



The Problems Faced in Primary-level Reading and Writing Teaching to Students whose Native Language is not Turkish

Ana Dili Türkçe Olmayan Öğrencilere Verilen İlkokuma Yazma Öğretiminde Karşılaşılan Sorunlar

Dr. Hamdi KARAMAN¹, Prof. Dr. Ömer YILAR²

Öz

Bu çalışma ana dili Türkçe olmayan öğrencilere ilkökuma yazma öğretiminde karşılaşılan sorunları öğretmenlerin bakış açılarına göre değerlendirmeyi amaçlayan nicel bir çalışmadır. Çalışmada nicel araştırma yöntemlerinden genel tarama modeli kullanılmıştır. Çalışma Ağrı ili Patnos ilçesinde gerçekleştirilmiş ve 205 sınıf öğretmeni katılmıştır. Sınıf öğretmenleri en az bir kere birinci sınıf okutmuş öğretmenlerden seçilmiştir. Çalışmada ana dili Türkçe olmayan ilkökul öğrencilerine ilkökuma yazma öğretiminde karşılaşılan sorunlar ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Elde edilen veriler SPSS 24 paket programı kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir. Verilerin analizinde normal olmayan dağılımlar için Kruskal Wallis Testi normal dağılımlar için Tek Yönlü Varyans Analizi (One Way Anova) Testi kullanılmıştır. Elde edilen bulgulara göre ilkökuma yazma öğretimi sürecinin bazı aşamalarında mesleki kıdemi düşük öğretmenler mesleki kıdemi yüksek öğretmenlere göre, öğrencinin ana dilini bilmeyen öğretmenler bilen öğretmenlere göre ve bir defa birinci sınıf okutmuş öğretmenler üç defa okutmuş öğretmenlere göre daha fazla sorunla karşılaşmışlardır. Ayrıca ölçeğe göre sınıf öğretmenleri ilkökuma yazma öğretiminin bütün aşamalarında çeşitli sorunlarla karşılaşmaktadırlar. Bu sonuçlara göre özellikle okul öncesi eğitime verilen değerin artırılmasının ve ailelerin bilinçlendirilmesinin önemi ifade edilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Ana dil, Türkçe, İlkokuma ve yazma öğretimi, Sınıf öğretmeni, İlkokul

Makale Türü: Araştırma

Abstract

The study had a quantitative design and aimed to evaluate the problems faced in primary reading and writing teaching to students whose mother tongue is not Turkish from the perspectives of teachers. The general survey model, which is one of the quantitative study methods, was used in the study. The study was carried out in Patnos district of Ağrı province and 205 classroom teachers participated. Classroom teachers were selected from those who had taught first grade at least once. The scale of problems faced in teaching primary reading and writing to primary school students whose mother tongue is not Turkish was used in the study. The obtained data were analyzed by using the SPSS 24 package program. In the analysis of the data, Kruskal Wallis Test for non-normal distributions and One Way Analysis of Variance (One Way Anova) Test for normal distributions were used. According to the findings, teachers who had low professional seniority in some stages of the primary literacy teaching process faced more problems than teachers with higher professional seniority, teachers who did not know the mother tongue of the student when compared to the teachers who knew the student's mother tongue, and teachers who taught first grade once compared to

* Bu çalışma birinci yazarın ikinci yazar danışmanlığında hazırladığı doktora tezinin bir kısmı kullanılarak oluşturulmuştur. Bu çalışma Atatürk Üniversitesi BAPK tarafından desteklenmiştir, proje no: SDK-2021-9017

¹Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, Ezine Pazar Atatürk İlkokulu, hamdi.karaman@hotmail.com.

²Atatürk Üniversitesi, Kazım Karabekir Eğitim Fakültesi, omery@atauni.edu.tr

teachers who taught it three times. Also, according to the scale, classroom teachers faced various problems at all stages of primary reading and writing teaching.

Keywords: Mother tongue; Turkish; Primary reading and writing teaching, Classroom teacher, Primary school

Paper Type: Research

Introduction

Turkey has been a country where many languages are used because of the togetherness of different cultures for centuries (Susar Kırmızı, Özcan & Şencan, 2016). There is more than one region in Turkey and different languages can be spoken in each of these (Yılmaz & Şekerci, 2016). Some needs must be met for people to live socially. One of these needs is communication, which is a process that begins before birth and continues until the end of life. The most important communication tool is language (De Casper & Fifer, 1980, cited by İlhan, 2005). There are many specialist definitions of language.

“Language is a natural communication tool among people, a living entity with its own laws developing only within the framework of these laws, a system of secret agreements with foundations laid at unknown times as a social institution formed by sounds” (Ergin, 2000, p. 3).

Language is so versatile that it is not possible to think of it all at once, a magical entity whose secrets cannot be solved today when we look at it from different angles, as an institution related to all fields such as science, art, and technique, which cannot be considered apart from human and society, and that also creates them (Aksan, 2000, p.10).

Language is a living and natural system formed by the symbols of sound without a direct relationship with the entities and concepts it refers to, providing an understanding and exchange of feelings and thoughts among people, formed in an unknown time and way, expresses the society it belongs to in every aspect, and does not have a direct relationship with the entities and concepts it refers to (Bayraktar, 2006), p. 15).

When the definitions are examined, it was determined that language is the main communication tool. It is one of the most important channels of all beliefs, perspectives, traditions, customs, etc. transferred to the next generations. Every person has their own culture and society, as well as their own language (Gülyüz, 2004). In the literature, this language is the mother tongue. The mother tongue, as the name suggests, is the language that was first taken from the mother and developed with the family and shaped by the environment (Koç, 1992; Topaloğlu, 1989). It was determined that the mother tongue is the communication tool that people use after their births.

Different languages can be spoken in many regions of Turkey. For this reason, children face a second language when they come to school in some regions. Children whose education language is not their mother tongue may face problems in schools. These difficulties are mostly experienced in the field of primary reading and writing teaching (Gözüküçük, 2015). Generally, communication problems increase when the mother tongues of teachers and students are different (Gözüküçük & Kıran, 2018). Children whose mother tongue is Turkish face a language they already know when they first start school. However, children whose mother tongue is not Turkish either do not know the language they face when they come to school or they know little (Çolakoğlu, 2019). According to Yıldız (2013), reading comprehension and fluent reading skills affect the academic life of children positively by 61%. It is already known that some most important problems of children whose mother tongue is not Turkish are the inability to read fluently and understand what they read (Aslan & Yılar, 2023; Çolakoğlu, 2019; Emeç, 2011; Gözüküçük, 2015). In light of this information, it was determined that students whose mother tongue is not Turkish have a disadvantage. Also, teachers are left alone in finding solutions. For

the solution of these problems, there are not enough data on Turkish education programs, educational institutions, or related sources (Yılar, 2019, pp. 225-232).

