ISSN: 2147-2971

Volume 6/2

The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies

JASSS

Editor
Dr. Serdar YAVUZ
Subeditors
Dr. Özcan BAYRAK
Dr. Mehmet GÜRLEK
Dr. Ünal TAŞKIN
Uzm. Ramazan BÖLÜK
Okt. Ufuk KÖSE

The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies



International Journal of Social Science

Academic Social Science Studies *dergisi yılda altı defa yayın yapan uluslararası hakemli bir dergidir.*
Academic Social Science Studies *dergisinde yayınlanan tüm yazıların, dil, bilim ve hukûki açıdan bütün sorumluluğu yazarlarına, yayın hakları* **www.jasstudies.com**'a *aittir.*
Yayınlanan yazılar yayıncının yazılı izni olmaksızın kısmen veya tamamen herhangi bir şekilde basılamaz, çoğaltılamaz.
Yayın Kurulu dergiye gönderilen yazıları yayınlayıp yayınlamamakta serbesttir.
Gönderilen yazılar iade edilmez.
The Journal Of* Academic Social Science Studies,** *Uluslararası hakemli ve indeksli bir dergidir.* ***MLA, EBSCO, ASOS, TEİ, ARASTİRMAX, Akademik Dizin (Akademik Türk Dergileri İndeksi) *başta olmak üzere onlarca veritabanı ve indeks tarafından taranmaktadır.*

The Academic Social Science Studies *is an international, six-reviewed in a year journal.*
Authors bear the sole legal responsibility for their published works in
www.jasstudies.com

The Academic Social Science Studies *has the sole ownership of copyright to all published works. No part of this publication shall be produced in any form without the written consent of* ***the Academic Social Science Studies****.*
The Editorial Board makes the final decision to publish articles.
No article is returned to authors.

ISSN: 2147-2971
1 Rue Gabriel Faure Batiment 1 Porte 51 56100 Lorient-FRANCE

Volume 6/2 February 2013

The Journal Of Academic Social Science Studies
International Journal of Social Science

The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies

International Journal of Social Science

Editor
Dr. Serdar YAVUZ

E-mail: srdryavuz23@gmail.com
Web: http://www.jasstudies.com/
Adress: 1 Rue Gabriel Faure Batiment 1 Porte 51 56100 Lorient-FRANCE

JASS Studies
Volume 6 /2 February 2013

The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies
Volume 6 Issue 2, February 2013

ACADEMIC SOCIAL SCIENCE STUDIES
Uluslararası Hakemli Dergi / International Journal of Academic Social Science Studies

Editör / Editor
Dr. Serdar YAVUZ

Editör Yardımcıları / Assistant Editor
Dr. Özcan BAYRAK
Dr. Mehmet GÜRLEK
Dr. Ünal TAŞKIN
Uzm. Ramazan BÖLÜK
Okt. Ufuk KÖSE

Alan Editörleri / Field Editors

Dr. Kürşat Yusuf AYTAÇ	Beden Eğitimi	Adıyaman Üniversitesi
Dr. Ali M. BAYRAKTAROĞLU	Fotoğrafçılık	Süleyman Demirel Ü.
Dr. Lütfiye CENGİZHAN	İngiliz Dili Eğitimi	Trakya Üniversitesi
Dr. İbrahim Halil ÇANKAYA	Sosyoloji	Uşak Üniversitesi
Dr. Murat ÇELİKDEMİR	Tarih	Gaziantep Üniversitesi
Dr. Mumin DAYAN	Pazarlama	University of United Arab Emirates
Dr. Murat ELMALI	Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı	İstanbul Üniversitesi
Dr. Erkan Turan DEMİREL	İşletme/İktisat	Fırat Üniversitesi
Dr. Ahmet ISPARTA	Dilbilim	İstanbul Üniversitesi
Dr. Fatma Ebru İKİZ	Psikolojik Dan. Reh.	Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi
Dr. Nevin YILDIRIM KOYUNCU	İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı	Ege Üniversitesi
Dr. Bahadır KÖKSALAN	Eğitim Bilimleri	İnönü Üniversitesi
Dr. Murat SUNKAR	Coğrafya	Fırat Üniversitesi
Dr. Ali SOYLU	Yönetim ve Organizasyon	University of Cameron
Dr. Barış TOPTAŞ	Müzik	Adıyaman Üniversitesi
Dr. Sibel ÜNALAN	Sanat Tarihi	Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi

Danışma Kurulu / Board of Advisory

Prof. Dr. Tayfun AMMAN	İstanbul Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Ahmet BURAN	Fırat Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Hikmet Yıldırım CELKAN	Gaziantep Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Enver ÇAKAR	Fırat Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Coşkun ÇAKIR	İstanbul Şehir Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Mustafa ÇİÇEKLER	İstanbul Medeniyet Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Cemalettin ÇOPUROĞLU	Fırat Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Mustafa DELİCAN	İstanbul Üniversitesi

The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies
Volume 6 Issue 2, February 2013

Prof. Dr. Mehmet DEMİRBAĞ	University Of Sheffield
Prof. Dr. Hayati DEVELİ	Yunus Emre Enstitüsü Başkanı
Prof. Dr. Hasan Tahsin FENDOĞLU	İnönü Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Tahsin GÖRGÜN	İstanbul 29 Mayıs Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Emine GÜRSOY NASKALİ	Marmara Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Mustafa KAÇALİN	Türk Dil Kurumu Başkanı
Prof. Dr. Aslan KALKAVAN	Dumlupınar Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. İbrahim KAVAZ	Bitlis Eren Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Timur KOCAOĞLU	Michigan State Üniversity
Dr. Dirk Krausmüller	Mardin Artuklu Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Murat ŞEN	Melikşah Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Nihat ÖZTOPRAK	Marmara Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Mustafa ÖZTÜRK	Fırat Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Kemal YÜCE	Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Erdal ZORBA	Gazi Üniversitesi

Yayın Kurulu / Editorial Board

Doç. Dr. Vedat ÇINAR	Fırat Üniversitesi
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mustafa ÇOLAK	University of United Arab Emirates
Doç. Dr. Nadir İLHAN	Ahi Evran Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Tarık ÖZCAN	Fırat Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Abdullah ŞAHİN	Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Ersin TERES	İstanbul Üniversitesi
Asst. Prof. Dr. Gülşad USLU	University of Penn State
Doç. Dr. Yücel YÜKSEL	İstanbul Üniversitesi

Yabancı Dil Uzmanları / Foreign Language Specialist

Öğr. Gör. Alize CAN	Trakya Üniversitesi
Okt. Özlem Aladağ BAYRAK	Trakya Üniversitesi
Okt. Servet ÇINAR	Trakya Üniversitesi
Okt. Seda TAŞ	Namık Kemal Üniversitesi

Hukuk Danışmanı / Legal Counselar

Av. Gürhan CANPOLAT	İstanbul Barosu Baro Sicili: 25490

ACADEMIC SOCIAL SCIENCE STUDIES
Uluslararası Hakemli Dergi / International Journal of Academic Social Science Studies
Volume 6/2 February 2013

Hakemler / Referees

Prof. Dr. Abdullah KAHRAMAN Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Abulkuddüs BİNGÖL Atatürk Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Adem BAŞIBÜYÜK Erzincan Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Adnan GÜRBÜZ Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Ahmet GÜRSES Atatürk Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Ali Osman UYSAL Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Altan ÇETİN Gazi Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Asuman S. SARACALOĞLU Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Bahattin DÜZGÜN Atatürk Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Behçet Kemal YEŞİLBURSA Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Bilgehan PAMUK Gaziantep Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Cemal YALÇIN Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Cevat BAŞARAN Atatürk Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Çiğdem ÜNAL Atatürk Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Ejder OKUMUŞ Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Enver Alper GÜVEL Çukurova Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Esra BURCU Hacettepe Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Esra MACAROĞLU AKGÜL Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Feridun MERTER İnönü Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Firdevs GÜNEŞ Bartın Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Gülden ERTUĞRUL Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Gülmira KURUOĞLU Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. H. İbrahim DELİCE Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Haluk SELVİ Sakarya Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Hamza GÜNDOĞDU Atatürk Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Hasan Hüseyin BAYRAKLI Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Hidayet AYDAR İstanbul Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Huseyin GÜMÜŞ Marmara Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. İbrahim Hakkı AYDIN Atatürk Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. İbrahim TELLİOĞLU Ondokuzmayıs Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. İsmail ÇALIŞKAN Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. İsmail TAŞ Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Kadir ÖZKÖSE Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Kenan DEMİRAYAK Atatürk Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. M. Hanefi PALABIYIK Atatürk Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Mehmet Ali BEYHAN İstanbul Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Mehmet Durdu KARSLI Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Mehmet EVSİLE Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Mehmet Sinan TEMURLENK Atatürk Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Mesut AYDIN İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi
Prof. Dr. Metin COŞAR Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Mohammad ARAFAT Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Mualla UYDU YÜCEL İstanbul Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Muhittin ELİAÇIK Kırıkkale Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Mukadder ERKAN Atatürk Üniversitesi

Prof. Dr. Mustafa Hilmi BULUT Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Mustafa TURAN Gazi Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Nejat ERK Çukurova Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. O. Faruk AKYOL İstanbul Medeniyet Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Ömür BÜTEV DOLĞUN Artvin Çoruh Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Ruhattin YAZOĞLU Atatürk Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Saliha KODAY Atatürk Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Sedat CERECİ Batman Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Selçuk ESENBEL İstanbul 29 Mayıs Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Suna Timur AĞILDERE Gazi Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Şaban SAĞLIK Ondokuzmayıs Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Şuayip ÖZDEMİR Fırat Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Tahir BALCI Çukurova Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Temel YEŞİLYURT Erciyes Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Tuğrul İNAL Ufuk Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Turan ÖNDEŞ Atatürk Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Turgut YİĞİT Ankara Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Vedat KELEŞ Atatürk Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Yusuf GÜRÇINAR Çukurova Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Zafer CİRHİNLİOĞLU Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Zakir AVŞAR Gazi Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Gülden SAĞOL YÜKSEKKAYA Marmara Üniversitesi

Doç. Dr. Abdulkadir BAHARÇİÇEK İnönü Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Abdulkadir GÜL Erzincan Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Abdulkadir LEVENT Batman Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Abdullah NARALAN Atatürk Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Abdullah SOYSAL Kilis 7 Aralık Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Abdullah ŞENGÜL Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Abdurrahman ATEŞ İnönü Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Abdüllatif TÜZER Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Adem KARA Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Ahmet MUTLU Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Ahmet OCAK Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Ahmet ŞİMŞEK Sakarya Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Ahmet YATKIN Fırat Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Ahmet YİĞİT Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Ahsen ARMAĞAN Ege Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Ali ASLAN Atatürk Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Ali Fuat ÖRENÇ İstanbul Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Ali Murat AKTEMUR Atatürk Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Alpaslan UÇAR Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Alper Cihan KONYALIOĞLU Atatürk Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Aslan GÜLCÜ Atatürk Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Aslı YAZICI Çankırı Karatekin Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Barış ÖZENER Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Başaran GENÇDOĞAN Atatürk Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Beyhan ASMA Erciyes Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Cemal ELİTAŞ Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Cengiz AKBULAK Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Cüneyt EREN Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. D. Yelda KAĞNICI Ege Üniversitesi

Doç. Dr. Diğdem SİYEZ	Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Durdu Mehmet BURAK	Ahi Evran Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Ebubekir SOFUOĞLU	Sakarya Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Enver TATAR	Atatürk Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Erdal ESER	Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Eren YÜRÜDÜR	Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Erkan AKAR	Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Eyup BEKİRYAZICI	Atatürk Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Eyüp AKMAN	Kastamonu Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Faruk YÜCEL	Ege Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Ferit USLU	Hitit Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Fikri SALMAN	Atatürk Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Fuat BOYACIOĞLU	Selçuk Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Gökhan DEMİRCİOĞLU	Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Gülbadi ALAN	Erciyes Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Gülşah BAŞOL	Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Gürbüz OCAK	Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Gürkan HAŞİT	Bilecik Şeyh Edebalı Ü.
Doç. Dr. Gürsoy ŞAHİN	Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Hakan SARIBAŞ	Bülent Ecevit Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Hakkı Engin GİDERER	Çankırı Karatekin Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Hakkı UYAR	Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Halil İbrahim SAĞLAM	Sakarya Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Halim ÖZNURHAN	Erciyes Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Halit EV	Celal Bayar Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Hanife Nalan GENÇ	Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Hasan Ali ŞAHİN	Erciyes Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Hasan ARSLAN	Canakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Hasan BURAN	İnönü Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Hatice ÇUBUKÇU	Çukurova Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Hava SELÇUK	Erciyes Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Hüseyin KÖSE	Atatürk Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. İbrahim KOPAR	Atatürk Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. İsa KIZGUT	Akdeniz Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. İsmail BOYACI	Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. İsmail Hakkı NAKİLCİOĞLU	Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Jülide Akyüz ORAT	Kafkas Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Kaan CANDURAN	Erciyes Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Kadir PAKSOY	Harran Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Kemal DOYMUŞ	Atatürk üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Kemal DURUHAN	İnönü Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Koray ÖZCAN	Selçuk Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Kürşad YILMAZ	Dumlupınar Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. M. Dursun ERDEM	Ondokuzmayıs Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Mahmut MASCA	Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Mahmut ÖZTÜRK	Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Mehmet ÇİÇEK	Gaziantep Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Mehmet DEMİRTAŞ	Bitlis Eren Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Mehmet ERDEM	Fırat Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Mehmet HASGÜLER	Lefke Avrupa Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Mehmet Sadık ÖNCÜL	Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Mehmet Serhat YILMAZ	Kastamonu Üniversitesi

Doç. Dr. Mehmet ŞAHİN	Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Mehmet Yaşar ERTAŞ	Pamukkale Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Mehmet ZAMAN	Atatürk Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Melek ÖKSÜZ	Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Mesut ERŞAN	Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Murat AKÇAKAYA	Gazi Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Murat YILDIZ	Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Musa BİLGİZ	Atatürk Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Mustafa CİHAN	Atatürk Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Mustafa EKİNCİ	Harran Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Mustafa ERTÜRK	Muğla Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Mustafa Fadıl SÖZEN	Akdeniz Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Mustafa HOTAMIŞLI	Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Mustafa ORAL	Akdeniz Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Mustafa ŞAHİN	Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Mustafa YAVUZ	Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Mücahit DİLEKMEN	Atatürk Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Müjde Ker DİNÇER	Ege Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Nazan YELKİKALAN	Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Nebahat GÖÇERİ	Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Necmettin AYGÜN	Aksaray Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Nevzat GÜMÜŞ	Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Nilay BAŞOK	Ege Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Nurettin TURGAY	Dicle Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Nuriye SEMERCİ	Bartın Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Okşan BAŞOĞLU	Gazi Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Orhan YAZICI	İnönü Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Özlem SERTKAYA DOĞAN	İstanbul Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Perihan YALÇIN	Gazi Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Recep KOÇAK	Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Refik DİLBER	Atatürk üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Rıfat GÜNDAY	Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Rıza KARAGÖZ	Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. S. Sunay YILDIRIM DOĞRU	Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Sabri KARADOĞAN	Dicle Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Sabriye SEVEN	Atatürk Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Sadiye TUTSAK	Uşak Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Salih Paşa MEMİŞOĞLU	Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Sami KILIÇ	Fırat Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Selçuk DUMAN	Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Selda İÇİN AKÇALI	Ege Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Serap DURUSOY	Abant İzzet Baysal üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Serkan ŞEN	Ondokuzmayıs Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Seyfullah KARA	Karabük Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Soner YAVUZ	Bülent Ecevit Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Soyalp TAMÇELİK	Gazi Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Suat ÜNAL	Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Süleyman AKYÜREK	Erciyes Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Süleyman DÜNDAR	Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Süleyman İNAN	Pamukkale Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Şahin KÖKTÜRK	Ondokuzmayıs Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Şevki ÖZBİLEN	Bayburt Üniversitesi

Doç. Dr. Şükrü YAPRAKLI	Atatürk Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Tevfik ERKAL	Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Tevhit AYENGİN	Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Tuncay İMAMOĞLU	Atatürk üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Türkan ARGON	Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Ulvi KESER	Atılım Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Vedat ÇALIŞKAN	Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Yasin SOYLU	Atatürk Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Yaşar KAYA	İnönü Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Yılmaz KARADENİZ	Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Yusuf CERİT	Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Yusuf DOĞAN	Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Yusuf KILIÇ	Pamukkale Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Yusuf TOPAL	Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Zeki KODAY	Atatürk Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Zülbiye TOLUK UÇAR	Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi

Editörden...

Saygıdeğer *JASSS* ailesi üyeleri;

***JASSS* (The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies)** dergisinin bu sayısı altıncı yılın ikinci sayısı olarak bilim dünyasının takdirine sunulmuştur. Yeni bir sayıyla ve dergimizin yeni internet sayfasıyla karşınızda olmanın mutluluğunu yaşıyoruz.

İnternet sayfamızın alt başlıklarını çeşitlendirmeye çalıştık. Sayfamıza "Editör Takımı, Yazar İndeksi, Alfabetik Makale İndeksi, Yayın Kurulu, Danışma Kurulu, Hakem Kurulu ve Basılı Sayıya Ulaşmak İçin" gibi yeni başlıklar ekledik. Bu başlıklarımızın bir bölümünün içini doldurduk ancak daha yapacağımız çok işin olduğunu biliyoruz. Yaptıklarımız ile ilgili olarak yapacağınız değerlendirmelerin bizleri mutlu edeceğini ve dergimize değer katacağını bilmenizi isteriz.

Makalelerinizi daha değerli kılmak amacıyla farklı indekslere başvurduğumuzu bilmenizi istiyoruz. Bir kısım indeks başvurularında izleme sürecinde sona yaklaşıldığını bir kısmında da henüz izleme sürecinin devam ettiğini sizlerle paylaşmak istiyoruz.

***JASSS* (The Journal of Academic Science Social Studies)'ın** önemli özelliklerinden biri de "misafir editörlük" sistemi çerçevesinde armağan sayı çıkarmaktır. Burada 2013 Ekim ve 2013 Aralık aylarında çıkacak olan armağan sayıların duyurusunu yapmış olmanın da sevincini sizlerle paylaşmak istiyorum. Ekim 2013 tarihinde Melikşah Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dekanı Prof. Dr. Murat ŞEN'in misafir editörlüğünde Prof. Dr. Hasan Tahsin FENDOĞLU, Aralık 2013'te ise Doç. Dr. Ergün SERİNDAĞ misafir editörlüğünde Prof. Dr. Tahir BALCI armağan sayısı çıkarılacaktır.

***JASSS* (The Journal of Academic Science Social Studies)** dergisi Ekim 2013 sayımızı Melikşah Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dekanı Prof. Dr. Murat ŞEN'in misafir editörlüğünde hukuk alanında yaptığı çalışmalar ve yetiştirdiği öğrencileri ile saygınlığını kazanmış Prof. Dr. Hasan Tahsin FENDOĞLU adına armağan sayı olarak çıkaracağız. **İş ve Sosyal Güvenlik Hukuku, Medeni Usul ve İcra İflas Kanunu, İdare Hukuku, Anayasa Hukuku, Milletlerarası Hukuk, Medeni Hukuk, Ticaret Hukuku, Ceza ve Ceza Muhakemesi Hukuku, Hukuk Tarihi, İnsan Hakları Hukuku, Genel Kamu Hukuku, Turizm Hukuku, Hukuk Felsefesi, İdare Hukuku, Milletlerarası Hukuk, Mali Hukuk, Roma Hukuku, Ticaret Hukuku, Deniz Hukuku** başlıklarında makaleler kabul edilecektir. Makale son gönderim tarihi 01.10.2013 şeklindedir.

***JASSS* (The Journal of Academic Science Social Studies)** dergisi, Aralık 2013 sayısını ise Çukurova Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Alman Dili Eğitimi öğretim üyelerinden Doç. Dr. Ergün SERİNDAĞ'ın misafir editörlüğünde Çukurova Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü Başkanı olarak görev yapmakta olan Prof. Dr. Tahir BALCI hocamıza armağan sayı olarak yayımlayacaktır. **Genel Dilbilim, Karşılaştırmalı Dilbilim, Edebiyat, Yabancı Dil ve Türkçe Eğitimi** özel sayısı olarak oldukça geniş yelpazeli olan bu sayıda adı geçen kavramlar çerçevesinde uygulamalı ya da kuramsal çalışmalar kabul edilecektir. Makale son gönderim tarihi Aralık 2013 olarak belirlenmiştir.

***JASSS* (The Journal of Academic Science Social Studies)**'ın armağan ve diğer sayılarına katkılarınızı bekler, Şubat 2013 sayısını sizlerle buluşturmaktan mutluluk duyarız.

Bir sonraki sayımızda buluşmak dileğiyle…

Dr. Serdar YAVUZ

Editor of JASSS

The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies

İÇİNDEKİLER / CONTENTS

Prof. Dr. Sedat CERECİ **1-12**
Medyanın İşlevi: Gerçeklerin Ötelenmesi Sorunu
Function Of Media: Matter Of Delaying Of Realities

Alptürk AKÇÖLTEKİN – Prof. Dr. Salih DOĞAN **13-29**
İlköğretim 6. Sınıf öğrencilerinin fen bilgisi dersine ilişkin kaygılarının farklı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi
The Analysis Of The Concerns Of The 6th Grade Students Towards The Course Of Science And Technology In Terms Of Different Variables

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Rövşen ALİZADE **31-45**
Türk Mitolojisi ve Eğitim
Turkish Mythology And Education

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Turgay ANAR **47-61**
Mehmet Âkif Ersoy'un Safahat'ta Medeniyet Kavramına Bakışı ve Batı Medeniyetine Yönelttiği Eleştiriler
Mehmet Âkif Ersoy's Approach To Concept Of Civilization In The Book Of Safahat And His Criticism Of Western Civilization

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Abdulselam ARVAS **63- 71**
Совместные мотивы Эпосов «бамсы бейрек» и «алып-манаша»
"Alıp-Manaş" ve "Bamsı Beyrek" Destanlarının Ortak Motifleri
Common Motıfs of "Alıp-Manaş" and "Bamsı Beyrek" Epos

Arş. Gör. Şenay ATAM **73-90**
1834 Yılında Tokat'ta Mahalle Yapılanması ve Muhtarlık Teşkilâtının Kurulması
Structuring Of A Neighborhood And Establishment Of Autonomous Village Administration (Mukhtar) In The Year 1834 In Tokat

Arş. Gör. Y. E. AVCI –Yrd. Doç. Dr. E. KOÇOĞLU – Arş. Gör. Ö. EKİCİ **91-105**
Göçün Eğitim ve Eğitim Yönetimine Etkisine İlişkin Okul Yöneticilerinin Görüşleri (Diyarbakır İli Örneği)
The Views Of School Administrators About Effect Of Migration To Education And Education Management (Case Of Diyarbakır)

Öğr. Gör. Dr. Serpil AYDOS **107-128**
Türkiye'nin Ortadoğu'da Yumuşak Güç Olma Çabası: "Batıya Doğru Akan Nehir" Belgeseli Üzerinden Bir Okuma
Turkeys' Effort That To Be 'Soft Power' In The Middle East: A Reading Over The Documentary Of The River Flowing Westward

Levent İSKENDEROĞLU – Dr. Ali AYHAN **129-137**
Müzik Algısında İmge Kullanımının Etkileri Üzerine Bir İnceleme
A Study For The Effects Of Image Use On Musical Perception

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Adem BALKAYA **139-147**
Türkülerin Sosyo-Kültürel Düzenleyicilik Misyonu: Kars'ta "Gelin Terifleme"
The Socio-Cultural Coordination Mission of Folk Songs:"Bride Praise In Kars"

Doç. Dr. İ. Sabri BALKAYA **149-164**
İkinci Dünya Savaşı Sonrası Kurulan Dünya Düzeni Ve Türkiye
New World Order After World War II And Turkey

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Bekir BİÇER **165-202**
Selçuklular ve Kürtler
Seljuks And Kurds

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Mustafa BIYIKLI **203-221**
Mehmet Esat Paşa'nın Çanakkale Cephesi Şimal Grubu Tahrirat Ve Telefon Görüşmeleri (02-20 temmuz 1915)
The Telephone Negotıatıons And Corresponds Of Esad Pasha Who Was The Commander Of The Northern Group At Çanakkale Front (02-20 July 1915)

Yrd. Doç. Dr. İsmail CERAN **223-268**
Merînîler Devleti
Marinid Dynasty

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ahmet CUMA **269-283**
Eine Mystische Reise In Die Welt Der Gerüche Das Geruchsmotiv In Den Werken „Haselnuss Acht" Von Metin Kaçan Und „Das Parfüm" Von Patrick Süskind
A Mystical Journey Into The World Of Smells The Smell Motif In The Works 'Hazelnut Eight"By Metin Kaçan And "The Perfume" By Patrıck Süskind

Doç. Dr. Yusuf ÇETİN **285-295**
Kuruluş Dönemi Osmanlı Mimarisine Ait Bir Hamam Örneği: Sakarya-Taraklı Yunus Paşa Hamamı
A Bath Sample Belongs To The Ottoman Architecture Of Foundatıon Period: Sakarya-Taraklı Yunus Pasha Bath

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Asım ÇOBAN **297-312**
Kelkit Vadisinde Nüfusun Dağılışı
Distribution Of The Population At Kelkit Valley

Selda ALAÇAM ÇAKIR-Yrd. Doç. Dr. Mehmet Kaan DEMİR **313-328**
Sınıf Mevcudunun 2005 Öğretim Programları'nın Başarısına Etkisi
The Effects Of Class Size On 2005 Elementary School Curriculums' Success

Okt. Aytemis DEPCİ-Yrd. Doç. Dr. Bülent C. TANRITANIR **329-350**
Identıty Erasure In Percıval Everett's *Erasure* And *I Am Not Sıdney Poıtıer*
Percival Everett'in Silinti ve Ben Sidney Poitier Değilim Romanlarında Kimlik Silinmesi

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Erol DURAN **351-365**
Türkçe Dersi Öğretim Programlarında Eleştirel Okuma
Critical Reading In Turkish Language Curriculums

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Hakan DÜNDAR **367-381**
Öğretmen Adaylarının Sahip Olduğu Değerler İle Demokratik Tutumları Arasındaki İlişki
Relationship Between Values Owned By Teacher Candidates And Their Democratic Attitudes

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Metin ELKATMIŞ **383-396**
Geleceğin Okullarına Dair Bir Perspektif
A Perspective On The Future Schools

Dr. Ayşe Elif EMRE KAYA-Prof. Dr. Zakir AVŞAR **397-416**
Demokrat Parti'nin Sivil Toplum Üzerinden Bir Siyasal İletişim Denemesi: Vatan Cephesi Örneği
A Political Communication Trial Of Democrat Party Over Civil Society: Motherland Front Example

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Sayime ERBEN KEÇİCİ **417-453**
Hemmende Und Fördernde Lehrerhaltungen Aus Der Perspektive Von Studenten
Öğrenci Görüşüne Göre Engelleyici ve Teşvik Edici Öğretmen Tutumları
Retardant And Promotional Entertainments Teachers From The Perspective Of Students

Doç. Dr. Veysel EREN-Öğr. Gör. Ufuk ORHAN **455-468**
Kurumsal Sosyal Sorumluluğun Çalışanların Kötü Yonetimi İfşa Düzeylerine Etkisi Üzerine Bir Araştırma
An Ampirical Study About Effect Of The Corporate Socıal Responsibility On Level Of Employers' Whistleblowing

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Kemal GÖZ **469-484**
Sühreverdi Düşüncesinde Ruh-Beden İlişkisi
Soul And Body Relationship In Suhrawardi Thought

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Bahar GÜDEK **485-503**
Müzik Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı Öğrencilerinin Farklı Müzik Türlerine Yönelik Müziksel Algıları
Attendees To The Music Education Department Perceptions Regarding Various Music Varieties

Dr. Meltem GÜL **505-530**
Türkçe Sözlükler Üzerine Bir Deneme
A Study On Turkish Dictionary

Ass. Prof. Dr. Mevlüt GÜLTEKİN **531-541**
Notes To Second Person Imperative Forms In Modern Turkic Languages
Çağdaş Türk Lehçelerinde İkinci Kişi Emir Kipine Dair Notlar

Dr. İlhami GÜNAY **543-564**
Kur'ân-ı Kerim'de Gençlerin Aklî-Zihnî Gelişimi Ve Eğitimi
Mental Education And Development Of The Youth In The Holy Qur'an

Yrd. Doç. Dr. İmran GÜR **565-592**
Tuğrul Tanyol'un Şiirinde Boşluk Problemi: Öznenin Tanrısı Ses-Varlık: Kendinde Şey, Tanrı Parçacığı
The Space Problem In The Poem Of Tuğrul Tanyol: The God Of The Subject, Sound-Existence: Thing It Itself, God Particle

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Yalçın ÖZDEMİR-Yrd. Doç. Dr. Tahsin İLHAN **593-611**
Benlik Kurguları Ve Öznel İyi Oluş: Otantik Olmanın Aracılık Rolü
Self-Construal And Subjective Well-Being: The Mediative Role Of Authenticity

Dr. Abdullah İNCE **613-628**
Çatışma Kuramı Bağlamında Din: Çetin Özek Örneği
Religion In The Context Of Conflict Theory: Instance Of Çetin Özek

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Taşkın DENİZ-Yrd. Doç. Dr. Güzin KANTÜRK YİĞİT **629-649**
İdari Coğrafya Açısından Büyükşehir Belediyeleri
Metropolitan Municipalities In Terms Of Administrative Geography

Doç. Dr. Adem KARA **651-668**
Şer'iyye Sicillerine Göre Kıbrıs'ta Ermeniler
The Armenians In Cyprus According To The Religious Registration

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Hakan KARA- Yrd. Doç. Dr. Emre SEZİCİ **669-695**
Girişimci Kadın Yöneticilerin Stres Altında Kendini Denetleme Becerileri: Bu Konuda Düzenlenen Bir Anket Çalışmasının Sonuçları
The Self-Assessment Abilities Of Entrepreneur Woman Managers Under Stress: The Results Of A Survey On This Issue

Doç. Dr. Bayram ÇETİN-Yrd. Doç. Dr. Birsen BAĞÇECİ-Arş. Gör. İsmail KİNAY-Arş. Gör. Ömer ŞİMŞEK **697-713**
Öğretim Teknolojileri Ve Materyal Tasarımı Dersine Yönelik Tutum Ölçeğinin (Ötmtdytö) Geliştirilmesi: Geçerlik Ve Güvenirlik Çalışması
Development Of Attitudes Towards Instructional Technologies And Material Development Course Scale (Atitmdcs): A Study Of Validity And Reliability

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Erol KOÇOĞLU-Arş. Gör. Özcan EKİCİ **715-730**
Sosyal Bilgiler Öğretmenlerinin Sosyal Bilgiler Dersinde Kullanılan Ölçme Araçlarına İlişkin Görüşleri
Measuring Instruments Used In Social Studies Teachers Perceptions Of Social Studies

Öğr. Gör. Kurtuluş KIYMET **731-746**
Hititler'de Bir Tufan Öyküsü: Atra(m)haši
A Story Of The Flood In The Hittites: Atra(m)hašı

Arş. Gör. Gönül ONUR SEZER-Arş. Gör. Dr. Ömür SADİOĞLU **747-763**
Öğretmen Adaylarının Uygulama Okullarında Gözlemledikleri Sınıfa Uygun Olmayan Öğrenci Davranışları Ve Bu Davranışlara İlişkin Öğretmenlerin Kullandıkları Çözüm Stratejileri
Student Behaviors Inappropriate For The Classroom That Teacher Candidates Observe At Teaching Practice Schools And Solution Strategies That Teachers Use Related To These Behaviors

Dr. Ali ÖZKAN **765-796**
Enosis, Kanlı Noel Olayı Ve Birleşmiş Milletlerde Kıbrıs Sorununda Türkiye'ye Arnavutluk Desteği
Enosis, Bloody Christmas And Albanian Support To Turkey On Cyprus Question In The United Nations

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Mehmet PEKKAYA-Arş. Gör. Nurdan ÇOLAK **797-818**
Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Meslek Seçimini Etkileyen Faktörlerin Önem Derecelerinin AHP İle Belirlenmesi
Determining The Priorities Of Ratings Via AHP For The Factors That Effects In Choosing Professions For The University Students

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Fikri SOYSAL **819-829**
Music Culture Of Islamic Civilization And Popular Culture In The 21st Century In Turkey
Doğu ve İslam Medeniyeti Musikisi ve 21. Yüzyılda Popüler Kültür

Havva SÜLÜN ERGÜL **831-841**
Religious Industry In Halal Food Consumption (Distrubition Of Knowledge)
Helal Gıda Tüketiminde Dinin Sanayileşmesi (Bilginin Dağılımı)

Yrd. Doç. Dr. A. SÜRÜCÜ - H. ÖZDEMİR - Yrd. Doç. Dr. K. BİLEN - Doç. Dr. S. KÖSE **843-852**
Fen Bilgisi Öğretmen Adaylarının Laboratuara Yönelik Tutumları
Attitudes Towards Laboratory Of Pre – Service Science Teachers

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Harun ŞAHİN **853-868**
Osmanlı Bütçe Sisteminin Tekâmülü, 1839–1922
Development Of Ottoman Budget System, 1839–1922

Doç. Dr. Sare ŞENGÜL-Arş. Gör. Pınar GÜNER **869-878**
DNR Tabanlı Öğretime Göre Matematik Öğretmen Adaylarının İspat Şemalarının İncelenmesi
Investigation Of Preservice Mathematics Teachers' Proof Schemes According To DNR Based Instruction

Dr. Meral TANER DERMAN **879-889**
10-11 Yaş Çocuklarının Saldırganlık Ve Umutsuzluk Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişkinin Belirlenmesi
Determining The Relationship Between Aggressiveness And Hopelessness Levels Of 10-11 Years Of Children

Dr. Polat TUNÇER **891-915**
Değişim Yönetimi
Change Management

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Gülden TÜM **917-934**
The Common European Framework Of Reference And Turkish Language
Avrupa Dilleri Öğretimi Ortak Çerçeve Programı ve Türkçe

Yrd. Doç. Dr. İbrahim USTA **935-950**
Arapçanın Gelişimindeki Dış ve İç Etkenler
External And Internal Factors In The Development Of Arabic Language

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Gökhan YALÇIN **951-976**
Cumhuriyetin İlanından Günümüze Kadar Türkiye'de Yayınlanan Armoni Kitaplarındaki Terminolojinin Değişim ve Gelişimi
Change And Improvement Of Terminology Of The Harmony Books Published In Turkey From The Proclamation Of The Republic To The Present

Dr. Yar Ali METE **977-993**
Yüksek Öğretim Kurumlarında Psikolojik Yıldırma (Terör) : Uygulayanlar, Mağdurlar ve Seyirciler
Mobbing In Higher Education: Practitioners, Victims And Audiences

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Mehmet YAZICI **995-1023**
Değerler Eğitimine Gönüllü Katılan Öğretmenlerin Profili ve Görüşleri
The Views And Profiles Of The Teachers Voluntarily Articipating In Values Education

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Şebnem YILDIRIM ORHAN-Selçuk BİLGİN **1025-1042**
Müzik Öğretmeni Adayları Gözüyle İdeal Öğretim Programı
Music Teacher Candidates' Views On Ideal Music Curriculum

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Sadık YÖNDEM **1043-1051**
Müzikte Yozlaşmaya Küreselleşmenin Etkisi
Corruption In The Music Effect Of Globalization

Öğr. Gör. Dr. Elif BENZER-Yrd. Doç. Dr. Mehtap YURDATAPAN- Yrd. Doç. Dr. İlknur GÜVEN-Prof. Dr. Fatma ŞAHİN **1053-1073**
Fen Bilgisi Öğretmen Adaylarının Sağlıklı Yaşama Yönelik Davranışlarının İncelenmesi
Anaylsis Of The Behaviours Of Science Teacher Candidates Towards Healthy Living

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Erol DURAN **1075-1085**
İlkokula 60. Ayında Başlayan Öğrencilerin Yazı Beceri Gelişimlerinin İncelenmesi
To Analysis Of 60 Months Old Students' Development Of Writing Skills

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Mehtap AYDINER UYGUN **1087-1110**
Piyano Dersindeki Öğrenme Yaklaşımı Düzeyleri İle Akademik Başarı Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişkilerin İncelenmesi
Analysis Of Relation Between Level Of Learning Approaches In Piano Lessons And Level Of Academic Success

Doç. Dr. Neslihan DERİN-Yrd. Doç. Dr. Erkan Turan DEMİREL **1111-1130**
Sağlık Hizmetlerinde Kalitenin Göstergesi Olan Hasta Memnuniyetine Yönelik Ölçek Geliştirme Çalışması
Scale Development Study Aimed At Patient Satisfaction Which Is The Quality Indicator In Medical Services

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Recep DÜNDAR **1131-1167**
59 Nolu Tahrir Defterine Göre Biga Sancağı'nda Yerleşim ve Nüfus
Demographical Features Of Biga Province According To Cencus Book No 59

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Özgen KORKMAZ-Doç. Dr. Halis ALTUN **1169-1185**
Mühendislik ve BÖTE Öğrencilerinin Bilgisayar Programlama Öğrenmeye Dönük Tutumları
Engineering And CEIT Student's Attitude Towards Learning Computer Programming

C. YILMAZ-C. HATİPOĞLU-Dr. F. SEMENDEROĞLU-Doç. Dr. G. A. SÖNMEZ-Prof. Dr. N. GÖKMEN-Prof. Dr. O. YILMAZ **1087-1205**
Anneden Ayrılma ve Tek Tek Barındırılma Stresinin Sıçanların Fiziksel ve Mental Gelişimleri Üzerine Etkileri
The Affect Of Seperation And Being Away From The Mother On Rats Puppies' Physical And Mental Development

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ali Haydar ŞAR **1207-1220**
Examination Of Loneliness And Mobil Phone Addiction Problem Observed In Teenagers From The Some Variables
Ergenlerde Yanlızlık ve Mobil Telefon Bağımlılığı Probleminin Bazı Değişkenlere Göre İncelenmesi

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Serpil UMUZDAŞ **1221-1239**
Lise ve Lisans Düzeyindeki Viyolonsel Öğrencilerinin Çalgı Çalmada Karşılaştıkları Teknik Problemlerin İncelenmesi
Identifying The Technical Problems Experienced By High-School And Undergraduate Students In Playing The Cello

Yrd. Doç. Dr. H. Sibel ÜNALAN **1241-1262**
Anadolu'dan Ünik Bir Türbe: Tarsus Duatepe Türbesi
A Unique Tomb From Anatolia: Tarsus Duatepe Tomb

Doç. Dr. Hava SELÇUK **1263-1294**
Niğde'de İlk Nüfus Sayımı (23 Şevval 1246/6 Nisan 1831)
First Population Census In Niğde (Shawwal 23, 1246 / April 6, 1831)

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Bedia KOÇAKOĞLU **1295-1313**
Yazarcılık Oyununun Başat Bir Figürü: Gönül Çolak
A Major Figure Of Authorship Game: Gönül Çolak

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ötüken SENGER **1315-1326**
Statistical Power And Probabilities Of Type I Error In Terms Of Suitable Number Of Simulations In Nonparametric Tests
Nonparametrik Testlerde En Uygun Simülasyon Sayisina Göre İstatistiksel Güç ve I. Tip Hata Olasılıkları

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Murat ATEŞ- Yrd. Doç. Dr. Akif KARATEPE **1327-1348**
Üniversite Öğrencilerinin "Çevre" Kavramına İlişkin Algılarının Metaforlar Yardımıyla Analizi
The Analysis Of University Students' Perceptions Towards "Environment" Concept With The Help Of Metaphors

Öğr. Gör. Resul BABAOĞLU **1349-1371**
6/7 Eylül 1955 Olayları'nın Muhtemel Failleri Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme
An Evaluation On The Probable Perpetrators Of The 6/7 September 1955 Events

Öğr. Gör. Dr. Hür Kamil BİÇİCİ **1373-1436**
Muğla Ortakent'te Bulunan Osmanlı Dönemi Süslemeli Mezar Taşları-II
Ottoman Perıod Decorated Gravestones Of Muğla Ortakent-II

Doç. Dr. İsmail ERDOĞAN **1437-1448**
Ali Suavî'nin "Salaman Ve Absal" Hikâyeleri İle İlgili Yazısı Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme
An Analysis On The Paper About '"Salaman And Absal" Written By Ali Suavi

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Turgut İLERİ **1449-1467**
Cumhuriyet'in İlk Yıllarında Maden İşçilerinin Çalışma Hayatına İlişkin Yapılan Düzenlemeler
The Regulations Made On The Working Life Of Miners In The First Years Of The Republic

Yrd. Doç. Dr. G. K. CUMAOĞLU-Prof. Dr. Y. KOÇAK USLUEL **1469-1479**
Çevrimiçi Öğrenme Ortamlarında Tartışma Tahtasının Kullanımında Öğretmenin Rolü
The Role Of Instructor On Use Of Discussion Boards In An Online Learning Environment

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Şahika KARACA **1481-1499**
Fatma Aliye Ve Emine Semiye'nin Kadının Toplumsal Kimliğinin Kazandırılmasında Öncü Fikirleri
Innovative Ideas Of Fatma Aliye And Emine Semiye On Giving Women A Social Identity

Doç. Dr. Fuat BOYACIOĞLU-Okt. Serap ERDAĞ **1501-1515**
André Gide'in *Vatikan Zindanları* Ve Albert Camus'nün *Yabancı* Adlı Yapıtlarında "Nedensiz Davranış" Kavramı
The Gratuitous Behavior Concept In Les Caves Du Vatican Of Andre Gide And L'etranger Of Albert Camus

Yrd. Doç. Dr. S. ÖZSOY-N. TEZCAN KARDAŞ-L.GÖRÜN-Öğr. Gör. M.E. TABUK-Okt. N. KANDAZ GELEN-A. AFAT **1517-1528**
Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Öğretmenlerinin Spor Medyası Hakkındaki Görüşleri
Opinions Of Physical Education And Sport Teachers Regarding The Sports Media

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Doğan DUMAN-Özgür Şahap VARNALI **1529-1547**
1930'larda Çocuk Piyeslerinde Yerli Malı Kullanma Ve Ulusal Ekonomi Bilincini Oluşturma Çabaları
Efforts To Use Domestic Goods In Children's Plays In 1930s And To Build Up A National Economy Consciousness

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Zekerya BATUR-Arş. Gör. Mustafa ULUTAŞ **1549-1563**
PISA Ile Türkçe Öğretim Programindaki Okuduğunu Anlama Kazanimlarinin Örtüşme Düzeylerinin Incelenmesi
An Analyze Of The Correspondence Levels Between Turkish Reading Proficiency Objectives And The PISA Scale

Assist. Prof. A. ÖZDEMİR - Assoc. Prof. A. NARALAN - Res. Assist. A. İ. AKBABA **1565-1579**
Unobstructed Access To Information And Communication Technologies Services: The Case Of Turkey
Bilgi ve İletişim Teknolojisi Hizmetlerine Engelsiz Erişim: Türkiye Örneği

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Hikmet Feridun GÜVEN **1581-1601**
Şiiri Anlamak: Necatî Bey'in Bir Gazelinin Hikâyesi ve Yorumu
Understanding Poetry: Story And Interpretion Of A Ghazal Of Necati Bey

Doç. Dr. Zeki NACAKCI **1603-1617**
Teke Yöresi Halk Oyunları Ezgilerinin Sınıflandırılmasına Yönelik Müzikal Analiz
A Musical Analysis Of The Classification Of Folkloric Melodies Of The Teke Region

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Alpaslan OKUR-Okt. Funda KESKİN **1619-1640**
Yabancılara Türkçe Öğretiminde Kültürel Ögelerin Aktarımı: *İstanbul* Yabancılar İçin Türkçe Öğretim Seti Örneği
Transmission Of Cultural Elements In Turkish Teaching To Foreigns

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Mehmet ÖZGER **1641-1652**
"Zamana Adanmış Sözler"De Sevgili Metaforunun Yapısökümü
Deconstruction Of Metaphor Of Beloved In "Zamana Adanmış Sözler"

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Şebnem SOYGÜDER **1653-1677**
Fotoğraf Editörlüğü Kurumu ve Gazeteler İçin Önemi
Photograph Editorship Institution And Its Importance For Newspapers

Arş. Gör. Seda ARIKAN **1679-1696**
"History" And "Root" In Zadie Smith's *White Teeth*
Zadie Smith'in White Teeth Romaninda "Tarih" ve "Köken"

Arş. Gör. Dr. Mehpare KARAHAN GÖKMEN **1697-1720**
An Empirical Study On Conditional Conservatism And Value Relevance Of Earnings
Koşula Bağlı Ihtiyatlılık ve Karın Getiriye Yansıması Üzerine Ampirik Bir Çalışma

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Çağrı ÖZTÜRK DEMİRBAŞ **1721-1736**
Coğrafya Öğretmenlerinin Toplumsal Değer Yönelimi Açısından Ekolojik İkilemlere İlişkin Tutumları: Kırşehir Örneği
Geography Teachers' Ecological Dilemma Attitudes In Terms Of Social Value Orientation: Kırşehir Sample

Dr. Ayşegül ERGİŞİ **1737-1747**
Psikanalitik Bir Çözümleme: Halide Edib Adıvar'ın Handan Romanı
A Psychoanalytic Analysis: Handan, Halide Edib Adıvar's Novel

Doç. Dr. Füsun KARA **1749-1767**
Kırgız Sovyet Devletinin Oluşması
Formation Of Kyrgyz Soviet State

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Osman ORUÇHAN **1769-1802**
"Ümmetimden Yetmiş Bin Kişi Cennete Sorgusuz Girecektir." Hadisi Üzerine Metin Eksenli Bir Analiz ve Değerlendirme
An Analysis And Critisize On Text Of Hadith: "Seventy Thousand People Will Go To Heaven Without Questioning From My Followers."

Doç. Dr. Kürşat YENİLMEZ-Arş. Gör. Ayla ATA **1803-1816**
Matematik Okuryazarlığı Dersinin Öğretmen Adaylarının Matematik Okuryazarlığı Özyeterliğine Etkisi
Effects Of Mathematical Literacy Course On Pre-Service Mathematics Teachers' Self-Efficacy Levels Of Mathematical Literacy

E. BAYRAK-Doç. Dr. V. ÇINAR-Doç. Dr. B. ÇOBAN-Yrd. Doç. Dr. Z. COŞKUNER **1817-1828**
Beden Eğitimi Ve Spor Yüksekokulu Öğretmen Adayları İle Eğitim Fakültesi Öğretmen Adaylarının Bilimsel Epistemolojik İnançlarının Farklı Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi (Fırat Üniversitesi Örneği)
Prospective Teachers Of Physical Education And Sport Schools And Faculty Of Education Student Teachers Scientific Epistemological Beliefs In Terms Of Different Variables Comparison Of (Example Of Fırat University)

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Gökhan GÖKULU-Nilay HOSTA **1829-1850**
Basında Kadına Yönelik Şiddet Haberlerinin Analizi: Hürriyet, Sabah ve Posta Gazeteleri Örneği (2005-2008)
Analysis Of Print Media Coverage Of Violence Against Women: A Case Of The Newspapers Of Hurriyet, Sabah, And Posta (2005-2008)

Mehmet Emin TUĞLUK **1851-1874**

Atasözlerini İçine Alan Kullanım Kalıpları

The Use Patterns Including The Proverbs

The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies

JASSS

International Journal of Social Science

Volume 6 Issue 2, p. 917-934, February 2013

THE COMMON EUROPEAN FRAMEWORK OF REFERENCE AND TURKISH LANGUAGE

AVRUPA DİLLERİ ÖĞRETİMİ ORTAK ÇERÇEVE PROGRAMI VE TÜRKÇE

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Gülden TÜM

Çukurova Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, İngilizce Bölümü

Abstract

The Common European Framework (CEF) is a reference document for curriculum and syllabus development, textbook writing, teacher training, and for assessment, and it has gained importance for discussions of AA curricula, and L2 teaching and learning in Europe. However, the CEF may not provide sufficient theoretical and practical guidance to enable test specifications to be drawn up for each level of the CEF. Although it is widely referred to all languages, the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) remains relatively insufficient for teaching vocabulary. There have been several studies on CEFP on different languages; nevertheless, there has been no single survey carried out in Turkish Language in this field. Therefore, this article tries to find answers by exploring questions of whether the CEFR can help foreign learners of Turkish language to construct vocabulary based on CEFR levels or not; whether the CEFR scales are sufficient to communicate at various levels; and then to what extent the most common words in Turkish should be included. The findings of this study indicate that application of CEFR, especially in

teaching vocabulary, seems to be complicated to build or acquire for some languages which have different characteristics when compared to common European languages.

Key Words: Teaching Turkish as a foreign language, Turkish vocabulary, Common European Framework

Öz

Avrupa Dilleri Öğretimi Ortak Çerçeve Programı (ADÖÇ), müfredat ve izlence gelişimi, ders kitabı yazımı, öğretmen yetiştirme ve değerlendirme açısından başvurulan önemli bir referans belgedir. Bu program AA müfredat tartışmaları ile Avrupa'da yabancı dil öğretimi ve öğrenilmesi açısından önem kazanmıştır. Ancak Avrupa dilleriyle ilgili yapılan birçok çalışmada, ADÖÇ teori ve uygulamalarının tüm dil seviyelerini karşılayabilecek değerlendirme özelliklerini sağlamada yetersiz kaldığı vurgulanmaktadır. Birçok dil için uygulanabilen yaygın bir referans olarak gösterilse de yabancı dilin öğrenilmesinde büyük önem taşıyan kelime öğretiminde yeterli ölçüde verimli olmadığı bazı çalışmalarda dile getirilmektedir. Şimdiye kadar yapılan incelemelerde Avrupa Dilleri Öğretimi Ortak Çerçeve Programı ile ilgili Türkçe dışında birçok dilde araştırma yapılmış olmasına rağmen, Türkçe ve Avrupa Dilleri Öğretimi Ortak Çerçeve Programı ile ilgili bir çalışmaya rastlanmamıştır.

Bu çalışmanın amacı, Avrupa Dilleri Öğretimi Ortak Çerçeve Programı'nın Türkçeyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilere yardımcı olup olmadığını araştırmak; değişik dil düzeylerinde öğrencilerin sağlıklı ve akıcı iletişim kurmada yeterli olup olmadığını tespit etmek; ayrıca Türkçe öğretiminde ne dereceye kadar ya da yaygın olarak hangi sözcüklerin AA düzeyinde kullanılması gerektiğinin ortaya çıkarılmasına katkıda bulunmaktır. Çalışmanın sonuçları farklı özellikler içeren bazı dillerin özellikle de başlangıç düzeyinde kelime öğretiminde Avrupa Dilleri Öğretimi Ortak Çerçeve Programını uygulamanın büyük zorluk yarattığını ortaya koymaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yabancı dil Türkçe öğretimi, Türkçe sözvarlığı, Avrupa Dilleri Öğretimi Ortak Çerçeve Programı

Introduction

Approximately 2500 languages active in the world have similar or different structures as they belong to different language families. Therefore, the process of learning a foreign language has always been considered difficult by learners whose native languages have linguistic dissimilarities from their target language. Especially, when there is a limited linguistic overlap at the lexical and semantic levels between these languages, it is hard for learners to grasp structural hints while

producing target language(s). Over the last 3 decades, much research has been conducted on vocabulary acquisition in many ways but how lexical knowledge is represented in the learner's mind, what is involved in the form-meaning mapping process, and what stages a word goes through before it becomes an integrated part o the learner's lexicon have received less salience (Jiang, 2004: 416). Therefore, it is necessary to investigate vocabulary knowledge, growth, and size considering what makes it difficult to learn words. Daller, Milton and Treffers-Daller (2007: 6) define a word as it is known if the learner can attach a meaning, such as an explanation or a translation, to a foreign language word. Upon consideration of words, Nation (2001: 27) draws attention to three distinctions: form, meaning, and use, as a fact that the words can be handled in the context, a part of speech, and storage in mind to call when necessary to use in speech or writing. When learners are exposed to a new language, they encounter some words they are familiar with or they have never encountered before. In this respect, they grasp the frequent and familiar words more easily than infrequent or unfamiliar words.

Considering familiarity and frequency, Jiang (2004) states that second language adult learners have a well established conceptual and lexical system and most L2 words have a correspondent concept and translation in the learner's native language. Thus, there seems to be little need for them to learn new concepts and meanings while learning L2 words, at least in the initial stages of L2 learning. Nevertheless, even though learners might be familiar with a second or third foreign language, and they are aware of patterns in any language or they have talents towards the foreign language facilities, they may feel insufficient for full communication. Jiang (2004) concludes that the lack of contextualized input and the presence of an existing conceptual and L1 system make learners' L2 vocabulary acquisition fundamentally different from vocabulary acquisition in the L1 (p.417). Additionally, vocabulary learning depends on the context surrounding each word, the redundancy or richness of information in a given context which enables a reader to guess unknown words successfully (Nation and Coady, cited in Huckin and Coady, 1999: 183). Thus, in order to guess the meaning of unknown words in context, the learner should be familiar with or recognize most of the surrounding words. According to Huckin and Coady, this ratio changes from researcher to researcher, ranging from 84% to 95% of the words in a text.

Common European Framework of reference is a guideline used to describe achievements of learners of foreign languages. In other words, CEFR is expected to provide a sound basis for the mutual recognition of language qualifications as plurilingualism is seen in the context of pluriculturalism. Thus, the Common European Framework takes into account the achievements by dividing learners into three broad divisions (A-Basic User, B-Independent User, and C-Proficient User)

which are also divided into six levels, two of which are A1 (breakthrough or beginner) and A2 (waystage or elementary), that are the focus of this study. Throughout these levels grading an individual's language proficiency, the CEFR describes what a learner is supposed to be able to do in reading, listening, speaking and writing at each level and the vocabulary level is also likely to be guessed out of the information given in the table below:

level	**description**
A1	Can understand and use *familiar everyday expressions* and *very basic phrases* aimed at the satisfaction of needs of a concrete type. Can introduce him/herself and others and can ask and answer questions about personal details such as where he/she lives, people he/she knows and things he/she has. Can interact in a simple way provided the other person talks slowly and clearly and is prepared to help.
A2	Can understand *sentences and frequently used expressions* related to areas of most immediate relevance (e.g. *very basic personal and family information*, shopping, local geography, employment). Can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on *familiar and routine matters*. Can describe in simple terms aspects of his/her background, immediate environment and matters in areas of immediate need.
	Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, Council of Europe, 2001

In the nature of the CEF, language teachers are expected to feel confident of being able to offer learners language learning opportunities that address their needs, and that are transparent in terms of what is expected of them to achieve set objectives, and the outcomes that will reflect such achievements. According to Milton (2006) the nature of CEFR, and the nature of language itself generally make comparison between languages extremely hard (p. 2). Also, Hulstijn (2007) explains the notion of language proficiency in the CEFR as it praises two important issues: quantity (what the learner is able to do) and quality (how well the learner is able to do this). No doubt, in this interwoven action, original work from this framework includes wordlists about what vocabulary knowledge, vocabulary size, and coverage are strongly connected to give a general indicator for language. For several researchers, vocabulary size or word count is determined by excluding number, proper nouns and names, and false starts in statements and mistakes unconsciously written in texts to have reference to 1,000-lemma frequency bands (Daller, Milton and Treffers-Daller, 2007: 2-3). All the word forms are taken as tokens, lemmas, and word families: *tokens*, total number of words, *lemmas*, a collection of words such as "work, works, working and worked, or orange and oranges", *word families*, a base form of words and all of its derived and inflected forms that are semantically regular such as "worker, workmanship and workable" (Daller, Milton and Treffers-Daller, 2007: 4; Huckin and Coady, 1999: 184). In the studies by Huckin and Coady, a minimal threshold is given in size from 3,000 most frequent word families to 10,000 word families. Jones (1995; cited in Huckin and Coady, 1999: 185) states that languages coming from different families might have

few borrowings from neighboring Indo-European languages; therefore, lexical acquisition could be effectively learnt after reaching threshold level. The word size targeted to teach to the learners is expected to have already been determined according to the level of education and graded in the texts accordingly (Çiftçi and Çeçen, 2010: 123). In the study carried out by Milton (2006), the vocabulary growth figure also gives wordlist size as 1000 in English, 850 in French, and 2000 in Greek for A2 level, except for A1 level. For Turkish, unfortunately, the word size for elementary level is given neither in surveys carried out or articles published so far, except the word size listed as 1120 at Princeton University, USA. Also, in several studies, it is clarified that Nation's Levels Test and Meara and Milton's X-Lex give advantage to learners and teachers about the most frequent words of overall vocabulary knowledge (Daller, Milton and Treffers-Daller, 2007: 10).

Especially, when considering Turkish and English which differ markedly in their phonological and orthographic structure, foreign learners of Turkish are observed to struggle with learning linguistic features and lack successful acquisition in Turkish language. As stated by Cotukesen (1983), foreign learners of Turkish encounter difficulty with not only orthography, punctuation but also intonation, pronunciation, pitch, and juncture. No doubt, contextualizing items will give the learners a richer sense of using the target language and this will result in an integral outcome both in acquisition of the mother tongue and learning a foreign language as the process continues for learners' understanding and cognition of the way the language functions (Rivoluncri, 1998). If this is a natural outcome, then to what extent is it correct for English speaking learners to follow the CEFR while producing Turkish words and phrases?

Upon consideration of words, one of the differences between Turkish and English is the *syllable structure*. According to Durgunoğlu and Öney (1999: 285), Turkish has fewer syllable types than English, and ninety-eight percent of all Turkish syllables belong to one of the four simple syllable forms (V, VC, CV, and CVC) while the most frequent syllable form being the CV structure, which makes up fifty percent of all Turkish syllables. In other words, Turkish words have very clear syllable boundaries and are very easy to break into syllables. Göksel and Kerslake, (2005: 12) also state that roots are predominantly monosyllabic and they contain a single vowel. Thus, phonemes within the syllable are easier to identify than in English. However, the unfamiliarity of Turkish words makes it difficult for learners to recognize the difference between the stem of the word and the suffix attached to it. Even for learners taking the first steps of learning Turkish, words would seem completely different from their native language, even the very common phrases such as "Thank you" or "Thanks" in English are taken into account. For instance, these words would also appear in their mother tongue or in languages they are learning as a foreign

language as "Danke", "Dank u" "Takk", "Tak", Děkuji", or Dziękuję", providing facilities to recall easily, but in Turkish it is likely to be impossible because of the forms of words as follows:

a. *"Teşekkür ederim"*, "Thank you."
"Teşekkürler", "Thanks."
"Sağ ol", Thanking warmly in a informal way.
"Sağ olun", Thanking warmly in a formal way.
"Sağ olunuz". Thanking warmly in a formal way.

Within syllable structure, several *affixes and flections* are explicit in one word in English. For instance, the same flectional suffix -s might express several different grammatical categories such as the indicator of plurality (e.g., book, *books*), the sign of third person singular in the simple present tense (e.g., go, *goes;* work, *works*), the possession (e.g., have, *has* in She's a brother*)* or the reduction of auxiliary verbs of *is, has*, or *was (*e.g., She's …). Also, different flections might express the same grammatical category (postman, dentist, actor, driver, and/or technician etc.) unlike Turkish, which is an agglutinating language where grammatical elements are joined to the words as suffixes that mark voice, aspect, modality, mood, person and number in nouns while they mark derivation, negation, tense, person, etc. Thus, it would be said that Turkish suffixes have an extremely variable nature (Durgunoğlu and Öney, 1999). Besides being unfamiliar when compared to words in their native language, forming of words of Turkish origin is generally euphonic and there is a vowel harmony rule [front vowels (e, i, ö, ü) and back vowels (a, ı, o, u)]; in other words, the attached suffixes to the roots could be confusing for foreign learners *gözl**ü**kç**ü**l**e**r+d**e***, "at the opticians", *satıc**ı**l**a**r+d**a*** "at the sellers"). The other problem here would be the suffixes attached to the root in the inflectional and derivational form as follows:

a. *göz* means "eye",
gözlük "eye-glasses",
gözlükler "eye+glass+es", (the suffix *-lEr*, makes nouns plural)
gözlük+çü, "optician", *(*the suffix –çI indicates occupation)

b. gözlükçülerde "at the opticians" *(*the suffix –dE is locative case).

Another difference foreign that learners find difficult is noun compounds, word-like units which are made up of two nouns or an adjective and a noun. It is difficult in Turkish as there are two types of noun compound: bare compounds and –(s)I compounds. Göksel and Kerslake, (2005: 102-103) explain bare compound as they consists simply of two juxtaposed nouns without suffixation to mark a relation between them. In this respect, it might seem easy for foreign learners of Turkish. (i.e.,

kağıt bardak means "paper cup", or *kadın doktor* means "woman doctor"). However, the latter is by far the more common type of compounding in Turkish as these compounds consist minimally of two juxtaposed nouns, the first of which has no suffix while the second is marked with the 3rd person possessive suffix –(s)I and this means that it has variations considering not only the vowel harmony and the ending letter of the second word in a consonant or vowel but also the plural form of the second noun as in the examples given below:

a. *otobüs bilet-i* "bus ticket",
Türkçe kitab-ı "Turkish book",
diş doktor-u "dentist",
otobüs şoför-ü "bus driver".

This rule changes when the noun compounds are made for words ending in a vowel as follows:

a. *Türk kahve-si* "Turkish coffee",
b. *kadın çanta-sı* "woman bag",
c. *masa örtü-sü* "table cloth" and
d. *erkek palto-su* "man coat".

This rule changes again when the noun compounds are made for plural words as in the following:

a. *okul sınıf-lar-ı* "school classrooms" and
b. *park yer-ler-i* "parking lots".

As seen in the examples, suffixes are rather confusing for foreign learners of Turkish, especially, in the case of –(s)I compounds that are rarely written as one word.

The other difference or important characteristic between two languages is that of Turkish phonology. Even though the Turkish alphabet seems to be easy because each letter is pronounced in a single sound which never changes with the preceding or following letter and is uttered as it is written, learners coming from different language families are likely to be unsuccessful in phonetics even though they have similar letters but different sounds such as **c** in car, cell, chair, and ocean (e.g., car is pronounced as /ˈkär or ka:(r)/, cell like /sel/, chair /ˈcher\ and ocean /ˈō-shən/, **i** in middle \ˈmi-dəl\, in falsity /ˈfȯl-sə-tē/, in family /ˈfam-lē, or ˈfa-mə-/, in girl /ˈgər(-ə)l/, in conversation /ˌkän-vər-ˈsā-shən/, and lastly **e** in elder /ˈel-dər/, in ear /ˈir/, in each /ˈēch/, in dye /ˈdī/, in earn /ˈərn/, in element /ˈe-lə-mənt/. Thus, vowel harmony becomes a very problematic feature in word formation when Turkish morphology is

considered (Durgunoğlu and Öney, 1999: 286). As mentioned earlier about the Turkish vowel system (a, e, i, ı, o, ö, u, ü) where they are divided into two categories as front and back vowels, they also have distinctive features as high/low, and rounded/unrounded. Any of the eight vowels may appear in the first syllable of a word but each is followed by a vowel immediately preceding it (Underhill 1976). Hence, the vowels are assimilated within the word in frontness and rounding. Nevertheless, it is hard to pronounce the new symbols/sounds of language for these learners; for instance, "ç, ı, g, ğ, ö, ü,". When learners see different symbols (e.g., **ç** or **ö**), they probably get help from their native language to make it easy for them to produce. For instance, regarding the letters *ch* in chair in English or *ea* in learn /ˈlərn/ to produce ö, there appears to be no problem as they can find equivalence in both languages but ***ı*** is rather difficult for them to produce. As recommended in CEF Framework (2001: 153), learners should be expected to develop their ability to pronounce a language by exposure to authentic spoken utterances, by imitation of the teacher or native speaker, by reading aloud phonetically textual texts or by learning orthoepic conventions might be failure to master for learners because the other languages learnt before would be dominant on the language with different phonetically system. However, it should be remembered that morphology deals with not only vowel harmony, roots, or stems, affixes as morphemes, but word-formation such as simple, complex, and compound words and also modifying word forms such as vowel alteration, consonant modification, irregular forms, suppletion and zero forms.

For learners learning Turkish as a foreign language, it is very common to utter the basic question of "How are you?" "Nasılsınız? /naˈːsəlsənəz/" in the pronunciation of /naˈːsilsini:z/ even though it is the most frequently used word in daily greetings. This results from the fact that L2 vocabulary acquisition is accompanied by little conceptual or semantic development. However, when speaking in L1, the retrieval of lexical forms is usually spontaneous and effortless (Jiang, 2004: 417). Among Turkish consonants, the so-called silent or soft "ğ" causes the greatest difficulty in utterance because in pronouncing the letter "ğ", known as g-breve in English, in such words *ağaç*—[tree]/ˈaa:ch/, *soğuk*—[cold]/ˈso:uk/, *değil*—[not/negation in nonverbal statements] /ˈde:il/, *öğretmen*—[teacher] /ˈə:retmen/. Hildreht (1972) comments on the Turkish orthography stating that "ğ" has no sound at all between certain vowels or may have the sound of "y" between certain vowels. However, it would be wrong to say that "ğ" has no sound at all between certain vowels, as this letter has a specific function each time it is used. When learners grasp that this letter is produced by extending the preceding vowel in the word, the problem would be solved. Otherwise, if they apply the phonological rules according to their native language or a foreign language, it will result in an inappropriate pronunciation such as *aç*—[hungry or open, imperative form of the verb to open] /ˈach/, instead of *ağaç*—[tree] /ˈaa:ch/, These examples could be

increased tremendously. As seen in the examples given, a foreign learner of Turkish should constantly monitor and manipulate subword linguistic units considering the phonological characteristics of suffixes based on the criteria.

Besides having problems with phonetics, the *syntax,* which is difficult for learners whose native language is quite different from Turkish, learners of Turkish have difficulty with not only word order, but also with many other factors, such as the agglutination system, nominalizations, subject-verb agreement, adjective phrases, complex sentences, relative clauses, nominal cases, and derivational suffixes (Çotukesen, 1983 and Tüm, 2012). All these features cause learners not to be able to elaborate the word meaning and fail at formulating the structure in their minds (Huckin and Coady, 1999). For example, *Dinle+dim* "I (have) listened" (indicating imperative, the first person singular), *Dinlen+dim* "I (have) rested or taken a rest" (indicating imperative, the first person singular), or *Dinle+y+ebilir+im,* "I might listen" *Dinle+y+ebilir+dim,* "I might have listened" (implying that an action envisaged as having been possible at some time in the past was not actualized for the first person singular and consider the buffer –y to attach the suffix) or *Dinlen+ebilir+im,* "I might take a rest" (Göksel and Kerslake, 2005: 346). As seen in the examples, the main word formation process in Turkish is suffixation, the formation of a new word by attaching an affix to the right of a root. Each flexion has only one function and the number of suffixes might range from one to ten. To them, processes of word formation create words that can be very long and sometimes correspond to whole sentences in English (p. 43). Therefore, the essence of differentiating aspects is unusual, namely the presence of the subject during the action in Turkish (Cip, 2008). In the example of *Dinle+y+ebilirim,* ***or*** *Dinle+y+ebilir+dim*,, there is a buffer attached to the root of the verb *Dinle* since the verb ends in a vowel and the suffix begins in a vowel. In this manner, two vowels can never come together in a word in Turkish, and in this case the suffix is attached by a buffer considering the feature of each suffix. However, there are also cases where the last vowel in the root of the verb may drop in the suffix. For example, *Dinle+yorum* "I am listening" in the form *Dinl**i**+yorum* with replacement of e to i and this affix attached is considered according to the vowel harmony, which means i changes to -ı, -u, -ü regarding the stem of the verb. Also, in the Genitive case, the vowel dropping in the suffix is very common. For instance, the suffix meaning 'my' is formulated as –Im in *Ev-im* "my house" but –m in *Çanta-m* "my bag" because Turkish is an inflected language and the last letter (consonant or vowel) is continuously rearranged when each new inflection is added. Even sometimes, the last letter –k changes into another letter *Sözlük-üm* but in the form *Sözlüğ-üm* "my dictionary" as -k is softened with the attached suffix (this exceptional rule is applied to few words ending in consonants -p, -t, -ç) (Durgunoğlu and Öney, 1999: 286). Consequently, as seen in the examples, it is not only

phonological characteristics, but also syntax and its feature about ordering of the inflectional and derivational suffixes to attach the words might become overwhelming for foreign learners of Turkish. In order to show the difficulty of ordering, the sentence *Çağdaşlaştıramadıklarımızdan mısınız*? "Aren't you the one whom we could not have contemporized?" would be a good example to give as evidence about recognizing the hints and the difficulties of lexicology and the number of words in a sentence in Turkish and English.

(8). a. *Çağdaşlaştıramadıklarımızdan mısınız*?

Aren't you the one whom we could not have contemporized?

Çağ	era
Çağ*daş*	contemporary
Çağdaş*laş*	become contemporary
Çağdaşlaş*tır*	make someone contemporary/contemporized
Çağdaşlaştır*a*	ability to make someone contemporary
Çağdaşlaştıra*ma*	negation
Çağdaşlaştırama*dı*	past tense
Çağdaşlaştıramadı*k*	1st person plural
Çağdaşlaştıramadık*lar*	plural
Çağdaşlaştıramadıkları*m*	1st person possession
Çağdaşlaştıramadıklarım*ız*	plural
Çağdaşlaştıramadıklarımız*dan*	ablative form
Çağdaşlaştıramadıklarımızdan *mı?*	question
Çağdaşlaştıramadıklarımızdan *mısın?*	2nd person singular (informal)
Çağdaşlaştıramadıklarımızdan *mısınız?*	2nd person plural (formal)

As seen in the example above, syntax deals with the organization of words into sentences in terms of the categories, elements, lasses, structures, processes and relations presented in the form of a set of rules. While ten words in English are coming together to form a statement, it is two words in Turkish. Even though the syntax of the language of a native speaker is highly complex and unconscious, the ability to organize sentences to convey meaning in a communicative competence

might be hard for any foreign learner when considering the words forming the sentence in the example given above.

Lastly, it is also possible to state that word order is flexible in Turkish; in other words, the direct word order is different in both languages: *S-O-P* in Turkish versus *S-P-O* in English. The primary emphasis tends to be initial in Turkish, with a slightly weaker emphasis in the end. In other words, in Turkish the headword always precedes the related word (except attributive adjectives) while in English there is the headword following the related one; verbs conjugate according to the person, number, tense, voice and mood, 3 tenses (Past, Present, and Future) and 3 moods (Indicative, Subjunctive and Imperative); prepositions in English are single words but in the form of suffixes or postpositions in Turkish; except a few usages there is no prefixation in Turkish, but English is a language that uses prefixes extensively; and lastly in Turkish all postpositions require the headword in the nominative or genitive cases. Walter (1993) also emphasizes that gerunds and infinitives are the other difficult issues for students since it is difficult to change the verbs into gerund and infinitive forms by adding necessary suffixes in Turkish.

Thus, the main focus of this study is to find out the answer to the questions of what the main problems of foreign learners of Turkish are while producing Turkish words and statements; whether the CEFR can help language learners to construct vocabulary based on CEFR levels or not; if the CEFR scales are sufficient to communicate at various levels; and finally, the reasons or sources that learners have difficulties while learning or formulating Turkish words.

Methodology

Participants

The participants are 38 Erasmus students attending Çukurova University, Adana, Turkey, to study in different departments corresponding to their fields. During their stay in Turkey, they also take *Turkish course for foreigners* either as a required course in their learning agreement or a selection course to survive during their stay in Turkey. They come from different European countries (Belgium, Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Romania, and Slovenia) and they all know English as a foreign language to a certain level. They take their major courses in English and their Turkish level is beginners (A1). Therefore, at the initial stages in Turkish lessons Turkish teacher gives details related to Turkish language and its structure in English.

Findings

Data Collection

Considering that vocabulary knowledge is complex and multi-faceted, the Erasmus students who attended Turkish lessons in the beginner level were asked to write the ten most frequently used English words for their needs. In order to tackle the problem more deeply, they were given a questionnaire including three different sections such as a) what they think about Turkish as a foreign language, b) what makes Turkish words difficult to learn, and c) what the most important ten words they need in their educational and personal life in Turkey are. The poll was aimed at investigating the items regarding learners' lexis and needs. The Erasmus students were interviewed to realize word choice for how much vocabulary they feel familiar or unfamiliar with based on the CEFR.

Data Analysis

Each Erasmus student wrote his ideas about Turkish language, his experiences about learning the other languages in his educational or personal life, and a list of the ten most frequently used words in English in his daily life. All English words written by 38 Erasmus students (excluding two students who left this section blank) on the questionnaire sheets were collected and translated into Turkish (N. 364). The identical words written in the list are evaluated as a single token (lemma or word family), and the list totally including 105 tokens were analyzed on how frequently these words appear by utilizing Concordance 3.3 program that constitutes the vocabulary list. Thus, the most frequently needed words could be provided and to make a correlation with the 1120 Turkish words prepared for the elementary level at Princeton University (http://www.princeton.edu/~turkish/aatt/vocablist.htm) since there is no *1000 most frequent word band* for the beginner level A1 in Turkish.

In order to make a frame about the amount of word size in Turkish as a foreign language at A1 and A2 level, three word lists provided by three different groups or institutions are taken into account:1) the wordlist by Erasmus students (N.105), 2) the wordlist by Princeton University, USA (N.1120), and 3) the wordlist by TOMER, Ankara University, Turkey (N.1685) (Yeni Hitit 1, a Turkish course book: for foreigners used at TOMER, Ankara University, Turkey). Also, a word list from an English course book entitled *Success*, which is utilized at the Foreign Language Vocational School at Çukurova University as an English course book for Turkish students to learn English. These two groups of word lists (Turkish and English), are taken into account in order to see which and how frequently both Turkish and English words are used in teaching a foreign language at a basic level.

All the Turkish words were analyzed by Concordance 3.3 Software for text analysis for languages to list tokens, lemmas, and word families. All the Erasmus students were sent all three word lists via e-mails to make clarifications about familiar

words for them (for original/non-original words in their native language or foreign language(s) they know). They were asked to make a list of the ten most frequently used words in English in their daily life; to highlight/distinguish the familiar words; and finally send them back to their Turkish teacher via e-mail in a word file form. The data regarding their vocabulary acquisition of Turkish and their word lists as reference manual were analyzed and presented in the following tables.

Views of Erasmus Students about Turkish Language

Table 1. Views of Erasmus Students about Turkish Language

		F	%
1	It is difficult to remember Turkish words.	15	39
2	Turkish is difficult because many words sound unfamiliar.	13	34
3	Turkish words are completely different compared to the other languages I speak.	11	29
4	Turkish is a difficult language.	12	32
5	Letters *ö, ü, ğ, ı* are difficult to pronounce.	10	26
6	Grammar rules are more difficult than words.	8	21
7	Pronunciation is similar to my native language so it is not difficult (Hungarian).	4	10
8	Turkish words are very difficult to remember and sometimes I forget what I have learnt	4	10
9	Turkish is very rich, interesting and funny.	2	5
10	Verbs are very hard to learn as they often have too many meanings.	1	3
11	I make up some similar words in my native language.	1	3
12	Sometimes it is possible to find some connections between new Turkish words and words I already know in my native or foreign language.	1	3
13	Turkish words are based on phonetics instead of spelling.	1	3

As seen in Table 1, most of the foreign language learners of Turkish have difficulties about both Turkish lexis, morphology, phonology, and its syntax. They explain their obstacles in threefold: a) the unfamiliarity of Turkish to the other languages, b) the agglutinative system and also c) pronunciation of some of the letters differently or inexistent words in Turkish. The reasons for not successfully acquiring Turkish words seem to appear due to vagueness in remembering the right word during conversation, lack of knowledge about the language they are learning, the complexity of Turkish language, either transferring words from the native language or failure transferring because of mismatch of words between two languages. These findings indicate a similarity with the statement of Milton (2006) that comparison across languages may not always be possible to carry out more language functions with fewer vocabulary resources in some languages than in others as vocabulary in both languages is structured differently. Structuring of the words according to the

two levels in CEFR also indicate that the basic words even at the beginner level require awareness for foreign learners while attaching inflectional and derivational suffixes.

Vocabulary Size

Table 2. Vocabulary Size

	tokens	**lemmas**	**word families**	**total**
Wordlist by Erasmus Students (A1)	105	3	9	105
Wordlist by Princeton University (A2)	1120	2	16	1120
Wordlist of Yeni Hitit 1 (A1 and A2)	1685	2027	1171	1685
Wordlist of Success (A1 and A2)	1034	277	178	1034

In Table 2, the wordlist prepared by Erasmus students to fulfill their vital needs for emergency usage is taken into account considering tokens, lemmas and word families. The reason for this is that researchers use word lists to investigate if learners can reach the targeted aim. The targeted word lists are compared to lemmatized word lists or 1000-lemma frequency bands as they would give an idea about the structure of language that constitutes a learner's knowledge of words. When considering the table above, the word list by Erasmus students namely, tokens, lemmas and word families are seen very limited since students wanted to learn survival words and phrases rather than to build up an effective conversation. Nevertheless, when considered that Turkish is an agglutinative language, all the derivational and inflectional suffixes are attached to the roots of the words, this outcome seems natural. In the list of Princeton University, it is seen that tokens are made as a list considering the classification (it is expected that inflectional and derivational ones are excluded in the list); therefore, the number of lemmas and word families are restricted. In the wordlist of TOMER, Yeni Hitit 1, more tokens are observed but this list is not categorized according to the first 1000 frequently word bands considering all the words at A1 and A2. It is observed that comparison of cross-languages sometimes is impossible because of differences in the structure of languages that belong to different language families. For instance, as seen as token, lemmas, and word families in Success, lemmas appears very limited when compared with Turkish words as Turkish is an agglutinative language. This could be explained that more language functions are carried out with fewer vocabulary resources in some languages than in others. They may inflect and derive words rather differently as seen in the table above. Even though vocabulary size and coverage appears to work very similarly in English and French (Milton, 2006: 4), in Turkish vocabulary sizes in the CEFR are not absolute and there might be differences because of the structuring of words in Turkish. Especially, the number of lemmas and word families in the table might give a clear idea about the suffixation of Turkish.

In this study the questionnaire was considered as an opportunity to acquire data concerning the discovery of the views of the participants about the Turkish vocabulary learning and the difficulties that they have had during learning process. Below is the note of one randomly chosen Erasmus students' views on this matter.

Erasmus S-07: "It's difficult because of the endings, I am often confused about them because there are so many of them. In my opinion Turkish language is all about the endings and that's the most difficult thing: to learn how to transmit the meaning by using correct ending."

Familiarity of Words

Table 3. Familiarity of Words

	tokens	**familiarity**		**unfamiliarity**	
		f	**%**	**f**	**%**
Wordlist by Erasmus Students (A1)	105/348	7	2.01	341	97.98
Wordlist by Princeton University (A2)	1120	50	4.46	1070	95.53
Wordlist of Yeni Hitit 1 (A1 and A2)	1685	182	10.80	1503	89.19

Vocabulary is a lively and vital part of the language as long as learners can reasonably use, attach a meaning to or find a correct collocation for something they recognize as a word. However, the ability to recognize or use the spoken form of a word is based on how words are constituted by suffixes. In several studies, productive vocabulary size is given as about 50% of receptive vocabulary size and it is emphasized that word knowledge includes knowledge at the level of the morpheme. Thus in learning Turkish, learners might feel lost as there are large vocabularies and recalling words might be hard. Learners are more likely to learn the frequent and familiar words than unfamiliar or infrequent words. As seen in the table above, the familiarity seems to be less than expected in learning a foreign language. It is expected that learners must be able to recognize on sight most of the surrounding words. For instance, in a study, a sight-recognition knowledge of the 2000 most-frequent word families of English enables learners to recognize and use is given approximately as 84% of the words in texts (Huckin and Coady, 1999: 184). When considered the table given above, the unfamiliarity of words seem to be around 90%. Probably, the statement in an Erasmus student's note below gives an idea about the difficulty with constituting or remembering words:

Erasmus S-14: "Turkish words are difficult to learn. I guess it's the fact that they sound quite exotic to me and mostly I have nothing in my mind which I can connect them with their meanings. I mean, in comparison with central and western European languages where I almost always have some connections in one way or another."

Knowledge, awareness and understanding of the language and its society are based on the relation between the 'world of origin' and the 'world of the target community', two of which produce an intercultural awareness. This can be enriched by awareness of a wider range of cultures than those carried by the learner's L1 and L2. Nevertheless, it should be remembered that the cultures are transferred through the cultural richness in the languages. Thus, sensitivity to language and language use enables new experience to be assimilated into an ordered framework and welcomed as enrichment as it involves knowledge and understanding of how languages are organized and used (Council of Europe, 2001: 107).

Conclusion

Many theorists argue that foreign language learning requires attention to both meaning and form and CEFR focuses on the communicative proficiency from the perspectives of communication themes, communicative tasks and purposes, communicative language activities and strategies, communicative language processes, all of which are based on vocabulary size. However, language-policy makers and educational professionals seem to ignore the need to conduct research for improving some scales for other target languages. As some grammatical properties are unlikely to be concerned with meaning, languages such as Turkish and English differ considerably which results in failure or insufficiency for learners in formulating Turkish language. Thus, institutions should urgently conduct studies on a wide variety of oral and written discourses and corpuses in the levels A1 and A2 if CEFR aims at rising performance quality to provide enough awareness and knowledge for teachers teaching different languages as a foreign language. The foreign language teachers need to know their linguistic objectives not only the language they teach as a foreign language but also the others to some extend in order that they could make comparisons while teaching. Otherwise, the vagueness of explanation about the target language lacks motivations for learners. Consequently, the institutions should overview their curriculum in order to provide the needs of would-be teachers and in-service trainings. Also, corpus based on vocabulary in Turkish should be determined in accordance with agreed national and international standards. Especially, the broadening of borders of the European Union requires broadening the number of available languages and having standards. While CEFR scales seem multidimensional and perfectly prepared according to some languages spoken in Europe, it might fail for the others coming from different language families having the characteristics of unidimensional scales.

REFERENCES

ÇİFTÇİ, O. and ÇEÇEN, M. A. (2010). İlköğretimde 6 - 8. Sınıf Türkçe Ders Kitaplarındaki Metinlerin Anlamı Bilinmeyen Sözcükler Açısından Değerlendirilmesi. Türkçe Öğretiminde Tartışmalar. Subaşı Uzun, Leyla and Bozkurt, Ümit, (Eds.). Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi TÖMER.

CİP, N. (2008). A'dan Z'ye Rus Dili Grameri. Ankara: Palme Yayıncılık

COLEMAN, J. (1996). Studying Languages: A Survey of British and European Students.

CILT Council of Europe. Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. Cambridge University Press/Council of Europe, 2001.

COTUKESEN, Y. (1983). Yabancı Dil Olarak Türkçe Öğretimi/ Yabancıların Türkçe Öğrenirken Karşılaştıkları Güçlükler ve Yaptıkları Yanlışlar. Türk Dili Sayı: 379–380.

DALLER, H., MILTON, J., and TREFFERS-DALLER, J. (2007). (Eds.) Modelling and Assessing Vocabulary knowledge. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Assessed 12 September 2010 http://www.tesl-ej.org/wordpress/ issues/ volume11/ ej44/ej44r6/

DURGUNOĞLU, A.Y. and ÖNEY, B. (1999). A Cross-Linguistic Comparison of Phonological Awareness and Word Recognition. Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal 11 281-299. Assessed 15 September 2010 http://www.springerlink.com/ content/ w 05572034341p526/

GÖKSEL, A. and KERSLAKE, C. (2005). Turkish: A Comprehensive Grammar. New York: Routledge.

HUCKIN, T. and Coady, J. (1999). Incidental Vocabulary Acquisition in a Second Language. Assessed 20 September 2010 http://74.125.155.132/scholar?q=cache:rnk2j6TKOUJ:scholar.google.com/+incidental+vocabulary+acquisition+in+a+second+language&hl=tr&as_sdt=2000&as_vis=1

HULSTIJN, J. H. (2007). ***The Shaky Ground Beneath the CEFR***: Quantitative and Qualitative Dimensions of Language Proficiency. The Modern Language Journal, V. 91, I.4 p. 663-667.

JIANG, N. (2004). Semantic Transfer and Its Implications for Vocabulary Teaching in a Second Language. The Modern Language Journal 0026-7904/04 P 416-432

MILTON, J. (2006). French as a Foreign Language and the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages Assessed 12 August 2010 http://www.llas.ac.uk/resources/paper/2715#toc_2.

NATION, I.P.S. (2001). Learning Vocabulary in Another Language. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

TÜM, G. (2012). Linguistic Difficulties For Polish Students Studying Turkish As A Foreign Language: A Case Study. International Journal of Social Science Volume 5 Issue 2, p. 305-316.

WALTER, E. (1993). Learning Turkish as a Foreign Language: A Personal Account. Dil Dergisi TOMER Sayı 14.