EXPLORING PRESERVICE TEACHERS' WRITING CULTURE[1]

Öğretmen Adaylarının Yazma Kültürü Üzerine Bir İnceleme

Melik ZORBAZ[2]

Gökhan ÇETİNKAYA[3]

Abstract

This study aimed to explore the status of writing cultures of preservice teachers. Preliminary learning of preservice teachers as the future leaders of teaching will be decisive in the quality of writing education they will provide. This descriptive study utilized the questionnaire method of data collection methods. The participants of the research were 122 preservice teachers during the academic year of 2018-2019. For the data regarding the participants' writing culture, a Likert questionnaire titled the European Writing Questionnaire was adapted into Turkish. The collected data were transferred to statistical software for the analysis of frequency, percentage and arithmetic mean. It was found in the analysis that there were not many courses in which written texts were evaluated in the department of the participants, a product-oriented evaluation was in question, inadequate and low-quality feedbacks were provided, not much time was dedicated for revising the outline, genres in which texts were produced were limited, and the participants were not informed of plagiarism. On the other hand, positive results included that the participants reported they often took down notes and made plans before starting to write. When the findings obtained from the database of the research are evaluated in general, it can be said that the applications in the program where preservice teachers are studying in terms of the qualified formation of the writing culture do not constitute sufficient resources. Pre-learning and beliefs arising from these pre-learning play an important role in the classroom practices of the teacher. Therefore, it is an imperative that the curriculum and practices to be offered to prospective teachers are qualified. Based on the results, recommendations were provided about improving the writing culture.

Keywords: Teacher education, writing education, feedback, process writing

Öz

Bu çalışmanın amacı, öğretmen adaylarının yazma kültürlerinin nasıl olduğunu ortaya koymaktır. İleride öğretim lideri olarak görev alacak öğretmen adaylarının vereceği yazma eğitiminin niteliğinde ön öğrenmeleri belirleyici olacaktır. Betimsel nitelikli bu çalışmada veri toplama tekniklerinden sormaca tekniği kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın çalışma grubunda 2018-2019 eğitim-öğretim yılında Türkçe Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı dördüncü sınıfta öğrenimlerini sürdüren 45 ve Türk Dili-Edebiyatı Bölümü dördüncü sınıfta öğrenimlerini sürdüren 77 olmak üzere toplam 122 öğretmen adayı yer almıştır. Katılımcıların yazma kültürüne ilişkin verileri toplamak için Avrupa Yazma Sormacası adlı likert tipi bir sormaca Türkçeye uyarlanmıştır. Toplanan veriler istatistik programına aktarılarak sıklık, yüzdelik ve aritmetik ortalamaları alınarak çözümlenmiştir. Yapılan çözümleme sonucunda, katılımcıların öğrenim gördükleri programda yazılı metinlerinin değerlendirildiği çok sayıda ders olmadığı, ürün odaklı değerlendirme yapıldığı, yetersiz ve niteliği düşük geribildirim verildiği, taslak metni gözden geçirmeye fazla zaman ayrılmadığı, üretilen metin türlerinin kısıtlı olduğu ve intihal konusunda bilgilendirme yapılmadığı sonucu ortaya çıkmıştır. Öte yandan, katılımcıların sıklıkla not alması ve yazmaya başlamadan önce plan yaptıklarını bildirmeleri ortaya çıkan olumlu sonuçlardır. Araştırmanın veri tabanından elde edilen bulgular genel olarak değerlendirildiğinde öğretmen adaylarının yazma kültürünün nitelikli biçimlenmesi bakımından öğrenim gördükleri programdaki uygulamaların yeterli kaynak oluşturmadığı söylenebilir. Öğretmenin sınıf içi uygulamalarında ön öğrenmeleri ve bu ön öğrenmelerden kaynaklanan inançları önemli rol oynar. Bu yüzden öğretmen adaylarına sunulacak öğretim programının ve uygulamaların nitelikli olması bir zorunluluktur. Çalışmanın sonuçlarından hareketle yazma kültürünün geliştirilmesi konusunda öneriler sunulmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Öğretmen yetiştirme, yazma eğitimi, geribildirim, süreç temelli yazma

INTRODUCTION

The most important source for in-class learning is the teacher. For a teacher to conduct a quality teaching process, they need to be equipped with qualified theoretical knowledge and to have improved implementation skills. With Turkish Language-Literature and Turkish courses it is aimed to provide comprehension and expression skills in Turkish. It is a prerequisite that the teacher has a high level of linguistic skills and knowledge on teaching theories, methods and approaches so that they can achieve those objectives.

Preliminary learning of the teacher and beliefs stemming from such preliminary learning play a key role in them in-class practices. Richards and Lockhart (1994) consider teachers' belief structures in a threefold point of view: cognitive, affective and behavioural. They state that teacher's "knowledge" and "thought" shape the main framework or schemes that guide the class activities they will perform.

According to Clark and Peterson (1986), teaching process involves two main domains: (1) teachers' thinking processes and (2) teachers' actions and observable impacts. Thinking processes are divided into three main categories: (1) teacher's planning, (2) teachers' interactive thoughts and decisions, and (3) teachers' theories and beliefs.

