Gaziantep Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi (http://sbe.gantep.edu.tr)
2009 8(1):101 -129 ISSN: 1303-0094

Investigation of Cross-cultural Communication between Native English-speaking Lecturers and their Students in Turkish Tertiary Education

Türk Yüksek Öğretim Kurumlarında Anadili İngilizce Olan Hocalar ile Öğrencileri Arasındaki Kültürler-arası İletişimin İncelenmesi

Berrin Uçkun[1]* and Jessica Buchanan[2]
[1]Gaziantep University, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Department of English Language and Literature,
[2] Gaziantep University, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Department of English Language and Literature, English Language Fellow.

Abstract

Cultural diversity between students and teachers may be a source of "miscommunication" that compromises the learning/teaching environment. In such cases, students may be accused of poor performance or teachers may be blamed for inadequate methodology. This comparative study aims to examine the education culture in two Turkish universities involving native teachers, English speaking foreign teachers and their Turkish students in an attempt to understand the strengths, weaknesses, and challenges faced by both students and teachers. Four versions of the questionnaire were administered to 15 teachers and 228 students. All four versions focused on classroom management and examination procedures, pedagogy, and other affective factors. The authors aimed to investigate students' and teachers' mutual beliefs, perceptions and expectations of each other within the educational context and whether any differences could be accounted for by cultural differences between the two parties. This study was designed by both a Turkish academic and a native English speaking instructor, a collaboration which serves to temper cultural biases inherent to any culturally based inquiry. We hoped to maximize the effectiveness of cross-cultural classrooms as well as to suggest directions for further research.

Keywords: cultural diversity, school culture, university context.

Özet

Öğrenciler ve öğretmenlerin farklı kültürlerden gelmeleri iletişim bozukluklarına neden olabileceği için eğitim-öğretim ortamına şüphe düşürebiliyor. Bu tür durumlarda, öğrenciler öğrenme davranışlarında başarısız, öğretmenler de öğretme becerilerinde yetersiz kalmakla suçlanabilirler. Bu karşılaştırmalı çalışmanın amacı bünyesinde Türk öğrenciler ve hocalarla beraber anadili İngilizce olan yabancı

*Corresponding author: University of Gaziantep, Faculty of Science and Letters, Department of English Language and Literature, 27310, Gaziantep, Turkey. e-mail:uckun@gantep.edu.tr

uyruklu hocaları da barındıran iki Türk üniversitesinde öğrenci ve öğretmenlerin karşılaştığı olumlu ve olumsuz durumları belirlemek. Anketin dört benzer sürümü 15 öğretmen ve 228 öğrenciye uygulandı. Dört anket türünde de maddeler sınıf içi iletişim, başarı değerlendirme yöntemleri, pedagoji ve diğer duygusal etkenler olarak düzenlendi. Yazarların amacı, bu eğitim ortamında öğretmen ve öğrencilerin karşılıklı olarak inançları, algılamaları ve birbirlerinden olan beklentilerini tespit edip görülen farklılıkların taraflar arasındaki kültürel farklılıktan kaynaklanıp kaynaklanmadığını incelemekti. Bu araştırma bir Türk öğretim üyesi ve bir yabancı uyruklu hocanın işbirliği ile ortaya çıkarıldı; böylece, bu tür bir kültüre dayalı araştırmada önyargılara dayalı sonuçlardan kaçınılması amaçlandı. Farklı kültürleri bağdaştıran bu tür eğitim-öğretim ortamlarının verimliliğinin arttırılması ve gelecekteki benzer çalışmalara yön verebilecek öneriler getirilmekte.
Anahtar kelimeler: kültürel farklılıklar, okul kültürü, üniversite bağlamı.

I. INTRODUCTION

In most educational contexts around the world, cultural diversity among classroom members, both teachers and students, is inevitable. The educational outcomes of such differences may be lower self-esteem, misbehavior or academic underachievement. When a teacher is new to a certain schooling environment, and therefore unfamiliar with the students' culture, it is possible for cultural differences to interfere with his/her effectiveness as a teacher. School cultures determine the way teachers and student communicate, the rules for talking, how much open discussion there is in class, how much one-way teacher-talk, how students feel, and how critical thinking is respected. This article explores the school culture in Turkish universities involving Turkish teachers, English speaking foreign teachers and their Turkish students in an attempt to understand the strengths, weaknesses, and challenges faced by both students and teachers. Cross-cultural perspectives were investigated between university students and teachers, both foreign and native, through their responses to questionnaire item relating to matters of classroom etiquette, classroom management, examination procedures, pedagogy, and other affective factors. Discussion are then carried out on how cultural differences may affect teaching and learning and on the implications of the findings for all the parties involved in universities where foreign academic staff are recruited as part of certain fellowship and academic exchange programs.

1) Definitions of culture

Culture (or cultures) has been defined by Woods (1990, in Planel, 1997: 350) as "social, shared, systematic, cognitive, learned. They include values beliefs, rules and codes of conduct and behavior, forms of language, patterns of speech and choice of words, understanding about ways of doing things and not doing things". Comparison of cultures and educational values is dealt with under the theoretical framework of social constructionism. As a theory of learning and development, it treats "human learning and cognitive development as a process which is culturally based, not just culturally influenced; a process which is social rather than

individual; a communicative process whereby knowledge is shared and understandings are constructed in culturally formed settings" (Mercer, 1991: 61).

There are culturalist approaches (Pritchard, 1995; Liu, 2001) to the study of differences between two cultures. Holliday (1999: 245) defines culturism as a notion "in which the members of a group to which an ethnic, national or international large cultural label has been attached are perceived as confined and reduced to pre-defined characteristics". Culturalist researchers claim that awareness of such differences should help communication partners to understand each other and adjust their communication behavior where necessary. Furusawa (2005) draws attention to the critical limitations of culturist approaches in that "they tend to polarize or dichotomise people's differences between nations and regions, while there may only exist some tendencies" (p. 65). The same author argues that such cultural stereotyping attributes certain features to some cultures which are quite groundless and detrimental to the self-image of its members.

2) Intercultural communication

Communication is viewed as "an on-going, transactional process in which individuals exchange messages whose meanings are influenced by the history of the relationship and the experiences of the participants"(Adler et al, 1998: 14). This transactional model of communication suggests that 1) the sending and receiving of messages occur simultaneously; 2) communication is an on-going process which we cannot separate into discrete acts of behaviors; and 3) communication patterns mutually influence each other, so that any communication is interactive (Adler et al, 1998: 12-14). Messages can be verbal or non-verbal, such as facial expressions, body movements, and silence. Communications partners need careful coordination between them to achieve a satisfactory result.

Misunderstandings in intercultural communication occur mainly because either one or both interactants adopt misconceptions about, or are simply ignorant of the cultural patterns of their interlocutors (Barna, 1991), with the result that "our being, seeing, behaving, and communicating" (O'Sulliven, 1994: 97) are often different from those of different backgrounds. Cushner and Brislin (1996: 6) maintain that differences in "people's values, attitudes, norms of behavior, and adopted roles" are considered to be causes of most cross-cultural misunderstandings.

