

**FIRST AND SECOND YEAR STUDENTS'  
OPINIONS ABOUT ENGLISH LANGUAGE  
COURSE IN THE FACULTIES AND  
VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOLS OF İĞDIR  
UNIVERSITY**

**Didem PARLAK**

**Yüksek Lisans Tezi**

**İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı**

**Yrd. Doç. Dr. Suna AKALIN**

**2011**

**(Her Hakkı Saklıdır)**

T.C.  
ATATÜRK ÜNİVERSİTESİ  
EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ  
YABANCI DİLLER EĞİTİMİ BÖLÜMÜ  
**İNGİLİZ DİLİ EĞİTİMİ ANABİLİM DALI**

**İĞDIR ÜNİVERSİTESİ FAKÜLTE VE MESLEK  
YÜKSEKOKULLARINDAKİ BİRİNCİ VE İKİNCİ SINIF  
ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN İNGİLİZCE DERSİ HAKKINDAKİ GÖRÜŞLERİ**

(First and Second Year Students' Opinions about English Language Course in  
the Faculties and Vocational High Schools of Iğdır University)

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

**Didem PARLAK**

Danışman: Yrd. Doç Dr. Suna AKALIN

**ERZURUM  
Ekim, 2011**

## KABUL VE ONAY TUTANAĞI

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Sema AKALIN danışmanlığında, .... Dilem... P. A. R. LAK... tarafından hazırlanan "First and Second Year Students' Opinions about English Language Course in the Faculties of Vocational High Schools of Işık University" başlıklı çalışma 29. / 10. / 2011.. tarihinde yapılan savunma sınavı sonucunda başarılı bulunarak jürimiz tarafından İngiliz Dil... Eğitimi... Anabilim Dalı'nda Yüksek Lisans Tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Jüri Üyesi : Yrd. Doç. Dr. Sema AKALIN

İmza: .....

Jüri Üyesi Prof. Dr. Mehmet PAKKACI

İmza: .....

Jüri Üyesi Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ferit EYDURAN

İmza: .....

Yukarıdaki imzaların adı geçen öğretim üyelerine ait olduğunu onaylarım.

.. / .. / .....

Prof. Dr. H. Ahmet KIRKKILIÇ

Enstitü Müdürü

## TEZ ETİK VE BİLDİRİM

Yüksek Lisans Tezi olarak sunduğum “.....” başlıklı çalışmanın, tarafımdan, bilimsel ahlak ve geleneklere aykırı düşecek bir yardıma başvurmaksızın yazıldığını ve yararlandığım eserlerin kaynakçada gösterilenlerden olduğunu, bunlara atıf yapılarak yararlanılmış olduğunu belirtir ve onurumla doğrularım.

Tezimin kâğıt ve elektronik kopyalarının Atatürk Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü arşivlerinde aşağıda belirttiğim koşullarda saklanmasına izin verdiğimi onaylarım.

Lisansüstü Eğitim-Öğretim yönetmeliğinin ilgili maddeleri uyarınca gereğinin yapılmasını arz ederim.

- Tezimin tamamı her yerden erişime açılabilir.
- Tezim sadece Atatürk Üniversitesi yerleşkelerinden erişime açılabilir.
- Tezimin ..... yıl süreyle erişime açılmasını istemiyorum. Bu sürenin sonunda uzatma için başvuruda bulunmadığım takdirde, tezimin tamamı her yerden erişime açılabilir.

.... / .... / ....

İmza

Ad Soyad: .....

## ÖZET

### YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

# İĞDIR ÜNİVERSİTESİ FAKÜLTE VE MESLEK YÜKSEKOKULLARINDAKİ BİRİNCİ VE İKİNCİ SINIF ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN İNGİLİZCE DERSİ HAKKINDAKİ GÖRÜŞLERİ

**Didem PARLAK**

**2011, 138 sayfa**

Üniversite öğrencilerinin İngiliz dili ve yüksek öğretim seviyesinde görülen İngilizce dersi hakkındaki düşüncelerini öğrenmek amacıyla gerçekleştirilen bu çalışma, 2010-2011 eğitim öğretim yılında Iğdır Üniversitesi'ne bağlı üç fakülte ve iki meslek yüksekokulunda gerçekleştirilmiştir.

İngilizce dersinin mevcut durumu ve dersin işlenişinde gerçekleşmesi muhtemel problemler hakkında öğrenciden dönüt almak amacıyla bir anket geliştirilmiş ve uygulanmıştır. Likert ölçeğinde hazırlanan bu anket aracılığı ile toplanan veriler SPSS 17.0 programı ile analiz edilmiştir.

Anket sonuçları göstermiştir ki, Iğdır Üniversitesi'ne bağlı fakülte ve meslek yüksekokullarında okuyan öğrencilerin büyük bir kısmı İngilizce dersinin sosyal, kültürel, ekonomik ve akademik açılardan önemli olduğunu düşünmektedir. Anket çalışmasından çıkan diğer bir sonuca göre öğrenciler derslerde iletişimsel etkinliklere daha fazla yer verilmesini ve dersi ölçme ve değerlendirmede objektif testlerin (doğru-yanlış, eşleştirme, tamamlama, vs) kullanılmasını talep etmektedir. Öğrencilerin birçoğu liseden yetersiz yabancı dil bilgisi ile mezun olduklarını ve bu durumun üniversite seviyesinde görülen İngilizce derslerinde başarısız olmalarının başlıca sebeplerinden biri olduğunu düşünmektedirler. Anket ayrıca fakülte/yüksekokul, yaş ve cinsiyet gibi değişkenlerin öğrenci cevaplarında ne tür farklılıklar yarattığına ilişkin önemli bilgiler ortaya koymuştur.

**Anahtar sözcükler:** Görüş, değerlendirme, İngiliz dili eğitimi

**ABSTRACT**  
**MASTER'S THESIS**  
**FIRST AND SECOND YEAR STUDENTS' OPINIONS ABOUT ENGLISH  
LANGUAGE COURSE IN THE FACULTIES AND VOCATIONAL HIGH  
SCHOOLS OF İĞDIR UNIVERSITY**

**Didem PARLAK**

**2011, 138 Pages**

This study, which investigates what the university students think about the English language and English language course that they take during their university education, was conducted at three faculties and two vocational high schools of İğdir University during 2010-2011 academic year.

A questionnaire was developed and applied with the aim of receiving students' feedback about the current situation of English course and problems possibly confronted during the classes. The questionnaire was prepared in Likert-scale and the data collected via the questionnaire were analyzed by SPSS 17.0. In the current study, Chi-square and G statistics were used to determine the association between two categorical variables.

The results show that most of the students studying at the faculties and vocational high schools of İğdir University believe that learning English language is important due to social, cultural, economic and academic reasons. Another result of the questionnaire is that the students feel the need for more communicative tasks during the classes and more objective tests (true – false, matching, completing, etc.) in the assessment and evaluation processes. Most of the students strongly agree on the idea that they graduate from high school with insufficient English, which is considered to be a significant factor in failure in this course. The results of the questionnaire also present significant information about to what degree the variables such as faculty/vocational high school studied, age and gender make difference in student responses.

**Key words:** Opinion, evaluation, English language teaching

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I firstly and mostly thank my supervisor, Assist. Prof. Dr. Suna Akalın, for her invaluable guidance, support and, most importantly, for her kindness and smiling face.

I would also like to express my gratitude to Prof. Dr. Mehmet Takkaç, for being in my examining committee, and also for being so modest and kind to me.

I am also grateful to Assist. Prof. Dr. Ecevit Eydurán, for both helping me in the data analysis of this study and being in my examining committee.

I would also like to thank all my students who participated in this study.

I am indebted to my colleague and closest friend Handan Yıldız, for her helpful suggestions and support.

My deepest thanks to my family; my parents, sisters and brothers, who had the faith in me from the very beginning of my educational life.

My final gratitude is to my husband, Erhan, for being the greatest source of my patience and ambition.

**Erzurum-2011**

**Didem Parlak**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

KABUL VE ONAY .....	i
BİLDİRİM .....	ii
ÖZET .....	iii
ABSTRACT .....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	vi
LIST OF TABLES .....	viii

### CHAPTER 1

<b>1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1. Background to the Study .....	1
1.2. The Statement of the Problem .....	2
1.3. Purpose of the Study .....	2
1.4. The Research Questions .....	3
1.5. The Assumptions .....	3
1.6. Limitations of the Study .....	3
1.7. Definition of Terms .....	4

### CHAPTER 2

<b>2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE .....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1. Introduction .....	5
2.2. About English Language and English Language Teaching (ELT) .....	5
2. 2. 1. Parameters in ELT .....	7
2. 2. 2. Schools of Thought Influencing ELT .....	8
2. 2. 3. Methods in ELT .....	10
2. 2. 4. ELT in Turkish Higher Education .....	13

2.3. Language Learning.....	14
2.3.1. Learning Styles and Strategies .....	17
2.3.2. Attitudes in Language Learning .....	20
2.3.3. Evaluation in Language Learning .....	21
2.3.3.1. The History of Evaluation in Foreign Language Teaching .....	22
2.3.3.2. The Significance of Evaluation .....	23
2.3.3.3. Formative and Summative Evaluation.....	23

### **CHAPTER 3**

<b>3. METHODOLOGY.....</b>	<b>25</b>
3.1. Research Design .....	25
3.2. Population and Sample .....	26
3.3. Data Collection Techniques .....	26
3.4. Data Analysis .....	27

### **CHAPTER 4**

<b>4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION .....</b>	<b>28</b>
4.1. Findings.....	28
4.1.1 Percents of Variables.....	28
4.1.2. Percentages of Student Responses According To The Items.....	30
4.1.3. Response Percentages in Terms of Gender .....	59
4.1.4. Response Percentages in Terms of Faculty/ Vocational High School .....	66
4.1.5. Response Percentages in Terms of Age Range .....	108
4.2. Discussion .....	113

### **CHAPTER 5**

<b>5. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS.....</b>	<b>118</b>
5.1. Conclusion .....	118
5.2. Suggestions .....	121
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>	<b>122</b>
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>126</b>
<b>CURRICULUM VITAE.....</b>	<b>138</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1. Language Teaching Methods by Larsen-Freeman.....	12
Table 2.2. Valette-Disick Taxonomy of Second Language Learning.....	15
Table 2.3. Top-Ten Learning Strategy Preferences of 44 “Good Learners” of English As A Foreign Language.....	19
Table 2.4. Differences between Summative and Formative Evaluation.....	24
Table 3.1. Reliability Statistics of The Questionnaire .....	27
Table 4.1. Percentages of Age Groups.....	28
Table 4.2. Percentages of Genders.....	29
Table 4.3. Percentages of Ages .....	29
Table 4.4. Percentages of Faculty/Vocational High School .....	30
Table 4.5. Percentages of student responses to item 1 .....	30
Table 4.6. Percentages of student responses to item 2.....	31
Table 4.7. Percentages of student responses to item 3.....	31
Table 4.8. Percentages of student responses to item 4.....	32
Table 4.9. Percentages of student responses to item 5.....	32
Table 4.10. Percentages of student responses to item 6.....	33
Table 4.11. Percentages of student responses to item 7.....	33
Table 4.12. Percentages of student responses to item 8.....	34
Table 4.13. Percentages of student responses to item 9.....	34
Table 4.14. Percentages of student responses to item 10.....	35
Table 4.15. Percentages of student responses to item 11.....	35
Table 4.16. Percentages of student responses to item 12.....	36
Table 4.17. Percentages of student responses to item 13.....	36
Table 4.18. Percentages of student responses to item 14.....	37
Table 4.19. Percentages of student responses to item 15.....	37
Table 4.20. Percentages of student responses to item 16.....	38
Table 4.21. Percentages of student responses to item 17.....	38
Table 4.22. Percentages of student responses to item 18.....	39
Table 4.23. Percentages of student responses to item 19.....	39
Table 4.24. Percentages of student responses to item 20A.....	40

Table 4.25. Percentages of student responses to item 20B .....	40
Table 4.26. Percentages of student responses to item 20C .....	41
Table 4.27. Percentages of student responses to item 20D .....	42
Table 4.28. Percentages of student responses to item 20E .....	42
Table 4.29. Percentages of student responses to item 21 .....	44
Table 4.30. Percentages of student responses to item 22 .....	45
Table 4.31. Percentages of student responses to item 23 .....	45
Table 4.32. Percentages of student responses to item 24 .....	46
Table 4.33. Percentages of student responses to item 25 .....	46
Table 4.34. Percentages of student responses to item 26 .....	47
Table 4.35. Percentages of student responses to item 27 .....	48
Table 4.36. Percentages of student responses to item 28 .....	48
Table 4.37. Percentages of student responses to item 29 .....	49
Table 4.38. Percentages of student responses to item 30 .....	49
Table 4.39. Percentages of student responses to item 31 .....	50
Table 4.40. Percentages of student responses to item 32 .....	51
Table 4.41. Percentages of student responses to item 33 .....	51
Table 4.42. Percentages of student responses to item 34 .....	52
Table 4.43. Percentages of student responses to item 35 .....	52
Table 4.44. Percentages of student responses to item 36 .....	52
Table 4.45. Percentages of student responses to item 37 .....	53
Table 4.46. Percentages of student responses to item 38 .....	53
Table 4.47. Percentages of student responses to item 39 .....	54
Table 4.48. Percentages of student responses to item 40 .....	54
Table 4.49. Percentages of student responses to item 41 .....	55
Table 4.50. Percentages of student responses to item 42 .....	55
Table 4.51. Percentages of student responses to item 43 .....	56
Table 4.52. Percentages of student responses to item 44 .....	56
Table 4.53. Percentages of student responses to item 45 .....	57
Table 4.54. Percentages of student responses to item 46 .....	57
Table 4.55. Percentages of student responses to item 47 .....	58
Table 4.56. Response Percentages in Terms of Gender for item 1 .....	60

Table 4.57. Response Percentages in Terms of Gender for item 2 .....	61
Table 4.58. Response Percentages in Terms of Gender for item 9 .....	62
Table 4.59. Response Percentages in Terms of Gender for item 14 .....	63
Table 4.60. Response Percentages in Terms of Gender for item 20B .....	64
Table 4.61. Response Percentages in Terms of Gender for item 21 .....	65
Table 4.62. Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 1 .....	67
Table 4.63. Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 2 .....	69
Table 4.64. Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 3 .....	71
Table 4.65. Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 8 .....	73
Table 4.66. Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 9 .....	75
Table 4.67. Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 12 .....	77
Table 4.68. Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 13 .....	79
Table 4.69. Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 20B.....	81
Table 4.70. Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 20C.....	83
Table 4.71. Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 20D.....	85
Table 4.72. Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 31 .....	87
Table 4.73. Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 32.....	89
Table 4.74. Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 33.....	91

Table 4.75. Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 34.....	93
Table 4.76. Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 36.....	95
Table 4.77. Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 37.....	97
Table 4.78. Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 38.....	99
Table 4.79. Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 40 .....	101
Table 4.80. Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 42.....	103
Table 4.81. Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 43.....	105
Table 4.82. Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 44.....	107
Table 4.83 Response Percentages in Terms of Age Range for item 1.....	109
Table 4.84 Response Percentages in Terms of Age Range for item 35.....	111
Table 4.85 Response Percentages in Terms of Age Range for item 41.....	113

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

#### **1.1. Background to the Study**

The ability to speak or to use a foreign language has become a widespread need for the social and intellectual life and career of an individual in the modern world. English language has been the most widely preferred and demanded foreign language for a while. According to many views, this situation resulted from the colonization movements in the history of Great Britain. On the other hand, some people suggest that the global need for English language knowledge mainly stems from the emergence and rise of the United States of America and its economical and cultural effects on the world. The English language soon became the language of all international affairs in almost all fields ranging from diplomacy, trade and economics to sciences, arts, entertainment and informatics.

In Turkey, compulsory English language courses start at the fourth grade at primary school in public schools and in some private schools English language teaching starts at the kindergarten level. At the university level, English language is compulsory for at least two semesters in all departments. The English language has been taught via various methods, techniques, materials and activities. This study particularly focuses on the current situation and problems regarding English language courses at the university level from the students' points of view.

## **1.2. Statement of Problem**

The wide currency English language has gained and the high demand for language skills have led the field of educational sciences to seek for new and more effective ways of language teaching and learning. There have been many methods developed and many materials invented for the sake of achieving a faster and better language learning.

In Turkey, the sector of language teaching has gained pace recently. This may be attributed to the current developments and improvements in global communication via the internet and the media. The number of people enrolling to public and private language courses is increasing every day. However, there has always been a debate on the success and effectiveness of the current approaches. Even those who take language courses for long periods of time complain about not having a total command on this language. This situation brings the question of “why cannot we learn English language?” into mind.

In this study, the answers to this question and many suchlike are looked for from the viewpoints of university students. According to the students’ answers, further statements might be made in terms of the problems and deficiencies of English language courses at the universities.

## **1.3. Purpose of the Study**

The aims of this study are a) to find out the views of university students about the importance of learning English language b) to have an opinion about the attendance and participation of the university students in English language courses c) to determine the problems confronted during the process of English language learning at the university from the viewpoints of the university students.

It is aimed to shed light on further studies in the field of English Language Teaching (ELT). Some further amendments in ELT at higher education level might be installed by taking the students’ opinions and comments into consideration.

#### **1.4. Research Questions**

The answers to the following questions were sought within the scope of this study:

1. What do the students studying at the faculties and vocational high schools of Iğdır University think about English language?
2. What do the students studying at the faculties and vocational high schools of Iğdır University think about the activities at English courses?
3. Do the students actively attend or participate into the activities at English courses?
4. What are the reasons for the students' not attending or participating into the activities at English classes?
5. What are the problems stemming from the students themselves?
6. What are the problems stemming from the instructors?
7. What are the problems stemming from the curriculum, environmental conditions and educational system?

#### **1.5. Limitations of the Study**

The participation in this study is limited with the students taking English courses at the faculties and vocational high schools of Iğdır University. The levels of the students vary between elementary and pre-intermediate. The questionnaire was consisting of totally 53 items, which may be considered as another limitation for this study.

#### **1.6. Assumptions**

1. In this study, it has been presumed that the students answered the questionnaire honestly and ingenuously.
2. It has been assumed that the students have problems in learning English.

### 1.7. Definition of the Terms

**Attitude:** an evaluative reaction to some referents or objects on the basis of the individual's beliefs or opinions about the referent (Gardner, 1985:9).

**Evaluation:** the systematic attempt to gather information in order to make judgments or decisions (Lynch, 2003; cited in Güllü, 2007:4).

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **2.1. Introduction**

In this chapter, firstly, some basic information is presented about the field of “English Language Teaching (ELT)”, the schools of thought having influenced ELT during the last decades and the ELT methods developed in the light of these thoughts. Then, English Language Teaching in Turkish higher education is introduced. Afterwards, basic theories about language learning and some characteristics of language learners are described. Finally, learner attitudes, evaluation, and their significance during language learning process are defined and explained.

#### **2.2. English Language and English Language Teaching (ELT)**

As noted by Broughton, Brumfit, Flavell, Hill and Pincas (1980), English language is the most widely used language among other 4.000 to 5.000 living languages. They add that it can be accepted as an international language since it is officially used by United Nations, NATO, International Aviation, etc. and unofficially used in international sports, pop scene and other cross-cultural organizations. The increase in the number of native speakers of English language was mostly in the nineteenth century when the figures for UK rose from 9 million in 1800 to 30 million in 1900 and to some 56 million within this century. In the USA, similarly, there was an increase in the population from 4 million in 1800 to 76 million in 1900 and approximately 216,451,900 at the end of the nineteenth century. As a matter of course, the UK and the USA were not the only countries where English was the national language. The people of those countries colonized by the British were also adopting this language, which made it an essential instrument for colonial power, commerce, education and therefore, communication.

Another reason for why English language has a global popularity is that, according to Broughton et al. (1980), the technology having developed rapidly in English speaking societies has made British and American television and radio programs, films, books, websites, etc. available all around the world.

As a consequence of this prevalence of English language, it has become of utmost importance to learn English as either a second or a foreign language and the field of English Language Teaching (ELT) has come into prominence.

Palmer (1965) states that there are nine fundamental principles that an ELT teacher should follow in the process of language study:

1. *Initial preparation*: a foreign language teacher should arrange proper exercises in the beginning stages to reveal the capacity of the students for language learning.

2. *Habit formation*: the teacher should help the learners use their habits acquired beforehand or build up new ones during language study.

3. *Accuracy*: it is essential in language study to develop accurate habit formation so that what is newly learned is built upon a solid basis.

4. *Gradation*: there must be a subject sequencing from known to unknown in order that students be prepared for the next phase of learning.

5. *Proportion*: in language study, there must be an accurate proportion of emphasis put on the subjects taught or skills to be developed.

6. *Concreteness*: the learners should first receive concrete information, and then abstract knowledge should follow.

7. *Interest*: the language teacher should arrange the lessons in such a way that the students would be interested any way.

8. *Order of progression*: there must be an order in the phases the students go through while learning the language.

9. *Multiple line of approach*: the language should be studied in different and simultaneous approaches and frameworks in order to avoid a one-sided view of language study.

### 2.2.1. Parameters in ELT

There are a number of parameters that somehow influence the process of language teaching. Larsen-Freeman (2000) states that these parameters include who the teacher is, who the students are and what kind of a society they are living within. Palmer (1965) suggests that there is always individuality and personality in language teaching as both the textbooks and the teachers may differ in the way they present materials or methods.

Levine (2003) also notes that almost all language teachers develop an ‘individualized’ approach in their way of teaching and these approaches are possibly affected by pedagogical education, the knowledge of second language acquisition literature, official policy, and particularly classroom experiences and intuitions about what feels right. Brown (2000) states that a teacher’s understanding of how the learners learn will determine his or her philosophy of education, teaching style, approach, methods, and classroom techniques.

Larsen-Freeman (2000) argues that it is very significant for the teachers to be conscious of their beliefs, attitudes, values and awareness that lead their actions in the classroom and she adds that each teacher should “arrive at the conceptualization of how thoughts lead to actions in his or her teaching and how, in turn, teaching leads to learning in the students” (2000:4).

Rivers and Melvin (1981) state that the field of language teaching and learning is never static, but there are always rapid changes and strong controversies instead. “As good navigators, we must be ready to change course if we find our map is wrong.” (Rivers & Melvin, 1981:82). Likewise, Brown (2000) puts an emphasis on the fact that today, instead of classifying language teaching into methods and trends, each teacher needs to build and develop an approach that can be successful in specific contexts with certain techniques and designs.

### 2.2.2. Schools of Thought Influencing ELT

Titone (1981) claims that psychological consideration and psycholinguistic theory are vital in second language learning and he states that since the advent of psycholinguistic theory in the early fifties, it has gone through a few stages of evolution.

The first stage was in 1940's, 1950's and early 1960's when behavioristic views and structuralist theories emerged. Brown (2000) states that, according to Structuralism, merely publicly observable responses could be investigated and the linguists' duty was to define and specify the structures of languages, which also explains the 'Verbal Behavior' of Skinner (Skinner, 1957, cited in Brown, 2000). Some of the scholars defending the structuralist view were Leonard Bloomfield, Edward Sapir, Charles Hockett and Charles Fries (Brown, 2000). Brown (2000) explains Behaviorism as a similar theory, which also emphasizes perceived, recorded and measured responses and which studies human behavior with experimental approaches. Ivan Pavlov and B. F. Skinner are the two of prominent behaviorists, who put forward the theories of Classical Conditioning and Operant Conditioning, respectively.

The second stage took place during the decades of 1960's and early 1970's when the Mentalistic-Cognitivism was put forward by Noam Chomsky and other transformationalists (Titone, 1981). Chomsky objects to the idea that language is restricted with merely observable behaviors, and his generative-transformational theory was based upon "a principled basis, independent of any particular language, for the selection of the descriptively adequate grammar of each language" (Chomsky, 1964: 63, cited in Brown, 2000:10). For Chomsky, there was a 'universal grammar' that lies beneath the constructions of all languages and that universal grammar is the result of a cognitive competence that can never be limited with observable behavior and is not taught in the later phases of one's life. Brown (2000) also mentions Cognitive Psychologists who were in seek of motivations and deeper structures underlying human behavior by using a rational approach. He adds that meaning, understanding and knowing were very important data for Cognitive Psychology.

The next stage in the development of psycholinguistic theory was during 1970's, when pragmatic and communicative – but still under the influence of transformational theory – viewpoints of some linguists such as Chafe, Hymes, Labov, etc., affected the

psycholinguistic theory (Titone, 1981). Richards and Rodgers (1986:69) state that “the communicative approach in language teaching starts from a theory of language as communication”. The goal of language teaching is to develop what Hymes (1972) referred to as ‘communicative competence’. According to Hymes (1967, 1972, cited in Brown, 2000), there are four dimensions of communicative competence; grammatical competence, discourse competence, strategic competence and sociolinguistic competence and he states that with acquiring communicative competence, one acquires not only the ability but also the knowledge of language.

The latest school of thought is Constructivism. Brown (2000:11) notes that “Constructivists argue that all human beings construct their own version of reality, and therefore multiple contrasting ways of knowing and describing are equally legitimate”. Jean Piaget and Lev Vygotsky are the two scholars who were known as the fathers of this theory.

Brown (2000) argues that as new schools of thought have come out one after another, language teaching gains or loses popularity in the same way. He adds that new trends in the field of education both contribute to and utilize from the emergence of new-coming theories. He continues with these words:

“Since the early 1970s, the relationship of theoretical disciplines to teaching methodology has been especially evident. The field of psychology has witnessed a growing interest in interpersonal relationships, in the value of group work, and in the use of numerous self-help strategies for attaining desired goals. The same era has seen linguists searching ever more deeply for answers to the nature of communication and communicative competence and for explanations of interactive process of language. ... Today the term ‘communicative language teaching’ as a byword for language teachers. Indeed, the single greatest challenge in the profession is to move significantly beyond the teaching rules, patterns, definitions, and other knowledge ‘about’ language to the point that we are teaching our students to communicate genuinely, spontaneously, and meaningfully in the second language.” (Brown, 2000:13)

### 2.2.3. Language Teaching Methods

Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics defines methodology as “the study of the practices and procedures used in teaching and the principles and beliefs that underlie them” (Richards et al., 1985:177, cited in Nunan, 1998:2). Nunan (1998) makes it clear that although they are divergent in many ways; all methods have one thing in common. Every method claims that there is one set of principles that leads to successful teaching and learning and unless those principles are followed, there will not be affirmative results in the process of teaching or learning a foreign language. However, almost none of these methods have proven a true victory in this race, and it has been clear that the methods are not the only variables that influence language learning. Nunan (1998) underlines the significance of the context and environment of learning along with the management of language classroom.

