



The Effects of Structural Features of Learning Turkish Language as a Foreign Language from Learners' Perspective: Bosnia and Herzegovina Case

Mustafa Arslan¹

Abstract

The structure of a language that is learned and the structure of the native languages of learners is a prominent factor in affecting learning foreign language. In this context, the objective of this study is determining the effects of the syntax, phonetic and phonological features on learning foreign languages. As a qualitative study, in the process of learning Turkish, a survey to discover the impact of the structural attributes of Turkish language on 178 Bosnian students was administered. The reliability Co-efficient, Cranach's Alpha, has been found 0.73 on all questions. Descriptive statistics and One Sample T-Tests have been run in the data analysis section. In the findings, some positive factors such as the progress of literacy in learning Turkish as a foreign language, making the words plural, the absence of irregular verbs and the regular conjugation, the easiness of Turkish pronunciation, the absence of gender in word formation have been found.

Keywords

Structural features of Turkish language
Foreign language learning
Pattern of Bosnia and Herzegovina

Article Info

Received: 01.16.2013

Accepted: 06.05.2014

Online Published: 08.06.2014

DOI: 10.15390/EB.2014.2554

Introduction

Humans are social beings who come into constant contact with their environment since the beginning of their creations. Even though there is no definite information on how this communication began, human beings created these vocal sounds and thousands of languages are spoken in the world today. Therefore, foreign language teaching and learning is as old as the history of humanity. Languages did not shape within a system or develop within a method, but they are created by societies that naturally kept them alive (Krashen and Terrell, 1983:7). Languages are also born with the community they exist, reach at a certain peak, and continue to live or to disappear with that particular community.

Evolving with the community, language develops by falling under the influence of geography where that community is located, its neighbors, and cultural features that it carries and begins to develop by becoming systemized around a set of rules. Doğru (1996) states that the relationship between language and culture cannot be separated from the relationship between language and thought. The structure of the language and texts that were generated under the influence of cultural characteristics are used in foreign language textbooks in their original states without changing their forms and they contribute to the process of understanding the foreign language and culture (Genç and Ünver, 2012:69). Therefore, it is possible to say that different elements become effective in the creation and systemization of languages and literary texts.

¹ Canik Başarı University, Education Faculty, Department of Turkish Language Teaching, Turkey, marslan@basari.edu.tr

System, origin and structure, which languages create within themselves, come into prominence in teaching that foreign language. Those, who speak languages that come from similar origin and structure, easily learn a language from this language family. For example, an individual, whose native language is Bosnian from Indo-European language family, can speak German in an easy way. Therefore, structural features, which languages develop since their birth, are directly related to foreign language teaching (Arak, 2010:50-60).

Since origin (source) and structural features which a language possesses, play an important role in the teaching of that language, it is necessary to examine the origin and structural features of Turkish language. In this regard, Swedish Strahlanberg has put forward his theory of the Ural-Altai language family in which Turkish is also included. Even though debate on this theory still continues, Strahlanberg has determined the common original features of languages that are in this language group in the following way:

- a. There is vowel harmony,
- b. They are agglutinative languages,
- c. There is no distinctions in words such as masculinity and femininity,
- d. Predicative (verb) is always at the end (Bozkurt, 2005:71-72).

Mathematical structure of Turkish language has always attracted the attention of linguists (Özkan and Musa, 2004:100). Due to constancy of root without an internal breakage, being agglutinative and having less exceptions, and highly systematic grammatical rules in Turkish language have particularly aroused admiration of western linguists. Foreign scientists are in agreement that Turkish language has reached a perfect structure with the effect of, not haphazard, but experienced linguists (Gencan, 1975:29). It is very important for Max Müller (1899), one of these linguists, to emphasize that Turkish language has a very clear and understandable internal and external structure (as cited in Eker, 2003:334).

Understanding the logic before teaching or learning a language makes the tasks of individuals easier. It is not enough for teachers as well as learners only to speak, to understand, to read and to write a language well. Therefore, different sound, format and syntax features of languages should be taken into consideration in teaching and learning. In addition, teachers of foreign languages should teach the target language with reflections since language reflects the socio-cultural characteristics of the nation that it belongs to (Savran, 2002:239).

It is necessary to know all structures of both languages up to the finest details in order to fully expose the differences and similarities between the language taught and the learners' mother tongue in foreign language teaching. This can help to determine what sort of difficulties to emerge when teaching a structure that is present in the language taught, but absent in the mother tongue (Arak, 2006:215). For this reason, teachers of foreign languages should be very well aware of the structures both in their native language and in the mother tongue of the learners.

