Analysis of "Turkish as a Foreign Language Course Programs" Implemented in Public Education Centers in Türkiye

Esma BOSTAN

Teaching Turkish to Foreigners, Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli University, Ankara, Türkiye
ORCID: 0000-0002-9797-0585

Elif İLHAN[*]

Teaching Turkish to Foreigners, Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli University, Ankara, Türkiye
ORCID: 0000-0002-8536-1571

The study aims to analyze the "Turkish as a foreign language course programs" implemented in public education centers to teach Turkish to foreign adults. Applying a qualitative case study design, data were obtained from semi-structured interviews. The study group consisted of 11 instructors and 33 trainees in public education centers operating in Ankara. In data collection process, two separate semi-structured interview forms were used, and the content analysis method was used to analyze the data. The findings indicate that the programs largely meet the needs of trainees, but issues as inadequacy of the duration, deficiencies in material support, the weight of traditional methods in measurement and evaluation processes, limited application of communicative approach principles and insufficient consideration of individual differences limited their effectiveness. Moreover, the instructors stated that the programs should be more flexible, functional, and andragogy-based. Additionally, the trainees emphasized their satisfactions with instructors' competencies, the need to focus more on skill-based development in course content and exam practices. The study highlights the necessity of revising Turkish as a foreign language course programs in alignment with andragogic principles. In line with the results, suggestions for regarding curriculum development and instructor training are presented along with the ones with the further research.

Introduction

Today, millions of people worldwide are forced to leave their homes and seek refuge in other countries due to wars, civil conflicts and economic crises. Especially, in the last two decades, Türkiye has been at the center of these forced migration movements from such countries as Syria, Ukraine, Pakistan and Afghanistan, and as of 24.04.2025, the number of foreigners in Türkiye with a residence permit has reached 1,089,381 (Ministry of Interior, Presidency of Migration Management, 2025). The migrations bring with them not only a physical change of location, but also the encounter with a new language and culture. Host country language is recognized as one of the most important integration tools in terms of education, employment and social participation in immigrants' new living spaces. However,

---

[*] Correspondency: elif.ilhan00@hbv.edu.tr

language barriers in this process can severely restrict individuals' active participation in social life and access to public services. In this context, the quality and effectiveness of foreign language teaching programs for immigrants has vital importance.

2024 data from TurkStat show that the age range of foreign nationals in Türkiye is 20-24 years, 25-29 years and 30-34 years, respectively (TurkStat, 2025). In other words, a large portion of immigrant population in Türkiye consists of adults. Therefore, high quality programs for teaching Turkish to adults are needed. Foreign adults in Türkiye experience problems in many areas such as social-cultural adaptation, health services, economy, and education (Şafak-Ayvazoğlu et al., 2020). Lack of language proficiency is often the main challenge faced by foreign adults. Therefore, the initial step to address the problems is to provide Turkish language instruction tailored to foreigners living in the country. Considering the specific needs of adult learners is crucial for the success of such programs. Although the MoNE has implemented Turkish language programs for adult foreigners since 2017, we have limited empirical evidence on their effectiveness and suitability for learners' diverse needs. This gap hinders efforts to improve adult Turkish language education and integration policies. The programs are generally designed without sufficient consideration of the characteristics and learning needs of adult learners. Furthermore, very few studies examined how these curricula address adult education principles or how they are evaluated according to stakeholder opinions. This study examines the existing course programs for teaching Turkish to adult immigrants in Türkiye.

Conceptual and Theoretical Framework

Adults' foreign language learning

Foreign language learning constitutes a complex and multifaceted issue for adults residing in a different country whether by choice or due to compulsory reasons. It is not only a matter of learning the official language of the country they live in, but also a first step towards acquiring social, medical and political knowledge and economic and social integration (Chao, 2020). They are simultaneously required to secure their livelihood and fulfil their familial and other responsibilities. In foreign language teaching to adults, plans should be made taking into account the impact of such external factors, the significant differences in learning habits among adults, and the need to use various learning techniques (Kozar & Yates, 2019).

The process of learning a foreign language for adults involves different cognitive, affective, and social dynamics compared to children. Although there may be a slowdown in learning speed due to age, adults can work on more complex language structures with conscious awareness thanks to their cognitive maturity (Lightbown & Spada, 2013). Moreover, having a strong native language base provides an advantage in terms of inferring meaning and making comparisons between linguistic structures in the foreign language. However, adults' learning process is also significantly influenced by affective factors. Krashen's (1982) affective filter hypothesis suggests that motivation, self-confidence, and anxiety levels are determinants of language acquisition. While high motivation and self-confidence facilitate language learning, anxiety and fear of failure can negatively affect the learning process. This is especially the case for refugees and immigrants whose educational background has been interrupted. Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural theory provides the theoretical foundation for the social aspect of adult language learning; this theory argues that adults need to take active roles in social interaction environments. Moreover, Knowles' (1980) andragogic model argues that adult learners expect to actively participate in learning processes, to benefit from their

experiences, to be goal-oriented, and to make the knowledge learned directly applicable in daily life. In this context, motivation and social acceptance are at the center of the learning process. Moreover, immigrants "come to the learning environment with different levels of literacy or prior education, different socio-cultural backgrounds and trauma experiences" (Kamisli, 2022, p. 90). Therefore, language teaching policies and programs to be prepared for immigrants must take these characteristics into account.

Proficiency in target language is essential for immigrants to fully engage in societal activities. Consequently, nations have established varied practices regarding their objectives and scope. Germany offers courses that provide integration training specifically designed for various groups (Köse & Özsoy, 2019). In Sweden, the "Swedish for Immigrants" program is designed to accommodate individual interests and experiences, offering three distinct educational pathways. Courses are tailored to students' educational backgrounds, Swedish language proficiency, and selected paths, with five language skills evaluated at the conclusion (İşigüzel & Baldık, 2019; Skolverket, 2022). In Canada, government-funded language courses are provided at no cost and encompass transportation, childcare, and support for individuals with special needs. Language proficiency is evaluated before the course, and instruction is provided in flexible time slots and diverse formats (Government of Canada, 2017). In the United Kingdom, the instruction of the English language for adult immigrants is guided by strategic documents. The 2018 "Integrated Communities Strategy Green Paper" highlights the significance of this issue (Simpson & Hunter, 2023). Programs in Australia and New Zealand incorporate flexible, distance, or individualised education options, alongside provisions for free childcare and transportation support (OECD, 2021).

