



Elementary school students' views on process-based writing modular program intervention and writer identity¹

Ömer Faruk Tavşanlı^{a*}, Asude Bilgin^b, Kasım Yıldırım^c

^a *İstanbul Aydın University, İstanbul, Turkey*

^b *Bursa Uludağ University, Bursa, Turkey*

^c *Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, Muğla, Turkey*

Abstract

This research aimed to examine the effects of process-based writing modular program on writer identity. Process based writing modular program has been developed by considering process-based writing approach. In this study, quasi-experimental design with a pretest-posttest was used. The research was carried out with six second grade students. The data was collected through semi-structured interview questions and content analysis method was used in the analysis of the data. The results showed that process-based writing modular program supported the students to think more about the writing subject. In addition, it was found out that the students were more positive about the editing and sharing of the writings they wrote. After the program, it was seen that the students gained sensitivity not only in terms of content but also in terms of formatting. In this process, it was determined that students diversified their writing content and subjects and became willing to write in different text types. In addition, it was found in the post-interview that the discourse about the importance of writing to the students increased.

Keywords: Process-based writing; elementary school students; writer identity

© 2016 IJCI & the Authors. Published by *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction (IJCI)*. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (CC BY-NC-ND) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

Approaches how to teach students writing and how students can write better have changed over the years. Writing studies, which were mostly focused on products in the past, have now been replaced by an approach that takes into account the constructivist approach, where the production process of written texts is considered (Calkins, 1986). In

¹ This manuscript has been presented as part of Ömer Faruk Tavşanlı's PhD thesis entitled "The Effect of Process Writing Modular Program on the Attitude towards Writing, Writing Skills and Writer Identity of the 2nd Grade Elementary School Students'."

* Ömer Faruk Tavşanlı

E-mail: omerfaruktavsanli@gmail.com

other words, while the behavioral approach is taken as the basis in the product-oriented writing approach, in the process-based writing approach, writing studies are programmed within the framework of the constructivist approach.

The process-based writing approach emphasizes the different processes that occur before and during the writing studies and the sub-skills related to the execution of these processes. It also produces strategies for establishing and using these sub-skills. In this approach, the roles of the teacher and the student are much different than in the product-centered writing. In the process-based writing approach, the teacher is responsible for guiding and supporting the student during the writing process (Tompkins, Campbell, Green, & Smith, 2014).

There are some tasks that need to be performed at each stage in the process-based writing approach. The ability of students to produce qualified writing studies depends on the correct performance at this stage. Moving to another step without completing any of these tasks causes the text to be grounded incorrectly. If one stage is passed before completing, the stage that is skipped should be compensated. The important thing here is to ensure that students create qualified products by correctly studying the stages of the process-based writing approach (Ministry of National education [MoNE], 2015).

1.1. Identity and writing relationship/ Writer identity

Identity affects many areas of human life as well as the literacy development of individuals through the cultural structure and social environment dynamics they possess. The individual is affected by the messages s/he sees, hears, reads, in writing or verbally, and determines her/his own life style with the inferences s/he derives from these messages. According to Collier (2010), literacy, listening and speaking skills, which constitute communication as a whole, have a serious relationship with identity.

Identity, which is one of the factors affecting the development of written expression skills of individuals, is the form of defining the individual created by the person's socio-cultural environment and experiences. At the same time, identity shapes individuals' views on writing (Kauffman, 2006). According to Bourne (2002), the reflections of the individual's identity in her/his social life and the ways of conveying the message s/he has in her/his writings have such a strong relationship that they cannot be evaluated separately.

The act of writing does not only mean transmitting a message through writing. The act of writing also gives clues about how one sees her/himself and how s/he represents. It cannot be considered that the expressions mentioned in individuals' writings, their perceptions about writing and the places they emphasize in their writings are disconnected from their lives. In this respect, identity, which also shapes the characteristics of the writer, is; it contains many components such as examples from

social experiences, perceptions of writing and reasons of this from past experiences, self-awareness of writing success. The act of writing has many social, cultural and individual sub-dynamics, and these dynamics affect the writing of individuals as a whole; gives the writing a personal identity (Hyland, 2002).

According to Young (1996), the writer identity of individuals; how they make sense of writing, their competence in writing activities, their perceptions about writing capacities, the value they attach to the act of writing and the writing activities they have experienced before. The beliefs and thoughts that the individual started to have in all these areas at an early age form the basis of the writer identity (Seban & Tavşanlı, 2015). Because students experience their first literacy studies in these ages (Bourne, 2002). At this stage, literacy education provided to students is very important in the formation of both social identities and writer identities (Mc Carthey, 2001).

Students who express themselves through writing also know their personal characteristics. Because there is an inseparable relationship between what individuals reflect in their writings and their identity. When we look at the sociocultural basis of identity structures, it is seen that identities are constantly structured and renewed around literacy. Individuals' activities after being literate define and configure their writer identity development (Bourne, 2002). In this structuring, the activities of the student with their teacher and peers at school are very important (Cappello, 2006). In this context, the writer identity can be viewed as a story, a life integrated with the social environment and based on experiences (Collier, 2010).

1.2. The importance of research

Studies in the last two decades, it is seen that the professional development and identity structures of teachers are considered to be important in revealing the environment in which they are grown and their cultural context (Collier, 2010). Besides the teachers' identities reflecting the professional development of teachers and their perceptions about how they are teachers, how teachers express themselves in writing, namely how they are writers, are among the important issues. The studies carried out with primary school students are very important, especially since the elementary school teachers provide their students with their first literacy experience. Because the literacy studies of elementary school teachers cover the processes that students will experience writing for the first time (Bourne, 2002). At this stage, it is known that the literacy guidance provided to them is great importance in the formation of both the social identities and writer identities of the students (McCarthy, 2001).

Teachers show their writer identity in all lessons, although they are predominant in lessons related to language education. This situation shapes the thoughts of the students they educate about writing and serves as the basic structure in the formation of writer identities (Ivanič, 1998). Because it is known that students' writer identities are affected

by the methods and techniques that teachers use in writing teaching (Freedman, 1994). In this respect, researching the writer identity of the students is important because it determines how to make the guidance that should be provided to them.

1.3. The present study

Although writer identity, which is an important field in teaching writing, is a highly researched subject in the world (Collier, 2010; Hyland, 2002; Kauffman, 2006; Young, 1996) Turkey has a limited number of studies on this subject in (Seben & Tavşanlı, 2015). For this reason, studies are needed to define the writer identity of Turkish students and to determine how the writer identity is shaped. It is not possible for this pattern to be independent from the learning approach in teaching writing. When the studies in the world are analyzed (Ahn, 2012; Bai, 2016; Ho, 2006), it is seen that process-based writing has been a centered learning model in teaching writing for a long time. Turkey is also used this model from the 2015.

In these researches, it is stated that there is a need to put forward what needs to be done at different stages of process-based writing in a more concrete way with examples of activities (Faraj, 2015; Qomariyah & Permana, 2016). In addition, it is foreseen that it would be beneficial what will be done in this process will be supported by different methods and techniques (Koutsoftas, 2018; Pour-Mohammadi, Abidin, & Fong, 2012). Because at every stage of this approach, the skills that should be gained to the students have been expressed, but concrete suggestions have not been presented in terms of how to gain these skills. For this reason, it has been seen that there is a need to demonstrate the activities that can be performed at each stage of the process-based writing approach in a concrete way by supporting them with different methods and techniques. Based on this need, the process-based writing approach was supported by formative assessment and graphic organizers, and the deficiency expressed were attempted to be eliminated. Thus, this research differs from other studies in terms of examining the effects of the process-based writing approach supported by different methods and techniques on writer identities. In this study, how the identity of the students is shaped based on this approach is discussed. In addition, the role of formative assessment and graphic organizers in shaping students' writer identities were examined.

In this study, it is aimed to examine the effects of the process-based writing modular program, which was developed by taking the process-based writing approach into consideration, on the writer identity. This research will reveal how the effects of the process-based writing modular program, on students' writer identities and will provide a different perspective in this area.

2. Method

In this study quasi-experimental design with a pretest-posttest was used. In quasi-experimental design, the researcher first conducts a pretest with control and study group. It then develops an intervention by adding the variable it wants to measure its effect to the process with study group. After the intervention, a posttest is made with control and study group. Then the researcher evaluates the differences between the pretest and posttest (Creswell, 2012; Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2011). In this research, the effect of process-based writing program supported by graphic organizers and formative assessment on writer identity was investigated. Pre and post interviews conduct with study group in the research serve this purpose. The interview form including open-ended questions, which prepared by the researchers, were used to collect the data by one-on-one interview sessions with the students

2.1. Subjects

Criteria sampling, which is one of the purposeful sampling methods, was preferred in determining the study group of the research. It is aimed to examine the participants who have a rich source of information in qualitative research with the purposeful sampling method. So, it is accepted that the purposeful sampling is appropriate for the in-depth examination, explanation and interpretation of an event, phenomenon or situation (Patton, 1990). In this study, both the written expression success of the students and the evaluations of the classroom teacher about the academic success of the Turkish lesson were determined as criteria. Accordingly, six elementary school second grade students who were successful, moderately successful and unsuccessful were selected in study group. Participants were determined through the written texts and the evaluation of these writings. Observations made by the researcher in the classrooms for one month before the implementation started were also effective in determining the participants. In these observations, the students who were willing to write, neutral and unwilling were determined by the researcher. In the realization of the research with the second-year students, the fact that the second year of primary school was the first grade level after learning to read and write and the emphasis on independent text creation studies at this grade level was effective (MoNE, 2015). Also, it is known that early literacy and primary school periods are very important when examining the shaping processes of students' identity (Young, 1996).

As a result, six students are included in the research, who are willing to write / have high writing success, moderate writing success / neutral writing, and low writing success / reluctant to write. Thus, how this approach affects the writer identities of students in these three different groups will be revealed. In the research, no other students were included in the study since it was understood that the data reached the satisfaction point

during the interviews with six students. Permissions was obtained from the Provincial Directorate of National Education and the school administration as well as from the parents of the students to conduct the interviews.

2.2. Measurement Tool

The data was collected through semi-structured/in-dept interviews by using open-ended questions in the interview form. The main purpose in collecting data with the interview method is not to get the answers of certain questions from the participants. The main thing is to reveal a personal point of view and the mechanisms to make sense of the subject under study (Barriball & While, 1994). In semi-structured interviews, the interviewers are free to go beyond the questions they have prepared and to ask additional questions for a more in-depth analysis (Patton, 2001). In this way, it is ensured that the points and stories that the participants want to tell are achieved in a way that they are not missing (Barriball & While, 1994). The reason for choosing the semi-structured interview technique is that it provides researchers with this flexibility. At this point the people interviewed is important not to be selected from those who have the shallow knowledge. This people should personally experience the researched subject (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). The students included as participants carried out writing activities for seven months in line with the modular program developed.

While preparing the questions of the interview form, the relevant literature was examined. Additionally, with regard to three elementary school teachers' and two field experts' views, the interview form was revised. The draft interview form consisted of 16 questions. During the preparation of the interview questions, attention was paid to the principles such as easy understanding of the questions, not being multi-dimensional and not responsive and guiding. The interview form was presented to the opinions of three specialists studying at literacy at primary school level. Three questions were removed and some questions were edited. As a result of the regulations, the interview form consisting of 13 questions was used in the study. Pilot interviews were made with three students before the actual interviews. The students participating in the pilot interview were third-grade students, just like the students participating in the main interview. During the pilot interviews, it was checked whether the interview questions were for the intended purpose and whether they were understood by the students. As a result of the pilot interviews, it was determined that two questions were understood and answered similarly by the students and another question was removed from the interview questions. Thus, the interview form consisting of twelve questions was finalized.

2.3. Procedure

In the implementation process of the research, the stages of the intervention program was explained. In the implementation process, a process-based writing modular program

supported by graphic organizers and formative assessment prepared by the researcher was used. The implementation of the program took seven months. Within the scope of the program, each student created six texts. A text was completed five weeks. The types of texts written by the students were determined in advance and the program describing this process was shared with the teacher. The students wrote in narrative and informative text. The students were informed about the type of the text to be written before the writing study started and the sample texts were shown.

The process-based writing modular program was created by systematically integrating formative assessment and graphic organizers into the process-based writing approach. Through this modular program, the actions to be taken at each stage of the process-based writing approach are concretely stated. Thus, the writing process was both easier and more fun for students. The stages of the program and how to use the support elements (formative assessment and graphic organizers) are described below.

In the pre-writing phase, which is the first stage of the process-based writing approach, students should identify the topic they want to write. Students have difficulty in determining the topic they will write (Tavşanlı, 2018). At this point, it is aimed to present in a concrete way what students want to write through the graphic organizers used. The graphic organizer, consisting of three columns, is based on the strategy of reducing the topics it wants to write from left to right. The student will write the ideas s/he wants to write the most in the left column, and then, in the other two columns, he will reach the most desired idea. At this point, it is necessary to contact the students and talk about writing ideas. The student can give the right subject to write after evaluating all the writing ideas. In this way, when the student came to the last column, a clearer idea was created.

In the planning part of the pre-writing phase of the process-based writing approach, graphic organizers are actively involved in the process, and graphic organizers in different forms are actively used in planning the topic that students will write. Each graphic organizer used at this stage has a different structure, but their use is similar. Graphic organizers used in this part of the study can be considered as summarized texts to be created by students. In other words, this process is to determine the structure, fiction and content of the texts that students will create and to save these components in visual forms in order to transfer them to the text more easily. Thus, when students start to create texts, they will be able to get the content they will write from the relevant graphic organizers in the correct order and establish a more accurate structure without missing in the text.

The formative assessment is included in the pre-writing and editing stages of the process-based writing approach. Formative assessment is based on the principle of planning and shaping the teaching process according to the assessments made. In this context, it is aimed that students have different thinking processes about the subject

with formative assessment questions during the determination of the subject. In the editing phase, it is aimed to evaluate students' writings in a multi-dimensional way with both self-evaluation and peer evaluation forms and to restructure their writings according to these evaluations. These evaluation forms are composed of items that enable students to examine both situations in order to evaluate their writings in both content and form. The students mark relevant items as yes / no and can add comments to the open-ended section below. Thus, the writings were evaluated both by the student who created the text and by their peers, and they were reshaped in line with these evaluations.

The data of the research were collected through the semi-structured interviews. The interviews were conducted both before and after the intervention. So, two interviews were made with each student. The interviews with the students were recorded with a voice recorder. Each interview lasted 15-20 minutes. Then, the transcript of the data obtained from the voice recorder. At this stage, 3 hours and 47 minutes of recording were transcribed and 53 pages of written transcripts were obtained. Afterwards, the transcripts obtained were carefully examined and the transcripts and sound recordings were compared by another researcher. Thus, the data of the research was made ready for analysis.

2.4. Analysis of Data

Content analysis method was used to analyze the data of the research. Content analysis can be defined as an analysis method based on the systematic analysis of any text (Berelson, 1952). The purpose of using content analysis is to reveal what is said in the whole text by revealing the word, sentence, concept, structure and the context in which they are represented and the relationships between these structures. Thus, in-depth knowledge is obtained about the event, situation or concept being examined. The occurred information takes place by classifying the raw data on the subject, obtaining the code, sub-themes and themes and reaching clear and latent meanings in this way (Merriam, 1998). While performing the analyzes, the discourses were examined in sentence or even word detail. Then, the discourses examined were classified under specific themes. Each theme deals with a dimension that creates a writer's identity. Certain sub-themes have also been reached under these themes. In total, 14 themes and 54 sub-themes were obtained. In this study, students' opinions about the process-based writing approach and their writer identity were obtained. The discourses are presented in a way that shows the effects of the approach on the writer identity.

2.5. Trustworthiness of the study

In the research, reliability, transferability, consistency and verifiability criteria were taken into consideration to ensure trustworthiness of the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). What is done to ensure trustworthiness of the study are as follows:

In the research, the students in the class were met one month before the interviews were made, and the students were trusted and accustomed to the researcher by spending two lesson hours a week together. After the questions to be asked to the students were determined, pilot interviews were conducted. Thus, the same environment was created before the interviews with the students and it was ensured that they experienced this situation before. As another process, the data obtained in the research have been linked with each other. In the process of analyzing the data, the researcher emphasized whether the data are suitable for the research problem and conducted interviews with the field experts. It has been determined that the data obtained as a result of these processes are in accordance with the research questions. In addition, in line with the subject of the research, students with good, moderate and poor written expression skills were included in the research in an equal number and the diversity of data sources was provided.

Throughout the research, experts were regularly interviewed and evaluations were made about all processes of the research. Accordingly, opinions from experts were reflected in the study. Thus, the quality of the research was tried to be increased. In the research, the data obtained from the students through interviews were shown to the students after they were written, and it was checked whether the answer was conveyed correctly. In the study, study group, data collection tools, data collection process and data analysis are explained in great detail. In addition, a detailed description has been made in the findings part by including one-to-one quotations from the participants' discourses. All these processes were monitored by expert researchers in the field and efforts were made to ensure that the researcher provided consistency principles in the research process. In the research, all stages from data collection tools to data collection and analysis processes were followed and it was seen that all these processes were carried out consistently in achieving a goal.

Necessary documents were kept for the works carried out in all processes of the study. Prior to each stage (for example, for data collection tools before data collection), field experts were presented with documents to obtain confirmation that the research was confirmed. When the research was completed, it has undergone a verifiability review in order to ensure the integrity of the whole process and it has been stated by the experts that the research is verifiable.

3. Results

According to the interviews, it was seen that the student's writer identity was shaped under fourteen themes. These themes are; things to do for better writing, views on the editing of writings, the characteristics of the good writer, views on sharing writings, views on getting help while writing, the writer's backgrounds, the writer's self selfies, the content preference of writing, the subject of writing, the type of writing, the reasons for writing, the effects of writing on life, the importance of writing and attitudes towards writing. Under these themes, one-to-one discourses of the students are also included, and each of the students is coded with a letter as per ethical rules.

Things to do for better writing

The students expressed some common discourses both in the pre-interview and in the post-interview under the theme of what should be done to write better. These discourses are; being a good reader, listening to the teacher, working hard, writing a lot and being careful while writing.

Table 1. Things to do for better writing

Theme	Sub-Themes	
	Pre-interview	Post-interview
Things to do for better writing	Being a good reader	Being a good reader
	Careful listening to the teacher	Careful listening to the teacher
	Work hard	Work hard
	Writing a lot	Writing a lot
	Being careful while writing	Being careful while writing
		Thinking about the topic

Examples of these discourses are as follows:

O: "I need to read encyclopedias. I must read everywhere. So, I can be more knowledgeable and write better." (Being a good reader/pre-interview)

H: "I need to listen to the lessons better. I will be more successful if I listen to my teacher. Everyone likes my writings more." (Listen to the teacher/post-interview)

E: "I have to write plenty. I have to work harder. I have to do more writing work." (Make writing studies/post-interview)

In the post-interview, students stated that, apart from these common discourses, they should also think about the topic they will write. This discourse reveals that the students have the consciousness that they should think about the subject they will write before starting the writing. Examples of students' discourses are presented below:

E2: “I need to think more about the subject I will write. I need to think to know that topic well.” (Thinking about the topic to write - post-interview)

Views on the editing of writings

Similar discourses were expressed in the pre- and post-interview by the students for the editing of writings. In both meetings, there are positive and negative statements about this situation. The negative of these discourses is that they have such a point of view because their writings are not liked and it is difficult to write again.

Table 2. Views on the editing of writings

Theme	Sub Theme	
	Pre-interview	Post-interview
Views on the editing of writings	Negative	
	Perceptions of dislike	Perceptions of dislike
	Difficult to write again	Difficult to write again
	Positive	
	Better writing	Better writing

For example:

H: “Bad. Then I feel like I wrote badly. I'm sorry.” (Negative/pre-interview)

O: "Sad. Because I will have to write again. Because sometimes my hands hurt.” (Negative/post-interview)

Students who expressed positive discourse under this theme stated that their writings would be better as a result of editing and stated that they thought the editing of their articles positive. In the post-interview, it was determined that the positive discourses of the students increased. Examples of these discourses are presented below:

E: “I feel happy because I try to understand where my mistake is.” (Positive/pre-interview)

H: "I fix it. Because they want my goodness. They say fix it to be better. I'll fix it too.” (Positive/post-interview)

The characteristics of the good writer

While the students express the characteristics of a good writer, some common discourses were expressed both in the pre- and post-interview. According to the students, a good writer; have to be a good reader, listen carefully to the teacher, be hardworking and slow writing.

Table 3. The characteristics of the good writer

Theme	Sub Theme	
	Pre-interview	Post-interview
The characteristics of the good writer	Being a good reader	Being a good reader
	Careful listening to the teacher	Careful listening to the teacher
	To be hardworking	To be hardworking
	Slow writing	Slow writing
	Being careful while writing	Being careful while writing
		Beautiful writing in terms of shape
		Doing research
	Follow the lessons regularly	
	Thinking about the writing subject	

Examples of these discourses are presented below:

O: “We must learn information by reading books. Good writers read a lot of books and become knowledgeable.” (Being a good reader/pre-interview)

H: “Because they listen to their teachers well, they write good writings. I didn't think of anything else.” (Listen to the teacher well/pre-interview)

Apart from the common discourses, the students also expressed different characteristics that a good writer should have in the post-interview. These features are; formal good writing, doing research, following the lessons regularly and thinking about the subject to write. Examples of students' discourses are as follows:

E2: “Being able to write properly. That is, such writing is beautiful.” (Formally writing beautiful/post-interview)

E: “S/he must be a researcher. For example, they give a lot of information in books. They research and find that information.” (Doing research/post-interview)

D: “S/he follows the lessons regularly. Because then they learn to write in the lesson.” (To follow the lessons regularly/post-interview)

H: “I think s/he should think. Good writers think a lot. For example, s/he thinks about her/his subject or something.” (Thinking about the subject he will write/the last interview)

Views on sharing of writings

Students expressed similar discourses in both the pre and the post-interview under this theme. Students who shared their writings stated that they were happy. On the other hand, the students, who viewed the sharing of the writings negatively, said that they were afraid of being ridiculed by the writings they wrote.

Table 4. Views on sharing of writings

Theme	Sub Theme	
	Pre-interview	Post-interview
Views on sharing of writings	Negative	
	Teasing with the writings they wrote	Teasing with the writings they wrote
	Positive	
	Sharing writings makes you feel happy	Sharing writings makes you feel happy

Examples of students' discourses are as follows:

E: “My friends like their own writings. They don't like my writing.” (Negative/pre-interview)

E: “Yes and I would be happy if I share it. So, they read our book and then we become authors.” (Positive/post-interview)

Both of the above opinions belong to the same student and it seems that the student's opinion changed as a result of the instruction.

G: “No way. If they are bad, they will make fun.” (Negative/pre-interview)

E2: “Yes I would. It seems to me a good thing. I would be very happy then.” (Positive/post-interview)

Views on getting help while writing

Students' views on getting help while writing is shaped under two views as positive and negative. Students who gave positive opinions stated that when they received help while writing, the quality of writings increased and they could write better.

Table 5. Views on getting help while writing

Theme	Sub Theme	
	Pre-interview	Post-interview
Views on getting help while writing	Negative	
	Not owning the writing	The thought that her/his writing will not be liked
	Positive	
	Improves the quality of writing Writing better	Improves the quality of writing Writing better

For example:

E: "It does. I think it's a good thing. Because it can make my writing more beautiful. It can even give me some ideas." (Positive/pre-interview)

D: "Yes it's a good thing. Well, because they get better places that we can't understand by getting help. We can write better" (positive/post-interview)

The students, who were negatively looking for help while writing, stated in the pre-interview that they could not own the text when they received help. In the post-interview, the students stated that they did not want them because they knew that they wrote badly while receiving help. Examples of students' discourses are as follows:

H: "No. It's not a good thing. Because I learn it myself. Then I will learn from her/him. I would have written what s/he said." (Negative/pre-interview)

G: "Nothing. I think it's bad. It is better to write at your own will. When someone gets help, it feels like s/he will get angry." (Negative/last meeting)

The writer's backgrounds

The students stated that they did not do any writing studies in the pre-interview under the theme of writer's backgrounds. This situation reveals that some students did not write before the research. However, in the post-interview, all students stated that they were doing writing.

Table 6. The writer's backgrounds

Theme	Sub Theme	
	Pre-interview	Post-interview
The writer's backgrounds	Negative No writing work	
	Positive Have done writing	Have done writing (which type, subject and content they wrote consciously)

Students' consciously in these discourses; It is remarkable that it gives details as to which type, subject and content they write. Examples are as follows:

E: “We never wrote before. So, we did homework or something, then we wrote. But we didn't write about such a subject” (pre-interview)

E: “Sometimes I write at home all of them. I am happy in all of them (all text types). I get the same happy as I write them all (all text types).” (post-interview)

G: “I wrote all (all text types). I was happier than the informative text. Because I wrote funny things. Then I was happy.” (post-interview)

The writer's self selfies

The students expressed different discourses in the pre- and post-interview under the theme of writer's self selfies. It was observed that the students, who saw themselves successful under this theme, made a good selection of topics in the pre-interview and stated that they did not hurry while writing. However, they stated that they worked hard and wrote good formally in the post-interview.

Table 7. The writer's self selfies

Theme	Sub Theme	
	Pre-interview	Post-interview
The writer's self selfies	Successful Do not hurry when writing Choosing the topic correctly	Formally beautiful writing Hard work
	Moderately Successful Making mistakes from time to time	Writing worse than other friends in their class Not listening to their

Examples of students' discourses are as follows:

E: “Yes, I think the subject is nice. I mean the writings I wrote. That's why I'm fine.” (I am a successful writer/pre-interview)

O: “I see it successful. Because I write well and read books. What I told in the writing is also beautiful.” (I am a successful writer/post-interview)

Under this theme, students stated that who consider themselves moderately successful at times make mistakes in the pre-interview. In the post-interview, it was observed that they wrote shorter writings compared to other people in the class and that they did not listen to the course very carefully. Examples of students' discourses are presented below:

G: “Medium. I hardly read the poem I wrote, but then I say what I wrote. I do not want to read because it is old.” (I am a moderately successful writer/pre-interview)

H: “I see medium. Because I can write some things short. I can write badly from time to time. Because I sometimes listen to the lesson badly.” (I am a moderately successful writer/post-interview)

The content preference of writing

Under this theme content preferences of the students were examined. They stated that they only wanted to write comedy content in the pre-interview. On the other hand, in the post-interview, they stated that they wanted to write about real life and imagination.

Table 8. The content preference of writing

Theme	Sub Theme	
	Pre-interview	Post-interview
The content preference of writing	Comedy	Pathetic
		Real life
		Based on imagination
		Funny

This situation can be evaluated as the students are more willing to write in different contents after the instructional program. Examples of students' discourses are as follows:

G: “Yes, because it is a happy subject, I feel happier and I never forget. But I'm sorry if I write an unhappy. I would like to write funny from him.” (funny events/pre-interview)

E: “I determine writing content according to my head. I become happier when I tell the superheroes. I also enjoy writing both the dream and the things I live.” (true-imaginative/post-interview)

O: “Immm I love writing funny things and I love sad things. I love them both.” (funny-pathetic/post-interview)

The subject of writing

When the students' writing preferences of subject are examined, some common discourses attract attention. These subjects are about animals, cars, cartoons and bicycles. Apart from that, in the post-interview, the students stated that they wanted to write about the superheroes and the subjects they know. This situation can be interpreted as increasing the desire of the students to write the subjects they know as a result of the instructional program.

Table 9. The subject of writing

Theme	Sub Theme	
	Pre-interview	Post-interview
The subject of writing	Animals	Animals
	Cars	Cars
	Cartoons	Cartoons
	Bicycles	Bicycles

Super heroes
Topics they know

Examples of students' discourses are as follows:

D: "I ask my surroundings, to my mom or something. It's about animals. Because I love animals." (animals/pre-interview)

H: "I wrote a story. I wrote about our car. I wanted to show the features in our car." (car/pre-interview)

E: "I determine according to my desire. I become happier when I tell the superheroes. I also enjoy writing both the dream and the things I live." (superheroes/post-interview)

D: "I choose by thinking. I write things I like and know. I think I will write these easier" (topics I know/post-interview)

The type of writing

The type of writing preferences of the students were examined, it was seen in the pre-interview that the students preferred more narrative texts. In the post-interview, however, it was determined that the students were eager to write from all text types. It was remarkable that students expressed their tendency to write informative texts in the post-interview. This situation revealed that students who want to write more narrative text before instructional program want to write informative text after the intervention.

Table 10. The type of writing

Theme	Sub Theme	
	Pre-interview	Post-interview
	Narrative	Narrative
The type of writing		Informative

Examples of students' discourses are as follows:

D: "Writing a story made me happier. Because I love it when I read it. I love reading my stories." (Narrative/pre-interview)

H: "Immm we wrote them all. Writing informative text made it happier. Because I learned information while writing it. It was good." (Informative/post-interview)

G: "I wrote all of them. I was happier than the informative text. Because I wrote funny things. In describing the things, I know, I made it funny because no one knew them. Then I was happy." (Informative/post-interview)

The reasons for writing

Under the theme of the reasons for writing, there are common discourses expressed by the students both in the pre-interview and in the post-interview. These discourses reveal that students write when they experience/see something or when homework is given. In other words, students write to do homework and to explain their experiences. Unlike these discourses, students stated that they wrote when they got bored or when they wanted to write. This situation reveals that, after the instruction, students write for fun.

Table 11. The reasons for writing

Theme	Sub Theme	
	Pre-interview	Post-interview
The reasons for writing	When they live/see something	When they live/see something
	When homework is given	When homework is given
		When they get bored
		When they want to write

Students' discourses are as follows:

H: "I write what I think. I write when I read something. I write in my diary. I write when I do something." (when I read something-live something/pre-interview)

E: "Something must happen. We need to have a lot of ideas in mind. So, you will experience something, something will come to your mind." (when something happened/post-interview)

O: "I don't know. I write whenever I want. For example, there is no need for homework. For example, I am writing when we are asked to write a story." (When s/he wants/post-interview)

The Effects of writing on life

The students focused on academic success both in the pre- and post-interviews under the theme of the effects of writing on life. Apart from this, there are students who stated that they wrote with to be liked. It was stated in the post-interview that writing is necessary to communicate. This situation enabled the students to have an awareness about the communication aspect of writing.

Table 12. The Effects of writing on life

Theme	Sub Theme	
	Pre-interview	Post-interview

	Academic success	Academic success
The Effects of writing on life	Appreciation	Communication

Examples of students' discourses are as follows:

O: “I don't know. There are some differences. Whoever has bad writing cannot write well. He can't be hardworking.” (academic success/pre-interview)

E: “It affects your life. If s/he writes badly, the teacher warns her/him but I would be happy if I was her/him, because I would try to understand what my mistake was.” (academic success/post-interview)

E2: “Good effects. If we write badly, nobody can read our writings. Even if we write well, everyone reads and likes it.” (appreciation/pre-interview)

H: “I think it affects your life. Because if someone writes well, it will be legible after all. Nobody writes badly. S/he cannot explain her/his problem by writing” (communication/post-interview)

The importance of writing

It was observed that students talked about the effects of writing on success under this theme. Secondly, students stated that writing is important because of anxiety about being liked. Apart from this, it was stated in the post-interview that it is important to write in order not to be defected and understood in the society.

Table 13. The importance of writing

Theme	Sub Theme	
	Pre-interview	Post-interview
The importance of writing	Academic success	Academic success
	Anxiety to be liked	Anxiety to be liked
		Not to be defused in society
		Be understood

Examples of students' discourses are presented below:

E2: “Important. It is important for someone to read. Then it doesn't matter. We write it so that someone can read it. I think it's a good thing to read. It allows us to be more successful.” (Important to be successful/pre-interview)

H: "Yes. Because you want your teacher to like it. My writings are important for proper reading." (Important- anxiety to be liked/pre-interview)

E: "I think it's important. Because if we write beautifully, those who read our book can understand it." (Important-Understanding of writings/post-interview)

H: "I think it's important. Because we can't write when others say something. We will be embarrassed when you can't write." (Important-Not to be defused in society/post-interview)

Attitudes towards writing

Under the attitude towards writing theme, there are discourses about students that they are happy and love to write. However, the presence of negative discourses is also noteworthy. In the pre-interview, the students stated that their hands were tired to justify their negative discourses. In the post-interview, there are students who say that they are tired of writing.

Table 14. Attitudes towards writing

Theme	Sub Theme	
	Pre-interview	Post-interview
Attitudes towards writing	Negative	
	Tiring	Tiring
	Positive	
	I like to write	I like to write
	I'd be happy	I'd be happy

Although the program is made to be fun for students, it seems that a student who has a negative attitude towards writing has a limited effect on changing her/his thought. Examples of students' negative discourses are as follows:

H: "I am happy when I write. Better than homework. I love when I write." (I like to write/pre-interview)

G: "No. Because my hand is getting tired. Better to travel. That's why I don't like it." (I don't like to write/pre-interview)

G: "I don't want to be a better writer. Because day and night pass by writing. I'm tired." (tired/post-interview)

It is seen that the above discourse was stated by the same student. In this context, it was observed that there was no difference in the thought of a student who did not have a positive attitude towards writing.

4. Discussion

According to the results of the research, students expressed discourse under fourteen different themes. Under the theme of things to do to write better, which is the first of the themes obtained; it has been stated that it is necessary to read a lot, to work hard, to write a lot and to be careful. Miller and Gildea (1987) stated that students should have more vocabulary in order to write better. The easiest way for students to learn more words and to know more about a topic is to read. In addition, in parallel with the results obtained from the interviews, it is known that students need to do a lot of writing activities and make efforts on this subject in order to be more successful in their writing activities. It is seen that the students who regularly write and like to write, making writing a part of their lives, are more qualified in their writings (McCarrier, Pinnell, & Fountas, 2000). It has been observed that the studies carried out in this direction are compatible with the studies mentioned above.

After the implementation, it was seen that thinking about the topic that the students will write also affects the quality of the writing. This is an important issue in the pre-writing phase of process-based writing (Graves, 1983). It is known that pre-writing strategies are useful in the formation of the writers' identity (Hung & Van, 2018). In this respect, the research results support Hung and Van's (2018) research. For this reason, it is very important for students to realize that they need to enter a serious thinking process before writing. It is thought that the students gained this awareness stemmed from the formative assessment and graphic organizers that facilitated this process. Because graphic organizers help students choose the topic, they want to write the most from among many alternatives at the stage of choosing the topic (Tavşanlı, 2019). At this stage, students think on all topics that are alternative to writing and decide on one and start thinking about the planning of this writing. In this process, formative assessment questions help them think deeply about what they will write. Because the formative assessment questions asked in this process are aimed at deepening the subject to be written.

Students focused on this subject under the theme of the characteristics of a good writer; being a good reader, listening to their teacher, being hardworking and slow writing. Under this theme, students argued that a good writer should be formally successful in the post-interviews, unlike the first interviews. One of the points to be considered while examining the students' writings is the visual view. Visual view of the writing step means the stylistic evaluation of the writing. In other words, as the students state, a good writing should be stylistically correct (Tompkins et al., 2014). In this

respect, the results of this research confirm the above statement. At this point, it has been seen that the process-based writing approach gives the students the awareness that a good writer should write properly in style.

Two of the themes obtained from the discourses of the students about writer identity are the editing and publishing stages of the process-based writing approach. According to the results of the research, it was determined that the students viewed the editing of their writings more positively than the pre-interview. This situation is thought to be due to the students realizing that they have written better writings through the program implemented with process-based writing approach. The discourses of the students are that their writings become more qualified by editing. Researches are also explained that the editing and revising of the writings increase students' writing success (Bradley & Thouëсны, 2017; Edwards & Liu, 2018). In this respect, the results of this study are similar to other research results. It is thought that one of the reasons that the students regard the editing of the writings positively is the formative assessment used in the process. Because formative assessment is an evaluation approach that is carried out like the teaching method at the point of making the product more qualified. In the research, formative assessment questions were used to think about writings, to criticize and to reconstruct their writings on both themselves and their comments. This process made it easier for students to move from the first draft stage to other stage and helped shape their writings according to peer / teacher opinions. Students who had a positive time in this process gained a positive perspective towards the editing of their writings.

Students expressed more positive thoughts about sharing their writing in the post-interview, even though they were limited. This situation is thought to be from the activities in the classroom related to the sharing phase of the process-based writing approach. Because the researches reveal that the sharing of writings, motivates students to write. In addition, this approach supports students to write more successful writings (Minnich et al. 2017; Seban & Tavşanlı, 2015). However, in the research, it was concluded that some students did not want to share their writings due to the poor writing and shame. Minnich et al. (2017) stated that sharing students' writings will be a risk especially for students with low writing success. This finding obtained in the study seems to be compatible with the study performed by Minnich et al. (2017). For this reason, it was stated that the students should be qualified and shared as much as possible before sharing their writings. At this point, it is very important for the teacher not to say anything that discourages the students who share their writings. On the contrary, it is known that it is necessary to say things that will motivate and encourage students.

One of the themes obtained from students is their thoughts on getting help while writing. Under this theme, the number of positive discourses is higher in the post-interview compared to the pre-interview. This revealed that the process-based writing approach helped students to have positive thoughts about getting help while creating

their writing. It is known that peer and teacher solidarity is high in writing studies based on process-based writing approach (Calkins, 1986). This situation is thought to cause students to look at getting help more positively. Harris, Graham, and Mason (2006) compared writing performances with and without peer support and found that peer support is important for writer identity development. The results of these two studies support each other. However, there are some students who think that writings will not be their own when help is received. This situation should be explained to the student and it should be stated that the writing will belong to the writer when help is received.

Students have stated discourses about whether they have previously written, which is one of the questions asked to them about their writer identity. It was seen that the students expressed more discourse about doing writing practice after the instruction under this theme. In addition, the students stated that they did writing activities outside the school. Cappello (2006) stated that students should not limit their writing activities to school only. In this regard, he stated that a good writer consists of individuals who use writing regularly and effectively in daily life. From this point of view, it can be said that this approach enables students to use writing more frequently in their daily lives. The results of this study confirm the situation identified by Cappello (2006).

Another of the themes obtained from the discourses is writer's self selfies. Students expressed how they see themselves as writers under this theme. It is understood that students see themselves as successful and moderately successful writers. In addition, students have expressed some discourses about why they are successful. From these discourses; It is remarkable that they are not in a hurry when writing, even if there is an error in their writings, they have a positive opinion about editing them and pay attention to the choice of subject. It is known that it will take time to create a writing based on the process-based writing approach. What is important at this stage is not to write quickly, but to enable students to acquire the skills they need in the process (MoNE, 2015). It is important for students to have a positive attitude towards editing their writings and to say that they pay attention to the topic selection. Because, as explained before, the editing of the writings is a situation that increases the quality of writings. In addition, topic selection seems to be very important for students to shape their writings more comfortably (Tavşanlı, 2018). Wang and Park (2015) stated that the choice of subject and the subjects written by students cannot be considered separately from their social contexts. This research supports the findings of the above two studies. The graphic organizers used in the process are thought to be effective in the students choosing the topic correctly. Because the graphic organizers used are designed to help students choose what they really want by systematically reducing the topics they want to write (Tavşanlı, 2019).

One of the themes obtained from the interviews is the students' reasons for writing. Under this theme, it was observed that the students stated that they wrote when they

read something, experience something, do homework, get bored and want writing about something. The process-based writing approach comes to the fore as an approach in which students write about what they experience. Because the students write more courageously about the subjects they experience and their sense of ownership increases (Seban & Tavşanlı, 2015). In this respect, it is positive for students to write their experiences. Apart from this, the students stated that they had to write to do their homework. It is a fact that writing is very important in homework, which is a skill type used in all lessons and even in all areas of life (Kepner, 1991). The students stated that they use writing when they are bored. In this case, it can be seen as a very positive situation for students. Because it is known that individuals can reduce their psychological problems by expressing themselves through writing and feel more comfortable (Young, 1996). The findings obtained in this study are in agreement with the studies mentioned above.

Three of the themes obtained from the discourses expressed by the students are related to each other, the content preference, writing subject preference and writing text type preference. The students stated that they wanted to write about animals, superheroes, bicycles, cars and cartoons under the theme of the content preference of writing. Tavşanlı (2018) determined that students want to write about animals, toys and cartoons in their research. In another study, females prefer topics such as toys, clothing and shopping; on the other hand, men prefer topics such as cartoon heroes, superheroes, computer games and cars. In addition, it was found that female students wrote about their immediate environment and male students wrote about their distant environment (Freedman, 1995; Peterson, 2000).

The students stated that their writing content preferences are mostly fun and surreal content. Under this theme, it is remarkable to give information about more content in the post-interview compared to the pre-interview. Tavşanlı (2018) revealed that students want to write funny events and adventure. From this point of view, it was determined that students prefer to write in funny, adventure and surreal content. It is seen that these results are similar to those of Tavşanlı (2018).

When students' discourses are examined in terms of writing text type preference, it is revealed that students tend to write narrative text in the pre-interview and informative text in the post-interviews. Tavşanlı (2018) stated that the process-based writing approach increases students' desire to write informative text. It is thought that students' positive view of writing informative text within the scope of writing studies carried out considering the process-based writing approach is due to the fact that the process-based writing approach facilitates informative text writing processes (Qomariyah & Permana, 2016). Because creating informative text is a more difficult for students due to its structure and style (Tavşanlı & Seban, 2015). However, it is thought that process-based writing approaches facilitates writing process, which is complicated for the student, by

making it progressive and focusing only on what needs to be done at that stage. In this regard, the results obtained in this study support the research conducted by Qomariyah and Permana (2016).

One of the themes obtained from the discourses expressed by the students about writer identity is effects of writing on life. Under this theme, it has been observed that students' express how they affect their lives. Under this theme, it was determined that students expressed that writing affects academic life more. Research similar to the results of the research has revealed that writing is quite effective on academic success (Aram, 2005; McIntosh & Draper, 2001). Apart from this, it is seen that in the post-interviews students emphasizes the communication dimension of writing. This situation is also positive for students. Because the communication aspect of writing is one of the most important functions (Collier, 2010).

Another themes about writer identity is the importance of writing. Under this theme, students expressed their opinions about whether writing is important or not. Under this theme, it was observed that students expressed more discourse about the importance of writing according to the pre-interview in the post-interview. This situation has revealed that writing has become a more important issue in the process. It is seen the students stated writing is essential because of academic success and communication under this theme.

The last themes obtained from the discourses about writer identity is attitude toward writing. Under this theme, it was observed that the positive discourses about writing increased partially compared to the pre-interview. This result can be interpreted that the process-based writing approach is effective in students' positive attitude towards writing. There are many studies supporting this result (Abbas, 2016; Seban, 2012). On the other hand, there was no positive development in the negative attitudes of writing of some students. As a reason, it is thought that the formation of the concept of identity requires a certain time and that a change in the identity is not possible in a short time (Ivanič, 1998).

As a result, the process-based writing modular program; It has made changes in student discourses in terms of thinking more about the topic students will write, looking at the editing and sharing of their writings more positively, making the writings better not only in terms of content, but also in terms of visual, diversifying the content / subject and type preference of writing and paying more attention to writing. These changes in students 'writing reveal how process-based writing affects students' perceptions of their own writing. These results emphasize the importance of process-based writing to be more emphatic in language instructional programs. These results also highlighted the importance of supporting process-based writing with different techniques. In this respect, concrete examples of activities have a great influence on the development of students' author identities. In line with the results of the research, it is thought that it will be

useful to examine each of the themes obtained in this research individually. In addition, in this study, writer identity is influenced by only one method or shaped accordingly. However, many variables affect the process of structuring the identity of the writer. In this direction, researches are needed to examine the effects of experiences on family literacy in the home from early childhood on shaping the identity of individuals.

References

- Abbas, S. (2016). The effect of reflection-supported process-based writing teaching on Iraqi efl students' writing performance and attitude. *Arab World English Journal*, 7(4), 42-62.
- Ahn, H. (2012). Teaching writing skills based on a genre approach to L2 primary school students: An action research. *English Language Teaching*, 5(2), 2-16.
- Aram, D. (2005). Continuity in children's literacy achievements: Alongitudinal perspective from kindergarten to school. *First Language*, 25, 259–289.
- Bai, B. (2016). *Writing strategies and strategy-based instruction in Singapore primary schools*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Barriball, K. L., & While, A. (1994). Collecting data using a semi-structured interview: a discussion paper. *Journal of Advanced Nursing-Institutional Subscription*, 19(2), 328-335.
- Berelson, B. (1952). *Content analysis in communication research*. Illinois: The Free Press, Glencoe.
- Bourne, J. (2002). 'Oh, what will Miss say!': Constructing texts and identities in the discursive processes of classroom writing. *Language and Education*, 16(4), 241-259.
- Bradley, L., & Thouësný, S. (2017). Students' collaborative peer reviewing in an online writing environment. *Themes in Science and Technology Education*, 10(2), 69-83.
- Calkins, L. M. (1986). *The art of teaching writing*. Portsmouth, NH; Heinemann.
- Cappello, M. (2006). Under construction: Voice and identity development in writing workshop. *Language Arts*, 83(6), 482.
- Collier, D. R. (2010). Journey to becoming a writer: Review of research about children's identities as writers. *Language and Literacy*, 12(1), 147.
- Creswell, J. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Boston: Pearson Publication.
- Edwards, J. H., & Liu, J. (2018). *Peer response in second language writing classrooms*. University of Michigan Press.
- Faraj, A. K. A. (2015). Scaffolding EFL Students' Writing through the Writing Process Approach. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(13), 131-141.
- Fraenkel, J., Wallen, N., & Hyun, H. (2011). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York: Mc Graw Hill Publications.
- Freedman, S. W. (1994). *Exchanging writing, exchanging culture: Lessons in school reform from the United States and Great Britain*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Freedman R. (1995). The mr. and mrs. club: the value of collaboration in writer's workshop. *Language Arts*, 72, 97-104.
- Graves, D. H. (1983). *Writing: Teachers and children at work*. Heinemann Educational Books, 4 Front St. Exeter, NH 03833.

- Harris, K. R., Graham, S., & Mason, L. H. (2006). Improving the writing, knowledge, and motivation of struggling young writers: Effects of self-regulated strategy development with and without peer support. *American educational research journal*, 43(2), 295-340.
- Ho, B. (2006). Effectiveness of using the process approach to teach writing in six Hong Kong primary classrooms. *Perspectives: Working Papers in English and Communication*, 17(1), 1-22.
- Hung, B. P., & Van, L. T. (2018). Depicting and Outlining as Pre-Writing Strategies: Experimental Results and Learners' Opinions. *International Journal of Instruction*, 11(2), 451-464.
- Hyland, K. (2002). Authority and invisibility: Authorial identity in academic writing. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34, 1091–1112.
- Ivanič, R. (1998). *Writing and identity*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Johnson, A. S. (2007). An ethics of access: Using life history to trace preservice teachers' initial viewpoints on teaching for equity. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(4), 299-314.
- Kauffman, G. (2006). Authoring ourselves as readers and writers. *Language Arts*, 83(6), 502-504.
- Kepner, C. G. (1991). An experiment in the relationship of types of written feedback to the development of second-language writing skills. *The modern language journal*, 75(3), 305-313.
- Koutsoftas, A. D. (2018). Writing-process products of fourth-and sixth-grade children: A descriptive study. *The Elementary School Journal*, 118(4), 632-653.
- Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- McCarrier, A., Pinnell, G. S., & Fountas, I. C. (2000). *Interactive writing: How language & literacy come together, K-2*. Portsmouth: Heinemann Publications.
- McCarthy, S. J. (2001). Identity construction in elementary readers and writers. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 36(2), 122-151.
- McIntosh, M. E., & Draper, R. J. (2001). Using learning logs in mathematics: Writing to learn. *The Mathematics Teacher*, 94(7), 554-557.
- Ministry of National Education (MoNE). (2015). *The elementary school Turkish language arts course (1-8 grades) teaching program and guidance*. Ankara, Turkey: Government Books Press.
- Merriam, S. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey- Bass.
- Miller, G. A., & Gildea, P. M. (1987). How children learn words. *Scientific American*, 257(3), 94-99.
- Minnich, C., Miller, D., Sokolowski, K., & Sharp, C. (2017). The risk and reward of sharing our writing. *Voices From the Middle*, 25(2), 59-61.
- Norton, B. (1997). Language and identity [Special issue]. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(3), 409-429.
- Norton, B., & Toohey, K. (2004). *Critical pedagogies and language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Parr, M., & Campbell, T. A. (2011). Educating for identity: Problematizing and deconstructing our literacy pasts. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 57(3), 337-348.
- Patton, M.Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. London: Sage Publications.
- Peterson S. (2000). Fourth, sixth, and eighth graders' preferred writing topics and identification of gender markers in stories. *Elementary School Journal*, 101(1), 79-100.
- Pour-Mohammadi, M., Abidin, M. J. Z., & Fong, C. L. (2012). The effect of process writing practice on the writing quality of form one students: A case study. *Asian Social Science*, 8(3), 88-99.

- Qomariyah, S. S. A., & Permana, D. (2016). Process based approach towards students' creativity in writing english paragraph. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 37-47.
- Rubin, H.J., & Rubin, I.S. (2005). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Seban, D. (2012). The effect of authoring cycle on third grade students' attitudes towards writing, self-perception and writing ability. *Education and Science*, 37(164), 147-158.
- Seban, D., & Tavşanlı, Ö.F. (2015). Children's sense of being a writer: identity construction in second grade writers workshop. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 7(2), 217-234.
- Tavşanlı, Ö. F., & Seban, D. (2015). Grafik örgütleyicilerin ilköğretim 4. sınıf öğrencilerinin bilgilendirici metinleri çözümleme ve özetleme başarıları üzerine etkisi [The effects of graphic organizers on 4th grade students' success in analyzing and summarizing expository texts]. *Dumlupınar University Journal of Social Sciences*. 43, 85-93.
- Tavşanlı, Ö. F. (2018). İlkokul öğrencileri ne yazar?: İlkokul öğrencilerinin yazılı anlatımlarında metin türü, konu ve içerik tercihlerinin incelenmesi [What do primary school students write about? : Investigation of text types, subjects and content preferences in the written works of primary school students]. *Journal of Mother Tongue Education*, 6(1), 32-47.
- Tavşanlı, Ö.F. (2019). *The effect of process writing modular program on the attitude towards writing, writing skills and writer identity of the 2nd grade elementary school students'* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Bursa Uludağ University, Turkey.
- Tompkins, G., Campbell, R., Green, D., & Smith, C. (2014). *Literacy for the 21st century*. Pearson Australia.
- Wang, G. T., & Park, K. (2015). *Student research and report writing: From topic selection to the complete paper*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Young, J. R. (1996). *First grade children's sense of being literate at school*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Oklahoma, Norman.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the Journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (**CC BY-NC-ND**) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).