SMOOTH TRANSITION AND ADJUSTMENT OF PRIMARY SCHOOL

ASLINUR DODURGALI

1731815

ANGLIA RUSKIN UNIVERSITY

MSC IN CLINICAL CHILD PSYCHOLOGY

SUPERVISOR: DR. SARAH KUPPEN

2019

Declaration Form

I, Aslinur Dodurgali, declare that the paper presented in this thesis is my own.

27th of September 2019.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Abstract

As the quality of the transition to the first grade has significant effects on children's future cognitive, social and behavioral development (Ramey & Ramey, 2004), it is crucial to determine the factors facilitating this period. This study aims to examine how the age of school entry, preschool education, teacher-child relationship and peer relationship affect the transition process. The data were gathered from two primary schools in Istanbul, a total of 10 teachers filled out questionnaires for 40 first grade children. Following this, the data were analysed by using T-test, a Man Whitney U, a one-way MANOVA, Kruskal Wallis and Multiple Regression tests. The findings displayed that older children and children whose parents completed higher education are more ready for the formal school compared to their peers. However, surprisingly, the results showed that preschool education does not have a significant effect on children's school adjustment and school readiness score. Besides, there was a statistically significant correlation between teacher-child relationship and children's school readiness and adjustment scores, and between peer relationship and school adjustment score. Finally, further analysis has displayed that the teacher-child relationship and parent education variables are the significant predictors of the school readiness, and the teacher-child relationship variable is the significant predictor of the school adjustment.

1. Introduction

Transition, as a term of education, is a period of moving from one educational step through another (Fabian, 2007; Dockett and Perry 2007). This period brings a lot of changes in places, rules, roles and relationships. Pupils have to cope with these different contexts, roles and expectations (Fabian, 2007). The quality of the transition to the first grade affects the child's future cognitive, emotional and physical development significantly (Ramey & Ramey, 2004). It is accepted by all nations that the process of transition from nursery to the first grade is one of the major developmental steps for children (Niesel & Griebel, 2002). Hence, nowadays, the process of the transition and adaptation to first grade has become a very important topic that has been investigated by worldwide researchers (Perry, Dockett & Petriwskyj, 2014). Empirical evidence has shown that children's characteristics, families, schools and communities have a significant role in ensuring a smooth transition (Dockett & Perry, 2007).

In the education continuum, primary school education is a different stage than early childhood education (Dockett & Perry, 2007). To illustration, in pre-schools, the curriculum uses playing to allow children to gain age-appropriate social skills such as empathy, self-control, emotion management and cooperation (Dockett & Perry, 2007), whereas, in the first grade, the curriculum focuses more on teaching academic skills (Goble et al., 2017). Furthermore, the formal school has larger classroom size, stricter rules, longer school hours and a tighter timetable (Fabian, 2007). For these reasons, it might be difficult for children to adapt to these changes, and this might cause stress and anxiety (Dockett & Perry, 2007). At this point, primary school teachers have a significant role in providing a positive school environment and facilitating children' school adjustment by establishing a good relationship with students (Rimm-Kaufman & Pianta, 2000).

Bronfenbrenner's ecological model describes the effects of the environmental factors on the child's development (Bronfenbrenner, 1994). Furthermore, it claims that the perception and interaction of the children with the context that they grow up and develop forms their development (Bronfenbrenner, 1994). According to this perspective, the subject must be considered as a developmental and dynamic entity, which has a reciprocal two-way interaction with the ecologies (Bronfenbrenner, 1994). For this reason, this view attaches importance to the child's relationship with other systems such as family, school and community (Rimm-Kaufman & Pianta, 2000). Accordingly, the ecological model has provided a theoretical framework for the transition process to formal school by helping to analyse relationships existed in this period (Rimm-Kaufman & Pianta, 2000; Stormshak & Dishion, 2002). According to this model, as well as the children's characteristics, the contexts that surround children, and systems took place in these contexts have important effects on this period (Rimm-Kaufman & Pianta, 2000).

Considering the educational system of Turkey, since preschool education is not compulsory, the transition occurs in two ways: from preschool settings to primary school setting or from home settings to the primary school setting (Erkan & Kirca, 2010) . For this reason, some children face the school concept in the primary stage for the first time. Moreover, there is a considerable difference between children in terms of duration of preschool experience. Accordingly, it can be said that for Turkish children, formal schooling starts with the first year of primary school. Another important point about the transition process in Turkey is the formal school entry age. Previously, the age of entering formal school was 84 months. Then, in 2012, the policy about the age of formal school entry changed, and the compulsory entry age dropped out from the age of 84 months to 66 months. However, afterwards, this was increased to 69 months, and then it was decided to leave it to the professionals' and parents' preference provided professional's report or parental consent for

children over 66 months (Buldu & Er, 2016). At this point, this situation brought about a concern that children between 66 months old and 84 months old share the same classroom in the first grade. Additionally, in Turkey, the basic education scheme includes 12 years of compulsory education starting from primary school (Buldu & Er, 2016).

In summary, in order to minimize the negative effects, it is vital to examine factors that facilitate the transition process. There is numerous research investigating factors affecting on this period. However, there is still a gap in the literature in Turkey about the importance of the relationship in the school context on the transition process. Taking into consideration to the education system of Turkey and based on the ecological perspective, the aim of the current study is to investigate how the age of school entry, preschool education, teacher-child relationship and peer relationship affect the transition process. In this manner, this study will contribute to the understanding of the transition process by examining factors from the broad view. Accordingly, the research question and the hypotheses were determined as follows.

How does the age of school entry, preschool education, child-teacher relationships and peers relationships affect the transition process and adaptation to primary school in Turkey?

The first hypothesis is that the level of children's school readiness and school adjustment differs according to the age of starting school and preschool education.

The second hypothesis is that the quality of the relationship between children and teachers and peers, affect the school adjustment and school readiness in primary school.

1.1.Literature Review

School adjustment is one of the most important outcomes and also determinants of the smooth transition (Yeo & Clarke, 2006). At this point, it can be considered that children, who adapt to school without much difficulty, experience a smooth transition (Yeo & Clarke,

2006). The term school adjustment is a multi-dimensional concept, including children's interest in the school, comfort, social behaviour and academic performance (Buyse, Verschueren, Verachtert & Damme, 2009). Specifically, in the early years of school, school adjustment is linked to emotional experiences such as loneliness, students' attitudes toward school such as liking or avoiding school, participation in the classroom activities and academic achievement (Buyse et. al., 2009). Empirical evidence has shown that children who adapt to school are more successful and have fewer dropout risks in the future, whereas children who have problems in adaptation to school have more difficulties in their academic and social relations in the future education levels (Moreno & Dongen, 2006). At this point, the importance of the role of the educators can not be ignored (Pianta, Steinberg & Rollins, 1995).

In light of this information, in order to engage fully in classroom activities and benefit from learning experiences children should reach an adequate level of cognitive, language, social-emotional and physical development in the first grade (Dockett & Perry, 2013). The general definition of the children's school readiness can be done as having enough pre-education skills and maturity and being ready for learning in formal school (Dockett & Perry, 2013). Indeed, the term school readiness encompasses many sub-targets in itself such as the ability to hold pens or using scissors properly, recognising the emotions, taking responsibilities, obeying rules while playing with friends, asking for permission to use someone else's belongings. Previous research mostly has focused on cognitive and academic characteristics while assessing children' school readiness, however, recent research has been considered all the developmental areas of children such as social-emotional, language and physical as well as literacy and cognitive skills (Halle, Hair, Wandner, & Chien, 2012; Morrison & Annemarie, 2011). While academic skills enable children to understand information, achieve reading, writing and mathematics tasks and fulfil the assignments, social

skills enable pupils to initiate verbal communication, engage social interaction, make friends and solve problems (Hughes et. al., 2015). As a result, school readiness comprises children's general knowledge, physical health, emotional and social development, language skills, creativity, motivation to learn and early academic skills (Williams et. al., 2016). The qualitative study carried out by Sahin, Tuncer and Sak (2013) examined the process of the school readiness from the view of the preschool and the first-grade teachers. Majority of the teachers reported that parents and teachers have the most important role in providing children's improvement in these areas and their adaptation to the new circumstances (Sahin et. al., 2013). Williams et al. (2016) have also supported this idea that children's early foundational skills shape in these contexts.

In short, the transition is a comprehensive period, including school readiness and school adjustment terms, and these three terms are highly related to and interact with each other. Many factors might affect these outcomes, yet in this study, the age of school entry, preschool education, teacher-child relationship and peer relationship will be examined.

1.1.1.Preschool Education

The main aim of the preschools is to prepare all the children for formal schools as giving children age-appropriate skills and supporting the physical, cognitive, social-emotional and language development of children (Burger, 2010). Preschool education allows all the children, who have different background and knowledge, to ready for formal school within equal learning environments (Burger, 2010). As all the children do not have the same family background, and also opportunities in the early childhood period, it is an important need for counteracting such inequalities (Magnusan, Meyers, Ruhm & Waldfogel, 2004).

Numerous research suggested that having a preschool education experience affects children's school readiness and adjustment positively. Erkan and Kırca (2010) carried out a study investigating how the preschool education impact on children's school readiness, with

170 pupils, and concluded that children, who attended preschool, are more ready for the formal school than their peers. The meta-analysis has also highlighted the importance of preschool education on children's academic success, cognitive development, school adjustment, and socializing (Camilli, Vargas, Ryan & Barnett, 2010). Similarly, another study carried out by Magnusan et. al. (2004) highlighted the importance of pre-education, primarily for children of low-income families. Furthermore, Arteaga, Humpage, Reynolds and Temple (2014) investigated whether the outcome differs according to the duration of the preschool education. The findings have demonstrated that two years of exposure to the preschool provides more benefits than a year for pupils.

