



Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi  
Mustafa Kemal University Journal of the Faculty of Education  
Yıl/Year: 2024 ♦ Cilt/Volume: 8 ♦ Sayı/Issue: 14, s. 40-56

## AN INVESTIGATION OF BILINGUAL STUDENTS' TURKISH WRITING STRATEGIES IN TERMS OF SOME VARIABLES<sup>1</sup>

Uzman Furkan CAN

Van Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi, [furkancanyyu@gmail.com](mailto:furkancanyyu@gmail.com)

Orcid: 0000-0002-3093-554X

Prof.Dr. Mehmet Nuri KARDAŞ

Van Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi, [mnkardas@yyu.edu.tr](mailto:mnkardas@yyu.edu.tr)

Orcid: 0000-0001-6732-7815

### Abstract

*The aim of this study is to determine the relationship between bilingual students' Turkish writing strategies and the variables of gender, grade level, father's education level, mother's education level, language spoken at home, duration of watching TV at home, reading books, keeping a diary, and type of books read. The study was conducted in accordance with the relational survey model, one of the quantitative research models. The study group of the research consists of 207 bilingual students studying in secondary schools in the central districts of Van province. The data of the study were collected with "Writing Strategies Scale" and "Person Information Form (PIF)". The collected data were analyzed with parametric analysis techniques using SPSS 21 package program. At the end of the study, it was found that bilingual students' writing strategies were at a "high" level. It was determined that the related dependent variable did not have a positive or negative relationship with the variables of grade level, father's education level, mother's education level, language spoken at home, duration of watching TV at home, reading books, and type of books read. On the other hand, it was found that women had higher metacognitive writing strategy levels than men, and students who kept a diary had higher metacognitive writing strategies than students who did not.*

**Keywords:** Bilingual students, writing strategies, variables.

## İKİ DİLLİ ÖĞRENCİLERİN TÜRKÇE YAZMA STRATEJİLERİNİN BAZI DEĞİŞKENLER AÇISINDAN İNCELENMESİ

### Özet

*Bu çalışmanın amacı; iki dilli öğrencilerin Türkçe üstbilişsel yazma stratejilerini kullanma düzeylerinin cinsiyet, sınıf düzeyi, baba eğitim düzeyi, anne eğitim düzeyi, evde konuşulan dil, evde TV izleme süresi, kitap okuma, günlük tutma durumu, okunan kitap türü değişkenleriyle ilişkisini tespit etmektir. Çalışma nicel araştırma modellerinden ilişkisel tarama modeline uygun olarak yapılmıştır. Araştırmanın çalışma grubunu Van ili merkez ilçelerindeki ortaokullarda öğrenim gören 207 iki dilli öğrenci oluşturmuştur. Araştırmanın verileri "Yazma Stratejileri Ölçeği" ve "Kişi Bilgi Formu (KBF)" ile toplanmıştır. Toplanan veriler SPSS 21 paket programı kullanılarak parametrik analiz teknikleri ile analiz edilmiştir. Çalışma sonunda iki dilli öğrencilerin yazma stratejilerinin "yüksek" düzeyde olduğu bulunmuştur. İlgili bağımlı değişkenin sınıf düzeyi, baba eğitim düzeyi, anne eğitim düzeyi, evde konuşulan dil, evde TV izleme süresi, kitap okuma, okunan kitap türü değişkenleriyle olumlu-olumsuz bir ilişkisinin olmadığı tespit edilmiştir. Buna karşılık kadınların üstbilişsel yazma strateji düzeylerinin erkeklere göre daha yüksek olduğu, günlük tutan öğrencilerin tutmayan öğrencilere göre daha yüksek üstbilişsel yazma stratejiye sahip olduğu sonucuna ulaşılmıştır.*

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** İki dilli öğrenciler, yazma stratejileri, değişkenler.

<sup>1</sup> Bilingual Students' Turkish Writing Competencies (Achievement, Attitude, Anxiety and Application of Writing Strategies) and Investigation of These Competencies in Terms of Some Variables", which was prepared under the supervision of Prof. Dr. Mehmet Nuri KARDAŞ.

## Introduction

Language is a complex structure that is constantly developing and changing, reflects the characteristics of the society to which it belongs, has a certain system and rules, and on which the society agrees and compromises at a minimum level. This complex structure is a determining factor in determining the individual's place in society and in his/her success and happiness in daily life. Because language is "a system of signs for conveying feelings, thoughts, wishes and designs to others" (Kavcar et al., 2015). It can be said that this system has a non-stationary structure. As a matter of fact, language has features that affect and are affected by the individual and society. In this context, investigating the potential and processes of language learning and acquisition is important for successful language education.

"A normally developing child has the potential to learn one or more languages that are spoken around him or her and with which he or she has the opportunity to communicate adequately. Moreover, in the first years of life, such a complex process of language learning is accomplished without any conscious effort on the part of the child. In this sense, there is no biological or neurological limit set by the brain in terms of the number of languages a child can learn." (Haznedar, 2021: 27). An individual can learn or acquire a language in the process as he/she is exposed to it, practices it and learns the rules of its functioning. People who learn more than one language constitute a significant portion of the world population today. These people are called bilingual and multilingual according to the number of languages they know. There are various explanations about the concept of bilingualism, which is also the subject of the present study.