For those who teach Turkish, knowing the structural features of Turkish and those of mother tongue of the target population who are taught is important in terms of determining the language methods to be applied. Grasping formational and stylistic features of words and word types in Turkish will provide those who will teach and learn Turkish the opportunity to compare languages in question. It is possible to realize a conscious teaching and learning of a foreign language by determining the similarities and differences between languages (Tosun, 2005:22).

Gasping the structural features of the language being taught does not mean that students should first be taught the structural features of the target language. Knowing the structural properties of that language is important for developing method and approach while teaching the target language. If not so, the structural and grammatical rules related to the target language should be comprehended especially by implicating them at the basic level in teaching of foreign language (Oymak, 2004:2).

Determining the effect of structural features of Turkish is important for learners and it is necessary for those who teach it to be conscious of this. In this context, 85.1% of respondents, whose opinions on teachers related to teaching Turkish to foreigners are sought in a study, stated that teacher should be well aware of the distinctive structural qualities of Turkish. Therefore, those who teach Turkish to foreigners must have a good grasp of the distinctive structural qualities of Turkish that form the dimension of specialist knowledge (Mete, 2012:102-125).

Determining the phonetic, morphological, semantic and syntactic features of Turkish is important for teachers and learners in terms of its impact on teaching and learning foreign language. The effects of the structural features, which were carried by Turkish language, on learning Turkish as a foreign language, were attempted to be determined in this study. In this regard, becoming aware of these features will make a significant contribution to those who teach and learn Turkish as a foreign language in developing methods and materials.

Table 1. Concepts and Definitions

Concepts	Definitions
Gender	There are no masculine, feminine and neutral cases in Turkish words. This feature facilitates learning Turkish.
Plural	Words in Turkish can easily be made plural by adding –ler/-lar affixes at the end according to Turkish vocal harmony.
Irregular verb	There are no irregular verbs in Turkish. This helps to comprehend the Turkish verb inflections.
Agglutinative	Turkish being agglutinative is a positive factor in memorizing words in Turkish.
Fix-root	Fixed-nature of roots and regularity in affixes in Turkish are powerful features of Turkish language.
Latin-voiced	Latin origin of Turkish alphabet helps to easily identify sounds in Turkish.
Writing in Latin	Latin origin of Turkish alphabet helps to provide ease in symbols of letters in Turkish.
Hearing and writing	Writing Turkish words as they are pronounced will facilitate the development of writing skills in Turkish.
Writing and reading	Reading of Turkish as it is written provides ease in the development of reading skills in Turkish.
Stress and pronunciation	There is no stress in pronunciation of Turkish words that will change the meaning and this is a positive factor in learning the pronunciation of words in Turkish.
Spelling's reminder of pronunciation	Sameness in spelling, reading and pronunciation of Turkish words is an important factor in learning Turkish words by recalling them.
Turkish-Bosnian structure	Bosnians experience difficulties while learning Turkish since the structure of Turkish language is not similar to that of Bosnian language.
Turkish proverbs	The excessive use of reduplication, idioms and proverbs in Turkish makes Turkish difficult for foreigners to learn.
Locative affix	Locative affixes in Turkish are easy to learn.
Sentence structure	Sentence structure in Turkish is difficult to learn since verb is located at the end.

Method

A 15-item likert scale survey was developed in order to determine the effect of the structural features of Turkish on learning Turkish as a foreign language. Questions on the demographic distribution of respondents, such as gender, education level and ages, were also asked. Survey, created within the context of qualitative research, was applied to 178 citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Since research hypotheses, which were applied to the respondents, contained scientific terms, their Bosnian translations were added in addition to their Turkish translations.

Population and Sampling

Turkish language is actively taught by institutions affiliated with Turkish Republic and private enterprises in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In addition to this, the ratio of Turkish speakers is high due to the common cultural history in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The population of the research was constituted by those whose native language is Bosnian and who learn Turkish as a second language. The sampling of the research consisted of the citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina who live in the city of Sarajevo and speak Turkish language.

Data Analysis

Data, obtained from the survey, were analyzed using SPSS program and descriptive statistics and one-sample t-test were also used in the analysis of data. Demographic features of the participants, such as gender, educational status and age, were calculated as frequency distributions and percentages. Concepts and definitions are given in a table in order to analyze data in a comprehensible manner. The results of analysis on 15 assumptions related to the structural features of Turkish were separately interpreted.