The methods have been created and developed with the notion that the teachers need to have the information of certain ways to be more successful in teaching and by this way they could be clear about why they do what they do (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). Methods offer teachers the alternatives to what they can do within the four walls of a classroom with a bunch of materials. Having a grasp of various methods enables the teachers to develop their professional growth, with the help of which one can pick the best and the most appropriate ways of accomplishing their professions. Methods can be seen as the models of an integration of theory and practice.

Larsen-Freeman (2000) states that studying on the methods is quite vital in teacher education particularly for the following reasons:

1. The teachers become more certain about “why they do what they do” and they recognize their own substantial assumptions, values and beliefs.
2. Teachers can make choices in alternative teaching circumstances, instead of obeying the rules established before them.
3. Being competent in methods of teaching, a teacher may become a part of the ‘community’ of the profession, which will enable the teacher to keep in touch with the others within the community.

4. This constant interaction within the profession may help the teachers keep their field knowledge up-to-date.

5. Having the grasp of various methods and techniques may help the teachers deal with their students with different learning styles, strategies or other characteristics.

Prator (1979) suggests that the most effective feature of the history of language teaching seems to be the diversity of the methodologies that have been found out. He adds that in a short time, many methods or approaches followed each other and each time, the new one denied the reliability of the previous. While one method appraised the use of mother tongue in classroom, the other denied or even banned it, for instance. Likewise, speaking skills were viewed as redundant first, but later it gained utmost importance.

Palmer (1964) states that the answer to the question ‘what is the best method of language study?’ is ‘which adopts the best means to the required end’. Then he adds that the most important point in this answer is what the required end is, since there are many possible ends, many categories of learners and various aims of them. Then he continues with the diversity of student aims such as just reading and writing in the target language, or acquiring the speaking skills only, or merely obtaining high marks after an examination with little study. According to Palmer (1964), thus, people with different aims of learning need different methods and techniques of teaching. Nunan (1998:15) suggests that “materials, learning tasks and pedagogical exercises need to be based not only on ideology or dogma, but on the evidence and insights into what constitutes effective language teaching.”

According to Prator (1979), language teaching methods should be based upon at least three cornerstones:

- a. What is known about the language
- b. What is known about the learner
- c. The aims of instruction

In respect of the phases that language teaching methodology has undergone, Richards (2006) states that language teaching has seen many changes in ideas about syllabus design and methodology in the last 50 years, and CLT prompted a rethinking of

approaches to syllabus design and methodology. We may conveniently group trends in language teaching in the last 50 years into three phases:

Phase 1: traditional approaches (up to the late 1960s)

Phase 2: classic communicative language teaching (1970s to 1990s)

Phase 3: current communicative language teaching (late 1990s to the present)

In table 2.1., Larsen-Freeman (2000:178) lists these methods and the most significant features of them:

Table 2.1  
*Language Teaching Methods*

<b>Method/approach</b>	<b>Language/culture</b>	<b>Language learning</b>	<b>Language teaching</b>
Grammar Translation	Literary language culture: literature and fine arts	Exercise mental muscle	Have students translate from target language texts to native language
Direct Method	Everyday spoken language Culture: history, geography, everyday life of target language speakers	Associate meaning with the target language directly	Use spoken language in situations with no native language translation
Audio-Lingual Method	Sentence and sound patterns	Overcome native language habits; form new target language habits	Conduct oral/aural drills and pattern practice
Cognitive-Code Approach	Grammar rules	Form and test hypothesis to discover and acquire target language rules	Do inductive/deductive grammar exercises
Silent Way	Unique spirit/melody	Develop inner criteria for correctness by becoming aware of how the target language works	Remain silent in order to subordinate teaching to learning. Focus student attention; provide meaningful practice.

Method/approach	Language/culture	Language learning	Language teaching
Desuggestopedia	Whole, meaningful texts,; vocabulary emphasized.	Overcome psychological barriers to learning	Desuggest limitations: teach lengthy dialogs through musical accompany, playful practice and the arts
Community Language Learning	Student generated	Learn nondefensively as whole persons, following developmental stages	Include the elements of security, attention, aggression, reflection, retention, discrimination
Comprehension Approach: Natural Approach, the Learnables, and Total Physical Response	Vehicle for communicating meaning; vocabulary emphasized	Listen; associate meaning with target language directly	Delay speaking until students are ready; make meaning clear through actions and visuals
Communicative Language Teaching	Communicative competence Notions/functions Authentic discourse	Interact with others in target language, negotiate meaning	Use information gaps, role plays, games
Content-based, Task-Based, and Participatory Approaches	Medium for doing/learning	Attend to what is being communicated, not the language itself, except when form-focused	Engage students in learning other subject matter, tasks or in problem-solving around issues in their lives
Learning Strategy Training, Cooperative Learning, and Multiple Intelligence		Learn how to learn	Teach learning strategies, cooperation; use a variety of activities that appeal to different intelligences

#### 2.2.4. Elt in Turkish Higher Education

Oğuz, Oktay and Ayhan (2010) classify Turkish universities into three groups in terms of the position of compulsory foreign language education in their educational system. In the first group, there are the universities where courses are taught completely in Turkish and there is a limited amount of compulsory foreign language education. In

the second group, there are the universities where the education is given in Turkish in general, but some certain courses or programs are entirely taught in a foreign language (such as Marmara University and Istanbul Technical University). Finally, in the third group, there are the universities that the education is thoroughly given in a foreign language, such as Boğaziçi University and Bilkent University.

Oğuz et al. (2010) argue that foreign language education should not be compulsory in all departments. They put emphasis on the fact that a compulsory course does not go further than a show-off and cannot result in success. Instead, they suggest that foreign language courses should be compulsory in certain departments and optional in others. A preparatory year before undergraduate study might solve the foreign language problem of many programs and faculties. Those students who get a foreign language license from this preparatory class might be able to maintain their education in any faculty they desire (Oğuz & Oktay & Ayhan, 2010).

### **2.3. Language Learning**

According to Palmer (1965), for most students there are four aims in language learning:

1. To understand what they hear from native speakers, particularly when they speak fast and fluently.
2. To speak the target language like the native speakers do.
3. To understand the written form of the target language
4. To write in the foreign language like the native speakers do.

The second language learning taxonomy of Valette-Disicks (1972:14, cited in Valette, 1981:163) in table 2.2 illustrates the phases that a language learner goes through:

Table 2.2  
*Valette-Disick Taxonomy of Second Language Learning*

Stage	Internal Behavior	External Behavior
1. Mechanical Skills: the student performs via rote memory, rather than by understanding	Perception: the student perceives differences between two or more sounds or letters or gestures and makes distinctions between them.	Reproduction: the student imitates foreign language speech, writing, gestures, songs and proverbs.
2. Knowledge: The student demonstrates knowledge of facts, rules, and data related to foreign language learning.	Recognition: The student shows he recognizes facts he has learned by answering true-false and multiple-choice questions.	Recall: The student demonstrates he remembers the information taught by answering fill-in or short answer questions
3. Transfer: The student uses his knowledge in new situations.	Reception: The student understands recombined oral or written passages or quotations not encountered previously	Application: The student speaks or writes in a guided drill situation or participates in cultural simulations.
4. Communication: The student uses the foreign language and culture as natural vehicles for communication.	Comprehension: The student understands a foreign language message or a cultural signal containing unfamiliar material in an unfamiliar situation.	Self-Expression: The student uses the foreign language to express his personal thoughts orally or in writing. He uses gestures as part of his expression.
5. Criticism: The student analyzes or evaluates the foreign language or carries out original research.	Analysis: The student breaks down language or a literary passage to its essential elements of style, tone, theme, and so forth. Evaluation: The student evaluates and judges the appropriateness and effectiveness of a language sample or literary passage.	Synthesis: The student carries out original research or individual study or creates a plan for such a project.

Brown (2000) remarks that people undertake a long and complicated process while learning another language. He adds that “your whole person is affected as you struggle to reach beyond the confines of your first language and into a new language, a new culture, a new way of thinking, feeling and acting” (2000:1). According to his point of view, achieving to send and receive messages in the target language depends on high commitment, deep involvement, and strong behavioral, cognitive and sentimental responses. He claims that it is almost impossible to speak a foreign language fluently by merely taking it within the borders of classroom and adds that knowing who will teach and who will be taught, what will be taught, how it will be taught, when and where the teaching will occur and why one learns a language is vital during the complicated process of foreign language learning.

Broughton et al. (1980) define two types of motivation that trigger foreign language learning: instrumental and integrative. If someone learns a foreign language instrumentally, s/he needs it for operational purposes such as reading books or communicating in the target language. Integrative motivation, on the other hand, is the result of an individual’s desire to identify and internalize the target language and the community it is spoken by. Alatis, Altman and Alatis (1981) also state that language learners study a foreign language for various reasons such as previous experiences differing highly from one to another and with different aptitudes, attitudes, motivation and different strategies and styles of learning.

Peck (1979) states that language learners’ needs highly differ from one another as the learners have different social and cultural backgrounds, ages, former education, etc. She adds that even the students in the same classroom should be thought as language learners who are separate and independent from each other as they have different learning styles and needs. Handsome and others (1974, cited in Peck, 1979) claim that a foreign language teacher should ‘individualize’ his or her teaching in such a way that all students with different ages, previous education, attitude, learning style, former language learning experiences, personality, field of interest and environment would be satisfied from the class.

### 2.3.1. Learning Styles and Strategies

Brown (2000) states that there are cognitive variations that influence language learning. They are the variations in learning styles and strategies that vary from one individual to another. Brown defines the styles as “consistent and rather enduring tendencies or preferences within an individual” (2000:113). Strategies, as he defines, are “specific methods of approaching a problem or task, models of operation for achieving a particular end, planned designs for controlling and manipulating certain information” (2000:113). Nunan (1998:168) defines learning strategies as “the mental processes which learners employ to learn and use the target language”.

The way we learn things in educational context under the influence of personal and cognitive factors is called as our ‘learning style’. Nunan (1998:168) defines learning styles as “any individual’s preferred ways of going about learning”. According to Brown (2000), there are numerous learning styles educators and psychologists have found out so far and he adds that these styles may consist of every sort of sentimental, communicative, cultural, affective, cognitive and intellectual agents. Some of these are field dependence and field independence, left-right brain functioning, ambiguity tolerance, reflectivity, impulsivity, and visual and auditory styles.

As Brown notes (2000), there are two kinds of strategies in second language acquisition: learning strategies and communication strategies. While learning strategies are related with the process of perceiving, storing and retrieving the input received, communication strategies are relevant to producing meaningful output to our addressee.

Oxford (1990) lists the key features of language learning strategies as follows:

1. They contribute to the main goal of communicative competence
2. They allow learners to become more self-directed
3. They expand the role of teachers
4. They are problem oriented.
5. They are specific actions taken by the learners
6. They involve many aspects of the learners, not just the cognitive
7. They support learning both directly and indirectly
8. They are not always observable
9. They are often conscious
10. They can be taught and they are flexible

Rubin (Rubin and Thompson, 1982, cited in Brown, 2000:171) describes the characteristics of 'good language learners' in terms of their personal characteristics, styles and strategies and claims that they

1. Find their own way, taking charge of their own learning.
2. Organize information about language.
3. Are creative, developing a 'feel' for the language by experimenting with its grammar and words.
4. Meet their opportunities for practice in using the language inside and outside the classroom.
5. Learn to live with uncertainty by not getting flustered and by continuing to talk or listen without understanding every word.
6. Use mnemonics and other memory strategies to recall what has been learned.
7. Make errors work for them and not against them.
8. Use linguistic knowledge, including knowledge of their first language, in learning a second language.
9. Use contextual cues to help them in comprehension.
10. Learn to make intelligent guesses.
11. Learn chunks of language as wholes and formalized routines to help them perform 'beyond their competence'.
12. Learn certain tricks that help to keep conversations going.
13. Learn certain production strategies to fill in gaps in their own competence.
14. Learn different styles of speech and writing and learn to vary their language according to the formality of the situation.

In a previous study conducted in Southern Asian countries by Nunan (1998:172), top ten learning strategy preferences of forty-four 'good learners' of English as a foreign language, who were actually teachers of English as a foreign language, were determined. The responses in table 2.3. were given to the questions below:

- A. When you learned English, which of the following ways of learning did you like?

B. When you learned English, which of the following ways of learning did you find most helpful?

C. If you were going to learn another language, which of the following ways of learning would you use?

D. Think of the learners you are currently teaching: how do you think they would respond to the questionnaire?

Table 2.3

*Top 10 Learning Strategy Preferences of 44 “Good Learners” of English as A Foreign Language (Nunan, 1998)*

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
1.	Learning by games	Reading newspapers	Talking to L1 speakers	Learning by games
2.	Learning by doing	Watching television	Pictures, films, video	Pictures, films, video
3.	Watching television	Learning by doing	Learning by doing	Learning by doing
4.	Going on excursions	Talking to friends	Talking to friends	Having a coursebook
5.	Pictures, films, video	Practising out of class	Practising out of class	Small group work
6.	Reading newspapers	Talking to L1 speakers	Watching television	Using cassettes
7.	Small group work	Going on excursions	Small group work	Going on excursions
8.	In class conversation	Small group work	In class conversation	Learning by hearing
9.	Talking about interests	In class conversation	Having a coursebook	In class conversation
10.	Talking to friends	Pictures, films, video	Learning by hearing	Talking about interests

Apart from learning styles and strategies, some other personal and sociocultural factors may affect second language acquisition. Self-esteem, motivation, empathy, risk-taking, state of inhibition, extroversion or introversion and anxiety are some of these personal factors (Brown, 2000). Willing (1988, cited in Nunan, 1998) suggests that an

individual's perceptions of his or her own strengths and weaknesses would also influence his or her learning.

### **2.3.2. Attitudes in Language Learning**

According to Gardner, "an individual's attitude is an evaluative reaction to some referents or objects on the basis of the individual's beliefs or opinions about the referent" (1985:9). Attitudes may be described in another way as "an internal state which affects an individual's choice of action toward some objects, people or event" (retrieved from <http://classweb.gmu.edu>).

In the Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics (1992:199, cited in Karahan, 2007:75) 'language attitudes' are defined "the attitude which speakers of different languages or language varieties have towards each others' languages or to their own language". Karahan (2007) adds that "expressions of positive or negative feelings towards a language may reflect impressions of linguistic difficulty or simplicity, ease or difficulty of learning, degree of importance, elegance, social status, etc. Attitudes towards a language may also show what people feel about the speakers of that language" (2007:75).

Gardner and Lambert (1972) fulfilled one of the earliest studies about different types of learner attitudes and they emphasized the 'group-specific attitude', which is felt against the native speakers of the target language. They suggested that if the learners have positive feelings about the community natively speaking the language to be learned, they are more vulnerable to be successful in learning. However, if there is any kind of prejudice, dislike or repulsion, which means a negative attitude, it hinders the learning process.

Brown (1981) states that "attitudes develop early in childhood and are the results of parental and peer attitudes, contact with people who are 'different' in any number of ways, and interacting affective factors in the human experience" (1981:125). In other words, attitudes of an individual are mostly influenced by the environmental factors he or she is grown in. According to Herr (1949, cited in Şeker, 2003) certain features that may have role in attitude formation are respectively family, school and the press.

There are many reasons for the development of negative attitude towards foreign language learning. One of these reasons is the fear of losing "social identity". Some

people think that learning another language, particularly a popular one like English language, would endanger the purity of their own language or even culture. Another reason defended by many language learners, particularly high school or university students who are obliged to take language courses at school, is the notion that there is no need to learn a foreign language. These people generally think that the profession they intend to pick up in the future will not require a foreign language and they unintentionally acquire a negative attitude against language learning, and finally they presumably become unsuccessful in learning (retrieved from <http://socyberty.com/education/attitude-and-motivation-in-second-language-learning-introduction>).

Brown (1981) claims that positive attitude contributes to language learning, however, negative attitude causes reduced motivation which may lead to failure in language learning process. Dörnyei (2001) acknowledges negative attitude as a demotivating factor in language learning and argues that negative attitudes towards the speakers of the target language damage the social aspect of foreign language learning motivation. However, Brown (1981) states that any negative attitude, which may emerge as a result of false stereotyping or undue ethnocentrism, may be altered by the teacher, by explaining the fact that other cultures must be understood as something that is to be respected and valued, although it is different from one's own culture. Meeting some people from the culture where the target language is spoken is another way of defeating negative attitude (Brown, 1981).

### **2.3.3. Evaluation in Language Learning**

Evaluation is a procedure we consciously or unconsciously go through every day. Rea-Dickins and Germaine (2003) state that making evaluative judgment is a part of our social life. However, they add that this evaluation may not always be reliable, well-defined or informative enough. Evaluation in the field of education is far more critical and demanding than our daily-life evaluations about the subjects such as the weather, clothes or television programs. In assessing the features of teaching and learning processes, it is crucial to have clearly determined criteria and a principled and systematic approach in order to avoid an ill-evaluation (Rea-Dickins and Germaine, 2003). Alderson and Baretta (2001) state that evaluation should be rigorous, theoretically motivated and data-based in order to be satisfactory.

Nunan (1991) characterizes evaluation as “a necessary component in any curriculum plan” and “particularly important in a needs-based, learner-centered program which is directed towards the achievement of specific goals and objectives” (Nunan, 1984:46, cited in Leung, 1991:65). Cronbach (1991) defines evaluation as the gathering and utilizing from some information to make decisions about an educational program. He claims that evaluation is used for the following three sorts of decisions:

1. The decisions about course improvement: this kind of decisions is about course improvement and they involve the determination of satisfactory materials and methods and the change to be done if needed.

2. The decisions about student progress: These decisions include the identification of students’ needs, assessment of the students’ preferences and grouping and also information to be given to the students about their improvement and weaknesses.

3. The decisions about administrative appliances: these are the decisions judging how good the school system is, how good individual teachers are, etc.

Alderson and Waters (1983, cited in Hutchinson and Waters, 1987) state that four essential questions should be asked while evaluating an English language course:

1. What should be evaluated?
2. How can the English language courses be evaluated?
3. Who should be involved in evaluation?
4. How often should a course be evaluated?

According to Rea-Dickins and Germaine (2003), it is disadvantageous to evaluate a course at the end of the term since many phases of the learning progress within the term may be missed, which will lead to a failure in determining the factors playing role on learners’ improvements or downgrades.

### **2.3.3.1. The history of evaluation in foreign language teaching**

To briefly mention the historical background of program evaluation in foreign language teaching, it is appropriate to start with 1960s, when, as Alderson and Beretta (2001) narrate, program evaluation drew an intense interest after the launch of Sputnik

in 1957 led the US to seek development in the fields of science, mathematics and foreign languages and therefore the evaluation of the programs developed in these fields. Another reason was that the ‘Great Society’ reforms of President Johnson in the USA required the evaluation of newly developed compensatory education programs. Though some other evaluation procedures were followed beforehand, many scientifically significant theories were developed after this period. The scholars such as Campbell and Stanley (1963), Cronbach (1963), Keating (1963), Scherer and Wertheimer (1964) and Smith (1970) produced some of very persistent works in foreign language teaching program evaluation (Alderson and Baretta, 2001).

### **2.3.3.2. The significance of evaluation**

Rea-Dickins and Germaine (2003) state that evaluation is critical in achieving good management. With the help of evaluation, teachers may ensure the appropriateness of the methods and techniques they use in the classroom, or they may find out what should be totally changed, modified or added into the teaching process.

Evaluation may play many roles, depending on the demands and constraints placed on it (Heath, 1969, cited in Payne, 1994:7). Three broad functions of evaluation are:

1. Improvement of the program during the development phase: The importance of formative evaluation is emphasized. Strengths and weaknesses of the program or unit can be identified and enhanced or strengthened. The process is iterative, involving continuous repetition of the tryout – evaluation – redesign cycle.

2. Facilitation of rational comparison of competing programs: Although differing objectives pose a large problem, the description and comparison of alternative programs can contribute to rational decision making.

3. Contribution to the general body of knowledge about effective program design: Freed from the constraints of formal hypothesis testing, evaluators are at liberty to search out principles relating to the interaction of learner, learning, and environment.

### **2.3.3.3. “Formative” and “summative” evaluation**

The potential contributions of evaluation to the improvement of quality and quantity in education, have been described by Scriven (1967, cited in Payne, 1994:8) as

‘summative’ and ‘formative’ evaluation. He notes that the goal of evaluation is always the same, that is, to determine the worth and value of something. That ‘something’ may be a microscope, a unit in biology, a science curriculum, or an entire educational system. Depending upon the role the value judgments are to play, evaluation data may be used developmentally or in a summary way. In the case of an overall decision, the role of evaluation is summative. An end-of-course assessment would be considered summative. Summative evaluation may employ absolute or comparative standards and judgments.

Formative evaluation, on the other hand, is aimed at improving an educational experience or product during the developmental phases. Information is gathered during the developmental phase with an eye toward improving the total product. The summative formative distinction among kinds of evaluation reflects the differences, for the most part, in intent rather than different methodologies or techniques.(Payne, 1994)

There are also other dimensions that these two types of evaluation might be contrasted. Worthen and Sanders (1987, cited in Payne,1994:8) summarize these differences as illustrated in table 2.4 below:

Table 2.4  
*Differences Between Summative and Formative Evaluation*

<b>Basis for Comparison</b>	<b>Formative Evaluation</b>	<b>Summative Evaluation</b>
Purpose	To improve program	To certify program utility
Audience	Program administrators and staff	Potential consumer or funding agency
Who Should Do It	Internal evaluator	External evaluator
Major Characteristic Measures	Timely Often informal	Convincing Valid / reliable
Frequency of Data Collection	Frequent	Limited
Sample Size	Often small	Usually large
Questions Asked	What is working? What needs to be improved? How can it be improved?	What results occur? With whom? Under What condition? With what training? At what cost?
Design Constraints	What information is needed? When?	What claims do you wish to make?

From: Educational Evaluation: Alternative Approaches and Practical Guidelines by Blaine R. Worthen and James R. Sanders. Copyright© 1987 by Longman Publishing Group.

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **3. METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1. Research Design**

In the current study, a fifty-three-question questionnaire was used to obtain available data. The questionnaire consisted of statements about the importance of English language, the attendance and participation of the students into the activities during English courses at the university, and the problems possibly stemming from the students, the teaching staff and the environment, that may be faced during teaching process. The independent variables of the study were students' genders, age groups and faculties/vocational high schools.

The participants of the study were first and second grade students all of whom were taking English language course in the terms the questionnaire was fulfilled. Three hundred twenty seven students from all faculties and vocational high schools of Iğdır University attended to the questionnaire. There were not any departments in the Faculty of Theology, however, the participants from the Faculty of Agriculture were divided into the departments of Horticulture and Field Crops, and the students from the Faculty of Engineering were studying at the department of Food Engineering. The programs of the Vocational High Schools were Medical Documentation and Secretaryship and Medical Laboratory Techniques from Vocational High School of Medical Services and the programs of Business Management, Computer Programming, Finance, Accounting, Foreign Trade and Banking from the Vocational School of Iğdır.

After taking the formal permission from the university presidency, the questionnaire was applied during the fall and spring semesters of 2010-2011 academic years. The first draft was applied in the middle of fall semester on 30 participants (see appendix A). After necessary changes were completed, the final draft was fulfilled in the units mentioned above. One hundred seventy four participants were female and one hundred fifty three students were male. Their ages ranged from 17 to 39.

The questionnaire was designed to find out the attitudes, opinions and assessments of the students about the English language course they compulsorily take at least one semester during their university education. The questionnaire with its 53 items arranged in Likert-scale mainly included three sections: a) ideas about English language and its use, b) student attendance and participation in the English course and c) the problems confronted during this course. The final section had three subsections: a) problems stemming from the student, b) problems stemming from the lecturer and c) problems stemming from the curriculum, physical conditions and the educational system.

### **3.2. Population and Sample**

The population of this study is all of the students studying at Iğdır University. Totally 327 first or second grade students who were taking English course during 2010-2011 academic year at three faculties and two vocational schools of the university participated into the study.

### **3.3. Data Collection Techniques**

In this study, a questionnaire of 53 (51 multiple choice and two open-ended) items was prepared. The reason for choosing this technique was the fact that in order to collect data from a population as large as possible; questionnaires are the most appropriate tools. The statements involved in the questionnaire were basically about the importance of English language, the attendance and participation of the students into the activities during English courses at the university, and the problems that may be faced in this course. The language of the questionnaire was Turkish. A trial version of the questionnaire (see appendix A) was conducted with 30 students and after receiving the results, some items were renewed and some mistakes were corrected. Then, the final draft (see appendices B and C) was applied in three faculties (Faculty of Agriculture, Faculty of Engineering and Faculty of Theology) and two vocational high schools (Vocational School of Iğdır and Vocational School of Medical Services) at Iğdır University. The obtained data were analyzed through SPSS 17.0.

### 3.4. Data Analysis

Chi-Square and G statistics were used to determine the association between the two categorical variables. As descriptive statistics; frequencies, percents and cumulative percents were calculated for each items. All statistical analyses were performed via SPSS 17.0.

Table 3.1  
*Reliability Statistics*

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.819	51

As it can be seen in Table 3.1 above, reliability coefficient of the questionnaire was found to be .819 according to Cronbach's Alpha, which means that the study was 82% reliable.

## CHAPTER 4

### 4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

#### 4.1. Findings

The results of the quantitative measurements of the study will be given in the following chapter under two main categories. In the first group, there are the percents of the students' according to the variables examined in the study (age range, gender and faculty/vocational high school) and the percents of participant responses to the items of the questionnaire. In the second part, the association between the student responses and the variables of the study will be presented.

##### 4.1.1. Percentages of the Variables

Table 4.1  
*Percentages of Age Groups*

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Group 1	182	55,7	55,7	55,7
Group 2	131	40,1	40,1	95,7
Group 3	14	4,3	4,3	100,0
Total	327	100,0	100,0	

As it is clear in table 4.1 above, 55.7% of 327 participants are between 17-20 (group 1), 40.1% of participants are between 21-24 (group 2) and 4.3% of the participants are 25 and over (group 3).

Table 4.2  
*Percentages of Genders*

		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
	female	174	53,2	53,2	53,2
Valid	male	153	46,8	46,8	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

Table 4.2 illustrates that the percentages of the male and female participants are 46,8 and 53,2, respectively.

Table 4.3  
*Percentages of Ages*

		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
	17,00	1	,3	,3	,3
	18,00	49	15,0	15,0	15,3
	19,00	51	15,6	15,6	30,9
	20,00	81	24,8	24,8	55,7
	21,00	63	19,3	19,3	74,9
	22,00	36	11,0	11,0	85,9
	23,00	21	6,4	6,4	92,4
Valid	24,00	11	3,4	3,4	95,7
	25,00	8	2,4	2,4	98,2
	27,00	2	,6	,6	98,8
	28,00	1	,3	,3	99,1
	29,00	1	,3	,3	99,4
	30,00	1	,3	,3	99,7
	39,00	1	,3	,3	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

As indicated in table 4.3, the majority of the participants were determined to be between the ages of 18 and 23.

