

Güvendir, E. (2016). ABD’de bulunan Türk öğrencilerin kültürlenme tutumları ve İngilizce başarıları arasındaki ilişki. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 16(4), 1745-1760.

Geliş Tarihi: 23/02/2016

Kabul Tarihi: 18/11/2016

ABD’DE BULUNAN TÜRK ÖĞRENCİLERİN KÜLTÜRLENME TUTUMLARI VE İNGİLİZCE BAŞARILARI ARASINDAKİ İLİŞKİ*

Emre GÜVENDİR**

ÖZET

Bu çalışmada Amerika Birleşik Devletleri’nde (ABD) İngilizce dersleri alan 40 Türk öğrencinin bu ülkede buldukları süre içerisinde sahip oldukları kültürlenme tutumlarıyla İngilizce başarıları arasındaki ilişki incelenmiştir. Öğrencilerin kültürlenme tutumları Ataca ve Berry (2002) tarafından geliştirilip Bektaş (2004) tarafından Türkçeye uyarlanan Kültürlenme Tutumları Ölçeği aracılığı ile belirlenmiştir. Çalışmanın bulguları hedef kültürü özümseme ve kendine ait kültürel tutumlardan uzaklaşma eğiliminde olan öğrencilerin ABD’de buldukları üç ayın sonunda en yüksek İngilizce başarıya artışına sahip olduklarını ortaya koymaktadır. Çalışmanın Türk öğrencilerin kültürlenme düzeyleri ve ikinci dil başarı düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkiyi göstermek açısından örnek oluşturacağı düşünülmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kültürlenme tutumları, yurtdışında eğitim, ikinci dil başarıları

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE ACCULTURATION ATTITUDES AND ENGLISH ACHIEVEMENT OF THE TURKISH STUDENTS IN THE U.S.

ABSTRACT

This research primarily aimed to examine the relationship between the acculturation attitudes of 40 Turkish students who took English courses at the United States (U.S.) and their English achievement during their presence in the same country. The study used the Acculturation Attitudes Scale to determine the participants’ acculturation attitudes. This scale was originally developed by Ataca and Berry (2002) and adapted to Turkish by Bektaş (2004). The study findings show that students who had the tendency to assimilate into the host culture (American culture) and ignore the practices of the home culture (Turkish culture) had the highest increase in the English achievement scores at the end of three months. It is thought that the current research will provide an example for demonstrating the relationship between the degree of Turkish students’ acculturation and their second language achievement.

Key Words: Acculturation attitudes, study abroad, second language achievement

* Bu çalışma TÜBİTAK tarafından desteklenen “The relationship between the acculturation attitudes and English achievement of the Turkish students who take English courses in the U.S.” başlıklı araştırmadan üretilmiştir.

**Yrd. Doç. Dr., Trakya Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü, emreguvendir@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

Foreign language/Second language (L2) learners often believe that the best way to learn a new language is to visit the country where that language is spoken (Brown, 2006; Johnson, 2008). This trend is also popular among Turkish students who think that living in the host culture will provide them supreme opportunities to practice and acquire the target language (Akalin & Zengin, 2007; Soner, 2007). Despite these positive opinions on visiting a country to practice an L2, several studies have shown that living in a foreign country creates new challenges for most L2 learners that they do not typically foresee (Pelligrino, 1998; Miller & Ginsberg, 1995; Segalowitz et al., 2004; Wilkinson, 1998). Barron (2003) stated that even spending a complete year in a foreign country, L2 learners may not have adequate contact with native speakers. Learners may also face various cultural and social adaptation difficulties that may minimize their interaction with host culture members and maximize their attachment to first language peers. Consequently, the learners have limited chances to use the L2 in interactive encounters which curtail their access to the linguistic input and limit the chances of constructing output. These cultural adaptation and social integration problems and their negative influence on L2 development have attracted considerable attention in L2 acquisition research after Schumann's (1978) Acculturation Model. Schumann (1978) argued that L2 learners need to have high levels of acculturation in order to get the maximum linguistic benefit from living in a country where the L2 is spoken as the native language.

Acculturation is defined as "the process of becoming adapted to a new culture" (Brown, 1980, p. 129). Schumann and two colleagues (Cancino, Rosansky, & Schumann, 1974) originally studied six Spanish learners of different ages learning English in the U.S. over a period of ten months. Schumann's acculturation work focused on a single 33-year old speaker of Spanish called Alberto, who showed noticeably less improvement than others. Alberto's speech exhibited several characteristics of pidgin languages such as lack of inflectional morphology (Johnson & Johnson, 1999). Schumann (1978) related Alberto's failure to show more progress to his limited interaction with the target language community that is, the social and psychological distance of Alberto – the two factors Schumann later used to develop his Acculturation Model – inhibited his attaining satisfactory proficiency in his target language, although he had been living in the U.S. for ten months. Thus, Schumann (1978) argued that "the degree to which a learner acculturates to the target language group will control the degree to which he acquires the second language" (p.34). Schumann's study discussed that living in a country where the target language is spoken does not guarantee social interaction with the native speakers of that language and in parallel does not assure L2 acquisition. The adult learner may face several social and psychological challenges that may result in his/her social and psychological isolation in the host community.