Findings and Comments

Of Educational status of the samplings participated in the survey, 80.9% are university graduates, 9.0% high school graduates, and 10.1 % did not specify their educational status. Of respondents, 61.2% are the age of 20, 30.9% under the age of 20 and 7.9% of them did not state their age status. The gender distribution of participants was determined to be 42.7% of males and 52.2% of females respectively. Highness in educational levels of the group who participated in the survey, majority of group of being over the age of 20 and equality in male-female ratio are important in terms of the reliability of the research.

The analyzed data were shown in the forms of tables in this section and the obtained data were interpreted. Range, mean, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis values were given in the table labeled as Descriptive Statistics. There is a difference in the size of sampling since there were incomplete responses in some questions. Responses, given to the survey questions, were measured in ordinal scale by the values of "1.00 = Absolutely disagree", "2.00 = Disagree", "3.00 = Neutral", "4.00 = Agree", and "5.00 = Absolutely agree."

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics

Concepts	N / Frequency Distribution	Range	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis		
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
Gender	178	4.00	4.0337	1.07303	-.872	.182	-.089	.362
Plural	178	4.00	4.3596	.84033	-1.513	.182	2.551	.362
Irregular verb	177	4.00	4.3164	.81283	-1.284	.183	2.096	.363
Agglutinative	178	4.00	4.0449	.97899	-.968	.182	.642	.362
Fix-root	176	4.00	3.6932	1.08873	-.573	.183	-.189	.364
Latin-voiced	175	4.00	4.1314	1.02267	-1.148	.184	.739	.365
Writing in Latin	173	4.00	4.2832	.97980	-1.609	.185	2.394	.367
Hearing and writing	175	4.00	4.3714	.87381	-1.690	.184	3.151	.365
Writing and Reading	178	4.00	4.2247	.97137	-1.512	.182	2.351	.362
Stress and pronunciation	176	4.00	3.5625	1.04557	-.410	.183	-.376	.364
Spelling's reminder of pronunciation	177	4.00	3.6949	1.07536	-.530	.183	-.358	.363
Turkish-Bosnian structure	174	4.00	3.0287	1.22794	.134	.184	-.992	.366
Turkish proverbs	175	4.00	2.8400	1.01574	.393	.184	-.316	.365
Locative affix	177	4.00	3.4011	1.15925	-.388	.183	-.524	.363
Sentence structure	178	4.00	2.6124	1.17952	.480	.182	-.562	.362

Averages in the concepts *Turkish proverbs*, *Turkish-Bosnian structure* and *Sentence structure* were seen to be under 3 and they were over 3 for other questions. Standard deviation values were generally close to 1 while skewness values were determined to be between acceptable values of ± 2 . Kurtosis values were realized between the acceptable values of ± 2 except the concepts of *Plural*, *Irregular verbs*, *Writing in Latin*, *Hearing and Writing and Pronouncing*.

Table 3. One-sample t-Test

Concepts	Test Value = 3					
	t / t-Test	Frequency Distribution	Significance value (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Gender	12.853	177	.000	1.03371	.8750	1.1924
Plural	21.585	177	.000	1.35955	1.2353	1.4838
Irregular verb	21.546	176	.000	1.31638	1.1958	1.4370
Agglutinative	14.240	177	.000	1.04494	.9001	1.1898
Fix-root	8.447	175	.000	.69318	.5312	.8551
Latin-voiced	14.636	174	.000	1.13143	.9788	1.2840
Writing in Latin	17.226	172	.000	1.28324	1.1362	1.4303
Hearing and writing	20.762	174	.000	1.37143	1.2411	1.5018
Writing and Reading	16.821	177	.000	1.22472	1.0810	1.3684
Stress and pronunciation	7.137	175	.000	.56250	.4070	.7180
Spelling's reminder of pronunciation	8.597	176	.000	.69492	.5354	.8544
Turkish-Bosnian structure	.309	173	.758	.02874	-.1550	.2125
Turkish proverbs	-2.084	174	.039	-.16000	-.3115	-.0085
Locative affix	4.604	176	.000	.40113	.2292	.5731
Sentence structure	-4.385	177	.000	-.38764	-.5621	-.2132

T-test and significance values were given in the table labeled as One Sample T-Test. Lean (invalid) averages were set to be less than 3 and alternative hypothesis averages were set to be greater than 3. According to 5% significance level, values given to *Turkish-Bosnian structure*, *Sentence structure* and *Turkish proverbs* hypothesis for one-tailed test were found to be 1.51 and 0.078 and invalid hypothesis was accepted. In other words, averages of responses given to concepts of *Sentence structure*, *Turkish-Bosnian structure* and *Turkish proverbs* were less than 3. Lean hypothesis was rejected since the significance levels of responses given to other questions were less than 5% and it was concluded that averages were greater than 3.