Table 4.4  
*Percentages of Students to Faculty/Vocational High School*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Vocational high school of Iğdir	124	37,9	37,9	37,9
	Fac. Of Theology	144	44,0	44,0	82,0
	Fac. Of engineering	14	4,3	4,3	86,2
	Vocational high school of Med. Serv.	18	5,5	5,5	91,7
	Fac. Of Agriculture	27	8,3	8,3	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

Table 4.4 shows that the percents of students from Vocational High School of Iğdir, Faculty of Theology, Faculty of Engineering, Vocational School of Medical Services and Faculty of Agriculture were 37,9%, 44,0%, 4,3%, 5,5% and 8,3%, respectively.

#### 4.1.2. Percentages of Student Responses According to the Items

Table 4.5  
*Percentages of the student responses to item 1*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	VERY DIFFICULT	40	12,2	12,2	12,2
	DIFFICULT	56	17,1	17,1	29,4
	MEDIUM DIFFICULT	138	42,2	42,2	71,6
	EASY	68	20,8	20,8	92,4
	VERY EASY	25	7,6	7,6	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

As shown in table 4.5, participant percents for *English language is very difficult, difficult, medium difficult, easy and very easy* in item 1 were 12,2%, 17,1%, 42,2%, 20,8% and 7,6%, respectively. The participants finding English difficult and those who

find it easy are almost the same in number and many students, almost half of the participants, find this course medium difficult.

Table 4.6  
*Percentages of the student responses to item 2*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	46	14,1	14,1	14,1
	DISAGREE	100	30,6	30,6	44,6
	I AM UNDECIDED	41	12,5	12,5	57,2
	AGREE	92	28,1	28,1	85,3
	STRONGLY AGREE	48	14,7	14,7	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

The second item of the questionnaire was “reading and writing in English are easier than speaking and understanding this language.” As it is apparent in table 4.6, percents of participating students for the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for this item were 14,1% 30,6%, 12,5%, 28,1% and 14,7%, respectively. From this result, it can be concluded that there is not a significant difference in the proportions of participant responses given to this item.

Table 4.7  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 3*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	15	4,6	4,6	4,6
	DISAGREE	24	7,3	7,3	11,9
	I AM UNDECIDED	30	9,2	9,2	21,1
	AGREE	148	45,3	45,3	66,4
	STRONGLY AGREE	110	33,6	33,6	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

The third item of the questionnaire was “I think English language will make me a more sophisticated person.” Percents of participating students for the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for i3 were 4,6% 7,3%, 9,2%, 45,3% and 33,6%, respectively. It can be induced that the majority of the students agree on the idea that knowing English language is good for their personal development.

Table 4.8  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 4*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	15	4,6	4,6	4,6
	DISAGREE	43	13,1	13,1	17,7
	I AM UNDECIDED	60	18,3	18,3	36,1
	AGREE	119	36,4	36,4	72,5
	STRONGLY AGREE	90	27,5	27,5	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

The fourth item of the questionnaire was the statement of “With the help of English, I can take part in cultural activities arranged by European Union.” As shown in table 4.8, the percents of participating students for the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for i4 were 4,6% 13,1%, 18,3%, 36,4% and 27,5%, respectively. This means that a vast number of participants find English language helpful in having intercultural relationships within Europe.

Table 4.9  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 5*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	9	2,8	2,8	2,8
	DISAGREE	18	5,5	5,5	8,3
	I AM UNDECIDED	20	6,1	6,1	14,4
	AGREE	124	37,9	37,9	52,3
	STRONGLY AGREE	156	47,7	47,7	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

The fifth item of the questionnaire was as follows: “With the help of English, I can communicate with more people.” Percents of participating students for the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for item 5 were 2,8% 5,5%, 6,1%, 37,9% and 47,7%, respectively. This result makes it clear that the majority of participating university students consider English language as a tool for a wider communication network.

Table 4.10  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 6*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	46	14,1	14,1	14,1
	DISAGREE	75	22,9	22,9	37,0
	I AM UNDECIDED	52	15,9	15,9	52,9
	AGREE	108	33,0	33,0	85,9
	STRONGLY AGREE	46	14,1	14,1	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

“With the help of English, people will respect me more.” was the sixth item of the questionnaire. As illustrated in table 4.10, percents of participating students for the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for item 6 were 14,1% 22,9%, 15,9%, 33,0% and 14,1%, respectively. The number of students agreeing this item slightly outnumbers the number of those who disagree.

Table 4.11  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 7*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	9	2,8	2,8	2,8
	DISAGREE	19	5,8	5,8	8,6
	I AM UNDECIDED	24	7,3	7,3	15,9
	AGREE	156	47,7	47,7	63,6
	STRONGLY AGREE	119	36,4	36,4	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

The seventh item of the questionnaire was “English language will help me understand other cultures.” For item 7, the percents of participating students for the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* were 2,8% 5,8%, 7,3%, 47,7% and 36,4%, respectively. It is apparent that a vast majority of the participating students agree with the significance of English language in cross-cultural empathy.

Table 4.12  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 8*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	17	5,2	5,2	5,2
	DISAGREE	16	4,9	4,9	10,1
	I AM UNDECIDED	11	3,4	3,4	13,5
	AGREE	110	33,6	33,6	47,1
	STRONGLY AGREE	173	52,9	52,9	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

The eight item of the questionnaire was “English language is crucial for an academic career.” Table 4.12 indicates that percents of participating students for the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* were 5,2% 4,9%, 3,4%, 33,6% and 52,9%, respectively. From this result, it can be deduced that most of the university students having participated the questionnaire have agreed on the idea that English language is necessary for an academic career.

Table 4.13  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 9*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	11	3,4	3,4	3,4
	DISAGREE	21	6,4	6,4	9,8
	I AM UNDECIDED	12	3,7	3,7	13,5
	AGREE	118	36,1	36,1	49,5
	STRONGLY AGREE	165	50,5	50,5	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

The ninth item of the questionnaire was “English language will help me find a better job.” The percents of the participating students for the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for item 9 were 3,4% 6,4%, 3,7%, 36,1% and 50,5%, respectively, which means that a large number of participants feel the need of English for a better career.

Table 4.14  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 10*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	179	54,7	54,7	54,7
	DISAGREE	115	35,2	35,2	89,9
	I AM UNDECIDED	16	4,9	4,9	94,8
	AGREE	8	2,4	2,4	97,2
	STRONGLY AGREE	9	2,8	2,8	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

The last item of the first section was “It is not important to learn English language.” Percents of participating students for the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for item 10 were 54,7%, 35,2%, 4,9%, 2,4% and 2,8%, respectively. As it is clearly understood, the participating students, except few, are aware of the significance of English language.

Table 4.15  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 11*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	10	3,1	3,1	3,1
	DISAGREE	40	12,2	12,2	15,3
	I AM UNDECIDED	35	10,7	10,7	26,0
	AGREE	171	52,3	52,3	78,3
	STRONGLY AGREE	71	21,7	21,7	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

The eleventh item of the questionnaire, and the first one in the second part, was “I attend the English courses regularly.” Students’ percents for the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for item 11 were 3,1% 12,2%, 10,7%, 52,3% and 21,7%, respectively, which indicates that nearly three fourth of the participating students attend English classes routinely.

Table 4.16  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 12*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	24	7,3	7,3	7,3
	DISAGREE	47	14,4	14,4	21,7
	I AM UNDECIDED	53	16,2	16,2	37,9
	AGREE	142	43,4	43,4	81,3
	STRONGLY AGREE	61	18,7	18,7	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

The twelfth item of the questionnaire was “The topics in the English courses draw my interest.” Student percentages for the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for twelfth item were 7,3% 14,4%, 16,2%, 43,4% and 18,7%, respectively. More than half of the students seemingly find the topics in this course interesting.

Table 4.17  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 13*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	51	15,6	15,6	15,6
	DISAGREE	74	22,6	22,6	38,2
	I AM UNDECIDED	61	18,7	18,7	56,9
	AGREE	110	33,6	33,6	90,5
	STRONGLY AGREE	31	9,5	9,5	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

The thirteenth item of the questionnaire was “Course materials help us learn English.” Participating students gave the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for item 13 with the percentages of 15,6%, 22,6%, 18,7%, 33,6% and 9,5%, respectively. Regarding these results, it can be said that though the students differ in their responses, the number of those who agree on this item slightly outnumber those who disagree.

Table 4.18  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 14*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	45	13,8	13,8	13,8
	DISAGREE	100	30,6	30,6	44,3
	I AM UNDECIDED	49	15,0	15,0	59,3
	AGREE	94	28,7	28,7	88,1
	STRONGLY AGREE	39	11,9	11,9	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

The fourteenth item of the questionnaire was “I find it difficult to understand the course book and related handouts.” Regarding this item, the percentages of participating students for the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for were 13,8%, 30,6%, 15,0%, 28,7% and 11,9%, respectively. The agreeing and disagreeing students are almost similar in number.

Table 4.19  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 15*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	66	20,2	20,2	20,2
	DISAGREE	153	46,8	46,8	67,0
	I AM UNDECIDED	54	16,5	16,5	83,5
	AGREE	42	12,8	12,8	96,3
	STRONGLY AGREE	12	3,7	3,7	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

The fifteenth item of the questionnaire was “I find the course book and related handouts easy/below my level.” Percents of participating students for the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for this item were 20,2% 46,8%, 16,5%, 12,8% and 3,7%, respectively. This result indicates that three fourth of the students do not find the course book easy or below their level.

Table 4.20  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 16*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	75	22,9	22,9	22,9
	DISAGREE	57	17,4	17,4	40,4
	I AM UNDECIDED	50	15,3	15,3	55,7
	AGREE	99	30,3	30,3	85,9
	STRONGLY AGREE	46	14,1	14,1	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

The sixteenth item of the questionnaire was “Oral exams should take place in the assessment and evaluation process.” For item 16, student student percents for the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* were 22,9% 17,4%, 15,3%, 30,3% and 14,1%, respectively.

Table 4.21  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 17*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	13	4,0	4,0	4,0
	DISAGREE	24	7,3	7,3	11,3
	I AM UNDECIDED	39	11,9	11,9	23,2
	AGREE	156	47,7	47,7	70,9
	STRONGLY AGREE	95	29,1	29,1	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

The seventeenth item of the questionnaire was “Objective tests (true-false, matching, completing, etc.) should take place in the assessment and evaluation process.”

As shown in table 4.21, the percents of the participating students for the responses of *I strongly disagree, I disagree, I am undecided, I agree and I strongly agree* for item 17 were 4,0% 7,3%, 11,9%, 47,7% and 29,1%, respectively. This result reflects the fact that the majority of participating students believe that objective tests are necessary in assessing and evaluating their improvements.

Table 4.22  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 18*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	13	4,0	4,0	4,0
	DISAGREE	21	6,4	6,4	10,4
	I AM UNDECIDED	27	8,3	8,3	18,7
	AGREE	134	41,0	41,0	59,6
	STRONGLY AGREE	132	40,4	40,4	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

The eighteenth item of the questionnaire was “There should be more practical language use during the classes.” Percents of participating students for the responses of *I strongly disagree, I disagree, I am undecided, I agree and I strongly agree* for item 18 were 4,0% 6,4%, 8,3%, 41,0% and 40,4%, respectively. With this result, it can be concluded that a great majority, 81,4 %, of the students would like to use English language actively in classroom.

Table 4.23  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 19*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	20	6,1	6,1	6,1
	DISAGREE	79	24,2	24,2	30,3
	I AM UNDECIDED	34	10,4	10,4	40,7
	AGREE	139	42,5	42,5	83,2
	STRONGLY AGREE	55	16,8	16,8	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

The nineteenth item of the questionnaire was “I actively attend to English classes.” Students percents for the responses of *I strongly disagree, I disagree, I am*

*undecided, I agree and I strongly agree* for this item were 6,1% 24,2%, 10,4%, 42,5% and 16,8%, respectively. It is evident that more than half of the students claim that they take part in classroom activities actively and roughly one third of the students state that they do not participate to the lessons.

Table 4.24  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 20A*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	128	39,1	39,1	39,1
	DISAGREE	116	35,5	35,5	74,6
	I AM UNDECIDED	34	10,4	10,4	85,0
	AGREE	31	9,5	9,5	94,5
	STRONGLY AGREE	18	5,5	5,5	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

Item 20A was “I do not actively attend to English classes because I am not interested in English.” Participating students gave the responses of *I strongly disagree, I disagree, I am undecided, I agree and I strongly agree* for i20A with the percents of 39,1%, 35,5%, 10,4%, 9,5% and 5,5%, respectively. Considering this result, it can be deduced that approximately 75% of the participants claim that being uninterested in English language course is not the reason for not attending the courses.

Table 4.25  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 20B*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	104	31,8	31,8	31,8
	DISAGREE	122	37,3	37,3	69,1
	I AM UNDECIDED	22	6,7	6,7	75,8
	AGREE	59	18,0	18,0	93,9
	STRONGLY AGREE	20	6,1	6,1	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

Item 20B was “I do not actively attend to English classes because the classes are usually teacher-centered and one-sided.” Percents of participating students for the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for item 20B were 31,8% 37,3%, 6,7%, 18,0% and 6,1%, respectively. From this result, it can be inferred that for most of the participants, teacher-centered and one-sided lessons are not the reason for being passive during classes.

Table 4.26  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 20C*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	94	28,7	28,7	28,7
	DISAGREE	118	36,1	36,1	64,8
	I AM UNDECIDED	34	10,4	10,4	75,2
	AGREE	56	17,1	17,1	92,4
	STRONGLY AGREE	25	7,6	7,6	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

Item 20C of the questionnaire was “I do not actively attend to English classes because I cannot catch up with the lessons”. The participating students gave the answers of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for item 20C with the percentages of 28,7% 36,1%, 10,4%, 17,1% and 7,6%, respectively. Though one fourth of the participants agree with this view, apparently more than half of the students do not agree with this.

Table 4.27  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 20D*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	170	52,0	52,0	52,0
	DISAGREE	98	30,0	30,0	82,0
	I AM UNDECIDED	23	7,0	7,0	89,0
	AGREE	15	4,6	4,6	93,6
	STRONGLY AGREE	21	6,4	6,4	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

The item number 20D was “I do not actively attend to English classes because I find the instructor insufficient in the field.” Percents of participating students for the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for item 20D were 52,0% 30,0%, 7,0%, 4,6% and 6,4%, respectively. This result has shown that only a very small number of students stated that the instructor’s insufficiency is a reason for not participating in the activities.

Table 4.28  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 20E*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	121	37,0	37,0	37,0
	DISAGREE	103	31,5	31,5	68,5
	I AM UNDECIDED	33	10,1	10,1	78,6
	AGREE	43	13,1	13,1	91,7
	STRONGLY AGREE	27	8,3	8,3	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

The item number 20E was “I do not actively attend to English classes because I am shy about speaking English/I feel shy in front of my friends.” Table 4.28 above illustrates that percents of participating students for the responses of *I strongly disagree*,

*I disagree, I am undecided, I agree and I strongly agree* for item 20E were 37,0%, 31,5%, 10,1%, 13,1% and 8,3%, respectively, which means that a significant number of students do not agree on this item.

The item number 20F was asking the students to indicate other reasons, if there are any, for not attending the courses actively. The most common answer the students gave was that they could not catch up with the lessons because they could not understand the language and they felt shy while speaking in English in front of their classmates. These students are seemingly the twenty percent of the participants, who agreed on the previous item which indicated being shy to speak in front of others as a reason for not attending this course. They stated that they could not be sure about the accuracy of pronunciation since English language is not spoken as it is written. Here are the comments that some of the students made:

A nineteen-year-old female student studying at the Faculty of theology says:

“We, the girls, generally feel shy about speaking in front of others, particularly the boys in the classroom.”<sup>1</sup>

A twenty-year-old male Theology student states:

“I cannot speak this language. It is not spoken as it is written.”<sup>2</sup>

Another male theology student at the age of 27 complains:

“I want to participate but I cannot find anybody to speak or to do practice with.”<sup>3</sup>

A twenty-year-old female participant from the Faculty of Theology says:

“I cannot put my knowledge into practice and I lack self-confidence.”<sup>4</sup>

A twenty-one-year-old student from the Vocational High School of Iğdır is of this opinion:

“I have difficulty in understanding and speaking English, which makes me shy at the classes.”<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Diğer insanlardan çekiniyorum, sınıftaki erkeklerden çekiniyoruz genel olarak.

<sup>2</sup> Konuşamıyorum. Yazıldığı gibi okunmuyor.

<sup>3</sup> Katılmak istiyorum ama pratik yapmada arkadaş bulamıyorum.

<sup>4</sup> Pratiğe dökemiyorum ve öz güvenim eksik.

<sup>5</sup> İngilizceyi anlamakta konuşmakta güçlük çekiyorum, bu yüzden derste çekingen oluyorum.

Another participant from the Vocational High School of Iğdır writes:

“I feel shy to speak. Pronunciations of the words feel ridiculous.”<sup>6</sup>

A student from the Faculty of Agriculture says:

“I cannot pronounce the words.”<sup>7</sup>

In the third part of the questionnaire, the students are asked about the problems that may presumably lead to be unsuccessful in English courses. This part is composed of three sub-sections: problems stemming from the students, problems stemming from the instructor and problems stemming from the curriculum, physical conditions and educational system.

Table 4.29  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 21*

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	73	22,3	22,3
	DISAGREE	104	31,8	54,1
	I AM UNDECIDED	39	11,9	66,1
	AGREE	76	23,2	89,3
	STRONGLY AGREE	35	10,7	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0

The twenty-first item is the first item of the first subsection of the third part. It is “Lack of tendency to foreign language learning”. Percents of student responses of *I strongly disagree, I disagree, I am undecided, I agree and I strongly agree* to item 21 were 22,3% 31,8%, 11,9%, 23,2% and 10,7%, respectively. According to the results, there is a small difference between the number of agreeing and disagreeing students.

<sup>6</sup> Konuşmaya çekiniyorum, kelime kullanımı komik bir duruma sebep oluyor.

<sup>7</sup> Telaffuzu yapamıyorum.

Table 4.30  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 22*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	100	30,6	30,6	30,6
	DISAGREE	120	36,7	36,7	67,3
	I AM UNDECIDED	30	9,2	9,2	76,5
	AGREE	53	16,2	16,2	92,7
	STRONGLY AGREE	24	7,3	7,3	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

Being the second item of the third part, item 22 was “Dislike for foreign language.” As it is apparent from table 4.30, percents of participating students for the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for item 22 were 30,6% 36,7%, 9,2%, 16,2% and 7,3%, respectively. Here, it can be inferred that the participants, in majority, do not feel dislike against English language.

Table 4.31  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 23*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	90	27,5	27,5	27,5
	DISAGREE	118	36,1	36,1	63,6
	I AM UNDECIDED	36	11,0	11,0	74,6
	AGREE	55	16,8	16,8	91,4
	STRONGLY AGREE	28	8,6	8,6	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

Third item of the third part, item 23 was “Being prejudiced against foreign language.” As table 4.31 indicates, participants’ percents for the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for item 23 were 27,5% 36,1%, 11,0%, 16,8% and 8,6%, respectively. Here it is possible to infer that

more than half of the students think that there is not a prejudice problem in English course.

Table 4.32  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 24*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	44	13,5	13,5	13,5
	DISAGREE	37	11,3	11,3	24,8
	I AM UNDECIDED	10	3,1	3,1	27,8
	AGREE	103	31,5	31,5	59,3
	STRONGLY AGREE	133	40,7	40,7	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

The fourth item of the last section, item 24 was “Finishing high school with insufficient foreign language knowledge” under the subtitle of the problems stemming from the student. Percents of participating students for the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for 24<sup>th</sup> item were 13,5% 11,3%, 3,1%, 31,5% and 40,7%, respectively. As table 4.32 demonstrates, a clear majority of the students consider finishing high school with insufficient foreign language knowledge as a reason for being unsuccessful at English courses at university level.

Table 4.33  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 25*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	51	15,6	15,6	15,6
	DISAGREE	63	19,3	19,3	34,9
	I AM UNDECIDED	29	8,9	8,9	43,7
	AGREE	115	35,2	35,2	78,9
	STRONGLY AGREE	69	21,1	21,1	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

The 25<sup>th</sup> item of the questionnaire was “Focusing on only passing the exams” under the subtitle of the problems stemming from the student. Student percentages for the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for item 25 were 15,6% 19,3%, 8,9%, 35,2% and 21,1%, respectively. It is apparent that more than half of the students accept that they become unsuccessful at this course because of an exam-centered consideration.

Table 4.34  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 26*

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	71	21,7	21,7	21,7
	DISAGREE	91	27,8	27,8	49,5
	I AM UNDECIDED	45	13,8	13,8	63,3
	AGREE	73	22,3	22,3	85,6
	STRONGLY AGREE	47	14,4	14,4	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

The 26<sup>th</sup> item of the questionnaire was “Having insufficient mother tongue knowledge” under the subtitle of the problems stemming from the student. Participant percents for the options of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for item 26 were 21,7% 27,8%, 13,8%, 22,3% and 14,4%, respectively. Those who agree with this notion are very close in number to – though less than those who disagree.

Table 4.35  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 27*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	68	20,8	20,8	20,8
	DISAGREE	102	31,2	31,2	52,0
	I AM UNDECIDED	39	11,9	11,9	63,9
	AGREE	82	25,1	25,1	89,0
	STRONGLY AGREE	36	11,0	11,0	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

In item 27, “reluctance” was given as a problem stemming from the students. The percents of participating students giving the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for 27<sup>th</sup> item were 20,8%, 31,2%, 11,9%, 25,1% and 11,0%, respectively. The number of those who disagreed on this item outnumbered the ones who agreed on it.

Table 4.36  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 28*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	87	26,6	26,6	26,6
	DISAGREE	97	29,7	29,7	56,3
	I AM UNDECIDED	32	9,8	9,8	66,1
	AGREE	81	24,8	24,8	90,8
	STRONGLY AGREE	30	9,2	9,2	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

“Leisureliness after the university entrance exam” was the 28<sup>th</sup> item presented in the questionnaire as a potential reason for failure in English courses. The percents of participating students for the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for item 28 were 26,6%, 29,7%, 9,8%, 24,8% and 9,2%, respectively, which means that more than half of the participants do not agree on this item.

Table 4.37  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 29*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	135	41,3	41,3	41,3
	DISAGREE	116	35,5	35,5	76,8
	I AM UNDECIDED	19	5,8	5,8	82,6
	AGREE	36	11,0	11,0	93,6
	STRONGLY AGREE	21	6,4	6,4	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

“Economic, familial and personal reasons” was another probable reason shown in the questionnaire for being unsuccessful in English courses. Percents of participating students for the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for item 29 were 41,3%, 35,5%, 5,8%, 11,0% and 6,4%, respectively. This result makes it clear that students do not think that out-of-classroom factors interfere with success in this course.

Table 4.38  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 30*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	46	14,1	14,1	14,1
	DISAGREE	59	18,0	18,0	32,1
	I AM UNDECIDED	25	7,6	7,6	39,8
	AGREE	125	38,2	38,2	78,0
	STRONGLY AGREE	72	22,0	22,0	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

The last item under the subtitle of problems stemming from the students was “Not studying regularly”. As indicated in table 4.38, participating students gave the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for item number 30 with the percents of 14,1%, 18,0%, 7,6%, 38,2% and 22,0%, respectively. It is apparent that almost two third of the students accept that they become unsuccessful in this course because they do not study on a regular basis.

Table 4.39  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 31*

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	197	60,2	60,2	60,2
	DISAGREE	81	24,8	24,8	85,0
	I AM UNDECIDED	20	6,1	6,1	91,1
	AGREE	13	4,0	4,0	95,1
	STRONGLY AGREE	16	4,9	4,9	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

Including the 31<sup>st</sup> item, the following 7 items were the problems stemming from the instructors. As there is not much difference in the student responses to these items, they will be assessed as a whole. The percents of participating students for the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for the item of “Coming to class half-heartedly” were 60,2% 24,8%, 6,1%, 4,0% and 4,9%, respectively.

The percents of participating students for the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for item 32, which was “Lack of communication” were 42,5% 24,5%, 7,0%, 17,7% and 8,3%, respectively. “Lecturing in a teacher-centered and boring way” was the 33<sup>rd</sup> item, for which percents of participating students for the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* were 48,3% 26,0%, 7,0%, 11,6% and 7,0%, respectively. “Being too disciplined” was the 34<sup>th</sup> item and the percentages of responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for this item were 41,3% 30,3%, 9,2%, 11,3% and 8,0%, respectively. The 35<sup>th</sup> item, “Being unable to discipline and control the class”, had the participant percents of 52,0% 32,4%, 4,6%, 6,4% and 4,6%, for the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree*, respectively. The 36<sup>th</sup> item was “Being confined to course book” and percentages of participating students giving the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for item number 36 were 30,3% 26,0%, 8,9%, 20,5% and 14,4%, respectively. Being the last

item under the subtitle of problems stemming from the instructor, 37<sup>th</sup> item was “Promoting memorization”. Percents of participating students for the responses of *I strongly disagree, I disagree, I am undecided, I agree and I strongly agree* for 37<sup>th</sup> item were 43,1% 30,0%, 8,3%, 11,0% and 7,6%, respectively.

As the figures above and the tables 4.40, 4.41, 4.42, 4.43, 4.44 and 4.45 below clearly indicate, students mostly do not agree on any problems stemming from the instructor as a reason for being unsuccessful at English course.

Table 4.40  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 32*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	139	42,5	42,5	42,5
	DISAGREE	80	24,5	24,5	67,0
	I AM UNDECIDED	23	7,0	7,0	74,0
	AGREE	58	17,7	17,7	91,7
	STRONGLY AGREE	27	8,3	8,3	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

Table 4.41  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 33*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	158	48,3	48,3	48,3
	DISAGREE	85	26,0	26,0	74,3
	I AM UNDECIDED	23	7,0	7,0	81,3
	AGREE	38	11,6	11,6	93,0
	STRONGLY AGREE	23	7,0	7,0	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

Table 4.42  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 34*

		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	135	41,3	41,3	41,3
	DISAGREE	99	30,3	30,3	71,6
	I AM UNDECIDED	30	9,2	9,2	80,7
	AGREE	37	11,3	11,3	92,0
	STRONGLY AGREE	26	8,0	8,0	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

Table 4.43  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 35*

		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	170	52,0	52,0	52,0
	DISAGREE	106	32,4	32,4	84,4
	I AM UNDECIDED	15	4,6	4,6	89,0
	AGREE	21	6,4	6,4	95,4
	STRONGLY AGREE	15	4,6	4,6	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

Table 4.44  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 36*

		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	99	30,3	30,3	30,3
	DISAGREE	85	26,0	26,0	56,3
	I AM UNDECIDED	29	8,9	8,9	65,1
	AGREE	67	20,5	20,5	85,6
	STRONGLY AGREE	47	14,4	14,4	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

Table 4.45  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 37*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	141	43,1	43,1	43,1
	DISAGREE	98	30,0	30,0	73,1
	I AM UNDECIDED	27	8,3	8,3	81,3
	AGREE	36	11,0	11,0	92,4
	STRONGLY AGREE	25	7,6	7,6	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

Table 4.46  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 38*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	77	23,5	23,5	23,5
	DISAGREE	98	30,0	30,0	53,5
	I AM UNDECIDED	30	9,2	9,2	62,7
	AGREE	68	20,8	20,8	83,5
	STRONGLY AGREE	54	16,5	16,5	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

Including the 38<sup>th</sup> item, the following ten items were under the subtitle of problems stemming from the curriculum, physical conditions and educational system. Percents of participating students for the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for item 38, which was “Having an intensive program in a short period of time” were 23,5% 30,0%, 9,2%, 20,8% and 16,5%, respectively. As also shown in table 4.46, the disagreeing students slightly outnumbered the agreeing participants.

Table 4.47  
 Percentages of the student answers to item 39

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	104	31,8	31,8	31,8
	DISAGREE	131	40,1	40,1	71,9
	I AM UNDECIDED	24	7,3	7,3	79,2
	AGREE	39	11,9	11,9	91,1
	STRONGLY AGREE	29	8,9	8,9	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

“The irrelevance between the course and the department” was the 39<sup>th</sup> item in the questionnaire and participant percents for the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for this item were 31,8% 40,1%, 7,3%, 11,9% and 8,9%, respectively. This result means that most, more than two third, of the participants do not agree on the idea that the irrelevance between the course and the department is a reason for being unsuccessful in this course.

Table 4.48  
 Percentages of the student answers to item 40

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	59	18,0	18,0	18,0
	DISAGREE	56	17,1	17,1	35,2
	I AM UNDECIDED	38	11,6	11,6	46,8
	AGREE	112	34,3	34,3	81,0
	STRONGLY AGREE	62	19,0	19,0	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

“Absence of diverse activities during the classes” was the 40<sup>th</sup> item in the questionnaire and participant percents for the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for this item were 18,0%, 17,1%,

11,6%, 34,3% and 19,0%, respectively. These figures, as also illustrated in table 4.48, have shown that more than half of the students would like to see diverse activities in English classes.

Table 4.49  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 41*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	39	11,9	11,9	11,9
	DISAGREE	52	15,9	15,9	27,8
	I AM UNDECIDED	26	8,0	8,0	35,8
	AGREE	118	36,1	36,1	71,9
	STRONGLY AGREE	92	28,1	28,1	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

“Unavailability of practical language use” was the 41<sup>st</sup> item in the questionnaire and as shown in table 4.49, participant percents for the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for item 41 were 11,9%, 15,9%, 8,0%, 36,1% and 28,1%, respectively. This result clearly indicates that most of the university students demand more communicative activities in the classroom.

Table 4.50  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 42*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	83	25,4	25,4	25,4
	DISAGREE	112	34,3	34,3	59,6
	I AM UNDECIDED	34	10,4	10,4	70,0
	AGREE	59	18,0	18,0	88,1
	STRONGLY AGREE	39	11,9	11,9	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

“Over-crowded classrooms” was the 42<sup>nd</sup> item in the questionnaire and as shown in table 4.50, participant percents for the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for item 42 were 25,4%, 34,3%, 10,4%, 18,0% and 11,9%, respectively. As it is apparent from the figures, most of the university students do not have the problem of overcrowded classrooms. By all means, different number of students study in each department, therefore the answers may vary accordingly.

Table 4. 51  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 43*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	72	22,0	22,0	22,0
	DISAGREE	91	27,8	27,8	49,8
	I AM UNDECIDED	27	8,3	8,3	58,1
	AGREE	82	25,1	25,1	83,2
	STRONGLY AGREE	55	16,8	16,8	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

“Insufficient course hours” was the 43<sup>rd</sup> item in the questionnaire and as shown in table 4.51, participant percents for the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for item 43 were 22,0%, 27,8%, 8,3%, 25,1% and 16,8%, respectively. These figures indicate that the agreeing and disagreeing students are very close in number.

Table 4.52  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 44*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	82	25,1	25,1	25,1
	DISAGREE	103	31,5	31,5	56,6
	I AM UNDECIDED	50	15,3	15,3	71,9
	AGREE	57	17,4	17,4	89,3
	STRONGLY AGREE	35	10,7	10,7	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

“Difficulty of the exams” was the 44<sup>th</sup> item in the questionnaire and as seen in table 4.52, participant percents for the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for this item were 25,1%, 31,5%, 15,3%, 17,4% and 10,7%, respectively. Obviously, almost two third of the participants disagree on the view that the exams are more difficult than they expect.

Table 4.53  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 45*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	72	22,0	22,0	22,0
	DISAGREE	93	28,4	28,4	50,5
	I AM UNDECIDED	58	17,7	17,7	68,2
	AGREE	52	15,9	15,9	84,1
	STRONGLY AGREE	52	15,9	15,9	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

“Inefficacy of the exams in measuring student improvement” was the 45<sup>th</sup> item in the questionnaire and as shown in table 4.53, participant percents for the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for this item were 22,0%, 28,4%, 17,7%, 15,9% and 15,9%, respectively.

Table 4.54  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 46*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	89	27,2	27,2	27,2
	DISAGREE	86	26,3	26,3	53,5
	I AM UNDECIDED	43	13,1	13,1	66,7
	AGREE	64	19,6	19,6	86,2
	STRONGLY AGREE	45	13,8	13,8	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

“Taking the course compulsorily” was the 46<sup>th</sup> item in the questionnaire and as shown in table 4.54, participant percents for the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for item 46 were 27,2%, 26,3%, 13,1%, 19,6% and 13,8%, respectively. These figures indicate that many students do not view taking the course compulsorily as a reason for failure in this course.

Table 4.55  
*Percentages of the student answers to item 47*

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Valid	STRONGLY DISAGREE	74	22,6	22,6	22,6
	DISAGREE	80	24,5	24,5	47,1
	I AM UNDECIDED	43	13,1	13,1	60,2
	AGREE	66	20,2	20,2	80,4
	STRONGLY AGREE	64	19,6	19,6	100,0
	Total	327	100,0	100,0	

“The fact that educational system is based upon memorization” was the 47<sup>th</sup> item in the questionnaire under the subtitle of problems stemming from the curriculum, physical conditions and the educational system. As indicated in table 4.55, participant percents for the responses of *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for this item were 22,6%, 24,5%, 13,1%, 20,2% and 19,6%, respectively.

At the end of the questionnaire, there was an open-ended question which asked the participants to write extra views or comments, if any, they would like to add. When the student comments in this section were analyzed, it was deduced that there is not a significant issue excluded in this questionnaire as most of the responding students wrote statements similar to what the items of the questionnaire indicated. Here are some examples of responses written by the participants:

“I want this course to be based on conversations and dialogues. We do not have basic knowledge so some of us do not like this course, but I like and want to learn this language.”<sup>8</sup>

“I really want to learn and speak English but it seems hard as we didn’t get required education beforehand.”<sup>9</sup>

“This course teaches us a language which is necessary throughout our lives. We need to learn this language voluntarily in order to reach other communities.”<sup>10</sup>

“The lessons are sometimes over the students’ level. I would like the teacher to teach at the students’ level.”<sup>11</sup>

“English language course is a necessary lesson and English language is required for a contemporary society. It is vital to increase the opportunities and to make this lesson more entertaining.”<sup>12</sup>

“It is much better to do more practice in English lessons. Course hours are insufficient and we lack basic knowledge of this language, so we fall behind the lessons.”<sup>13</sup>

#### 4.1.3. Response Percentages of items in Terms of Gender

The analysis results have shown that students’ genders do not have a significant influence on their responses for most of the items investigated. For only six items (items number 1, 2, 9, 14, 20B and 21), there is a statistically significant association between the variable of gender and student responses and the tables illustrating these results are as follows:

---

<sup>8</sup> İşlenen dersin dialog kurarak ve konuşarak olmasını isterim. Temelimiz olmadığı için bazı arkadaşlar sevmiyor fakat benim sevdiğim ve öğrenmek istediğim bir ders.

<sup>9</sup> İngilizceyi konuşmayı ve öğrenmeyi çok istiyorum, fakat sağlam bir temel olmadığından biraz zor geliyor.

<sup>10</sup> İngilizce dersi bize hayatımız boyunca gerekli olan bir dil öğretiyor. Bizim de kitlelere ulaşmamız için bu dili severek öğrenmemiz gerekiyor.

<sup>11</sup> Dersler bazen öğrencinin seviyesinin üzerinde oluyor. Biraz öğrenci seviyesine inilerek anlatılmasını isterim.

<sup>12</sup> İngilizce dersi okunması ve öğrenilmesi gereken bir derstir. Aynı zamanda çağdaş bir topluma gitme yolunda gerekli bir dildir. Olanakların artırılması ve bu dersin daha eğlenceli hale getirilmesi gerekir..

<sup>13</sup> İngilizce dersinde daha çok pratik yapılırsa daha iyi olur. Ders saati yetersiz, bu dilde temelimiz yok bu yüzden de derste konunun gerisinde kalıyoruz.

Table 4.56.  
*Response Percentages in Terms of Gender for item 1*

		<b>i1</b>					<b>Total</b>
		<b>VERY DIFFICULT</b>	<b>DIFFICULT</b>	<b>MEDIUM DIFFICULT</b>	<b>EASY</b>	<b>VERY EASY</b>	
gender	Count	25	39	70	26	14	174
	Expected Count	21,3	29,8	73,4	36,2	13,3	174,0
	female % within gender	14,4%	22,4%	40,2%	14,9%	8,0%	100,0%
	% within i1	62,5%	69,6%	50,7%	38,2%	56,0%	53,2%
	% of Total	7,6%	11,9%	21,4%	8,0%	4,3%	53,2%
	Count	15	17	68	42	11	153
	Expected Count	18,7	26,2	64,6	31,8	11,7	153,0
	male % within gender	9,8%	11,1%	44,4%	27,5%	7,2%	100,0%
	% within i1	37,5%	30,4%	49,3%	61,8%	44,0%	46,8%
	% of Total	4,6%	5,2%	20,8%	12,8%	3,4%	46,8%
Total	Count	40	56	138	68	25	327
	Expected Count	40,0	56,0	138,0	68,0	25,0	327,0
	% within gender	12,2%	17,1%	42,2%	20,8%	7,6%	100,0%
	% within i1	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	12,2%	17,1%	42,2%	20,8%	7,6%	100,0%

Chi-Square statistic: 14.006 (P<0.01)

G statistic: 14.247 (P<0.01)

Chi-Square and G statistics reflected that the association between gender and i1 was statistically significant (P<0.01).

As seen in table 4.56, the percents of female participants responding to the items *English language is very difficult, difficult, medium difficult, easy* and *very easy* were 14,4%, 22,4%, 40,2%, 14,9% and 8,0 respectively. The percents of male participants responding to the same items were 9,8%, 11,1%, 44,4%, 27,5% and 7,2%, respectively.

Table 4.57  
*Response Percentages in Terms of Gender for item 2*

		<b>i2</b>					<b>Total</b>
		<b>STRONGLY DISAGREE</b>	<b>DISAGREE</b>	<b>I AM UNDECIDED</b>	<b>AGREE</b>	<b>STRONGLY AGREE</b>	
gender	Count	33	46	25	43	27	174
	Expected Count	24,5	53,2	21,8	49,0	25,5	174,0
	female % within gender	19,0%	26,4%	14,4%	24,7%	15,5%	100,0%
	% within i2	71,7%	46,0%	61,0%	46,7%	56,3%	53,2%
	% of Total	10,1%	14,1%	7,6%	13,1%	8,3%	53,2%
	Count	13	54	16	49	21	153
	Expected Count	21,5	46,8	19,2	43,0	22,5	153,0
	male % within gender	8,5%	35,3%	10,5%	32,0%	13,7%	100,0%
	% within i2	28,3%	54,0%	39,0%	53,3%	43,8%	46,8%
	% of Total	4,0%	16,5%	4,9%	15,0%	6,4%	46,8%
Total	Count	46	100	41	92	48	327
	Expected Count	46,0	100,0	41,0	92,0	48,0	327,0
	% within gender	14,1%	30,6%	12,5%	28,1%	14,7%	100,0%
	% within i2	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	14,1%	30,6%	12,5%	28,1%	14,7%	100,0%

Chi-Square statistic: 11.150(P<0.01)      G statistic: 11.419 (P<0.01)

Chi-Square and G statistics reflected that the association between gender and i2 was statistically significant (P<0.01).

Table 4.57 indicates that percentages for *I totally disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I totally agree* in i2 for female students were 19.0%, 26.4%, 14.4%, 24.7% and 15.5, respectively. Male students' percentages for the corresponding responses were 8.5%, 35.3%, 10.5%, 32.0% and 13.7%, respectively.

Table 4.58  
*Response Percentages in Terms of Gender for item 9*

		<b>i9</b>					<b>Total</b>	
		<b>STRONGLY DISAGREE</b>	<b>DISAGREE</b>	<b>I AM UNDECIDED</b>	<b>AGREE</b>	<b>STRONGLY AGREE</b>		
gender	female	Count	8	17	7	74	68	174
		Expected Count	5,9	11,2	6,4	62,8	87,8	174,0
		% within gender	4,6%	9,8%	4,0%	42,5%	39,1%	100,0%
		% within i9	72,7%	81,0%	58,3%	62,7%	41,2%	53,2%
		% of Total	2,4%	5,2%	2,1%	22,6%	20,8%	53,2%
		male	Count	3	4	5	44	97
		Expected Count	5,1	9,8	5,6	55,2	77,2	153,0
		% within gender	2,0%	2,6%	3,3%	28,8%	63,4%	100,0%
		% within i9	27,3%	19,0%	41,7%	37,3%	58,8%	46,8%
		% of Total	,9%	1,2%	1,5%	13,5%	29,7%	46,8%
Total		Count	11	21	12	118	165	327
		Expected Count	11,0	21,0	12,0	118,0	165,0	327,0
		% within gender	3,4%	6,4%	3,7%	36,1%	50,5%	100,0%
		% within i9	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	3,4%	6,4%	3,7%	36,1%	50,5%	100,0%

Chi-Square statistic: 22.120 (P<0.01)      G statistic: 22.840 (P<0.01)

Chi-Square and G statistics reflected that the association between gender and i9 was statistically significant (P<0.01).

As shown in table 4.58, percentages for *I totally disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I totally agree* in i9 for female students were 4,6%, 9,8%, 4,0%, 42,5% and 39,1%, respectively. Male students' percentages for the corresponding responses were 2,0%, 2,6%, 3,3%, 28,8% and 63,4%, respectively.

Table 4.59  
 Response Percentages in Terms of Gender for item 14

		i14					Total
		STRONG LY DISAGRE F	DISAGRE E	I AM UNDECID ED	AGREE	STRONG LY AGREE	
gender	Count	18	50	32	57	17	174
	Expected Count	23,9	53,2	26,1	50,0	20,8	174,0
	female % within gender	10,3%	28,7%	18,4%	32,8%	9,8%	100,0 %
	% within i14	40,0%	50,0%	65,3%	60,6%	43,6%	53,2%
	% of Total	5,5%	15,3%	9,8%	17,4%	5,2%	53,2%
	Count	27	50	17	37	22	153
	Expected Count	21,1	46,8	22,9	44,0	18,2	153,0
	male % within gender	17,6%	32,7%	11,1%	24,2%	14,4%	100,0 %
	% within i14	60,0%	50,0%	34,7%	39,4%	56,4%	46,8%
	% of Total	8,3%	15,3%	5,2%	11,3%	6,7%	46,8%
Total	Count	45	100	49	94	39	327
	Expected Count	45,0	100,0	49,0	94,0	39,0	327,0
	% within gender	13,8%	30,6%	15,0%	28,7%	11,9%	100,0 %
	% within i14	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0 %
	% of Total	13,8%	30,6%	15,0%	28,7%	11,9%	100,0 %

Chi-Square statistic: 9.981(P<0.01)      G statistic: 10.060 (P<0.01)

When Chi-Square and G statistics were examined, it was determined that the association between gender and i14 was statistically significant (P<0.01).

As shown in table 4.59, percentages for *I totally disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I totally agree* in i14 for female students were 10,3%, 28,7%,

18,4%, 32,8% and 9,8%, respectively. Male students' percentages for the corresponding responses were 17,6%, 32,7%, 11,1%, 24,2% and 14,4%, respectively.

Table 4.60  
*Response Percentages in Terms of Gender for item 20B*

		<b>i20B</b>					<b>Total</b>
		<b>STRONGLY DISAGREE</b>	<b>DISAGREE</b>	<b>I AM UNDECIDED</b>	<b>AGREE</b>	<b>STRONGLY AGREE</b>	
gender	Count	48	57	17	39	13	174
	Expected Count	55,3	64,9	11,7	31,4	10,6	174,0
	female % within gender	27,6%	32,8%	9,8%	22,4%	7,5%	100,0%
	% within i20B	46,2%	46,7%	77,3%	66,1%	65,0%	53,2%
	% of Total	14,7%	17,4%	5,2%	11,9%	4,0%	53,2%
	male	Count	56	65	5	20	7
	Expected Count	48,7	57,1	10,3	27,6	9,4	153,0
	% within gender	36,6%	42,5%	3,3%	13,1%	4,6%	100,0%
	% within i20B	53,8%	53,3%	22,7%	33,9%	35,0%	46,8%
	% of Total	17,1%	19,9%	1,5%	6,1%	2,1%	46,8%
Total	Count	104	122	22	59	20	327
	Expected Count	104,0	122,0	22,0	59,0	20,0	327,0
	% within gender	31,8%	37,3%	6,7%	18,0%	6,1%	100,0%
	% within i20B	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	31,8%	37,3%	6,7%	18,0%	6,1%	100,0%

Chi-Square statistic: 14.314(P<0.01)      G statistic: 14.765 (P<0.01)

When Chi-Square and G statistics were examined, it was determined that that the association between gender and i20B was statistically significant (P<0.01).

As shown in table 4.60, percentages for *I totally disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I totally agree* in i20B for female students were 27,6%, 32,8%,

9,8%, 22,4% and 7,5%, respectively. Male students' percentages for the corresponding responses were 36,6%, 42,5%, 3,3%, 13,1% and 4,6%, respectively.

Table 4.61  
*Response Percentages in Terms of Gender for item 21*

		<b>i21</b>					
		<b>STRONGLY DISAGREE</b>	<b>DISAGREE</b>	<b>I AM UNDECIDED</b>	<b>AGREE</b>	<b>STRONGLY AGREE</b>	<b>Total</b>
gender	Count	38	48	25	49	14	174
	Expected Count	38,8	55,3	20,8	40,4	18,6	174,0
	female % within gender	21,8%	27,6%	14,4%	28,2%	8,0%	100,0%
	% within i21	52,1%	46,2%	64,1%	64,5%	40,0%	53,2%
	% of Total	11,6%	14,7%	7,6%	15,0%	4,3%	53,2%
	male	Count	35	56	14	27	21
Expected Count	34,2	48,7	18,2	35,6	16,4	153,0	
% within gender	22,9%	36,6%	9,2%	17,6%	13,7%	100,0%	
% within i21	47,9%	53,8%	35,9%	35,5%	60,0%	46,8%	
% of Total	10,7%	17,1%	4,3%	8,3%	6,4%	46,8%	
Total	Count	73	104	39	76	35	327
	Expected Count	73,0	104,0	39,0	76,0	35,0	327,0
	% within gender	22,3%	31,8%	11,9%	23,2%	10,7%	100,0%
	% within i21	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	22,3%	31,8%	11,9%	23,2%	10,7%	100,0%

Chi-Square statistic: 10.304(P<0.01)      G statistic: 10.405 (P<0.01)

Chi-Square and G statistics revealed that the association between gender and i21 was statistically significant (P<0.01).

As shown in table 4.61, percentages for *I totally disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I totally agree* in i21 for female students were 21,8%, 27,6%,

14,4%, 28,2% and 8,0%, respectively. Male students' percentages for the corresponding responses were 22,9%, 36,6%, 9,2%, 17,6% and 13,7%, respectively.

#### **4.1.4. Response Percentages in Terms of Faculty/ Vocational High School**

The statistical results have shown that students' faculties / vocational high schools do not have an association with their responses for more than half of the items. In this section, the association between the variable of faculty/ vocational high school and student responses will be illustrated with tables and explained in a sequence.

Table 4.62  
*Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 1*

		i1					Total	
		very difficult	difficult	medium difficult	easy	very easy		
Faculty/ vhs	Vocational high school of Igdir	Count	23	27	58	13	3	124
		Expected Count	15,2	21,2	52,3	25,8	9,5	124,0
		% within faculty	18,5%	21,8%	46,8%	10,5%	2,4%	100,0%
		% within i1	57,5%	48,2%	42,0%	19,1%	12,0%	37,9%
		% of Total	7,0%	8,3%	17,7%	4,0%	,9%	37,9%
	Fac. of theology	Count	11	17	55	40	21	144
		Expected Count	17,6	24,7	60,8	29,9	11,0	144,0
		% within faculty	7,6%	11,8%	38,2%	27,8%	14,6%	100,0%
		% within i1	27,5%	30,4%	39,9%	58,8%	84,0%	44,0%
		% of Total	3,4%	5,2%	16,8%	12,2%	6,4%	44,0%
	Fac. of engineering	Count	0	4	5	4	1	14
		Expected Count	1,7	2,4	5,9	2,9	1,1	14,0
		% within faculty	,0%	28,6%	35,7%	28,6%	7,1%	100,0%
		% within i1	,0%	7,1%	3,6%	5,9%	4,0%	4,3%
		% of Total	,0%	1,2%	1,5%	1,2%	,3%	4,3%
	Vocational high school of med. Serv.	Count	3	4	8	3	0	18
		Expected Count	2,2	3,1	7,6	3,7	1,4	18,0
		% within faculty	16,7%	22,2%	44,4%	16,7%	,0%	100,0%
		% within i1	7,5%	7,1%	5,8%	4,4%	,0%	5,5%
		% of Total	,9%	1,2%	2,4%	,9%	,0%	5,5%
Fac. of agriculture	Count	3	4	12	8	0	27	
	Expected Count	3,3	4,6	11,4	5,6	2,1	27,0	
	% within faculty	11,1%	14,8%	44,4%	29,6%	,0%	100,0%	
	% within i1	7,5%	7,1%	8,7%	11,8%	,0%	8,3%	
	% of Total	,9%	1,2%	3,7%	2,4%	,0%	8,3%	
Total	Count	40	56	138	68	25	327	
	Expected Count	40,0	56,0	138,0	68,0	25,0	327,0	
	% within faculty	12,2%	17,1%	42,2%	20,8%	7,6%	100,0%	
	% within i1	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
	% of Total	12,2%	17,1%	42,2%	20,8%	7,6%	100,0%	

Chi-Square statistic: 43.511(P<0.01)

G statistic: 49.087 (P<0.01)

Chi-Square and G statistics reflected that the association between faculty/vocational high school and i1 was found statistically significant ( $P < 0.01$ ).

Percentages for *English language is very difficult, difficult, medium difficult, easy* and *very easy* in i1 for the students of Vocational School of Iğdır were recorded as 18,5%, 21,8%, 46,8%, 10,5% and 2,4%, respectively. The related percents for the students of the Faculty of Theology were 7,6%, 11,8%, 38,2%, 27,8% and 14,6%, respectively. The percents of the participants from the Faculty of Engineering for the corresponding options were 0,0%, 28,6%, 35,7%, 28,6% and 7,1%, respectively. Percents of corresponding responses of Vocational High School of Medical Services students were observed as 16,7%, 22,2%, 44,4%, 16,7% and 0,0%, respectively. In the Faculty of Agriculture, the student percentages for mentioned options were 11,1%, 14,8%, 44,4%, 29,6% and 0,0%, respectively.

Table 4.63  
*Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 2*

		i2					Total
		I STRONGLY DISAGREE	I DISAGREE	I AM UNDECIDED	I AGREE	I STRONGLY AGREE	
Vocational high school of Iğdır	Count	29	30	15	35	15	124
	Expected Count	17,4	37,9	15,5	34,9	18,2	124,0
	% within faculty	23,4%	24,2%	12,1%	28,2%	12,1%	100,0%
	% within i2	63,0%	30,0%	36,6%	38,0%	31,3%	37,9%
	% of Total	8,9%	9,2%	4,6%	10,7%	4,6%	37,9%
Fac. of theology	Count	10	54	16	40	24	144
	Expected Count	20,3	44,0	18,1	40,5	21,1	144,0
	% within faculty	6,9%	37,5%	11,1%	27,8%	16,7%	100,0%
	% within i2	21,7%	54,0%	39,0%	43,5%	50,0%	44,0%
	% of Total	3,1%	16,5%	4,9%	12,2%	7,3%	44,0%
Faculty/ vhs	Count	3	3	2	5	1	14
	Expected Count	2,0	4,3	1,8	3,9	2,1	14,0
	% within faculty	21,4%	21,4%	14,3%	35,7%	7,1%	100,0%
	% within i2	6,5%	3,0%	4,9%	5,4%	2,1%	4,3%
	% of Total	,9%	,9%	,6%	1,5%	,3%	4,3%
Vocational high school of med. Serv.	Count	3	5	0	7	3	18
	Expected Count	2,5	5,5	2,3	5,1	2,6	18,0
	% within faculty	16,7%	27,8%	,0%	38,9%	16,7%	100,0%
	% within i2	6,5%	5,0%	,0%	7,6%	6,3%	5,5%
	% of Total	,9%	1,5%	,0%	2,1%	,9%	5,5%
Fac. of agriculture	Count	1	8	8	5	5	27
	Expected Count	3,8	8,3	3,4	7,6	4,0	27,0
	% within faculty	3,7%	29,6%	29,6%	18,5%	18,5%	100,0%
	% within i2	2,2%	8,0%	19,5%	5,4%	10,4%	8,3%
	% of Total	,3%	2,4%	2,4%	1,5%	1,5%	8,3%
Total	Count	46	100	41	92	48	327
	Expected Count	46,0	100,0	41,0	92,0	48,0	327,0
	% within faculty	14,1%	30,6%	12,5%	28,1%	14,7%	100,0%
	% within i2	100,0 %	100,0 %	100,0 %	100,0 %	100,0 %	100,0%
	% of Total	14,1%	30,6%	12,5%	28,1%	14,7%	100,0%

Chi-Square statistic: 32.450(P<0.01)

G statistic: 33.825 (P<0.01)

Chi-Square and G statistics reflected that the association between faculty/vocational high school and i2 was statistically significant ( $P < 0.01$ ).

When table 4.63 is examined, it can be seen that percentages for *I strongly disagree, I disagree, I am undecided, I agree and I strongly agree* for i2 for the students of Vocational School of Iğdır were recorded as 23,4%, 24,2%, 12,1%, 28,2% and 12,1%, respectively. The related percents for the students of the Faculty of Theology were estimated as 6,9%, 37,5%, 11,1%, 27,8% and 16,7%, respectively. The percents of the participants from the Faculty of Engineering for the corresponding options were 21,4%, 21,4%, 14,3%, 35,7% and 7,1%, respectively. Percents of corresponding responses of Vocational School of Medical Services students were observed as 16,7%, 27,8%, 0,0%, 38,9% and 16,7%, respectively. In the Faculty of Agriculture, the student percentages for mentioned options were 3,7%, 29,6%, 29,6%, 18,5% and 18,5%, respectively.

Table 4.64  
*Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 3*

		<b>i3</b>					<b>Total</b>
		<b>I STRONGLY DISAGREE</b>	<b>I DISAGREE</b>	<b>I AM UNDECIDED</b>	<b>I AGREE</b>	<b>I STRONGLY AGREE</b>	
Vocational high school of İğdır	Count	11	11	5	56	41	124
	Expected Count	5,7	9,1	11,4	56,1	41,7	124,0
	% within faculty	8,9%	8,9%	4,0%	45,2%	33,1%	100,0%
	% within i3	73,3%	45,8%	16,7%	37,8%	37,3%	37,9%
	% of Total	3,4%	3,4%	1,5%	17,1%	12,5%	37,9%
Fac. of theology	Count	4	8	19	68	45	144
	Expected Count	6,6	10,6	13,2	65,2	48,4	144,0
	% within faculty	2,8%	5,6%	13,2%	47,2%	31,3%	100,0%
	% within i3	26,7%	33,3%	63,3%	45,9%	40,9%	44,0%
	% of Total	1,2%	2,4%	5,8%	20,8%	13,8%	44,0%
Faculty/vhs Fac. of engineering	Count	0	0	0	7	7	14
	Expected Count	,6	1,0	1,3	6,3	4,7	14,0
	% within faculty	,0%	,0%	,0%	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
	% within i3	,0%	,0%	,0%	4,7%	6,4%	4,3%
	% of Total	,0%	,0%	,0%	2,1%	2,1%	4,3%
Vocational high school of med. Serv.	Count	0	3	1	9	5	18
	Expected Count	,8	1,3	1,7	8,1	6,1	18,0
	% within faculty	,0%	16,7%	5,6%	50,0%	27,8%	100,0%
	% within i3	,0%	12,5%	3,3%	6,1%	4,5%	5,5%
	% of Total	,0%	,9%	,3%	2,8%	1,5%	5,5%
Fac. of agriculture	Count	0	2	5	8	12	27
	Expected Count	1,2	2,0	2,5	12,2	9,1	27,0
	% within faculty	,0%	7,4%	18,5%	29,6%	44,4%	100,0%
	% within i3	,0%	8,3%	16,7%	5,4%	10,9%	8,3%
	% of Total	,0%	,6%	1,5%	2,4%	3,7%	8,3%
Total	Count	15	24	30	148	110	327
	Expected Count	15,0	24,0	30,0	148,0	110,0	327,0
	% within faculty	4,6%	7,3%	9,2%	45,3%	33,6%	100,0%
	% within i3	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	4,6%	7,3%	9,2%	45,3%	33,6%	100,0%

Chi-Square statistic: 27.329(P<0.05)

G statistic: 30.989 (P<0.05)

Chi-Square and G statistics reflected that the association between faculty/vocational high school and i3 was statistically significant ( $P < 0.01$ ).

As seen from table 4.64, Percentages for *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for i3 for the students of Vocational School of Iğdır were recorded as 8,9%, 8,9%, 4,0%, 45,2% and 33,1%, respectively. The related percents for the students of the Faculty of Theology were 2,8%, 5,6%, 13,2%, 47,2% and 31,3%, respectively. The percents of the participants from the Faculty of Engineering for the corresponding options were 0,0%, 0,0%, 0,0%, 50,0% and 50,0%, respectively. Percents of corresponding responses of Vocational School of Medical Services students were observed as 0,0%, 16,7%, 5,6%, 50,0% and 27,8%, respectively. In the Faculty of Agriculture, the student percentages for mentioned options were 0,0%, 7,4%, 18,5%, 29,6% and 44,4%, respectively.

Table 4.65  
*Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 8*

		<b>i8</b>					<b>Total</b>	
		<b>I STRONGLY DISAGREE</b>	<b>I DISAGREE</b>	<b>I AM UNDECIDED</b>	<b>I AGREE</b>	<b>I STRONGLY AGREE</b>		
Faculty/ vhs	Vocational high school of İğdir	Count	7	8	6	49	54	124
	Expected Count	6,4	6,1	4,2	41,7	65,6	124,0	
	% within faculty	5,6%	6,5%	4,8%	39,5%	43,5%	100,0%	
	% within i8	41,2%	50,0%	54,5%	44,5%	31,2%	37,9%	
	% of Total	2,1%	2,4%	1,8%	15,0%	16,5%	37,9%	
	Fac. of theology	Count	7	4	5	46	82	144
	Expected Count	7,5	7,0	4,8	48,4	76,2	144,0	
	% within faculty	4,9%	2,8%	3,5%	31,9%	56,9%	100,0%	
	% within i8	41,2%	25,0%	45,5%	41,8%	47,4%	44,0%	
	% of Total	2,1%	1,2%	1,5%	14,1%	25,1%	44,0%	
	Fac. of engineering	Count	0	0	0	2	12	14
	Expected Count	,7	,7	,5	4,7	7,4	14,0	
	% within faculty	,0%	,0%	,0%	14,3%	85,7%	100,0%	
	% within i8	,0%	,0%	,0%	1,8%	6,9%	4,3%	
	% of Total	,0%	,0%	,0%	,6%	3,7%	4,3%	
	Vocational high school of med. Serv.	Count	0	3	0	9	6	18
	Expected Count	,9	,9	,6	6,1	9,5	18,0	
	% within faculty	,0%	16,7%	,0%	50,0%	33,3%	100,0%	
	% within i8	,0%	18,8%	,0%	8,2%	3,5%	5,5%	
	% of Total	,0%	,9%	,0%	2,8%	1,8%	5,5%	
Fac. of agriculture	Count	3	1	0	4	19	27	
Expected Count	1,4	1,3	,9	9,1	14,3	27,0		
% within faculty	11,1%	3,7%	,0%	14,8%	70,4%	100,0%		
% within i8	17,6%	6,3%	,0%	3,6%	11,0%	8,3%		
% of Total	,9%	,3%	,0%	1,2%	5,8%	8,3%		
Total	Count	17	16	11	110	173	327	
Expected Count	17,0	16,0	11,0	110,0	173,0	327,0		
% within faculty	5,2%	4,9%	3,4%	33,6%	52,9%	100,0%		
% within i8	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%		
% of Total	5,2%	4,9%	3,4%	33,6%	52,9%	100,0%		

Chi-Square statistic: 29,581(P<0.01)

G statistic: 32,237 (P<0.01)

Chi-Square and G statistics reflected that the association between faculty/vocational high school and i8 was statistically significant ( $P < 0.01$ ).

Table 4.65 illustrates that in terms of i8, percentages for *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for the students of Vocational School of Iğdır were recorded as 5,6%, 6,5%, 4,8%, 39,5% and 43,5%, respectively. The corresponding percents for the students of the Faculty of Theology were 4,9%, 2,8%, 3,5%, 31,9% and 56,9%, respectively. The percents of the participants from the Faculty of Engineering for the corresponding options were 0,0%, 0,0%, 0,0%, 14,3% and 85,7%, respectively. Percents of corresponding responses of Vocational School of Medical Services students were observed as 0,0%, 16,7%, 0,0%, 50,0% and 33,3%, respectively. For the Faculty of Agriculture, the student percentages for mentioned options were 11,1%, 3,7%, 0,0%, 14,8% and 70,4%, respectively.

Table 4.66  
*Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 9*

		<b>i9</b>					<b>Total</b>
		<b>I STRONGLY DISAGREE</b>	<b>I DISAGREE</b>	<b>I AM UNDECIDED</b>	<b>I AGREE</b>	<b>I STRONGLY AGREE</b>	
Vocational high school of Iğdir	Count	3	6	7	55	53	124
	Expected Count	4,2	8,0	4,6	44,7	62,6	124,0
	% within faculty	2,4%	4,8%	5,6%	44,4%	42,7%	100,0%
	% within i9	27,3%	28,6%	58,3%	46,6%	32,1%	37,9%
	% of Total	,9%	1,8%	2,1%	16,8%	16,2%	37,9%
Fac. of theology	Count	6	9	1	49	79	144
	Expected Count	4,8	9,2	5,3	52,0	72,7	144,0
	% within faculty	4,2%	6,3%	,7%	34,0%	54,9%	100,0%
	% within i9	54,5%	42,9%	8,3%	41,5%	47,9%	44,0%
	% of Total	1,8%	2,8%	,3%	15,0%	24,2%	44,0%
Faculty/ vhs	Count	0	0	1	2	11	14
	Expected Count	,5	,9	,5	5,1	7,1	14,0
	% within faculty	,0%	,0%	7,1%	14,3%	78,6%	100,0%
	% within i9	,0%	,0%	8,3%	1,7%	6,7%	4,3%
	% of Total	,0%	,0%	,3%	,6%	3,4%	4,3%
Vocational high school of med. Serv.	Count	1	2	2	8	5	18
	Expected Count	,6	1,2	,7	6,5	9,1	18,0
	% within faculty	5,6%	11,1%	11,1%	44,4%	27,8%	100,0%
	% within i9	9,1%	9,5%	16,7%	6,8%	3,0%	5,5%
	% of Total	,3%	,6%	,6%	2,4%	1,5%	5,5%
Fac. of agriculture	Count	1	4	1	4	17	27
	Expected Count	,9	1,7	1,0	9,7	13,6	27,0
	% within faculty	3,7%	14,8%	3,7%	14,8%	63,0%	100,0%
	% within i9	9,1%	19,0%	8,3%	3,4%	10,3%	8,3%
	% of Total	,3%	1,2%	,3%	1,2%	5,2%	8,3%
Total	Count	11	21	12	118	165	327
	Expected Count	11,0	21,0	12,0	118,0	165,0	327,0
	% within faculty	3,4%	6,4%	3,7%	36,1%	50,5%	100,0%
	% within i9	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	3,4%	6,4%	3,7%	36,1%	50,5%	100,0%

Chi-Square statistic: 29,255(P<0.01)

G statistic: 31,633 (P<0.01)

Chi-Square and G statistics reflected that the association between faculty/vocational high school and i9 was statistically significant ( $P < 0.01$ ).

Table 4.66 illustrates that in terms of i9, percentages for *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for the students of Vocational School of Iğdır were recorded as 2,4%, 4,8%, 5,6%, 44,4% and 42,7%, respectively. The related percents for the students of the Faculty of Theology were 4,2%, 6,3%, 0,7%, 34,0% and 54,9%, respectively. The percents of the participants from the Faculty of Engineering for the corresponding options were 0,0 %, 0,0 %, 7,1%, 14,3% and 78,6%, respectively. Percents of corresponding responses of Vocational School of Medical Services students were observed as 5,6 %, 11,1%, 11,1%, 44,4% and 27,8%, respectively. For the Faculty of Agriculture, the student percentages for mentioned options were 3,7 %, 14,8%, 3,7%, 14,8% and 63,0%, respectively.

Table 4.67  
*Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 12*

		i12					Total
		I STRONGLY DISAGREE	I DISAGREE	I AM UNDECIDED	I AGREE	I STRONGLY AGREE	
Vocational high school of Iğdır	Count	15	26	20	46	17	124
	Expected Count	9,1	17,8	20,1	53,8	23,1	124,0
	% within faculty	12,1%	21,0%	16,1%	37,1%	13,7%	100,0%
	% within i12	62,5%	55,3%	37,7%	32,4%	27,9%	37,9%
	% of Total	4,6%	8,0%	6,1%	14,1%	5,2%	37,9%
Fac. of theology	Count	8	13	20	72	31	144
	Expected Count	10,6	20,7	23,3	62,5	26,9	144,0
	% within faculty	5,6%	9,0%	13,9%	50,0%	21,5%	100,0%
	% within i12	33,3%	27,7%	37,7%	50,7%	50,8%	44,0%
	% of Total	2,4%	4,0%	6,1%	22,0%	9,5%	44,0%
Faculty/ vhs Fac. of engineering	Count	0	1	4	6	3	14
	Expected Count	1,0	2,0	2,3	6,1	2,6	14,0
	% within faculty	,0%	7,1%	28,6%	42,9%	21,4%	100,0%
	% within i12	,0%	2,1%	7,5%	4,2%	4,9%	4,3%
	% of Total	,0%	,3%	1,2%	1,8%	,9%	4,3%
Vocational high school of med. Serv.	Count	1	6	4	5	2	18
	Expected Count	1,3	2,6	2,9	7,8	3,4	18,0
	% within faculty	5,6%	33,3%	22,2%	27,8%	11,1%	100,0%
	% within i12	4,2%	12,8%	7,5%	3,5%	3,3%	5,5%
	% of Total	,3%	1,8%	1,2%	1,5%	,6%	5,5%
Fac. of agriculture	Count	0	1	5	13	8	27
	Expected Count	2,0	3,9	4,4	11,7	5,0	27,0
	% within faculty	,0%	3,7%	18,5%	48,1%	29,6%	100,0%
	% within i12	,0%	2,1%	9,4%	9,2%	13,1%	8,3%
	% of Total	,0%	,3%	1,5%	4,0%	2,4%	8,3%
Total	Count	24	47	53	142	61	327
	Expected Count	24,0	47,0	53,0	142,0	61,0	327,0
	% within faculty	7,3%	14,4%	16,2%	43,4%	18,7%	100,0%
	% within i12	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	7,3%	14,4%	16,2%	43,4%	18,7%	100,0%

Chi-Square statistic: 31,933(P<0.01)

G statistic: 33,971 (P<0.01)

Chi-Square and G statistics reflected that the association between faculty/vocational high school and i12 was statistically significant ( $P < 0.01$ ).

Table 4.67 illustrates that regarding i12, percentages for *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for the students of Vocational High School of Iğdır were recorded as 12,1%, 21,0%, 16,1%, 37,1% and 13,7%, respectively. The related percents for the students of the Faculty of Theology were found 5,6%, 9,0%, 13,9%, 50,0% and 21,5%, respectively. The percents of the participants from the Faculty of Engineering for the corresponding options were 0,0%, 7,1%, 28,6%, 42,9% and 21,4%, respectively. Percents of corresponding responses belonging to Vocational School of Medical Services students were observed as 5,6%, 33,3%, 22,2%, 27,8% and 11,1%, respectively. In the Faculty of Agriculture, the student percentages for examined options were 0,0%, 3,7%, 18,5%, 48,1% and 29,6%, respectively.

Table 4.68  
*Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 13*

		<b>i13</b>					<b>Total</b>
		<b>I STRONGLY DISAGREE</b>	<b>I DISAGREE</b>	<b>I AM UNDECIDED</b>	<b>I AGREE</b>	<b>I STRONGLY AGREE</b>	
Vocational high school of Iğdır	Count	27	33	18	37	9	124
	Expected Count	19,3	28,1	23,1	41,7	11,8	124,0
	% within faculty	21,8%	26,6%	14,5%	29,8%	7,3%	100,0%
	% within i13	52,9%	44,6%	29,5%	33,6%	29,0%	37,9%
	% of Total	8,3%	10,1%	5,5%	11,3%	2,8%	37,9%
Fac. of theology	Count	17	22	33	56	16	144
	Expected Count	22,5	32,6	26,9	48,4	13,7	144,0
	% within faculty	11,8%	15,3%	22,9%	38,9%	11,1%	100,0%
	% within i13	33,3%	29,7%	54,1%	50,9%	51,6%	44,0%
	% of Total	5,2%	6,7%	10,1%	17,1%	4,9%	44,0%
Faculty/ vhs Fac. of engineering	Count	2	6	3	2	1	14
	Expected Count	2,2	3,2	2,6	4,7	1,3	14,0
	% within faculty	14,3%	42,9%	21,4%	14,3%	7,1%	100,0%
	% within i13	3,9%	8,1%	4,9%	1,8%	3,2%	4,3%
	% of Total	,6%	1,8%	,9%	,6%	,3%	4,3%
Vocational high school of med. Serv.	Count	4	7	3	2	2	18
	Expected Count	2,8	4,1	3,4	6,1	1,7	18,0
	% within faculty	22,2%	38,9%	16,7%	11,1%	11,1%	100,0%
	% within i13	7,8%	9,5%	4,9%	1,8%	6,5%	5,5%
	% of Total	1,2%	2,1%	,9%	,6%	,6%	5,5%
Fac. of agriculture	Count	1	6	4	13	3	27
	Expected Count	4,2	6,1	5,0	9,1	2,6	27,0
	% within faculty	3,7%	22,2%	14,8%	48,1%	11,1%	100,0%
	% within i13	2,0%	8,1%	6,6%	11,8%	9,7%	8,3%
	% of Total	,3%	1,8%	1,2%	4,0%	,9%	8,3%
Total	Count	51	74	61	110	31	327
	Expected Count	51,0	74,0	61,0	110,0	31,0	327,0
	% within faculty	15,6%	22,6%	18,7%	33,6%	9,5%	100,0%
	% within i13	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	15,6%	22,6%	18,7%	33,6%	9,5%	100,0%

Chi-Square statistic: 28,060(P<0.01)

G statistic: 29,591 (P<0.01)

Chi-Square and G statistics revealed that the association between faculty/vocational high school and i13 was statistically significant ( $P < 0.01$ ).

Table 4.68 illustrates that regarding i13, percentages for *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for the students of Vocational School of Iğdır were recorded as 21,8%, 26,6%, 14,5%, 29,8% and 7,3%, respectively. The related percents for the students of the Faculty of Theology were 11,8%, 15,3%, 22,9%, 38,9% and 11,1%, respectively. The percents of the participants from the Faculty of Engineering for the corresponding options were 14,3%, 42,9%, 21,4%, 14,3% and 7,1%, respectively. Percents of corresponding responses belonging to Vocational School of Medical Services students were observed as 22,2%, 38,9%, 16,7%, 11,1% and 11,1%, respectively. In the Faculty of Agriculture, the student percentages for examined options were 3,7%, 22,2%, 14,8%, 48,1% and 11,1%, respectively.

Table 4.69  
*Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 20B*

		<b>i20B</b>					<b>Total</b>
		<b>I STRONGLY DISAGREE</b>	<b>I DISAGREE</b>	<b>I AM UNDECIDED</b>	<b>I AGREE</b>	<b>I STRONGLY AGREE</b>	
Vocational high school of Igdir	Count	29	40	10	32	13	124
	Expected Count	39,4	46,3	8,3	22,4	7,6	124,0
	% within faculty	23,4%	32,3%	8,1%	25,8%	10,5%	100,0%
	% within i20B	27,9%	32,8%	45,5%	54,2%	65,0%	37,9%
	% of Total	8,9%	12,2%	3,1%	9,8%	4,0%	37,9%
Fac. of theology	Count	56	58	3	20	7	144
	Expected Count	45,8	53,7	9,7	26,0	8,8	144,0
	% within faculty	38,9%	40,3%	2,1%	13,9%	4,9%	100,0%
	% within i20B	53,8%	47,5%	13,6%	33,9%	35,0%	44,0%
	% of Total	17,1%	17,7%	,9%	6,1%	2,1%	44,0%
Faculty/ vhs Fac. of engineering	Count	4	7	0	3	0	14
	Expected Count	4,5	5,2	,9	2,5	,9	14,0
	% within faculty	28,6%	50,0%	,0%	21,4%	,0%	100,0%
	% within i20B	3,8%	5,7%	,0%	5,1%	,0%	4,3%
	% of Total	1,2%	2,1%	,0%	,9%	,0%	4,3%
Vocational high school of med. Serv.	Count	5	6	4	3	0	18
	Expected Count	5,7	6,7	1,2	3,2	1,1	18,0
	% within faculty	27,8%	33,3%	22,2%	16,7%	,0%	100,0%
	% within i20B	4,8%	4,9%	18,2%	5,1%	,0%	5,5%
	% of Total	1,5%	1,8%	1,2%	,9%	,0%	5,5%
Fac. of agriculture	Count	10	11	5	1	0	27
	Expected Count	8,6	10,1	1,8	4,9	1,7	27,0
	% within faculty	37,0%	40,7%	18,5%	3,7%	,0%	100,0%
	% within i20B	9,6%	9,0%	22,7%	1,7%	,0%	8,3%
	% of Total	3,1%	3,4%	1,5%	,3%	,0%	8,3%
Total	Count	104	122	22	59	20	327
	Expected Count	104,0	122,0	22,0	59,0	20,0	327,0
	% within faculty	31,8%	37,3%	6,7%	18,0%	6,1%	100,0%
	% within i20B	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	31,8%	37,3%	6,7%	18,0%	6,1%	100,0%

Chi-Square statistic: 41,801 (P<0.01)

G statistic: 44,354 (P<0.01)

Chi-Square and G statistics reflected that the association between faculty/vocational high school and i20B was statistically significant ( $P < 0.01$ ).

Table 4.69 illustrates that regarding i20B, percentages for *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for the students of Vocational School of Iğdır were recorded as 23,4%, 32,3%, 8,1%, 25,8% and 10,5%, respectively. The related percents for the students of the Faculty of Theology were 38,9%, 40,3%, 2,1%, 13,9% and 4,9%, respectively. The percents of the participants from the Faculty of Engineering for the corresponding options were 28,6%, 50,0%, 0,0%, 21,4% and 0,0%, respectively. Percents of corresponding responses belonging to Vocational School of Medical Services students were reported as 27,8%, 33,3%, 22,2%, 16,7% and 0,0%, respectively. In the Faculty of Agriculture, the student percentages for mentioned options were 37,0%, 40,7%, 18,5%, 3,7% and 0,0%, respectively.

Table 4.70  
*Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 20C*

		<b>i20C</b>					<b>Total</b>
		<b>I STRONGLY DISAGREE</b>	<b>I DISAGREE</b>	<b>I AM UNDECIDED</b>	<b>I AGREE</b>	<b>I STRONGLY AGREE</b>	
Vocational high school of Iğdir	Count	27	39	13	30	15	124
	Expected Count	35,6	44,7	12,9	21,2	9,5	124,0
	% within faculty	21,8%	31,5%	10,5%	24,2%	12,1%	100,0%
	% within i20C	28,7%	33,1%	38,2%	53,6%	60,0%	37,9%
	% of Total	8,3%	11,9%	4,0%	9,2%	4,6%	37,9%
Fac. of theology	Count	53	55	11	16	9	144
	Expected Count	41,4	52,0	15,0	24,7	11,0	144,0
	% within faculty	36,8%	38,2%	7,6%	11,1%	6,3%	100,0%
	% within i20C	56,4%	46,6%	32,4%	28,6%	36,0%	44,0%
	% of Total	16,2%	16,8%	3,4%	4,9%	2,8%	44,0%
Faculty/ vhs Fac. of engineering	Count	2	8	2	2	0	14
	Expected Count	4,0	5,1	1,5	2,4	1,1	14,0
	% within faculty	14,3%	57,1%	14,3%	14,3%	,0%	100,0%
	% within i20C	2,1%	6,8%	5,9%	3,6%	,0%	4,3%
	% of Total	,6%	2,4%	,6%	,6%	,0%	4,3%
Vocational high school of med. Serv.	Count	4	8	3	3	0	18
	Expected Count	5,2	6,5	1,9	3,1	1,4	18,0
	% within faculty	22,2%	44,4%	16,7%	16,7%	,0%	100,0%
	% within i20C	4,3%	6,8%	8,8%	5,4%	,0%	5,5%
	% of Total	1,2%	2,4%	,9%	,9%	,0%	5,5%
Fac. of agriculture	Count	8	8	5	5	1	27
	Expected Count	7,8	9,7	2,8	4,6	2,1	27,0
	% within faculty	29,6%	29,6%	18,5%	18,5%	3,7%	100,0%
	% within i20C	8,5%	6,8%	14,7%	8,9%	4,0%	8,3%
	% of Total	2,4%	2,4%	1,5%	1,5%	,3%	8,3%
Total	Count	94	118	34	56	25	327
	Expected Count	94,0	118,0	34,0	56,0	25,0	327,0
	% within faculty	28,7%	36,1%	10,4%	17,1%	7,6%	100,0%
	% within i20C	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	28,7%	36,1%	10,4%	17,1%	7,6%	100,0%

Chi-Square statistic: 26,924 (P<0.01)

G statistic: 28,663 (P<0.01)

Chi-Square and G statistics clearly showed that the association between faculty/vocational high school and i20C was determined to be significant ( $P < 0.01$ ).

As table 4.70 indicates, regarding i20C, percentages for *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for the students of Vocational School of Iğdır were recorded as 21,8%, 31,5%, 10,5%, 24,2% and 12,1%, respectively. The related percents for the students of the Faculty of Theology were 36,8%, 38,2%, 7,6%, 11,1% and 6,3%, respectively. The percents of the participants from the Faculty of Engineering for the corresponding options were 14,3%, 57,1%, 14,3%, 14,3% and 0,0%, respectively. Percents of corresponding responses on Vocational School of Medical Services students were detected as 22,2%, 44,4%, 16,7%, 16,7% and 0,0%, respectively. In the Faculty of Agriculture, the student percentages for mentioned options were 29,6%, 29,6%, 18,5%, 18,5% and 3,7%, respectively.

Table 4.71

Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 20D

		i20D					Total
		I STRONGLY DISAGREE	I DISAGREE	I AM UNDECIDED	I AGREE	I STRONGLY AGREE	
Vocational high school of İğdir	Count	43	43	14	9	15	124
	Expected Count	64,5	37,2	8,7	5,7	8,0	124,0
	% within faculty	34,7%	34,7%	11,3%	7,3%	12,1%	100,0%
	% within i20D	25,3%	43,9%	60,9%	60,0%	71,4%	37,9%
	% of Total	13,1%	13,1%	4,3%	2,8%	4,6%	37,9%
Fac. of theology	Count	91	41	4	2	6	144
	Expected Count	74,9	43,2	10,1	6,6	9,2	144,0
	% within faculty	63,2%	28,5%	2,8%	1,4%	4,2%	100,0%
	% within i20D	53,5%	41,8%	17,4%	13,3%	28,6%	44,0%
	% of Total	27,8%	12,5%	1,2%	,6%	1,8%	44,0%
Faculty/ vhs Fac. of engineering	Count	9	2	1	2	0	14
	Expected Count	7,3	4,2	1,0	,6	,9	14,0
	% within faculty	64,3%	14,3%	7,1%	14,3%	,0%	100,0%
	% within i20D	5,3%	2,0%	4,3%	13,3%	,0%	4,3%
	% of Total	2,8%	,6%	,3%	,6%	,0%	4,3%
Vocational high school of med. Serv.	Count	10	3	4	1	0	18
	Expected Count	9,4	5,4	1,3	,8	1,2	18,0
	% within faculty	55,6%	16,7%	22,2%	5,6%	,0%	100,0%
	% within i20D	5,9%	3,1%	17,4%	6,7%	,0%	5,5%
	% of Total	3,1%	,9%	1,2%	,3%	,0%	5,5%
Fac. of agriculture	Count	17	9	0	1	0	27
	Expected Count	14,0	8,1	1,9	1,2	1,7	27,0
	% within faculty	63,0%	33,3%	,0%	3,7%	,0%	100,0%
	% within i20D	10,0%	9,2%	,0%	6,7%	,0%	8,3%
	% of Total	5,2%	2,8%	,0%	,3%	,0%	8,3%
Total	Count	170	98	23	15	21	327
	Expected Count	170,0	98,0	23,0	15,0	21,0	327,0
	% within faculty	52,0%	30,0%	7,0%	4,6%	6,4%	100,0%
	% within i20D	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	52,0%	30,0%	7,0%	4,6%	6,4%	100,0%

Chi-Square statistic: 48,987 (P&lt;0.01)

G statistic: 52,980 (P&lt;0.01)

Chi-Square and G statistics obviously illustrated that the association between faculty/vocational high school and i20D was statistically significant ( $P < 0.01$ ).

As shown in table 4.71, regarding i20D, percentages for *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for the students of Vocational School of Iğdır were recorded as 34,7%, 34,7%, 11,3%, 7,3% and 12,1%, respectively. The related percents for the students of the Faculty of Theology were 63,2%, 28,5%, 2,8%, 1,4% and 4,2%, respectively. The percents of the participants from the Faculty of Engineering for the corresponding options were 64,3%, 14,3%, 7,1%, 14,3% and 0,0%, respectively. Percents of corresponding responses regarding Vocational School of Medical Services students were observed as 55,6%, 16,7%, 22,2%, 5,6% and 0,0%, respectively. In the Faculty of Agriculture, the student percentages for mentioned options were 63,0%, 33,3%, 0,0%, 3,7% and 0,0%, respectively.

Table 4.72  
*Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 31*

		i31					Total	
		I STRONGLY DISAGREE	I DISAGREE	I AM UNDECIDED	I AGREE	I STRONGLY AGREE		
Faculty/ vhs	Vocational high school of Iğdır	Count	60	32	14	9	9	124
		Expected Count	74,7	30,7	7,6	4,9	6,1	124,0
		% within faculty	48,4%	25,8%	11,3%	7,3%	7,3%	100,0%
		% within i31	30,5%	39,5%	70,0%	69,2%	56,3%	37,9%
		% of Total	18,3%	9,8%	4,3%	2,8%	2,8%	37,9%
	Fac. of theology	Count	106	27	2	3	6	144
		Expected Count	86,8	35,7	8,8	5,7	7,0	144,0
		% within faculty	73,6%	18,8%	1,4%	2,1%	4,2%	100,0%
		% within i31	53,8%	33,3%	10,0%	23,1%	37,5%	44,0%
		% of Total	32,4%	8,3%	,6%	,9%	1,8%	44,0%
	Fac. of engineering	Count	7	5	2	0	0	14
		Expected Count	8,4	3,5	,9	,6	,7	14,0
		% within faculty	50,0%	35,7%	14,3%	,0%	,0%	100,0%
		% within i31	3,6%	6,2%	10,0%	,0%	,0%	4,3%
		% of Total	2,1%	1,5%	,6%	,0%	,0%	4,3%
	Vocational high school of med. Serv.	Count	10	6	1	1	0	18
Expected Count		10,8	4,5	1,1	,7	,9	18,0	
% within faculty		55,6%	33,3%	5,6%	5,6%	,0%	100,0%	
% within i31		5,1%	7,4%	5,0%	7,7%	,0%	5,5%	
% of Total		3,1%	1,8%	,3%	,3%	,0%	5,5%	
Fac. of agriculture	Count	14	11	1	0	1	27	
	Expected Count	16,3	6,7	1,7	1,1	1,3	27,0	
	% within faculty	51,9%	40,7%	3,7%	,0%	3,7%	100,0%	
	% within i31	7,1%	13,6%	5,0%	,0%	6,3%	8,3%	
	% of Total	4,3%	3,4%	,3%	,0%	,3%	8,3%	
Total	Count	197	81	20	13	16	327	
	Expected Count	197,0	81,0	20,0	13,0	16,0	327,0	
	% within faculty	60,2%	24,8%	6,1%	4,0%	4,9%	100,0%	
	% within i31	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
	% of Total	60,2%	24,8%	6,1%	4,0%	4,9%	100,0%	

Chi-Square statistic: 36,041(P<0.01)

G statistic: 39,173 (P<0.01)

Chi-Square and G statistics reflected that the association between faculty/vocational high school and i31 was found to be statistically significant ( $P < 0.01$ ).

Table 4.72 illustrates that regarding i31, percentages for *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for the students of Vocational School of Iğdır were recorded as 48,4%, 25,8%, 11,3%, 7,3% and 7,3%, respectively. The related percents for the students of the Faculty of Theology were 73,6%, 18,8%, 1,4%, 2,1% and 4,2%, respectively. The percents of the participants from the Faculty of Engineering for the corresponding options were 50,0%, 35,7%, 14,3%, 0,0% and 0,0%, respectively. Percents of corresponding responses belonging to Vocational School of Medical Services students were observed as 55,6%, 33,3%, 5,6%, 5,6% and 0,0%, respectively. In the Faculty of Agriculture, the student percentages for mentioned options were 51,9%, 40,7%, 3,7%, 0,0% and 3,7%, respectively.

Table 4.73  
*Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 32*

		i32					Total
		I STRONGLY DISAGREE	I DISAGREE	I AM UNDECIDED	I AGREE	I STRONGLY AGREE	
Vocational high school of Iğdır	Count	34	25	11	37	17	124
	Expected Count	52,7	30,3	8,7	22,0	10,2	124,0
	% within faculty	27,4%	20,2%	8,9%	29,8%	13,7%	100,0%
	% within i32	24,5%	31,3%	47,8%	63,8%	63,0%	37,9%
	% of Total	10,4%	7,6%	3,4%	11,3%	5,2%	37,9%
Fac. of theology	Count	86	32	6	15	5	144
	Expected Count	61,2	35,2	10,1	25,5	11,9	144,0
	% within faculty	59,7%	22,2%	4,2%	10,4%	3,5%	100,0%
	% within i32	61,9%	40,0%	26,1%	25,9%	18,5%	44,0%
	% of Total	26,3%	9,8%	1,8%	4,6%	1,5%	44,0%
Faculty/ vhs Fac. of engineering	Count	3	5	1	3	2	14
	Expected Count	6,0	3,4	1,0	2,5	1,2	14,0
	% within faculty	21,4%	35,7%	7,1%	21,4%	14,3%	100,0%
	% within i32	2,2%	6,3%	4,3%	5,2%	7,4%	4,3%
	% of Total	,9%	1,5%	,3%	,9%	,6%	4,3%
Vocational high school of med. Serv.	Count	7	7	3	0	1	18
	Expected Count	7,7	4,4	1,3	3,2	1,5	18,0
	% within faculty	38,9%	38,9%	16,7%	,0%	5,6%	100,0%
	% within i32	5,0%	8,8%	13,0%	,0%	3,7%	5,5%
	% of Total	2,1%	2,1%	,9%	,0%	,3%	5,5%
Fac. of agriculture	Count	9	11	2	3	2	27
	Expected Count	11,5	6,6	1,9	4,8	2,2	27,0
	% within faculty	33,3%	40,7%	7,4%	11,1%	7,4%	100,0%
	% within i32	6,5%	13,8%	8,7%	5,2%	7,4%	8,3%
	% of Total	2,8%	3,4%	,6%	,9%	,6%	8,3%
Total	Count	139	80	23	58	27	327
	Expected Count	139,0	80,0	23,0	58,0	27,0	327,0
	% within faculty	42,5%	24,5%	7,0%	17,7%	8,3%	100,0%
	% within S32	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	42,5%	24,5%	7,0%	17,7%	8,3%	100,0%

Chi-Square statistic: 57,619(P<0.01)

G statistic: 59,235 (P<0.01)

Chi-Square and G statistics reflected that the association between faculty/vocational high school and i32 was statistically significant ( $P < 0.01$ ).

As shown in table 4.73, regarding i32, percentages for *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for the students of Vocational School of Iğdır were recorded as 27,4%, 20,2%, 8,9%, 29,8% and 13,7%, respectively. The related percents for the students of the Faculty of Theology were 59,7%, 22,2%, 4,2%, 10,4% and 3,5%, respectively. These percents from the Faculty of Engineering for the corresponding options were 21,4%, 35,7%, 7,1%, 21,4% and 14,3%, respectively. Percents of corresponding responses concerning Vocational School of Medical Services students were observed as 38,9%, 38,9%, 16,7%, 0,0% and 5,6%, respectively. In the Faculty of Agriculture, the student percentages for mentioned options were 33,3%, 40,7%, 7,4%, 11,1% and 7,4%, respectively.

Table 4.74  
 Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 33

		i33					Total
		I STRONGLY DISAGREE	I DISAGREE	I AM UNDECIDED	I AGREE	I STRONGLY AGREE	
Vocational high school of Iğdır	Count	37	35	12	24	16	124
	Expected Count	59,9	32,2	8,7	14,4	8,7	124,0
	% within faculty	29,8%	28,2%	9,7%	19,4%	12,9%	100,0%
	% within i33	23,4%	41,2%	52,2%	63,2%	69,6%	37,9%
	% of Total	11,3%	10,7%	3,7%	7,3%	4,9%	37,9%
Fac. of theology	Count	91	30	6	10	7	144
	Expected Count	69,6	37,4	10,1	16,7	10,1	144,0
	% within faculty	63,2%	20,8%	4,2%	6,9%	4,9%	100,0%
	% within i33	57,6%	35,3%	26,1%	26,3%	30,4%	44,0%
	% of Total	27,8%	9,2%	1,8%	3,1%	2,1%	44,0%
Faculty/ vhs	Count	4	6	3	1	0	14
	Expected Count	6,8	3,6	1,0	1,6	1,0	14,0
	% within faculty	28,6%	42,9%	21,4%	7,1%	,0%	100,0%
	% within i33	2,5%	7,1%	13,0%	2,6%	,0%	4,3%
	% of Total	1,2%	1,8%	,9%	,3%	,0%	4,3%
Vocational high school of med. Serv.	Count	10	5	1	2	0	18
	Expected Count	8,7	4,7	1,3	2,1	1,3	18,0
	% within faculty	55,6%	27,8%	5,6%	11,1%	,0%	100,0%
	% within i33	6,3%	5,9%	4,3%	5,3%	,0%	5,5%
	% of Total	3,1%	1,5%	,3%	,6%	,0%	5,5%
Fac. of agriculture	Count	16	9	1	1	0	27
	Expected Count	13,0	7,0	1,9	3,1	1,9	27,0
	% within faculty	59,3%	33,3%	3,7%	3,7%	,0%	100,0%
	% within i33	10,1%	10,6%	4,3%	2,6%	,0%	8,3%
	% of Total	4,9%	2,8%	,3%	,3%	,0%	8,3%
Total	Count	158	85	23	38	23	327
	Expected Count	158,0	85,0	23,0	38,0	23,0	327,0
	% within faculty	48,3%	26,0%	7,0%	11,6%	7,0%	100,0%
	% within i33	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	48,3%	26,0%	7,0%	11,6%	7,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square statistic: 50,684(P<0.01)

G statistic: 53,231 (P<0.01)

Chi-Square and G statistics reflected that the association between faculty/vocational high school and i33 was statistically significant ( $P < 0.01$ ).

Table 4.74 illustrates that regarding i33, the percentages for *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for the students of Vocational School of Iğdır were recorded as 29,8%, 28,2%, 9,7%, 19,4% and 12,9%, respectively. The related percents for the students of the Faculty of Theology were 63,2%, 20,8%, 4,2%, 6,9% and 4,9%, respectively. The percents of the participants from the Faculty of Engineering for the corresponding options were 28,6%, 42,9%, 21,4%, 7,1% and 0,0%, respectively. The percents of corresponding responses belonging to Vocational School of Medical Services students were determined as 55,6%, 27,8%, 5,6%, 11,1% and 0,0%, respectively. In the Faculty of Agriculture, the student percentages for mentioned options were calculated as 59,3%, 33,3%, 3,7%, 3,7% and 0,0%, respectively.

Table 4.75  
*Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 34*

		i34					Total
		I STRONGLY DISAGREE	I DISAGREE	I AM UNDECIDED	I AGREE	I STRONGLY AGREE	
Vocational high school of Iğdır	Count	35	27	18	28	16	124
	Expected Count	51,2	37,5	11,4	14,0	9,9	124,0
	% within faculty	28,2%	21,8%	14,5%	22,6%	12,9%	100,0%
	% within i34	25,9%	27,3%	60,0%	75,7%	61,5%	37,9%
	% of Total	10,7%	8,3%	5,5%	8,6%	4,9%	37,9%
Fac. of theology	Count	80	50	5	6	3	144
	Expected Count	59,4	43,6	13,2	16,3	11,4	144,0
	% within faculty	55,6%	34,7%	3,5%	4,2%	2,1%	100,0%
	% within i34	59,3%	50,5%	16,7%	16,2%	11,5%	44,0%
	% of Total	24,5%	15,3%	1,5%	1,8%	,9%	44,0%
Faculty/ vhs	Count	2	4	2	1	5	14
	Expected Count	5,8	4,2	1,3	1,6	1,1	14,0
	% within faculty	14,3%	28,6%	14,3%	7,1%	35,7%	100,0%
	% within i34	1,5%	4,0%	6,7%	2,7%	19,2%	4,3%
	% of Total	,6%	1,2%	,6%	,3%	1,5%	4,3%
Vocational high school of med. Serv.	Count	6	5	3	2	2	18
	Expected Count	7,4	5,4	1,7	2,0	1,4	18,0
	% within faculty	33,3%	27,8%	16,7%	11,1%	11,1%	100,0%
	% within i34	4,4%	5,1%	10,0%	5,4%	7,7%	5,5%
	% of Total	1,8%	1,5%	,9%	,6%	,6%	5,5%
Fac. of agriculture	Count	12	13	2	0	0	27
	Expected Count	11,1	8,2	2,5	3,1	2,1	27,0
	% within faculty	44,4%	48,1%	7,4%	,0%	,0%	100,0%
	% within i34	8,9%	13,1%	6,7%	,0%	,0%	8,3%
	% of Total	3,7%	4,0%	,6%	,0%	,0%	8,3%
Total	Count	135	99	30	37	26	327
	Expected Count	135,0	99,0	30,0	37,0	26,0	327,0
	% within faculty	41,3%	30,3%	9,2%	11,3%	8,0%	100,0%
	% within i34	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	41,3%	30,3%	9,2%	11,3%	8,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square statistic: 82,078(P<0.01)

G statistic: 83,321 (P<0.01)

Chi-Square and G statistics reflected that the association between faculty/vocational high school and i34 was statistically significant ( $P < 0.01$ ).

Table 4.75 shows that regarding i34, the percentages for *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for the students of Vocational School of Iğdır were recorded as 28,2%, 21,8%, 14,5%, 22,6% and 12,9%, respectively. The related percents for the students of the Faculty of Theology were 55,6%, 34,7%, 3,5%, 4,2% and 2,1%, respectively. These percents of the participants from the Faculty of Engineering for the corresponding options were 14,3%, 28,6%, 14,3%, 7,1% and 35,7%, respectively. Percents of corresponding responses for Vocational School of Medical Services students were observed as 33,3%, 27,8%, 16,7%, 11,1% and 11,1%, respectively. In the Faculty of Agriculture, the student percentages given for mentioned options were 44,4%, 48,1%, 7,4%, 0,0% and 0,0%, respectively.

Table 4.76  
*Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 36*

		<b>i36</b>					<b>Total</b>
		<b>I STRONGLY DISAGREE</b>	<b>I DISAGREE</b>	<b>I AM UNDECIDED</b>	<b>I AGREE</b>	<b>I STRONGLY AGREE</b>	
Vocational high school of Igdir	Count	21	24	11	39	29	124
	Expected Count	37,5	32,2	11,0	25,4	17,8	124,0
	% within faculty	16,9%	19,4%	8,9%	31,5%	23,4%	100,0%
	% within i36	21,2%	28,2%	37,9%	58,2%	61,7%	37,9%
	% of Total	6,4%	7,3%	3,4%	11,9%	8,9%	37,9%
Fac. of theology	Count	58	41	14	17	14	144
	Expected Count	43,6	37,4	12,8	29,5	20,7	144,0
	% within faculty	40,3%	28,5%	9,7%	11,8%	9,7%	100,0%
	% within i36	58,6%	48,2%	48,3%	25,4%	29,8%	44,0%
	% of Total	17,7%	12,5%	4,3%	5,2%	4,3%	44,0%
Faculty/ vhs	Count	4	4	1	4	1	14
	Expected Count	4,2	3,6	1,2	2,9	2,0	14,0
	% within faculty	28,6%	28,6%	7,1%	28,6%	7,1%	100,0%
	% within i36	4,0%	4,7%	3,4%	6,0%	2,1%	4,3%
	% of Total	1,2%	1,2%	,3%	1,2%	,3%	4,3%
Vocational high school of med. Serv.	Count	4	6	2	4	2	18
	Expected Count	5,4	4,7	1,6	3,7	2,6	18,0
	% within faculty	22,2%	33,3%	11,1%	22,2%	11,1%	100,0%
	% within i36	4,0%	7,1%	6,9%	6,0%	4,3%	5,5%
	% of Total	1,2%	1,8%	,6%	1,2%	,6%	5,5%
Fac. of agriculture	Count	12	10	1	3	1	27
	Expected Count	8,2	7,0	2,4	5,5	3,9	27,0
	% within faculty	44,4%	37,0%	3,7%	11,1%	3,7%	100,0%
	% within i36	12,1%	11,8%	3,4%	4,5%	2,1%	8,3%
	% of Total	3,7%	3,1%	,3%	,9%	,3%	8,3%
Total	Count	99	85	29	67	47	327
	Expected Count	99,0	85,0	29,0	67,0	47,0	327,0
	% within faculty	30,3%	26,0%	8,9%	20,5%	14,4%	100,0%
	% within i36	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	30,3%	26,0%	8,9%	20,5%	14,4%	100,0%

Chi-Square statistic: 45,596 (P<0.01)

G statistic: 46,897 (P<0.01)

Chi-Square and G statistics reflected that the association between faculty/vocational high school and i36 was statistically significant ( $P < 0.01$ ).

As it is illustrated in table 4.76, regarding i36, percentages for *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for the students of Vocational School of Iğdır were recorded as 16,9%, 19,4%, 8,9%, 31,5% and 23,4%, respectively. The related percents for the students of the Faculty of Theology were 40,3%, 28,5%, 9,7%, 11,8% and 9,7%, respectively. The percents of the participants from the Faculty of Engineering for the corresponding options were 28,6%, 28,6%, 7,1%, 28,6% and 7,1%, respectively. Percents of corresponding responses obtained from Vocational School of Medical Services students were observed as 22,2%, 33,3%, 11,1%, 22,2% and 11,1%, respectively. In the Faculty of Agriculture, the student percentages for mentioned options were 44,4%, 37,0%, 3,7%, 11,1% and 3,7%, respectively.

Table 4.77  
*Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 37*

		i37					Total
		I STRONGLY DISAGREE	I DISAGREE	I AM UNDECIDED	I AGREE	I STRONGLY AGREE	
Vocational high school of Iğdir	Count	35	36	10	27	16	124
	Expected Count	53,5	37,2	10,2	13,7	9,5	124,0
	% within faculty	28,2%	29,0%	8,1%	21,8%	12,9%	100,0%
	% within i37	24,8%	36,7%	37,0%	75,0%	64,0%	37,9%
	% of Total	10,7%	11,0%	3,1%	8,3%	4,9%	37,9%
Fac. of theology	Count	77	44	10	5	8	144
	Expected Count	62,1	43,2	11,9	15,9	11,0	144,0
	% within faculty	53,5%	30,6%	6,9%	3,5%	5,6%	100,0%
	% within i37	54,6%	44,9%	37,0%	13,9%	32,0%	44,0%
	% of Total	23,5%	13,5%	3,1%	1,5%	2,4%	44,0%
Faculty/ vhs	Count	7	5	1	1	0	14
	Expected Count	6,0	4,2	1,2	1,5	1,1	14,0
	% within faculty	50,0%	35,7%	7,1%	7,1%	,0%	100,0%
	% within i37	5,0%	5,1%	3,7%	2,8%	,0%	4,3%
	% of Total	2,1%	1,5%	,3%	,3%	,0%	4,3%
Vocational high school of med. Serv.	Count	8	6	2	2	0	18
	Expected Count	7,8	5,4	1,5	2,0	1,4	18,0
	% within faculty	44,4%	33,3%	11,1%	11,1%	,0%	100,0%
	% within i37	5,7%	6,1%	7,4%	5,6%	,0%	5,5%
	% of Total	2,4%	1,8%	,6%	,6%	,0%	5,5%
Fac. of agriculture	Count	14	7	4	1	1	27
	Expected Count	11,6	8,1	2,2	3,0	2,1	27,0
	% within faculty	51,9%	25,9%	14,8%	3,7%	3,7%	100,0%
	% within i37	9,9%	7,1%	14,8%	2,8%	4,0%	8,3%
	% of Total	4,3%	2,1%	1,2%	,3%	,3%	8,3%
Total	Count	141	98	27	36	25	327
	Expected Count	141,0	98,0	27,0	36,0	25,0	327,0
	% within faculty	43,1%	30,0%	8,3%	11,0%	7,6%	100,0%
	% within i37	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	43,1%	30,0%	8,3%	11,0%	7,6%	100,0%

Chi-Square statistic: 43,214 (P<0.01)      G statistic: 45,730 (P<0.01)

Chi-Square and G statistics reflected that the association between faculty/vocational high school and i37 was ascertained significant ( $P < 0.01$ ).

Table 4.77 illustrates that regarding i37, percentages for *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for the students of Vocational School of Iğdır were recorded as 28,2%, 29,0%, 8,1%, 21,8% and 12,9%, respectively. The related percents for the students of the Faculty of Theology were 53,5%, 30,6%, 6,9%, 3,5% and 5,6%, respectively. The percents of the participants from the Faculty of Engineering for the corresponding options were 50,0%, 35,7%, 7,1%, 7,1% and 0,0%, respectively. Percents of corresponding responses of Vocational School of Medical Services students were found as 44,4%, 33,3%, 11,1%, 11,1% and 0,0%, respectively. In the Faculty of Agriculture, the student percentages for mentioned options were identified as 51,9%, 25,9%, 14,8%, 3,7% and 3,7%, respectively.

Table 4. 78

Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 38

		i38					Total
		I STRONGLY DISAGREE	I DISAGREE	I AM UNDECIDED	I AGREE	I STRONGLY AGREE	
Vocational high school of Iğdır	Count	22	23	9	37	33	124
	Expected Count	29,2	37,2	11,4	25,8	20,5	124,0
	% within faculty	17,7%	18,5%	7,3%	29,8%	26,6%	100,0%
	% within i38	28,6%	23,5%	30,0%	54,4%	61,1%	37,9%
	% of Total	6,7%	7,0%	2,8%	11,3%	10,1%	37,9%
Fac. of theology	Count	39	48	17	23	17	144
	Expected Count	33,9	43,2	13,2	29,9	23,8	144,0
	% within faculty	27,1%	33,3%	11,8%	16,0%	11,8%	100,0%
	% within i38	50,6%	49,0%	56,7%	33,8%	31,5%	44,0%
	% of Total	11,9%	14,7%	5,2%	7,0%	5,2%	44,0%
Faculty/ vhs	Count	2	9	0	2	1	14
	Expected Count	3,3	4,2	1,3	2,9	2,3	14,0
	% within faculty	14,3%	64,3%	,0%	14,3%	7,1%	100,0%
	% within i38	2,6%	9,2%	,0%	2,9%	1,9%	4,3%
	% of Total	,6%	2,8%	,0%	,6%	,3%	4,3%
Vocational high school of med. Serv.	Count	5	8	3	2	0	18
	Expected Count	4,2	5,4	1,7	3,7	3,0	18,0
	% within faculty	27,8%	44,4%	16,7%	11,1%	,0%	100,0%
	% within i38	6,5%	8,2%	10,0%	2,9%	,0%	5,5%
	% of Total	1,5%	2,4%	,9%	,6%	,0%	5,5%
Fac. of agriculture	Count	9	10	1	4	3	27
	Expected Count	6,4	8,1	2,5	5,6	4,5	27,0
	% within faculty	33,3%	37,0%	3,7%	14,8%	11,1%	100,0%
	% within i38	11,7%	10,2%	3,3%	5,9%	5,6%	8,3%
	% of Total	2,8%	3,1%	,3%	1,2%	,9%	8,3%
Total	Count	77	98	30	68	54	327
	Expected Count	77,0	98,0	30,0	68,0	54,0	327,0
	% within faculty	23,5%	30,0%	9,2%	20,8%	16,5%	100,0%
	% within i38	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	23,5%	30,0%	9,2%	20,8%	16,5%	100,0%

Chi-Square statistic: 44,119 (P&lt;0.01) G statistic: 46,800 (P&lt;0.01)

Chi-Square and G statistics illustrated that the association between faculty/vocational high school and i38 was found statistically significant ( $P < 0.01$ ).

Table 4.78 presents that regarding i38, percentages for *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for the students of Vocational School of Iğdır were recorded as 17,7%, 18,5%, 7,3%, 29,8% and 26,6%, respectively. The related percents for the students of the Faculty of Theology were 27,1%, 33,3%, 11,8%, 16,0% and 11,8%, respectively. The percents of the participants from the Faculty of Engineering for the corresponding options were 14,3%, 64,3%, 0,0%, 14,3% and 7,1%, respectively. Percents of corresponding responses belonging to Vocational School of Medical Services students were observed as 27,8%, 44,4%, 16,7%, 11,1% and 0,0%, respectively. In the Faculty of Agriculture, the student percentages for mentioned options were 33,3%, 37,0%, 3,7%, 14,8% and 11,1%, respectively.