In a follow up case study, Schmidt (1983) examined Wes, a learner who was acquiring English through naturalistic interaction with other speakers of language. Schmidt found that although Wes had substantive social contact with the English native speakers and interacted with them, his linguistic development was considerably slow as in the case of Alberto. Schmidt (1983) concluded that what Wes missed was 'noticing' which according to him enabled the transformation of linguistic input to intake. In his early formulation of Noticing Hypothesis Schmidt (1990) argued that noticing is a necessary and sufficient condition for L2 acquisition. In his later arguments, he came to view

noticing as a facilitator of L2 development instead of a sufficient condition (Schmidt, 2001).

Despite Schmidt’s arguments that prioritized noticing the L2 input instead of pertaining a significant role to cultural adaptation and social integration in L2 acquisition, research in second language acquisition (SLA) provided arguments and findings on the significant role of one’s cultural adaptation and social integration on his/her L2 development. Gardner (1979) stressed that as acquiring an L2 entails a person to include pieces of a new culture into his or her own life space, “the student’s harmony with his own cultural community and his willingness or ability to identify with other cultural communities become important considerations in the process of L2 acquisition” (p. 193–194). In their discussions of L2 learning conditions, Scarcella and Oxford (1992), Lightbown and Spada (1993), and Brown (1994) listed cultural adaptation as a vital dimension of L2 learning. Ward and Kennedy (1999) argued that high level of target language proficiency is associated with high level of contact with the target language people and low level of maladaptation to the target language culture. The Language Socialization Theory by Schieffelin and Ochs (1986) argued that first language acquisition and socialization have a reciprocal influence on one another. Novices in a community are socialized both to language forms and, through language, to the values, behaviors, and practices and practices of the community in which they live. Later, Ellis (2008) related the Language Socialization Theory to L2 research and argued that “in the process of learning to become a member of the community, learners learn the L2, and conversely, that part of learning an L2 is becoming a member of the community that speaks it. One clear implication of such a theory is that language learning will be facilitated if socialization takes place and impede if it does not” (p. 334). Schieffelin and Ochs (1986) assign a reciprocal role to language learning and socialization and state that the failure to socialize will hinder language development.

Some studies have investigated how L2 learners’ degree of cultural adaptation and social integration affected L2 acquisition on different populations. Maple’s (1982) research on 190 Spanish-speaking students learning English at the University of Texas found a strong relationship between social distance and L2 proficiency. Clement (1986) studied the social psychological effects of language learning on students at a bilingual university in Canada. Among many of the conclusions in this study, it was established that the frequency of interaction with native speakers was related to students’ level of acculturation. Moreover, Clement found that both majority and minority group members who were highly motivated to learn and to use their L2, evidenced a high degree of integrativeness and quality of social interaction. Lybeck (2002) tested Schumann’s acculturation theory with English native speakers who acquired Norwegian as their L2 and found that those who established positive network connections with native Norwegian speakers demonstrated more native-like Norwegian pronunciation than those who had greater difficulty launching such relationships. Hansen (1995) measured German-born American immigrants’ acculturation on the variables identified in Schumann’s Acculturation Model and found that acculturation correlated with native-like pronunciation of successful older-arrival-age speakers that was assessed in both careful reading and spontaneous speech tasks.

SLA is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon that defies simple definition (Ellis, 2008). Thus, the field of SLA currently recognizes cultural adaptation and social integration as essential dimensions that promote L2 acquisition while keeping in mind that they do not absolutely guarantee language acquisition. On the other hand, based on the role of cultural adaptation in L2 acquisition, SLA researchers aim to make L2 learners gain as much as they can from the study abroad experiences. Cohen et al. (2005) note that most L2 learners do not have a coherent overall plan for learning the culture or developing intercultural communication skills. Thus, it is possible to encounter studies that offer cultural integration and intercultural communication strategies to maximize the benefits received from studying L2 abroad (see Cohen et al. 2005 for detailed work).

There are studies that have examined the acculturation attitudes of students or immigrants who went to foreign countries from Turkey for different purposes. Ataca and Berry (2002) examined how the facilitative factors influenced the psychological and sociocultural adaptation of the Turkish immigrants living in Canada. Aycan and Berry (1996) studied the psychological conditions and adaptations of the Turkish immigrants in Canada in terms of financial resources. Phalet and Hegendoorn (1996) inspected the personal adaptation and integration of the Turkish immigrants in Belgium. In another study, Baltas and Steptoe (2000) examined the psychological conditions of the Turkish-English married couples in light of acculturation levels and intercultural conflicts. In a study that was conducted on the Turkish college students in the U.S., Poyrazlı, Arbora, Bullington, and Pisecco (2001) found that the students with a higher English proficiency also had higher levels of acculturation than the students whose English proficiency was low. Bektaş, Demir, and Bowden (2009) studied how the psychological adaptation of the Turkish students living in the U.S. is affected by the acculturation factors. The most comprehensive research on the Turkish students living in the U.S. is the dissertation written by Bektaş (2004). In this study, Bektaş (2004) reported a detailed examination of the factors that influenced the psychological adaptation of the Turkish college students in the U.S.

1.2. Research Purpose

Although the studies on the cultural and psychological adaptation of the Turkish citizens living abroad provide valuable findings, there is no research that particularly examines the relationship between the acculturation attitudes and English achievement of the Turkish students who visit the U.S. to take English courses for a short period of time. Hence, this research predominantly aims to close this gap in the literature. In particular, the study deals with the following research question;

- 1- Is there a relationship between the acculturation attitudes of the Turkish students in the U.S. and their English achievement?

2. METHOD

This research uses correlational research model in order to examine the relationship between the acculturation attitudes (assimilation, separation, marginalization, and integration) and English language achievement. Characteristically, correlational studies

examine a number of variables hypothesized to be related to a central variable such as *academic achievement* (Anderson & Arsenault, 2004).