It is important to note, however, that preschool entails both exposure to enriched learning environments but also separation from parents (Loeb, Bridges, Bassok, Fuller & Rumberger, 2007). Furthermore, empirical evidence has shown that the effects of early entry to preschool might differ depending upon the sociodemographic factors (Vandell & Ramanan, 1992; Han, Waldfogel, & Brooks-Gunn, 2001; Clements, Reynolds & Hickey, 2004). While Vendel and Ramanan (1992) has found that starting childcare settings in infancy provides benefits for poor children, Han et. al.'s study (2001) revealed that it might not provide benefits for middle-class children. Bridges et al. (2004) suggested that starting pre-education at the age of three boosts children's early year skills. Loeb et al. (2007) added that entry to pre-education at the age of two or three years provides cognitive advantages in kindergarten, yet starting earlier than the age of two years might cause negative socioemotional outcomes. Moreover, another study carried out by Belsky (2002) suggested that there is a positive relationship between starting early year centre-care and children's externalizing behaviour, and aggressive and disruptive behaviour has been observed in later school. At this point, Colwell et. al. (2001) reported that these negative social behaviours might be related to the cumulative time spending in an educational setting, rather than the entering age.

Additionally, Kotaman (2009) has found that although the children have preschool experiences, they might have difficulties to adapt to formal school because of marked differences between preschool and formal school environment. Nores and Barnett (2010) suggested participating in preschool for one to three years has more benefits as compared to less than one year. Yet, it has been found that more than three years of preschool experiences does not extend the gains (Nores & Barnett, 2010).

1.1.2.Age of school entry

Another important consideration in the transition process is the age of school entry. It has been discussing for years by the worldwide researchers what the ideal school entry age should be, and if there are any disadvantages of starting school younger than their peer. The policy of the age of school entry of the countries, and children' season of birth have been found important elements maintaining this problem (Norbury et al., 2016). While some researchers believed that younger children at the first grade have more adaptation problems and negative academic outcomes (Kahramanoglu, Tiryaki & Canpolat, 2016; Gunduz & Caliskan, 2013), others believed that there are not long or short term disadvantages of starting to formal school earlier, or there are not long term benefits of entering school late (Lincove & Painter, 2006). Additionally, in Turkey, many research has been investigating the effects of the policy change about the formal school entry age on children' transition process. Yet, still, there is not a consensus in this topic.

On the one hand, there are quantitative and qualitative studies regarding the entry of school age that have found a meaningful difference between children's age and school readiness in first grade (Canbulat, 2017; Norbury et al., 2016; Kahramanoğlu, Tiryaki & Canpolat, 2016; Ensar & Keskin, 2014; Gunduz & Caliskan, 2013). These studies have shown that younger children face more challenges at the elementary school due to being immature, and, this also influences school adjustment negatively (Canbulat, 2017; Kahramanoğlu et al.,

2016; Ensar & Keskin, 2014; Yoleri & Tanis, 2014; Gunduz & Caliskan, 2013). Ensar and Keskin (2014) have found that children entering school at the age of 66-72 months have a higher level of social-emotional adjustment than children aged 60-66 months. In addition to this, family socioeconomic factors and preschool education were found determinant factors impact on these results (Ensar & Keskin, 2014). Similarly, Canbulat's study (2017) revealed that children aged 73-84 months are more successful in the first grade than children aged 60-66 and 66-72 months old. Gunduz and Caliskan (2013) supported this idea and added that children aged 72-84 months have greater school readiness in terms of fine motor development than children aged 60-66 and 66-72 months old. Another study carried out by Kahramanoglu, Tiryaki and Canpolat (2016) revealed that children aged 60-66 months have difficulty in fine motor skills such as holding pens, and also their language and cognitive competence are insufficient for formal school.

On the other hand, Morrison, Griffith and Alberts (1997) investigated whether the formal school entry age impact on pupils' academic achievement in the first grade by taking into account background characteristics. The findings revealed that younger children show the improvement as much as the older peers, and the age of school entry found as not a good predictor of academic or learning risks (Morrison et. al., 1997). In addition to this, Lincove and Painter's (2006) carried out a study investigating the long term academic and social effects of age of school entry, especially for those children entering kindergarten a year later than others, and they concluded that delaying school entry until the age of 6 does not create any long-term advantages.

1.1.3.Teacher-child relationship

School and classroom are significant socializing contexts providing us to understand children's wellbeing and positive school adaptation by observing their interrelations (Bronfenbrenner, 1979), which are the key resources of children (Rudasill & Rimm-Kaufman,

2009). At this point, teachers' relationships with pupils become critical in facilitating the adjustment period of children (Rimm-Kaufman & Pianta, 2000). Considering that, in the school context, teachers are key element ensuring children's adaptation to school, class and rules by building a positive relationship with the pupils, and providing them with a positive class environment (Rimm-Kaufman & Pianta, 2000). Furthermore, the positive relationship between teacher and child provides pupils with emotional security, which is crucial to participate in learning activities and improve fundamental skills needed in the school context (Pianta, 1999).

Birch and Ladd's study (1997) conducted with 206 first grade children have displayed that the teacher-student closeness is positively correlated with children's school achievement, school liking and school adjustment according to teachers ratings. In 2005, Silver et. al. (2005) has investigated the association between the relationship quality of teacher and child, and children's externalizing behaviour after the transition to first grade. The findings revealed that conflict between teacher and child during the transition period leads to a higher level of externalizing behaviour and social-emotional maladjustment. In addition to this, family socioeconomic status has been also found as a significant contributor (Silver et. al., 2005). The studies also have supported this idea and emphasized the importance of establishing good student-teacher relationships in elementary school (Baker, Grant & Morlock, 2008; McCormick et. al., 2013; Cadima et. al., 2015). Furthermore, the high quality of the relationship between children and teachers in the first grade has been found one of the protective factors of middle childhood behaviour problems (O'Connor et. al., 2011). Having a positive bond between children and teachers are not only crucial for the school adjustment but also their academic success (Cadima et al., 2015). Additionally, findings have indicated that the supportive and closeness attitude of the teachers towards the children affect their academic success positively (McCormick et. al., 2013; Cadima et. al., 2015). Moritz et al. (2006) have

added that the positive relationship between children and teachers helps children to adapt to school and develop their language, social-emotional and behavioural skills.

1.1.4.Peer Relationship

According to Ladd and Kochenderfer (1996), another determinative element that affects the adaptation period to formal school is peer relationship. At this point, their study suggested that friendship quality is a potential contributor to school adaptation in early years (Ladd & Kochendeerfer, 1996). Supporting early friendships is particularly important as it develops children's interrelation skills and facilitate school adjustment period (Hollingsworth & Winter, 2013). Furthermore, Fabian (2000) suggested that children, who make friends in the first 2 months of the school revealed more positive outcomes.

Biermen (2004) supported this phenomenon and added that establishing good peer relationships in the early years of school affect both short and long-term school adjustment of children positively. Furthermore, the longitudinal study carried out by Corsaro and Molinari (2008) in Italy, investigated the effects of the relationship between teacher and child, and peers on the transition process. Using direct observation method, they found that peer acceptance, positive teacher and peer relationships, and particularly friendships facilitate adjustment to primary school (Corsaro & Molinari, 2008). Moreover, Engle, McElwain and Lasky (2011) suggested there is a strong correlation between high-quality peer relationship and children' social skills. Put it another way, children, who have high-quality friendships, tend to show better social skills, whereas children, who have low-quality friendships or have no friends, tend to show higher level externalizing behaviour in first grade (Engle et. al., 2011). By the same token, Buhs and Ladd (2001) investigated the effects of peer relationship on children's social and behavioural adaptation in kindergarten. Findings have displayed that

rejected children are more likely to exposure negative peer treatments, avoid school and report loneliness, whereas less likely to engage in classroom activities and to perform well academically (Buhs & Ladd, 2001). Additionally, Bossaert et. al. (2011) reported that peer acceptance is significantly related to pupils' academic success in first grade.

In this present study, children's school readiness and school adjustment have been examined by considering the school entry age and preschool education and relationships quality in the school environment. Finally, their effects on the transition period have been analysed.

2. Method

2.1.Participants

A total of 10 teachers from two primary schools in Istanbul volunteered to participate in this study. All participants were first-grade teachers with 6 (60%) were female, and 4 (40%) were male. Teachers filled out questionnaires about 40 children that parental consent had been obtained. 17 (42.5%) of the children were boys, and 23(57.5%) were girls.

2.2. Data Collection Tools

2.2.1. Teacher Rating Scale of School Adjustment (TRSSA) (Ladd, Kochenfender & Coleman, 1996)

The Turkish version of TRSSA was used to measure children's school adjustment. Onder and Gulay (2016) adapted the scale to Turkish. This scale a 25-item questionnaire assessing children's school adjustment using a 3-point Likert scale. It has four subscales including classroom participation, school avoidance, self-directiveness and school liking. Onder and Gulay (2016) tested validity by using the item analysis. For the reliability, they measured Cronbach's alpha result as 0.70, and test-retest reliability coefficient as r = 0.97.