H₀: The Average of the responses given to questions is less than 3.

H_a: The Average of the responses given to questions is greater than 3.

The average of responses given by participants to *type* concept was calculated as 4.03 and its standard deviation as 1.0733. One-sample t-test statistic value was determined to be 12.853 and significance level as 0.000. Lean hypothesis H₀ was rejected and alternative hypothesis H_a was accepted. The acceptability of skewness value and its average being far above the value of 3 render hypothesis to be valid. According to the findings obtained, it was concluded that the absence of type category in Turkish words, such as femininity, masculinity, and neutral, happens to be a positive structural feature for foreigners learning Turkish.

Located originally in the category of Ural-Altaic languages, there is no gender category in Turkish in terms of grammar (Doğan, 2011:90). Gender status shows differences in the languages in which gender category exists. While there are three genders, such as masculine, feminine, and neutral, in Latin and Greek which are from Indo-European languages, there are only two gender categories (masculine and feminine) in French, Italian and Spanish which are from the Roman branch of the

same language family. While there are three genders in German, one of Germanic languages, it is less in English than in many languages in the same group (Aksan, 1977:86-88). The most complicated language group of Indo-European language family in terms of gender category is Slavic languages. Foreigners who belong to different family of languages and learn languages in question experience difficulties in understanding the gender status of the words. According to the findings obtained, foreigners, who study Turkish, easily learn Turkish since Turkish words do not carry gender features.

The average of responses given to *plural* concept was determined to be 4.36 and their standard deviation as 0.84. T-statistic value was measured as 21.585 and significance level as 0.000. In this case, H_0 hypothesis was rejected and alternative hypothesis H_a was accepted. The acceptability of kurtosis and skewness values and their average being far above the value of 3 has further strengthened this hypothesis. According to these results, it was understood that foreigners do not experience difficulties in grasping plural grammatical category of Turkish words with the help of vocal harmony.

According to vocal harmony in Turkish, vowel that comes later will follow the vowel that comes before (back-front). There is also a similar harmony (voicelessness) among consonants. Vowels and consonants in a Turkish word resemble by affecting one another. The reason for this resemblance is the minimum effort rule that is complied while talking. There are roots that remain fixed and do not break as well as affixes that are added to these roots. The grammatical categories, vocabulary derivation and process in Turkish are carried out this way (Efendioğlu and İşcan, 2010:137). According to the findings obtained, those, who learn Turkish as a foreign language, stated that they easily make words plural in Turkish by adding the accurate one from -ler/-lar affixes at the root of the word in accordance with the vocal harmony.

The average of responses given by the participants to the description of *There are no irregular verbs in Turkish and this helps me to easily grasp verbs while learning Turkish* was realized to be 4.32 and its standard deviation as 0.813. T-statistic value was measured as 21.546 and significance level as 0.000. Lean H_0 hypothesis was rejected and alternative hypothesis H_a was accepted. Foreigners, who learn Turkish, grasp verb inflection in Turkish without any difficulties due to high response averages of the participants, the acceptability of kurtosis and skewness values and according to the findings obtained.

The verbs in Turkish do not undergo an internal breakage while they are creating grammatical forms (conjugating). Affixes, which create grammatical categories, also remain fixed. For example, the past simple form of verb *go* in English occurs when it flexes in the form of *went*. In Turkish root cannot break in the form of *git(di)ti* and, again, the past tense conjugation can be realized in a systematic way with the affix of *-di* which provides the meaning of past tense and remains unchanged. The agglutinative and associative structure of Turkish is an important feature in the creation verb grammatical categories and in their relations between them. Turkish sentences form a logical relation according to affixes they take in verb roots and their positions in the sentence (Akçataş, 2010:141). It is possible to reach at the conclusion that foreigners, who study Turkish, learn verb layout in Turkish in a simple way within a certain system.

