.2	
		13	Female	41	22.8	59	32.8	80	44.4	.35	2	.83	
		1.4	Male	62	26.4	135	57.4	38	16.2	10	2	02	
		14	Female	50	27.8	103	57.2	27	15.0	.16	2	.92	
Teachers' cultural sensitivity Male Nate 102 43.4 109 46.4 24 10.2 6.6 16 Male 69 38.3 70 38.9 41 22.8 3.77 2 .15 17 Male 102 43.4 109 46.4 24 10.2 .95 2 .62 18 Male 60 25.5 155 70.2 10 4.3 .83 2 .66 19 Male 83 35.3 94 40.0 58 24.7 1.39 2 .49 20 Male 72 30.6 83 35.3 80 34.0 .95 2 .62 21 Male 50 21.3 153 65.1 32 13.6 1.97 2 .37 22 Male 70 29.8 40 17.0 125 53.2 8.27 2 .01* 23 Male		15	Male	70	29.8	130	55.3	35	14.9	1.00	2	27	
		15	Female	43	23.9	105	58.3	32	17.8	1.99	2	.37	
		1.0	Male	85	36.2	111	47.2	39		2 77	0	1.5	
		16	Female	69	38.3	70	38.9	41		3.77	2	.15	
Teachers' cultural sensitivityImage: remate sensitivityRemate sensitivityRema		17	Male	102	43.4	109	46.4	24	10.2	05	2	()	
sensitivity18Female5326.411966.184.4.832.6619Male8335.39440.05824.71.392.4920Male7230.68335.38034.0.952.6221Male5925.13816.213858.72.882.2322Male5021.315365.13213.61.972.3723Female4223.310658.9321.7.81.972.3723Male7029.84017.012553.28.272.01*24Male10444.310544.72611.12.962.2225Female6636.7147.810055.68.272.01*24Male10444.310544.72611.12.962.2225Male6929.414662.1208.51.92.9026Female6636.79854.4168.9.192.9027Male6929.414662.1208.5.192.8628Male6929.414662.1208.5.192.29.8629Mal	Teachers'	17	Female	84	46.7	75	41.7	21	11.7	.95	Ζ	.02	
Tenale 53 26.4 119 66.1 8 4.419Male 83 35.3 94 40.0 58 24.7 Female 63 35.0 64 35.6 53 29.4 1.39 2 .4920Male 72 30.6 83 35.3 80 34.0 Female 48 26.7 64 35.6 68 37.8 Female 45 25.0 19 10.6 116 64.4.95 2 .6221Male 59 25.1 38 16.2 138 58.7 	cultural	10	Male	60	25.5	165	70.2	10	4.3	02	2	66	
	sensitivity	18	Female	53	26.4	119	66.1	8	4.4	.83	Ζ	.00	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	-	10	Male	83	35.3	94	40.0	58	24.7	1.20	2	40	
		19	Female	63	35.0	64	35.6	53	29.4	1.39	Ζ	.49	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		20	Male	72	30.6	83	35.3	80	34.0	05	2	\sim	
		20	Female	48	26.7	64	35.6	68	37.8	.95	2	.62	
Teachers' classroom management21Male Female5021.315365.13213.61.972.3723Male Female7029.84017.012553.28.272.01*23Male Female6636.7147.810055.68.272.01*24Male Female10444.310544.72611.12.962.2225Male Female6636.78748.32715.02.962.2225Male Female6636.79854.4168.9.282.8626Male Female5027.811362.8179.4.192.9027Male Female5027.811362.817.94.192.8528Male Female3921.712977.7146.0.302.8528Male Female3921.712977.715.03.072.4030Male Female9351.77240.0158.33.772.4031Male Female6728.515465.5146.02.2672.2632Male Female6435.610457.8126.72.672.2633Male Female </td <th></th> <td>- 21</td> <td>Male</td> <td>59</td> <td>25.1</td> <td>38</td> <td>16.2</td> <td>138</td> <td>58.7</td> <td>2 00</td> <td>2</td> <td>22</td>		- 21	Male	59	25.1	38	16.2	138	58.7	2 00	2	22	
		21	Female	45	25.0	19	10.6	116	64.4	2.88	Ζ	.23	
Teachers' classroom management skills Male 92 23.3 106 58.9 32 17.8 23 Male 70 29.8 40 17.0 125 53.2 8.27 2 .01* 24 Male 104 44.3 105 54.7 26 11.1 2.96 2 .22 25 Male 66 36.7 87 48.3 27 15.0 2.96 2 .22 25 Male 66 36.7 98 54.4 16 8.9 .28 2 .86 26 Male 69 29.4 146 62.1 20 8.5 .19 2 .90 27 Male 56 23.8 165 70.2 14 6.0 .30 2 .85 28 Male 47 20.0 174 74.0 14 6.0 .29 .40 Female 93 51.7 72		22	Male	50	21.3	153	65.1	32	13.6	1.07	2	27	
Teachers' classroom management skills 23 Female 66 36.7 14 7.8 100 55.6 6.27 2 .01* 24 Male 104 44.3 105 44.7 26 11.1 2.96 2 .22 25 Male 88 37.4 123 52.3 24 10.2 .28 2 .86 26 Male 66 36.7 98 54.4 16 8.9 .28 2 .86 26 Male 69 29.4 146 62.1 20 8.5 .19 2 .90 27 Male 56 23.8 165 70.2 14 6.0 .30 2 .85 28 Male 47 20.0 174 74.0 14 6.0 .30 2 .86 29 Male 99 42.1 114 48.5 22 9.4 .17 2 .40 30 Female 85 47.2 37 20.6 58. 32.2		22	Female	42	23.3	106	58.9	32	17.8	1.97	Ζ	.37	
Teachers' classroom management skills 23 Female 66 36.7 14 7.8 100 55.6 6.27 2 .01* 24 Male 104 44.3 105 44.7 26 11.1 2.96 2 .22 25 Male 88 37.4 123 52.3 24 10.2 .28 2 .86 26 Male 66 36.7 98 54.4 16 8.9 .28 2 .86 26 Male 69 29.4 146 62.1 20 8.5 .19 2 .90 27 Male 56 23.8 165 70.2 14 6.0 .30 2 .85 28 Male 47 20.0 174 74.0 14 6.0 .30 2 .86 29 Male 99 42.1 114 48.5 22 9.4 .17 2 .40 30 Female 85 47.2 37 20.6 58. 32.2		22	Male	70	29.8	40	17.0	125	53.2	0.07	2	01.	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		23	Female	66	36.7	14	7.8	100	55.6	8.27	Ζ	.01*	
Teachers' classroom management skillsMale6636.78748.32715.025Male6636.79854.4168.9.282.8626Male6929.414662.1208.5.192.9027Male5623.816570.2146.0.302.8528Male4726.112267.8116.1.302.8528Male4720.017474.0146.0.292.8629Male9942.111448.5229.4.192.9030Female3551.77240.0158.33.772.1530Male9841.76025.57732.81.792.4031Male6728.515465.5146.02.672.2632Male9942.17230.66427.21.292.5233Male8837.49339.65423.03.092.2134Male8435.713155.7208.53.672.1635Male7029.814461.3218.91.912.3836Male7029.814461.		24	Male	104	44.3	105	44.7	26		2.06	C	22	
Teachers' classroom management 25 Female Female $66.$ 50 36.7 98 98 54.4 16 16 8.9 2.8 20 2 8.5 1.9 2 90 Teachers' classroom management skills $Male$ 47 20.0 20.0 174 113 62.8 17 9.4 9.4 9.4 $.19$ 2 2 $.90$ Teachers' classroom management skills $Male$ 47 20.0 20.0 174 174 74.0 14 60.0 22.9 2.85 23.8 Teachers' classroom management skills $Male$ 99 42.1 114 48.5 48.5 $22.9442.12.92.9422.942.8622.943.772.92.922.86Teachers'classroommanagementskillsMale9942.111448.548.522.9442.111448.522.9422.9442.13.77222.8629Female9942.111448.548.522.9442.51.7722.940158.33.77222.1515430Female6728.515465.51460.029.41.792.672.672.672.672.672.672.672.672.672.672.672.672.672.922.922.52333.6742.1727230.66425.65329.42.922.672.522.67$		24	Female	66	36.7	87	48.3	27	15.0	2.90	Z	.22	
Teachers' classroom management skillsMale66.36.79834.4168.926 $\frac{Male}{Female}$ 6929.414662.1208.5.192.9027 $\frac{Male}{Female}$ 5027.811362.8179.4.192.9027 $\frac{Male}{Female}$ 5623.816570.2146.0.302.8528 $\frac{Male}{Female}$ 4720.017474.0146.0.292.8629 $\frac{Male}{99}$ 92.1.712971.7126.7.292.8629 $\frac{Male}{99}$ 92.111448.5229.4.1792.1530 $\frac{Male}{99}$ 9351.77240.0158.33.772.1530 $\frac{Male}{99}$ 42.111448.5229.4.3772.4031 $\frac{Male}{99}$ 42.17230.658.32.21.792.4031 $\frac{Male}{99}$ 42.17230.66427.22.2632 $\frac{Male}{99}$ 42.17230.66427.22.5233 $\frac{Male}{10}$ 7139.48044.42916.13.092.2134 $\frac{Male}{10}$ 7139.48044.42916.13.092.2135 \frac{Male}		25	Male	88	37.4	123	52.3	24	10.2	20	2	96	