2.2.2. The Scale of Readiness Primary School (SRPS) (Canbulat & Kiriktas, 2016)

SRPS was used to assess children's school readiness. It was developed by Canbulat and Kiristas (2016), so it is valid and reliable for Turkish primary school students. It is a 33-item questionnaire assessing children's school readiness using a 5-point Likert scale. It has four subscales including cognitive skills, affective skills, psychomotor skills and self-care skills. Canbulat and Kiriktas (2016) tested validity by using exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis. Besides, for the reliability, they measured Cronbach's alpha as 0.98.

2.2.3. Student-Teacher Relationship Scale (TSRS) (Pianta, 2001).

The Turkish version of TSRS was used to assess the teacher-child relationship. Demirtas-Zorbaz, Ozer, Kurt and Ergene (2016) adapted the scale to Turkish. It is a 28-item questionnaire with a 5-point Likert scale. This scale has two subscales measuring closeness (11 items) and conflict (12 items). Demirtas-Zorbaz et. al. (2016) tested validity by using confirmatory and exploratory factor analysis. For the reliability, they measured the Cronbach's alpha as 0.86 for the conflict and 0.83 for the closeness subscale.

2.2.4. Child Behaviour Scale (CBS) (Ladd & Profilet, 1996).

The Turkish version of CBS was used to assess children's relationship quality with peers. Ergene, Demirtas-Zorbaz, Kurt and Ozer (2018) adapted the scale to Turkish. It is a 59-items in the total questionnaire, but 34 of them measuring aggressive behaviours (7 items), hyperactivity (4 items), exclusion by peers (7 items), asocial relationship with peers (6 items), worry-fear feeling (4 items) and prosocial behaviours (7 items) using 3-point Likert scale. Other 24 items were included to prevent bias. Ergene et. al. (2018) tested validity with confirmatory factor analysis. For the reliability, they measured Cronbach's alpha as 0.92, 0.86, 0.74, 0.86 and 0.92 for aggressive behaviours, hyperactivity, asocial with peers subscale, worry-fear feeling subscale, prosocial behaviours and excluded by peers subscales respectively.

2.3. Procedure

After the ethical approval was received from Anglia Ruskin University, the research was introduced. Following this, the permission was taken from two headteachers to speak with the teachers to obtain information regarding students in their school. The information sheets about the research and consent forms were sent to parents. Then, teachers filled the questionnaires out for each child, whose parental consent had been obtained, in their classes. In order to determine children's school adjustment, school readiness and the relationship quality between pupils and teachers, and peers four scales were used. Additionally, the demographic form was used in order to learn children's gender, school entry age, preschool education and parents education.

2.4. Statistical Analysis

The quantitative method was used to analyse the data. First, several independent t-tests, a Man Whitney U test, one-way MANOVA and Kruskal Wallis test were conducted to determine differences between groups in school adjustment and school readiness score. Then, Pearson's correlation test was run to examine associations between scales used. Finally, two multiple regression was applied for both school readiness and school adjustment dependent variables to determine which variables predict the models the most.

3. Results

Demographic characteristics of the participants and the descriptive statistics of the scales used in this study were presented below.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of the participants

		N	%
Teachers	Gender		
	Female	6	60
	Male	4	40
		N	%
Children	Gender		
	Female	23	57.5
	Male	17	42.5
	Age		
	Younger (66-71	16	40
	Months)	24	60
	Older (72-84 months)		
	Preschool		
	1 year	2	5
	2 years	20	50
	3 years	9	22.5
	4 years	5	12.5
	5 years	4	10
	Parent's Education		
	High	23	57.5
	Low	17	42.5

Table 2:Descriptive Statistics of the scales

	N	***M***	***SD***
School Adjustment (Max score: 75)	40	39.55	8.76
Schoool Readiness (Max score: 165)	40	139.93	21.75
Teacher-child Relationship (Max score: 127)	40	91.45	16.28
Peer Relationship (Max neg. peer relationship score: 84)	40	41.22	10.32

As the data was normally distributed and there were not extreme outliers, several independent t-tests were applied to determine if the school readiness and adjustment score differ according to gender and parents education (Table 3). The results have displayed that there is not significant differences in the school adjustment score between male (*M*= 38.76, *SD*= 7.09) and female (*M*= 40.13, *SD*= 9.93), *MD* = -1.37, 95% *CI* [-6.81, 4.08], *t*(37.973) = -.508, p= .62, and in the shool readiness score between male (*M*= 138.24, *SD*= 21.95) and female (M= 141.17, SD= 22.02), *MD* = -2.94, 95% *CI* [-17.18, 11.30], *t*(38) = -.418, *p* = .69. Furthermore, there was no significant difference in school adjustment score between children

those have at least one parent completed higher education (*M*= 40.61, *SD*= 8.98), and those parents have not higher education (*M*= 38.12, *SD*= 8.49), *MD*= 2.49, 95% *CI* [-3.19, 8.18], t(38) = .887, *p* = .38. However, the school readiness score in children whose parent has completed higher education (*M*= 137.83, *SD* = 18.51) was greater than children whose parent has not completed higher education (*M*= 129.24, *SD*= 21.71), a significant difference, *MD*= 18.59, 95% *CI* [5.69, 31.49], *t*(38) = 2.918, *p* = .006, *r* = 0.92.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics of t-test results

	Variables		N	Mean	Standart Deviation	*p*
School Readiness Score	Gender	Female	23	141.17	22.02	.69
		Male	17	138.24	21.95	
School Adjustment Score		Female	23	40.13	9.93	.62
		Male	17	38.76	7.09	
School Readiness Score	Parents' higher education	Yes	23	137.83	18.51	.006
		No	17	129.24	21.71	
School Adjustment Score		Yes	23	40.61	8.98	.38
		No	17	38.12	8.49	

As the data was not normally distributed for each group, a Mann-Whitney U test was applied to determine if there is a difference in children's school readiness score between children aged 66-72 months and children aged 72-84 months. As distributions of the school readiness score for older and younger children were not similar, the mean rank was reported. School readiness score for children aged 72-84 months (mean rank = 23.50) were significantly higher than children aged 66-72 months (mean rank = 16), *U* = 120, *z* = -1.991, *p* = .048. However, school adjustment scores for children aged 72-84 months (mean rank = 22.33) were not statistically significantly higher than children aged 66-72 months (mean rank= 17.75), *U* = 148, *z* = -1.217, *p* = .23.

Table 4 : Descriptive Statistics of a Man Whitney U results

	Age	*N*	*Mean Rank*	*U*	*P*
School Readines Score	Younger (66-71 months)	16	16	120	.048
	Older (72-84 months)	24	23.50		
School Adjustment Score	Younger (66-71 months)	16	17.75	148	.23
	Older (72-84 months)	24	22.33		

Although there was a small sample size in some groups, the robust parametric one-way MANOVA was applied to be able to examine the effects of preschool education on the combined dependent variables. As shown in table 5, participants were classified into five groups: children has no preschool education (2), has a one-year preschool education (20), has two years preschool education (9), has three years preschool education (5), and has four years preschool education (4). The results indicated that there were no significant differences between children, who have different duration of preschool experiences, on combined dependent variables, $F(8,68)= 1.798$, $p= .093$, Wilks' $\Lambda =.681$, partial $\eta 2 = .175$.

Additionally, the Kruskal Wallis test was applied to assess the effects of preschool education on children's school readiness and adjustment scores separately. As the distributions of school readiness and adjustment score of groups were not similar, the mean rank was reported (Table 6). Kruskal Wallis tests results revealed that there were no significant differences in school readiness of children between children, who have different duration of the preschool education, $X2(4) = 1.847$, $p = .76$, and in children's school adjustment scores between children, who have the duration of the preschool education, $X2 (4) = 8.467$, $p = .076$.

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics of MANOVA

	School Readiness			School Adjustment		
	N	*M*	*SD*	*N*	*M*	*SD*
0	2	136	5.66	2	47	1.41
1 year	20	139.15	20.86	20	37.65	7.93
2 years	9	135	29.40	9	43	8.12
3 years	5	150.20	20.10	5	44.40	6.70
4 years	4	144	16.10	4	31.50	11.82

Table 6: Descriptive Statistic of Kruskal Wallis results

	Year of preschool education	N	Mean Rank	X^2	*P*
School Readiness Score	0	2	136	1.847	.76
	1 year	20	139.15		
	2 years	9	135		
	3 years	5	150.20		
	4 years	4	144		
School Adjustment Score	0	2	47	8.467	.076
	1 year	20	37.65		
	2 years	9	43		
	3 years	5	44.40		
	4 years	4	31.50		

Pearson's correlation test was conducted to determine if there is an association between scales (Table 7). As expected, there was a significant, moderately strong assocation between children's school readiness and school adjustment score r(38) = .41, 95% CI [.10, .65], p = .009. Furthermore, there was a statistically significant, positive strong correlation between positive teacher child relationship and school adjustment r(38) = .87, 95% CI [.78, .93], p < .001. Similarly, there was a statistically significant, negative large association between negative peer relationship and school adjustment r(38) = -.75, 95% CI [-.87, -.62], p < .001. Moreover, there was a medium correlation between positive teacher-child relationship and children's school readiness r(38) = .47, 95% CI [.22, .67], p = .002. Additionally, there was a negative strong correlation between positive teacher-child relationship and negative peer relationship r(38) = -.76, 95% CI [-.87, -.62], p < .001.