The average of responses given to hypothesis directed with the concept of *agglutinative* was calculated as 4.04 and its standard deviation as 0.979. T statistical value was 14.240 and significance level was 0.000. Lean H_0 hypothesis was not accepted and alternative H_a hypothesis was approved. It is understood that the agglutinative mathematical structure of Turkish, together with the average being above 3, and the acceptability of skewness value, made a positive contribution in learning Turkish words easily by foreigners.

Within the context of teaching Turkish as foreign language, creating word order in Turkish and mathematical structure in the structure of agglutinative language provide a logical basis that especially develops vocabulary acquisition and teaching process. If cognitive grounds, which are present in the structural characteristics of Turkish, are being grasped accurately by candidates in teaching Turkish as a foreign language, vocabulary learning would be based on an easy ground (Onan, 2009:238). For

example, the word *göz-lük* from the word *göz*, and *gözlük-çü* from *gözlük* can be derived on the fixed root and these can practically be memorized by foreigners who learn Turkish.

The average of responses given by the participants of the research to the concept of *fixed-root* was 3.69 and standard deviation was 1.089. T statistics was measured as 8.447, significance level as 0.000 and skewness value was accepted. Lean H_0 hypothesis was not accepted and alternative H_a hypothesis was approved. According to the findings obtained, the feature of non-breakable nature of roots and their remaining fixed, which is one of the basic structural features of Turkish, is thought to be an important factor for foreigners while learning Turkish. For example, even though plurality suffix is *-s* in English, but it does not always work like this and the plural form of child is not *childs*, however it is achieved by an internal breakage in the form of *children*.

Roots do not change in Turkish and suffixes are systematically added at the end of the words. In Inflected languages, derivation and conjugation occur in the beginning of the word by affixes from its middle and end and by changes shown in the root (Gencan, 2001:32). It is difficult for foreigners who are learning inflected languages to grasp this situation. However, roots do not change in Turkish and affixes only come at the end of the words. Therefore, foreigners, who learn Turkish, can form any grammatical category that they desire on the fixed root.

The average of responses given to the opinion defined as *Latin origin of Turkish alphabet helps to easily recognize sounds in Turkish* was 4.13 and its standard deviation was 1.023. T statistics was measured as 14.636, significance level as 0.000 and skewness value was accepted. Lean H_0 hypothesis was rejected and alternative H_a hypothesis was approved. According to these data, it can be concluded that Latin alphabet is known by most people on the earth with the influence of English which is the most widely taught and learnt language in the world and therefore, those, who learn Turkish as a foreign language, learn the sounds in Turkish without any difficulties. The use of Latin alphabet, which is closest to Turkish phonetics in spelling and pronunciation of sounds in Turkish, is an aiding factor for foreigners, who study Turkish, to learn sounds in Turkish (Demirci, 2011:228).

The average of responds given by the participants to the argument of *The Latin origin of Turkish alphabet helps to provide ease while writing symbols of letters in Turkish* was determined to be 4.28, its standard deviation as 0.98, T-statistical value as 17.226 and significance level as 0.000. In this case, lean H_0 hypothesis was approved and alternative H_a hypothesis was accepted. According to the findings obtained, it was seen that foreigners do not experience difficulties in the development of their writing skills in Turkish while learning Turkish due to the acceptability of kurtosis and skewness values for *writing in Latin*. The hypothesis of *Writing Turkish words as they are pronounced will facilitate the development of writing skills in Turkish* is the highest value with an average of 4.37. Its standard deviation was determined as 0.874, T-statistical value as 20.762, significance level as 0.000, lean H_0 hypothesis was rejected and alternative H_a hypothesis was approved. According to all findings, with the acceptance of kurtosis value of *hearing and writing* concept, it was understood that the easiest developing language skill of those, who learn Turkish as a foreign language, is their writing skills in Turkish.

According to the participant of the research, it is possible to say that their writing skills and reading skills develop in the same parallelism. The average of responds given by the participants to the argument of *Reading of Turkish as it is written provides ease in the development of reading skills in Turkish* was 4.22, and its standard deviation as 0.971. T-statistical value was determined as 16.821 and significance level as 0.000. Lean H_0 hypothesis was rejected and alternative H_a hypothesis was accepted. According to the approval of kurtosis and skewness values, the reading skills of foreigners in Turkish develop in a rapid and easy manner while learning Turkish.

