

## The Effects of Intertextual Reading Approach on the Development of Creative Writing Skills

Deniz AKDAL\*\*

Ayfer ŞAHİN\*\*\*

### Suggested Citation:

Akdal, D. & Şahin, A. (2014). The effects of intertextual reading approach on the development of creative writing skills, *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 54, 171-186.

### Abstract

*Problem Statement:* The aim of the first five years of primary school is to teach and help the students develop basic skills as stated in the Primary School Language Program and Guide. Creative thinking and intertextual reading are among these skills, and it is important to give these to the students during language courses.

*Purpose of Study:* The purpose of this study is to determine the effectiveness and efficiency of an intertextual reading approach on the improvement of writing skills among primary school fifth-grade students.

*Methods:* The "Pretest - Post-test with Control Group" experimental research model has been used. The sample for the study is comprised of fifth-grade students at Akpınar Primary School, located at Kirsehir. The "Creative Writing Rubric" has been used as the data gathering tool. The "Creative Writing Rubric" has eight subdimensions, namely *Originality of Ideas*, *Fluency of Thoughts*, *Flexibility of Thoughts*, *Vocabulary Richness*, *Sentence Structure*, *Organization*, and *Writing Style and Grammar*". In this study, the creative writing works of the students have been examined and evaluated in terms of "Originality of Ideas" and "Vocabulary Richness".

One-Way Anova has been used to analyze the relations inside test and control groups and the interrelations between them. Normal distribution of the obtained data has been analyzed in order to determine the reason for the differences between groups. "Post-hoc" has been applied, and the "Scheffe" test's results have been used.

*Findings and Results:* At the end of the study, it was found that the *Originality of Ideas* and the *Vocabulary Richness* scores of the students from the test group, to whom the intertextual reading approach had been applied, are higher than from the students of the control group, where the courses had been conducted conventionally. This difference is statistically significant. These results show that the intertextual reading approach that

\*\* Fatih Sultan Mehmet Primary School Teacher, Kirsehir, Turkey. E-mail: denizakdal@gmail.com

\*\*\* Corersponding Author, Dr. Ahi Evran University, Kirsehir- Turkey. e-mail: ayfersahin1@gmail.com

has been applied to the test group is effective for improving the creative writing skills of the students in terms of “including creative and original ideas” and “word selection” (using the words appropriately and in line with the purpose of the text and making right usage choices, etc.).

*Conclusions and Recommendations:* By using an intertextual reading approach, students’ thought generation as well as their formation of relations between ideas, have improved. Thus, by using these activities during the creative writing skill development process, original idea generation can be established.

Texts studied using an intertextual approach create a significant difference in the creative writing of fifth-grade students in terms of *word selection*. Thus, through the higher connections made while applying intertextual reading, students learn more new words and can use them with different meanings, in the right places, and in line with their aims.

*Keywords:* Intertextuality, reading, intertextual reading, writing, creative writing

Spoken and written language is an important tool for expressing feelings, thoughts, and desires at every stage of life. Writing is an important element for transferring the cultural heritage to subsequent generations. In order to use written language effectively, writing should be emphasized in all stages of training and education; an appropriate environment leading to better writing should be set and different methods, techniques, and strategies should be applied.

Writing is the process of transferring structured information to texts. “To do this, students should have a good understanding of what they read and they should structure it in the brain” (Ministry of National Education [MoNE], 2005, p. 22). “Writing is the skill of kinesthetically producing the symbols and signs required for expressing thoughts” (Akyol, 2010, p. 51). Writing is explaining feelings, thoughts, and projects that have been seen and experienced. “Like speaking, it is a way to express ourselves, to communicate with others” (Sever, 2004, p. 24).

Writing, which constitutes an important area of language education, requires skill as well as knowledge. Writing has two important dimensions: Firstly, it might be written fast and legible. Secondly, feelings and thoughts should be communicated in an original way via writing. The first dimension is taught in the first classes of primary school, whereas the second dimension is a skill that should be developed during an entire lifetime and is directly related with creativity.

Sever (1991) emphasizes the parallel nature of writing and literary creativity. According to Sever, literary creativity is the bringing to life of basic elements of a creative work and its applications, such as self-recognition and decision making by thinking, planning, and converting decisions into action using these plans.

“Creativity is the ability of developing new ideas, solving problems using original solutions, and being superior to others in terms of imagination, behavior, and productivity” (Buzan, 2003, p. 12). Creativity is setting relations among unrelated contacts, creating a new experience, and introducing experiences, ideas, and products. Creativity is restructuring our meaning of the universe and adding novelty to the reality for individuals or for the culture (San, 1985). Parham (1998, p.

279) defines creativity as “the skill of finding out new, original and useful solutions to problems”.

Creativity can be displayed with several products such as painting, constructing a building, or composing a song. Or it can be demonstrated by having different and original ideas and expressing them. One of the most important ways of expressing creativity is writing genuine and original texts.

