Determination of Writing Expression Skills of Primary School 4th Grade Students and Teachers' Activities During Writing Process

Özge Erdoğan

Department of Classroom Educatio

n, Karadeniz Technical University, Fatih Education Faculty, Adnan Kahveci Street, A Block, No: 110, 61300, Trabzon, Turkey

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to determine the writing expression skills of primary 4th grade students and their teachers' activities during writing process. The research was carried out with 472 primary school 4th grade students. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 20 classroom teachers in order to reveal the writing activities done by the teachers. Qualitative research method was used in the collection, analysis and interpretation of the data. The writings of the students were analyzed by document analysis. The data obtained from the semi-structured interviewed teachers were analyzed by content analysis. The results obtained from the research reveal that 4th grade students in primary school have a poor level of written expression skills. Findings from interviews with teachers reveal that teachers don't do enough work in the classroom to improve their writing skills and to correct students' writing mistakes.

Keywords: Writing expression skill, Writing process, Teacher

1. Introduction

Writing, which is a very powerful means of communication in today's literate society, is a complex skill that must be struggled with many cognitive elements (Saddler, Moran, Graham & Harris 2004). Writing is the cognitive problem-solving process that allows the person to transmit his/her information, ideas and feelings to the reader in a meaningful way (Hayes &Flower 1980). Therefore, the writing process requires a conscious effort (Vygotsky 1998). To Flowers and Hayes (1981), the writer has to make decisions that require a lot of mental processing to give a meaningful message to the reader. The reason for this is the fact that how to write the text, to whom it is written and why it is written are associated to each other and that cognitive, linguistic and physical processes are performed together while forming the text (Erdoğan 2013; Sever 2013; Harris, Steve & Linda 2003).

To Koster, Bouwer and Bergh (2017), the necessary knowledge and skills must be taught to the students in order to manage the cognitive activities needed during writing. The emergence of good writing in this process depends on being successful at word, sentence, paragraph and text levels and making as few errors as possible at these levels (Akbaba &Yalçın 2016). Akbaba and Yalçın (2016) who distinguishes the writing process into four steps, specifies the mistakes made at the word level as word repetition, wrong word choice and writing errors. Coşkun (2011) expresses, at sentence level, that students' writings usually include in-coherency, and that there are mistakes in their vocabulary preferences and that they frequently make punctuation errors. He/she specifies that they established weak links between sentences at paragraph level, they could not completely improve their thoughts and they often give place to subject transitions. He/she states that there are disconnections between paragraphs at text level, thoughts are often left unfinished and unnecessary repetitions are included.

When the word, sentence, paragraph and text levels which help to evaluate the writing process is examined in general, it is seen that some competencies are expected from students related to both upper level and lower level skills. Students' achievements related to word, sentence, paragraph and text level is possible by reducing errors made in these steps. In this context, in the elimination of deficiencies of the students related to the writing process; writing's content, writing style, language and expression, spelling and punctuation elements play important role.

Language and expression is an important element of writing. The language and expression features used by the students in the writing process should be clear, plain and belong to the desired message. So, certain integrity is provided between sentences and paragraphs (Graham & Perin 2007). Otherwise, an unnecessary and irrelevant word in the text, constantly repeated information impairs the flow of the narration, and they can awaken a sense of boredom in the reader (Erol &Kıroğlu 2012). In this context, it can be said that the fact that the written text is sufficient in terms of language and expression depends on the use of the words appropriately, the use of a clear and understandable language, and establishment of an integration between sentences and paragraphs.

In order to accurately transmit the message which was desired to give to the reader, the narrative must be simple and fluent, as well as it must possess a logical integrity in terms of content. According to Bae, Bentler and Lee (2016), the content is an extremely important dimension of writing and it is considered as an idea or meaning in the writing. The fact that the content is expressed richly depends on using the skills effectively such as students' the ability to use the vocabulary, transmitting the desired message to the other side without going off

the subject, and enriching text content by using understandable sentences. (Cemiloğlu 2009; Raimes 1983).

In order to be able to form a qualified written expression product, it is important that the text is carefully arranged in terms of language, expression and content. However, for a good and readable writing, mechanical skills are also extremely important. This mechanical process includes the smooth and proper writing of letters in coordination with working of motor skills. The fact that these skills are weak reduces the content and quality of writing (Limpoa, Alvesa &Connelly 2017). Therefore, another important element of writing is the spelling and punctuation. According to Waugh (1998), spelling and punctuation have a very important role in the quality of writing. Spelling and punctuation allows the text to be understood correctly and the message given in the text to reach the reader correctly. Because the emphasis and intonation that are sometimes not included in speech are provided by punctuation on the text. By means of this, language units are noticed and the fact that text is understandable becomes stronger.