Reading and writing skills in Turkish develop more quickly than in languages where pronunciations and spellings of words are different like in English due to the structural feature of Turkish language that allows it to spelled as it is written and pronounced as it is spelled (Berkmen, 2003:275-278).

The average of *Stress and pronunciation* concept was 3.56 and its standard deviation was 1.046. T-statistics value was calculated as 7.137, significance level as 0.000 and its skewness value was accepted. Lean H_0 hypothesis was rejected and alternative H_a hypothesis was approved. According to this result, learners of Turkish stated that there was no apparent stress in Turkish words that would cause the change in the meaning and, in this context they did not experience difficulties while pronouncing Turkish words. For example, in stressed languages like in Bosnian, *docı* (come) cannot be understood if stress is no made on *do* syllable and the meaning of the word changes.

There is a very apparent and strong stress system in some languages. European languages and Arabic language generally are stressed languages. Stress is very strong especially in German among Western languages. In one-syllable languages, like in Chinese language, it is necessary to make stress and pronunciation accurately in order to differentiate word difference from meaning. Turkish is a softly-stressed, slightly rough language and there is no strong stress which will change the meaning (Ergin, 2007:143). Therefore, foreigners, who study Turkish, learn the pronunciation of Turkish words in a very easy manner.

The participation average of respondents to an opinion related to phonetic feature of Turkish defined as *Sameness in spelling, reading and pronunciation of Turkish words is an important factor in learning Turkish words by recalling them* was determined to be 3.69 and its standard deviation was 1.075. T-statistics value was 8.59, and significance level was 0.000. Lean H_0 hypothesis was rejected and alternative H_a hypothesis was accepted. According to the acceptability of skewness value, the sameness in writing, reading and pronunciation features in Turkish words helps these words to be learnt by recollection. For example, even though the word *school* in English is written in this way, but its pronunciation is different. *Okul* (school) in Turkish is written in this way and pronounced as *okul* (school).

The average of respondents given to the hypothesis defined as *Bosnians experience difficulties while learning Turkish since the structure of Turkish language is not similar to that of Bosnian language* was 3.03 and its standard deviation was 1.228. T-statistic value was measured as 0.309, significance level as 0.38 and skewness value was accepted. According to the results of analysis, H_0 hypothesis was approved and alternative H_a hypothesis was accepted as rejected. According to the findings, it is possible to reach at a conclusion closer to the opinion that the structural features of Turkish are more comprehensible than the structural features of Bosnian language. Turkish is a language which has regular rules in terms of structure and has very rare exceptional usages (Üstüner, 2001:178). The structural features of Bosnian, which is included in Slavic branch of Indo-European family of languages, are very complex. Even though there are rules, but there are also many exceptions to distort them.

The most difficult topics to be grasped in foreign language teaching are routine words such as reduplications, idioms and proverbs. These structures contain cultural features since they are formed as a result of certain experience within the community. Therefore, lineage, kinship names and numbers that frequently used in everyday life in Turkish, frequently-used nouns and verbs, idioms and proverbs that are related to these, and routine words that have a significant place in communication have important places in teaching Turkish to foreigners (Barın, 2003:311). In this regard, average of those who participated in the opinion defined as *The excessive use of reduplication, idioms and proverbs in Turkish makes Turkish difficult for foreigners to learn* was calculated as 2.84, its standard deviation as 1.016, T-statistic value as -2.084 and significance level as 0.98. Skewness value was accepted. For this reason, H_0 hypothesis was accepted and, according to the participants of the research, it was concluded that the frequent use of reduplication, idioms, and proverbs in Turkish in everyday conversations does not constitute as an obstacle while learning Turkish. However, it is possible for Bosnia-Herzegovinians to learn routine words that are related to culture when considering the effect of common socio-cultural structure between the Ottomans and Bosnia and Herzegovina.

One of the factors that determine whether a language is easy or difficult to grasp while learning a foreign language is the case noun suffixes in that particular language. Foreigners especially experience difficulties in using accusative cases (-ı, -i, -u, -ü) while learning Turkish. This difficulty occurs in the absence of accusative cases due to the effect of students' mother tongue in languages with different root and structural features (Karababa, 2009:273). The average of *noun case suffix* concept was determined as 3.40, its standard deviation as 1.159, T-statistic value as 4.60, significance level as 0.000 and skewness value was approved. According to data, lean H_0 hypothesis was rejected and alternative H_a hypothesis was approved by the participants and the suggestion that case noun suffixes in Turkish are easier to learn than expected was approved. Agglutinative structure of Turkish and fixed-nature of case noun suffixes in Turkish have a positive effect on foreigners to learn these case noun suffixes quickly.

