Examining Student Satisfaction Levels with a Foreign Language Course: Mixed Method Research

Dr. Murat Korucuk

Kafkas University - Turkey

ORCID: 0000-0001-5147-9865

muratkorucuk@kafkas.edu.tr

Abstarct

In this study examining whether university students' satisfaction levels with foreign language courses and their satisfaction levels differ by several variables (gender, education type, department, and grade point average), a sequential explanatory, a mixed-methods design was used. While 398 students recruited by using a simple random sampling method participated in the quantitative component of the study, 12 students recruited by using the maximum diversity sampling method -a purposeful sampling method- participated in the qualitative study. "Personal Information Form" and the "Foreign Language Course Satisfaction Scale - FLCSS" developed by Taşgın and Korucuk (2018) and the "Semi-Structured Interview Form" were used as data collection tools. As the data did not meet the parametric test assumptions, Mann Whitney U and Kruskal Wallis tests, which are nonparametric methods, were used in quantitative data analysis. The quantitative data analyses showed that the curriculum and instructor sub-dimensions of the FLCSS and the entire scale were in the high-level "positive" value range. Additionally, it was found that the student satisfaction level on the physical environment sub-dimension of FLCSS is in the "medium" range. On the other hand, while there are statistically significant differences between students' foreign language course satisfaction levels and various variables (education type, department, and grade point average), no statistically significant difference was found between the gender variable and satisfaction levels. It was found that the qualitative data obtained supported the quantitative data of the study.

Keywords: *Language education, Foreign Language Course, Satisfaction, University Students.*

INTRODUCTION

The concept of communication, which can be defined as the transfer and reception of information (Barker, 2010), is a crucial mechanism for the continuity of human relations and existence (Schramm, 1993). People who have needed communication since birth constantly receive and send messages and thus, try to understand and interpret their environment (Malik, Qin and Oteir, 2021; Porzig, 1995). The correct use of language elements, especially in the realization of oral and written communication, can directly influence effective communication (Harris and Taylor, 2002). Although there are debates on whether the concept of language is a written or oral concept, the common point that linguists meet is that language is a set of systematic signs based on rules (Amberg and Vause, 2010). In other words, language is one of the tools to convey messages in communication (Yalçın and Şengül, 2007). According to Condon (2000), language is "one of the most valuable assets that people benefit from in the communication process" (p. 21). Even though communication is carried out through different channels and tools, language has a very important place in the communication process (Akarsu, 1998). Language development, which is extremely important for people, is largely completed within the first five years of an individual's life (Schunk, 2014). However, in the current information age, individuals are expected to learn a second or even a third language due to several reasons, such as rapid globalization, increasing competition, changes in communication tools and the increasing importance of human capital (Atadere, 2012; Güven and Bal, 2004). It is now seen that more and more importance is placed on foreign language education in schools in Turkey, and therefore, foreign language courses are offered starting from the 2nd grade of elementary school since the 2013 - 2014 academic year (Babayiğit and Erkuş, 2014; Kırkgöz, Çelik and Arıkan, 2015).

Although foreign language education starts in the second grade of elementary school and continues until higher education in Turkey, Turkey is not at the desired level in terms of foreign language proficiency (Başat, 2014). According to the English proficiency ranking published by Education First (EF) in 2018, in which 1.3 million people participated, Turkey dropped 11 places compared to the previous year and ranked 73rd among 88 countries in the "Very Low Proficiency" class (EF - EPI, 2018). Therefore, if the desire is to raise generations that can compete with the world, foreign language education should be emphasized more and the factors affecting foreign language education should be determined and controlled correctly (Oliver, 1999; Yeşilyurt, 2013).

Motivation, teacher behaviors, peer behaviors, environmental factors and satisfaction levels arising from all these factors are the leading factors that affect students' foreign language education (Chastain, 1988; Krashen, 2009; McDonough, 1986; Özer and Korkmaz, 2016). As a concept, satisfaction is the degree to which the benefits obtained from any product or service can meet expectations (Reio and Crim, 2013; Robinson, Decenzo and Coulter, 2011). Student satisfaction, on the other hand, can be explained as the level of satisfaction of students' expectations in educational environments (Eliot and Shin, 2002) and research show that satisfaction levels in learning environments are highly effective on student achievement (Alsadoon, 2018; Baykal, Sökmen, Korkmaz and Akgün, 2002; Cobb, 2019; Grossman, 1999; Özer and Korkmaz, 2016).

When the relevant literature is evaluated; In the study conducted by Qutob in 2018, it was determined that the students' level of satisfaction with the foreign language course instructor was high, but there were some deficiencies in the physical environment and equipment related to the foreign language course. A similar conclusion was reached in the study conducted by Shahriar, Pathan, Mari and Umrani in 2011 and it was seen that the students were satisfied with the foreign language course curriculum and the instructor. Similarly, in the study conducted by Karakaş in 2017, it was determined that the satisfaction level of the students in the foreign language course was positive. Suwantarathip, on the other hand, determined the satisfaction of students who received hybrid education foreign language education as a high level in 2019. On the other hand, in the study conducted by Asakereh and Dehghannezhad in 2015, it was understood that the competences of foreign language students such as speaking and practice were positively affected, and for this reason, the students were satisfied with foreign language education. In the study carried out by Özüdoğru in 2017 to determine the effectiveness of the English Preparatory Program at Uşak University, it was determined that both students and

142

instructors were not satisfied with the adequacy of the teaching environment. However, it was determined that the students were satisfied with the other variables such as the content, the instructor and the method used in the course. On the other hand, in the study conducted by Yıldıran in 2010, significant differences were found between the departments of the students and their foreign language satisfaction levels. However, in the same study, no significant difference was found between the departments of the students, the program and the level of satisfaction of the instructor and the foreign language course.

On the other hand, foreign language education, which starts in elementary school level in Turkey, is carried out in universities in two semesters and as mandatory, as stated in Section 2, Article 5 (1) of the Higher Education Law No. 2547 dated 06.11.1981 (http://www.yok.gov.tr). However, it is seen that the desired level of English proficiency has still not been achieved (EF - EPI, 2018; Özbent, 2010; Özer and Korkmaz, 2016; Suna and Durmuşçelebi, 2013). Thus, this study aims to examine the satisfaction levels of university students in foreign language education, which is one of the elements in foreign language education, in terms of various variables. This study is significant in terms of providing recommendations to increase the success of foreign languages courses by identifying the aspects of a foreign language course that create satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction in students. The main purpose of this study is to examine the differences in foreign language satisfaction levels of students enrolled at a state university located in Eastern Turkey by gender, education types, departments, and grade point averages. The research question guiding this study is "What is the level of foreign language satisfaction of students?". In addition to this research question, other research questions were determined as follows:

1. Is there a statistically significant difference between the students' level of foreign language course satisfaction and their gender?
2. Is there a statistically significant difference between the foreign language course satisfaction levels of students and the education type?
3. Is there a statistically significant difference between foreign language course satisfaction levels of students and their departments?
4. Is there a statistically significant difference between foreign language course satisfaction and their GPAs?
5. What do students think about their foreign language course satisfaction?

METHOD

Research Design

In this study, mixed method was preferred. Mixed method research can be classified in various ways (sequential explanatory design, exploratory design, nested design, transformative design, etc.) (Creswell and Plano - Clark, 2018). In this study, sequential explanatory design was used, since firstly quantitative research data and then qualitative research data were obtained and analyzed. Thus, the findings obtained with quantitative data can be explained in more detail with qualitative data. A mixed methods approach with a sequential explanatory design was used to evaluate the data obtained in more detail, to minimize the limitations of both designs by considering the quantitative and qualitative findings together, and to explain the quantitative findings in depth with qualitative findings (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004). In the quantitative part of the study, a survey model was used while a case study design was used in the qualitative part of the study.

Research Groups

The research group of this mixed method study was divided into two parts as quantitative research group and qualitative research group.

Quantitative research group: The quantitative research group of the study was formed randomly. The main reason for this is that in the simple random sampling method, each individual forming the population is given an equal chance (Bustami, Corebima, Suarsini and Ibrahim, 2017) and the ability to represent the population is more effective in the random selection of the sample (Büyüköztürk Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz and Demire, 2017). The population of the study consists of 534 students. In the study,

the minimum sample size with 95% reliability and an error of 5% was calculated as 224 (www.surveysystem.com; Krejcie and Morgan, 1970; Yazıcıoğlu and Erdoğan, 2004). According to Comrey and Lee (1992), a sample size of at least 300 indicates that the sample will adequately represent the population. Accordingly, the sample size reached in the study is 398.

Qualitative research group: A maximum variation sampling, one of the purposive sampling methods, was used in determining the research group so that rich information would be obtained in line with the research purpose in (Vogt, Gardner and Haeffele, 2012). With this sampling method, the aim is to reach as many different individuals as possible (Travers, 2001). In order to achieve maximum diversity, the sample was determined according to gender (female – male) and foreign language course GPAs (2 and below low, 2-3 medium, 3-4 high). Qualitative research group consisted of 12 participants (by gender: 6 females / 6 males, by average: 4 low, 4 medium and 4 high), since the sample size of 6-12 in qualitative studies in which the interview technique (Başkale, 2016) is used allows the data to be analyzed more clearly.

