

# Assay of the Factors Affecting Student's Success in Teaching

<sup>1</sup>Dr. Timucin Ozkan, <sup>2</sup>Dr. Aytac Tokel, <sup>3</sup>Tugrul Gunay

## **Abstract**

*The aim of this study is to reveal the factors that affect the success of students in teaching. Questionnaire prepared for the purpose was practiced a total of 317 students who were selected from the 6th, 7th and 8th grade students, including 167 male and 150 female students, were educated in Cumhuriyet, Lefkoşa Turk and Namık Kemal high schools in TRNC in 2017-2018 academic year. Used data collection tool is, the questionnaire titled "Assay of the Factors Affecting Students' Success in Teaching" which is taken from a doctoral thesis entitled "Factors Affecting Student Achievement in Primary School Religious Culture and Moral Education Course." In the study, 31 item Likert and teacher attitudes scale was used. The method of this study is conducted in a relational screening model to examine the change of quantitative research method. As a conclusion, there were no significant differences in the demographic characteristics except Mann-Whitney U test outputs of the Turkish lesson attitudes according to the male-female situation and the total lesson attitudes of the students compared to the total teacher attitudes according to the non-parametric correlations test.*

**Keywords:** School climate, Family behavior, Teaching, Culture.

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

Mankind has to find out the information that is needed to get rid of the needs that are not presented in a golden tray after birth. This is how the human adventure of learning begins (Wilson, 1996), to develop as a society; Rational thinking, curious, interrogating, investigating, the foundation of the birth of individuals is taken first in the family. Then the institution called the school develops these features.

It is a fact that the family has a great role in school success as much as it is in the development of social harmony and personality of the child. The educational environment created by the family can reinforce or blind the learners' learning at school (Şimşek, 2003; Başaran, 1996). Therefore, it is of utmost importance to meet the needs of personal, social and professional development as much as primary education to higher education, to help them to personal development and adaptation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Educational Sciences Institute, Faculty of Education, Cyprus West University, Famagusta

<sup>2</sup> Educational Sciences Institute, Faculty of Education, Cyprus West University, Famagusta

<sup>3</sup> [Faculty of Economics, Administrative and Social Sciences](#), Tourism and Hotel Management Cyprus West University, Famagusta

Education is compulsory up to a certain level in most countries today and covers a large part of the individual's life (Deniz, 2002, Deniz,2007, Deniz, 2010). Today, the educated human population is regarded as a measure of the level of development of nations. In this respect, all countries are making regular arrangements for a more effective education and training process by constantly monitoring their education processes.

The most emphasized issue in education and training activities is student achievement, the product of education. Differences in academic achievement at the end of the semester or at the end of the year are among the topics investigated by the educators of students who take the same courses in similar ways in the same educational institution (Nikolaevna, Buslovskaya, Kovtunenکو, Klimova & Ryzhkova, 2019).

Education and training activities; It is a very complicated process involving many variables. For this reason, it is not possible to reduce the student's success or failure to a few simple reasons (Ergün & others., 2004). Students are interested in the topic and are satisfied with the work they are doing, increasing their success in the tests and examinations. Attitude plays a very important role in the variables affecting student achievement at every level of education (Shams, 2019).

At the conceptual level of attitude, Alport comes first among those who handle and define it. According to Alport, who tends to look at the subject from a psychological point of view, his position is "to be prepared to take a rational and nervous behavior, which is organizing the attitudes and attitudes that constitute a guiding or effective force on the reactions and situations that the individual has against all objects"

Here, the attitude determines its behavior as an element to guide the individual's reaction. On the other hand, in this definition, the emphasis on being organized by experiences with attitudes suggests the tendency to establish a link between the process of attitude formation and the learning process.

Attitude is the pre-tendency of a mental, emotional, and behavioral response that an individual organizes based on experience, knowledge, emotion, and motivation of any object, social subject, or event in or about himself or herself. The social subject referred to here can be an individual, a product, or anything created by an individual (Savas & Celik Kayapinar, 2019).

What is important here is how the individual has associated experiences, knowledge, emotions and instincts in an organization. That is, the organization structure at the individual level is important. In sum, the level and form of organization of emotional, cognitive, behavioral, and experiential items that constitute the personality structure of the individual is a point that should never be overlooked in the conduct of attitude and opinion orientation (Sayad Ghobadi, 2018). Among the elements that make up the attitude; There are many factors such as age, home and school environment, teacher's personality and teaching technique, parents' attitudes and behaviors. (Oskay, Erdem and Yılmaz, 2009).