Teaching Turkish as a foreign language to adults in Türkiye: Turkish as a foreign language course programs

To deal with the rising number of immigrants, Türkiye has to implement language education programs for the adult ones. The Ministry of National Education (MoNE) offers lifelong learning courses through its Public Education Centers and municipalities, especially for Syrian adults in Türkiye. However, NGOs and EU-supported language education projects are short-term, limited, and project-based. The state wants to centralise quality control, but access, sustainability, and inclusiveness policies are lacking (Nimer & Oruç, 2019). These issues stretch back nearly a decade. However, updating adult education center programs can address these issues.

General Directorate of Lifelong Learning of the Ministry of National Education developed Turkish as a foreign language course programs for adult foreign trainees in 2017. The course programs include three programs for A1, A2, and B1 levels. Although three different programs were developed, the general framework sections are the same, on which this study focuses. They have various objectives that take into account the general objectives of Turkish national education as well as the definitions of the levels in the "Common European Framework of Reference for Languages" (MoNE, 2017a, 2017b, 2017c). They include many examples of tools and materials that can be used in the lessons. In all three programs, the methods that can be used in the lesson are specified. In the programs, it is stated that instructors are left free to choose the method, nevertheless such factors as the personal characteristics of the target audience and the environmental conditions in which teaching is carried out should be taken into consideration. When the themes in the programs are examined, five themes are determined in the A1 level program, 10 themes in the A2 level program, and 10 themes in the B1 level program (MoNE, 2017a, 2017b, 2017c). When the measurement and evaluation sections are examined, at the end of each theme, it is stated that

an assessment should be made in which the four language skills have equal proportions, provided that the duration does not exceed one lesson hour. Accordingly, the instructor conducts an exam covering three language skills (Listening, Reading and Writing) out of 75 points. Speaking skill is scored by observing during the lesson (MoNE, 2017a, 2017b, 2017c).

Although the Programs have been implemented for about ten years, when the literature is examined, it is seen that the related studies are quite limited. Aytan et al. (2020) evaluated the Turkish for foreigners course programs; Erdoğan (2019) focused on the A1 level course program and examined the instructors' opinions. Garip (2023) studied the comparative examination of public education center courses within the scope of teaching Turkish as a foreign language. Other studies on Turkish teaching programs for foreigners are generally on the programs prepared by the Maarif Foundation (Aydın & Tunagür, 2021; Balcı & Melanlıoğlu, 2020; Çekici, 2022; Durmuşçelebi, 2015; Dündar & Polat, 2021; Kaplan, 2023; Karabulut, 2021; Kara & Topbulut, 2022; Kaya & Kardaş, 2020; Maden, 2020; Nurlu et al., 2021; Ulusoy, 2022).

 For foreign adults to learn the host country's official language, cultural integration, respect for individual backgrounds, and pedagogical flexibility are needed. The OECD report (2021) revealed that most countries do not scientifically evaluate adult immigrant language training programs. These programs are one of the most expensive public integration policies, thus they must be effective, fit-for-purpose, and sustainable. In Türkiye, Syrian refugees are very diverse in age, education, socioeconomic status, and language (Nimer & Oruç, 2019). The content and implementation of Turkish courses in Public Education Centers must be re-evaluated to account for immigrants' learning needs and literacy levels. More functional and science-based collaborations in curriculum development, instructor training, and program monitoring with NGOs and specialised institutions are necessary. In this context, this study aims to analyse the Turkish as a foreign language course programs used in public education centers to teach Turkish to foreign adults based on instructors' and trainees' opinions. The study contributes to instructors' self-evaluation and professional development. Furthermore, it provides insights for designing new adult foreign language course programs and enhancing existing ones.

Method

Research model

This qualitative study employs a case study design which provides rich and detailed insights (Creswell, 2014). The case refers to Turkish language course programs offered to adult foreigners at a Public Education Center, examined in detail within the framework of instructors' and trainees' opinions.

S***tudy group***

The study group consists of 11 instructors working in Public Education Centers in Ankara, Türkiye and 33 trainees enrolled in those courses. Participants were determined by convenience sampling method due to the accessibility of participants and the feasibility of data collection within the institutional context. The study group is explained in Table 1 and Table 2.

Table 1. Instructor participants' demographics

Variables	Participants	n
Gender	Woman	8
	Man	3
Bachelor Degree Field	Turkish Language and Literature	5
	Turkish Language Teaching	3
	German Language Teaching	1
	Turkish Folklore	1
	Contemporary Turkish Dialects and Literatures	1
Certificate in Teaching Turkish to Foreigners	Yes	6
	No	5
Years of Profession	1-5	7
	6-10	3
	16-20	1
Education Status	Bachelor	8
	Master's	2
	Doctorate	1

Table 2. Trainee participants' demographics

Variables	Participants	n
Gender	Woman	24
	Man	9
Nationality	Iraq	11
	Syria	7
	Libya	6
	Morocco	3
	Afghanistan	2
	Lebanon	2
	Yemen	1
	Russia	1
Arrival time	2016-2020	19
	2021-2024	7
	2011-2015	6
	2000-2005	1
Reasons for coming to Turkiye	War	14
	Education	5
	Marriage	4
	Love and admiration for Turkiye	3
	Health	2
	Occupation	2
	Desire a new life	1
	Good living conditions	1
	Relatives	1
Job / Occupation	Housewife	17
	Student	3
	Retired	3
	Unemployed	3
	Own business	3
	Teacher	2
	Veterinarian	1
	Accounting	1
Attendance to the course	Regularly	32
	Not regularly	1

Data collection and analysis

The data were collected by interviews where two parallel semi-structured interview forms developed by the researchers. The form includes 10 questions for trainees, and 15 questions for instructors. The questions were designed to determine participants' opinions/suggestions regarding the aim, content, educational status, measurement and evaluation of the Turkish as a Foreign Language Course Programs.

After getting permissions from the administrators of the Public Education Center, interviews were conducted with the *instructors* via telephone (n=2), online (n=2) and face-to-face (n=7) for 20-40 minutes. The *trainee* interviews were conducted face-to-face and lasted approximately 10 minutes. During the interviews, for the trainees with difficulty in understanding the questions, the questions were simplified or translated by other trainees or translation programs.