2.1. Participants

The participants of the study included 40 Turkish citizens (22 males and 18 females) who visited the U.S. (Los Angeles) during the summer of 2015 in order to take English classes for a period of 3 months. All of the participants had never been to the U.S. before. Their ages ranged from 16 to 34. There were 4 high school students, 32 university students, and 4 college graduates. They were all enrolled in the same short-term summer study program.

2.2. Data Collection and Data Analysis

The study used the Turkish version of the Acculturation Attitudes Scale (see Appendix 1) to examine the participants’ acculturation attitudes. This scale was originally developed by Ataca and Berry (2002) and adapted to Turkish by Bektaş (2004). This scale includes 9 domains: friendship, social activities, food, special days (e.g. feasts), language use, decoration, newspapers, life style, and culture. Each acculturation attitude comprises ‘assimilation’, ‘separation’, ‘marginalization’, and ‘integration’ factors. According to Berry (1980) assimilation attitude indicates relatively high contact and participation in the host culture but relatively low maintenance of the culture of origin. Integration is an attitude representing biculturalism. Thus, the learner is expected to preserve his/her own cultural values but at the same time adapt to the target culture. Separation indicates relatively high cultural maintenance and relatively low contact with the host culture members and participation in their social circles. Lastly, marginalization encompasses low identification with both the origin and the host cultures. Statements 1, 2, 10, 11, 20, 19, 25, 31, and 36 on the survey measured assimilation. Statements 4, 7, 12, 14, 21, 22, 24, 29, and 33 measured separation. Statements 5, 8, 13, 16, 18, 23, 27, 32 and 35 measured marginalization. Statements 3, 6, 9, 15, 17, 26, 28, 30, and 34 measured integration. The Cronbach’s Alpha reliability coefficient values in relation to the factors of the modified scale were .80 (assimilation), .81 (separation), .76 (integration) and .75 (marginalization). In the original version of the scale, Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients for each attitude factor were reported as .83 (assimilation), .89 (separation), .84 (integration) and .78 (marginalization). In this study, the Cronbach’s Alpha reliability coefficient values in relation to the factors of the modified scale were .86 (assimilation), .87 (separation), .64 (integration) and .71 (marginalization).

The participants’ pretest and posttest English proficiency scores were obtained from the language institution in the U.S. that the students were enrolled in. These scores were compared in order to examine the changes in their English proficiency scores.

Correlation analysis (Pearson moment correlation) was calculated in order to examine the relationship between the acculturation attitudes of the Turkish students in the U.S. and their English achievement

3. FINDINGS

The objective of the research was to inspect the possible relationship between the acculturation attitudes of the Turkish students in the U.S. and the differences in the

participants' English achievement. The participants' pretest and posttest English proficiency scores were obtained from the language institution in the U.S. that the students joined during the course of their stay. These scores were compared to examine the changes in their English proficiency scores. Correlation analysis (Pearson moment correlation) was calculated in order to examine this possible relationship. The findings of the correlation analysis reveal a positive significant relationship between the assimilation attitude and achievement score differences ($r = .33$) (see Table 1). Thus, the students who had the tendency to assimilate into the host culture (American culture) and ignore the practices of the home culture (Turkish culture) had the highest increase in the English achievement scores at the end of three months.

On the other hand, the findings on Table 1 signify a negative significant relationship between separation attitude and L2 improvement ($r = -.32$). Hence, as the students' preference to be attached to the home culture (Turkish culture) and their avoidance of establishing contact with the host culture (American culture) members and practices increased, their L2 improvement levels decreased.

Correlation analysis results display no significant relationship between marginalization ($r = -.02$) and integration attitudes ($r = -.01$) of the students and their L2 achievement score differences (see table 1).

Table 1.
Correlations between Acculturation Attitudes and L2 Achievement
Correlations

		Assimilation	Separation	Marginalization	Integration
Assimilation	<i>r</i>				
	<i>p</i>				
Separation	<i>r</i>	-.87			
	<i>p</i>	.00			
Marginalization	<i>r</i>	-.33	.23		
	<i>p</i>	.04	.16		
Integration	<i>r</i>	.11	-.01	-.03	
	<i>p</i>	.51	.95	.8	
Achievement score differences	<i>r</i>	.33	-.32	-.02	-.01
	<i>p</i>	.04	.04	.88	.97

The examination of items that are associated with the assimilation factor of the scale shows that social activities (item 2), decoration (item 11), language use (item 20), and friendship (item 36) were the areas in which more participants reached higher percentages of assimilation (see Table 2). Thus, 60% of the students indicated that they preferred to spend time with Americans rather than Turks, 42% stated that they preferred to use American style decorations in their apartments, 60% indicated a preference to speak English rather than Turkish at home, and 37.5% stated that they preferred their close friends to be American rather than Turkish. On the other hand, a higher percentage of the participants were not inclined to show signs of assimilation for special days (item 1), food

(item 10), and newspaper choice (item 25) (see Table 2). Hence, 75% of the students reported that they do not prefer to celebrate the American feasts instead of the Turkish feasts, 85% did not prefer to eat American food at home/dormitory, and 47.5% stated that they do not choose to read American newspapers rather than Turkish newspapers. For the culture item (item 19), the percentage of participants that were undecided (35%) and who rejected adopting American culture rather than Turkish culture (35%) was equal. However, these were slightly higher than the percentage of participants that preferred to adopt American culture rather than Turkish culture (30%). For the life style item (item 31) an equal percentage (32.5%) of participants reported a preference and rejection. However, the percentage of undecided participants (35%) for the same item was slightly higher than the other options.