The average of responds given to the hypothesis on *Sentence structure* was determined as 2.61 and its standard deviation was 1.18. T-statistical value was found to be -4.38, significance level as 1.00 and skewness value was accepted. For this reason, lean H_0 hypothesis was accepted and it is understood that Bosnians, who study Turkish, do not experience any difficulties in grasping the sentence structure while learning Turkish. The participants' approval of comprehensibility of the structural features in Turkish in comparison with those of Bosnian supports the view that they learn the sentence structure in Turkish easily.

Conclusion and Suggestions

When considering the Bosnia-Herzegovina case, it is understood that phonetic, morphologic, semantic, and syntactic features of Turkish language mostly have a positive impact on learning Turkish as a foreign language.

- Primarily, the following features were determined as positive factors that helps foreigners to study Turkish while learning Turkish language:
 1. The spelling of Turkish words as they are pronounced facilitates the development of writing skills in Turkish.
 2. Words in Turkish easily made plural by bringing suffixes -ler /-lar at the end of the words based on the vocal harmony in Turkish language.
 3. There are no irregular verbs in Turkish and this helps to comprehend verbs while learning Turkish easily.
 4. The Latin origin of Turkish alphabet provides convenience while writing the symbols of letters in Turkish.
 5. The spelling of Turkish words the same way they are pronounced facilitates the improvement of reading skills in Turkish.
 6. The Latin origin of Turkish alphabet is effective in recognizing Turkish sounds easily.
 7. The agglutinative structure of Turkish language is a positive factor while learning words in Turkish.
 8. Since there are no grammatical forms such as masculine, feminine and neutral in Turkish, this feature makes Turkish easy to learn.
- Secondly, the following features have been identified by foreigners learners of Turkish language as positive factors while learning Turkish language:
 1. The stability of word roots and the regularity of the suffix attachments are one of the strong aspects of Turkish language.
 2. The sameness in spelling and pronunciation of Turkish words is one of the significant factors in evocative learning Turkish words.
 3. There is no stress on the pronunciation of Turkish words and this is a positive factor in learning the pronunciation of the words in Turkish language.
 4. The suffixes of noun condition in Turkish language are easy to learn.

5. It is not difficult, rather easy, to learn the sentence structure in Turkish language since the predicate (verb) comes at the end.
6. The structure of Turkish language is comparatively easier than the structure of Bosnian language.

Since the effect of common Turkish – Bosnia and Herzegovinian socio-cultural structure on the result of *The excessive use of reduplication, idioms and proverbs in Turkish makes Turkish difficult for foreigners to learn* was taken into consideration, it was not included in assessment.

Suggestions

1. It is necessary for those, who will teach Turkish to foreigners, to be aware of the structural features that are influential in teaching Turkish as a foreign language. In this context, it is a problematic approach to develop a teaching method without considering phonetic, morphologic, semantic and syntactic features of Turkish language.
2. Becoming aware of the structural features of teaching Turkish as a foreign language will provide guidance on the necessity of using which foreign language teaching method while teaching Turkish to target audiences who share different or same language family and structure with Turkish.
3. The structural features of Turkish should be explained to those who will teach Turkish to foreigners by relevant experts in terms of teaching foreign language.
4. The structural features of Turkish as a foreign language should be taken into account while preparing textbooks and supplementary materials in Turkish as a foreign language. Similarly, the structural features of Turkish language must be known in order to develop accurate visual and audio materials in teaching Turkish as a foreign language.
5. Teaching Turkish to foreigners and teaching Turkish as a mother tongue are different issues. Therefore, fields of expertise must be created in order to train Turkish teachers who will teach Turkish to foreigners.
6. The structural logic of Turkish should be explained correctly in order for those who study Turkish to learn it easily.
7. It is necessary for those who teach Turkish to foreigners to be aware of the structural features in Turkish as a foreign language in order to respond to negative psychological pressures that were attempted to be created on teaching Turkish as a foreign language.
8. Those, who will teach Turkish to foreigners, must know the structural features of mother tongue of the target audience to whom Turkish is taught.