3) Cultures of learning

Culture of learning is defined by Cortazzi and Jin (in Furusawa, 2005:61) as:

> taken-for-granted frameworks of expectations, attitudes, values and beliefs about what constitutes good learning, about how to *teach* or *learn*, whether and how to ask questions, what textbooks are for, and how (language) teaching relates to broader issues of the nature and purpose of education (emphases added by the researchers).

This implies that the culture in a classroom is formed not only by the daily interactions between teachers and students but also by the expectations,

assumptions and interpretations that underlie their conduct. It is maintained that pupil attitudes to education are derived from students' sociocultural backgrounds and that student attitudes predispose students to learning. Students interpret both what and how they learn through the medium of culture to which they belong (Planel, 1997). It has also been claimed that it is the students' perceptions of teacher behavior that to a great extent accounts for how much they learn (Waxman & Eash, 1983). Planel also suggests that cultural values are more significant for learning than pedagogic styles as the underlying educational values give meaning to styles of pedagogy.

Despite the claim that "there is no reason to suppose that one culture of learning is superior to another" (Cortazzi and Jin, 1996: 174), there is sufficient reason to suspect that a foreign teacher's behavioral and learning expectations of their students of a different culture will be culturally determined. Denscombe (1982) suggests that the culture brought into the classroom by a teacher has its origin in the teacher's own learning experience as a student, during which time they develop notions of what teaching is all about and learn to discern the good teacher from the bad. Therefore, "knowledge is not something objective and independent of the teacher to be learned and transmitted but, rather; is the sum total of the teacher's experiences" (Connely et al, 1997, p. 666). When communication between students and teachers does not work out, students' personal factors such as "laziness, lack of motivation or incompetence" are often blamed (Kato, 2001, p. 51); similarly, when a behavior different from one's own is observed, it tends to be perceived as rude, insensitive or uncooperative rather than a different way of doing things (Gumperz, 1982), a proposition also supported by Leigh's (2004) findings in a U.K. language institution.

Planel (1997) has found that concepts about order and structure in the classroom also vary among students. Some students may be accustomed to highly structured environment as opposed to student-centered instruction. Individual learning styles also influence notions about classroom settings and Oxford (1992) has found that learning styles are directly related to culture. Verbally expressing ideas and asking questions during class can prove difficult for students unaccustomed to active participation (Liu, 2002). Sometimes students' perceptions of their classroom participation may not concur with the instructor's opinion. For example, some students may presume that their attentive behavior is interpreted by the teacher as active participation. Values, such as self-control and deference to authority, may also be a source of misunderstandings between students and teachers. Farver et al. (1995) noted that Korean-American students' practice of self-control was incorrectly interpreted as inattentiveness or withdrawal. With such a potential for cultural clashes and differences between teachers and students, utilizing contextual analyses may provide us with an empirical basis for developing instructional techniques or treatments that are more beneficial for certain cultural contexts.

II. THE CONTEXT OF THE PRESENT STUDY

University classrooms, where either language courses or academic courses take place, are sites of complex communication. Communication partners need careful coordination between them to achieve a satisfactory result; however, there is a clear power difference that exists between teacher and students, and therefore the teacher needs to assume greater responsibility for bringing learning into the classroom through effective communication. A teacher's interpersonal actions can create and maintain a positive classroom atmosphere which is vital for the quality of teaching. The teacher's and students' cultural origins can play a role in creating such a class climate; this makes it necessary to approach classroom communication from a cultural perspective.

In the educational context of countries like Turkey, where the medium of education in some universities and departments is English, there are a number of foreign programs which supply these institutions with expatriating lecturers such as the English Language Fellows and Fulbright Scholars, in addition to university employed foreign academics. In such classroom, cultural diversity between teachers and students is inevitable. When a teacher is new to a certain teaching situation and therefore unfamiliar with student culture, one can expect cultural differences to affect the teacher's effectiveness in managing their lessons. Alptekin and Alptekin (1984) warn that when "guest" teachers are unable to understand the particular nature of the "host" culture, their ignorance may exacerbate the opposing pedagogical views (see also Ekmekçi and Inal, 1981). Furthermore, teacher effectiveness is defined by Powell (1997: 468) as "contingent on teachers' abilities to connect students to subject mater in personally meaningful and *culturally appropriate* ways" (emphasis added by the authors).

Considering the fact that so much financial and human resources are being invested into such cross-cultural educational collaboration programs, it is essential to investigate their educational impact on the parties that provide and receive such a service. Although teachers themselves probably have a hunch that one major source of their difficulties is their unfamiliarity with the local classroom culture, they would still need to be informed about what differences exist between their culture and that of their students, and how such differences may affect the learning outcome. The present research, therefore, originated from the need to examine the relationship between cultural differences and teaching effectiveness. The researchers wish to avoid the pitfall of assuming "Turkish" classroom as monolithic culture, and what diversity exists within one culture is beyond the scope of this study.

Woods (1990) argues that even within the same culture, the views of teachers and students regarding the culture of learning are not always compatible. Such differences can exist in the perceptions held by teachers and students about each other's role and function in the educational process, what they expect to achieve, and what they think they are learning. Levy et al. (1997) observed that teachers did not appear to be aware of the differences in the way they were perceived by their students. This same author also suggested that teachers were unaware of the cultural gap between their teaching style and student's learning style. This study gains its significance from the aspect that it aims to measure the

perspectives of both foreign teachers and their students pertaining to classroom practices.

Self-report instruments that express students' perceptions of the classroom environment have been found to be more realistic and reliable measures than the teachers' own perceptions of their own teaching behavior. Rosenshine (1971), for example, reports that the use of student ratings as predictors of the general effectiveness of teachers has yielded slightly more reliable results than observer ratings. Studies which compare students', teachers', and classroom observers' reports of classroom processes have found that students and classroom observers were in general agreement although students' and observers' reports did not correspond very closely to teachers' reports (Hook and Rosenshine, 1979; Steele et al, 1971). Waxman (2001) substantiates the importance of using student perceptions in classroom research. Student self-report instruments (designed to analyze students' perceptions of classroom instruction) hold a tremendous advantage over observational techniques in that they can be standardized and are economical and efficient in obtaining larger amounts of data in a short amount of time. The present study will make use of self-reports to identify students' and teachers', both foreign and native, perceptions of classroom processes and compare them with each other. The results of the study aims to reveal whether there is a significant gap between the foreign teachers' and native students' perceptions pertaining to the classroom environment, as well as whether a similar gap exists between the perceptions of Turkish teachers and Turkish students.

In the light of the above literature review and the context of the present study, the following research questions have been put forward by the researchers, the answers to which will be the main aspiration of the researchers' investigation.

1. According to students' perceptions, are there any significant differences between Turkish instructors and native English-speaking instructors in Turkish tertiary classrooms in terms of a) methodology and classroom management; and b) examination and grading criteria?
2. Do students' perceptions of their Turkish and native English-speaking instructors differ from these instructors' perceptions of themselves in terms of a) methodology and classroom management; and b) examination and grading criteria?