Primary reading and writing teaching is not just about reading and writing practices. Also, it is expected to develop some skills such as using Turkish accurately and effectively, problem-solving, and communication (Akyol, 2013). It is very difficult to acquire these skills for students who do not communicate in Turkish and do not use Turkish effectively and accurately before starting school. In the present study, the problems of primary school teachers who taught reading and writing to students whose mother tongue is not Turkish were investigated. For this reason, uncovering the problems of classroom teachers who teach reading and writing to students whose mother tongue is not Turkish can eliminate the problems of both students and their families whose mother tongue is not Turkish, and provide a more detailed and specific implementation of education and training activities by the Ministry of National Education.

1. The Purpose of the Study

The study aimed to uncover the problems faced in primary reading and writing teaching to students whose mother tongue is not Turkish from the perspectives of teachers. For this purpose, answers to the following questions were sought in the study.

1. What are the problems faced in teaching primary reading and writing to students whose mother tongue is not Turkish? Do these problems differ
 - according to the teachers' professional seniority,
 - if the students know their mother tongue,
 - according to the number of teaching first graders?

2. Method

The general screening model was used to conduct the study as a study approach aiming to describe a past or present situation as it is, without making any changes to the whole population or a sample to be taken from the population to form a general judgment about a population in a universe where the number of elements is high (Karasar, 2007).

2.1 Universe and Sample

The population of the study consisted of classroom teachers working in Patnos County of the city of Ağrı, and the sample consisted of 205 classroom teachers who taught first grade at least once. It was chosen with the convenient sampling method, which is easy to reach and practical in selecting the participants and determining the sample (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2016). With the appropriate sampling method, the participants who were suitable for the purpose of the research were studied. Demographic information of the participants participating in the research is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. The Demographic Data of the Teachers who Participated in the Study

Variables		N	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	83	40.5
	Female	122	59.5
Professional seniority	1-3 Years	81	39.5
	4-6 Years	88	42.9
	7-10 Years	29	14.1

	11+ Years	7	3.4
Grade	1. grade	34	16.6
	2. grade	57	27.8
	3. grade	59	28.8
	4. grade	40	19.5
	Multigrade class	15	7.3
Knowing the Mother Tongue of the Student	Yes	48	23.4
	No	141	68.8
	Partly	16	7.8
Teaching first graders	Once	114	55.6
	Twice	67	32.7
	Three times	24	11.8

Among the teachers who participated in the study, 83 were male and 122 were female, 81 had 1-3 years of experience, 88 had 4-6 years of experience, 29 had 7-10 years of experience, and 7 had 11+ years of experience. A total of 34 of the teachers worked in the first grade, 57 in the second grade, 59 in the third grade, and 40 in the first grade. Although 48 of the teachers knew the students' mother tongue, 141 did not know the students' mother tongue. 114 taught first grade only once, 67 taught first grade twice, and 24 taught first grade three times.

2.2 Data Collection Tools

Personal information form and "The Scale of Problems Faced in Primary Reading and Writing Teaching to Primary School Students whose mother tongue is not Turkish (SPFBRWTPSS)" was used to collect the study data (Gözüküçük, 2015). The personal information form consists of 5 demographic questions. The scale was prepared in a 5-point Likert style. The reliability value of the scale was 0.966 and in this respect value, the scale was found reliable (Alpar, 2000). Also, the result of Cronbach's Alpha analysis for the study was 0.965. The scale has four dimensions. The second dimension of the scale consists of three sub-dimensions. These dimensions were created to identify the problems encountered in all of the primary reading and writing stages. The scale is prepared as a five-point Likert type and there are options such as "1-Strongly Agree, 2- Agree, 3-Partly Agree, 4- Disagree, 5- Strongly Disagree".

2.2 Analysis of Data

The SPSS 24 package program was used for the analysis of the data obtained in the study. In normality analyses, skewness and kurtosis values, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test values and histogram graphs were examined. Normality analyzes were performed to see if the data were normally distributed and it was decided to perform the Kruskal Wallis Test for the first dimension of the scale and the One-Way Analysis of Variance (One Way ANOVA) Test for the other dimensions.

3. Results

The quantitative and qualitative findings of the study are given respectively in this part through tables and figures.

3.1 Descriptive Statistical Findings

The statistical findings regarding the problems faced by classroom teachers who teach primary school students whose mother tongue is not Turkish are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. The Descriptive Statistical Findings

Item No	Items	n	\bar{X}	SD	Participation Level
1	Students whose mother tongue is not Turkish have difficulty adapting to school during the preparation period.	205	4.47	.813	I definitely agree
2	Students have difficulty understanding what is being said because of language problems.	205	4.57	.686	I definitely agree
3	Students whose mother tongue is not Turkish cannot express what they listen to.	205	4.46	.770	I definitely agree
4	The necessity of learning a new language causes students to prolong the preparation stage.	205	4.58	.656	I definitely agree
5	Students whose mother tongue is not Turkish fall behind in the stage of sensing and recognizing sounds.	205	4.40	.820	I definitely agree
6	Students whose mother tongue is not Turkish have difficulty recognizing sounds.	205	4.16	.945	I agree
7	Students whose native language is not Turkish forget sounds very quickly.	205	3.98	1.02	I agree
8	Students whose native language is not Turkish confuse the “ö” and “ü” sounds.	205	4.42	.851	I definitely agree
9	It is necessary to emphasize the place of the sound in words because students whose mother tongue is not Turkish have difficulty recognizing sounds.	205	4.41	.685	I definitely agree
10	The stages of forming syllables, words, and sentences, which are the products of the language, do not develop sufficiently because students whose mother tongue is not Turkish do not know Turkish sufficiently.	205	4.24	.793	I definitely agree
11	Students whose mother tongue is not Turkish cannot produce words from syllables.	205	3.93	.929	I agree

12	Students whose native language is not Turkish cannot understand words formed from syllables.	205	3.93	.931	I agree
13	Students whose mother tongue is not Turkish have difficulty in making up sentences because their vocabulary is not enhanced enough.	205	4.41	.785	I definitely agree
14	Students whose mother tongue is not Turkish do not understand sentences formed from words.	205	4.04	.900	I agree
15	Students whose native language is not Turkish cannot remember the words while dictating because they cannot make sense of them.	205	4.19	.850	I agree
16	The reading speed of students whose mother tongue is not Turkish is slow.	205	4.05	.935	I agree
17	Students whose mother tongue is not Turkish write incomplete letters or syllables when writing.	205	4.21	.853	I definitely agree
18	Since students whose mother tongue is not Turkish cannot make sense of the words, they write some words adjacent while doing dictation work.	205	4.10	.867	I agree
19	Students whose native language is not Turkish have trouble writing words with more than three syllables.	205	4.10	.898	I agree
20	Students whose mother tongue is not Turkish, who are constantly absent, cannot produce syllables because they cannot fully comprehend the sounds.	205	4.50	.704	I definitely agree
21	Students whose native language is not Turkish decrease letters while reading words with more than three syllables.	205	4.07	.868	I agree
22	Students whose mother tongue is not Turkish cannot establish meaningful relationships between sentences.	205	4.22	.811	I definitely agree
23	Students whose mother tongue is not Turkish have difficulties because they learn Turkish later and when they switch from sentence to text, the text is longer.	205	4.27	.818	I definitely agree
24	Students whose mother tongue is not Turkish cannot create meaningful texts on their own.	205	4.12	.893	I agree

25	The slow reading of students whose mother tongue is not Turkish causes them to be unable to understand the text.	205	4.36	.808	I definitely agree
26	The writing phase takes a long time when students whose mother tongue is not Turkish do not want to learn Turkish.	205	4.08	.986	I agree
27	Students whose mother tongue is not Turkish cannot understand what they read when they do not want to learn Turkish.	205	4.10	.984	I agree
28	Students whose native language is not Turkish write slowly because they cannot make sense of words.	205	4.21	.845	I agree
29	Parents whose mother tongue is not Turkish do not want their students to learn Turkish.	205	2.56	.976	I do not agree
30	Students whose mother tongue is not Turkish do not want to learn Turkish.	205	2.20	.944	I do not agree
31	Students whose mother tongue is not Turkish cannot communicate with their teachers because they do not know enough Turkish.	205	3.70	.986	I agree
32	Students whose mother tongue is not Turkish have difficulty expressing themselves because of language differences.	205	4.19	.811	I agree
33	Students whose mother tongue is not Turkish are shy because they do not know Turkish adequately.	205	4.00	.941	I agree
34	Students whose mother tongue is not Turkish are not able to comprehend simple instructions in the first days of school.	205	4.00	.952	I agree
35	Students whose mother tongue is not Turkish cannot be understood.	205	3.60	1.05	I agree
General		205	4.10	.594	I agree

According to Table 2, the general mean of the scale was found to be 4.10 (“I agree”). In this respect, the level of facing problems of the classroom teachers who taught primary reading and writing to students whose mother tongue was not Turkish was in the form of “I agree”. The item that had the highest average on the scale ($\bar{X} = 4.58$) was “The necessity of learning a new language causes the students to prolong the preparation stage”. Based on this point of view, it can be argued that one of the most important problems of primary school teachers who teach primary reading and writing to students whose mother tongue is not Turkish is the prolongation of the primary reading and writing process, especially the preparation period, because of the language differences of the students. The item that had the lowest mean of the scale ($\bar{X} = 2.20$) was

“Students whose mother tongue is not Turkish do not want to learn Turkish”. In this regard, it was found that primary school teachers thought that the problems faced by students whose mother tongue is not Turkish are not because they do not want to learn Turkish during the primary reading and writing teaching process.

3.2 Variability Analysis Findings on the Primary Literacy Readiness Dimension

The Kruskal Wallis test was used to see whether the scores of the primary school teachers from the first dimension of the scale differed according to the variable of professional seniority. The results are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. The Results of the Kruskal Wallis Test of the Scores Received from the First Dimension of the Scale According to the Variable of Professional Seniority

Variable	Groups	n	Rank mean	X ²	SD	p
Facing difficulties in the preparation stage for primary literacy	1-3 years	81	101.68	.194	3	.979
	4-6 years	88	104.94			
	7-10 years	29	100.90			
	11+ years	7	102.57			

*p>0.05

No significant differences were detected according to the Kruskal Wallis Test, which was used to see whether the scores of the primary school teachers from the first dimension of the scale differ according to the variable of professional seniority ($X^2 = .194$, $p = .979$). In this regard, it can be argued that classroom teachers who had different professional seniority face similar problems in the preparation stage for primary reading and writing.

The Kruskal Wallis Test was used to see whether the scores of the primary school teachers from the first dimension of the scale differed according to the variable of knowing the mother tongue of the student. The results are shown in Table 4.

Table 4. The Kruskal Wallis Test Results of the Scores Received from the First Dimension of the Scale According to the Variable of Knowing the Native Language of the Student

Variable	Groups	n	Rank mean	X ²	SD	p
Facing difficulties in the preparation stage for primary literacy	Yes	48	98.80	1.561	2	.458
	No	141	105.93			
	Partly	16	89.78			

*p>0.05

No significant differences were detected according to the result of the Kruskal Wallis Test, which was used to see whether the scores of the primary school teachers in the first dimension of the scale differed according to the variable of knowing the mother tongue of the

student ($X^2 = 1.561$, $p = .458$). In this regard, it can be argued that classroom teachers who know or do not know the mother tongue of the student and who partially know face similar problems at the stage of preparation for primary reading and writing.

The Kruskal Wallis Test was used to determine whether the scores of the primary school teachers from the first dimension of the scale differ according to the variable of the number of first-grade lecturers. The results are shown in Table 5.

Table 5. The Kruskal Wallis Test Results According to the Variable of Number of First Grade Instruction of Scores Received from the First Dimension of the Scale

Variable	Groups	n	Rank mean	X^2	SD	p
Facing difficulties in the preparation stage for primary literacy	Once	114	108.61	3.376	2	.185
	Twice	67	92.89			
	three times	24	104.60			

* $p > 0.05$

No significant differences were detected according to the Kruskal Wallis Test, which was used to see whether the scores of the primary school teachers in the first dimension of the scale differ according to the variable of the number of teaching first graders ($X^2 = 3.376$, $p = .185$). In this regard, it can be argued that primary school teachers who have taught first grade for 1, 2, and 3 times face similar problems during the preparation for primary reading and writing.