References

- Akçataş, A. (2010). Türkiye Türkçesinde Fiil Kökleri Arası İlişkilerde Etkili Unsurlar Üzerine. *Turkish Studies International Periodical For the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 5(1), 141
- Aksan, D. (1977). *Her Yönüyle Dil*. Ankara: TDK Yayınları.
- Arak, H. (2010). Almanca Öğreniminde ve Öğretiminde Köprü Dil İngilizceden Olumlu Transfer Örnekleri. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi The Journal of International Social Research*, 3(10), 50-60
- Arak, H. (2006). İkinci Yabancı Dil Olarak Almancanın Öğrenilmesinde İngilizcenin ve Karşılaştırmalı Dilbilgisinin Rolü. *Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi Sayı*, 21(2), 215
- Barın, E. (2003). Yabancılar Türkçenin Öğretiminde Temel Söz Varlığının Önemi. *TÜBAR*, 13, 311
- Berkmen, Y. M. (2003). Bilim Dilinin Türkçeleşmesi. *Türk Tanısal ve Girişimsel Radyoloji Dergisi*, 9(3), 275-278
- Bozkurt, F. (2005). *Türklerin Dili*. İstanbul: Kapı Yayınları.
- Demirci, Ü. Ö. (2011). Türk Dünyasında Latin Alfabesine Geçiş Süreci. *Türk Yurdu Dergisi*, 287, 228
- Doğan, E. (2011). Türkiye Türkçesinde Cinsiyet Kategorisinin İzleri. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 4(17), 90
- Doğru, E. (1996). Dil, Düşünce ve Kültür Arasındaki İlişki. *Ankara Üniversitesi (TÖMER) Dil Dergisi*, 45, 15-25.
- Efendioğlu, S. ve İşcan, A. (2010). Türkçe Ses Bilgisi Öğretiminde Ses Olaylarının Sınıflandırılması. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 43, 121-143
- Eker, S. (2003). *Çağdas Türk Dili*. (2. Baskı). Ankara: Grafiker Yay.
- Ergin, M. (2007). *Üniversiteler İçin Türk Dili*. İstanbul: Bayrak, Yayım, Tanıtım.
- Gencan, T. N. (1975). *Dilbilgisi*, (3. Baskı) Ankara: TDK Yayınları.
- Gencan, T. N. (2001). *Dilbilgisi*. Ankara: Ayraç Yayınevi.
- Genç, A. ve Ünver, Ş. (2012). Türkiye’de Geçmişten Günümüze Almanca Öğretimi İçin Yazılan Ders Kitaplarındaki Metinlerin İncelenmesi. *Eğitim ve Bilim/Education and Science*, 37(163), 69
- Karababa, Z. C. C. (2009). Yabancı Dil Olarak Türkçenin Öğretimi Ve Karşılaşılan Sorunlar. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 42(2), 265-277
- Krashen, S. D. & Terrell, T. (1983) *The Natural Approach*. New Jersey: Alemany Press.
- Mete, F. (2012). Yabancı Dil Olarak Türkçe Öğretimine İlişkin Öğretmen Görüşlerinin Değerlendirilmesi. *Dede Korkut Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 1(1), 102-125
- Müller, M. (1899). *Science of Language*. London: Longmans
- Onan, B. (2009). Eklemeli Dil Yapısının Türkçe Öğretiminde Oluşturduğu Bilişsel (kognitif) Zeminler. *Mustafa Kemal University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 6(11), 237-264
- Oymak, R. (6-9 Temmuz 2004). Türkçe Öğretiminde Dilbilgisel Bir Biçimbirim/Ulam Olan “Kip” Kavramının Biçim Dizimdeki İşlevi ile Kavranma Düzeyi ve Geleneksel Dilbilgisi Eleştirisi. XIII. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kurultayı’nda sunulmuş bildiri, Malatya.
- Özkan, F. ve Musa, B. (2004). Yabancı Dillerin Türkçenin Söz Dizimi Üzerindeki Etkisi. *Bilig*, 30, 100
- Savran, N. Z. (2002). Cevapta Açıklama İsteyen Soru Zamirleri “Welch_/ Was Für Ein_/ Was” Türkçede Hangi Anlamlarla Karşılır?, *G.Ü. Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 22(1), 239
- Tosun, C. (2005). Türkçenin Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğretilmesi. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 1(1), 22
- Üstüner, A. (2001). Eski Türkiye Türkçesinde -sUz Eki. *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi Fırat University Journal of Social Science*, 11(2), 178