# Academic Literacy Skills of Instructors Teaching Turkish as a Foreign Language

Emrah Boylu[1]*, Arzu Çevik[2]

[1]*Istanbul Aydin University, Istanbul, Turkey*
[2]*Bartın University, Bartin, Turkey*
**Corresponding author:** Emrah Boylu, E-mail: emrahboylu@aydin.edu.tr

## ARTICLE INFO

## ABSTRACT

Academic literacy covers reading, understanding, and evaluating academic studies that form the basis of science. It is one of the essential qualifications of the 21st century. In the education and training process, teachers are expected to have this skill in particular because teachers with academic qualifications integrate academic literacy skills with their professions according to the necessities of the time to improve themselves and present this to the learners during the teaching process. In this context, this study aims to determine Turkish instructors' academic competence levels and examine them according to different variables. In the research using the survey model, «The Academic Literacy Scale» prepared by Demir and Deniz (2020) was used as a data collection tool. This scale, which consists of three factors: academic disposition, research process, and information use, consists of 28 items in total. The study determined that academic literacy skills were at a "high" level when the average score of the Turkish instructors from the overall scale was taken into account. When the academic literacy skills of Turkish instructors were examined in terms of various variables, no significant difference was found with the gender variable in the scale. Another divergence was found between the educational status variable and all the sub-dimensions of the scale, like research process, information use, and academic tendency. In addition, the graduated department variable differs with the research process and information use dimensions of the scale. There is also a significant difference between the variable of receiving education to increase academic literacy skills and the research process sub-dimension of the scale. Last but not least, a considerable distinction was discovered between all scale sub-dimensions and the overall scale in relation to the status of having knowledge of scientific research methodologies and having published academic work.

**Key words:** Academic Literacy, Teaching Turkish As A Foreign Language, Instructors

## INTRODUCTION

The state of being literate can be explained as reading and writing the written products of the language in the alphabet system accepted by society. However, while literacy had this meaning in the past, it is seen that today it is shaped and diversified by the conditions of the period. Different names vary the concept of literacy. For example, digital literacy with the introduction of digitalization, media literacy with the increasing impact of media, academic literacy with the expansion of the academy, and the reach of wider audiences in the field are some of them. Different concepts are also encountered in literacy classification, such as literary literacy for reading and writing skills, cultural literacy for ideologies and values of the common culture, critical literacy for critical critics, and cyber literacy to understand the internet and other electronic media (Doru, 2018; Neeley, 2005). The rapid change and transformation of information have also accelerated academic studies. In this regard, it has been difficult for new researchers to read, comprehend, and evaluate academic works. These results justify the significance of academic literacy.

## ACADEMIC LITERACY

Academic literacy is essential for creating, continuing, and effectively transmitting scientific information (Norris & Phillips, 2003). The abilities of defining, claiming, comparing, creating comparisons, categorizing, accepting or rejecting, exemplifying, elaborating, anticipating, and solving are all part of academic literacy (Weideman, 2018). Understanding the structure of the language used in academia and creating an academic perspective requires mastery of the mother tongue (Boughey, 2000; Weideman, 2003). When we look at the definition of academic literacy, it is explained as the individuals' ability to grasp and use the information in their life by being aware of it. At the same time, it means they can direct their own life by looking at the problems they encounter from the window of scientific thinking and

effectively transferring the scientific knowledge they have obtained (Demir & Deniz, 2020). In the Turkish teaching process, the individual's development skills in the desired language areas within the framework of the program are possible by providing a high level of functionality. It seeks to develop cognitive abilities like comprehension, inquisitiveness, creativity, thinking, analysis, interpretation, association, and assessment (Karakoç & Demir, 2020).

The creation or understanding of academic texts requires special skills. Mother tongue education is essential based on academic literacy (Demir & Deniz, 2020). Academic literacy is not limited to a particular subject area (Ekmekçi, 2017). The development of academic literacy is left to the following periods. Students with similar abilities and capacities may perform differently in language learning (Daemi et al., 2017). However, academic writing and reading of scientific works by scholars are expected of pupils (Deniz & Karagöl, 2017, p. 288). In this context, if we examine the concept of academic literacy in two areas, the first is the state of being literate.

