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Abstract

Self-disclosure, simply defined, is the intuitive understanding of private feelings, thoughts or experiences between interlocutors. It is revealing information about yourself to others. This revealing is believed crucial in building up a completely personal connection among teachers and students, which might give cause for students’ engagement, class participation and might boost their foreign language learning. The purpose of this study, therefore, is to investigate the perception of appropriateness of teacher self-disclosure of the pre-service language teachers in Turkish context and to compare whether there is a significant difference between teachers’ beliefs who attended a pedagogical formation course program and who did not. The data was collected from 140 ELL junior students and 77 pedagogical formation course students at a Turkish university through the appropriateness of teacher self-disclosure scale. Compared to the related studies for the appropriateness of pre-service teachers’ perceptions of self-disclosure, the study presents some important similarities but also differences in terms of common topics, uncommon topics, common purposes, uncommon purposes and consideration of students.
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1. Introduction

The concept of teacher self-disclosure emerged immediately after the term self-disclosure appeared in communication studies, and it was in use to depict intentional and unintentional verbal disclosure of teachers about themselves in an instructional setting (Nussbaum & Scott, 1979). Self-disclosure is somehow the intuitive understanding of private feelings, thoughts, beliefs or experiences between interlocutors. It is the action of making your thoughts and practices known by others. In the similar line, Nussbaum and Scott (1979) defined teacher self-disclosure as “any message about the self-revealed to another, not only occurs in the classroom both voluntarily and involuntarily but also occurs and varies on the dimensions of intent, amount, direction, honesty-accuracy, and depth” (p. 569). Similarly, Sorensen (1989) defined teacher self-disclosure as “teacher statements in the classroom about self that may or may not be related to subject content, but reveal information about the teacher that students are unlikely to learn from other sources” (p. 260). Goldstein and Benassi (1994), in the same line, defined...
teacher self-disclosure as a teacher’s sharing of individual and expert data about oneself in a convincing manner.

Among many scholars (Williams, & Burden, 1997; Vogel, & Wester, 2003; Rahimi, & Bigdeli, 2016; Shoeib, 2018) it is believed that such kind of disclosure can be crucial in developing a fully intimate relationship between teachers and students since it might give cause for students’ engagement, class participation and finally boost learning, especially, foreign language learning. While lecturing, teachers consciously or unconsciously share their personal experiences with their students whether to awake their awareness to clear up the course content (Downs, Javidi, & Nussbaum, 1988) or just to create a positive classroom atmosphere.

In conclusion, by defining self-disclosure, it is asserted that interlocutors reveal information about themselves to others, and this sharing of information about themselves might be a facilitator for student class participation as an educational device to improve learning. However, it should also be considered that self-disclosure is culture dependent. Simply speaking, cultures such as western and eastern cultures distinguish each other in many ways. That is, the way the teachers transmit their experiences, how they transmit, and to what extend they transmit can vary from culture to culture. Additionally, characteristics of the society may also play an important role. That is, besides members’ cultural background, their gender, emotional status, political or religious beliefs might also have some influence.

In this sense, this was a complementary study aimed to investigate the perceptions of ELL pre-service teachers & ELT pedagogical certificate program teacher candidates on the appropriateness of language teachers’ self-disclosure at a Turkish context at a Turkish University. In short, there was an attempt to find out whether there is a significant difference between participants’ perceptions and finally, whether there is a gender difference.

1.1. Literature review

Since the publication of Jourard’s “the experimental investigation of transparent self” in 1971, the concept of self-disclosure has been explored in different contexts as well as in educational settings. The topic, especially, has also been studied in the field of language learning in different ways, which gave quite diverse results. For example, one of the important studies is conducted by Goldstein and Benassi in 1994. In their study, they hypothesized that teacher self-disclosure is directly related with students’ class participation and found that their perceptions of teacher self-disclosure were significantly in line with their perceptions of the amount of class participation. In a different study, Pishghadam and Askarzadeh (2009) investigated the influence of teacher’s self-disclosure on students’ speaking anxiety and ability; and in language learning context, they found a positive relation between them.