Creative writing is “expressing the impressions received from the outer world with a different presentation” (Aşiloğlu, 1993, p. 146). According to Oral (2003, p. 7), creative writing is “one of the methods that will improve creativity and personality”. According to Brookes and Marshall (2004), creative writing is authenticity and imagination instead of standardization and the accuracy of thoughts. Also, creative writing is more than transferring knowledge; it is possessing language usage ability. Since creative writing is a personal expression, it does not have a standard format. Sharples (1996, p. 134) also mentions that creative writing cannot accompany limited and standard thinking. He believes that the main philosophy of creative writing is the “recreation of sentimental experiences within the mind”.

According to Rawlinson (1995, p. 20), creative thinking, which is the basis of creative writing, is “establishing relationship among unconnected objects or thoughts”. The main idea here is that the departure points of creative thinking are existing objects or thoughts (Temizkan, 2010, p. 624). The individual’s connection of these aspects with outside events has considerable importance for realizing these mental relations. The basis of an intertextual reading approach is making connections with other texts.

Texts are meaningful structures formed by consecutive sentences, words and visuals, and all kinds of information; feelings or thoughts are added into this structure following a logical order. (Güneş, 2007). Akyol (1996, p. 8) defines text as follows: “everything from which a meaning can be formed is a text”. Kristeva (1969) states that every text is a structure formed by quoted passages and a product of blending with other texts.

Every text is sited inside a culture; thus it may refer not only to the reality of the world we live in, but also to its predecessors, other written or oral texts; these referrals are called intertextual relations (Kıran, 2000). From this perspective, the text meaning is shaped by another text. While setting up such a meaning, the reader uses a top-level cognitive effort. The reader is reading and at the same time discussing the texts (authors). Intertextual reading and meaning formation allow the reader to think intertextually and develop alternative perspectives. (Akyol, 2010).

According to Bothorel, Duberg, and Thoraval (1976, p. 94), a text does not belong to one person; it belongs to everybody. It cannot be limited by a language or by a thought or a world. Each text is a re-reading, a highlighting, a relocation, and a profound expression. Each text is located at the intersection point of many texts. Each kind of text possesses many meanings, independent of its content. A text is the property of its writer until its production; afterwards it is the anonymous property of the reader.

“Intertextuality is the sharing of a text with other ones; it is a cooperation of texts” (Ögeyik, 2008, p. 21). It is a kind of exchange, a speech or communication

format among two or more texts (Ünal, 2007, p., 29). Kristeva (2003) names all kinds of relationships among texts as intertextuality and saw them as a measure of literality (Aktulum, 2000). Scholes (1985) indicates three main elements of the relationships among the concepts of “reading”, “intertextual meaning setting”, and “intertextuality”: reading, commenting, and criticizing.

According to Hartman (1992), intertextuality should be based on three factors: the writer of the text, the reader of the text, and the context. The expression of style in the text is based on the texture (Cited in Ünal, 2007). “Intertextual reading is producing new meanings by setting up relationships among the thoughts and ideas of the texts” (Akyol, 2010, p., 233). It is running two or more texts at the same time to get meaning (Ünal, 2007). “The intertextual reader gets rid of the limited meaning restrictions of texts. There is not a route directing the reader” (Irwin, 2004, p. 230).

Barthes (1998) argues that with an intertextual approach, the writer disappears at the point in the text where the reader finds himself. Barthes insists that the validity of a text does not lie on its originality; what should be counted is the way that the text directs the reader. Comprehensibility of the text is determined by the understanding of the reader from the text, not from what the writer has written. The learning level of the reader is directly proportional to the meaning assigned to the text by the reader.

Scholes (1985, p. 24) defines the relation between reading and text as, “producing a text inside a text while reading”, “producing a text over a text while commenting”, and “producing a text versus a text while criticizing”. For the importance of the connections, each text should systematically have unlimited connections with another text. Scholes states further that if a text has no connections with the others, it is like emptiness.

This study aims to reveal the effectiveness and efficiency of an intertextual reading approach on the improvement of writing skills among primary school fifth-grade students. Davaslıgil (1994, p. 53) states that “creativity is not a rare ability owned by a minority; it is a cognitive skill that can be developed, improved, and owned by everybody. Primary school students who experience the pleasure of writing, express their feelings comfortably through writing, and reveal their creativity are encountering something really important in terms of education. But conducted studies reveal that students have a negative attitude towards writing; schools have insufficiencies in teaching writing skills, and most of the graduated students have difficulties with writing. (Akkaya, 2011; Öztürk, 2007; Allen, 2003; Hansen and Hansen, 2003; Richards 2000 (cited in İnal, 2006); Gökalp-Alpaslan (2000); Essex, 1996).

The writing skill, which is quite difficult to acquire, should be taught and improved in schools using different techniques and methods. Students who have a positive attitude towards writing and get pleasure from it have reached that position through a teacher’s appropriate creative writing methods and techniques in the education environment. Because of applications’ difficulties, which are exposed by students, the writing skills should have priority over the other learning areas of language study.