The main thing in reading is to gain the skills of understanding, analyzing, and finding information, while the main thing in writing is to understand correctly through the language and produce a writing of that language. According to Karatay (2009), reading is a complicated process that necessitates the simultaneous activation of sensory and mental activities. This method is based on the movement of past knowledge from the detection, comprehension, and interpretation of pictures such as letters, words, graphs, and images via sensory organs. On the other hand, writing is the coding of the meanings to be conveyed with symbols called letters agreed upon by everyone (Karadağ & Maden 2013). An individual who is competent in these skills in his/her mother tongue is expected to read scientific texts and understand what he/she reads. It should be aimed to develop literacy education, which starts from the pre-school period, in a scientific sense as well (Demir & Deniz, 2020). It is essential to bring the academic dimension to the student in the process of being literate. The quality of the texts that academic literacy encounters distinguishes it from general literacy. Academic texts are based on research and are reports containing terms specific to the field of study. Academic publications require a deep understanding of content and include methods, applications, and scientific results used in research beyond the information described in a textbook. They are also major vehicles for disseminating knowledge of theory and practice. The benefit of these scientific studies is possible with their analysis, interpretation, and evaluation by students (Hoskins et al., 2007; Harrington et al., 2015; Taylor et al., 2020).

The most crucial benefit of scientific research is that it sheds light on future researchers. However, there is a well-known gap between research and practice. Therefore, scholars must analyze and synthesize the literature (Banks et al., 2016; Barends & Rousseau, 2018). Developing academic literacy often guides new researchers in research (Burke & Rau, 2010). In this respect, the first stage of the research is to be competent in academic literacy. In order to understand and

interpret a scientific study, it is necessary to have a sufficient vocabulary and to gain a scientific perspective; otherwise, it creates stress (Pekrun et al., 2002; Van de Ven & Johnson, 2006; Bartunek & Rynes, 2010; Banks et al., 2016; Barends & Rousseau, 2018). For this reason, it is necessary to provide students with the skills required to understand academic articles by increasing their reading adaptability, helping them think critically, and understanding academic texts. (Hoskins et al., 2007; Round & Campbell, 2013; Weideman, 2018). This situation is also valid for the field of teaching Turkish as a foreign language. It was attempted to improve Turkish academic literacy learning areas, and abilities for international students based on the field studies Ekmekçi (2017) carried out to identify the academic language demands of foreign students and produce solutions and student needs. Because the language learning courses for communication skills (listening, reading, writing, and speaking) taken by international students, who come to Turkey for university education, will not be sufficient for their academic success. Besides these courses, academic language or literacy instruction must also be provided for a professional purpose. In fact, in the United States of America, guide resources such as the California State Common Core Standards, which cover the academic language competencies and achievements that students will need at universities, aim to provide academic literacy learning areas and standards (Ekmekçi, 2017). In Turkey, in line with this need, many universities have Academic Turkish programs within the scope of Turkish language programs for foreigners within the Turkish teaching center. Despite this, it is known that there are many problems (Yahşi Cevher & Güngör, 2016; Memiş, 2021) and needs (Ekmekçi, 2017) regarding the use of Turkish as an academic language. However, as mentioned by Elkıran (2021), language instructors are expected to integrate academic literacy abilities with their professions by the needs of the age to equip themselves academically and show this to students when teaching. In a similar vein, Turkish instructors must be equipped with the skills necessary to prepare these contextual materials and deliver the lesson concurrently with it in order to give students an academic literacy foundation. It is possible with this skill to make foreign language teaching more effective, faster, and more accurate, to produce scientific solutions for the problems encountered, to make academic studies in this field, and contribute to the literature. However, no study has been found to determine the academic literacy levels of Turkish instructors. In this context, the research aims to assess the level of academic literacy skills of Turkish instructors and to examine this in terms of various variables, answers to the following questions were sought.

1. What is the academic literacy level of Turkish instructors?
2. Do the academic literacy levels of Turkish instructors differ significantly in terms of
a) Gender,
b) Educational status,
c) Graduated department,
d) The status of having an education to increase academic literacy skills,

e) The status of having an education on scientific research processes,

f) The status of having a published academic study.

## METHOD

### Research Model

This research was carried out with the survey model, which is one of the quantitative research methods. "The survey model is a research approach that aims to reveal a past or present situation as it is" (Karasar, 2012).

### Study Group

The study group of the research consists of those who teach Turkish as a foreign language. In this context, data were collected from 188 people working in Turkish Language Teaching programs of universities, TÖMER/DİLMER, Yunus Emre Institute, Maarif Foundation, and MEB/ PIKTES institutions. The demographic information of the relevant study group is as follows:

It can be seen in Table 1, 188 Turkish instructors took part in the study. Of the pertinent participants in this context 122 are female, and 66 are male. There are 59 undergraduates, 78 graduates, and 51 doctoral graduates among the participants. When the distribution of the departments they graduated from is examined, it is seen that they graduated from the departments of Turkish Language and Literature (n=37), Turkish Education (n=67), Linguistics (n=8), Turkish Teaching (n=30), and Foreign Language Teaching (n=46).

### Data Collection Tools

In this research, "The Personal Information Form" prepared by the researcher and "The Academic Literacy Scale"

**Table 1.** Demographic information of the study group

| Variable | Number (n) | Percent (%) |
|---|---|---|
| Gender | | |
| Female | 122 | 64.9 |
| Male | 66 | 35.1 |
| Total | 188 | 100 |
| Educational Status | | |
| Undergraduate | 59 | 31.4 |
| Postgraduate | 78 | 41.5 |
| Doctorate | 51 | 27.1 |
| Total | 188 | 100 |
| Graduated Department | | |
| Turkish Language and Literature | 37 | 19.7 |
| Turkish Education | 67 | 35.6 |
| Linguistics | 8 | 4.3 |
| Turkish Teaching | 30 | 16 |
| Foreign Language Teaching | 46 | 24.5 |
| Total | 188 | 100 |

prepared by Demir and Deniz (2020) was used to determine the academic literacy levels of Turkish instructors and to examine them in terms of various variables. The relevant scale has three dimensions. The relevant scale has three dimensions. Items 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 23, 24, and 25 of the scale belong to the academic tendency sub-dimension. Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 belong to the research process sub-dimension. Items 9, 18, 19, and 22 belong to the information use sub-dimension. In order to determine the validity and reliability of the scale, exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis was performed. As a result of the exploratory factor analysis, the three-factor structure of the Academic Literacy Scale was confirmed by confirmatory factor analysis ($X^2$=457.55, SD=226, RMSEA=.045, SRMR=.053, NFI=.91, NNFI=.95, CFI=.95, GFI=.92, AGFI=.91). Test-retest procedure, Cronbach's Alpha, Spearman Brown, Guttman Split-Half tests were applied, and the reliability values were found above.70 (Demir & Deniz, 2020, pp. 1370-1376).

### Analysis of Data

The study conducted descriptive analysis such as frequency, percentage, arithmetic average, and standard deviation. This analysis revealed the characteristics of the participants and their answers to the scale items in terms of matter and factor. The t-test was used to see whether responses to the scale varied by participant's gender, whether they had received training to improve academic literacy, whether they had learned about scientific research methods, and whether they had a published academic study. It was tested whether the scores obtained by the participants from the research provided the assumptions in terms of factor and total score and terms of t-test and analysis of variance. The findings demonstrated that the assumptions were provided by the t-test and single-factor analysis of variance. In addition, it was investigated by using a one-way analysis of variance whether the scores of the participants from the scale changed in terms of educational status and the department they graduated from. After the analysis of variance, the levels of difference of the variables of education status and graduated department were investigated using the Tukey post-hoc test.

### Findings

In this section, the findings obtained as a result of the analysis of the data obtained from the instructors participating in the research are included.

**1. Academic literacy levels of Turkish instructors**

Average scores of Turkish instructors from the Academic Literacy Scale, standard deviation values, and information on the level of using the relevant skill are presented in Table 2.

When Table 2 is examined, it is seen that the skill level of Turkish instructors regarding the research process is "high" at 3.80, and the skill level of information use is "high" at 3.99. The skill level of academic tendency is "high" with 4.17. In this context, when the average score of

the Turkish instructors on the scale is examined, it is seen that they use their academic literacy skills at a "high" level ($\bar{x}$=4.01).

**2. Difference in academic literacy skills of Turkish instructors according to various variables**

**a) Gender**

The t-test results to determine whether Turkish instructors' academic literacy skill levels differ according to gender are given in Table 3.

When the academic literacy skills of Turkish instructors were examined in terms of various variables, no significant difference was found with the gender variable in the scale.

**b) Educational status**

The results of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) applied to determine whether the academic literacy skill

levels of Turkish instructors differ according to their educational status are given in Table 4.

When the scores of Turkish instructors from the academic literacy scale are examined according to the educational status variable, it is seen that there is a significant difference both in all sub-dimensions of the scale and in general.

When the participants' scores obtained from the research process factor of the scale were compared according to their educational status, it was observed that there was a significant difference between the scores according to the results of the single-factor analysis of variance, $F_{(2, 185)}$= 14.730; p<.000. According to the results of the Tukey post hoc test, which was conducted to determine between which education levels this difference is, they can be listed as follows from the group with the highest score to the group with the lowest score in terms of this skill: doctorate group (M=4.21; SD=0.79), postgraduate group (M=3.78; SD=0.59) and undergraduate group (M=3.48; SD=0.77).

When the participants' scores obtained from the information use factor of the scale were compared according to their educational status, it was observed that there was a significant difference between the scores according to the results of the single-factor analysis of variance, F(2.185)= 14. 398; p<.000. According to the results of the Tukey post hoc test, which was conducted to determine between which education levels this difference is, they can be listed as follows from the group with the highest score to the group with the lowest score in terms of this skill: doctorate group (M=4.25; SD=0.64), postgraduate group (M=4.02; SD=0.40) and undergraduate group (M=3.72; SD=0.52).

When the participants' scores obtained from the academic tendency factor of the scale were compared according to their educational status, it was observed that there was a significant

**Table 2.** Average scores of Turkish instructors from the Academic Literacy Scale, standard deviation values, and levels of using the relevant skill

| Dimensions | n | M | Ss | Academic Literacy Skill Level |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Research Process | 188 | 3.80 | 0.76 | High |
| Information Use | 188 | 3.99 | 0.55 | High |
| Academic Tendency | 188 | 4.17 | 0.52 | High |
| Total | 188 | 4.01 | 0.52 | High |

**Table 3.** T-test results of Turkish instructors' scores from the Academic Literacy Scale according to gender variable

| Dimension | Gender | n | M | Ss | SD | t | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Female | 122 | 4.16 | 0.43 | 186 | 0.445 | 0.19 |
| | Male | 66 | 4.20 | 0.66 | | | |

**Table 4.** One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) results of the scores of Turkish instructors from the Academic Literacy Scale according to the educational status variable

| Dimensions | Total of Squares | SD | Average of Squares | F | p | Significant Difference |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Research Process | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | 14.890 | 2 | 7.445 | 14.730 | 0.000* | undergraduate-postgraduate-doctorate |
| In Groups | 93.502 | 185 | 0.505 | | | |
| Total | 108.391 | 187 | | | | |
| Information Use | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | 7.645 | 2 | 3.823 | 14.398 | 0.000* | undergraduate-postgraduate-doctorate |
| In Groups | 49.117 | 185 | 0.265 | | | |
| Total | 56.763 | 187 | | | | |
| Academic Tendency | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | 4.138 | 2 | 2.069 | 8.283 | 0.000* | undergraduate-postgraduate-doctorate |
| In Groups | 46.215 | 185 | 0.250 | | | |
| Total | 50.353 | 187 | | | | |
| Academic Literacy Scale Total | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | 7.582 | 2 | 3.791 | 16.201 | 0.000* | undergraduate-postgraduate-doctorate |
| In Groups | 43.293 | 185 | 0.234 | | | |
| Total | 50.875 | 187 | | | | |

*p<.05

difference between the scores according to the results of the single-factor analysis of variance, F(2.185)=8.283; p<.000. In other words, academic tendency skills, which are included in the academic literacy skills of participants, vary according to their educational status. According to the results of the Tukey post hoc test, which was conducted to determine between which education levels this difference is, they can be listed as follows from the group with the highest score to the group with the lowest score in terms of this skill: doctorate group (M=4.3109; SD=0.57756), postgraduate group (M=4.2468; SD=0.41615) and undergraduate group (M=3.9573; SD=0.52852).

When comparing the scores obtained from the scale according to the educational status of the participants, it was observed that there was a significant difference between the scores according to the results of the single-factor analysis of variance, $F_{(2, 185)}$=16.201; p<.000. In other words, academic literacy skills of researchers vary according to their educational background. According to the results of the Tukey post hoc test, which was conducted to determine between which education levels this difference is, they can be listed as follows from the group with the highest score to the group with the lowest score in terms of this skill: doctorate group (M=4.26; SD=0.60), postgraduate group (M=4.05; SD=0.38) and undergraduate group (M=3.74; SD=0.48).

### c) Graduated department

The results of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) applied to determine whether the academic literacy skill levels of Turkish instructors differ according to the department they graduated from are given in Table 5.

When the participants' scores obtained from the research process factor of the scale were compared according to the department graduated, it was observed that there was a significant difference between the scores according to the results of the single-factor analysis of variance, $F_{(4,183)}$= 2.726; p<.05. In other words, research process skills, which are included in the academic literacy skills of researchers, vary according to the department graduated. According to the results of the Tukey post hoc test conducted to determine which departments this difference is between, the scores of the students who graduated from the Turkish education department (M=4.00, SD=0.84) are higher than the students

who graduated from the foreign language teaching department (M=3.54; SD=0.70).

When the participants' scores obtained from the information use factor of the scale were compared according to the department graduated, it was observed that there was a significant difference between the scores according to the results of the single-factor analysis of variance, F(4.183)=2.458; p<.05. In other words, information use skills, which are included in the academic literacy skills of researchers, vary according to the department graduated. According to the results of the Tukey post hoc test conducted to determine which departments this difference is between, the scores of the students who graduated from the Turkish education department (M=4.14; SD=0.59) are higher than the students who graduated from the foreign language teaching department (M=3.88, SD=0.48).

### d) Status of having education to increase academic literacy skills

The results of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) applied to determine whether the academic literacy skill levels of Turkish instructors differ according to their educational status to increase academic literacy skills are given in Table 6.

When Table 6 is examined, it is seen that there is a significant difference only in the Research Process sub-dimension of the scale, as a result of the t-test conducted to determine whether the academic literacy skill levels of Turkish instructors differ according to their educational status to increase academic literacy skills, ($t_{(188)}$= 0.03, p<.05). As a result of the findings, it was observed that the research process skills of the students who had an education to increase their academic literacy skills (M= 4.09; SD=0.78) were higher than the students who did not have education (M=3.71; SD=0.73).

### e) Status of having education on scientific research processes

The results of the one-way ANOVA applied to determine whether the academic literacy skill levels of Turkish instructors differ according to their educational status in scientific research processes are given in Table 7.

When Table 7 is examined, it is seen that there is a significant difference in all sub-dimensions of the scale and in the general scale as a result of the t-test conducted to determine whether the academic literacy skill levels of Turkish

**Table 5.** One-way ANOVA results of the scores of Turkish instructors from the Academic Literacy Scale according to the graduated department variable

| Dimensions | Total of Squares | SD | Average of Squares | F | p | Significant Difference |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Research Process | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | 6.096 | 4 | 1.524 | 2.726 | 0.003* | Turkish Education-Foreign Language Teaching |
| In Groups | 102.295 | 183 | 0.559 | | | |
| Total | 108.391 | 187 | | | | |
| Information Use | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | 2.895 | 4 | 0.724 | 2.458 | 0.047* | |
| In Groups | 53.868 | 183 | 0.294 | | | |
| Total | 56.763 | 187 | | | | |

*p<.05

instructors differ according to their educational status on scientific research processes ($t_{(188)}$=0.08, p<.000; $t_{(188)}$= 0.08; p<.000; $t_{(188)}$= 0.08, p<.000). When the average scores of the instructors from the scale are examined, it is seen that the instructors who had education on academic research processes in all sub-dimensions of the scale and the overall scale had higher average scores than those who did not.

**f)  Status of having a published academic study**

The results of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) applied to determine whether the academic literacy skill levels of Turkish instructors differ according to their status of having a published academic study are given in Table 8.

When Table 8 is examined, it is seen that there is a significant difference in all sub-dimensions of the scale and in the general scale as a result of the t-test conducted to determine whether the academic literacy skill levels of Turkish instructors differ depending on whether they have an academic study or not ($t_{(188)}$=.000, p<.000; $t_{(188)}$=.000, p<.000;

$t_{(188)}$= 0.01, p<.000). When the average scores of the instructors from the scale are examined, it is seen that the instructors who have an academic study in all sub-dimensions of the scale and, in general, have a higher average score than those who do not have an academic study.

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this study on the academic literacy skills of Turkish instructors, it was determined that the relevant group used their academic literacy skills at a "high" level. In fact, all of the teachers' competence levels for the sub-dimensions of the scale—"research process," "information utilization," and "academic tendency"—are at a "high" level. Since there is no direct study on those who teach Turkish as a foreign language in the literature, the discussion was made within the scope of studies with Turkish teacher candidates. In this context, in the research conducted by Tunagür (2021) and Elkıran (2021), the academic literacy levels of Turkish teacher candidates were found to be "high."

When the academic literacy skills of Turkish instructors were examined in terms of various variables, no significant difference was found with the gender variable in the scale. In the research conducted by Tunagür (2021) and Elkıran (2021), no relationship was found between the academic literacy levels of Turkish teacher candidates and their gender.

When the scores of Turkish instructors from the academic literacy scale are examined according to the educational status variable, it is seen that there is a significant difference

**Table 6.** The t-test results of the Turkish instructors' scores from the Academic Literacy Scale according to the variable of their educational status to increase their academic literacy skills

| Sub-Dimension | Having Education | n | M | Ss | SD | t | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Research Process | Yes | 47 | 4.09 | 0.78 | 186 | 3.01 | 0.003* |
| | No | 141 | 3.71 | 0.73 | | | |

*p<.05

**Table 7.** The t-test results of the scores of turkish instructors from the academic literacy scale according to the variable of their educational status on scientific research processes.

| Dimensions | Having Education | N | M | Ss | SD | t | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Research Process | Yes | 138 | 3.93 | 0.72 | 186 | 4.018 | 0.000* |
| | No | 50 | 3.45 | 0.78 | | | |
| Information Use | Yes | 138 | 4.08 | 0.55 | 186 | 3.884 | 0.000* |
| | No | 50 | 3.74 | 0.46 | | | |
| Academic Tendency | Yes | 138 | 4.25 | 0.50 | 186 | 3.604 | 0.000* |
| | No | 50 | 3.95 | 0.53 | | | |
| Academic Literacy Scale Total | Yes | 138 | 4.11 | 0.50 | 186 | 4.556 | 0.000* |
| | No | 50 | 3.74 | 0.47 | | | |

*p<.05

**Table 8.** T-test results according to the variable of having a published academic study of the scores of Turkish instructors from the Academic Literacy Scale

| Dimensions | Having Academic Study | N | M | Ss | SD | t | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Research Process | Yes | 72 | 4.09 | 0.82 | 185 | 4.213 | 0.000* |
| | No | 115 | 3.63 | 0.67 | | | |
| Information Use | Yes | 72 | 4.18 | 0.55 | 185 | 3.796 | 0.000* |
| | No | 115 | 3.88 | 0.52 | | | |
| Academic Tendency | Yes | 72 | 4.29 | 0.54 | 185 | 2.503 | 0.001* |
| | No | 115 | 4.10 | 0.49 | | | |
| Academic Literacy Scale Total | Yes | 72 | 4.20 | 0.56 | 185 | 4.036 | 0.000* |
| | No | 115 | 3.90 | 0.47 | | | |

*p<.05

both in all sub-dimensions of the scale and in general. When groups are ranked in this context from top to lowest, it can be observed that the doctoral group has the highest score and the undergraduate group has the lowest score. Elkıran (2021) also found a significant difference in the academic literacy levels of teacher candidates according to the variable of academic achievement level in his own study. From this point on, it can be stated that academic grade level (undergraduate, postgraduate, and doctoral) and academic literacy level are directly related. Lent, Brown, and Larkin (1986) clearly state that there is a linear relationship between academic self-efficacy and academic achievement. Additionally, students who are unable to build their academic literacy abilities throughout their undergraduate education report a lack of academic literacy during their postgraduate study, according to studies (Aslan, 2010; Kan & Gedik, 2016). As Demir and Deniz (2020) stated, the scientific goals that students need to gain can only be achieved if the teachers who carry out the education have academic literacy skills and can transfer these skills to the students. The fact that individuals with undergraduate degrees had lesser academic literacy than the other categories is an issue that should be carefully explored in this setting. Since academic literacy skills fall under the category of "research process," "information use," and "academic tendency," it is noteworthy that Turkish instructors' skill levels in these areas vary depending on their level of education. In terms of these skills, when sorted from the highest scoring group to the lower scoring group, it is understood that the group with a doctorate education level is the highest, and the undergraduate group is the lowest.

There was only a significant difference between Turkish instructors who graduated from the department of Turkish education and foreign language teaching when scores from the research process factor of the scale were compared based on the departments they attended. This difference was in favor of those who graduated from the department of Turkish education. In this context, it is seen that the academic literacy skills of Turkish instructors differ significantly in terms of "research process skills" and "information use skills" sub-dimensions.

When the academic literacy skill levels of Turkish instructors are examined according to their educational status to increase academic literacy skills, it has been determined that there is a significant difference only in the research process sub-dimension of the scale. In this context, Küçükoğlu, et al., (2013) found in their research that the education of teacher candidates regarding the research process is insufficient. It is possible to conclude from both studies that having education in the scientific research process will influence one's degree of academic literacy. According to the educational status of the instructors in scientific research procedures, it is evident in this study that there is a considerable variation in both the overall scale and all sub-dimensions of their academic literacy ability levels. When the average scores of the teachers on the scale are compared, it can be observed that the teachers with more education had higher averages across the board and across all scale sub-dimensions.This result once again confirms the view of Cengiz and Karataş (2014) that

undergraduate students should be educated in the relevant field in order to increase their scientific research skills. In the same vein, In order to improve their academic literacy skills, Tunagür (2021) emphasizes the importance of encouraging teacher candidates to read and write academic texts, to direct them to academic environments like academic journal platforms, information festivals, and congresses, and to create and share academic publications. In this context, it can be said that instructors with high academic literacy skills will contribute to integrating these skills with their professions and presenting this to learners in the teaching process. Whether Turkish instructors' academic literacy abilities have an impact on the success of language teaching is a topic for further research to be done in this area. Additionally, it has been found that Turkish teachers' academic literacy skills, which are part of their research process skills, vary depending on their level of education. Studies can be done within the context of this information to improve the academic literacy of Turkish instructors with undergraduate degrees.

## REFERENCES

Aslan, C. (2010). Türkçe Eğitimi programlarında lisansüstü öğrenim gören öğrencilerin akademik özyeterliklerine ilişkin görüşleri. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 19*, 87-115.

Banks, G. C., Pollack, J. M., Bochantin, J. E., Kirkman, B. L., Whelpley, C. E., & O'Boyle, E. H. (2016). Management's science-practice gap: A grand challenge for all stakeholders. *Academy of Management Journal, 59*(6), 2205–2231. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2015.0728

Barends, E., & Rousseau, D. M. (2018). *Evidence-based management: How to use evidence to make better organizational decisions.* Kogan Page Ltd.

Bartunek, J. M., & Rynes, S. L. (2010). The construction and contributions of "implications for practice": What's in them and what might they offer? *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 9*(1), 100–117. https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.9.1.zqr100

Boughey, C. (2000). Multiple metaphors in an understanding of academic literacy. *Teachers and Teaching, 6*(3), 279-290.

Burke, L. A., & Rau, B. (2010). The research-teaching gap in management. *Academy of Management Learning and Education, 9*(1), 132-143. https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.9.1.zqr132

Cengiz, C., & Karataş, F.Ö. (2014). Alan eğitiminde araştırma projesi dersi: Biyoloji öğretmen adaylarının yansıtmaları. *Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi, 3*(4), 51-58.

Daemi, M., N., Tahriri, A., & Zafarghandi, A., M. (2017). The relationship between classroom environment and EFL learners' academic self-efficacy. *International Journal of Education & Literacy Studies 5*(4), 16-23. http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.5n.4p.16

Demir, S., & Deniz, H. (2020). Akademik okuryazarlık ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi, 28*(3), 1366–1379.

Deniz, K., & Karagöl, E. (2017). Akademik yazma açısından tez yazım kılavuzları. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, *5*(2), 287-312.

Doru, M. N. (2018). Akademik okur-yazarlık. In M Öztürk (Ed.), *Sosyal Bilimlerde Etik Sorunlar* (pp. 87-102). Nobel Yayıncılık.

Ekmekçi, V. (2017). *Yabancılara Türkçe Öğretiminde Akademik Okuryazarlık Öğretimine Yönelik Bir Eylem Araştırması* [Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi]. Kayseri: Erciyes Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.

Elkıran, M. Y. (2021). Türkçe öğretmeni adaylarının akademik okuryazarlık düzeyleri ile teknoloji yeterliği öz-değerlendirmeleri arasındaki ilişki. *Manisa Celal Bayar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 19*(3), 325-343.

Harrington, I. A., Grisham, W., Brasier, D. J., Gallagher, S. P., Gizerian, S. S., Gordon, R. G., & Wiest, M. C. (2015). An instructor's guide to (some of) the most amazing papers in neuroscience. *Journal of Undergraduate Neuroscience Education*, *14(1*), 3- 14.

Hoskins, S. G., Stevens, L. M., & Nehm, R. H. (2007). Selective use of the primary literature transforms the classroom into a virtual laboratory. *Genetics, 176*(3), 1381–1389. https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.107.071183

Kan, M. O., & Gedik, F. N. (2016). Türkçe Eğitimi alanında yüksek lisans tezi tamamlayanların akademik yazma ve tez oluşturma sürecine ilişkin görüşleri. *Yükseköğretim ve Bilim Dergisi, 6*(1), 402-408.

Karadağ, Ö., & Maden, S. (2013). Yazma eğitimi: kuram, uygulama, ölçme ve değerlendirme. In A Güzel, & H Karatay (Eds.), *Türkçe öğretimi el kitabı* içinde (pp. 265-306). Pegem Akademi.

Karakoç, C., & Demir, Ö (2020). The predictive power of Turkish teachers' reflective thinking skills perceptions in their problem solving skills perceptions. *International Journal of Education & Literacy Studies 8*(3), 12-24. http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.8n.3p.12

Karasar, N. (2012). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. Nobel Yayınları.

Karatay, H. (2009). Okuma stratejileri farkındalık ölçeği. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi 2*(19), 58-80.

Küçükoğlu, A., Taşgın, A. ve Çelik, N. (2013). Öğretmen adaylarının bilimsel araştırma sürecine ilişkin görüşleri üzerine bir inceleme (eğitim bilimleri bölümü örneği). *Türkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, 173*, 11-24.

Kurbanoğlu, S. S., Akkoyunlu, B., & Umay, A. (2006) Developing the information literacy self efficacy scale. *Journal of Documentation, 62*(6), 730-743, https://doi.org/10.1108/00220410610714949.

Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., & Larkin, K.C. (1986). Self-efficacy in the prediction of academic performance and perceived career options. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 33*, 265-269.

Memiş, M. R. (2021). *Yabancılara Türkçe öğretiminin güncel sorunları*. Pegem Akademi Yayınları.

Neeley, S. D. (2005). *Academic Literacy*. Pearson Longman.

Norris, S. P., & Phillips, L. M. (2003). How literacy in its fundamental sense is central to scientific literacy. *Science Education, 87*(2), 224-240.

Pekrun, R., Goetz, T., Titz, W., & Perry, R. P. (2002). Academic emotions in students' self-regulated learning and achievement: A program of qualitative and quantitative research. *Educational Psychologist, 37*(2), 91–105. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326985EP3702_4

Round, J. E., & Campbell, A. M. (2013). Figure Facts: Encouraging Undergraduates to Take a Data-Centered Approach to Reading Primary Literature. *CBE-Life Sciences Education*, *12*(1), 39-46.

Taylor, V., & Stickney, L., DeMarr, B. & Fender, C, M. (2020). Improving Academic Literacy in the Management Classroom: Are Your Students Lost in Translation?. *Management Teaching Review.* 237929811990015. 10.1177/2379298119900156.

Tunagür, M. (2021). Türkçe öğretmeni adaylarının akademik okuryazarlık düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *EKEV Akademi Dergisi, 25*(87), 435-450.

Van de Ven, A. H., & Johnson, P. E. (2006). Knowledge for theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review, 31*(4), 802–821. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2006.22527385

Weideman, A. (2003). Assessing and developing academic literacy. *Per Linguam: a Journal of Language Learning=Per Linguam: Tydskrif vir Taalaanleer, 19*(1-2), 55-65.

Weideman, A. (2018). Academic literacy: Five new tests. Geronimo Distribution. https://albertweideman.files.wordpress.com/2018/03/academic_literacy_aql_practice_test s_and_answers.pdf.

Yahşi Cevher, Ö., & Güngör, C. (2016). The importance of teaching academic Turkish as a foreign language. *Anthropologist, 24*(1), 309-318.