Attitudes Toward Turkish Culture and Social Cohesion of Turkish Learners as a Second Language

Gülnur Aydın, Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli University,
gulnur.aydin@hbv.edu.tr, 🆔 0000-0003-0490-9580

Huriye Özlen Avaroğlu, Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli University,
avaroglu.huriyeozlen@hbv.edu.tr, 🆔 0009-0003-8878-6406

Abstract

This relational survey study aims to determine the relationship between the attitudes of students learning Turkish as a second language towards Turkish culture and their social cohesion. The participants were determined by criterion sampling. 189 international learners studying Turkish at various Turkish universities participated in the study. The data were gathered through the Attitude Towards Turkish Culture Scale and the Social Cohesion Scale for Immigrants. Parametric tests were used for data analysis. The study's findings revealed that Turkish language learners' attitudes toward Turkish culture were significantly more favorable toward Asians in terms of their regions of origin and toward the Ural-Altaic language family in terms of their mother tongues. However, there was no significant difference in attitude scores depending on their knowledge of other language(s), reasons for visiting Türkiye, and length of stay in Türkiye. In the social cohesion scores of Turkish as a second language learner, a significant difference was found in favor of those from the "Ural-Altaic language family" in some sub-dimensions concerning the language family of the participants. In addition, there was a significant difference only in the belonging dimension of the scale depending on the length of stay in Türkiye - in favor of those who stayed in Türkiye between 2-4 years. However, no significant difference was found in cohesion scores by region, their knowledge of other language(s), and the reasons for visiting Türkiye. Finally, the moderate positive correlation between the participants' attitudes towards Turkish culture and their social cohesion indicates that students with positive attitudes also have a higher level of social cohesion.

To cite this article: Aydın, G. & Avaroğlu, H. Ö. (2023). Attitudes toward Turkish culture and social cohesion of Turkish learners as a second language. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instructional Studies, 13*(2), 249-277. https://doi.org/10.31704/ijocis.2023.011

Introduction

In recent years, many positive and negative developments in the world (technology, transportation, interest/curiosity, disasters, war, and security issues, etc.) have created a rationale for mass migration or transnational activities. This encourages engagement with the sociocultural and interactional conditions experienced in other countries. The boundaries of these conditions are determined by the individual's motivation and competencies to participate, as well as the country's equal opportunities for participation. Current research draws attention to social cohesion, which enables the elimination of boundaries for the development of individuals and society (Ager & Strang, 2008; Lam, 2006).

Social cohesion is the ability to acquire skills appropriate to the host culture and to assume roles appropriate to these skills in natural social contexts; it refers to positive social relationships. Dragolov et al. (2013) argue that social cohesion has three dimensions, namely social relations, connectedness, and focus on the common good. Social relations refer to social networks, trust between people, and acceptance of diversity; connectedness refers to identification, trust in institutions, and perception of justice; and focus on the common good refers to solidarity/charity, respect for social rules, and civic engagement. The sustainability of the diversity of nations based on the coexistence of different cultural identities requires the internalization of all dimensions of social cohesion. Social cohesion, which involves mutual trust and understanding between groups, is one of the main topics of education in multicultural societies. An understanding of education individual and social functions which are structured on the axis of 'respect for differences' has a significant potential to increase social cohesion (Nesterova, Dielini & Zamozhskyi, 2019; Roberts-Schweitzer, Greaney & Duer, 2006). Language is a major factor in utilizing this potential. Indeed, language is at the center of understanding the host society, adapting to it, and establishing social ties (Aydın & Altuntaş-Gürsoy, 2022; Derwing & Waugh, 2012; Esser, 2006; Lam, 2006). Esser (2006) states that language functions as a symbol of belonging or alienation. Ozer (2015) and Duru and Poyrazlı (2011) provide evidence that language proficiency level is a predictor of sociocultural cohesion. This is precisely why individuals/groups whose sociocultural experiences are different from those of the host community develop a strong interest in learning the language of that community, in line with the causal relationship between language and adaptation. Language functions as a communication channel to sustain cohesion.

Language teaching courses are not only the courses in which linguistic knowledge is presented. The complex intertwining of language and culture necessitates the introduction of formal or hidden curricula that reflect cultural contexts in language teaching. The hidden curriculum, which is based on content outside the explicit/formal curriculum, has a direct relationship with the knowledge and skills that foreign individuals need to survive in the target society. From this perspective, cultural backgrounds/identities are accepted as an element of the hidden curriculum (Türedi, 2008). In terms of referring to values, behaviors, and norms that always exist in the educational environment but are not spoken or written down, the hidden curriculum is effective in transferring societies' peculiar views and ways of thinking, in the continuity of traditions and customs, and in creating real changes (Altın & Gündoğdu, 2022). In this framework, it can contribute to the quality of learning the language that gains meaning in real contexts of use appropriate to the target culture rather than structural rules; teaching materials, activities and practices, attitudes and behaviors, individual/social interactions, etc. It

can develop intercultural awareness through its influence on many factors. The hidden curriculum in language teaching refers to the organization of background knowledge for the learner's adaptation to the target culture. The meaningful use of receptive and productive language skills depends on the pedagogical quality of this organization. The hidden curriculum has the potential to prepare the learner to engage with sociocultural knowledge and behaviors as well as linguistic processes. It therefore has a high possibility to facilitate active participation, increasing the desire to learn, the use of language for communicative purposes, and the socialization of learners as global citizens. This can lead to a flexible, cooperative, and quality-oriented approach towards the target community. It is essential to improve positive attitudes towards different cultures in language teaching. Mei (2015) argues that language teachers' attitudes toward the hidden curriculum can help to better understand and implement the formal curriculum. An increase in the learner's positive perceptions will bring about a desirable improvement in attitude and compliance.

One of the biggest problems of international students involved in education and training processes in another country is the problem of cohesion (Gallagher, 2013; Osmanlı, 2018; Tanaka, 2002). The level and speed of overcoming this problem differs for each student depending on past experiences in the target culture. Preferences regarding acculturation orientation (assimilation, integration, separation, or marginality) and cultural distance can be decisive here (Ozer, 2015; Smith & Khawaja, 2011). As distance increases, which focuses on the level of overlap and divergence in cultural representations (language, beliefs, lifestyle, values, and norms, etc.), it becomes more difficult to learn skills specific to the target culture (Aydın, 2020; Masgoret & Ward, 2006). In related studies, it has been reported that students who find similarities in terms of sociocultural characteristics have easier social cohesion (Li, 2015; Ozer, 2015; Ward & Kennedy, 1999; Yeh & Inose, 2003), while those with significant differences have difficulty in cohesion (Constantine at all., 2005; Swagler & Ellis, 2003). Problems such as language and communication problems, coping with differences, anxiety/stress, lack of friends, homesickness, and cohesion in academic life are the most common problems faced by international students in their cohesion to the host society (Ana, 2020; Andrade, 2006; Mesidor & Sly, 2016; Mori, 2000; Sawir, Marginson, Deumert, Nyland & Ramia, 2008). On the other hand, problems arising from the reciprocity of integration are also undeniable. Being discriminated against, treated unfairly, and unwanted by the host community, as well as being seen as a security problem and legal problems (Duman, 2019; Tekinyer, 2022) are some of them.

It is also possible to see the above-mentioned problems in international students learning Turkish as a second language. For students to fully participate in Turkish society, all components of cohesion should be put to work following the principle of reciprocity. What is essential here is to build a "third place" between the source culture and the target culture (Bhabha, 1988; Kramsch, 1993; Oldenburg, 1989). The third place is an inclusive space, where all are psychologically and physiologically comfortable, where no one is required to host anyone else, and where individuals have developed sensitivity towards each other. In this space, students are encouraged to be active interactors/sharers in the host society, not just passive recipients/learners. Creating this space can positively change attitudes towards Turkish culture and, as a natural consequence, can facilitate social cohesion. Cultural activities organized to create common spaces increase motivation, success, and progress towards integration (Çağış, 2022; Özden, 2021). Göktaş and Mercan (2022) found that cultural adaptation courses prepared for learners of Turkish as a second language facilitate cohesion to social life.

The literature shows that there has been a significant increase in the number of international students in Türkiye, especially with the recent increase in migration and educational effects. This increase has also manifested itself in academic research trends on social cohesion. It is noteworthy that the research is particularly concentrated in the fields of social work (Arifoğlu, 2022; Ayyıldız, 2023; Özçetin, 2013; Şahin, 2021; Tekinyer, 2022) and psychology (Ana, 2020; Özdemir, 2022; Saygın & Hasta, 2018; Türel, 2021). Although there are studies examining the perceptions and experiences of international students towards Turkish culture (Alptekin & Kaplan, 2018; Çelik, 2014; Ünal, 2018), studies that relate these experiences to the compatibility with the attitudes determined by these experiences are quite limited (Göktaş & Mercan, 2022).

Since people from different cultures have different processes of interpretation, comparison, association, and evaluation, it is rational for them to develop different attitudes toward the characteristics and vital dynamics of society. The quality of attitudes that guide behaviors can predict coping with new sociocultural codes, in other words, social cohesion. Positive or negative attitudes towards Turkish culture and educational environments are also thought to affect the level of cohesion. It can be argued that this issue will be strongly influenced by the hidden curriculum of the language learning environments. The purpose of this study is to determine the relationship between attitudes toward Turkish culture and the social cohesion of international students who learn Turkish as a second language.

In line with this general purpose, answers to the following questions were searched for:

1. Do the attitudes of learners of Turkish as a second language towards Turkish culture and their social cohesion levels differ concerning

- the regions they come from?
- language family?
- knowledge of other language(s)?
- the reason for visiting Türkiye?
- the duration of their stay in Türkiye?

2. Is there a statistically significant relationship between Turkish as a second language learners' attitudes towards Turkish culture and their social cohesion?

Method

Research Design

In the present quantitative study, a correlational design was employed. Correlational research is preferred to determine the relationships between variables and the degree of these relationships without any intervention (Büyüköztürk et al., 2012; Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2013).

