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ABSTRACT

Purpose: The purpose of this research is to understand how creative writing practices affect the written expression skills of B2 level students.

Method: In this study, a pretest-posttest control group semi-experimental model was used. While creative writing practices were implemented in the experiment group, instruction in alignment with the Teacher Guide of Yunus Emre Institution was provided in the control group. The study was conducted with 49 students at the B2 level at the Aksaray University Turkish Learning Application and Research Center during the 2018-2019 academic year. Written expression works (composition), writing self-efficacy, and writing anxiety scales were used as data collection instruments. Written expression works were evaluated according to the Creative Writing Evaluation Scale. Dependent and independent t-tests were conducted for pairwise comparisons.

Findings: The means for post-test scores in the experiment group for the scales except for the writing anxiety scale were higher than the means of post-test scores in the control group. This indicates that creative writing practices in comparison with the traditional methods are an important factor in improving the written expression skills of students who learn Turkish as a second language.

Implications for Research and Practice: Future research to identify the effects of creative writing practices on fundamental language skills that are reading, speaking, and listening can be conducted.
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Introduction

Creativity is a concept that is frequently used particularly in education and technology in recent years. Technology has entered individuals’ lives at a fast pace and caused changes in their lifestyles. It has become a necessity for individuals to keep up with the changes and to find creative ideas for the issues they encounter. Creativity is an identifying component of human intelligence, and the power of imaginary and symbolic thinking (Robinson, 2003, p. 131). Torrance (1998) defines creativity as seeing the differences, making predictions on the missing pieces of the current knowledge, hypothesizing, and as the process of testing and developing of these predictions and hypotheses. According to Senemoglu (2015), creativity is to be able to adapt to changing conditions, to layout ideas clearly, authenticity, and to think untraditionally while Honig (2001) defines creativity as originality, imagination, discovering new things, doing what is not done, and saying what is not said.

There are direct and indirect associations between creative thinking and writing skills. Writing is one of the fundamental language skills that is used to express emotions, thoughts, imaginations, and impressions in accordance with written expression rules. In teaching Turkish, both as native and as a second language, writing is a skill that is learned last and that is the most challenging.

Writing skills require the use of cognitive and psychomotor skills together due to having multiple components such as word selection, using words in the right context, correct grammar use, consistency, text type, theme, style, spelling rules, punctuation, format, and good hand-writing (Cetin, 2017, p. 394). As it involves these multiple elements, writing skills is considered to be the most challenging skill for students in teaching Turkish both as a native and as a second language (Bagci & Basar, 2018, p. 311; Bolukbas, 2011; Cakir, 2010; Erol, 2016, p. 178; Kara, 2010; Yilmaz, 2015).

Improvement of writing skills in foreign language learning is possible through knowing the phonetics, morphological, semantic and syntax structure of the language. These structures of the target language should be instructed from simple to complex over time (Cetin, 2017, p. 395). Written expression skills of students can be improved by approaches that focus on planning the writing process and having the learner to follow the writings with the teacher in the beginning and then gradually by himself, and evaluate (Karatay, 2011, p. 26). That’s why it is important to use process-based writing practices in improving writing skills. Common European Framework of Recommendations for Languages also emphasizes utilizing process-based writing practices (Balci & Melanlioglu, 2015).

In the process-based writing model, teaching should include triggering prior knowledge of students on the content of a writing, organizing thoughts, creating a writing outline, reviewing the expression in written works and evaluating (Karatay, 2011, pp. 27-28). During this process, students are supported in writing creatively through being able to think differently by using their experiences and making connections between events, situations, and people (Temizkan, 2014, p. 6).
It is known that creative writing practices have an important role in revealing the hidden and creative power in students (Gunduz & Simsek, 2012, p. 229). The purpose of creative writing practices is to provide an environment that encourages students to express their knowledge from their point of view and in a different way by improving their writing skills and creativity (Gocer, 2016, p. 119). Creative writing, which is a cognitive and psychological process, contributes to the social, psychological and academic fields. These activities primarily prevent the alienation of the person, increase self-confidence and give him the courage to write. Creative writing also enriches narrative power, enhances literary pleasure and opens the way for originality. Creative writing activities provide opportunities for educators to get to know students' inner worlds closely and to build affection with them, as well as helping students to know themselves. It enables students to freely express their own thoughts and is effective in gaining the habit of respecting and accepting other people's feelings and thoughts (Oral, 2003).

