




Examination of classroom writing practices in the context of process-based approach to teaching writing

Tuncay Türkben^{a 1} 

^a Aksaray University, Aksaray, Turkey

APA Citation:

Türkben, T. (2021). Examination of classroom writing practices in the context of process-based approach to teaching writing. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(Special Issue 1), 619-644.

Submission Date: 19/11/2020

Acceptance Date: 15/01/2021

Abstract

This research was conducted to evaluate the efforts made by Turkish teachers on developing written expression in their classrooms by considering the basic principles of the process-based writing approach and to determine whether the students' written expressions meet the basic principles of the process-based writing approach. In this respect, the method of the research was determined as a case study, a qualitative research design, and the study group consisted of 24 Turkish teachers teaching 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th grades and 24 students enrolled in these classrooms. Maximum variation sampling, a purposeful sampling method, was used to form the study group. A semi-structured interview form was used with 24 selected teachers, and the practices of these teachers and the reactions of the students in these classes were observed. A content analysis was completed in analyzing the data obtained from the observation and interview forms. In addition, the texts written by the students participating in the study were analyzed using the planned writing and evaluation scale. According to the findings obtained from the research, it was determined that in-class written expression activities were not carried out in line with the process-oriented writing approach and that the written expression products of the students did not meet the process-based writing criteria.

© 2021 JLLS and the Authors - Published by JLLS.

Keywords: Turkish education; writing education; process-based writing education; in-class writing activities

1. Introduction

While writing is one of the most effective ways of self-expression, it is difficult as it requires high-level skills, but it also ensures retention of knowledge which is why it is a necessary skill. Writing is the process of organizing the emotions, thoughts and information that are structured in the mind and putting them on paper or another platform with symbols that form a meaningful structure (Zorbaz, 2010). Writing is a complex process that requires coordination of many cognitive skills such as planning, gathering, editing, and reviewing which can be learned through application and structured feedback, and that provides high-level thinking (Benjamin, 2005; Canady, 2008; Evans, 2001; García & Fidalgo,

¹ Corresponding author.

E-mail address: tuncayturkben57@gmail.com

2008). Writing has cognitive, affective, and psychomotor dimensions (Karatay, 2013; Rosenblum, Weiss, & Parush, 2003; Rubin & Handerson, 1982; Tseng & Chow, 2000; Yılmaz, 2012). The cognitive dimension of the writing consists of the mental processing and interpretation of the acquired information, observations, and thoughts, while the affective dimension consists of the simplicity, fluency, attractiveness, the beauty, and readability of the writing. The common use of muscle movements in writing and the use of notebook, paper and pencil constitutes the psychomotor dimension of writing (Gülyüz, 2000, p.6; Köksal, 1999, p.5). Writing is a complex cognitive activity that requires a set of processes and strategies. In the writing process, the writer must perform many cognitive processes in a coordinated manner to express their feelings and thoughts effectively and to convey a meaningful message to the reader (Flowers & Hayes, 1981). In this context, writing is the language skill that students have the most difficulty and that is the most difficult to develop (Albertson & Billingsley, 2000; Demirel & Şahinel, 2006; Güneyli, 2016; Maltepe, 2006; Keçik & Uzun, 2004; Olinghouse & Santangelo, 2010; Raimes, 1983; Yalçın, 2018).

Although many studies have been and continue to be conducted in the field of teaching writing in our country, writing instruction is still not carried out at the desired level. Studies conducted emphasize that the writing products of students in various educational levels in Turkey do not meet the "good writing" criterion (Arıcı & Ugan, 2008; Demir, 2013; Kurudayıoğlu & Karadağ, 2010; Karadağ & Kayabaşı, 2013; Sallabaş, 2007). This situation shows that teachers approach teaching with a traditional understanding, that feedback and revision processes are not followed adequately, that writing skills are believed to be a skill specific to some people and that it is perceived as a difficult process. Richards (2000) states that writing is an involuntary task and lists the reasons for the difficulties experienced in the lessons as boredom, lack of knowledge required for sub-skills, the student not being interested in the topic given, the inability of the student to be motivated enough in writing, and not being taught ways to facilitate writing. According to Güneyli (2016), the adoption of product-based writing as opposed to process-based writing in teaching and ignoring the emotional dimension by focusing on the cognitive dimension of writing have led students in Turkey over time to perceive writing as a special talent or skill. Thus, students believe that not everyone can have writing skills and they develop a negative attitude towards writing. The writing process is a field that developed later than other learning areas, but it includes skills that can be learned. Therefore, students should be encouraged to internalize writing, to see that writing is not a very difficult task, and to express their feelings and thoughts in writing through the activities organized during the writing education process (Sever, 2013).

The deficiencies and problems related to the acquisition of writing skills in every step of education from primary education to higher education and in various professions, and the need for an effective writing system continues to be expressed consistently. In studies focusing on teaching writing with the purpose of improving writing skills, two types of approaches come to the fore: product-based writing approach and process-based writing approach. The product-based writing approach focuses on the writing product, and the important aspect in this approach is the correct application of the technique (Oral, 2008). This approach may be insufficient to improve writing skills as it accepts all students as equal by not taking individual differences in the writing process into consideration; it adopts a teacher-centered understanding, focuses on structural elements and on the product rather than the process (Tabak & Göçer, 2013, p.150). The process-based approach, on the other hand, does not consider writing as just creating a text, but accepts it as a process. This approach is based on the principle of dividing the writing process into certain steps to provide students with successful written expression skills. The process-based writing approach includes the stages of pre-writing preparation, drafting, writing through reviewing and organizing, editing, and publishing/sharing (Akyol, 2014; Tavşanlı & Kaldırım, 2020; Tompkins, 2002). Writing in the Turkish curriculum prepared in line with a constructivist approach is seen as a skill to be acquired by the student in the process.

1.1. Teaching Writing with a Process-Based Approach

Process-based teaching is a learning and teaching method and a strategy that focuses on the student's process awareness, thinking by increasing their alertness, independent learning, self-decision making, problem solving and planning (Duman, 2004, p. 74). The process-oriented writing approach is a teaching approach that considers written expression activities not as a product, but as a process, and that attempts to reveal what students think, what they do in the writing process, and the characteristics of the writing process based on the written expression products. According to the constructivist learning theory perspective, this approach aims to organize writing processes with the cognitive support of teachers (Kaldırım, 2014). Process-based writing is an approach that emphasizes the necessity of focusing on the process, which is the answer to the question of "how" rather than the product, which is the answer to the question of "what" was written (Ülper, 2008). One of the models based on process-based writing is the 4+1 planned writing and evaluation model, and the other is the 6+1 analytical writing and evaluation model. The analytical writing and evaluation model focuses on *ideas, organization, style, word choice, sentence fluency, spelling, and presentation features*. In this study, classroom writing practices were examined in line with the planned writing and evaluation model.

The 4+1 Planned Writing and Evaluation Model is based on a process-based writing approach. It requires people to express their feelings and thoughts in a planned manner, to put them in a certain order and to present them in a coherent way (Karadağ, 2016). The process-based learning-teaching model creates a framework for in-class learning and teaching activities and enables teachers to provide information to their students about plans and planning (Doğan, 2020, p.329). The planned writing and evaluation model consists of the following stages (Akyol, 2014; Karatay, 2013; Tabak & Göçer, 2013; Tompkins, 2002; Zorbaz, 2014):

During the *preparation* phase, students should be willing to write before deciding on the writing topic. Students should be motivated to write with different activities in the classroom. In 4+1 PWEM, writing preparation activities are in two forms that are short- and long-term. The purpose of short-term preparation activities is to motivate students and direct them to write. These activities can be done ten or fifteen minutes before starting to write. In long-term preparation activities, there is gradual research and gathering of information. Brainstorming, clustering method, using a sample text, using pictures, question-answer technique and discussion technique can be used in the preparation phase (Karatay, 2013). At this stage, students prepare for writing. Pre-writing preparation phase includes sub-stages in itself such as "*topic selection, determining the goal, determining the target audience, determining the type of writing, and organizing thoughts on the subject*" (Akyol, 2014, p.109). In order for the preparation phase to be implemented efficiently, attention should be paid primarily to the choice of the subject, and the principle of relativity to the student should be taken into account in the selection of the subject (Doğan, 2020, p.338). Care should be taken in the selection of topics that are of interest to children. With the determination of the topic, it is important for students to determine the purpose for which they write because this affects students' decisions regarding the target audience and genre (Tompkins, 2005, p.133). After determining the target audience and the genre to be written, what the student needs to do is to collect and organize the thoughts, information and events that can be used in the text (Zorbaz, 2014, p. 119).

In the *planning (writing a draft)* stage, the student creates a writing plan by considering the subject and the main idea as a result of their preparation. In studies on writing skills, it is often emphasized that planning is the focal point of the writing process (Aydın, 2019). The main and sub-headings of the subject, the introduction, development, and conclusion sections are determined for short texts with the use of a draft (Karatay, 2013, p. 33). At this stage, the student can review and change the purpose, target audience and type of writing that they identified in the preparation phase, make changes on the text,

change the paragraphs and add new sections in incomplete sections. In short, the student should take into consideration that writing is a process, a draft is a text that needs to be developed, and should focus mainly on the content (Zorbaz, 2014, p. 127). In this process, the teacher can be a model for their students. If fluency and coherence cannot be achieved in the draft text, the draft writing phase can be repeated several times.

During the *reviewing/organizing/developing phase*, students review the draft they create. They share their writings with their classmates and groups, and exchange views with the teacher. They revise in line with the feedback they receive (Akyol, 2014, p. 113). In this reorganization process, changes such as additions, supports, deletions and replacements are made (Faigley & Witte, 1981).