Establishing an effective and positive learning environment is possible through the co-operation and coordination of many teaching elements. The desired result of a learning depends on; The mental structure of the child, the physical condition of the classroom, the effective use of time, the classroom atmosphere, the methods and techniques used by the teacher, the establishment of learning centers, (Güleç and Alkış, 2003). The student's success is described as "progress" in which the student has shown achievement according to the school,

class and course in which the student is located, and failure as “the difference between the actual ability of the student and the success in the school”.(Ari, 2007).

There are many variables that affect the course success of the learners. These variables, also called “learning change”, are all related to physiological, psychological and social conditions and conditions. Learning variables influence the student’s “learning situation” and therefore the level of success positively or negatively. School success is also significantly influenced by many “intellectual” factors. These include the nature of the teaching service, the nature of the teacher, class or school conditions, the affective characteristics of the student, mental capacity, socioeconomic status. (Bloom,1979, Jersild, 1983).

These factors can be grouped as environmental, individual and organizational by a general classification (Memduhoğlu and Tanhan, 2009). In addition to these, success motivation, anxiety, family qualities, general environmental characteristics, nutrition and health conditions, and the like are included (Güleç and Alkış, 2003). Also, school failure may be caused by the individual, as well as by different factors such as a teacher with a traditional understanding, parents’ unconscious attitudes, classroom and school environment. Besides, the wrong learning programs and systems applied impair the individual’s academic self-esteem, self-confidence and sense of achievement (Tasar, 2019).

An effective school is the school that adopts the principle of realizing the educational needs of the individual and society at the highest level. Nowadays, teacher-centered and memorized education, which is a traditional education concept, cannot respond to the needs of the individual and society. Instead, educational programs based on research and project production have gained importance, focusing on individual (student) oriented, practical, individualized and competent, responding to their needs, considering all the developmental features of the individual.

Otherwise, many secondary school students are failing as a victim of misguided educational policies and are leaving their education at bay. This has many negative consequences, such as suicide at an early age. School Guidance services have undoubtedly a great function in eliminating or reducing school failure. With the effective guidance services implemented, these problems will be resolved to a large extent. The first and most important function of guidance services is to help individuals to acquire experiences that will help them to assess their potentials correctly and to think about the meaning of these experiences; And the second function is to inform individuals of options (Hamarta, 2010).

The guidance services provided at the school are a whole and complement each other. The ultimate purpose is “the individual realizes himself” (Yeşilyaprak, 2003). The educational organization is to train students according to the purpose of existence and one-sided education.

The education of the students is based on the education program of the school. So, managing the school means actually managing the education program and teaching (Başaran, 1993). The concept of success is defined as a progress in reaching a desired outcome (Memduhoglu and Tanhan, 2009) or the attainment of a specified goal. When success is referred to success in education, success is often referred to as ‘ Academic Achievement ‘, which is often expressed in skills and attitudes that are developed by teachers in the school, graded by teachers’ grades, test scores, or both. (Memduhoğlu and Tanhan, 2009).

Academic success is described as an important concept that affects the whole life of the individual. Individuals develop happiness, trust and personal fulfillment in the face of success; And in the face of failure develop emotional reactions such as sadness, frustration and depression. Besides, individuals with high academic achievement have shown less anti-social behavior than those with low academic achievement (Donald, 1986, Guzel and Oral, 2011). It has been stated that successful individuals and those who catch themselves are more motivated to work and concentrate, and lose confidence in success, even if they have the ability to do so (Bandura, 1982).

In many researches on the subject, it is stated that those who have failed in the learning-teaching process with similar input behaviors, academic self-designs are negated and the individual learning levels are lower and the academic self- designs and learning levels of successful students are higher (Bloom, 1979; Lau and Chan, 2001; Marsh et al., 2005). It was also found that the level of achievement was higher for students with higher academic self-designs and higher for students with higher academic self-esteem, the effect of academic self-efficacy on achievement, (Marsh et al.,2005; Karasakaloglu and Saracaloglu, 2009).