III. MATERIALS AND METHODS

1) Research tool

This study made use of a questionnaire that takes as its basis the concept of culture of learning as defined by Cortazzi and Jin (in Furusawa, 2005). The process began with a series of interviews with a group of fourth year undergraduates and several alumni who were taking Master's courses in the same department. These two groups of students were consulted about their experiences with native English-speaking foreign teachers because they had taken at least one department course each semester from by a foreign teacher during their undergraduate study. A brainstorming activity with these subjects yielded a list of opinions and beliefs

related to working with foreign teachers. These items appeared to fall under the categories of classroom practices of foreign teachers in terms of classroom management, grading examination papers and term projects, teaching methods and principles, and some comments related to the advantages and disadvantages of having foreign teachers in their classrooms. Further review of literature written on cultures of learning and discussions with Turkish and foreign teachers contributed more items into the scale.

Hence, four parallel versions of the questionnaire were developed which all contained the same 37 items (e.g. to the student: "Does your teacher negotiate with students on topics for homework and term projects?"; to the teacher: "Do you negotiate with students on topics for homework and term projects?") addressing the two groups of respondents separately as teachers and students. Six items were added (to make 43 in total) that solely concerned foreign lecturers. Subjects were asked to rank the second section of the questionnaire with a frequency scale of 1) always/almost always, 2) often, 3) sometimes, 4) never/almost never, and NA) not applicable. Instructions for the task, demographic and subject-specific questions were collected on the first page of the questionnaire. A pilot study employing the student version of the questionnaire with a group of 29 first year students yielded a Cronbach's alpha of $\alpha = .88$. Items with inter-item reliability values of less than .15 were either omitted or improved. In addition, several Turkish and foreign colleagues, from those who would be participating in the study, were consulted concerning the wording and contents of the questionnaire and modifications were made based on their feedback.

2) Criteria for selection of student and teacher participants

The researchers of the current study are both lecturers in a department which hosts every year an English Language Fellow who teaches literature and culture courses. The current study was originally conceived to examine the type of cross cultural interaction experienced in this and similar contexts. The students in this course have already achieved a fluency in English that allows them to receive content based instruction delivered completely in the English language. This condition became the primary criterion for selection of the student participants. In the process of defining the profile for the student participants of this research it became clear that there are two general groups of students in Turkey receiving instruction from native-English speaking instructors: students taking content courses in the English medium and those that take English as a second language course. The prior group was isolated for use in this study because they match the target student population. Content-based courses provide more opportunity for the type of cross-cultural interactions that this study seeks to understand, and subjects' fluency in English also allows for a higher level of culturally significant interactions. Therefore, only students that were enrolled in a Liberal Arts course were selected for participation.

The selection of the native English-speaking participants was a process which involved identifying lecturers in Turkey who were teaching students who met the above criteria (ie. content based Liberal Arts courses in English to students

with fluency in English). There were two main avenues for identifying these instructors: the Fulbright program and the Turkish American Association in Ankara. The researches obtained a list from the US Embassy in Ankara of Fulbright Scholars working in Turkey for the 2007-2008 academic year. An email was sent to each of these scholars to determine a) if they were teaching courses or just conducting research, b) if their courses were content based rather than ESL based, c) if they matched the Liberal Arts profile for discourse and examinations, and d) if they were willing to participate in the study. An email was also sent to the Turkish American Association in Ankara requesting contact information for native English-speaking instructors teaching in Turkey. The TAA responded with a list of instructors who might be suitable for this project. At the end of this process seven lecturers were identified at Bilkent University as suitable and willing to participate in the study; their disciplines included English and Composition (EngC), History (H), American Culture and Literature (ACL), Political Science (PS).The participants from Gaziantep University were teachers and students of the Department of English Language and Literature (ELL). Hence, it is possible to say that convenience sampling method was used for the selection of the research population (see Table 1 for profile of participants).

One of the purposes of the study was to investigate whether students' perspectives related to the Turkish teachers' educational practices agreed with the perspectives of the teachers themselves. Due to the additional difficulty of collecting data from Turkish academics in the other participating universities, the researchers decided to suffice with the group in their own university. The information would be helpful for judging consistency and congruity between teachers' and students' opinions and experiences related to the same issues.

Table 1 Participants in the study

Name of department	No. of Foreign Teachers	No. of Turkish Teachers	No. of Students
English Language & Literature (Gaziantep University)	2	8	109
History (Bilkent)	2	-	47
American Culture & Literature (Bilkent)	1	-	29
Political Science (Bilkent)	1	-	10
English and Composition (Bilkent)	1	-	33

3) Administration of questionnaires

The distribution of the student questionnaires at Gaziantep University was conducted in person by the researchers. The questionnaires were collated so that the two questionnaires seeking students' opinions about their Turkish and native English-speaking instructors were stacked to alternate between the two versions.

Students were instructed to carefully read the instructions at the beginning of the questionnaire before beginning. Students took between 15 and 20 minutes to complete the questionnaire. The two former English Language Fellows at Gaziantep University received the native English-speaking Instructor Questionnaire via email; the participating professors and students at the other Turkish Universities, on the other hand, received their surveys through the mail service, which included one questionnaire for the instructor, both versions of the student questionnaires collated to alternate, one document with instructions for the native English-speaking instructor, and an addressed return envelope with postage.

IV. RESULTS

The Cronbach alpha reliabilities for the four versions of the questionnaire following the main study were .87 for the student questionnaire concerning foreign lecturers; .86 for the student questionnaire concerning Turkish lecturers; .75 for Turkish lecturer questionnaire; and .75 for the foreign lecturer questionnaire. The data were statistically analyzed using chi-square and presented under the following four headings.

1) Students' perceptions of Turkish and foreign lecturers in terms of classroom management

Of a total of thirty-seven questionnaire items which commonly evaluated both the Turkish and the native English-speaking teachers, teachers of the two nationalities were believed by students to have differed from each other significantly ($p<.05$) on twenty-seven items (see Appendix A). These differences could be summarized in terms of the frequency with which these two groups of teachers engage in the given behaviors, as follows:

A) Compared to Turkish teachers, **native English-speaking teachers** in the specified departments tend **MORE FREQUENTLY** to:

- address students directly with their names (EngC, p=.003);
- create a classroom environment that fosters an open exchange of ideas (ELL, p=.003; H, p=.042);
- require students to respond to student presentations with comments, opinions and questions (ELL, p=.012);
- ask higher order questions that promote analytical and evaluative thinking skills (ELL, p=.001);
- motivate classroom participation by showing appreciation and appraisal of student responses (EngC, p=.001; H, p=.003);
- allow sufficient class time for questions and discussion (ELL, p=.000; H, p=.001);
- Rate classroom participation as a significant part of the course grade (ELL, p=.006);

- Choose course materials that covers the objectives of the course (ELL, p=.024);
- Be specific in defining the contents and requirements of the course (H, p=.026);
- Move beyond the boundaries of a certain course content and drawing references from other disciplines (H, p=.010);
- Come well-prepared to lectures (ELL, p=.004);
- Be casual in relations with the students (ELL, p=.002; H, p=.032; EngC, p=.010);
- Try to make class interesting (ELL, p=.000; H, p=.038; EngC, p=.023);
- Try to make class enjoyable (ELL, p=.000; EngC, p=020);
- Negotiate with students on topics for homework and term projects (ELL, p=.000; H, p=.020);
- Negotiate with students on exam dates (ELL, p=.000; PS, p=.036; EngC, p=021);
- Use mimics, gestures, tone of voice and body language to communicate meaning to class (EngC, p=021);
- Make use of projector, internet or other technologies to support course content (ELL, p=000);
- Provide immediate and explanatory feedback following exams (ELL, p=.001);
- Be supportive of student learning (ELL, p=.004);
- Be willing to provide students with assistance regarding questions and requests for information related to other courses (ELL, p=.027);
- Have a lenient approach to classroom discipline which reduces the effectiveness of teaching (ACL, p=.046);
- Be misunderstood by students in terms of their accent and rate of speech (ELL, p=.011).