It is stated that teachers' beliefs are associated with (1) experiences during linguistic learning; (2) experiences about what is the best; (3) form of practice that is experienced; (4) personality factors; (5) mentality of structured education and research; and (6) principles acquired from a given approach or method (Kindsvatter, Willenand, & Ishler, 1988).

Based on the approaches above, one can argue that education received by preservice teachers in their programmes may determine the teaching approaches in their future teaching. Within the context of the subject of this study, it is possible to say that writing

cultures of the preservice teachers that were shaped during their education in the programme may affect their approaches regarding the writing education they will provide in their future teaching.

Writing culture involves several components. These components may include frequency of creating a written text, writing process, planning, revision, feedback, genre, publishing, writing and studying competences, awareness of quality text, and awareness of semantic and formal requirements of written texts. All these components listed are important both for improvement of preservice teachers' writing skills and for how students' writing skills would be improved during the teaching process. Accordingly, writing culture can be defined as the body of approaches employed by an individual to realize the act of writing and to publish it.

With Turkish Curriculum introduced in 2005, the process writing model developed by Flower and Hayes (1981) which stresses out the stages of writing an outline, revision, and publishing started to be included in the curriculum. However, previous studies have concluded that the writing approach in the curriculum does not coincide with the writing approach in practice in Turkey (Aşıkcan & Pilten, 2016; Tabak & Göçer, 2013). However, at the same time there are some study results showing that process writing education is an effective approach in improving students' writing skills (Bayat, 2014; Dilidüzgün, 2013; Karatay, 2011; Ülper & Uzun Subaşı, 2009).

Stages of the process writing model are covered by the components of writing culture. The results achieved in the literature indicate that other components are also important for the development of writing skills (Kellogg, 2008; Reimer, 2001).

There are several studies which have made it clear that components of writing culture are important for the improvement of students' writing skills and in terms of their contributions to the teaching process (Adıgüzel, 1998; Ceyhan, 2014; Erdoğan & Yangın, 2014; Topuzkanamış, 2014).

Creating a text by writing is a difficult and complicated task. Difficulty producing a text is due to the requirement of establishing certain specific relationships between multiple units according to the specific context of each text (Bayat, 2019). Thus, there is need for qualified teaching leaders to provide the writing performance. For training preservice teachers as future teaching leaders who will be qualified in writing, it is also required to improve the quality of their preliminary learning.

In the literature, even more studies have been conducted on creating and improving the writing culture in recent years (Alvarez & Yaniz, 2015; Castelló, 2015; Kruse, Chitez, Rodriquez, & Castello, 2016). In the literature in Turkish, there are studies that address individual components of writing but no studies have been performed to directly focus on writing culture as a whole to date (Bayat, 2009; Çetinkaya & Köğce, 2014; Erbilen, 2014; Gülüşen, 2011; Özdemir & Erdem, 2011; Özdemir & Özbay, 2016; Temizkan, 2016).

Components of Writing Culture

Writing culture involves the approaches of realizing the act of writing and publishing it. One of the primary factors that shape individual's writing culture is the education they have received. Therefore, how writing education is provided is also a component of writing culture.

In the literature, there are studies aiming to explore what kind of a writing culture is present at European universities. Majority of these studies show that universities possess positive characteristics of writing culture and few of them indicate that they do not have such positive characteristics (Chitez, Kruse, & Castello, 2015; Kruse, Chitez, Rodriquez, & Castello, 2016).

Components of writing culture handled in the studies can be classified under eleven headings

Figure 1. Components of Writing Culture

Components of writing culture reveal individual's behaviors, attitudes and current knowledge of writing performance. The structure of writing culture predominating the university can invert preservice teachers' behaviours and attitudes positively or negatively.

Results of studies describing the writing cultures at universities indicate that institutions do not attach sufficient importance to writing culture. For instance, the research by Castelló, Mateos, Castells, İnesta, Cuevas, and Sole (2012) titled "Academic Writing

Practices in Spanish Universities" concluded that lecturers care about academic writing but do not have students do many activities. Another result of the research is that students are not competent enough in academic writing to use it as a learning tool. The results of the study performed by Corcelles, Oliva, Castelló, and Millian (2015) show that universities make its greatest contributions to explanation and presentation skills. There are several similar research results emphasizing the inadequacy of writing practices at universities (Alvarez & Yaniz, 2015). On the other hand, there are very few studies indicating the positive aspects of writing practices at universities (Kruse, Chitez, Rodriquez, & Castello, 2016).

Previous research results show that preservice teachers have poor writing self-efficacies, writing attitudes and writing skills while having high writing anxieties (Atay & Kurt, 2006).

Writing culture is a concept involving important components so as to conduct a successful writing process and to construct a product through which the communicational purpose and intend is clearly put forth. A set of phenomena such as genre-specific structure knowledge, awareness and attitude about text production processes is crucial. Culture is a dynamic phenomenon. Positive stimuli and experiences can improve a culture. Likewise, positive stimuli and experiences can improve a writing culture. Hence, writing practices employed in the programmes attended by preservice teachers are important. Preliminary learning of preservice teachers as the future leaders of teaching and their shaped writing cultures will be decisive in the quality of writing education they will provide. Importance of this study is even more obvious as it offers a detailed picture of writing education received by preservice teachers and their existing cultures. The findings achieved can guide researchers, programme makers and teacher training institutions as a source.