Table 2.
Acculturation Attitudes Scale-Assimilation

	1		2		3		4		5	
Assimilation	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Item 1	19	47,5	11	27,5	6	15,0	2	5,0	2	5,0
Item 2	6	15,0	5	12,5	5	12,5	10	25,0	14	35,0
Item 10	21	52,5	13	32,5	4	10,0	1	2,5	1	2,5
Item 11	6	15,0	7	17,5	10	25,0	11	27,5	6	15,0
Item 19	7	17,5	7	17,5	14	35,0	5	12,5	7	17,5
Item 20	1	2,5	3	7,5	12	30,0	10	25,0	14	35,0
Item 25	8	20,0	11	27,5	9	22,5	5	12,5	7	17,5
Item 31	10	25,0	3	7,5	14	35,0	5	12,5	8	20,0
Item 36	9	22,5	4	10	8	20	6	15	13	32,5

Separation is another factor of the acculturation attitudes on the scale. The findings on separation show that the percentages related to separation were higher than the other options only for the dimensions of special days (item 7) and food (item 29), (see Table 3). Accordingly, 47.5% of the participants reported a preference to celebrate the Turkish feasts rather than the American feasts and 55% of them preferred to eat Turkish food at home/dormitory.

A higher percentage of students did not express a relatively high cultural maintenance for social activities (item 4), culture (item 14), newspaper (item 21), life style (item 24), and language (item 33). The percentage of students who did not favor spending time with Turks rather than Americans was 55. Likewise, 42.5% of the participants disagreed with the item 14 that favors to adopt Turkish culture rather than the American culture. 55% of the participants stated that they did not prefer to read Turkish newspapers rather than American newspapers. The percentage of participants who did not prefer to live as a Turk rather than an American was 60%. Language was the area where the participants reported the lowest cultural maintenance as 77.5% of them stated that they did not prefer to speak Turkish rather than English at home or in the dormitory.

For the friendship dimension (item 12), an equal percentage (32.5%) of participants was undecided and in the direction of separation. For the same item, 35% of the participants stated that they did not prefer their close friends to be Turks rather than Americans. Although this percentage is higher than the other two options, it is still very proximate to them. For decoration (item 22), the percentage of its separation is very low (15%), but the percentage of undecided participants (40%) and the ones who did not design their room with a Turkish style of decoration instead of American style (45%) are very close.

Table 3.
Acculturation Attitudes Scale-Separation

	1		2		3		4		5	
<i>Separation</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
Item 4	9	22,5	13	32,5	9	22,5	7	17,5	2	5,0
Item 7	3	7,5	4	10,0	14	35,0	15	37,5	4	10,0
Item 12	7	17,5	7	17,5	13	32,5	9	22,5	4	10,0
Item 14	7	17,5	10	25,0	9	22,5	7	17,5	7	17,5
Item 21	11	27,5	11	27,5	9	22,5	4	10,0	5	12,5
Item 22	5	12,5	13	32,5	16	40,0	2	5,0	4	10,0
Item 24	7	17,5	17	42,5	7	17,5	6	15,0	3	7,5
Item 29	4	10,0	2	5,0	12	30,0	14	35,0	8	20,0
Item 33	20	50,0	11	27,5	8	20,0	0	0	1	2,5

Marginalization is the third factor that the acculturation attitudes scale includes. The findings in relation to this factor show that the majority of participants did not agree with the nine items that encompass low identification with both the origin and the host cultures (see Table 4). Thus, most of the students had the tendency to identify themselves with a culture.

Table 4.
Acculturation Attitudes Scale-Marginalization

	1		2		3		4		5	
<i>Marginalization</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
Item 5	17	42,5	12	30,0	6	15,0	2	5,0	3	7,5
Item 8	13	32,5	17	42,5	5	12,5	2	5,0	3	7,5
Item 13	24	60,0	8	20,0	5	12,5	1	2,5	2	5,0
Item 16	19	47,5	9	22,5	7	17,5	2	5,0	3	7,5
Item 18	14	35,0	14	35,0	8	20,0	3	7,5	1	2,5
Item 23	18	45,0	6	15,0	9	22,5	2	5,0	5	12,5
Item 27	8	20,0	10	25,0	13	32,5	2	5,0	7	17,5
Item 32	19	47,5	5	12,5	6	15,0	7	17,5	3	7,5
Item 35	13	32,5	11	27,5	5	12,5	5	12,5	6	15,0

Integration is the fourth and last dimension of the scale. A higher percentage of participants did not select to follow a bicultural route for language (item 28), newspaper preference (item 30), and decoration (item 34). For instance 42.5 % of the students

disagreed with the statement “I prefer to speak both English and Turkish at home/dormitory.” Similarly, 52% of them did not prefer to follow both the Turkish and American newspapers. 42.5% of them also did not have a preference for designing their room with both American and Turkish styles (see Table 5).

The results on Table 5 show that the number of students who preferred to be bicultural and the number who did not were very close to one another for culture (item 09), life style (item 15), and friendship (item 17). While 40% of the students indicated that they did not wish to adopt both American and Turkish cultures at the same time, the percentage of the ones who preferred to be bicultural was 37.5%. An equal percentage of students (42.5%) preferred to have a bicultural life style and the opposite. For the friendship dimension while 40% of the participants had a preference to have both American and Turkish close friends, 37.5% disagreed with that item.