In addition, it is obvious that the creative writing skills of the students cannot be improved by using conventional methods; the methods often applied are insufficient. Therefore, providing concrete results that display the improvement of students' creative writing skills and offering recommendations based on these results is quite important for future studies. This study, revealing the relation between an intertextual reading approach and creative writing skills, will provide an important contribution to the literature.

## Method

### *Research Design*

This study, which investigates the effectiveness and efficiency of an intertextual reading approach on the improvement of writing skills among primary school fifth-grade students, is designed as a "Pretest - Post-test with Control Group" experimental research model. The Pretest - Post-test with Control Group model consists of two randomly determined groups. One of them is used as the test group, whereas the other is the control group. Measurements are taken in both groups before and after the experiment. Pretests of the model help to reveal the similarity levels of the groups before the experiment and also help to calibrate post-test results accordingly (Karasar, 1994). Experimental studies are the kind of research where the most accurate results must be obtained. Because the researcher uses comparable applications and observes their effects, the results of these studies are expected to lead the researcher to the most accurate comments. (Büyüköztürk, Kılıççakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz & Demir, 2009)

During the study, an intertextual approach was applied to the students from the test group, whereas students from the control group continued with their normal training. At the end of the application, a creative writing activity was conducted with both groups, and the differences between groups were investigated.

### *Research Sample*

The research sample composed of primary school fifth-grade students in Kırşehir provinces in 2012 academic term. The sample of the study was obtained by randomly selecting fifth-grade students at Akpınar Primary School.. In order to guarantee internal validity of the data, the test and the control groups were determined by drawing. There were 42 students, 21 in the test group and the remaining 21 in the control group.

### *Research Instrument*

Data from the study was gathered and assessed according to the "Creative Writing Rubric" developed by Öztürk (2007). The "Creative Writing Rubric" has eight subdimensions, namely "Originality of Ideas, Fluency of Thoughts, Flexibility of Thoughts, Vocabulary Richness, Sentence Structure, Organization, Writing Style, and Grammar". The creative writing samples from the students were examined and evaluated in terms of "Originality of Ideas" and "Vocabulary Richness". Scores from each subdimension could vary between 1 and 5. Thus the score of each student could vary between 2 and 10.

### *Experimental Application*

Within the content of the study, three texts were chosen (*The Foundation of the Union*, *The Old Holiday Fragrances*, and *Atatürk Became Children*) under the theme “Our Values” from the course book, published by Engin Publishing House and distributed to the students by the Ministry of National Education. The students of the test group were instructed using an intertextual approach. The same texts were instructed to the students of the control group by following the conventional text processing steps of a language course. After completing each text, both test and control group students were asked to write an informative or narrative essay (creative writing) about the subject of the text. The research took place between April 4 and 29 (year?) as an experimental study.

*Experimental Process Stages.* Each text was taught to both test and control groups on the same dates for six hours. During the instruction, *intertextual connection categories* prepared by Pappas, Maria, Anne, and Amy (tran. by Ünal, 2007 from 2003) were applied to the test group by the researcher in four categorical operations. The intertextual connection categories used in the research are as follows: 1. making connections with other written texts about the same subject, 2. making connections with research outputs, 3. making connections with communicated events, and 4. making connections with other situations that were not explicitly explained, only implied. During the same time interval, the same texts were taught to the students of the control group by following the conventional steps of a typical language course. Following each text, the test and the control group students were asked to write an essay about the subject of the text, using either “narrative” or “informative” style.

The first text, in line with the sequencing of the language course book, is “The Foundation of the Union”. The works written by the students after completing this text were scored separately by the researcher and two specialists (one language teacher and one class teacher) according to the Creative Writing Rubric. “Midtest 1” data were formed by figuring the arithmetic mean of these three scores. Data obtained by scoring the writings of students from the test and the control groups after reading and discussing the second text, “Atatürk Became Children,” were recorded as “Midtest 2”. The same procedure applied to the last text, “The Old Holiday Fragrances”; the arithmetic mean of the scores was recorded as “Mid-test 3”.

After reading and writing about all texts and performing the measures mentioned above, students from the test and the control groups were asked to write an essay, on the subject and in style that they prefer, in order for the researcher to make a general evaluation. These writings were scored the same way. This essay was designated as the “Final Test”. Midtest 1, Midtest 2, and Midtest 3 were tests given to evaluate the students after each text of the “Our Values” theme, during the process, whereas the final test was a general evaluation aiming to determine the level of the students after the whole process.

#### *Data Analysis*

At the beginning of the study, students from the test and the control groups were asked to write a free text about a subject that they chose themselves (adventure, excitement, death, image, environment, friendship, etc.) in order for the researcher to determine the starting levels of their creative writing skills. The students’ creative writing was scored separately by the researcher and two specialists (one language

teacher and one class teacher). The pretest data of the study were formed by taking the arithmetic mean of these three scores. There was no significant difference between the pretest results of the test and the control groups. Data obtained from this evaluation have a normal distribution for both the test and the control groups. In this context, One-Way Anova was used to analyze the data from all the students' essays evaluated according to the rubrics. "Post-hoc" was applied to determine the source of the difference between the groups and the "Scheffe" test's results were used. A 0.05 significance level was taken as significant differences.