This study aimed to examine the writing culture among preservice Turkish Language-Literature and Turkish teachers. By this means, an outlook will be achieved about components that may contribute positively or negatively to the formation of their writing cultures in their programs.

The research questions underpinning this study are:

1. What are the participants' views about the writing education they receive in their programs?
2. How do the participants assess feedback practices in terms of forming outlines, taking notes and plagiarism rules in their programs?
3. What are the participants' views toward their engagement in the writing processes in class?
4. What is outlook of importance attached by participants to components of creating a text?
5. What are the types and features of feedbacks received by participants for their outlines?
6. How is the overview of genres written by participants?
7. How do participants submit (publish) the texts they have created?
8. How are participants' self-evaluations of their writing competences?
9. What are participants' thoughts on features of a quality text?
10. What are participants' opinions on their own study competences?
11. What are opinions and preferences of participants about the ways of improving the written texts?

<div align="center">

METHOD

</div>

Research Design

Aiming to examine the writing culture among pre-service Turkish Language-Literature and Turkish teachers, this research was conducted in the survey model. In a survey model, studies aim at collecting data for determining certain characteristics of a cluster. Questions measuring participants' opinions about methods can be answered in the best way by using various questionnaire techniques. Answers are later tabularized into frequencies and percentages regarding the individuals who answered the questions and are presented. An important advantage of survey model is that it offers the information acquired from a sample formed by many individuals (Büyüköztürk et al., 2017).

Study Group

The participants of the research were 122 preservice teachers studying the programmes of Turkish Teaching (TT) in Faculty of Education and Turkish Language-Literature (TLL) in Faculty of Science and Letters at a public university in the academic year of 2018-2019. Participant distribution by department and gender is given in Table 1.

Table 1. *Gender and Department*

				F	**M**	**Total**
1	**Gender and Department**	**TT**	f	27	18	45
			%	60,0	40,0	100,0
		TLL	f	61	16	77
			%	79,2	20,8	100,0
		Total	f	88	34	122
			%	72,1	27,9	100,0

Data Collection Tools

For data on participants' writing culture, the 102-item Likert questionnaire developed by Chitez, Kruse, and Castello (2015) was adapted into Turkish. After the form had been translated into Turkish, it was applied to five participants in advance to confirm whether it was understandable. The form was finalized upon the feedbacks from the pilot application. Each of 102 items in the questionnaire form was rated as "5- Strongly Agree", "4- Agree", "3- Somewhat Agree", "2- Disagree", and "1 Strongly Disagree".

Data Collection

After required permits had been received, the data collection instrument was applied in writing. Before the application, the participants were informed of the objective and implementation of the questionnaire. Participants answered the items in 15-20 minutes.

Data Analysis

Frequency, percentages, arithmetic mean and standard deviations were determined by transferring the responses of the participants to the statistical program in the form in the questionnaire. However, when interpreting the mean scores, ranges were determined according to 0.80 (Balcı, 2005). For example, the range 1-1.79 is "never"; 1.80-2.59 range

"rarely"; 2.60-3.39 range "sometimes"; The range 3.40-4.19 was interpreted as "usually" and the range 4.20-5.00 as "always".

FINDINGS

Participants' Views about the Writing Education They Receive in Their Programmes

Table 2. *General Questions on Writing in Your Study Programme*

	How many of your courses require writing a paper that is graded?		None	1-5	6-10	11-16	20+	Total
1		**f**	15	77	21	6	3	122
		%	12,3	63,1	17,2	4,9	2,5	100,0

According to the participant answers, 63.1% of them reported that there were 1 to 5 courses that required them to write papers to be graded.

Table 3. *General Questions on Writing in Your Study Programme*

	Item		**None**	**3**	**6**	**9**	**10+**	**Total**
1	How many hours per week do you dedicate to writing?	**f**	55	57	7	1	2	122
		%	45,1	46,7	5,7	0,8	1,6	100,0
2	How many graded papers have you written in your current study programme?	**f**	44	43	17	4	14	122
		%	36,1	35,2	13,9	3,3	11,5	100,0

According to the table, 45.1% of the participants reported that they did not dedicate any time to writing in a week. However, in the second item, 36.1% reported that none of their paper were evaluated and graded in their programme.

Table 4. *General Questions on Writing in Your Study Programme*

			Exclusively individual	More individual	Half half	More collaborative	Total
1	In your study programme, is individual writing or collaborative writing more dominant?	**f**	30	58	24	10	122
		%	24,6	47,5	19,7	8,2	100,0

As seen in Table 4, 47.5 of the participants reported that more activities were performed in individual writing.