Table 7: Pearson's Correlation Coefficients of Variables (N=40)

	1	**2**	**3**	**4**
1. School Adjustment	-			
2. School Readiness	.41*	-		
3.Teacher-Child Relationship	.87**	.47*	-	
4. Peer Relationship	-.75**	-.14	-.76*	-

*p < .01 , **p < .001

After considering the results of group differences and associations between variables, two multiple regression tests were conducted with School Readiness and School Adjustment in order to determine variables predicting the models significantly. A multiple regression model was statistically significantly predicted children's school readiness score, $F(3,36) = 8.332$, $p < .001$. R^2 for the overall model was 41% with an adjusted R^2 was 36.1%. It was found that parent education and teacher-child relationship variables were significantly predicted the outcome. Coefficients values and standard errors of all variables can be found in Table 8 below.

Table 8. Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis

	Unstandardized Coefficient		**Standardized Coefficient**	
	B	SE_B	B	P
Intention	124.955	20.58	-	.00
Teacher-child relationship	.535	.17	.40	.004
Parent Education	-14.366	5.73	-.33	.017
Age	-9.620	5.82	-.22	.107

Note. *B* = Unstandardized regression coefficient; SE_B = Standard error of the coefficient; β = Standardized coefficient

The second multiple regression model was also statistically significantly predicted children's school adjustment score, $F(2,37) = 62.227$, $p < .00$. R^2 for the overall model was 77.1% with an adjusted R^2 was 75.8%. It was found that the teacher-child relationship was the only variable that significantly predicted the outcome. Coefficients values and standard errors of all variables can be found in Table 9 below.

Table 9: Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis

	Unstandardized Coefficient		**Standardized Coefficient**	
	B	SE_B	B	P
Intention	12.853	9.668	-	.192
Teacher-child relationship	.376	.066	.699	.00
Peer relationship	-.186	.103	-.220	.079

Note. *B* = Unstandardized regression coefficient; SE_B = Standard error of the coefficient;
β = Standardized coefficient

4. Discussion

The present study has been conducted to examine if the age of school entry, preschool education, teacher-child relationship, peer relationship and demographic characteristics of children affect the transition process.

The t-test findings revealed that the level of school readiness and adjustment do not differ according to gender. Yet, parent education has been found as a significant factor affecting children's school readiness, which is consistent with Clements, Reynolds and Hickey's (2004) findings that sociodemographic factors may influence the quality of transition process. In this case, it can be considered that parents who have higher education are more aware of the importance of this period and more support their children to improve their skills. For this reason, children, who have parents that have higher education, may have more knowledge about what is expected in schools and have more pre-education skills before they get in the primary stage. At this point, the importance of the family environment is also seen as cleary.

The Mann Whitney test results indicated that children those entering school older are more ready for the school than children those entering school younger. In this manner, aligned with the previous studies (Canbulat, 2017; Ensar & Keskin, 2014; Kahramanoğlu, Tiryaki & Canpolat, 2016; Aslan & Cikar, 2019) that the skills that need for entering the school of children aged 72-84 months old are more improved than children aged 66-72 months old. However, the school adjustment scores did not differ between children those entering school in 66-72 months old and children entering school in 72-84 months old. In other words, children's school adjustment level does not differ according to their age of school entry. At this point, consistent with the findings of the current study the role of the teachers and their managing skills might have influenced these results. Teachers might have been aware of the pupils' different level of readiness. Accordingly, they may have used effective methods and

activities that help children to settle in the school and establish friendships. Additionally, they might have provided each child with emotional security by establishing a positive relationship (Pianta, 1999). Given that, children can feel secure in the school context, be willing to participate in classroom activities and, to make friends. These are the key factors that help children to like school (Buyse, Verschueren, Verachtert & Damme, 2009). Therefore, it can be said that if the teacher can manage the transition period of children well by considering these points, the differences in school entry age between children might become unimportant in terms of school adjustment.

Surprisingly, a one-way MANOVA and the Kruskal Wallis test results revealed that preschool education does not affect children's school readiness and adjustment scores. Furthermore, the length of preschool education did also not significantly affect children's school adjustment or readiness scores. At this point, these unexpected results indicated that the readiness of children, who attended four years of preschool education, for formal school is not significantly different from children, who attended only one year. In this case, several limitations need to take into account, and it will be discussed further at the limitations part of the study. Additionally, although there were no statistically significantly different in the level of school adjustment among children experience the different length of preschool education, the mean of school adjustment score of children increases from experiencing one year preschool education, to two years, and to three years, yet, it decreases from three years to four years. It can be said that this finding possibly supports in some ways that while pre-education experience provides benefits for children (Loeb, 2007), the cumulative amount of time in the preschool setting might affect children's attitude toward school and adjustment negatively (Clowell, 2001).

Pearson's Correlation test results indicated as expected that there is a positive association between children's school readiness score and school adjustment score. This means, children, who are more ready for the formal school setting, tend to have fewer difficulties during the adaptation period of the formal school setting. Furthermore, the results also have shown that there is a strong correlation between teacher-child relationship and children's school adjustment and readiness. This result also aligned with the previous research and confirmed the key role of teachers in facilitating school adaptation of children and developing their language, social-emotional and behavioural skills in school settings (Corsaro & Molinari, 2008; Moritz et. al., 2006; Silver et. al., 2005). Another important finding was the significant negative correlation between children's school adjustment score and negative peer relationship. At this point, children, who show asocial, aggressive, worry-feeling and hyperactive behaviours and are excluded by their peers, have more difficulties to adjust school environment. In other words, pupils, who establish a good relationship with their peers and are accepted by their classmates, are more likely to adapt to school without much difficulty, as consistent with the previous studies (Hollingsworth & Winter, 2013; Corsaro & Molinari, 2008; Buhs & Ladd, 2001).

Finally, further analysis was conducted to determine which variables predict the school readiness and school adjustment models the most. The first regression analysis revealed that the teacher-child relationship is the only variable that predicts children's school adjustment significantly. The second regression analysis showed that the teacher-child relationship and also parent education were the variables that predict children's school readiness significantly. In light of this information, it is seen from the results of the current study that teacher-child relationship is the only factor predicting both children's school readiness and school adjustment score significantly. At this point, it can be said that the close and warm relationship between teacher and child impacts children's physically and

emotionally adaptation to school as well as helps them to improve their skills. As the first term of the formal school is also part of the transition period, children still in the process of gaining academic and social skills needed in the primary school setting. Therefore, teachers' approach to pupils, their relationships established with students and their managing skills are crucial both children's school adjustment and school readiness. Another thing, which also predicted children's school readiness significantly, is parent education. Given that, it can be said that parents, who completed higher education, might have involved more in school settings and cooperated with teachers. Furthermore, they might have provided an environment that children may get exposed more stimulants and more interaction with their parents in the home context, and this might have helped them to increase their vocabulary knowledge as well as academic and social skills. As a result, these findings align with Sahin, Tuncer and Sak's study (2013) that parents and teachers are significant elements helping children to improve their emotional, cognitive, language and social skills and to adapt to the new circumstances.

There are several limitations of the study that needed to discuss. Firstly, having a small number of participants in each group have might influenced our results. As there were only two children who did not experience preschool education, it would not be right to compare between children those attended preschool and those who did not. However, it can be said that the majority of the parents prefer to send their children at least one year to preschool education, even if the preschool education is not compulsory in Turkey. This might be also confirming the necessity of the preschool settings in some way. Secondly, the differences between the preschools that children attend might have also influenced these findings. Although the general aim of the preschools is to help children to acquire age-appropriate skills, each institution applies different ways and methods to transfer information to children. At this point, the type of preschools, such as regular or Montessori, attendance regulation of

the institutions, such as five days a week or less, full or half-day, and methods used at the preschool environment, and even the socioeconomic status become important elements to consider (Barnett, W. S., & Youn, M.-J.,2011; Biedinger Becker Rohling, 2008; Magnuson and Waldfogel, 2005; Vandell & Ramanan, 1992; Han et. al., 2001). Thus, it is needed to do more investigation about this topic by considering the points above. Furthermore, concerning the age of school entry variable, it can be seen that the majority of the previous studies include the 60-66 months old age range, which was considered as the higher risk group. However, in the current study, the 67-months-olds were the youngest participants, as the recent policy requires 66 months old and above for the formal school entry.

Another important limitation was the tests were not administered to the children directly, and the only source of the information obtained was teachers. Children, teachers and parents are the main elements of this process that need to take into account (Fabian, 2007). Furthermore, teachers filled out the questionnaires on the second term of the year by casting their thoughts back to the first term of the school. All these situations decrease the reliability of the results and make hard to do a healthy analysis. On the other hand, there were also some strengths of this study. Firstly, the data tools used were reliable and valid for the Turkish population evidently (Onder & Gulay, 2016; Canbulat & Kırıştaş, 2016; Demirtaş-Zorbaz, Özer, Kurt & Ergene; 2016; Ergene, Demirtaş-Zorbaz, Kurt & Ozer, 2018). Furthermore, primary schools, which are collected data, were from different districts of Istanbul, and this provided sociodemographic diversity which is an important criterion to be able to generalise the result around Turkey.

Considering the information above, future researchers may investigate the effect of preschool education on the children's school adjustment and readiness by taking into account the differences between preschools such as methods and techniques used, attendance regulation. Furthermore, they may investigate children's relationship quality in the family

context and its effects on the transition period. Similarly, they may examine the effects of the relationship quality in the preschool settings on the transition period. In addition to this, they may investigate how much schools provide programmes and activities for parents as well as how much parents show involvement in these activities, and how the collaboration between these contexts affect children's school adjustment and readiness.