B) Compared to native English-speaking teachers, **Turkish teachers** in the specified departments tend **MORE FREQUENTLY** to:

- Spend class time with teacher-talk than student-talk (ELL, p=.002);
- Have their own student profile in mind, with students sometimes not meeting those expectation (ELL, p=.003; H, p=.014);
- Be unable to empathize with the difficulties students experience in handling course load (ELL, p=.000; H, p=.008);
- Be difficult for students to get used to in terms of teaching style (ELL, p=.001).

2) Students' perceptions of Turkish and foreign lecturers in relation to examinations and grading

With the purpose of investigating how congruent students' perceptions of their foreign teachers were as compared with the teachers' perceptions of the self, the responses of both participants are compared through percentage values in Appendix B.

A) Compared to Turkish teachers, **native English-speaking teachers** in the specified departments tend **MORE FREQUENTLY** to:

- Value clearly presented, well-organized answers (PS, p=.036);
- Look for skills of critical thinking in take-home exams (ELL, p=.027);
- Grade the effort of the student as well as his/her intellectual capacity (ELL, p=.005; EngC, p=.018);
- Give grades not only to knowledge that is taught and generally accepted, but also to well supported original idea (ELL, p=.000; H, p=.016).

B) Compared to native English-speaking teachers, **Turkish teachers** in the specified departments tend **MORE FREQUENTLY** to:

- Look to see their own teachings expressed in similar words (ELL, p=.000);
- Look to see a standardized format in take-home exams (ELL, p=.011);
- Grade correct use of language (ELL, p=.027);
- Look to see knowledge directly adapted from text books and other resources (ELL, p=.044; EngC, p=.017);
- Give grades to answers that are directly relevant to the exam questions (ELL, p= .000; H, p=.005);
- Give grades to page tidiness and legibility of the handwriting (ELL, p=.020; ACL, p=.008).

3) Comparison of students' perceptions of their foreign lecturers and the lecturers' self-perceptions in relation to methodology and examination grading

The second research question of the study requires an investigation of differences in terms of how students perceive their foreign teachers and how the teachers view themselves in terms of analyzed on the basis of two universities rather than departments because students were required to answer the items with consideration to all their foreign teachers in general rather than any particular teacher.

The data obtained from Bilkent University yielded significant differences of perception between students and their teachers on nine items. With regard to item six, 93.1 % of the students believed that their foreign teachers *always/almost always* (42.6 %) or *often* (47.5 %) required them "to respond to students presentations with their own comments ,opinions or questions", whereas 60 % of the foreign teachers believed they only *sometimes* required this from students (p=.007). As regards item sixteen, all the participating foreign teachers in Bilkent University argue that they *always/almost always* "place the responsibility of learning on the student" whereas students feel this is *often* (33.9 %)or *sometimes* (37.1 %) true (p=.001). As with item twenty-one, foreign teachers believe they *always/almost always* "try to make class interesting" (60 %) or *often* (40 %) do so, whereas students do not believe it happens at such frequency (p=.017). In response to item twenty-nine, the participating teachers "expect students to take notes selectively" either *always/almost always* (60 %) or *often* (40 %); however, 41 % of

the students believed note-taking was *not applicable* to their situation and 26.2 % thought it was only *sometimes* necessary (p=.001).

With respect to item thirty-two, while 100 % of the foreign teachers believed they were *always/almost always* "supportive of student learning", 75 % of the students believed it was at a lesser degree (p=.019). Item thirty-six stated that foreign teachers "cannot empathize with the difficulties students experience in handling course work"; 100 % of the foreign teachers argued that this *never/almost never* happened whereas 75.0 % of the students were not of this opinion (p=.014). Item forty-two asserted that the foreign teacher "is interested in learning about [his/her] students' culture". In response to this item, the foreign teachers all agreed this was *always/almost always* true (100 %); students' responses, on the other hand, were distributed between the five frequency rates as *always/almost always* (23 %), *often* (29.5 %), *sometimes (*24.6 %) and *never/almost never* 14.8 % and *not applicable* 8.2 % (p=.010).

Under the examination and grading section, item forty-five stated that in examinations that are of take-home type, teachers "look to see a standardized format". Sixty percent of the teachers marked the *not applicable* option but 64.5 % of the students marked *often* or *always/almost always* (p=.017). The second and last item that yielded a significant difference under this section was item fifty-one, which stated that foreign teachers "look to see knowledge directly adapted from books and other resources". Teacher responses to this item was *not applicable* for 60 percent of the participants, and *always/almost always* (20 %) or *often* (20 %) for others. For the same item, 90.3 % percent of the students were under the impression that this was *always/almost always* or *often* their teachers' expectation (p =.000).

For the students and foreign lecturers of Gaziantep University, department of English Language and Literature, the total data yielded significant student-teacher differences of perception on three items. For item twenty-two, which states that foreign teachers "negotiate with students on topics for homework and term projects", 100 % of the teachers marked *sometimes*; students, on the other hand, tend to believe negotiation happens *always/almost always* (46.9 %) or often (44.9 %) (p=.000). Item 23 expresses the view that foreign teachers tend to "negotiate with students on exam dates". Student believe this to be their situation *always/almost always* (40.8 %) and *often* (36.7 %) whereas all the foreign teachers in this department have expressed that this is *never* the case with them (p=.004). Item forty-two states that the foreign teacher "is interested in learning about [his/her] students' culture". All foreign teachers assert that they *always/almost always* feel this way whereas their students are in the opinion that this is *often* (36.7 %), *sometimes* (32.7 %) or *never/almost never* (14.3 %) the reality (p=.046).

Despite these differences of opinion reflecting opposing perspectives, all the students express agreement of opinion with their foreign teachers on forty-four items. Especially important to mention are items which have the potential of being a problem source due to the foreignness of the teachers. For item thirty-nine, foreign teachers argue that their "lack of familiarity with the Turkish institutions' policies and procedures" *often* (28.6 %) or *sometimes* (57.1 %) poses challenges for them. Some students agree that this is only *sometimes* (39.4 %) true or that they have *no information* (33.0 %) on this subject. In response to item forty, foreign teachers

argue that they *never/almost never* (71.4 %) or *sometimes* (28.6 %) have clashes with students due to differences of culture and students appear to be of the same opinion. Foreign teachers believe that unfamiliarity with the student's first language and culture *sometimes* (42.9 %) or *never/almost never* (57.1%) interferes with the teaching/learning process and a majority of the students believe it is *never/almost never* (63.6 %) the case.

