

The Effect of the Process-based Writing Approach on Writing Success and Anxiety of Pre-service Teachers

Ali Fuat Arici¹ and Abdullah Kaldirim²

¹*Yildiz Technical University, Faculty of Education, Department of Turkish Language Education, Istanbul, Turkey*

E-mail: afaturkey@hotmail.com

²*Dumlupinar University, Faculty of Education, Department of Turkish Language Education, Kutahya, Turkey*

E-mail: abduallahkaldirim@gmail.com

KEYWORDS Process-based Writing. Pre-service Teachers, Writing Skills. Writing Anxiety

ABSTRACT The instruction of writing should start from childhood, and students' writing should be observed to increase their writing abilities. Furthermore, revealing writing mistakes and making studies according to these mistakes can contribute to developing these students' writing abilities. In this study, a quasi-experimental study method was proffered that tests the impact of the process-based writing approach on the writing skills of pre-service teachers. Therefore, the research was designed with a pretest/post-test control group of quasi-experimental design. For related samples, t-testing for independent samples and ANCOVA analysis were used, and the results were evaluated. In the results, writing instruction courses, in which Turkish pre-service teachers used activities in the scope of the process-based writing approach, were found to have a great impact on the written expression skills of Turkish pre-service teachers in the experimental group compared to those in the control group.

INTRODUCTION

Since the first day of mankind, people have tried to understand what was going on around them and have had the need to tell other people what goes through their minds. In order to meet this need, the communication tool of language emerged and through this people transferred their feelings, thoughts, and dreams to each other, both verbally and through written expression. Here, the concepts the researchers mention for comprehension skills are: listening, reading and visual reading, and for explanation skills: speaking, writing and visual presentation. These language skills are obtained from birth as an individual tries to develop these skills in his/her education advances in life.

Being able to express oneself orally or in writing depends on the correct and effective use of language skills. Namely, the bases of these two skills are to understand and to be able to explain and interpret what was read, heard and seen. Writing is an expression skill. The development of this skill depends on the development of other language skills. Good reading, listening and speaking abilities are one of the most important factors that facilitate written expression education. With the development of writing skills, an individual's opportunities (to transfer information, to make connections between one's own

thoughts and information learned, and to provide consistency in the structure of the text) increase. However, simply developing language skills for literacy is not sufficient. The constitution of the writing environment in schools and the materials that the teacher will use in this field must support the writing skills of the student (Akdal and Sahin, 2014).

Santangelo et al. (2007) indicate that writing is a highly efficient tool because it connects time and distance, collects information and protects it, presents information about new arranged or developed issues, and provides a flexible environment about artistic, spiritual, political issues and self-expression. However, they also complain about the difficulty and complications of the planning, organizing, evaluating and reviewing stages, which are necessary for efficient communication. Lane (2006) indicates that students without good writing skills are not only at risk in primary education but also stand in an awkward position in their future academic lives. Therefore, the instruction of writing should start from childhood, and their writing should be observed to increase their writing abilities. Furthermore, the realization of writing mistakes and learning from these mistakes can contribute to the development of their writing ability. Thus, effective approaches to writing should be internalized first. There are generally two approaches in writing:

product-based and process-based. In this context, this chapter will discuss the product- and process-oriented approaches to writing.

Product-Based Writing Approach (PRBWA)

The product-based writing approach focuses on the results of writing expression, or the written product, rather than the process that is followed in the study. The aim of this approach is to provide individuals a way to write the ideas that they have about the issue in a consistent and flawless way (Sun and Feng 2009). During this process, the teacher's duties are to identify the writing topic that students will write about, bring writing types to the class, which students can use as examples, and evaluate the written product. By the end of the writing process, the teachers who evaluate their students' written products as a whole cannot identify at which stage their students faced difficulties. This means that, at the end of the activities made according to the product-based writing approach, one cannot evaluate writing expressions strictly. As a result, students imitate the writing expressions given as examples and their writing skills do not strictly develop. Shortly, the product-based writing approach is seen as repetitive and simply improves the students' information about the structure of language (Badger and White 2000).

Process-Based Writing Approach (PBWA)

The process-based writing approach does not handle the written expression as a product. Instead, it is a teaching method for writing that handles it as a process and benefits from the students' writing expressions. It encourages students to find what they think, what they do, what they take into consideration, and what kind of characteristics their writing contains. The process-based writing approach aims to arrange the writing process according to constructivist teaching theory and with the cognitive assistance of a teacher. On the basis of this approach, the concepts 'proximal development zone' and 'cognitive assistance' are key points in Vygotsky's sociocultural learning theory (Thompson 2013).

Students should pay attention to the characteristics during the arrangement of components in writing in order to be able to explain what they want to express efficiently. It is also important

that the writing applies (proceeds) as a process. The reason for this is that a written expression that has not been applied through a process cannot provide integrity on its own and therefore cannot express the author's thoughts in an effective way and does not enable the author to deliver his/her exact thoughts to the reading public. To eliminate these drawbacks and to reveal a good written product, the author should plan his/her thoughts in the beginning. In other words, a writing draft should be constructed and arranged first, and finally, the written expressions should be corrected in terms of language and expression.

Teachers using the process-based writing approach engage in the process of writing with their students. In addition, these teachers provide evaluations of the students' writings by giving directions at every planned stage. Even Worth-Baker (2004) mentions that teachers should also write articles (writings) with their students. Through feedback, each student can improve the quality of his/her writing and internalize the stages of the entire process. Thus, students' writing skills are developed. In more detail, the planned writing and evaluation process consists of the following stages (Tompkins 2010; Karatay 2011; Ministry of National Education [MoNE] 2012).

Preparing to Write

This stage is getting ready to write. Here, students bring their prior knowledge to the environment, and they learn about the process of writing. Similar to how important the preparation before running is for a runner, preparation before writing is also important for a writer (Tompkins 2010). These studies should never be abandoned, especially for individuals who are new to writing. Additionally, it is suggested that these studies have to be transformed to their habits (Arici and Ugan 2012). At this stage, motivation, topic selection, goal setting, identifying the aim and audience, determining the type of writing, identifying thoughts about the issue, and organizing one's studies can be made.

Pre-writing

In the prewriting stage, students try to draft their ideas fluently by considering their goals and the audience. However, during the creation

of the first writing draft, writing and rewriting activities can be completed more than once. Here, the main thing is that the student is able to pen his/her ideas or dreams onto paper.

Drafting

In this stage, drafts written by the students are changed into text form. It is difficult for many people to start writing. For this, it can be necessary for teachers to assist students who are having difficulties with how to start to write. In addition, as mentioned before, writing with the students can encourage them.

Revising

In the correction phase, the written product takes its final shape. Studies up to this stage focus on the content of the text, which was written by the student. This stage focuses on the structural components of grammar, word usage, formatting, spelling, and punctuation in the text; these things are controlled in terms of adequacy in the paper (Tompkins 2010). Oz (2001) indicates that writing studies of children have a meaning if these studies are evaluated, but Hansen (1996) states that evaluation plays an important role for developing the writing of the students.

Publication and Sharing

The role of sharing their writing with others is important for students to be motivated for upcoming writing assignments (MoNE 2012). At this stage, the writing draft in its final shape is shared with others in verbal or visual ways.

Studies were made for improving language skills since it is known that this is a difficult matter for students. Improving their writing skills is something they are reluctant to do. A teacher's traditional approach to the writing process, writing topics that students are not interested in, the belief that writing is a skill special to specific people, negative writing experiences that students have encountered and are now the cause for reluctance, the inadequacy of the feedback and correction stages, and the intensity of the class all play a negative role on the writing skill's development (Karatay 2011; Topuzkanamis 2015). Thus, the problems that the researchers mentioned above will be solved and the teachers will reach their objectives in writing instruction.

In the literature, when papers conducted on the basis of process-based writing were examined, it was revealed that this approach had a positive effect on students' writing skills or their writing anxiety. Bayat (2014) conducted a research study with university students and found that the process-based writing approach has a significant effect on writing success and anxiety. Li et al.'s (2014) paper explored the effects of Wiki-based Collaborative Process Writing Pedagogy (WCPWP) on writing ability and writing attitudes among Primary Four students. The results provided a general picture of the students' collaborative writing process and showed that WCPWP had a positive, but not very significant, effect on the students' writing abilities. Importantly, the results indicated that WCPWP did have a significant positive effect on the writing attitudes of the students. Graham and Sandmel (2011) have conducted a meta-analysis of 29 experimental/quasi-experimental studies on the process-based writing approach. They revealed that the process-based writing approach has a positive effect on the students' writing achievements.

