Yazarlık Döngüsü'nün Üçüncü Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Yazmaya Karşı Tutum, Algı ve Yazma Becerilerine Etkisi

The Effect of Authoring Cycle on Third Grade Students' Attitudes towards Writing,
Self-perception and Writing Ability

Demet SEBAN[*]

Akdeniz Üniversitesi

Öz

Bu araştırma, "Yazarlık Döngüsü" programının üçüncü sınıf öğrencilerinin yazılı anlatıma karşı tutumları, yazarlığa yönelik algıları ve yazılı anlatım becerileri üzerindeki etkisini araştırmak üzere planlanmıştır. Öntest ve sontest kontrol gruplu deneysel desen kullanılmıştır. Araştırma sonuçlarına göre deney ve kontrol gruplarının Yazma Tutum Ölçeği öntest ve sontest sonuçları arasında anlamlı bir fark bulunmuştur. Bununla birlikte gruplar arasında ve grup içinde Yazar Algı Ölçeği sonuçlarına göre anlamlı bir fark bulunamamıştır. Verilen konular üzerine yazdırılmış olan kompozisyonlar görünüm, planlama, geliştirme ve dil kullanımı kategorilerine göre değerlendirilmiş ve analizler sonunda gruplar arasında anlamlı bir fark bulunamamıştır. Bu araştırmanın sonuçları, algıda olan değişikliğin tutumda olan değişikliğe göre daha yavaş gerçekleştiğini göstermektedir. Çalışma, Yazarlık Döngüsü'nün öğrencilerin yazılı anlatım becerisini geliştireceği yönündeki bulguları desteklememektedir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Yazma süreci, beceri, tutum, algı.

Abstract

This study was designed to explore the effects of authoring cycle curricular framework on third grade students' writing skills, attitudes toward writing and self-perceptions as writers. Pre-test and post-test control group experimental design was used in the study the results of which revealed that there were significant differences between pre-test and post-test conditions of the experimental and control group in Writing Attitude Survey scores. On the other hand, the results revealed no significant differences between and within the groups' Writer Self-Perception Scale scores. Three compositions on given topics were scored on appearance, organization, development, language. The analysis indicated no significant differences between groups' composition scores. The results of the study show that changes in attitudes toward writing occur less in time. This study did not support the assertion that using authoring cycle to teach writing has a potential to alter the quality of students' writing ability.

Keywords: Writing process, ability, attitude, self-perception

Introduction

One of the major concerns for elementary teachers is teaching literacy. Writing instruction by itself is also becoming an important subject among teachers and scholars. The significance of writing comes from the fact that it is another form of language learning. As a unique mode of thinking, it is very connected to, but different from, reading, listening and talking. Writing is about learning communication, paying attention to what is going on, making connections and finding the significance hidden in our lives (Sever, 2004). The very deep necessity to teach writing

---

* *Yrd. Doç. Dr., Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, İlköğretim Bölümü, dseban@akdeniz.edu.tr
  Yrd. Doç. Dr. Demet SEBAN.

to help students make sense out of their lives should became a trigger for educators to learn more about how to teach writing. It is not just about learning new techniques and strategies, but it also needs a vision to decide what is essential to effectively teach writing (Pritchard & Honeycutt, 2006).

Traditional writing instruction is criticized for not having the significant potential to alter the quality of students' writing because of focusing too strongly on the products instead of the writing process experienced by children (McCrimmon, 1984; Poindexter & Oliver, 1999). Well-known practices such as competitive grading of written work and correcting the writing style of assigned topics were no longer considered to be good teaching practices (Pritchard & Honeycutt, 2006; Stice, Bertrand & Bertrand, 1995). In 1987, Hillocks reviewed about 2000 studies which focused on the teaching of composition to provide a guide for developing a more effective curriculum. Hillocks (1987) highlighted six effective methods of teaching writing. The first one, related to teaching grammar indicated, "The study of traditional school grammar has no effect on raising the quality of student writing…. Moreover, a heavy emphasis on mechanics and usage results in significant losses in overall quality" (p. 74). The presentation of good pieces of writing as models, the practice of building complex sentences from simpler ones, having students evaluate their own and others' writing, and inquiry method and free writing techniques were other methods recommended as major instructional techniques.