### Results

Outputs of the study are summarized and interpreted in the tables below. Table 1 displays the pretest results that show the starting creative writing levels of the students from the test and the control groups.

Table 1  
*One-way Anova Results of Creative Writing Analysis of Test and Control Groups - Pretest*

Source of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	P	Significant Difference
Between Groups	2,881	1	2,881			
Inside Group	99,238	40	2,481	1,161	,288	$P > .05$
Total	102,119	41				

SS: Sum of Squares, df: Degree of freedom, MS: Mean Square,

The output displayed in the table shows that there is not a significant difference between the pretest scores of the students from the test and the control groups [ $F(1,161)$ ;  $p > .05$ ]. This means that, before the investigation, the creative writing level of the test group was close to the creative writing level of the control group.

Table 2  
*One-way Anova Results of Creative Writing Analysis of Test and Control Groups - Post-Test*

Source of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	P
Between Groups	54,857	1	54,857		
Inside Group	163,429	40	4,086	13,427	,001
Total	218,286	41			

SS: Sum of Squares, df: Degree of freedom, MS: Mean Square,

As displayed in Table 2, the difference between the means of the post-test in the test and the control groups is significant [ $F(13,427)$ ;  $p < .0$ ].

Table 3  
Findings about the "Originality of Ideas" in the Test and the Control Groups

Source of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	P
Between Groups	18,667	1	18,667		
Inside Group	48,952	40	1,224	15,253	,000
Total	67,619	41			

SS: Sum of Squares, df: Degree of freedom, MS: Mean Square,

The findings in the table show that texts taught using an intertextual approach in primary school fifth-grade students create a significant difference in terms of "featuring creative and unusual ideas (originality of ideas)" [ $F(15,253)$ ;  $p<.05$ ]. The Scheffe test was conducted in order to see the groups whose means have created this difference. The data is represented in Table 4.

Table 4  
Mean Scores of Test and Control Groups in Terms of Originality of Ideas and Significance Levels

	Test Pre-test	Test Mid-test 1	Test Mid-test 2	Test Mid-test 3	Test Final test	Control Pre-test	Control Mid-test 1	Control Mid-test 2	Control Mid-test 3	Control Final test
Test Pre-test	M =2,00									
Test Mid-test 1		M =2,90				,023	,035		,023	,035
Test Mid-test 2			M =2,14							
Test Mid-test 3				M =2,23						
Test Final test					M =2,90	,023	,035		,023	,035
Control Pre-test		$p<.05$			$p<.05$	M =1,52				
Control Mid-test 1		$p<.05$			$p<.05$		M =1,57			
Control Mid-test 2								M =1,66		
Control Mid-test 3		$p<.05$			$p<.05$				M =1,52	
Control Final test		$p<.05$			$p<.05$					M =1,57

M: Aritmetic Mean; P: Significance

According to the findings of Table 4, the difference between pretest mean scores of the test ( $M = 2.00$ ) and the control ( $M = 1.52$ ) groups' students is not significant ( $p > .05$ ). Thus, before the application, both groups were at similar levels in terms of "originality of ideas". On the other hand, the difference ( $M_{\text{test final-test} - \text{control final test}} = 1.33$ ) between the final test mean scores of the test group ( $M = 2.90$ ) and the control group ( $M = 1.57$ ) is found to be significant in favor of test group ( $p < .05$ ). This finding shows that an intertextual reading approach, which has been applied to the test group, increases the success of students in terms of "originality of ideas".

It was also found that midtest 1, midtest 2, and midtest 3 mean scores of the test group are higher than the mean scores of the control group and these differences are statistically significant. We can possibly view these results as signifying that an intertextual reading approach applied to the test group is effective in improving students' creative writing skills in terms of "originality of ideas".

Findings about the comparison of the creative writing of the test and the control groups in terms of "Vocabulary Richness" (richness of word meanings, appropriate usage of the words, words being in line with the purpose of the text, etc.) are displayed in Table 5 and Table 6.

Table 5

*Findings About the "Vocabulary Richness" Dimension In the Test and the Control Groups*

Source of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	P
Between Groups	9,524	1	9,524		
Inside Group	40,952	40	1,024	9,302	,004
Total	50,476	41			

SS: Sum of Squares, df: Degree of freedom, MS: Mean Square,

Table 5 shows that the difference between the final-test mean scores of the test and the control groups' students in terms of "Vocabulary Richness" is significant [ $F(9,302); p < .0$ ]). The Scheffe test was conducted in order to see the groups whose means have created this difference. The data is represented at Table 6.