### **Purpose of the Study**

The main purpose of this research is to analyze and determine the factors that affect the success of the students in secondary education at Turkish lesson. Because Turkish courses, (understanding, listening, reading, writing etc.) which constitute the basis of all lessons. It is a compulsory and important document which contains the elements. The success of these students will indirectly affect their success in other courses.

### **Problem Sentence**

Within the framework of these general objectives, the problem of this research “ What are the factors that influence student achievement in Turkish language teaching in secondary education? In addition, the following sub-problems have been searched.

### **Sub Problems**

- Do the attitudes of the students towards the Turkish lesson and the Turkish teacher differ significantly according to their gender?
- Does the attitude of the students towards the Turkish lesson and the Turkish teacher differ significantly according to the situation of taking Turkish education outside the school?
- Is there a relationship between the attitudes of the students towards the Turkish course and their attitudes towards the Turkish teacher?
- Is there a relation between the achievement levels of the students and their attitudes towards Turkish language teaching and Turkish teaching?

## **II. METHOD**

### **Research Model**

This research was conducted in a relational screening model to examine the change of quantitative research method according to the attitudes of the students to the lesson and the teacher and the demographic characteristics. Scan pattern, is a research approach that aims to describe the past or present as it exists. It is tried to be defined as an event, an individual or an object that is subject to research, as if it is within its own conditions. Any attempt to change or influence them cannot be shown. There is something to know and there. The important thing is to be able to “watch” and identify it appropriately (Karasar, 2002).

### **Universe and Sample**

The sample consisted of 317 students who were educated in Cumhuriyet highschool, Lefkoşa Turk HighSchool and Namık Kemal High School while the universe of the research was formed by affiliated to the Ministry of National Education in TRNC.

### **Data collection Tool**

Survey technique was used as data collection method in the survey. In the use of the questionnaire titled “Statistical Analysis of Factors Affecting Student Achievement in Secondary Education Institutions of Secondary School Institutes of Science”, taken from a doctoral thesis entitled “Factors Affecting Student Achievement in Primary School Religious Culture and Moral Education Course” by Arı (2007) and by Karaarslan, the master’s thesis prepared.

The questionnaire contains 11 questions about the demographic characteristics of the students and a total of 31 question- and-answer “attitudes towards teaching and teaching”. The reliability of the scale was tested using the Alpha Coefficient (Cronbach’s Alfa). Factor analysis was applied to the scale to reveal construct validity and Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient was calculated for general reliability. The results were assessed at 95% confidence interval and significance at  $p < 0.05$ .

### **Data Collection and Analysis**

SPSS-23 (Statistical Package for Social Sciences for Windows) program was used for the results and statistical interpretations. Independent samples were used for comparison of descriptive statistical methods (Frequency, Percentage, Mean, Standard deviation) as well as quantitative data in the case of two groups. One-way ANOVA test and Turnkey test were used in the comparison of quantitative data in the case of more than two groups in the comparison of quantitative data.

Pearson non-parametric Correlation Analysis was used for the comparison of two quantitative data in cases with no normal distribution. Questions to be asked to students participating in the survey, 5 (Absolutely Participate), 4 (Participate), 3 (Undecided), 2 (I do not participate), 1 (I definitely do not Participate). Using the quintet likert scale. The weight of the option and the limits were found as follows.

Options	Option weight	Limits
Absolutely	5	4.21 – 5.00
Agree	4	3.41 – 4.20
Undecided	3	2.61 – 3.40
Do not agree	2	1.81 – 2.60
Strongly	1	1.00 – 1.80

### III. RESULTS

According to the sex of the participating students, 167 (52.7%) were male and 150 (47.3%) were female. Accordingly, it is seen that about half of the participants in the survey are female students and the other half are male students.

According to the classes of students participating in the research; The number of 6th grade students to 83 to 26%, the number of 7th grade students to 100 to 31.5%, the number of 8th grade students to 134 to 42.3%, and the number of students participating increased as the class grew.

According to the sister figures of the students who participated in the research; 1 sibling with 40 person 12.6%, with 2 siblings 168 persons 53.0 %, 3 siblings 79 persons 24.9%,4 siblings with 17 persons 5.4%, 5 siblings with 8 persons 2.5%, 6 siblings with 5 persons 1.6%, It is observed that the number of siblings, especially is intensifying at 2.