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, the transition to first grade is a crucial period affecting children's future development of cognitive, emotional and behavioural (Niesel & Griebel, 2002). At this point, empirical evidence shows that children's characteristics, families, schools and communities have a significant role in ensuring a smooth transition (Dockett & Perry, 2007). In addition to this, ecological view attaches important to the relationship quality of children with other systems such as family, teachers and community (Rimm-Kaufman & Pianta, 2000). In light of this information, the current study investigated the effects of the age of school entry, preschool education, and the relationship between teachers and children and peers on the transition process. At this point, the information about children was obtained from teachers through questionnaires. According to findings, older children and children whose parents completed higher education were found more ready for the formal school than others. Furthermore, children, who establish a positive relationship with their teachers and peers, showed greater school adjustment compared to others. However, the duration of the preschool did not affect on children's school readiness and adjustment significantly. Further analysis indicated that the teacher-child relationship is the only factor predicting both children's school readiness and school adjustment. Additionally, parents education was found another significant factor that predicting children's school readiness.

References

Arteaga, I., Humpage, S., Reynolds, A. J., & Temple, J. A. (2014). One year of preschool or two: Is it important for adult outcomes?. *Economics of education review*, *40*, 221-237.

Aslan, M., & Cikar, İ. (2019). The School Readiness of 60-65 Months Old Students: A Case Study. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research*, *6*(1), 86-99.

Baker, J. A., Grant, S., & Morlock, L. (2008). The teacher-student relationship as a developmental context for children with internalizing or externalizing behavior problems. *School psychology quarterly*, *23*(1), 3.

Barnett, W. S., & Youn, M.-J. (2011). Comparison of full-day versus half-day preschool in the Chicago Public Schools (Final report on child outcomes). New Brunswick, NJ: National Institute for Early Education Research.

Belsky, J. (2002). Quantity counts: Amount of child care and children's socioemotional development. *Journal of Developmental & Behavioral Pediatrics*, *23*(3), 167-170.

Bierman, K. L. (2004). *Peer rejection: Developmental processes and intervention strategies*. Guilford Press.

Birch, S. H., & Ladd, G. W. (1997). The teacher-child relationship and children's early school adjustment. *Journal of school psychology*, *35*(1), 61-79.

Bossaert, G., Doumen, S., Buyse, E., & Verschueren, K. (2011). Predicting children's academic achievement after the transition to first grade: A two-year longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *32*(2), 47-57.

Bridges, M., Fuller, B., Rumberger, R., & Tran, L. (2004). Preschool for California's Children: Promising Benefits, Unequal Access. Policy Brief 04-3. *Policy Analysis for California Education, PACE (NJ1).*

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). Contexts of child rearing: Problems and prospects. *American psychologist*, *34*(10), 844.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1994). Ecological models of human development. *International encyclopedia of education*, *3*(2), 37-43.

Buhs, E. S., & Ladd, G. W. (2001). Peer rejection as antecedent of young children's school adjustment: An examination of mediating processes. *Developmental psychology*, *37*(4), 550.

Buldu, M., & Er, S. (2016). School readiness and school entry-age: views and experiences of Turkish teachers and families on a new educational policy. *Egitim ve Bilim*, *41*(187).

Burger, K. (2010). How does early childhood care and education affect cognitive development? An international review of the effects of early interventions for children from different social backgrounds. *Early childhood research quarterly*, *25*(2), 140-165.

Buyse, E., Verschueren, K., Verachtert, P., & Damme, J. V. (2009). Predicting school adjustment in early elementary school: Impact of teacher-child relationship quality and relational classroom climate. *The Elementary School Journal*, *110*(2), 119-141.

Cadima, J., Doumen, S., Verschueren, K., & Buyse, E. (2015). Child engagement in the transition to school: Contributions of self-regulation, teacher–child relationships and classroom climate. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *32*, 1-12.

Camilli, G., Vargas, S., Ryan, S., & Barnett, W. S. (2010). Meta-analysis of the effects of early education interventions on cognitive and social development. *Teachers college record*, *112*(3), 579-620.

Canbulat, T. (2017). Evaluation of School Compliance Levels and Readiness for School of Freshmen's Who Are Affected from Intermittent Mandatory Training. *Kastamonu Education Journal*, *25*(4).

Canbulat, T., & Kiriktas, H. (2016). The Development Scale of Readiness Primary School : Validity and Reliability Studies.

Colwell, M. J., Pettit, G. S., Meece, D., Bates, J. E., & Dodge, K. A. (2001). Cumulative risk and continuity in nonparental care from infancy to early adolescence. *Merrill-Palmer quarterly (Wayne State University. Press)*, *47*(2), 207.

Corsaro, W. A., & Molinari, L. (2008). Policy and practice in Italian children's transition from preschool to elementary school. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, *3*(3), 250-265.

Dockett, S., & Perry, B. (2013). Trends and tensions: Australian and international research about starting school. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, *21*(2-3), 163-177.

Dockett, S., & Perry, B. (2007). Children's transition to school: Changing expectations. In A-W. Dunlop, & H. Fabian (Eds.), *Informing transitions in the early years: research policy and practice* (1 ed., pp. 92-104). [7] London: Open University Press.

Dockett, S., Petriwskyj, A., & Perry, B. (2014). Theorising transition: Shifts and tensions. In *Transitions to school-International research, policy and practice* (pp. 1-18). Springer, Dordrecht.

Engle, J. M., McElwain, N. L., & Lasky, N. (2011). Presence and quality of kindergarten children's friendships: Concurrent and longitudinal associations with child adjustment in the early school years. *Infant and Child Development*, *20*(4), 365-386.

Ensar, F., & Keskin, U. (2014). A Survey On The Adjustment Of Prımary Fırst Grade Students To School. *Journal of Theory & Practice in Education (JTPE)*, *10*(2).

Ergene, T., Demirtaş-Zorbaz, S., Kurt, D. G., & Ozer, A. (2018). Turkish Adaptation of Child Behaviour Scale. *İlköğretim Online*, *17*(4).

Erkan, S., & Kırca, A. (2010). A study on the effects of preschool education on primary first graders' school preparedness. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, *38*, 94-106.

Fabian, H. (2000, August). A seamless transition. In *EECERA 10th European Conference on Quality in Early Childhood Education, London*.

Fabian, H. (2007). Informing transitions. *Informing transitions in the early years*, 3-17.

Goble, P., Eggum-Wilkens, N. D., Bryce, C. I., Foster, S. A., Hanish, L. D., Martin, C. L., & Fabes, R. A. (2017). The transition from preschool to first grade: A transactional model of development. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *49*, 55-67.

Griebel, W., & Niesel, R. (2002). Co-constructing transition into kindergarten and school by children, parents and teachers. *Transitions in the early years*, 64-75.

Gunduz, F., & Caliskan, M. (2013). Investigating The Level Of 60-66, 66-72, 72-84 Month old Children's School Readiness And Acquisition Of Literacy Skills *Electronic Turkish Studies*, *8*(8).

Halle, T. G., Hair, E. C., Wandner, L. D., & Chien, N. C. (2012). Profiles of school readiness among four-year-old Head Start children. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *27*(4), 613-626.

Han, Wen-Jui, Jane Waldfogel and Jeanne Brooks-Gunn. 2001. "The Effects of Early Maternal Employment on Later Cognitive and Behavioral Outcomes." Journal of Marriage and Family 63, February, pp. 336-354

Hollingsworth, H. L., & Winter, M. K. (2013). Teacher beliefs and practices relating to development in preschool: Importance placed on social–emotional behaviours and skills. *Early Child Development and Care*, *183*(12), 1758-1781.

Hughes, C., Daly, I., Foley, S., White, N., & Devine, R. T. (2015). Measuring the foundations of school readiness: Introducing a new questionnaire for teachers–The Brief Early Skills and Support Index (BESSI). *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *85*(3), 332-356.

Kahramanoglu, R., Tiryaki, E. N., & Canbolat, M. (2015). A Study On The School Readiness Of The 60 To 66 Months Old Students Who Have Just Started Primary School.

Kotaman, H. (2010). Turkish early childhood educators' sense of teacher efficacy. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology*, *8*(2), 603-616.

Ladd, G. W. (1992). The teacher rating scale of school adjustment. *Urbana-Champaign, IL: University of Illinois*.

Ladd, G. W., & Profilet, S. M. (1996). The Child Behavior Scale: A teacher-report measure of young children's aggressive, withdrawn, and prosocial behaviors. *Developmental psychology*, *32*(6), 1008.

Lincove, J. A., & Painter, G. (2006). Does the age that children start kindergarten matter? Evidence of long-term educational and social outcomes. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *28*(2), 153-179.

LoCasale-Crouch, J., Mashburn, A. J., Downer, J. T., & Pianta, R. C. (2008). Pre-kindergarten teachers' use of transition practices and children's adjustment to kindergarten. *Early childhood research quarterly*, *23*(1), 124-139.

Loeb, S., Bridges, M., Bassok, D., Fuller, B., & Rumberger, R. W. (2007). How much is too much? The influence of preschool centers on children's social and cognitive development. *Economics of Education review*, *26*(1), 52-66.

Magnuson, K. A., & Waldfogel, J. (2005). Early childhood care and education: Effects on ethnic and racial gaps in school readiness. *The future of children*, 169-196.

Magnuson, K. A., Meyers, M. K., Ruhm, C. J., & Waldfogel, J. (2004). Inequality in preschool education and school readiness. *American educational research journal*, *41*(1), 115-157.