In the *editing* phase, it is checked whether the sentences and paragraphs in the written expression product are listed in a logical coherence, whether the ways of developing the thought are used correctly, whether the quotation techniques are applied correctly, and the status of the text in terms of semantic coherence (Karatay, 2013, p. 37). In addition, the texts written by students are evaluated in terms of language and expression and edits are made where necessary.

The *presentation* stage is the last stage of the writing process. After the preparation, planning (drafting, organizing, and editing stages), the texts written by the students are shared with others. The 4+1 Planned Writing and Evaluation Model is generally implemented by following the steps mentioned above. However, in the writing process, it is more appropriate for students to use a process called iterative or spiral, in which they can navigate between these stages, sometimes go forward or backward rather than using a linear approach (Aşıkcan & Pilten, 2016). Success of the act of writing and obtaining a good written expression product depend on the creation of the text step by step through certain stages. In this process, the teacher should help students to fulfill their writing task independently by providing them constructive feedback.

Studies in the field show that process-based writing education positively affects the writing skills of students and increases the quality of the writing (Ahraz, 2018; Aksu, 2015; Altuner, 2017; Arıcı & Kaldırım, 2015; Balcı, 2017; Bayat, 2014; Çakır, 2003; Dilidüzgün, 2013; Görgüç, 2016; Erdoğan, 2012; Erdoğan & Yangın, 2014; Kaldırım, 2014; Karatay, 2011; Karatosun, 2014; Kurt, 2019; Özdemir, 2014; Özkara, 2007; Sezgin, 2016). Although many studies have been and continue to be done in the field of teaching writing in our country, there are studies showing that writing instruction still cannot be achieved at the desired level (Alkan, 2007; Arı, 2010; Arıcı & Urgan, 2008; Bağcı, 2010; Bahşi & Sis, 2019; Büyükkız, 2007; Demir, 2013; Derman, 2020; Ekinci Çelikipazu, 2006; Erbilin, 2014; Kaynaş & Anılan, 2015; Kırbaş, 2008; Sallabaş, 2007; Temizkan & Erdevir, 2019; Temizkan & Erbilin, 2020). When studies were examined, it was seen that there are studies on determining the effects of different methods and techniques on developing written expression skills while there are other studies focusing on determining the current writing level. Studies on the source of the problem are almost nonexistent. Aşıkcan and Pilten (2016) found in their study conducted at the primary school level that writing activities are mostly done by using traditional methods. The researchers found that most of the teachers were not aware of the process-based writing model and did not include them in writing activities in their lessons.

There is no study examining classroom writing practices at the middle school level. In the literature, it is stated that the learning area that students have the most difficulty is writing, but this learning area includes skills that can be improved. Studies show that process-based writing activities are effective in writing education. It is stated that a process-based writing approach is adopted in writing education in the Turkish lesson teaching program. The fact that process-based writing activities are effective on writing skills and although this approach is adopted in the curriculum regarding the implementation of writing activities, it is not implemented at the desired level in writing education which requires

examination of how in-class writing learning and teaching activities are implemented. In this context, the examination of written expression studies in the second level of primary education in line with the basic principles of process-based writing education in the present study reveals the importance of the study. In this context, the examination of written expression studies in the second level of primary education (middle school) in line with the basic principles of process-based writing education reveals the importance of the study.

1.2. Research Purpose

This study aims to evaluate the written expression development activities carried out by Turkish teachers in their classrooms by considering the basic principles of the process-based writing model and to determine whether the texts created by students meet the principles of process-based writing. Accordingly, answers to the questions below were sought:

1. What are teachers' opinions about the function of writing activities in achieving the writing goals
2. and objectives of the Turkish Language Curriculum?
3. In the written expression of Turkish lessons in middle school education (5th-8th grades), in line
4. with the basic principles of process-based writing education;
- 2.1. Are "pre-writing preparation" activities implemented?
- 2.2. Are "planning (drafting)" activities implemented?
- 2.3. Are "reviewing/editing /developing" activities implemented?
- 2.4. Are "revising" activities implemented?
- 2.5. Are "presentation/sharing" activities implemented?
3. Do students' written expressions meet the basic principles of process-based writing education?

2. Method

The research model was determined as a case study which is one of the qualitative research designs. A case study is a qualitative approach that collects detailed and in-depth information about real life, a current limited system (a situation) or multiple constrained systems (situations) in a given time period through multiple sources of information (e.g. observations, interviews, audio-visual materials, documents and reports), and describes a situation or reveals themes (Creswell, 2016, p.97). The study focuses on process-based writing education. Qualitative data collection methods (observation and interview) and qualitative data analysis (content analysis) methods were used in this study.

2.1. Study Group

The study group of the research consists of the teachers selected in line with the purposeful sampling method and the students of these teachers in 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th grades. Interview forms were implemented with 24 Turkish teachers who teach 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th grades in seven different public middle schools in the city of Aksaray, and the teachers in 24 different classes and one student from each classroom were observed for a week. In the study group consisting of Turkish teachers, there were 13 female and 11 male teachers. 15 of the teachers are graduates of Education Faculty and 9 of Faculty of Arts and Science. There are five teachers between the ages of 24-29 and 30-34, and fourteen teachers aged 35 and over. In terms of professional seniority, five teachers were between 4-9 years, seven teachers between 10-14 years and twelve teachers with 15 years or more. Six teachers, each with an average class size of 20-24 people, 25-29 people, 30-34 people and 35 or more people, were in the study group. In the study group consisting of students, there were 12 male and 12 female students. There were

8 students each with low, medium, and high academic achievement and 6 students each in 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th grades.

2.2. Data Collection

In the study, the data were collected by interview and observation methods. Semi-structured interview and observation forms were implemented to Turkish teachers. The interview form is a method developed to ensure that all dimensions and questions related to the research problem are covered (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2013, p.150). The semi-structured interview form included questions about whether the teachers included the stages of preparation, drafting, editing, reviewing, and publishing in their written expression activities, and if so, what they did at these stages. The other data collection tool was the observation form. Observation is a method used to describe in detail the behavior that occurs in any environment or institution (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2013, p.199). 24 teachers who were interviewed and 24 students in their classes were observed using the observation forms. A semi-structured observation form was used to observe whether in-class writing practices were carried out in line with process-oriented writing education. Student products of written expression activities were also examined as documents.

2.3. Data Analysis

A descriptive analysis was completed on the data obtained from the interviews, and the categories that emerged in the analysis were created based on the literature. In descriptive analysis, direct quotations are frequently used to reflect the views of individuals interviewed or observed (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2013). A document analysis was used in the evaluation and analysis of the written expression products. Document analysis includes analyzing the written materials containing information about the phenomenon or cases that are investigated (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2013). The texts produced by the students were analyzed in line with the 4+1 Planned Writing and Evaluation Scale developed by Karatay (2013). In this model, the criteria that should be in a good article consist of 5 sections. There is a total of 30 items in the scale including *preparation, planning, development, revision, and presentation*. In the scale, the features that should be included in a text are evaluated as "no, partially sufficient and yes". The writing activities implemented were evaluated together by the researcher and another teacher who is an expert in the field. During the document analysis, based on the written expression products of the students, probe questions were asked to reveal what students thought, what they did in the writing process, and what kind of features the writing process had.

The following coding and description techniques were used in the analysis of the data obtained through the interview and observation form:

E₁, E₂, E₃...: Teachers consulted,

Ö₁, Ö₂, Ö₃...: Students consulted,

A: Observations by the researcher,

AÖ₁, AÖ₂, AÖ₃...: The researcher's observations about the student consulted,

AE₁, AE₂, AE₃...: The researcher's observations about the teacher consulted,

[¹], [²], [³] ...: Noteworthy and quoted answers of the participants.

Validity and Reliability: The process of collecting and analyzing the data to ensure the validity of the study is explained in detail. In order to ensure the internal reliability (consistency) of the research, the analysis of the data consisting of the evaluations made for the written expression activities was completed by the researcher, and the analysis of the data obtained from the interview forms was

completed by another field expert. Afterwards, the data were exchanged and analyzed again. Thus, the reliability of the results obtained was confirmed. In the last phase, a joint decision was reached by comparing the analyses made by the researcher and the field expert. The roles and responsibilities of the researcher and field expert were clarified within the scope of the external reliability (verifiability) of the research. The roles and responsibilities of the researcher and the expert can be described as planning, conducting and terminating the research, collecting data, carrying out the implementation, making the necessary analyses and reporting the findings and results.

3. Results

Research findings are presented by considering sub-problems.

1. The first question of the study is *"What are the teachers' opinions about the function of writing activities in achieving the writing goals and objectives of the Turkish Teaching Program?"* Within the scope of the research, the opinions of the teachers about the function of writing activities in reaching the writing objectives in the Turkish teaching program were sought. The responses from the interviewed teachers regarding the function of writing activities in the textbook were grouped under three themes: positive opinions, negative opinions, and suggestions in terms of improving writing skills. Six of the teachers who shared positive opinions stated that writing activities improved the writing skills, while five stated that if the writing activities are handled in accordance with the instructions, then they would improve the writing skills. Two of them stated that writing activities would improve students' writing skills because they were suitable for the students' level and the other two stated that they would improve the students' skills as they attracted the attention of students. Accordingly, the statement of one of the teachers is as follows: *"Activities are applicable, understandable activities and appropriate to the student's level. We try to help students gain the targeted outcomes during the semester through activities."* (E₃) [1]. Four of the teachers who shared negative opinions stated that the activities are insufficient in terms of "level appropriateness", one teacher thinks in terms of "fitness for purpose", two in "applicability" and two in "understandability". One of these teachers stated *"Some activities fall short of meeting the outcomes. Or the skills and outcomes to be gained with the purpose of the activity do not match. There are activities that are not suitable for the purpose or the level in the textbook."* (E₇) [2]. Another teacher stated, *"We cannot allocate much time to writing skills. Since the implementation of the activities takes a lot of time, sometimes we have to skip some activities, or we assign them as homework."* (E₁₁) [3]. Another teacher's view is as follows: *"Some activities are easy, so students get bored and some are difficult which discourage students"* (E₄) [4]. In relation to the topic, recommendations are shared, such as *"Environmental characteristics, students' interests and needs should be taken into consideration when preparing the activity"* (E₁) [5] *"Writing should be planned as a separate lesson, the necessary time should be given for implementation,"* (E₅) [6], *"Activities that can get the attention of students should be prepared"* (E₉) [7], *"Most of the activities are similar or the same activities are repeated. Activities should be designed in line with different methods and techniques that will motivate students"* (E₁₂) [8]. It is understood from the teachers' opinions that to reach the goals and outcomes stated in the program, importance should be given to activity preparation, selection, application, and evaluation activities.