Another complementary writing of written expression is the writing style. It is a necessary feature in terms of both readability and aesthetics that written letters have a visually regular appearance. For this reason, it is expected that the students will perform mechanical skills such as leaving appropriate spaces in the written expression process, writing letters and words properly, leaving appropriate spaces between letters, words and sentences and lines (Raimes 1983; Grabe & Kaplan 1996). According to Raimes (1983), the fact that students use spelling and punctuation rules effectively and appropriately helps them to enrich content, writing style, language and expression, and to form a qualified essay.

The aim in the development of writing skills is to bring up individuals who are motivated to write, who can evaluate their writing by themselves and who can make the necessary adjustments independently (Bryson 2003). However, in this process, students may encounter some problems. According to Hachem, Nabhani and Bauhaus (2008), some students cannot understand exactly what authors make during the writing process. In this context, students need the guidance of teachers (Fisher 2006). In short, another factor that plays a role in making the writing process more efficient is teachers (Brooks 2007; Bryson 2003).

Teachers have important tasks so that students can be more successful during the writing process (Wood & Shea-Bischoff 1997). Therefore, teachers are expected that they should plan the writing process in the form of levels in which students can apply fondly and should shape them with appropriate feedback and orientation (Karatay 2011; Tompkins 2004). At this point, the competences of the teachers regarding the writing process are come to the fore. Teachers who not feel he/she is sufficient in the writing process cannot become a good model for their students in this process and cannot have students gained the skills required for their writing development (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy 2001). Since teachers' confidence in themselves as a writer influences their pedagogical preferences (Cremin & Oliver 2016), they cannot provide adequate support with their students during the writing process (Morgan 2010).

Kara-Soteriou and Kaufman (2002) have shown that some teachers have carried out the writing process, depending on formulas and rules. In addition, they have stated that teachers did not become models in the writing process to their students, they did not spare time to share written products, and they did not offer choices to their students about subject selection. In this context, it can be said that the teachers' studies which they made in the writing process become a pathfinder in the development of the writing skills of the students (Tompkins 2004). According to Graves (1983), the fact that teachers guide their students in this process, prepare them for writing and indicate the steps which are required to follow practically in the writing process influence the quality of the students' writings.

When the literature related to writing skills is examined, it is seen that the number of researches that examine the writing expression skills of primary school students is very few. It can be said that the conducted researches were usually carried out at secondary, high school and university level. In this research, determination of the written expression skills of the primary school students and the activities done by the teachers in the writing process will contribute to reveal the deficiencies in the process. According to Parr and Limbrick (2010), knowing and determination of teachers' practices in the writing process will shed light on the effectiveness of the writing process. In this respect, the researcher's objective is to determine the writing expression skills of the primary 4th grade students and the activities teachers do in the writing process. In the scope of the research, the answers to the following questions are sought:
1. What is the level of writing expression skills of 4th grade primary school students?
2. What do class teachers do in the process of teaching writing?

2. Method
2.1 Model of Research
In this research which aims to determine the writing expression skills of primary school 4th grade students and the works that teachers do during the writing process, the descriptive model has been used since it is aimed to reveal the existing situation as it is. Qualitative research method was used in the collection, analysis and interpretation of the data obtained in the research. Qualitative research is a research in which qualitative data

collection methods such as interviews and document analysis are used (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2006). In this research, students' writings were examined by document analysis technique. Moreover, semi-structured interviews related to writing process were conducted with teachers.

2.2 Study Group

The study group of research consisted of 472 students who were selected among six primary schools in the center of the province of Trabzon and these student's teachers. The study group was selected through easy sampling method among purposive sampling methods. Easy sampling method gives speed and practicality to research. Because in this method the researcher selects a situation that is close and easy to access (Yıldırım & Şimşek 2006).

In the research, interviews were made with the teachers of the students whose writings were examined in order to determine the works they did during the writing process. The distributions of teachers who are all graduated from classroom teaching facilities according to their professional seniorities and genders are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Professional seniorities and genders of teachers participated in research

Feature	Category	f
Sex	Female	12
	Male	8
Professional Seniorities	4-8 years	3
	9-15 years	8
	16-20 years	9

When Table 1 is examined, it is seen that 12 female and 8 male teachers participated in the research. When the professional seniority of teachers is examined, it is seen that 3 teachers worked 4-8 years, 8 teachers worked 9-15 years and 9 teachers worked 16-20 years.

2.3 Data Collection Tools

In this research, "Written Expression Evaluation Rubric" developed by the researcher was used to evaluate the written expression skills of the 4th grade students of primary school. For this purpose, firstly the researches about the evaluation of written expression have been examined. Then, sub-dimensions of rubric are written. Opinions of three field experts were obtained for the validity study of the prepared rubric. The statements in the rubric were rearranged according to expert opinions. Thus the content validity of the rubric is provided. For the reliability, 37 students who are in the 4th grade in primary school were written story. Stories were analyzed separately by 3 field specialists. Then the reliability between the scorers is analyzed. Kendall's compliance coefficient is used when the number of scorers for this is more than two. Kendall's coefficient of fit was found to be W = .85 in the analyzes performed. This result shows that there is a high level of conformity between the scorers. The rubric used in the study was developed as a 3-point likert (good, medium, poor) type. The developed rubric has 4 sub-dimensions and 25 items in total. These are language and expression, content, writing style and spelling and punctuation. Language and expression has 5 items, content has 8 items, writing style has 9 items and spelling and punctuation has 3 items. The highest score that can be taken from each item is 3, the lowest score is 1.