Overall Situation about Receiving Feedback for Outlines, Taking Notes and Informing About Plagiarism Rules in the Programmes Attended by Participants

Table 5. *General Questions on Writing in Your Study Programme*

	Item	$\bar{x}$	Ss	Level
1	Have you received written instructions for a writing task?	2,05	,97319	rarely
2	Have you received oral instructions for a writing task?	2,57	1,18474	rarely
3	Have you engaged in discussion(s) with your university teacher(s) on your written work?	2,14	1,08842	rarely
4	Have you engaged in discussion(s) with your classmate(s) on your written work?	2,38	1,12409	rarely
5	Have you participated in online chats, discussions, forums, wikis etc. At your university?	3,06	1,05813	often
6	Have you taken notes during classes?	4,00	1,16772	often
7	Have you been informed about plagiarism rules?	2,02	1,20921	rarely

Participants answered items 1, 2, 3, 4, and 7 "rarely". On the other hand, they answered items 5 and 6 "often".

Participants' Views toward Their Engagement in the Writing Processes in Class

Table 6. *From Your Own Writing Experience, Would You Rather Agree or Disagree with the Following Statements*

	Item	$\bar{x}$	Ss	Level
1	I always plan before writing a paper	3,67	1,04005	agree
2	I always start writing right away and see where 1 get at	3,11	1,13689	agree
3	I do all the reading before 1 start writing	3,81	,92724	not sure
4	My ideas change while 1 work on a paper	3,90	,79257	agree
5	I reserve a considerable part of my time budget for revision	3,24	,84610	not sure
6	I always ask someone for feedback to improve my paper	3,63	1,00578	agree
7	I receive sufficient feedback form y texts/ papers from my instructors	3,08	1,11036	not sure
8	I think that my university supports my writing development well	3,50	1,15887	agree
9	Writing is a well discussed matter at my university	3,25	1,22347	not sure
10	Avoiding plagiarism is an important aspect of my writing	3,43	1,15700	agree

According to Table 6, participants answered items 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, and 10 "Agree" and items 3, 5, 7, and 9 "Not Sure".

Outlook of Importance Attached by Participants to Components of Creating A Text

Table 7. *How Important Is for Your Writing*

	Item	x̄	Ss	Level
1	Writing an outline	4,06	,85992	important
2	Brainstorming	4,18	,73873	important
3	Planning	4,33	,72283	very important
4	Reading	4,39	,67490	very important
5	First draft	4,17	,77877	important
6	Revision	4,45	,69356	very important

According to Table 7, participants answered items 1, 2, and 5 "important" and items 3, 4, and 6 "very important".

Types and Features of Feedbacks Received by Participants for Their Outlines

Table 8. *What Kind of Feedback Do You Usually Receive?*

	Item	x̄	Ss	Level
1	Oral comments	3,39	,98381	sometimes
2	Written comments: general comments at the end of the text	2,81	1,12325	sometimes
3	Written comments: specific comments in the margins	2,39	1,08755	rarely
4	Ratings: points on a scale grading different aspects of the text	2,67	1,16024	sometimes
5	Grade only	3,31	1,24161	sometimes

In Table 8, participants answered items 1, 2, 4, and 5 "sometimes" and item 3 "rarely".

Overview of Genres Written by Participants

Table 9. *Which of These Genres Do You Write in Your Classes?*

	Item	x̄	Ss	Level
1	Notes during lectures	4,18	,97078	often
2	Seminar papers (on theoretical or empirical topics)	2,38	1,07908	rarely
3	Research papers	2,58	1,10476	rarely
4	Reflections (on personal experiences)	2,91	1,08780	sometimes
5	Technical reports	2,03	1,05183	rarely
6	Summaries	3,52	,96392	often
7	Protocols (minutes of lessons)	2,72	1,33011	sometimes
8	Internship reports	3,04	1,33854	sometimes
9	Proposals	2,61	1,16027	sometimes

10	Essays	2,74	1,27637	sometimes
11	Narrative or expressive texts	2,89	1,10452	sometimes
12	Log books or learning diaries	2,52	1,23458	rarely
13	Written in-class exams	3,73	1,25838	often
14	Other (which?)	2,27	1,29374	rarely

Table 9 shows that participants answered items 1, 6, and 13 "often", items 2, 3, 5, 12, and 14 "rarely", and items 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 "sometimes".

Ways of Submitting (Publishing) the Texts Created by Participants

Table 10. *How Do You Usually Submit Papers?*

	Item	$\bar{x}$	Ss	Level
1	Paper version	4,12	1,04112	often
2	E-mail	2,27	,98972	rarely
3	Learning platform	2,04	1,07452	rarely
4	Website	1,94	1,10819	rarely
5	Poster	1,80	1,05736	rarely
6	Oral presentation	3,15	1,23329	sometimes
7	Other (which?)	1,95	1,10892	rarely

According to Table 10, participants answered item 1 "often", item 6 "sometimes", and items 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7 "rarely".