Teachers' classroom management 26 \overline{Female} 50 27.8 113 62.8 17 9.4 $.19$ 2 $.90$ Teachers' classroom management skills $Male$ 47 20.1 122 67.8 11 6.1 $.30$ 2 $.85$ 28 $Male$ 47 20.0 174 74.0 14 6.0 $.29$ 2 $.86$ 29 $Male$ 99 42.1 114 48.5 22 9.4 3.77 2 $.15$ 30 $Male$ 99 42.1 114 48.5 22 9.4 3.77 2 $.15$ 30 $Male$ 99 42.1 114 48.5 22 9.4 3.77 2 $.15$ 30 $Male$ 98 41.7 60 25.5 77 32.8 3.77 2 $.40$ 31 $Male$ 67 28.5 154 65.5 14 6.0 2.67 2 $.26$ 32 $Male$ 69 42.1 72 30.6 64 27.2 1.29 2 $.26$ 32 $Male$ 99 42.1 72 30.6 64 27.2 1.29 2 $.26$ 33 $Male$ 99 42.1 72 30.6 64 27.2 1.29 2 $.52$ 33 $Male$ 88 37.4 93 39.6 54 23.0 3.09 2 $.21$ <th></th> <td>23</td> <td>Female</td> <td>66.</td> <td>36.7</td> <td>98</td> <td>54.4</td> <td>16</td> <td>8.9</td> <td>.20</td> <td>Z</td> <td>.80</td>		23	Female	66.	36.7	98	54.4	16	8.9	.20	Z	.80	
Teachers' classroom management skillsMale5027.811362.8179.427 $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		26	Male	69	29.4	146	62.1	20	8.5	10	2	00	
Teachers' classroom management27Female4726.112267.8116.1.302.88Teachers' classroom management30Male9942.111448.5229.4Male9942.111448.5229.429Male9942.111448.5229.429Male9942.111448.5229.430Male9841.76025.57732.830Male9841.720.658.32.21.792.4031Male6728.5146.02.672.672.2672.2672.2672.2672 <th col<="" td=""><th></th><td>20</td><td>Female</td><td>50</td><td>27.8</td><td>113</td><td>62.8</td><td>17</td><td>9.4</td><td>.19</td><td>Ζ</td><td>.90</td></th>	<th></th> <td>20</td> <td>Female</td> <td>50</td> <td>27.8</td> <td>113</td> <td>62.8</td> <td>17</td> <td>9.4</td> <td>.19</td> <td>Ζ</td> <td>.90</td>		20	Female	50	27.8	113	62.8	17	9.4	.19	Ζ	.90
Teachers' classroom management skillsMale4726.112267.8116.128 $\frac{Male}{Female}$ 3921.712971.7126.7.292.8629 $\frac{Male}{99}$ 42.111448.5229.43.772.1530 $\frac{Male}{99}$ 9351.77240.0158.33.772.1530 $\frac{Male}{99}$ 42.111448.5229.43.772.4031 $\frac{Male}{67}$ 28.515465.5146.02.672.2632 $\frac{Male}{99}$ 42.17230.66427.22.2633 $\frac{Male}{99}$ 42.17230.66427.21.292.5233 $\frac{Male}{71}$ 9942.17230.66427.21.292.5233 $\frac{Male}{71}$ 99.48044.42916.13.092.2134 $\frac{Male}{70}$ 29.814461.3218.91.912.3836 $\frac{Male}{70}$ 29.814461.3218.91.912.3836 $\frac{Male}{40}$ 17.017976.2166.85.312.07		27	Male	56	23.8	165	70.2	14	6.0	20	r	85	
28Female3921.712971.7126.7.292.8629Male9942.111448.5229.43.772.1530Male9841.76025.57732.83.772.4030Male9841.76025.57732.81.792.4031Male6728.515465.5146.02.672.2631Male6728.515465.5146.02.672.2632Male6435.610457.8126.72.672.2633Male9942.17230.66427.21.292.5233Male9942.17230.66427.21.292.5233Male8837.49339.65423.03.092.2134Male8435.713155.7208.53.672.1634Male8435.713155.7208.53.672.1635Male7029.814461.3218.91.912.3836Male7029.8<		27	Female	47	26.1	122	67.8	11	6.1	.50	Z	.83	
Female3921.712971.7126.729Male9942.111448.5229.43.772.1530Male9841.76025.57732.83.772.4030Male9841.76025.57732.81.792.4031Male6728.515465.5146.02.672.2632Male6435.610457.8126.72.672.2632Male9942.17230.66427.22.5233Male9942.17230.66427.21.292.5233Male9942.17230.66427.21.292.5233Male9942.17230.66427.21.292.5233Male8837.49339.65423.03.092.2134Male8435.713155.7208.53.672.1634Male7029.814461.3218.91.912.3835Male7029.814461.3218.91.		26	Male	47	20.0	174	74.0	14	6.0	20	r	86	
Teachers' classroom management skills 29 Female Female 93 51.7 72 72 40.0 15 8.3 3.77 2 $.15$ 30 Male Female 98 41.7 60 25.5 77 32.8 1.79 2 $.40$ 31 Male Female 67 28.5 154 65.5 14 6.0 2.67 2 $.26$ 32 Male Female 99 42.1 72 30.6 64 27.2 2.67 2 $.52$ 32 Male Female 99 42.1 72 30.6 64 27.2 1.29 2 $.52$ 33 Male Male 88 37.4 93 39.6 54 23.0 3.09 2 $.21$ 34 Male Remale 65 36.1 108 60.0 7 3.9 3.67 2 $.16$ 35 Male Female 64 35.6 104 57.8 12 6.7 1.91 2 $.38$ 34 Male Female 65 36.1 108 60.0 7 3.9 3.67 2 $.16$ 35 Male Female 64 35.6 104 57.8 12 6.7 1.91 2 $.38$ 36 Male Female 40 17.0 179 76.2 16 6.8 5.31 2 $.07$		20	Female	39	21.7	129	71.7	12	6.7	.29	2	.80	
Teachers' classroom management skillsFemale93 51.7 7240.0158.330Male98 41.7 60 25.5 77 32.8 Temale 85 47.2 37 32.8 32.2 1.79 2 40 31 Male 67 28.5 154 6.7 2.67 2 $.40$ 31 Male 67 28.5 154 6.7 2.67 2 $.267$ 2 $.267$ 2 $.267$ 2 $.267$ 2 $.267$ 2 $.267$ 2 $.267$ 2 $.267$ 2 $.267$ 2 $.267$ 2 $.267$ 2 $.267$ 2 $.267$ 2 $.267$ 2 $.267$ 2 $.267$ 2 $.267$ 2		20	Male	99	42.1	114	48.5	22	9.4	2 77	2	15	
classroom management30Male9841.76025.57752.81.792.40Female8547.23720.65832.21.792.4031Male6728.515465.5146.02.672.2631Male6435.610457.8126.72.672.2632Male9942.17230.66427.21.292.5233Male8837.49339.65423.03.092.2134Male8435.713155.7208.53.672.1635Male7029.814461.3218.91.912.3836Male4017.017976.2166.85.312.07	Taaahamal	29	Female	93	51.7	72	40.0	15	8.3	5.11	2	.15	
management skillsMale8547.23720.658.32.231Male6728.515465.5146.02.672.2632Male9942.17230.66427.21.292.5233Male8837.49339.65423.03.092.2134Male8435.713155.7208.53.672.1635Male7029.814461.3218.91.912.3836Male4017.017976.2166.85.312.07		30	Male	98	41.7	60	25.5	77	32.8	1 70	\mathbf{r}	40	
skills31Male6728.513463.5146.02.672.2632Male9942.17230.66427.21.292.5233Male8837.49339.65423.03.092.2134Male8435.713155.7208.53.672.1635Male6536.110860.073.93.672.1635Male7029.814461.3218.91.912.3836Male4017.017976.2166.85.312.07		- 50	Female	85	47.2	37	20.6	58.	32.2	1.79	2	.40	
Female6435.610457.8126.732 $\frac{\text{Male}}{\text{Female}}$ 9942.17230.66427.21.292.5233 $\frac{\text{Male}}{\text{Female}}$ 8145.04625.65329.41.292.5233 $\frac{\text{Male}}{\text{Female}}$ 7139.48044.42916.13.092.2134 $\frac{\text{Male}}{\text{Female}}$ 6536.110860.073.93.672.1635 $\frac{\text{Male}}{\text{Female}}$ 6435.610457.8126.71.912.3836 $\frac{\text{Male}}{\text{Hemale}}$ 4424.413072.263.35.312.07		31	Male	67	28.5	154	65.5	14	6.0	2 67	\mathbf{r}	26	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	SKIIIS	51	Female	64	35.6	104	57.8	12	6.7	2.07	2	.20	
Female8145.04625.65329.433Male8837.49339.65423.0Female7139.48044.42916.1 3.09 2.2134Male8435.713155.7208.5 3.67 2.1635Male7029.814461.3218.9 1.91 2.3836Male4017.017976.2166.8 5.31 2.07		32	Male		42.1	72	30.6	64		1 29	2	52	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		52	Female	81	45.0	46	25.6	53	29.4	1.27	2	.52	
Female7139.48044.42916.134Male8435.713155.7208.5Female6536.110860.073.93.672.1635Male7029.814461.3218.91.912.3836Male4017.017976.2166.85.312.07		33	Male	88	37.4	93	39.6	54	23.0	3 00	2	21	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			Female	71	39.4	80	44.4	29	16.1	5.07	2	.21	
Female6536.110860.073.935Male7029.814461.3218.9Female6435.610457.8126.71.912.3836Male4017.017976.2166.85.312.07		34	Male	84	35.7	131	55.7	20		3 67	2	16	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			Female	65	36.1	108	60.0	7	3.9	5.07	2	.10	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		25	Male	70	29.8	144	61.3	21	8.9	1 01	γ	38	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			Female	64	35.6	104	57.8	12	6.7	1.71	4	.50	
Female 44 24.4 130 /2.2 6 3.3		26	Male	40	17.0	179	76.2	16	6.8	_ 5 21	ົ	07	
37 Male 76 323 147 626 12 51 260 2 27	-	36 -	Female	44	24.4	130	72.2	6	3.3	5.51	7	.07	
57 Marc 70 52.5 147 02.0 12 5.1 2.00 2 .27		37	Male	76	32.3	147	62.6	12	5.1	2.60	2	.27	