3.3 The Variability Analysis Findings of the Sub-Dimension of Sensing and Recognizing the Voice of the Initial Reading, Writing, and Progress Dimension

The One-Way ANOVA Test was used to see whether the scores of the primary school teachers received from the first sub-dimension of the second dimension of the scale differ according to the variable of professional seniority. The results are shown in Table 6.

Table 6. The Mean Scores Received from the First Sub-Dimension of the Second Dimension of the Scale by Professional Seniority Variable

Variables	n	\bar{X}	SD
1-3 years	81	4.3679	.53334
4-6 years	88	4.3750	.64456
7-10 years	29	3.7448	.83477
11+ years	7	4.2000	.83267
Total	205	4.2771	.67280

Table 7. The Differences in the Scores Received from the First Sub-Dimension of the Second Dimension of the Scale According to the Professional Seniority Variable (One-Way ANOVA)

Source of variance	Sum of Squares	SD	Mean Value of Squares	F	P	Significant difference
Intergroup	9.769	3	3.256			
Intragroup	82.573	201	.411	7.927	.000	1-3 years, 4-6 years> 7-10 years
Total	92.342	204				1-3 years> 4-6 years

*p<0.05

Significant differences were detected according to the One-Way ANOVA Test, which was used to see whether the scores of the primary school teachers from the first sub-dimension of the second dimension of the scale differ according to the variable of professional seniority ($F_{(3-201)}=7.927$, $p=.000$). According to the multiple comparison test used to see among which groups the significant difference is, teachers with 1-3 years of experience and 4-6 years of experience ($\bar{X}=4.3679$, $\bar{X}=4.3750$) compared to teachers with 7-10 years of experience ($\bar{X}=3.7448$), and teachers with 1-3 years of experience ($\bar{X}=4.3679$) had more problems than teachers with 4-6 years of experience ($\bar{X}=4.3750$). The effect size value of these results was found to be $\eta^2=.106$.

The One-Way ANOVA Test was used to see whether the scores of the primary school teachers received from the first sub-dimension of the second dimension of the scale differed according to the variable of knowing the mother tongue of the student. The results are shown in Table 8.

Table 8. The Averages of the Scores Received from the First Sub-Dimension of the Second Dimension of the Scale According to the Variable of Knowing the Student's Native Language

Variables	n	\bar{X}	SD
Yes	48	4.0458	.73135
No	141	4.3660	.62790
Partly	16	4.1875	.73926
Total	205	4.2771	.67280

Table 9. The Differences in Scores Received from the First Sub-Dimension of the Second Dimension of the Scale According to the Variable of Knowing the Student's Mother Tongue (One-Way ANOVA)

Source of variance	Sum of Squares	SD	Mean Value of Squares	F	P	Significant difference
Intergroup	3.809	2	1.904			
Intragroup	88.533	202	.438	4.345	.014	No>Yes
total	92.342	204				

*p<0.05

Significant differences were detected according to the One-Way ANOVA Test, which was used to see whether the scores of the primary school teachers from the first sub-dimension of the second dimension of the scale differ according to the variable of knowing the mother tongue of the student ($F_{(2-202)} = 4.345$, $p=0.014$). According to the multiple comparison test used to see among which groups the significant difference was, it was seen that the teachers who did not know the mother tongue of the students ($\bar{X}= 4.3660$) faced more problems than the teachers who knew the students' mother tongue ($\bar{X}= 4.0458$). The effect size value of these results was found as $\eta^2=.041$.

The One-Way ANOVA Test was used to see whether the scores of the primary school teachers from the first sub-dimension of the second dimension of the scale differ according to the variable of the number of teaching first graders. The results are shown in Table 10.

Table 10. The Averages of the Scores Received from the First Sub-Dimension of the Second Dimension of the Scale According to the Variable of the Number of Teaching First Graders

Variables	n	\bar{X}	SD
Once	114	4.4158	.58364
Twice	67	4.1851	.67178
Three times	24	3.8750	.87041
Total	205	4.2771	.67280

Table 11. The Differences in the Scores Received from the First Sub-Dimension of the Second Dimension of the Scale According to the Number of Teaching First Graders Variable (One-Way ANOVA)

Source of variance	Sum of Squares	SD	Mean Value of Squares	F	p	Significant difference
Intergroup	6.641	2	3.320			
Intragroup	85.702	202	.424	7.826	.001	Once > three times
Total	92.342	204				

*p<0.05

Significant differences were detected according to the One Way ANOVA test, which was used to see whether the scores of the primary school teachers from the first sub-dimension of the second dimension of the scale differ according to the variable of the number of teaching first graders ($F_{(2-202)} = 7.826$, $p=0.001$). According to the multiple comparison test conducted to see among which groups the significant difference was, it was seen that teachers who taught first grade once ($\bar{X}= 4.4158$) faced more problems than teachers who taught first grade 3 times ($\bar{X}= 3.8750$). The effect size value of these results was found as $\eta^2=.072$.

3.4 The Variability Analysis Findings for the Sub-Dimension of Forming Syllables, Words, Sentences, and Text from Sounds of the Initial Reading, Writing, and Progress Dimension

The One-Way ANOVA Test was used to see whether the scores of the primary school teachers from the second sub-dimension of the second dimension of the scale differ according to the variable of professional seniority. The results are shown in Table 12.

Table 12. The Averages of the Scores Received from the First Sub-Dimension of the Second Dimension of the Scale by Professional Seniority Variable

Variables	n	\bar{X}	SD
1-3 years	81	4.2076	.63244
4-6 years	88	4.2756	.62913
7-10 years	29	3.8922	.79442
11+ years	7	3.7500	.70434
Total	205	4.1765	.67023

Table 13. The Differences in the Scores Obtained from the Second Sub-Dimension of the Second Dimension of the Scale According to the Professional Seniority Variable (One-Way ANOVA)

Source variance	of Sum Squares	of SD	Mean Value of Squares	F	p	Significant difference
Intergroup	4.558	3	1.519			
Intragroup	87.081	201	.433	3.507	.016	4-6 years >7-10 years
Total	91.639	204				

*p<0.05

Significant differences were detected according to the One Way ANOVA test, which was used to see whether the scores of the primary school teachers from the second sub-dimension of the second dimension of the scale differ according to the variable of professional seniority ($F_{(3, 201)} = 3.507, p=.016$). According to the multiple comparison test used to see among which groups the significant difference is, it was seen that teachers of 4-6 years ($\bar{X}= 4.3750$) faced more problems than teachers of 7-10 years ($\bar{X}= 3.7448$). The effect size value of these results was found as $\eta^2=.050$.

The One-Way ANOVA Test was used to see whether the scores of the primary school teachers from the second sub-dimension of the second dimension of the scale differ according to the variable of knowing the mother tongue of the student. The results are shown in Table 14.

Table 14. The Averages of the Scores Received from the Second Sub-Dimension of the Second Dimension of the Scale According to the Variable of Knowing the Mother Tongue of the Student

Variables	n	\bar{X}	Ss
Yes	48	3.9089	.76307

No	141	4.2673	.62201
Partly	16	4.1797	.60591
Total	205	4.1765	.67023

Table 15. The Differences in the Scores Received from the Second Sub-Dimension of the Second Dimension of the Scale According to the Variable of Knowing the Student's Mother Language (One-Way ANOVA)

Source of variance	Sum of Squares	SD	Mean Value of Squares	F	p	Significant difference
Intergroup	4.601	2	2.300			
Intragroup	87.039	202	.431	5.339	.006	No>Yes
Total	91.639	204				

*p<0.05

Significant differences were detected according to the One-Way ANOVA Test, which was used to see whether the scores of the classroom teachers from the second sub-dimension of the second dimension of the scale differ according to the variable of knowing the mother tongue of the student ($F_{(2-202)} = 5.339, p=.006$). According to the multiple comparison test used to see among which groups the significant difference was, it was seen that the teachers who did not know the mother tongue of the students ($\bar{X}= 4.2673$) faced more problems than the teachers who knew the mother tongue of the students ($\bar{X}= 3.9089$). The effect size value of these results was found as $\eta^2=.050$.

The One-Way ANOVA Test was used to see if the scores of the primary school teachers from the second sub-dimension of the second dimension of the scale differ according to the variable of the number of first graders. The results are shown in Table 16.

Table 16. The Averages of the Scores Received from the Second Sub-Dimension of the Second Dimension of the Scale According to the Variable of the Number of Teaching First Grade

Variables	n	\bar{X}	SD
Once	114	4.2396	.62094
Twice	67	4.1278	.67739
Three times	24	4.0130	.84779
Total	205	4.1765	.67023

Table 17. The Differences in the Scores Received from the Second Sub-Dimension of the Second Dimension of the Scale According to the Variable of Number of First Grade Instruction (One-Way ANOVA)

Source of variance	Sum of Squares	SD	Mean Value of Squares	F	P	Significant difference
Intergroup	1.254	2	.627			
Intragroup	90.385	202	.447	1.401	.249	-
Total	91.639	204				

*p>0.05

No significant differences were detected according to the One-Way ANOVA Test, which was used to see whether the scores of the primary school teachers from the second sub-dimension of the second dimension of the scale differ according to the variable of the number of teaching first graders ($F(2-202) = 1.401, p=.249$). In this regard, it was determined that teachers with different first-grade teaching numbers in the second sub-dimension of the second dimension of the scale face similar problems.

3.5 Variability Analysis Findings for the Dimension of Literacy Achievement

The One-Way ANOVA Test was used to see whether the scores of the primary school teachers from the third dimension of the scale differ according to the variable of professional seniority. The results are shown in Table 18.

Table 18. The Averages of the Scores Received from the Third Dimension of the Scale by Professional Seniority Variable

Variables	n	\bar{X}	SD
1-3 years	81	3.5235	.52590
4-6 years	88	3.5864	.63810
7-10 years	29	3.1379	.67845
11+ years	7	3.0000	.67330
Total	205	3.4780	.62352

Table 19. The Differences in the Scores Received from the Third Dimension of the Scale According to the Variable of Professional Seniority (One-Way ANOVA)

Source of variance	Sum of Squares	SD	Mean Value of Squares	F	p	Significant difference
Intergroup	6.154	3	2,051			1-3>7-10
Intragroup	73.157	201	.364	5.636	.001	4-6>7-10
Total	79.311	204				

*p<0.05

Significant differences were detected according to the One-Way ANOVA Test, which was used to see whether the scores of the classroom teachers from the third dimension of the scale differ according to the variable of professional seniority ($F_{(3-201)} = 5.636, p=.001$). According to the multiple comparison test used to see among which groups the significant difference is, teachers with 1-3 years of experience ($\bar{X} = 3.5235$) compared to teachers of 7-10 years ($\bar{X} = 3.1379$) and teachers of 4-6 years ($\bar{X} = 3.5864$) 7- It was observed that they faced more problems than teachers of 10 years ($\bar{X} = 3.1379$). The effect size value of these results was found as $\eta^2 = .078$.

The One-Way ANOVA Test was used to see whether the scores obtained by the classroom teachers from the third dimension of the scale differ according to the variable of knowing the mother tongue of the student. The results are shown in Table 20.

Table 20. The Averages of the Scores Received from the Third Dimension of the Scale According to the Variable of Knowing the Native Language of the Student

Variables	n	\bar{X}	SD
Yes	48	3.2167	.72503
No	141	3.5816	.57615
Partly	16	3.3500	.45314
Total	205	3.4780	.62352

Table 21. The Differences in the Scores Received from the Third Dimension of the Scale According to the Variable of Knowing the Mother Language of the Student (One Way ANOVA)

Source of variance	Sum of Squares	SD	Mean Value of Squares	F	p	Significant difference
Intergroup	5.052	2	2.526			
Intragroup	74.259	202	.368	6.872	.001	No>Yes
Total	79.311	204				

* $p < 0.05$

Significant differences were detected according to the One-Way ANOVA Test, which was used to see whether the scores of the classroom teachers in the third dimension of the scale differ according to the variable of knowing the mother tongue of the student ($F_{(2-202)} = 6.872, p=.001$). According to the multiple comparison test used to see among which groups the significant difference was, it was seen that the teachers who did not know the mother tongue of the students ($\bar{X} = 3.5816$) faced more problems than the teachers who knew the mother tongue of the students ($\bar{X} = 3.2167$). The effect size value of these results was found as $\eta^2 = .064$.

The One-Way ANOVA Test was used to see whether the scores obtained by the classroom teachers from the third dimension of the scale differ according to the variable of the number of teaching first graders. The results are shown in Table 22.

Table 22. The Averages of the Scores Received from the Third Dimension of the Scale According to the Variable of the Number of Teaching First Graders

Variables	n	\bar{X}	SD
Once	114	3.5789	.57829
Twice	67	3.4358	.62564
Three times	24	3.1167	.70010
Total	205	3.4780	.62352

Table 23. The Differences in the Scores Received from the Third Dimension of the Scale According to the Variable of Number of First Grade Instruction (One Way ANOVA)

Source of variance	Sum of Squares	SD	Mean Value of Squares	F	p	Significant difference
Intergroup	4.414	2	2.207			
Intragroup	74.897	202	.371	5.953	.003	once> three times
Total	79.311	204				

*p<0.05

Significant differences were detected according to the One-Way ANOVA Test, which was used to see whether the scores of the classroom teachers in the third dimension of the scale differ according to the variable of the number of teaching first graders ($F(2-202) = 5.953, p=.003$). According to the multiple comparison test used to see among which groups the significant difference was, it was seen that teachers who taught first grade once ($\bar{X} = 3.5789$) faced more problems than teachers who taught first grade 3 times ($\bar{X} = 3.1167$). The effect size value of these results was found as $\eta^2=.056$.

3.6 Variability Analysis Findings of the Communication Dimension

The One-Way ANOVA Test was used to see whether the scores of the classroom teachers from the fourth dimension of the scale differ according to the variable of professional seniority. The results are shown in Table 24.

Table 24. The Averages of the Scores Received from the Fourth Dimension of the Scale by Professional Seniority Variable

Variables	n	\bar{X}	SD
1-3 years	81	3.8938	.73694
4-6 years	88	3.9864	.76462
7-10 years	29	3.6759	.76981
11+ years	7	3.9143	.84741
Total	205	3.9034	.75838

Table 25. The Differences in the Scores Received from the Fourth Dimension of the Scale According to the Variable of Professional Seniority (One-Way ANOVA)

Source of variance	Sum of Squares	of SD	Mean Value of Squares	F	P	Significant difference
Intergroup	2.115	3	.705	1.230	.300	-
Intragroup	115.212	201	.573			
Total	117.328	204				

*p>0.05

No significant differences were detected according to the One-Way ANOVA Test, which was used to see whether the scores of the classroom teachers from the fourth dimension of the scale differ according to the variable of professional seniority ($F(3-201) = 1.230, p=.300$). In this regard, teachers with different professional seniority face similar problems in the fourth dimension of the scale.

The One-Way ANOVA Test was used to see whether the scores obtained by the classroom teachers from the fourth dimension of the scale differ according to the variable of knowing the mother tongue of the student. The results are shown in Table 26.

Table 26. The Averages of the Scores Received from the Fourth Dimension of the Scale According to the Variable of Knowing the Mother Language of the Student

Variables	n	\bar{X}	SD
Yes	48	3.7583	.83433
No	141	3.9589	.73154
Partly	16	3.8500	.73937
Total	205	3.9034	.75838

Table 27. The Differences in the Scores Received from the Fourth Dimension of the Scale According to the Variable of Knowing the Mother Language of the Student (One Way ANOVA)

Source of variance	Sum of Squares	of SD	Mean Value of Squares	F	P	Significant difference
Intergroup	1.490	2	.745	1.299	.275	-
Intragroup	115.838	202	.573			
Total	117.328	204				

*p>0.05

No significant differences were detected according to the One-Way ANOVA Test, which was used to see whether the scores of the classroom teachers in the fourth dimension of the scale differ according to the variable of knowing the mother tongue of the student ($F_{(2-202)} = 1.299$, $p=.275$). In this regard, teachers who do not know, know, and partially know the mother tongue of the students face similar problems in the fourth dimension of the scale.

The One-Way ANOVA Test was used to see whether the scores of the classroom teachers from the fourth dimension of the scale differ according to the variable of the number of teaching first graders. The results are shown in Table 28.

Table 28. The Averages of the Scores Received from the Fourth Dimension of the Scale According to the Variable of the Number of Teaching First Graders

Variables	n	\bar{X}	SD
Once	114	3.9860	.76180
Twice	67	3.8000	.74671
Three times	24	3.8000	.75757
Total	205	3.9034	.75838

Table 29. The Differences in the Scores Received from the Fourth Dimension of the Scale According to the Variable of Number of First Grade Instruction (One-Way ANOVA)

Source of variance	Sum of Squares	SD	Mean Value of Squares	F	p	Significant difference
Intergroup	1.750	2	.875			
Intragroup	115.578	202	.572	1.529	.219	-
Total	117.328	204				

* $p>0.05$

No significant differences were detected according to the One-Way ANOVA Test, which was used to see whether the scores of the classroom teachers in the fourth dimension of the scale differ according to the variable of the number of teaching first graders ($F_{(2-202)} = 1.529$, $p=.219$). In this regard, teachers who have taught first grade once, twice, and three times face similar problems in the fourth dimension of the scale.

Discussion Conclusion and Recommendations

According to classroom teachers who teach students whose mother tongue is not Turkish, the most important problem they face during the preparation stage of primary literacy teaching is that the necessity of learning a second language prolongs the preparation stage. According to Susar Kırmızı, Özcan & Şencan (2016), the literacy process is prolonged because students who cannot speak Turkish effectively and fluently focus on learning a new language in the first stages of primary reading and writing teaching. In the study, it was determined that the students switched to reading and writing later than the students whose mother tongue was not Turkish. These results are in agreement with the results of the present study. Based on this point of view, it was determined how important it is for students whose mother tongue is not Turkish to use Turkish

effectively and accurately before starting school. Ensuring that students whose mother tongue is not Turkish can speak Turkish effectively and fluently can be solved by raising awareness of families and eliminating the problem of attendance at preschool education.

According to the classroom teachers, it was found that the most important problem in the stage of sensing, recognizing, and distinguishing sounds is that students whose mother tongue is not Turkish confuse the “ö” and “ü” sounds. This result was found to be similar to that of some other studies (Gözüküçük, 2015; Karadaş, 2017). According to previous studies, students’ confusion about these sounds may be because of mother tongue differences and local dialects. Classroom teachers should pay more attention to the letters and sounds confused in this way, which can help to eliminate the problems.

According to the classroom teachers, the most important problem faced in the process of creating syllables from letters, words from syllables, and sentences from words is that students whose mother tongue is not Turkish and who are constantly absent from classes are unable to understand sounds and have difficulty in producing syllables. It was determined that the addition of problems such as absenteeism to the problems faced because of the difference in mother tongue significantly affects the reading and writing process negatively. It is considered that the main source of the absenteeism problem is the indifference of the family (Yılar, 2019, pp. 225-232).