The data were analysed using content analysis method. First, the data obtained from the instructors and subsequently from the trainees were systematically coded. Themes aligned with the codes were determined, and the themes were grouped under main themes, namely the aim, content, educational status, measurement and evaluation dimensions of the programs and the instructors' suggestions. Data collection continued until thematic saturation was achieved.

Credibility, transferability and consistency

Instructors and trainees from different public education centers were interviewed to gain different perspectives, experiences, and perceptions. This diversity helped reveal multiple realities and contributed to the credibility of the study. The examined programs were described in detail and supported by interview quotes to ensure transferability. The interview forms were also presented to experts for feedback, and the necessary arrangements were made based on their detailed review to ensure the research's content validity. Saturation was also ensured as no new codes emerged during the last interviews. To ensure research consistency, the study process was clearly described and the codes and themes from the analysis results were recorded so other researchers could verify the results. Using data interpretations, the programs were evaluated thoroughly. The results are explained to the goals. The study was conducted and reported in accordance with the ethical guidelines for scientific research, and the ethical approval from the researchers' university was taken.

Results

The instructors' and trainees' opinions on the aim, content, educational status, measurement and evaluation dimensions of the Programs and the instructors' suggestions on the general implementation were determined.

Instructors' and trainees' opinions on the dimensions of the Programs

The instructors stated that *the aims of the programs* are to meet the needs of the trainees and to provide them with communication skills. On the other hand, the trainees stated that their expectations from the programs were to improve their writing, speaking, reading skills, vocabulary, to learn the alphabet, to learn grammar, to have information about Türkiye, to correct pronunciation, to have information about Turkish culture. Moreover, the trainees stated that they attended the courses for various purposes such as meeting their daily needs, continuing their lives in Türkiye, and communicating with people.

When their opinions are considered holistically, it can be inferred the course programs are well aligned with the trainees' goals. For example, Instructor 1 stated "The aim coincides with student goals. They want to speak a little and to master the grammatical structure of the language, which is enough". Trainee 28 explained that he needed Turkish to survive with the following words: "I go out, go to the hospital, on the streets, I mean I live here, I have to use Turkish".

Course aims are related to what the students want to learn as well as what the instructors want to teach (Marsh, 2004). Therefore, trainee needs should also be taken into consideration in the goal setting stage. Although the trainees made no negative statements about the aims, the instructors expressed very rare negative opinions like that the programs do not meet the special needs of the trainees as the trainees attend courses for different reasons. For example, a trainee may only need to learn enough Turkish to facilitate his/her daily life and may not consider other skills necessary, or a student may need a more comprehensive Turkish language teaching as he/she will continue his/her education. To the instructors, the programs do not meet such specific Turkish learning needs of the trainees. As a solution to this problem, the instructors suggest that the programs can be created for different needs: "There are different programs for young people, different programs for daily life, and they can be done by changing their duration. For example, German for young people, German for workers, that is, programs that appeal to different audiences" (Instructor 4). In programs prepared to the needs of the trainees, goals can be achieved more easily, and their motivation can be higher.

While the instructors' opinions regarding the content of the Programs are mostly negative, the trainees' are generally positive. The instructors criticized the content level of the programs and highlighted issues such as "giving general information", "focusing mainly on grammar" and "insufficiency in developing vocabulary". These criticisms show that the instructors would like to see the programs in a more functional and practical structure. For example, Instructor 8 drew attention to the superficiality of vocabulary teaching and criticized the lack of diversification of concrete object names: "...we say 'pen' but there are pencils and ballpoint pens. It shouldn't be like that." (Instructor 8). Similarly, Trainee 4 stated that the B1 module was "completely grammatical and heavy". Bölükbaş Kaya (2023) emphasize grammar should be taught as a tool that will contribute to the development of the four basic language skills. Likewise, the programs advocate that grammar is necessary for language teaching but should not be seen as the sole aim, and that it is sufficient to teach grammar enough to fulfil its function in the four basic skills (MoNE, 2017a, 2017b, 2017c). Despite this advocate, the instructors emphasized that the programs are grammar-oriented, which reveals a contradiction between the programs and their implementation.

When the trainees' opinions are examined together with these evaluations, positive comments that the programs are comprehensible in terms of content, rich in vocabulary and directly connected to everyday life come to the fore. However, it is noteworthy that the trainees frequently stated that "the topics were not understood" and this situation points to problems related to the language level or presentation style of the programs.

Furthermore, the results demonstrate the content has both strengths and room for improvement. While the trainees' praise for the vocabulary and comprehensibility of the content indicates progress in the learning process, the instructors highlighted more pedagogical and contextual concerns including that the programs are "not suitable for adult education" and do "not reflect Turkish culture". Marsh (2004) argues curriculum objectives

should be structured primarily from a learner-centered not predominantly teacher-centered perspective.

The instructors did not express any positive or negative opinions about the relevance of the content to daily life. It is thought that the content should be functional and related to daily life in order for the trainees to have language skills that will facilitate their daily lives, to learn about Turkish culture and to communicate easily in Turkish. Similarly, Doğanay and Sarı (2008) discuss the content should be based on real life experiences. However, no instructors provided any opinions regarding the relationship between the program content and daily life.

Regarding the educational status of the Programs, the instructors generally highlighted the insufficiency of the course duration. To the instructors, the reasons for this inadequacy are focused on the fact that the course hours are generally short and the duration is insufficient to provide the content. Especially at A1 level, it was noted that the available time is insufficient to meet the aims: "I can only finish A1 by taking another 136 hours on top of 136 hours" (Instructor 1). Another instructor emphasized that the insufficiency of time is due to the trainee profile and therefore it is inadequate for effectively delivering the content: "I don't think the time is enough since we also have students at A0 level" (Instructor 5). These opinions also coincide with the trainees'. Trainee 16 said, "I want to continue. Better, for example, 4 hours, 2 hours every day, I mean, I think it is not enough", she focused on the weekly duration of the course and stated that she found the duration insufficient. These common opinions reveal that duration planning should be flexible and reconfigurable to meet trainee needs. In fact, the official regulation states that the weekly course hours should be determined to the physical condition of the training center, the number of applicants and the hours of availability (MoNE, 2017a, 2017b, 2017c). However, this flexibility in the programs could not be put into practice to meet the needs of the instructors.