Participants

Criterion sampling, which is one of the purposive sampling methods involving the selection of individuals, phenomena, objects or situations with certain characteristics, was used to determine the participants (Büyüköztürk et al., 2012; Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2013). The participants of this study consisted of 189 foreign learners studying the Turkish language at the Turkish and Foreign Languages Application and Research Center (TÖMER&DİLMER) in different universities in Türkiye in the academic year 2022-2023. For the participants to be able to understand and

answer the scales correctly, it was determined as the basic criterion that they should know Turkish at the C1 level. Data were gathered from 219 participants, but since 25 participants submitted incomplete or invalid responses to the scales, the data from 194 participants were used. After the normality assumption and outlier checks, the data of 189 participants were included in the statistical analysis. The descriptive data of the foreign learners who participated in the study are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Descriptive Data of the Participants

Variables	*Variables*	*N*	*%*
Gender	Female	100	52,90
	Male	89	47,10
Nationality (Continents)	Asia	133	70,40
	Africa	38	20,10
	Other	18	9,50
Mother-Tongue Family	Indo Europe	55	29,10
	Semitic	62	32,80
	Ural Altaic	64	33,90
	Other	8	4,20
Other Language Proficiency	Single	14	7,40
	Two	85	45,00
	Three	54	28,60
	Four	25	13,20
	Five +	11	5,80
Reason for Visiting Türkiye	Education	152	80,40
	War and safety issues	22	11,60
	Other	15	7,90
Length of Stay in Türkiye	0-1 year	77	40,70
	2-4 years	58	30,70
	5-7 years	32	16,90
	8 + years	22	11,60
	Total	189	100

A total of 189 people, 100 women (52.9%) and 89 men (47.1%) participated in the study. Analysis of the participants' places of origin reveals that 133 (70.4%) of the participants are from Asia, 38 (20.1%) are from Africa, and 18 (9.5%) are from other continents. In addition, there are 14 (7.4%) monolingual people, 85 (45%) who are bilingual, 54 (28.6%) who are trilingual, 25 (13.2%) who are quadrilingual, and 11 (5.8%) who know five or more languages. In terms of the reason for visiting Türkiye, 152 (80.4%) of the participants came for education, 22 (11.6%) came because of the war, and 15 (7.9%) came for other reasons such as economy or climatic conditions. In terms of the length of their stay in Türkiye, 77 people (40.7%) have been living in Türkiye for just 0-1 years, 58 people (30.7%) for 2-4 years, 32 people (16.9%) for 5-7 years, and 22 people (11.6%) for eight or more years.

Data Collection Tools

The research data were gathered with the 'Attitudes Towards Turkish Culture Scale' (ATTCS) developed by Sallabaş and Gök (2021) and the 'Social Cohesion Scale for Immigrants' (SCS) developed by Kaya (2022). The written permission of the mentioned authors was obtained for the use of the scales. The scales were transferred to an online environment and a link address was created to be sent to the participants. In the posted link, the participants were first informed about the research, and their voluntary approval was obtained, then they were asked to fill out the scales.

The ATTCS was developed as a five-point Likert-type scale with 21 items to be applied to foreign students. The scale includes items such as "I feel Turkish culture is very close to my own culture", "I can say that Türkiye is my second country", "Turkish culture is very foreign to me", etc. The calculated KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin) value (.897) and Bartlet's test value (.00) of the scale revealed that it was suitable for exploratory factor analysis. As a result of the exploratory factor analysis, two sub-dimensions were identified. The "interest" dimension consists of 16 items and the "reluctance" dimension consists of five items. In the analyses, the lowest score of 21 and the highest score of 105 can be obtained from the scale. The Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was calculated as .89 in the interest sub-dimension and .84 in the reluctance sub-dimension. The reliability coefficient for the whole scale was found to be .89 (Sallabaş & Gök, 2021).

The SCS for Immigrants was developed as 28 items on a five-point Likert scale to be applied to immigrants living in Türkiye. The scale includes items such as "I do not feel that I belong to this country", "I do not see a better future for myself in this country", "I am struggling to get used to this country", etc. Exploratory factor analysis revealed six interrelated sub-dimensions. The sub-dimensions of the scale are "exclusion" (six items), "belonging" (five items), "psychological and social support" (five items), "individual factors" (five items), "hope" (four items), and "past experiences" (three items). Based on the analysis, the items accounted for 59.44% of the total variation. The confirmatory factor analysis revealed that the model fit indices showed an excellent fit. A minimum score of 28 and a maximum score of 140 can be obtained from the scale. Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was calculated as .83 in the exclusion sub-dimension, .86 in the belonging sub-dimension, .78 in the psychological, and social support sub-dimension, .80 in the individual factors sub-dimension, .84 in the hope sub-dimension, and .82 in the past experiences sub-dimension. The reliability coefficient for the whole scale was .82 (Kaya, 2022).

Analysis of the Data

After the data were imported into the SPSS 24.0 program, it was checked whether the data were normally distributed. Kolmogrov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk normality tests were performed to determine whether the data were normally distributed, and the normality assumption was checked by checking the kurtosis and skewness values of the data. If these values are within ±1.5 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2014) or ±1 (Field, 2013), it can be assumed that the normality assumption is accepted. The kurtosis and skewness values of the data obtained in the study are within the range of ±1. The values obtained for the control of the normality assumption are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Results of Normality Test

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov (p)	Shapiro-Wilk (p)	Kurtosis	Skewness
ATTCS	.003	.214	-.222	-.157
SCS	.200	.027	.180	-.393

As a result of the normality test results and skewness and kurtosis values together, it was assumed that the data obtained in this study provided the normality assumption. Therefore, it was found more convenient to use parametric tests in the analysis of the data.

Results

Results of the First Research Question

Within the scope of the first main research question of the study, "Turkish as a second language learners' attitudes towards Turkish culture and their social cohesion" were analyzed in terms of different variables. In this section, the findings obtained from the analysis of these variables are given respectively.

One-way ANOVA was carried out to find the answer to the question "Do the attitudes of learners of Turkish as a second language towards Turkish culture and their social cohesion differ concerning the continents they come from?". The descriptive statistics and ANOVA results of the participants' scores on the ATTCS concerning the participants' continents are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the Attitude Levels Towards Turkish Culture Concerning Continents

Cont.	N	X̄	Sd			Sum of Squares	Df	Mean of Squares	F	p	Diff.
Asia	133	3,94	,571	Interest	Inter-G	2,773	2	1,387	4,421	.013	Asia> Africa
Africa	38	3,64	,578		Intra-G	58,347	186	,314			
Other	18	3,94	,421		Total	61,121	188				
Total	189	3,88	,570								
Asia	133	3,95	,805	Reluctance	Inter-G	,372	2	,186	,343	.710	
Africa	38	3,88	,471		Intra-G	100,861	186	,542			
Other	18	3,81	,645		Total	101,232	188				
Total	189	3,92	,734								
Asia	133	3,94	,506	Total	Inter-G	1,794	2	,897	3,642	.028	Asia> Africa
Africa	38	3,70	,494		Intra-G	45,817	186	,246			
Other	18	3,91	,418		Total	47,611	188				
Total	189	3,89	,503								

As Table 3 shows, participants from the Asia scored higher than participants from other continents in the overall scale and all subscales. One-way analysis of variance was conducted to determine whether this difference was statistically significant. Based on the results of the analysis, there was no statistically significant difference in the reluctance sub-dimension of the scale concerning the continent of origin. However, there was a statistically significant difference between the participants in the overall scale (F= 3.642, p< .05) and in the sub-dimension of interest (F= 4.421, p< .05). Scheffe test, one of the Post Hoc tests, was used to determine which

groups this difference was between. Accordingly, there was a statistically significant difference between the participants from Asia and Africa in favor of the participants from Asia. Participants from Asia have more positive attitudes towards Turkish culture than those from Africa. The descriptive statistics and ANOVA results of the participants' scores on the SCS concerning their continents are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

One-Way ANOVA Results on Social Cohesion Levels of the Participants Concerning Continents

Cont.	N	x̄	Sd			Sum of Squares	Df	Mean of Squares	F	p
Asia	133	3,21	,553	Exclusion	Inter-G	,487	2	,243	,815	.444
Africa	38	3,10	,531		Intra-G	55,566	186	,299		
Other	18	3,28	,533		Total	56,053	188			
Total	189	3,19	,546							
Asia	133	3,58	,571	Belonging	Inter-G	1,965	2	,983	2,878	.059
Africa	38	3,33	,621		Intra-G	63,497	186	,341		
Other	18	3,43	,603		Total	65,462	188			
Total	189	3,51	,590							
Asia	133	3,46	,510	Support	Inter-G	,170	2	,085	,333	.717
Africa	38	3,49	,511		Intra-G	47,400	186	,255		
Other	18	3,57	,451		Total	47,570	188			
Total	189	3,48	,503							
Asia	133	3,54	,659	Individual Factors	Inter-G	,053	2	,027	,067	.935
Africa	38	3,52	,551		Intra-G	73,787	186	,397		
Other	18	3,49	,554		Total	73,840	188			
Total	189	3,53	,627							
Asia	133	3,78	,630	Hope	Inter-G	,014	2	,007	,017	.983
Africa	38	3,80	,655		Intra-G	77,058	186	,414		
Other	18	3,78	,717		Total	77,071	188			
Total	189	3,79	,640							
Asia	133	3,23	,686	Past Experience	Inter-G	2,665	2	1,332	2,884	.058
Africa	38	3,07	,707		Intra-G	85,926	186	,462		
Other	18	3,54	,562		Total	88,590	188			
Total	189	3,23	,686							
Asia	133	3,46	,325	Total	Inter-G	,233	2	,117	1,079	.342
Africa	38	3,38	,335		Intra-G	20,097	186	,108		
Other	18	3,49	,340		Total	20,330	188			
Total	189	3,45	,329							

In Table 4, the mean scores obtained from the overall scale are ranked from largest to smallest as those from other continents (X̄= 3.49, sd= .340), Asia (x̄=3.46, sd= .325), and Africa (X̄= 3.38, sd= .335). The results of the one-way analysis of variance conducted to determine whether the mean scores of the participants differed concerning their continents stated no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the participants in the whole scale and its sub-dimensions. Accordingly, although the mean scores of the participants from other continents are higher than those from Asia and Africa, this difference is not statistically significant. In other words, it was found that the continents they came from did not show a significant difference in their social cohesion.