Participants' Self-Evaluations of Their Writing Competences

Table 11. *Self-Evaluation of the Competences in Academic Writing*

	Item	$\bar{x}$	Ss	Level
1	Understanding and reflecting on research methods	3,29	,89709	somewhat competent
2	Finding the relevant literature about a topic	3,34	,94275	somewhat competent
3	Revising a text to make it linguistically correct	3,73	,84113	competent
4	Using the right terminology	3,27	,79526	somewhat competent
5	Summarizing research sources	3,56	,88128	competent
6	Planning the writing process	3,72	,87232	competent
7	Structuring a paper	3,82	,77877	competent
8	Supporting one's own point of view	3,49	,92035	competent
9	Interpreting and integrating research findings	3,60	,79832	competent

10	Referring to sources	3,26	,87010	somewhat competent
11	Dealing critically with a subject	3,47	,87399	competent
12	Expressing yourself precisely	3,77	,87940	competent
13	Finding the right style for academic texts	3,45	,82470	competent
14	Inserting and integrating tables and graphs in a text	3,25	1,08758	somewhat competent
15	Discussing theories	2,74	1,02499	somewhat competent
16	Writing a bibliography	2,84	1,00429	somewhat competent
17	Writing a stylistically elegant paper	3,48	,87418	competent
18	Using writing to learn something new	3,73	1,05864	competent
19	Keeping to schedule	3,75	,94748	competent
20	Assessing the impact of a text on the reader	3,54	,85380	competent
21	Handling writing problems and writing crises	3,56	,84294	competent

Table 11 shows that participants answered items 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21 "competent" and items 1, 2, 4, 10, 14, 15, and 16 "somewhat competent".

Participants' Thoughts on Features of a Quality Text

Table 12. *Good Writing*

	Item	$\bar{x}$	Ss	Level
1	Elegant language	4,46	,81499	very important
2	Terminological accuracy	4,39	,79832	very important
3	Objectivity	3,98	1,08318	very important
4	Avoiding of the first person "I"	3,59	1,20371	very important
5	Supporting arguments with evidence	4,23	,96255	very important
6	Clear thematic structure	4,18	,95360	very important
7	Basing the text on sources	4,22	,90465	very important
8	Figurative language	3,72	1,01262	important
9	Simple, comprehensive language	4,36	,85475	very important
10	Convincing arguments	4,11	,91088	important
11	Creative ideas	4,24	,92987	very important
12	Critical thinking	4,25	,87727	very important

In Table 12, participants answered items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, and 12 "very important" and items 8 and 10 "important".

Participants' Opinions on Their Own Study Competences

Table 13. Study Competences

	Item	$\bar{x}$	Ss	Level
1	Discussing in class	3,22	,95789	somewhat competent
2	Organizing group-work efficiently	3,67	,97440	competent
3	Giving an oral presentation	3,64	,89924	competent
4	Academic writing	2,96	,95289	somewhat competent
5	Preparing efficiently for an exam	3,82	,84004	competent
6	Using information technology	3,66	,94134	competent
7	Reading and understanding academic texts	3,63	,88201	competent
8	Not-taking during lessons	4,11	,95517	competent

According to Table 13, participants answered items 1 and 4 "somewhat competent" and items 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8 "competent".

Opinions and Preferences of Participants about the Ways of Improving the Written Texts

Table 14. *Writing Support*

	Item	$\bar{x}$	Ss	Level
1	More courses in which writing is used as a means of learning (like seminars)	3,59	,97625	quite helpful
2	More feedback on my texts	3,74	,90510	quite helpful
3	Better instructions for my writing in existing courses	3,76	,89122	quite helpful
4	Professional tutoring for my writing (e. g. from a writing centre)	3,77	1,01872	quite helpful
5	Online-support for my writing (providing materials, instructions, models of good papers, etc.)	3,92	1,00551	quite helpful
6	Training in writing to improve my powers of expression	3,90	1,04450	quite helpful

Participants answered all of the items in the table "quite helpful".

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Findings indicate that the programmes attended by participants appear not to be positive in terms of writing education. Participants reported that they didn't have more than five courses that required writing papers to be graded in the programme. Given the departments of participants, one can argue that this number is inadequate in regard to the requirements of education they will provide in their future teaching process. Moreover, it is remarkable that almost half of the participants reported that they did not write any texts in a week, and similarly, they did not have any written texts that were evaluated and graded in their programmes. Participants also reported that they did individual writing activities in general in their programmes. In the existing literature, on the other hand, results show that collaborative writing significantly improves writing skills and has a positive impact on writing attitude. For instance, the results achieved in the study by Erdoğan (2016) on effects of collaborative writing activities on preservice classroom teachers' writing skills and writing attitudes indicate that this method improved participants' writing skills and affected their writing attitudes positively.

It was observed that participants rarely received written and verbal feedbacks for their outlines. Furthermore, participants reported that they discussed rarely with their lecturers and sometimes with their classmates about outlines and sometimes participated in virtual conversations, discussions and forums at their universities. This can be explained by the fact that preservice teachers did not receive feedbacks for their outlines at a sufficient frequency and rate and they did not share their written texts with the others.

Note taking is a complicated, cognitive and linguistic process that requires the stages of comprehension, choosing information and written production because during the act of note taking, several mental processes take place at the same time. Student should pay attention to lecturer, comprehend the subject, choose important points to be noted and write them down physically. And they need to do these all under the pressure of a limited period (Friedman, 2017 as cited in Aslandağ & Çetinkaya, 2019). Note taking is an important learning strategy. However, studies have shown that students have low levels of note-taking skills (Çetingöz, 2006; Yılmaz, 2008). The fact that participants reported they frequently took down notes can be regarded as an important gain about having knowledge and skills about this strategy.