After considering these stated problems, it is accepted that using methods that are shaped according to the needs of students is more necessary than using applications that do not respond to the needs of students. To be able to use methods that meet the needs of students, teacher and teacher candidates should be informed about how to provide an instructional environment. In this way, these teacher-based problems can be solved and the desired achievements can be reached.

According to Slavin (2013), anxiety is an intimate friend of education. Therefore, all students in the education process have anxieties during specific periods. In particular, in an environment where the students are obliged to use their language skills during the process of "language skills training," student anxiety levels can increase. For Daly and Wilson (1983: 327), writing anxiety is a situation that emerges when an individual believes that his/her written expression will be evaluated and wants to avoid writing according to individual differences. This revealed reaction to writing could cause sadness, anger, fear, indifference, or even physical changes, like various muscle cramps (Ozbay and Zorbaz 2011).

One factor that plays a negative role on the development of writing skill is writing anxiety.

Among students, this anxiety causes procrastination, fear and tension, reduction in motivation and self-confidence, and interruptions in the thinking process (Yaman 2010). The regular use of writing skills in the learning environment and requesting students to express their thoughts in black and white increases the probability of writing anxiety.

Yaman (2014) examined the relationship between general anxiety, writing anxiety, and attitudes toward secondary-level Turkish courses and found that when the students' writing anxiety levels increased, their general anxieties also increased. In contrast, a negative correlation was determined between writing anxiety and attitudes about Turkish courses. Furthermore, as the students' writing anxieties increased, their attitudes about Turkish courses were affected negatively. These findings indicate that in order to ensure an increase in student writing achievements, teachers have the greatest duty. Pre-service teachers are the teachers of the future and must be trained with this awareness in order to achieve their set targets. Researches that have been carried out show that if writing incidence increases, writing anxiety will fall (Iseri and Unal 2012). In the process of process-based writing, text is rewritten through multiple stages of prewriting, drafting and revising. From this perspective, the process-based writing approach may be effective in reducing writing anxiety for pre-service teachers.

Research Objectives

This study involves important research for pre-service teachers, the models for students in the future, to increase the quality of their writing and to plan their writing instruction process in a qualitative way. In this context, the main objective of this research is to determine the impact of the process-based writing approach on the writing skills of pre-service teachers.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

For this study, a quasi-experimental method was utilized in order to test the impact of the process-based writing approach on the writing skills of pre-service teachers. The research was also designed with pretest/post-test control groups of quasi-experimental design.

It was decided that the assignment of students to the experimental and control groups of

the study would, if conducted on students receiving a formal education, cause disruption of the educational process already in progress. Therefore, pedagogists often use non-artificial, pre-determined groups and quasi-experimental designs (Fraenkel et al. 2011; Creswell 2012), and these were what was utilized in this study.

Study Group

In the spring semester of 2013-2014, the entire study group consisted of third year students from Dumlupinar University's Faculty of Education, Department of Turkish Language Education. One subset of students was identified as the experimental group and the other subset was identified as the control group.

Data Collection Tools and Implementation

In this research study, writing expression examples, which were taken from the students as data collection tools, are evaluated through the 6+1 Analytical Writing and Assessment Scale adapted to Turkish by Ozkara (2007) and to level by Ozdemir (2014). After assessment, the interrater reliability coefficient was examined, and the reliability coefficient for each dimension was found to be above 0.70. The emergence of over 0.70 reliability coefficients indicates that assessment is at an acceptable level of reliability (Miles and Huberman 1994). Kayapinar's (2014) paper indicated that using markings in essay assessments is evidently not reliable for assessing essays.

The Writing Anxiety Scale developed by Karakaya and Ülper (2011) is used to measure writing anxiety levels of pre-service teachers. The Writing Anxiety Scale consists of 21 items and is one-dimensional. It is a Likert-type scale and individuals marked using quinary grading. Items in the scale were rated as 5 if "Always" was marked and as 1 if "Never" was marked. The calculation for reliability—an analysis of Cronbach's alpha internal consistency—is a coefficient of 0.84. According to this, it can be said that the reliability of the measurement is really high. The Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient measured for this study was 0.96.

Research Application

Research was carried out in 8 weeks during the spring semester of 2013-2014. Before the study, a pretest was administered to both groups. Then, experimental activities were started with the experimental group. In this context, pre-ser-

vice teachers were informed of prewriting preparations (topic selection, writing, goal setting, and determination of the target audience and of writing type), the creation of writing drafts, the actual writing of later drafts after being reviewed and rearranged, text corrections, and publishing. Finally, after the writing applications were finished, those related to writing skill and post-test anxieties were applied and the differences between the groups were evaluated. In assessing the differences, the results would be more useful in terms of interpretation if not only the pretest but also the post-tests were compared.

Data Analysis

For related samples, t-tests for independent samples and the ANCOVA analysis were used and the results were evaluated. In addition, percentage and frequency analyses were used for descriptive statistics.

FINDINGS

After the data in Table 1 was examined, great statistical differences were found between the pretest scores and the anxiety scales of the Turkish pre-service teachers in the experimental group and in the control group. By reason of differences between the groups, a one-way covariance analysis was made to reduce the partiality of the study.

The experimental and control groups' writing anxiety scales and post-test scores were revised based on the pretest. These are given in Table 2. Accordingly, the average pretest score

for the experimental group was calculated as 80.11; for the control group, it was 102.76. The final test adjustment for average score for the experimental group was 84.80; for the control group, it was 97.93.

Table 2: Regarding writing anxiety scale, post-test's scores revised based on pre-test ancova test results by group

Group	N	Average	Corrected average
Study	35	80.11	84.80
Control	34	102.76	97.93

The ANCOVA results, which are related to the differences between corrected post-test scores for the groups, are given in Table 3. According to these results, it may be stated that there was a great difference found between the experimental and control groups' writing anxiety and mean post-test scores that had been revised based on pretest scores ($F(1, 66)=10.41, p<.05$). In other words, process-based writing instruction plays an efficient role by reducing the anxieties of Turkish pre-service teachers.

During the research process, it was stated that there is a great decrease in anxiety related to writing for Turkish pre-service teachers, $t(34)=4.05, p<.05$ (Table 4). While the average of the writing anxiety scores for Turkish pre-service teachers in the experimental group was $\bar{X}=89.62$ before implementation of the process-based writing process, this decreased to $\bar{X}=80.11$ after the use of applications determined by HEC's (Higher Education Council) scope. These findings can be interpreted to say that a pro-

Table 1: t- test results of the anxiety scale, pre-test average scores according to groups

Group	N	\bar{X}	S	sd	t	p
Study	35	89.62	20.70	67	2.29	.02
Control	34	102.88	26.89			

Table 3: ANCOVA analysis results of Writing Anxiety Scale post test's scores revised based on pre-test by group

Variance source	Totality of squares	sd	Average of squares	F	The level of significance (p)
Pre-test (Reg.)	19854.70	1	19854.70	75.07	.000
Group	2754.62	1	2754.62	10.41	.002
Error	17454.96	66	264.46		
Totality	46157.76	69			

Table 4: Results of anxiety scale pre-test and post-test average scores of study group related to writing

Measurement	N	X	S	sd	t	p
Pre-test	35	89.62	20.70	34	4.05	.000
Post-test	35	80.11	20.32			

cess-based writing education plays an important role by reducing the writing anxieties of Turkish pre-service teachers.

Practices done in the writing education course have not caused a statistically significant reduction in writing anxiety, $t(33)=0.033$, $p>.05$ (Table 5). While the average writing anxiety score of Turkish pre-service teachers was $\bar{X}=102.88$ before application, it reduced to $\bar{X}=102.76$ after implementation; however, as a statistic, this is not a meaningful finding. The resulting interpretation is that applications made in the writing instruction course play an inefficient role on the writing anxieties of Turkish pre-service teachers.

After the data in Table 6 was examined, no meaningful differences were seen between the pretest scores of Turkish pre-service teachers in the experimental group and the pretest scores of Turkish pre-service teachers in the control group, $t(67)=0.34$, $p>.05$. In this case, before application implementation, both groups were equal according to written expression success.

To determine whether there is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores obtained from the achievement tests of the experimental and control groups, t-tests for the independent samples were conducted (Table 7). Accordingly, a significant difference was dis-

cerned between the achievement scores obtained from process-based writing instruction of the experimental group ($\bar{X}_{\text{Experiment}}=131.48$) and the scores of the students in the control group ($\bar{X}_{\text{Control}}=108.85$), $t(67)=5.86$, $p<.05$. The test results with effect size calculated in ($d=1.41$) show that this difference is on a very large level.

To determine whether there is a statistically significant difference between the average writing achievement scores obtained from the experimental group before and after the education course, t-tests for the related samples were conducted. In the results, there is a significant difference between pretest ($\bar{X}_{\text{Pretest}}=107.08$) and post-test ($\bar{X}_{\text{Posttest}}=131.48$) scores, $t(34)=6.07$, $p<.05$. The test results with effect size calculated in ($d=1.02$) show that this difference is on a very large level. It may be stated that applications in the writing education course do not provide a meaningful increase in the written expression skills of Turkish pre-service teachers in the control group, $t(33)=1.07$, $p>.05$. While the average writing anxiety score for Turkish pre-service teachers was $=105.26$, after applications were made in the writing education course, this increased to $=108.85$. However, this result is not statistically meaningful (See Tables 8 and 9). These findings can be interpreted to mean that

Table 5: Results of anxiety scale pre-test and post-test average scores of control group related to writing

Measurement	N	X	S	sd	t	p
Pre-test	34	102.88	26.89	33	.033	.974
Post-test	34	102.76	26.55			

Table 6: t-test results of the writing expression pre-test average scores according to groups

Group	N	X	S	sd	t	p
Experiment	35	107.08	20.46	67	.34	.735
Control	34	105.26	23.98			

Table 7: t-test results of the writing expression post-test average scores according to groups

Group	N	X	S	sd	t	p
Experiment	35	131.48	18.51	67	5.86	.000
Control	34	108.85	12.97			

Table 8: t-test results of the writing expression pre-test and post-test average scores of experiment group

Measurement	N	X	S	sd	t	p
Pre-test	35	131.48	20.46	34	6.07	.000
Post-test	34	107.08	18.51			

Table 9: t- test results of writing expression pre-test and post-test average scores of control group

Measurement	N	X	S	sd	t	p
Pre-test	34	105.26	23.98	33	1.07	.289
Post-test	34	108.85	12.97			

the applications determined by the scope of the Council of Higher Education have an unimportant impact on the writing expression success of Turkish pre-service teachers.

After the data in Table 10 was examined, no meaningful difference was seen between the scores of the experimental group and the control group for the 6+1 analytical writing and assessment scale's "ideas" dimension, $t(67)=0.671$, $p>.05$. After the average scores related to the "organization" dimension for the experimental and control groups were examined, it was again determined that there is no meaningful statistical difference between these groups, $t(67)=0.850$, $p>.05$.

In the t-test, a meaningful difference was found between the scores that Turkish pre-service teachers took from voices in favor of the control group, $t(67)=2.026$, $p<.05$. However, after further consideration of the data from the t-tests, it was no longer seen as a meaningful difference between the average scores. There was also no meaningful difference found between the scores

that Turkish pre-service teachers took from "word choice" which is the fourth dimension of the 6+1 analytical writing and assessment scale, $t(67)=0.479$, $p>.05$. In addition, there was no meaningful difference discovered between the scores they took from "sentence fluency," $t(67)=0.548$, $p>.05$.

The written expression products of pre-service teachers were evaluated according to the 6+1 analytical writing and assessment scale's "convention" dimension, and the difference between the scores of the two groups was tested according to the meaningfulness of difference. In the t-test, no difference was seen between the scores of both groups for "convention," $t(67)=0.810$, $p>.05$. However, it was determined that there is a meaningful difference in favor of the control related to the "presentation" dimension, $t(67)=2.026$, $p<.05$.

After consideration of the data in Table 11, a meaningful difference can be seen between the scores of the experimental and control groups for the "ideas" dimension of the 6+1 analytical

Table 10: t-test results of pre-test averages scores that study groups took from every dimensions of 6+1 analytic writing and evaluation scale

Dimension	Group	N	X	S	sd	t	p
Ideas	Study	35	16.37	4.27	67	.671	.504
	Control	34	15.61	5.03			
Organization	Study	35	16.17	4.04	67	0.850	.398
	Control	34	15.23	5.06			
Voice	Study	35	12.28	2.59	67	2.026	.047
	Control	34	13.67	3.09			
Word Choice	Study	35	17.34	3.26	67	.479	.633
	Control	34	16.91	4.17			
Sentence Fluency	Study	35	14.97	2.91	67	.548	.586
	Control	34	14.55	3.32			
Convention	Study	35	15.42	2.31	67	.810	.421
	Control	34	14.94	2.67			
Presentation	Study	35	12.28	2.59	67	2.026	.047
	Control	34	13.67	3.09			

Table 11: T-test results for post-test averages of both groups for every dimension of the 6+1 Analytical Writing and Evaluation Scale

<i>Dimension</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>sd</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
<i>Ideas</i>	Study	35	20.80	2.99	67	5.068	.000
	Control	34	17.00	3.22			
<i>Organization</i>	Study	35	20.54	2.97	67	5.171	.000
	Control	34	16.67	3.23			
<i>Voice</i>	Study	35	18.88	2.76	67	6.198	.000
	Control	34	15.11	2.25			
<i>Word Choice</i>	Study	35	20.54	2.88	67	6.032	.000
	Control	34	16.79	2.22			
<i>Sentence Fluency</i>	Study	35	18.34	2.79	67	5.364	.000
	Control	34	15.26	1.86			
<i>Convention</i>	Study	35	17.00	2.78	67	3.322	.001
	Control	34	15.23	1.37			
<i>Presentation</i>	Study	35	15.37	3.38	67	3.900	.000
	Control	34	12.76	1.95			

writing and assesment scale, $t(67)=5.068, p<.05$. After the average scores related to the “organization” dimension of the two groups were examined, it is seen that there is also a meaningful difference here, $t(67) = 5.171, p < .05$.

In the t-test results, a meaningful statistical difference was found between the scores that Turkish pre-service teachers took from voices in favor of the control group, $t(67)=6.198, p<.05$. In addition, a difference was discovered between the scores that pre-service teachers took from the “word choice” dimension, or the fourth dimension of the 6+1 analytical writing and assessment scale, $t(67)=6.032, p<.05$. Likewise, researchers encountered similar results after the scores related to “sentence fluency” were examined, $t(67)=5.364, p<.05$.

The written expression products of pre-service teachers were evaluated in terms of the “convention” dimension, and the difference between the post-test scores of both groups were tested. In the t-test, a meaningful difference was found between the scores that pre-service teachers took from “convention” in favor of the control group, $t(67)=3.322, p<.05$. Furthermore, a meaningful difference was uncovered between the scores that pre-service teachers took from “presentation” in favor of the control group, $t(67)=3.900, p<.05$.

DISCUSSION

From the results of the research, it was concluded that writing instruction courses in which Turkish pre-service teachers utilized activities in the scope of the process-based writing approach had a great impact on the writing skills of pre-

service teachers who were in the experimental group as compared to those who were in the control group. This result is consistent with other similar studies’ results, which were made for improving process-based writing skills at different levels (Reimer 2001; Kozlow and Bellamy 2004; Senturk 2009; Ulper and Uzun 2009; Karatay 2011; Diliduzgun 2013; Ozdemir 2014; Bayat 2014; Li 2014). In addition, in this research, it has been reached that the process-based writing approach has a meaningful and positive impact on the writing anxiety of pre-service teachers. According to Fritzsche et al. (2003) and Singh and Rajalingam (2012), there is a relationship between the writing skill and writing anxiety. Arici and Ungan (2012) mention that a high anxiety level and a fear of failure affect an individual’s writing skill in a negative way. After consideration of this study’s results, it can be said that through the process-based writing approach, writing expression success can increase in writing courses and thereby remove writing anxiety.

During the study, the writing expression samples of pre-service teachers were evaluated through the 6+1 Analytical Writing Assessment Scale (Ozkara 2007). In the evaluation results, it may be stated that the experimental group students who were in classes where process-based writing activities were used are more successful in every subdimension of the scale than the students of the control group. In Ozdemir’s (2014) paper, pre-service teachers from Gazi University were evaluated for writing achievement with the 6+1 Analytical Writing Assessment Scale, and similar conclusions to this research’s findings were reached. In this particular study, pre-ser-

vice teachers' pretest and post-test scores lack a statistically significant difference, except for the spelling subscale. Also, Yazar (2004) did not determine this difference in his study with 31 students. It is thought that this difference emerges because of personal differences among the pre-service teachers who are included in the study.

When other studies based on process-based writing education are examined, the results obtained are consistent with this research. Ozkara (2007), DeJarnette (2008), Ulper (2008), Senturk (2009), and Ozdemir (2014) gained statistically meaningful results in favor of the experimental groups. Ulper did this research with eighth grade students, Ozkara with fifth grade students, DeJarnette with 162 fifth grade students, and Senturk with 70 eighth grade students. Bayat's (2014) quasi-experimental research, which was conducted with 74 pre-service teachers, show that the process-based writing approach improved the participants' success in written expression and also found that the process-based writing approach decreased writing anxiety by a statistically significant extent. Li et al.'s (2014) paper showed that WCPWP had a positive, albeit not significant effect, on the students' writing abilities and that a significantly positive effect was made on the writing attitudes of students.

CONCLUSION

This study tried to determine the impact of the process-based writing approach on the development of writing skills of pre-service teachers and the reduction of writing anxieties. From its results, it may be stated that the process-based writing approach is efficient for reducing writing anxieties and developing writing skills. This is very important for pre-service teachers, and therefore, it is also important for students who will be majoring within the Turkish education system. Being aware of the variables that influence the writing process and managing this process in a qualitative way allows a pre-service teacher to provide students with a qualitative writing product. Thus, students can express themselves better in writing. It is clear that teachers should first start with being motivated about this writing issue. In consideration of this, it can be said that writing studies should be performed with this approach, not only in primary and middle/high schools but also in higher education

institutions. That way, the writing process, which has been handled as a problem, will no longer be called a difficult activity after the needed studies are followed. At this point, it is thought that this research study has made an important contribution to the field.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The prewriting phase is very important for reducing writing anxiety, and it makes the process of writing more effective. Therefore, this step should be followed meticulously. It will greatly improve the writing quality of any writer. For this reason, the necessary steps should be taken at the preparation stage since getting ready for the introduction part of writing is not easy work. In writing education studies, both the writing process and the evaluation process must be made a process-based (analytical) system. This will improve the quality of the students' writing by providing necessary feedback.

REFERENCES

- Arici, AF, Urgan S 2012. *Yazili Anlatim El Kitabı*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayınları.
- Akdal D, Sahin A 2014. The effects of intertextual reading approach on the development of creative writing skills. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 54: 171-186. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2014.54.10>
- Badger R, White G 2000. A process genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT Journal*, 54(2): 153-160.
- Bayat N, 2014. The effect of the process writing approach on writing success and anxiety. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 14(3): 1133-1141.
- Creswell J 2012. *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. Boston: Pearson.
- Daly J, Wilson D 1983. Writing apprehension, self-esteem, and personality. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 17(4): 327-339.
- DeJarnette N 2008. *Effect of the 6+1 Trait Writing Model on Student Writing Achievement*. PhD Thesis. Lynchburg/USA: Liberty University. UMI Dissertation Publishing (3336558).
- Diliduzgun S 2013. The effect of process writing activities on the writing skills of prospective Turkish teachers. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 52: 189-210.
- Fraenkel J, Wallen N, Hyun H 2011. *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education*. New York: McGraw Hill Publications.
- Fritzsche BA, Young BR, Hickson KC 2003. Individual differences in academic procrastination tendency and writing success. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 35: 1549-1557.
- Graham S, Sandmel K 2011. The process writing approach: A meta-analysis. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 104: 396-407.

- Hansen J 1996. Evaluation: The center of writing instruction. *The Reading Teacher*, 50: 188-195.
- Iseri K, Unal E 2012. Analysing the Turkish teacher candidates' writing anxiety situations in terms of several variables. *Mersin University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 8(2): 67-76.
- Karakaya I, Ulper H 2011. Developing a writing anxiety scale and examining writing anxiety based on various variables. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 11(2): 703-707.
- Karatay H 2011. The effect of 4+1 planned writing and evaluation model to develop the attitudes of pre-service teachers as to written expression and their writing skills. *Turkish Studies*, 6(3): 1029-1047.
- Kayapinar U 2014. Measuring essay assessment: Intra-rater and inter-rater reliability. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 57: 113-136 <http://dx.doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2014.57.2>
- Kozlow M, Bellamy P 2004. *Experimental Study on the Impact of the 6+1 Trait Writing Model on Student Achievement in Writing*. Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.
- Lane K L 2006. Teaching writing strategies to young students struggling with writing and at risk for behavioral disorders: Self-regulated strategy development. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 39: 60-64
- Li C, Chu SKW, Ki WW 2015. The effects of a wiki-based collaborative process writing pedagogy on writing ability and attitudes among upper primary school students in Mainland China. *Computers and Education*, 77: 151-169
- Ministry of National Education 2012. *Orta Okul ve Imam Hatip Orta Okulu Yazariik ve Yazma Becerileri Dersi (5, 6, 7 ve 8. Siniflar) Ogretim Programi*. Ankara: Milli Egitim Bakanligi Yayinlari.
- Miles M, Huberman A 1994. *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*. California: SAGE Publication.
- Ozbay M, Zorbaz K Z 2011. Adaptation of Daly-Miller's writing apprehension test to Turkish. *Mustafa Kemal University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 8(16): 33-48.
- Ozdemir B 2014. *The Effect of Analytical Writing and Assessment Method on Pre-service Turkish Teachers' Writing Skills and Attitudes towards Writing*. PhD Thesis. Ankara/Turkey: Gazi University Institute of Educational Science. HEC Thesis Center (354676).
- Ozkara Y 2007. *The Effect of 6+1 Analytic Writing and Evaluative Model on Enhancing 5th Grade Students' Narrative Writing Skills*. PhD Thesis. Ankara/Turkey: Gazi University Institute of Educational Science. HEC Thesis Center (206907).
- Reimer M 2001. *The Effect of a Traditional, a Process Writing and a Combined Talking and Writing Instructional Approach on the Quality of Secondary English Students' Written Response*. Master Thesis. Canada: The University of Manitoba. UMI Dissertations Publishing (MQ62831).
- Santangelo T, Karen RH, Graham S 2007. Self-regulated strategy development: A validated model to support students who struggle with writing. *Learning Disabilities: A Contemporary Journal*, 5: 1-20.
- Singh TKR, Rajalingam SK 2012. The relationship of writing apprehension level and self-efficacy beliefs on writing proficiency level among pre-university students. *English Language Teaching*, 5(7): 42-52.
- Senturk N 2009. *The Effect of Planned Writing and Evaluative Model on Enhancing 8th Grade Students' Expository Writing Skills*. Master Thesis. Bolu/Turkey: Abant Izzet Baysal University Institute of Social Sciences. HEC Thesis Center (263521).
- Slavin R 2013. *Educational Psychology*. Ankara: Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.
- Sun C, Feng G 2009. Process approach to teaching writing applied in different teaching models. *English Language Teaching*, 2(1): 150-155.
- Thompson I 2013. The mediation of learning in the zone of proximal development through a co-constructed writing activity. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 247-276.
- Tompkins G 2010. *Literacy for The 21st Century: A Balanced Approach*. 5th Edition. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Topuzkanamis E 2015. The effect of teaching writing strategies on Turkish language teaching department freshman students' writing apprehension. *Journal of Language and Literature Education*, 13: 97-110.
- Ulper H 2008. *The Effects of Teaching Writing Programme Prepared in Accordance with Cognitive Process Model on Student Achievement*. PhD Thesis. Ankara/Turkey: Ankara University Institute of Social Sciences.
- Worth-Baker M 2004. Plan to write. *Teaching PreK-8*, 35: 64-64.
- Yaman H 2010. Writing anxiety of Turkish students: Scale development and the working procedures in terms of various variables. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 2(1): 267-289
- Yaman H 2014. The relation general anxiety levels, anxiety of writing, and attitude for Turkish course of secondary school. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 14(3): 1117-1122.
- Yazar O 2004. *The Significance and the Contribution of 6+1 Traits of Writing to the Success of the Students in Writing Courses in English Language Teaching*. Master Thesis. Ankara/Turkey: Gazi University Institute of Educational Science. HEC Thesis Center(145026).