Following are things that can be said about the process of creative writing (Gocer, 2016, pp. 120-121; Ipsiroglu, 2006, p. 27; Ipsiroglu, 2007, p. 23; Maltepe, 2006, pp. 60-61; Ungan, 2007, p. 469):

- The purpose in creative writing is not to raise writers but to allow individuals to see the creative power in themselves.
- The fundamental condition of writing is to have a good command of the language. It is necessary to see possibilities of the language by pushing the limits with writing exercises because language improvement is faster through writing.
- The focus of creative writing should be meaning and thoughts.
- Teachers should be tolerant towards students in selecting their own writing models.
- Creative writing should be considered as a product of imagination.
- Creating writing products should be addressed and discussed with different perspectives in classrooms.
- Teachers should engage in writing activities with students.

Ipsiroglu (2006, pp. 27-30) lists the phases of writing as follows:

- Preliminary Work (Brainstorming): Associations related to the content of writing and the field should be triggered.
- Preparation (Research, sorting, selecting): In the preparation phase, materials collected during the preliminary phase are sorted and selected. Additionally, materials that are not relevant are eliminated and the ones that are missing are completed.
- Design Phase (Organization): After collecting thoughts, associations, images, data and documents during the preliminary and preparation phases, these
are selected, sorted, and organized in a systemic unity. In other words, a construct is created. In this phase, questions such as ‘where do I start?, how do I create coherence in thoughts?, how will the writing develop?, how will I express my thoughts in order?...’ are of high importance. As writing is not an activity of writing random thoughts, it is important to plan and organize thoughts.

• Writing phase (shaping): After the preliminary, preparation, and design phases, the most important phase, the writing phase, starts with shaping. In this phase in which associative and analytic thinking are intertwined, some writers adhere to their outlines prepared prior to writing while some do not adhere to the outline and experience the phase like a journey.

• Self-assessment (Critique): During the last phase following the writing phase, the written work is evaluated. In this phase, the written text is reviewed with a holistic view and revised as needed (Gocer, 2016, pp. 121-122).

There are two important psychological thresholds during the use of writing skills that are anxiety and anxiety-control phase, and motivation that is the driving force of writing (Yalcin, 2018, pp. 372-373). Methods, strategies, and techniques used in the writing phase should be planned and implemented to support students to control their anxiety. A program designed accordingly would affect students’ self-efficacy perceptions and their attitudes towards writing positively and motivate them.

It is seen in the literature that creative writing practices are effective in improving writing skills in teaching Turkish both as a native and a second language (Alar, 2018; Beydemir, 2010; Demir, 2011; Duran, 2010; Duru, 2014; Erdogan, 2012; Kasap, 2019; Maltepe, 2006; Ozturk, 2007; Top, 2013; Uzun, 2015). There are very few studies on using creative writing practices to improve writing skills in teaching Turkish as a second language. Thus, the current study is significant as it will contribute to the field.

**Purpose of the Study**

The current study was conducted to identify the effects of creative writing practices on the writing skills, writing self-efficacy, and writing anxiety of B2 level students who learn Turkish as a second language. Within the scope of the purpose, the research question guiding the study is “are creative writing practices effective in improving the writing skills of students who learn Turkish as a second language?” The following hypotheses were developed in alignment with the purpose of the study.

1. **Hypothesis:** There is a significant difference between the posttest scores of the experiment group in which creative writing practices are implemented and the control group in which traditional methods of instruction are implemented when the sum of pretest scores of ‘self-efficacy scale’ are controlled.

2. **Hypothesis:** Between the experiment group in which creative writing practices are implemented and the control group in which traditional methods of instruction are implemented,
2.1. when the total pretest scores for the general (the whole scale) writing anxiety scale are controlled, there is a significant difference in posttest scores,

2.2. when the total pretest scores for the subscale of action-oriented anxiety are controlled there is a significant difference in posttest scores,

2.3. when the total pretest scores for the subscale of environment-oriented anxiety are controlled, there is a significant difference in posttest scores.

3. Hypothesis: For the ‘creative writing evaluation scale’,

3.1. when the pretest total scores of the creative writing scale are controlled, there is a significant difference in posttest total scores between the experiment and control groups.

3.2. when the pretest total scores of the creativity sub-scale are controlled, there is a significant difference in posttest total scores between the experiment and control groups.

3.3. when the pretest total scores of the text structure subscale are controlled, there is a significant difference between the experiment and control groups.

3.4. when the pretest total scores of the writing, punctuation and presentation sub-scale are controlled, there is a significant difference between the experiment and control groups.

Method

Research Design

An experimental design was used for this study to identify the effects of creative writing practices on the written expression skills of students learning Turkish as a second language. In experimental research, the effects of differences created by the researcher on the dependent variable are tested. As there are two groups, experiment and control, a semi-experimental design was used in this study. In accordance with this design, paired groups were assigned randomly to the experiment and control groups, and a pretest-posttest control group model was used (Buyukozturk, Cakmak, Akgun, Karadeniz, & Demirel, 2015).