4) Comparison of students' perceptions of their Turkish lecturers and the lecturers' self-perceptions in relation to methodology and examination grading

These discrepancies between the foreign lecturers and their Turkish students discussed under the previous section could be the result of a cultural misunderstanding; however, it could also be due to differences of opinion between the students and teachers regarding their expectations of each other, their understandings related to their mutual responsibilities, etc. To cross-check this possibility, only the questionnaires administered to Turkish teachers in the department of English Language and Literature in Gaziantep University could be used since Turkish colleagues at Bilkent could not be reached for participation in the survey.

Examination of Turkish teacher and student questionnaires reveal differences of opinion which cannot be explained by cultural differences but by differences of learner-teacher perspective within the same culture. Turkish teachers and students in the English Language and Literature have their differences over some pedagogical issues. When we examine the table in Appendix B, we notice that while 62.5 % of teachers believe they *always/almost always* choose course materials that cover the course objectives only 17.8 % of the students believe so (p=.026). As a second example, 62.5 % of the teachers argue that they *never/almost never* rate course attendance as a significant part of the course grade while a majority (62.5 %) of the student believe that they do (p=.000). Such significant differences of opinion and understanding between teachers and students related to academic practices exist for fourteen items on the questionnaire. While these findings would be interesting in a discussion concerning differences within cultures of learning between teachers and students, they do not reflect a difference of culture and therefore are outside the scope of this study. It is sufficient to acknowledge that student-teacher incongruities over educational matters seem to develop even within the same culture and therefore such incongruities between students and foreign lecturers may not necessarily be culturally based.

V. DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

When we consider the students' perspectives of their foreign and Turkish lecturers in general, it is possible to argue that the differences of university cultures between Gaziantep and Bilkent Universities may account for the differences between students' perspectives of their foreign and Turkish teachers. Students of Gaziantep University have reported that their foreign teachers are significantly different from their Turkish teachers on twenty-one items out of the twenty-seven

as opposed to Bilkent students who reported such differences for only fifteen items. These differences could be explained by the fact that foreign lecturers in the given departments of Bilkent University constitute a majority of the academic staff (with the exception of Political Science) while the number of foreign academics in Gaziantep is limited to one visiting lecturer each year. The profile of the teachers in the respective universities also reflects a uniformity that could explain the differences in students' perspectives. For example, the foreign and Turkish lecturers at Bilkent University mostly hold Ph.D. degrees and some of the Turkish lecturers have received some of their degrees from American or British universities or have taught in one of them. Gaziantep, on the other hand, has an academic staff comprised of mostly M.A. holders without foreign experience. Similarly, the visiting lecturers to this university also hold M.A. degrees.

An equally important outcome of the study is the observation that cultural differences exist not only between universities, but also between departments of the same university. When we examine the table in Appendix A, it can be clearly seen that each department has a distinct distribution of difference of perspectives. History department students perceive foreign-Turkish teacher differences in fifteen items, English and Composition students perceive seven, American Culture and Literature students and Political Science students perceive only one of such differences. For example, the lenient approach to classroom discipline reducing the effectiveness of the foreign teacher appears to be a situation in one department only and not in the others. An analysis of the same table will also reveal that foreign teacher responses to some items point to differences that could be departmental or even individual. For example, for a foreign teacher in a certain department a standardized format in take home examinations is a must (i.e. always/almost always true) while for teachers in other departments it is not applicable.

Students of Gaziantep University, more than any other group, demonstrate a uniqueness in their perspectives of classroom management. In almost all of the items related to discourse (i.e. classroom interaction and management), student respondents perceive their foreign teachers to communicate and conduct classes differently than their Turkish counterparts. For example, foreign lecturers tend to ask higher order questions that promote analytical and evaluative thinking. It should be noted, however, that students at Gaziantep University participated in the focus group that assisted in the development of the questionnaire and this may account for the high number of items indicating significant responses.

While the most conclusive findings from the study seem to point to a uniqueness of educational culture within departments, the one area of similarity across departments and universities seem to exist with items related to affective classroom behaviors. In general, these items have two or more departments reporting that foreign teachers engage in positive affective practices more frequently. For example, being casual in relations with students, making class interesting, making class enjoyable, negotiating on exam dates and project/homework topics, and showing appraisal and appreciation of student responses are items which could be considered affective and common to foreign lecturers across departments. In the area of examinations and grading, students believe that their foreign lecturers value effort, originality, critical thinking and

organization of ideas more than their Turkish teachers, and responses from foreign lecturers confirm these perspectives.

Finally, it is important not to overlook the information obtained from the six additional items that were intended for evaluating the foreign lecturer functioning in the Turkish context. All of the participating foreign teachers believed that they were always perceptive of and sensitive to cultural differences between themselves and their students, and students alike believe this is always or often true of their teachers. Foreign teachers feel that their lack of familiarity with the Turkish institutions' policies and procedures often or sometimes poses challenges for them as teachers; students also believe that this is sometimes true but over a quarter of the students feel this is not applicable to their situation. One interpretation of this could be that these problems do not reflect into the classroom or relations with the students. Hence, Turkish institutions would do well to provide an orientation specific to the foreign teacher addressing policy issues as well as informal practices of which the foreign teacher might not be aware. Likewise, foreign teachers should have discussions with their Turkish counterparts to gain an understanding of classroom norms and students' expectations.

A great majority of the foreign teachers and students believe that they never or only sometimes experience clashes with each other due to cultural differences. Similarly, unfamiliarity with the students' first language and culture only sometimes or never/almost never interferes with the teaching/learning process according to foreign teachers and majority of the students.

One item which points acutely to institutional differences is the one which argues that foreign teachers are particularly interesting to students because of their foreignness. While foreign lecturers and students at Bilkent University greatly vary in their responses (probably because foreign academics on this campus have become the norm and have lost their novelty as such), lecturers and students at Gaziantep University still believe that foreignness of the teacher is a point of interest and novelty in the department. While foreign teachers strongly hold that they are always interested in learning about their students' culture, students at either Gaziantep or Bilkent do not agree with this assertion to the same degree, while a considerable number of students go so far to say that their foreign teachers are never interested in their culture.

The researchers would like to draw the attention of foreign teachers entering the tertiary Turkish educational environment to areas of difference between the perspectives of foreign teachers and their Turkish students under the light of the current study. The first point of significant difference regards the question of where the responsibility of learning lies. Foreign teachers believe that learning is always the responsibility of the student while Turkish teachers and students believe the responsibility of this learning should be shared between teachers and students. The strong agreement between Turkish students and teachers on this issue could be explained as an aspect of cultural continuity within the Turkish education system and a significant point of divergence from foreign teachers in their educational practices. It is important for foreign teachers to be aware of this difference and to take account of their students' expectations.

