

Preservice Turkish Teachers' Attitudes Towards Anatolian Dialects

Bünyamin Sarikaya

Faculty of Education, Muş Alparslan University, Turkey

Corresponding author: Bünyamin Sarikaya, E-mail: b.sarikaya@alparslan.edu.tr

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Received: December 23, 2018

Accepted: January 29, 2019

Published: January 31, 2019

Volume: 7 Issue: 1

Conflicts of interest: None

Funding: None

ABSTRACT

The term *dialect* refers to a variation of a language that is peculiar to a specific place, city or region, and therefore, can be regarded as the richness of that language. This study aimed to investigate preservice teachers' attitudes towards Anatolian dialects. A screening model was used. Study sample consisted of 143 first-, second-, third and fourth-grade students of the Department of Turkish Language Teaching of the Faculty of Education of Muş Alparslan University in the fall semester of 2018-2019 academic year. Data were collected using the "Attitude Scale towards Anatolian Dialects" (ASTAD) developed by Pehlivan (2012). It is a Likert-type scale consisting of 22 items and 4 subscales. Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows 22.0 at a significance level of 0.05. Results showed that participants had a moderate level of attitude towards Anatolian dialects. Participants' attitudes towards Anatolian dialects significantly differed by bilingualism and grade while gender, mother's and fathers' educational levels, and socioeconomic status had no significant effect. Based on the results, it is recommended that activities, seminars and conferences be held to inform teachers and preservice teachers about what to do when they encounter students speaking local dialects. Parents and students should also be taught that local dialects are the richness of languages but that they should not use them in school environment.

Key words: Dialect, Attitude, Preservice Turkish Teacher

INTRODUCTION

Cultural and social changes have a direct effect on language. An ever-changing society needs a common standardized language, which is not much affected by everyday changes, to be able to have a written communication. The grammar and lexicon of a written language ensure the standard in question and maintains communication (Akar, 2009). Communities face socio-cultural differences and structural changes as they multiply, develop, divide or migrate. These structural changes lead to transformations, first, in those communities' worldviews and then in their languages, resulting in linguistic variations (Buran, 2002). One of those variations is dialects.

The concept of dialect is defined in various ways in the literature. Korkmaz (2010) defines it as modal, verbal, vocal and semantic changes in the vernacular of a language. Ergin (1998) defines it as the difference in the lexical stress pattern in a given language spoken in a certain geographic area. According to Göztaş (2017), dialect is used by people who share a common territory, facilitates communication and strengthens the sense of belonging.

Approaching from a different perspective, Demir (2002) defines the concept of dialect as a local form of a main language. However, to him, a dialect adheres to the main standard language from which it originates. A new dialect

emerges on its own motion and is used in family and social circles by people who are not highly literate and who have not been away from their community for long. The frequency of the use of a dialect depends on how frequently the speakers of that dialect encounter other forms of the main standard language. A dialect is used and respected less than the main standard language in formal circles, does not become a written rule, provides limited communication, and can deviate as long as it maintains mutual intelligibility. According to Uzun (2015), dialect is a form of speech that differs within the boundaries of a language.

These explanations and definitions show that dialects are a natural, simple and organic languages. They reflect the historical changes and developments which languages go through. Affected by technology, dialects are now undergoing change as well. Erdem (2014) states that dialects are losing their unique features and people's vocabulary is becoming more and more limited in a world where transportation and communication are rapidly developing.

There is a relationship between the concept of dialect and written and spoken languages. A written language is first used as an official language and a legal parlance, and then becomes the language of education, science and literature. The use of an official language in law standardizes that lan-

guage (Akar, 2009). The uniformity of a written language is rather related to standard writing. Written languages are used in various areas. While dialects are completely excluded from some of those areas such as textbooks and official documents (Demir, 2013), they are allowed in others such as the written forms of oral literature products (tales, legends, proverbs, idioms, riddles, jokes and folk stories, poems and songs), comics, plays, dialogues of stories and novels, and local press (Demir, 2009).

Spoken languages are natural, sincere and organic languages used in daily life. They are phraseological and vary according to the geographical location in which they are used. They differ by the way words are pronounced. These are dialectical differences that are observed in different regions but are not used in written languages (Oğuzkan, 2001).