Semi-structured interviews with 20 teachers were conducted to determine the primary school teachers' works that they did during the writing process. The relevant literature was searched for interviews to be carried out, interview questions were prepared and opinions of three field experts related to these questions were obtained. According to expert opinions, the final forms of questions were made.

2.4 Collection and Analysis of Data

The students who form the working group were asked to write something about "family love". The writings of students were analyzed separately by 3 domain experts using " Written Expression Evaluation Rubric". Then the inter-rater reliability was checked. Since the number of raters for this is more than two, Kendall's compliance coefficient is used. Kendall's compliance coefficient was found to be W = .92 in the analysis performed. This obtained result reveals that there is a high level of compliance among raters.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with teachers in the research. The interviews lasted about 15 minutes. In line with the permission of participant teachers, the interview was recorded with voice recorder. The data obtained from interviews in the research were analyzed with "content analysis" technique. Participants' opinions were coded and were separated into sub-themes. Statements related to sub-themes were supported by the same quotations. When the same quotations are being made, a number was given to each teacher who was interviewed. Furthermore, the data obtained from the interviews were analyzed by three different researchers. The compliance between the researchers was examined and high compliance has been observed.

3. Findings and Comments

3.1 Findings and Comments Related to First Research Question

In the research, the writing expression skills of the 4th grade students of primary school were examined.

Table 2. Written expression skills of 4th grade students in primary school

Written Expression Skills	Good		Medium		Poor	
	f	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**
Language and expression	85	18.0	129	27.33	258	54.66
Content	74	15.67	145	30.72	253	53.60
Writing style	114	24.15	261	55.29	97	20.55
Spelling and punctuation	63	13.34	97	20.55	312	66.10

When Table 2 is examined, it is seen that written expression skills of 4th grade students in primary school are generally in a poor level. This finding from the research reveals that the students do not adequately reflect the message they want to give in their writing and that they do not have adequate equipment in this regard.

3.2 Findings and Comments Related to Second Research Question

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with classroom teachers in order to reveal the works which they did about writing process in the research. The first theme that is formed of the conducted interviews is "Writing Competencies". Statements concerning this theme are given in Table 3.

Table 3. Teachers' statements for "writing competencies"

Sub-theme	f	Teacher opinions examples
Insufficient	11	It is easy to teach students to write something, but it is difficult to teach writing something good. I do not think I'm very good at this. (T9) uess I'm not good enough. Because whenever I want students to write something, they do not want to write, they say they are bored. (T10)
Intermediate level	4	m doing my best. I'm not very bad. I'm not very good either. I leave them free. They write as they wish. (T1) Sometimes we do good works but sometimes ordinary writings come out. I guess I'm not too bad at this point. (T4)
Indecisive	3	re are also some aspects that I feel weak at writing as well as aspects that I feel strong at writing. For this reason, I cannot say anything exactly. (T12) It is difficult to reach a judgment about teaching writing. I do not even know whether I'm sufficient. (T13)
Sufficient	2	Writing something is a character. Everyone cannot write something good. But I know how to make students write something good. (T8)

When teachers' writing competencies about themselves are examined, it can be said that the great majority of them regard themselves as "insufficient". Apart from this, it is seen that the number of teachers who regard themselves sufficient is few. The fact that teachers think that they do not have sufficient qualifications about teaching writing can be interpreted as if this thought will be able to influence the writing works which they will do in the class.

Table 4. Teachers' statements for "students' competencies"

Sub-theme	f	Teacher opinions examples
Very bad	9	Obviously the writings are so bad, not just as content. The writings are not even readable. They make a lot of errors when writing. (T7) The most important deficiency I see in the students' writings is that they do not possess sufficient vocabulary. That is why they can write irrelevant and disconnected sentences. (T16)
Intermediate level	6	I cannot say they are very good. They do not write something perfect, but they don't write something bad. (T4) It is not bad although they do not meet my expectations. (T11)
Optimistic	5	They are so forced even in making sentences! They are never sufficient. And I do not have any hope about they will get better in future. Because they do not read books. (T17) They do not have enough vocabulary capacity. They do not know the spelling rules. They cannot even start writing. They say that nothing comes into their minds for a long time and they wander around. Because they do not have ideas. I do not know how to solve this problem. (T1)
Good	3	hen I review the writings of my students in general, I see that they are at a good level. They look they have gained most of learning outcomes. (T8) They can write the way I want. That's enough for me. They are good. (T2)

According to data in Table 4, the teachers stated that students' writings were bad to a great extent. In the conducted interviews, some of the teachers said they were pessimistic about that students will improve their writings. This situation can be interpreted as the fact that the teachers have a negative perception about the improving of writing skills.