_	Female	68	37.8	99	55.0	13	7.2			
38	Male	97	41.3	78	33.2	60	25.5	2 75	ſ	15
30	Male Female	62	34.4	57	31.7	61	33.9	5.75	Ζ	.13
39	Male	91	38.7	103	43.8	41	17.4	251	ſ	17
39	Male Female	63	35.0	72	40.0	45	25.0	5.54	Ζ	.1/

*p<,05

When Table 3 is examined, it is clear that the responses given by the students to the questions about their interactions with the teachers did not have a statistically significant relationship by gender. The views of male and female students participating in the study on their interactions with their teachers were similar. Regarding the responses given by the students to questions about gender and teachers' teaching skills, it was revealed that there was a weak (Cramer's V=.12) and statistically significant relationship only in the answers given to the item "Teachers don't frequently give feedback for assignments" [$\chi 2(2) = 6.80$, p<.05]. When the responses given by the participants to this item are examined, it is explicit that 20% of the male participants stated that the teachers gave feedback to their homework, 37.4% stated that they did not give any feedback, and 42.6% stated that they sometimes gave feedback. Regarding the female participants, on the other hand, 10.6% of them stated that the teachers gave feedback to their homework, 41.7% stated that the teachers did not give any feedback was sometimes given. It is apparent that there was statistically no significant relationship between the distribution of answers to other items and gender.

Nevertheless, regarding the answers to the questions about gender and the cultural sensitivity of the teachers, it was revealed that there was a weak (Cramer's V=.14) and statistically significant relationship only in the answers given to the item "Teachers are constantly intolerant of some students." [$\chi 2(2) = 8.27$, p<.05]. When the answers given by the participants to this item are examined, it is explicit that 17% of the male participants stated that the teachers did not tolerantly treat students from different cultures, 53.2% stated that the teachers said no, and 29.8% stated that they sometimes acted intolerantly. On the other hand, 7.8% of the female participants answered yes, 55.6% answered no, and 36.7% stated that the teachers sometimes did not show tolerance to the students. It is clear that there was no statistically significant relationship between the distribution of answers to other items and gender. It is also apparent that there was no statistically significant relationship between the genders of the students and the answers given to the questions about the teachers' classroom management skills. The views of male and female students participating in the study on these aspects of the teachers were similar.