Participants

The participants of the study consisted of advanced B2 level students at Aksaray University, Turkish Education Application and Research Center. The study was conducted during the spring semester of the 2018-2019 academic year. Random sampling was used to identify the experiment and control groups. While creative writing practices were implemented in the experiment group consisting of 24 students, methods from the Teacher Guide of Yunus Emre Institution were implemented in the control group consisting of 25 students. The experimental methods were implemented 7 hours a week during an 8-week period.
Data Collection

For data collection, the ‘writing self-efficacy scale’ developed by Buyukikiz (2011) to measure the writing skills of international students learning Turkish, the ‘writing anxiety’ scale developed by Sen and Boylu (2017), and compositions written by students were used.

To identify the effects of creative writing practices on the writing self-efficacy of students, the scale developed by Buyukikiz (2011) for students learning Turkish as a second language was used. In developing the scale for the target group, expert opinions were received, and analyses were completed for the pilot study. The final scale was a 7-point Likert scale with 16 items. The coefficient of internal consistency, Cronbach Alpha value was 0.928 for the first factor, 0.743 for the second factor, and 0.922 for the whole scale. These results indicated that the scale was reliable. The scale was piloted with five students in the current study, and the scale items were found to be comprehensible.

To identify the effects of creative writing practices on the anxiety level of students, a scale developed by Sen and Boylu (2017) to measure the anxiety levels of students learning Turkish as a second language was used. In developing the scale, first, a literature search was conducted and then, in light of the information collected, an item pool was developed to identify writing anxiety of students learning Turkish. The items in the item pool were organized and a scale was created. Expert opinion was sought for the survey. The scale was implemented with 280 students at the Aksaray University Turkish Education Center and Yunus Emre Institution. An exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis were conducted to identify the structure and validity of the scale. The analyses revealed that the scale had two dimensions and 13 items with a good fit score. The Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was 0.84. The two-factor structure explained 46.82% of the total variance.

A “creative writing evaluation scale” developed by Karatay and Tonyali (2010) to assess creative writing activities and writing skills was implemented as a pretest-posttest. During the scale development, creative writing scales and written expression evaluation scales from the literature were reviewed. Experts commented on the items developed in alignment with these scales. The scale consisted of 3 sub-dimensions that were; ‘creativity’, ‘text structure’, and ‘punctuation and presentation.’ Creativity dimension consisted of 4 items, text structure dimension consisted of 12, and presentation dimension consisted of 4 items. In the scale developed as a rubric, students got a score of 1, 3, or 5 for each measure. This procedure was completed by 3 experts including the author of this article. The reliability coefficient was 0.796, and there was a positive and high correlation between the scores.

To identify the effects of creative writing practices on writing skills, composition topics were identified by the author. These topics were implemented in the form of pre-test and post-test. In identifying the topics, first a literature was reviewed and 20 topics for composition were identified. In determining whether these topics were suitable for the study, expert opinions were asked. Based on the feedback received from eight experts in the field of Turkish education as a second language, five topics
were selected to be used in the experimental study. The topics selected were: “If you invent something that would make your life easier, what would you do? How would you use it?”, “What would you like to do to raise awareness in environmental issues and global warming?”, “If you had a magic key and if this key would open all the doors, which doors would you want to open, and why?”, “If you had a chance to be a tale hero, in which tale would you like to be a hero, and why? What would you do in this tale and how would your presence change this tale?”, “He waited here only for an hour…/ complete the story activity”.

Data Analysis

The findings for each research question and sub-questions are presented under separate headings in the findings section. Pairwise mean comparisons were conducted to answer all research questions. Before the comparison tests were completed, the fitness of data with the analyses were tested. First, a normality assumption was tested. The results of normality assumptions are presented in the form of a table in the findings section. SPSS 22.0 software was used in analyzing the data, and Excel was used to create the graphics.

In pairwise comparisons, t-tests were completed for dependent and independent groups because an experimental design was used in the study. In an experimental design, individuals paired based on all characteristics are randomly assigned into groups. There are one experiment and one control group in this design. A pretest and a posttest were implemented to both groups. An intervention is done only in the experiment group for the independent variable (Karasar, 2017, p. 130).