According to the educational status of the fathers of the students participating in the research; the number of illiterate 1 person 0.3%, the litarete with 8 persons 2.5%,The rate of primary school graduates 81 persons was 25.6%, the number of secondary school graduates 66 persons was 20.8%, the number of high school graduates

109 persons was 34.4%, the number of university graduates 52 persons was 16.4%. It can be seen that the level of father education has increased with 34% of the high school graduates with scattered.

According to the educational status of the mothers of the students participating in the research; 9 people who were illiterate, 2.8%,10 people who were literate 3.2%, 72 people who were primary school graduates 22.7%, 61 people who were middle school graduates 19.2%, high school graduates were 117 persons 36.9%, and 48 people who were university graduates 15.1%. It is seen that the mother education levels are very similar to the father education levels, and 36.9% of those who graduated from high school have come to the fore.

According to the numerical-verbal abilities of the students participating in the research; It is seen that those who have verbal division ability have 187 people and 59%, those with numerical division ability have 130 people and 41%.

According to the situation of getting Turkish course out of school participated in the research; The number of students who took Turkish course was 104 and 32.8%, the number of students who did not take courses was 213 and 67.2%. It is seen that the number of those who do not take Turkish lessons are more than twice the number of the subjects.

According to the existence of Turkish teachers in the families of the students who participated in the research; The number of those who were 32 to 10.1%, the number of non-members 285 to 89.9%.

Distribution of the students who participated in the research according to the grade of the course report in the first term; 6 people who get 3 with 1.9%, 20 people who get 4 with 6.3%, 36 people who get 5 with 11.4%, 73 people who get 6 with 23%, 75 people who get 7 with 23.7%, 64 people who get 8 with 20.2%, 28 people who get 9 with 8.8%, 14 people who get 10 with 4.4%, were found.

According to this result, it is seen that the grades taken in the Turkish lesson concentrate in the range of 7,6 and 8. It was also determined that the highest score was 7.

The mean values of the attitudes of the students who participated in the survey to the Turkish lesson and the teacher are like the following table.

M 22 “ I know my teacher’s name.” (= 4.67) The participation of 248 learners in the material is strictly at the level of I agree. M 15 “My teacher knows my name.” (= 4.56) participation of 233 learners in the material, I strongly agree. M 11 “ In lesson is easier to understand if given an example.” (= 4.54) The participation of 208 learners in the material is strictly at the level of I strongly agree. M 14, “My teacher is smile-faced.” (= 4.23) The participation of 182 learners in the matter is strictly at the level of I strongly agree. M 3 “should take care to take high marks in Turkish lessons.” (= 4.37) The participation of 182 learners in the matter is strictly at the level of I strongly agree. M 31 “My teacher gives me the grades in the exams are incomplete.” (= 1.72) The participation of 206 students in the matter is at the level of I totally disagree. M 30 says “When my teacher talks to lesson, I get rid of her.” (= 2.02) The participation of 166 learners in the matter is strictly disagree. M 28, “My teacher does not understand me.” (= 2.17) The participation of 145 learners in the material is strictly at the level I totally do not agree. M 29, “My teacher tells the lesson boring.” (=2.23) The participation of 140 learners in the material, I definitely do not agree. M 22 “ I know my teacher’s name.” (= 4.67) participation of 3 learners in the material, at the level of not participating. M 23, “I understand my teacher’s talking.” (= 4.25) participation of 3 learners in the item, at the level of not participating.