2. In this section, the answers provided to the questions of *"Are the basic principles of the process-based writing approach used in written expression activities in Turkish lessons in middle school (5-8th grades)?"* and *"Do students' written expressions meet the principles of process-based writing model?"* were evaluated together. Since classroom writing practices were examined in line with the stages of the process-based writing approach, it is thought that it would be useful to examine the teachers' opinions, the researcher's in-class observations and the student documents together for each stage.

Table 1. Activities implemented during preparation prior to writing

Theme	Code	Interview		Observation	
		f	%	f	%
Preparation Prior to Writing	Motivating for writing	5	20.83	4	16.67
	Researching the topic	3	12.50	4	16.67
	Topic selection	9	37.50	11	45.83
	Goal setting	3	12.50	4	16.67
	Determining the target audience	3	12.50	2	8.33
	Determining the genre	10	41.67	7	29.17
	Determining and organizing the thoughts on the topic	-	0	3	12.50

As shown in Table 1, 20.83% (f: 5) of the teachers participating in the study stated that they carried out activities to increase the writing motivation of students prior to writing. In the observation of classroom practices, it was seen that 16.67% (f: 4) of the teachers encouraged students to trust themselves before writing and made efforts to increase their writing motivation. While 12.50% (f: 3) of the teachers participating in the study stated that they asked the students to do research on the topic before writing, it was observed that this rate was 16.67% (f: 4). Activities on topic selection before writing were 37.50% according to teachers' opinions (f: 9), and 45.83% (f: 11) according to observation data. While 12.50% (f: 3) of the teachers stated that they do activities for the goal setting stage after topic selection, it was observed that 16.67% (f: 4) of the teachers performed activities to determine the purpose of writing. Only 12.50% (f: 3) of the teachers stated that they guide the students to determine the target audience. The rate of teachers who stated that after determining the genre, they engage in activities to determine the purpose of writing was 41.67% (f: 10) while this rate was found to be 29.17% (f: 7) in the observation. In the interview, none of the teachers stated that they engage in activities about determining and organizing the thoughts on the subject, while it was observed that 12.50% of the teachers (f: 3) engaged in these activities together with the students.

According to the findings obtained from the interviews with the teachers participating in the research and the observation findings of classroom writing practices, most of the teachers do not have preparatory work prior to writing. However, a good preparation is essential for a good quality of text. Preparation studies have an important place in the process-based writing model. It was determined that most Turkish teachers give their students a topic to write about and they expect their students to write the text in one lesson hour. It was observed that students had difficulty in starting to write because methods such as cluster method, brainstorming, listing, using sample texts, using pictures, cubing, associative writing, 5W1H were not used. It was found that the teachers provide explanations about the topic mostly through direct lectures, and then task the students to write about the topic. This shows that teachers implement writing practices with traditional methods and do not observe the basic principles of process-based writing education. It is normal for students who do not gain sufficient skills regarding the writing stages to be reluctant in writing activities. Teachers need to develop themselves in writing education and teaching approaches and help students to gradually gain these skills by using different methods, techniques, and strategies in the classroom.

Some of the teachers' views that support the above findings are as follows: *E₁: "I bring quality texts on the topic and genre of the article and read it in class. I discuss the text with the students. This is how I prepare students for the topic and the genre of writing. Then the students start to write their own texts. The writing topics in the book sometimes do not interest students or are not suitable for their level. In such a case, I determine different topics together with the students."* [¹]. *E₃: "I do preparation work for the topic of writing. I prepare the students for the lesson using the question and answer method."* [²]. *E₇: "Before starting to write, I give information about the topic of writing and what should be done in*

the writing process according to the intended outcomes. " [3]. E₁₃: "Before starting the activity, I read the writing instructions aloud. I start the writing activity after getting the students' views on writing." [4].

Table 2. Findings on the evaluation of students' written expressions in terms of " pre-writing preparation"

Theme	Code	No		Partially		Yes	
		f	%	f	%	f	%
Preparation Prior to Writing	1. Text has a topic.	5	20.83	8	33.33	11	45.83
	2. Keywords and key concepts are determined.	17	70.83	5	20.83	2	8.33
	3. Limited the topic of the text.	19	79.17	3	12.50	2	8.33
	4. Text has a purpose (main theme).	9	37.50	10	41.67	5	20.83
	5. Text has a target audience.	15	62.50	5	20.83	4	16.67
	6. Researched the topic.	17	70.83	4	16.67	3	12.50
	7.Used different source for the text.	16	66.67	5	20.83	3	12.50
	8.Organized the information gathered for the text.	17	70.83	5	20.83	2	8.33

According to the findings in Table 2, it is seen that 20.83% (f: 5) of the students' written expressions before writing did not have a certain topic or the topic was not clear, 33.33% (f: 8) did not have a determined topic while 45.83% (f: 11) had a clear topic. In the study, it was determined that 70.83% (f: 17) of the students did not determine the keywords and basic concepts of the text before writing, 20.83% (f: 5) had missing elements, 8.33% (f: 2) determined the keywords of the article on the topic sufficiently. 79.17% of the students (f: 19) did not limit the topic of writing, 12.50% (f: 3) tried to limit the topic of writing but they went off topic, and 8.33% (f: 2) limited their topic clearly. According to the findings in Table 2, 37.50% of the students (f: 9) did not determine the purpose of writing correctly, 41.67% (f: 10) tried to determine the purpose of writing but it was not understandable enough, and 20.83% (f: 5) determined the purpose of writing clearly. 62.50% (f: 15) of the students did not determine a target audience for their written expressions, 20.83% (f: 5) did not determine their target audience, and 16.67% (f: 4) determined the target audience clearly. According to the findings, the majority of the students (70.83%; f: 17) did not do research on the topic before writing, some of them did research but not at a sufficient level (16.67%; f: 4), and very few students (12.50%; f: 3) did enough research before writing. The rate of the students who did not research the topic of the text from different sources is 66.67% (f: 16), the rate of those who did not do it at a sufficient level is 20.83% (f: 5), and the rate of those who used different sources sufficiently is 12.50% (f: 3). It was found that 70.83% (f: 17) of the students did not organize the information they gathered at all, 20.83% (f: 5) had incomplete or inaccurate information, and 8.33% (f: 2) organized the information in line with the purpose.

Some student views about the implementation of in-class pre-writing activities are as follows: Ö₂: "I thought about the topic that our teacher gave. I started writing what came to my mind." [1]. Ö₄: "Our teacher wants us to do research on the topic before the writing activity. So, I collected information on the topic from the internet and books." [2].

The observation made by the researcher shows that the necessary pre-writing activities were not done. Teachers often ask them to do the writing activities in the textbook. Most of the students wait too long as they have no idea what to write. Since the topic given is mostly not limited, it is seen that students move from one idea to another in their written expressions. This situation makes writing difficult. It also increases students' anxiety levels.

Some notes from the researcher's observations about the students participating in the research are as follows: *A₀₂*: ““The student waited for a long time as they did not have any prior knowledge on the topic of the writing activity. They had a hard time because they came to class without doing research.” [1]. *A₀₉*: “The student was trying to find a title before starting to write. This situation caused losing time.” [2] *A₀₁₂*: “The student thought for 2-3 minutes before starting to write. They tried to identify something in their mind. Then they started writing without creating a draft. When I observed the student, I realized that the student only paid attention to the page layout and appearance.” [3] *A₀₁₈*: “The teacher asked the students to write a fairy tale about justice. There was no preliminary preparation on the topic in the classroom. Like other students, the student observed was also in doubt about what to write. There were also no students preparing a draft on the topic of writing in the classroom. The teacher did not have such a suggestion either.” [4].

Table 3. Activities implemented during the planning (drafting)

Theme	Code	Interview		Observation	
		f	%	f	%
Planning (Drafting)	Creating a writing plan appropriate for text	1	4.17	2	8.33
	Determining the main and sub-headings of text	5	20.83	9	37.50
	Turning ideas into written expressions using the plan	1	4.17	1	4.17
	Organizing the ideas according to the text structure	1	4.17	2	8.33
	Using connecting elements, and transitional and introductory sentences to ensure text organization and coherence in the text	2	8.33	3	12.50

In process-based writing, considering that each step is related to each other, it is important to have a good plan before starting to write. The drafting stage is the first stage in which the student starts writing. This draft can change and transform during the writing process. Based on the findings in Table 3, it is seen that teachers hardly give any importance to writing planning or do not emphasize this stage at all. Only one of the teachers (4.17%) who participated in the study stated that while starting to write, drafting was emphasized. During the time periods when in-class writing practices were observed, it was observed that 2 teachers (8.33%) worked on developing a draft with students. In the interviews with the teachers, 20.83% (f: 5) of the teachers stated that they want students to determine the main and sub-headings while creating their texts, and the rate of the teachers who stated that the main and sub-headings should be determined in classroom practices was 37.50% (f: 9). According to the findings, it was understood that only one teacher (4.17%) engaged in activities for expressing feelings and thoughts about the topic according to the plan. There is 1 (4.17%) teacher who stated that they do an activity to sort the ideas according to the text structure. During the implementations, it was observed that 2 teachers (8.33%) worked together with the students to sort the ideas in line with the text structure. There are 2 teachers (8.33%) who encourage students to use connecting elements, transitional and introductory sentences in the text creation process. During the in-class practices, it was observed that 3 teachers (12.50%) guided the students about the topic before starting to write and made the necessary warnings. Most of the teachers stated that they do not have the drafting work done due to losing time. Since the draft writing activities are not given enough importance, students cannot have the opportunity to present their ideas and write them down. During the writing process, it was observed that most of the students were indecisive in writing and therefore lost time. In this respect, the writing a draft facilitates the writing activities for students.