The undecided students formed the majority for the items on social activities (item 6) and food (item 26) which shows that a higher percentage of students were unsure about spending time with both American and Turks and eating both American and Turkish food.

Special day (item 3) was the only area that a higher number of the students preferred to be bicultural. Thus, 40% of them preferred to celebrate both Turkish and American special days (see Table 5).

Table 5.
Acculturation Attitudes Scale-Integration

Integration	1		2		3		4		5	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Item3	5	12,5	8	20,0	11	27,5	4	10,0	12	30,0
Item6	6	15,0	5	12,5	16	40,0	4	10,0	9	22,5
Item9	5	12,5	11	27,5	9	22,5	4	10,0	11	27,5
Item15	7	17,5	10	25,0	6	15,0	4	10,0	13	32,5
Item17	4	10,0	11	27,5	9	22,5	8	20,0	8	20,0
Item26	4	10,0	9	22,5	18	45,0	7	17,5	2	5,0
Item28	11	27,5	6	15,0	9	22,5	6	15,0	8	20,0
Item30	6	15,0	15	37,5	8	20,0	4	10,0	7	17,5
Item34	7	17,5	10	25,0	11	27,5	5	12,5	7	17,5

4. DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

This study principally aimed to examine the relationship between the acculturation attitudes of the Turkish students who took English courses at the U.S. and their English achievement during their stay in the same country. The study results revealed that the students who had the propensity to assimilate into the American culture and disregard the practices of the Turkish culture during the three months had the highest increase in their English achievement scores. Correspondingly, as the students’ preference to be attached

to the Turkish culture and their avoidance of creating interaction with the American culture members and practices increased, their English improvement levels decreased. While the assimilation factor indicated the maximum degree of acculturation to the host culture, the separation factor stood for complete attachment to the home culture.

These results highlight the essentialness of establishing strong relationships with the host culture and avoidance of home culture practices in order to obtain maximum English learning benefits from staying in the U.S. for a short period of time which was three months in the current research. These findings overlap with Schumann's (1978, p.34) argument that "the degree to which a learner acculturates to the TL group will control the degree to which he acquires the second language" and other studies that marked a strong relationship between cultural adaptation and L2 learning (Brown, 1994; Clement, 1986; Hansen, 1995; Lybeck, 2002; Maple, 1982; Scarcella & Oxford, 1992). The findings stress that students who plan to visit a country for a short period of time need to have complete integration into the host society if they plan to witness considerable improvements in their L2 scores.

On the other hand the study findings do not overlap with Gardner's (1979, p. 193-194) argument that "the student's harmony with his own cultural community and his willingness or ability to identify with other cultural communities become important considerations in the process of L2 acquisition" as there was no relationship between L2 achievement and integration (biculturalism) in the current study. Gardner (1979) assigns a vital role adapting to the cultural values of the target-language community, but at the same time he still contends that students could preserve their own cultural practices. Although Gardner's bicultural model could be valid for longer periods of cultural contact and language improvement, the current study results show that when the duration of stay in the target-language culture is short, only the highest degree of acculturation attitude (assimilation) leads to the uppermost L2 improvements.

The adult student accessing the L2 learning situation in the host culture is like any subject in a social psychological experiment in that s/he is confronted with stimuli that are the products of another cultural community. Then, the L2 learning situation involves cultural and linguistic groups communicating, which can potentially lead to behavioral and attitudinal gains. Within a contemporary interactionist view of L2 acquisition, L2 achievement would rest principally on the L2 learners' perception of the other host group involved, their attitudes towards agents of the group, and their inclination to recognize and adopt characteristic features of linguistic and non-verbal aspects of cultural behaviors. Thus, this study is important in terms of providing an additional example for the relationship between the level of acculturation reached and the degree of L2 improvement achieved.

REFERENCES

- Akalın, S., & Zengin, B. (2007). Türkiye’de halkın yabancı dil ile ilgili algıları. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 3, 181-200.
- Anderson, G & Arsenault, N. (2004). *Fundamentals of education research*. London: Routledge Falmer
- Ataca, B., & Berry, J. W. (2002). Psychological, sociocultural, and marital adaptation of Turkish immigrant couples in Canada. *International Journal of Psychology*, 37, 13-26.
- Aycan, Z., & Berry, J. W. (1996). Impact of employment related experiences on immigrants’ psychological well-being and adaptation to Canada. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 28, 240-251.
- Baltas, Z., & Steptoe, A. (2000). Migration, culture conflict and psychological well-being among Turkish-British married couples. *Ethnicity & Health*, 5, 173-181.
- Barron, A. (2003). *Acquisition in interlanguage pragmatics: Learning how to do things with words in a study abroad context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bektaş, D. Y. (2004). *Psychological adaptation and acculturation of the Turkish students in the United States* (Dissertation). Middle East Technical University.
- Bektaş, Y., Demir, A., & Bowden, R. (2009). Psychological adaptation of Turkish students at U.S. campuses. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, 31, 130-143.
- Berry, J. W. (1980). Acculturation as varieties of adaptation. In A. Padilla (Eds.), *Acculturation: Theory, models and findings* (pp. 9–25). Boulder: Westview.
- Brown, H. D. (1980). The optimal distance model of second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 14, 157-64.
- Brow, H. D. (1994). *Teaching by principles*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Brown, H. D. (2006). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. New York, NY: Pearson/Longman.
- Cancino, H., Rosansky, E., & Schmuann, J. (1974). The acquisition of the English auxiliary by native Spanish speakers. *TESOL Quarterly* 9, 421-430.
- Cohen, A. D., Paige, R. M., Shievely, R. L. Emert, H. A., & Hoff, J. G. (2005). *Maximizing study abroad through language and culture strategies: Research on students, study abroad program professionals, and language instructors*. Minneapolis: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, Office of International Programs, University of Minnesota.
- Clement, R. (1986). Second language proficiency and acculturation: An investigation of the effects of language status and individual characteristics. *Journal of Language & Social Psychology*, 5, 271-290.
- Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Gardner, R. C. (1979). Social psychological aspects of second language acquisition. In H. Giles & R. St. Clair. (Eds.), *Language and social psychology* (pp. 193-229). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hansen, D. (1995). A study of the effect of the acculturation model on second language acquisition. In F. Eckman, D. Highland, P. Lee, J. Mileham, and R. Rutkoewski Weber (Eds.), *Second language acquisition theory and pedagogy* (pp.305-316). Mahwah, Nj: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Johnson, K., & Johnson, H. (1999). *Encyclopedic dictionary of applied linguistics*. Oxford/Malden, MA: Blackwell.

- Johnson, K. (2008). *An introduction to foreign language learning and teaching*. Pearson/Longman.
- Lightbown, P. & Spada, N. (1993). *How languages are learned*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.
- Lybeck, K. E. (2002). *The role of acculturation and social networks in the acquisition of second language pronunciation* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Minnesota.
- Maple, R. (1982). *Social distance and the acquisition of English as a second language: a study of Spanish-speaking adult learners*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Texas at Austin.
- Miller, L., & Ginsberg, R. B. (1995). Folklinguistic theories of language learning. In B. F. Freed (Eds.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 293-316). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Pelligrino, V. A. (1998). Student perspectives on language learning in a study abroad context. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 4, 91-120.
- Phalet, K., & Hagendoorn, L. (1996). Personal adjustment to acculturative transitions: The Turkish experience. *International Journal of Psychology*, 31, 131-144.
- Poyrazlı, S., Arbona, C., Bullington, R., & Pisecco, S. (2001). Adjustment issues of Turkish college students studying in the United States. *College Student Journal*, 35, 52-63.
- Scarcella, R. C., & Oxford, R. L. (1992). *The tapestry of language learning: The individual in the Communicative classroom*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Schieffelin, B. & Ochs, E. (1986). Language socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 15, 163-191.
- Schmidt, R. (1983). Interaction, acculturation and the acquisition of communicative competence. In N. Wolfson, & E. Judd, (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition* (pp. 137-174). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11, 129-158.
- Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Eds.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 3-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schumann, J. (1978). The acculturation model for second-language acquisition. In R. Gringas (Eds.), *Second language acquisition and foreign language teaching* (pp. 27-50). Washington, DC; Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Segalowitz, N., Freed, B. F., Collentine, J., Lafford, B., Lazar, N., & Diaz-Campos, M. (2004). A comparison of Spanish second language acquisition in two different learning contexts: Study abroad and the domestic classroom. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 10, 1-18.
- Soner, O. (2007). Türkiye'de yabancı dil eğitimin dünü bugünü. *Öneri*, 7(28), 397-404.
- Ward, C., & Kennedy, A. (1999). The measurement of sociocultural adaptation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 23 (4), 659-677.
- Wilkinson, S. (1998). On the nature of immersion during study abroad: Some participant perspectives. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 4, 121-138.

APPENDICES**Appendix-1****KÜLTÜRLENME TUTUMLARI ÖLÇEĞİ**

Aşağıdaki ifadeler, Amerika’daki hayatınızda karşılaştığınız ve değişik durumlarda nasıl düşündüğünüzle ilgilidir. Bazı ifadeler Türk kültürü, bazıları Amerikan kültürü, bazıları ise hem Türk, hem Amerikan kültürleri hakkındadır. Diğer ifadelerde ise bir kültür seçimi yoktur. Lütfen bu konulardaki kişisel tercihlerinizi belirtiniz.

	1-----2-----3-----4-----5				
	Tamamen farklı buluyorum		Tamamen aynı buluyorum		
1. Türk bayramlarından çok Amerikan bayramlarını kutlamayı tercih ederim	1	2	3	4	5
2. Türklerden çok Amerikalılarla bir araya gelip vakit geçirmeyi tercih ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Hem Amerikan hem Türk bayramlarını kutlamayı tercih ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Amerikalılardan çok Türklerle bir araya gelip vakit geçirmeyi tercih ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
5. "Bayram" bana bir şey ifade etmiyor.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Hem Amerikalılarla hem Türklerle bir araya gelip vakit geçirmeyi tercih ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Amerikan bayramlarından çok Türk bayramlarını kutlamayı tercih ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Kimlerle bir araya gelip vakit geçirdiğime aldırmam.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Hem Türk hem Amerikan kültürünü benimsemeyi tercih ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Evde/yurtta Türk yemeklerinden çok Amerikan yemekleri yemeyi tercih ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Evimde/odamda Türklerce özgü süslemelerden çok Amerikalılara özgü süslemelerin olmasını tercih ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Yakın arkadaşlarımın Amerikalıdan çok Türk olmasını tercih ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Evde/yurtta ne çeşit yemek yediğime aldırış etmem.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Amerikan kültüründen çok Türk kültürünü benimsemeyi tercih ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Hem Türk hem Amerikalı gibi yaşamaktan hoşlandığımı söyleyebilirim.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Ne tür gazete okuduğuma aldırış etmem.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Yakın arkadaşlarımın hem Amerikalı hem Türk olmasını tercih ederim.	1	2	3	4	5

18. Çoğu zaman ne şekilde yaşayacağıma aldırış etmem.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Türk kültüründen çok Amerikan kültürünü benimsemeyi tercih ediyorum.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Evde/yurtta Türkçeden çok İngilizce konuşmayı tercih ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
21. Amerikan gazetelerinden çok Türk gazetelerini okumayı tercih ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
22. Evimde/odamda Amerikalılarca özgü süslemelerden çok Türklere özgü süslemelerini olmasını tercih ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
23. Hangi kültürü benimsediğime aldırış etmem.	1	2	3	4	5
24. Amerikalımdan çok bir Türk gibi yaşamaktan hoşlandığımı söyleyebilirim.	1	2	3	4	5
25. Türk gazetelerinden çok Amerikan gazetelerini okumayı tercih ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
26. Evde/yurtta hem Amerikan hem Türk yemekleri yemeyi tercih ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
27. Evi/odamı süsleme gibi önemsiz şeylerle kafamı yormam.	1	2	3	4	5
28. Evde/yurtta hem İngilizce hem Türkçe konuşmayı tercih ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
29. Evde/yurtta Amerikan yemeklerinden çok Türk yemekleri yemeyi tercih ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
30. Hem Amerikan hem Türk gazetelerini okumayı tercih ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
31. Türk'ten çok bir Amerikalı gibi yaşamaktan hoşlandığımı söyleyebilirim.	1	2	3	4	5
32. Yakın arkadaşlarımdan kimler olduğuna aldırış etmem.	1	2	3	4	5
33. Evde/yurtta İngilizceden çok Türkçe konuşmayı tercih ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
34. Evimde/odamda hem Amerikalılarca hem Türklere özgü süslemelerin olmasını tercih ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
35. Çoğu zaman duygu ve düşüncelerimi nasıl dile getirdiğime aldırış etmem.	1	2	3	4	5
36. Yakın arkadaşlarımdan Türk'ten çok Amerikalı olmasını tercih ederim.	1	2	3	4	5

UZUN ÖZET

1. Giriş

Türkiye’den birçok öğrenci yeni diller öğrenmek için yabancı ülkelere gitmenin gerekli olduğunu düşünmektedir. Kişilerin yeni bir dil öğrenmek için yurtdışını tercih etmelerinin en önemli nedenleri arasında hedef dili o dilin konuşulduğu coğrafyada daha iyi ve hızlı öğrenecekleri düşüncesi yatmaktadır (Brown, 2006; Johnson, 2008). Öğrenciler arasındaki bu genel düşünceye rağmen Schumann’ın (1978) gerçekleştirdiği kültürlenme çalışması ancak belirli şartlar sağlandığı zaman ikinci bir dilde başarının daha üst düzeylere taşınabileceğini göstermektedir. Kültürlenme, yeni bir kültüre uyum sağlamak demektir. Schumann’ın (1978) kültürlenme varsayımının temelini Cancino ve Rosansky ile yaptığı çalışma oluşturmaktadır. Cancino, Rosansky ve Schumann (1975) anadilleri İspanyolca olan ve ABD’de yaklaşık on aylık bir süre zarfında İngilizceye maruz kalmış altı kişinin dilsel gelişimlerini inceleyen bir çalışma gerçekleştirmiştir. Bu altı kişi arasında Schumann’ın (1978) kültürlenme varsayımının ana karakteri olan Kosta Rika kökenli otuz üç yaşındaki Alberto, incelenen diğer katılımcılara göre çok daha az dilsel gelişim göstermiştir. Schumann (1978), Alberto’nun dilsel gelişiminin yetersizliğini ve konuştuğu hedef dilin karma dil özellikleri taşımasını onun anadili konuşuru olan hedef toplumla yeterli düzeyde etkileşimde bulunamamasına bağlamıştır. Alberto örneği yurtdışında bulunan bireylerin hedef dil başarı düzeylerinin sosyal ve psikolojik etmenlerle ilişkili olduğunu ortaya koymaktadır.

Türkiye’den yurtdışına öğrenim amacıyla giden ya da diğer nedenlerle göç etmiş olan bireylerin kültürlenme düzeylerini ele alan bazı çalışmalar bulunmaktadır. Örneğin Ataca ve Berry (2002) kolaylaştırıcı etmenlerin Toronto’da yaşayan Türk göçmenlerin psikolojik ve sosyokültürel uyumlarını nasıl etkilediğini incelemiştir. Diğer bir çalışmada Aycan ve Berry (1996) Kanada’da yaşayan Türk göçmenlerin ruhsal durumlarını ve uyumlarını maddi konular çerçevesinde ele almıştır. Phalet ve Hagendoorn (1996) Belçika’da kültürlenme aşamasında olan Türk göçmenlerin kişisel uyumlarını araştırmışlardır. Baltaş ve Steptoe (2000) Türk-İngiliz evli çiftlerin ruhsal durumlarını kültürlenme düzeyi ve kültürlerarası çatışmalar ışığında incelemiştir. ABD’de üniversite eğitimi alan Türk öğrenciler üzerine gerçekleştirilen çalışmada Poyrazlı, Arbora, Bullington ve Pisecco (2001) İngilizce seviyeleri yüksek olan öğrencilerin kültürlenme düzeylerinin de yüksek olduğunu ortaya koymuşlardır. Bektaş, Demir ve Bowden (2009) ABD’de bulunan Türk öğrencilerinin ruhsal uyumlarının kültürlenme etmenlerinden nasıl etkilendiği üzerinde durmuşlardır. ABD’de eğitim gören Türk öğrenciler üzerine en kapsamlı kültürlenme çalışması Bektaş’ın (2004) “Amerika Birleşik Devletleri’nde Eğitim Gören Türk Öğrencilerin Psikolojik Uyumları ve Kültürlenmeleri” başlıklı doktora çalışmasıdır. Bu çalışmada ABD’de eğitim gören Türk öğrencilerin psikolojik uyumları incelenmiştir.