Despite the limited production of instructional materials, the instructors explain "ready-made textbooks" are predominantly favoured. As Sülükçü (2011) emphasizes, this is an important deficiency in meeting the need for materials adapted for teaching in heterogeneous classes. Instructor 9's statement that "I also use other books to support the subject" indicates that this gap is tried to be filled by individual efforts". Trainees were generally positive about the materials used. Statements such as "It is enough for everything, it seems enough for me" (Trainee 10) and "There is every word [we need]" (Trainee 5) reveal the functionality of the books and their richness in terms of vocabulary. As Karatay (2007) states, vocabulary is a determining factor in terms of meaning-making and expression competence. Therefore, it can be said that there is a direct relationship between trainee satisfaction and material diversity.

In terms of methods and techniques, the instructors mostly utilize "question-answer" and "lecture" methods. Evidence suggesting the question-and-answer method facilitates speaking skills and improves pronunciation (Küzeci, 2007; Yekhlef, 2015) implies that the intensive implementation of this method by the instructors is supported by a pedagogical rationale. Conversely, the fact that contemporary methods such as the "communicative method" were mentioned by only a single instructor highlights a gap between the pedagogical intentions of the programs and their practice. While MoNE (2017a) emphasizes communicativeness and functionality, the instructors still tend to use traditional methods. Moreover, methods like drama and role-play, despite valued by the instructors, are not always applicable due to the cultural shyness of adult trainees. Instructor 11's statement "...we have students who can hardly even get up to the blackboard" indicates that the choice of method is shaped not only by pedagogical but also by sociocultural factors.

The trainees chose their teaching methods and techniques based on the course content and the trainee needs. For example, Trainee 11 "...the requirements of the subject are also very different. Unfortunately, not every subject can handle the same expression technique or format" and Instructor 2 stressed the diversity in methods and techniques by "I try to explain the needs if the students in a way that they can understand better". The Programs includes no restriction on the choice of method, but instructors should make a choice in accordance with the achievements of the theme. The programs also include no specifically interrelated method, so they should choose methods and techniques. Sözer (1998), endorsing the program, argues that the nature of the subject matter should guide the choice of methods and techniques and that those most suitable for the prioritized content. Trainees frequently evaluated the pedagogical knowledge and skills of the trainers positively. The most frequently mentioned factors were "retelling unclear topics" and "easy to communicate". These findings suggest that the instructors act with a student-centered and flexible approach. As Alkan (1979, cited in Yalçın, 2002) states, the learning process depends directly on the quality of the instructor-student interaction. In this context, instructors' communication skill increase the trainees' learning motivation. Trainee descriptions of instructor-trainee interaction (e.g. "very good teaching style, teaching everything" - Trainee 25) reveal that the training is conducted in an effective environment not only in academic but also in emotional and social contexts.

In terms of the measurement and evaluation applied in the Programs, it is found that they are generally process-based, based on written and traditional tools, but several important deficiencies emerge in practice. Many instructors preferred paper and pencil based methods for assessment and evaluation. Multiple-choice questions, open-ended long-answer questions and short-answer questions are the most commonly used tools. Only one instructor utilized computer-assisted tests, which shows instructors use technological tools to a limited extent and prefer more traditional methods. The trainees' opinions overlap with the instructors. Trainees also stated that they mostly encountered fill-in-the-blank and open-ended questions in the exams and that they were satisfied with these question types. However, some trainees stated that the exams were difficult and that especially speaking and listening skills were not sufficiently measured. Trainee 11's statement "Exams are only in summer, summer exams are here but speaking exams are needed" clearly reveals this expectation. The trainees' criticism in this respect is justified. Because such exams are easy to administer and easy to score, but they also inhibit original ideas and high-level thinking skills (Başol, 2019).

The fact that measurement and evaluation is mostly done with traditional methods contradicts the communicative approach stressed in the Program. The programs aim to acquire four basic language skills in a balanced manner. Speaking and listening skills should also be included in the measurement and evaluation process. However, trainees state that these two skills are ignored in the evaluation processes, which indicates a gap between the objectives of the program and its implementation.

The instructors stated that they generally conduct the assessment process-oriented and that the assessments are carried out at the end of each unit or week. This is in line with the principle of "measuring the gains at the end of each theme" in the programs. Instructor 4's statement "I do a short exam at the end of each unit" reflects this understanding. Process assessment is important not only for determining the level of learning but also for providing instant feedback (Aydoğmuş, 2012; Birgin & Baki, 2012).

The instructors stated that they usually gave feedback to the students one-on-one, face-to-face, and sometimes provided information through exam scores. However, some instructors

stated that they provided feedback through subject repetitions for learning deficiencies. These practices overlap with the principles of effective feedback. One-on-one feedback to students is much more effective than class-wide feedback (Ministry of National Education, General Directorate of Teacher Training and Development, 2020). The timing of feedback is also important for the instructors; many instructors stated that they gave feedback "instantly". Instructor 2's statement "I can give the feedback of the speaking test at that moment" is an example of the relationship between effective feedback and time. Although there is no statement directly related to the feedback process, it is seen that assessment and evaluation practices affect their development areas and they have expectations about the content of the exams. For this reason, the content, timing and presentation style of feedback given by the instructors are decisive in terms of motivation and learning process (Göçer, 2019).

Trainees also suggested increasing the number of writing, speaking and listening skill sections in the assessment and evaluation process, and conducting exams in which all skills are measured together. These suggestions reveal that trainees expect more functional and multidimensional skill measurements in exams. These demands for productive language skills are in line with Kırkkılıç and Yirgin (2018)'s emphasis on the relationship between writing and life. The expectation to measure speaking skills is an indication that trainees want to learn Turkish not only for academic purposes but also for daily life. At this point, developing more functional, everyday life-related and skill-based assessment tools is important to ensure that the programs' communicative objectives are effectively met.

Instructors' suggestions on the development and implementation processes of the Programs

The suggestions expressed by the instructors for a more effective implementation of the Programs are presented under the themes of content, general structure of the program, educational status and aim: The instructors frequently emphasize that the content of the program should be prepared to the interests, needs and expectations of the trainees. This view reflects the principle of needs-based learning, which is one of the basic principles of adult education. To Knowles' andragogic model (1984), adults are motivated to learn only what is meaningful and what they need. Therefore, preparing content including functional language patterns appropriate to the situations that immigrant and refugee adult trainee face in daily life will make learning both accelerating and sustainable.