One-way ANOVA was carried out to find the answer to the question "Do the attitudes of learners of Turkish as a second language towards Turkish culture and their social cohesion differ concerning the language families of their mother tongue?". The descriptive statistics and ANOVA results of the participants' scores on the ATTCS concerning the language family are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

One-Way ANOVA Results Regarding the Attitude Levels Towards Turkish Culture Concerning the Language Family of the Participants' Mother Tongue

Language Family	N	x̄	Sd			Sum of Squares	Df	Mean of Squares	F	p	Diff
Indo-Europe	55	3,86	,576		Inter-G	1,943	3	,648	2,025	.112	
Semitic	62	3,82	,572	Interest	Intra-G	59,178	185	,320			
Ural-Altaic	64	3,99	,568		Total	61,121	188				
Other	8	3,55	,377								
Total	189	3,88	,570								
Indo-Europe	55	3,88	,656		Inter-G	4,588	3	1,529	2,928	.035	Ural-Altaic>
Semitic	62	3,96	,558	Reluctance	Intra-G	96,644	185	,522			
Ural-Altaic	64	4,01	,904		Total	101,232	188				Other
Other	8	3,23	,645								
Total	189	3,92	,734								
Indo-Europe	55	3,87	,502		Inter-G	2,247	3	,749			Ural-Altaic>
Semitic	62	3,85	,499	Total	Intra-G	45,364	185	,245	3,055	.030	
Ural-Altay	64	4,00	,501		Total	47,611	188				Other
Other	8	3,48	,327								
Total	189	3,89	,503								

The participants scored close to the middle level on the overall scale (X̄= 3.89, sd= .503). Concerning the language family of their mother tongue, they were ranked as Ural-Altaic (X̄= 4.00, sd= .501), Indo-European (X̄= 3.87, sd= .502), Hami-Sami (X̄= 3.85, sd= .499), and other language families (X̄= 3.48, sd= .327). ANOVA was conducted to determine whether this difference between the groups was significant. Based on the results of the analysis, there was a statistically significant difference between the groups in the whole scale (F= 3.055, p< .05) and in the reluctance dimension (F= 2.928, p< .05). Post Hoc Scheffe test was applied to determine which language families these differences were between. There was a statistically significant difference between the participants from the Ural-Altaic language family and the participants from other language families in favor of the Ural-Altaic language family in both the overall scale and the reluctance sub-dimension. Accordingly, it can be said that people belonging to the Ural-Altaic language family have more positive attitudes towards Turkish culture than those in the other group. Descriptive statistics and ANOVA results of the participants' SCS scores concerning the language family of their mother tongues are presented in Table 6.

Table 6

One-Way ANOVA Results Regarding the Social Cohesion Levels of the Participants Concerning the Language Family of the Participants' Mother Tongue

Language Family	N	X̄	Sd			Sum of Squares	Df	Mean of Squares	F	p	Diff
Indo-Europe	55	3,24	,538		Inter-G	2,784	3	,928	3,223	.024	Ural> Indo
Semitic	62	3,02	,532	Exclusion	Intra-G	53,269	185	,288			
Ural-Altaic	64	3,30	,552		Total	56,053	188				
Other	8	3,33	,418								
Total	189	3,19	,546								
Indo-Europe	55	3,47	,582		Inter-G	3,653	3	1,218	3,645	.014	Ural> Other
Semitic	62	3,46	,528	Belonging	Intra-G	61,809	185	,334			
Ural-Altaic	64	3,66	,619		Total	65,462	188				
Other	8	3,00	,586								
Total	189	3,51	,590								
Indo-Europe	55	3,59	,458		Inter-G	1,287	3	,429	1,715	,166	
Semitic	62	3,38	,517	Support	Intra-G	46,283	185	,250			
Ural-Altaic	64	3,49	,531		Total	47,570	188				
Other	8	3,40	,355								
Total	189	3,48	,503								
Indo-Europe	55	3,57	,571		Inter-G	2,227	3	,742	1,918	,128	
Semitic	62	3,65	,546	Individual Factors	Intra-G	71,613	185	,387			
Ural-Altaic	64	3,42	,726		Total	73,840	188				
Other	8	3,28	,604								
Total	189	3,53	,627								
Indo-Europe	55	3,77	,735		Inter-G	1,899	3	,633	1,558	,201	
Semitic	62	3,89	,563	Hope	Intra-G	75,172	185	,406			
Ural-Altaic	64	3,75	,640		Total	77,071	188				
Other	8	3,41	,352								
Total	189	3,79	,640								
Indo-Europe	55	3,28	,753		Inter-G	4,411	3	1,470	3,231	,024	Ural> Indo
Semitic	62	3,02	,631	Past Experiences	Intra-G	84,180	185	,455			
Ural-Altaic	64	3,38	,669		Total	88,590	188				
Other	8	3,25	,388								
Total	189	3,23	,686								
Indo-Europe	55	3,48	,357		Inter-G	,567	3	,189	1,769	,155	
Semitic	62	3,40	,301	Total	Intra-G	19,763	185	,107			
Ural-Altaic	64	3,49	,328		Total	20,330	188				
Other	8	3,28	,292								
Total	189	3,45	,329								

In Table 6, the mean scores obtained from the overall SCS were respectively Ural-Altaic (X̄= 3.49, sd= .328), Indo-European (X̄= 3.48, sd= .357), Hami-Sami (X̄= 3.40, ss= .301), and other language families (X̄= 3.28, sd= .329). The results of one-way analysis of variance conducted to determine whether these score differences between language families are significant show

that there is no statistically significant difference between the scores obtained from the whole scale concerning the language family of their mother tongue. However, a statistically significant difference was found in the sub-dimensions of exclusion (F= 3.223, p< .05), belonging (F= 3.645, p< .05), and past experiences (F= 3.231, p< .05). Post Hoc Scheffe test was conducted to determine which language families these differences were between. Accordingly, it was determined that participants from the Ural-Altaic language family had statistically significantly higher mean scores than those from the Hami-Sami language family in the exclusion and past experiences sub-dimensions of the social cohesion scale. However, in the past experiences sub-dimension of the scale, there was a statistically significant difference in favor of the participants from the Ural-Altaic language family compared to the participants from other language families.

One-way ANOVA was carried out to find the answer to the question "Do the attitudes of learners of Turkish as a second language towards Turkish culture and their social cohesion differ concerning their knowledge of other language(s)?". The descriptive statistics and ANOVA results of the participants' scores on the ATTCS concerning the number of other languages they speak are presented in Table 7.

Table 7

One-Way ANOVA Results Regarding Participants' Attitudes Towards Turkish Culture Concerning the Number of Other Languages Spoken

Lang.	N	$\bar{X}$	Sd			Sum of Squares	Df	Mean of Squares	F	p	Diff.
1 Lang.	14	3,42	,576		Inter-G	4,904	4	1,226	4,013	.004	3Lang.>
2 Lang.	85	3,85	,572		Intra-G	56,217	184	,306			1Lang.
3 Lang.	54	3,92	,567	Interest	Total	61,121	188				
4 Lang.	25	4,14	,509								
5+Lang.	11	3,92	,346								
Total	189	3,88	,570								
1 Lang.	14	3,93	,585		Inter-G	1,642	4	,411	,759	.553	
2 Lang.	85	3,90	,652		Intra-G	99,590	184	,541			
3 Lang.	54	3,84	,842	Reluctance	Total	101,232	188				
4 Lang.	25	4,12	,870								
5+Lang.	11	4,07	,608								
Total	189	3,92	,734								
1 Lang.	14	3,54	,532		Inter-G	3,377	4	,844	3,511	.009	3Lang.>
2 Lang.	85	3,86	,505		Intra-G	44,235	184	,240			1lang.
3 Lang.	54	3,90	,478	Total	Total	47,611	188				
4 Lang.	25	4,14	,485								
5+Lang.	11	3,96	,375								
Total	189	3,89	,503								

Table 7 presents that the mean scores obtained from the overall scale were four languages (X̄= 4.14, sd= .485), five or more languages (X̄= 3. 96, sd= .375), three languages (X̄= 3.90, sd= .478), two languages (X̄= 3.86, sd= .505) and finally one language (X̄= 3.54, sd= .532). It is observed that those who speak only one language have the lowest mean score. ANOVA was conducted to determine whether the score differences between the groups were statistically significant. Based on the results of the analysis, there was a statistically significant difference between the groups in the whole scale (F= 3.511, p< .05) and in the sub-dimension of interest (F= 4.013, p< .05). Concerning the results of the Scheffe test conducted to determine the number of languages between these differences, it was found that there was a statistically

significant difference between trilingual speakers and monolingual speakers both in the whole scale and in the sub-dimension of interest. In other words, it can be said that trilingual speakers have more positive attitudes towards Turkish culture than monolingual speakers. Table 8 presents the descriptive statistics and ANOVA results regarding the social cohesion levels of the participants concerning the number of other languages they speak.

Table 8

One-Way ANOVA Results Regarding Participants' Social Cohesion Levels Concerning the Number of Other Languages Spoken

Lang.	N	$\bar{x}$	Sd			Sum of Squares	Df	Mean of Squares	F	p
1 Lang.	14	2,89	,517		Inter-G	2,221	4	,555	1,898	.113
2 Lang.	85	3,16	,560	Exclusion	Intra-G	53,832	184	,293		
3 Lang.	54	3,23	,532		Total	56,053	188			
4 Lang.	25	3,36	,552							
5+Lang.	11	3,27	,410							
Total	189	3,19	,546							
1 Lang.	14	3,29	,586		Inter-G	2,785	4	,696	2,044	.090
2 Lang.	85	3,47	,580	Belonging	Intra-G	62,677	184	,341		
3 Lang.	54	3,49	,575		Total	65,462	188			
4 Lang.	25	3,75	,601							
5+Lang.	11	3,71	,616							
Total	189	3,51	,590							
1 Lang.	14	3,33	,626		Inter-G	,735	4	,184	,722	.578
2 Lang.	85	3,52	,486	Support	Intra-G	46,834	184	,255		
3 Lang.	54	3,43	,526		Total	47,570	188			
4 Lang.	25	3,50	,375							
5+Lang.	11	3,58	,623							
Total	189	3,48	,503							
1 Lang.	14	3,41	,552		Inter-G	,914	4	,229	,577	.680
2 Lang.	85	3,60	,604	Individual Factors	Intra-G	72,926	184	,396		
3 Lang.	54	3,53	,637		Total	73,840	188			
4 Lang.	25	3,44	,723							
5+Lang.	11	3,42	,654							
Total	189	3,53	,627							
1 Lang.	14	3,75	,658		Inter-G	,796	4	,199	,480	.750
2 Lang.	85	3,83	,635	Hope	Intra-G	76,275	184	,415		
3 Lang.	54	3,69	,639		Total	77,071	188			
4 Lang.	25	3,84	,710							
5+Lang.	11	3,86	,552							
Total	189	3,79	,640							
1 Lang.	14	3,21	,549		Inter-G	,940	4	,235	,494	.741
2 Lang.	85	3,21	,700	Past Experiences	Intra-G	87,650	184	,476		
3 Lang.	54	3,17	,740		Total	88,590	188			
4 Lang.	25	3,33	,714							
5+Lang.	11	3,42	,368							
Total	189	3,23	,686							
1 Lang.	14	3,29	,301		Inter-G	,645	4	,161	1,506	.202
2 Lang.	85	3,46	,323	Total	Intra-G	19,686	184	,107		
3 Lang.	54	3,43	,354		Total	20,330	188			
4 Lang.	25	3,53	,322							
5+Lang.	11	3,53	,249							
Total	189	3,45	,329							

Table 8 shows that the mean scores of the participants on the entire SCS concerning the number of other languages they know are as follows: four languages (X̄= 3.53, sd= .322), five or more languages (X̄= 3.53, sd= .249), two languages (X̄= 3.46, sd= .323), three languages (X̄= 3.43, sd= .354) and one language (X̄= 3.29, sd= .301). Accordingly, it is understood that speaking more than one language is positive in terms of social cohesion. Based on the results of the one-way analysis of variance conducted to determine whether this difference between the groups was significant or not, it was seen that there was no statistically significant difference between the social cohesion levels of the participants concerning the number of other languages they knew. In other words, the differences between the mean scores of the groups were found to be statistically insignificant.