Experimental Procedures

This study aimed to identify the effects of creative writing practices on the writing skills of B2 level students learning Turkish as a second language. The study was conducted in the spring semester of the 2018-2019 academic year. In developing the creative writing practices, Yunus Emre Institution Turkish Education Set B2 level writing outcomes and the B2 writing competency of Common Application Text for European Languages were considered. The study was conducted for an eight-week period with an average of seven class hours per week by the researcher. The researcher has a Ph.D. in Turkish education. In developing the creative writing activities, related literature was reviewed. In alignment with the information obtained, the activities were developed. These activities were presented to experts for feedback to finalize the activities.

The procedural activities were as follows: 1. If I had a magic wand… 2. Freewriting (brainstorming and cluster of thoughts). 3. If I were to build a new city for myself… 4. Writing a dialogue between a crow and a fox. 5. Writing a story departing from comics. 6. Developing a new text from another text. 7. If I come back to world as an animal. 8. As a superhero… 9. If I were invisible… 10. If I were a tale hero… 11. Life in 100 years… 12. Writing an influential letter. 13. Completing a story. 14. If I had a chance to come back to the world… 15. Writing a story from a poem. 16. Writing a text-based on comics. Creating an environment that students can express themselves comfortably
was taken into consideration while developing creative writing activities. Sufficient time was provided for students to write their texts.

**Results**

**Test of Normality**

Kolmogorov-Smirnov test results for all sub-groups were reported to test normality. Statistical values obtained are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1.**

Results of Normality Tests According to Total Scale Scores of the Control and Experiment Groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Statistical Value</th>
<th>P Value*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Writing Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>0.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Writing Anxiety</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>Writing Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>0.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Writing Anxiety</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>Writing Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>0.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Writing Anxiety</td>
<td>0.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>0.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>Writing Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>0.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Writing Anxiety</td>
<td>0.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>0.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>Writing Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>0.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Writing Anxiety</td>
<td>0.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>0.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the results presented in Table 1, the total scores of control and experiment groups were distributed normally (p>.05). Independent and dependent t-tests were completed on all groups. The results of the analyses for each hypothesis are presented below.

1. For B2 level learners of Turkish as a second language, when the total pre-test scores for ‘writing self-efficacy’ scale were controlled, there was a significant difference between the experiment group in which creative writing practices were implemented and the control group in which traditional methods of instruction were implemented.
The results presented in Table 2 indicated that there was a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the control group in writing self-efficacy ($t_{(24)}=3.81; p<.05$).

The results in Table 3 showed that there was no significant difference between the control and the experiment group in pre-test scores in writing self-efficacy ($t_{(47)}=-.85; p>.05$). The control and the experiment group had similar means for pre-test scores.

The results in Table 4 showed that there was a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the experiment group ($T_{(23)}=-11.73; p<.01$). This difference was for the post-test scores of the experiment group. This indicated that interventions implemented in the experiment group had a positive and significant effect on the scores of writing self-efficacy.

The results presented in Table 2 indicated that there was a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the control group in writing self-efficacy ($t_{(24)}=3.81; p<.05$).

The results in Table 3 showed that there was no significant difference between the control and the experiment group in pre-test scores in writing self-efficacy ($t_{(47)}=-.85; p>.05$). The control and the experiment group had similar means for pre-test scores.

The results in Table 4 showed that there was a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the experiment group ($T_{(23)}=-11.73; p<.01$). This difference was for the post-test scores of the experiment group. This indicated that interventions implemented in the experiment group had a positive and significant effect on the scores of writing self-efficacy.

The results presented in Table 2 indicated that there was a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the control group in writing self-efficacy ($t_{(24)}=3.81; p<.05$).

The results in Table 3 showed that there was no significant difference between the control and the experiment group in pre-test scores in writing self-efficacy ($t_{(47)}=-.85; p>.05$). The control and the experiment group had similar means for pre-test scores.

The results in Table 4 showed that there was a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the experiment group ($T_{(23)}=-11.73; p<.01$). This difference was for the post-test scores of the experiment group. This indicated that interventions implemented in the experiment group had a positive and significant effect on the scores of writing self-efficacy.

The results presented in Table 2 indicated that there was a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the control group in writing self-efficacy ($t_{(24)}=3.81; p<.05$).

The results in Table 3 showed that there was no significant difference between the control and the experiment group in pre-test scores in writing self-efficacy ($t_{(47)}=-.85; p>.05$). The control and the experiment group had similar means for pre-test scores.

The results in Table 4 showed that there was a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the experiment group ($T_{(23)}=-11.73; p<.01$). This difference was for the post-test scores of the experiment group. This indicated that interventions implemented in the experiment group had a positive and significant effect on the scores of writing self-efficacy.

The results presented in Table 2 indicated that there was a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the control group in writing self-efficacy ($t_{(24)}=3.81; p<.05$).