One of the earlier studies on this topic was a comparative study by Guo-Ming Chen in 1992. He investigated self-disclosure patterns among American and Chinese students studying in the United States. Chen used a scale developed by Barnlund (1995) which quested students’ communication patterns and to what extend they disclose themselves to intimate friends, acquaintances and strangers. The results displayed that Americans showed a higher levels of disclosure than Chinese students. Additionally, the results indicated that a significant difference existed among both American and Chinese males and females.

Another study on the topic in question was conducted by Rahimi and Bigdeli in 2016. They investigated Iranian EFL teachers' perceptions on self-disclosure and explored whether there was a significant difference between male and female teachers' perceptions and found divergences between them considering teachers' perceptions. Furthermore, Farani and Fatemi, (2014) examined the possible effect of teacher’s self-disclosure on students’ attitudes towards language learning in two phases.
Participants’ responses displayed positive results and supported the idea that teacher self-disclosure might improve students’ attitudes towards language learning.

Focusing on teacher-student relationships, Henry & Thorsen (2018) observed the identity work that occurs when a teacher makes an identification element not usually significant in the classroom visible. An interpersonal conceptualization of the motivational impacts of educators’ identity work was provided in their interesting research, self-disclosure as a relational practice, and drawing on ethnographic information involving observations of English classes in Swedish secondary schools.

In a similar and recent research, Shoeib (2018) studied the awareness of the suitability and appropriateness of TSD topics by EFL University instructors and tried to find out the distinctions between the concepts of the significance of TSD by male and female EFL instructors. In short, considering the TSD matter, the main aim of the research was to examine whether male and female English language teachers’ perceptions were suitable, convenient and appropriate. To achieve these goals, the TSD Scale is administered at the Faculties of Arts and Humanities of Al Baha University, Saudi Arabia, to 60 EFL instructors from the Foreign Languages Department. The research findings suggested that EFL instructors used TSD as a teaching and career development instrument to enhance learning despite the reality that in some characteristics they should be cautious about their impacts as TSD is culture-oriented and context-oriented. As a final point, there was concurrence but also a significant alteration among male and female participants’ beliefs on TSD topics. Such results should be considered and analyzed carefully since these results deduce novel and in depth research on the issue.

On the topic discussed, there are few studies in Turkish context, however, one of the main studies in Turkish context was conducted by Çakmak & Arap in 2013 which was a replication of Zhang, Shi, Tonelson, & Robinson (2009). The findings showed statistically meaningful distinctions in their perception of the adequacy of teacher self-disclosure within two groups of educators in two fields: common topics and uncommon topics. There were no statistically significant differences in three other dimensions; uncommon purposes, common purposes and consideration of students.

Nevertheless, it should be highlighted that in most of these mentioned studies, gender difference of student teachers was not in consideration.

1.2. Research questions

As stated earlier, self-disclosure is culture specific, i.e., how much individuals will [wish] disclose to others is controlled by the social structures of the related culture (Wu & Lu, 2013). Additionally, not only culture but also gender difference might play a crucial role in revealing personal information in such educational contexts. As far as we searched the literature, there have not been many studies concerning the issue especially in Turkish context. The only study we could find was the study by Çakmak and Arap in 2013. They investigated Turkish pre-service and in-service teachers’ perceptions of the appropriateness of teacher-self disclosure according to purpose and found some differences in participants’ perceptions of appropriateness. However, this study especially attempts to contribute to the field by investigating the teacher self-disclosure perception of the ELL (Department of English Language and Literature) students and of pre-service teachers who are involved in the pedagogical formation certificate program. Since in Turkey, students participating in such program represent a group for whom teaching is not their first choice of profession. They later decide to become teachers for different reasons. In this sense, it is the first study conducted in a Turkish context.

Three research questions were posed to explore their opinion. Considering teacher self-disclosure questionnaire items;

1. What are the ELL students’ and pre-service teachers’ perceptions towards the appropriateness of teacher-self disclosure?
2. Is there any significant difference among their perceptions?

3. Is there any significant gender difference among participants?

2. Method

2.1. Participants

The study was conducted at a Turkish university with 217 participants; 140 (36 males, 104 females) ELL pre-service teachers & 77 (13 males, 64 females) ELT pedagogical certificate program teacher candidates with an age range between 21 to 28. This program is offered by the Faculty of Education at a Turkish University in Turkey in the 2016-2017 academic year.

The main aim of the Pedagogical Formation Program, in Turkey, is to offer graduates of the ELL department with basic knowledge and abilities for being teachers at the Ministry of National Education in Turkey. This program, each 14 weeks, includes 10 courses such as Classroom Management, Approaches, Guidance, Teaching Methods, Materials Design, and Teaching Practice to obtain teacher competencies.

2.2. Instrument(s)

Consisting 20 items, the scale “Appropriateness of Teacher Self-disclosure” by Zhang, Shi, Tonelson, & Robinson, (2009) was used in this study. The scale utilized a 5-point Likert type, expecting participants to respond to each entry once stating their agreement or disagreement (1 point for strongly disagreement, 5 points for strongly agreement). So as to look at the instrument reliability, internal consistency estimate of reliability was calculated for the five dimensions by the authors of the original scale. They calculated Cronbach’s alpha for the five dimensions and the results showed for Common Topics α = .48; Uncommon Topics α = .67; Common Purposes α = .85; Uncommon Purposes α = .53; and Consideration of Students α = .86. As seen by the calculations, the results displayed adequate level of reliability for three dimensions except common topics and uncommon purposes.

2.3. Data collection and analysis

Data for this investigation was gathered toward the part of 2017 educational year. It took the participants approximately 10 minutes to complete the scale. However, to prevent any misunderstandings, the scale was translated into Turkish and two authorized interpreters checked the translation of the scale items validity through the back-translation technique. Additionally, in order to assure that the participants understand the scale items in the same way as intended by the author, a verbal reporting-test was used for the response validity. To check out this validity, five randomly selected ELL students were chosen to think aloud while completing the Turkish version of the scale. The aim was to check out whether the Turkish version of the scale items had the similar effect as the English version.

The statistical analysis of the study began with the search for correlation among items of the disclosure scale. The result showed the significance level of the items varying between 0.20 – 0.80 and this yields to a further study which is known as Factor Analysis. It may show us the degree of internal reliability and consistency, therefore, the KMO & Bartlett’s Test was used, and the results displayed a good degree of reliability and consistency (α = 0.808; p = .000). Furthermore, the analysis with Varimax rotation of the scale items yielded five dimensions which explain 62.57% of the total variance. These are Common Topics, Uncommon Topics, Common Purposes, Uncommon purposes and Consideration of Students.
Addition ally, a Shapiro-Wilk’s Test (p > .05), a visual review of the histogram and typical Q-Q plots displayed that the data was around normally distributed.

3. Results

The main purpose of statistics is to test hypotheses i.e. to test the results of a survey or experiment to see if there is a meaningful result. In a scientific experiment, for example, a null hypothesis (H0) is a stated assumption that there is no difference in parameters (mean, variance, etc.). The null hypothesis is useful because it can be tested and found to be false, which then implies that there is a relationship between the observed data. If the null hypothesis is true, any observed difference in a population would be due to sampling error (random chance) or experimental error. The “one-sample t-test” is a statistical method to work out such difference(s).

The One Sample t Test which is additionally a parametric test decides if the sample mean is factually unique in relation to a mean. In another word, “it is commonly used to test the statistical difference between a sample mean and a known or hypothesized value of the mean in the population. That is, the One Sample t Test can only compare a single sample mean. It cannot compare sample means between two or more groups” (Statistics solutions, 2019).

Considering the first research question (RQ1), the mean level of participants’ perceptions was in the same manner compared to a known or hypothesized population to search a significant difference between the sample and the population means. The known or hypothesized population mean is the sample midpoint of the test variable. In this study, the sample midpoint is 60. (The scale has 20 items and uses a five-point likert type ranges from 1 to 5. Therefore, the midpoint can be easily calculated as 20 x 3 = 60 points.)

However, running the One Sample t Test for the research data displayed 77 points of score which is higher than the expected value 60. In short, one-sample statistics result rejected the null hypothesis and displayed a significant difference between the sample and the hypothesized population means (p = .000). This means, the participants’ perceptions in this study showed a positive attitude towards the appropriateness of teachers’ self-disclosure. That is, for the sake of teaching & learning, pre-service teachers and students find teachers’ self-disclosing of their personal information acceptable and appropriate.

The aim of the second research question (RQ2) was to test if there is any significant difference between ELL students and pre-service teachers’ perceptions. For this reason, the independent samples t-test was carried out and the results including means and standard deviations of the ELL students’ and pre-service teachers’ perceptions on the teacher self-disclosure for the five dimensions were displayed in Table 1.

Table 1. Independent Samples t-test Results for the Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Pre-service Teachers (formation)</th>
<th>ELL Students (no-formation)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2 tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common Topics</td>
<td>3.31 .82</td>
<td>3.29 .81</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncommon Topics</td>
<td>2.46 1.46</td>
<td>1.84 1.14</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Purposes</td>
<td>3.94 .62</td>
<td>4.05 .55</td>
<td>-1.39</td>
<td>.166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this sense, pre-service teachers enrolled in a pedagogical formation course have higher means compared to ELL students in terms of “Common Topics”, “Uncommon Topics” and “Uncommon Purpose” whereas ELL students have slightly higher mean scores in “Common Purpose” and “Consideration of students” (see Table 1 above). On the other hand, in Table 1, the independent samples t-test results for the dimensions show a significant difference merely for the dimension “Uncommon Topics” (t=.176; p < .01). Except the dimension “Uncommon Topics” there is no significant difference among the ELL students’ when compared with pre-service teachers’ perceptions on the appropriateness of teacher self-disclosure. These results can be explained as; participants have a common consensus on TSD topics, and they find using the TSD topics appropriate and acceptable in an educational setting.

Finally, considering the gender difference, there are very few studies in the literature. However, contrary to the findings by Rahimi and Bigdeli (2016) and Shoeib (2018), this study did not find any statistically significant difference among the participants.

4. Discussion

Brief but to the point, although there are statistically different results, this study confirmed the related literature and aforementioned scholars such as Williams, & Burden (1997); Vogel, & Wester (2003); Rahimi, A. & Bigdeli (2016); Çakmak, & Arap, (2013); and Zhang, Shi, Tonelson & Robinson, (2009); Shoeib, 2018; in that teacher self-disclosure, in an overall analysis, was seen as an appropriate approach in a teaching environment. That is, the concept of teachers disclosing their personal thoughts with their students in terms of instructional purposes has been also found appropriate by the participants of this study.

We should keep in mind that these thoughts, beliefs or perceptions were grouped under five dimensions after the factor analysis: Common Topics, Uncommon Topics, Common Purposes, Uncommon Purposes and Consideration of Students. And for this reason, an overall evaluation seems not be an appropriate approach to look at the big picture and make some generalizations about language learning and teaching. Therefore, in this study, the five sub-topics were analyzed and discussed.

Among the five sub-topics, except the dimension “Uncommon Topics”, this study showed no significant difference on the appropriateness of teacher self-disclosure beliefs (see Table 1 above). However, although the statistical calculation does not reveal a significant difference, descriptive statistics (percentages) shows us that the participants are very much sure on Teacher Self Disclosure (TSD) topics if these are about consideration of students’ level, gender, feelings or cultural diversity (see Table 2 below).

### Table 2. Consideration of Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration of Students</th>
<th>Appropriate (%)</th>
<th>Inappropriate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Teachers consider their students’ grade levels.</td>
<td>Students 85.8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preservice T 80.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students 78.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Teachers consider their students’ cultural backgrounds.</td>
<td>Preservice T 77.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Teachers consider their students’ gender.</td>
<td>Students 67.3</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01*
This result seems to be consistent with the related literature and previously mentioned studies by Williams, & Burden, 1997; Vogel, & Wester, 2003; Rahimi, A. & Bigdeli, 2016 and Çakmak, & Arap, 2013, however, it is inconsistent with the study by Zhang et al. 2009. It is a well-known and indisputable fact in education to consider students’ grade levels, cultural backgrounds, gender, and emotions which are an inseparable part of teaching and learning. However, considering such TSD topics and revealing personal information, teachers should be highly sensitive and cautious. Since social, moral, spiritual or cultural values of the students may vary tremendously from society to society. Therefore, we as practitioners should keep in mind that these can certainly affect the whole learning process.