Another area of difference lies in the fact that foreign teachers do not perceive themselves to often negotiate with students on issues of examination dates and homework assignments. However, Turkish students perceive their foreign teachers to negotiate much more frequently on these matters than their foreign teachers are aware of. One explanation for this disparity of opinion may lie in the fact that foreign teachers may be uncertain in which areas Turkish teachers usually negotiate. Foreign teachers may be perceived as willing to negotiate more frequently than their Turkish counterparts, not because they are in fact more flexible, but because they are unfamiliar with and hesitant to break with the educational cultural norms of their new environment.

A final point of difference between the perspectives of foreign teachers and their Turkish students pertains to selective note-taking. All foreign teachers believe that their students should take notes selectively. However, almost half the Turkish students indicated that this is not applicable to their situation. It is appears to be essential that foreign teachers discuss their expectation and classroom standards concerning responsibility, negotiation, and note-taking with their Turkish students. They should explain to their students exactly what they expect from academic performance. As a final note, it is important to keep in mind that students may not be the best judge of issues that require pedagogical expertise; yet, it was nevertheless important for this study to see classroom events from their perspective. It has informative value for teachers, foreign and Turkish alike, to know how they are being perceived by their students.

The authors of this study would like to state the limitations of the study as follows:

a) no data could be collected from the Turkish academics at Bilkent University and therefore no comparative data concerning Turkish and foreign teachers' perspectives in this context could be acquired;
b) the number of foreign lecturers from each department was not sufficient enough to allow the researchers to make conclusive generalizations about the pedagogical tendencies and practices of foreign academics within one department or across departments;
c) Whereas Department of English Language and Literature of Gaziantep University was represented in the population by three levels (2^{nd}, 3^{rd}, and 4^{th} years), the departments of Bilkent University were represented by only one group of students taking a certain course. This unevenness of student participants may have had some effect on the results.

In the light of these limitations, further research into cross-cultural education should involve complete departments including foreign and native teachers along with students from all levels. A series of focus groups could be conducted with students and teachers following the administration of the surveys for a better interpretation of the results.

REFERENCES

Adler, R.B., Rosenfeld, L.B., Towne, N. & Proctor II, R.F. (1998). *Interplay: the process Of interpersonal communication,* Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Alptekin, C. & Alptekin, M. (1984). The question of culture: EFL teaching in non-English-speaking countries. *ELT Journal*, 38, 14-20.

Barna, L. (1991). Stumbling blocks in international communication. In L. Samover & R. Porter (Eds.). *Intercultural Communication*, 345-352. Belmont, CA: Wardsworth Publishing.

Connelly, F.M., Clandinin, D.J. & He, M.F. (1997). Teachers' personal practical Knowledge on the professional knowledge landscape, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13/7, 665-674.

Cushner, K. & Brislin, R.W. (1996). *Intercultural interactions: A practical guide* (2nd ed.), London: Sage.

Denscombe, M (1982). The "hidden pedagogy" and its implications for teacher training. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 3, 249-265.

Ekmekçi, F. Ö. & Inal, N. (1981). *Advantages and disadvantages of working with native-speaker language teachers, and the expectations of the host institution*. Paper presented at TESOL '81 Convention at Detroit, Michigan. March 2-7.

Farver, J.A., Kim, Y.K. & Lee, Y. (1995). Cultural differences in Korean- and Anglo-American preschoolers' social interaction and play behaviors. *Child Development*, 66, 1088-1099.

Furusawa, H. (2005). *An integrated approach to understanding Japanese students' classroom communication: a case study*. Unpublished dissertation,

Gumperz, J. (1982). Discourse strategies. *Strategies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 1*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holliday, A. (1999). "Small Cultures". *Applied Linguistics*, 20, 237-264.

Hook, C & Rosenshine, B. (1979). Accuracy of teacher reports on their classroom behavior. *Review of Educational Research*, 49, 1-12.

Kato, K. (2001). Exploring "culture of learning": A case of Japanese and Australian classrooms. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 22, 51-67.

Levy, J., Wubbels, T., Brekelmans, M., & Morganfield, B. (1997). Language and cultural factors in students' perceptions of teacher communication style. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations,* 21, 29-56.

Liu, J (2002). Negotiating silence in American classrooms: three Chinese cases. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 2, 37-54.

Mercer, N. (1991) Accounting for what goes on in the classroom: What have neo-Vygotskians got to offer. *Journal of the British Psychological Society*, 15, 61-67.

O'Sulliven, K. (1994). *Understanding Ways*. Sydney: Hale & Iremonger.

Oxford, R., Hollaway, M.E. & Horton-Murillo, D. (1992). Language learning styles: Research and practical considerations for teaching in the multicultural tertiary ESL/EFL classroom. *System*, 20, 439-456.

Planel, C. (1997). National cultural values and their role in learning: A comparative ethnographic study of state primary schooling in England and France. *Comparative Education*, 33, 349-373.

Powell, R. (1997). Then the beauty emerges: a longitudinal case study of culturally relevant teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13, 276-286.

Pritchard, R.M.O. (1995). AMAE and the Japanese learner of English: An actions research study. *Language, Culture, and Curriculum*, 8, 249-264.

Rosenshine, B. (1971). *Teaching behaviors and student achievement*. Slough, England,
NFER.

Steel, J.M., House, E.R. & Kerins, T. (1971). An instrument for assessing instructional climate through low-inference student judgments. *American Research Journal*, 8, 447-466.

Waxman, H. & Eash, M.J. (1983). Utilizing students' perceptions and context variables to analyze effective teaching: A process-product investigation. *Journal of Educational Research*, 76, 321-325.

APPENDIX A

CLASSROOM METHODOLOGY AND PRACTICES: TURKISH versus FOREIGN TEACHERS	**Department**	**Always/ Almost Always**		**Often**		**Sometimes**		**Never/ Almost Never**		**Not Applicapl e**		**p value**
Questionnaire Items		**Turk %**	**For %**	**Turk %**	**For %**	**Turk %**	**For %**	**Turk %**	**For %**	**Turk %**	**For %**	
# 1 Addressing students directly with their names.	Eng. &Comp.	13.3	72.2	46.7	27.8	26.7	.0	13.3	.0			**.003**
# 5 Creating a classroom evvironment that fosters an open exchange of ideas.	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	23.0	60.4	39.3	35.4	32.8	2.1	4.9	2.1			**.003**
	History	0.	16. 0	40.9	56.0	45.5	24.0	13.6	.0			**.042**
# 6 Requiring students to respond to student presentations with comments, opinions and questions.	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	41.0	70.8	45.9	27.1	9.8	2.1	3.3	.0			**.012**
# 7 Asking higher order questions that promote analytical and evaluative thinking skills.	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	14.8	45.8	21.3	29.2	37.7	16.7	13.1	2.1	13.1	6.3	**.001**