The results in Table 3 showed that there was no significant difference between the control and the experiment group in pre-test scores in writing self-efficacy ($t_{(47)}=-.85; p>.05$). The control and the experiment group had similar means for pre-test scores.

The results in Table 4 showed that there was a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the experiment group ($T_{(23)}=-11.73; p<.01$). This difference was for the post-test scores of the experiment group. This indicated that interventions implemented in the experiment group had a positive and significant effect on the scores of writing self-efficacy.

The results presented in Table 2 indicated that there was a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the control group in writing self-efficacy ($t_{(24)}=3.81; p<.05$).

The results in Table 3 showed that there was no significant difference between the control and the experiment group in pre-test scores in writing self-efficacy ($t_{(47)}=-.85; p>.05$). The control and the experiment group had similar means for pre-test scores.

The results in Table 4 showed that there was a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the experiment group ($T_{(23)}=-11.73; p<.01$). This difference was for the post-test scores of the experiment group. This indicated that interventions implemented in the experiment group had a positive and significant effect on the scores of writing self-efficacy.
The results presented in Table 5 showed that there was a significant difference in post-test scores of the experiment and control groups in the writing self-efficacy scale ($T_{(47)} = -8.98; p < .01$). This difference was in favor of the experiment group. This indicated that the creative writing practices implemented in the experiment group had a positive and significant difference compared to the control group.

2. For the “Writing Anxiety Scale” for B2 level students learning Turkish as a second language, when the pre-test scores were controlled, there was a significant difference between the post-test scores in favour of the experiment group.

### Table 6.

**T-test Results for the Pre-test and Post-test Scores of the Control Group in Writing Anxiety.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32.24</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32.44</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level **Significant at the .01 level

According to the results in Table 6, there was no significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores in writing anxiety for the control group ($t_{(24)} = -0.21; p > .05$).

### Table 7.

**T-test Results for Pre-test Scores between the Control and Experiment Groups in Writing Anxiety.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32.24</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>-2.15</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36.28</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level **Significant at the .01 level

The results presented in Table 7 showed that there was no significant difference in pre-test scores between the control and experiment groups in writing anxiety ($t_{(47)} = -2.15; p > .05$). The pre-test scores of the control and experiment groups had similar means.

### Table 8.

**T-Test Results for Pre-test and Post-Test Scores of the Experiment Group in Writing Anxiety.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36.08</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28.41</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>action-oriented</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16.92</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13.38</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.16</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment-oriented</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.04</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level **Significant at the .01 level
According to the results shown in Table 8, there was a significant difference between the pretest and posttest scores of the experimental group in which creative writing activities were performed (T (23) = 5.51; p < .01). This difference was in favor of the pretest scores of the experimental group. Accordingly, the study conducted on the experimental group scores had a positive effect on writing anxiety scores. When the table was examined, the writing anxiety scale of the experimental group in which creative writing activities were carried out indicated the difference in the pre-test and post-test scores of the action-oriented sub-dimension (T (23) = 4.41; p < .01) and the pre-test and post-test scores of the environment-oriented sub-dimension (T (23) = 3.63; p < .05). This difference was in favor of the pretest scores of the experimental group. Accordingly, the change in the experimental group scores had a positive effect on writing anxiety environment and action-oriented subscale scores because anxiety level decreased as expected in posttest scores.

Table 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32.44</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>-2.63</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.012*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28.42</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.012*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level **Significant at the .01 level

The results in Table 9 showed that there was a significant difference in post-test scores between the experiment and the control group in writing anxiety (T (47) = 2.63; p < .05). This difference was in favor of the control group. The interventions implemented in the experiment group had a positive and significant difference compared to the control group because the level of anxiety decreased in the experiment group as expected.

3. There was a significant difference between the post-test scores of the experiment group in which creative writing practices were implemented and the control group in which traditional methods of instruction were implemented when the sum of pre-test scores of ‘Creative Writing Evaluation Scale’ were controlled.

Table 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39.68</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>-3.36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43.68</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>-3.36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.003*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level **Significant at the .01 level

According to the results presented in Table 10, there was a significant difference between the pre- and post-test scores of the control group in creative writing (t (24) = -3.36; p < .05).
Table 11.

**T-Test Results for Pre-Test Scores of the Control and Experiment Groups in Creative Writing.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39.68</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>-3.49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level **Significant at the .01 level

The results in Table 11 showed that there was a significant difference between the pre-test scores of the control and experiment groups in creative writing ($t_{(47)}=-3.49; p<.05$).

Table 12.