In the similar line with Çakmak & Arap, 2013 and Zhang et al. 2009, participants are very much sure on TSD topics for common and uncommon purposes such as offering a positive relationship and real world practices, or in creating a positive classroom environment, in attracting students’ attention, enhancing their learning interest or in reinforcing the course content (see Tables 3 & 4 below).

### Table 3. Common Purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Preservice T</th>
<th>Appropriate (%)</th>
<th>Inappropriate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teachers use their personal experiences/stories as TSD topics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Teachers use TSD to entertain their students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Teachers use TSD to offer real-world, practical examples.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Teachers use TSD to attract students’ attention.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Teachers use TSD to create positive teacher–student relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Teachers use TSD to create a class environment comfortable to students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4. Uncommon Purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Preservice T</th>
<th>Appropriate (%)</th>
<th>Inappropriate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Teachers use TSD to set social role models.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Teachers use TSD to enhance students’ learning interests.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Teachers use TSD to clarify teaching content.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In an educational setting, it is very crucial and undeniable to build up a constructive relationship with students, create a positive learning environment, attract students’ attention or offer real world practices. Such unhidden instructional dynamics are very fundamental in educational settings since teaching is what students learn and not more than that, however, without these dynamics it would be very challenging to realize this simple fact.
However, contrary to a common agreement on TSD topics among participants’ responses, the results in this study seem not to be much sure on perceptions for common topics such as using information related to their family & friends, personal opinions, or personal interests & hobbies as TSD topics (see Table 5 below).

**Table 5. Common Topics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Appropriate (%)</th>
<th>Inappropriate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Teachers use the information related to their family, relatives and friends as TSD topics.</td>
<td>Students 43.3</td>
<td>Preservice T 38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teachers use their personal opinions as TSD topics.</td>
<td>Students 48.3</td>
<td>Preservice T 43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teachers use their personal interests or hobbies as TSD topics.</td>
<td>Students 58.8</td>
<td>Preservice T 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results on Table 5 seem not to be relevant with the previous literature since the uncertainty of the participants’ perception seems to be novel as far as the previous studies have been investigated. However, this could be interpreted as; the respondents were fully aware of and agree for the appropriateness of TSD topics on common & uncommon purposes, or on respecting learners’ needs & expectations but not on common topics such as teachers’ private matters. An unofficial interview with some of the participants confirmed this interpretation and predicated these items as too much private to disclose in an instructional setting and therefore they might be confused.

Finally, this study fully agrees with the previous studies conducted in the literature, and finds it absolutely inappropriate for disclosing teachers’ political thoughts, religious beliefs, and intimate relationships in an educational setting (see Table 6 below). Unofficial interviews with some of the participants revealed that they simply do not prefer teachers to disclose such beliefs in a classroom environment.

If a teacher gives examples out of his/her political views, it may affect the views of the students; it may negatively affect the freedom of thought and the intellectual development of the students; it may mislead the students; a teacher should be neutral, otherwise it may drive the students to act biased. Furthermore, a teacher should not use his/her religious views as examples in the classroom because he/she should be respectful towards the religious views of the students; this may change or negatively affect the views of the students. Everybody is entitled to their own religious beliefs, there should be no discrimination of religion-language or race in the classroom. Moreover, they said, a teacher who talks about his/her private relationships does not set a good example, it will distract the course, and private life should not be an interest for the students. Finally, the classroom is not the place for the teacher to satisfy his/her ego, this is out of purpose, the purpose of a teacher is to teach and educate.

On the other side, the data should be interpreted very cautiously since the results of the independent t-test displayed a significant difference for the uncommon topics. That is, participants are certain on the inappropriateness of these topics but their degree or better said the percentages of inappropriateness differ between participant groups.
5. Conclusions

This study itself was a further study of previous studies in the literature, however, it went a step further to broaden the area and investigated especially perceptions of ELL pre-service teachers’ and ELT pedagogical certificate program teacher candidates’ on the appropriateness of language teachers’ self-disclosure. This was one of the initial runs in this sense (since there is a reality in Turkey and studies should not neglect this group of teachers and teacher candidates) and found some similarities but also some important deviations from the literature to discuss.