Table 5. Teachers' statements for "writing errors of students" theme

Sub-theme	f	Teacher opinions examples
Text level	13	It's a bit difficult to make students write text about a topic now. They write but, unfortunately they are not very successful. In fact, they are not able to achieve topic integrity. (T8)
Paragraph Level	11	If they know topic very well, they can write a clear paragraph, but they cannot write everything in paragraph exactly. Something is certainly missing in their writings. (T3)
Sentence level	10	How many words can a student who does not read a book know? Our students are not reading and improving themselves. So they can make meaningless sentences. (T14)
Word level	6	Students are making so many spelling errors! Mostly I complain about this issue. Almost every word they write is wrong. (T7)

Table 5 shows that students make spelling errors at almost all levels. According to the teachers, it can be said that the level which the students make the most errors in the writing process is the level of the text. This can be interpreted as the students' writing skills are not at the desired level.

Table 6. Teachers' statements for "writing process" theme

Sub-theme	f	Teacher opinions examples
After writing	16	When the writing process ended, I make every student read their writing individually (T4) I hang the writings of the students on bulletin board. But I do not hang all of them. I select and hang up the best ones. (T3)
Ordinary/ Boring	13	My students do not like to write. Some girls like to write, but boys never like it. They are so bored when writing. (T9) Activities in the workbook want the same thing all the time. There is nothing different for the students. They do not want to write because it does not arouse interest. I do not want them to make a different activity. (T12)
Challenging	10	When writing, sometimes they are forced. They do not know what to write. Then, I want them to think a little more. (T18) Some students cannot decide what to write for long time. The bell rings until they decide. That is, I have a few students who want to write readily. (Ö6)
Before writing	4	Students must be ready before writing. For this reason, I definitely ask them questions about topic. (T2) I want them write just after I give them topic. We do not have much time to write anyway. (T5)
During writing	2	When students are writing, I walk through among them. I answer questions of students. I do not intervene in their writings at all. (T11) Sometimes I see that students make spelling errors and I intervene immediately. If I do not intervene at that moment, it can be forgotten. (T13)
Entertaining	2	When it is time to write, the fun begins. Because I want students make the writing work with group. (T20) They are having fun while writing. Because I found a solution like this. Everyone will picture his/her writing. At that time, they are having a lot of fun. (T3)

When Table 6 is examined, according to teacher's opinions, it is seen that students perceive writing as "ordinary / boring" and "challenging" activity mostly. Moreover, a few teachers stated that they give place to various studies before writing, and a large part of them stated that they did not share something a lot with their students during writing. This finding obtained in the research can be interpreted as the fact that the teachers did not perform the necessary studies for the writing process adequately and therefore did not provide sufficient guidance to their students during this process.

Table 7. The time teachers spent on writing individually

Sub-theme	f	Teacher opinions examples
Rarely	14	I do not like to write. If I have free time, I do not spend time to write. (T17)
		I cannot tell my writing is so bad. We always write at school. But I do not write anything in my free time at home. (T18)
Often	6	Writing something improves me. For this reason, I try to write something every day. (T2)
		I write together with my students. When I give them a writing work in classroom, I sit opposite of them and I write in the same way. (T19)

When the individual writing frequency of teachers is examined according to Table 10, it is seen that most of the teachers rarely write. This situation can be interpreted as teachers do not have a positive perception about writing.

Table 8. Teachers' statements for "time spared for writing process" theme

Sub-theme	f	Teacher opinions examples
Preparation before writing	8	We do not spend a lot of time before we start writing. When they understand topic, they already start to write. (T7)
		We spend some time to explain properly the writing topic to the students. That's all. (T10)
Writing activity in classroom	18	I can spare up to 15 minutes for writing activities. Otherwise, if I wait for them to write completely, I cannot finish curriculum. (T2)
		I cannot finish the writing activity in class. After 10-15 minutes of writing, I say them to complete writing at home. (T9)
Sharing after writing	3	After students finish the writing, I usually hang them on bulletin board. I do not have time to make students read the writing one by one in classroom. (T11)
		Two or three students who I select from the class read their writings. Apart from that, if I want students read their writings, the lesson ends. (T8)

It can be said that the great majority of teachers do not spare enough time to write in classroom. During the writing activity on the class; it can be said that the required works are not done and various studies are not included in order that the writing products which are emerged are shared, in order to motivate students' preliminary knowledge prior to the writing. This situation can be interpreted as if the teachers could not provide sufficient support to their students in order that students' writing works are provided to be more qualified.