One-way ANOVA was carried out to find the answer to the question "Do the attitudes of learners of Turkish as a second language towards Turkish culture and their social cohesion differ concerning the reason for visiting Türkiye?" The descriptive statistics and ANOVA results of the participants' scores on the ATTCS concerning the reason for visiting Türkiye are presented in Table 9.

Table 9

One-Way ANOVA Results Regarding the Social Cohesion Levels of the Participants Concerning the Reason for Visiting Türkiye

Reason	N	X̄	Sd			Sum of Squares	Df	Mean of Squares	F	p
Education	152	3,86	,581	Interest	Inter-G	,909	2	,454	1,404	.248
War and Safety	22	4,06	,433		Intra-G	60,212	186	,324		
Other	15	3,79	,618		Total	61,121	188			
Total	189	3,88	,570							
Education	152	3,96	,723	Reluctance	Inter-G	1,143	2	,572	1,062	.348
War and Safety	22	3,82	,790		Intra-G	100,089	186	,538		
Other	15	3,71	,759		Total	101,232	188			
Total	189	3,92	,734							
Education	152	3,89	,504	Total	Inter-G	,513	2	,257	1,013	.365
War and Safety	22	4,00	,426		Intra-G	47,098	186	,253		
Other	15	3,77	,595		Total	47,611	188			
Total	189	3,89	,503							

Table 9 points out that the group with the highest attitude score towards Turkish culture is those who came because of the war (X̄= 4.00, sd=.426). This is followed by those who came for education (X̄= 3.89, sd=.504) and then for other reasons (X̄= 3.77, sd= .503). Based on the results of the one-way analysis of variance applied to determine whether these score differences are statistically significant or not, it was determined that there was no statistically significant difference in the attitudes of the participants towards Turkish culture both in the whole scale and in both sub-dimensions concerning the reasons for visiting Türkiye. In other words, the differentiation of the reasons for visiting Türkiye does not cause a significant change in the participants' attitudes towards Turkish culture. Descriptive statistics and ANOVA results of the participants' scores on the SCS based on the reason for visiting to Türkiye are presented in Table 10.

Table 10

One-Way ANOVA Results Regarding the Social Cohesion Levels of the Participants Based on the Reason for Visiting Türkiye

Reason	N	X̄	Sd			Sum of Squares	Df	Mean of Squares	F	p
Education	152	3,23	,533	Exclusion	Inter-G	1,450	2	,725	2,469	.087
War and Safety	22	2,95	,578		Intra-G	54,603	186	,294		
Other	15	3,19	,580		Total	56,053	188			
Total	189	3,19	,546							
Education	152	3,54	,591	Belonging	Inter-G	,503	2	,252	,721	.488
War and Safety	22	3,45	,494		Intra-G	64,959	186	,349		
Other	15	3,36	,714		Total	65,462	188			
Total	189	3,51	,590							
Education	152	3,53	,499	Support	Inter-G	1,633	2	,817	3,306	.039
War and Safety	22	3,31	,541		Intra-G	45,937	186	,247		
Other	15	3,27	,390		Total	47,570	188			
Total	189	3,48	,503							
Education	152	3,49	,635	Individual Factors	Inter-G	2,022	2	1,011	2,619	.076
War and Safety	22	3,82	,527		Intra-G	71,818	186	,386		
Other	15	3,51	,609		Total	73,840	188			
Total	189	3,53	,627							
Education	152	3,83	,612	Hope	Inter-G	2,281	2	1,140	2,836	.061
War and Safety	22	3,68	,632		Intra-G	74,791	186	,402		
Other	15	3,45	,836		Total	77,071	188			
Total	189	3,79	,640							
Education	152	3,24	,667	Past Experiences	Inter-G	,650	3	,217	,455	.714
War and Safety	22	2,97	,776		Intra-G	87,941	185	,475		
Other	15	3,44	,686		Total	88,590	188			
Total	189	3,23	,686							
Education	152	3,47	,333	Total	Inter-G	,339	3	,113	1,045	.374
War and Safety	22	3,37	,302		Intra-G	19,992	185	,108		
Other	15	3,35	,304		Total	20,330	188			
Total	189	3,45	,329							

Table 10 presents that the group with the highest social cohesion score is those who came for educational reasons (X̄= 3.47, sd=.333). This is followed by those who came due to war (X̄= 3.37, sd= .302) and for other reasons (X̄= 3.35, sd= .304). One-way analysis of variance showed that there was no statistically significant difference in the other sub-dimensions and the overall scale, except for the psychological and social support sub-dimension (F= 3.306, p<.05). Scheffe, Tukey, and LSD tests, which are Post Hoc tests, were applied to determine between which groups the difference in the psychological and social support sub-dimension existed. However, no relationship with a significance level less than '<.05' was found in any Post Hoc test applied for pairwise comparisons. As a result, it can be said that there is no statistically significant difference between the social cohesion scores of the groups in terms of their reasons for visiting Türkiye.

One-way ANOVA was carried out to find the answer to the question "Do the attitudes of learners of Turkish as a second language towards Turkish culture and their social cohesion differ concerning the duration of their stay in Türkiye?". The descriptive statistics and ANOVA

results of the participants' scores on the ATTCS concerning the duration of their stay in Türkiye are presented in Table 11.

Table 11

One-Way ANOVA Results Regarding the Attitude Levels Toward Turkish Culture Based on the Duration of the Participants' Stay in Türkiye

Duration	N	X̄	Sd			Sum of Squares	Df	Mean of Squares	F	p
0-1 year	77	3,78	,603		Inter-G	2,168	3	,723	2,268	.082
2-4 years	58	3,96	,554	Interest	Intra-G	58,953	185	,319		
5-7 years	32	3,82	,567		Total	61,121	188			
8+ years	22	4,09	,426							
Total	189	3,88	,570							
0-1 year	77	3,81	,776		Inter-G	1,882	3	,627	1,168	.323
2-4 years	58	3,97	,703	Reluctance	Intra-G	99,350	185	,537		
5-7 years	32	4,05	,664		Total	101,232	188			
8+ years	22	4,03	,747							
Total	189	3,92	,734							
0-1 year	77	3,79	,514		Inter-G	1,838	3	,613	2,476	.063
2-4 years	58	3,96	,478	Total	Intra-G	45,774	185	,247		
5-7 years	32	3,88	,522		Total	47,611	188			
8+ years	22	4,08	,447							
Total	189	3,89	,503							

Table 11 indicates that the group with the highest mean score in the overall scale is those who stayed in Türkiye for 8+ years (X̄= 4.08, sd= .447), followed by those who stayed in Türkiye for 2-4 years (X̄= 3.96, sd=.478), 5-7 years (X̄= 3.88, sd= .522) and finally 0-1 year (X̄= 3.79, sd=.514). One-way analysis of variance indicates that there is no statistically significant difference in the participants' attitudes towards Turkish culture concerning the duration of their stay in Türkiye, both in the whole scale and in both sub-dimensions. In other words, the difference in the duration of their stay in Türkiye does not create a significant change in the participants' attitudes toward Turkish culture. Descriptive statistics and ANOVA results of the participants' scores on the SCS based on their length of stay in Türkiye are presented in Table 12.

Table 12 points out that the group with the highest score is the participants who stayed in Türkiye for 2-4 years (X̄= 3.50, sd= .334). This was followed by participants who stayed in Türkiye for 8+ years (X̄= 3.48, sd = .315), 0-1 year (X̄= 3.42, sd = .330), and 5-7 years (X̄= 3.40, sd= .325), respectively. The mean scores obtained from the SCS show that there is no significant relationship between the groups in terms of length of stay in Türkiye. One-way analysis of variance was used to determine whether the differences in scores between the groups were significant or not. Based on the results of the one-way analysis of variance, no statistically significant difference was found in the other sub-dimensions and the overall scale, except for the sub-dimension of belonging (F= 3,209, p< .05). Scheffe test, which is one of the Post Hoc tests, was applied to determine between which groups the difference in the belonging sub-dimension existed. As a result, it was found that there was a statistically significant difference between those who stayed in Türkiye for 0-1 year and those who stayed for 2-4 years in favor of 2-4 years. Accordingly, it can be said that the newcomers to Türkiye have a lower level of social cohesion compared to those who have been in Türkiye for only 2-4 years.