In general, beliefs of ELL pre-service teachers’ and ELT pedagogical certificate program teacher candidates’ on the appropriateness of language teachers’ self-disclosure were in the same line with the previous studies. All in all, the above results indicate the following conclusions; first, respondents regard TSD topics suitable in instructional environments, so what appears to be evident from these results is that there is not much discrepancy between the latest views and the crucial role of TSD topics in teaching and that of previous research. Both believe in the same way and take into account the role of TSD topics as a necessary and indispensable part of teaching and learning.

In brief, if the participants conceive TSD topics as necessary as the present study reveals, then we are one step close to the reality of the practicality of incorporating these topics in our classroom settings. That is, teachers should be trained especially on these psychological and interpersonal dynamics since these might give cause for intimate student – teacher relations which might decrease anxiety and boost positive classroom atmosphere, students’ engagement, class participation and finally boost academic achievement and social learning.

On the other hand, this and previous studies showed a negative outlook when the topics consider teachers’ political or religious views, or when they disclose their intimate relationships, or when they use TSD topics to please themselves.
It is extremely important that teachers teach, model and guide students to become more sociable and intellectual individuals. Additionally, in many countries all over the world, teachers are believed to be authority figures, and this kind of belief might be the effect of participants’ perceptions in a negative way. It seems that participants in this study have such a negative attitudes towards mentioned topics. Therefore, they may have the fear that their teachers could impose their own opinions, religious or political beliefs on themselves. Furthermore, participants might think that their teachers would not respect social, ethnic, or cultural diversities. For that and many reasons, teachers and teacher candidates should be very cautious while talking or discussing about, or disclosing on such topics.

Finally, the participants seemed not to be much sure on perceptions for common topics such as using information related to their family & friends, personal opinions, or personal interests & hobbies as TSD topics, which deviates from the literature. This interesting perception could be arisen by the idea that the participants considered the topics in question as too much private to disclose in an instructional setting and therefore they might be confused.

To conclude, learners learn what they perceive as important and only that much. If our learners conceive TSD topics as important, as the present study reveals, then we are one step close to the reality of the practicality of incorporating these elements in our classroom settings. We believe that now we are not facing a group of learners who resist or reluctant to TSD topics. For that reason, further studies need to be conducted to enrich the related field of study.
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Dil öğretmenleri kendileri ile ilgili bilgi vermeli mi? Öğretmenin kendinden bahsetmesi üzerine algılar

Öz

Bireyin kendini açması, basıta tanımlandığında, özel hislerin, düşüncelerin ya da tecrübe rehberi iki taraf arasında sezgisel olarak anlaşılmasıdır. Bu kendi hakkında bilgileri başkalarına açmaktır. Öğrencilerin derste aktif olmalarına ve derse katılmalara sebep olacak ve öğrencilerin yabancı dil öğrenimini daha üst seviyelere çıkartabilecek bu bahsetişi öğrencilere ve öğretmenler arasında tamamen samimi bir ilişkinin geliştirilmesi için çok önemli olduğunu inanılır. Bu yüzden, bu çalışmanın amacı, Türkiye bağlamında dil öğretmen adaylarının öğretmenin kendini açmasının uygunluğu üzerine algılarını incelemek ve pedagojik formasyon programına katılan ve katılmayanlar arasında kayda değer bir fark olup olmadığını karşılaştırmaktır. Veriler bir Türk üniversitesinde öğretmenin kendini açmasının uygunluğu üzerine ölçeğiyle 140 İDE lisans öğrencisi ve 77 pedagojik formasyon öğrencisinden toplanmıştır. Öğretmen adaylarının kendini açma algısının uygunluğunun uygunluğuna göre, bu çalışma ankette kullanılan konuların benzerlikler ve farklılıklarını sunmaktadır.

Anahtar sözcükler: Öğretmenin kendini açması; aday öğretmenler; dil öğrenimi; algı; etkileşim
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