Table 4. 79

*Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 40*

		<b>i40</b>					<b>Total</b>	
		<b>I STRONGLY DISAGREE</b>	<b>I DISAGREE</b>	<b>I AM UNDECIDED</b>	<b>I AGREE</b>	<b>I STRONGLY AGREE</b>		
Faculty/ vhs	Vocational high school of Iğdır	Count	19	10	10	51	34	124
	Expected Count	22,4	21,2	14,4	42,5	23,5	124,0	
	% within faculty	15,3%	8,1%	8,1%	41,1%	27,4%	100,0%	
	% within i40	32,2%	17,9%	26,3%	45,5%	54,8%	37,9%	
	% of Total	5,8%	3,1%	3,1%	15,6%	10,4%	37,9%	
	Fac. of theology	Count	28	30	21	44	21	144
	Expected Count	26,0	24,7	16,7	49,3	27,3	144,0	
	% within faculty	19,4%	20,8%	14,6%	30,6%	14,6%	100,0%	
	% within i40	47,5%	53,6%	55,3%	39,3%	33,9%	44,0%	
	% of Total	8,6%	9,2%	6,4%	13,5%	6,4%	44,0%	
	Fac. of engineering	Count	0	5	2	4	3	14
	Expected Count	2,5	2,4	1,6	4,8	2,7	14,0	
	% within faculty	,0%	35,7%	14,3%	28,6%	21,4%	100,0%	
	% within i40	,0%	8,9%	5,3%	3,6%	4,8%	4,3%	
	% of Total	,0%	1,5%	,6%	1,2%	,9%	4,3%	
	Vocational high school of med. Serv.	Count	4	6	2	5	1	18
	Expected Count	3,2	3,1	2,1	6,2	3,4	18,0	
	% within faculty	22,2%	33,3%	11,1%	27,8%	5,6%	100,0%	
	% within i40	6,8%	10,7%	5,3%	4,5%	1,6%	5,5%	
	% of Total	1,2%	1,8%	,6%	1,5%	,3%	5,5%	
Fac. of agriculture	Count	8	5	3	8	3	27	
Expected Count	4,9	4,6	3,1	9,2	5,1	27,0		
% within faculty	29,6%	18,5%	11,1%	29,6%	11,1%	100,0%		
% within i40	13,6%	8,9%	7,9%	7,1%	4,8%	8,3%		
% of Total	2,4%	1,5%	,9%	2,4%	,9%	8,3%		
Total	Count	59	56	38	112	62	327	
	Expected Count	59,0	56,0	38,0	112,0	62,0	327,0	
	% within faculty	18,0%	17,1%	11,6%	34,3%	19,0%	100,0%	
	% within i40	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
	% of Total	18,0%	17,1%	11,6%	34,3%	19,0%	100,0%	

Chi-Square statistic: 32,195 (P<0.01)

G statistic: 34,904 (P<0.01)

Chi-Square and G statistics reflected that the association between faculty/vocational high school and i40 was observed statistically significant ( $P < 0.01$ ).

Table 4.79 illustrates that regarding i40, the percentages for *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for the students of Vocational School of Iğdır were recorded as 15,3%, 8,1%, 8,1%, 41,1% and 27,4%, respectively. The related percents for the students of the Faculty of Theology were 19,4%, 20,8%, 14,6%, 30,6% and 14,6%, respectively. The percents of the participants from the Faculty of Engineering for the corresponding options were 0,0%, 35,7%, 14,3%, 28,6% and 21,4%, respectively. Percents of corresponding responses belonging to Vocational School of Medical Services students were observed as 22,2%, 33,3%, 11,1%, 27,8% and 5,6%, respectively. In the Faculty of Agriculture, the student percentages for mentioned options were determined to be 29,6%, 18,5%, 11,1%, 29,6% and 11,1%, respectively.

Table 4.80  
*Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 42*

		<b>i42</b>					<b>Total</b>
		<b>I STRONGLY DISAGREE</b>	<b>I DISAGREE</b>	<b>I AM UNDECIDED</b>	<b>I AGREE</b>	<b>I STRONGLY AGREE</b>	
Vocational high school of Iğdır	Count	17	28	14	37	28	124
	Expected Count	31,5	42,5	12,9	22,4	14,8	124,0
	% within faculty	13,7%	22,6%	11,3%	29,8%	22,6%	100,0%
	% within i42	20,5%	25,0%	41,2%	62,7%	71,8%	37,9%
	% of Total	5,2%	8,6%	4,3%	11,3%	8,6%	37,9%
Fac. of theology	Count	46	56	15	18	9	144
	Expected Count	36,6	49,3	15,0	26,0	17,2	144,0
	% within faculty	31,9%	38,9%	10,4%	12,5%	6,3%	100,0%
	% within i42	55,4%	50,0%	44,1%	30,5%	23,1%	44,0%
	% of Total	14,1%	17,1%	4,6%	5,5%	2,8%	44,0%
Faculty/ vhs	Count	6	6	0	2	0	14
	Expected Count	3,6	4,8	1,5	2,5	1,7	14,0
	% within faculty	42,9%	42,9%	,0%	14,3%	,0%	100,0%
	% within i42	7,2%	5,4%	,0%	3,4%	,0%	4,3%
	% of Total	1,8%	1,8%	,0%	,6%	,0%	4,3%
Vocational high school of med. Serv.	Count	4	10	1	2	1	18
	Expected Count	4,6	6,2	1,9	3,2	2,1	18,0
	% within faculty	22,2%	55,6%	5,6%	11,1%	5,6%	100,0%
	% within i42	4,8%	8,9%	2,9%	3,4%	2,6%	5,5%
	% of Total	1,2%	3,1%	,3%	,6%	,3%	5,5%
Fac. of agriculture	Count	10	12	4	0	1	27
	Expected Count	6,9	9,2	2,8	4,9	3,2	27,0
	% within faculty	37,0%	44,4%	14,8%	,0%	3,7%	100,0%
	% within i42	12,0%	10,7%	11,8%	,0%	2,6%	8,3%
	% of Total	3,1%	3,7%	1,2%	,0%	,3%	8,3%
Total	Count	83	112	34	59	39	327
	Expected Count	83,0	112,0	34,0	59,0	39,0	327,0
	% within faculty	25,4%	34,3%	10,4%	18,0%	11,9%	100,0%
	% within i42	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	25,4%	34,3%	10,4%	18,0%	11,9%	100,0%

Chi-Square statistic: 61,085 (P<0.01)

G statistic: 67,831 (P<0.01)

According to the results of Chi-Square and G statistics, the association between faculty/vocational high school and i42 was statistically significant ( $P < 0.01$ ).

Table 4.80 shows that for item 42, percentages for *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for the students of Vocational School of Iğdır were recorded as 13,7%, 22,6%, 11,3%, 29,8% and 22,6%, respectively. The related percents for the students of the Faculty of Theology were 31,9%, 38,9%, 10,4%, 12,5% and 6,3%, respectively. The percents of the participants from the Faculty of Engineering for the corresponding options were 42,9%, 42,9%, 0,0%, 14,3% and 0,0%, respectively. Percents for Vocational School of Medical Services students were observed as 22,2%, 55,6%, 5,6%, 11,1% and 5,6%, respectively. In the Faculty of Agriculture, the student percentages for investigated options were 37,0%, 44,4%, 14,8%, 0,0% and 3,7%, respectively.

Table 4.81  
*Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 43*

		<b>i43</b>					<b>Total</b>
		<b>I STRONGLY DISAGREE</b>	<b>I DISAGREE</b>	<b>I AM UNDECIDED</b>	<b>I AGREE</b>	<b>I STRONGLY AGREE</b>	
Vocational high school of İğdır	Count	35	38	11	24	16	124
	Expected Count	27,3	34,5	10,2	31,1	20,9	124,0
	% within faculty	28,2%	30,6%	8,9%	19,4%	12,9%	100,0%
	% within i43	48,6%	41,8%	40,7%	29,3%	29,1%	37,9%
	% of Total	10,7%	11,6%	3,4%	7,3%	4,9%	37,9%
Fac. of theology	Count	24	33	12	45	30	144
	Expected Count	31,7	40,1	11,9	36,1	24,2	144,0
	% within faculty	16,7%	22,9%	8,3%	31,3%	20,8%	100,0%
	% within i43	33,3%	36,3%	44,4%	54,9%	54,5%	44,0%
	% of Total	7,3%	10,1%	3,7%	13,8%	9,2%	44,0%
Faculty/ vhs Fac. of engineering	Count	1	1	2	5	5	14
	Expected Count	3,1	3,9	1,2	3,5	2,4	14,0
	% within faculty	7,1%	7,1%	14,3%	35,7%	35,7%	100,0%
	% within i43	1,4%	1,1%	7,4%	6,1%	9,1%	4,3%
	% of Total	,3%	,3%	,6%	1,5%	1,5%	4,3%
Vocational high school of med. Serv.	Count	3	9	2	3	1	18
	Expected Count	4,0	5,0	1,5	4,5	3,0	18,0
	% within faculty	16,7%	50,0%	11,1%	16,7%	5,6%	100,0%
	% within i43	4,2%	9,9%	7,4%	3,7%	1,8%	5,5%
	% of Total	,9%	2,8%	,6%	,9%	,3%	5,5%
Fac. of agriculture	Count	9	10	0	5	3	27
	Expected Count	5,9	7,5	2,2	6,8	4,5	27,0
	% within faculty	33,3%	37,0%	,0%	18,5%	11,1%	100,0%
	% within i43	12,5%	11,0%	,0%	6,1%	5,5%	8,3%
	% of Total	2,8%	3,1%	,0%	1,5%	,9%	8,3%
Total	Count	72	91	27	82	55	327
	Expected Count	72,0	91,0	27,0	82,0	55,0	327,0
	% within faculty	22,0%	27,8%	8,3%	25,1%	16,8%	100,0%
	% within i43	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	22,0%	27,8%	8,3%	25,1%	16,8%	100,0%

Chi-Square statistic: 30,864 (P<0.01)

G statistic: 33,410 (P<0.01)

Chi-Square and G statistics reflected that the association between faculty/vocational high school and i43 was statistically significant ( $P < 0.01$ ).

Table 4.81 illustrates that regarding i43, percentages for *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for the students of Vocational School of Iğdır were recorded as 28,2%, 30,6%, 8,9%, 19,4% and 12,9%, respectively. The related percents for the students of the Faculty of Theology were 16,7%, 22,9%, 8,3%, 31,3% and 20,8%, respectively. The percents of the participants from the Faculty of Engineering for the corresponding options were 7,1%, 7,1%, 14,3%, 35,7% and 35,7%, respectively. The percents of corresponding responses given by the students of Vocational School of Medical Services were observed as 16,7%, 50,0%, 11,1%, 16,7% and 5,6%, respectively. In the Faculty of Agriculture, the student percentages for mentioned options were 33,3%, 37,0%, 0,0%, 18,5% and 11,1%, respectively.

Table 4.82  
*Student Percents in Terms of faculty/Vocational High School for item 44*

		<b>i44</b>					<b>Total</b>
		<b>I STRONGLY DISAGREE</b>	<b>I DISAGREE</b>	<b>I AM UNDECIDED</b>	<b>I AGREE</b>	<b>I STRONGLY AGREE</b>	
Vocational high school of Igdir	Count	17	25	23	33	26	124
	Expected Count	31,1	39,1	19,0	21,6	13,3	124,0
	% within faculty	13,7%	20,2%	18,5%	26,6%	21,0%	100,0%
	% within i44	20,7%	24,3%	46,0%	57,9%	74,3%	37,9%
	% of Total	5,2%	7,6%	7,0%	10,1%	8,0%	37,9%
Fac. of theology	Count	49	51	21	15	8	144
	Expected Count	36,1	45,4	22,0	25,1	15,4	144,0
	% within faculty	34,0%	35,4%	14,6%	10,4%	5,6%	100,0%
	% within i44	59,8%	49,5%	42,0%	26,3%	22,9%	44,0%
	% of Total	15,0%	15,6%	6,4%	4,6%	2,4%	44,0%
Faculty/ vhs Fac. of engineering	Count	3	7	3	1	0	14
	Expected Count	3,5	4,4	2,1	2,4	1,5	14,0
	% within faculty	21,4%	50,0%	21,4%	7,1%	,0%	100,0%
	% within i44	3,7%	6,8%	6,0%	1,8%	,0%	4,3%
	% of Total	,9%	2,1%	,9%	,3%	,0%	4,3%
Vocational high school of med. Serv.	Count	4	9	0	5	0	18
	Expected Count	4,5	5,7	2,8	3,1	1,9	18,0
	% within faculty	22,2%	50,0%	,0%	27,8%	,0%	100,0%
	% within i44	4,9%	8,7%	,0%	8,8%	,0%	5,5%
	% of Total	1,2%	2,8%	,0%	1,5%	,0%	5,5%
Fac. of agriculture	Count	9	11	3	3	1	27
	Expected Count	6,8	8,5	4,1	4,7	2,9	27,0
	% within faculty	33,3%	40,7%	11,1%	11,1%	3,7%	100,0%
	% within i44	11,0%	10,7%	6,0%	5,3%	2,9%	8,3%
	% of Total	2,8%	3,4%	,9%	,9%	,3%	8,3%
Total	Count	82	103	50	57	35	327
	Expected Count	82,0	103,0	50,0	57,0	35,0	327,0
	% within faculty	25,1%	31,5%	15,3%	17,4%	10,7%	100,0%
	% within i44	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	25,1%	31,5%	15,3%	17,4%	10,7%	100,0%

Chi-Square statistic: 59,210 (P<0.01)

G statistic: 64,706 (P<0.01)

Chi-Square and G statistics reflected that the association between faculty/vocational high school and i44 was statistically significant ( $P < 0.01$ ).

Table 4.82 illustrates that regarding i44, percentages for *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* for the students of Vocational School of Iğdır were recorded as 13,7%, 20,2%, 18,5%, 26,6% and 21,0%, respectively. The related percents for the students of the Faculty of Theology were 34,0%, 35,4%, 14,6%, 10,4% and 5,6%, respectively. The percents of the participants from the Faculty of Engineering for the corresponding options were 21,4%, 50,0%, 21,4%, 7,1% and 0,0%, respectively. The percents of Vocational School of Medical Services students were detected as 22,2%, 50,0%, 0,0%, 27,8% and 0,0%, respectively. From the Faculty of Agriculture, the student percentages for mentioned options were 33,3%, 40,7%, 11,1%, 11,1% and 3,7%, respectively.

#### **4.1.4.1. Response Percentages in Terms of Age Range**

The results of the questionnaire have indicated that age ranges of the participant students do not have a significant effect on the responses given to almost all questions. There were significant associations between age groups and student responses for namely the items number 1, 35 and 41. The tables illustrating the association between these items and the age ranges of the participants are given below:

Table 4. 83  
Response Percentages in Terms of Age Range for item 1

		i1					Total
		Very difficult	difficult	Medium difficult	easy	Very easy	
Group 1	Count	13	24	79	48	18	182
	Expected Count	22,3	31,2	76,8	37,8	13,9	182,0
	% within age range	7,1%	13,2%	43,4%	26,4%	9,9%	100,0%
	% within i1	32,5%	42,9%	57,2%	70,6%	72,0%	55,7%
	% of Total	4,0%	7,3%	24,2%	14,7%	5,5%	55,7%
Age range Group 2	Count	25	28	52	19	7	131
	Expected Count	16,0	22,4	55,3	27,2	10,0	131,0
	% within age range	19,1%	21,4%	39,7%	14,5%	5,3%	100,0%
	% within i1	62,5%	50,0%	37,7%	27,9%	28,0%	40,1%
	% of Total	7,6%	8,6%	15,9%	5,8%	2,1%	40,1%
Group 3	Count	2	4	7	1	0	14
	Expected Count	1,7	2,4	5,9	2,9	1,1	14,0
	% within age range	14,3%	28,6%	50,0%	7,1%	,0%	100,0%
	% within i1	5,0%	7,1%	5,1%	1,5%	,0%	4,3%
	% of Total	,6%	1,2%	2,1%	,3%	,0%	4,3%
Total	Count	40	56	138	68	25	327
	Expected Count	40,0	56,0	138,0	68,0	25,0	327,0
	% within age range	12,2%	17,1%	42,2%	20,8%	7,6%	100,0%
	% within i1	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	12,2%	17,1%	42,2%	20,8%	7,6%	100,0%

Chi-Square statistic: 23,139 (P<0.01) G statistic: 24,522 (P<0.01)

Chi-Square and G statistics reflected that the association between age range and i1 was statistically significant ( $P < 0.01$ ).

As it is seen in table 4.83, the percents for *English language is very difficult, difficult, medium difficult, easy* and *very easy* in i1 for the students at the ages of 17-20 were recorded as 7,1%, 13,2%, 43,4%, 26,4% and 9,9%, respectively. The related percents for the students 21-24 years old were 19,1%, 21,4%, 39,7%, 14,5% and 5,3%, respectively. Percents of 25 years-old and older students for the corresponding responses were 14,3%, 28,6%, 50,0%, 7,1% and 0,0%, respectively.

Table 4.84  
*Response Percentages in Terms of Age Range for item 35*

		i35					Total	
		I Strongly disagree	I disagree	I am undecided	I agree	I strongly agree		
Age range	Group 1	Count	100	61	11	4	6	182
		Expected Count	94,6	59,0	8,3	11,7	8,3	182,0
		% within age range	54,9%	33,5%	6,0%	2,2%	3,3%	100,0%
		% within i35	58,8%	57,5%	73,3%	19,0%	40,0%	55,7%
		% of Total	30,6%	18,7%	3,4%	1,2%	1,8%	55,7%
	Group 2	Count	65	41	3	14	8	131
		Expected Count	68,1	42,5	6,0	8,4	6,0	131,0
		% within age range	49,6%	31,3%	2,3%	10,7%	6,1%	100,0%
		% within i35	38,2%	38,7%	20,0%	66,7%	53,3%	40,1%
		% of Total	19,9%	12,5%	,9%	4,3%	2,4%	40,1%
	Group 3	Count	5	4	1	3	1	14
		Expected Count	7,3	4,5	,6	,9	,6	14,0
		% within age range	35,7%	28,6%	7,1%	21,4%	7,1%	100,0%
		% within i35	2,9%	3,8%	6,7%	14,3%	6,7%	4,3%
		% of Total	1,5%	1,2%	,3%	,9%	,3%	4,3%
Total	Count	170	106	15	21	15	327	
	Expected Count	170,0	106,0	15,0	21,0	15,0	327,0	
	% within age range	52,0%	32,4%	4,6%	6,4%	4,6%	100,0%	
	% within i35	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
	% of Total	52,0%	32,4%	4,6%	6,4%	4,6%	100,0%	
Chi-Square statistic: 19,088 (P<0.01)			G statistic: 18,629 (P<0.01)					

When Chi-Square and G statistics are taken into consideration, it was concluded that the association between age range and i35 was statistically significant (P<0.01).

Table 4.84 shows that the percents for *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* in i35 for the students at the ages of 17-20 were recorded as 54,9%, 33,5%, 6,0%, 2,2% and 3,3%, respectively. The related percents for students who were 21-24 years old were 49,6%, 31,3%, 2,3%, 10,7% and 6,1%, respectively. Percents of 25 years-old and older students for the corresponding responses were 35,7%, 28,6%, 7,1%, 21,4% and 7,1%, respectively.

Table 4. 85  
*Response Percentages in Terms of Age Range for item 41*

		i41					Total
		<b>I Strongly disagree</b>	<b>I disagree</b>	<b>I am undecided</b>	<b>I agree</b>	<b>I strongly agree</b>	
Group 1	Count	23	32	19	56	52	182
	Expected Count	21,7	28,9	14,5	65,7	51,2	182,0
	% within Age range	12,6%	17,6%	10,4%	30,8%	28,6%	100,0%
	% within i41	59,0%	61,5%	73,1%	47,5%	56,5%	55,7%
	% of Total	7,0%	9,8%	5,8%	17,1%	15,9%	55,7%
Age range Group 2	Count	15	19	7	51	39	131
	Expected Count	15,6	20,8	10,4	47,3	36,9	131,0
	% within Age range	11,5%	14,5%	5,3%	38,9%	29,8%	100,0%
	% within i41	38,5%	36,5%	26,9%	43,2%	42,4%	40,1%
	% of Total	4,6%	5,8%	2,1%	15,6%	11,9%	40,1%
Group 3	Count	1	1	0	11	1	14
	Expected Count	1,7	2,2	1,1	5,1	3,9	14,0
	% within Age range	7,1%	7,1%	,0%	78,6%	7,1%	100,0%
	% within i41	2,6%	1,9%	,0%	9,3%	1,1%	4,3%
	% of Total	,3%	,3%	,0%	3,4%	,3%	4,3%
Total	Count	39	52	26	118	92	327
	Expected Count	39,0	52,0	26,0	118,0	92,0	327,0
	% within Age range	11,9%	15,9%	8,0%	36,1%	28,1%	100,0%
	% within i41	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	11,9%	15,9%	8,0%	36,1%	28,1%	100,0%

Chi-Square statistic: 16,233 (P<0.01)

G statistic: 16,809 (P<0.01)

Chi-Square and G statistics reflected that the association between age range and i41 was statistically significant ( $P < 0.01$ ).

Table 4. 85 indicates that the percents for *I strongly disagree*, *I disagree*, *I am undecided*, *I agree* and *I strongly agree* in i41 for the students at the ages of 17-20 were recorded as 12,6%, 17,6%, 10,4%, 30,8% and 28,6%, respectively. The related percents for students who were 21-24 years old were 11,5%, 14,5%, 5,3%, 38,9% and 29,8%, respectively. Percents of 25 years-old and older students for the corresponding responses were 7,1%, 7,1%, 0,0%, 78,6% and 7,1%, respectively.

## 4.2. DISCUSSION

This study was conducted to find out university students' opinions about English language and to determine their evaluations about English language course they take at university. According to the results of the questionnaire, it can be deduced that the majority of the participants agreed upon the following statements:

1. English language will make me a more sophisticated person and with the help of English, people will respect me more.
2. English language will help me understand other cultures and with the help of English, I can take part in cultural activities arranged by European Union.
3. English language is crucial for an academic career.
4. English language will help me find a better job.
5. The topics in the English courses are interesting and the course book and related handouts are appropriate to my level.
6. Objective tests are necessary in assessing and evaluating the students' improvements.
7. There should be more practical language use during the classes.
8. Finishing high school with insufficient foreign language knowledge, focusing on only passing the exams and not studying regularly are some of the student-based problems that are presumably the reasons for being unsuccessful at this course.

9. Absence of diverse activities during the classes and the unavailability of practical language use are failure reasons that stem from the curriculum, physical conditions and the educational system.

Considering the results of the questionnaire, it is feasible to conclude that the students studying at the faculties and vocational high schools of Iğdır University have a positive attitude towards learning English language. Almost all of the students are conscious of the fact that English language is necessary in social, cultural, economic and academic aspects. With this respect, this study is in line with many studies conducted in Turkish universities.

Üzüm (2007), for instance, explains the attitudes of English language learners in Turkey towards this language with these words:

“In terms of instrumental orientation, Turkish learners are fully aware of pragmatic benefits of English language knowledge, and are instrumentally oriented towards English, which might have facilitative influences in the acquisition process” (Üzüm, 2007:127).

In another study, which was conducted by Güllü (2007), it was understood that the students think that learning English would provide an advantage in their future career.

Though the students apparently have positive attitudes towards this lesson, they express that they face many problems that inhibit efficient language learning. One of these problems is the lack of communicative and dialogue-based activities in lessons. Similarly, in the study by Güllü (2007), the students were found out to believe that the lessons should be more student-centered. It was also concluded that English language teachers should enable students to use the language in the class, which was pointed by the respondents of this study as one of the main problems in the English courses. Moreover, it was suggested that the teachers of the English course should use other methods instead of lecturing, and more visual and audial materials to enrich the lesson and increase students' motivation. When the students were asked for the reasons for not being successful, their answers varied from not being motivated enough to crowded population of the classroom.

As a result of an extensive research, Pekgüç (2008) summarizes the basic problems confronted in foreign language education at Turkish universities as follows:

- 1) The students do not study regularly.
- 2) The students graduate from high schools with little knowledge of foreign language.
- 3) Some students prefer learning by heart.
- 4) The students are not used to reading in both native and target language.
- 5) The students do not know the grammatical structures of their native language very well.
- 6) The students are not interested in the culture of the people speaking the language they have been learning.
- 7) The students and teachers do not adequately benefit from technology that is supposed to be used in the teaching and learning environment.
- 8) The teachers are made to depend on the intensive teaching programme based on the curriculum and they teach grammar.

In a study carried out by Gökdemir (2003), the problems that university students encounter during English language courses are given as follows:

1. The English language courses are basically on theoretical information, rather than practical use.
2. The English language courses are teacher-centered, rather than student-centered, and the students are not entitled with tasks that might facilitate active participation.
3. The universities are not considered to be the best places to learn a foreign language and the students do not spend enough time and effort to learn the target language.
4. University administration do not give much importance to foreign language teaching.

5. The universities do not provide appropriate conditions and materials required for these courses.

6. The program is followed fast in order to catch up with the curriculum and correct methods that may encourage active participation are not used.

As regards to the relations of the results of the questionnaire with the variables (gender, age group and faculty/vocational high school studied), it was concluded that the variables of gender and age group did not have a significant effect on students' responses, while the faculty/vocational high school studied made significant differences in participants' answers for twenty-one items of the questionnaire. Present results supported the previous ones significantly. In a study carried out by İnceçay and İnceçay (2009), for instance, it was seen that the variables of gender and age did not make significant differences in students responses to the questions asked about communicative activities in EFL classrooms. In another study, which was conducted by Üstünel and Samur (2010), it was found out that gender and department were not always a determining factor in students' beliefs about language learning. Another example is a study conducted by Al Rifai (2010) and as a result of this study, it was concluded that there was no significant difference between the students' answers to the questionnaire about their beliefs about English language course with respect to their age. Hussein, Demirok and Uzunboylu (2009) also studied university students' attitudes towards English language and they came up with the results that students' attitudes were not affected by the variables of gender and department.

Again in the study by İnceçay and İnceçay (2009), almost all of the participating students stated that they demanded more communicative activities that may provide more student to student interaction. In the same research, it was found out that having grammar-based exams in the evaluation process hinders their active participation into communicative activities.