Continuity and being aware of previous research are in the nature of scientific research. Every scientific research is developed on previous ones. It is fundamental to follow certain rules and specify the references utilized according to certain rules when using previous studies in a publication (Uçak & Birinci, 2008). Plagiarism can be defined simply as not showing a source that has been utilized and an author's showing existing information as if they produced it. "Unethical behaviours can be caused by individual characteristics as well as social structure, values, and economic reasons. It is known that there are unethical behaviours due to different reasons in different areas, and similar explanations are provided about the reasons. In TÜBA's (2002) report, reasons for unethical behaviours in science are grouped under four headings. The first one of them is defined as lack of education" (as cited in Uçak & Birinci, 2008). The fact that the participants reported they were never or rarely informed of plagiarism during their education reinforces the opinion that the first reason for unethical behaviours mentioned before is lack of education.

In the present study, a high rate of participants reported that they made plans before writing the paper, and some of them reported that they always started writing paper right away and wrote according to how the text went. Bridwell, Johnson, and Brehe (1987) and

Galbraith (1992) describe outline writers in two groups: "executors" and "discoverers". Executors make great efforts to make detailed plans before transferring their thoughts into the text. During this preparation, they concretize their thoughts and perspectives of the subject. Plans that they construct may remain "mental" or may have been written down on paper. Such outline writers put their thoughts into words only when they are sure of what they want to say and how they want to say it. Discoverers, on the other hand, start to shape their existing thoughts without thinking how to construct their messages and write naturally and freely. They find their thoughts as they write. By revealing anything that has seemed to be the essence of their thoughts in the beginning, they clarify their views and refine them. They often summarize what they are writing in the effort of forming a possible plan. In the meantime, they evaluate the resulting thoughts and associate them with their general objectives (purpose of texts and coherence with addressee), therefore modifying their outlines all the time. They constantly revise the text and reshape it on the paper. In fact, discoverers use a critical rewriting strategy. Based on the findings achieved from the study database, it is possible to say that the preservice teachers bear the characteristics of an executor according to the above description.

Findings showed that the preservice teachers did not dedicate much time to revision. They also stated that they received feedbacks from their classmates more than the lecturers. It was observed that participants were doubtful about the contribution of their university to the improvement of their written expression skills and about whether these skills were cared at the university.

Writers employ a repetitive creation process involving the stages of planning, writing, revision to construct their thoughts and create rhetorical and linguistic structures to express them (Çetinkaya, Bayat, & Alaca, 2016, p. 86). Findings about the importance attached to the components of creating a text indicated that participants found the components of writing an outline, first draft, and brainstorming important and the components of planning, reading, and revision very important. While participants reported that they found these components important or very important, answers to other items give rise to the question whether such importance is put into practice.

Feedback for a written text can be oral or written. The type preferred by the students is usually written feedback (Ülper & Çetinkaya, 2016; Ülper, Çetinkaya, & Bayat, 2016). Some of the primary variables that determine the type of feedback given by teacher is class size and adequacy of time to be spared for it. Hence, teachers may choose to provide a few students with oral feedback for their papers or to give holistic or analytic feedbacks for papers after the course. Considering the types of feedback received by the participants, they received oral and written feedbacks for their outlines at varying times. They also reported that they sometimes had feedbacks as a general comment at the end of the text and as a specific comment in the margins.

Findings show that papers of the participants were evaluated through a scale rating different aspects of the texts or simply through a grading. Grading alone as an evaluation is a product-oriented approach. "Assessments in writing may include process-oriented assessment practices performed to determine student's progress on one hand. On the other hand, they may consist of product-oriented assessment practices conducted to determine the qualities of written texts, or products, created by students at the end of the writing process" (Ülper, 2019). Process evaluation has an important function so that students can comprehend the components of creating a written text and develop skills in this matter. In this sense, the fact that lecturers conducted evaluations through a scale rating different aspects of texts in participants' programmes is a positive finding.

How preservice teachers know about genres and text structure is important in that they employ a proper text production and analysis process. Results in literature indicate that preservice teachers have problems classifying the genres (Tağa & Ünlü, 2013; Tok & Yılmaz, 2014). Thus, it should be ensured that preservice teachers experience different genres during their education and produce written texts in genres. Genres frequently written by the participants in their programmes were found to be summaries, written in-class exams and notes. It seems that the preservice teachers did not perform many genre types such as essays, narrative or expressive texts, research papers, technical reports, petitions, or log books.

The resulting text is shared orally or in writing with the target reader in the publication stage. With advanced technology and its wide area of usage today, a rich variety of options has been available in regard to areas of submission posibilities. These options allow writers to reach more readers. However, it was seen in this study that the participants did not make use of these options much. It was observed that the participants often shared their texts in papers and rarely used other options offered by technology such as e-mail, learning platform, and etc.

The finding that participants rarely wrote research papers coincides with the fact that they found themselves somewhat competent in creating scientific texts in their self-evaluations about writing competences. The participants did not find themselves competent in comprehending and reflecting on research methods, finding the relevant literature about a topic, using the right terminology, referring to sources, inserting and integrating tables and graphs in a text, discussing theories, or writing a bibliography. This can be considered a proof about the necessity of performing activities in skills development as the genres they wrote in least frequently and skills in which they found themselves most incompetent coincided.

About characteristics of quality texts, it was observed that the participants found elegant language, terminologically accuracy, supporting arguments with evidence, simple and comprehensive language, creative and critical thinking to be very important. It can be said that participants focused rather on scientific texts, and they chose characteristics of quality texts according to the genre in which they found themselves least incompetent. A clear and understandable thematic structure which has an important function in the comprehension of a text's communicational purpose properly and completely by reader followed the abovementioned characteristics.

Participants found themselves competent in organizing the group work efficiently, oral presentation, preparation for exam, using information technologies, reading and comprehending academic texts and taking down notes during the course. However, they found themselves incompetent in discussing in the course and academic writing. The remarkable result here is that they regarded themselves as competent in using information technologies while it was found in regard to ways of submitting their texts that they did not share their texts via e-mail or website. This can be interpreted as the fact that they used information technologies not to promote information but to access information.

Participants reported that it would be very helpful in the development of creating written text to increase number of courses involving writing activities, to receive more feedback for their texts, to have a course directly aiming to improve writing skills and to perform more writing activities.

Given the findings achieved in the research overall, one can argue that practices in the programmes attended by preservice teachers are not sufficient for qualified formation of a writing culture among them. Primary deficiencies of practice include activities in inadequate amounts, not addressing all components of writing process at a sufficient rate, not enough performing activities in different genres, and negligence of process evaluation.

As mentioned in the introduction, preliminary learning of the teacher and beliefs stemming from such preliminary learning play a key role in them in-class practices. Thus, curriculum and practices to be offered to preservice teachers must be of quality.

Creating a framework of writing culture necessitates a process-based structuring if the purpose is to achieve gains in this culture and development in writing skills in general in a long period of time. It can be ensured that individuals acquire the writing culture systematically and consciously with the contribution of their surroundings starting from the moment they begin to write. However, it should be noted that acquiring the writing culture is a process with multiple variables.

REFERENCES

Adıgüzel, M. F. (1998). *The effects of the process approach to teaching writing on Turkish student's writing skills and overall language proficiency in EFL.* Unpublished master's thesis, Mersin University Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Mersin.

Álvarez, M., & Yañiz, C. (2015). Writing practices in Spanish universities / Las prácticas escritas en la universida de Española. *Cultura & Educacion, 27* (3), 594-628.

Aşıkcan, M., & Pilten, G. (2016). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin yazılı anlatım çalışmalarının süreç temelli yazma modeli odaklı değerlendirilmesi. *International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic Volume 11*(3), 255-276. Doi Number: http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/.

Aslandağ, B., & Çetinkaya, G. (2019).The effect of organized scaffolding technique on note-taking skills and academic achievement of pre-service teachers.*PAU Journal of Education, 45*, 190-210. Doi: 10.9779/PUJE.2018.229

Atay, D., & Kurt, G. (2006). Prospective teachers and L2 writing anxiety. *Asian EFL Journal, 8* (4), 100-118.

Bayat, N. (2009). Structural features in academic writing of Turkish and English teacher learners. *Language Journal, 145*, 48-63.

Bayat, N. (2014). The effect of the process writing approach on writing success and anxiety.*Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice, 14*(3), 1123-1141.

Bayat, N. (2019). Yazma modelleri. İçinde N. Bayat (Ed), *Yazma ve Eğitimi* (s. 9-47). Ankara: Anı Yayınları.

Bridwell-Bowles, L. S., Johnson, P., & Brehe, S. (1987). Computers and composing: Case studies of experienced writers. In A. Matsuhashi (Ed.), *Writing in real time: Modelling production processes.* (pp. 81-107). Norwood, N. J.:Ablex.

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2017). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri.* Ankara: Pegem A.

Castelló, M. (2015). Research on academic writing in the teaching-learning processes in the Spanish university context / La investigación sobre escritura académica en los procesos de enseñanzaaprendizaje en la universidad española. *Culture and Education. 27(3),* 465-476. DOI: 10.1080/11356405.2015.1072362

Castelló, M., Mateos, M. Castells, N. Iñesta, A. Cuevas, I., & Solé, I. (2012): Prácticas de redacción académica en las universidades Españolas. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology, 10*(2), 569–590.

Çetingöz, D. (2006). *Teaching of note-taking strategy history success, remembering and motivation for success.* Unpublished doctorate dissertation, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İzmir.

Çetinkaya, G., & Köğce, D. (2014).An evaluatıon of secondary school Turkish and mathematics teachers' verbal feedback to students.*The Journal of International Social Research. 18*(2), 113-136.

Çetinkaya, G., Bayat, N., & Alaca, S. (2016). Written corrective feedback and students' uptake in teaching Turkish as a foreign language.*Mediterranean Journal of Humanities, 6*(1), 85-98.

Ceyhan, N. G. (2014). The effect and place of process writing approach in writing. *Dil Dergisi, 163*, 46-63.

Chitez, M., Kruse, O., & Castelló, M. (2015).*The European writing survey (EUWRIT): Background, structure, implementation, and some results.* Zurich University of Applied Sciences: Working Papers in Applied Linguistics 9. URL: https://digitalcollection.zhaw.ch/handle/11475/1016

Clark, C., & Peterson, P. (1986). Teachers' thought processes. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (pp. 255-296). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Corcelles, M., Oliva, À., Castelló, M., & Milian, M. (2015). Writing at university: Are we on the same page? *Culturay Educacion, 27*(3), 534-568. https://doi.org/10.1080/11356405.2015.1072359

Dilidüzgün, Ş. (2013). The effect of process writing activities on the writing skills of prospective Turkish teachers. *Eğitim Arastirmaları–Eurasion Journal of Educational Research, 52,* 189-210.

Erbilen, M. (2014). *Evaluation of planning skills of middle school 8th grade students in written expression.* Unpublished master's thesis, Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Hatay.

Erdoğan, Ö. (2016). The effects of collaborative writing activities on preservice classroom teachers' writing and attitude towards writing. *Bartın Journal of Faculty of Education 5*(2), 273 – 286.

Erdoğan, Ö.,& Yangın, B. (2014). The effects of process based creative writing activities on students' writing expression and attitude towards writing. *Abant İzzet Baysal University Journal of Faculty of Education, 14*(1), 438-459. http://dx.doi.org/10.17240/aibuefd.2014.14.1-5000091521.

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Compozition and Comminication. 32,* 365-387.

Galbraith, D. (1992). Conditions for discovery through writing.In M. Sharples (Ed.), Computers and writing.*Issues and Implementations* (pp. 45-72). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Gülüşen, A. (2011). *The effect of peer feedback on eighth grade students of elementary school writing skills.* Unpublished master's thesis, İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Malatya.

Karatay, H. (2011) The effect of 4+1 planned writing and evaluation model to develop the attitudes of preservice teachers as to written expression and their writing skills. *International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic, 6*(3), 1029-1047.

Kellogg, R.T. (2008). Training writing skills: A cognitive developmental perspective. *Journal of writing research, 1*(1), 1-26.

Kindsvatter, R., Willen, W., & Ishler, M. (1988).*Dynamics of Effective Teaching.* New York, NY: Longman.

Kruse, O., Chitez, M., Rodriquez, B., & Castello, M. (2016). *The European writing survey (EUWRIT): Background, structure, implementation, and some results.* Zurich University of Applied Sciences: Working Papers in Applied Linguistics 10. URL: https://digitalcollection.zhaw.ch/handle/11475/1056

Özdemir, B., & Özbay, M. (2016).The effect of analytical writing and assessment method on pre-service Turkish teachers' writing skills.*Journal of Mother Tongue Education, 4*(2), 261-276.

Özdemir, N. H., & Erdem, İ. (2011). A research on Turkish language teaching students' writing habits ın the aspects of some variables. *Usak University Journal of Social Sciences, 4*(2), 101-125.

Reimer, C. N. (2001). *Strategies for teaching writing to primary students using the writing process.* Unpublished master's thesis, Biola University.

Richards, J. C., & Lockhart, C. (1994). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms.* Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press

Tabak, G., & Göçer, A. (2013). Evaluating the writing skill of sixth and eighth grade turkish language teaching curriculum in terms of product and process approaches. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (KEFAD), 14*(2), 147-169

Tağa, T., & Ünlü, S. (2013). A review on the problems faced in the writing instruction. *Turkish studies - International Periodical For The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic, 8*(8), 1285-1299.

Temizkan, M. (2016). Assessment of the reading activities in Turkish language course students' workbooks in terms of text structure. *Journal of Mother Tongue Education, 4*(1), 31-52.

Tok, M. & Yılmaz, E. (2014). Turkish teacher candidates' text perceptions. *Mustafa Kemal University Journal of Graduate School of Social Sciences, 25*(11), 245-263 .

Topuzkanamış, E. (2014). The effect of teaching writing strategies on Turkish language teaching department fresman students' writing achievement. *International Journal of Turkish Literature Culture Education (TLCE), 3*(2), 274-290.

Uçak, N. Ö. & Birinci, H. G. (2008).Scientific ethics and plagiarism.*Türk Kütüphaneciliği 22*(2), 187-204.

Ülper, H. & Çetinkaya, G. (2016).Foreign students' expectations in relatıon to receive feedback towards their written draft texts ın Turkish learning process. *Mustafa Kemal University Journal of Graduate School of Social Sciences, 13*(33), 1-17.

Ülper, H. (2011). An evaluation of student texts ın the context of coherence.*Turkish Studies. 6*(4), 849-863.

Ülper, H. (2019). Yazılı metinleri ölçme ve değerlendirme. İçinde N. Bayat (Ed) *Yazma ve Eğitimi* (s. 159-175). Ankara: Anı Yayınları.

Ülper, H., & Uzun Subaşı, L. (2009). The Effect of the writing programme prepared in accordance with cognitive process model on student success. *Elementary Education Online, 8*(3), 651-665.

Ülper, H., Çetinkaya, G., & Bayat, N. (2016). Preferences of teachers teaching Turkish as a foreign language when providing feedback for draft texts. *Aydın Tömer Dil Dergisi 1*(1), 31-46.

Yılmaz, M. (2008). The developing methods of reading comprehension skills in Turkish. *Mustafa Kemal University Journal of Graduate School of Social Sciences, 5*(9), 131-139.