Awareness among educators regarding daily uninterrupted, authentic writing in elementary schools steadily increased by language researchers including Murray (1980; 1984), Graves (1983), Harste, Short and Burke (1996), Tompkins (2002). As the more general application of teaching writing "as a process" movement is a workshop approach (Calkins, 1994; Dyson & Freedman, 1991; Graves, 1983), emphasizing the creation of environments in which students engage in and practice the craft of writing. Students take ownership of their writings by determining the topics, audiences, purposes and forms of their texts. With the support of their teacher and collaboration with peers, children are supposed to become more aware of their intentions in writing their texts. Grammar and mechanics are learned through recursive periods and stages, such as drafting, revising, editing, and publishing. In this approach, producing a holistic writing curriculum which uses real authentic literature and interaction are at the heart of teaching writing.

A writing process that has been called "the authoring cycle" has been recommended as a writing program for implementation in the classroom (Akyol, 2006; Calkins, 1994; Harp & Brewer, 1996; Harste, Short, & Burke, 1996). This authoring cycle approach is now commonly used to organize the language arts curriculum in school settings. Effective writing results from regularly scheduled opportunities for children to write and share their writing with specific audiences (Calkins, 1994; Graves, 1983; Harste, Short, & Burke, 1996). The major components of this authoring cycle framework are: to include life experiences that involve learners' current knowledge and understanding (i.e. begin with the known); uninterrupted reading and writing time that allows time for reading, writing, observation and reflection (i.e. making lists of experiences and ideas to write about, using writers' notebooks, sketch journals, author folders, and journals); authors' circles that allow writers to gain new perspectives through sharing and thinking about their topics with other writers; self-editing (i.e. reflection and revision); outside editors (i.e. editing by peers and teachers); publishing and celebrating (i.e. recognition of authorship, sharing what was learned); and invitations and language strategy instruction consisting of the phase during which authors have examined their writing processes and their goals for learning (i.e. psychological and sociological strategies for taking thoughtful new action) (Harste, Short & Burke, 1996). These components of the writing process are recursive, allowing authors to move in any direction and across the cycle to fulfill their needs and purposes. A typical approach is to involve students in a short lesson, providing them with work time for writing, including organizing and rethinking ideas with the opportunities for editing with both teacher and peers in which they share their works, and publishing finished written works with a larger audience if the writer wishes to share (Calkins, 1994; Tompkins, 1997).

When students use writing as a tool for personal expression, not only do they explore their own personal interests, but they also explore the world around them. Thus, the process model of writing allows students to have a voice and to create a more humane and just atmosphere in schools (Lensmire, 1994; Jasmine & Weiner, 2007). In the end, they have a chance to share their writing and see that their writing is valued. As Fox (1993) stated, when students have the opportunity to write and see their writing valued, they care about their writing, become more invested in their own work and become encouraged to write for fun and enjoyment. It changes the traditional teachers' and students' roles so that the teacher gets a chance to "stand beside and help students, rather than lord it over them" (Lensmire, 1994, p. 9). These experiences also stimulate children's literacy activities about the nature of writing.

These approaches allow students to engage in writing in meaningful ways because the best way to teach writing is simply to let students write, and writing is more than learning a series of skills (Graves, 1983). Students have an opportunity to develop positive attitudes towards writing and to make writing a useful part of their own lives through applying and developing their craft through a meaningful process. Positive self-perception and achievement were found to be consistently linked to each other (Kahne, 1996; Wiggins, Schatz, & West, 1994). Students' attitudes toward reading and writing are an impact factor in achieving literacy learning (Turner & Paris, 1995). It has been acknowledged that process-based learning improves motivation and attitudes towards writing, regardless of the academic achievement (Bottomley, Truscott, Marinac, Henk, & Melnick, 1999). There are other research reports that show there are not significant differences in attitude between students in a process writing class and others in control groups (Grisham, 1993; Jackson, 1996).

Although Turkish national standards do not explicitly place an emphasis on the writing process, in general it supports the process approach. At the beginning of the written curriculum, some of the terms such as planning, beginning with the known, topic selection, self-editing, and evaluating a written piece using forms emphasize a part of writing instruction. Self-assessment sheets and teacher forms for evaluation are provided with the curriculum. However, these sheets focus more on language structure and organization than on the process.

Composition is one of the most important aspects of writing. However, the focus of the curriculum is on conventions and mechanical concerns related to grammar, punctuation, organization, word choice, and vocabulary use—not on composition. Curriculum teachers' guidance books emphasize using students' experiences and background knowledge, helping them to find their voice, and using teaching strategies to develop the content of the writing. Nevertheless, in the Turkish curriculum's teacher manuals and student textbooks, writing in general is emphasized as an activity that takes place at the end of the reading process. Writing topics are mostly related to the main theme of the reading piece. First, pre-reading activities are done to motivate students; then as a second step further activities are done to help students understand what they read.

Under interdisciplinary teaching, students are required to explore issues using as many curriculum areas as possible, such as the arts, science and technology, and mathematics. Students are free to choose the genre. However, genre writing activities are also done separately. Looking at the details we might say that the national curriculum has the features of both traditional and process approaches. Cagımlar and Iflazoglu (2002) indicate that there is not an effective conceptual framework to teach writing in elementary classrooms and also students do not actively and systematically engage in writing in Turkey.

This study is designed to explore the effect of the authoring cycle curricular framework on third grade students' writing skills, based on the argument that the process approach is not adequately reflected in the third grade Turkish curriculum within its balanced design. The secondary purpose of the study is to look at the effect of this framework on students' attitudes toward writing and self-perceptions as writers. Looking at the effect of positive attitude and self-perception on students' achievements in writing is also another specific purpose of the study.

Method

The purposes of this study were to investigate how the authoring cycle curricular framework affected third-grade students' attitudes toward writing and self-perceptions as writers. In addition, it set out to discover whether there was any significant improvement and development in students' writing skills. In this study a quantitative method was used to get a better understanding of the effect of the program used in third grade classroom. One class was assigned as the control group and the other one was the experimental group. The special feature of this classroom was that all students were taught by the same classroom teacher until the third grade.

Setting, Participants and Data Resources

The study was conducted in a state elementary school located in an urban area with low-income inhabitants in Turkey. A total of 42 students participated. The third grade teachers were asked to participate to the study. One agreed to be in the experimental group with his students (n=21) and work with the researcher in applying the program and following the process. In terms of demographics, all of the students were white with similar mixes of students from middle to lower class communities. Nineteen of them were female and 23 of them were male students. In each group, almost equal numbers of male and female students were represented.

The surveys used were adapted from *The Writing Attitude Survey* (WAS) developed by Kear, Coffman, McKenna and Ambrosio (2000), and *The Writer Self-Perception Scale* (WSPS) developed by Bottomley, Henk and Melnick (1997/1998). All items in the scales were translated into Turkish by the researcher and were checked to verify the accuracy of the translations by three academicians whose profession in English language teaching. The questions also were sent to a number of colleges to comment upon. In the light of suggestions questions were chosen to ask.

In the original WAS, there were 28 items using the incorporated Garfield character into a Likert-type scale supplied by the creator of the Garfield cartoon character, Jim Davis, and the copyright owner, Paws Incorporated, displaying emotions from 'very happy' assigned a score of 4 to 'very upset' Garfield assigned a score of 1. The reliability coefficient of the survey is .88. The original survey is seven pages and each has four questions with pictures. The items were reduced to a 10-item questionnaire in order to make easier to answer for third grade students. The questions were also eliminated to overcome transitional errors that might lead misunderstandings (i.e. how do you feel if you could write more in school / how do you feel if you didn't write as much in school). Similar questions (i.e. how do you feel keeping a diary / how do you feel writing about things that have happened in your life), the questions that does not covered in our writing program in third grade (i.e. writing about the things they have done in science and social science courses) and the questions that are common applications in that culture (i.e. writing a letter to a store asking about something you might buy there) were also eliminated. (See Appendix A)

The original WSPS survey included 38 items with a five-point Likert type-scale, normed with students in fourth, fifth and sixth grade. There were categories of assessed self-perception along five dimensions of self-efficacy: (1) general progress, (2) specific progress, (3) observational comparison, (4) social feedback, and (5) physiological states. The reliability coefficients in these five dimensions is .90, .89, .90, .87, .91, respectively. Two statements from each category were chosen according to the level of third grade students and modified the scale to three-point Likert-type scale with a range from 'disagree' (1) to 'agree' (3) (See Appendix B).

In addition to the small surveys, each class was asked to write one composition on a given topic over three weeks. The topics were: (a) If you had a chance to change one thing, what would this be and why? (b) Describe a place where you feel safe and happy; and (c) What kind of place is this world going to be after a hundred years? A scoring rubric was developed to examine students' written compositions. The rubric had four main categories: appearance, organization, development and language. Each category has subcategories with its scoring scale (See Appendix C). In addition to the scoring rubric the word count was applied for each written text to compare the length of the compositions.

At the beginning of the semester over three weeks the pre-tests were applied to the control and experimental group. No statistical differences were found. After gathering data, students in the experimental group engaged in writing activities planned in the light of the authoring cycle framework for two hours a week over 28 weeks. A program with activities that would engage students in different kinds of writings was applied while control group was following the activities in curricula. The program for experimental group was designed to reflect all of the stages of "Authoring Cycle" including building from the known, uninterrupted reading and writing time, gaining new perspectives, attending to difference, sharing what was learned, self-editing, selecting outside editors, publishing and celebrating and invitations for taking thoughtful new action. The program started with providing books and reading materials that were connected closely to their lives. The children were invited to read aloud and do some shared reading. Different picture books to explore were chosen and then the styles and illustrations of the books were talked about. The similarities in the books from the same author and from different authors were discussed. Also, the experimental group required to have journals in which to write regularly about the ideas they wanted to inquiry and entries about anything they wanted to write about. Later, their drafts were shared with the class and feedback was taken. They chose a topic to write about and published it as a picture book, either from their drafts they had written in their journals until that time or as a new topic that they had not worked on before. For the last three months the students worked on their books. We made a list of students who wanted to share their piece to get feedback. We used overheads and discussed some pieces as a whole group. Then, the editor tables were conducted. Three editors for each week were assigned to work on others' pieces as we had done together. When they finished their pieces and organized their picture book drafts they were all assigned times to write them on the teacher's computer. Using software, the books were published as they had planned. They added illustrations or had someone to do that. They worked on the front and back cover. In the last week an Authors Day was prepared and teachers, students, families and friends were invited to celebrate their success. Before the celebration all students were asked to fill out surveys and write about the same topics that were given at the beginning of the semester.

Procedures of Data Analysis

In this study, quantitative analysis method was applied. The data were examined to address the following questions: (1) How has the authoring cycle curricular framework affected third grade students' attitudes toward writing and self-perceptions about themselves as writers? (2) Are there any significant improvements and development in students' writing skills? Statistical analysis was performed to examine the research questions. Descriptive statistics using frequencies (i.e., means and standard deviations) were used to describe students' attitudes toward writing, self-perceptions about themselves as writers and development in their writing skills. Independent sample *t*-tests were computed to see if there were significant differences in students' mean scores of pre and post tests. The $p < .05$ and $p < .01$ levels were selected to determine the statistical significance of the *t*-test results.

Results

In this section, the survey results were brought together. In addition to the statistical analysis and the interpretation of the findings obtained from surveys and composition assessment, the results considering the books that students in the experimental group wrote as additional data were also discussed. The quality of books using the same composition assessment rubric without comparing the control group was talked about.

The results indicated that there were no significant differences between pre-test WAS scores of experimental (M=31.04, SD=3.42) and control group [M=32.57, SD=4.38; t (42) = -1.25, ns]. No significant differences were found between the WSPS scores of the experimental group (M=23.42,

SD=2.67) and control group [M=24.09, SD=4.22; t (42) = - .61, ns]. Also, no significant differences were found between the composition scores of the experimental group (M=35.20, SD=14.56) and control group [M=26.45, SD=13.25; t (40) = 1.98, ns]. Because of the results of independent *t*-tests (presented in Table 1) we would accept that the level of groups was similar to each other. Each composition of the students was analyzed using the composition assessment rubric. Adding the three scores each students' final score was computed.

Table 1

Comparison of the WAS and WSPS Pre-test Scores of Experimental and Control Group

Groups' Scores	n	M	SD	t-test	p
Groups' WAS Scores					
Experimental Pre-test	21	31.04	3.42		
				-1.25	.21*
Control Pre-test	21	32.57	4.38		
Groups' WSPS Scores					
Experimental Pre-test	21	23.42	2.67		
				-.61	.54*
Control Pre-test	21	24.09	4.22		
Composition Scores					
Experimental Pre-test	20	35.20	14.56		
				1.98	.05**
Control Pre-test	20	26.45	13.25		

*p<.05; ** p<.01

After the program was implemented the surveys were applied to the same groups of participants. The analysis revealed that there were significant differences between pre-test and post-test conditions of the experimental and control group's WAS scores (see table 2). According to results the attitudes of the control group toward writing decreased compared to their pre-test scores. There was also a statistically significant difference between the post-scores of the control and experimental group which means the program had a positive effect on the attitudes of the experimental group (see Table 2).

Table 2

Comparison of Pre-test and Post-test WAS Scores of Experimental and Control Group

Groups	n	M	SD	t-test	p
Experimental Pre-test	21	31.04	3.42		
				-2.36	.02*
Experimental Post-test	21	33.71	3.87		
Control Pre-test	21	32.57	4.38		
				3.51	.001*
Control Post-test	21	28.61	2.71		
Experimental Post-test	21	33.71	3.87		
				4.93	.000*
Control Post-test	21	28.61	2.71		

*p<.05

On the other hand, the results of the independent samples *t*-test revealed no significant differences within the groups' WSPS scores (see Table 3). While the attitudes of the students

toward writing had changed, the self-perception of students as writers remained the same. Similarly there were no significant difference between the post WSPS scores of the control and experimental group which means the program had no effect on the self-perception of the students in the experimental group as writers (see Table 3).

Table 3

Comparison of Pre-test and Post-test WSPS Scores of Experimental and Control Group

Groups	n	M	SD	t-test	p
Experimental Pre-test	21	23.42	2.67		
				-.91	.35*
Experimental Post-test	21	24.38	3.76		
Control Pre-test	21	24.09	4.22		
				.82	.41*
Control Post-test	21	23.19	2.74		
Experimental Post-test	21	24.38	3.76		
				1.17	.24*
Control Post-test	21	23.19	2.74		

*p<.05

The words provided in the compositions were counted. In the experimental group, students wrote 25 words while the control group wrote 19 words for each topic at the beginning of the semester. At the end of the semester students in the experimental group wrote 103 words while the other group wrote 60 words for each topic. Experimental group students wrote without considering the level of their textual content which had improved four times while other groups' students writing improved three times. Although the results of the independent samples *t*-test revealed no significant differences between groups, the results revealed significant differences within groups' composition scores (see Table 4). Furthermore, the analysis revealed that there were no significant differences between post-test conditions of the experimental and control group composition scores (see table 4). According to results, the students who got the program showed no significant differences in their writing abilities.

Table 4

Comparison of the Pre-test and Post-test Composition Scores of Experimental and Control Group

Groups	n	M	SD	t-test	p
Experimental Pre-test	20	35.20	14.56		
				-2.67	.01**
Experimental Post-test	20	47.10	13.57		
Control Pre-test	20	26.45	13.25		
				-2.75	.00**
Control Post-test	20	39.20	15.93		
Experimental Post-test	20	47.10	13.57		
				1.68	.10**
Control Post-test	20	39.20	15.93		

**p<.01

To examine or describe students' writing performance based on the items in the rubric, descriptive statistics using frequencies (i.e., means and standard deviations) were used. The *t*-test result showed significant differences between pre-test and post-test conditions mainly on organization and development categories (see Table 5).

Table 5

Mean and Standard Deviation Scores of Items

Assessment Categories	Experimental Group				Control Group			
	Pre-test		Post-test		Pre-test		Post-test	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Appearance	6.00	0.00	5.15	1.69**	5.25	1.77	5.70	1.55
Organization	4.00	1.29	6.20	2.19*	3.30	1.49	4.60	2.08**
Development	10.50	6.73	20.80	7.95*	6.55	6.94	15.00	10.86*
Language	14.70	8.18	16.25	6.31	12.10	7.78	14.95	7.26

*$p<.05$; **$p<.01$

Students' writing abilities in mechanics and style did not show significant progress but the content of the compositions improved without depending on the applied program. The overall quality of the experimental group's pre-test scores of the students was 35.5 percent and it increased to 48.8 percent. The control group's scores increased from 27.4 percent to 40.6 percent. According to results, experimental group students' composition success was lower than it was expected to be as a result of the applied program.

Besides writing composition, the experimental group wrote picture books and poetry books. Eleven of them wrote a picture book and 10 of them made their poems in the form of book. The length of the stories varied from 169 words to 854 words with an average 402 words per person. Books with poems varied from 147 words to 340 words with an average 221 words per person. The books met all the requirements of the composition assessment rubric because, before the publishing process, all the written pieces were checked in the editors table.

Discussion and Conclusion

The result of this study showed that the program had a positive effect on students' attitudes toward writing but no significant effect on their self-perception. There are studies to support results that there is no relationship between students' self-perception toward writing and the kind of teaching method (Pollington, Wilcox & Morrison, 2001; Bottomley et al., 1999). There are studies that support a positive relationship between attitudes and teaching method (Strech, 1994) although no differences in academic achievement were found when comparing the traditional method and whole language (Grisham, 1993). The results of the study show that change in attitudes toward writing occur less in time than the self-perception of students as writers. Similarly, Strech (1994) reported that attitude changes occur less in time. Additionally, the results also showed no relationship between attitude and writing achievement as well as self-perception and writing achievement.

As the data revealed no significant differences between groups writing achievement this study did not support the conclusion that the method of teaching writing using the authoring cycle framework has a strong potential to alter the quality of students' writing ability.

In the case of this particular study, there were several reasons for not statistically supporting the assumptions explained in the literature review. One of them was that implementation for one school year was not enough for effects to emerge. During the process, many difficulties in implementing the weekly plans were experienced. One of them was the group working abilities of the students. After several group works, students figured out some of their main responsibilities and the expectations at the beginning of any literacy activity done in the classroom.

In addition to the group works, students had difficulty when they were giving feedback. After several weeks they learned how to give feedback to a written piece. They had tended to focus on grammatical errors rather than the meaning and content of the writing. The quality

of their feedback increased over time. The editing and publication process were also the most challenging parts of the program. There was only one computer in the classroom and students were assigned to write their books after they had been edited by getting feedback from two or three student editors and the teacher. The illustrations in the books were also another time-demanding work. If the students had gained some abilities when they were in first grade they would be able to do the tasks in time without frustration. These reasons also may act as a barrier to developing their self-perception as writers. The frustration they experienced during the activities acted as a barrier to develop their writing abilities further, too. Lastly, at the beginning of the study, a state school was chosen instead of a private school to increase the accessibility of the program. The state schools have limited resources compared to private schools. Many times the studies implemented in private schools were criticized for having limited generalizability of the implications. The academic successes of the school where the study was conducted were also in the lower categories. This might have decreased the quality of the program implemented.

In Turkey, there are several studies conducted to increase students' writing achievement in different grades through applying different methods. In these studies, they found that cooperative writing method increased 3rd grade students writing ability in a positive way (Anılan, Akkuş & Acar, 2009), integrated learning-teaching approach effected 8th grade students written expression skills in terms of knowledge, comprehension and application levels (Hamzadayı, 2010), and clustering method is effective method developing 5th grade students writing expression skills (Anılan & Gültekin, 2006). In 6th grade, literary children books were used as basic instrument to teach literacy and it was found that this this methods more efficient except knowledge level than traditional method on students writing skills (Aslan, 2007). Thus, the results of this study brought new questions for further research and showed that longitudinal studies are necessary to assess the long-term outcomes of a process approach to writing. This program offers students continuous opportunities to be engaged in writing with a guiding philosophy. Students and teachers may have a broader understanding of how to use the writing process as a tool for personal growth and individual learning through engagement as reflective and creative writers. The program was more about suggesting that writing can be taught in more meaningful ways through acting as writers.

References

Akyol, H. (2006). *Yeni Programa Uygun Türkçe* Öğretim Yöntemleri [Turkish teaching methods appropriate to the new program]. Ankara: Kök Yayıncılık.

Anılan, H. & Gültekin, M. (2006) Yazılı Anlatım Becerilerinin Geliştirilmesinde Kelime Ağı Oluşturma yönteminin etkililiği [The effectiveness of clustering method in developing written expression skills]. *Eskisehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 7 (1), 1-23.

Anılan, H., Akkuş, R., & Acar, D. (2009, May). *İşbirlikli Yazma Çalışmalarının İlköğretim* Üçüncü *Sınıf* Öğrencilerinin *Yazma Başarılarına Etkisi* [The effect of cooperative writing works on 5th grade students' writing success]. Paper presented at the meeting of the 8. Ulusal Sınıf Öğretmenliği Sempozyumu, Eskişehir.

Aslan, C. (2007). Yazınsal Nitelikli Çocuk Kitaplarının Çocuğun Okuduğunu Anlama ve Yazılı Anlatım Becerilerine Etkisi [The effect of literary children's books on reading comprehension and writing skills of children]. *Eğitim Araştırmaları*, 27, 15-29.

Bottomley, D. M., Henk, W. A., & Melnick, S. A. (1997/1998). Assessing children's views about themselves as writers using the Writer Self-Perception Scale. *The Reading Teacher*, *51 (4),* 286–296.

Bottomley, D. M., Truscott, D. M., Marinac, B. A., Henk, W. A., & Melnick, S. A. (1999). An affective comparison of whole language, literature-based and basal literacy instruction. *Reading*

Research and Instruction, *38*, 115–129.

Calkins, L. M. (1994). *The art of teaching writing*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Çağımlar, Z. & İflazoğlu, A. (2002). Yazılı ve Sözlü Anlatım Becerilerinin (Kompozisyon) İlköğretim 5. Sınıflarda Öğretmen ve Öğrenci Görüşleri Açısından Değerlendirilmesi [The evaluation of written and oral expression skills (composition) of 5th grade students in terms of teacher and students views]. Çukurova Üniveristesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 23 (2), 12-22.

Dyson, A. H., & Freedman, S. W. (1991). Writing. In J. Flood, J. Jensen, D. Lapp, & J. Squire (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching the English language arts*. (pp. 754–775). New York: Macmillan.

Fox, M. (1993). *Radical reflections*. San Diego; Harcourt Brace & Co.

Graves, D. (1983). *Writing: teachers and children at work*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Grisham, D. (1993, April). *The integrated language arts: Curriculum enactments in whole language and traditional fourth grade classrooms.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 359 495)

Hamzadayı, E. (2010). Bütünleştirilmiş *Öğrenme-Öğretme* Yaklaşımının Okuduğunu Anlama ve Yazılı Anlatım Becerilerine Etkisi [The effect of integrated learning-teaching approach on reading comprehension and narration skills]. *Gaziantep Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 9 (3), 631-668.

Harp, B., & Brewer, J. (1996). *Reading and writing: Teaching for the connections*. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.

Harste, J. C., Short, K. G., & Burke, C. (1996). *Creating classrooms for authors and inquirers*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Hillocks, G. (1987). Synthesis of research on teaching writing. *Educational Leadership*, *45*, 71–82.

Jackson, D. M. (1996). *Specialized training in process writing*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 395 313).

Jasmine, J.,& Weiner, W (2007). The effects of writing workshop on abilities of first grade students to become confident and independent writers. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 35 (2), 131-139

Kahne, J. (1996). The politics of self-esteem. *American Educational Research Journal, 33 (1)*, 3–22.

Kear, D. J., Coffman, G. A., McKenna, M. C., & Ambrosio, A. L. (2000). Measuring attitude toward writing: A new tool for teachers. *The Reading Teacher*, *54 (1)*, 10–23.

Lensmire, T. J. (1994). *When children write: Critical re-visions of the writing workshop*. New York: Teachers College Press.

McCrimmon, J. M. (1984). Writing as a way of knowing. In R. L. Graves (Ed.), *Rhetoric and composition: A sourcebook for teachers and writers* (p. 89–94). Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/ Cook Publishers.