Yurtdışında farklı amaçlarla bulunan Türkiye Cumhuriyeti vatandaşları üzerinde yapılan çalışmalar kültürlenme üzerine önemli bilgiler sunmalarına rağmen ilgili alan yazında yurtdışında yabancı dil öğrenmek amacıyla bulunan Türk öğrencilerin kültürlenme tutumları ile yabancı dil başarıları arasındaki ilişkiyi inceleyen bir çalışma mevcut değildir. Türkiye’den her yıl yurtdışına yabancı dil eğitimi amacıyla giden öğrenci sayısından yola çıkılarak yurtdışına giden öğrencilerin kültürlenme tutumlarının belirlenmesi ve bu tutumların yabancı dil başarısıyla ilişkisini belirlemek gerekli görülmüştür. Bu çalışmanın

temel amacı ABD’de İngilizce eğitimi almak için bulunan Türk öğrencilerin kültürlenme tutumlarının İngilizce başarılarıyla olan ilişkisini ortaya koymaktır.

2. Yöntem

Araştırmada ilişkisel model kullanılmıştır.

2.1. Katılımcılar

Araştırmanın katılımcılarını ABD’nin Los Angeles kentinde aynı İngilizce kursunda 3 ay boyunca öğrenim gören 40 öğrenci öğrenim görmekte olan Türkiye Cumhuriyeti vatandaşı öğrenciler oluşturacaktır. Çalışmaya katılan öğrencilerin ilk defa ABD’de bulunmaları göz önünde bulundurulmuştur. Katılımcıların yaşları 16-34 arasında değişmektedir. Katılımcıların 18’i kadın iken 22’si erkektir.

2.2. Verilerin toplanması ve analizi

Öğrencilerin kültürlenme tutumlarını belirlemek için Ataca ve Berry (2002) tarafından uyarlanan 44 maddelik Kültürlenme Tutum Ölçeği, Bektaş’ın (2004) 36 maddeye indirildiği formuyla kullanılmıştır. Bu ölçekte arkadaşlık, sosyal aktivite, yiyecek, özel gün (bayram vb.) kutlama, dil kullanımı, dekorasyon, gazete okurluğu, yaşam tarzı ve kültür olmak üzere dokuz alan bulunmaktadır. Her bir kültürlenme tutumu dokuz maddeden oluşan asimilasyon, ayrılma, marjinalleşme ve bütünleşme faktörlerinden oluşmaktadır.

ABD’de İngilizce eğitimi için bulunan Türk öğrencilerin kültürlenme tutumları ile İngilizce başarıları arasındaki ilişkiyi belirlemek için korelasyon analizi (Pearson momentler çarpım korelasyon katsayısı hesaplanmıştır) yapılmıştır.

3. Bulgular, Yorum ve Sonuçlar

Yapılan korelasyon analizlerinin sağladığı sonuçlara göre asimilasyon faktörü ve yabancı dil başarısı arasında pozitif yönde anlamlı bir ilişki vardır. Yani hedef kültüre ait yaşam tarzını benimseyip kendi öz kültürüne ait uygulamalardan uzak duran öğrenciler 3 aylık süre içerisinde en yüksek İngilizce başarısı artışına ulaşmışlardır.

Çalışmanın diğer bir bulgusu ayrılma faktörü ile İngilizce başarısı arasındaki negatif anlamlı ilişkidir. Bu doğrultuda kendi öz kültürlerine bağlı kalıp hedef kültüre ait unsurlardan uzak duran öğrencilerin İngilizce başarı düzeylerinde artış gözlemlenmemiştir.

Çalışma sonuçları marjinalleşme ve bütünleşme tutumları ile İngilizce başarısı arasında anlamlı bir ilişki bulamamıştır.

Çalışmanın sonuçları incelendiğinde kısa süreliğine ABD’de bulunan öğrencilerin sadece hedef kültüre ait unsurları benimsediklerinde beklenen dilsel artışı sağladıkları görülmektedir. Bu sonuç ikinci dil öğrenim sürecinde kültürlenmenin önemini tekrar vurgulamak açısından önem taşımaktadır.

Araştırmada elde edilen diğer bir bulguya göre bütünleşme ve İngilizce başarısı arasında anlamlı bir ilişki yoktur. Bu sonuç Gardner’ın (1979) ikinci dil öğrenim sürecinde bütünleşmenin (iki kültürlülük) önemine yaptığı vurgu ile zıtlık içermektedir. Gerçekleştirilen bu çalışmada süre 3 ay ile kısıtlı tutulduğu için bütünleşme tutumu ile İngilizce başarısı arasında bir ilişki bulunmadığı düşünülmüştür.