The concept of bilingualism, whose English equivalent is "bilingualism", was formed by the combination of the Latin words "bi" meaning two and "lingualism" meaning language (Cengiz, 2009:192). Bilingualism is not a subject studied by a single field. "It is difficult to explain bilingualism as it is an interdisciplinary subject. What is bilingualism? When and under what conditions is a person considered bilingual? Should one be fluent in both languages? Or is knowing the second language to a limited extent enough to qualify a person as bilingual?... Although these questions are frequently asked today, no clear, satisfactory answer has yet been given to these questions (Kelağa, 2005: 43-44). Lewandowski (1984:184) defines bilingualism as "the ability to master two languages equally well, to express oneself in the second language as well as in the first or one's mother tongue, to communicate with others and to understand others...", while Bloomfield (1933: 56) defines bilingualism as "the ability to speak and actively use both languages as one's mother tongue". Weinreich (1979) defines bilingualism as the ability to use both languages, while Valdez and Figueora (1994) define bilingualism as knowing two languages. Whether a person is monolingual, bilingual or multilingual, writing skills are as important as listening, speaking or reading skills.

Human beings have the desire to reflect their feelings and thoughts, wishes and desires by expressing them in different ways. In this process, they often resort to speech. In this context, writing skill is one of the activities produced by the human mind." (Aktaş & Gündüz, 2021:163). Developing individuals' writing skills is also important in terms of increasing the variety of tools for sharing their feelings and ideas. "The first way to improve writing skills is to create a desire to write. This desire points to motivation to write. Writing motivation is when the student becomes eager in the process of creating a correct and successful text." (Erbilen & Temizkan, 2021:171). In the context of writing motivation, some strategies are determined in the writing process and it is aimed to complete the writing process successfully.

Writing strategies have an important place in the development of written expression skills. Writing strategies, which are usually handled together with language learning strategies, can be defined as cognitive or metacognitive operations or sequences of operations that one employs to solve the problem encountered in the process of composing a text (Oxford, 1990).

Monolingual or bilingual students may have some negative attitudes towards writing such as anxiety, worry and uneasiness. It can be stated that one of the main reasons for these possible situations is the thought of not being able to produce a successful writing. In order to eliminate or reduce these negative attitudes, writing strategies are developed during the writing process. These strategies contribute to the development of writing skills and the successful realization of the writing process. According to Mete and Esendemir (2020:581), writing strategies "include ways that produce solutions to problems that may be encountered in the writing process. Teachers' guiding their students in writing activities in line with these strategies can increase the success of the writing process. Students' realization of writing strategies in this process will also help them form a positive attitude towards writing."

"Writing strategies are a set of procedures carried out in order to successfully complete a writing activity or task." (Graham & Harris, 2005). Writing strategies are related to writing processes. "Strategies can be both cognitive and metacognitive in nature as they are practices that are employed to solve problems encountered during writing. During writing, both the information in the mind is transferred to the language center to be presented through language and the written sentences are checked for accuracy. The transfer of thoughts to writing is explained as a cognitive process, and the control of this transfer process is explained as a metacognitive process." (Collins, 2000).

Individuals who do not have very high writing anxiety, do not have a negative attitude towards writing and successfully apply writing strategies are more likely to realize a successful writing process. Those who write in this way can be called good writers. Therefore, "Good writers are strategic writers. Good writers use a wide variety of strategies to create and develop their writing and to support the writing process. These strategies generally include planning, text production, evaluation and revision. Students with underdeveloped writing skills cannot write with an approach that includes these stages. In this respect, teaching these strategies to students with low writing achievement is of great importance." (Graham & Harris, 2005).

Strategies are also a criterion for distinguishing successful and unsuccessful students. Because the person who knows and uses strategies is more likely to be successful in their work." (Topuzkanamış, 2014: 24). Being successful in all language skills, especially writing skills, depends to a great extent on the competence of applying communication strategies. It is very important to reveal these competencies through scientific studies and to find solutions to problems, if any.

In the local literature, there is no study to determine bilinguals' proficiency in applying Turkish writing strategies. On the other hand, there are scientific studies on different skill areas of bilinguals. Kan and Hatay (2017) conducted a study on the dictation and writing skills of bilingual primary school students, while Gözüküçük and Kıran (2016) examined the problems encountered by non-native Turkish primary school students in primary literacy teaching. Kan and Yeşiloğlu (2017) addressed the problems bilingual children experience in the first literacy teaching stages and suggested solutions to these problems, while Yazıcı and İlter (2008) prepared a study on the language acquisition process of bilingual children in preschool period. Yavuz (2021) examined the effect of micro-teaching method on the writing skills of bilingual seventh-grade students, while Tunçel and Aytan (2013) evaluated the visual reading and written expression skills of bilingual teacher candidates. Kalı et al. (2021) examined Turkish teachers' views on bilingual secondary school students' Turkish speaking skills, and Kaya and Kardaş (2020) examined the effect of role-playing activities on bilingual students' Turkish speaking anxiety. Ergüt (2021) examined the mother tongue and speaking anxieties of bilingual Turkish children abroad. Susar-Kırmızı, Özcan, and Şencan (2016) aimed to determine teachers' views on the problems encountered in the first literacy process in regions where Turkish is spoken less. Sarı (2002) tried to determine the difficulties bilingual children face while learning to read and write by using the analysis method. In addition to these studies, various studies have been conducted

on bilingualism. Kaya et al. (2022) prepared a bibliography of scientific studies on bilingualism in Turkey. Can and Kardaş (2023) examined the trends of these studies; Can et al. (2023) examined the compliance of the title and abstract sections of master's and doctoral theses on bilingualism in Turkey with academic writing principles.

In the foreign literature, many scientific studies have been conducted to examine the writing strategies of different study groups. Fan and Wang (2024) aimed to determine the effects of writing strategies, writing anxiety and perceived writing difficulty on writing performance. Oussou et al. (2024) examined the use of writing strategies by 245 students studying in the English department of a university. Anyau et al. (2024) explored the writing strategies used by 122 undergraduate students and investigated the relationship between all the strategies used. Zhu et al., (2024) aimed to examine the relationships between teacher feedback, students' use of writing strategies and English writing proficiency. Raoofi et al. (2017) examined the relationship between writing strategy use and EFL writing proficiency. Proske et al. (2014) used the ARCS (Attention/Attention, Relevance/Relevance, Confidence, Satisfaction/Satisfaction Motivation Model) model to investigate the motivational characteristics of different practice conditions. Shen and Bai (2022) aimed to describe the interaction between self-regulated writing strategies and English writing performance in their study, while Soraya (2016) aimed to find appropriate methods to be used in writing lessons, especially for students with high creativity and low creativity. Resmini et al. (2024) investigated the strategies used by students in the writing process. Kieft et al. (2006) tested the effectiveness of adapting writing-learning tasks to different writing strategies in teaching literature. Villaruz and Palma (2024) aimed to determine the writing strategies used by students in their study. It is possible to increase the number of these studies.

The number of bilingual Turkish citizen students studying in Turkey is considerable. It is very important to determine the current situation of these individuals for a successful Turkish education. Determining their application of Turkish writing strategies is also important in terms of finding solutions to problems, if any. However, unfortunately, no study has been found in the literature for these purposes.

The main reason for determining the subject of the current study as the examination of the writing strategies of bilingual Turkish citizen secondary school students is that no study of this dimension has been conducted in Turkey to date. With this feature of the study, it is thought that it will contribute to the related literature. In this context, the aim of the current study is to determine bilingual middle school students' competencies in applying Turkish writing strategies and the relationship between these competencies and the variables of gender, grade level, father's education level, mother's education level, language spoken at home, TV watching time at home, book reading, diary keeping status, and type of books read. In the context of this main purpose, the following questions were sought to be answered in the research:

1. At what level do bilingual Turkish citizen middle school students use Turkish metacognitive writing strategies?
2. Do the variables of gender, grade level, father's education level, mother's education level, language spoken at home, time spent watching TV at home, reading books, keeping a diary, and type of books read have any effect on students' Turkish writing strategies?

## **Methods**

### ***Research Model***

In this study, since it was aimed to determine the relationship between bilingual students' Turkish writing strategies and the variables of gender, grade level, father's education level, mother's education level, language spoken at home, duration of watching TV at home, reading books, keeping a diary, and the type of books read, the relational survey model, one of the descriptive methods, was used in the study. Relational survey researches are research models

that aim to determine the existence of change between two or more than two variables (Karasar, 2014).

### **Participants of the Study**

The participants of the study consisted of 207 bilingual students studying in the central districts of Van province. The data of the study were collected in a face-to-face educational environment. The study group was formed by using convenient sampling method, which is one of the non-random sampling methods. Descriptive statistics regarding the socio-demographic information of the middle school students participating in the study are given in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Frequency and percentages of students' socio-demographic information

Variables	Variable levels	Frequency (f)	Percent (%)
Gender	Woman	116	56,04
	Male	91	43,96
Class Level	5th grade	71	34,30
	6th grade	46	22,23
	7th grade	61	29,47
	8th grade	29	14,00
Father's Education Level	University	40	19,33
	High School	56	27,06
	Middle School	61	29,47
	Primary School	22	10,61
Mother Education Level	Illiterate	28	13,53
	University	13	6,28
	High School	42	20,30
	Middle School	50	24,15
	Primary School	43	20,77
Language spoken at home	Illiterate	59	28,50
	Kurdish	54	26,09
	Turkish	75	36,23
Number of books read (annually)	Turkish + Kurdish	78	37,68
	0	6	2,89
	1-5	1	0,48
	6-10	4	1,93
	11-15	107	51,71
	16-20	21	10,14
Type of book read	21 and above	68	32,85
	Tale	53	25,60
	Story	31	14,97
	Novel	53	25,60
	Personal Development	41	19,83
Keeping a diary	Travelling	29	14,00
	Yes	63	30,44
Television viewing time	No	144	69,56
	I never watch	22	10,62
	Half an hour	73	35,26
	1-2 hours	89	42,99
	3-4 hours	14	6,79
More than 5 hours	9	4,34	

<b>Total</b>	207	100
--------------	-----	-----

When Table 1 is analysed, it is seen that 56.04% of the students participating in the study are female and 43.96% are male. The majority of the students participating in the study were in the 5th and 7th grades. When the educational status of the parents of the students was analysed, it was found that 29.47% of the fathers were graduated from secondary school and 28.50% of the mothers were illiterate. When the students were analysed according to the language spoken at home, it was found that the majority of the students spoke two languages. The majority of the students read between 11-15 books per year and prefer fairy tales and novels the most. The majority of the students who participated in the research do not write diaries and watch television between 1-2 hours a day.

#### **Data Collection Process**

The data collection tool used in data collection was hand delivered to the participants of the study and collected.

#### **Data Collection Tools**

In this study, it was aimed to determine the relationship between bilingual students' levels of using Turkish writing strategies and some variables. For this purpose, the "Metacognitive Writing Strategies Scale" developed by Erol (2021) was used as a data collection tool. The measurement tool consists of two parts. The first part includes personal information (gender, grade level, father's education level, mother's education level, language spoken at home, TV watching time at home, book reading, diary keeping status, type of book read). In the second part, there are items to measure the writing strategies of bilingual students.