McCormick, M. P., O'Connor, E. E., Cappella, E., & McClowry, S. G. (2013). Teacher–child relationships and academic achievement: A multilevel propensity score model approach. *Journal of school psychology*, *51*(5), 611-624.

Moreno, T., & Dongen, J. (2006). Early Childhood Matters: Transition in the early years: A learning opportunity. *The Hague, Netherlands: Bernard Van Leer Foundation*, (107), 3-4.

Moritz Rudasill, K., Rimm-Kaufman, S. E., Justice, L. M., & Pence, K. (2006). Temperament and language skills as predictors of teacher-child relationship quality in preschool. *Early Education and Development*, *17*(2), 271-291.

Morrison, F. J., & Annemarie, H. (2012). Promoting school readiness. *Contemporary Debates in Childhood Education and Development*, 123.

Morrison, F. J., Alberts, D. M., & Griffith, E. M. (1997). Nature–nurture in the classroom: Entrance age, school readiness, and learning in children. *Developmental Psychology*, *33*(2), 254.

Norbury, C. F., Gooch, D., Baird, G., Charman, T., Simonoff, E., & Pickles, A. (2016). Younger children experience lower levels of language competence and academic progress in the first year of school: evidence from a population study. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *57*(1), 65-73.

Nores, M., & Barnett, W. S. (2010). Benefits of early childhood interventions across the world:(Under) Investing in the very young. *Economics of education review*, *29*(2), 271-282.

O'Connor, E. E., Dearing, E., & Collins, B. A. (2011). Teacher-child relationship and behavior problem trajectories in elementary school. *American Educational Research Journal*, *48*(1), 120-162.

Onder, A., & Gulay, H. (2010). Reliability and validity of the Teacher Rating Scale of School Adjustment for 5-6 years of children. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, *2*(1), 204-224.

Pianta, R. C. (1999). *Enhancing relationships between children and teachers*. American Psychological Association.

Pianta, R. C. (2001). *STRS: Student-teacher Relationship Scale: professional manual*. Psychological Assessment Resources.

Pianta, R. C., Steinberg, M. S., & Rollins, K. B. (1995). The first two years of school: Teacher-child relationships and deflections in children's classroom adjustment. *Development and psychopathology*, *7*(2), 295-312.

Ramey, Craig T., & Ramey, Sharon L. (2004). Early learning and school readiness: Can early intervention make a difference? *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 50*(4), 471-491.

Rimm-Kaufman, S. E., & Pianta, R. C. (2000). An ecological perspective on the transition to kindergarten: A theoretical framework to guide empirical research. *Journal of Applied developmental psychology*, *21*(5), 491-511.

Rudasill, K. M., & Rimm-Kaufman, S. E. (2009). Teacher–child relationship quality: The roles of child temperament and teacher–child interactions. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *24*(2), 107-120.

Sahin, I. T., Sak, R., & Tuncer, N. (2013). Comparison of Preschool and First Grade Teachers' Views about School Readiness. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, *13*(3), 1708-1713.

Silver, R. B., Measelle, J. R., Armstrong, J. M., & Essex, M. J. (2005). Trajectories of classroom externalizing behavior: Contributions of child characteristics, family characteristics, and the teacher–child relationship during the school transition.

Stormshak, E. A., & Dishion, T. J. (2002). An ecological approach to child and family clinical and counseling psychology. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, *5*(3), 197-215Vandell, D. L., & Ramanan, J. (1992). Effects of early and recent maternal employment on children from low-income families. *Child development*, *63*(4), 938-949.

Williams, P. G., Okamoto, J., Lieser, D., DelConte, B., Donoghue, E., Earls, M., ... & Takagishi, J. (2016). The pediatrician's role in optimizing school readiness. *Pediatrics*, *138*(3), e20162293.

Yeo, L. S., & Clarke, C. (2006). Adjustment to the first year in school—A Singapore perspective. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, *14*(2), 55-68.

Yoleri, S., & Tanış, H. M. (2014). Determination of the factors affecting adjustment levels of first class students at elementary school. *Karabuk University Journal of Institute of Social Sciences*, *4*(2), 130-141.

Zorbaz, S. D., Arif, Ozer., Genctanirim-Kurt, D., & Ergene, T. (2016). Adaptation of Teacher–Student Relationship Scale (STRS). *Eğitimde ve Psikolojide Ölçme ve Değerlendirme Dergisi*, *7*(2), 407-418

APPENDIX-I MATERIALS

- **Scale of Readiness of Primary School**
- **Teacher Rating Scale of School Adjustment**
- **Child Behaviour Scale**
- **Demographic Information Form**

APPENDIX-II ETHICS APPROVAL LETTER

19/12/18

Principal investigator:	Aslınur Dodurgalı
Project supervisor:	Sarah Kuppen
Project title:	Smooth Transition and Adjustment to Primary School
DREP code:	EHPGT18-08
Approval date	Valid to 19/12/2019

Application decision: **Approve** under the terms of Anglia Ruskin University's Research Ethics Policy (Dated 8 September 2016, Version 1.7). Approval by DREP is subject to ratification by the FREP.

All documents (PIS, Consent form, Debrief) given to participants, must be printed onto Anglia Ruskin University headed paper.

Any advert must contain the following statement:
The study has received ethics approval by the Psychology Departmental Research Ethics Panel (DREP) and ratified by the Faculty Research Ethics Panel under the terms of Anglia Ruskin University's Policy and Code of Practice for the Conduct of Research with Human Participants

If you make changes to any aspect of your approved research, it is important that you discuss this with your supervisor as they can advise you on whether you need any additional ethical approval.

Ethical approval is given for a period of 1 year for undergraduates/masters students. If your research will extend beyond this period, it is your responsibility to apply for an extension before your approval expires.

It is your responsibility to ensure that you comply with Anglia Ruskin University's Research Ethics Policy and the Code of Practice for Applying for Ethical Approval at Anglia Ruskin University available at www.anglia.ac.uk/researchethics including the following.

- The procedure for submitting substantial amendments to the committee, should there be any changes to your research. You cannot implement these amendments until you have received approval from FREP/DREP for them.
- The procedure for reporting accidents, adverse events and incidents.
- The General Data Protection Requirement and Data Protection Act (2018).
- Any other legislation relevant to your research. You must also ensure that you are aware of any emerging legislation relating to your research and make any changes to your study (which you will need to obtain ethical approval for) to comply with this.
- Obtaining any further ethical approval required from the organisation or country (if not carrying out research in the UK) where you will be carrying the research out. This includes other Higher Education Institutions if you intend to carry out any research involving their

students, staff or premises. Please ensure that you send the FREP/DREP copies of this documentation if required, prior to starting your research.

- Any laws of the country where you are carrying the research and obtaining any other approvals or permissions that are required.
- Any professional codes of conduct relating to research or requirements from your funding body (please note that for externally funded research, where the funding has been obtained via Anglia Ruskin University, a Project Risk Assessment must have been carried out prior to starting the research).
- Completing a Risk Assessment (Health and Safety) if required and updating this annually or if any aspects of your study change which affect this.
- Notifying the FREP/DREP Secretary when your study has ended.

Please also note that your research may be subject to monitoring.

Should you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact me. May I wish you the best of luck with your research.

Yours sincerely,

Emma Kaminskiy

Department of Psychology DREP Chair

APPENDIX III – INFORMATION GIVEN TO PARTICIPANTS

Teachers Information Sheet

Anglia Ruskin University

Katılımcı Bilgilendirme Formu

Projenin adı: İlköğretime Sorunsuz Geçiş ve Uyum

Benim adım Aslınur Dodurgalı. Anglia Ruskin Üniversitesi Psikoloji Bölümü'nde yüksek lisans öğrencisiyim ve "İlköğretime Sorunsuz Geçiş ve Uyum" üzerine bir çalışma yürütüyorum. Bu araştırmaya katılımcı olarak davetlisiniz. Danışman hocam Dr Sarah Kuppen'dir sarah.kuppen@anglia.ac.uk

Bu çalışmayı, okula giriş yaşının, okul öncesi eğitimin, öğretmen-öğrenci ilişkisinin ve akran ilişkilerinin çocukların ilkokula geçiş sürecine ve okula uyumuna nasıl etki ettiğini incelemek için yapıyorum. Önceki çalışmalar, çocukların bireysel özelliklerinin veya çocuğun öğretmen ve akran gibi diğer sistemlerle ilişkisinin okula uyumu üzerinde etkilerini ayrı ayrı incelemiştir. Ben bu faktörleri birleştirmek ve hangisinin daha anlamlı bir fark yarattığını incelemek istiyorum.

Bu çalışma süresince kaydedilen veriler, yüksek lisans tezimi yazmak amacıyla istatistiksel olarak analiz edilecektir. Çalışma hakkında daha fazla bilgi için benimle iletişime geçmek isterseniz, aslinur.dodurgali@student.anglia.ac.uk adresinden bana ulaşabilirsiniz. Bu araştırma finanse edilmemiştir.

Araştırma Projesine Katılımınız

Bu araştırmaya katılmaya davet edildiniz çünkü siz öğrencilerin özellikleri ve okul ortamındaki ilişkileri hakkında bilgi sahibi olan eğitimcilersiniz. Bu çalışmaya katılarak ilkokula geçiş süreci ve çocukların okula uyumu hakkındaki bilgimizi arttırabilirsiniz. Bu çalışmaya katılma zorunluluğu yoktur. Bu çalışmaya katılmaya karar verdikten sonra çıkmak isterseniz, bir hafta içinde bunu yapmakta özgürsünüz.