A bivariate chi-square test was implemented in order to establish whether there was a significant relationship between the ages of foreign students learning Turkish and their answers to the questions about their views on the teachers. The results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Distribution of the views of foreign students learning Turkish about the teachers by age and results of the chi-square analysis

			Sometimes		Yes		No			Jf	
	Item		f	%	f	%	f	%	- χ2	aı	р
Interaction with	1	17- 20	85	45.9	71	38.4	29	15.7	- 6.02	4	19
teachers	1	21- 24	37	33.6	48	43.6	25	22.7	- 6.03	4	.19



$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$.73
$2 \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$.87
$3 \frac{\begin{array}{ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$.87
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$.87
25	
+ $55 27.5 15 10.0 74 01.7$	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	
$4 \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$.57
25 + 41 + 34.2 + 21 + 17.5 + 58 + 48.3	
$\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$	
$5 \begin{array}{rrrrr} 21 - \\ 24 33 30.0 37 33.6 40 36.4 4.21 4 \end{array}$.37
25 + 32 + 26.7 + 42 + 35.0 + 46 + 38.3	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	
$6 \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$.75
$25 \\ + 36 30.0 79 65.8 5 4.2$	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	
$7 \frac{21}{24} 34 30.9 68 61.8 8 7.3 5.22 4$.26
25 + 36 30.0 75 62.5 9 7.5	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	0.4
Teachers' $8**$ 20 .34 2 teaching skills + 56 24.3 163 70.9 11 4.8 2	.84
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	
9 $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$.05
25 + 41 - 34.2 - 14 - 11.7 - 65 - 54.2	
$10 \frac{17}{20} 83 44.9 33 17.8 69 37.3 4.75 4$.31



		21- 24	51	46.4	20	18.2	39	35.5			
		25 +	52	43.3	13	10.8	55	45.8	-		
		17- 20	49	26.5	118	63.8	18	9.7			
	11	21- 24	37	33.6	64	58.2	9	8.2	2.02	4	.73
		25 +	34	28.3	73	60.8	13	10.8	-		
		17- 20	65	35.1	31	16.8	89	48.1			
	12	21- 24	40	36.4	25	22.7	45	40.9	3.18	4	.52
		25 +	48	40.0	24	20.0	48	40.0	-		
		17- 20	39	21.1	52	28.8	94	50.8			
	13	21- 24	30	27.3	39	35.5	41	37.3	8.16	4	.08
		25 +	31	25.8	45	37.5	44	36.7	_		
		17- 20	49	26.5	107	57.8	29	15.7			
	14	21- 24	26	23.6	66	60.0	18	16.4	1.55	4	.81
		25 +	37	30.8	65	54.2	18	15.0	_		
		17- 20	50	27.0	103	55.7	32	17.3			
T	15	21- 24	31	28.2	61	55.5	18	16.4	.69	4	.95
Teachers' cultural		25 +	32	26.7	71	59.2	17	14.2			
sensitivity		17- 20	70	37.8	76	41.1	39	21.1	_		
	16.	21- 24	38	34.5	52	47.3	20	18.2	1.46	4	.83
		25 +	46	38.3	53	44.2	21	17.5			
_		17- 20	81	43.8	83	44.9	21	11.4	_		
	17	21- 24	46	41.8	53	48.2	11	10.0	1.77	4	.77
		25 +	59	49.2	48	40.0	13	10.8			
	18**	17- 20	50	27.0	129	69.7	6	8.0	1.00	2	.60
		21+	63	27.4	155	67.4	12	5.2			00
	19	17- 20	61	33.0	67	36.2	57	30.8	8.14	4	.08



		21- 24	36	32.7	52	47.3	22	20.0			
		25 +	49	40.8	39	32.5	32	26.7			
		17- 20	51	27.6	59	31.9	75	40.5			
	20	21- 24	33	30.0	48	43.6	29	26.4	7.03	4	.13
		25 +	36	30.0	40	33.3	44	36.7			
		17- 20	49	26.5	23	12.4	113	61.1			
	21	21- 24	29	26.4	20	18.2	61	55.5	4.14	4	.38
		25 +	26	21.7	14	11.7	80	66.7			
		17- 20	35	18.9	124	67.0	26	14.1			
	22	21- 24	29	26.4	58	52.7	23	20.9	7.20	4	.12
		25 +	28	23.3	77	64.2	15	12.56			
		17- 20	58	31.4	18	9.7	109	58.9			
	23	21- 24 25	41	37.3	20	18.2	49	44.5	7.44	4	.11
		25 +	37	30.8	16	13.3	67	55.8			
		17- 20	68	30.9	83	44.9	34	18.4			
	24	21- 24	47	42.7	51	46.4	12	10.9	11.14	4	.02*
		25 +	55	45.8	58	58.3	7	5.8			
		17- 20	74	40.0	91	49.2	20	10.8			
Teachers'	25	21- 24	34	30.9	64	58.2	12	10.9	4.29	4	.36
classroom management		25 +	46	38.3	66	55.0	8	6.7			
skills		17- 20	63	34.1	107	57.8	15	8.1			
	26	21- 24	24	21.8	73	66.4	13	11.8	6.40	4	.17
		25 +	32	26.7	79	65.8	9	7.5			
	27	17- 20	42	22.7	137	74.1	6	3.2	6.71	4	.15
	21	21- 24	31	28.2	69	62.7	10	9.1	0.71	+	.15



	25 +	30	25.0	81	67.5	9	7.5			
	17- 20	42	22.7	128	69.2	15	8.1			
28	21- 24	21	19.1	82	74.5	7	6.4	4.01	4	.40
	25 +	23	19.2	93	77.5	4	3.3	-		
	17- 20	88	47.6	80	43.2	17	9.2			
29	21- 24	48	43.6	54	49.1	8	7.3	1.35	4	.85
	25 +	56	46.7	52	43.3	12	10.0	_		
	17- 20	85	45.9	42	22.7	58	31.4			
30	21- 24	48	43.6	30	27.3	32	29.1	2.78	4	.59
	25 +	50	41.7	25	20.8	45	37.5	-		
	17- 20	57	30.8	114	61.6	14	7.6			
31	21- 24	32	29.1	72	65.5	6	5.5	1.90	4	.75
	25 +	42	35.0	72	60.0	6	5.0	-		
	17- 20	78	42.2	59	31.9	48	25.9	_		
32	21- 24	51	46.4	24	21.8	35	31.8	3.64	4	.45
	25 +	51	42.5	35	29.2	34	28.3			
	17- 20	73	39.5	75	40.5	37	20.0	_		
33	21- 24	44	40.0	46	41.8	20	18.2	.97	4	.91
	25 +	42	35.0	52	43.3	26	21.7			
	17- 20	64	34.6	108	58.4	13	7.0	_		
34	21- 24	45	40.9	59	53.6	6	5.5	1.78	4	.77
	25 +	40	33.3	72	60.0	8	6.7			
	17- 20	69	37.3	98	53.0	18	9.7	_	_	-
35	21- 24	35	31.8	64	58.2	11	10.0	12.27	4	.01*
	25 +	30	25.0	86	71.7	4	3.3			



	17- 20	36	19.5	139	75.1	10	5.4	_		
36	21- 24	22	20.0	82	74.5	6	5.5	.24	4	.99
	25 +	26	21.7	88	73.3	6	5.0	_		
	17- 20	74	40.0	101	54.6	10	5.4			
37	21- 24	27	24.5	74	67.3	9	8.2	7.85	4	.09
_	25 +	43	35.8	71	59.2	6	5.0			
	17- 20	71	38.4	51	27.6	63	34.1	_		
38	21- 24	46	41.8	35	31.8	29	26.4	7.49	4	.11
	25 +	42	35.0	49	40.8	29	24.2			
	17- 20	64	34.6	72	38.9	49	26.5			
39	21- 24	44	40.0	47	42.7	19	17.3	7.15	4	.12
	25 +	46	38.3	56	46.7	18	15.0			

*p<,05

** The cells with an expected value less than 5 were merged.

Table 4 clearly illustrates that there was no statistically significant relationship between the ages of the students and their responses regarding the interaction with the teachers, the teaching skills of the teachers and their sensitivity to culture. It is possible to say that the students between the ages of 17 and 25+ who participated in the study had similar views on their interactions with the teachers, their teaching skills and their sensitivity to culture.