In a similar research carried out by Bektaş-Çetinkaya and Oruç (2010), it was found out that almost all of the participating students believed that English language is necessary for them and they need English to obtain a good job and to communicate with international community through media and interpersonal exchanges. The participants of this study, similar to the participants of the present study, claim to be aware of the

necessity of learning English in their lives, for their future career and etc., however, very few of them seem to be paying attention to spend time and effort to be successful in achieving this goal.

## CHAPTER 5

### 5. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

#### 5.1. Conclusion

Given the global significance of English language, it is almost impossible to disagree with these words of Alptekin (2002:60):

“Social and economic globalization has necessitated the use of an international means of communication in the world. English has become the language of international communication. It was estimated as early as 1985 that the number of people who used English worldwide either as their native or nonnative language was one and a half billion. English is likely to remain the basic international medium of communication well into the twenty-first century, and within a short period of time the number of people who speak English as a nonnative language may well exceed the number of its native speakers. Even now, English is the world’s primary vehicle for storing and transmitting information. An estimated 75% of the world’s mail is in English, 80% of computer data in English, and 85% of all information stored or abstracted is in English (Thomas, 1996). Given the lingua franca status of English, it is clear that much of the world needs and uses English for instrumental reasons such as professional contacts, academic studies and commercial pursuits”.

With these instrumental or integrative reasons, people have been in an attempt to learn and have a command of this language. Nonetheless, there have always been complaints or discontentedness for not being fully competent in the use of this language. Karahan (2007) argues that the reasons for the poor foreign language skills of students have long been a matter of discussion among educators since being exposed to English instruction for a long time at different levels does not end up with a satisfactory foreign language knowledge. Even though they spend a huge amount of time and effort,

learners cannot go beyond the basics or they have difficulty in developing their level of proficiency unless they are individually motivated.

As in many studies (Ariogul & Unal & Onursal, 2009; De Saint Leger & Storch, 2009; Ocak & Özçalışan & Kuru, 2010, and Sokuragi, 2006) conducted in the field of ELT in the previous years, the current study handed the micropohone to learners to find out their point of view as regards to English language learning problems in question. In this respect, the main purposes of this study have been a) to learn about the views of university students on English language b) to have an opinion about the attendance and participation of the university students in English language course c) to determine foreign language learning problems, stemming from the student, the instructor, curriculum, physical conditions and the educational system.

The questionnaire developed within the framework of this study was fulfilled at three faculties and two vocational high schools of Iğdır University in 2010-2011 academic years. It was prepared in Likert-scale and the program used for the analysis of the data gathered by means of this questionnaire was SPSS 17.0. The participants of the study were first and second grade students all of whom were taking English language course during the terms the questionnaire was fulfilled. Three hundred twenty seven students from all faculties and vocational high schools of Iğdır University attended to the questionnaire. The participants from the Faculty of Agriculture were studying at the departments of Horticulture and Field Crops, and the students from the Faculty of Engineering were studying at the department of Food Engineering. The programs of the Vocational High Schools were Medical Documentation and Secretaryship and Medical Laboratory Techniques from Vocational High School of Medical Services; and Business Management, Computer Programming, Finance, Accounting, Foreign Trade and Banking from the Vocational School of Iğdır. Of totally 327 participants, one hundred seventy-four were female and one hundred fifty-three students were male. Their ages ranged from 17 to 39.

While reviewing the results of this study, it is appropriate to look through the gathered data in separated sections of the questionnaire, which was composed of three main sections. In the first section, the items were prepared with the aim of determining students' ideas, attitudes indeed, about English language learning and the necessity of

English language. Almost all of the students shared the conviction that English language is crucial for social, cultural, economic and academic aspects in their lives. Therefore, from this result it can be deduced that the students of Iğdır University have positive attitudes towards English language.

Considering student responses to the items in the second part, it is possible to make deductions concerning students' attendance and participation into English lessons and their opinions about the teaching and evaluating process in this course. It can be concluded that a significant number of students attend English lessons regularly and more than half of them actively participate into the activities in these lessons. About the activities and the teaching methods in these activities, the students think that more communicative and practice-based activities would be much more beneficial rather than teacher-centered and course-book-based activities. In addition, on the evaluation procedures the students demand more objective tests, consisting of exercises such as true-false, completing, matching, etc.

The next section of the questionnaire was arranged with the aim of determining the problems that might lead to being unsuccessful in English language courses. These problems were divided into three categories: 1) problems stemming from the students, 2) problems stemming from the instructor, and 3) problems stemming from the environment (curriculum, physical conditions and educational system). The items that a notable number of students agreed on were included in the first and third subsections. Of ten items in the first subsection (problems stemming from the students), the ones indicating "finishing high school with insufficient foreign language knowledge, focusing on only passing the exams, and not studying regularly" are the items on which most of the students agreed. "Absence of diverse activities during the classes" and "the unavailability of practical language use" are some of the failure reasons that stem from the curriculum, physical conditions and the educational system according to the majority of the students. The items stating the possible problems stemming from the instructor are agreed upon by a small number of participants, which seems insignificant. Furthermore, it should be mentioned here that the questionnaire used in this study was a new synthesis, which makes this study an innovation in this field.

## 5.2. Suggestions

To sum up the study, it would be appropriate to suggest every person involved in the process of teaching and learning a foreign language to bear in mind that learning a foreign language is an individual process in which the environmental, physiological and psychological needs cannot be ignored or neglected. Evaluation is the best way achieving the goal of determining these needs and therefore, a systematic assessment should be at an indispensable position in English language teaching programs.

Another suggestion might be about the use of more communicative and interactive activities in English language courses. The results derived from students' responses have shown that there is a high demand for more practice-based exercises in foreign language courses. The problem that the students feel shy, reluctant or suspensive to speak in English in lessons might be overcome with the help of these kinds of activities.

Another challenge that is required to be eliminated for effective language learning at university is the lack of a sufficient English language input at secondary education. If this could be accomplished, there might be more qualified foreign language education at university level.

It should be kept in mind that the scope of this study was limited to the students studying at the faculties and vocational high schools of Iğdır University in 2010-2011 academic years. More comprehensive studies could be fulfilled simultaneously in different universities in order to obtain more valid and reliable data. Moreover, teaching and administrative staff could be included in a similar study so that the viewpoints of all effective factors are comprised.

## REFERENCES

- Al Rifai, N. (2010). Attitude, motivation and difficulties involved in learning the English language and factors that affect motivation in learning it. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 2, 5216-5227.
- Alatis, J. E., Altman, H. B. and Alatis, P. M. (1981). *The second language classroom, directions for the 1980s, Essays in honor of Mary Finacchiaro*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Alderson, J. C. and Beretta, A. (1992). *Evaluating second language education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Alptekin, C. (2002). Towards intercultural communicative competence in ELT. *ELT Journal* 56(1), 57-64.
- Ariogul, S., Unal, D. C., Onursal, I. (2009). Foreign language learners' beliefs about language learning: a study on Turkish university students. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 1, 1500-1506.
- Bektaş-Çetinkaya, Y. and Oruç, N. (2010). Turkish students' motivation to learn English at public and private universities. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 2 (2009), 4662-4666.
- Broughton, G., Brumfit, C., Flavell, R., Hill, P. and Pincas, A. (1980). *Teaching English as a foreign language*. New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Brown, H. D. (1981) Affective factors in second language learning. In Alatis, J. E., Altman, H. B. and Alatis, P. M. (Eds.) *The second language classroom, directions for the 1980s, essays in honor of Mary Finacchiaro* (p. 113-129). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of learning language and teaching*. New York: Longman
- Cronbach, L. J. (1991). Course improvement through evaluation. In Madaus, G.F., Scriven, M.S. and Stufflebeam, D. L. (Eds.), *Evaluation models: viewpoints on educational and human services evaluation* (p. 101- 115). Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff Publishing.
- De Saint Leger, D. and Storch, N. (2009). Learners' perceptions and attitudes: implications for willingness to communicate in an L2 classroom. *System*, 37, 269-285.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001) *Teaching and researching motivation*. England: Pearson Education
- Gardner, R. C. and Lambert, W. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning*. Rowley, Ma: Newbury House.

- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning. The role of attitudes and motivation*. London; Baltimore, MD: Edward Arnold.
- Gökdemir, C. V. (2003). *Üniversitelerde ingilizce hazırlık programına devam eden öğrencilerin ingilizce derslerinde karşılaştıkları sorunlar*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Dokuz Eylül University, Institute of Educational Sciences.
- Güllü, A. S. (2007). *An evaluation of english program at kozan vocational school of çukurova university: students' point of view*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Çukurova University, The Graduate School of Social Sciences, English Language Teaching Department, Adana.
- Hussein, G., Demirok, M. S. and Uzunboylu, H. (2009). Undergraduate students' attitudes towards English language. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1 (2009), 431-433.
- Hutchinson, T. and Waters, A. (1987). *English For specific purposes: A learning-centred approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- İnceçay, G. and İnceçay, V. (2009). Turkish university students' perceptions of communicative and non-communicative activities in EFL classroom. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1 (2009), 618-622.
- Karahan, F. (2007). Language attitudes of Turkish students towards the English language and its use in Turkish context. *Çankaya Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi, Journal of Arts and Sciences*, 7, 73-87.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Leung, P. (1991). An evaluation study of a programme to teach standard report writing. *Hong Kong Papers in Linguistics and Language Teaching*, 14, 65- 79.
- Levine, G. S. (2003). Student and instructor beliefs and attitudes about target language use, first language use, and anxiety: report of a questionnaire study. *The Modern Language Journal*, 87, 343-364.
- Lynch, B. K. (2003). *Language program evaluation: theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1998). *Language teaching methodology*. London: Prentice Hall International.
- Ocak, G., Özçalışan, H. and Kuru, N. (2010) The student attitudes in terms of the usage of English activities and materials and their contributions to English learning process. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2, 560-564.
- Oğuz, O., Oktay, A. and Ayhan, H. (2010). *21. Yüzyılda eğitim ve Türk eğitim sistemi*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

- Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. New York: Newbury House
- Palmer, H. (1965). *The principles of language study*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Payne, D.A. (1994). *Designing educational project and program evaluations: A practical overview based on research and experience*. Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Peck, S. (1979). Differing needs of ESL students. In Celce-Murcia, M. and McIntosh, L. (Eds.) *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (p. 261-269). Cambridge, MA: Newbury House Publishers
- Pekgüç, S. (2008). *Üniversitelerde yabancı dil öğretiminde yönetim ve örgütlenme sorunları*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Yeditepe University, İstanbul.
- Prator, C. H. (1979). The cornerstones of method. In Celce-Murcia, M. and McIntosh, L. (Eds.) *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (p. 5-16). Cambridge, MA: Newbury House Publishers
- Rea-Dickins, P. and Germaine, K. (1992). *Evaluation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Richards, J. C. and Rodgers, T.S. (1986). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Richards J. C. (2006). *Communicative language teaching today*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Rivers, W. M. and Melvin, B. J. (1981). Language learners as individuals: Discovering their needs, wants, and learning styles. In Alatis, J. E., Altman, H. B. and Alatis, P. M. (Eds.) *The second language classroom, directions for the 1980s, essays in honor of Mary Finacchiaro* (p. 81-93). Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Sakuragi, T. (2006). The relation between Attitudes toward language study and cross-cultural attitudes. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 30, 19-31.
- Şeker, M. (2003). *Attitudes toward language learning: a sociolinguistic study of preparatory students at ELT department at çukurova university*. Unpublished master's thesis, Çukurova University, Adana.
- Titone, R. (1981). The holistic approach to second language education. In Alatis, J. E., Altman, H. B. and Alatis, P. M. (Eds.) *The second language classroom, directions for the 1980s, essays in honor of Mary Finacchiaro* (p. 69-77). Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Üstünel, E. and Samur, E. (2010). Examining the relationship between two year vocational school students' beliefs about language learning and their academic success. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2 (2010), 3489-3493.

- Üzüm, B. (2007). *Analysis of Turkish learners' attitudes towards English language and english speaking societies*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, The Graduate School of Social Sciences, Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- Valette, R. M. (1981). The evaluation of second language learning. In Alatis, J. E., Altman, H. B. and Alatis, P. M. (Eds.) *The second language classroom, directions for the 1980s, essays in honor of Mary Finacchiaro* (p. 161-174). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**APPENDIX A**  
**ÖĞRENCİ ANKETİ**

*Lütfen isminizi yazmayın*

Cinsiyet : ( ) Kadın ( ) Erkek

Yaş:

Fakülte / Yüksekokul:

Bölüm / Program:

1. İNGİLİZCE DERSİ BENİM İÇİN	a. Çok kolay	b. Kolay	c. Orta derece zorlukta	d. Zor	e. Çok zor
I.BÖLÜM	KESİNLİKLE KATILYORUM	KATILYORUM	KARARSIZIM	KATILMIYORUM	KESİNLİKLE KATILMIYORUM
2. İngilizceyi okumak ve yazmak, bu dili konuşmak ve anlamaktan daha kolaydır.					
3. İngilizcenin beni daha bilgili bir birey yapacağını düşünüyorum.					
4. İngilizce sayesinde Avrupa Birliği kapsamında yapılacak kültürel etkinliklere katılabilirim.					
5. İngilizce sayesinde daha geniş bir kitleyle iletişim kurabilirim.					
6. İngilizce sayesinde insanların bana olan saygısı artabilir.					
7. İngilizce diğer kültürleri anlamamda bana yardımcı olacaktır.					
8. İngilizce akademik kariyer için gereklidir.					
9. İngilizce iyi bir iş sahibi olmamda bana yardımcı olacaktır.					
10. İngilizce öğrenmek önemli değildir.					

II. BÖLÜM	KESİNLİKLE KATILYORUM	KATILYORUM	KARARSIZIM	KATILMIYORUM	KESİNLİKLE KATILMIYORUM
11. İngilizce derslerine düzenli devam ediyorum.					
12. İngilizce dersinde işlenen konular ilgimi çekiyor.					
13. Kullanılan ders araçları İngilizce öğrenmemizde bize yardımcı oluyor.					
14. Ana ders kitabını ve ilgili basılı materyallerini anlamakta güçlük çekiyorum.					
15. Ana ders kitabını ve ilgili basılı materyallerini basit / seviyemin altında buluyorum.					
16. Dersi ölçme ve değerlendirmede sözlü sınava yer verilmeli.					
17. Dersi ölçme ve değerlendirmede objektif teste (doğru, yanlış, eşleştirme, tamamlama...) yer verilmeli.					
18. İngilizce dersinde başarılıyım.					
19. İngilizce derslerine aktif katılıyorum.					
20. İngilizce derslerine aktif katılmıyorum çünkü:					
a. Derse yeterince güdülenemiyorum					
b. Dersler genellikle öğretmen merkezli					
c. Dersin hızına yetişemiyorum.					
d. Öğretim elemanı alan bilgisinde yetersiz					
e. İngilizce konuşmaya çekiniyorum./ arkadaşlarımdan utanıyorum.					
f. Diğer sebepler					

III. BÖLÜM İngilizce dersinde yaşadığınız / yaşanan başarısızlık nelerden kaynaklanıyor olabilir?	KESİNLİKLE KATILYORUM	KATILYORUM	KARARSIZIM	KATILMIYORUM	KESİNLİKLE KATILMIYORUM
<b>Öğrenciden Kaynaklanan Problemler</b>					
21. Yabancı dil öğrenmeye karşı yatkınlığın olmaması					
22. Yabancı dili sevmeme					
23. Yabancı dile karşı önyargılı olma					
24. Liseden yetersiz dil bilgisiyle mezun olma					
25. Sınav odaklı olma					
26. Anadil bilgisinin yetersizliği					
27. İsteksizlik					
28. ÖSS sonrası yaşanan rahatlık					
29. Ekonomik, ailevi, kişisel nedenler					
30. Düzenli ders çalışmama					
<b>Öğretim Elemanından Kaynaklanan Problemler</b>					
31. Öğretim elemanının işini sevmemesi/ Derse isteksiz girmesi					
32. İletişim eksikliği/ Empati kuramama					
33. Derslerin öğretmen merkezli, sıkıcı olması					
34. Öğretim elemanının çok disiplinli olması					
35. Öğretim elemanının disiplini sağlayamaması					
36. Kitaba bağlı kalma					
37. Ezbere teşvik etme					

Müfredattan Fiziki Koşullardan ve Sistemden Kaynaklanan Problemler					
<b>Kısa sürede yoğun program işlenmesi</b>					
38. Dersin okunan bölümle bir ilgisinin olmaması					
39. Derste değişik aktivitelerin yapılmaması					
40. Pratik yapma imkanının olmaması					
41. Sınıfların kalabalık olması					
42. Ders saatinin az olması					
43. Sınavların zor olması					
44. Sınavların öğrenci başarısını tam olarak ölçmüyor olması					
45. Dersin zorunlu olması					
46. Eğitim sisteminin ezbere dayanması					

Anket formunda yer alan sorular dışında eklemek istediğiniz görüş veya eleştiriniz varsa lütfen not ediniz:

.....

.....

.....

.....

İlgi ve katkılarınız için teşekkür ederim.

**APPENDIX B**  
**ÖĞRENCİ ANKETİ**

*Lütfen isminizi yazmayın*

*Tercih ettiğiniz cevabı ilgili kutucuğa “ X ” koyarak belirtin*

**Cinsiyet :** ( ) Bay ( ) Bayan

**Yaş:**

**Fakülte / Yüksekokul:**

**Bölüm / Program:**

<b>1. İngilizce dersi benim için</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Çok zor	<input type="checkbox"/> Zor	<input type="checkbox"/> Orta derece zorlukta	<input type="checkbox"/> Kolay	<input type="checkbox"/> Çok kolay
--------------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------------------	---	--------------------------------	------------------------------------

I.BÖLÜM	KESİNLİKLE KATILMIYORUM	KATILMIYORUM	KARARSIZIM	KATILIYORUM	KESİNLİKLE KATILIYORUM
2. İngilizceyi okumak ve yazmak, bu dili konuşmak ve anlamaktan daha kolaydır.					
3. İngilizcenin beni daha bilgili bir birey yapacağını düşünüyorum.					
4. İngilizce sayesinde Avrupa Birliği kapsamında yapılacak kültürel etkinliklere katılabilirim.					
5. İngilizce sayesinde daha geniş bir kitleyle iletişim kurabilirim.					
6. İngilizce sayesinde insanların bana olan saygısı artabilir.					
7. İngilizce diğer kültürleri anlamamda bana yardımcı olacaktır.					
8. İngilizce akademik kariyer için gereklidir.					
9. İngilizce iyi bir iş sahibi olmamda bana yardımcı olacaktır.					
10. İngilizce öğrenmek önemli değildir.					

**LÜTFEN TÜM SORULARA EKSİKSİZ CEVAP VERİNİZ**

<b>II. BÖLÜM</b>	<b>KESİNLİKLE KATILMIYORUM</b>	<b>KATILMIYORUM</b>	<b>KARARSIZIM</b>	<b>KATILIYORUM</b>	<b>KESİNLİKLE KATILIYORUM</b>
11. İngilizce derslerine düzenli devam ediyorum.					
12. İngilizce dersinde işlenen konular ilgimi çekiyor.					
13. Kullanılan ders araçları İngilizce öğrenmemizde bize yardımcı oluyor.					
14. Ana ders kitabını ve ilgili basılı materyallerini anlamakta güçlük çekiyorum.					
15. Ana ders kitabını ve ilgili basılı materyallerini basit / seviyemin altında buluyorum.					
16. Dersi ölçme ve değerlendirmede sözlü sınava yer verilmeli.					
17. Dersi ölçme ve değerlendirmede objektif teste (doğru-yanlış, eşleştirme, tamamlama, vs) yer verilmeli.					
18. Derste daha çok pratik İngilizceye yer verilmeli					
19. İngilizce derslerine aktif katılıyorum.					
20. Bu derse aktif katılmıyorum çünkü:					
20a. İngilizceye karşı bir ilgim yok.					
20b. Dersler genellikle öğretmen merkezli, tek taraflı işleniyor.					
20c. Dersin hızına yetişemiyorum.					
20d. Öğretim elemanını alanında yetersiz buluyorum.					
20e. İngilizce konuşmaya çekiniyorum / arkadaşlarımdan utanıyorum.					
20f. Başka sebep var ise belirtiniz					

**LÜTFEN TÜM SORULARA EKSİKSİZ CEVAP VERİNİZ**

<b>III. BÖLÜM</b> <b>İngilizce dersinde yaşadığınız / yaşanan başarısızlık nelerden kaynaklanıyor olabilir?</b>	<b>KESİNLİKLE KATILMIYORUM</b>	<b>KATILMIYORUM</b>	<b>KARARSIZIM</b>	<b>KATILIYORUM</b>	<b>KESİNLİKLE KATILIYORUM</b>
<b>Öğrenciden Kaynaklanan Problemler</b>					
21. Yabancı dil öğrenmeye karşı yatkınlığın olmaması					
22. Yabancı dili sevmeme					
23. Yabancı dile karşı önyargılı olma					
24. Liseden yetersiz dil bilgisiyle mezun olma					
25. Sadece dersi geçmeye odaklı olma					
26. Anadil bilgisinin yetersizliği					
27. İsteksizlik					
28. ÖSS sonrası yaşanan rahatlık					
29. Ekonomik, ailevi, kişisel nedenler					
30. Düzenli ders çalışmama					
<b>Öğretim Elemanından Kaynaklanan Problemler</b>					
31. Öğretim elemanının derse isteksiz girmesi					
32. İletişim eksikliği					
33. Derslerin öğretmen merkezli, sıkıcı olması					
34. Öğretim elemanının çok disiplimli olması					
35. Öğretim elemanının disiplini sağlayamaması					
36. Kitaba bağlı kalma					
37. Ezbere teşvik etme					

**LÜTFEN TÜM SORULARA EKSİKSİZ CEVAP VERİNİZ**

<b>Müfredattan Fiziki Koşullardan ve Sistemden Kaynaklanan Problemler</b>	<b>KESİNLİKLE KATILMIYORUM</b>	<b>KATILMIYORUM</b>	<b>KARARSIZIM</b>	<b>KATILIYORUM</b>	<b>KESİNLİKLE KATILIYORUM</b>
38. Kısa sürede yoğun program işlenmesi					
39. Dersin okunan bölümle bir ilgisinin olmaması					
40. Derste değişik aktivitelerin yapılmaması					
41. Pratik yapma imkanının olmaması					
42. Sınıfların kalabalık olması					
43. Ders saatinin az olması					
44. Sınavların zor olması					
45. Sınavların öğrenci başarısını tam olarak ölçmüyor olması					
46. Dersin zorunlu olması					
47. Eğitim sisteminin ezbere dayanması					

**Anket formunda yer alan sorular dışında eklemek istediğiniz görüş veya eleştiriniz varsa lütfen not ediniz:**

.....

.....

.....

.....

İlgi ve katkılarınız için teşekkür ederim.

**LÜTFEN TÜM SORULARA EKSİKSİZ CEVAP VERİNİZ**

**APPENDIX C  
STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE**

*Please do not write your name*

*Write an "X" in the box indicating your answer for each item*

**Gender:** ( ) Male ( ) Female

**Age:**

**Fakulty / Vocational High School:**

**Department / Program:**

<b>1. English course is</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Very difficult	<input type="checkbox"/> difficult	<input type="checkbox"/> medium difficult	<input type="checkbox"/> easy	<input type="checkbox"/> very easy
-----------------------------	---	------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------	------------------------------------

PART I	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
2. Reading and writing in English are easier than speaking and understanding this language.					
3. I think English language will make me a more sophisticated person.					
4. With the help of English, I can take part in cultural activities arranged by European Union.					
5. With the help of English, I can communicate with more people.					
6. With the help of English, people will respect me more.					
7. English language will help me understand other cultures.					
8. English language is crucial for an academic career.					
9. English language will help me find a better job.					
10. It is not important to learn English language.					

**PLEASE ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS PRECISELY**

<b>PART II</b>	<b>STRONGLY DISAGREE</b>	<b>DISAGREE</b>	<b>NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE</b>	<b>AGREE</b>	<b>STRONGLY AGREE</b>
11. I attend the English courses regularly.					
12. The topics in the English courses draw my interest.					
13. Course materials help us learn English.					
14. I find it difficult to understand the course book and related handouts.					
15. I find the course book and related handouts easy/below my level.					
16. Oral exams should take place in the assessment and evaluation process.					
17. Objective tests (true-false, matching, completing, etc.) should take place in the assessment and evaluation process.					
18. There should be more practical language use during the classes.					
19. I actively attend to English classes.					
20. I do not actively attend to English classes because					
20a. I am not interested in English					
20b. the classes are usually teacher-centered and one-sided					
20c. I cannot catch up with the lessons					
20d. I find the instructor insufficient in the field					
20e. I am shy about speaking English/I feel shy in front of my friends.					
20f. please indicate other reasons if any.					

**PLEASE ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS PRECISELY**

<b>PART III</b> <b>What can be the reasons for the failure in English course?</b>	<b>STRONGLY DISAGREE</b>	<b>DISAGREE</b>	<b>NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE</b>	<b>AGREE</b>	<b>STRONGLY AGREE</b>
<b>Problems stemming from the student</b>					
21. Lack of tendency to foreign language learning					
22. Dislike for foreign language					
23. Being prejudiced against foreign language					
24. Finishing high school with insufficient foreign language knowledge					
25. Focusing on only passing the exams.					
26. Having insufficient mother tongue knowledge					
27. Reluctance					
28. Leisureliness after the university entrance exam					
29. Economic, familial and personal reasons					
30. Not studying regularly					
<b>Problems Stemming From the Instructor</b>					
31. Coming to class half-heartedly					
32. Lack of communication					
33. Lecturing in a teacher-centered and boring way					
34. Being too disciplined					
35. Being unable to discipline and control the class					
36. Being confined to course book					
37. Promoting memorization					

**PLEASE ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS PRECISELY**

<b>Problems stemming from the curriculum, physical conditions and the system</b>	<b>STRONGLY DISAGREE</b>	<b>DISAGREE</b>	<b>NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE</b>	<b>AGREE</b>	<b>STRONGLY AGREE</b>
38. Having an intensive program in a short period of time					
39. The irrelevance between the course and the department					
40. Absence of diverse activities during the classes					
41. Unavailability of practical language use					
42. Over-crowded classrooms					
43. Insufficient course hours					
44. Difficulty of the exams					
45. Inefficacy of the exams in measuring student improvement					
46. Taking the course compulsorily					
47. The fact that educational system is based upon memorization					

**Please write any views or comments you would like to add**

.....

.....

.....

.....

Thanks for your interest and contributions.

**PLEASE ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS PRECISELY**

## **CURRICULUM VITAE**

Didem Parlak was born in Iğdır in 1986. She went to Yaycı primary school and MEV Anatolian High School in Iğdır. She studied at English Language Teaching Department of Gazi University. She graduated in 2008 and has been working as an English language instructor at Iğdır University for three years. She is married and lives in Iğdır.