Çalışmaya katılmayı kabul ederseniz:

Ebeveynlerinden izin aldığımız çocuklarla ilgili bazı anketleri doldurmanız istenecektir. Bir çocuk demografik bilgi formu ve gözlemlerinize dayanan öğrenci-öğretmen ilişkisi, akran ilişkisi, çocukların okula hazır bulunuşluk durumu ve okula uyumunu ölçen 4 ölçek olacaktır.

Bu çalışmaya katılımda, günlük yaşamda yaşananın ötesinde hiçbir risk olmayacaktır. Tüm standart sağlık ve güvenlik düzenlemelerine uyulacak ve test öncesinde risk değerlendirmesi tamamlanacaktır. Çalışmaya katılmadan önce, sırasında veya sonrasında almanız gereken özel önlemler yoktur.

Katılımcıların bilgileri ve bu araştırmanın sonuçları tamamen gizli kalacaktır. Veriler sadece ben ve danışman hocam tarafından değerlendirilecektir. Adınız sadece onay formunda bir kimlik numarasıyla belirtilecek ve onay formları güvenli bir şekilde saklanacaktır. Veriler anonim olduğu için ebeveynler çocukları hakkında bireysel geri bildirim talep edemeyecektir. Katılımınızdan toplanan veriler üç yıl boyunca güvenli bir şekilde saklanacaktır. Bu süreden sonra tüm veri ve formlar güvenli bir şekilde bertaraf edilecektir. Eğer çalışmadan çekilmek istiyorsanız, verilerinizin çalışmadan kaldırılması için bir hafta içinde benimle iletişime geçebilirsiniz.

İSTEĞİNİZ DAHİLİNDE BU FORMUN BİR KOPYASI ONAY FORMU İLE BİRLİKTE SİZE VERİLECEKTİR.

Letter to Parents

Anglia Ruskin University

Değerli veliler,

Ben Aslınur Dodurgalı, İngiltere Cambridge'de bulunan Anglia Ruskin Üniversitesi'nde Klinik Çocuk Psikoloji bölümünde yüksek lisans öğrencisiyim ve "İlköğretime Sorunsuz Geçiş ve Uyum" üzerine bir çalışma yürütüyorum.

Bu çalışmanın amacı; okula başlama yaşının, okul öncesi eğitimin, öğretmen-öğrenci ilişkisinin ve akran ilişkilerinin çocukların ilkokula geçiş süreci ve okul uyumuna nasıl etki ettiğini incelemektir. Bu çalışma kapsamında çocuğunuzun ilköğretime geçiş süreci hakkında öğretmeninden bilgi almak için izninizi istiyorum**.**

Kabul ederseniz, çocuğunuzun öğretmeninden çocuğunuzla ilgili bazı anketleri doldurmasını isteyeceğim. Bir çocuk demografik bilgi formu ve öğretmen gözlemine dayanan öğrenci-öğretmen ilişkisi, akran ilişkisi, çocukların okula hazır bulunuşluk ve okula uyumunu ölçen dört ölçek olacaktır. Bu bilgiler sadece araştırma amaçlı kullanılacaktır ve çocuğun adı kaydedilmeden saklanacaktır. Bilgiler isim alınmadan toplanacağı için çocuklar hakkında size bireysel geri bildirim olmayacaktır.

Çalışma, Anglia Ruskin Üniversitesi Psikoloji Bölümü Araştırma Etiği Paneli tarafından etik onayı almış ve onaylanmıştır.

Çocuğunuzun bu projeye katılmasını onaylarsanız, izin formunu doldurup çocuğunuzun öğretmenine geri gönderebilirsiniz. Bu araştırma hakkında herhangi bir sorunuz varsa aslinur.dodurgali@student.anglia.ac.uk adresinden benimle iletişime geçebilirsiniz.

Zaman ayırdığınız için çok teşekkürler,

Aslınur Dodurgalı

Anglia Ruskin Universitesi Klinik Çocuk Psikolojisi Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi

Cambridge, İngiltere.

Parents Infortmation Sheet

Anglia Ruskin University

Katılımcı Bilgi Formu

Projenin adı: İlköğretime Sorunsuz Geçiş ve Uyum

Araştırma Projesi

Ben Aslınur Dodurgalı, İngiltere Cambridge'de bulunan Anglia Ruskin Üniversitesi'nde Klinik Çocuk Psikoloji bölümünde yüksek lisans öğrencisiyim ve "İlköğretime Sorunsuz Geçiş ve Uyum" üzerine bir çalışma yürütüyorum. Danışman hocam Dr. Sarah Kuppen'dir (sarah.kuppen@anglia.ac.uk).

Bu çalışmayı, Türkiye'de okula giriş yaşının, okul öncesi eğitimin, öğretmen-öğrenci ilişkisinin ve akran ilişkilerinin geçiş sürecine ve Türkiye'deki okul uyumuna nasıl etki ettiğini incelemek için yapıyorum. Önceki çalışmalar, çocukların bireysel özelliklerinin veya çocuğun diğer sistemlerle ilişkisinin okul düzenlemesi üzerindeki etkilerini ayrı ayrı incelemiştir. Bu faktörleri birleştirmek ve hangisinin daha anlamlı bir fark yarattığını incelemek istiyorum.

Bu çalışma süresince kaydedilen veriler, yüksek lisans tezim yazmak amacıyla istatistiksel olarak analiz edilecektir. Çalışma hakkında daha fazla bilgi için benimle iletişime geçmek isterseniz aslinur.dodurgali@student.anglia.ac.uk adresinden bana ulaşabilirsiniz. Bu araştırma finanse edilmemiştir.

Araştırma Projesine Katılımınız

Çocuğunuz projeye katılan sınıf öğretmeninin sınıfında olduğu için sizinle iletişime geçiyorum. Katılmayı kabul ederseniz, öğretmen çocuğunuzun ilköğretime geçiş süreci ve bazı sosyal ve kişisel özellikleri hakkında geri bildirim sağlayacaktır. **Öğretmen çocuğunuzun ismini vermeyecek ve bu şekilde sağlanan veriler anonim kalacaktır**.

Bu çalışmaya izin vererek, çocuklar için önemli bir gelişim basamağı olan ilkokula geçiş süreci konusundaki bilgimizi arttımaya yardımcı olacaksınız. Bu çalışmaya katılma zorunluluğu yoktur. Bu çalışmaya izin verdiğiniz takdirde bir hafta içinde vazgeçebilirsiniz.

Çalışmaya katılmayı kabul ederseniz:

Çocuğunuzun öğretmeninden çocuğunuzla ilgili bazı anketleri doldurması istenecektir. Bir çocuk demografik bilgi formu ve öğretmen gözlemine dayanan öğrenci-öğretmen ilişkisi, akran ilişkisi, çocukların okula hazır bulunuşluk ve okula uyumunu ölçen dört ölçek olacaktır.

Bu çalışmaya katılımda, günlük yaşamda yaşananın ötesinde hiçbir risk olmayacaktır. Tüm standart sağlık ve güvenlik düzenlemelerine uyulacak ve test öncesinde risk değerlendirmesi tamamlanacaktır. Çalışmaya katılmadan önce, sırasında veya sonrasında almanız gereken özel önlemler yoktur. Bu araştırmaya katılma anlaşması, bir şeylerin yanlış gitmesi durumunda yasal haklarınızdan ödün vermez.

Bilgiler isim alınmadan toplanacağı için çocuklar hakkında size bireysel geri bildirim olmayacaktır. Bu çalışmada toplanan veriler anonim olacak ve üç yıl boyunca güvenli bir şekilde saklanacaktır. Bu süreden sonra tüm veri ve formlar güvenli bir şekilde yok edilecektir. Çocuğunuzu çalışmadan çıkarmak istiyorsanız bir hafta içinde benimle iletişime geçebilirsiniz.

İSTEĞİNİZ DAHİLİNDE BU FORMUN BİR KOPYASI ONAY FORMU İLE BİRLİKTE SİZE VERİLECEKTİR.

Teachers Consent Form

Anglia Ruskin University

Katılımcı Onam Formu

Katılımcının adı:

Projenin adı: İlköğretime Sorunsuz Geçiş ve Uyum

Araştırmacı ve iletişim bilgileri: Aslınur Dodurgalı aslinur.dodurgali@student.anglia.ac.uk

Araştırma ekibinin üyeleri: Sarah Kuppen sarah.kuppen@anglia.ac.uk

1. Yukarıdaki araştırmaya katılmayı kabul ediyorum. Sağlanan Katılımcı Bilgi Formunu okudum. Bu araştırmada rolümün ne olacağını anladım. Araştırma için verilen bilgileri yeterli buldum.

2. Bir hafta içinde herhangi bir sebepten araştırmadan çekilebileceğim bilgisini aldım.

3. Verdiğim bilgilerin gizliliğinin korunacağı hakkında bilgilendirildim.

4. Çalışma öncesi ve sırasında herhangi bir zamanda soru sormakta özgür olduğum konusunda bilgilendirildim.

5. Bu formun bir kopyasını ve Katılımcı Bilgi Forumunu aldım.

Veri Koruma: Üniversitenin temin ettiğim kişisel verileri işleme koymasını kabul ediyorum. Bu verilerin, bana açıklandığı gibi Araştırma Projesi ile bağlantılı herhangi bir amaç için kullanılmasını kabul ediyorum.