**T-Test Results Between the Pre- and Post-Test Scores of the Experiment Group in Creative Writing.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-scale</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>9.87</td>
<td>-25.17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>83.42</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>-13.44</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16.17</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Structure</td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30.33</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>-21.92</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>49.67</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing, Punctuation and Presentation</td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10.08</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>-13.84</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.58</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level **Significant at the .01 level

According to the results presented in Table 12, there was a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the experimental group in which creative writing activities were performed ($T_{(23)}=-25.17; p<.01$). This difference was in favor of the posttest scores of the experimental group. Accordingly, the change in experimental group scores had a positive effect on creative writing scores. In addition, when the sub-dimensions of the scale were examined, the creativity pre-test and posttest scores of the experimental group ($T_{(23)}=-13.44; p<.01$), the text structure pretest and posttest scores ($T_{(23)}=-21.92; p<.01$), and punctuation and presentation pretest and posttest scores ($T_{(23)}=-13.84; p<.01$) there was a significant difference. This difference was in favor of the post-test scores of the experimental group. Accordingly, the change in the experimental group scores had a positive effect on the creative writing scale and its sub-dimensions.

Table 13.

**T-Test Results of the Post-Test Scores Between the Control and Experiment Groups in Creative Writing.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43.68</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>-16.70</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>83.42</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level **Significant at the .01 level
The results in Table 13 showed that there was a significant difference between the post-test scores of the control and the experiment groups (T_{47}=-16.70; p<.01). This difference was in favor of the experiment group. The interventions in the experiment group had a positive and significant difference compared to the control group.

**Discussion, Conclusion, and Recommendations**

According to the research design, the desired analyses from pre-tests and post-tests were completed. The findings of the analyses are presented below:

1. There was not a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the control groups only for the second hypothesis.

2. A significant difference between the pre-test scores of the control and experiment groups was found only in the third hypothesis. In order to observe the effect of the interventions in groups with experimental designs, similar pre-test scores in both groups were expected. Thus, this was provided for the other research hypotheses.

3. Significant differences between the pre- and post-test scores of the experiment groups as a result of interventions were only found for the first and the third hypotheses. The significant difference for the second hypothesis was in favor of the pre-test due to the expected decrease in the anxiety scores. Therefore, the interventions resulted in a significant and positive effect on the experiment groups. This change is illustrated in Figure 1.

![Figure 1. The Change in the Mean Scores of Pre- and Post-Test in the Experiment Group](image-url)
As illustrated in Figure 1, the post-test scores of writing self-efficacy and creative writing scales in the experiment group were higher than the pre-test scores while it was the opposite in the writing anxiety scale. This was an expected outcome of the research as a decrease in the level of anxiety was expected.

![Graph showing the difference of control and experimental group scale score means.](image)

**Figure 2.** The change in the post-test mean scores of the control and experiment groups.

As illustrated in Figure 2, the post-test mean scores in the experiment groups were higher than the control group except for the writing anxiety scale. The post-test scores of the experiment group were lower than the control group.
Figure 3. Change in the mean scores of the pre- and post-test of the experiment group in the sub-scales of writing anxiety.

Figure 3 shows the change in the pre- and post-test scores of action- and environment-oriented scale scores. The decrease in the post-test scores indicated a decrease in the level of anxiety.

Figure 4. Change in the Mean Pre- and Post-Test Scores of the Experiment Group in the Sub-Scales of Creative Writing Scale.
Figure 4 shows the change in the pre- and post-test scores of creativity, text structure, and punctuation and presentation sub-scales of the creative writing scale. As illustrated, there was an increase in the post-test scores in all the sub-scales.

Writing skills are the most challenging skillset for students learning Turkish either as a native or as a second language. Departing from the current study, it can be said that activities throughout the process would contribute to students’ writing skills. In this study, it was found that creative writing practices were effective in improving students’ text writing and creativity levels. The presence of going outside the box, challenging imagination, being authentic, and writing by enjoying impacted students’ development especially in the creativity dimension. The literature shows to support that creative writing activities improve students’ creativity (Dorlay, 2018; Oztürk, 2007; Tonyali, 2010; Top, 2013).

Oztürk (2007) determined that creative writing skills improved 5th-grade students’ skills to include original (creative and extraordinary) thoughts in the texts they wrote. It was found that the pre- and post-test scores of “originality” in the texts written by students in the experiment and control groups were significantly different [F(1,38) = 11.39, p < .05]. Tonyali (2010) found a significant difference between the pre- and post-test scores of 6th grade students in the experiment group in which creative writing activities were performed. These findings support the current study’s findings. Creative writing activities are found to be effective in including original thoughts in writing. Another study supporting our findings was conducted by Top (2013). The researcher conducted the study with B1 and C1 level students learning Turkish as a second language and found that there was a significant difference in post-test scores of students who engaged in creative writing activities.

The findings of the study indicate that creative writing practices are effective in students’ written expression skills. Analyses revealed that the study was effective in students’ text structure, punctuation, and presentation dimensions. Oztürk (2007), in their study, found that creative writing practices were effective in students’ word choices in the texts they wrote, in improving sentence structures, reflecting organization (introduction, body, conclusion) in order, revealing their own styles, and expressing their feelings. These findings are compatible with the current study’s findings. Similarly, in Tonyali’s (2010) study, there was a significant difference in the scores for text structure, punctuation and presentation dimensions in the experiment and control groups. In studies conducted with 5th-grade students (Beydemir, 2010) and 6th-grade students (Korkmaz, 2015), the group that was instructed with a creative writing approach was more successful than the group that was instructed with traditional methods in teaching Turkish. Temizkan (2011) studied the impact of creative writing practices on the writing skills for story-writing of higher education students. The results of the study revealed that there was a significant difference between the post-test scores in story-writing skills of students in the experiment and control groups [t(29) = -5.172, p ≤ .05]. Top, Fidan, and Gunay (2015) determined that creative writing practices improve the writing skills of B1 and C1 level student learning Turkish as a second language. Therefore, this study is significant as it focuses on learning Turkish as a second language.
According to the findings of the study, creative writing practices had a positive impact on the perceptions of writing self-efficacy. Demir (2011) found a positive and statistically significant relationship between the creative writing levels and perceptions of writing self-efficacy of 8th-grade students. Korkmaz (2015) identified a positive effect of creative writing methods on 6th-grade students’ writing self-efficacy perceptions. Meier, McCarthy and Schmeck (1984) stated that writing self-efficacy increases the writing performance of college students. Buyukikiz (2011), in the study they conducted, found a significant relationship between the writing skills and writing self-efficacy perceptions of students learning Turkish as a second language.

One of the sub-questions of the research is whether creative writing practices have an impact on students’ writing anxiety. The current study showed that the intervention activities were effective on students’ writing anxiety. There are several studies in the literature focusing on writing anxiety which is an important factor impacting written expression success and development (Daly & Miller, 1975; Martinez, Kock & Cass, 2011; Yaman, 2010; Zorbaz, 2010). Daly (1985, p. 43) stated that students who have writing anxiety do not enjoy activities related to written expression. A high level of anxiety is one of the reasons that impact students’ success in written expression and that causes students to shy away from writing. Iscan (2015) studied writing anxiety in students learning Turkish as a second language and found that students had a high level of somatic and social anxiety while they had a low-level cognitive anxiety. In a study conducted by Maden, Dincel and Maden (2015), it was found that international students experience anxiety frequently when writing in Turkish, and the levels of anxiety vary depending on factors such as nationality, different alphabet, and reading habits.

Departing from the findings of the current study, it can be said that creative writing practices are effective in the writing skills of students learning Turkish as a second language. Based on the findings, recommendations can be made. Learning environments should be designed for students learning Turkish as a second language that allows them to express their opinions comfortably, express their emotions, and allow them to enjoy writing. Methods such as active learning, collaborative learning, or creative drama-based activities should be used effectively to improve students’ writing skills. Writing activities should be performed through a process-based learning model. Teachers should plan this process and provide guidance to students. In teaching Turkish as a second language, anxiety should be considered as an important factor, and attitudes, behaviors and actions to eliminate this anxiety should be developed during the education process. Practices to improve students’ perceptions of writing self-efficacy would also increase their academic success. Future research is recommended to identify the effects of creative writing practices on reading, speaking, and listening that are fundamental language skills.
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Yaratıcı Yazma Uygulamalarının Yabancı Dil Olarak Türkçe Öğrenen Öğrencilerin Yazma Becerilerine Etkisi

Atıf:


Özet

Problem Durumu: Yazma becerisi, hem ana dili eğitiminde hem de yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretiminde en son öğrenilen aynı zamanda en çok zorlanan bir beceri alanıdır. Yazma becerisi; kelime seçimi, kelimelerin bağlama uygun kullanımı, dil bilgisi kurallarının doğru kullanımı, anlamlı bir bütünlük, tutarlık, metin türü, tema, üstlup, yazım kuralları, noktalama işaretleri, sayfa düzeni, güzellik vb. birçok bileşene sahip olması nedeniyle, bilişsel ve psikomotor becerilerin birlikte işe koşulması gerektirir. Bu kadar unsuru bir arada barındırmak sebebiyle öğrencilerin en çok zorlandıkları bir beceri alanıdır. Yabancı dil öğretiminde yazılı anlatım becerilerinin geliştirilmesi özellikle o dilin fonetik, morfolojik, semantik ve sentaks yapısını bilmeyle mümkündür. Hedef dile ait bu yapıların süreç içerisinde aşama aşama basıncı karmasığa doğru verilmesi gerekmektedir. Yazma sürecinin planlanması ve aşamalı olarak öğrennenin yazısıklarını başlangıçta öğretmenle daha sonra kendi kendine izlemesi ve değerlendirilmesine ağırlık veren, yazmayı çeşitli...

