Analysis of Effectiveness of Alternative Phonic Sequence on Phonic Based Sentence Method in First Literacy Education*

Özgür BABAYİĞİT, Emre ÜNAL***

Abstract

In this experimental study we aimed to test the effectiveness of alternative phonic sequence by changing the phonic sequence of Elementary Turkish Lesson's Education Program and Guide Book's (First and Fifth grades) first section named First Literacy Education. Protest-Posttest control group models which are one of the real experimental type were used. Research's groups consists of 1. grade class students (2011-2012 academic year) where they have 2 branches at Bozköy Primary School at Bozköy town of Çiftlik district, Niğde. As the result of this study: There isn't a significant different between the time to begin reading and speed of reading aloud, reading capacity or comprehension capacity of experimental group and control group students. But, there is a significant difference on dictate capacity in favor of experimental group.

Key Words: *First literacy education, phonic based sentence method, alternative phonics sequence.*

İlk Okuma-Yazma Öğretiminde Ses Temelli Cümle Yöntemine İlişkin Alternatif Ses Sıralamasının Etkililiğinin İncelenmesi*

Özet

Bu deneysel çalışmada, İlköğretim Türkçe Dersi Öğretim Programı ve Kılavuzunun (1-5. Sınıflar) İlk Okuma-Yazma Öğretimi başlıklı bölümünde verilen ses sıralamasında değişiklikler yapılarak, alternatif ses sıralamasının etkililiğinin denenmesi amaçlanmıştır. Gerçek deneme modellerinden öntest-sontest kontrol gruplu model kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın çalışma grubunu 2011-2012 eğitim-öğretim yılında Niğde ili Çiftlik İlçesi Bozköy Kasabası Bozköy İlköğretim Okulunda öğrenim gören 2 şubeden oluşan birinci sınıf öğrencileri oluşturmaktadır. Çalışma neticesinde şu sonuçlara ulaşılmıştır: Deney grubu ile kontrol grubu öğrencilerinin okumaya geçiş zamanı, sesli okuma hızı, okuma becerisi, okuduğunu anlama açısından manidar farklılık göstermemektedir. Fakat dikte becerisi açısından deney grubu lehine manidar faklılık göstermektedir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: *İlk okuma-yazma öğretimi, ses temelli cümle yöntemi, alternatif ses sıralaması.*

** Arş. Gör., Bozok Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, İlköğretim Bölümü, Sınıf Öğretmenliği Anabilim Dalı. Yozgat
e-posta: ozgur982@hotmail.com
*** Doç. Dr., Niğde Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, İlköğretim Bölümü, Sınıf Öğretmenliği Anabilim Dalı. Niğde
e-posta: dr.emreunal@gmail.com

Introduction

The first literacy education is a language education process which is carried on with parent-teacher association in first grade of primary school in order to add reading and writing skills on the language skills which began from early childhood period. For (Baş, 2006) and Kayıkçı (2008), the first literacy education is a process consist of coding with significant marks as the source and as the receiver, giving meanings to significant signals by decoding. For Berninger, Abbott, Swanso, Lovitt, Trived, Lin, Gould, Youngstrom, Shimada, Amtmann (2010), there are three stages in reading education. 1. Phonetic (sounds) 2. Writing (writing language) 3. Morphology (Meaning of the writing language). For (Kim, 2009) these three stages are formed sequentially. Sound/letter knowledge of children and phonetic awareness are two important factors for the first literacy education and reading capacities in the future of children. At first literacy education, it is important to know how the reading happens. At the time of reading, when the photons reflected from the words on a paper reaches the retina, the information of the white paper on which black letters, perceived as an information fragmented myriad items not as an entire shape by neurons in the retina, then, it is transferred to the brain's visual center. Our visual center gathers again all these information. At this stage, both our brain converts the letters to sounds (phonetic way) and determines what is the word (we read) by referring to the dictionary in our memory (lexical way). Consequently, the letters are perceived as the words have a particular sound and particular meaning (Karaçay, 2011). Phonetic awareness and letter knowledge are both important for literacy (Treiman, 2006).

For Demirel (1999), Özenç (2007), Erdem (2007) and Çelenk (2007), based on the children's basic language skills such as listening and speaking, the common purpose of the first literacy education is child's achieve basic literacy capacity used throughout his life. Sophisticate the capacities of reading and understanding what we read take their places in education programs and education period as the biggest help for becoming meaningful a person's life (Akyol, 2010).

According to Elementary Turkish Lesson's Education Program and Guide Book's (First and Fifth Grade Classes), in Sound Based Sentence Method, first to literacy instruction is initiated with the phonics. After a few sounds to form meaningful of all, syllables, words and sentences are reached. The first reading-writing instruction, sentences are arranged to be achieved in a short time. Reading and writing are carried out together for the first reading-writing instruction. Read each item being written, is read in those articles. Text in teaching, students› development adjacent italic letters are used as appropriate (Ministry of Education (MEB) 2005).

According to Elementary Turkish Lesson's Education Program and Guide Book's (First and Fifth Grade Classes), first literacy education according to the sound-based sentence method is executed by following these steps (Ministry of Education (MEB) 2005):

1.Preparation for first literacy.

2.Beginning to first literacy and advance.

   a. Feeling and recognition to sound.

   b. Reading and writing to sound/letter.

   c. Creating syllables from sound/letter, words from syllables and sentences from words.

   d. Creating a text.

3. Become a literate.

Sound/letter sequence and their groups which are recommended in the literacy education section of Elementary Turkish Lesson's Education Program and Guide Book's (First and Fifth grades were indicated at table 1:

In phonic/letter education the sequence which indicates at table 1 should be basis, not at the alphabet sequence. In this sequence, Turkish's sound structure, ease of writing letters, the activity of production syllables and words are taken into consideration. Moreover, different groupings could made by changing some phonic/letters' position in this groups. But, this arrangement should be conformable to understanding of Turkish Lesson Education

Table 1. Ministry of Education (MEB) (2005) recommendation sound/letter

1. Group	e, l, a, t	E, L, A, T
2. Group	i, n, o, r, m	İ, N, O, R, M
3. Group	u, k, ı, y, s, d	U, K, I, Y, S, D
4. Group	ö, b, ü, ş, z, ç	Ö, B, Ü, Ş, Z, Ç
5. Group	g, c, p, h	G, C, P, H
6. Group	ğ, v, f, j	Ğ, V, F, J

Program, thematic approach and sound-based sentence method (Ministry of Education, 2005: 252).

In phonic/letter education the sequence should be basis, not at the alphabet sequence. In this sequence, Turkish's phonic structure, ease of writing letters, the activity of production syllables and words are taken into consideration. Moreover, different groupings could made by changing some sounds/letters' position in this groups. But, this arrangement should be conformable to understanding of Turkish Lesson Education Program, thematic approach and phonic based sentence method. (Ministry of Education, 2005).

In the Elementary Turkish Lesson's Education Program and Guide Book's (First and Fifth grades) first section named first literacy education (MEB, 2005), it is indicated that different groupings also can be created by changing the phonic/letters' position in the sound groups of program. In this study, the purpose is determine to the effectiveness of alternative sound sequence as change in sound sequence of Elementary Turkish Lesson's Education Program and Guide Book's (First and Fifth grades) first section named first literacy education. When references of this study are examined, we see that some of the class teachers think the sound sequence which is indicated in program is not appropriate and they make some changes for the sequence. In conclusion of this experimental study we are going to see effectiveness of an alternative sound sequence. With this result, successes of the sound sequence in this program and alternative sound sequence would be compared. The importance of this research, ranking the effectiveness of alternative phonics to reveal.

Problem Sentence: What is the level of effectiveness of alternative sound sequence on sound-based sentence method at first literacy education?

Sub-Problems: At first literacy process of primary school 1.grade students, in the exercises of sound-based sentence method, what is the level of effectiveness of activities prepared with sound sequence in Ministry of Education (MEB) Elementary School Turkish Lesson Education Program and Guide Book (First and Fifth grades) and activities prepared with alternative sound sequence on students' process of learning to read; speed of reading aloud; reading capacities; reading comprehension; dictate capacity?

'I'm Reading And I'm Writing' book groups, developed by Özlem BAŞ, are applied on experiment group. 'I'm Reading And I'm Writing' book groups are given as free to the experiment group. 'I'm Learning to Read And Write' lesson book which is given as free by the Ministry of Education is applied on control group.

The phonic sequence (Baş, 2007a) applied on the experiment group is shown at Table 2:

While the sound/letter sequence is being composed at Table 2 according to Baş (2007b) these matters are taken into attention:

1. We paid attention to give firstly the continuous letters of consonants. The f,j,ğ letters, which cannot be easily understood, are put into last letter group even though they are continuous

2. A detailed dictionary work was done for vowels' issuance sequence and the vowels are systematized according to creation our language's words.

3. In order to prevent some phonic complications (b-d, y-ğ, j-c, s-z, v-f) in the acquisition process of reading capacity,

Table 2. The phonic sequence applied on the experiment group

Letter Group	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Letter Group	e	l	a	t	A	E	İ i	L	Y y
2. Letter Group	O o	S s	n	k	r	U u	T	Ü ü	Ç ç
3. Letter Group	I ı	m	d	C c	g	D	K	Ö ö	
4. Letter Group	b	h	Z z	V v	Ş ş	P p	B	N	
5. Letter Group	R	f	J j	ğ	M	G	Ğ	F	H	

Vowels	Continuous Consonants

the most mixed phonics are taught in different phonic groups and with breaks.

4. In the acquisition process of writing capacity, some letters which lead writing mistakes take place into different letter groups. For example; such as n, m, b, p, h and spotty letters (i, ö, ç, ş).

5. Because of the purpose is teaching the literacy, bounds' characteristics are taken into consideration for phonic sequence. The phonic of each letter is firstly taught with his little symbol. The letter his phonic is already learned is given then with his big symbol.

Methodology

Participants

Research field consists of primary schools of Niğde city. In chose of example, simple random sampling method was used. In simple random sampling, all parts of field have equal chance to enter the example. Thus, same weight will be given to each element in the calculations. (Arıkan, 2004). As result of simple random sampling, research's groups consists of 1.grade class students (2011-2012 academic year) where they have 2 branches at Bozköy Primary School at Bozköy town of Çiftlik district, Niğde. Bozköy. As the result of pretests, the two branches of 1.grade classes are determined as 1/A and 1/B class branches that they are equal to each other. Lots are drawn in order to determine the experiment

and the control groups. In conclusion of the drawing of lots, 1/A has become experiment group and 1/B has become control group. In the student list of 1/A there are 29 students. But 1 student has impediment, because of this student is continuously absent, he/she is not included to the count. So, 1/A class experiment group has 28 students. In the 1/B students list there are 31 students. 1/A class is made to the experimental procedure. 1/B class has learned to read and write with the phonic sequence specified in Ministry of Education (MEB) Elementary School Turkish Lesson Education Program and Guide Book (First and Fifth grades).

Data collection tools

Pretest Data Collection Tools

At the beginning of academic year, the pretests showed below are applied to determine whether the students are equal with each other or not.

Observation form before first literacy (To be ready)

The observation form before first literacy (to be ready) is developed by researcher. It is applied for determine that the students are ready to first literacy or not. The observation form before first literacy (to be ready) was completed by researcher with class teacher's help.

Visual Reading Scale

Visual reading scale was developed by researcher. It is applied to test students' ability to express the objects they see. It is applied in a different way for each student. It is applied by researcher at last week of september. The lowest point is 0 and the highest is 5 that can be taken from this test. Each picture is evaluated as 1 point. In the appliance done on students, the picture was showed to the student. It is asked to say what is the name of creature see at the picture. Researcher wrote what the student said in the scale. According to grade results, the experiment and control groups' marks were transferred to (SPSS 15.0) Statistical Package Program for the Social Sciences. It is compared that the experiment and control groups are equal each other or not. 3 teachers were taken for the content validity opinions. In addition to reliability, two experts were consulted. Reliability coefficient has increased ,91.

Line Work Scale

Line work scale was developed by researcher. The purpose is determine the students are ready for literacy or not. Small hand muscles' development state was examined. Line work scale is applied on each student in different ways at last week of september by the researcher. The lowest point is 0 and the highest is 5 that can be taken from this test. According to grade results, the experiment and control groups' marks were transferred to (SPSS 15.0) Statistical Package Program for the Social Sciences. It is compared that the experiment and control groups are equal each other or not. 3 teachers were taken for the content validity opinions. In addition to reliability, two experts were consulted. Reliability coefficient has increased ,93.

Posttest Data Collection Tools

In the end of experimental work, for looking the situation between the experiment and control groups, these posttest data collection tools are applied:

Time to Become a Literate

Time to become a literate scale was developed by the researcher. The Class Teacher marked the students who become literate on this scale. 3 teachers were taken for the content validity opinions. In addition to reliability, two experts were consulted. Reliability coefficient has increased ,100.

Reading Capacity Scale

Reading capacity scale is prepared by Obalar (2009) on purpose to determine the students' reading capacities, dated 2005, by taking into consideration elementary school 1.level students' acquisitions where the elementary Turkish lesson education program and guide book (First and Fifth grades). The scale is prepared by Obalar consists of 18 articles with five-point likert type. The necessary permission was taken from Obalar (2012) by e-mail to use to the 'Reading capacity scale'. The last 2 articles were added on the scale by researcher, so scale has 20 articles. The more point you take from the scale, reading capacity also increases. This scale is applied on each student in different ways at first week of june by the researcher. 'Reading Capacity Measurement Text' named 'Hasan' is read loudly to the students in order to determine the students' reading capacities. Students' reading loudly is recorded as video by the researcher. While the students was reading loudly, researcher completed the 'Reading capacity scale'. The articles marked in this scale were transferred to (SPSS 15.0) Statistical Package Program for the Social Sciences. The validity and reliability studies were carried out.

KMO and Barlett tests were done in order to determine whether the reading capacity scale is conformable to exploratory factor analysis or not. In this context, the result of KMO test should be .50 and higher, also, Barlett globalization test results should be statistically significant. (Jeong, 2004). As a result of this study, KMO test result is 85 and Barlett globalization test (p<0.01) result is significant and it can be made a factor analysis to the scale. In the exploratory factor analysis the limit value is taken as 45 for factors' load factor and with the principle component analyses method, varimax rotation technique which is one of the vertical techniques is used to find items giving them a high correlation and to make comments easily about the factors.

3 factors were obtained as the result of exploratory factor analysis done with reading

capacity scale. The first factor emphasizes %23,87 and the second factor emphasizes %22,47 and third factor emphasizes % 22,45 of the total variance of the scale. The total sizes of the scale shows %68,79 of the scale. For Büyüköztürk (2002), ıt is enough that if the rate variances are explained in the scale has one factor is %30 or higher. The data obtained the factor analysis emphasizes that validity of the scale is high level.

At first, Reading Capacity Scale consists of 20 articles, but then in the decided example for this study, after dashing the substances (3,13,14,18) which are not in any article or has load value under .45, the scale decreased 16 articles and evaluated with those remaining articles. Büyüköztürk (2002) indicates that the substances' factors co-variance are close to 1 or higher than .66 is a good solution, but, in practice it is generally difficult to accept. After factor rotation, it is seen that the first factor of factor includes 7 substances (1,6,7,16,17,19,20); and the second factor includes 6 substances (2,4,5,8,9,15) and the third factor includes 6 substances (10,11,12,15,16,17).

Cronbach's alpha reliability statistic was performed to determine the reliability of the scale. According to the statistics, the Cranbach Alpha Value is .91. Cranbach Alpha Value related to the scale's first and second factors are both found.87 and Cranbach Alpha Value related to the scale's third factor is found .90. Tezbaşaran (1997) indicates that the quotient of reliability which can considered enough in a likert-type scale should be as close as possible to 1. According to the these results it can be said that the reliability of two factors is higher than the last factor.

Word Comprehension Scale

Word understanding scale was developed by researcher as profiting from 'scales for reading comprehension' which were prepared by Erdoğan (2009). The necessary permission was taken from Erdoğan (2012) by e-mail to use as changing the 'Scales of reading comprehension' which are also used on his master thesis. The lowest point is 0 and the highest is 5 that can be taken from this word comprehension scale. This scale is applied on each student in different ways at first week of june by the researcher. According to point

result, marks obtained by experiment and control groups were transferred to (SPSS 15.0) Statistical Package Program for the Social Sciences. The validity and reliability studies were carried out. 3 teachers were taken for the content validity opinions. In addition to reliability, two experts were consulted. Reliability coefficient has increased ,92.

Sentence Comprehension Scale

Sentence comprehension scale was developed by researcher as profiting from 'scales for 'reading comprehension' which were prepared by Erdoğan (2009). The necessary permission was taken from Erdoğan (2012) by e-mail to use as changing the 'Scales of reading comprehension' which are also used on his master thesis. The lowest point is 0 and the highest is 5 that can be taken from this sentence comprehension scale. This scale is applied on each student in different ways at first week of june by the researcher. According to point result, marks obtained by experiment and control groups were transferred to (SPSS 15.0) Statistical Package Program for the Social Sciences. 3 teachers were taken for the content validity opinions. In addition to reliability, two experts were consulted. Reliability coefficient has increased ,90.

Dictate Capacity Scale

Dictate is defined as to say by someone else for writing, to be wrote (TDK, 1998). Dictate capacity scale is prepared by Obalar (2009) on purpose to determine the students' dictate and writing capacities, dated 2005, by taking into consideration elementary school 1.level students' acquisitions where the elementary Turkish lesson education program and guide book (1.-5. level classes). The necessary permission was taken from Obalar (2012) by e-mail to use to the 'Dictate capacity scale'. The scale is prepared by Obalar consists of 21 articles with five-point likert type. The more point you take from the scale, dictate and wring capacities also increase. 'Dictate Performance Text' named 'Advertisements' which is conformable their levels is chosen in order to evaluate the scale and a dictate paper is prepared to write easily. Dictate capacity scale is applied by the researcher at first week of june. Dictate performance text is read by the researcher to the all students at the same time.

The dictate performance papers gathered from students are evaluated one by one, by the researcher with the dictate capacity scale. The articles chosen at scale were transferred to (SPSS 15.0) Statistical Package Program for the Social Sciences. The validity and reliability studies were carried out.

KMO and Barlett tests were done in order to determine whether the dictate capacity scale is conformable to exploratory factor analysis or not. In this context, the result of KMO test should be .50 and higher, also, Barlett globalization test results should be statistically significant (Jeong, 2004: 70). As a result of this study, KMO test result is 85 and Barlett globalization test (p<0.01) result is significant and it can be made a factor analysis to the scale. In the exploratory factor analysis the limit value is taken as 45 for factors' load factor and with the principle component analyses method, varimax rotation technique which is one of the vertical techniques is used to find items giving them a high correlation and to make comments easily about the factors.

4 factors were obtained as the result of exploratory factor analysis done with dictate capacity scale. The first factor emphasizes %27,43, the second factor emphasizes %20 ,87, third factor emphasizes % 19,56 and the fourth factor emphasizes %9,00 of the total variance of the scale. The total sizes of the scale shows %76,85 of the scale. For Büyüköztürk (2002), it is enough that if the rate variances are explained in the scale has one factor is %30 or higher. The data obtained the factor analysis emphasizes that validity of the scale is at high level.

At first, Dictate Capacity Scale consists of 21 articles, but then in the decided example for this study, after dashing the substances (3,7,13) which are not in any article or has load value under .45, the scale decreased 18 articles and evaluated with those remaining articles. Büyüköztürk (2002) indicates that the substances' factors co-variance are close to 1 or higher than .66 is a good solution, but, in practice it is generally difficult to accept. After factor rotation, it is seen that the first factor of factor includes 7 substances (1,2,17,18,19,20,21); and the second factor includes 6 substances (1,2,4,5,6,8,) and the third factor includes 4 substances (9,10,11,15);

and the fourth factor includes 3 substances (12,14,16).

Cronbach's alpha reliability statistic was performed to determine the reliability of the scale. According to the statistics, the Cranbach Alpha Value is .93. Cranbach Alpha Value related to the scale's first factor is found .95, the second factor is found .90, the third factor is found 91 and the fourth factor is found .41. Tezbaşaran (1997) indicates that the quotient of reliability which can considered enough in a likert-type scale should be as close as possible to 1. According to the these results it can be said that the reliability of three factors is higher and the last factor (4.) is in average level.

Reading Speed Measurement Text

'Reading speed measurement text' named 'Gökkuşağı (Rainbow)' is chosen by researcher. In order to determine how many words they read in a minute 'Reading speed measurement text' named 'Rainbow' is read by all students one by one at first week of June. Students' readings loudly are recorded by the researcher. The number of words which are read by students in a minute were transferred to (SPSS 15.0) Statistical Package Program for the Social Sciences. Content validity is taken for the 3 teacher opinions for text.

Procedures

Studies are made in first and second semester of the 2011-2012 academic year. Pretest and posttest was administered by the researcher. Pretest was administered during the last week of the month of September. Posttest was administered during the first week of June.

Data Analysis

Data collected was analyzed by using descriptive, inferential statistical analysis methods. Reliability analysis was conducted to test the reliability. The descriptive statistics were conducted to report the differences between the experimental group and control group on achievement. For the analysis of the data, SPSS 15.0 (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) was used.

Findings

Pretest Results of Working Group

At Table 3, there is independent t test table of visual reading scale's results before experimental procedure of students in working group:

When we examine the Table 3; in conclusion of independent t test it was found that there isn't a significant difference between experiment and control groups students' visual reading

Table 3. Visual reading scale results

Group	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	p
Experiment	28	6,68	0,48	1,21	0,23
Control	31	6,48	0,72		

capacity ($t_{(59)}$=1,21, p>0,05). Experiment group class and control group class are equal in visual reading capacity.

At table 4, there is independent t test table of line work scale's results before experimental procedure of students in working group:

Table 4. Line work scale results

Group	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	p
Experiment	28	4,39	0,57	2,94	0,005
Control	31	4,77	0,43		

When we examine the Table 4; in conclusion of independent t test it was found that there is a significant difference ($t_{(59)}$=2,94, p<0,05 between experiment and control groups students' lining work capacity. Lining capacity

has a significant difference in favor of control group class's students.

At Table 5 there is the table related to process of learning to read:

Table 5. Time to begin independent reading

Group		The month he/she began to reading		
		January	February	Couldn't begin
Experiment	n	22	5	1
	%	79	18	3
Control	n	25	5	1
	%	81	16	3
Total	n	47	10	2
	%	80	17	3

When we examine to the Table 5; 22 students began on january, 5 students began on february, 1 student couldn't begin to the independent reading in the experiment group. 25 students began on january, 5 students began on february, 1 student couldn't begin to the independent reading in the control group. When we examine to the data of Table 5; we can see that there isn't a significant difference

between the students of experiment group and control group at time to begin reading. When the Table 5 is examined, we see that the students began to independent reading on January and February.

At Table 6 there is the table related to *speed of reading aloud:*

Table 6. Experiment and control groups' speed of reading aloud

Group	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	p
Experiment	28	31,46	14,88	0,56	0,58
Control	31	33,68	15,20		

When we examine to the Table 6; the experiment group's students read aloud 31,46 words in average per minute. The control group's students read aloud 33,68 words in average per minute. As a result of independent t test, there isn't a significant difference related to speed of reading aloud ($t_{(59)}$=0,56, p>0,05) between the experiment and control groups' students.

At Table 7 there is the table related to students' reading capacities:

Table 7. The results of reading capacity scale of experiment and control groups

Group	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	p
Experiment	28	3,52	0,79	1,45	0,15
Control	31	3,24	0,67		

When we examine to the Table 7, in five-point likert type reading capacity of experiment group, the average is 3,52 . The average of students' reading capacity scale of control group is 3,24 . As a result of independent t test, there isn't a significant difference ($t_{(59)}$=1,45, p>0,05) related to reading capacities between the experiment and control groups. Students' reading capacities has a good level according to the study result.

At table 8. and 9., there are the result of students' reading comprehension:

Table 8. The results of word comprehension scale of experiment and control groups

Group	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	p
Experiment	28	4,96	0,19	1,20	0,23
Control	31	4,68	1,25		

When we examine to the Table 8, the average of students' word comprehension scale of experiment group is 4,96. The average of students' word understanding scale of control group 4,68. As a result of independent t test, there isn't a significant difference ($t_{(59)}$=1,20, p>0,05) related to word understanding capacities between the experiment and control groups.

Table 9. The results of sentence comprehension scale of experiment and control groups

Group	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	p
Experiment	28	2,89	0,31	1,10	0,27
Control	31	2,71	0,824		

When we examine to the Table 9, the average of students' sentence comprehension scale of experiment group is 2.89. The average of students' sentence comprehension scale of control group 2,71. As a result of independent t test, there isn't a significant difference ($t_{(59)}$=1,10, p>0,05) related to sentence comprehension capacities between the experiment and control groups.

At table 10 there are the result of students' dictate capacity:

Table 10. The results of dictate capacity of experiment and control groups

Group	n	$\overline{x}$	s	t	p
Experiment	28	4,15	0,73	2,49	0,016
Control	31	3,69	0,69		

When we examine to the Table 10, in five-point likert type dictate capacity of experiment group, the average is 4,15. The average of students' dictate capacity scale of control group 3,69. As a result of independent t test, there isn't a significant difference ($t_{(59)}$=2,495, p<0,05) related to dictate capacities between the experiment and control groups.

When we examine to the Table 10, we see that alternative phonic sequence which is prepared by Baş (2007a) has a positive effect on the students' dictate capacity. As this positive result's source, it is thought that alternative sound sequence which is prepared by Baş (2007a) has a positive effect on students' capacities of feeling, recognizing and distinguishing to the sound.

Discussion

It is seen that there isn't a significant difference related to time to begin reading, reading aloud, reading capacity and understanding what they read capacity between the students of experiment group and control group. In the studies of Şahin (2005); Şahin, İnci, Turan, Apak (2006) and Bay (2008), in the phonic based sentence method, the students began to reading in the middle of academic year, not at the end of academic year. In the study of Şahin (2005), the students who have become literates with the phonic based sentence method read 71,5 words in average per minute in the end of the academic year. In the study of Bay (2008), students' (who have become literates with the phonic based sentence method) speeds of reading aloud per minute in the end of academic year are: 18 students who read 0-60 words in a minute, 50 students who read 61-80 words in a minute, 30 students who read 81-100 words in a minute, 13 students who read 101-120 words in a minute and 5 students who read 121-140 words in a minute. In the studies of Şahin (2005) and Bay (2008), it is seen that students' speeds of reading aloud is nearly as twice as the speeds indicated at Table 7. the studies of Şahin (2005) and Bay (2008) are done in city center but this study is done in town, because of this we get such a result. This factor is the most important one. In the studies of Şahin (2005) and Bay (2008), Students' speed of reading lower than this study's students. The reason of this matter is thought that the students' social-economic status and preliminary information are effective factors. In the study of Demirci (2008), literacy truth level of second class students who learned literacy with phonic based sentence method is in average and third class students' literacy truth level is high. It is seen that the word and sentence comprehension capacity of working group are at high level. In the studies of Özsoy (2006); Şahin, İnci, Turan, Apak (2006); Yurduseven (2007) and Bay (2008), teachers indicate that the word and sentence comprehension levels of first literacy education with phonic based sentence method are at high level. But, it is found that there is a significant difference related to dictate capacity between the students of experiment group and control group. There is a significant difference in favor of experiment group. In the studies of Şahin (2005) and Turan (2007), students who learned the first literacy with phonic based sentence method do a few writing mistakes.

Another sources (painting book, story book) should add on lesson books for the students' literacy education. Students should be encouraged to use contiguous inclined handwriting, mistakes should be corrected without delay. Vowels should take place into first 3 groups. So, creation of meaningful syllable, word and sentence could be made earlier. Phonics whose vocalizations are difficult should be given at last. The letters whose phonics can be confused are should be take place in different groups. (For example: n-m letters, ş-z letters). Primary school 1.grade class's lesson books should be written with contiguous inclined handwriting. This situation encourages to the students to use the contiguous inclined handwriting. The teachers should be encourages to use contiguous inclined handwriting and they should be controlled. In order to reading without syllabify they should profit from reading quickly techniques. For example; a teacher can show the words with neutral and big word cards and want them to read at once. The workings should be done to develop the students' reading speed. For example; teacher can manage competitions in order to increase students' speed reading aloud in a minute. When the parents helps and supports their children in the process of first literacy, they should say the phonics of letters, not their names. At the beginning of this academic year, a meeting for parents should be done in order to give information about the first literacy education and to prevent the wrong interferences, and the parents should be made conscious of first literacy education. The publisher enterprise who publishes the first literacy education book should publish booklets in order to give information to the parents about that process. At the beginning of academic year, these booklets should be given to the students as free with their lesson books.

REFERENCES

Akyol, H. (2010). *Yeni programa uygun türkçe* öğretim *yöntemleri (3. Edition) [Turkish education methods according to new curriculum].* Ankara: Pegem Academy.

Arıkan, R. (2004). *Araştırma teknikleri ve rapor hazırlama [Research techniques and report preparation].* Ankara: Asil Publishing.

Baş, Ö. (2006). Ses temelli cümle yöntemi ve bitişik eğik yazıyla okuma yazma öğretiminde alternatif harf sıralaması [Alternative phonic sequence in literacy education with phonic based sentence method and contiguous inclined handwriting]. *International Congress of Classroom Profession of Teaching, Notification Book of Gazi University, Education Faculty.* 1, 215-224, Ankara: Kök Publishing.

Baş, Ö. (2007a). *Yapılandırmacı yaklaşım ve* çoklu *zeka kuramına göre bitişik eğik yazı ve ses temelli cümle yöntemi etkinlikleri okuyorum yazıyorum 1e kitabı ['I'm reading and i'm writing' contiguous inclined handwriting and phonic based sentence method activities book according to the constructivist approach and theory of multiple intelligences].* Ankara: Üner Publishing.

Baş, Ö. (2007b*). Yapılandırmacı yaklaşım ve* çoklu *zeka kuramına göre bitişik eğik yazı ve ses temelli cümle yöntemi etkinlikleri okuyorum yazıyorum* öğretmen *el kitabı [I'm reading and* ı'm *writing' contiguous ınclined handwriting and phonic based sentence method activities teachers handbook according to the constructivist approach and theory of multiple ıntelligences].* Ankara: Üner Publishing.

Bay, Y. (2008). Ses temelli cümle yöntemiyle ilk okuma yazma öğretiminin değerlendirilmesi [Evaluation of first literacy education with phonic based sentence method], (ankara city example), *Dissertation,* Gazi University, Pedagogy Institute, at Ankara.

Berninger V. W., Abbott, R. D., Swanson, H. L, Lovitt, D., Trivedi, P., Lin, S., Gould, L., Youngstrom, M., Shimada, S., Amtmann, D. (2010). Relationship of word-and sentence-level working memory to reading and writing in second, fourth, and sixth grade. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools,* 41 (2), 179-193.

Çelenk, S. (2007). İlkokuma *yazma programı ve* öğretimi [First literacy program and education]. Ankara:Maya Academy.

Demirci, M. E. (2008). Okuma becerisini ses temelli cümle yöntemi ile kazanan ilköğretim okulu ikinci ve üçüncü sınıf öğrencilerinin okuduğunu anlama, okuma hızı ve okumada doğruluk düzeyleri [Reading comprehension, reading speed and reading right levels of primary school second and third grade students who had reading capacity with phonic based sentence method]. *Master Thesis*, Yeditepe University, Social Sciences Institute, İstanbul.

Demirel, Ö. (1999). İlköğretim *okullarında türkçe* öğretimi *[Turkish education in primary schools] (2. Edition).* İstanbul: National Education Printing.

Erdem, A. (2007). 2005 ilköğretim türkçe programı'nın önceki program ve irlanda'nın ana dili öğretim programı ile karşılaştırılması [Comparison of primary school turkish program with prior program and native language education program in ıreland]. *Master Thesis*, Hacettepe University, Social Sciences Institute, Ankara.

Erdoğan, Ö. (2009). İlköğretim birinci sınıf öğrencilerinin fonolojik farkındalık becerileri ile okuma yazma becerileri arasındaki ilişki [Relationship of phonetical awareness capacities and literacy capacities of first grade students in primary school], *Master Thesis*, Hacettepe University, Social Sciences Institute, at Ankara.

Erdoğan, Ö. (2012). Private e-mail. oerkul@hacettepe.edu.tr, (07.02.2012).

Jeong, J. (2004). Analysis of the factors and the roles of hrd in organizational learning styles as identified by key informants at selected corporations in the republic of Korea; major subject: educational human resource development. Dissertation, Texas A&M University, America.

Karaçay, B. (2011). Okuyan beyin [The brain which reads]. *Science and Technique,* 526, 20-27.

Karasar, N. (2002). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi (11.edition)* [Scientific research method]. Ankara: Nobel Publication Distribution.

Kayıkçı, K. (2008). İlköğretim müfettişleri ve öğretmenlerin ses temelli cümle öğretim yönteminin uygulamasına ilişkin görüşleri [Primary school auditors' and teachers' opinions for phonic based sentence education method]. *Educational Administration-Theory and Practice*, 55, 423-457.

Kim, Y. (2009). The foundation of literacy skills in korean: the relationship between letter-name knowledge and phonological awareness and their relative contribution to literacy skills, *Read Write*, 22, 907–931.

MEB (Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı) (Ministry of Education) Talim ve Terbiye Kurulu Başkanlığı (Head Council of Education and Mortality) (2005). İlköğretim *türkçe dersi* öğretim *programı ve kılavuzu (1-5. Sınıflar) [Education program and guide (first and fifth grade classes) of turkish lesson in primary school]*. Ankara: Directorate of State Books Printing.

MEB (Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı) (Ministry of National Education) Talim ve Terbiye Kurulu Başkanlığı (Head Council of Education and Mortality) (2009). İlköğretim türkçe dersi öğretim programı ve kılavuzu (1-5. Sınıflar) [Education program and guide (first and fifth grade classes) of turkish lesson in primary school]. Ankara: Directorate of State Books Printing.

Obalar, S. (2009). İlköğretim birinci sınıf öğrencilerinin ilk okuma yazma becerileri ile sosyal duygusal uyum ve zeka düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi [Analysis on relationship of first reading and writing capacities and social sensual accord and ıntelligence levels of 1. grade students in primary school]. *Dissertation*, Marmara University, Pedagogy Institute, İstanbul.

Obalar, S. (2012). Private e-mail. selda.obalar@gmail.com, (09.02.2012).

Özenç, E. G. (2007). İlk okuma ve yazma öğretiminde oyunla öğretim yöntemine ilişkin öğretmen

görüşlerinin incelenmesi [Analysis of teachers' opinions about education method with games in first literacy education], *Master Thesis*, Marmara University, Pedagogy Institute, İstanbul.

Özsoy, U. (2006). Ses temelli cümle yöntemiyle okuma yazma öğretiminde karşılaşılan güçlükler (Eskişehir city example) [Troubles of literacy education with phonic based sentence method]. *Master Thesis,* Eskişehir Osmangazi University, Social Sciences Institute, Eskişehir.

Şahin, A. (2005). İlk okuma-yazma öğretiminde kullanılan çözümleme ve bireşim yöntemlerinin uygulamalı olarak karşılaştırılması [Comparisons with practices of analyze and synthesis methods in first literacy education], *Dissertation,* Gazi University, Pedagogy Institute, Ankara.

Şahin, İ., İnci, S., Turan, H., Apak, Ö. (2006). İlk okuma öğretiminde ses temelli cümle yöntemiyle çözümleme yönteminin karşılaştırılması [Comparison of phonic based sentence method and analyze method in first reading education]. *National Education*, 171, 109-129.

TDK (Türk Dil Kurumu) (Turkish Language Association) (1998), *Türkçe Sözlük (9. Baskı) [Turkish Dictionary (9.Edition)]*. Ankara: Turkish History Association Printing.

Tezbaşaran, A. A. (1997), Likert Tipi Ölçek Geliştirme Kılavuzu (2. Baskı), [Likert Scale Development Guide (2nd Edition), Ankara: Turkish Psychological Association Publication.

Treiman, R. (2006). Knowledge about letters as a foundation for reading and spelling. *Handbook of Orthography and Literacy*. 581-599, United Sates of America: Laerence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Turan, M. (2007). İlköğretim 1. Sınıf türkçe dersi ilk okuma yazma programında uygulanan ses temelli cümle yönteminin uygulamadaki etkililiği [Effectiveness of phonic based sentence method on application to 1.grade class turkish lesson first literacy program in primary school]. *Dissertation*. Fırat University, Social Sciences Institute, Elazığ.

Yurduseven, S. (2007). İlk okuma yazma programının öğretmen görüşleri çerçevesinde değerlendirilmesi [evaluation of first literacy program with teachers' opinions]. *Master Thesis*, Afyon Kocatepe University, Social Sciences Institute, Afyon.

Geniş özet

Giriş

İlk okuma-yazma öğretimi, erken çocukluk döneminde başlayan dil becerilerine okuma ve yazma becerilerinin kazandırılması amacıyla ilköğretimin birinci basamağında dil öğretimi sürecidir. İlk okuma-yazma öğretimi; kaynak olarak, anlamlı işaretlerle kodlama ve alıcı olarak, anlamlı işaretlerin kodlarını çözerek anlamlandırmanın öğretimini içeren bir süreçtir. Okuma öğrenmede üç safha bulunmaktadır: 1. Fonetik (sesler) 2. Yazı (yazılı dil) 3. Morfoloji (yazılı dilin anlamı). Bu üç safha birbirinin devamı olarak gerçekleşmektedir. Çocukların ses/harf bilgisi ile fonolojik farkındalık, ilk okuma-yazma öğrenmede ve ileriki yıllardaki okuma becerilerinde iki önemli faktördür. Seslerin/harflerin öğretiminde alfabedeki sıralama değil; verilen sıralama ele alınmalıdır. Bu sıralamada Türkçe›nin ses yapısı, harflerin yazım kolaylığı, anlamlı hece ve kelime üretmedeki işleklik dikkate alınmıştır. Ayrıca, bu gruplardaki bazı seslerin/harflerin yerleri değiştirilerek farklı gruplamalar da yapılabilir. Ancak bu düzenleme Türkçe Dersi Öğretim Programı'nın anlayışına, tematik yaklaşıma ve ses temelli cümle yöntemine uygun olmalıdır.

Yöntem

Araştırma evrenini Niğde ili ilköğretim okulları oluşturmaktadır. Örneklem seçiminde basit tesadüfi örnekleme yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Basit tesadüfi örneklemde evreni oluşturan her elemanın örneğe girme şansı eşittir. Dolayısıyla hesaplamalarda da her elemana verilecek ağırlık aynıdır. Basit tesadüfi örnekleme sonucunda; araştırmanın çalışma

grubunu 2011-2012 eğitim-öğretim yılında Niğde ili Çiftlik İlçesi Bozköy Kasabası Bozköy İlköğretim Okulunda öğrenim gören 2 şubeden oluşan birinci sınıf öğrencileri oluşturmuştur. Bozköy İlköğretim Okulunda bulunan iki adet 1. sınıf şubesinin, öntestler sonucunda birbirine denk olduğu anlaşılan 1/A ve 1/B şubeleri tespit edilmiştir. Deney grubu ve kontrol grubunu belirlemek amacıyla kura çekilmiştir. Çekilen kura sonucunda 1/A şubesi deney grubu olarak, 1/B şubesi kontrol grubu olarak belirlenmiştir. 1/A şubesi sınıf listesinde 29 öğrenci bulunmaktadır. Ancak 1 öğrenci fiziksel engelli olup sürekli devamsız olduğu için sayıya dahil edilmemiştir. Bu nedenle deney grubu sınıfı olan 1/A şubesi 28 öğrenciden oluşmaktadır. 1/B sınıf listesinde 31 öğrenci bulunmaktadır.