There are two types of spoken language: standard spoken language and dialectical spoken language. Based on dialects, standard spoken languages are closer to written languages and used in social life and educational institutions just like written languages. Educational institutions are also responsible for maintaining and improving standard spoken languages by encouraging learners to use them rather than local dialects (Uşaklı, 2005).

Used by all segments of society, standard languages have an area of influence transcending regions. They also have superior functionality to dialects, rules established by official institutions and certain systems (Yıkıncı, 2015). Demir (2002) states that the concept of standard language should first be clearly defined in order to define that of dialect. A dialect becomes a standard language when it is widely used in official and educational institutions across the country. Turkish spoken in Turkey, also referred to as Istanbul Turkish, became official in the twentieth century.

There are certain criteria for a dialect to be a standard language and these criteria distinguish that dialect from others and reveals its peculiar characteristics. The criteria are as follows (Demir, 2002):

Selection: The selection of a dialect as a standard language depends not on dialectal variation but on the economic, cultural and political power of the people who speak that dialect.

Coding: Official institutions such as the Language Association or the Ministry of National Education systematize, i.e., legalize, the characteristics of the standard language. Dictionaries and spelling books are prepared to ensure maximum mutual intelligibility between people who are to speak that language.

Development of Functions: It is ensured that the standard language can meet the needs in all cases that require writing whether in official institutions or in daily life.

Adoption: The last and most important condition is that the standard language must be adopted by a segment of society.

Table 1 compares the properties of standard language and dialect, and sets out the features that should be present in the latter (Table 1).

Dialects of Turkish were classified in different ways by different researchers at different times. The work titled "St. Petersburg" by Maksimov is the first scientific research on dialects of Turkish spoken in Turkey. Ignác Kúnos classified the dialects of Turkish in 1896. Anatolian dialects were classified into 9, 14 and 6 groups by Ahmet Caferoğlu in 1946, by Piet Kral and Tahsin Banguoğlu, and by A. Grunina in 1998, respectively (Tekin, 2017). There is also some other research on Anatolian dialects. For example, Karahan (2014) classified the Anatolian dialects in three main groups based on phonetic, modality and syntax, while Ergin (1998) grouped them as the Black Sea, Konya and Istanbul Turkish etc.

Dialects are also spoken in educational environments, because educational institutions are also social institutions. In this context, it is important to elicit information about preservice Turkish teachers' attitudes towards Anatolian dialects. This study sought answers to the following questions:

Research Questions

This study sought answers to the following question to determine preservice Turkish teachers' attitudes towards Anatolian dialects:

1. What is the level of preservice Turkish teachers' attitudes towards Anatolian dialects?
2. Do preservice Turkish teachers' attitudes towards Anatolian dialects significantly differ by grade?
3. Do preservice Turkish teachers' attitudes towards Anatolian dialects significantly differ by gender?
4. Do preservice Turkish teachers' attitudes towards Anatolian dialects significantly differ by fathers' education?
5. Do preservice Turkish teachers' attitudes towards Anatolian dialects significantly differ by mothers' education?
6. Do preservice Turkish teachers' attitudes towards Anatolian dialects significantly differ by socioeconomic status?
7. Do preservice Turkish teachers' attitudes towards Anatolian dialects significantly differ by bilingualism?

METHOD

This section addresses the research design, study population and sample, data collection, measurement reliability, and data analysis.

Table 1. Comparison of standard language and dialect

Areas of comparison	Dialect	Standard language
Linguistic criteria	Simple	More complicated because it feeds on more resources.
Vocabulary	Common	Wide enough to encompass other dialects.
Area of Use, functionality	Narrow, verbal communication, limited function	Widely used in all kinds of communication, official institutions and literature. Unlimited, advanced function
Speaker	People with low literacy	More educated, the elite layer of society
Distribution	Village, countryside	Transcending regions

Research Design

A screening model was used to determine preservice Turkish teachers' attitudes towards Anatolian dialects. According to Fraenkel and Wallen (2006), screening models are used on large samples to determine their opinions, interests, skills, abilities or attitudes concerning a subject or event. Karasar (2003) defines screening models as research models used to describe a past or present phenomenon as it was or is. In this study, a screening model was the method of choice because preservice Turkish teachers' attitudes towards Anatolian dialects were measured using a Likert-type scale.

Population and Sample

The study population and sample consisted of 143 first-, second-, third and fourth-grade students of the Department of Turkish Language Teaching of the Faculty of Education of Muş Alparslan University in the fall semester of 2018-2019 academic year.

Data Collection

Data were collected from 143 first-, second-, third and fourth-grade students of the Department of Turkish Language Teaching of the Faculty of Education of Muş Alparslan University in the fall semester of 2018-2019 academic year. The data collection tool was distributed to participants by the researcher. Participants were informed about the purpose and procedure of the study prior to participation.

Data Collection Tool and Measurement Reliability

Data were collected using the Attitude Scale Towards Anatolian Dialects (ASTAD) developed by Pehlivan (2012). It is a Likert-type scale consisting of 22-items and 4 subscales: Significance and Function of Dialects in Education (SFDE; 8 items), Attitudes Towards Dialect Speakers (ATDS; 5 items), Emotional Value Towards Dialect Use (EVDU; 6 items) and Status of Dialects (SoD; 3 items).

Positive items were scored from 5 to 1 while negative items were reverse-scored (from 1 to 5) (Table 2).

The scale has 11 positive and 11 negative items. the lowest score being 22 and the highest score being 110. The higher the score, the more positive attitude towards dialects.

The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was found to be 0.880 (Pehlivan, 2012) while it was 0.864 in this study. The reliability of the subscales were as follows: $\alpha=0.863$ for SFDE, $\alpha=0.845$ for ATDS, $\alpha=0.806$ for EVDU and $\alpha=0.833$ for SoD.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows 22.0 at a significance level of 0.05. Numbers, percentages, mean and standard deviation were used as descriptive statistical methods. The t-test was used for analysis of quantitative continuous data in two independent groups while one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used for analysis of quantitative continuous data in more than two independent groups. A Scheffe's Test was

used to make posthoc comparisons between the groups to determine significant differences.

FINDINGS AND COMMENTS

This section addresses the findings of data analysis and includes explanations and comments based on the findings (Table 3).

Of participants, 22 (15.4%) are first-graders, 27 (18.9%) second-graders, 33 (23.1%) third-graders and 61 (42.7%) fourth-graders.

89 (62.2%) of participants are women and 54 (37.8%) are men.

Of participants, 20 (14.0%) have Illiterate fathers, 55 (38.5%) have fathers with a primary school degree, 30 (21%) have fathers with an elementary degree, 21 (14.7%) have fathers with a high school degree and 17 (11.9%) have fathers with a bachelor's degree.

Table 2. Scale scoring

Likert (5 points)	Positive items	Negative items
Strongly agree	5	1
Agree	4	2
Undecided	3	3
Disagree	2	4
Strongly disagree	1	5

Table 3. Participants' descriptive characteristics

Tables	Groups	Frequency (f)	Percentage
Grade	1	22	15.4
	2	27	18.9
	3	33	23.1
	4	61	42.7
Gender	Women	89	62.2
	Men	54	37.8
Fathers' educational levels	Illiterate	20	14.0
	Primary	55	38.5
	Elementary	30	21.0
	High school	21	14.7
	University	17	11.9
Mothers' educational levels	Illiterate	51	35.7
	Primary	68	47.6
	Elementary	24	16.8
	High school	0	0
	University	0	0
Socioeconomic status	Very low	0	0
	Low	0	0
	Medium	112	78.3
	High	31	21.7
	Very high	0	0
Bilingualism	Yes	85	59.4
	No	58	40.6

Of participants, 51 (35.7%) have Illiterate mothers, 68 (47.6%) have mothers with a primary school degree and 24 (16.8%) have mothers with an elementary degree while none of the participants has a mother with a high school or bachelor's degree.

Of participants, 112 (78.3%) have a moderate socioeconomic status while 31 (21.7%) have a high socioeconomic status. None of the participants has a very low, low or very high socioeconomic status.

Of participants, 85 (59.4%) are bilingual while 58 (40.6%) are monolingual (Table 4).

Participants' SFDE subscale mean score is 25.322±6.150 (Min=12; Max=40), ATDS subscale mean score is 15.042±3.747 (Min=5; Max=25), EVDU subscale mean score is 23.601±4.586 (Min=6; Max=30), SoD subscale mean score is 9.245±2.982 (Min=3; Max=15) and "Total Attitude Towards Anatolian Dialects" (TAAD) mean score is 73.210±13.968 (Min=36; Max=110). These mean scores are considered to be moderate (Table 5).

The One-way Anova test results showed that participants' ASTAD total scores significantly differed by grade (F=5.219; p=0.002<0.05). Scheffé tests were used to determine which groups differed significantly from one another. First graders had significantly higher ASTAD total scores than third and fourth graders (p<0.05).

Participants' SFDE subscale mean scores significantly differed by grade (F=3.674; p=0.014<0.05). Scheffé tests were used to determine which groups differed significantly from one another. First graders had significantly higher SFDE subscale mean scores than third and fourth graders (p<0.05).

Participants' EVDU subscale mean scores significantly differed by grade (F=3.770; p=0.012<0.05). Scheffé tests were used to determine which groups differed significantly from one another. First graders had significantly higher EVDU subscale mean scores than third and fourth graders (p<0.05). Second graders had significantly higher EVDU subscale mean scores than fourth graders (p<0.05).

Table 4. Participants' ASTAD mean scores

	N	M	Sd	Min.	Max.	Scale ratio	Alpha
SFDE*	143	25.322	6.150	12.000	40.000	8-40	0.863
ATDS**	143	15.042	3.747	5.000	25.000	5-25	0.845
EVDU***	143	23.601	4.586	6.000	30.000	6-30	0.806
SoD****	143	9.245	2.982	3.000	15.000	3-15	0.833
TAAD*****	143	73.210	13.968	36.000	110.000	22-110	0.864

*Significance and Function of Dialects in Education, **Attitudes Towards Dialect Speakers, ***Emotional Value Towards Dialect Use, ****Status of Dialects, *****Total Attitude Towards Anatolian Dialects

Table 5. Participants' ASTAD scores depending on grade

	Group	N	M	Sd	F	p	Sig.
SFDE	Grade 1	22	28.864	5.668	3.674	0.014	1>3
	Grade 2	27	25.815	5.684			1>4
	Grade 3	33	25.030	6.317			
	Grade 4	61	23.984	6.035			
ATDS	Grade 1	22	16.955	4.237	2.415	0.069	
	Grade 2	27	15.000	3.508			
	Grade 3	33	14.515	3.581			
	Grade 4	61	14.656	3.623			
EVDU	Grade 1	22	25.909	3.100	3.770	0.012	1>3
	Grade 2	27	24.556	4.535			1>4
	Grade 3	33	23.424	4.576			2>4
	Grade 4	61	22.443	4.752			
SoD	Grade 1	22	10.636	2.421	3.567	0.016	1>4
	Grade 2	27	9.852	2.727			2>4
	Grade 3	33	9.273	2.809			
	Grade 4	61	8.459	3.171			
TAAD	Grade 1	22	82.364	12.595	5.219	0.002	1>3
	Grade 2	27	75.222	12.665			1>4
	Grade 3	33	72.242	13.110			
	Grade 4	61	69.541	14.083			

Participants' SoD subscale mean scores significantly differed by grade ($F=3.567$; $p=0.016<0.05$). Scheffé tests were used to determine which groups differed significantly from one another. First and second graders had significantly higher SoD subscale mean scores than fourth graders ($p<0.05$) (Table 6).

The *t* test results showed no significant difference ($t=-1.509$; $p=0.161>0.05$) in TAAD scores between male ($M=75.463$) and female participants ($M=71.843$). However,

male participants had higher scores than female participants.

Participants' SFDE subscale mean scores significantly differed by gender ($t=-2.060$; $p=0.041<0.05$), indicating that female participants had lower SFDE subscale mean scores ($M=24.506$) than male participants ($M=26.667$). However, Participants' ATDS, EVDU and SoD subscale mean scores did not significantly differ by gender ($p>0.05$) (Table 7).

The One-way Anova test results showed that participants' TAAD scores did not significantly differ by fathers' educa-

Table 6. Participants' ASTAD scores depending on gender

	Group	N	M	Sd	t	p	Sig.
SFDE	Women	89	24.506	5.655	-2.060	0.041	
	Men	54	26.667	6.729			
ATDS	Women	89	14.933	3.551	-0.447	0.656	
	Men	54	15.22	4.078			
EVDU	Women	89	23.382	4.519	-0.733	0.465	
	Men	54	23.963	4.714			
SoD	Women	89	9.023	2.637	-1.146	0.286	
	Men	54	9.611	3.472			
TAAD	Women	89	71.843	12.316	-1.509	0.161	
	Men	54	75.463	16.205			

Table 7. Participants' ASTAD scores depending on fathers' educational levels

	Group	N	M	Sd	F	p
SFDE	Illiterate	20	24.900	6.025	0.143	0.966
	Primary school	55	25.527	6.596		
	Elementary school	30	24.733	6.125		
	High school	21	25.667	5.304		
	University	17	25.765	6.418		
ATDS	Illiterate	20	14.600	3.050	0.346	0.846
	Primary school	55	15.346	3.940		
	Elementary school	30	14.700	3.426		
	High school	21	14.714	3.703		
	University	17	15.588	4.638		
EVDU	Illiterate	20	24.550	4.199	0.456	0.768
	Primary school	55	23.400	5.035		
	Elementary school	30	23.067	4.502		
	High school	21	24.238	4.392		
	University	17	23.294	4.104		
SoD	Illiterate	20	9.900	2.469	0.678	0.608
	Primary school	55	8.982	3.028		
	Elementary school	30	8.800	3.078		
	High school	21	9.714	2.986		
	University	17	9.529	3.300		
TAAD	Illiterate	20	73.950	12.373	0.204	0.936
	Primary school	55	73.255	15.675		
	Elementary school	30	71.300	13.651		
	High school	21	74.333	10.599		
	University	17	74.177	15.237		

Table 8. Participants' ASTAD scores depending on mothers' educational levels

	Group	N	M	Sd	F	p
SFDE	Illiterate	51	25.216	6.568	0.303	0.739
	Primary	68	25.088	5.937		
	Elementary or higher	24	26.208	6.007		
ATDS	Illiterate	51	15.667	3.907	1.434	0.242
	Primary	68	14.882	3.728		
	Elementary or higher	24	14.167	3.358		
EVDU	Illiterate	51	23.745	4.668	0.113	0.893
	Primary	68	23.632	4.734		
	Elementary or higher	24	23.208	4.118		
SoD	Illiterate	51	9.510	2.989	0.311	0.734
	Primary	68	9.103	3.125		
	Elementary or higher	24	9.083	2.603		
TAAD	Illiterate	51	74.137	14.480	0.173	0.842
	Primary	68	72.706	14.142		
	Elementary or higher	24	72.667	12.775		

tional levels ($F=0.204$; $p=0.936>0.05$). Participants whose fathers had a high school or bachelor's degree had the highest TAAD scores. Participants' SFDE, ATDS, EVDU and SoD subscale scores did not significantly differ by fathers' educational levels ($p>0.05$) (Table 8).

The One-way Anova test results showed that participants' TAAD scores did not significantly differ by mothers' educational levels ($F=0.173$; $p=0.842>0.05$). Participants whose mothers are Illiterate had the highest TAAD scores. Participants' SFDE, ATDS, EVDU and SoD subscale scores did not significantly differ by mothers' educational levels ($p>0.05$) (Table 9).

The One-way Anova test results showed that participants' TAAD scores did not significantly differ by socioeconomic status ($F=0.442$; $p=0.659>0.05$). Participants had similar TAAD scores regardless of socioeconomic status. Participants' SFDE, ATDS, EVDU and SoD subscale scores did not significantly differ by socioeconomic status ($p>0.05$) (Table 10).

The t test results showed that participants' TAAD scores significantly differed by bilingualism ($t=2.459$; $p=0.015<0.05$), indicating that bilingual participants ($M=75.541$) had significantly higher TAAD scores than monolingual participants ($M=69.793$).

Bilingual participants ($M=26.165$) had significantly ($t=2.005$; $p=0.047<0.05$) higher SFDE scores than monolingual participants ($M=24.086$).

Bilingual participants ($M=24.318$) had significantly ($t=2.295$; $p=0.023<0.05$) higher EVDU scores than monolingual participants ($M=22.552$).

There was, however, no statistically significant difference in ATDS and SoD scores between bilingual and monolingual participants ($p>0.05$).

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

This study investigated preservice Turkish teachers' attitudes towards Anatolian dialects. The variables analyzed

Table 9. Participants' ASTAD scores depending on socioeconomic status

	Group	N	M	Sd	F	p
SFDE	Moderate	112	25.464	6.247	0.526	0.600
	High	31	24.807	5.856		
ATDS	Moderate	112	14.973	3.819	-0.416	0.678
	High	31	15.290	3.523		
EVDU	Moderate	112	23.705	4.506	0.514	0.608
	High	31	23.226	4.924		
SoD	Moderate	112	9.339	2.982	0.719	0.473
	High	31	8.903	3.004		
TAAD	Moderate	112	73.482	14.078	0.442	0.659
	High	31	72.226	13.747		

Table 10. Participants' ASTAD scores depending on Bilingualism

	Group	N	M	Sd	t	p
SFDE	Yes	85	26.165	6.100	2.005	0.047
	No	58	24.086	6.065		
ATDS	Yes	85	15.447	3.577	1.573	0.118
	No	58	14.448	3.939		
EVDU	Yes	85	24.318	4.422	2.295	0.023
	No	58	22.552	4.657		
SoD	Yes	85	9.612	3.055	1.796	0.075
	No	58	8.707	2.810		
TAAD	Yes	85	75.541	13.787	2.459	0.015
	No	58	69.793	13.637		

were grade, gender, father's and mothers' educational levels, socioeconomic status and bilingualism. We can argue that all these variables affect preservice Turkish teachers' use of

dialects. There has been very little discussion of preservice Turkish teachers' attitudes towards Anatolian dialects due to the limited number of studies on this topic.

Almost all languages have dialects. Turkish teachers and preservice Turkish teachers are responsible for teaching and speaking Istanbul Turkish. Eryılmaz supports this view in his master's thesis (2015) as well. He states that teachers should learn or familiarize themselves with the characteristics of dialects spoken in regions where they work and discourage students from speaking them in school (151-152). According to Eryılmaz (2015), teachers are responsible for detecting students speaking dialects, teaching them to what local terms that they use correspond in written language, correcting their mistakes in writing or speaking and checking whether they still continue to speak dialects. Solmaz (1997) also states that dialectical differences should be discouraged especially by schools to ensure unity in language objectives. Muharrem Ergin (1998) argues that teachers should pay utmost attention to the way students speak especially in Turkish lessons. In his master's thesis, Şimşek (2004) states that teachers are role models for students, and therefore, avoid using local dialects in school environment. Sargin (2006) argues that people should avoid using dialects as it might cause them to have difficulty communicating with others. According to Yaylağan (2010), teachers should be well aware of the fact that students from different sociocultural backgrounds are likely to speak dialects and use local terms. When they have such students in class, they should teach them the equivalent of those terms in the standard Turkish. However, Davies (2000) conducted a study in Germany and reported that some teachers with insufficient training do not know how to meet the needs of students who speak dialects.

This study analyzed preservice Turkish teachers' attitudes towards Anatolian dialects based on six variables, one of which was grade. Participants' ASTAD total scores significantly differed by grade ($F=5.219$; $p=0.002<0.05$). The total ASTAD scores of first-, second-, third- and fourth graders were $M=82.364$, $M=75.222$, $M=72.242$ and $M=69.541$, respectively, indicating that the higher the grade, the lower participants' attitudes towards Anatolian dialects. First-graders are freshmen and it is therefore not surprising that they had the highest scores as it might be due to increased education or Turkish education. Şimşek (2016) conducted a study on elementary school students (Grades 6, 7 and 8) and reported that six-graders spoke dialects the most while eight-graders spoke the least, indicating that the higher the grade, the less use of dialects. This result is similar to that reported by Şimşek (2016).

Although there was no significant difference in TAAD scores between male and female participants, the former had higher ($M=75.463$) scores than the latter ($M=71.843$), suggesting that the former had more positive attitudes towards Anatolian dialects than the latter. This result is similar to that of Şimşek (2016), who found that female students spoke dialects less frequently and used fewer local terms than male students. Yılmaz (2009) also reported that female students used less dialect in writing than male students.

Although we assumed that the higher the father's education, the more negative the participant's attitudes towards

dialects, the results did not support this assumption. The results did not reveal any significant effect of mothers' educational levels on participants' TAAD scores either. However, the general pattern was that the higher the mother's education, the lower the participant's score, that is, the more negative the participant's attitudes towards dialects. The difference between the effect of fathers' and mothers' education on participants' attitudes towards dialects might be due to the fact that mothers spend more time in family and school settings than fathers. Kırmızı (2000) conducted a study on Turkish language teachers and reported that participants' parents tend to speak dialects and that this has a negative effect on the way they speak and write in standard Turkish. Arhan (2007) conducted a study on 244 Turkish teachers working in the central districts of Ankara. In his study, participants reported that students often spoke dialects during Turkish lessons and that it was mainly due to the use of dialects by their parents. These findings suggest that parents should be advised against speaking dialects and to warn their children if they speak them.

The results showed no significant effect of socioeconomic status on participants' attitudes towards dialects ($F=0.442$; $p=0.659>0.05$). Participants with a moderate socioeconomic status had a mean score of $M=73.482$ while those with a high socioeconomic status had a mean score of $M=72.226$, suggesting that the higher the socioeconomic status, the more negative the participants' attitudes towards dialects. Uşaklı (2005) analyzed teachers' views of Turkish-related problems experienced by primary school second-grade students of families who migrated to Izmir. He reported that students of low socioeconomic status have greater difficulty learning Turkish than those of high socioeconomic status due to the fact that children of immigrant families speak dialects rather than standard Turkish. The effect of socioeconomic status on students' academic achievement and dialect use has also been reported by different studies (Şimşek, 2000; Alkan, 2007; Yılmaz, 2009).

Demircan (1990) defines the concept of bilingualism as the ability of an individual to use a second language to some extent other than his/her native language. According to Lewandowski (1984, As cited in Oruç, 2016), bilingualism refers to the ability of mastering two languages at high levels of proficiency, and speaking and understanding both. Kielhöfer and Jonekeit (1998) state that when a bilingual individual switches from one language to another, he/she should know the characteristics of the switched language completely. This study also investigated the effect of bilingualism on participants' attitudes towards dialects. Participants were informed about the concept of bilingualism prior to participation. The results showed that bilingual participants had significantly higher TAAD scores ($M=75.541$) than monolingual participants ($M=69.793$), suggesting that the former had more positive attitudes towards dialects than the latter.

The following suggestions can be made based on the results of the study:

- Given the fact that local dialects are widely used in Turkey, activities, seminars and conferences should be held to inform teachers and preservice teachers about what to do when they encounter students speaking local dialects.

- Awareness should be raised among parents and students of the fact that local dialects are the richness of languages but that they should not be used in school environment.
- Teachers should always keep in mind that they are role models for students, and therefore not speak local dialects.
- Further research should be conducted on the effects of dialects on students' basic language skills such as reading, speaking and writing.