When Table 4 is examined, it is explicit that regarding the responses given by the foreign students learning students to questions regarding the classroom management skills of teachers by the age variable were weak (Cramer's V=.16) and statistically significant relationship only in the answers given to the item "Teachers are aware of the self-confidence problems of different students " [$\chi 2(4) = 11.14$, p<.05]. 44.9% of the 17-20 aged participants stated that the teachers were aware of the students' self-confidence problems, 18.4% stated that they were not aware of them, and 30.9% stated that the teachers were sometimes aware of them. It is clear that 10.9% of the participants aged 21-24 stated that the teachers were not aware of that the teachers were aware of the students they were aware of this, and 42.7% stated that the teachers were sometimes aware of it.

45.8% of the participants aged 25+ stated that the teachers were sometimes aware, 58.3% said they were aware, and 5.8% said they were not aware. It is explicit that there was a weak (Cramer's V=.17) and statistically significant relationship in the answers given to the item "It is important for teachers to be meticulous in the entrance and exit times of the lesson" [$\chi 2(4)$ =12.27, p<. 05]. 53% of the participants aged 17-20 stated that the teachers were particular about punctuality regarding lesson entry and exit times, 37.3% of the participants aged 21-24 stated that the teachers were sometimes were particular about it. 31.8% of the participants aged 21-24 stated that the teachers were sometimes were particular about lesson entry and exit times,



58.2% of them were particular about it and 10% of them were not particular about it. 71.7% of the participants aged 25+ replied that they were particular about lesson entry and exit times, 3.3% of them were not particular about it, and 25% replied that were sometimes particular about punctuality regarding lesson entry and exit times. It is clear that there was no statistically significant relationship between the answers given to the other questionnaire items and the age variable.

A two-variable chi-square test was implemented to identify whether there was a significant relationship between the education levels of the students and their answers to their views on the teachers. The results are illustrated in Table 5.

Table 5. Distribution of the views of foreign students learning Turkish about teachers by the variable of education level and results of the chi-square analysis

			Sometime s		Yes		No			d	
	Ite m		f	%	f	%	f	%	- χ2	f	р
	1	Undergraduat e	123	41.7	12 2	41. 4	50	16. 9	- 1.06	2	59
	1	Postgraduate	44	36.7	52	43. 3	24	20. 0	1.00	Z	$\begin{array}{c cccc} \mathbf{f} & \mathbf{p} \\ \hline 2 & .58 \\ \hline 2 & .69 \\ \hline 2 & .69 \\ \hline 2 & .57 \\ \hline 2 & .57 \\ \hline 2 & .98 \\ \hline 2 & .98 \\ \hline 2 & .98 \\ \hline 2 & .25 \\ \hline 2 & .47 \end{array}$
	2	Undergraduat e	43	14.6	20 4	69. 2	48	16. 3 13.	72	2	.58 .69 .57 .00 * .98 .25
	2	Postgraduate	20	16.7	84	70. 0	16	3	.12	2	
	3	Undergraduat e	75	25.4	34	11. 5	18 6	63. 1 63.	- 1.09	\mathbf{r}	
Interaction with	3	Postgraduate	34	28.3	10	8.3	76	3	1.09	2	.57
teachers	4	Undergraduat e	74	25.1	52	17. 6	16 9		11.0	2	.00
	4	Postgraduate	49	40.8	21	17. 5	50	41. 7	8	2	*
	5	Undergraduat e	88	29.8	89	30. 2	11 8	40. 0	02	2	08
	5	Postgraduate	35	29.2	37	30. 8	48	40. 8	02	Ζ	.90
	6	Undergraduat e	75	25.4	19 8	67. 1	22	7.5	- 2.75	2	25
	0	Postgraduate	38	3 31.7 77	64. 2	5	4.2	- 2.15	2	.25	
	7	Undergraduat e	109	36.9	16 6	56. 3	20	6.8	- 1.50	2	17
Teachers'	/	Postgraduate	37	30.8	73	60. 8	10	8.3	1.50	2	.47
teaching skills	8	Undergraduat e	69	23.4	21 1	71. 5	15	5.1	- 2 57	2	27
	0	Postgraduate	35	29.2	82	68. 3	3	2.5	- 2.57	L	.21



		Undergraduat e	86	29.2	56	19. 0	15 3	51. 9			
	9	Postgraduate	37	30.8	15	12. 5	68	56. 7	- 2.54	2	.28
	10	Undergraduat e	139	47.1	53	18. 0	10 3	34. 9	- 8.87	2	.01
		10	Postgraduate	47	39.2	13	10. 8	60	50. 0	0.07	2
	11	Undergraduat e	77	26.1	19 2	65. 1	26	8.8	571	2	.05
		Postgraduate	43	35.8	63	52. 5	14	11. 7	5.71	2	.00
	12	Undergraduat e	106	35.9	57	19. 3	13 2	44. 7	42	2 .	.80
	12	Postgraduate	47	39.2	23	19. 2	50	41. 7	. 12		.00
	13	Undergraduat e	65	22.0	97	32. 9	13 3	45. 1	- 2.70	2	.25
		Postgraduate	35	29.2	39	32. 5	46	38. 3	2.70	-	.20
	14	Undergraduat e	74	25.1	17 6	59. 7	45	14. 3	- 2.42	2	.29
		Postgraduate	38	31.7	62	51. 7	20	16. 7		_	>
	15	Undergraduat e	77	26.1	16 6	56. <u>3</u>	52	17. 6	- 1.88	2	.38
		Postgraduate	36	30.0	69	57. 5	15	12. 5			
	16	Undergraduat e	104	35.3	12 9	43. 7	62	21. 0	- 2.55	2.55 2	.27
Teachers'		Postgraduate	50	41.7	52	43. <u>3</u>	18	15. 0			
cultural sensitivity	17	Undergraduat e	126	42.7	14 0	47. 5	29	9.8		2	.12
		Postgraduate	60	50.0	44	36. 7	16	13. 3			.12
	18	Undergraduat e	80	27.1	20 2	68. 5	13	4.4	01	2	.99
		Postgraduate	33	27.5	82	68. 3	5	4.2			
	19	Undergraduat e	99	33.6	11 5	39. 0	81	27. 5	- 1.17	2	.55
		Postgraduate	47	39.2	43	35. <u>8</u>	30	25. 0			
	20	Undergraduat e	84	28.5	10 9	36. 9	10 2	34. 6	- 1.07	2	.58
		Postgraduate	36	30.0	38	31. 7	46	38. 3		-	
	21	Undergraduat e	81	27.5	40	13. 6	17 4	59. 0	3.18	2	.20