Bu araştırmada nicel araştırma yöntemlerinden olan deneme modeli kullanılmıştır. Gerçek deneme modellerinden öntest-sontest kontrol gruplu model kullanılmıştır. Deneme modelleri, neden sonuç ilişkilerini belirlemeye çalışmak amacı ile, doğrudan araştırmacının kontrolü altında, gözlenmek istenen verilerin üretildiği araştırma modelidir (Karasar, 2002). Öntest-sontest kontrol gruplu modelde, yansız atama ile oluşturulmuş iki grup bulunur. Bunlardan biri deney, öteki kontrol grubu olarak kullanılır. Her iki grupta da deney öncesi ve sonrası ölçmeler yapılır.

Bulgular

Deney grubu ile kontrol grubu öğrencilerinin okumaya geçiş zamanı açısından, sesli okuma hızı açısından, okuma becerisi açısından, okuduğunu anlama açısından manidar farklılık göstermediği bulunmuştur. Fakat deney grubu ile kontrol grubu öğrencilerinin dikte becerisi açısından manidar farklılık gösterdiği bulunmuştur. Deney grubu lehine manidar farklılık göstermektedir. Öğrenciler uzun kelimeleri okurken ve daha önce karşılaşmadıkları kelimeleri okurken zorlanmaktadırlar. Öğrencilerin bir kısmı, sıklıkla rastlamadıkları kelimeleri okurken, bildikleri kelimelere benzeterek yanlış olarak okumaktadırlar. Aileler çocuklarına ilk okuma-yazma sürecinde destek verirken, harflerin seslerini değil harflerin adlarını söylemektedir. Bu durum olumsuzluklara neden olmaktadır. Öğrencilerin kelime hazinesinin azlığı nedeniyle okuma hızı

olumsuz etkilenmektedir. Öğrencilerin bir kısmı dikte çalışmasında harfleri birbirine karıştırarak yazmıştır (m-n, r-l, f-v, s-z, ğ-h). Öğrencilerin bir kısmı dikte çalışmasında noktalı harfleri (ç, i, j, ö, ş, ü,) yazarken harflerin noktalarını koymamıştır. Öğrencilerin bir kısmı dikte çalışmasında satıra sığmayan kelimeleri kısa çizgiyle ayırırken, kelimeyi yanlış olarak bölmüştür (ür-ünleri, tasarla-nmaktadır). Öğrencilerin bir kısmı noktalama işaretlerini yerinde kullanmamıştır. Öğrencilerin bir kısmı dikte çalışmasında okunan metni eksik olarak yazmışlardır. Öğrencilerin bir kısmı dikte çalışmasında okunan kelimeleri eksik olarak yazmışlardır (satmak-satma, içecekler-içekler, çürümüştür-çürütür). Öğrencilerin bir kısmı dikte çalışmasında özel ismin baş harfini küçük harfle yazmışlardır (ahmet). Öğrencilerin bir kısmı dikte çalışmasında özel isme gelen eki yazarken, kesme işareti koymamıştır (Ahmetin). Öğrencilerin bir kısmı dikte çalışmasında özel isme gelen eki kesme işaretiyle ayırırken yanlış yerden ayırmıştır (Ahme›tin). Öğrencilerin bir kısmı dikte çalışmasında yazılarını eğik yazmaları gerekirken, dik olarak yazmışlardır. Öğrencilerin dikte çalışması sırasında kağıda kalemle fazla bastırdıkları ve bu nedenle yazılarının bozulduğu tespit edilmiştir.

Tartışma

Deney grubu ile kontrol grubu öğrencilerinin okumaya geçiş zamanı, sesli okuma hızı, okuma becerisi, okuduğunu anlama açısından manidar farklılık göstermediği bulunmuştur. Ancak deney grubu ile kontrol grubu öğrencilerinin dikte becerisi açısından manidar farklılık gösterdiği bulunmuştur. Deney grubu lehine manidar farklılık göstermektedir.

İlk okuma-yazma öğretimi için öğrencilere ders kitaplarının yanında ek kaynaklar da temin edilmelidir (boyama kitabı, hikaye kitabı). Öğrencilerin bitişik eğik el yazıyı kullanmaları teşvik edilmeli, yanlışlıklar geciktirilmeden düzeltilmelidir. Sesli harfler ilk üç grupta yer almalıdır. Böylece anlamlı hece, kelime ve cümle oluşturma daha erken yapılabilecektir. Seslendirilmesi zor olan sesler en sonlarda verilmelidir. Sesi birbirine karıştırılan harfler farklı gruplarda yer almalıdır (örneğin: n-m, ş-z). İlköğretim birinci sınıf ders kitapları bitişik eğik yazı ile yazılmalıdır. Bu durum öğrencilerin bitişik eğik yazı kullanımını teşvik edecektir. Öğretmenler bitişik eğik yazı

kullanımını özendirmeli ve denetlemelidir. Öğrencilerin okuma hızlarını geliştirici çalışmalar yapılmalıdır. Örneğin, öğretmen öğrencilerin dakikadaki sesli okuma hızlarını artırmaya yönelik yarışmalar düzenleyebilir. Aileler çocuklarına ilk okuma-yazma sürecinde destek olurken harflerin adlarını değil, harflerin seslerini söyleyerek yardımcı olmalıdırlar. Ailelere ilk okuma-yazma öğretimi hakkında bilgi vermek ve aileler tarafından yapılan yanlış müdahaleleri önlemek amacıyla eğitim-öğretim yılı başında veli toplantısı yapılmalı, aileler bilinçlendirilmelidir. İlk okuma-yazma öğretimi kitabını basan yayımcı kuruluş tarafından, aileleri süreç hakkında bilgilendirici kitapçık basılmalı, bu kitapçık sene başında ders kitabıyla birlikte öğrenciye ücretsiz olarak dağıtılmalıdır.