The most important problem that is identified for the independent reading and writing phase is that students whose mother tongue is not Turkish cannot make sense of words, and for this reason, write slowly. According to Nguyen & Astington (2014), the working memory of individuals with more than one language is supported. Bilingual individuals store information from both languages in their memory. For this reason, they can use any language they need in any situation. However, individuals whose mother tongue is not Turkish and who do not use Turkish effectively enough have difficulty in thinking in Turkish because of the weaknesses in their vocabulary. For this reason, they have difficulty thinking in Turkish and therefore write slowly (Gözüküçük, 2015; Öztepe, 2019).

In the communication dimension of the scale, the opinions in the items “Students whose mother tongue is not Turkish do not want to learn Turkish” and “Parents whose mother tongue is not Turkish do not want their students to learn Turkish” were in the form of “I do not agree”. Gözüküçük (2015) and Aslan (2018) reached the same conclusion in their studies by using the same scale. This shows the consistency of our results. Also, according to these results, it was found that the source of the problems was not the reluctance of the students and parents.

In the communication process of primary reading and writing teaching, the most important problem is that students with different mother tongues who cannot use Turkish effectively enough cannot express themselves adequately. According to Yılmaz & Şekerci (2016), students whose mother tongue is different in the primary reading and writing teaching process have problems expressing themselves. Sarı (2001) reported that bilingual individuals do not express themselves in Turkish. Gözüküçük (2015) and Aslan (2018) found that the biggest problems of teachers are the communicative problems they face with students whose mother tongue is not Turkish. The results are consistent with the results of previous studies. It is already known from both the present study and similar studies that the most important reason for communication problems in the process of primary reading and writing teaching is the difference in the mother tongue. It can be argued that the elimination of this problem depends on the students’ becoming individuals who use Turkish effectively and accurately before starting school. For this reason, studies to be conducted with families regarding the communication process and preschool education are extremely important.

In the stage of sensing, recognizing, and distinguishing the sound of primary reading and writing teaching, teachers with 1-3 years of experience had more problems compared to teachers with 7-10 years and 4-6 years of experience, and teachers with 4-6 years of experience had more problems compared to teachers with 7-10 years of experience. It was also found that teachers with

4-6 years of experience in reading and writing letters, syllables from letters, words from syllables, creating sentences from words, and reading texts had more problems than teachers with 7-10 years of experience. According to these results, it can be argued that teachers with less experience had more problems. According to Gözüküçük (2015), as the professional seniority of classroom teachers teaching students whose mother tongue is not Turkish increases, the problems they face during the primary reading and writing teaching process decrease. Karaman, Yılar & Aslan (2022) and Öztepe (2019) reported in his study that the problems increased with the addition of inexperience on top of the mother tongue difference. It is already known that individuals who teach students whose mother tongue is not Turkish are generally in the first years of their profession. For this reason, teachers working here are generally inexperienced. For this reason, teachers who face problems have difficulty knowing how to act (Yılar, 2019, pp. 225-232). Teachers who faced these problems before and knew how to act had fewer problems.

It was found that teachers who do not know the mother tongue of their students face more problems than teachers who know their mother tongue in the stages of feeling, recognizing and distinguishing sounds, reading and writing letters, syllables from letters, making up words from syllables, forming sentences from words, and reading text and independent reading and writing in primary reading and writing teaching. According to these results, it can be considered that the communication between the students who know the mother tongue and the teachers who do not know the students is different. Gözüküçük (2015) and Aslan (2018) reported that the reason for communication problems with students is the difference in the mother tongue. The communication established by the teacher who knows the mother tongue of students, and also by the teacher who does not know, depends on the student's ability to speak Turkish effectively enough.

It was found that the teachers who taught the first grade for once in the stages of sensing, recognizing, and distinguishing the voice and independent reading and writing of the primary reading and writing teaching faced more problems than the teachers who taught the first grade three times. It was determined that the problems of classroom teachers decreased as their experience with first graders increased. Generally, newly appointed classroom teachers first start to work in the first grades in regions where the mother tongue is not Turkish. For this reason, teachers who have not yet gained experience try to cope with many problems in the first years of their profession because of the difference in the mother tongue. Because of these problems, they sometimes panic, worry, and try to make students literate as soon as possible (Yılar, 2019, pp. 225-232). Newly appointed teachers should not start teaching the first graders in the first year, and start their profession with more experienced teachers in regions where the mother tongue is not Turkish to make use of their experiences.

Recommendations

In line with these results,

- Studies can be conducted to strengthen the communication of teachers with families,
- Training and courses can be organized to raise awareness of families,
- Home trips can be made to achieve maximum efficiency in preschool education,
- Large-scale studies can be conducted to enable students to speak Turkish effectively and fluently before they come to school.

References

- Aksan, D. (2000). *Her yönüyle dil: ana çizgileriyle dilbilim* (6. Baskı). Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Akyol, H. (2008). *Türkçe ilk okuma yazma öğretimi* (6. Baskı) Pegem A Yayıncılık.
- Alpar, R. (2000). *Spor Bilimlerinde Uygulamalı İstatistik*. GSGM Yayınları.
- Aslan, A. (2018). *Türkçenin yeterince etkin ve güzel konuşulmadığı yerlerde ilkokuma yazma öğretiminde öğretmenlerin karşılaştığı sorunlar* (Yüksek lisans tezi). İbrahim Çeçen Üniversitesi, Ağrı
- Aslan, O., & Yılar, Ö. (2023). Etraflı (Peritekstual) Okuma Yapmanın Okuma Motivasyonuna Etkisi. *Dicle Üniversitesi Ziya Gökalp Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, (43), 34-55.
- Bayraktar, N. (2006). *Dil bilimi*. Nobel Yayınları.
- Bialystok, E. Craik, F. I. M. Green, D. W. & Gollan, T. H. (2009). Bilingual minds, A Journal of the Association for Psychological Science. *New York: Cambridge University Press*. 10(3), 89-129. doi: 10.1177/1529100610387084.
- Costa, A., Hernández, M. & Sebastián-Gallés, N. (2008). Bilingualism Aids Conflict Resolution: Evidence From The Ant Task. *International Journal Of Cognitive Science*, 106(1), 59–86. Doi: 10.1016/j.cognition.
- Çolakoğlu, S. (2019). *Anadili Türkçe Olmayan ilkokul Öğrencilerine ilkokuma Yazma Öğretiminde Sınıf Öğretmenlerinin Karşılaştıkları Sorunlar ve Çözüm Önerileri (Şanlıurfa ili Örneği)* (Yüksek lisans tezi). On Sekiz Mart Üniversitesi, Çanakkale.
- Emeç, H. (2011). *Türkçenin yeterince etkin ve güzel konuşulmadığı yerlerde ilkokuma yazma öğretiminde öğretmenlerin karşılaştıkları sorunlar (Erzurum ili örneği)* (Yüksek lisans tezi). Atatürk Üniversitesi, Erzurum.
- Ergin, M. (2000). *Edebiyat ve Eğitim Fakültelerinin Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümleri İçin Türk Dil Bilgisi*. Bayrak Yayıncılık.
- Gözüküçük, M. (2015). *Anadili Türkçe olmayan ilkokul öğrencilerine ilkokuma yazma öğretiminde karşılaşılan sorunlar ve çözüm önerileri* (Doktora tezi). Pamukkale Üniversitesi, Denizli.
- Gözüküçük, M. & Kıran, H. (2018). İkinci dili Türkçe olan ilkokul öğrencileriyle iletişim kurmada karşılaşılan sorunlar ve çözüm önerileri. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, (32), 225-236. Doi: 10.30794/pausbed.424365
- Gülyüz, H. (2004). *Türkçe ilkokuma yazma öğretimi kuram ve uygulamaları*. (7. Baskı) Pegem A Yayınları.
- İlhan, N. (2005). Çocukların dil edinimi, gelişimi ve dile katkıları. *Manas Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 13, 155-160. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/manassosyal/issue/49971/640597>
- Karaman, H., Yılar, Ö., & Aslan, O. (2022). Covid-19 salgını sürecinde Türkçeyi Yeterince etkin kullanamayan ilkokul öğrencilerinin uzaktan Türkçe öğretiminin değerlendirilmesi. *Uluslararası Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 9(31), 101-120.
- Karasar, N. (2007), *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi* (17. Baskı). Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Koç, N. (1992). *Açıklamalı dilbilgisi terimleri sözlüğü*. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi.
- Nguyen, T. K. & Astington, J. W. (2014). Reassessing the bilingual advantage in theory of mind and its cognitive underpinnings. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 17(2), 396-409. Doi: 10.1017/S1366728913000394.

- Öztepe, D. (2019). *Anadili Farklı Olan İlkokul Öğrencilerine Türkçe İlkokuma ve Yazma Öğretiminde Karşılaşılan Güçlüklerle İlişkin Öğretmen Görüşlerinin İncelenmesi*. (Yüksek lisans tezi). Trabzon Üniversitesi, Trabzon.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Portes, A. & Hao, L. (1998). E pluribus unum: Bilingualism and loss of language in the second generation. *Sociology of Education*, 71(4), 269-294. <http://www.jstor.org/discover/2673171>
- Sarı, M. (2001). *İki dilli çocukların çözümleme yöntemiyle okuma- yazma öğrenirken karşılaştıkları güçlükler* (Yüksek lisans tezi). Çukurova Üniversitesi, Adana.
- Sarioğlu, B. (2021). *Türkçenin yeterince etkin ve güzel konuşulmadığı sınıflarda öğretmenlerin ilkokuma yazma öğretimi sürecinde yaşadıkları sorunlar ve çözüm önerileri* (Yüksek lisans tezi). Atatürk Üniversitesi, Erzurum.
- Susar Kırmızı, F., Özcan, E. & Şencan, D. (2016). Türkçenin az konuşulduğu bölgelerde ilk okuma yazma sürecinde karşılaşılan sorunlara ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim Dergisi*, 5(1), 412-445. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/227862>
- Topaloğlu, A. (1989). *Dil bilgisi terimleri sözlüğü*. İstanbul: Ötüken Yayınları.
- Tulu, Y. (2009). *Ana dili Türkçe olan ve ana dili Türkçe olmayan (iki dilli) 4-7 yaş çocukların dil düzeyine etki eden faktörlerin incelenmesi* (Yüksek lisans tezi). Selçuk Üniversitesi, Konya.
- Yılar, Ö. (2019). *İlkokuma Yazma Öğretimi* (2. Baskı). Ömer Yılar (Ed.). "Türkçenin Etkin ve Güzel Konuşulmadığı Yerlerde İlkokuma ve Yazma Öğretimi" (ss. 225-232). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Yılar, R., (2019). Ses esaslı ilkokuma ve yazma öğretimi. Ö. Yılar (Ed.), *İlkokuma ve yazma öğretimi* içinde (2. baskı, ss. 156-174). Pegem Akademi.
- Yıldırım, Ali & Simsek, Hasan. 2016. *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri* (10. Baskı). Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Yıldız, M. (2013). Okuma motivasyonu, akılcı okuma ve okuduğunu anlamanın beşinci sınıf öğrencilerinin akademik başarılarındaki rolü. *Electronic Turkish Studies*, 8(4).
- Yılmaz, F. & Şekerci, H. (2016). Ana dil sorunsalı: Sınıf öğretmenlerinin deneyimlerine göre ilkokul öğrencilerinin yaşadıkları sorunlar. *Eğitimde Nitel Araştırmalar Dergisi- Journal of Qualitative Research in Education*, 4(1), 47-63. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/enad/issue/32029/354378>
- Yiğit, V. (2009). *Ses temelli cümle yöntemi ile ilkokuma yazma öğretim sürecinde karşılaşılan güçlükler ve bu güçlüklerle baş etme stratejilerinin belirlenmesi: Şırnak ili örneği* (Yüksek lisans tezi). Çukurova Üniversitesi, Adana

ETİK ve BİLİMSEL İLKELER SORUMLULUK BEYANI

Bu çalışmanın tüm hazırlanma süreçlerinde etik kurallara ve bilimsel atıf gösterme ilkelerine riayet edildiğini yazar(lar) beyan eder. Aksi bir durumun tespiti halinde Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi'nin hiçbir sorumluluğu olmayıp, tüm sorumluluk makale yazarlarına aittir. Yazarlar etik kurul izni gerektiren çalışmalarda, izinle ilgili bilgileri (kurul adı, tarih ve sayı no) yöntem bölümünde ve ayrıca burada belirtmişlerdir.

Kurul adı: Atatürk Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Birim Etik Kurulu

Tarih: 21.08.2020

No: 14

ARAŞTIRMACILARIN MAKALEYE KATKI ORANI BEYANI

1. yazar katkı oranı : % 50

2. yazar katkı oranı : % 50

Bu çalışma Atatürk Üniversitesi BAPK tarafından desteklenmiştir, proje no: SDK-2021-9017.