	F%		Mean deviation				SD
	Absolutel	Agree	Undecided	Don't	Strongly		
1-Turkish course book should be read	133 (42)	120 (37.9)	48 (15.1)	7 (2.2)	9 (2.8)	4.15	0.931
2- The subjects of the Turkish course should be dealt with.	127 (40.1)	145 (45.7)	32 (10.1)	8 (2.5)	5 (1.6)	4.20	0.840
3- Care should be taken to take high marks in	182 (57.4)	94 (29.7)	25 (7.9)	9 (2.8)	7 (2.2)	4.37	0.910
4- Learn more about Turkish than what is taught in	74 (23.3)	84 (26.5)	102 (32.2)	33 (10.4)	24 (7.6)	3.48	1.18
5- I try to answer the questions about Turkish lesson	140 (44.2)	135	37 (11.7)	4 (1.3)	1 (0.3)	4.28	0.756
6- Listening to the teacher's explanations about	125 (39.4)	150	31 (9.8)	8 (2.5)	3 (0.9)	4.21	0.805
7- The information I gained in Turkish lessons is	100 (31.5)	103	74 (23.3)	24 (7.6)	16 (5.0)	3.78	1.12
8- Turkish lessons are required.	136 (42.9)	111	47 (14.8)	11 (3.5)	12 (3.8)	4.09	1.03
9- I like studying Turkish and I willingly.	111 (35.0)	118	61 (19.2)	18 (5.7)	9 (2.8)	3.96	1.01
10- We take care to continue to Turkish lesson.	113 (35.6)	132	57 (18.0)	8 (2.5)	7 (2.2)	4.05	0.912
11- In lesson is easier to understand if given an	208 (65.6)	85 (26.8)	16 (5.0)	4 (1.3)	4 (1.3)	4.54	0.747
12-. My teacher listens to what I tell	152 (47.9)	110	32 (10.1)	13 (4.1)	10 (3.2)	4.20	1.00
13- My teacher will allow me to ask	179 (56.5)	93 (29.3)	28 (8.8)	6 (1.9)	11 (3.5)	4.33	0.970
14- My teacher is smily.	182 (57.4)	74 (23.3)	33 (10.4)	12 (3.8)	16 (5.0)	4.23	1.12
15- My teacher knows my name.	233 (73.5)	59 (18.6)	7 (2.2)	8 (2.5)	10 (3.2)	4.56	0.920
16- My teacher answers my questions clearly.	170 (53.6)	91 (28.7)	40 (12.6)	7 (2.2)	9 (2.8)	4.27	0.980
17- My teacher checks what I do.	114 (36.0)	116	52 (16.4)	17 (5.4)	18 (5.7)	3.93	1.10
18- I ask my teacher questions about the lesson	126 (39.7)	101	59 (18.6)	17 (5.4)	14 (4.4)	3.94	1.11
19- I can tell my teacher my thoughts freely.	82 (25.9)	101	82 (25.9)	29 (9.1)	23 (7.3)	3.60	1.17
20- I'm a smile face to my teacher.	171 (53.9)	93 (29.3)	34 (10.7)	12 (3.8)	7 (2.2)	4.28	0.970
21- I try to do what my teacher wants to do with the	164 (51.7)	117	26 (8.2)	5 (1.6)	5 (1.6)	4.34	0.840
22- I know my teacher's name.	248 (78.2)	53 (16.7)	6 (1.9)	3 (0.9)	7 (2.2)	4.67	0.788
23- I understand my teacher's talking.	164 (51.7)	106	31 (9.8)	3 (0.9)	13 (4.1)	4.25	1.00
24- Whenever I need to help ask for my teacher.	121 (38.2)	98 (30.9)	67 (21.1)	12 (3.8)	19 (6.0)	3.90	1.14
25- My teacher is like my friend	70 (22.1)	72 (22.7)	78 (24.6)	47 (14.8)	50 (15.8)	3.21	1.36
26- My teacher trusts me.	113 (35.6)	89 (28.1)	80 (25.2)	18 (5.7)	17 (5.4)	3.82	1.14
27- Trust my teacher.	170 (53.6)	83 (26.2)	37 (11.7)	13 (4.1)	14 (4.4)	4.20	1.09
28- My teacher does not understand me	27 (8.5)	29 (9.1)	59 (18.6)	57 (18.0)	145 (45.7)	2.17	1.33
29- My teacher tells the lesson boring	35 (11.0)	29 (9.1)	46 (14.5)	67 (21.1)	140 (44.2)	2.23	1.39
30- When my teacher talks to lesson I get rid of her	26 (8.2)	20 (6.3)	41 (12.9)	63 (19.9)	166 (52.4)	2.02	1.32
31- My teacher is missing grades on exams	15 (4.7)	20 (6.3)	29 (9.1)	47 (14.8)	206 (65)	1.72	1.16