Table 12

One-Way ANOVA Results Regarding the Social Cohesion Levels of the Participants Based on the Duration of Their Stay in Türkiye

Duration	N	X̄	Sd			Sum of Squares	Df	Mean of Squares	F	p	Diff.
0-1 year	77	3,21	,486	Exclusion	Inter-G	,314	3	,105	,348	.791	
2-4 years	58	3,22	,491		Intra-G	55,739	185	,301			
5-7 years	32	3,10	,686		Total	56,053	188				
8+ years	22	3,22	,671								
Total	189	3,19	,546								
0-1 year	77	3,36	,609	Belonging	Inter-G	3,238	3	1,079	3,209	.024	2-4> 0-1
2-4 years	58	3,64	,592		Intra-G	62,224	185	,336			
5-7 years	32	3,59	,508		Total	65,462	188				
8+ years	22	3,61	,536								
Total	189	3,51	,590								
0-1 year	77	3,53	,535	Support	Inter-G	1,124	3	,375	1,493	.218	
2-4 years	58	3,51	,458		Intra-G	46,445	185	,251			
5-7 years	32	3,31	,549		Total	47,570	188				
8+ years	22	3,47	,403								
Total	189	3,48	,503								
0-1 year	77	3,42	,644	Individual Factors	Inter-G	1,696	3	,565	1,449	.230	
2-4 years	58	3,63	,568		Intra-G	72,144	185	,390			
5-7 years	32	3,56	,630		Total	73,840	188				
8+ years	22	3,63	,688								
Total	189	3,53	,627								
0-1 year	77	3,80	,639	Hope	Inter-G	,599	3	,200	,483	.695	
2-4 years	58	3,84	,653		Intra-G	76,473	185	,413			
5-7 years	32	3,73	,607		Total	77,071	188				
8+ years	22	3,67	,679								
Total	189	3,79	,640								
0-1 year	77	3,26	,639	Past Experiences	Inter-G	,650	3	,217	,455	.714	
2-4 years	58	3,18	,684		Intra-G	87,941	185	,475			
5-7 years	32	3,15	,757		Total	88,590	188				
8+ years	22	3,33	,770								
Total	189	3,23	,686								
0-1 year	77	3,42	,330	Total	Inter-G	,339	3	,113	1,045	.374	
2-4 years	58	3,50	,334		Intra-G	19,992	185	,108			
5-7 years	32	3,40	,325		Total	20,330	188				
8+ years	22	3,48	,315								
Total	189	3,45	,329								

Results of the Second Research Question

Finally, the research sought an answer to the question "Is there a statistically significant relationship between the attitudes of learners of Turkish as a second language towards Turkish culture and their social cohesion?"

The results of the correlation analysis conducted to answer this question are given in Table 13.

Table 13

Correlation Coefficients of the Relationship between Participants' Attitudes Towards Turkish Culture and Social Cohesion

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	1									
2	.31**	1								
3	.21**	.27**	1							
4	-.16*	.16*	.01	1						
5	.28**	.38**	.28**	.29**	1					
6	.43**	.17*	.06	-.29**	.16*	1				
7	.63**	.70**	.53**	.35**	.71**	.39**	1			
8	.14	.46**	.18*	.14	.23**	.10	.38**	1		
9	.22**	.55**	.28**	.16*	.35**	.16*	.52**	.22**	1	
10	.20**	.59**	.26**	.18*	.32**	.15*	.51**	.94**	.54**	1

1.SCS_Exclusiıon　　**3.**SCS_Psyc.and Social Support　　**5.**SCS_Hope　　　　**7.**SCS_Overall　　　　**9.**ATTCS_Reluctance

2.SCS_Belonging　　**4.**SCS_Indvidual Factors　　　　**6.**SCS_Past Experiences　　**8.**ATTCS_Interest　　**10.**ATTCS_Overall

Table 13 indicates that there is a positive moderate relationship between the participants' social cohesion levels and their attitudes towards Turkish culture (r= .51, p< .001). On the other hand, there is a moderate positive relationship between the belonging sub-dimension of the social cohesion scale and overall the attitude towards Turkish culture scale (r= .59, p<.001). Also, there is a moderate positive relationship between the general average of the social cohesion scale and the reluctance sub-dimension (r= .52, p< .001) and the interest sub-dimension (r= .38, p< .001) of the attitude towards Turkish culture scale.

Discussion, Conclusion and Implications

Programs that give weight to both the learning environment and cultural factors and regulate experiences outside the learning environment have an important place in second language education. The present study investigated the relationship between attitudes toward Turkish culture and social cohesion of international students learning Turkish as a second language. First, the effects of variables on attitudes toward Turkish culture and social cohesion were examined then the relationship between the two was examined. As a result of the study, the participants' attitudes towards Turkish culture based on the regions (continents) they came from showed a significant difference in favor of those from the Asia continent, while no significant difference was found in their level of social cohesion. Meloni (1986) states that a student's nationality can give clues about the problems they may experience in the host society. Since most of the participants (70.4%) came from Asian countries and these countries are composed of Turkic Republics and the Middle East geography, which prefer Türkiye, maybe the main factor in the high attitude towards Turkish culture. Indeed, similarities are considered as an advantage for a foreigner to feel secure in terms of ethnic identity. This finding is consistent with other studies showing that commonalities and similarities reduce feelings of alienation and increase social cohesion. (Apak, 2014; Bolgün, 2020; Sever, 2020; Traş & Güngör, 2011; Yıldız, 2018). On the other hand, it was found that social cohesion was not affected by

participants' regions of origin. Therefore, it may be argued that attitudes toward Turkish culture do not predict social cohesion based on participants' regions of origin. In Poyrazlı and Kavanaugh's (2006) study on international students in the United States, it was reported that Asian students had more cohesion problems; this may be due to their lower English proficiency compared to European students.

In the study, it was reported that there was a significant difference in favor of the "Ural-Altaic language family" in the attitudes toward Turkish culture concerning the language family in which the participants' mother tongue is located. In social cohesion levels, it was found that those from the "Ural-Altaic language family" showed a significant difference in some dimensions of the scale, although not in the whole scale, compared to those from other language families. The mother tongue has a framework of meaning that encompasses a unique perspective and a way of life shaped by values and norms (Alpar, 2013). Going beyond this framework requires creating a new universe of meaning. Since Turkish is a language belonging to the Ural-Altaic language family, this result seems to be rational in the attitudes and social cohesion of those from the same language family towards Turkish culture. From this point of view, it can be said that the origin of languages can positively change the approaches and attitudes that control behaviors toward cohesion.

Although the mean scores of the participants' attitudes toward Turkish culture increased as the number of languages increased, the significant difference was only between those who spoke three languages and those who spoke just one. On the other hand, although it is inferred from the mean scores that speaking another language(s) is an effective variable for social cohesion levels, these differences in scores are not significant. International migration and transnational activities increase the importance of multilingualism and multiculturalism. To know a language fully is to know its sociocultural codes that point to contexts of use. Therefore, the number of languages known creates the perception of being familiar with different cultures. Therefore, different sociocultural experiences are expected to positively affect attitudes and social cohesion. The fact that not all of the score differences in this study were significant may be due to the lack of details about the participants' proficiency levels in these languages. For example, any second language known at the beginner or intermediate level would have a low impact on attitude and social cohesion. Dewaele, Petrides & Furnham (2008) found that multilingualism is associated with stronger socialization, a wider network of interlocutors, higher proficiency, and lower anxiety. Studies on foreign language use by international students have also indicated that speaking another language(s) leads to less anxiety and higher self-efficacy perceptions (Dewaele & MacIntyre, 2014; Sevim, 2014; Tunçel, 2015). An international student needs to be able to cope with the uncertainties they may encounter in the host country and to empathize culturally. Wei and Hu (2019) found that the number of languages spoken is an important predictor of tolerance for ambiguity, while Deweale & Van Oudenhoven (2009) found that it contributes significantly to cultural empathy. The effect of the number of languages in the aforementioned studies in eliminating affective factors that reduce the desire to interact may help to make similar inferences about attitudes and cohesion. Nevertheless, it can be said that there is a need to investigate the variable of the number of languages in studies on cohesion both in the field of teaching Turkish as a second language and in other fields in Türkiye.

Although there was a difference in the attitudes of the participants towards Turkish culture in favor of those who came due to "war and security problems", this difference was not

statistically significant. War and security problems bring along forced migration. This necessity may have fostered a sense of positive approach for individuals who believe that they can no longer return to the comfort of their home country because they have no choice other than to get used to the host culture. It is thought that this may be the reason for the high attitude scores of those who came due to war and security problems. Contrary to this idea, Koçan and Kırlıoğlu (2020), in their study on Syrians, state that the temporary protection status, which reinforces the perception of transience, does not support Syrians to establish a future in Türkiye and integrate with the society. On the other hand, there is no significant difference in the social cohesion levels of the participants, although the average of those who came due to "education" is found to be higher. Receiving a university education in another country is the dream of many young people around the world. Considering that international students who come to Türkiye for education come with a high level of arousal, it is natural that their average social cohesion scores stand out. To summarize, the differentiation of the reasons for visiting Türkiye does not create a significant change in both attitudes towards Turkish culture and social cohesion.

In the study, although there was a difference in favor of those who stayed "8 and more years" in the attitudes of the participants towards Turkish culture concerning the variable of the length of stay in Türkiye, this difference was not statistically significant. In social cohesion levels, it was determined that those who stayed "2-4 years" had a higher average, which was significant only for one dimension of the scale. Regardless of age, gender, and nationality, international students are expected to increase their target language proficiency and change their attitudes, and social cohesion positively as their duration of residence and interaction with the society increases. There are studies supporting this in the literature (An & Chiang, 2015; Hechanova-Alampay et al, 2002; Wang & Mallinckrodt, 2006). An and Chiang (2015) found that the first year is very important in the cohesion process of international students in China and that there are significant differences between the first year and the rest of the three years. Osmanlı (2018) found that the cohesion problems of international students studying at the European University of Lefke decreased as the duration of their stay in Lefke increased. Allaberdiyev (2007) and Özçetin (2013), on the other hand, did not find a significant difference in the effect of international students' length of stay in Türkiye on social cohesion. Similar to Allaberdiyev's and Özçetin's studies, this study found no significant effect of the length of stay in Türkiye on attitude and cohesion. The reason for this is thought to be that a significant portion of the participants (40.7%) have been in Türkiye for 0-1 years.

Finally, the study concluded that the relationship between the participants' attitudes toward Turkish culture and their social cohesion was moderately positive. This result is in line with previous research pointing to the effect of cultural attitudes in promoting social cohesion among language learners (Kamal & Maruyama, 1990; Searle & Ward, 1990). The positive correlation coefficient indicates that students who have more positive attitudes toward Turkish culture also tend to experience a greater sense of social cohesion. In addition, the analysis revealed a moderate positive relationship between the belonging sub-dimension of the social cohesion scale and the general attitude towards the Turkish culture scale. This relationship emphasizes the effect of a sense of belonging on the development of positive attitudes towards the target culture and is consistent with Gardner's (2010) study. Students with a strong sense of belonging are more likely to have positive attitudes towards Turkish culture. In addition, the moderate positive correlation between the overall mean of the social cohesion scale and both the reluctance sub-dimension and the interest sub-dimension of the attitude

towards Turkish culture scale indicates that students who report higher levels of social cohesion are more likely to show lower levels of reluctance and more interest. This result is consistent with the findings of Dewaele & MacIntyre (2014) on positive and negative emotion patterns among foreign language learners.