Katılımcı adı ……. ……İmza…… ..
…….....Tarih.....

Araştırmacı adı …… ..İmza …… ..…
……Tarih.....

BU FORMUN KOPYASI SİZE VERİLECEKTİR

Araştırmadan çekilmek isterseniz, lütfen aşağıdaki formu doldurup bir hafta içinde yukarıdaki araştırmacıya geri dönün.

Proje Adı: İlköğretime Düzgün Geçiş ve Uyum
BU ÇALIŞMADAN ÇIKARMAK İSTİYORUM

İmza: _____ Tarih: _____

Parents Consent Form

Anglia Ruskin University

Veli Onam Formu

Katılımcının adı:

Projenin adı: İlköğretime Sorunsuz Geçiş ve Uyum

Araştırmacı ve iletişim bilgileri: Aslınur Dodurgalı aslinur.dodurgali@student.anglia.ac.uk

Araştırma ekibinin üyeleri: Sarah Kuppen sarah.kuppen@anglia.ac.uk

1. Çocuğum hakkında öğretmen tarafından ismi alınmadan verilen bilgilerin araştırmada kullanılmasına izin veriyorum. Sağlanan Bilgi Formunu okudum. Çocuğumun bu araştırmadaki rolünün ne olacağını anladım. Araştırma ile ilgili verilen bilgileri yeterli buldum.

2. Çocuğumu herhangi bir sebepten dolayı bir hafta içinde araştırmadan geri çekebileceğim bilgisini aldım.

3. **Bilgilerin gizliliğinin korunacağına ve çocuğumun isminin kaydedilmeyeceğine dair bilgilendirildim.**

4. Araştırma sırasında herhangi bir zamanda soru sormakta özgür olduğumu biliyorum.

5. Bu formun bir kopyasını ve Veli Bilgilendirme Formunu aldım.

Veri Koruma: Temin edilen kişisel verilerin üniversitede işleme konulmasını kabul ediyorum. Bu verilerin, bana açıklandığı gibi Araştırma Projesi ile bağlantılı herhangi bir amaç için kullanılmasını kabul ediyorum.

Katılımcı adı …….....imza……....tarih..…….....

Araştırmacı adı ……..... imza.....tarih..….....……

BU FORMUN BİR KOPYASI SİZE VERİLECEKTİR

Araştırmadan çekilmek isterseniz, lütfen aşağıdaki formu doldurup bir hafta içinde yukarıdaki araştırmacıya geri dönün.

Proje Adı: İlköğretime Düzgün Geçiş ve Uyum
BU ÇALIŞMADAN ÇIKARMAK İSTİYORUM

İmza: _____ Tarih: _____

Anglia Ruskin University

Debrief Sheet

Bilgilendirme Formu

Projenin adı: İlköğretimde Sorunsuz Geçiş ve Uyum

“İlköğretimde Düzgün Geçiş ve Uyum” konulu araştırmaya katıldığınız için teşekkür ederiz. Bu çalışma şunlara bakıyor:

Bu çalışmanın amacı, okula başlama yaşı, okul öncesi eğitim, öğretmen-öğrenci ilişkisi, akranlar arasındaki ilişkinin çocukların okula hazır olma durumu, Türkiye'de geçiş süreci ve okul düzenlemesi üzerindeki etkisini incelemektir. İlk hipotezim, çocukların okula hazır olma ve okula uyum düzeylerinin, okula başlama yaşı ve okul öncesi eğitime göre değişmesidir. İkinci hipotezim, çocuklar ve öğretmenler ve akranlar arasındaki ilişkilerin kalitesinin, okul düzenlemesini birinci sınıfta etkilediğidir.

Bu çalışmayı tamamladığınız zaman için bir kez daha teşekkür ederiz. Araştırma ile ilgili başka sorularınız varsa benimle iletişime geçebilirsiniz. E-posta adresim aslinur.dodurgali@student.anglia.ac.uk ve danışmanımın e-posta adresi sarah.kuppen@anglia.ac.uk. Bu çalışmadan çekilmek istiyorsanız, bir hafta içind bu e-posta üzerinden bana ulaşabilirsiniz.

APPENDIX IV : DISSERTATION SUPERVISION LEARNING CONTRACT

Department: Psychology

Module Code: MOD002540

Level: 7

Appendix IV: Dissertation Supervision Learning Contract

DISSERTATION SUPERVISION LEARNING CONTRACT

Both students and their allocated supervisors must sign this contract. Supervision cannot progress until this has taken place. A signed contract needs to be included with student dissertations when submitted.

The dissertation student:

- should come to supervision meetings with an agenda or list of topics to be discussed.
- is responsible for the development of their research dissertation, including identifying, reading and reviewing relevant literature.
- is responsible for the design and day to day running of the dissertation.
- is responsible for (a) deciding on an appropriate strategy to analyse their data, (b) carrying out their data analysis and (c) interpreting the data/ results.
- is responsible for the write up of the report.
- is responsible for their research being conducted in a professional manner.
- Is responsible for ensuring that their research complies with all ethical, data protection and safety issues in a timely manner.
- is responsible for the development of all materials for use in their research (programming, assaying, etc.).
- must be fully trained on all equipment use to the satisfaction* of the technicians, laboratory manager, or equipment manager before using it;
- shall use the laboratories and equipment in a professional manner, ensuring that all laboratories are kept clean and tidy;
- is responsible for attending relevant scheduled workshops for the acquisition of any skills and/or techniques that they require in a timely manner.
- should make provision to store all data, informed consent forms and questionnaires for at least six months after completion of the dissertation and make this available to the Department of Psychology if required.
- is responsible for immediately raising any issue(s) of concern relating to the dissertation and/or supervision with their supervisor. Failing successful resolution of these issue(s), the student should discuss these with the Module Leader(s).
- will give the supervisor at least 10 working days to read through a draft version of the dissertation.

The dissertation supervisor:

- will be available to meet with the student not less than 20 times over the course of the psychology dissertation.
- and not usually more than 30 times. The meetings will usually be a maximum of 30 minutes each, totalling 15 hours.
- give advice during the development, implementation and analysis of your research idea.

- will provide detailed feedback on one section of the dissertation or provide general feedback on the dissertation and usually more than 15 substantive comments in total. The supervisor can only read through a section or the dissertation once.
- in order to provide feedback the draft dissertation must be submitted to the supervisor by no less than 4 working weeks before your dissertation deadline.
- will provide guidance on the ethical nature of the research.
- will not be expected to proof read through the dissertation
- is responsible for ensuring that all students receive appropriate guidance regarding safety issues relevant to their research.
- is responsible for giving guidance on developing materials for the students research (e.g., programming, assaying, etc.).
- will provide assistance as required in the analysis of data collected from such specialist equipment, tests, and programmes**.

Both student and supervisor agree to:

- Attend all scheduled meetings.

The technicians:

- will arrange the appropriate training for all the equipment and organise the administation appropriate assessed observations;
- will book out the equipment and sign it back in;
- will manage the research laboratories, ensuring that they are used efficiently and fairly;
- will provide guidance in the programming of experiments using specialist software***.

Comments or additional points:

Student Name: Aslinur Dodugali **Signature:**

Supervisor Name: Sarah Kupper **Signature:**

Date: 01st November, 2018

*This will involve passing appropriate assessed observation for use of the EEG.
** Specialist equipment includes but is not limited to the eye-tracker; the EEG; the tDCS; the PNI robot; Cattell's Culture Fair and other questionnaires.

*** Guidance can take the form of training through scheduled workshops and/or individual one-to-one support. Technicians are not responsible for programming individual students' paradigms.

APPENDIX V : DISSERTATION SUPERVISION SHEET AND SUPERVISION WORKBOOK

Appendix VII: Supervision Record Sheet

Supervision Record Sheet
(to be printed out and filled in)
Trimester _, Meeting _

Date of meeting: 8th November, 2018

Activities undertaken before the meeting:

Introductory meeting. Signed supervisory contract.

Agenda for the meeting:

Discuss possible research question and measures to use. Discuss Psychtests

NEXT MEETING: contact parents first or schools first
Focus on teachers

Agreed actions for next meeting:

[Parenting behaviours] (maybe remove.) + [parental involvement + co-operation with school] + demographics of child and ~~family~~. BESSI ✓ ask teachers what do you do support
Need to specify school dates. School readiness, is there an age effect.

Date and time of next meeting:

2:30 15th November.

send article about parental involvement.

15th December possible testing 27th January

Student signature: ~~Ashy~~ **Date:** 8th November 2018

Supervisor signature: **Date:** 8th November, 2018

Appendix VII: Supervision Record Sheet

Supervision Record Sheet
(to be printed out and filled in)
Trimester _, Meeting _

Date of meeting: 15th November, 2018

Activities undertaken before the meeting:
Sent articles for discussion
3 minimum teachers primary vs. public school.

Agenda for the meeting:
→ 2013 education reform pre this point starting @ 7.
Now not compulsory, start at 5-6 (5.5 years).
First year is targeted year.

Agreed actions for next meeting:
possible measures → age of entry/attending pre-schap/higher income (Ensart Keskin) - also Yoleri et al.
parental involvement to ask twice → Jan/May
Teacher/~~peer~~ child relationship, peer adjustment
Suggested combine all measures and look for strength of predictors linear regression

Date and time of next meeting:
→ email all chosen final measures
→ word document of demographics

Student signature: Date:

Supervisor signature: Date: