

THE EFFECT OF PROGRESSIVE SENTENCE DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES ON 5TH GRADERS' DESCRIPTION SKILLS

ERGUN HAMZADAYI
Gaziantep University, Turkey

The aim of this study was to examine the effect of progressive sentence development activities on 5th graders' description skills. The study was conducted based on the pretest-posttest quasi-experimental model with a control group. A total of 58 students participated in the study; 29 in the control group, and 29 in the experimental group. The quantitative data were gathered using "Description Skill Scoring Rubric". The "Description Skill Scoring Rubric" was employed as the pre and posttest in the activities in both control and experimental group. The evaluations were carried out by three independent experts. The obtained data were analysed using SPSS. According to the findings revealed from the data, the progressive sentence development activities statistically significantly differentiated the experimental group students' description skills, compared to the students in the control group being exposed to traditional activities. In addition, it was found that the progressive sentence development activities significantly developed the experimental group students' skills of constructing additive and subordinating sentences, and using concretisation, determiners, reduplications, similes and adjectives in the description process. However, there was no significant difference in the pre and posttest scores of the control group students who were exposed to the traditional method. In the learning-teaching process, it can be argued that students should be the primary element of activities. In this sense, the progressive sentence development activities which give students the opportunity to participate in the lessons effectively should be emphasized in the teaching process.

Key Words: Writing skill, description skill, teaching writing

Introduction

Writing is the expression of feelings, ideas, desires and events in our minds through various symbols based on certain rules. In other words, it is the process of putting the information structured in mind on paper (Gunes, 2013: 157). One of the important determinants of this operational process is the purpose of the author to write his/her text. The purpose wanted to be reached through the text determines the type of text and the wording used in the text.

In general, texts can be divided into two categories as informative and literary texts (Ozdemir, 2007). On the other hand, every author refers to some ways of expression when structuring his/her text. While narration and description are mostly used in literary texts, explanation, argumentation and description can be used in informative texts. The author uses each of these ways of expression for a certain purpose. Explanation is usually used to provide information to the reader; argumentation to reveal various aspects of a topic

and persuade the reader; and narration to aesthetic pleasure to the reader within the scope of an event. As for description that is used in both literary texts and informative texts, it is used to inform depending on the purpose of the text, or to explain/narrate an impression.

“Although its area of usage is very broad, description can be defined as the way of expression that reflects/conveys an impression that an object, person, situation or an image have on the person who is in the position of narrator/conveyor. In this regard, description is making some kind of painting based on the data obtained from observations.” (Gunduz & Simsek, 2011: 51). Description addressed readers’ senses. In other words, the author wants to deliver his/her impressions related to the outside world, the entities. For this, he/she chooses a detail through a careful observation, and organises the detail in a way that form an image (Ozdemir, 2002: 33). This organisation achieved with intense attributions is the one that is related to the physical world (Gunay, 2003: 214).

A descriptive text becomes apparent with the use of various lexical and grammatical tools that enable naming an object, referring to it, putting it in a time or place, and delivering the impression that it has to the reader (Kiran & Kiran, 2003: 20). However, it is not easy as it seems to make lexical and grammatical arrangements in a way to form an image with the words related to an object, situation or scene. Thus, although description activities are included in the Turkish Teaching Program, it can be argued that students are not successful in this regard considering the pre and posttest findings of this study. It may be due to that they do not know and cannot sufficiently use lexical and grammatical ways of expression that strengthen language use in Turkish, and makes expression more effective.

In every language, there are certain rhetoric or language features to strengthen expression and make it fluent. One of these is

metaphors. Metaphors can be easily found in descriptive texts as a semantic phenomenon. “A metaphor is created by using an object or event to better express a feature of another object or event. People can use metaphors unique to themselves.” (Aksan, 1999: 61). “Metaphors are frequently used to make the elements in the texts easier to understand, and clear in the reader’s mind. To use a metaphor is to start a description. As in a description, the purpose of a metaphor is to form a detailed picture of the object or event in the receiver’s mind (Uzdu, 2008: 46)

Another language feature that can be used to strengthen the meaning or clarify a term is reduplications. Reduplications reinforce and strengthen a term as well as adding an important expressive strength and effectiveness to the sentence in terms of syntax (Aksan, 1999: 175). The objects in a description look more apparent through reduplications, which helps readers to differentiate these objects more easily. Particularly, the description becomes more alive with reduplications that reinforce a taste, sound, image or smell.” (Uzdu, 2008: 70).

One of the important features of Turkish is that sub-ordinate clauses are connected to the main clause via participles and gerunds, not relative pronouns. With nominalisation, adjectivisation and adverbialisation, the text is made more fluent, and thus, more effective expression is ensured with less words (Aksan, 1999: 172-173). Besides, ideas, feelings or actions in human mind cannot sometimes be expressed in a single clause, and for this reason, several clauses that are semantically connected to each other are given in a progressive way (Kara, 2012).

Another language element that is used to clarify and strengthen the meaning is adjectives. Adjectives is an essential element of descriptive texts that require detailed expression. They indicate the characteristics of the descriptive object as the language structure.

Adjectives intervene the word meaning that is constant, and limit or expand the meaning (Uzdu, 2008: 60). "Some of these have a qualification function such as wet and tasty while some have a determinative function such as this, that and it." (Aksan, 2003: 95). In Turkish, effective expression can be ensured by putting many adjectives or adjective phrases qualifying the same noun in a sequence without needing a conjunction (Aksan, 1999: 178).

Writing is one of the skill areas in which students have the most difficulty. An important aim of the education that takes creativity as its base is to enable individuals gain a multidimensional habit of intuition, emotion and thought (Sever, 1991: 371). The writing activities presented by teachers should be far from being boring. However, in the traditional approach, students are asked to write on a certain topic. In this process, the teacher only has the role of assessing students' works at the end. Therefore, the traditional approaches focus on the product in teaching writing. However, in the writing process, students should interact both with their teachers and peers. According to Zamel (1982), writing is the process in which students explore their ideas, structure meaning and at the same time, evaluate it. In this process, the focus is firstly on content and meaning, and then on form. Smith (2005) indicates that in the writing process, authors have to use two strategies, which are language-based and referent-based strategies. Language-based strategies increase the author's sensitivity to language and makes him/her selective and creative in language use. In language-based strategies, a word takes you to another word until a full text is formed. As for referent-based strategies, the topic of the text that the author creates is related to the theme and flow of ideas.

One of the activities that can be implemented to make students strengthen their expression in Turkish, and use rhetoric features effectively is progressive sentence

development activities. Also known as the activity of "Expanding a Simple Sentence" in the literature, students are given a simple sentence consisting of a few words. They are then asked to add a word or word phrase to this sentence and write it under the first sentence. In this way, the sentence is developed in a progressive way (Coskun, 2011: 51).

The logic of the description process is parallel to the logic of progressive sentence development process. In a description, the author selects a point of view. From this point, he/she addresses what is being described by taking a top-down or bottom-up approach (Adali, 2004: 122). In the progressive sentence development process, the individual visualises an image or portrait based on a sentence provided, and expands it step by step. An example for developing a sentence progressively is presented below:

Example:

1. *Degirmen donuyordu.* «The mill was turning.»
2. *Degirmen agir agir donuyordu.* «The mill was turning very slowly.»
3. *Eski degirmen agir agir donuyordu.* «The old mill was turning very slowly.»
4. *Eski tahta degirmen agir agir donuyordu.* «The old wooden mill was turning very slowly.»
5. *Eski tahta degirmen yillara meydan okur gibi agir agir donuyordu.* «The old wooden mill was turning very slowly as if it was defying the years.»
6. *Karsi koyun eski tahta degirmeni yillara meydan okur gibi agir agir donuyordu.* «The old wooden mill of the neighbouring village was turning very slowly as if it was defying the years.»
7. *Karsi koyun eski tahta degirmeni yillara meydan okur gibi vakarli bir*