Table 9. Teachers' statements for "writing process activities" theme

Sub-theme	f	Teacher opinions examples
Individual works	17	I do not think the group works are beneficial. Because one person is writing and others are looking at him/her. Inefficient, I make each student write individually. (T19)
Course book	15	I only use the course book. Sufficient Time is not enough to do other activities. (T9)
		I do not do any special work for writing activities. I use the course book. Students also love it. (T14)
Resource book	13	There are a lot of repetitions in our books. Students are bored. Willingly or unwillingly, we have to use a resource book. (T18)
		The writing spaces in course book are either too little or too much. The spaces are unevenly distributed. That's why I use a resource book. (T20)
Cooperative works	7	Writing studies are very effective when being done in groups. The students overcome the each other's' deficiencies. (T20)
		As far as I observe, they are more motivated with the group. Because they do not want to be alone. I also frequently use this method. (T3)
Activity not included in course book	6	The only activity that is not in course book which I have done is dictation. (T1)
		Apart from the course book, I do not do any work. I only do dictation work because the writings of students are not so readable. (T11)

According to Table 9, teachers stated that they benefited from both course books and resource books in the writing process. Apart from the writing exercises in course books and in resource books, it can be said that teachers give place to a great deal of dictation works in classes. In addition, it is seen that teachers give more emphasis to individual works rather than group works during the writing works which were carried out in classroom. This finding, which is obtained from research, can be interpreted as the fact that teachers do not give enough place to creative and various writing works in their lessons.

Table 10. Teachers' statements for "evaluation" theme

Sub-theme	f	Teacher opinions examples
Hanging on bulletin board	15	All the writings are absolutely hung on bulletin board. Sometimes they are hung on bulletin board in classroom and sometimes bulletin board in the corridor. (T11) I choose and hang the best writings on bulletin board. When they see their works hanging there, they are very happy. The student whose writing is not hung struggles to write better. (T15)
Verbal feedback	11	When I mark or draw on their notebooks, they are very sad. So I say without drawing with pen. (T5)
Written feedback	8	There are certain signs that we have specified as a class. I draw marks on their notebooks by using these marks. They also understand their errors. (T6)
Peer evaluation	1	I change the writings between desk mates. They control each other's writings. (T7)
Exhibition	1	I gather all the children's performance home works, activities and writings. We exhibit them at the end of the year. (T8)

When statements of teachers for "Evaluation" theme are examined, it is seen that the writings which were conducted in classroom have been hung on bulletin board in a large scale. Apart from this, it can be said that most of the teachers give verbal feedback to the students' writings. This situation can be interpreted as the fact that alternative measurement and evaluation studies are not adequately included in the writing process.

3. Discussion, Conclusions and Recommendations

This research's objective is to determine the writing expression skills of the primary 4th grade students and the activities teachers do in the writing process. The results obtained from the research reveal that 4th grade students in primary school have a poor level of written expression skills. In addition, findings obtained from interviews which were conducted with teachers also reveal that the students' writings are not at the desired level and that they make a lot of errors in their writings This finding of the research is consistent with the research conducted by Akbaba and Yalçın (2016). As a result of the research, it has been seen that students generally make a lot of errors related to writing skills and could not write a correct and fluent text.

The results obtained from the research show that the 4th grade students of primary school make errors for a lot of criteria that require cognitive effort at word, sentence, paragraph and text levels. Because, cognitive factors play a very important role in text production (Costa, Edwards & Hooper 2016; Graham & Hebert 2011). The contribution of many high-level skills to the writing process requires that students make a conscious effort to be successful in this process (Vygotsky 1998). In this context, it can be said that the students whose writings were examined in the scope of the research did not spend enough time and make enough effort for the writing process.

Many factors play a role in the failure of the desired quality of students' writing (Magnifico 2010). According to Graham and Harris (2009), since some students have difficulties in forming content, do not make a good writing plan, do not know how to use writing strategies and do not make enough effort to write; their writing performance is very weak. When the results of this research are examined, it is seen that very few of the teachers give place to various works before writing. However, all studies which were carried out before writing reveal the students' preliminary knowledge and prepare them to write mentally and psychologically (Miller 2003; Muschla 2006). Thus, the student who forms the content in his/her mind for writing makes a planning for writing. Planning is extremely important in order to form a good writing and is an important factor that improves students' writing performances (Graham & Perin 2007). According to this research, it can be said that the teachers do not make any work concerning planning and they do not have sufficient knowledge and experience in this respect. This deficiency is thought to be an important factor for students who frequently make cognitive errors in the writing process.

Although a good and qualified writing requires much more than writing correctly with simple words and using spelling rules and punctuation marks correctly (Casey, Miller, Stockton & Justice 2016), one of the components of the writing process is spelling and punctuation (Harris, Graham, Mason & Friedlander 2012; Mather, Wendling & Roberts 2009). Starting from this point, writing style and spelling and punctuation of the students' writings were also examined. The obtained results indicate that the students are not sufficient in the dimensions which require mechanic processes and that the writings do not have a smooth and clear appearance in terms of aesthetically. This finding obtained from research shows consistency with the study of Aşıcı and Mataracı (1999). As a result of the research which aimed to reveal the level of knowledge and skill about the spelling and punctuation marks in Turkish lesson of 5th grade students in primary schools; it has been determined that there are insufficiencies of the students about using the punctuation and spelling rules.

Wood and Shea-Bischoff (1997) state that the writing applications must be included in classroom activities as much as possible so that the writings of the students should be at the desired quality. However, in the light of

the results obtained from the research, it seems that the teachers do not spare enough time for the writing works in classroom. As a result of a national research conducted by Gilbert and Graham (2010), 4-6. grade classroom teachers stated that they only spared 15 minutes in a day for the writing works. Cutler and Graham (2008) point out that in some researches, teachers spared only 20 minutes in a day for the writing works. According to Street and Stang (2008), one of the reasons that why teachers do not spare enough time for the writing works in classroom is lack of time. The fact that the limited time is a repressive factor hinders all works that will contribute to the teaching writing.

The results of the research reveal that teachers do not spare enough time for the writing both in classroom and individually. Whereas, teachers having little writing experience cannot provide sufficient support to their students during the writing process (Morgan 2010). According to Zumbrunn and Krause (2012), teachers need to better embrace the writing process by increasing their own writing experience. However, teachers' writing experiences do not play an important role on students' writings alone. Individually, the effectiveness of a teacher is a complex and eclectic issue that includes the teacher's personal reading and writing attitudes, beliefs, practices and experiences (Brooks 2007). From this point of view, the perceptions of the teachers about the writing process become important.

The results of research reveal that teachers have a negative perception related to the writing process and that they do not think themselves having adequate qualifications about this process. Whereas, self-confidence of the teacher who guides his students in the effective writing process is extremely important. Because, according to Clifford and Green (1996), the idea that teachers think themselves adequate about written narration affects teaching processes. In this research, it makes us think that, the fact that the great majority of teachers consider themselves as "insufficient" may directly affect their approach related to the writing process and their works which they will do in this process. Grisham and Wolsey (2005) and Fisher (2006) emphasize that the importance which teachers give to the writing works in classroom is significant for the shaping of students' writing skills, and that in this context students need a teacher who will teach themselves writing effectively.

In the process of developing writing skills, teachers should focus on what they teach and how they teach (Koster, Bouwer & Bergh 2017). Because, at this point, the works that teacher will do affect students' perspectives about writing (Bruning & Horn 2000; Richards & Lassonde 2011). The results obtained from this research reveal that some students mostly perceive writing as an "ordinary / boring" and "challenging" activity. Starting from this point, previous negative experiences of students towards the writing process may cause them to have negative thoughts. Nevertheless, it can be said that the writing activities which were carried out in these students' classes do not arouse interest and are not accepted by the students. According to Black (1991), teachers think that their own activities are enjoyed by students and serve the purpose. At this point, Paquette (2008) emphasizes that teachers should review the works they will do in the writing process and that they must give more places to the works related to students' interests.

When the results of the research are examined, it is seen that most of the teachers give place to individual writing works in classroom and but they do not plan their writing works in a cooperative way. Whereas, the most important aim of co-operative writing is to facilitate the loneliness felt by the alone student and to motivate him/her faster (Sutherland & Topping 1999). Because writing individually can be extremely challenging for people who do not have enough knowledge (Amir, Ismail & Hussin 2011). This situation may be effective for students possessing negative thoughts about the writing process and forming more qualified writings. Graham and Perin (2007) indicate that co-operative writing enhances the quality of writing. In a research conducted by Jasmine and Weiner (2007), it revealed that cooperative writing works have developed students' attitudes and skills about writing. Boscolo (2008) claims that teachers must give place to small group works in order that students produce better quality writings. From this point of view, in this research, the fact that cooperative writing studies are not adequately included can be interpreted as if it caused students to experience many difficulties and to struggle on their own in the process of writing.

The results obtained from the research reveal that most of the teachers hang the writings on the bulletin board at the end of the writing works and give students verbal feed-backs. Parr and Timperley (2010) stated that teachers who traditionally approach to writing process generally give written or verbal feed-backs; and in their research, they have reached the conclusion that the higher quality and operational feed-backs given to students have positively influenced their writing development. Moreover, interviews conducted with teachers show that teachers do not give enough place to alternative measurement and evaluation works in the writing process. This situation may be stemmed from the fact that teachers do not have enough knowledge and experience about the topic. Because, quality evaluation requires good planning, thinking process (Olinghouse & Santangelo 2010) and effective preparation of the teacher (Zampardo 2008). Since the evaluation studies which were conducted after the writing process play an important role in reaching a decision about the students' situation and in determining the students who need more support (Olinghouse & Santangelo 2010), the reason for the many errors in the writings of the students who participated in the research are considered to be effect of evaluation studies. Parr and Limbrick (2010) state that evaluation studies support the productivity, achievement and development of

students' writings. Similarly, Martin and Provost (2014) emphasize that what the students whose writing skills do not develop at the desired level need, is to be able to benefit from the feedback.