# 8 Motivating classroom participation by showing appreciation and appraisal of student responses.	Eng. & Comp.	13.1	43.8	37.7	41.7	37.7	12.5	8.2	2.1	3.3	.0	**.001**
	History	4.5	8.0	18.2	64.0	59.1	16.0	18.2	4.0	.0	8.0	**.003**
# 9 Allowing sufficient class time for questions and discussions.	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	9.8	47.9	36.1	37.5	45.9	12.5	8.2	.0	.0	2.1	**.000**
	History	.0	24.0	18.2	48.0	72.7	20.0	9.1	.0	.0	8.0	**.001**
# 11 Rating classroom participation as a significant part of the course	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	32.8	41.7	24.6	43.8	31.1	12.5	11.5	.0	.0	2.1	**.006**
# 12 Choice of course materials covers the objectives of the course.	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	16.4	37.5	44.3	47.9	32.8	10.4	1.6	2.1	4.9	2.1	**.024**
# 13 Being specific in defining the contents and requirements of the course.	History	13.6	32.0	36.4	56.0	45.5	8.0 5	4.5	.0	.0	4.0	**.026**
# 14 Moving beyond the boundaries of a certain course content and draw references from other disciplines.	History	.0	12.0	22.7	44.0	59.1	32.	18.2	.0	.0	12.0	**.010**
# 18 Coming well prepared to lectures.	Eng. Lang. & Lit	16.4	47.9	57.4	41.7	19.7	4.2	1.6	2.1	4.9	4.2	**.004**
	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	4.9	29.2	21.3	31.3	39.3	18.8	31.1	16.7	3.3	4.2	**.002**

# 19 Being casual in relations with the students.	History	.0	20.0	18.2	12.0	31.8	52.0	45.5	12.0	4.5	4.0	**.032**
	Eng. & Comp.	.0	38.9	6.7	22.2	46.7	22.2	46.7	11.1	.0	5.6	**.010**
# 20 Trying to make class interesting.	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	3.3	25.0	24.6	39.6	50.8	31.3	21.3	13.8			**.000**
	History	.0	4.0	13.6	40.0	54.5	48.0	31.8	4.0	.0	4.0	**.038**
	Eng. & Comp.	6.7	50.0	26.7	22.2	60.0	16.7	6.7	11.1			**.023**
# 21 Trying to make class enjoyable.	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	3.3	27.1	21.3	33.3	54.1	37.5	21.3	.0	.0	2.1	**.000**
	Eng. & Comp.	6.7	33.3	13.3	33.3	73.3	22.2	.0	11.1	6.7	.0	**.020**
# 22 Negotiating with students on topics for homework and term projects.	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	11.5	45.8	19.7	39.6	39.3	8.3	29.5	4.2	.0	2.1	**.000**
	History	9.1	28.0	4.5	36.0	40.9	16.0	45.5	12.0	.0	8.0	**.002**
	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	9.8	25.0	14.8	35.4	37.7	31.3	37.7	6.3	.0	2.1	**.000**
# 23 Negotiating with students on exam dates.	Political Science	.0	40.0	.0	40.0	100.0						**.036**
	Eng. & Comp.	6.7	55.6	26.7	22.2	46.7	16.7	20.0	5.6			**.021**

# 25 Lenient approach to classroom discipline reduces the effectiveness of teaching.	American Lit.& Culture	7.1	6.7	7.1	26.7	7.1	40.0	57.1	26.7	21.4	.0	**.046**
# 27 Using mimics, gestures, tone of voice and body language to communicate meaning to class.	English & Comp.	13.3	66.7	53.3	16.7	20.0	11.1	13.3	5.6			**.021**
# 28 Spending more class time with teacher-talk than student-talk.	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	23.0	10.4	47.5	22.9	23.0	47.9	4.9	18.8	1.6	.0	**.002**
# 30 Making use of projector, internet or other technologies to support course content.	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	14.8	50.0	44.3	39.6	32.8	8.3	6.6	2.1	1.6	.0	**.000**
# 31 Provide immediate and explanatory feedback following exams.	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	9.8	27.1	18.0	37.5	59.0	22.9	13.1	10.4	.0	2.1	**.001**
# 32 Being supportive of student learning.	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	18.0	41.7	42.6	45.8	34.4	6.3	3.3	4.2	1.6	2.1	**.004**
# 33 Having difficulty getting used to teacher's teaching style.	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	11.5	4.2	18.0	10.4	63.9	45. 8	6.6	33.3	.0	6.3	**.001**

# 34 Having difficulty getting used to teacher's accent and rate of speech.	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	8.2	8.3	11.5	20.8	39.3	58.3	41.0	12.5			**.011**
# 35 Havign own student profile in mind and sometimes students not meeting that expectation.	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	24.6	4.2	19.7	16.7	44.3	39.6	6.6	25.0	4.9	14.6	**.003**
	History	9.1	4.0	40.9	8.0	31.8	24.0	13.6	32.0	4.5	32.0	**.014**
# 36 Inability to empathize with the difficulties students experience in handling course load.	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	31.1	6.3	36.1	16.7	19.7	37.5	4.9	27.1	8.2	12.5	**.000**
	History	13.6	8.0	36.4	.0	31.8	40.9	9.1	36.0	9.1	16.0	**.008**
# 37 Willingness to provide students with assisstance regard. questions and requests of nforma- tion related to other courses.	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	18.0	22.9	29.5	43.8	41.0	16.7	6.6	2.1	4.9	14.6	**.027**
EXAMINATIONS AND GRADING: TURKISH versus FOREIGN TEACHERS	**Department**	**Always/ Almost Always**		**Often**		**Sometimes**		**Never/ Almost Never**		**Not Applicapl e**		**p-value**
Questionnaire Items		**Turk**	**For**	**Turk**	**For**	**Turk**	**For**	**Turk**	**For**	**Turk**	**For**	
# 44 Looking to see own teachings expressed in similar words.	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	47.5	6.3	32.8	35.4	19.7	22.9	.0	27.1	.0	8.3	**.000**

# 45 With take-home exams, looking to see a standardized format.	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	39.5	16.7	42.6	37.5	13.1	25.0	1.6	12.5	3.3	8.3	**.011**
# 46 Looking to see a standardized format.	Political Science	20.0	100.0	60.0	0.	20.0	.0					**.036**
# 47 Grading correct use of language.	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	42.6	16.7	36.1	39.6	16.4	29.2	3.3	6.3	1.6	8.3	**.027**
# 48 With take-home exams, looking for skills of critical thinking..	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	29.5	50.0	31.1	43.8	21.3	4.2	4.9	.0	13.1	2.1	**.003**
# 51 Looking to see knowledge directly adapted from books and other resources.	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	21.3	29.2	36.1	29.2	37.7	22.9	.0	10.4	4.9	8.3	**.044**
	Eng. & Comp.	53.3	5.6	33.3	55.6	13.3	27.8	.0	11.1			**.017**
# 52 Giving grades to answers that are directly relevant to the exam questions.	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	60.7	14.6	31.1	56.3	8.2	16.7	.0	8.3	.0	4.2	**.000**
	History	31.8	36.0	59.1	24.0	.0	24.0	9.1	.0	.0	16.0	**.005**
# 53 Giving grades to page tidiness and legibility of the handwriting.	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	26.2	12.5	34.4	18.8	26.2	33.3	4.9	18.8	8.2	16.7	**.020**
	American Lit.& Culture	28.6	.0	35.7	6.7	28.6	33.3	.0	40.0	7.1	20.0	**.008**

# 54 Grading the effort of the student as well as his/her intellectual ability.	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	21.3	41.7	37.7	45.8	37.7	10.4	3.3	.0	.0	2.1	**.005**
	Eng. & Comp	13.3	55.6	40.0	16.7	46.7	11.1	.0	5.6	.0	11.1	**.018**
# 55 Giving grades not only to knowledge that is taught and generally accepted, but also to well supported original ideas.	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	14.8	52.1	29.5	41.7	36.1	4.2	14.8	.0	4.9	2.1	**.000**
	History	22.7	24.0	22.7	56.0	40.9	12.0	13.6	.0	.0	8.0	**.016**

APPENDIX B

CLASSROOM METHODOLOGY AND PRACTICES: STUDENTS versus FOREIGN TEACHERS		**Always/Almost Always**		**Often**		**Sometimes**		**Never/ Almost Never**		**Not Applicaple**		**p-value**
		%	**%**	**%**	**%**	**%**	**%**	**%**	**%**	**%**	**%**	
Questionnaire Items	**University**	**Stud.**	**Teach**	**Stud.**	**Teach**	**Stud.**	**Teach**	**Stud.**	**Teach**	**Stud.**	**Teach**	
# 6 requiring students to respond to student presentations with their own comments, opinions and questions.	Bilkent	42.6	20.0	47.5	20.0	6.6	60.0	1.6	.0	1.6	.0	.007
# 16 placing the responsibility of learning on the student.	Bilkent	16.1	100.0	37.1	.0	33.9	.0	6.5	.0	6.5	.0	.001
# 20 trying to make class interesting.	Bilkent	15.9	80.0	34.9	20.0	30.2	.0	17.5	.0	1.6	.0	.017
# 22 negotiating with students on topics for homework and term projects.	Antep	46.9	.0	44.9	.0	6.1	100.0	2.0	.0		.0	.000
# 23 negotiating with students on exam dates.	Antep	40.8	.0	36.7	.0	12.2	.0	8.2	100.0	2.0	.0	.004
# 29 expecting students to take notes selectively.	Bilkent	6.6	60.0	13.1	40.0	26.2	.0	13.1	.0	41.	.0	.001
# 32 being supportive of student learning.	Bilkent	25.8	100.0	51.6	.0	12.9	.0	8.1	.0	1.6	.0	.019
# 36 lack of familiarity with the Turkish institutions' policies and procedures posesa challenge for the teacher.	Bilkent	21.3	.0	4.9	.0	32.8	.0	24.6	100.0	16.4	.0	.014

# 42 being interested in learning about the students' culture.	Bilkent	23.0	100.0	29.5	.0	24.6	.0	14.8	.0	8.2	.0	.010
	Antep	14.3	100.0	36.7	.0	32.7	.0	14.2	.0	2.0	.0	.046
EXAMINATION GRADING: STUDENTS v.s. FOREIGN TEACHERS		**Always/ Almost Always**		**Often**		**Sometimes**		**Never/ Almost Never**		**Not Applicaple**		**p-value**
		%	**%**	**%**	**%**	**%**	**%**	**%**	**%**	**%**	**%**	
In students' exam papers….	**University**	**Stud.**	**Teach**	**Stud.**	**Teach**	**Stud.**	**Teach**	**Stud.**	**Teach**	**Stud.**	**Teach**	
# 45 looking to see a standardized format in take-home exams.	Bilkent	23.8	20.0	39.7	.0	17.5	.0	9.5	20.0	9.5	60.0	.015
# 51 looking to see knowledge directly adapted from books and other resources.	Bilkent	59.7	20.0	30.6	20.0	4.8	.0	1.6	.0	3.2	60.0	.000

CLASSROOM DISCOURSE AND METHODOLOGY: STUDENTS v.s. TURKISH TEACHER	**Department**	**Always/ Almost Always % %**		**Often % %**		**Sometimes % %**		**Never/ Almost Never % %**		**Not Applicaple % %**		**p-value**
Questionnaire Items		**Stud**	**Teach**	**Stud**	**Teach**	**Stud**	**Teach**	**Stud**	**Teach**	**Stud**	**Teach**	
# 12 Choice of course materials covers course objectives.	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	17.8	62.5	42.1	25.0	32.7	.0	1.9	.0	5.6	12.5	**.026**
# 15 Rating course attendance as a significant part of the course grade	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	32.7	.0	25.2	12.5	20.6	12.5	21.5	62.5	.0	12.5	**.000**
# 17 Punctuality with class and office hours.	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	19.6	75.0	43.0	25.0	23.4	.0	6.5	.0	7.5	.0	**.010**
# 18 Coming well prepared to lectures	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	17.8	87.5	56.1	12.5	19.6	.0	.9	.0	5.5	.0	**.000**
#20 Making Class Interesing	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	3.7	25.0	26.2	75.0	49.5	.0	20.6	.0	.0	.0	**.000**
# 21 Making class enjoyable.	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	3.7	25.0	23.4	62.5	52.5	12.5	20.6	.0	.0	.0	**.005**
# 23 Negotiating with students on exam dates.	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	11.2	.0	15.9	37.5	36.4	50.0	36.4	.0	.0	12.5	**.001**
# 26 Expecting attention as a matter of classroom discipline.	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	46.7	12.5	39.3	50.0	13.1	25.0	.9	12.5	.0	.0	**.000**
# 33 Difficulty of getting used to teaching style.	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	12.1	12.5	17.8	.0	62.6	12.5	7.5	75.0	.0	.0	**.000**
# 36 Unable to empathize with students' work load	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	29.9	.0	39.3	12.5	18.7	25.0	3.7	62.5	8.4	.0	**.000**

EXAMINATION GRADING: STUDENTS v.s. TURKISH TEACHERS	Department	Always/ Almost Always %		Often %		Sometimes %		Never/ Almost Never %		Not Applicaple %		p-value
In students' exam papers….		Stud	Teach	Stud	Teach	Stud	Teach	Stud	Teach	Stud	Teach	
# 38 Looking to see own teachings in similar words.	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	47.7	.0	32.7	25.0	19.6	37.5	.0	37.5	.0	.0	**.000**
# 39 In take-home exams, looking to see a standardized format.	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	40.2	25.0	42.1	25.0	13.1	25.0	.9	25.0	3.7	.0	**.001**
# 45 Looking for knowledge directly adapted from books and other resources.	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	19.6	12.5	37.4	25.0	37.4	37.5	.0	25.0	5.6	.0	**.000**
# 46 Giving grades to answers that are directly relevant to the given question.	Eng. Lang. & Lit.	61.7	25.0	30.8	62.5	7.5	.0	.0	12.5	.0	.0	**.000**