The instructors also emphasized the need to increase the variety of subjects. This suggestion reveals the importance of flexible learning designs sensitive to individual differences and freedom of choice. Especially considering the heterogeneous structure of immigrant adults, offering alternative content to their individual experiences, educational backgrounds and language learning goals will contribute to increasing motivation (Brookfield, 2001). Indeed, considering that many trainees have different cultural backgrounds, age groups and educational levels, flexible, modular content structures will be more effective than uniform content.

A significant number of the instructors stated that the programs duration is insufficient in its current form and that the program hours should be increased to fully achieve the learning outcomes. This view coincides with the literature that the intensive but short duration of the courses, especially at A1 and A2 levels, does not allow for the reinforcement of the knowledge learned (İnal, 2018). For example, Instructor 4's suggestion for a longer structure of 180-200 hours between A1 and A2 stems from a need to reduce the fragility in the

transition between levels.

Moreover, several instructors highlighted the need for program flexibility, given that immigrant adults frequently encounter difficulties in consistently engaging in the learning process due to critical obligations (e.g. work, childcare, official procedures). Therefore, these temporally and spatially flexible programs will increase participation and make learning accessible (Boeren & Holford, 2016). They further emphasized the development of the programs should adhere to the andragogy principles, highlighting that adult learners should be treated as autonomous leaners capable of integrating their experiences to the learning process, directing their learning via meaningful content. MoNE programs (2017a, 2017b, 2017c) suggest the programs may be ineffective if pedagogical approaches are not designed in accordance with the cognitive needs of adult learners. Therefore, instructor suggestions highlight the need for a rethinking of the pedagogical basis of the programs.

Many instructors draw attention to the lack of equipment in the centers where the courses are held and emphasize the need to provide material support to the institutions. In this context, Instructor 10's experience of teaching in a women's shelter provides a striking example of the spatial and technological disadvantages faced by immigrant women. The absence of digital aids such as computers and projectors in the teaching environment leads to the inability to utilize the advantages of multimedia tools in language teaching (Bartram, 2006). It is possible to eliminate such inequalities by standardizing learning environments.

Another important suggestion is to increase the practical trainings. Instructors state that theoretical knowledge remains limited and that their students are unable to use this knowledge in daily life. This view supports the understanding of functional language teaching based on the principle that language is "acquired through use". Duman (2013) and Çelik (2019) draw attention to the necessity of continuous practice for the development of speaking skills. Therefore, encouraging out-of-class, life-integrated practices besides in-class activities will increase the effectiveness of the program in line with the suggestions of the instructors.

Moreover, some instructors stated that a course book aligned with the program should be created. This suggestion highlights issues like the existing resources being fully incompatible with the course program, content sequencing or achievements. Holistic materials addressing instructor and learner needs, structured level by level, and covering multiple skills will increase program effectiveness.

The instructors stated that the trainees' demographic characteristics should be taken into account in program development process. Such variables as age, gender, education level, and previous language experience can affect the learning speed, needs, and expectations of individuals (Güneş & Deveci, 2021). The programs recommended to take these differences into account in some practices such as method selection. However, the instructors emphasize that this demographic diversity should be taken into consideration in all parts namely methodology, materials, content, and implementation. In order for adults to participate effectively in learning processes, a personalized and diversity-sensitive learning environment should be created (Merriam & Bierema, 2014). In this context, the instructors suggest that all dimensions of the curriculum should be revised as learner-centerd.

Conclusion, discussion and recommendations

The study examining the instructors' and trainees' opinions has drawn important conclusions. In terms of *the aims of the Programs,* they have common ideas and the trainees

generally attribute their motivation to learn Turkish to needs such as sustaining their daily lives, communicating and carrying out official procedures. Expectations for writing and speaking skills stand out in this context. In particular, the fact that expectations for writing skills are higher than those for speaking skills reflects trainees' needs in areas such as receiving education in Türkiye, filling out official documents and conducting transactions in government offices. This also indicates adult learners perceive Turkish as a functional tool for accessing education and public services. Although various studies in the literature (Balcıkanlı, 2010; Karababa & Karagül, 2013; Yıldız, 2015; Yılmaz, 2014) reveal that speaking skill is generally seen as the most prioritized need in foreign language learning, the prominence of writing skill in this study may be associated with the demographic and socio-cultural profiles of the trainees.

Moreover, the instructors stated that the programs' aims are generally sufficient for the trainees to use Turkish in daily life. However, some instructors stated that the programs could not address all trainee profiles and that more flexible and special purpose programs should be developed for different needs. The suggestion of "separate programs for children and for workers", which is one of the instructors' opinions, evokes structures similar to the differentiated language programs successfully implemented in immigration-receiving countries such as Germany, Sweden and Canada. This suggests that existing programs should be made more modular and target group-specific.

Moreover, the linguistic skills needed by trainees are directly related to the social, economic and cultural contexts in which they live. In this context, analyzing trainees' needs correctly and shaping program aims in line with these needs will increase their effectiveness. Within the framework of andragogic approaches, it should be taken into account that adults tend to learn the information they need most in their learning processes and that they can transfer it to daily life (Knowles, 1980).

Another important conclusion is that instructors and trainees disagree on *content of the Programs*. The instructors mostly criticised the content, but the trainees generally expressed satisfaction. The instructors expressed the content was superficial, grammar was overemphasised, and vocabulary improvement was insufficient. These findings suggest that the programs place excessive weight on form rather than meaning, limiting learners' opportunities to develop functional and interactional competence. In particular, the fact that the B1 level is "heavy and grammar-oriented" shows that it does not coincide with the communication-based approach stated in the program itself (MoNE, 2017). However, grammar should be structured as a tool to support the four basic skills and should not be turned into an end in itself (Bölükbaş Kaya, 2023). In this context, the program needs to be revised both structurally and pedagogically. Moreover, as the instructors stated that the program is insufficient in terms of "reflecting Turkish culture", foreign language teaching should not be limited to technical knowledge.