Data Collection Tools

Quantitative data collection tool: In the study, the "Foreign Language Course Satisfaction Scale - FLCSS" was used to determine the satisfaction level of students in foreign language courses. FLCSS was developed by Taşgın and Korucuk (2018) as a result of a scale development study conducted with 460 students in Turkey. The 5-point Likert scale consists of a total of 28 items and 3 sub-dimensions (items related to the 1st sub-dimension of curriculum are: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10; items related to the 2nd sub-dimension of instructor are: 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24; and the items related to the 3rd sub-dimension of physical environment are: 25, 26, 27, 28). The FLCSS scale ranged between 1 and 5 with "5-strongly agree- very positive score range", "4-agree-positive score range", "3-somewhat agree- moderate score range", "2-disagree-negative score range" and "1- strongly disagree-very Negative score range". To test the validity of the three-dimensional structure of FLCSS, a confirmatory factor analysis (DFA) was performed by Taşgın and Korucuk and the values should be >0.90 for CFI, GFI, AGFI, NFI and TLI, >0.80 for for SRMR and RMSEA, and the χ2/ sd value should be less than 5 (Kayapalı-Yıldırım and Ekinci, 2019; Marcoulides and Schumacher, 2001; Naktiyok, 2019; Özdamar, 2017; Schumacher and Lomax, 2004; Seçer, 2015, Yıldırım and Naktiyok, 2017). The values were controlled and as a result the three-dimensional structure of the scale was confirmed. The Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient values of Taşgın and Korucuk's FLCSS ranged between .81 and .93 among the sub-dimensions, and the value for the whole scale was determined as .96. Evaluation intervals of the Cronbach - Alpha internal consistency coefficient are defined as "0.00 ≤ α ≥ 0.40 = unreliable, 0.40 ≤ α ≥ 0.60 = low reliability, 0.60 ≤ α ≥ 0.80 = highly reliability, 0, 80 ≤ α ≥ 1.00 = highly reliable" (Özdamar, 1997). When these results are evaluated, it is seen that the FLCSS scale is highly reliable. In this study, Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficients of both the entire scale and the four dimensions were calculated to determine the reliability of the FLCSS and when Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficients are evaluated according to Özdamar (1997) both for sub-dimensions (between α=.81 and α=.92) and for the whole scale (α=.95), it was concluded that the FLCSS is highly reliable.

144

Qualitative data collection tool: In the study, a semi-structured interview form was prepared to determine the students' views on foreign language course satisfaction. As the main reason for obtaining qualitative data with semi-structured form; With the semi-structured interview form, the researcher can be shown to provide the necessary flexibility during the interview (Ekiz, 2003). Interview forms should be prepared in advance in a planned and regular way (Kuş, 2012). Therefore, during the preparation phase of the form, first, the relevant literature was evaluated and then the opinions of 4 instructors and 1 Turkish language expert in the relevant field (Curriculum and Instruction, Foreign Language Education) were sought. Before the final implementation phase of the form, a pilot interview was conducted with 5 students, and the clarity of the interview form was checked. The interview form consists of four questions in total.

Data Analysis

Quantitative data analysis: Statistical package programs were used in the analysis of the quantitative data obtained in the study. In order to determine the statistical tests to be used in analyzing the data, first, it is necessary to determine the normality of the distribution and the homogeneity of

variance (Büyüköztürk et al., 2017; Derinalp-Çanakçı, Çanakçı and Geçgin, 2019). It was determined that the data were not normally distributed according to the obtained graphics, skewness - kurtosis values, and the normality test values. In addition, it was observed that the variances were not homogeneous (p<.05). In line with these results, it was determined that the data were not suitable for parametric tests and thus, nonparametric tests were used. The Mann-Whitney U test, which is suitable for comparing two independent groups that do not meet the normality conditions, was used to determine the differentiation status of students' foreign language course satisfaction levels according to their genders and teaching types. Similarly, the Kruskal Wallis test, which is suitable for comparing two or more groups that do not meet the normality conditions, was used (Büyüköztürk, et al. 2017) in order to determine the differentiation status of students' foreign language course satisfaction levels according to their departments and averages. In data analysis, the level of significance was determined as "p=.05". However, Bonferroni regulation was applied to alpha values in order to determine the dimensions of a significant difference at the Kruskal Wallis test "p=.05" level and to control type 1 errors (Can, 2018). In the Bonferroni arrangement, the alpha value "p=.05" is divided by the number of tests used and the significance level is tested with the new value obtained (Pallant, 2017). For this reason, since the level of significance is the average of students and their departments are 5 groups, the comparison to be made at the level of significance (1-2, 1-3, 1-4, 1-5, 2-3, 2-4, 2-5, 3-4, 3- 5, 4-5) and the significance level obtained was accepted as "p=.005".

Qualitative data analysis: A descriptive analysis approach was used for the qualitative data of the study. The main reason for this can be shown as the descriptive analysis and the regular presentation of the data in line with the classifications created by the research questions and the frequent use of direct quotations (Corbin and Strauss, 2015; Gliner, Morgan and Leech, 2015). For this reason, while the qualitative data obtained in the study were classified and presented in tables, direct quotations were often included. The qualitative data (voice recordings) obtained from the interviews were stored in the computer environment. The interviewed students were named as S1, S2, S3,..S12.

A number of measures were taken to ensure the validity and reliability of the qualitative data of the study. The first of these is that field experts (two faculty members with doctorate titles in the field of education education and tranining programs, a lecturer with at least 10 years of seniority in the field of English and a lecturer with at least 9 years of seniority in the field of Turkish Language during the interview form preparation and qualitative data evaluation stages.) opinion (to ensure internal validity). In addition, direct quotations were frequently included in the analysis of qualitative data, and selective (purposive sampling method) sampling methods were used in the selection of the qualitative study group (to ensure external validity). Interviews were held with the students at the appropriate place and time and no pressure or coercion was applied (to ensure internal reliability). The data obtained in the research have been kept under the assumption that it may be needed later (to ensure external reliability).

145

FINDINGS

1. Findings on the First Research Question

The first research question of the study was "*What is the level of students' foreign language course satisfaction?*" In answering the question, the data obtained from the students with FLCSS were examined, the averages, standard deviations of the sub-dimensions of and the whole scale are shown in Table 1 with explanations for each value.

Table 1. *Mean Distributions of the Sub-Dimensions of FLCSS and the Entire Scale*

Sub-Dimensions	n	$\overline{X}$	sd	Value
Curriculum	398	3.54	.93	Positive (High)
Instructor	398	3.56	.94	Positive (High)
Physical Environment	398	3.32	1.10	Moderate
TOTAL	398	3.52	.85	Positive (High)

As shown in Table 1, the students' means in the dimensions of FLCSS are in the highly "positive" range with the curriculum dimension ($\overline{X}$=3.54, sd=.93), the instructor dimension ($\overline{X}$=3.56, sd=.94) and

the whole scale ($\overline{x}$ =3.52, sd=.85). However, the mean of the physical environment sub-dimension of FLCSS ($\overline{x}$ =3.32, sd=1.10) is in the moderate value range.

2. Findings on the Second Research Question

The second research question of the study was "*Is there a statistically significant difference between the students' level of foreign language course satisfaction and their gender?*" A Mann Whitney U test, which is one of the nonparametric methods, was completed to answer the question and to determine whether there is a significant difference between the gender and the satisfaction levels on the foreign language courses.

Table 2. *Mann Whitney U Test Results for Comparing Students' Gender and Foreign Language Satisfaction Levels*

Sub-Dimensions	Gender	n	Mean Rank	Total Rank	U	z	p
Curriculum	Female	238	196,09	46669,50	18228,500	-,722	,470
	Male	160	204,57	32731,50			
Instructor	Female	238	193,73	46107,00	17666,000	-1,222	,222
	Male	160	208,09	33294,00			
Physical Environment	Female	238	196,05	46660,00	18219,000	-,732	,464
	Male	160	204,63	32741,00			

The findings in Table 2 revealed that there was no significant difference between the gender of the students and their level of satisfaction with the foreign language course. [($U_{Curriculum}$=18228,5, z=-.722, p=.470), ($U_{Instructor}$=17666,0, z=-1.222, p=.222), ($U_{Physical environment}$=18219,0, z=-.732, p=.464)]. In other words, when evaluated in terms of gender, it is seen that there is no significant difference between the satisfaction levels of the students in the foreign language course.

3. Findings on the Third Research Question

The third research question of the study was "Is there a statistically significant difference between students' foreign language course satisfaction and the education type?" A Mann Whitney U test, which is one of the nonparametric techniques, was completed to answer the question and to determine whether there is a significant difference between the teaching styles of and the students' satisfaction levels of the foreign language courses. The results are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. *Mann Whitney U Test Results for Comparing Education Types and Foreign Language Satisfaction Levels*

Sub-Dimensions	Education Type	n	Mean Rank	Total Rank	U	z	p
Curriculum	Daytime Course Program	265	203.45	53915.50	14574.50	-2.69	**.001***
	Evening Courses Program	133	151.62	20165.50			
Instructor	Daytime Courses Program	265	199.15	52246.00	15001.00	-1.57	**.04***
	Evening Courses Program	133	153.17	20371.50			
Physical Environment	Daytime Courses Program	265	201.20	53317.00	17173.00	-.416	.677
	Evening Courses Program	133	196.12	26084.00			

When Table 3 is examined, a statistically significant difference was found between the education types and student satisfaction levels of the foreign language course curriculum ($UE_{Education type}$ = 14574.5, z = -2.69, p = .001) and the instructor (U $_{Instructor}$ = 15001.0, z = -1.57, p = .04). It was observed that there is a statistically significant difference between the satisfaction levels of the Daytime Courses Program (Mean Rank = 203.45) and Evening Courses Program students (Mean Rank = 151.62) in the foreign language course satisfaction levels in the curriculum sub-dimension of the FLCSS. Similarly, there is a statistically significant difference in favor of Daytime Courses Program students between the satisfaction levels of the Daytime Courses Program students in the foreign language course (Mean Rank = 199.15) and the satisfaction levels of the Evening Courses Program students (Mean Rank = 153.17) in the instructor dimension of FLCSS. However, no statistically significant difference was found between the education type and the level of foreign language course satisfaction in the physical environment sub-dimension ($U_{Physical Environment}$=17173,0, z=-.416, p=.677).

4. Findings on the Fourth Research Question

The fourth research question of the study was "*Is there a statistically significant difference between the students' level of satisfaction with foreign language courses and their departments?*" A Kruskal Wallis test, which is one of the nonparametric techniques, was completed to answer the question and to determine whether there is a significant difference between the students' department and their satisfaction level of the foreign language course, and the findings are shown in Table 4.

Table 4. *Kruskal Wallis Test Results Regarding the Difference Between Students' Foreign Language Satisfaction Levels and Their Departments*

Sub-Dimensions	Department	n	Mean Rank	S.d	X^2	p	Difference
Curriculum	1. Child Dev.	200	192.71	4	5.915	.206	---
	2. Private Sec. Prot.	59	216.91				
	3. Local Gvt.	32	219.17				
	4. Occ.Health and Safe.	33	168.56				
	5. Logistics	74	209.27				
Instructor	1.Child Dev.	200	193.52	4	5.570	.234	---
	2. Private Sec. Prot.	59	224.18				
	3. Local Gvt.	32	201.81				
	4. Occ.Health and Safe.	33	171.59				
	5. Logistics	74	207.45				
Physical Environment	1. Child Dev.	200	191.35	4	10.96	**.027***	**5>4**
	2. Private Sec. Prot.	59	208.06				
	3. Local Gvt.	32	215.25				
	4. Occ.Health and Safe.	33	156.20				
	5. Logistics	74	227.22				

According to Table 4, a statistically significant difference was found between the departments of the students and the satisfaction levels on the physical environment of the foreign language course ($X^2_{(4)physical\ environment}$=10.961, p<.05). In order to determine between which groups the difference was, a Mann Whitney U test was performed separately between the group pairs. The main purpose here is to make a Bonferroni adjustment in alpha values to keep Type 1 errors under control (Can, 2018). In the Bonferroni adjustment, the significance level (.05) is divided by the number of tests to obtain a new level of significance (Pallant, 2017). Accordingly, since there are 5 sub-groups in the department variable, a total of 10 Mann Whitney U tests were completed between the pairs with a significance level of .05, and the new significance level was determined as .005. According to the results of the Mann Whitney U tests completed with the new alpha value, between the satisfaction levels of the logistics department students (Mean Rank=227.22) and occupational health and safety students' (Mean Rank =156.20) in the physical environment sub-dimension of the FLCSS, a statistically significant difference was found in the logistics department students. However, no statistically significant difference was found between the students' departments and foreign language course satisfaction levels in the sub-dimension of curriculum and instructor [($X^2_{(4)Educational\ Program}$=5.915, p>.05); ($X^2_{(4)Instructor}$=5.570, p>.05)] in the FLCSS.

5. Findings on the Fifth Research Question

The fifth research question of the study was "*Is there a statistically significant difference between the students' level of satisfaction with foreign language course and their GPA?*" A Kruskal Wallis test, which is one of the nonparametric techniques, was completed to answer the question and to determine whether there is a significant difference between the student GPAs and the level of satisfaction with the foreign language course. The results obtained are shown in Table 5.

When table 5 is examined, there is a statistically significant difference between the student GPAs and the satisfaction levels of the foreign language course curriculum ($X^2_{(4)\ Curriculum}$=1.952, p<.05) and the instructor ($X^2_{(4)Instructor}$=3.844, p<.05). In order to determine between which groups the difference was, Bonferroni adjustment was completed, "as in the section variables", and the new significance level was determined as .005. According to the results of the Mann Whitney U tests completed with the new alpha value, between the satisfaction levels of the students who have a GPA of "2.51 – 3.00" in the sub-dimension of the FLCSS curriculum (Mean Rank =202.15) and students with a GPA of "3.01 – 3.50" (Mean Rank =207.02) and the satisfaction levels of the students with an average of "2.00 and below" (Mean

147

Rank =155.74), a statistically significant difference in students with "2.51 - 3.00" and "3.01 – 3.50" GPA was found.

Table 5. *Kruskal Wallis Test Results on the Difference Between Students' Foreign Language Satisfaction Levels and GPAs*

Sub-Dimensions	Mean	n	Mean Rank	S.d.	X²	p	Difference
Curriculum	1. 2.00 and below	24	155.74				
	2. 2.01 – 2.50	41	196.87				
	3. 2.51 – 3.00	97	202.15	4	1.952	.038*	3>1, 4>1
	4. 3.01 – 3.50	124	207.02				
	5. 3.51 – 4.00	112	192.96				
Instructor	1. 2.00 and below	24	162.46				
	2. 2.01 – 2.50	41	181.24				
	3. 2.51 – 3.00	97	206.20	4	3.844	.042*	3>1, 4>1
	4. 3.01 – 3.50	124	210.94				
	5. 3.51 – 4.00	112	192.61				
Physical Environment	1. 2.00 and below	24	189.43				
	2. 2.01 – 2.50	41	196.39				
	3. 2.51 – 3.00	97	208.49	4	1.339	.855	---
	4. 3.01 – 3.50	124	200.82				
	5. 3.51 – 4.00	112	191.68				

Similarly, in the sub-dimension of the instructor, the between the satisfaction levels of the students with an average of "2.51 - 3.00" (Mean Rank = 206.20) and students with a GPA of "3.01 - 3.50" (Mean Rank = 210.94) and students with a GPA of "2.00 and below" (Mean Rank = 162.46), a statistically significant difference was found in students with a GPA of "2.51-3.00" and "3.01-3.50." However, no statistically significant difference was found between the mean scores of the students and their satisfaction with the foreign language course in the physical environment sub-dimension of FLCSS [($X^2_{(4)Physical Environment}$=1.339, p>.05)].

6. Findings on the Sixth Research Question

The sixth research question of the study was "*What are the students' views on foreign language course satisfaction?*" In order to answer the question, a descriptive analysis approach was used to analyze the responses provided to the four statements in the interview form. Student responses were coded, and the frequency values of the codes obtained were tabulated and explained. The interview questions in the semi-structured interview form were analyzed sequentially.

The first interview question of "*Are you satisfied with the curriculum (goal, content, educational situations, assessment and evaluation) elements applied in the foreign language course? Please indicate your views on this subject.*" The frequency distributions of the responses provided by the students are shown in Table 6.

Table 6. *Distributions of the First Interview Question*

Codes	Students	Frequency
Generally satisfied.	S1, S2, S4, S6, S7, S8, S9, S10, S12	9
Not satisfied enough.	S3, S5, S11	3

As shown in Table 6, most of the students stated that they were generally satisfied (S1, S2, S4, S6, S7, S8, S9, S10, S12) in responding to the first interview question, while some students (S3, S5, S11) stated that they were not satisfied enough. Examples of student opinions in line with the first interview question are presented below:

"No, I am not satisfied. I am not satisfied with the fact that it is a monotonous and memory-based education process. More activities and practices should be included, and professional language should be emphasized." (S3)

"I am not very satisfied. With more practices and activities, foreign language education should be freed from memory-based learning." (S11)

The second interview question was *"Are you satisfied with the foreign language course instructor (content knowledge, teaching, pronunciation, writing, dedication, communication skills, etc.)? Please indicate your views on this subject."* The frequency distributions of the responses provided by the students are shown in Table 7.

Table 7. *Distributions of the Second Interview Question*

Codes	Students	Frequency
Generally satisfied.	S1, S2, S3, S4, S6, S7, S9, S10, S11	9
Not satisfied enough.	S5, S8, S12	3

As shown in Table 7, in the responses provided to the second interview question, most of the students stated that they were generally satisfied (S1, S2, S3, S4, S6, S7, S9, S10, S11), while some students (S5, S8, S12) stated that they were not satisfied enough. Examples of student opinions in line with the second interview question are presented below:

"Yes, I am extremely satisfied with the instructor of this course. Because the instructor is a nice, understanding person who helps students and good at their job. I had very little foreign language knowledge, but now my foreign language level is quite good. Of course, the instructor of the course has contributed a lot." (S1)

"I'm not satisfied. Because the instructor does not teach according to my level in the foreign language course, he only teaches by writing on the board. We do not engage in speaking, reading or other practice activities. Therefore, what we learn is not permanent. On the other hand, the instructor is a strict person so, sometimes I can be hesitant to ask questions." (S8)

The third interview question was *"Are you satisfied with the physical environment (technological equipment, ventilation, cleanliness, temperature, etc.) in which the foreign language course is conducted? Please indicate your views on this subject."* The frequency distributions of the responses provided by the students are shown in Table 8.

Table 8. *Distributions of the Third Interview Question*

Codes	Students	Frequency
Moderately satisfied.	S1, S2, S3, S6, S7, S9, S10, S12	8
Satisfied.	S4, S11	2
There Are Shortcomings.	S5, S8	2

149

As seen in Table 8, in the answers given to the third interview question, while most of the students stated that they were moderately satisfied (S1, S2, S3, S6, S7, S9, S10, S12), some students (S4, S11) were satisfied and some students (S5, S8) had some difficulties and Indicated that there were shortcomings. Examples of student opinions in line with the third interview question are presented below:

"My satisfaction with the physical environment is moderate. I can't say I'm very satisfied, but I can't say I'm not satisfied either." (S3)

"I am quite satisfied. Our classroom and school are very hygienic.. However, the instructor teaches the course in a monotonous way and does not use a projector or computer. There is no smart board in our classroom anyway. If the class is conducted using technology, a more effective language learning can be achieved." (S5)

"I am moderately satisfied with the physical condition. Because the school and classroom are clean, warm, and ventilation is not bad. However, we do not receive any technological support in the course." (S8)

"I am quite satisfied." (S11)

The fourth and last interview question was *"Have you acquired the skills, such as speaking, understanding, writing, and reading in a foreign language with the foreign language education you received? What are your opinions about your satisfaction in this matter?"* The frequency distributions of the students' answers are presented in Table 9.

Table 9. *Distributions of the Fourth Interview Question*

Codes	Students	Frequency
Satisfied.	S3, S5, S6, S7, S8, S9	6
Moderately satisfied.	S1, S10, S12	8
Not satisfied (Low level of satisfaction).	S2, S4, S11	4

As shown in Table 9, while some of the students stated that they were satisfied (S3, S5, S6, S7, S8, S9), others' satisfaction levels were moderate (S1, S10, S12) and low (S2, S4, S11). Examples of student opinions in line with the fourth interview question are presented below:

"I was satisfied with the foreign language course, but unfortunately, I cannot say that I have gained the aforementioned features. I think the main reason for this is the insufficient weekly class hours. After all, I think very few people can improve their literacy, comprehension, and speaking in a foreign language with 2 hours a week." (S1)

"I am satisfied with the course. Everything went well and I even felt that I was learning a foreign language, but then I realized that I just passed the course. I have not observed any improvement in my speaking, understanding, reading, and writing. I think that the course, the assignments and even the exams are based on memorization. Therefore, we pass the course and do not gain anything afterwards." (S4)

Table 10 shows the distribution of the answers given by the students to the questions in the interview form.

Table 10. *Student Views and Distributions*

Dimension (Student Views)	Not Satisfied (Low Level Satisfaction)			Partially Satisfied (Moderate Level Satisfaction)			Satisfied (High Level Satisfaction)		
	Student	f	%	Student	f	%	Student	f	%
Curriculum Satisfaction (1st Interview Question)	S3, S5, S11	3	%25	---------	--	----	S1, S2, S4, S6, S7, S8, S9, S10, S12	9	%75
Instructor Satisfaction (2nd Interview Question)	S5, S8, S12	3	%25	---------	--	----	S1, S2, S3, S4, S6, S7, S9, S10, S11	9	%75
Physical Environment/Equipment (3rd Interview Question)	---------	--	----	S1, S2, S3, S6, S7, S9, S10, S12	8	%67	S4, S5, S8, S11	4	%33
Outcome Satisfaction (4th Interview Question)	S2, S4, S11	3	%25	S1, S10, S12	3	%25	S3, S5, S6, S7, S8, S9	6	%50

As shown in Table 10, 75% of the students have high levels of satisfaction while 25% have a low-level satisfaction in the curriculum used in the foreign language course and the foreign language course instructor. However, while 67% of the students are partially satisfied (moderate level) with the physical environment and equipment used in the foreign language course, only 33% have high levels of satisfaction. In terms of satisfaction with the foreign language course outcomes (understanding, speaking, reading, and writing in a foreign language) is 50% have a high level of satisfaction, 25% have partial-moderate level of satisfaction, and 25% are not satisfied (low level). When the qualitative data obtained are evaluated, it can be concluded that the qualitative findings support the findings from the quantitative data.

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study aims to determine the foreign language satisfaction levels of university students and to examine the differentiation of students' foreign language satisfaction levels by gender, education type, department, and GPA. The mean and standard deviation values of the data were analyzed in order to answer the first research question of the study which is *"What is the level of satisfaction of the students in foreign language lessons?"*. The analyses results showed that the sub-dimensions of curriculum and instructor of the Foreign Language Course Satisfaction Scale (FLCSS) and the whole scale were in the high-level "positive" value range. These findings show that the level of student satisfaction with the foreign language course curriculum (target, content, educational status, measurement and evaluation) and the instructor conducting the course and the whole scale is high. Similar findings were also found by Qutob (2018), and it was concluded that students' satisfaction levels of foreign language course instructors were at a high level. In addition to this finding, it was determined that the level of student

satisfaction in the physical environment sub-dimension of FLCSS was in the "medium" range. According to this finding, it is understood that the satisfaction level of the students regarding the physical environment where foreign language lessons are conducted is at a moderate level. Similar findings were also found by Hernández (2009) and Karakaş (2019) that students' satisfaction with the foreign language course was at a high level. According to another finding by Obando-Guerrero and Sánchez-Solarte (2018), the satisfaction levels of students towards the foreign language course curriculum and the instructor were high, while the satisfaction levels of the physical environment were moderate. To a similar conclusion, Shahriar et al. (2011) and Karakaş (2017), it was also reached in the studies and it was determined that the satisfaction level of the students from the foreign language course was positive. On the other hand, Suwantarathip (2019) determined in his study that the satisfaction of students who receive foreign language education carried out with hybrid education is high. Özüdoğru (2017), on the other hand, found that both students and instructors were not satisfied with the teaching environment in his study conducted at the Uşak University English Preparatory Program. However, in addition to this result, Özüdoğru determined that the students were satisfied with other variables such as the instructor and the method used.

Findings in the literature support the study results. The reasons for these findings may be related to the technological equipment (smart board, computer, projector, Wi-Fi, internet, etc.) that the school provides for foreign language education and the materials (book, printout, lesson summary, practice applications, short stories, etc.) for the foreign language course offered by the school to the students, and that physical environments such as classrooms and libraries are not at the desired level in order for foreign language education to be carried out successfully.

The second research question of the study was "*2. Is there a statistically significant difference between the students' level of satisfaction with the foreign language course and their gender?*" and a Mann Whitney U test was completed in analyzing the data to answer the question. As a result of the Mann Whitney U test, no statistically significant difference was found between the gender of the students and their level of satisfaction with the foreign language course. In other words, it was concluded that no significant difference could be found between the satisfaction levels of female and male students in foreign language courses. However, a different finding was obtained by Bećirović (2017) that a statistically significant difference was found between the foreign language satisfaction levels of female students and male students in favor of female students.

In answering the third research question of the study which was "*Is there a statistically significant difference between the students' level of satisfaction with foreign language lessons and the types of teaching?*", a Mann Whitney U test was used to analyze the data. As a result of the analysis, a statistically significant difference was found in favor of Daytime Courses Program students between the education types and the satisfaction levels of the foreign language course curriculum and instructors while there was no statistically significant difference in the level of satisfaction with the physical environment. The reason why the Daytime Courses Program students' foreign language course curriculum and instructor satisfaction levels are higher than the Evening Courses Program students may be that the lessons are held in the evening and therefore the willingness, motivation, performance and/or learning/teaching readiness levels of the students and the instructors are lower.

The fourth research question was "*Is there a statistically significant difference between the students' level of satisfaction with the foreign language course and their departments?*" and a Kruskal Wallis test was used to analyze data in answering the question. According to the results of the Kruskal Wallis test, in the sub-dimensions of students' departments and physical environment, there is a statistically significant difference between the satisfaction levels of the logistics department students and the satisfaction levels of the occupational health and safety students in favor of the logistics department students. Similar results were found by Yıldıran (2010) which found that there was a statistically significant difference between students' departments and foreign language satisfaction levels. However, no statistically significant difference was found between the departments of the students and the satisfaction levels of the foreign language course in the curriculum and instructor sub-dimensions.

151

In answering the fifth research question which was "*Is there a statistically significant difference between the students' level of satisfaction with the foreign language course and their GPA?*", the data were analyzed using the Kruskal Wallis test. The analysis results showed a statistically significant difference between the student GPAs and the satisfaction levels of the foreign language course curriculum and instructors. In the curriculum and instructor sub-dimensions, a statistically significant difference was found in favor of students with a GPA of "2.51 – 3.00" and "3.01 – 3.50" between the satisfaction levels of students with a GPA of "2.51 - 3.00" and "3.01 - 3.50" and the satisfaction levels of students with a GPA of "2.00 and below." However, in the physical environment sub-dimension, no statistically significant difference was found between the GPAs of the students and their level of satisfaction with the foreign language course. It can be said that students with a GPA of "2.00 and below" view the reasons for their low GPAs as the curriculum and instructor. However, students with a GPA of "2.51 and below" constitute only 16.3% of all students. If the real reason for low GPAs was the instructor and the curriculum, 83.7% of the students should not have had a GPA of "2.51 and above". In the light of these evaluations, it can be said that students with a GPA of "2.00 and below" associate their low academic achievements with various reasons as the curriculum and instructor. However, a different finding was obtained by Yıldıran (2010) and no statistically significant difference was found between students' GPAs and foreign language satisfaction levels.

The sixth research question was *"What are the students' views on their foreign language course satisfaction?"*. In answering the question, the data were obtained by using a semi-structured interview form and a descriptive analysis approach was used analyze the responses provided to the interview questions. In this context, it was seen that the qualitative data obtained supported and explained the findings of the quantitative data analyses. As a result of the interviews, it is seen that the students are satisfied with the curriculum elements and the instructor of the foreign language courses which supports the quantitative data in general. Similar results were reported by Shahriar et al. (2011), and it was concluded that the students were satisfied with the curriculum elements and the instructor of the foreign language course. In addition, it was observed that the students were moderately satisfied with the physical environment in which the foreign language courses were carried out which support the quantitative data. Students generally stated that they were satisfied with the cleanliness and temperature of the classroom/school, and moderately satisfied with the ventilation. The factor that most affects students' satisfaction with the physical environment in which the foreign language course is conducted was not using any technological equipment and conducting the class was using the board routinely. Additionally, in terms of the students' views on the outcomes (speaking, comprehension, reading, and writing) they have achieved in the foreign language course, while half of the students stated they were satisfied, the other half have moderate and low level of satisfaction. Students attributed the level of their satisfaction in this aspect to the weekly course hours (2 hours), the applied teaching strategy, method, and technique (usually lectures through presentation), the level of utilization of technological opportunities (not using any equipment and materials other than the board and pencil), the foreign language course not being student-centered, not placing emphasis on practice, students not being able to study enough, and the conduct of class through memorization. A similar conclusion to this study was reached by Carreira (2006) where it was concluded that the arrangement of learning environments in a way that supports foreign language learning and the creation of an interactive learning environment affect students' foreign language course satisfaction positively. On the other hand, students stated that their reading and writing skills improved more than speaking and comprehension skills in a foreign language. The reason for this is that the students stated that the foreign language course is carried out with activities that improve reading and writing rather than practices that improve speaking and comprehension. The study conducted by Asakereh and Dehghannezhad (2015) supports the results of this study by concluding that the increase in the speaking and practice activities of the students in a foreign language course positively affects the satisfaction of the students in the foreign language course.

Several recommendations were developed in line with the results of the study. These recommendations are presented below.

152

- Creating environments that are ready for learning by making the cleaning, temperature and especially ventilation of other areas such as classrooms, schools and libraries at a sufficient level can make students' physical environment satisfaction levels more positive.
- In order to increase the satisfaction level of the Evening Courses Program students with the foreign language course, it can be recommended to determine the expectations of the students, to prepare weekly lesson plans in a way that the instructor can maintain their performance in the Evening Courses Program classes although the classes are later in the evening, and to use the same strategies, methods/techniques as in the Daytime Courses Program.
- Similarly, to increase the level of satisfaction of the students in the occupational health and safety department with the foreign language course, student expectations can be determined, lacking and weaknesses can be eliminated to increase student satisfaction.
- In order to increase the level of satisfaction of students with a foreign language course, especially those with a GPA of 2.00 and below, it can be recommended to determine the reasons for the negative attitudes of students on the course and to increase the motivation, satisfaction and success levels of students by identifying the main reasons for the failures of the students.
- It can be recommended that students be more active in foreign language courses, developing student-centered curricula and considering student achievement levels in classes.
- Use of computers, projections, smart boards in foreign language lessons can be recommended as well as implementing/using content (video, slides, written and visual materials) and methods/techniques that will appeal more to sensory organs.
- More effective learning can be achieved by using active learning techniques in foreign language classes.
- It can be suggested that the foreign language instructor should carry out activities that increase student motivation, do more literacy activities, and give importance to practice activities for speaking and listening.

153

REFERENCES

Akarsu, B. (1998). *Dil - kültür bağlantısı.* İstanbul: İnkılâp Yayınları.

Alsadoon, E. (2018). The impact of social presence on learners satisfaction in mobile learning. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology. 17*(1), 226-233.

Amberg, J. S., & Vause, D. J. (2010). *American English: History, structure and usage*. London: Cambridge University Press

Asakereh, A., & Dehghannezhad, M. (2015). Student satisfaction with EFL speaking classes: Relating speaking self-efficacy and skills achievement. *Educational Research, 25*(4), 345-363.

Atadere, Y. K. (2012). *Türkiye'de erken yaşta yabancı dil eğitimi veli ve öğretmenlerin erken yaşta yabancı dile yönelik algı ve tutumları* (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi, Çanakkale. Obtained from the National Thesis Center of the Council of Higher Education. (Thesis No. 345887).

Babayiğit, Ö., & Erkuş, B. (2014). İlkokul 4. Sınıf öğrencilerinin dikte becerilerinin değerlendirilmesi. *Uluslararası Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 2*(4), 123-135.

Barker, A. (2010). *Improve your communication skills.* (Revised Second Edition). USA: Alan Barker Publishers.

Başat, G. (2014). Neden yabancı dil öğrenemiyoruz? *Aljazeera Türk Dergi.* http://dergi.aljazeera.com.tr/2018/04/06/neden-yabanci-dil ogrenemiyoruz/ It was obtained from the address on 19.02.2018.

Başkale, H. (2016). Nitel araştırmalarda geçerlik, güvenirlik ve örneklem büyüklüğünün belirlenmesi. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Fakültesi Elektronik Dergisi, 9*(1), 23-28.

Baykal. Ü, Sökmen, S. Korkmaz, Ş. &, Akgün E. (2002). Öğrenci memnuniyeti ölçeği geliştirme çalışması. *İÜFNHYO Hemşirelik Dergisi, 12*(49), 23-32.

Bećirović, S. (2017). The Relationship between gender, motivation and achievement in learning English as a

foreign language. *European Journal of Contemporary Education, 6*(2), 210-220.

Bustami, Y., Corebima, A. D., Suarsini, E., & Ibrahim (2017). The social attitude empowerment of biology students: Implementation jirqa learning strategy in different ethnics. *International Journal of Instruction*, *10*(3), 15-30. doi.org/10.12973/iji.2017.1032a.

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E. K., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2017). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri.* (23. Baskı). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Can, A. (2018). *SPSS ile bilimsel araştırma sürecinde nicel veri analizi* (6. Basım). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Carreira, J. M. (2006). Relationships between motivation for learning English and foreign language anxiety: A pilot study. *JALT Hokkaido Journal, 10,* 16-28.

Chastain, K. (1988). *Developing second language skills theory and practice* (3rd ed.). Florida: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Comrey, A. L., & Lee, H. B. (1992). *A first course in factor analysis.* Hilsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Condon, J. C. (2000). *Kelimelerin büyülü dünyası - anlambilim ve iletişim.* (Çev: Murat Çiftkaya). İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları.

Cobb, S. C. (2009). Social presence and online learning: a current view from a research perspective. *Journal of Interactive Online Learning, 8*(3), 241–254.

Corbin, J. M., & Strauss, A. (2015). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (4th Ed.). Sage.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Karma yöntem araştırmaları tasarımı ve yürütülmesi* (3. Basım). (Çev. Edt. Y. Dede & S. B. Demir). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Derinalp-Çanakçı, S., Çanakçı, T. ve Geçgin, E. (2019). Kars ilinin destinasyon imajı ve doğu ekspres'i deneyimi. *OPUS-Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi, 11*(18), 1876-1896. DOI: 10.26466/opus.- 567950.

EF English Proficiency Index. (2018). *EF EPI Index 2018*. 15 Mart 2020 tarihinde ttp://media.ef.com/__/~/media/centralefcom/epi/v4/downloads/full-reports/ef-epi-2020 English.pdf. The address was obtained from.

Ekiz, D. (2003). *Eğitimde araştırma yöntem ve metotlarına giriş: nitel, nicel ve eleştirel kuram metodolojileri.* Anı Yayıncılık.

Elliott, K. M., & Shin, D. (2002). Student satisfaction: an alternative approach to assessing this important concept. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *24*(2), 197-209.

Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. T. (2003). *Educatioanal research* (7th Ed.). New York: Pearson Education.

Gliner, J. A., Morgan, G. A., & Leech, N. L. (2015). *Uygulamada araştırma yöntemleri desen ve analizi bütünleştiren yaklaşım* (2. Basım). (S. Turan Çev. Ed.). Nobel.

Grossman, R. P. (1999). Relational versus discrete exchanges: the role of trust and commitment in determining customer satisfaction. *Journal of Marketing Management, 9*(2). 47-58.

Güven, N., & Bal. S. (2004). *Dil gelişimi 0 – 6 yaş dönemindeki çocuklar için destekleyici etkinlikler.* İstanbul: Epilson Yayıncılık.

Harris, R., & Taylor, T. J. (2002). *Dil bilimi düşününde dönüm noktaları I.* (Çev: Eser E. Taylan ve Cem Taylan). Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.

Hernández, M. S. (2009). Graduates' degree of satisfaction with the ma program in teaching english as foreign language at the University of Costa Rica. *Revista de Lenguas Modernas, 10,* 373-392

https://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm Obtained on 30.03.2020 from.

http://www.yok.gov.tr/documents/ Obtained on 29.03.2020 from.

Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational researcher*, *33*(7), 14-26. doi: https://doi.org/10.3102%2F0013189X033007014.

Karakaş, A. (2017). The forgotten voices in higher education Students satisfaction with English-medium instruction. *The Journal of English as an International Language, 12*(1), 1–14.

Karakaş, A. (2019). Öğrencilerin 'Etkileşimli İngilizce Dil Sınıfı' projesinden memnuniyetleri ve projenin öğrencilerin derse İngilizce katılım isteklilikleri üzerine etkileri. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi, 16,* 194-213.

Kayapalı-Yıldırım, S., & Ekinci, O. (2019). Siber mobbing ölçeği geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Mavi Atlas, 7*(2), 294-320.

Kırkgöz, Y., Çelik, S. and Arıkan, A. (2015). Laying the theoretical and practical foundations for a new elementary English curriculum in Turkey: A procedural analysis. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi, 24*(3), 1199-

154

1212.

Krashen, S. (2009). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition* (1nd. Ed.). CA: Universty of Southern California.

Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *30*(3), 607-610. doi.org/10.1177/001316447003000308.

Kuş, E. (2012). *Nicel ve nitel araştırma yöntemleri.* Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Malik, S., Qin, H., & Oteir, I. (2021). Perceived psychological, linguistic and socio-cultural obstacles: An investigation of English communication apprehension in EFL learners. *International Journal of Instruction, 14*(4), 733-752. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2021.14442a.

Marcoulides, G., & Schumacher, R. (2001). *New developments and tecniques in structural equation modeling.* London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

McDonough, S. H. (1986). *Psychology in foreign language teaching.* London: UnwinHyman.

Naktiyok, S. (2019). Otel çalışanlarının örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarının iş performansı üzerine etkisi: Sivas ilinde bir uygulama. *Journal of Tourism and Gastronomy Studies, 7*(2), 1057-1076.

Obando-Guerrero, G. V., & Sánchez-Solarte, A. C. (2018). Learners' satisfaction in two foreign language teacher education programs: Are we doing our homework? *HOW, 25*(1), 135-155. https://doi.org/10.19183/ how.25.1.436.

Oliver, R. L. (1999). Whence consumer loyalty? *Journal of Marketing, 25*(63), 33-44.

Özbent, S. (2010). Türkiye'de yabancı dil eğitimi. *İstanbul Eğitim ve Kültür Dergisi, Eylül,* 51-55.

Özdamar, K. (1997). *Paket programlar ile istatistiksel veri analizi.* Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Özdamar, K. (2017). *Ölçek ve test geliştirme yapısal eşitlik modellemesi IBM SPSS, IBM SPSS AMOS ve MINTAB uygulamalı.* Eskişehir: Nisan Kitabevi.

Özer, B., & Korkmaz, C. (2016). Yabancı dil öğretiminde öğrenci başarısını etkileyen unsurlar. *EKEV Akademi Dergisi, 20*(67),59-84.

Özüdoğru, F. (2017). Evaluation of the voluntary English preparatory program at a Turkısh State University. *Journal of International Social Research, 10*(48).

Pallant, J. (2017). *SPSS Kullanma klavuzu SPSS ile adım adım veri analizi.* (Çev. Sibel Balcı, Berat Ahi). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Porzig, W. (1995). *Dil denen mucize.* (Çev. Vural Ülkü). Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.

Reio T. G., & Crim, S. J. (2013). Social presence and student satisfaction as predictors of online enrollment intent. *American Journal of Distance Education, 27*(2), 122-133.

Robinson, S. P., Decenzo, D. A., Coulter, M. (2011). *Fundamentals of management* (7th. Ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.

Shahriar, A., Pathan, H., Mari, M. A., & Umrani, T. (2011). The extent of satisfaction on the key factors that affect learner motivation. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 1*(3), 96-108.

Schramm, W. (1993). How communication works. In W. Schramm (Ed.), *The process and effects of communication.* Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press.

Schumacher, R., & Lomax, R. (2004). *A beginner's guide to structural equation modeling.* London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Schunk, H. D. (2014). *Öğrenme teorileri eğitimsel bir bakışla.* (Çev. M. Y. Demir). (Çev. Edt. M. Şahin). Ankara: Nobel Yayınları.

Seçer, İ. (2015). *Psikolojik test geliştirme ve uyarlama süreci SPSS ve LISREL uygulamaları.* Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Suna, Y., & Durmuşçelebi, M. (2013). Türkiye'de yabancı dil öğrenme-öğretme proble-mine ilişkin yapılan çalışmaların derlemesi. *Türkiye Sosyal Politika ve Çalışma Hayatı Araştırmaları Dergisi, 3*(5), 7-24.

Suwantarathip, O. (2019). Predictors of students' satisfaction with a hybrid English course. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education, 20*(1), 115-130.

Qutob, M. M. (2018). The relationship between EFL learners' satisfaction within the classroom environment and their speaking skills. *Canadian Center of Science and Education, 11*(7), 116-124.

Taşgın, A., & Korucuk, M. (2018). Development of foreign language lesson satisfaction scale (flss): Validity and reliability study. *Journal of Curriculum and Teaching, 7*(2), 66-77.

Travers, M. (2001). *Qualitative research through case studies.* London: Sage.

155

Vogt, W. P., Gardner, D. C., & Haeffele, L. M. (2012). *When to use what research design.* New York: Guilford Press.

Yalçın, S. K., & Şengül, M. (2007). Dilin iletişim süreci içerisindeki rolü ve işlevleri. *Turkish Studies / Türkoloji Araştırmaları, 2*(2), 749-769.

Yazıcıoğlu, Y., & Erdoğan, S. (2004). *SPSS Uygulamalı bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri.* Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.

Yeşilyurt, E. (2013). Metacognitive awareness and achievement focused motivation as the predictor of the study process. *International J. Soc. Sci. & Education, 3*(4), 1013-1026.

Yıldıran, Ç. (2010). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin yabancı dil seviyelerinin ve yabancı dil eğitim programına karşı tutumlarının incelenmesi* (Aksaray Üniversitesi örneği). (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Niğde Üniversitesi, Niğde. Obtained from the National Thesis Center of the Council of Higher Education. (Thesis No. 265272).

Yıldırım, F., & Naktiyok, S. (2017). The mediating role of organizational support in the effect of transformational leadership on employee empowerment. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, *16*(1): 292-303.

156

Öğrencilerin Yabancı Dil Dersi Memnuniyet Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi: Karma Yöntem Araştırması

Dr. Murat Korucuk

Kafkas University - Turkey
ORCID: 0000-0001-5147-9865
muratkorucuk@kafkas.edu.tr

Özet

Üniversite öğrencilerinin yabancı dil dersi memnuniyet düzeyleri ile memnuniyet düzeylerinin çeşitli değişkenler (cinsiyete, öğretim türüne, bölüm, not ortalaması) açısından farklılaşıp farklılaşmadığının incelendiği bu çalışmada karma yöntemlerden ardışık açıklayıcı desen tercih edilmiştir. Çalışmanın nicel araştırma grubu basit seçkisiz örnekleme yöntemi ile belirlenen 398 öğrenciden; nitel araştırma grubu ise amaçsal örnekleme yöntemlerinden maksimum çeşitlilik örnekleme yöntemi ile belirlenen 12 (cinsiyete göre: 6 kız/6 erkek, ortalamaya göre: 4 düşük, 4 orta ve 4 yüksek) öğrenciden meydana gelmiştir. Veri toplama aracı olarak "Kişisel Bilgi Formu" ile Taşgın ve Korucuk (2018) tarafından geliştirilen "Yabancı Dil Dersi Memnuniyet Ölçeği – YDDMÖ" ve "Yarı Yapılandırılmış Görüşme Formu" kullanılmıştır. Veriler parametrik test varsayımlarını karşılamadığı için nicel veri analizinde nonparametrik teknikler olan Mann Whitney U ve Kruskal Wallis testinden yararlanılmıştır. Nicel verilere uygulanan analizler sonucunda Yabancı Dil Dersi Memnuniyet Ölçeği (YDDMÖ) eğitim programı ve öğretim elemanı alt boyutları ile ölçeğin tamamının yüksek düzey "olumlu" değer aralığında yer aldığı tespit edilmiştir. Bunun yanında YDDMÖ fiziksel ortam alt boyutuna ait öğrenci memnuniyet düzeyinin ise "orta" değer aralığında olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Diğer taraftan öğrencilerin yabancı dil dersi memnuniyet düzeyleri ile çeşitli değişkenler arasında (öğretim türü, bölüm, not ortalaması) istatistiksel olarak anlamlı farklılıklara rastlanırken; cinsiyet değişkeni arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir farklılığa rastlanmamıştır. Ulaşılan nitel verilerin ise araştırmanın nicel verilerini açıklayarak desteklediği görülmüştür.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Dil eğitimi, Yabancı dil dersi, memnuniyet, üniversite öğrencileri*

157

Genişletilmiş Özet

Problem: Türkiye'de ilkokuldan itibaren başlayan yabancı dil eğitimi üniversitelerde 06.11.1981 tarihli 2547 sayılı Yükseköğretim Kanunu'nun 2. Bölüm 5. Madde (1) bendinde belirtildiği gibi iki dönem halinde ve zorunlu bir şekilde yürütülmektedir (http://www.yok.gov.tr). Ancak yine de istenen İngilizce yeterlik düzeyinin yakalanamadığı görülmektedir (EF - EPI, 2018; Özbent, 2010; Özer and Korkmaz, 2016; Suna and Durmuşçelebi, 2013). Bu sebeple bu çalışmada üniversite öğrencilerinin yabancı dil eğitiminde unsurların başında gelen yabancı dil dersi memnuniyet düzeylerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi amaçlanmıştır. Bu çalışmanın yabancı dil dersinin öğrencilerde memnuniyet ve/veya memnuniyetsizlik yaratıcı kısımları tespit edilebilerek yabancı dil dersi başarısının arttırılmasına yönelik öneriler geliştirilebilmesi açısından önemli olduğu söylenebilir. Bu çalışmanın temel amacı Türkiye'nin doğusunda yer alan bir devlet üniversitesinde öğrenim gören öğrencilerin yabancı dil memnuniyet düzeylerinin cinsiyetlerine, öğretim türlerine, bölümlerine ve ortalamalarına göre farklılaşma durumlarının incelenmesidir. Çalışmada cevaplanmaya çalışılan temel soru "Öğrencilerin yabancı dil dersi memnuniyetleri hangi düzeydedir?" olarak belirlenmiştir.

Yöntem: Bu araştırmada elde edilen verilerin daha detaylı biçimde değerlendirilebilmesi, nicel ve nitel bulguların birlikte ele alınarak her iki desenin de sınırlılıklarının en aza indirilebilmesi ve ulaşılan nicel bulguların nitel bulgular ile derinlemesine açıklanabilmesi (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004) için karma yöntemlerden ardışık açıklayıcı desen tercih edilmiştir. Çalışmanın nicel kısmında tarama modeli kullanılmıştır. Çalışmanın nitel kısmında ise durum çalışması deseni kullanılmıştır. Karma yöntemli bu çalışmanın araştırma grubu nicel araştırma grubu ve nitel araştırma grubu olarak iki kısma ayrılmıştır. Nicel araştırma grubu: Çalışmanın nicel araştırma grubunun oluşturulması aşamasında seçkisiz bir şekilde hareket edilmiştir. Çalışma evreni 534 öğrenciden oluşmaktadır. Çalışmada %95 güvenirlikle ve %5 'lik bir hata ile hesaplanan en az örneklem büyüklüğü 224 olarak hesaplanmıştır; (Krejcie and Morgan, 1970; Yazıcıoğlu and Erdoğan, 2004). Bu sebeple çalışmada ulaşılan örneklem büyüklüğü ise 398'tir. Nitel araştırma grubu: Nitel araştırma grubunun belirlenmesinde araştırma amacı doğrultusunda daha yoğun bilgiye ulaşılacağı düşünüldüğünden (Vogt, Gardner and Haeffele, 2012) seçkili olarak amaçsal örnekleme yöntemlerinden maksimum çeşitlilik örnekleme kullanılmıştır. Maksimum çeşitlilik elde edilebilmesi için örneklem cinsiyet (kadın – erkek) ve yabancı dil dersi başarı puanlarına (2 ve altı düşük, 2-3 orta, 3-4 yüksek) göre belirlenmiştir. Görüşme tekniğinin kullanıldığı nitel araştırmalarda örneklem büyüklüğünün 6-12 arasında olması verilerin daha net şekilde çözümlenebilme olanağı sunmasından dolayı (Başkale, 2016) nitel araştırma grubu 12 (cinsiyete göre: 6 kız/6 erkek, ortalamaya göre: 4 düşük, 4 orta ve 4 yüksek) kişiden oluşturulmuştur. Çalışmada karma yöntem kullanılmasından dolayı veri toplama araçları nicel ve nitel veri toplama araçları olarak iki türlüdür. Nicel veri toplama aracı: Çalışmada öğrencilerin yabancı dil dersi memnuniyet düzeylerinin belirlenebilmesi için "Yabancı Dil Dersi Memnuniyet Ölçeği - YDDMÖ" kullanılmıştır. YDDMÖ Taşgın ve Korucuk (2018) tarafından Türkiye'de 460 öğrenci ile yürütülen bir ölçek geliştirme çalışması sonucu oluşturulmuştur. Toplam 28 madde ve 3 boyuttan (1. Boyut eğitim programı ile ilgili maddeler: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10/2. Boyut öğretim elemanı ile ilgili maddeler: 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24/3. Boyut fiziksel ortam ile ilgili maddeler: 25, 26, 27, 28) oluşan YDDMÖ 5'li likert bir yapıya sahiptir. Bu çalışmada YDDMÖ'nin güvenirliğinin denetlenebilmesi için öncelikle hem ölçeğin tamamının hem de oluşan dört boyutun Cronbach Alfa iç tutarlılık katsayı değerleri hesaplanmış ve Cronbach alfa iç tutarlılık katsayıları hem alt boyutlara (α=,81 ile α=,92 arasında) hem de ölçeğin tamamı için (α=,95) Özdamar (1997)'ye göre değerlendirildiğinde; YDDMÖ'nin yüksek derecede güvenilir olduğu sonucuna ulaşılmıştır. Nitel veri toplama aracı: Çalışmada öğrencilerin yabancı dil dersi memnuniyetlerine yönelik görüşlerinin belirlenebilmesi amacı ile yarı yapılandırılmış görüşme formu hazırlanmıştır. Görüşme formu hazırlanma aşamasında öncelikle ilgili literatür değerlendirilmiş ve ardından ilgili alanda (Eğitim Programları ve Öğretim, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi) 4 öğretim üyesi ile 1 Türk Dili uzmanının görüşlerine başvurulmuştur. Formun son uygulama aşamasına geçilmeden önce 5 öğrenci ile ön uygulama yapılmış görüşme formunun anlaşılırlığı kontrol edilmiştir. Görüşme formu toplamda 4 sorudan oluşmaktadır. Nicel veri analizi: Araştırmada elde edilen nicel verilerin analizinde istatistik paket programlarından yararlanılmıştır.

158

Verilerin parametrik testlere uygun olmadığı belirlenmiş ve nonparametrik testlerin uygulanmasına karar verilmiştir. Nitel veri analizi: Araştırmanın nitel verileri için betimsel analiz yaklaşımı kullanılmıştır.

Bulgular: Öğrencilerin YDDMÖ alt boyutlarına ait ortalamaları; eğitim programı alt boyutu ($\overline{X}$ =3,54, ss=,93), öğretim elemanı alt boyutu ($\overline{X}$ =3,56, ss=,94) ve ölçeğin tamamı ($\overline{X}$ =3,52, ss=,85) ile yüksek "olumlu" değer aralığında yer almaktadır. Ancak YDDMÖ fiziksel ortam alt boyutuna ait ortalama ($\overline{X}$ =3,32, ss=1,10) ile orta değer aralığında yer almaktadır. Öğrencilerin cinsiyetleri ile yabancı dil dersi memnuniyet düzeyleri arasında anlamlı bir farklılık olmadığı tespit edilmiştir. [($U_{Eğitim\ Programı}$=18228,5, z=-.722, p=.470), ($U_{Öğretim\ Elemanı}$=17666,0, z=-1.222, p=.222), ($U_{Fiziksel\ Ortam}$=18219,0, z=-.732, p=.464)]. Öğrencilerin öğretim türleri ile yabancı dil dersi eğitim programı ($U_{Eğitim\ Programı}$=14574,5, z=-2.69, p=.001) ve öğretim elemanı ($U_{Öğretim\ Elemanı}$=15001,0, z=-1.57, p=.04) memnuniyet düzeyleri arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir farklılık olduğu belirlenmiştir. Öğrencilerin bölümleri ile yabancı dil dersi fiziksel ortam memnuniyet düzeyleri ($X_{2(4)fiziksel\ ortam}$=10.961, p<.05) arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir farklılık tespit edilmiştir. Öğrencilerin ortalamaları ile yabancı dil dersi eğitim programı ($X_{2(4)Eğitim\ Programı}$=1.952, p<.05) ve öğretim elemanı ($X_{2(4)Öğretim\ Elemanı}$=3.844, p<.05) memnuniyet düzeyleri arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir farklılık tespit edilmiştir. Elde edilen nitel veriler değerlendirildiğinde; nicel verilerin nitel veriler ile desteklendiği görülmüştür.

Sonuçlar: Bu çalışmada üniversite öğrencilerinin yabancı dil memnuniyet düzeylerinin belirlenmesi ile öğrencilerin yabancı dil memnuniyet düzeylerinin cinsiyete, öğretim türüne, bölüme ve ortalamaya göre farklılaşma durumlarının incelenmesi amaçlanmıştır. Çalışmanın ilk araştırma problemi olan "1. Öğrencilerin yabancı dil dersi memnuniyetleri hangi düzeydedir?"in cevaplandırılabilmesi için verilere ait ortalama ve standart sapma değerleri analiz edilmiştir. Analizler sonucunda Yabancı Dil Dersi Memnuniyet Ölçeği (YDDMÖ) eğitim programı ve öğretim elemanı alt boyutları ile ölçeğin tamamının yüksek düzey "olumlu" değer aralığında yer aldığı tespit edilmiştir. Bu bulgular yabancı dil dersi eğitim programı (hedef, içerik, eğitim durumları, ölçme ve değerlendirme) ve dersi yürüten öğretim elemanı ile ölçeğin tamamına ait öğrenci memnuniyet düzeylerinin yüksek düzeyde olduğunu göstermektedir. Yapılan Mann Whitney U testi sonucunda öğrencilerin cinsiyetleri ile yabancı dil dersi memnuniyet düzeyleri arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir farklılığa rastlanamamıştır. Diğer bir ifadeyle kız ve erkek öğrencilerin yabancı dil dersi memnuniyet düzeyleri arasında anlamlı seviyede bir farklılaşmanın tespit edilemediği sonucuna varılmıştır. Öğrencilerin öğretim türleri ile yabancı dil dersi eğitim programı ve öğretim elemanı memnuniyet düzeyleri arasında birinci öğretim öğrencileri lehine istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir farklılık olduğu; fiziksel ortam memnuniyet düzeyinde ise istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir farklılık bulunmadığı sonucuna ulaşılmıştır. Birinci öğretim öğrencilerinin yabancı dil dersi eğitim programı ve öğretim elemanı memnuniyet düzeylerinin ikinci öğretim öğrencilerine oranla daha yüksek olmasının nedeni olarak, ikinci öğretimde derslerin akşam saatlerinde yapılmasına ve bu sebeple öğrenciler ile öğretim elemanının isteklilik, motivasyon, performans ve/veya öğrenme/öğretmeye hazır olma düzeylerinin daha düşük olması gösterilebilir. Yapılan Kruskal Wallis testi sonuçlarına göre öğrencilerin bölümleri ile fiziksel ortam alt boyutunda; lojistik bölümü öğrencileri memnuniyet düzeyleri ile iş sağlığı ve güvenliği öğrencileri memnuniyet düzeyleri arasında lojistik bölümü öğrencileri lehine istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir farklılık olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Öğrencilerin ortalamaları ile yabancı dil dersi eğitim programı ve öğretim elemanı memnuniyet düzeyleri arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir farklılık tespit edilmiştir. Eğitim programı ve öğretim elemanı alt boyutlarında "2,51 – 3,00" ortalamaya sahip öğrencilerin memnuniyet düzeyleri ve "3,01 – 3,50" ortalamaya sahip öğrencilerin memnuniyet düzeyleri ile "2,00 ve altı" ortalamaya sahip öğrencilerin memnuniyet düzeyleri arasında "2,51 – 3,00" ve "3,01 – 3,50" ortalamaya sahip öğrenciler lehine istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir farklılık olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Ancak fiziksel ortam alt boyutunda öğrencilerin ortalamaları ile yabancı dil dersi memnuniyet düzeyleri arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir farklılık bulunamamıştır. "2,00 ve altı" ortalamaya sahip öğrencilerin düşük ortalamalarının nedenlerini eğitim programı ve öğretim elemanı olarak gördükleri söylenebilir. Ulaşılan nitel verilerin araştırmanın nicel verilerini açıklayarak desteklediği görülmüştür. Yapılan görüşmeler sonucunda öğrencilerin yabancı dil dersinde uygulanan eğitim programı öğeleri ve öğretim elemanından genel olarak nicel verileri destekler nitelikte memnun oldukları görülmektedir. Bunun yanında öğrencilerin yabancı dil dersinin yürütüldüğü fiziksel ortamdan nicel verileri destekler nitelikte orta seviyede memnun oldukları görülmüştür. Öğrenciler genellikle sınıfın/okulun temizlik ve sıcaklığından memnun, havalandırmasından ise orta düzey memnun oldukları yönünde görüş

159

bildirmişlerdir. Öğrencilerin yabancı dil dersinin yürütüldüğü fiziksel ortama yönelik memnuniyetlerini en fazla etkileyen unsur olarak; ders esnasında herhangi bir teknolojik donanımdan yararlanılmaması ve rutin bir şekilde sadece tahta kullanılarak anlatım yapılması belirlenmiştir. Bunun yanında öğrencilerin yabancı dil dersi ile elde etikleri kazanımlar (konuşma, anlama, okuma ve yazma) ile ilgili görüşleri olarak; öğrencilerin yarısı memnun iken, diğer yarısı ise orta ve düşük düzey memnuniyete sahiptir. Öğrenciler bu konudaki memnuniyet seviyelerinin haftalık ders saatinden (2 saat), uygulanan öğretim strateji, yöntem ve tekniğinden (sunuş yolu ile genellikle düz anlatım), teknolojik imkânlardan yararlanma düzeyinden (tahta ve tahta kalemi dışında herhangi bir donanım ve materyalden yararlanılmaması), yabancı dil dersinin öğrenci merkezli olmayışından, uygulamaya önem verilmeyişinden, öğrencilerin yeteri kadar çalışmamasından ve dersin ezber ağırlıklı yürütülmesinden dolayı olumsuz yönde etkilendiği yönünde görüş bildirmişlerdir.

Öneriler: İkinci öğretim öğrencilerinin de yabancı dil dersinden memnuniyet düzeylerinin yükseltilebilmesi için öğrenci beklentilerinin belirlenmesi, öğretim elemanın geç saatlerde de olsa ikinci öğretim derslerinde performansını koruyabileceği şekilde haftalık ders programlarının hazırlanması ve birinci öğretim ile aynı strateji, yöntem/tekniklerin kullanılması önerilebilir. Benzer şekilde iş sağlığı ve güvenliği bölümü öğrencilerinin de yabancı dil dersinden memnuniyet düzeylerinin yükseltilebilmesi için öğrenci beklentilerinin belirlenmesi, eksik ve zayıf yönlerin giderilerek öğrenci memnuniyetlerinin arttırılması sağlanabilir. Özellikle 2.00 ve altı ortalamaya sahip öğrencilerin yabancı dil dersinden memnuniyet düzeylerinin yükseltilebilmesi için öğrencilerin ders hakkındaki olumsuz tutumlarının nedenlerinin belirlenmesi ve öğrencilerin başarısızlıklarının temel sebeplerinin ortaya çıkartılarak öğrencilerin motivasyon, memnuniyet ve başarı düzeylerinin yükseltilmesi önerilebilir. Yabancı dil derslerinde öğrencilerin daha aktif olması, öğrenci merkezli programlar geliştirilmesi ve derslerde öğrenci başarı seviyelerinin dikkate alınması önerilebilir.