Some of the teachers' views that support the above findings are as follows: *E₁₀*: “Students prepare drafts by listing their feelings and thoughts that are presented verbally before writing.” [1] *E₁₅*: “Students do

not yet have the skills to create drafts in their writings and edit them afterwards. They write down what they think. " [2]. E₂₁: "I used to not develop a draft, but I think it matters after a certain grade level. From now on, I will include drafting studies before starting writing activities." [3].

Table 4. Findings regarding the evaluation of students' written expressions in terms of "planning"

Theme	Code	No		Partially		Yes	
		f	%	f	%	f	%
Planning (Drafting)	9.Had a draft in line with the text.	19	79.17	3	12.50	2	8.33
	10.Determined the main and sub-headings of text.	9	37.50	8	33.33	7	29.17
	11.Determined the introduction, body, and conclusion sections of text	16	66.67	5	20.83	3	12.50
	12.There is connection between the sections.	17	70.83	4	16.67	3	12.50

According to the findings in Table 4, it is seen that the planning activities in the written expressions of the students were insufficient. It was determined that 79.17% (f: 19) of the students participating in the study did not make a writing plan suitable for text, 12.50% (f: 3) had excessive or missing parts in the drafts they tried to create, and only 8.33% of the students (f: 2) created a writing plan suitable for the topic of writing. In the document analysis, it was seen that 37.50% of the students (f: 9) did not determine the main and sub-headings of the text, 33.33% (f: 8) were insufficient in determining the main and sub-headings, and only 29.17% (f: 7) determined the main and sub-headings of the text. In 66.67% (f: 16) of the students' written expressions, there are no sections such as introduction, development and conclusion or layout, node and solution, in 20.83% (f: 5) these sections are not explicit, and in 12.50% (f: 3) these parts are clear and understandable. The majority of students' written texts (70.83%; f: 17) had disconnections and inconsistencies between the parts of the text, 16.67% (f: 4) had a general coherence between the sections of the text they wrote, although some sections of the text needed to be revised. It was observed that a very small number of students (12.50%: f: 3) had coherence in terms of meaning between the sections of their written expressions.

Some of the students' views about the implementation of in-class writing activities are as follows: Ö₄: "Before writing, I don't know how to start. ... I am having difficulties in making a writing plan. It is difficult for me to separate the introduction, development and conclusion parts of my text." [1]. Ö₁₁: "After my teacher gives the topic, I take notes on a piece of paper of what comes to my mind. Then I look at those notes and write my text." [2]. Ö₁₇: "After I start writing, I have a hard time figuring out how to continue. I can't think of anything." [3]. Ö₂₃: "I am having difficulty in gathering my thoughts while writing a composition. Therefore, I cannot write well." [4].

The researcher's observational notes regarding the writing process are as follows: A₀₁: "The student had a lot of hesitation as to how to start the second paragraph. They had difficulties in determining the introduction, development and conclusion parts of the text because they did not formulate the writing plan well." [1]. A₀₁₃: "The student thought about what they could write for a few minutes before starting to write. Then they wrote the first sentence to start writing but deleted it again. They repeated this process several times. I asked the student why they acted like that after their writing task was over. They said that they did not know how to handle the issue and that the subject was very general. The student had difficulty in writing because they did not limit the subject and did not determine the message." [2]. It was observed that students with good writing skills participate more eagerly in writing activities than other students. A₀₁₀: "Before writing, the student started writing without looking at the notes they took

on the topic. They tried to identify the thoughts to be addressed in the introduction, development, and conclusion sections.” [3]. A: “I have observed that most of the students have difficulty in the beginning of writing. Especially, writing becomes excruciating for students with poor writing skills because they do not have the basic skills of writing preparation. Since most of the teachers are not competent in the process-based writing approach, they cannot provide the necessary guidance to the students at this stage. Some teachers take care of other students by virtually ignoring the students who have difficulty writing in the classroom.” [4].

Table 5. Activities carried out during the reviewing/editing/developing phase

Theme	Code	Interview		Observation	
		f	%	f	%
Reviewing/ editing/ development	Re-reading the draft created	1	4.17	1	4.17
	Sharing the written text with peers and groups	7	29.17	9	37.50
	Exchanging ideas with the teacher	9	37.50	7	29.17
	Motivating students	3	12.50	2	8.33
	Re-organizing feelings and thoughts about the topic	5	20.83	3	12.50
	Checking and reviewing the text in terms of content	4	16.66	3	12.50
	Checking and reviewing the text in terms of formal structure	4	16.66	4	16.66

During the reviewing/editing/development phase, students are expected to read their texts, re-examine their feelings and thoughts about the topic they want to convey, organize, and improve them. The findings in Table 5 show that there is not much emphasis on the editing and development of the text in the writing process. This prevents the emergence of quality texts and negatively affects the development of students' writing skills. According to the findings in Table 5, only 1 (4.17%) of the teachers asked the students to review the draft they have written at this stage. 29.17% (f: 7) of the teachers who participated in the study stated that students share the writings that are developed to a certain stage with their classmates or groups. During the in-class activities, it was observed that 37.50% (f: 9) of teachers asked students to share their writings with their friends for evaluation. 37.50% of the teachers (f: 9) stated that they exchanged views with the students during the writing process. During the activities, it was determined that the rate of exchange of views between the teacher and the student was 29.17% (f: 7). As the writing time progresses, it was observed that some students got bored of or had difficulties with writing. At this stage, 12.50% (3) of the teachers stated that they tried to motivate students to write. During the applications, this rate was found to be 8.33% (f: 2). It is seen that the rates are quite low. 20.83% (f: 5) of the teachers participating in the study guided the students to re-organize the texts during written expression activities, but this rate was found to be 12.50% (f: 3) in the observation. Some of the teachers (16.66%; f: 4) stated that the students evaluate the texts they wrote in terms of form and content and showed the corrections made on the text. During the applications, it was determined that 12.50% (f: 3) of teachers and students reviewed the text in terms of content while 16.66% (f: 4) reviewed the text in terms of format structure.

Some of the teachers' views that support the above findings are as follows: E₂: “During the writing activity, I share brief information to trigger ideas and I try to open the horizons of the students.” [1]. E₁₉: “Students occasionally show me what they write in the process of writing their texts. I check the students' texts in terms of content, language, and expression. I show the mistakes made and the places that need to be corrected on the text. Then I want them to fix the parts that need to be fixed.” [2].

Some of the researcher's observation notes regarding the writing process are as follows: A: *Within the scope of the research, it was observed that the teacher performed writing practices in line with the*

stages of the process-based writing approach only in one of the classes in which writing practice was examined. In other classes, it was determined that teachers mostly teach writing with traditional methods. Most teachers initially give the topic of writing and ask students to write their essays. However, during the process, students are not given any guidance on how to continue gradually according to the genre. Students write a bit and quit because they could not gain skills related to the writing process. At the end of the writing, it was observed that the essays written by the students were mostly not controlled in terms of content and grammar. It is observed that students are very reluctant when it is time to do writing activities. This situation continues throughout the writing activity. Students often ask questions such as "Is that enough?", "Is that okay?" They get bored without writing and want to be done with it immediately." [1] *A_{EI}*: "Students have a hard time developing paragraphs. The teacher checks the students' writings and gives directions." [2]

Table 6. Findings regarding the evaluation of students' written expressions in terms of "reviewing/editing/developing"

Theme	Code	No		Partially		Yes	
		f	%	f	%	f	%
Reviewing/Editing/Developing	13.Has an introduction according to the genre.	14	58.33	6	25.00	4	16.67
	14.Supported the main idea with supporting ideas.	15	62.50	5	20.83	4	16.67
	15.Utilized methods of developing ideas.	13	54.17	7	29.17	4	16.67
	16.Appropriate transitions between sections.	15	62.50	6	25.00	3	12.50
	17.There is no unclear section in the text.	11	45.83	7	29.17	6	25.00
	18. Does not have unnecessary details in the text.	13	54.17	8	33.33	3	12.50
	19.There is an interesting idea, information, or event in each section of the text.	15	62.50	5	20.83	4	16.67
	20.Ended the text with an appealing conclusion.	11	45.83	9	37.50	4	16.67

According to the findings in Table 6, it is seen that 58.33% (f:14) of the students did not have an introduction appropriate for the genre, 25% (f:6) has an introduction in line with the genre's characteristics but not effective, and only 16.67% (f:4) of the students had an introduction that is appealing and in line with the characteristics of the genre. In the document analysis, it was determined that 62.50% (f: 15) of the students did not support the main idea by using supporting ideas in their written expressions, 20.83% (f: 5) had supporting ideas that did not directly support the main idea, and only % 16.67% (f:4) used ideas that supported the main idea. It was determined that the majority of the students (54.17%; f: 13) did not use methods of developing ideas effectively and correctly, and that in 29.17% (f: 7), the methods used to develop ideas did not support the topic and the main idea fully. It was determined that only 16.67% (f: 4) of the students used methods of developing ideas that supported the topic and the main idea. It was determined that the transitions between the sections of the text written by 62.50% of the students (f: 15) are not connected, there is no coherence in terms of semantics in the text, and the transitions between the sections in the texts written by 25.00% students (f: 6) sometimes caused semantic gaps. It was observed that only 12.50% (f: 3) of the students had appropriate transitions between the sections of the text and the coherence of the meaning was provided in the text. It was

determined that 45.83% (f: 11) of the texts written by the students had sections that were not clear, and 29.17% (f: 7) had parts that were partially unclear. 54.17% of students (f:13) had details such as examples or explanations that are not relevant to the topic and unnecessary, 33.33% of the students (f:8) had partially irrelevant and unnecessary examples or explanations, while only 12.50% of the students (f:3) had necessary examples or explanations in their texts. In the texts written by the majority of the students (62.50%; f: 15), the texts did not arouse interest, create new knowledge, thoughts or expectations in the reader, and 20.83% of the students (f: 5) had new information, thoughts or events in the text although not every part of the article aroused interest in the reader. It was determined that four students' texts included an interesting information, thought and event. It was found that 45.83% (f: 11) of the students (f: 11) did not conclude their texts properly, 37.50% (f: 9) concluded the topic in the text properly, but the result was not appealing. It was concluded that only 16.67% of students (f: 4) concluded their text in an effective way.

In the interviews conducted with the students, it was seen that the writing practices in the classroom are either not done or are put on the backburner. Some of the students' views about the implementation of in-class writing activities are as follows: A₀₄: *"I could not complete my writing because our teacher gave writing activities as homework most of the time (The answer given by the student when asked why they left their text unfinished.)"* [1]. Ö₂: *"After completing my writing homework, I reviewed my writing and corrected my mistakes."* [2]. Ö₂₂: *"When I had a hesitation while writing, I got support from my teacher and friends. I rearranged some places with my teacher."* [3]

It is observed that not enough importance is given, and not enough time is allocated to writing practices in Turkish lessons due to the belief that writing activities take too much time. This situation can easily be understood from the student's performance in the writing process. The researcher's observation notes regarding the writing process are as follows: A₀₁₇: *"The student was hesitant while writing. They seemed afraid of making a mistake."* [1]. A₀₈: *The student continued to review and write after writing a little to not to deviate from the context of the text. Occasionally deleted and rewrote some parts."* [2]. A₀₂₄: *"Since the student did not create a writing draft, they had a lot of difficulty in writing. The student had difficulty transcribing their feelings and thoughts in writing and making meaningful sentences. After trying a little more, they stopped writing."* [3]. A₀₁₈: *"The student was having difficulty in continuing the text. They kept asking frequently, "do we have to fill the whole paper? It was clear from their state that they did not enjoy writing. The student was not competent in using writing methods and techniques. When I examined their text, it was determined that there was no coherence in the article, and they could not develop their thoughts."* [4]. A₀₁₅: *"There is no coherence between thoughts, as they do not make appropriate transitions between sections of the text. They listed some of their thoughts on the topic, but since they did not support these ideas with supporting ideas, they had a hard time developing their article."* [5]. A₀₂₂: *"The student's vocabulary that they used was very limited. This creates a situation that prevents them from writing long and quality texts."* [6]. A₀₁₀: *"After the student finished the writing process, they read the text they wrote thoroughly and made corrections where they deemed necessary. The student's writing was successful in spelling and grammar, and the page layout was neat."* [7].

Table 7. Activities done during the editing phase

Theme	Code	Interview		Observation	
		f	%	f	%
Editing	Checking and editing the elements of the text and their order	3	12.50	2	8.33
	Controlling/editing the text coherence	7	29.17	4	16.67
	Checking to see if the text met its goal and reached the reader	5	20.83	5	20.83
	Final review of text for language and expression	8	33.33	8	33.33

In the process-based writing model, the text is reviewed for appropriateness in terms of format, language, and grammar in the editing phase. In addition, in the editing phase, the expressions in the text are reviewed for consistency and semantic coherence, and organization is done either from part to whole or from whole to part. When the findings in Table 7 are examined, it is seen that the teachers participating in the research do not focus on this stage in the writing process. In traditional writing education, the phases up to the editing stage are not done and the text is evaluated only according to its initial state. The present study findings also show that teachers do not give enough space to monitoring and evaluating the written expression process. According to the findings, 12.50% (f: 3) of the teachers stated that they check the elements and order of the text written by the students and make necessary corrections. In the observations made, it was seen that this rate was 8.33% (f: 2). It was determined that 29.17% (f: 7) of the teachers participating in the study examined the texts in terms of semantic coherence and consistency, but this rate was even lower in the observation (16.67%; f: 4). 20.83% (f: 5) of the teachers stated that they check the texts in terms of writing purpose, and 33.33% (f: 8) checked in terms of language and expression. In the observation made in the classroom, it was seen that these activities were implemented.

Some of the teachers' views supporting the above findings are as follows: E₉: “When the writing activity is over, I collect the students' writings, read them one by one and show them the places that need to be corrected on the text. I give feedback to the students about the corrections.” [1]. E₁₄: “When the essays are done, I collect and review them to evaluate. After reviewing, I add my comments at the end of the texts. I indicate the places that need to be corrected in terms of content and format. I redistribute the papers to the students to make edits.” [2]. E₁₇: “I check the students' writing, take notes on the places that need to be corrected, if any, and share with the student.” [3]. E₉: “I collect and analyze students' writings. I give a plus to students whose writing is good. I make suggestions to students who have missing parts.” [4]. E₂₁: “I walk around the classroom without disturbing the students while they are writing. I make sure they pay attention to composition rules, spelling and punctuation while writing their essays.” [5].

The researcher's observation notes regarding the writing process are as follows: A: “Some students ignored the content and semantic coherence due to fear of making mistakes in spelling and grammar.” “Some teachers invite the students who have finished their writing to the teacher's desk and examine the writings with the students.” [1].

Table 8. Findings regarding the evaluation of students' written expressions in terms of "editing"

Theme	Code	No		Partially		Yes	
		f	%	f	%	f	%
Editing	21. Ideas or events are aligned consistently in text	13	54.17	7	29.17	4	16.67
	22. Sentences used in the text are coherent.	16	66.67	5	20.83	3	12.50
	23. The cause-effect, goal-effect relationships are done correctly in the text.	13	54.17	7	29.17	4	16.67
	24. Used vocabulary appropriate for the context.	6	25.00	11	45.83	7	29.17
	25. Used punctuation correctly.	8	33.33	13	54.17	3	12.50
	26. No grammar mistakes in text.	15	62.50	7	29.17	2	8.33

According to the findings in Table 8, it was determined that the thoughts and events listed in the written expressions of 54.17% (f: 13) of the students were not consistent with each other, and the thoughts and events listed in the written expressions of 29.17% (f: 7) contradicted each other. It is observed in only 16.67% (f: 4) of the student texts the thoughts and events listed are consistent and coherent with each other. It was found that in the majority of the texts written by the students (66.67%; f: 16), the sentences developed were not coherent, while 20.83% of the students (f: 5) had partial coherence in their written expressions. In the texts written by only three students (12.50%), it is seen that the sentences comply with the rules of Turkish in terms of meaning and grammar. It is seen that cause-effect, goal-effect relationships are not used correctly and appropriately in some of the texts (54.17%; f: 13), while in others they are partially used (29.17%; f: 7). It is seen that very few students used goal-effect, cause-effect sentences correctly and appropriately in their writings (16.67%; f: 4). It was determined that vocabulary that are not related to the topic and context were used in the written expressions of some students (25.00%; f: 6), and some vocabulary were partially unrelated to the topic and context (45.83%; f: 11). It was determined that the vocabulary used by 29.17% (f: 7) of the students were suitable for the subject and the context. 33.33% (f: 8) of the students never used punctuation marks in their writings, and many of those who used punctuation made mistakes. It was determined that the majority of the students did not use punctuation marks in accordance with their functions or did not use punctuation marks in some places (54.17%; f: 13) while only three students (12.50%) used punctuation in the text correctly and in accordance with their functions. It was determined that 62.50% (f: 15) of the written texts created by the students had errors in the use of capital letters and spelling of words, and 29.17% (f: 7) had partial spelling errors. It was determined that the written expressions of 8.33% students (f: 2) were in accordance with the rule of using capital letters and spelling of words.

Some of the students' views about the implementation of in-class writing activities are as follows: Ö₁: "After I finish my essay, I read it again. I fix some parts myself. Then I show it to my teacher and my classmate. I complete my essay by considering the suggestions of my teacher and friend." [1]. Ö₁₆: "Since I write fast while writing, I re-read the sentences after writing and correct the places I wrote wrong or the parts I don't like." [2]. Ö₁₇: "I notice some things that I did not think of before while reviewing my friends' essays. I am making corrections in my own essay accordingly." [3].

The researcher's observation notes regarding the writing process are as follows: A_{Ö8}: "After the student finished their text, they read it over and over again, erasing some parts and making additions. Then they asked their friend to read what they had written and show them the mistakes they made." [1]. A_{Ö18}: "The student could not write because they did not organize their thoughts, and they panicked because they could not write. They only wrote a paragraph and there were disconnections between the sentences they used in the paragraph. They were also not successful in terms of paper layout, spelling, and grammar. they kept covering the text with their hand so that no one could see it. After the bell rang, they crumpled the paper they wrote and threw it away." [2]. During the interview with the student, they stated that they

were afraid of their friends making fun of them and that they did not want to show their text to anyone because they thought that the teacher would be angry with them.

Table 9. Activities during the presentation phase

Theme	Code	Interview		Observation	
		f	%	f	%
Presenting / Sharing	Reading out loud the text to peers or the class	11	45.83	5	20.83
	Display of text in the classroom library, hallway, or the classroom board	3	12.50	2	8.33
	Sending a letter or email to friends or family members	1	4.17	-	0
	On the school-class paper or journal	1	4.17	1	4.17
	Sending the text to the school's website	1	4.17	1	4.17
	Dramatize the text in class	3	12.50	4	16.67

When Table 9 was examined, it was determined that most of the teachers (45.83%; f: 11) had the written texts read by the class or a friend in a class, and in the classroom observation it was found that five teachers (20.83%) had the written texts read in the classroom. 12.50% (f: 3) of the teachers participating in the study stated that they exhibited the texts in the classroom library, hallway walls or classroom board, while 4.17% (f: 1) of the teachers stated that they sent the texts to the school's website, magazine or school-classroom paper to be published. Although only one of the teachers (4.17%) stated that they encouraged students to send the texts to their friends or families via letter or e-mail, it was observed that such guidance was not made during the classroom practice time. 12.50% of the teachers stated that they dramatize the texts in the classroom. It was observed that 4 teachers (16.67%) dramatized what was written in the classroom during the time when the practices were observed.

Some of the teachers' views that support the above findings are as follows: *E₂: "I read the writings of the students who write well in the classroom. I reward these students with stickers or prints."* [1]. *E₇: "I have the students read the written expression works at the end of the lesson. If it is beautifully written, I display it on the school board or on the school hallway boards."* [2]. *E₁₅: "I have some of them dramatized in class, depending on the writing theme and genre. Students like it very much."* [3].

The researcher's observation notes regarding the writing process are as follows: *A: "After writing, if there is time, teachers ask a few students to read what they wrote in the classroom."* "At the end of the writing, it was observed that some students did not share their writing with the class because they thought their friends would not like it or the teacher would criticize the writing. The student (A18) I observed within the scope of the research was also in this situation." [1].

Table 10. Findings regarding the evaluation of students' written expressions in terms of "presentation"

Theme	Code	No		Partially		Yes	
		f	%	f	%	f	%
Presentation	27. Organized the text in line with the genre	10	41.67	9	37.50	5	20.83
	28. Used neat and legible writing.	11	45.83	7	29.17	6	25.00
	29. Followed page layout in text.	15	62.50	5	20.83	4	16.67
	30. Headings and visuals used in the text are interesting	11	45.83	9	37.50	4	16.67

When Table 10 is examined, it is seen that 41.67% (f: 10) of the students did not organize their texts according to the characteristics of the genre in terms of form, and that 37.50% (f:9) of the texts were aligned with the characteristics of the genre in terms of structure but there were missing elements. It was found that 20.83% (f: 5) of the texts written were arranged according to the characteristics of the genre in terms of format. It was determined that the handwriting of 25.00% of the students (f: 6) was clear and legible, however, 45.83% (f: 11) of the students did not use a neat, legible writing while 29.17% (f: 7) had a handwriting that is partially neat and legible. It is seen that in 62.50% of the texts (f: 15), no attention was paid to the paper and page layout, and in 20.83% (f: 5) of the texts, the paper and page layout was not fully done. It was determined that only 16.67% (f: 4) of the students paid attention to paper and page layout in their written expressions. The headings and visuals used in the written expressions of 45.83% of the students (f: 11) were not placed appropriately, and there was a displacement or misplacement in the heading and visuals used in 37.50% (f: 9) of the texts. It was found that 16.67% (f: 4) of the students used headings and visuals in their written texts correctly and appropriately, and the headings and visuals were also interesting.

Some of the students' views about the implementation of in-class writing activities are as follows: Ö₄: *"I didn't want to read my essay in class because I thought my friends would make fun of me."* [1]. Ö₈: *Our teacher provides us with vocabulary and asks us to explain. I have difficulty in explaining. I don't want to read what I wrote in class, fearing that my teacher will be angry."* [2].

It was observed that students with poor writing skills did not want to share their writing with anyone at the end of the writing process. It was noticed in the observations that the students who eagerly participated in the writing activities were happy to share their writings with the class. The researcher's observation notes regarding the writing process are as follows: Aö₅: *"The student was eager to share their writing afterwards with the class. They enjoyed being rewarded by the teacher. After the student read their writing, the teacher asked them to post it on the class board."* [1].

4. Discussion and Conclusion

The aim of this study is to evaluate the Turkish teachers' practices of developing written expression in their classrooms by taking into account the basic principles of the process-based writing model, and to examine the status of the texts created by students to meet the principles of the process-based approach.

According to the findings obtained from the research, most of the teachers stated that the activities provided in Turkish textbooks are sufficient for the development of writing skills while a significant part of them thought that the activities are not sufficient in terms of understandability, appropriateness for purpose, suitability for the student level, and applicability. In a study conducted by Elma and Bütün (2015), it was determined that most of the teachers participating in the study did not find the activities in the textbook appropriate for the student level, and stated that students experienced difficulties and were reluctant during the implementation of these activities. According to Güneş (2017), students learn better with activities. Language learning activities should be based on the prior knowledge of the student, and should be prepared for learning through interactions, using various learning techniques, by doing, experiencing, and applying. According to Güfta and Özçakmak (2013), activities that are not sufficient in the textbooks should be identified and rearranged in line with the outcomes specified in the curriculum.

According to the results obtained from the research findings, it is seen that most of the teachers do not teach with the framework of the process-based writing model and put writing practices in the background. This is reflected on the texts written by the students, according to the evaluation of the texts. It is observed that the students create texts with the influence of traditional writing which is supported by their answers to the interview questions and the document analysis. It was determined that

the texts written by the students were insufficient in meeting the planning and writing evaluation criteria. In the observations made, it was seen that the students did not use the process-based writing steps sufficiently in the writing process, and their "format" related concerns were at the forefront. The process-based writing is an approach addresses the teaching writing process gradually in line with the constructivist approach that highlights the importance of skills acquired in the process and the process rather than the product. In various countries of the world, the effects of the process-based writing approach on students' written expression success, writing attitudes and authorship identities have been researched and this approach has been placed at the center of the field of writing learning. In our country, the learning writing curriculum was updated by taking the process-based writing approach into consideration (Tavşanlı, 2017). It was emphasized that the studies to be carried out in the Turkish Language Teaching Program (MEB, 2019) will be conducted by taking the process-based writing approach into consideration. In classroom writing practices, the failure of teachers to teach in line with this approach directly affects the development of writing skills. Aşıkcan and Pilten (2016) also found in their study that teachers' classroom writing practices at the primary school level were examined in line with the process-based approach, and that most of the teachers were not aware of the process-based writing model and never focused on the stages that should be followed in the writing process.

According to the findings obtained from the study, there is almost no emphasis on pre-writing preparatory work. Teachers mostly focus on determining the genre of the text, motivating students to write, and determining the subject. It was observed that the students perceived the pre-writing preparation as preparing lesson materials. Drawing attention to the effect of the preparation phase in the process, Murray (1982) states that 70% of the time allocated for writing should be spent on this stage (as cited in Akyol, 2014, p.109). Rohman (1965) states that pre-writing activities are rarely given the value they deserve, and these activities, which are very important for success in writing, are defined as the discovery phase in the writing process. Balcı (2017) also states that pre-writing preparatory work is an important step in coherent text writing and positively affecting writing attitudes. In the study, it is seen that motivation activities for students to write are mostly done by direct expression. According to Coşkun (2014), it is wrong to think that the student is ready to write on any subject at any time and that the student should be prepared and willing to write psychologically and intellectually. According to Göçer (2010), who expressed a similar opinion, students should be encouraged by developing their ability to express their feelings and thoughts in writing, and personal motivation for writing should be encouraged. When the literature is reviewed, it is stated that pre-writing preparations can be made in both short and long-term. It is stated that in the short-term preparation, interesting and guiding activities that would be carried out for at most five to ten minutes just before writing and in long-term preparation, activities that will solve their problems, and help them to comprehend and reinforce such as learning about vocabulary, sentences, paragraphs, plans, titles, subject punctuation marks, spelling rules, figures, etc. should be implemented (Tekşan, 2001, p.18-20).

In the process-based writing model, after the pre-writing preparation is completed, the planning phase starts. Most of the teachers in the study group do not carry out writing and drafting activities. Based on the interviews with students and the document analysis, almost all the students do not engage in draft writing activities. However, at the stage of planning to write, it is one of the most important points of written instruction to help students gain the ability to determine why and whom to write the text, and the structure of the text. After revealing the thoughts on the topic in the preparatory phase, these ideas should be associated with each other and presented in a certain order (Coşkun, 2014, p. 63). In a study conducted by Temizkan and Erbilin (2020), it was concluded that middle school 8th grade students did not show sufficient success in their planning skills in written expression. Teacher and student roles shift with the process approach in writing. The teacher should be a model for students at every stage of the writing process. In the study, most of the teachers did not follow the writing process after giving the

writing topic to the students and did not provide the necessary guidance. As in the traditional approach, it was observed that teachers focused on the final product. This situation is also supported by the answers given to the interview questions. Although the product-oriented writing approach is adopted in the program, the application of the product-oriented writing approach is seen as a contradiction. It is stated that the planned writing and evaluation model is a process in which the teacher plans and conducts written expression studies with students on one side, and is an auxiliary tool that helps students gain the ability to write themselves, on the other (Karatay, 2013, p.29). If teachers show how to prepare a draft by using think aloud method during the draft creation phase, students can create their own drafts by following the process.

In this study in which classroom writing activities are examined in the context of process-based writing education, the review and writing phase is mostly carried out by showing the students' writings to the teacher during the writing process and by rewriting them in line with the feedback received. At this stage, it involves the student re-reading the draft they wrote, sharing the draft in a writing group created in the classroom, and rearranging the content taking into account the feedback from their friends in the writing group (Cavkaytar, 2010, p. 136). In the observations made, it was observed that some teachers did not allow much interaction among students due to noise. It was observed that only in a few classrooms the teacher allowed peer review. It was observed that teachers mostly consider and examine the writings in terms of grammar.

While the process-based writing approach focuses on the content and the arrangement of the content until the editing stage, the spelling rules and punctuation marks, which are called the mechanical aspect of writing, are examined in the editing stage (Cavkaytar, 2010, p. 137). It is seen that most of the teachers in the study group had students read what they wrote and realized their mistakes. Some of them stated that they collected the papers and read the texts themselves and corrected the spelling and grammar mistakes. According to Çetinkaya (2019), the pre-requisite for creating a quality text is possible with the introduction of a quality review process. Therefore, the concept of revision should be given due importance in the Turkish curriculum, textbooks, and teaching environments. The final draft created by students after implementing all stages of the writing process should be evaluated by teachers in a holistic or analytical approach. These evaluation results also provide feedback to the student on the quality of the text they created.

Most of the teachers included in the study have students read their texts in the classroom or they share these texts with other students by placing them on the classroom board or in the hallways. This stage is the last stage of the writing process. At this stage, students should be encouraged to present their written product. In the observations made, it was seen that some teachers did not emphasize this stage much. If the created products are presented differently, the student who writes the text is both rewarded and other students are encouraged to write.

As a result, to achieve the desired goals in the field of writing education, it is necessary to focus on process-based writing education, which has been proven to be effective with research. In the study, one of the most important reasons why students' success levels in writing and writing attitudes are low is that writing activities based on process are not done effectively in the classroom. The fact that teachers do not teach according to the process-based writing approach and that they lack knowledge about process-based writing stands out as a serious problem. In this regard, efforts should be made urgently to provide teachers with these knowledge and skills. In the light of the findings of this study, the following recommendations can be made:

- While educating teacher candidates in education faculties, both theoretical information should be provided, and applied practices should be carried out to improve writing skills.
- Turkish textbooks should be enriched with activities that will support process-based writing.

- Turkish teachers and teacher candidates should be supported with pre-service and in-service trainings on the teaching and use of process-based writing.
- In the activities to be implemented in the classroom, every stage of process-based writing education should be carefully emphasized and learning environments should be designed in line with the specified approach.
- In order to make students like writing, students' opinions should be taken while determining the topics and entertaining topics that students can use their creativity should be selected.
- Writing activities should be carried out under the guidance of the teacher, and teachers should provide the necessary guidance at every stage of the writing process.
- Teachers should ensure the development of writing skills by giving effective feedback in the writing process.

5. Ethics Committee Approval

The author confirms that ethical approval was obtained from Aksaray University (Approval Date: 22/06/2020).

References

- Ahraz, S. (2018). *The effect of planned writing method on the unique text creation access of fourth grade primary school students* (Unpublished master's thesis). Aksaray University Social Sciences Institute, Aksaray.
- Aksu, Ö. (2015). *Impact of planned writing and assessment model on preperation of performance works of eight class students* (Unpublished master's thesis). Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University Institute of Education Sciences, Bolu.
- Akyol, H. (2014). *Turkish teaching methods*. Ankara: Pegem Academy.
- Albertson, L. R., & Billingsley, F. F. (2000). Using strategy instruction and self-regulation to improve gifted students' creative writing. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 12 (2), 90-101.
- Alkan, Z. N. (2007). *5th grade students' writing mistakes in Turkish public schools* (Unpublished master's thesis). Eskişehir Osmangazi University Institute of Social Science, Eskişehir.
- Altuner, G. Ş. (2017). *The impact of 6 + 1 analytical writing and evaluation model on written expression skills and self-efficacy and writing anxiety in primary school teacher students* (Unpublished master's thesis). Gazi University Institute of Education Sciences, Ankara.
- Arı, G. (2010). Evaluation of the narrative texts of sixth and seventh grades students. *Journal of Turkology Research*, 27, 43-75.
- Arıcı, A.F., & Urgan, S. (2008). An evaluation of secondary school students' writing mistakes with respect to some points. *Dumlupınar University Journal of Social Sciences*, 20, 317-328.
- Arıcı, A. F., & Kaldırım, A. (2015). The effect of the process-based writing approach on writing success and anxiety of pre-service teachers. *Anthropologist*, 22, 318-327.
- Aşıkcan, M., & Piltin, G. (2016). The evaluation of classroom teachers' written expression implementations in terms of process based writing model. *Turkish Studies*, 11(3), 255-276.
- Aydın, İ. S. (2019). Planning of writing. In N. Bayat (Ed.), *Writing and education* (pp.91-114). Ankara: Ani Publishing.

- Bahşi, N., & Sis, N. (2019). The writing levels of middle school students and their problems. *Millî Eğitim*, 48(224), 181-211.
- Bağcı, H. (2010). Levels of Turkish language teacher candidates' efficiency of written expression. *Inonu University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 11(2), 45-68.
- Balcı, O. (2017). *Affect of 4+1 planned writing and evaluation model on the development of writing skills and written expression attitudes of sixth grade student* (Unpublished master's thesis). Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University Institute of Education Sciences, Bolu.
- Bayat, N. (2014). The effect of the process writing approach on writing success and anxiety. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 14(3), 1133-1141.
- Benjamin, A. (2005). *Writing in the content areas*. New York: Eye On Education.
- Büyükkız, K. K. (2007). *Determination of the written expression skills of primary school 8th class students from the point of view syntax and bad expression* (Unpublished master's thesis). Gazi University Institute of Education Sciences, Ankara.
- Canady, C. E. (2008). *Effects of models, writing frames, and sentence combining on second grade writing quality* (Unpublished doctoral of dissertation). University of Virginia.
- Cavkaytar, S. (2010). Benefitting from writing process method to improve written expression skills in primary education. *The Journal of International Social Research*, 3(10), 133-139.
- Creswell, J. W. (2016). *Qualitative research methods* (Translation Editors: M. Bütün and S. B. Demir). Ankara: Siyasal Publication.
- Coşkun, E. (2014). Writing education. In A. Kırkkılıç & H. Akyol, (Editors), *Teaching Turkish in Primary Education* (4th edition) (pp.49-91). Ankara: Pegem Academy.
- Çetinkaya, G. (2014). Review and correction. In N. Bayat (Ed.), *Writing and education* (pp.135-158). Ankara: Ani Publishing.
- Demir, T. (2013). Realization of gains related to writing skills in the secondary school. *Research in Reading & Writing Instruction*, 1(1), 45-56.
- Demirel, Ö., & Şahinel, M. (2006). *Turkish teaching*. Ankara: Pegem Academy.
- Derman, S. (2020). Evaluation of written expression skills of experiment type of students in different teaching levels. *OPUS–International Journal of Society Researches*, 15(26), 4265-4292.
- Dilidüzgün, Ş. (2013). The effect of process writing activities on the writing skills of prospective Turkish teachers. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 52, 189-210.
- Doğan, Y. (2020). “Preparation” as a dimension of process-based writing approach. *Journal of Mother Tongue Education*, 8(2), 326-342.
- Duman, B. (2004). *Learning-Teaching Theories and Process Based Education*. Ankara: Ani Publishing.
- Ekinci Çelikipazu, E. (2006). *A study on 6th grade primary students writing skills in Erzurum city centre* (Unpublished master's thesis). Atatürk University Institute of Social Science, Erzurum.
- Elma, C., & Bütün, E. (2015). Teachers opinions about primary and secondary school students writing skills. *Abant İzzet Baysal University Journal of Education Faculty*, 15(2), 104-131.
- Erbilen, M. (2014). *Evaluation of secondary school 8th grade students' planning skills in written expressions* (Unpublished master's thesis). Mustafa Kemal University Institute of Social Science, Hatay.

- Erdoğan, Ö. (2012). *The effects of process based creative writing activities on students' writing expression and attitude towards writing* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Hacettepe University Social Sciences Institute, Ankara.
- Erdoğan, Ö., & Yangın, B. (2014). The effects of process based creative writing activities on students' writing expression and attitude towards writing. *Abant İzzet Baysal University Journal of Education of Faculty*, 14(1), 438-459.
- Evans, J. (2001). Introduction: learning and teaching the complexities of writing. In Janet Evans (Ed.), *Writing in the Elementary Classroom: A Reconsideration*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Faigley, L. & Witte, S. (1981). Analyzing revision. *College Composition and Communication*, 32, 400-410.
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32(4), 365–387.
- García, J. N., & Fidalgo, R. (2008). Orchestration of writing processes and writing products: A comparison of sixth-grade students with and without learning disabilities. *Learning Disabilities*, 6 (2), 77-98.
- Göçer, A. (2010). Writing education in Turkish teaching. *The Journal of International Social Research*, 3(12), 178-195.
- Görgüç, Ç. (2016). *The effect of analytical writing and evaluation on writing attitude and achievement of the 6th graders*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Dokuz Eylül University Graduate School of Educational Sciences, İzmir.
- Güfta, H., & Özçakmak, H. (2013). Evaluation of the writing activities in the primary school 6th- 8th Turkish course books according to the teacher views. *Mustafa Kemal University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 10(21), 125-144.
- Güleryüz, H. (2000). *Türkçe Programlanmış İlk Okuma Yazma Öğretimi* [Turkish Programmed First Reading and Writing Instruction]. Ankara: PegemA Publishing.
- Güneş, F. (2017). Activity approach in Turkish teaching. *Journal of Mother Tongue Education*, 5(1), 48-64
- Güneyli, A. (2016). Analyzing writing anxiety level of Turkish Cypriot students. *Education and Science*, 41(183), 163-180.
- Kaldırım, A. (2014). *The effect of 6+1 analytical writing and evaluation model on the sixth grade students' writing expression skills* (Unpublished master's thesis). Kütahya Dumlupınar University Graduate School of Educational Sciences, Kütahya.
- Karadağ, R. & Kayabaşı, B. (2013). “Why don’t we write?”: Prospective elementary teachers’ opinions regarding writing obstacles (Sample of Adiyaman University), *Erzincan University Journal of Education Faculty (EUJEF)*, 15(1), 1-32.
- Karadağ, R. (2016). Writing education. In F. Susar Kırmızı (Ed.), *Turkish education in primary and secondary schools* (pp.163-210). Ankara: Anı Publishing.
- Karatay, H. (2013). Process-based writing models: 4 + 1 planned writing and evaluation model. In M. Özbay (Ed.), *Writing Education* (2nd Edition) (pp. 21–43). Ankara: Pegem Academy.

- Karatay, H. (2011). The effect of 4 + 1 planned writing and evaluation model to develop the attitudes of preservice teachers as to written expression and their writing skills. *Turkish Studies*, 6(3), 1029-1047.
- Karatosun, S. (2014). *The effect of planned writing and evaluation model on enhancing 5th grade students' composition writing skills* (Unpublished master's thesis). Mustafa Kemal University Social Sciences Institute, Hatay.
- Kaynaş, E., & Anılan, H. (2015). Narrative text writing skills assessment of fifth grade students. *Dicle University Journal of Ziya Gökalp Education Faculty*, 26, 121-147.
- Keçik İ. & Uzun L., (2004). *Oral and Written Expression in Turkish*. Eskişehir. Anadolu University Publications.
- Kırbaş, A. (2010). Investigation of eighth grade students' written expression skills (according to the school variable). *Atatürk University Journal of Kazım Karabekir Education Faculty*, 0 (18), 72-93.
- Köksal, K. (1999). *Okuma yazmanın öğretimi* [Teaching Reading and Writing]. Ankara: PegemA Publishing.
- Kurt, A. (2019). Contribution of process based writing approach in developing students' writing acquisition and skills in Turkish education. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Erciyes University Institute of Education Sciences, Kayseri.
- Kurudayıoğlu, M. & Karadağ, Ö. (2010). Examining the written expressions of primary school graders as regard to their choice of topics. *Mustafa Kemal University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 7(13), 192-207.
- Maltepe, S. (2006). *Evaluation of writing processes and products in Turkish courses based on creative writing approach* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ankara University Social Sciences Institute, Ankara.
- Olinghouse, N. G., & Santangelo, T. (2010). Assessing the writing of struggling learners. *Focus On Exceptional Children*, 43(4), 1-27.
- Oral, G. (2008). *We are writing again* (3rd Edition). Ankara: Pegem A Academy.
- Özdemir, B. (2014). *The effect of analytical writing and assessment method on pre-service Turkish teachers' writing skills and attitudes towards writing* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Gazi University Graduate School of Educational Sciences, Ankara.
- Özkara, Y. (2007). *The Effect of 6+1 analytic writing and evaluative model on enhancing 5th grade students' narrative writing skills* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Gazi University Graduate School of Educational Sciences, Ankara.
- Raimes, A. (1983). *Techniques in Teaching Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (2000). *Language Teaching*. Matrix, N.Y.: CUP.
- Rohman, D. G. (1965). Pre-writing the stage of discovery in the writing process. *College Composition and Communication*, 16(2), 106-12.
- Rosenblum, S., Weiss, P. L., & Parush, S. (2003). Product and process evaluation of handwriting difficulties. *Educational Psychology Review*, 15(1), 41–81.
- Rubin, N., & Henderson, S. E. (1982). *Two Sides of the Same Coin: Variations in Teaching Methods and Failure Learn to Write* (Special Edition). Forward Trends.

- Sallabaş, M. E. (2007). *Primary school 5th students' acquisition level of expressing themselves in written language* (Unpublished master's thesis). Gazi University Graduate School of Educational Sciences, Ankara.
- Sever, E. (2013). *The effect of processed writing models at the 4th level of primary school students on their writing and creative writing* (Unpublished master's thesis). Bülent Ecevit University Institute of Social Sciences, Zonguldak.
- Sezgin, N. (2016). *Analysis of the effect of process-based writing education on the student's writing skill who has mild mental deficiency* (Unpublished master's thesis). Karadeniz Technical University Institute of Educational Sciences, Trabzon.
- Tabak, G., & Göçer, A. (2013). Evaluating the writing skill of sixth and eighth grade Turkish language teaching curriculum in terms of product and process approaches. *Ahi Evran University Journal of Kırşehir Education Faculty*, 14(2), 147-169.
- Tavşanlı, Ö.F. (2017). Evaluation of the instructional program in Turkey based on the process-based writing approach. *International Journal of Language Academy*, 5(2), 79-97. Tavşanlı, Ö. F., & Kaldırım, A. (2020). Process based writing approach in Turkey: A thematic analysis study. *Cumhuriyet International Journal of Education*, 9(1), 108-138.
- Tekşan, K. (2001). *The effect of preliminary preparation on writing skills development* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University Social Sciences Institute, Çanakkale.
- Temizkan, M., & Erdevir, M. (2019). Substructure of thought in the written texts of students in secondary schools. *Mustafa Kemal University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 16(43), 18-45.
- Temizkan, M., & Erbilin, M. (2020). Evaluation of opinions and skills of 8th grade students toward planning in written expression. *Journal of Mother Tongue Education*, 8(2), 469-486.
- Tompkins, G. E. (2002). *Language Arts. Content and teaching strategies*. New Jersey: Prentice- Hall.
- Tompkins, G.E. (2005). *Language arts: Patterns of practice*. New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Ülper, H. (2008). *The effects of teaching writing programme prepared in accordance with cognitive process model on student achievement*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ankara University Social Sciences Institute, Ankara.
- Tseng, M. H., & Chow, S. M. K. (2000). Perceptual-Motor Function of School Age Children with Slow Handwriting Speed. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 54, 83-88.
- Yalçın, A. (2018). *Teaching methods of Turkish in the light of recent scientific developments*. Ankara: Pegem Academy.
- Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2013). *Qualitative research methods in the social sciences*. Ankara: Seçkin Publishing.
- Yılmaz, M. (2012). Importance of plan of writing method in improve of students' composition writing abilities in elementary school first grade. *Mustafa Kemal University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 9(19), 321-330.
- Zorbaz, K.Z. (2010). *The relationship between middle school student's writing apprehension and blocking with their written expression skills* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Gazi University Graduate School of Educational Sciences, Ankara.
- Zorbaz, K.Z. (2014). Writing education. In M. Yılmaz (Ed.), *In the light of new developments, in Turkish teaching* (pp. 109-147). Ankara: Pegem Academy.

Süreç temelli yazma eğitimi bağlamında sınıf içi yazma uygulamalarının incelenmesi

Öz

Yazma, diğer öğrenme alanlarına göre geç gelişen bir alandır fakat öğrenilebilir becerileri içermektedir. Süreç temelli öğrenme-öğretim, öğrencilerin yazma becerilerini ve yazmaya karşı tutumlarını geliştirmede etkili en etkili yaklaşımlardan bir tanesidir. Bu araştırma, Türkçe öğretmenlerinin sınıflarında gerçekleştirdikleri yazılı anlatımı geliştirme çalışmalarının, süreç temelli yazma modelinin temel ilkeleri göz önüne alınarak değerlendirilmesi ve öğrencilerin yazılı anlatımlarının, süreç temelli yazma modelinin temel ilkelerini karşılayıp karşılamadığının belirlenmesi amacıyla gerçekleştirilmiştir. Bu yönüyle çalışmanın yöntemi nitel araştırma desenlerinden durum çalışması olarak belirlenmiş ve çalışma grubunu 5, 6, 7.ve 8. sınıflarda öğretmenlik yapan 24 Türkçe öğretmeni ve bu sınıflarda öğrenim gören 24 öğrenci oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmanın çalışma grubunu oluşturmada amaçlı örnekleme yöntemlerinden maksimum çeşitlilik örnekleme kullanılmıştır. Seçilen 24 öğretmene yarı yapılandırılmış görüşme formu uygulanmış, bu öğretmenlerin uygulamaları ve bu sınıflardaki öğrencilerin tepkileri gözlenmiştir. Gözlem ve görüşme formundan elde edilen veriler üzerinden içerik analizi yapılmıştır. Ayrıca araştırmaya dâhil olan öğrencilerin yazdıkları metinler, planlı yazma ve değerlendirme ölçeği ile incelenmiştir. Araştırmadan elde edilen bulgulara göre, sınıf içi yazılı anlatım etkinliklerinin süreç odaklı yazma yaklaşımı doğrultusunda gerçekleştirilmediği ve öğrencilerin yazılı anlatım ürünlerinin de süreç temelli yazma ölçütlerini karşılamadığı tespit edilmiştir. Yazma eğitimi alanında istenilen hedeflere ulaşılması için araştırmalarla da etkililiği kanıtlanmış süreç odaklı yazma eğitimine ağırlık verilmesi gerekmektedir.

Anahtar sözcükler: Türkçe eğitimi; yazma eğitimi; süreç temelli yazma eğitimi; sınıf içi yazma etkinlikleri.

AUTHOR BIODATA

Tuncay Türkben works as an instructor at Aksaray University, Department of Turkish Education. He completed his doctorate in Gazi University, Department of Turkish Education. He received the title of associate professor in the field of Turkish Education in 2020. He has published numerous papers in various refereed international journals and presented papers in national and international symposia. His areas of interest are Turkish education, reading education, writing education, teaching Turkish as a foreign language and children's literature.