Trainees highlighted positive aspects of the program such as its comprehensibility in terms of content, its relevance to daily life and its richness of vocabulary. However, the fact that some trainees "did not understand" the topics suggests that the content may not match their language level or presentation style. Trainers said this supports the need for more illustration and explanation in topic coverage. Program content should be relevant to daily life. Interestingly, none of the instructors addressed this issue. Adult learners' motivation to learn is driven by daily life tasks (Doğanay & Sarı, 2008). To benefit trainees in practical areas like communication, shopping, transportation, etc., content must be directly related to daily life.

The findings regarding *the educational status of the Programs* show that the opinions of both instructors and trainees overlap in various aspects and that there is a need for improvement in some areas. One of the most striking findings is the widespread view that the duration of the program is insufficient to meet the learning outcomes. Both instructors and trainees stated that the available hours are not enough to use the language functionally, especially at A1 level. This indicates despite the principle of "flexibility" stated in MoNE (2017), it has not been effectively implemented in practice. Similarly, Yazar and Lala (2018) drew attention to the problem of insufficient time in the course modules implemented in public education centers.

The instructors predominantly prefer ready-made textbooks and they limitedly produce them, which suggest that textbooks provide structure and consistency but limit their flexibility to adapt lessons to learners' diverse needs and the principles. This is in line with the findings of Sülükçü (2011) who emphasized the need for diverse and adaptable materials for effective teaching in heterogeneous groups. In current practices, although the use of additional resources by instructors on their individual initiatives improves the process to some extent, the lack of a standardized course material weakens the unity in content (Erdoğan & Kana, 2019)

The instructors mostly preferred traditional methods such as question-answer and lecture; however, the communicative method, the basic philosophy of the program, was not sufficiently adopted. However, MoNE (2017a) recommends putting communicativeness and functionality at the center of language teaching. Göçen (2020) and Memiş and Erden (2013) emphasize that adhering to a single method can limit learning and that a variety of methods is essential to different student profiles and content structures. It is a positive attitude for instructors to determine the method to the content and trainee profile (Sözer, 1998), but this situation should be supported consciously and systematically. In particular, the limited use of activities such as role-playing, drama and group work was attributed to trainees' cultural shyness. This suggests that teaching methods should be considered not only in a pedagogical but also in a sociocultural context (Knowles, 1980).

When *the measurement and evaluation processes applied in the Programs* are examined, it is seen that the instructors mostly use traditional and paper-pencil based tools, and in parallel to this, the trainees mostly face written exams. Although the opinions of instructors and trainees overlap in this sense, it is a noteworthy finding that speaking and listening skills are rarely evaluated in practice, which reflects failure to capture trainees' needs and inconsistency with the structure of the examined program.

The criticisms expressed by the trainees, especially about the lack of a speaking exam, reflect the direct relationship of this skill with real life and the need for the communicative approach of the program. This expectation is in line with the findings of İnal (2018) and Kırkkılıç and Yirgin (2018) who emphasize the relationship of productive language skills with life. Therefore, there is a need for exam designs based on skill-based and functional assessment, not only on knowledge measurement. Also, it is concluded that there is a gap between practice and assessment and evaluation principles of the programs, which is a general problem in the related area (Erdoğan & Kana, 2019).

When the measurement tools used were examined, it was found that the instructors preferred multiple-choice and open-ended questions the most, while the trainees experienced both more comfortable and more meaningful learning with open-ended questions. This finding coincides with the studies of Özçelik (2011) and Parmaksız and Yanpar (2006). While open-ended

questions allow students to reveal their productions and identify misconceptions (Başol, 2019), multiple-choice tests have the risk of measuring superficial knowledge and are insufficient to distinguish false learning (Demirbilek, 2015).

Finally, the study concluded that instructors' opinions indicate that comprehensive adjustments are needed in terms of content, structure, pedagogical basis, and equipment in order for language teaching programs to become more effective. Their opinions suggest the examined programs do not fully accommodate the needs of adult learners, especially ones living under challenging socio-economic conditions. Moreover, in line with the principles of adult education outlined by Knowles (1984) and Brookfield (2001), it is necessary to create needs-based, flexible, and individualized learning environments. Furthermore, as emphasized by İnal (2018), the inadequacy of current program durations hinders the sustainability of learning outcomes. As Boeren and Holford (2016) also point out, instructors state that flexible structures are needed in terms of time and space due to the living conditions of immigrant adults. Addressing hardware deficiencies (Bartram, 2006), increasing application-based activities (Çelik, 2019; Duman, 2013), and considering the demographic diversity of participants in all program dimensions (Güneş & Deveci, 2021) are other important elements that will enhance the functionality of the learning process. All these findings indicate that programs need to be restructured with an individual-centerd and multi-layered approach (Merriam & Bierema, 2014).

All in all, future research can address two key areas. *For curriculum development*, studies on program evaluation, needs analysis, monitoring trainee motivation and long-term learning outcomes, and program alignment with andragogy principles could be conducted. *For instructor training*, issues such as the effectiveness of feedback types, technology-supported assessment and evaluation practices, material-curriculum compatibility, instructor competencies and the role of out-of-class learning environments should be investigated in depth. Lastly, *future research* on these aspects into account and be designed as qualitative, quantitative and mixed-method research in this direction will make valuable contributions to both institutional practices and academic literature.

Declarations

References

Aydın, E., & Tunagür, M. (2021). Examination of the Curriculum of Turkish as a Foreign Language in terms of 21st century skills. *Journal of Bayburt Education Faculty (BAYEF), 16*(32), 349-374. https://doi.org/10.35675/befdergi.853046

Aydoğmuş, A. (2012). *The situation of social studies teachers' using of process-oriented assessment and evaluation instruments: A sample of İstanbul* [Masters' Thesis]. Sakarya University.

Aytan, T., Uzun, O., & Günaydın, Y. (2020). Evaluation of Turkish language teaching for foreigners course programs of general directorate of lifelong learning in terms of various variables. *RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies,* (21), 70-99.https://doi.org/10.29000/rumelide.835499

Balcı, M., & Melanlıoğlu, D. (2020). On the "Curriculum of Teaching Turkish as a Foreign Language". *Kırıkkale University Journal of Social Sciences (KUJSS)*, *10* (2), 173-198.

Balcıkanlı, C. (2010). A study on needs analysis of learners of Turkish language. *Sino US English Teaching, 7*(1), 24-28.