		Postgraduate	23	19.2	17	14. 2	80	66. 7				
	22	Undergraduat e	64	21.7	18 5	62. 7	46	15. 6	12	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	02	
	22	Postgraduate	28	23.3	74	61. 7	18	15. 0	13		.93	
	22	Undergraduat e	96	32.5	38	12. 9	16 1	54. 6	0.5	0	07	
	23	Postgraduate	40	33.3	16	13. 3	64	53. 3	05	2	.97	
	2.4	Undergraduat e	111	37.6	14 0	47. 5	7. 14.		n	.03		
	24	Postgraduate	59	49.2	52	43. 3	9	7.5	- 6.75	2 .97 2 $.03$ 2 .34 2 .99 2 .99 2 .91 2 .01 2 .13 2 .49 2 .22 2 .22 2 .22		
	25	Undergraduat e	103	34.9	16 2	54. 9	30	10. 2	0.15	0	.97 .03 * .34 .99 .01 * .13 .80	
	25	Postgraduate	51	42.5	59	49. 2	10	8.3	- 2.15	2	.34	
	26	Undergraduat e	85	28.8	18 4	62. 4	26	8.8	01		0.0	
	26	Postgraduate	34	28.3	75	62. 5	11	9.2	01	2	.99	
	07	Undergraduat e	63	21.4	21 6	73. 2	16	5.4	7.07	2		
	27	Postgraduate	40	33.3	71	59. 2	9	7.5	- 7.97	2	*	
	20	Undergraduat e	60	20.3	21 2	71. 9	23	7.8	4.07	2 .13	10	
Teachers'	28	Postgraduate	26	21.7	91	75. 8	3	2.5	- 4.07		.13	
classroom managemen		Undergraduat e	136	46.1	13 1	44. 4	28	9.5	40	2	00	
t skills	29	Postgraduate	56	46.7	55	45. 8	9	7.5	42		.80	
	20	Undergraduat e	130	44.1	73	24. 7	92	31. 2	1 20	2	40	
	30	Postgraduate	53	44.2	24	20. 0	43	35. 8	- 1.38		.49	
		21	Undergraduat e	89	30.2	18 4	62. 4	22	7.5	2.05	2 .01 * 2 .13 2 .80 2 .49 2 .22	22
	31	Postgraduate	42	35.0	74	61. 7	4	3.3	- 2.95	2	.22	
	32	Undergraduat e	128	43.4	90	30. 5	77	26. 1	- 3.12	2	20	
	32	Postgraduate	52	43.3	28	23. 3	40	33. 3	3.12	۷	.20	
	33	Undergraduat e	113	38.3	12 2	41. 4	60	20. 3	08	2	05	
	33	Postgraduate	46	38.3	51	42. 5	23	19. 2	.00	2	.75	



	34	Undergraduat e	101	34.2	17 5	59. 3	19	6.4	1 2 2	2	.51
	34	Postgraduate	48	40.0	64	53. 3	8	6.7	1.32	Z	.31
	25	Undergraduat e	98	33.2	17 1	58. 0	26	8.8	1 77	2	41
	35	Postgraduate	36	30.0	77	64. 2	7	5.8	1.77		.41
-	36	Undergraduat e	64	21.7	21 6	73. 2	15	5.1	1.26	2	50
	30	Postgraduate	20	16.7	93	77. 5	7	5.8	1.36	Z	.50
-	37	Undergraduat e	100	33.9	17 6	59. 7	19	6.4	50	2	.77
	57	Postgraduate	44	36.7	70	58. 3	6	5.0	.50	2	.//
-	38	Undergraduat e	109	36.9	99	33. 6	87	29. 5	96	2	.64
	30	Postgraduate	50	41.7	36	30. 0	34	28. 3	.86	Z	.04
-	39	Undergraduat e	104	35.3	12 7	43. 1	64	21. 7	1.59	2	.45
	37	Postgraduate	50	41.7	48	40. 0	22	18. 3	1.39	L	.45

*p<,05

When Table 4 is examined, regarding the answers given by the students to the questions about their interaction with the teachers by their education level, it is clear that only the answers given to the item "I get disturbed when some of the teachers show overly-relaxed manners in the classroom" were weak (Cramer's V=.16) and that there was a statistically significant relationship [$\chi 2(2) = 11.08$, p<.05]. As far as the answers given by the participants to this item are concerned, it is explicit that 17.6% of the undergraduate students were afraid of the teachers being overly-relaxed manners in the classroom, 57.3% of them were not afraid, and 25.1% of them were sometimes afraid. 17.5% of the postgraduate students, on the other hand, stated that they were afraid, 41.7% were not afraid, and 40.8% were sometimes afraid. It is clear that there was no statistically significant relationship between the answers of the other items. It is possible to say that the views of undergraduate and postgraduate foreign students on their interactions with their teachers were similar. Regarding the answers given by the participants to the questions about the teaching skills of the teachers by the education level, it is clear that only the answers given to the item "Teachers don't frequently give feedback for assignments" were weak (Cramer's V=.14) and that there was a statistically significant relationship [$\chi 2(2) = 8.87$, p<.05]. Considering the answers given by the participants to this item, it is explicit that 18% of the undergraduate students stated that the teachers gave feedback to the homework, 34.9% stated that they did not, and 47.1% stated that they gave feedback from time to time.

Regarding the answers given by the participants to the questions about the teaching skills of the teachers by the education level, it is explicit that there was a weak (Cramer's V=.14) and statistically significant relationship in the answers given to the item "Teachers don't frequently give feedback for assignments" [$\chi 2(2) = 8.87$, p<.05]. When the answers given by the participants to this item are examined, it is clear that 18% of the undergraduate students stated that the teachers gave feedback to their homework, 34.9% stated that they did not, and



47.1% stated that they sometimes gave feedback. On the other hand, it is apparent that 10.8% of the postgraduate participants stated that feedback was given, 50% stated that they were not given feedback, and 39.2% stated that feedback was sometimes given. It is possible to say that that the postgraduate students thought that minor feedback was given. It is explicit that there was no statistically significant relationship between the distribution of answers to other items and gender. It is clear that there was no statistically significant relationship between the answers given by the participants to the questions about the cultural sensitivity of the teachers and the level of education. It is possible to say that the views of the undergraduate and postgraduate students participating in the study on the cultural sensitivity of the teachers were similar.

Regarding the answers given by the students to the questions about the level of education and the classroom management skills of the teachers, it is explicit that there was a weak (Cramer's V=.12) and statistically significant relationship in the answers given to the item "Teachers are aware of the self-confidence problems of different students" [$\gamma 2(2) = 6.75$, p < .05]. As far as the answers given by the participants to this item are concerned, 14.9% of the undergraduate students thought that the teachers were not aware of the students' self-confidence problems, and 47.5% thought that they were aware of it; 37.6% thought that this situation sometimes occurred. 43.3% of the postgraduate participants, on the other hand, stated that the teachers were aware of the students' self-confidence problems, 7.5% stated that they were not aware, and 49.2% stated that the teachers were sometimes aware of them. It is clear that there was a weak level (Cramer's V=.13) and statistically significant relationship in the answers given by the participants to the item "Teachers give all students equal time and right to speak" [$\chi 2(2)$] =7.97, p<.05]. While 73.2% of the undergraduate students stated that the teachers gave equal rights to the students, 21.4% stated that they were sometimes given equal rights; on the other hand, 5.4% stated that they were not given an equal right to speak. On the other hand, 59.2% of the postgraduate participants stated that the teachers gave equal rights, 7.5% stated that they did not give equal rights, and 33.3% stated that this situation sometimes occurred. The undergraduate students were of the opinion that they were given more equal rights than the postgraduate students. It is explicit that there was no statistically significant relationship between the distribution of answers to other items and gender.

4. Conclusion and Recommendations

In this study, the views of foreign students learning Turkish on Turkish instructors were collected under the headings of "interaction with teachers", "teaching skills", "teachers' sensitivity to culture" and " teachers' classroom management skills" in terms of their relationship with gender, age and teaching level. When the relevant literature was reviewed, no study was encountered in which the views of foreign students learning Turkish about Turkish instructors were identified and investigated. In his study investigating students' views on language skills in foreign language teaching, Darancık (2018) aimed to identify students' views on four basic language skills while learning a foreign language. The studies on identifying the views of foreign students learning Turkish on cultural transfer in the process of learning Turkish as a foreign language (Direkçi et al., 2020; Koparan, 2019); investigating the views of foreign students' views on Turkey, Turkish and Turkish culture (Uçak, 2017; Şengül, 2017; Arslan & Batur, 2021; Kaplan, 2018).