The research reveals that 4th grade students of primary school have a poor level of written expression skills. The data obtained from interviews with teachers also supports this conclusion. Nevertheless, when the expressions of the teachers are examined, it is seen that they have not done enough works for the writing process and have difficulty about teaching writing. In this context, it can be said that students made a great deal errors in the writing process. In the light of these results obtained from the research, it may be advised to carry out supportive works with the students about writing errors. Moreover, various studies should be conducted, with the students, related to enhancing the writing process. In this context, teachers should also receive in-service training concerning the writing teaching process.

References

Akbaba, R. S. & Yalçın, S. K. (2016). 6. sınıf öğrencilerinin yazma becerilerinde görülen hataların sınıflandırılması. *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim Dergisi*, 5(3), 1320-1338.

Amir, Z., Ismail, K. & Hussin, S. (2011). Blogs in language learning: Maximizing students' collaborative writing. Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 18, 537–543.

Aşıcı, M. & Mataracı, E. (1999). İlköğretim birinci kademede, öğrencilerin imla ve noktalama ile ilgili bilgi ve beceri düzeyi, *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, Özel Sayı: IV. Ulusal Sınıf Öğretmenliği Sempozyumu Bildirileri. 6, 106-115.

Bae, J., Bentler, P. M., & Lee, Y. S. (2016). On the role of content in writing assessment. *Language Assessment Quarterly,* 13(4), 302-328.

Black, K. (1991). How students see their writing: A visual representation of literacy. *Journal of Reading*, 35, 206-214.

Boscolo, P. (2008). Writing in primary school. In C. Bazerman (Ed.), Handbook of research on writing: History, society, school, individual, text (293–309). New York, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Brooks, G. W. (2007). Teachers as readers and writers and as teachers of reading and writing, *The Journal of Educational Research,* 100(3), 177-191.

Bruning, R. & Horn, C. (2000). Developing motivation to write. *Educational Psychologist*, 35(1), 25–37.

Bryson, F. K. (2003). An examination of two methods of delivering writing instruction to fourth grade students. (Unpublished master thesis). Texas Woman's University, Texas. (UMI No: 1417565)

Casey, L. B., Miller, N. D., Stockton, M. B., & Justice, W. V. (2016) Assessing writing in elementary schools: Moving away from a focus on mechanics, *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 13(1), 42-54.

Cemiloğlu, M. (2009). Dil bilimi açısından Türkçe yazılı anlatım ve anlatım teknikleri öğretimi, Bursa: Alfa Akademi.

Clifford, E. E., & Green, V. P. (1996). The mentor- protdgd relationship as a factor in pre-service education: A review of the literature. *Early Child Development and Care*, 125,73-83.

Costa, L. C., Edwards, C. N., & Hooper, S. R. (2016). Writing disabilities and reading disabilities in elementary school students: Rates of co-occurrence and cognitive burden. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 39(1), 17-30.

Coşkun, E. (2011). Yazma eğitiminde aşamalı gelişim. Yazma eğitimi (ed. Murat Özbay) (s. 45-82). Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.

Cremin, T., & Oliver, L. (2016). Teachers as writers: A systematic review, *Research Papers in Education*, 1-27.

Cutler, L., & Graham, S. (2008). Primary grade writing instruction: A national survey. *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 100(4), 907-919.

Erdoğan, T. (2013). The effect of creative drama method on pre-service classroom teachers' writing skills and attitudes towards writing, *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*: 38(1), 44-61.

Erol, B., & Kıroğlu, K. (2012). Hayat bilgisi ders kitaplarının dil ve anlatım yönünden değerlendirilmesi. *Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 32, 155-176.

Fisher, R. (2006). Whose writing is it anyway? Issues of control in the teaching of writing. *Cambridge Journal of Education,* 36(2), 193-206.

Flowers, L. & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication,* 32 (4), 928-950.

Gilbert, J., & Graham, S. (2010). Teaching writing to elementary students in grades 4–6: A national survey. *The Elementary School Journal*, 110, 494-517.

Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R. (1996). *Theory and practice of writing. An applied linguistic perspective.* London: Longman.

Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (2009). Almost 30 years of writing research: Making sense of it all with the wrath of khan. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, 24 (2), 58-68.

Graham, S., & Hebert, M. (2011). Writing to read: A meta-analysis of the impact of writing and writing instruction on reading. *Harvard Education Review*, 81, 710-744.

Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). A meta-analysis of writing instruction for adolescent students. *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 99(3), 445–476.

Grisham, D. L., & Wolsey, T. D., (2005). Improving Writing: Comparing the responses of eighth-graders, preservice teachers and experienced teachers, *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 21(4), 315-330.