Murray, D. (1980). Writing as processes: How writing finds its own meaning. In T. R. Donovan & B .W. McClelland (Eds.), *Eight approaches to teaching composition* (p. 3-20). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Murray, D. (1984). Teaching writing as a process not product. In R. L. Graves (Ed.), *Rhetoric and composition: A sourcebook for teachers and writers* (p. 89-94). Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton / Cook Publishers.

Poindexter, C. C., & Oliver, I. R. (1999). Navigating the writing process: strategies for young children. *Reading Teacher*, *52 (4)*, 420–423.

Pollington, M. F., Wilcox, B., & Morrison, T. G. (2001). Self-perception in writing: The effects of writing workshop and traditional instruction on intermediate grade students. *Reading Psychology*, 22, 249–265.

Pritchard, R. J. & Honeycutt, R. L. (2006). Process approach to writing instruction: Examining its effectiveness. In. C. A. McArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (eds.) *Handbook of Writing Research* (pp. 275 - 290). Gilford Press.

Sever, S. (2004). Türkçe Öğretimi ve Tam Öğrenme [Turkish teaching and mastery learning]. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Stice, C., Bertrand, J., & Bertrand, N. (1995). *Integrating reading and the other language arts*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Strech, L. L. (1994). *Action research: The implementation of Writing workshop in the third grade.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 380 798).

Tompkins, G. E. (2002). *Language arts: Content and teaching strategies*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Tompkins, G. E. (1997). *Literacy for the 21st century: A balanced approach*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Turner, J., & Paris, S. (1995). How literacy tasks influence children's motivation for literacy. *The Reading Teacher*, *48*, 662–673.

Wiggins, J. D., Schatz, E. L., & West, R. W. (1994). The relationship of self-esteem to grades, achievement scores, and other factors critical to school success. *School Counselor, 41*, 239–244.

Appendix A

Writing Attitude Survey (WAS)

Note: The items on the instrument displayed with Garfield character from 'very happy' Garfield assigned a score of 4 to 'very upset' Garfield assigned a score of 1.

How do you feel if you wrote about something you have heard or seen?

How do you feel about spending free time reading?

How do you feel keeping a diary?

How do you feel writing a letter stating your opinion about a topic?

How do you feel if you were an author who writes books?

How do you feel if you had a job as a writer for a newspaper?

How do you feel about writing a story instead of watching TV?

How do you feel writing about something you did in social science courses?

How do you feel if your teacher asked you to go back and change some of your writing?

How do you feel if your classmates read something you wrote?

Appendix B

The Writer Self-Perception Scale (WSPS)

The items on the instrument displayed with scale to three-point Likert-type scale with a range from 'disagree' (1) to 'agree'.

I write better than other kids in my class. (Observational Comparison)

When I write I feel calm. (Physiological States)

Writing is easier for me than it used to be. (General Progress)

People in my family think I am a good writer. (Social Feedback)

My sentences are clearer than they used to be. (General Progress)

I write more often than other kids. (Observational Comparison)

I enjoy writing. (Physiological States)

The order of my sentences makes better sense now. (Specific Progress)

My teacher thinks my writing is fine. (Social Feedback)

I choose the words I use in my writing more carefully now. (Specific Progress)

Appendix C
Writing Assessment Rubric

Appearance

Paper organization (well organized 2, adequate 1, weak 0)

Handwriting (well 2, adequate 1, weak 0)

Has a title (yes 1, no 0)

Organization

Has an introduction sentences (yes 1, no 0)

Has a development sentences (yes 1, no 0)

Has an ending sentences (yes 1, no 0)

Has an appropriate title (well 2, adequate 1, weak 0)

Development

Strong and purposeful beginning (Strong 3, competent 2, limited 1, deficient 0)

Sufficient key ideas (Sufficient 3, competent 2, limited 1, deficient 0)

Appropriate development of ideas (Appropriate 3, competent 2, limited 1, deficient 0)

Appropriate conclusion consistent with the main idea (Appropriate 3, competent 2, limited 1, deficient 0)

Clear and strong ending (Strong 3, competent 2, limited 1, deficient 0)

Language

Use of mechanics (Strong 3, competent 2, limited 1, deficient 0)

Language usage (Strong 3, competent 2, limited 1, deficient 0)

Sentence structure (well 2, adequate 1, weak 0)