The hidden curriculum refers to the implicit, unintended learning and values that students acquire through the education system and that are not explicitly taught in the formal curriculum. Second language learning focuses on the process of acquiring proficiency in a second language. The socio-cultural environment plays an important role in shaping both the hidden curriculum and second language learning experiences. In this study, the relationship between the hidden curriculum and second language learning is also highlighted with a special emphasis on the socio-cultural environment. The relationship between the hidden curriculum and second language learning underscores the great importance of the socio-cultural environment and highlights how implicit messages, values, and social interactions embedded in educational settings can influence learners' language acquisition experiences and outcomes. The results of the research can be instructive for practitioners and curriculum developers involved in teaching Turkish as a second language. Indeed, conclusions can be drawn about the extent to which there is a need to promote positive attitudes towards the target culture and to create inclusive environments that support social cohesion. Teaching Turkish as a second language should be organized around a well-defined hidden curriculum in addition to the explicit/formal curriculum that serves as a road map. The hidden curriculum can meet the mutual expectation for cognitive, affective, and psychomotor behaviors between society and the individual. In this context, results related to attitudes and level of compliance can be considered as evidence of the degree to which the program achieves its goals.

The results obtained in the study should be generalized by taking into account the number of international students in Türkiye. In addition, the majority of the students in the sample were from Asian countries, which can also be seen as another limitation. If there had been a balanced distribution from different continents, the results on cohesion and attitudes might have been different. Research on larger samples in terms of cultural diversity or inclusion of different language levels would be more suitable for statistical generalization. On the other hand, the fact that the study presents attitudes toward Turkish culture and social cohesion as a relational case study makes it difficult to understand the causality of the results. Intervention or longitudinal studies may provide more effective inferences at this point.

Author Contributions

The first author undertook the task of designing the study, determining the data collection tools, literature review, analyzing the data, discussing and interpreting the results, and presenting recommendations.

The second author undertook the task of collecting the data properly and recording them in the SPSS software and also contributed to the literature review.

Both authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

References

Ager, A., & Strang. A. (2008). Understanding integration: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Refugee Studies, 21*(2), 167–191. https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fen016

Allaberdiyev, P. (2007). *Türk Cumhuriyetlerinden Türkiye`ye yüksek öğrenim görmeye gelen öğrencilerin uyum düzeylerinin incelenmesi (An analysis of orientation level of students coming from Turkish republics to Türkiye for higher education)* (Thesis No: 206999) [Master's Thesis, Gazi University]. Turkish Council of Higher Education Theses Center.

Alpar, M. (2013). Yabancı dil öğretiminde kültürel unsurların önemi. *The Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 9*(1), 95-106.

Alptekin, M., & Kaplan, T. (2018). Türkçe öğrenen yabancı öğrencilerin Türk kültürüne ilişkin metaforik algıları. *TÜRÜK Uluslararası Dil, Edebiyat ve Halk Bilimi Araştırmaları Dergisi, 1*(12), 254-262. https://doi.org/10.12992/TURUK430

Altın, M., & Gündoğdu, K. (2022). Örtük program. In G. Ocak, İ. Ocak and E. Akkaş-Baysal (Eds.) *Eğitimde program dışı etkinlikler ve örnek uygulamalar* (pp. 79-110). Anı Publishing.

An, R., & Chiang, S-Y. (2015). International students' culture learning and cultural adaptation in China. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 36*(7), 661-676. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2015.1009080

Ana, Z. M. (2020). *Türkiye'de yaşayan yabancı uyruklu öğrencilerin sosyal uyum sürecine ilişkin görüşlerinin incelenmesi: Nitel bir yaklaşım (Examining the views of International Students on Social Adjustment Process: A Qualitative Approach).* (Thesis No: 624843) [Master's Thesis, Necmettin Erbakan University]. Turkish Council of Higher Education Theses Center.

Andrade, M. S. (2006). International students in English-speaking universities. *Journal of Research in International Education, 5*(2), 131–154. https://doi.org/10.1177/1475240906065589

Apak, H. (2014). Suriyeli göçmenlerin kente uyumları: Mardin örneği. *Mukaddime, 5*(2), 53-70. https://doi.org/10.19059/mukaddime.00462

Arifoğlu, A. T. (2021). *Suriyeli gençlerin sosyal destek ve sosyal uyum algılarının başetme stilleriyle ilişkisinin incelenmesi (Examination of the relationship between Syrian youth perceptions of social cohesion and their coping style).* (Thesis No: 699396) [Master's Thesis, Istanbul Cerrahpaşa University]. Turkish Council of Higher Education Theses Center.

Aydın, G. (2020). Kültür öğretiminin temel kavramları. In G. Aydın (Ed.) *Yabancı/ikinci dil öğretiminde kültür ve kültürel etkileşim* (pp. 1-50). Pegem Akademi.

Aydın, G., & Altuntaş-Gürsoy, İ. (2022). Yabancı/ikinci dil olarak Türkçe öğretimi alanyazınında Suriyeliler: Bir eğilim araştırması. *Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 12*(3), 1428-1447. https://doi.org/10.30783/nevsosbilen.1135087

Ayyıldız, A. A. (2023). *Geçici koruma altındaki Suriyeli göçmenlerin sosyal uyum ve iyilik halleri: Sivil toplum örgütleri üzerinden bir değerlendirme (Social cohesion and wellbeing of Syrian refugees who are under temporary protection: An evaluation over nongovernmental organizations).* (Thesis No: 774337) [Doctoral Dissertation, Hacettepe University]. Turkish Council of Higher Education Theses Center.

Bhabha, H. K. (1988). The commitment to theory. *New Formations,* (5), 5-23.

Bolgün, C. (2020). *Sosyal uyum ve gruplararası ilişkiler: Türkiye'de yerel toplum ve Suriyeliler (Social cohesion and intergroup relations: Local community and Syrians in Türkiye).* (Thesis No: 628492) [Doctoral Dissertation, Hacettepe University]. Turkish Council of Higher Education Theses Center.

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç-Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel F. (2012). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri [Scientific research methods]* (11th ed.). Pegam Academy.

Constantine, M. G., Anderson, G. M., Berkel, L. A., Caldwell, L. D., & Utsey, S. O. (2005). Examining the cultural adjustment experiences of African international college students: A qualitative analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*(1), 57-66. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.52.1.57

Çağış, P. (2022). *Geçici koruma altındaki Suriyeli çocukların sosyal uyumunda spor faktörünün incelenmesi (Investigation of sport factor in social cohesion of Syrian children under temporary protection).* (Thesis No: 758695) [Master's Thesis, Mersin University]. Turkish Council of Higher Education Theses Center.

Çelik, H. (2014). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrenenlerin Türkiye'de kültüre ve dine ait algıları. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yabancı Dil Olarak Türkçe Araştırmaları Dergisi,* (1), 41-52.

Derwing, T. M., & Waugh, E. (2012). *Language skills and the social integration of Canada's adult immigrants.* IRPP-31. Institute for Research on Public Policy. http://irpp.org/wp-content/uploads/assets/research/diversity-immigration-and-integration/language-skills-and-the-social-integration-of-canadas-adult-immigrants/IRPP-Study-no31.pdf

Dewaele, J-M., & MacIntyre, P. D. (2014). The two faces of Janus? Anxiety and enjoyment in the foreign language classroom. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 4*(2), 237-274. https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2014.4.2.5

Dewaele, J-M., & van Oudenhoven, J. P. (2009). The effect of multilingualism/multiculturalism on personality: No gain without pain for Third Culture Kids? *International Journal of Multilingualism, 6*(4), 443-459. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790710903039906

Dewaele, J-M., Petrides, K.V., & Furnham, A. (2008). Effects of trait emotional intelligence and sociobiographical variables on communicative anxiety and foreign language anxiety among adult multilinguals: A review and empirical investigation. *Language Learning, 58*(4), 911-960. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2008.00482.x

Dragolov, G., Ignácz, Z., Lorenz, J., Delhey, J., & Boehnke, K. (2013). *Social cohesion radar measuring common ground: An international comparison of social cohesion methods report.* https://aei.pitt.edu/74134/1/Social_cohesion_radar.pdf

Duman, T. (2019). Toplumsal uyum için eğitimin önemi: Türkiye'deki Suriyeliler örneği. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi,* (41), 343-368. https://doi.org/10.21497/sefad.586638

Duru, E., & Poyrazlı, S. (2011). Perceived discrimination, social connectedness, and other predictors of adjustment difficulties among Turkish international students. *International Journal of Psychology, 46*(6), 446-454. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207594.2011.585158

Esser, H. (2006). *Migration, language, and integration* (AKI Research Review 4). Social Science Research Center. https://bibliothek.wzb.eu/pdf/2006/iv06-akibilanz4b.pdf

Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS Statistics* (4th ed.). Sage Pub.

Gallagher H. C. (2013). Willingness to communicate and cross-cultural adaptation: L2 communication and acculturative stress as transaction. *Applied Linguistics*, *34*(1), 53–73. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ams023

Gardner, R. C. (2010). *Motivation and second language acquisition -The socio-educational model.* Peter Lang.

Göktaş, B., & Mercan, Ö. (2022). Kültürel uyum derslerinin kültürlerarası etkileşime etkisi. *International Journal of Language Academy*, *10*(3), 30-51. http://dx.doi.org/10.29228/ijla.63394

Hechanova-Alampay, R., Beehr, T. A., Christiansen, N. D., & Van Horn, R. K. (2002). Adjustment and strain among domestic and international student sojourners: A longitudinal study. *School Psychology International,* *23*(4), 458–474. https://doi.org/10.1177/0143034302234007

Kamal, A. A., & Maruyama, G. (1990). Cross-cultural contact and attitudes of Qatari students in the United States. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 14*(2), 123-134. https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767(90)90001-D

Kaya, Ö. S. (2022). Göçmenler için sosyal uyum ölçeği: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Türkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, 26*(32), 353-368.