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

Hachem, A., Nabhani, M. & Bahous, R. (2008). 'We can write!' The writing workshop for young learners. *Education 3-13*, 36(4), 325-337.

Harris, K. R., Steve, G. & Linda H. M. (2003). Self – regulated strategy development in the classroom: part of balanced approach to writing instruction for students with disabilities, *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 35(7), 1-16.

Harris, K. R., Graham, S., Mason, L. H. & Friedlander, B. (2012). Powerful writing strategies for all students. Paul H. Brookes Publishing.

Hayes, J. R., & Flowers, L. S. (1980). Identifying the organization of writing processes. In L. W. Gregg & E. R.; Steinberg (eds.), Cognitive processes in writing (pp. 3-30). Hillsdale, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum.

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.

Karatay, H. (2011). Süreç Temelli Yazma Modelleri: Planlı Yazma ve Değerlendirme, (Ed. M. Özbay), Yazma Eğitimi, Ankara: Pegem.

Kara-Soteriou, J., & Kaufman, D. (2002). Writing in the elementary school: The missing pieces. *The New England Reading Association Journal*, 38(3), 25–33.

Koster M., Bouwer R., & van den Bergh H. (2017). Professional development of teachers in the implementation of a strategy-focused writing intervention program for elementary students. *Contemporary Educational Psychology,* 49, 1-20.

Limpoa, T., Alvesa, R. A., & Connelly, V. (2017). Examining the transcription-writing link: Effects of handwriting fluency and spelling accuracy on writing performance via planning and translating in middle grades. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 53, 26-36.

Magnifico, A. M. (2010). Writing for whom? Cognition, motivation, and a writer's audience. *Educational Psychologist,* 45(3), 167-184.

Martin, F. H., & Provost, S. C. (2014). Teaching students to discriminate between good and poor writing. Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences. 141, 205-209.

Mather, N., Wendling, B. J. & Roberts, R. (2009). Writing assessment and instruction for students with learning disabilities. Jossey-Bass Teacher.

Miller, R. K. (2003). Motives for writing (4th ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.

Morgan, D. N. (2010). Preservice teachers as writers. Literacy Research and Instruction, 49(4), 352-365.

Muschla, C. R. (2006). Teach terrific writing. New York: McGraw Hill.

Olinghouse, N. G., & Santangelo, T. (2010). Assessing the writing of struggling learners. *Focus On Exceptional Children*, 43 (4), 1-27.

Paquette, K. R. (2008). Study of elementary students' attitudes about writing after a cross-age tutoring experience. *Reading Improvement*, 45(4), 181-191.

Parr, J. M., & Timperley, H. S. (2010). Feedback to writing, assessment for teaching and learning and student progress. *Assessing Writing*, 15 (2), 68–85.

Parr, J. M., & Limbrick, L. (2010). Contextualising practice: Hallmarks of effective teachers of writing. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(3), 583-590.

Raimes, A. (1983). Techniques in teaching writing. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Richards, J. C. & Lassonde, C. A. (2011). Writing strategies for all primary students. Jossey-Bass Teacher.

Saddler, B., Moran, S., Graham, S. & Harris, K. R. (2004). Preventing writing difficulties: The effects of planning strategy instruction on the writing performance of struggling writers. *Exceptionality*, 12(1), 3-17.

Sever E. (2013). Süreç temelli yazma modellerinin ilkokul dördüncü sınıf öğrencilerinin yazılı anlatım ve yaratıcı yazma becerilerine etkisi. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Bülent Ecevit Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Zonguldak.

Sutherland, J. A. & Topping, K. J. (1999). Collaborative creative writing in eight year-olds: Comparing cross-ability fixed role and same-ability reciprocal role pairing. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 22 (2), 154-179.

Street, C., & Stang, K. (2008). Improving the teaching of writing across the curriculum: A model for teaching in-service secondary teachers to write, *Action in Teacher Education*, 30:1, 37-49.

Tompkins, G. E., & Collom, S. (2004). Sharing the pen: Interactive writing with young children. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing and elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 783-805.

Waugh. D. (1998). Practical approaches to teaching punctuation in the primary school. *Reading*. 32(2), 14-17.

Wood, K., & Shea-Bischoff, P. (1997). Research into practice: Helping struggling writers write, Middle School Journal, 28(4), 50-53.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1998). Düşünce ve dil (Çev: S. Koray). İstanbul: Toplumsal Dönüşüm Yayınları.

Yıldırım, A. & Şimşek, H. (2006). Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.

Zampardo, K. M. (2008). An examinatıon of the impact of teacher modeling on young children's writing. Doctoral of dissertation, Oakland University, Michigan.

Zumbrunn, S. & Krause, K. (2012). Conversations with leaders: Principles of effective writing instruction. *The Reading Teacher*, 65(5), 346–353.