REFERENCES

- Akar, A. (2009). Ağız sözlükleri: yöntem ve sorunlar I. *Turkish Studies*, 4(4), 1-11.
- Alkan, Z. N. (2007). *İlköğretim beşinci sınıf öğrencilerinin yazılı anlatım hataları*. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Eskişehir: Osmangazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Arhan, S. (2007). *Öğretmen görüşlerine göre ilköğretim okulları ikinci kademedeki konuşma eğitimi: Ankara ili örneği*. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
- Buran, A. (2002). Konuşma dili yazı dili ilişkileri ve derleme faaliyetleri. *Türk bilig*, 4, 97-104.
- Davies, V. W. (2000). Language awareness amongst teachers in a central German dialect area. *Language Awareness*, 9(3), pp. 119-134
- Demir, N. (2002). Ağız terimi üzerine. *Türk bilig*, 4, 105-116.
- Demir, N. (2009). Edebi Metinlerde Ağız Kullanımı Hakkında Bir Ön Çalışma, <http://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu/documents/40733038/berntarmagani.pdf>
- Demir, N. (2013). *Ankara örneğinde ağızların belgelenmesi*. Ankara: TDK Yayınları
- Demircan, Ö. (1990). *Yabancı dil öğretim yöntemleri*. İstanbul: Ekin Yay.
- Erdem, G. (2014). *Anamur ve yöresi ağızları*. Yayımlanmamış Doktora tezi, Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Erzincan.
- Ergin, M. (1998). *Türk dilbilgisi*. İstanbul: Bayrak Yayınları.
- Eryılmaz, R. (2015). *Çameli ilçesi ağız ve Çameli ortaokullarında eğitim gören öğrencilerin yerel ağız özelliklerinin Türkçe eğitimine etkisi*. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Denizli: Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
- Fraenkel, J. R. & Wallen, N. E. (2006). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York: McGraw-Hill International Edition.
- Göztaş, G. (2017). Edebi Metinlerde Ağız Kullanımı: Bekir Yıldız Örneği. *SUTAD*, 42, 113-134.
- Karahan, L. (2014). *Anadolu ağızlarının sınıflandırılması*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yay.
- Karasar, N. (2003). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Kırmızı, F. S. (2000). *Türkçe öğretiminde karşılaşılan sorunlar ve bu sorunların öğretmen performansına etkileri*. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Denizli: Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
- Kielhöfer, B. & Jonekeit, S. (1998). *Zweisprachige Kindererziehung*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag.
- Korkmaz, Z. (2010). *Gramer terimleri sözlüğü*. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Lewandowski, T. (1984). *Linguistisches wörterbuch 1-2-3*. Heidelberg: Quelle und Meyer Verlag.
- Oğuzkan, A. (2001). *Örneklerle Türkçe ve kompozisyon bilgileri*. İstanbul: MEB.
- Oruç, Ş. (2016). Ana dili, ikinci dil, iki dillilik, yabancı dil. *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies*. 45(3), 279-290.
- Pehlivan, İ. (2012). Öğretmen adaylarının Anadolu ağızlarına yönelik tutum ölçeğinin geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Bilgi Türk Dünyası Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 63, 135-158.
- Sargın, M. (2006). *İlköğretim öğrencilerinin konuşma becerilerinin değerlendirilmesi*. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Muğla: Muğla Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Solmaz, M. (1997). *Üniversite öğrencilerinde ağız özelliklerine dayanan Türkçe hataları*. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
- Şimşek, F. (2016). *Ortaokul 6, 7, 8. sınıf öğrencilerinin sözlü ve yazılı anlatımlarında ağız özelliklerini kullanım durumları*. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
- Şimşek, H. A. (2004). *İlköğretim 2. kademe Türkçe öğretiminde konuşma becerisinin önemi ve geliştirme yolları*. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
- Şimşek, Ö. (2000). *İlköğretim 4. ve 5. sınıf öğrencilerinin yazılı anlatım becerilerinin incelenmesi ve bilgisayar destekli yazılı anlatım*. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
- Tekin, Y. (2017). *Eski Türkçe cümle yapılarının modern türkçenin ağızlarında kullanımı: bursa- boğazköy örneği*. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Uşaklı, H. (2005). *İzmir ilinde göç alan bölgelerdeki ilköğretim okullarında Türkçe öğretiminde karşılaşılan sorunlar ve çözüm önerileri*. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). İzmir: Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
- Uzun, C. (2015). *Türkiye Türkçesi ağızlarında ön ses ünsüzleri*. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Elazığ.
- Yaylağan, N. (2010). *Isparta'nın Eğirdir, Senirkent ve Atabey ilçelerinin ağız özelliklerinin tespiti ve Türkçe eğitimi bakımından önemi*. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). İzmir: Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
- Yıkımsı, S. (2015). *Ağız atlasları hazırlama yöntemleri ve Eskişehir ili Türkmen ağızları*. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Eskişehir: Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Yılmaz, O. (2009). *6, 7, 8. sınıftaki 100 öğrenciye ait öğrenci çalışma kitabından hareketle öğrencilerin yazılı anlatım becerilerinin incelenmesi*. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Erzincan: Erzincan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.