M 5, "I try to answer questions about Turkish lesson in the best way." (= 4.28) participation of 4 learners in the item, at the level of not participating. M 21, "I try to do what my teacher wants to do with the lesson." (= 4.34) participation of 5 learners in the item, at the level of not participating. M 11, "In lesson is easier to understand if given an example." (= 4.54) participation of 4 learners in the material, at the level of not participating. M 5, "I try to answer questions about Turkish lesson in the best possible way." (= 4.28) participation of 1 student in the matter, I definitely do not agree. M 6, "I listen diligently to the teacher's explanations about Turkish lesson." (= 4.21) participation of 3 learners in the material, I definitely do not agree. M 21, "I try to do what my teacher wants to do with the lesson." (= 4.34) participation of 5 learners in the material, I definitely do not agree. M 4, "Learn more about Turkish than what is taught in class." (= 3.47) The participation of 102 learners in the matter, at the level of hesitation. M 19, "I will tell my teacher my thoughts freely." (= 3.59) participation of 82 students in the matter, at the level of hesitation. M 26, "My teacher trusts me." (= 3.82) participation of 80 students in the matter, at the level of hesitation. M 25, "My teacher is like my friend." (= 3.21) 78 students were found to be at the level of hesitation.

According to gender characteristics, the attitudes of the students against the Turkish lesson, Investigation

According to the Mann-Whitney U Test result made in Table 1; ( $U= 104,0, p< 0.05$ ) It can be said that attitude towards Turkish lesson is a meaningful difference in favor of male students.

Examination of the Attitudes of the Students Against Turkish Teachers According to Gender Characteristics:

According to Mann-Whitney U Test result made in Table 2; ( $U= 110,0, p< 0.05$ ) It can be said that there is no meaningful difference in the gender of the students who are against the Turkish teacher.

#### **Examination of the Attitudes of the Students Against the Turkish Language Classes**

Table 3, According to the test result; [ $\chi^2 (2) = 4,995 p<.05$ ] It can be said that there is not a significant difference between the attitudes of the students to the Turkish lesson according to the classes.

#### **Examination of Students' Attitudes Towards Turkish Teachers According to Their Classes:**

According to the result of the test, [ $\chi^2 (2) = 4,618 p<.05$ ] It can be said that there is no meaningful difference between the attitudes of the Turkish teachers to the classes of the students.

#### **Examination of Students' Attitudes Against Turkish lesson According to Verbal/Numerical Information:**

According to Mann-Whitney U Test result made in Table 5; ( $U= 109,0, p< 0.05$ ) It can be said that there is no meaningful difference on the verbal/numerical interest of the students in their attitude toward Turkish lesson.

#### **Examination of Students' Attitudes Towards Turkish Teacher Based on Verbal/Numerical abilities:**

According to Mann-Whitney U Test result made in Table 6; ( $U= 112,0$ ,  $p< 0.05$ ) It can be said that there is no meaningful difference on verbal/numerical interest in the attitudes of the students towards the Turkish teacher.

#### **Examination of Total lesson attitudes of students by total teacher attitudes:**

According to the result of the non-parametric correlations test made in Table 7; ( $P=.000$ ,  $p< 0.05$ ) It can be said that the total lecture attitudes of the students are significantly different according to the total teacher attitudes.

## **IV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

Students participating in the research; 167 (%52.7) boy, 150 (%47,3) girl. According to this, the two generations are very close to each other, number of 1-3 siblings 287 (%90.8), 30 (9.2%) in the number of 4 and up, especially the number of siblings is in the range of 1-3, According to the educational status of the parents of the students participating in the research; 1 non-literate person 0.3%, Literate 8 people 2.5%, 81 people who graduated from primary school were 25.6%, 66 people graduated from secondary school % 20.8, 109 high school graduates (34.4%), 52 of the university graduates were 16.4%, According to the educational status of their mothers, 9 were illiterate 2.8%, Literate 10 people 3.2%, 72 people who graduated from primary school were 22.7%, 61 people graduated from secondary school 19.2%, High school graduates 117 people% 36.9, The rate of university graduates 48 people are 15.1%, The mother education levels are almost equal to the father education levels, The course of the students who participated in the research are graded as follows; 6 people who get 3 %1.9, 20 people who get 4 %6.3, 36 people who get 5, %11.4, 73 people who get 6 %23, 75 people who get 7 %23.7, 64 people who get 8 %20.2, 28 people who get 9 8.8%, 14 people who

get 10 %4.4. A similar result was reached in the study (Ozer & Anil 2011).