Table 6

Mean Scores of the Test and the Control Groups in Terms of Vocabulary Richness and Significance Levels

	Test Pre- test	Test Mid- test 1	Test Mid- test 2	Test Mid- test 3	Test Final test	Control Pre-test	Control Mid- test 1	Control Mid- test 2	Control Mid- test 3	Contr ol Final test
Test Pre-test	M =1,66									
Test Mid- test 1		M =2,80					,015	,003		
Test Mid- test 2			M =2,23							
Test Mid- test 3				M =2,23						
Test Final test					M =2,66			,015		,150
Control Pre-test						M =1,61				
Control Mid- test 1		$p<.05$					M =1,47			
Control Mid- test 2		$p<.05$		$p<.05$				M =1,33		
Control Mid- test 3									M =1,66	
Control Final test				$p<.05$						M =1,33

M:Mean; P: Significance

According to the findings in Table 6, the difference between pretest mean scores of the test ( $M = 1.66$ ) and the control ( $M = 1.61$ ) groups' students is not significant ( $p > .05$ ). It is clear that, before the application, both groups were at similar levels in terms of "vocabulary richness". On the other hand, the difference ( $M_{\text{test final-test} - \text{control final test}} = 1.33$ ) between the final test mean scores of the test group ( $M = 2.66$ ) and the control group ( $M = 1.33$ ) is found to be significant in favor of the test group ( $p < .05$ ).

This finding shows that an intertextual reading approach, which has been applied to the test group, increases the success of students in terms of “*vocabulary richness*”.

It also was found that the midtest 1, midtest 2, and midtest 3 mean scores of the test group are higher than the mean scores of the control group, and these differences are statistically significant. These results show that an intertextual reading approach applied to the test group is effective in improving students’ creative writing skills in terms of “*vocabulary richness*”.

### Discussion and Conclusion

In this study, where the effect of an intertextual reading approach on the writing skills of primary school fifth-grade students has been investigated, a significant difference has been revealed between the final test scores of the test group’s students to whom intertextual reading activities were conducted and the control group’s students to whom intertextual reading activities were not applied. In his study, Ünal (2007) also discovered that an intertextual reading approach positively affects students’ understanding of what they read. In addition, there are several studies stating that creative writing activities provided in class contribute to the creative writing skills of the students (Akkaya, 2011; Susar Kırmızı, 2009; Öztürk, 2007). These findings support the output of the study.

Primary school fifth-grade texts taught using an intertextual reading approach create a significant difference in “*featuring creative and unusual (original) ideas*”. Öztürk (2007), in his study “Creative writing skill evaluation of primary school fifth-grade students”, identified that creative writing strategies done with the students improved the “*originality of ideas*” dimension. The findings of Öztürk support the findings of this study.

Primary school fifth-grade texts presented using an intertextual reading approach create a significant difference in the “*Vocabulary Richness*” (richness of word meanings, appropriate usage of the words, words being in line with the purpose of the text, etc.) dimension. Öztürk (2007) also indicated that using creative writing methods with the primary school fifth-grade students to improve their creative writing skills improved the “*vocabulary richness*” dimension. The findings of Öztürk overlap with the findings of this study.

In Conclusion, an intertextual reading approach can be used to reach effective results in the achievement and improvement of students’ creative writing skills. Intertextual reading allows for an increase in the idea generation of the students; it creates interaction among thoughts by making connections between them. These kinds of activities should take place in order to produce fluency of thought and originality of ideas. In addition, using an intertextual reading approach increases the thinking capacity of the students, and thought disconnection can be prevented. The use of an intertextual reading approach is important for achieving thought flexibility. While applying intertextual reading, the increased number of connections means that students learn new words. They can use these learned words in their creative writing with different meanings, in the right places and to support the purpose of the text.

\* This study was created making benefit of the master's thesis titled as "The Effect of Intertextual Reading Approach on 5<sup>th</sup> Grade Students' Creative Writing Skills". It was promoted by Ahi Evran University Scientific Research Project Department ( Project No: SBA-1-04).

### References

- Akkaya, N. (2011). İlköğretim 6. Sınıf Türkçe derslerinde yaratıcı yazma yaklaşımının Türkçe derslerine yönelik tutuma etkisi [The effect of creative writing approach in seceondary education 6th grade Turkish language courses on attitudes towards Turkish language course ]. *Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 30, 311-319
- Aktulum, K. (2000). *Metinler arası ilişkiler* [Intertextual relations]. Ankara: Öteki Yayınevi.
- Akyol, H. (2010). *Türkçe Öğretim yöntemleri* [Turkish language instruction methods]. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Akyol, H. (1996). Metinler arası (Intertextuality) okuma ve sorular [Intertextual reading and questions]. *Bilgi Çağında Eğitim, Nisan-Mayıs-Haziran*
- Allen R. (2003) *Expanding writing's role in learning*. (16.11.2009). [http://www.ascd.or/publications/curr\\_update/html](http://www.ascd.or/publications/curr_update/html).
- Aşılıoğlu, B. (1993). *Okullarda Türkçe öğretimi* [Turkish Language teaching in schools] Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Barthes, R. (1998). The death of the author modern criticism and theory: A reader. David Lodge (Eds.) London: Longman, 167-172.
- Brookes, I. & Marshall D. (2004). *Good writing guide*. Edinburgh: Chambers Harrap Publishers Ltd.
- Bruning, R. ve Horn, C. (2000). Developing motivation to write. *Educational Psychologist*, 35:(1), 25-37.
- Buzan, T. (2003). *Aklın gücü* [Power of mind] (Çev. Gültekin Yazgan), İstanbul: Epsilon Yayıncılık.
- Bothorel, N., Duberg, F., & Thoraval, J. (1976). *Situation Et structuresdu nouveau Roman*, Bordas.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıççakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş. ve Demirel F. (2009). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* [Scientific research skills], Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
- Davashgil, Ü. (1994). Yüksek gizilgüce sahip lise öğrencilerinin yaratıcılıkları üzerine bir deneysel araştırma [An experimental research on creativity of lycee students who have high potential]. *M.Ü. Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi* (6): 53-68.
- Essex, C. (1996). Teaching Creative Writing in the Elementary School, *ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading English, and Communication Digest*, <http://www.indiana.edu/~reading/ieo/digests/> (12.12.2011).
- Gökalg Alpaslan G. (2000). Derslikten günlük yaşama edebiyat eğitimi [Literature teaching from classroom to daily life]. *Türkbilig Türkoloji Araştırmaları*. (I):185-202.
- Graves, D. H. (1994). *A fresh look at writing*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Güneş, F. (2007). *Türkçe öğretimi ve zihinsel yapılandırma* [Turkish language teaching and cognitive construction] Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

- Hansen, R. & Hansen, S. (2003). *The Importance of Good Writing Skills*. (02.03.2003). <http://www.quintcareers.com>.
- Hengirmen, M., Öziş, N., & Öngay, N. (2010). *İlköğretim Türkçe 5. sınıf ders kitabı* [Secondary school 5th grade Turkish language course book]. İstanbul: Engin Yayınevi.
- Irwin, W. (2004). Against intertextuality. *Philosophy and Literature*, 28, 227-242.
- Karasar, N. (1994). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. Ankara: 3A Araştırma Eğitim Danışmanlık Ltd.
- Kıran, A. Z. (2000). *Yazınsal okuma süreçleri* [Literary reading processes]. Ankara: Seçkin Yayınevi.
- Kristeva, J. (1969). *Séméiotiké, recherches pour une sémanalyse*. Seuil, Paris.
- Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı (2005). *İlköğretim Türkçe dersi programı (1-5. Sınıflar)*. [Secondary school Turkish language course programme (1-5th grades)]. Ankara: Author.
- Oral, G. (2003). *Yine yazı yazıyoruz*. [We are writing once again]. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Ögeyik, C. M. (2008). *Metinler arası ve yazın eğitimi*. [Intertextuality and literal teaching]. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Öztürk, E. (2007). *İlköğretim beşinci sınıf öğrencilerinin yaratıcı yazma becerilerinin değerlendirilmesi*. [Evaluating the creative writing skills of the 5th grades of primary education]. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Parham, A. C. (1998). *Studying the behavior of people 2 E United States of America*. Ohio: South-Western Publish Co. Cincinnati.
- Routman, R. (1996). *Literacy at the crossroads: Crucial talk about reading, writing, and other teaching dilemmas*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- İnal, S. (2006). İngilizce yazılı anlatım dersinin sorunları üzerine bir inceleme. [An examination about the problems of English written expression course]. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, Vol.2, No.2.
- San, İ. (1985). *Sanat ve yaratıcılık eğitimi olarak tiyatro* [Theatre as an art and creativity teaching]. Ankara: Natürel Kitap Yayıncılık.
- Scholes, R. E. (1985). *Textual power: literary theory and the teaching of English*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Sever, S. (1991). *Dil ve edebiyat öğretiminde yaratıcılık* [Creativity in language and literature Instruction] Eğitimde Nitelik Geliştirme/Eğitimde Arayışlar 1. Sempozyumunda sunulan bildiriler içinde, 371-374.
- Sever, S. (2004). *Türkçe öğretimi ve tam öğrenme* [Turkish language teaching and]. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Sharples, M. (1996). An account of writing as creative design, in the science of writing, theories, methods, individual differences and applications. *C.M. Levy & S. Ransdell (Eds)*, pp. 127-148, Lawrence Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ.
- Sommers, N. (1994). Revision strategies of student writers and experienced adult writers. In *S. Perl (Eds.), Landmark Essays on Writing Process*, pp. 75-84. Davis, CA: Heragoras Press

- Temizkan, M. (2010). Türkçe öğretiminde yaratıcı yazma becerilerinin geliştirilmesi. [Development of creative writing skills in Turkish language teaching]. *Tübar*, 26, 621-643.
- Susar Kırmızı, F. (2009). Türkçe dersinde yaratıcı drama yöntemine dayalı yaratıcı yazma çalışmalarının yazmaya yönelik tutuma etkisi. [The effect of creative writing works based on creative drama method in Turkish language classes on attitude towards writing]. *Yaratıcı Drama Dergisi*, (2): 5, 159-177
- Ünal, E. (2007). *Metinler arası okumanın okuduğunu anlamaya etkisi*. [The impact of intertextual reading comprehending what is read]. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.

### Yaratıcı Yazma Becerisinin Geliştirilmesinde Metinler Arası Okuma Yaklaşımının Etkisi

#### Atf:

- Akdal, D. & Şahin, A. (2014). The effects of intertextual reading approach on the development of creative writing skills, *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 54, 171-186.

#### Özet

*Problem Durumu:* Hayatın her aşamasında konuşma ve yazı dili; duyguları, düşünceleri, istekleri açıklamada kullanılan önemli bir araçtır. Kültürün gelecek kuşaklara aktarılması için de yazı önemli bir unsurdur. Yazı dilinin etkin bir şekilde kullanılması için yazma öğretimine, eğitim-öğretimin bütün aşamalarında gereken önem verilmeli, öğrencilerin daha iyi yazmaları için uygun ortam hazırlanıp farklı yöntem, teknik ve stratejiler işe koşulmalıdır. Metinler arası okuma yaklaşımı da öğrencilerin yazma becerilerinin geliştirilmesi için başvurulabilecek stratejilerden birisidir.

Metinler arası okuma, bir metnin başka metinlerle olan paylaşımıdır, metinlerin iş birliğidir. İki ya da daha çok metin arasında bir alışveriş, bir tür konuşma ya da söyleşim biçimidir. Metinler arası okuma ise metinlerdeki düşünceler ve fikirler arasında ilişkiler kurarak yeni manalar üretmektir. İki ya da daha çok metni anlam kurmak için işe koşturmak.

Yazma, beyinde yapılandırılmış bilgilerin yazıya dökülmesi işlemidir. Bunun için öğrencilerin dinledikleriyle okuduklarını iyi anlamaları ve beyinde yapılandırmaları gerekmektedir. Yazma, düşüncelerin ifade edilebilmesi için gerekli olan sembol ve işaretleri kinestetik olarak üretebilme becerisidir. Yaratıcı yazma ise; dış dünyadan edinilen izlenimlerin farklı bir sunumla ortaya konulmasıdır. Düşüncelerdeki doğruluktan ya da standartlaştırmadan daha çok özgünlük ve hayal gücüdür. Ayrıca yaratıcı yazma bilgiyi aktarmaktan ziyade, dili kullanabilme yeteneğine sahip olmaktır. Pek çok uzmana göre yaratıcı yazma, "yaratıcılığı ve kişiliği geliştirecek yöntemlerden birisidir.

Problemlere farklı çözüm yolları üretebilmek, üretilen çözüm yollarından yola çıkarak yeni fikirler oluşturabilmek ve yeni buluşlar gerçekleştirebilmek kişilerdeki yaratıcılık becerisi ile paralellik göstermektedir. Eğitim-öğretim sürecinde yaratıcı yazma becerilerinin geliştirilmesinde uygun yöntem ve yaklaşımların kullanılması öğrencilerin daha başarılı eserler ortaya koyabilmelerini sağlamaktadır.

İlköğretimin ilk beş sınıfında İlköğretim Türkçe Dersi Öğretim Programı ve Kılavuzunda yer alan temel becerilerin öğrencilere kazandırılması ve geliştirilmesi amaçlanmaktadır. Bu becerilerden olan "yaratıcı düşünme ve metinler arası okuma becerilerinin" Türkçe dersleri içerisinde öğrencilere kazandırılması önem arz etmektedir.

*Araştırmanın Amacı:* Bu çalışmada Türkçe derslerinde metinler arası okuma yaklaşımını uygulamanın, ilköğretim beşinci sınıf öğrencilerinin yaratıcı yazma becerilerinin geliştirilmesinde etkili olup olmadığının tespit edilmesi amaçlanmıştır.

*Araştırmanın Yöntemi:* Araştırmada "Ön Test - Son Test Kontrol Grubu" deneysel araştırma modeli kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın çalışma grubunu Kırşehir Millî Eğitim Müdürlüğüne bağlı Akpınar İlköğretim Okulunun 5. sınıf şubelerinde okuyan öğrenciler oluşturmuştur. Araştırma sürecinde deney grubundaki öğrencilere Türkçe derslerinde metinler arası okuma yaklaşımını uygulanırken, kontrol grubundaki öğrenciler Türkçe derslerinde normal öğretimlerine devam etmişlerdir. Uygulamalar sonrasında her iki gruptaki öğrencilere yaratıcı yazma etkinliği yaptırılmış ve metinler arası okumanın öğrencilerin yaratıcı yazmalarında farklılık oluşturup oluşturmadığı belirlenmeye çalışılmıştır.

Veri toplama aracı olarak "Yaratıcı Yazma Rubriği" kullanılmıştır. Yaratıcı Yazma Rubriği; "Fikirlerin Orijinalliği, Düşüncelerin Akıcılığı, Düşüncelerin Esnekliği, Kelime Zenginliği, Cümle Yapısı, Organizasyon, Yazı Tarzı ve Dil Bilgisi" olmak üzere sekiz alt boyuttan oluşmaktadır. Araştırmada öğrencilerin yaratıcı yazma eserleri bu boyutlardan "Fikirlerin Orijinalliği" ve "Kelime Zenginliği" bakımlarından incelenmiş ve değerlendirilmiştir.

Çalışmada deney ve kontrol gruplarının kendi içlerinde ve birbirleri ile ilişkilerinin tespitinin veri analizinde, tek yönlü varyans analizi (One-Way Anova) kullanılmıştır. Elde edilen verilerin normallik dağılımları incelenmiş, gruplar arası farkın kaynağının belirlenmesi amacıyla "Posthoc" yapılmış ve bu kapsamda "Scheffe" testi sonuçları kullanılmıştır.

*Araştırmanın Bulguları:* Uygulamalar öncesinde deney ve kontrol grubundaki öğrencilerin hazırbulunuşluk seviyelerinin belirlenmesi amacıyla yapılan ön test puanları arasında anlamlı bir farklılığın olmadığı görülmüştür.

Deney grubundaki öğrencilerin fikirlerin orjinalliği boyutuyla ilgili ara test 1, ara test 2 ve ara test 3 ortalamalarının kontrol grubu öğrencilerinden daha yüksek olduğu belirlenmiştir. Ayrıca deney grubunun son test ortalamaları ( $M = 2,90$ ) ile kontrol grubunun son test ortalamaları ( $M = 1,57$ ) arasında farkın ( $M_{\text{deney son test - kontrol son test}} = 1,33$ ) deney grubu son test lehine anlamlı olduğu saptanmıştır ( $p < .05$ ). Bu durum

deney grubuna uygulanan metinler arası okuma yaklaşımının, öğrencilerin “fikirlerin orijinalliği” boyutundaki başarılarını arttırdığını göstermektedir.

Deney grubundaki öğrencilerin kelime zenginliği boyutuyla ilgili son test ortalamaları ( $M = 2,66$ ) ile kontrol grubunun son test ortalamaları ( $M = 1,33$ ) arasında farkın ( $M_{\text{deney son test}} - M_{\text{kontrol son test}} = 1,33$ ) deney grubu son test lehine anlamlı olduğu saptanmıştır ( $p < .05$ ). Bu durum metinler arası okuma yaklaşımının uygulandığı deney grubundaki öğrencilerin yaratıcı yazmalarında daha farklı ve daha çok kelime kullandıklarını göstermektedir. Kelime zenginliği ile ilgili ara test 1, ara test 2 ve ara test 3 ortalamaları karşılaştırıldığında da deney grubundaki öğrencilerin puanlarının, kontrol grubundaki öğrencilerin puanlarından daha yüksek olduğu ve bu farklılığın istatistiksel olarak anlamlı olduğu belirlenmiştir. Bu sonuçlar deney grubuna uygulanan metinler arası okuma yaklaşımının öğrencilerin yaratıcı yazma becerilerinin geliştirilmesinde, “kelime zenginliği” boyutunda etkili olduğunu göstermektedir.

*Sonuçlar ve Öneriler:* Araştırma sonucunda, metinler arası okuma yaklaşımının uygulandığı deney grubundaki öğrencilerin yaratıcı yazma eserlerinin orijinal fikirlere yer verme ve kelime zenginliği boyutlarındaki puanlarının, geleneksel yöntemlerle derslerin işlendiği kontrol grubu öğrencilerinden daha yüksek olduğu ve bu farklılığın istatistiksel olarak anlamlı olduğu saptanmıştır.

Metinler arası okuma yaklaşımı ile öğrencilerin düşünce üretimlerinin artmasını sağlanırken, fikirler arasında bağlar kurdurularak düşüncelerin birbirleriyle etkileşimi sağlanabilmektedir. Bu nedenle İlköğretim sınıflarında öğrencilerin yaratıcı yazma becerilerinin geliştirilmesi sürecinde, bu tür etkinliklere yer verilerek orijinal fikirlerin ortaya konulması sağlanabilir.

İlköğretim 5. sınıfta metinler arası okuma yaklaşımıyla işlenen metinler, öğrencilerin yaratıcı yazmalarında “kelime seçimi” boyutunda anlamlı bir fark oluşturmaktadır. Bu nedenle metinler arası okuma uygulanırken ne kadar çok bağlantı yaptırılırsa; öğrencilerin yeni kelime öğrenmeleri, öğrendikleri kelimeleri farklı anlamlarda ve doğru yerlerde, amaçları doğrultusunda kullanmaları sağlanabilir.

*Anahtar Kelimeler:* Metinler arasılık, okuma, metinler arası okuma, yazma, yaratıcı yazma.