The results regarding the views of foreign students learning Turkish under the above sub-headings were evaluated by gender. It is explicit that there was no statistically significant relationship between the answers given by foreign students to the questions about "interactions



with Turkish teachers". The views of male and female students participating in the study on their interactions with their teachers were similar. The instructor, who is the source unit in the teaching process, is the person who has the knowledge and conveys this knowledge to the target unit in the learning environment, and the student is the target unit. In the teaching process, the message consists of the pre-determined knowledge, skills, attitudes, behaviors and habits. The instructor tries to convey this information to the students through the channels of hearing, sight, touch etc. (Vatansever Bayraktar, 2015: 266). According to K1rm121 (2010), a healthy communication with students is one of the most important elements in augmenting the quality of the lesson taught. If the communication is one-way and the tools and equipment used are familiar and ordinary, the motivation levels of the students also decrease (200). It seems to be essential for teachers to take the first step in communicating with the students in the lesson and establish eye contact with the student. On the other hand, teachers' critical and judgmental attitudes towards their students also affect the students negatively.

Regarding the responses given by the students to questions about gender and teachers' teaching skills, it was revealed that there was a weak (Cramer's V=.12) and statistically significant relationship in the answers given to the item "Teachers don't frequently give feedback for assignments". It is explicit that there was no statistically significant relationship between the distribution of answers to other items and gender. In the sub-heading of "Teachers' sensitivity to culture", there was only a weak relationship in the answers given to the item "Teachers are constantly intolerant of some students" by gender. It is clear that there was no statistically significant relationship between the distribution of answers to other items and gender. The views of male and female students learning Turkish on the "classroom management skills" of the teachers were similar. It is explicit that there was no statistically significant relationship between the distribution of answers to other items and gender.

The views of foreign students learning Turkish on Turkish teachers were also investigated with regards to their ages. It is explicit that there was no statistically significant relationship between the answers given by foreign students learning Turkish to the questions about their "interaction with teachers" by the age variable. It is possible to say that the views of the students between the ages of 17 and 25+ who participated in the study on their interactions with the teachers were similar. There was no statistically significant relationship between the answers given by the foreign students learning Turkish to the questions about the "cultural sensitivity" of the teachers by age. No statistically significant relationship was found between the answers given by the foreign students learning Turkish to the questions about the "teaching skills" of the teachers by age. Considering the answers given by foreign students learning Turkish to the questions in this context, only the answers given to the item "Teachers don't frequently give feedback for assignments" demonstrated a weak relationship. It is possible to say that the postgraduate students thought that minor feedback was given. According to different age groups, there was a similarity in the views of the students regarding the classroom management skills of the teachers. Only the answers given to the items "Teachers are aware of the self-confidence problems of different students" and "It is important for teachers to be meticulous in the entrance and exit times of the lesson" had a weakly significant relationship.

The significance that teachers attach to their profession is closely associated to the success of educational institutions and students. If a teacher makes an effort especially in the teaching process and applies different teaching methods and techniques by taking into account the individual differences of the students, the students will be very motivated for the lesson and their success will increase. The teacher should always endeavor devotedly to highlight the needs, interests, and abilities of his/her students and ensure that each and every one of his/her students is trained appropriately and effectively. Furthermore, the teacher should facilitate the students' learning and creativity, and inspire them. The teachers in this day and age should



provide students with access to various educational resources and endeavor devotedly to develop their digital literacy skills.

Nevertheless, they should actively take part in continuous training in order to improve their curriculum and be the designers of their own materials (Kozikoğlu & Özcanlı, 2020). An effective teacher in the teaching process should possess a rich repertoire of teaching techniques, be able to convey the subject by adapting it to the level of the students, and be competent enough to enrich the process (Karakelle, 2005: 4). In the study of Kalfa and Ceylan (2020), the views of students and teachers on various classroom activities in teaching Turkish as a foreign language were consulted. It was aimed to reveal the similarities and differences between the views of teachers and students on classroom activities, and present a different perspective in order to create a more successful language teaching process.

The view of foreign students learning Turkish on Turkish teachers were also investigated by their education levels. The answers given by the foreign students to the questions about "interactions with Turkish teachers" were evaluated. It was revealed that there was a weak relationship only in the answers given by the foreign students to the item "I get disturbed when some of the teachers show overly-relaxed manners in the classroom". It is possible to say that the views of undergraduate and postgraduate foreign students participating in the study on their interactions with their teachers were similar. There was a weakly significant relationship in the answers given to the items "Teachers are aware of the selfconfidence problems of different students" and "Teachers give all students equal time and right to speak". There was no statistically significant relationship between the answers given by the foreign students to the questions about "teachers' sensitivity to culture" by their education level. It is possible to say that the views of the undergraduate and graduate students participating in the study on the cultural sensitivity of the teachers were similar. Regarding the difference between the education level of foreign students and the answers given to the questions about "teachers' classroom management skills", there was a weak and statistically significant relationship in the answers given to the item "Teachers are aware of the self-confidence problems of different students".

It is crucially important to identify the views and attitudes of the students in teaching Turkish as a foreign language for the success of the education process. It is simply because, one of the most important elements of the teaching process is the students. The positive or negative attitudes and views of the students towards the course, the teaching process or the teachers are the source of their motivation and success. Based on the studies available in the relevant literature and the results of this study, the following recommendations can be made:

Teachers should be able to establish a healthy communication with students in the lesson. Students expect the first move from the teacher to initiate communication. Students are pleased that teachers make eye contact with them and listen to their life stories.

In the evaluation of the teaching skills of the teachers, it is considered essential that the instructors encourage the students to attend the lessons on time. Furthermore, teachers should speak at a speed that students can understand while explaining the subjects in the lesson. Teachers should encourage students to develop their pronunciations in the target language that are not available in their mother tongue.

Teachers should be aware that the foreign language teaching process also includes the promotion of culture, to be patient before making a judgment about students from different cultures, not to make positive discrimination against different cultures, to know and apply the necessary techniques and approaches in order to eliminate the timid behavior of the students



from different cultures.

One of the stipulations for the success of a lesson is the punctuality of teachers and students regarding the lesson entry and exit times. Therefore, teachers should always take the necessary steps to ensure that students attend the lesson on time, ensure that students are tolerant towards each other, and encourage the students to overcome their timid behaviors and gain self-confidence. Furthermore, teachers should give the students an equal say in the lessons and should prepare a suitable environment for the students to ask questions about the subjects that they cannot understand in the lesson.

This is an opinion-identifying study and the results obtained are limited to the items in the data collection tool. It is, however, beyond the scope of the study which attitudes, discourses and behaviors of their teachers that the students base these views on. In future studies, qualitative studies including in-depth interviews can be conducted to identify the reasons for students' opinions.

References

- Akpınar Dellal, N., & Çınar, S. (2011). Yabancı dil eğitiminde iletişimsel yararcı yaklaşım, öğretmen rolleri, davranışları ve sınıf içi iletişim. *Dil Dergisi*, 154, 21-36.
- Aytekin, H. (2002)., Sınıf yönetimi ve disiplinle ilgili kurallar geliştirme ve uygulama. Küçükahmet, L (Eds). *Sınıf Yönetimi*, Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Berk, F. M. (2009). Yabancı dil öğretim yöntemlerinde sözsüz iletişim ve beden dili. Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Meslek Yüksekokulu Dergisi, 12(1-2), 575.
- Boylu, E., & Işık, Ö. F. (2017). Türkçeyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenenlerin Türkçeye yönelik algılarının metaforlar aracılığı ile belirlenmesi. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, *5*(3), 450-471.
- Cain, K. M., & Dweck, C. S. (1995). The relation between motivational patterns and achievement cognitions through the elementary school years. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 41(1), 25–52.
- Cortazzi, M., & Jin, L. (1999). Bridges to learning: Metaphors of teaching, learning and language. In L. Cameron & G. Low (Eds.), Researching and applying metaphor (pp. 149–176). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cortazzi, M., & Jin, LX (1996). English teaching and learning in China, *Language Teaching*, 29, 61–80.
- Cremes, B.P. (1996). School level conditions affecting the effectiveness of instruction. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*. (7), 3, 197-228.
- Çakmak, M. (2009). Öğrenmeye uygun olumlu bir sınıf ortamı oluşturmada öğretmen davranışları: örnekler ve öneriler. (Ed. Leyla Küçükahmet). *Sınıf Yöneti*mi. Ankara: Pegem Akademi, 10. Baskı, s. 295-328.
- Çelik, V. (2002). Sınıf Yönetimi, Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Darancık, Y. (2018). Students' views on language skills in foreign language teaching. *International Education Studies*, 11(7), 166-178. https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v11n7p166

Demirel, Ö., & Kaya, Z. (2003). Öğretmenlik Mesleğine Giriş, Pegem Yayıncılık, Ankara.

- Direkci, B., Şimşek, B., & Akbulut, S. (2020). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrenme sürecinde kültür aktarımına yönelik öğrenci görüşlerinin incelenmesi. *Avrasya Uluslararası Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 8(22), 278-293.
- Eren, Z. (2018). Öğretim sürecinin yönetimi. (Ottekin Demirbolat, A. Eds). *Sınıf Yönetimi*, Pegem Akademi, Ankara, s. 93-178.
- Gareth, T. (2014). *Effective classroom management: The Essentials*. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.
- Harmer, J. (1991). The Practice of English Language Teaching, Chapter 11 "Class Management", Pearson Education Limited, England, 235 243.



- Eslami-Rasekh, Z., & Valizadeh, K. (2004). Classroom activities viewed from different perspectives: Learners' voice vs. teachers' voice. TESL-EJ, 8(3), 1-13.
- Gün, M., & Şimşek, R. (2020). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretiminde sosyo-kültürel yansımalar. *Turkish Journal of Primary Education*, 5 (1), 46-58.
- Gürbüz, S., & Şahin, F. (2017). Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma yöntemleri: Felsefe-Yöntem-Analiz. Seçkin Yayınları.
- Hengirmen, M. (1990). Yabancı dil öğretim yöntemleri: ve Tömer yöntemi. Engin Yayınevi.
- Hengirmen, M. (1993). Türkiye'de Türkçeyi yabancı dil olarak öğreten kurumlar ve eğitim araçları. *Dil Dergisi*, 11, 5-8.
- İbili, Z. (2015). Selanik Aristoteles Üniversitesindeki Öğrencilerin Yabancı Dil Olarak Türkçeyi Öğrenmeye Karşı Tutum ve Motivasyonlarının Araştırılması. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek lisans tezi, Çanakkale On Sekiz Mart Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Çanakkale.
- Jiang, W. (2001). Handling culture bumps. ELT Journal, 55/4, 382-390.
- Kalfa, M., & Ceylan, F. (2020). Yabancılara Türkçe öğretiminde kullanılan sınıf içi etkinliklerine yönelik öğrenci ve öğretmen görüşleri. *Turkish Studies-Educational Sciences*, 15(1), 199-218.
- Kaplan, T. (2018). Yabancı öğrencilerin Türkçeye ilişkin görüşleri: Gaziantep Üniversitesi örneği. *Journal of International Social Research*, 11(55). 622-627.
- Karababa, C. Z., & Karagül, S. (2013). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrenenlere yönelik gereksinim çözümlemesi. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, *38*(170). 361-371.
- Karakelle, S. (2005). Öğretmenlerin etkili öğretmen tanımlarının etkili öğretmenlik boyutlarına göre incelenmesi. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, *30*(135). 1-10.
- Karatay, H., & Kartallıoğlu, N. (2019). Moğol öğrencilerin Türkiye ve Türkçe algıları. Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 19(3), 1016-1028.
- Kırmızı, B. (2010). Anadolu lisesi öğrencilerinin Almanca dersinin öğretimine yönelik görüşlerinin belirlenmesi. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Ahmet Keleşoğlu Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 29, 197-210.
- Koparan, B. (2019). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretiminde Türk kültür ögelerinin aktarımına ilişkin öğrenci ve öğretim elemanı görüşleri ile ders kitaplarının incelenmesi. Akdeniz Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Türkçe ve Sosyal Bilimler Eğitimi Ana Bilim Dalı Basılmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi.
- Kozikoğlu, İ., & Özcanlı, N. (2020). Öğretmenlerin 21. yüzyıl öğreten becerileri ile mesleğe adanmışlıkları arasındaki ilişki. *Cumhuriyet Uluslararası Eğitim Dergisi*, 9(1), 270-290.
- Liu, N. F., & Littlewood, W. (1997). Why do many students appear reluctant to participate in classroom learning discourse? *System*, *25*(3), 371-384.
- Logie, N. N. (2004) Yabancı dil öğretiminde kültürel becerinin oluşturulmasının önemi ve budunbilimsel boyut. *HAYEF Journal of Education*, *1*, 173-180.
- Okutan, M. (2006). Sunif Yönetiminde Örnek Olaylar, Pegem A Yayıncılık, Ankara.
- Oyar, İ. (2021). Yabancı Dil Olarak Türkçe Öğretiminde Uluslararası Öğrencilerin Yaşadıkları Sorunlara Yönelik Bir Meta-Sentez Çalışması. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek lisans tezi. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü, Türkiyat Araştırmaları Anabilim Dalı, Ankara.
- Ökten, C. E., & Kavanoz, S. (2014). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretimini hedefleyen ders kitaplarında kültür aktarımı. *Turkish Studies International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic, 9*(3), 845-862.
- Peacock, M. (1998). Exploring the gap between teachers' and learners' beliefs about 'useful' activities for EFL. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(2), 233-250. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.1998.tb00131.x
- Şengül, K. (2017). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrenen Afganistanlı Özbek Türklerinin Türkiye Türkçesine yönelik görüşleri. *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 27(2), 91-100.



- Tunçel, H. (2016). Yunan üniversite öğrencilerinin yabancı dil olarak Türkçeye yönelik algıları ve Türkçe öğrenme sebepleri. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 20(1), 107-128.
- Uçak, S. (2017). Irak'ta yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrenen öğrencilerin Türkiye, Türkler ve Türkçe algısı. *Electronic Turkish Studies*, *12*(14), 491-512.
- Valdes, J. (1990). The inevitability of teaching and learning culture in a foreign language course. *Culture and the Language Classroom*. ELT Documents 132. Haz. B. Harrison.London: Macmillan. Modern English Publicationsand the British Council: 20-30.
- Vatansever Bayraktar, H. (2015). Eğitim ortamında öğretmen öğrenci iletişimi. Akademik Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi/The Journal of Academic Social Science (ASOS Journal). 262-285.
- Yaşar, G., & Batur, Z. (2021). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrenen öğrencilerin Türkçe, Türkiye ve Türk kültürüne ilişkin görüşleri: Slovakya Matej Bel Üniversitesi örneği. Uluslararası Yabancı Dil Olarak Türkçe Öğretimi Dergisi, 4(1), 4-30.
- Yılmaz, F., & Arslan, S. B. (2014). ÇOMÜ TÖMER'de Türkçe öğrenen yabancı öğrencilerin motivasyon kaynakları ve sorunları. *Electronic Turkish Studies*, 9(6), 1181-1196.