- bicimde agir agir domuyordu.* «The old wooden mill of the neighbouring village was turning very slowly in a sedate way as if it was defying the years.»
8. *Yamaclarinda gunesin batmakta oldugu karsi koyun eski tahta degirmeni yillara meydan okur gibi vakarli bir bicimde agir agir domuyordu.* «The old wooden mill of the neighbouring village, on whose hillsides the sun was going down, was turning very slowly in a sedate way as if it was defying the years.»
9. *Arkadasim Selim'le yururken yamaclarinda gunesin batmakta oldugu karsi koyun eski tahta degirmeni yillara meydan okur gibi vakarli bir bicimde agir agir domuyordu.* «While I was walking with my friend, Selim, the old wooden mill of the neighbouring village, on whose hillsides the sun was going down, was turning very slowly in a sedate way as if it was defying the years.»
10. *Arkadasim Selim'le salina salina yururken yamaclarinda gunesin batmakta oldugu karsi koyun eski tahta degirmeni yillara meydan okur gibi vakarli bir bicimde agir agir domuyordu.* «While I was walking calmly with my friend, Selim, the old wooden mill of the neighbouring village, on whose hillsides the sun was going down, was turning very slowly in a sedate way as if it was defying the years.»

11. ...

As is seen in this example, the sentence started with the verb “*domuyordu*” «was turning» having the imperfect mood that is usually employed in descriptive texts. In the second sentence, the reduplication “*agir agir*” «very slowly», and in the third and fourth sentences,

the adjectives “*eski*” «old» and “*tahta*” «wooden» were added to the sentence, respectively. In the fifth sentence, a metaphor consisting of the clause “*yillara meydan okur gibi*” «as if it was defying the years» was added and in the sixth sentence, a possessive construction was formed by adding the lexical bundle “*Karsi koyun*” «of the neighbouring village». In the seventh sentence, another metaphoric element consisting of the lexical bundle “*vakarli bir bicimde*” «in a sedate way» was added while in the eighth sentence, a sub-ordinate clause connected to the main clause through adjectivisation using the lexical bundle “*Yamaclarinda gunesin batmakta oldugu*” «on whose hillsides the sun was going down» was attached. In the ninth sentence, a sub-ordinate clause was added which consisted of the lexical bundle “*Arkadasim Selim'le yururken*” «While I was walking with my friend, Selim» and was connected to the main clause through adverbialisation. This expansion is a process which requires reasoning and pushes the individual to produce new clauses in the sentence.

In the progressive sentence development process, the student being asked to add a new word or lexical bundle to the sentence in each step would contribute to his/her cognitive and language development. On the other hand, trying out new ways of expression through metaphors, nominalisation, adjectivisation and adverbialisation would make him/her learn such ways that would be appropriate to the structure and rules of Turkish. In this process, some guidance can be provided by the teacher. For example, that the 5W (What, When, Who, Why, Where) and 1H (How) technique can be used in this process can be reminded to students by the teacher. Similarly, sample descriptive texts can be used for class reading and students' prior knowledge on descriptive language can be enhanced. On the other hand, in the description process, students can be made to develop the sentence in cooperation

by the teacher dividing the students in groups of two or three.

Visuals have always been used in descriptive writing practices. As a matter of fact, the use of visuals in the writing process develops both students' creative writing and their alternative writing skills (Richardson, Sax & Ayers, 2003). Panteleo (2009) states that when students are asked to create a text based on a visual, they produce more holistic texts. Similarly, they form more detailed and well-organised texts containing more intense linguistic structures when they write from a visual (Vincent, 2001). In the present study, the students were asked to create a text from a visual stimulus. In this way, they were enabled to effectively use linguistic structures in the sentence development process.

For Turkish, there has not been any experimental study regarding how descriptive way of expression can be developed. This study is thought to fill this gap in the literature.

Aim

The aim of this study was to reveal the effect of progressive sentence development activities on the students' description skills in the experimental group. The study addressed the following research questions:

1. Is there a significant difference in the pre and posttest scores of the experimental group in which the progressive sentence development activities are conducted?
2. Is there a significant difference in the pre and posttest scores of the control group in which the traditional method is used?
3. Is there a significant difference between the posttest scores of the experimental group in which the progressive sentence development activities are conducted, and the control group in which the traditional method is used?

Method

Research Design

In this study aiming to identify the effect of progressive sentence development activities on 5th graders' description skills, the quasi-experimental model was adopted and pretest-posttest model with a control group was used. The quasi-experimental design is used in the cases where it is not possible to control all variables (Buyukozturk, 2007). In such quasi-experimental studies, a pretest and posttest are administered to both groups, but only the experimental group is exposed to an intervention (Creswell, 2003).

The model used in the study is represented in Table 1.

Table 1. Pretest - Posttest Model with a Control Group

(G1) Experi- mental group	(T1) Pretest	(V) Independent Variable Progressive Sentence Development Tech- nique	(T2) Posttest
(G2) Control group	(T3) Pretest	Traditional Method	(T4) Posttest

Participants

The participants of the study were students from two 5th grade classes at Vali M. Lutfulah Bilgin Middle School in the spring term of 2013-2014 school year. Two classes having similar characteristics were determined as experimental and control groups. There were a total of 58 students, 29 in the experimental group and 29 in the control group. While there were 13 female and 16 male students in the experimental group, there were 14 female and 15 male students in the control group. The students in the experimental and control group had an achievement level of over 90% in the Turkish course and other courses in the previous year.

Data Gathering Tool and Techniques

The quantitative data of the study were obtained using “Description Skill Scoring Rubric”. In the development of this instrument, items were firstly written based on the related outcomes in the literature and the teaching syllabus. These items included in the scoring rubric were examined by experts in program development and Turkish. The necessary changes and modifications were done in these items which were examined by the experts in terms of content, wording and item writing techniques. For the reliability of the description skill scoring rubric which was piloted in the middle school where the study was conducted later, the correlations among the evaluations of the experts were considered and these correlations were found to be high (ranging from 0.75 to 0.81). The inter-rater reliability being over 0.70 is an acceptable value for the reliability of a rubric (Brown et al., 2004; Stemler, 2004; Wang, 2009). Consequently, the reliability of the rubric can be regarded as high.

The “Description Skill Scoring Rubric” that was developed within this study is presented in Table 2.

Procedure

1. The experimental and control group students were shown a picture (see Appendix I), including both stable

and moving elements, and asked to describe this picture.

2. The texts containing the descriptions were obtained from the experimental and control group students without any feedback-revision.
3. In the experimental group, progressive sentence development activities were conducted during a total of 8 lessons in a four-week process.
4. While these progressive sentence development activities were conducted in the experimental groups, description practices were done in the control group using the traditional method in 8 lessons.
5. At the end of four weeks, the picture shown to both groups in the pretest was shown again and the students were asked to describe this picture (posttest).
6. The data gathered from the pre and posttest were scored by three different experts in accordance with the “Description Skill Scoring Rubric”.

Data Analysis

The description skill scoring rubric was used as the pre and posttest for the works of both control and experimental group. The works produces by the experimental and control

Table 2. Description Skill Scoring Rubric

	VERY GOOD	GOOD	INSUFFICIENT
Details can be chosen and presented in a way to form an in image with words in our mind.	2	1	0
Successive sentences and subordinating clauses that are important in making expression fluent and effective can be constructed.			
Reduplications can be used properly to strengthen expression.			
Metaphors can be used properly to strengthen expression.			
Adjectives can be used properly to strengthen and clarify expression.			

group were scored by three different experts as very good (2), good (1) and insufficient (0). For scoring reliability, the correlations between the scores given by the three experts were examined. The correlations between the scores given by the experts were found to be high (ranging from 0.73 to 0.82). This finding shows that the scoring reliability is high (Turgut, 1977).

In data analysis, a significance level of 0.05 was used. With regard to the first and second research questions, Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test, one of the non-parametric tests, was used to test the significance of the difference between two measurements. Related to the third research question, Mann Whitney U test, another non-parametric test, was employed to test the significance of the difference between the measurements.

Findings

This section presents the findings with respect to the research questions of the

study. Firstly, the pretest and posttest scores given in accordance with the description skill scoring rubric were compared within groups, and then, the experimental and control group was compared in terms of the posttest scores. The findings revealed based on the primary aim of the study were interpreted with tables and explanations with respect to the research questions.

The first research question of the study was "Is there a significant difference in the pre and posttest scores of the experimental group in which the progressive sentence development activities are conducted?"

For this research question, the experimental group students' pre and posttest scores given in accordance with the description skill scoring rubric were analysed using Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test. The findings are presented in Table 3.

As can be seen in Table 3, the results revealed that there was a significant different

Table 3. Results of Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test for the Experimental Group Students' Pre and Post-Experiment Scores

	Posttest/Pretest	n	Rank Mean	Rank Total	z	p
Whole test	Negative Rank	0	0.00	0.00	4,559	.000*
	Positive Rank	27	14.00	378.00		
	Equal	2				
Concretisation	Negative Rank	0	0.00	0.00	4,347	.000*
	Positive Rank	21	11.00	231.00		
	Equal	8				
Successive clause Subordinating clause	Negative Rank	0	0.00	0.00	3,987	.000*
	Positive Rank	19	10.00	190.00		
	Equal	10				
Reduplication	Negative Rank	1	8.50	8.50	4,394	.000*
	Positive Rank	25	13.70	342.50		
	Equal	3				
Metaphor	Negative Rank	2	4.50	9.00	3,140	.002*
	Positive Rank	14	9.07	127.00		
	Equal	13				
Adjective	Negative Rank	1	9.00	9.00	4,044	.000*
	Positive Rank	21	11.62	244.00		
	Equal	7				

*p<0.05

between the experimental group students' score before and after the treatment, $p < 0.05$. Considering the rank mean and totals of the score differences, this difference was found to be in favour of the posttest.

The second research question of the study was "*Is there a significant difference in the pre and posttest scores of the control group in which the traditional method is used?*". The results of the analysis are presented below:

No significant differences were revealed between the pretest and posttest scores for the whole Description Skill Scoring Rubric of the control group and the criteria of successive/subordinating clause, reduplication, metaphor and adjective criteria, ($p < 0.05$).

The third research question of the study was "*Is there a significant difference between the posttest scores of the experimental group in which the progressive sentence development activities are conducted, and the control group in which the traditional method is used?*". To answer this question, the posttest

scores of the participants in the experimental and control groups were analysed using Mann Whitney U Test. The findings are presented in Table 5.

As is seen in Table 5, the results showed that there was a significant difference between the experimental and control groups in the whole Description Skill Scoring Rubric as well as the concretization, reduplication, simile and adjective criteria. Considering the pair mean scores, the difference was in favour of the experimental group.

Discussion and Conclusion

The writing activities presented by the teachers should be far from being boring. When the literature is examined, it can be argued that students are not competent in writing, and have high levels of writing anxiety and negative attitudes toward writing. For example, based on the studies of Arici and Ungan (2008), Coskun (2005), Kirbas (2006), Sallabas (2009) and Yilmaz (2009)

Table 4. Results of Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test for the Control Group Students' Pre and Post-Experiment Scores

	Pretest/Posttest	n	Rank Mean	Rank Total	z	p
Whole test	Negative Rank	8	7.12	57.00	.295	.768
	Positive Rank	6	8.00	48.00		
	Equal	15				
Concretisation	Negative Rank	4	4.00	16.00	.378	.705
	Positive Rank	3	4.00	12.00		
	Equal	22				
Successive clause Subordinating clause	Negative Rank	3	3.00	9.00	.447	.655
	Positive Rank	2	3.00	6.00		
	Equal	24				
Reduplication	Negative Rank	4	5.50	22.00	.632	.527
	Positive Rank	6	5.50	33.00		
	Equal	19				
Metaphor	Negative Rank	4	4.50	18.00	.000	1,000
	Positive Rank	4	4.50	18.00		
	Equal	21				
Adjective	Negative Rank	4	4.00	16.00	.378	.705
	Positive Rank	3	4.00	12.00		
	Equal	22				

* $p < 0.05$

on elementary school students; Bagci (2012) and Aktan (2013) on high school students; Coskun (2011), Coskun and Tiryaki (2013), Dogan (2002) and Arici (2008) on university students, it can be argued that the insufficiency in the writing skill is present in different levels of education, from elementary school to university. The findings obtained from the pretests in this study are also in parallel with these studies.

In this study aiming to examine the effect of progressive sentence development activities on 5th graders' description skills, whether there was a significant difference between the experimental group students' description skill scores in pre and posttest as well as those of control group students, and between the posttest scores of experimental and control groups was investigated. As a result of the analysis, it was revealed that there was a significant difference between the pre and posttest scores of the 5th graders in the experimental group in favour of the posttest; but, there was no difference between the pre and posttest scores of the control group at the significance level of $p < 0.05$. On the

other hand, to examine whether there was a significant difference between the posttest scores of experimental and control groups, Mann Whitney U test was run and the results revealed a statistically significant difference at the level of $p < 0.05$. Based on the results of the study, it can be argued that the progressive sentence development activities implemented in the experimental group were more effective in developing 5th graders' description skill than the traditional activities used in the control group.

When the experimental group students' texts were examined in terms of constructing additive and subordinating sentences, and using determiners, reduplications, metaphors and adjectives, there was a considerable level of positive development. The findings based on the statistical analysis also revealed that the experimental group students showed a development for the aforementioned categories. However, this development was not seen in the pre and posttest scores of the control group students who were exposed to the traditional activities. Studies conducted in the literature show that creative writing practices

Table 5. Results of Mann Whitney U Test for Posttest Scores

	Group	N	\bar{X}	Rank Mean	Rank Total	U	p
Whole test	experimental	29	6.41	41.78	1211.50	64.50	0,000*
	control	29	0.47	17.22	499.50		
Concretisation	experimental	29	1.31	38.69	1122.00	154.00	0,000*
	control	29	0.45	20.31	589.00		
Subordinating clause Successive clause	experimental	29	1.14	38.38	1113.00	163.00	0,000*
	control	29	0.35	20.62	598.00		
Reduplication	experimental	29	1.38	39.91	1157.50	118.50	0,000*
	control	29	0.34	19.09	553.50		
Metaphor	experimental	29	0.93	35.74	1036.50	239.50	0,002*
	control	29	0.28	23.26	674.50		
Adjective	experimental	29	1.62	40.05	1161.50	114.50	0,000*
	control	29	0.66	18.95	549.50		

* $p < 0.05$

make great contributions to students' vocabulary. For example, the results of Dougherty's (2011) revealed that creative writing was beneficial in terms of developing vocabulary. As for progressive sentence development activities, they can also make contributions to students in making proper an effective use of Turkish vocabulary.

In the literature, there are experimental and theoretical studies in which various techniques are employed to develop students' sentence writing skills. Particularly the studies conducted in the last 50 years, those related to sentence combining have come to forth. With this technique developed by Hunt (1965), it is aimed to develop students' writing skills by adding words, phrases and clauses to the smallest clause to the extent that English grammar and linguistic structure allows. According to Hunt (1967; 1970), this technique enables students to write longer essays and construct more complex sentences while developing their syntactic fluency. In the current study, the focus was on the students progressively develop a sentence from its basic form. This study is consistent with the studies of Hunt.

With respect to the studies on sentence combining (Strong, 1976; Ney, 1981; Saddler, 2005; Saddler & Asora-Saddler, 2010), there are findings revealing that students can construct more meaningful, varied and alternative types of sentences with this technique. In general, these findings can be argued to support the results reached in this study.

On the other hand, since the writing process defined in the cognitive process model of Flower and Hayes (1981) is actively processed in the practices of progressive sentence development activities, students would take the behaviours of planning, transferring to writing and revision that are in the knowledge level to the application level and internalise them. At the same time, the logic behind the progressive sentence development activities

overlaps the two important and required processes of the writing skill including reflection and revision (Fox, 2001). In this regard, students firstly transfer the picture or idea that they design in mind to writing (reflection), and then the reflected idea, information or picture is organised at sentence level.

As a result of this study, progressive sentence development activities applied in a teaching environment can be argued to be more effective than the traditional method in terms of students' description skills. The following suggestions are offered for practitioners and researchers based on the results of this study:

- In the learning-teaching process, students should be the primary element of the activities. In this sense, the progressive sentence development activities which give students the opportunity to participate in the lessons effectively should be strongly emphasized in the teaching process.
- The process of progressive sentence development should not be thought as an individual work only, but cooperative practices should be used when necessary.
- This study was conducted with middle school 5th graders. There is a need for studies that would examine the effectiveness of progressive sentence development activities on students' description skill in different school levels.

References

- Adali, O. (2004). *Anlamak ve anlatmak*. Istanbul: Pan Yayincilik.
- Aksan, D. (1999). *Anlambilim*. Ankara: Engin Yayınevi.
- Aksan, D. (2003). Her yönüyle dil ana çizgileriyle dilbilim. Ankara: TDK.
- Arici, A. F. & Urgan, S. (2008). İlköğretim ikinci kademe öğrencilerinin yazılı anlatım çalışmalarının bazı yönlerden değerlendirilmesi. *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 20, 317-328.
- Arici, A. F. (2008). Üniversite öğrencilerinin yazılı anlatım hataları. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, XXI (2), 209-22.
- Bagci, H. (2012). Ortaöğretim 9. sınıf öğrencilerinin yazılı anlatım alan bilgisi başarı düzeyleri üzerine bir araştırma. *Turkish Studies*. Volume 7/4, 907-919.
- Brown, G. T. L., Glasswell, K., & Harland, D. (2004). Accuracy in the scoring of writing: Studies of reliability and validity using a new zealand writing assessment system. *Assessing Writing*, 9, 105-12
- Buyukozturk, S. (2007). *DeneySEL Desenler Ontest-Son-test Kontrol Grubu Desen ve Veri Analizi*, Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
- Coskun, E. & Tiryaki, E. N. (2013). Üniversite öğrencilerinin tartışmacı metin yazma becerileri. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 28(2), 102-115.
- Coskun, E. (2005). İlköğretim öğrencilerinin okuyucu anlatımlarında bağdaşlılık, tutarlılık ve metin elementleri. *Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi*, Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
- Coskun, E. (2011). Yazma eğitiminde aşamalı gelişim. Editor: Murat Ozbay. *Yazma Eğitimi*, 45-83. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Creswell, J.W. (2003). *Research design*. California: Sage Publication
- Dougherty, P. (2011) Creative writing and vocabulary acquisition: A study of Emirati college students. In D. Anderson's (Ed.) *Focus on Vocabulary: Emerging Theory and Practice for Adult Arab Learners*, 57-69. Abu Dhabi: HCT Press.
- Flower, L. & Hayes J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32, 365-387.
- Fox, R. (2001). Helping young writings at the point of writing. *Language and Education*, 15(1), 1-13.
- Gunay, D. (2003). *Metin bilgisi*. Istanbul: Multilingual.
- Gunduz, O. ve Simsek, T. (2011). *Uygulamalı yazma eğitimi*. Ankara: Grafiker Yayınları.
- Gunes, F. (2013). *Türkçe öğretimi yaklaşımlar ve modeller*. Ankara: Pegem A Yayınları.
- Hunt, Kellogg W. (1965). *Grammatical Structures Written at Three Grade Levels*, National Council of Teachers of English Research Report, 3 (Champaign, IL: NCTE), p. 21.
- Hunt, Kellogg W. (1967). *Grammatical Structures*. Roy C. O'Donnell, William J. Griffin & Raymond C. Norris, *Syntax of Kindergarten and Elementary School Children: A Transformational Analysis*, National Council of Teachers of English Research Report, 8 (Champaign, IL: NCTE).
- Hunt, Kellogg W., (1970). *Syntactic Maturity in Schoolchildren and Adults*, Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 35, i (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press,).
- Kara, S. (2012). *Sıralı cümle üzerine bir inceleme*. *Turkish Studies*, 7/4, 2163-2171.
- Karakus Aktan, E. N. (2013). Ortaöğretim öğrencilerinin yaratıcı yazma becerileri üzerine bir araştırma (Kutahya ili örneği). *Adıyaman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 6(11), 701-732.
- Kiran (Eziler), A. ve Kiran, Z. (2003). *Yazınsal okuma süreleri*. Ankara: Seckin Yayıncılık.
- Kirbas, A. (2006). İlköğretim sekizinci sınıf öğrencilerinin yazılı anlatım becerilerinin değerlendirilmesi. *Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*, Erzurum: Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Ozdemir, E. (2002). *Yazınsal türler*. Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi.
- Ozdemir, E. (2007). *Eleştirel okuma*. Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi.
- Pantaleo, S. (2009). An ecological perspective on the socially embedded nature of reading and writing. *Journal of early Childhood Literacy*, 9(1), 75-99.
- Richardson, M. V., Sacks, M. K., & Ayers, M. N. (2003). Paths to reading and writing through the visual arts. *Reading Improvement*, 40(3), 113-116.
- Saddler, B. & Asaro-Saddler K. (2009). *Writing Better Sentences: Sentence-Combining Instruction in the Classroom, Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth*, 54:3, 159-163, DOI: 10.1080/10459880903495851.
- Saddler, B. (2005). *Sentence combining: A sentence-level writing intervention*. *The Reading Teacher* vol.58 no.5 pp. 468-471.
- Sallabas, M. E. (2009). İlköğretim 5. sınıf öğrencilerinin yazılı anlatım becerilerinin çeşitli değişkenler bakımından değerlendirilmesi. *Milli Eğitim*, 180, 94-107.
- Sever, S. (1991). *Dil ve edebiyat öğretiminde yaratıcılık*. *Eğitimde Nitelik Geliştirme/Eğitimde Arayışlar 1. Sempozyumu Bildiri Metni*, 371-374. Istanbul: Kültür Koleji Yayınları.
- Smith, H. (2005). *The writing experiment: strategies for innovative creative writing*. Sydney, Allen and Unwin.

- Stemler, S. E. (2004). A comparison of consensus, consistency, and measurement approaches to estimating interrater reliability. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 9.
- Turgut, M. F. (1977). *Egitimde olcme ve degerlendirme metotlari*. Ankara: Nuve Matbaasi.
- Uzdu, F. (2008). *Betimleyici metinlerin dilsel ozellikleri ve bu tur metinler yoluyla sozcuk ogretimi*. Yayinlanmamis Yuksek Lisans Tezi, İzmir: Dokuz Eylul Universitesi Egitim Bilimleri Enstitusu.
- Vincent, J. (2001). The role of visually rich technology in facilitating children's writing. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 17(1), 242-250.
- Wang, Ping. (2009). The Inter-rater Reliability in Scoring Composition. *English Language Teaching*. Volume 2, No 3, 39-43.
- Yilmaz, O. (2009). 6, 7, 8. siniftaki 100 ogrenciye ait ogrenci calisma kitabindan hareketle ogrencilerin yazili anlatim becerilerinin incelenmesi. Yayinlanmamis Yuksek Lisans Tezi, Erzincan: Erzincan Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.
- Zamel, V. (1982). Writing: The process of discovering meaning. *TESOL Quarterly* 16, 195-209.

APPENDIX I.

The picture used in the pretest and posttest of the description practices in the experimental and control groups



APPENDIX II.

The pretest description work of a student (Meliha AKYILMAZ) in the experimental group

Mavi bir deniz ve yeşil armanlar
dan dağın üstünde dört tane kulübe
vardır. Karşıdaki dağın üstünde sela-
le ve denizin üstünde gökyüzü var-
dır. Dağın üstünde bir süpürge ağacı vardır.
Bir de denizin üstünde bir tane gemi
vardır.

Meliha Akylmaz
5-E 736

There are four cottages on top of a green hill looking at the blue sea. There is a waterfall on the other hill and the sky above the sea. There are many trees on the hill. In addition, there is a ship on the sea.

APPENDIX III.

The posttest description work of a student (Melih AKYILMAZ) in the experimental group

Dağın üstündeki sebtle yeşil renk-
li ağaçların ve ağaçların içinden ta-
temiz akıyordu.
Mavi denizin üstündeki beyaz bir ge-
mi sanki bize selam veriyor gibi hız-
lı gidiyordu.
Yeşil ağaçların üstündeki küçük
kahverengi renkli bir kulübe ve gökyü-
zünde sarı renkte olan güneş her
yere neşe veriyor ve her yeri ay-
dınlatıyordu.
Denizin arkasındaki dağın üstünde
ben beyaz ve bir sürü kar vardı ve ço-
cukların onun üstünde kar topu oyna-
yıp eğleniyorlardı.

Melih Akylmaz
736 5-E

The waterfall on the hill was flowing down the green grass and among the trees. A white ship on the blue sea was moving fast as if she was saluting us. A brown cottage on the green hill and the yellow sun in the sky were bringing joy to everywhere and lightening the environment. There was a lot of white snow on the hill across the sea and the children were having fun by playing snowball on it.

Copyright of Education is the property of Project Innovation, Inc. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.