Bartram, D. (2006). Testing on the internet: Issues, challenges and opportunities in the field of occupational assessment. In D. Bartram, & R. Hambleton (Ed.), *Computer-based testing and the internet: Issues and advances* (pp. 13-37). Educational testing service.

Başol, G. (2019). *Measurement and evaluation in education* (6th ed.). PegemA.

Birgin, O., & Baki, A. (2012). An investigation of the purposes of the measurement and assessment practice of primary school teachers within the context of the new mathematics curriculum. *Education and Science*, *37*(165), 152-167.

Boeren, E., & Holford, J. (2016). Vocationalism varies (a lot): A 12-country multivariate analysis of participation in formal adult learning. *Adult Education Quarterly, 66*(2), 120-142.https://doi.org/10.1177/0741713615624207

Bölükbaşı Kaya, F. (2023). Grammar in teaching Turkish as a foreign language. In N. Akkaya (Ed.), *Teaching Turkish as a foreign language in 100 questions* (pp. 93-105). Akademisyen Kitabevi. https://doi.org/10.37609/akya.2610

Brookfield, S. (2001). Repositioning ideology critique in a critical theory of adult learning. *Adult Education Quarterly, 52*(1), 7-22. https://doi.org/10.1177/07417130122087368

Chao, X. (2020). Language and identity: An inquiry of church-based U.S. citizenship education for refugee background Bhutanese adults. *Language and Education, 34*(4), 311-327.http://doi.org/10.1080/09500782. 2020.1739066

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage.

Çekici, Y. E. (2022). Investigation of the acquisitions in the curriculum of teaching Turkish as a foreign language in the context of sociolinguistic competence. *Çukurova University Journal of Turkology Research (ÇÜTAD), 7*(2), 1164-1186. https://doi.org/10.32321/cutad.1136322

Çelik, F. (2019). Speaking skills in teaching Turkish to foreigners. *International Journal of Social Sciences Academic Research*, *3*(3), 32-41.

Demirbilek, S. (2015). *Examination of pre-service teachers' misconceptions in measurement and evaluation concepts* [Masters' Thesis]. Hacettepe University.

Doğanay, A., & Sarı, M. (2008). The new social studies curriculum from the teachers' point of view: a study in the Adana province of Turkey. *Elementary Education Online*, 7(2), 468-484.

Duman, G. B. (2013). Material development and effective use of materials in teaching Turkish as a foreign language. *Journal of Mother Tongue Education*, *1*(2), 1-8. https://doi.org/10.16916/aded.16003

Durmuşçelebi, M. (2015). Effectiveness of a Turkish as a Foreign Language Teaching Program. *Journal of Teacher Education and Educators*, *4* (2), 247-273.

Dündar, S. A., & Polat, A. (2021). Examining the Curriculum of Teaching Turkish as a Foreign Language in the scope of 21st century skills. *International Journal of Karamanoglu Mehmetbey Educational Research*, (1), 66-77. https://doi.org/10.47770/ukmead.995111

Erdoğan, D. (2019). *The application process of the "Foreign Language Turkish A1 Level Course Program" of the teachers who teach Turkish to foreigners in non-formal education institutions* [Masters' Thesis]. Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University.

Erdoğan, D., & Kana, F. (2019). The application process of the Foreign Language Turkish A1 Level Course Program of the teachers who teach Turkish to foreigners in non-formal education institutions. *International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching*, *7*(4), 49-74. https://doi.org/10.29228/ijlet.39601

Garip, S. (2023). Comparative analysis of public education center courses in the scope of teaching Turkish as a second language. *MAUN Journal of Education, 3*(2), 121-136.https://doi.org/10.60107/maunef.1287282

Government of Canada (2017). *Language classes funded by the Government of* Canada.https://www.canada.ca/en/immigration-refugeescitizenship/services/newimmigrants/new-life-canada/improve-englishfrench/classes.html [Retrieved on 31.01.2025]

Göçen, G. (2020). Methodology in teaching Turkish as a foreign language. *RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, (18), 23-48. https://doi.org/10.29000/rumelide.705499

Göçer, A. (2019). Use of feedback an important application technique that contributes to the functionality of measurement and evaluation in Turkish Education. *Kırıkkale University Journal of Social Science (KUJSS), 9*(1), 111-126.

Güneş, F., & Deveci, T. (2021). *Adult education and lifelong learning* (5th ed.). PegemA.

İnal, S. (2018). Teaching writing in Turkish as a foreign language: The importance of writing and writing activities in teaching Turkish as a foreign language. In A. Şahin (Ed.), *Teaching Turkish as a foreign language: Theories, approaches, activities* (2nd ed., pp. 526–534). Pegem Akademi.

İşigüzel, B., & Baldık, Y. (2019). Investigation of education and language policies for immigration communities in educational systems. *Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University Journal of Institute of Social Sciences*, *9*(2), 487-503.

Kamisli, M. U. (2022). Language and culture learning needs of adult refugees. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, *2022*(175-176), 85-93.https://doi.org/10.1002/ace.20470

Kaplan, K. (2023). Comparative analysis of Turkish as a foreign language teaching programs prepared by Maarif Foundation and Ankara University TÖMER. *Iğdır University Journal of Social Sciences*, (33), 66-84. https://doi.org/10.54600/igdirsosbilder.1190233

Kara, M., & Topbulut, S. D. (2022). An investigation of reading and writing achievements in the Turkish Maarif Foundation program to progressiveness and reciprocity. *International Journal of Turcology Studies and Reviews*, *7*(1), 1-21. https://dx.doi.org/10.29228/uluturkad.63431

Karababa, C., & Karagül, S. (2013). A needs analysis for learners of Turkish as a foreign language. *Education and Science*, (38), 361-371.

Karabulut, A. (2021). Analysis of the outcomes of Turkish Teaching Curriculum as a Foreign Language to Webb's depth of knowledge levels. *Journal of History School*, *55*, 4577-4602. https://doi.org/10.29228/joh.52304

Karatay, H. (2007). Teaching vocabulary. *Gazi University Gazi Faculty of Education Journal* (GUJGEF), *27*(1), 141-153.

Kaya, M., & Kardaş, M. N. (2020). A study on Turkish Curriculum as a Foreign Language. *Social Sciences: Theory & Practice, 4*(1), 1-20.

Kırkkılıç, H. A., & Yirgin, Y. (2018). Basic principles and concepts in teaching Turkish as a foreign language. In A. Şahin. (Ed.) *Teaching Turkish as a foreign language: theories, approaches, activities* (2. Ed., pp. 93-107). Pegem Akademi.

Knowles, M. S. (1980). *The modern practice of adult education: from pedagogy to andragogy.* Cambridge.

Knowles, M. S. (1984). *Andragogy in action. Applying modern principles of adult education*. Jossey Bass.

Kozar, O., & Yates, L. (2019). Factors in language learning after 40: insights from a longitudinal study. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 57*(2), 181- 204.

Köse, D., & Özsoy, E. (2019). Teaching foreign languages to immigrants Germany and Turkey example. *International Journal of Teaching Turkish as a Foreign Language*, *2*(1), 112-125.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition.* Pergamon Press.

Küzeci, D. (2007). Acquisitjon of general skills in foreign language teaching. *Selçuk University Journal of Faculty of Letters*, (18)13-27.

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2013). *How languages are learned*. Oxford University Press.

Maden, A. (2020). Enriching of the vocabulary in Turkish teaching programs as a foreign language. *Journal of History School*, (XLVI), 1822-1857. https://doi.org/10.29228/Joh.42788

Marsh, C. J. (2004). *Key concepts for understanding curriculum (3rd Ed.)*. Routledge Falmer.

Ministry of Interior, Presidency of Migration Management (2025). *Statistics.* https://www.goc.gov.tr/ikamet-izinleri [Retrieved on 01.05.2025].

MoNE Directorate General for Lifelong Training (2017a). *Foreign languages Turkish A1 level course program.* https://ookgm.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2021_01/05115713_YabancY_iller_YabancYDiller_Turkce__A1_Seviyesi.pdf [Retrieved on 27.02.2025].

MoNE Directorate General for Lifelong Training (2017b). *Foreign languages Turkish A2 level course program.* https://ookgm.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2021_01/05121541_YabancY_iller_YabancY_Diller_Turkce_A2_Seviyesi.pdf [Retrieved on 27.02.2025].

MoNE Directorate General for Lifelong Training (2017c). *Foreign languages Turkish B1 level course program.* https://ookgm.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2021_01/05121818_Yabanc Y_iller_Yaban cY_Diller_Turkce_B1_Seviyesi.pdf [Retrieved on 27.02.2025].

Memiş, M. R., & Erdem, M. D. (2013). Methods/usage features that are used in foreign language teaching and critics. *Turkish Studies*, *8*(9), 297-318. http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.5089.

Merriam, S. B., & Bierema, L. L. (2014). *Adult learning: linking theory and practice*. Jossey Bass.

Ministry of National Education, General Directorate of Teacher Training and Development. (2020). *Handbook for teachers: feedback*. https://sehitfatihkostikio.meb.k12.tr/ [Retrieved on 08.10.2024]

Nimer, M. & Oruç, T. (2019). Sustainable approaches to language education for adult refugees in Türkiye. *IPM-MERCATOR policy brief.*

https://ipc.sabanciuniv.edu/Content/Images/Document/turkiyedeki-yetiskin-multecilere-dilegitimi-konusunda-surdurulebilir-yaklasimlar-626194/turkiyedeki-yetiskin-mültecilere dil-egitimi-konusunda-surdurulebilir-yaklasimlar-626194.pdf

Nurlu, M., Konyar, M. Tuna L., & Görgüç, Ç. (2021). A critique on the Curriculum of Ministry of National Education Teaching Turkish as a Foreign Language. *Education and Society in the 21ˢᵗ Century the Journal of Education Science and Social Research, 10*(29), 485-521.

OECD. (2021). *Language training for adult migrants, making integration work*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/02199d7f-en.

Özçelik A. (2011). *The frequency of use of assessment and evaluation techniques by science and technology teachers and the problems they face* [Masters' Thesis]. Dicle University.

Parmaksız, R. Ş., & Yanpar, T. (2006). The usableness of alternative assessment approaches in social studies. *Fırat University Journal of Social Science, 16*(2), 159-172.

Simpson, J., & Hunter, A. M. (2023). Policy formation for adult migrant language education in England: national neglect and its implications. *Language Policy, 22*, 155-178.https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-023-09655-6

Skolverket (2022). *Swedish education and training plan for immigrants in municipal adult education.*https://www.skolverket.se/undervisning/vuxenutbildningen/komvux-Svenska forinvandrare-sfi [Retrieved on 30.01.2025]

Sözer, E. (1998). Principles, strategies, methods and techniques in teaching social studies. In G. Can (Ed.), *Teaching social studies* (pp.73-88). Anadolu University Open Education Publications.

Sülükçü, Y. (2011). *Developing computer assisted materials in teaching Turkish to foreigners (Basic User A1) and its effects on students' success* [Doctorate Thesis]. Selçuk University.

Şafak-Ayvazoğlu, A., Kunuroğlu, F., & Yağmur, K. (2020). Psychological and socio-cultural daptation of Syrian refugees in Türkiye. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 80, 99-111. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2020.11.003

TurkStat. (2025, 24 June). *International migration statistics*, 2024. https://data.tuik.gov.tr/Bulten/Index?p=Uluslararasi-Goc-Istatistikleri-20254083&dil=1

Ulusoy, F. (2022). *Examining the Language Program for Teaching Turkish as a Foreign Language prepared by Turkish Maarif Foundation in the context of new literacy* [Masters' Thesis]. Akdeniz University.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: the development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Yalçın, E. (2002). *Evaluation of the communication between facilitator and adult learners through adult education process (Model of Çankaya Adult Education center and Directorate of 7ᵗʰ Evening School)* [Masters' Thesis]. Ankara University.

Yazar, T., & Lala, Ö. (2018). Evaluation of the problems encountered in public education centers. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 18*(76), 125-146.

Yekhlef, H. (2015). Contemporary methods in foreign language teaching. *Harvard Journal of Fundamental and Applied Studies*, *8*(7), 428-441.

Yıldız, U. (2015). An investigation into European learners' needs with regards to Turkish as a foreign language. *Anthropologist*, *19*(3), 585-596. https://doi.org/10.1080/09720073.2015.11891693

Yılmaz, F. (2014). An investigation into students' Turkish language needs at Jagiellonian University in Poland. *Educational Research and Reviews*, *9*(16), 555-561. http://dx.doi.org/10.5897/err2013.1701