Araştırmının Amacı: Bu araştırmada, yaratıcı yazma uygulamalarının yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrendikleri öğrencilerin yazma becerilerini, yazma özgürlük algıları ve yazma kayguları üzerindeki etkisini belirlemek amacıyla çalışılmıştır.


Bulgular: Yazma öz yeterlilik ölçeğine göre deney ve kontrol grubunun öntest puanları arasında anlamlı bir fark bulunamamıştır \((t_{(47)}=-.85; p>.05)\). Buna göre kontrol ve deney gruplarının öntest puanlarının benzer ortalamaları sahip olduğu görülüktedir. Yazma öz yeterlilik ölçeğine göre deney ve kontrol gruplarının sontest puanları arasında anlamlı bir fark bulunmamaktadır \((t_{(47)}=8.98; p<.01)\). Bu farklılık deney grubu puanları lehinedir. Buna göre deney grubu üzerinde yapılan değişimleme kontrol grubuna göre pozitif ve anlamlı bir farklılık oluşturmuştur. Yazma kaygısı ölçeğine göre deney ve kontrol gruplarının öntest puanları arasında anlamlı bir fark bulunmamıştır \((t_{(47)}=-2.15; p>.05)\). Buna göre deney ve kontrol gruplarının öntest puanlarının benzer ortalamaları sahip olduğu görülmektedir. Yazma kaygısı ölçeğine göre deney grubu puanları lehinedir ve kontrol grubunda puanlar düşmüştür. Buna göre deney grubu puanları lehinedir ve kontrol grubunda puanlar düşmüştür. Buna göre deney grubundaki puanların Sontest puanları arasında anlamlı bir farklılık bulunmıştır \((t_{(47)}=2.63; p<.05)\). Bu farklılık kontrol grubu puanları lehinedir. Buna göre deney grubu puanları lehinedir ve kontrol grubunda puanlar düşmüştür. Bunu nedeni kaygı puanlarındaki beklenilen azalmadır. Buna göre deney gruplarında yapılan değişimleme pozitif yönde anlamlı bir etki yaratmıştır. Deney grubunda yazma öz yeterlilik ve yaratıcı yazma ölçeklerinin sontest puanlarının öntest puanlarına göre daha yüksek olduğu görülmüştür. Yazma kaygısı ölçeğinde ise durum tam tersidir. Araştırmada çıktı beklenen bir durumdur. Çünkü kaygı seviyesinde azalma beklenmektedir. Araştırmadan elde edilen bulgular, yaratıcı yazma etkinliklerinin öğrencilerin yazılı anlatı becerileri üzerinde etkili olduğunu göstermektedir.


Araştırmaların sonuçlarından hareketle şu önerilere yer verilebilir. Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrenen öğrencilerin öğrenme öğretme ortamları, öğrencilerin düşüncelerini rahatlıkla ifade edebilecekleri, duyugularını akıcı bir şekilde anlayabilecekleri, yazmadan zevk alabilecekleri bir şekilde tasarlanmalıdır. Öğrencilerin yazılı anlatı becerilerinin geliştirilmesinde aktif öğrenme, işbirlikli öğrenme, yaratıcı dramaya dayalı çalışmalar gibi yöntem ve teknikler etkin bir şekilde kullanılmalıdır. Yazma çalışmaları sürec temelli öğrenme modeli doğrultusunda kullanılmıştır. İkiyle karşılaştırmalar için ise bağımlı ve bağımsız gruplar için t-testleri yapılmıştır.
gerçekleştirilmelidir. Öğretmenlerin bu süreci planlayıp uygulamaları ve öğrencilere gerekli rehberliği yapmaları gerekir. Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretiminde kaygının önemli bir etken olduğunu görülmeli, eğitim sürecinde bu kaygıyi giderecek tutum, davranış ve eylemler geliştirilmelidir. Öğrencilerin yazma öz yeterlilik algılarını artırmaya yönelik çalışmalar, onların yazma akademik başarısını da artıracaktır. Yaratıcı yazmanın diğer dil becerilerine etkisi ölçülebilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Türkçe eğitti, yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretimi, yazma becerisi, kaygı, öz yeterlilik