Metacognitive writing strategies scale. The development process and analyses of the scale developed by Erol (2021) are explained as follows: "The scale developed is based on two basic data. The first data is the data obtained from the literature review. In order to create the item pool of the scale, basic theories and concepts specific to the field, especially metacognition and metacognitive strategies, were scanned. The second data constituting the item pool was obtained from the students. Thus, a draft consisting of 62 items was prepared. After the draft was shaped, expert opinion was sought for content and face validity. In this direction, five academicians working in the Department of Turkish Education, two academicians in the field of measurement and evaluation, 4 Turkish teachers working in secondary schools affiliated to the Ministry of National Education and continuing their education at the doctoral level (11 experts in total) were consulted about the draft. The opinions expressed by the experts were converted into a table using the excel programme and minimum values were obtained using the content validity formula. The items with a content validity ratio below 0.59 were removed from the scale draft. In the content validity calculation based on the formula and inter-expert agreement, 12 items in the scale draft received 1 full point, 20 items received 0.81 points and 12 items received 0.63 points. After the calculation, it was seen that the number of items exceeding the threshold value of 0,59 was 44. Thus, the number of items in the scale was reduced from 62 to 44 in line with the opinions of the experts. The remaining 44 items were randomised and made ready for application. In the scale prepared for factor analysis, a 5-point Likert-type rating (completely agree, generally agree, moderately agree, slightly agree, strongly disagree) was used. In order to determine the students' level of agreement with the items, it was graded as 5 points for completely agreeing, 4 points for generally agreeing, 3 points for moderately agreeing, 2 points for slightly agreeing, and 1 point for strongly disagreeing." (Erol, 2021).

### Analysing the Data

Parametric tests were used in the analysis of the data since they met the normality assumptions. In this context, t-test was used for variables with two groups and one-way ANOVA test was used for variables with more than two groups. For multiple comparisons, Tukey test, one of the Post Hoc tests, was used.

### Reliability and Validity Study

In this section, the reliability, validity and normality values of the measurement tool were examined.

**Table 2.** Results related to reliability values of measurement instrument

Measurement tool	Number of items	Cronbach alfa
Metacognitive Writing Strategies Scale	35	.913

When Table 2 is analysed, it is seen that the reliability value of the measurement tool used to collect data in the research is .91. This value indicates that the measurement tool is reliable.

**Table 3.** Results related to normality tests of the measurement instrument

Measurement Tool	N	Skewness	Kurtosis	Kolmogorov- Smirnov (KS)	Shapiro-Wilk (SW)
				p	p
Metacognitive Writing Strategies Scale	207	-,407	,912	,200*	,000

\*p > 0,05

One of the assumptions of normality is that skewness and kurtosis take a value close to zero. However, skewness and kurtosis values alone are not sufficient to determine normality values, statistical tests such as Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) and Shapiro-Wilk (SW) tests are used for this purpose. Among these tests, KS test is used for large sample groups ( $n > 50$ ) and SW test is used for small sample groups ( $n \leq 50$ ) (Büyüköztürk, 2013; Field, 2013; Ghasemi & Zahediasl, 2012). In this context, when Table 3 is analysed, it is seen that the skewness and kurtosis values of the measurement tool are between +1 and -1. This value indicates that the data collected with the measurement tool show a normal distribution. For this reason, it was decided to use t-test and one-way ANOVA test, which are parametric tests, to analyse the data considering that the total score provided normality.

### Finding

In this section, the findings related to the problem questions of the study are presented in tables and explained one by one.

The mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum mean scores of bilingual students' total scores on the Metacognitive Writing Strategies Scale are presented in Table 4.

**Table 4.** Results related to bilingual students' levels of use of Turkish metacognitive writing strategies

Metacognitive Writing Strategies Scale	N	Min.	Max.	Aver.	Ss.
Measurement Tool	207	35,00	175,00	134,38	21,89792

When Table 4 is analysed, it can be seen that the lowest and the highest total scores of the Metacognitive Writing Strategies Scale were 35 and 175 points, respectively. The average of the students' total score from the scale is 134,38. According to the evaluation category, it is seen that bilingual students' level of using metacognitive writing strategies in Turkish is "high" (3,8). Based on this result, it can be said that bilingual students' writing strategies are at a "high" level.

After the students' writing strategy levels were examined, parametric tests (t-test, one-way ANOVA) were used to compare the variables affecting writing strategies (gender, grade level, father's education level, mother's education level, language spoken at home, TV watching time at home, book reading, diary keeping status, type of book read). In this context, t-test results for the gender variable are shown in Table 5.

**Table 5.** Results related to the comparison of bilingual students' Turkish metacognitive writing strategy levels according to gender

Metacognitive Writing Strategies Scale	Gender	N	Aver.	Ss.	t	p
Measurement Tool	Woman	116	137,42	20,05217	2,234	,027*
	Male	91	130,50	23,59396		

\*p<0,05

When Table 5 is analysed, it is understood that bilingual students' writing strategies differ in terms of gender (t = 2,234; p<0,05). Based on the arithmetic averages, it was determined that the level of female students' use of writing strategies was higher than that of male students.

One-way ANOVA test was conducted to compare the writing strategies of bilingual students according to their grade level and the results are given in Table 6.

**Table 6.** Results related to the comparison of students' Turkish metacognitive writing strategies according to grade level

Metacognitive Writing Strategies Scale	Class Level	N	Aver.	Ss.	Variance Source	S	F	p	Differ-ence
Measurement Tool	5th grade	71	135,22	22,247	Between Reliability	300,4			
	6th grade	46	134,89	21,033	Intra-reliability	98480,4			
	7th grade	61	134,37	18,720	Total	98780,8	,206	,892	-
	8th grade	29	131,51	28,597					
	Total	207	134,38	21,897					

\*p<0,05; S = Sum of squares

When Table 6 is analysed, it is understood that the scores of bilingual students on the writing strategy scale do not differ according to the grade level (F= ,206; p> 0,05). According to these results, it can be said that the grade level is not effective on bilingual students' Turkish writing strategies.

One-way ANOVA test was conducted to compare bilingual students' writing strategies according to their father's education level and the results are given in Table 7.



**Table 7.** Results related to the comparison of students' Turkish metacognitive writing strategies according to father's education level

Metacognitive Writing Strategies Scale	Father's Education Level	N	Aver.	Ss.	Variance Source	S	F	p	Difference
Measurement Tool	(1) University	23	135,6	28,905	Between Reliability	2819,9			
	(2) High School	61	134,6	19,631	Intra-reliability	95960,8			
	(3) Middle School	56	131,0	22,122	Total	98780,8	1,484	,208	-
	(4) Primary School	40	140,7	19,633					
	(5) Illiterate	27	129,8	21,716					
	Total	207	134,3	21,897					

\*p<0,05; S = Sum of squares

When Table 7 is analysed, it is understood that the scores of bilingual students' writing strategies scale do not differ according to their father's education level (F= 1,484; p>0,05). According to these results, it can be said that the level of father's education is not effective in bilingual students' Turkish writing strategies.

One-way ANOVA test was conducted to compare bilingual students' writing strategies according to their mother's education level and the results are given in Table 8.

**Table 8.** Results regarding the comparison of students' Turkish metacognitive writing strategies according to mother's education level

Metacognitive Writing Strategies Scale	Mother education Level	N	Aver.	Ss.	Variance Source	S	F	p	Difference
Measurement Tool	(1) University	43	134,6	21,816	Between Reliability	1426,0			
	(2) High School	50	131,6	23,714	Intra-reliability	97354,7			
	(3) Middle School	42	137,2	21,578	Total	98780,8	,740	,566	-
	(4) Primary School	13	141,6	16,405					
	(5) Illiterate	59	133,1	21,638					
	Total	207	134,3	21,897					

\*p<0,05; S = Sum of squares

When Table 8 is analysed, it is understood that the scores of bilingual students' writing strategies scale do not differ according to their mother's education level (F= ,740; p>0,05). According to these results, it can be said that the level of mother's education is not effective in bilingual students' Turkish writing strategies.

In order to compare bilingual students' writing strategies according to the language spoken at home, one-way ANOVA test was performed and the results are given in Table 9.

**Table 9.** Results regarding the comparison of students' Turkish metacognitive writing strategies according to the language spoken at home

Metacognitive Writing Strategies Scale	Language spoken at home	N	Aver.	Ss.	Variance Source	S	F	p	Difference
Measurement Tool	(1) Turkish	75	136,1	22,204	Between Reliability	437,88			
	(2) Kurdish	54	134,1	23,297	Intra-reliability	98342,9			
	(3) Turkish +Kurdish	78	132,8	20,730	Total	98780,8	,454	,636	-
	Total	207	134,3	21,897					

\*p<0,05; S = Sum of squares

When Table 9 is analysed, it is understood that the scores of bilingual students' writing strategies scale do not differ significantly according to the language spoken at home (F= ,454; p>0,05). According to these results, it can be said that the language spoken at home is not effective in bilingual students' Turkish writing strategies.

One-way ANOVA test was conducted to compare bilingual students' writing strategies according to the number of books read per year and the results are given in Table 10.

**Table 10.** Results of the comparison of students' Turkish metacognitive writing strategies according to the number of books read in a year

Metacognitive Writing Strategies Scale	Number of Books	N	Aver.	Ss.	Variance Source	S	F	p	Difference
Measurement Tool	(1) 0	3	133,9	22,328	Between Reliability	3920,43			
	(2) 1-5	1	136,8	24,162	Intra-reliability	94860,4			
	(3) 6-10	4	140,3	20,762	Total	98780,8	1,66	,146	-
	(4) 11-15	10	137,5	18,715					
	(5) 16-20	24	120,5	17,783					
	(6) 21 and above	68	134,2	23,882					
Total	207	134,3	21,897						

\*p<0,05; S = Sum of squares

When Table 10 is analysed, it is understood that bilingual students' scores from the writing strategies scale do not differ according to the number of books read per year (F= , 1,66;

$p > 0,05$ ). According to these results, it can be said that the number of books read per year is not effective in bilingual students' Turkish writing strategies.

One-way ANOVA test was conducted to compare bilingual students' writing strategies according to the type of books read and the results are given in Table 11.

**Table 11.** Results regarding the comparison of students' Turkish metacognitive writing strategies according to the type of book read

Metacognitive Writing Strategies Scale	Book Type	N	Aver.	Ss.	Variance Source	S	F	p	Difference
Measurement Tool	(1)Story	54	131,7	25,217	Between Reliability	1444,7			
	(2)Story	31	138,3	21,140	Intra-reliability	97336,0			
	(3)Novel	53	132,1	18,137	Total	98780,8			
	(4)Personal development	43	135,8	23,826			,750	,559	-
	(5) Travelling	26	136,1	20,217					
	Total	207	134,3	21,897					

\* $p < 0,05$ ; S = Sum of squares

When Table 11 is analysed, it is understood that bilingual students' scores obtained from the writing strategies scale do not differ according to the type of book read ( $F = ,750$ ;  $p > 0,05$ ). According to these results, it can be said that the type of book read is not effective in bilingual students' Turkish writing strategies.

One-way ANOVA test was conducted to compare bilingual students' writing strategies according to the duration of watching television and the results are given in Table 12.

**Table 12.** Results regarding the comparison of students' Turkish metacognitive writing strategies according to the duration of television viewing

Metacognitive Writing Strategies Scale	TV viewing Time	N	Aver.	Ss.	Variance Source	S	F	p	Difference
Measurement Tool	(1)Half an hour	73	138,2	19,257	Between Reliability	3498,7			
	(2)1-2 hours	89	133,2	24,591	Intra-reliability	95282,1	1,854	,120	-
	(3)3-4 hours	14	124,7	20,419	Total	98780,8			
	(4)5 or more hours	9	126,1	19,908					

(5)I never watch	22	136,2	18,97	4
Total	20	134,3	21,89	7

\* $p < 0,05$ ; S = Sum of squares

When Table 12 is analysed, it is understood that bilingual students' scores from the writing strategies scale do not differ according to the duration of television viewing ( $F = 1,854$ ;  $p > 0,05$ ). According to these results, it can be said that the duration of watching television has no effect on bilingual students' Turkish writing strategies.

In order to understand whether the variable of keeping a diary is effective on bilingual students' writing strategies, t-test was conducted and the test results are shown in Table 13.

**Table 13.** Results of the comparison of bilingual students' Turkish metacognitive writing strategies according to journal keeping

Metacognitive Writing Strategies Scale	Keeping a Diary	N	Aver.	Ss.	t	p
Measurement Tool	Yes	63	140,20	18,56476	2,779	,006*
	No	144	131,83	22,80044		

\* $p < 0,05$

When Table 13 is analysed, it is understood that bilingual students' writing strategies differ significantly in terms of keeping a diary ( $t = 2,779$ ;  $p < 0,05$ ). When the arithmetic averages are analysed, it is seen that students who keep a diary have higher writing strategy levels than students who do not keep a diary

#### Conclusion, Discussion and Suggestions

In the study, it was concluded that bilingual secondary school students' use of metacognitive writing strategies was at "high level". In the study, it was also determined that "class level, father's education level, mother's education level, language spoken at home, TV watching time at home, book reading, type of book read variables do not have a positive-negative effect on students' levels of using metacognitive writing strategies. On the other hand, it was concluded that women had higher levels of metacognitive writing strategies than men, and that students who kept a diary used writing strategies more intensively than students who did not.

In the literature, there is no study conducted to determine the level of bilingual students' use of metacognitive writing strategies in Turkish. However, there are various studies published on students' writing strategies. While some of these studies in the literature investigate the level of students' use of writing strategies, some of them aim to determine the writing strategies used by students.

Villaruz and Palma (2024) aimed to determine the writing strategies used by students in their study. At the end of the study, it was found that students frequently used writing strategies based on metacognitive awareness in the processes of planning, monitoring and evaluating their academic compositions. Oussou et al. (2024) examined the use of writing strategies by 245 students studying in the English department of a university. The findings obtained by combining both quantitative and qualitative analyses determined that students used writing strategies more intensively, especially memory and compensation strategies. Resmini et al. (2024) investigated the strategies used by students in the writing process. As a result of the research, it was determined that students used some strategies at every stage of the writing process such as prewriting (70.63%), writing (72.95%) and revision (60.16%). Alpaslan (2002) analysed the writing strategies used by three first-year students from the Department of Basic English while writing in

a foreign language and found that the participants used similar writing strategies and that the students used both the taught strategies and the strategies they found themselves. Fan and Wang (2024) aimed to determine the effect of writing strategies on writing performance. At the end of the study, it was determined that writing strategies had a "high level" effect on writing performance. Bektaş Esen (2012), in his study conducted with 1864 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th grade students in primary schools in Giresun, determined the reading and writing strategies used by students in science and technology course. According to the results of the study, 58.1% of the students reported that they "made a plan before starting to write", 76.3% reported that they "reviewed and reorganised what they wrote", 79.8% reported that they "understood the subject more clearly after writing", and 67.9% reported that they "became more active in science lessons with reading and writing activities". Zhu et al. (2024) aimed to examine the relationships between teacher feedback, students' use of writing strategies and writing competence. According to the results of the study, teacher feedback showed that there was a relationship between students' use of English writing strategies and their writing competence. Raoofi et al. (2017) examined the relationship between writing strategy use and EFL writing proficiency. The results of the study showed that the participants generally used English as a second language writing strategies at a relatively high level. The results also showed that students with high writing abilities reported a higher level of writing strategy use compared to those with medium or low writing proficiency. The reported results on students' levels of writing strategy use support the related results of the current study.

There are also studies in the literature that report results that do not coincide with the results of the current study. In his study, Yapıcı (2009) aimed to investigate the writing strategy preferences of English language teaching students. The results of the study reported that second year English language teaching students partially used writing strategies while writing essays. Wang (2013), in his study on 15 university students, investigated which difficulties students face in writing and what teaching techniques students find effective. At the end of the study, he found that students had problems in terms of content, organisation, writer's block and writing process. In order to understand the reasons for the results of these studies, which do not support the results of the current study, it is useful to determine the writing strategies that students prefer and why and at what level they use these strategies.

In the literature, studies reporting that the level of using writing strategies has a positive effect on students' achievement are also noteworthy. Friend (1994) investigated the effect of teaching writing strategies on university students' summarising skills. According to the results of the study, it was determined that the intervention group students were more successful in writing main idea sentences, removing unimportant, secondary and unnecessary thoughts from the text and in all summarising skills. Akçin (2002) investigated the effect of the strategies used in descriptive writing by a teacher who organised the curriculum according to the whole language approach on the writing of students with learning difficulties. At the end of the study, it was determined that the writing strategies training according to the whole language approach contributed positively to the written expression of students with learning disabilities. Nicholas (2002), in his study with African-American university students with learning disabilities, investigated the effect of explicit writing strategies instruction on students' expository writing skills. According to the results, it was observed that the experimental group showed more improvement in terms of auxiliary ideas than the control group. Ashworth (1992) investigated the effect of writing strategies on students' academic achievement and critical thinking skills in his study on undergraduate students. As a result of the study, the academic achievement of the experimental group was statistically higher than the academic achievement of the control group. These results shared in the literature also point out how important it is to determine the level of

students' use of writing strategies in order to provide students with a successful writing education.

Based on the results of the current study and related studies in the literature, the following suggestions can be made for researchers in the field:

- In order to provide more successful writing instruction to bilinguals, studies can be conducted to determine the writing strategies they use.
- The problems bilinguals face in writing education and the strategies they use to overcome these problems can be investigated.
- In order to achieve more successful results in the field of writing education, students can be trained on cognitive and metacognitive writing strategies.
- Students can be trained on the strategies that should be used in pre-writing, during writing and post-writing processes.
- Studies can be conducted to determine the writing strategies of monolingual students.
- This study can be repeated with different participants.

### References

Akçin, N. (2002). Tüm dil yaklaşımına göre öğretim programını düzenleyen bir öğretmenin betimsel yazı çalışmasında kullandığı stratejilerin öğrenme güçlüğü olan öğrencinin yazmasına etkisinin betimlenmesi, (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis), Anadolu University.

Aktaş, Ş. ve Gündüz, O. (2021). Yazılı ve sözlü anlatım: okuma, dinleme, konuşma, yazma. Akçağ Yayınları.

Alpaslan, Ö. (2002). The writing strategies of three freshman students at Middle East Technical University. (Unpublished Master's Thesis), Bilkent University.

Anyau, E., Habali, A. H. M., Aziz, A. A., Rahman, A. L. B. A., Roslan, F. H. Binti, & Rahmat, N. H. (2024). A study of the use of strategies in ESL academic writing. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 14(5), 1291–1306.

Ashworth, T. E. (1992). Using writing-to-learn strategies in community college associate degree nursing programs, (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis), Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University,

Bektaş Esen, E. (2012). Öğrencilerin fen ve teknoloji dersinde kullandıkları okuma ve yazma stratejileri (Giresun ili örneği). (Unpublished Master Thesis), Karadeniz Technical University.

Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. H. Holt and Company.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2013). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı*. Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.

Can, F. ve Kardaş, M. N. (2023). Türkiye’de iki dillilik üzerine yapılmış akademik çalışmaların eğilimleri. *Bayburt Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 18 (38), 555-577. <https://doi.org/10.35675/befdergi.1206969>.

Can, F., Kardaş M.N. ve Can, E. (2023). İki dillilik konusunda hazırlanmış yüksek lisans tezlerinin başlık ve özet bölümlerinin akademik metin hazırlama ilkelerine uygunluğu. Yağmur Şahin, E. (Ed.), *Dil eğitimi araştırmaları içinde* (s. 127-155). Çanakkale: Paradigma Akademi Yayınları.

Cengiz, K. (2009). Hatay’da iki dillilikten kaynaklanan dil karışması. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 6, 190-208.

Collins, J. L. (2000). Review of key concepts in strategic reading and writing instruction. (ed. John L. Collins (Ed.). In *cheektowaga-sloan handbook of practical reading and writing strategies*.

Erbilen M. ve Temizkan, M. (2021). Yazma öncesi etkinliklerinin yazma motivasyonuna ve yazma başarısına etkisi. *Hatay Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 18 (48), 170-201.

Ergüt, S. E. (2021). Türkçe ve Türk kültürü dersi alan yurt dışındaki iki dilli Türk çocuklarının miras dil konuşma kaygılarının incelenmesi. (Unpublished Master Thesis) Yıldız Technical University.

Erol, T. (2021). Üstbilişsel yazma stratejileri eğitiminin yazma becerisine ve yazmaya yönelik tutuma etkisi. (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi), İnönü University.

Fan, C., Wang, J. (2024). Configurational impact of self-regulated writing strategy, writing anxiety, and perceived writing difficulty on EFL writing performance: an fsQCA approach. *Sci Rep* 14, 1-16.

Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics*. Sage Publications.

Friend, R. (1994). Effects of strategy instruction and self-monitoring on summary writing of college students. (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis), City University of New York.

Ghasemi, A., & Zahediasl, S. (2012). Normality tests for statistical analysis: a guide for non-statisticians. *International Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism*, 10(2), 486-489.

Gözüküçük, M. ve Kıran, H. (2016). Anadili Türkçe olmayan ilkököl öğrencilerine ilkökuma yazma öğretiminde karşılaşılan sorunlar. *Aydın Tömer Dil Dergisi*, 1(1), 47-64.

Graham, S. ve Harris, K. R. (2005). *Writing better effective strategies for teaching students with learning difficulties*. Paul H. Brookes Publishing.

Haznedar, B. (2021). İkidillilik ve çokdillilik. *Anı Yayınları*.

İnce, B. ve Demiriz, H.N. (2021). İkidillilik ve ikidilli çocukların eğitimi. İ. Güleç, B. İnce ve H. N. Demiriz (Ed.). *Avrupa Birliği Ülkelerinde İkidillilik/Çokdillilik Politikaları içinde Kesit Yayınları*.

Kalı, G., Özkaya, P. G., ve Coşkun, M. (2021). Türkçe öğretmenlerinin iki dilli ortaokul öğrencilerinin Türkçe konuşma becerilerine yönelik görüşleri. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 50(230), 195-220. <https://doi.org/10.37669/milliegitim.678342>.

Kan, M. O. ve Hatay Uçar, F. (2017). İki dilli ilkököl öğrencilerinin dikte ve yazma becerisi. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, 5 (2), 217-225.

Kan, M. O. ve Yeşiloğlu, F. (2017). İlk okuma yazma öğretiminde izlenen aşamalarda iki dilli çocukların yaşadıkları sorunlar ve bu sorunlara dair çözüm önerileri. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, 5 (3), 519-533.

Karasar, N. (2014). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. Nobel Yayıncılık.

Kavcar, C., Oğuzkan, F. ve Sever, S. (2015). *Yazılı ve sözlü anlatım*. Anı Yayıncılık.

Kaya, M. ve Kardaş, M. N. (2020). İki dilli öğrencilerin Türkçe konuşma kaygıları üzerinde rol oynama etkinliklerinin etkisi. *Çukurova Araştırmaları*, 6 (1), 126- 140.

Kaya, M., Palas, R. ve Can, F. (2022). İki dillilik ve çok dillilik üzerine yapılan araştırmalara ilişkin kaynakça denemesi. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*(31), 605-634. <https://doi.org/10.29000/rumelide.1222073>.

Kelağa, İ. (2005). Yunanistan'da (Batı Trakya'da) ikidilli eğitim veren azınlık okullarında Türkçe ve Yunanca öğrenim gören öğrencilerin okuduğunu anlama ve yazılı anlatım becerilerinin değerlendirilmesi. (Unpublished Master Thesis) Ankara University.

Kieft, M., Rijlaarsdam, G., & van den Bergh, H. (2006). Writing as a learning tool: Testing the role of students' writing strategies. *European Journal Of Psychology Of Education*, 21, 17-34.

Lewandowski, T. (1984). *Linguistisches wörterbuch 1-2-3, Quelle und Meyer Verlag, Heidelberg*.

Mete, F. ve Esendemir, N. (2020). Türkçe öğretmenlerinin yazma stratejilerine dair görüşleri. *Van Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 17 (1), 579- 602.

Nicholas, K. R. (2002). The effects of structured writing strategy training on expository compositions produced by African-American college students with learning disabilities. (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis). The Florida State University.

Oussou, S., Kerouad, S., & Hdii, S. (2024). The relationship between EFL students' use of writing strategies and their writing achievement. *Jurnal Arbitrer*, 11(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.25077/ar.11.1.1-12.2024>.

Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: what every teacher should know*. Newbury House Publishers.

Proske, A., Roscoe, R. D., & McNamara, D. S. (2014). Game-based practice versus traditional practice in computer-based writing strategy training: effects on motivation and achievement. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 62, 481-505.

Raofi, S., Binandeh, M., & Rahmani, S. (2017). An investigation into writing strategies and writing proficiency of university students. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 8 (1), 191.

Resmini, S., Bhuana, G.P., Rizkiani, S. ve Maulana, A. (2024). EFL students strategies in the process of writing. *Journal of Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 1-12.

Sarı, M. (2002). İki dilli çocukların çözümleme yöntemiyle okuma yazma öğrenirken karşılaştıkları güçlükler. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 9(9). 108-122.

Shen, B. & Bai, B. (2024). Chinese university students' self-regulated writing strategy use and EFL writing performance: influences of self-efficacy, gender, and major. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 15(1), 161-188.

Soraya, K. (2016). The effectiveness of collaborative writing strategy (cws) in writing lesson regarded to the students' creativity. *Lingua Cultura*, 10(2). 63-67.

Susar Kırmızı, F., Özcan, E. ve Şencan, D. (2016). Türkçenin az konuşulduğu bölgelerde ilk okuma yazma sürecinde karşılaşılan sorunlara ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim Dergisi*, 5 (1), 412-445.

Topuzkanamış, E. (2014). Yazma stratejileri öğretiminin Türkçe öğretmenliği birinci sınıf öğrencilerinin yazılı anlatım başarısı ve yazma kaygısına etkisi. (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis), Gazi University.

Tunçel, H. ve Aytan, N. (2013). İki dilli öğretmen adaylarının görsel okuma ve yazılı ifade becerilerinin değerlendirilmesi. *Journal of Turkish Studies*, 1321-1343.

Villaruz, Jomar M., and Reita C. Palma (2024). Metacognitive awareness of writing strategies, oral proficiency, and writing instructions: a structural equation model of academic writing skills in Filipino language. *Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports* 18 (7),114-34.

Wang, M. (2013). Strategies to advance college-ready writing competencies. (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis). Cardinal Stritch University.

Weinreich, U. (1979). *Languages in contact: findings and problems*. The Hague: Mouton.

Yapıcı, B. (2009). Writing strategy preferences of undergraduate English as a foreign language teacher trainees at Hacettepe University. (Unpublished Master's Thesis), Hacettepe University Graduate School of Social Sciences.

Yavuz, E. (2021). Mikro öğretim yönteminin iki dilli yedinci sınıf öğrencilerin yazma becerilerine etkisi. (Unpublished Master Thesis). Van Yüzüncü Yıl University.

Yazıcı, Z. ve İlter, B. G. (2008). Okul öncesi dönemdeki iki dilli / çok dilli çocukların dil kazanım süreci. *Dil Araştırmaları*, 3 (3), 47-61.



Zhu, J., Yang, Y., & Yan, Z. (2024). Relationships between teacher feedback and English writing proficiency in Chinese students: The mediating effect of writing self-regulated learning strategies. *System*, 123, 103338.