Students who participated in the research can be considered as successful according to the grade average they have taken from the Turkish course, According to the numerical- verbal abilities of the students participating in the research; 187 people with verbal segregation ability had 59%, 130 people with numerical segmentation ability is 41%, According to which students have more talent in Turkish lessons compared to numerical lessons like mathematics, According to the fact that the students who participated in the research take Turkish education out of school; 104 students and 32.8% of the students taking Turkish lessons, While the number of untaken students are 213 and 67.2%. The number of students who are studying Turkish outside of school is high. It is considered that the reason for this may be the belief that the Turkish lesson education is not given enough to the students in schools. (Savas, Tas & Duru 2010) have reached similar findings in their research.

It was concluded that the students who participated in the research had a positive attitude towards Turkish lesson and Turkish teacher. This result; It is evaluated that the students may be related to the positive communication established by the Turkish teacher. According to their gender, there was a significant difference in favor of female students in attitude towards Turkish lesson, Attitudes of students towards Turkish teachers according to their sex, There is no significant difference, There is not a meaningful difference in the attitude towards the Turkish lesson according to the classes of the students.

There is no meaningful difference on the classes of the students who have attitude towards the Turkish teacher, In the attitude towards Turkish lesson, there is no meaningful difference on verbal/numerical, there is not a significant difference in verbal/numerical interest in the attitudes of the students towards the Turkish teacher Were obtained from the statistical results obtained.

Whereas, there was a significant difference between the total course attitudes of students and teacher attitudes. Statistical findings revealed; As the attitudes of the students towards the Turkish lesson increase, the attitudes towards the teacher also increase positively. In this context, the following suggestions can be presented; Measures should be taken for Turkish lessons from being liked and not to bored. School principals should lead this issue. Turkish teachers should create an environment where they can communicate more warmly with their students in the course and express their opinions without hesitation.

### **Limitations of the Research**

This research; Is limited to secondary school students who continue their education in the TRNC. In The 2015-2016 academic years are.

- is limited to 6th, 7th and 8th grade students.
- is limited with “Attitude Questionnaire” and “Personal Information Form”.
- Is limited to answers given to survey questions by the Students
- is limited to the sample group.
- is limited to third secondary schools.
- is limited to 167 male students and 150 female students.

### **REFERENCES**

1. Arı, İ.,2007. İlköğretim Din Kültürü ve Ahlak Bilgisi Dersinde Öğrenci Başarısını Etkileyen Faktörler (Ankara Örneği. Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Felsefe Ve Din Bilimleri (Din Eğitimi) Anabilim Dalı, Doktora Tezi, Ankara.
2. Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist*, 37, 2, 122-147.
3. Başaran, İ.E. (1993). *Türk Eğitim Sistemi*. Ankara: Kadioğlu Matbaası.
4. Bloom, B. S. (1979). *İnsan Nitelikleri ve Okulda Öğrenme*. (çev. D. A. Özçelik.) Ankara: MEB Yayınevi.
5. Deniz, M. E. (2002). *Ergenlik Çağı Sosyal İlişkileri. Eğitime Yeni Bakışlar 1*. (Editör: A. Murat Sünbül). (1.Baskı). Ankara: Mikro Yayıncılık, 291-300.
6. Deniz, M. E. (2010). *Kişisel Rehberlik*. (Editör. M. Engin Deniz). *Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik*. Ankara: Maya Akademi Yayın Dağıtım Eğitim Danışmanlık, 117-137.
7. Deniz. M. E. (2007). *Eğitim Psikolojisinin İçeriği*. (Editör. M. Engin Deniz). *Eğitim Psikolojisi*. Ankara: Maya Akademi Yayın Dağıtım Eğitim Danışmanlık, 2-22.
8. Donald, R. (1986). *Productive and Effective Schools*. Chicago, Illinois: The Annual Conference of The American Finance Association.