Koçan, A., & Kırlıoğlu, M. (2020). Suriyeliler ve sosyal uyum: Scudder'in çerçevesinden bir değerlendirme. *Toplum ve Sosyal Hizmet*, *31*(4), 1855-1885. https://doi.org/10.33417/tsh.745325

Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching.* Oxford University Press.

Lam, W. S. E. (2006). Re-envisioning language, literacy, and the immigrant subject in new mediascapes. *Pedagogies: An International Journal,1*(3), 171–195. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15544818ped0103_2

Li, X. (2015). International students in China: Cross-cultural interaction, integration, and identity construction. *Journal of Language Identity & Education*, *14*(4), 237-254. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2015.1070573

Masgoret, A. M., & Ward, C. (2006). *Culture learning approach to acculturation.* Eds. D. L. Sam & J. W. Berry, In *The Cambridge handbook of acculturation psychology* (pp. 58–77). Cambridge University Press.

Mei, P. (2015). The hidden curriculum in language classrooms. *Sino-US English Teaching, 12*(6), 424-429. https://doi.org/10.17265/1539-8072/2015.06.003

Meloni, C. F. (1986). Adjustment problems of foreign students in U.S. colleges and universities. *Q & A,* ED276296. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED276296.pdf

Mesidor, J., & Sly, K. (2016). Factors that contribute to the adjustment of international students. *Journal of International Students*, *6*(1), 262–282. https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v6i1.569

Mori, S. (2000). Addressing the mental health concerns of international students. *Journal Counseling and Development*, *78*(2), 137-143. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.2000.tb02571.x

Nesterova, M., Dielini, M., & Zamozhskyi, A. (2019). Social cohesion in education: Cognitive research in the university community. *International Journal of Cognitive Research in Science, Engineering and Education (IJCRSEE)*, *7*(2), 19-27. https://doi.org/10.5937/IJCRSEE1902019N

Oldenburg, R. (1989). *The great good place: Cafés, coffee shops, community centers, beauty parlors, general stores, bars, hangouts, and how they get you through the day*. Paragon House.

Osmanlı, Ü. (2018). Uluslararası öğrencilerin sosyal adaptasyonuna yönelik bir araştırma: LAÜ örneği. *LAÜ Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *9*(1), 49-74.

Ozer, S. (2015). Predictors of international students' psychological and sociocultural adjustment to the context of reception while studying at Aarhus University, Denmark. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, *56*(6), 717–725. https://doi.org/10.1111/sjop.12258

Özçetin, S. (2013). *Yükseköğrenim gören yabancı uyruklu öğrencilerin sosyal uyumlarını etkileyen etmenler (The factors that affect foreign university students' social adaptations)*. (Thesis No: 321955) [Master's Thesis, Hacettepe University]. Turkish Council of Higher Education Theses Center.

Özdemir, C. (2022). *Yabancı uyruklu öğrenciler ile ev sahibi öğrencilerin sosyal uyumlarında göç travması önleyici psiko-eğitim programlarının etkisi (The effect of migration trauma preventive psycho-education programs on social adaptation of foreign students and host students)*. (Thesis No: 754001) [Master's Thesis, Çankırı Karatekin University]. Turkish Council of Higher Education Theses Center.

Özden, F. (2021). *Mülteci öğrencilerin okula uyum süreçlerine yönelik gerçekleştirilen eğitsel etkinliklerin incelenmesi (Investigation of educational activities performed for the adaptation process of refugees to school students)*. (Thesis No: 675729) [Master's Thesis, Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University]. Turkish Council of Higher Education Theses Center.

Poyrazlı, S., & Kavanaugh, P.R. (2006). Marital status, ethnicity, academic achievement, and adjustment strains: The case of graduate international students. *College Student Journal, 40*(4), 767–780.

Roberts-Schweitzer, E., Greaney, V., & Duer, K. (Eds.). (2006). *Promoting social cohesion through education: Case studies and tools for using textbooks and curricula*. The World Bank Institute.

Sallabaş, M. E., & Gök, V. (2021). Türkçe öğrenmiş yabancı öğrencilerin 'Türk kültürüne' karşı tutumlarını belirlemeye yönelik bir ölçek geliştirme çalışması. F. Temizyürek ve E. Barın (Editörler), *Türk kültürü üzerine çalışmalar* içinde (ss. 137-147), Uluslararası A. Halûk Dursun Türk Kültürü Sempozyumu, 18-22 Ağustos, Ankara.

Sawir, E., Marginson, S., Deumert, A., Nyland, C., & Ramia, G. (2008). Loneliness and international students: An Australian study. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 12*(2), 148–180. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315307299699

Saygın, S., & Hasta, D. (2018). Göç, kültürleşme ve uyum. *Current Approaches in Psychiatry, 10*(3), 312-333. https://doi.org/10.18863/pgy.364115

Searle, W., & Ward, C. (1990). The prediction of psychological and sociocultural adjustment during cross-cultural transitions. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations,14*(4), 449-464. https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767(90)90030-Z

Sever, M.B. (2020). Suriyeli mülteci çocukların eğitim durumu ve sosyal uyum örneklemi. *Journal of European Education, 10*(1-2), 1-16.

Sevim, O. (2014). Yabancı uyruklu öğrencilerin Türkçe konuşma kaygılarının bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Ekev Akademi Dergisi, 18*(60), 389-402.

Smith, R. A., & Khawaja, N.G. (2011). A review of the acculturation experiences of international students. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 35*(6), 699–713. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2011.08.004

Swagler, M. A., & Ellis, M.V. (2003). Crossing the distance: Adjustment of Taiwanese graduate students in the United States. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 50*(4), 420–437. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.50.4.420

Şahin, Y. (2021). *Çözüm odaklı grupla çalışmanın mülteci öğrencilerin sosyal uyum ve benlik saygısı düzeylerine etkisi (The effect of working with a solution-focused group on the levels of refugee students' social adaptation and self-respect).* (Thesis No: 696941) [Doctoral Dissertation, Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University]. Turkish Council of Higher Education Theses Center.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L.S. (2014). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Pearson Education.

Tanaka, G. (2002). Higher education's self-reflexive turn: Toward an intercultural theory of student development. *Journal of Higher Education, 73*(2), 263-296. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2002.11777143

Tekinyer, S. (2022). *Afganistanlı mültecilerin sosyal uyuma ilişkin deneyimleri (Experiences of Afghan refugees in social integration).* (Thesis No: 729381) [Master's Thesis, Hacettepe University]. Turkish Council of Higher Education Theses Center.

Traş Z., & Güngör H. C. (2011). Avrupa ülkelerinden gelen Türk asıllı üniversite öğrencilerinin sosyal destek ve sosyal bağlılıkları üzerine nitel bir araştırma. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi,* (25), 261-271.

Tunçel, H. (2015). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe konuşma kaygısının çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yabancı Dil Olarak Türkçe Araştırmaları Dergisi,* (2), 107-135.

Türedi, H. (2008). Örtük programın eğitimde yeri ve önemi (Importance of hidden curriculum in education). (Thesis No: 228627) [Master's Thesis, Sakarya University]. Turkish Council of Higher Education Theses Center.

Türel, M. T. (2021). Uluslararası öğrencilerin sosyokültürel uyumu. *Avrasya Beşeri Bilim Araştırmaları Dergisi, 1*(2), 73-89. https://doi.org/10.7596/abbad.31122021.003

Ünal, D. Ç. (2018). Türk insanını ve kültürünü tanımak: Almanca ERASMUS deneyim raporlarında kültürlerarası etkileşimin incelenmesi. *Bilig – Türk Dünyası Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* (87), 1-32.

Wang, C. D., & Mallinckrodt, B. (2006). Acculturation, attachment, and psychosocial adjustment of Chinese/Taiwanese international students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*(4), 422–433. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.53.4.422

Ward, C., & Kennedy, A. (1999). The measurement of sociocultural adaptation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 23*(4), 659–677. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767(99)00014-0

Wei, R., & Hu, Y. (2019). Exploring the relationship between multilingualism and tolerance of ambiguity: A survey study from an EFL context. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition, 22*(5), 1209-1219. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728918000998

Yeh, C. J., & Inose, M. (2003). International students' reported English fluency, social support satisfaction, and social connectedness as predictors of acculturative stress. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly, 16*(1), 15–28. https://doi.org/10.1080/0951507031000114058

Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2013). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri.* Seçkin Publishing.

Yıldız, F. (2018). *Suriyeli sığınmacı çocukların eğitim sorunları ve entegrasyon süreçleri: Mersin örneği (Problems of education in Syria refugee children and integration processes: Mersin sample).* (Thesis No: 495576) [Master's Thesis, Marmara University]. Turkish Council of Higher Education Theses Center.

TÜRKÇE GENİŞ ÖZET

Türkçeyi İkinci Dil Olarak Öğrenenlerin Türk Kültürüne Yönelik Tutumları ve Sosyal Uyumları

Giriş

Teknoloji, ulaşım, ilgi/merak, afetler, savaş ve güvenlik sorunları ile ilgili yaşanan gelişmeler, kitlesel göçlere ya da ulus ötesi faaliyetlere gerekçe oluşturmaktadır. Bu durum başka ülkelerde deneyimlenen sosyokültürel ve etkileşimsel koşullarla özellikle eğitim yoluyla bağ kurmayı teşvik etmektedir. Güncel araştırmalarda, bireylerin ve toplumun gelişimi için sınırların ortadan kaldırılmasına olanak sağlayan sosyal uyuma dikkat çekilmektedir. Sosyal uyum, eğitim yoluyla yapılandırılan olumlu sosyal ilişkilere dönük ve ev sahibi kültüre uygun bilgi, beceri ve yetkinliklere atıfta bulunur. Gruplar arasında karşılıklı güven ve anlayışı içeren sosyal uyum, çok kültürlü toplumlarda eğitimin ana konularından biridir. Bireysel ve toplumsal işlevleri 'farklılıklara saygı' ekseninde yapılandırılan bir eğitim anlayışı, sosyal uyumu artırmada önemli bir potansiyele sahiptir. Dil, bu potansiyeli değerlendirebilmede başat ve uyumu sürekli kılacak iletişim kanalı işlevini görür. Nitekim ev sahibi toplumu anlama, ona uyum sağlama ve sosyal bağlar kurmanın merkezinde dil vardır.

Başka bir ülkede eğitim-öğretim süreçlerine dahil olan uluslararası öğrencilerin en büyük sorunlarından biri uyum sorunudur. Dil ve iletişim problemi başta olmak üzere farklılıklarla başa çıkma, kaygı/stres, arkadaş eksikliği, vatan hasreti, akademik hayata uyum sağlama gibi problemler, uluslararası öğrencilerin ev sahibi topluma geçişlerinde en çok karşılaştıkları problemlerdir. İkinci/yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrenen uluslararası öğrencilerde de bu problemleri görmek olanaklıdır. Öğrencilerin Türk toplumuna tam katılımı için uyumun tüm bileşenleri karşılıklılığa göre işe koşulmalıdır. Bu husus yalnızca resmi program değil, aynı zamanda var olan örtük programın sosyolojik boyutlarını dikkate almayı gerektirir.

Toplumun özelliklerine ve yaşamsal dinamiklerine karşı farklı kültürlerden gelen insanların yorumlama, karşılaştırma, ilişki kurma, değerlendirme süreçleri farklı olacağından, farklı tutumlar geliştirmesi olağandır. Tutumların, davranışları yönlendiren doğası, yeni sosyokültürel kodlarla baş edebilmeyi, dolayısıyla da sosyal uyumu yordayabilir. Türk kültürüne yönelik tutumların olumlu ya da olumsuz olması, uyumun düzeyini de etkileyeceği düşünülmektedir. Bu araştırmada ikinci/yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrenen uluslararası öğrencilerin Türk kültürüne yönelik tutumları ile sosyal uyumları arasındaki ilişkinin tespit edilmesi amaçlanmıştır.

Yöntem

İlişkisel tarama modelinde desenlenen araştırmaya, amaçlı örnekleme yöntemlerinden ölçüt örneklemeye göre belirlenen 189 uluslararası öğrenci katılmıştır. Sallabaş ve Gök (2021) tarafından geliştirilen "Türk Kültürüne Yönelik Tutum Ölçeği" ile Kaya (2022) tarafından geliştirilen "Göçmenler İçin Sosyal Uyum Ölçeği" aracılığıyla veriler toplanmıştır. Verilerin analizinde parametrik testlere başvurulmuştur.

Bulgular

Bulgulara göre, ikinci dil olarak Türkçe öğrenenlerin Türk kültürüne yönelik tutum puanları, geldikleri bölgelere göre "Asya" kıtasından gelenler lehine; ana dillerinin yer aldığı dil ailesine göre ise "Ural-Altay dil ailesi" lehine anlamlıdır. Ancak tutum puanlarında başka dil/ler bilme durumuna, Türkiye'ye geliş nedenlerine ve Türkiye'de bulunma süresine göre anlamlı bir fark olmadığı görülmüştür. İkinci/yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrenenlerin sosyal uyum puanlarında ise ana dillerinin yer aldığı dil ailesine göre -ölçeğin tamamında olmasa da bazı boyutlarında- "Ural-Altay dil ailesi"nden gelenler lehine; Türkiye'de bulunma süresine göre -ölçeğin yalnızca bir boyutunda- "2-4 yıl arası Türkiye'de kalanlar" lehine anlamlı fark bulunmuştur. Ancak uyum puanlarında geldikleri bölgelere, başka dil/ler bilme durumuna, Türkiye'ye geliş nedenlerine göre anlamlı bir fark bulunamamıştır. Son olarak, katılımcıların Türk kültürüne yönelik tutumları ile sosyal uyumları arasında tespit edilen pozitif yönlü orta düzey ilişki, olumlu tutumlara sahip olan öğrencilerin aynı zamanda daha büyük bir sosyal uyum düzeyine sahip olduklarına işaret etmektedir.

Tartışma, Sonuç ve Öneriler

Araştırma sonucunda; katılımcıların, geldikleri bölgelere (kıtalara) göre Türk kültürüne yönelik tutumları, 'Asya' kıtasından gelenler lehine anlamlı farklılık gösterirken sosyal uyum düzeylerinde anlamlı bir farklılık bulunamamıştır. Meloni (1986), öğrencinin uyruğunun, ev sahibi toplumda yaşayabileceği sorunlar hakkında ipuçları verebileceğini dile getirir. Katılımcıların büyük bir oranının (%70,4) Asya ülkelerinden gelmesi, bu ülkelerin özellikle Türki Cumhuriyetler ve Türkiye'yi çokça tercih eden Orta Doğu coğrafyasından oluşması, Türk kültürüne yönelik tutumun yüksek çıkmasında temel etken olabilir. Çünkü benzerlikler, bir yabancı için etnik kimliği güvende hissetme açısından avantaj olarak kabul edilir. Diğer yandan, sosyal uyum düzeylerinin katılımcıların geldikleri bölgelerden etkilenmediği ortaya çıkmıştır.

Katılımcıların ana dillerinin yer aldığı dil ailesi değişkenine göre Türk kültürüne yönelik tutumlarında 'Ural-Altay dil ailesi' lehine anlamlı bir fark tespit edilmiştir. Sosyal uyum düzeylerinde ise 'Ural-Altay dil ailesi'nden gelenlerin ölçeğin tamamında olmasa da bazı boyutlarında diğer dil ailelerinden gelenlere göre anlamlı bir farklılık gösterdiği bulunmuştur. Ana dilinin anlam evreninin dışına çıkmak yeni bir anlam evreni yaratmayı gerektirir. Türkçe'nin Ural-Altay dil ailesine mensup bir dil olduğu göz önünde bulundurulduğunda aynı dil ailesinden gelenlerin Türk kültürüne yönelik tutum ve sosyal uyumlarında bu sonucun çıkması olağan görünmektedir.

Başka dil/ler bilme durumuna göre katılımcıların Türk kültürüne yönelik tutumlarında dil sayısı arttıkça puan ortalamalarının yükseldiği söylenebilse de anlamlı fark -yalnızca- üç dil bilenlerle tek dil bilenler arasında çıkmıştır. Öte yandan sosyal uyum düzeyleri için başka dil/ler bilmenin etkili bir değişken olduğu puan ortalamalarından anlaşılsa da anlamlı bir farklılık bulunamamıştır. Bir dili tam olarak bilmek, onun kullanım bağlamlarına işaret eden

276

sosyokültürel kodlarını da bilmektir. Dewaele, Petrides & Furnham (2008) çok dilliliğin daha güçlü sosyalleşme, daha geniş muhatap ağı, daha yüksek yeterlilik ve daha zayıf kaygı ile bağlantılı olduğunu bulgulamıştır. Bu araştırmadaki puan farklılıklarının tamamının anlamlı çıkmaması, bilinen dil sayısına ilişkin öğrenci beyanlarının, bu dillerin hangi düzeyde bilindiğine ilişkin ayrıntı içermiyor olmasıyla alakalı olabilir.

Katılımcıların Türkiye'ye geliş nedenleri bakımından Türk kültürüne yönelik tutumlarında 'savaş ve güvenlik sorunları' nedeniyle gelenler lehine farklılık bulunmuştur. Ancak bu fark anlamlı değildir. Savaş ve güvenlik sorunları, zorunlu göçü beraberinde getirmektedir. Bu zorunluluk, kendi ülkesindeki konforuna artık geri dönemeyeceğine inanan bireyler için ev sahibi kültüre alışmaktan başka çarenin olmamasından kaynaklı pozitif yaklaşma duygusunu beslemiş olabilir. Diğer yandan, katılımcıların sosyal uyum düzeylerinde 'eğitim' nedeniyle gelenlerin ortalaması yüksek çıkmasına rağmen anlamlı bir farklılık yoktur. Başka bir ülkede üniversite eğitimi görmek, dünyadaki pek çok gencin hayalidir. Türkiye'ye eğitim almak için gelen uluslararası öğrencilerin de her şeyden önce yüksek bir uyarılmışlıkla geldiği düşünüldüğünde sosyal uyum puan ortalamalarının öne çıkması doğaldır.

Araştırmada, Türkiye'de bulunma süresi değişkenine göre, katılımcıların Türk kültürüne yönelik tutumlarında '8 ve üzeri yıl' kalanlar lehine bir fark bulunsa da bu fark anlamlı değildir. Sosyal uyum düzeylerinde ise '2-4 yıl arası' kalanların yüksek ortalamaya sahip olduğu, bunun ölçeğin yalnızca bir boyutu için anlamlı olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Araştırmalar, ikamet ve toplumla etkileşim süreleri ölçüsünde uyum ve tutumun etkileneceğine işaret etmektedir (An & Chiang, 2015; Hechanova-Alampay at all, 2002; Wang & Mallinckrodt, 2006). Bu araştırmada Türkiye'de bulunma süresinin tutuma ve uyuma belirgin bir etkisinin olmadığı ortaya çıkmıştır. Bunun sebebinin, katılımcıların önemli bir kısmının 0-1 yıl arası Türkiye'de bulunması olduğu düşünülmektedir.

Son olarak, katılımcıların Türk kültürüne yönelik tutumları ile sosyal uyumları arasındaki ilişkinin pozitif yönlü orta düzey bir ilişki olduğu sonucuna ulaşılmıştır. Bu sonuç kültürel tutumların dil öğrenenler arasında sosyal uyumu teşvik etmedeki etkisine işaret eden önceki araştırmalarla uyumludur (Kamal & Maruyama, 1990; Searle & Ward, 1990). Pozitif korelasyon katsayısı, Türk kültürüne yönelik daha olumlu tutumlara sahip olan öğrencilerin aynı zamanda daha büyük bir sosyal uyum duygusu yaşama eğiliminde olduklarını göstermektedir. Araştırma sonuçları, ikinci dil olarak Türkçe öğretim süreçlerinde görev alan uygulayıcılar ile program geliştiriciler için yönlendirici olabilir. Nitekim hedef kültüre yönelik olumlu tutumları teşvik etmeye ve sosyal uyumu destekleyen kapsayıcı ortamlar yaratmaya ne düzeyde ihtiyaç duyulduğu konusunda çıkarımlar yapılabilir. İkinci dil olarak Türkçe öğretimi, yol haritası işlevi gören açık/formal programın yanında iyi tanımlanmış bir örtük program etrafında düzenlenmelidir. Örtük program, toplum ve birey arasındaki bilişsel, duyuşsal ve psikomotor davranışlara yönelik karşılıklı beklentiyi karşılayabilir. Bu bağlamda tutum ve uyum düzeyi ile ilgili sonuçlar, programın hedefe ulaşma derecesi ile ilgili kanıtlar olarak düşünülebilir.