9. Ergün, H. Özdemir, M., Çorlu, M. A., 2004. “ Dil ve Sayısal Yetenekler İle Fizik Başarısı Arasındaki İlişki”,Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi, 12, (2): 361- 368.
10. Güleç, S., Alkış S., 2003. “İlköğretim Birinci Kademe Öğrencilerinin Derslerdeki Başarı Düzeylerinin Birbirine İlişkisi”, İlköğretim-Online E-Dergi, 2 (2):19-27.
11. Güzel, H. ve Oral, İ. (2011). Fizik Öğretmen Adaylarının Profilleri ile Fizik Dersi Başarıları Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. Selçuk Üniversitesi Ahmet Keleşoğlu Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 31, 115-137.
12. Hamarta, E. (2010). Eğitsel Rehberlik. (Editör: M. Engin Deniz). Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik. Ankara: Maya
13. Akademi Yayın Dağıtım Eğitim Danışmanlık, 157-180.İnceoğlu,M. (2010).Tutum Algı İletişim. (5. Baskı). İstanbul: Beykent Üniversitesi Yayınları, no:69.
14. Jersild, A. T. (1983). Çocuk Psikolojisi. (4. baskı), Çev: Gülseren Günçe, Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi EğitimBilimleri Fakültesi Yayınları.
15. Karasakaloğlu, N. ve Saracaloğlu, A.S. (2009). Sınıf Öğretmeni Adaylarının Türkçe Derslerine Yönelik Tutumları, Akademik Benlik Tasarımları İle Başarıları Arasındaki İlişki. Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi EğitimFakültesi Dergisi, 6, 1, 343-362.
17. Karasar, N., 2002. Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi, Nobel Yayınları, Ankara.
18. Lau, K. L. & Chan D.W. (2001). Motivational Characteristics of Under- achievers in Hong Kong. Educational Psychology. 21, 4, 417-430
19. Marsh, H. W., Trautwein, U., Lüdtke, O., Köller, O. & Jürgen B. (2005). Self- concept, Interest, Grades and Standardized Test Scores: Reciprocal Effects Models of Causal Ordering. Child Development. March/April, 76, 2, 397-416.
20. Memduhoğlu, H.B. ve Tanhan, F. (2009). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Akademik Başarılarını Etkileyen ÖrgütselFaktörler Ölçeğinin Geliştirilmesi, The First International Congress of Educational Research, 1-3 May.
21. Çanakkale bildiri olarak sunulmuştur. www.Eab.Org.Tr/Eab/Oc/Egtconf/Pdfkitap/Pdf/187. Pdf.(06.03.2019).
22. Nikolaevna, V., Buslovskaya, L., Kovtunenko, A., Klimova, V., & Ryzhkova, Y. (2019). Evaluation of the adaptive potential of first graders with normal speech development and speech disorders. Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences, 14(2), 345-351. <https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v14i2.4241>.
23. Oskay, Ö. Ö. Erdem, E. Yılmaz, A., (2009). “Kimya Laboratuvar Uygulamalarının Öğrencilerin Kimyaya YönelikTutum Ve Başarılarına Etkisi Üzerine Bir Çalışma”, Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 8 (27): 222-321.
24. Özer, Y. & Anıl, D. (2011). “Examining the factors effecting students’ science and mathematics achievement with structural equation modeling”, Hacettepe üniversitesi eğitim fakültesi dergisi (H.U. Journal of education ) 41:313-324 (2011), Ankara.
25. Savas, B., & Kayapinar, C. (2019). Comparing the attitudes of students of faculty of divinity and faculty of education towards the physical activity. New Trends and Issues Proceedings on Humanities and Social Sciences, 6(1), 85-90. <https://doi.org/10.18844/prosoc.v6i1.4158>
26. Savaş, E., Taş, S. & Duru, A. (2010). “Matematikte Öğrenci Başarısını Etkileyen Faktörler “ İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi 11 / 1 (February 2010): 113-132.

27. Sayad Ghobadi, A. (2018). The Relationship Between Knowledge Management and Workforce Productivity with a Mediator Role of Strategic Human Resource Management in Gilan Ports and Maritime Administration. *Global Journal of Business, Economics and Management: Current Issues*, 8(3), 127-137. <https://doi.org/10.18844/gjbem.v8i3.3796>
28. Shams, Z. (2019). The relationship between emotional intelligence and self-concept and educational achievement of Tehran students. *International Journal of Learning and Teaching*, 11(1), 28-33. <https://doi.org/10.18844/ijlt.v11i1.3573>
29. Şimşek, C. (2003). Çocuk ve Aile Eğitimi. Erişim Tarihi:30.04.2019,
30. Tasar, H. (2019). Financing from Demand-Side in Education. *Contemporary Educational Researches Journal*, 9(1), 14-19. <https://doi.org/10.18844/cej.v9i1.4019>
31. Wilson, G. B. (1996). What is the constructivist learning environment? Brent G. Wilson (Ed.), *constructivist learning environments: Case studies in instructional design, USA*, Educational Technology Publications.
32. Yeşilyaprak, B. (2003). Eğitimde Rehberlik Hizmetleri. (6. Baskı). Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım