

The Improvement of Elementary School Students' Correct Use of Punctuation Marks: Poetry Method

Research Article

Sabri SIDEKLI¹, Mehmet OZSAVLI²,

¹Sitki Kocaman University, Faculty of Education, Department of Basic Education, Mugla, Turkey, ORCID: 0000- 0003-3202-6451

²Ministry of Education Bayır Elementary School, Mugla, Turkey, ORCID: 0000-0002-5621-3684

To cite this article: Sidekli, S., & Ozsavli, M. (2019). The Improvement of Elementary School Students' Correct Use of Punctuation Marks: Poetry Method, *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 11 (5), X.

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 16.09.2019

Available online
02.11.2019

ABSTRACT

Punctuation marks are one of the issues that students cannot acquire correctly even if they have had a well-designed education. The studies in this field show that teaching techniques should be more significant than the students' grade or topics. Accordingly, the current study aims to investigate the effect of the poetry method on the elementary school students' skill of proper use of punctuation marks. The current study was conducted in 2017-2018 school year. The study conducts a mixed method research design via pre/post-test experimental design with a control group. The data is collected through a semi-structured interview in three weeks. As a result, it was found that the mean success of the control group was decreased, however the mean success rate of the experimental group increased significantly. The important effect is calculated on hyphen, exclamation mark and question mark and a moderate effect was seen on the use of full stop, comma, semi colon, apostrophe, ellipsis marks and dash.

© 2019 IOJES. All rights reserved

Keywords:

Elementary School, poetry method, punctuation marks, students

Introduction

As naturally, as a social entity, human beings live in a community. As a requirement of the community life, they are engaged in a steady communication. Communication between human beings occurs in two ways: the first one is verbal and simultaneous communication and the other one is writing performed by using the signs and symbols collectively accepted by the society (Özşavli, 2017: 1).

Individuals use either oral or written skills to communicate in terms of their positions and needs. No matter which of these is used, these skills must be used effectively and in accordance with the rules in order to achieve a healthy communication. According to Uçgun (2007), *not getting stress/intonation/ rhythm/ pause errors, not speaking with the local accent, not mispronouncing sounds, not using unnecessary body movements and*

² Corresponding author's address: Muğla Sitki Koçman Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi
Telephone: +905052755971
e-mail: ssidekli@gmail.com
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15345/iojes.2019.05.011>

having adequate vocabulary during the speech are the elements to be considered for a good speech (Uçgun, 2007: 62). The significant issues that should be considered for a good writing also include *syntax, content, grammar, text layout, word choices, purpose, target audience* and *writing process* (Raimes, 1983 as cited in Karatay, 2011: 25). It can be said that if these issues are taken into consideration, the sender fulfils his/her own responsibility for a good communication.

Some of the features mentioned in the literature regarding punctuation marks directly affect the meaning. While *emphasis, intonation, rhythm, pause, gesture* and *facial expressions* directly affect the meaning of speech, punctuation and spelling directly affect the meaning of writing. According to Bağcı (2011), while tone, gestures and mimics are used to better express emotions; thoughts and desires in speech, the most useful tools in writing to serve this function are punctuation marks. Punctuation marks used to facilitate the understanding of writing, to separate sentences from each other and to make meaning effective enable reading to be organized, meaning to be elaborated and the reader's attention to be kept awake (Bağcı, 2011: 695).

Punctuation marks "are used to express emotions and thoughts more clearly, to determine the structure of the sentence and pause points, to make it easier to read and understand, to emphasize the characteristics of the word such as stress and tone." (TDK, 2005: 32). According to Eker (2002), punctuation marks are a series of signs apart from the letters, generally having international values and used to bring the written expression closer to the oral expression and to convey the message in full (Eker, 2002: 445). "Punctuation is a sign system that supports the oral expression and improves written /oral expression" (Ağca, 2006: 95). Vardar (2002) defines punctuation marks "as syntactic quality distinctions as well as all of the writing indicators used to indicate all phenomena of writing to a certain extent" (Vardar 2002: 148), while Jones (1994) defines them "as the basic parts of the spelling except for words." (Jones, 1994: 421).

Punctuation marks first appeared as three different signs within a system established by Byzantine Aristophanes in 2nd Century B.C.: 1) *High Point*, 2) *Elementary Point*, 3) *Low Point*. The first one is today's full stop, the second one is semicolon and the third one is colon. However, while his system was tried to be taught in schools, punctuation marks were not used in books for a long time. As can be understood from here, punctuation marks were rarely used in the beginning. At that time, as the words used to be written combined, existing punctuation marks served to the function of separating these words from each other. Although the punctuation marks gaining different values in the coming years were started to be used in a real sense after the invention of the printing press, the exact rules of the use of punctuation marks were established after the 19th century (Bayrav, 1998: 77-78).

As stated above, punctuation marks attained a solid place in the written language after a long process and now they serve important functions. In addition to their main benefits listed in the above-given review of the relevant literature, punctuation marks assume a very important role in better understanding and permanence of the message relayed by the sender (Özbay, 2011: 180). Punctuation marks are not only used to prevent misunderstanding of the message in writing, they also serve the function of strengthening the meaning (Göçer, 2010: 185). According to Kalfa (2000: 182), punctuation marks serve different purposes such as transferring the subtleties of spoken language into written language, identifying and distinguishing the elements of sentences and expressing various feelings and thoughts in writing. According to Jones (1994: 421), since punctuation marks are integral parts of written language, it is not possible to write a good text or to understand a written text without them. According to Adorno (1990: 300), the less punctuation marks are used, the more the meaning becomes blurred; the more they are used, the clearer the meaning and expression become.

Despite the fact that punctuation marks are taught useful from the beginning of the elementary education up to the end of the last grades of the secondary school education, it has been reported in many studies that they cannot be used at the desired level by students (Mataracı, 1998; Kalfa, 2000; Uludağ, 2002;

Yıldız, 2002; Atasoy, 2009; Kara, 2010; Karagül, 2010; Çetin, 2013; Demir, 2013; Scout, 2013; Kaya, 2016). Obtaining similar results in different study groups gave rise to the idea that rather than students, problems in the teaching method should be focused on. Thus, in the current study, it was aimed to teach the characteristics and functions of punctuation marks to students by using the technique of narration with poetry as different from the traditional technique and to determine the effect of this method on elementary school students' skill of proper use of punctuation marks.

In order to reach the main aim of the study, following questions were sought:

1. What are the elementary school students' state of using punctuation marks in the control and experimental groups according to the results of the Pretest?
2. According to pretest results, is there any significant difference on the control group students' skills of using punctuation marks in terms of;
 - 2.1. Gender,
 - 2.2. Grade level?
3. According to pretest results, is there any significant difference on the experiment group students' skills of using punctuation marks in terms of;
 - 3.1. Gender,
 - 3.2. Grade level?
4. Is there a significant difference between the control group students and experimental group students' success in the correct use of punctuation marks according to the pretest results?
5. What is the elementary school students' state of using punctuation marks in the control and experimental groups according to the posttest results?
6. According to posttest results, is there any significant difference on the control group students' skills of using punctuation marks in terms of;
 - 6.1. Gender,
 - 6.2. Grade level?
7. According to posttest results, is there any significant difference on the control group students' skills of using punctuation marks in terms of;
 - 7.1. Gender,
 - 7.2. Grade level?
8. Is there a significant difference between the control group students and experimental group students' success in the correct use of punctuation marks according to the posttest results?
9. What are the opinions of the elementary school students on the technique of narration with poetry?

Method

Research Model

In the current study investigating the effect of the technique of narration with poetry on elementary school students' skill of proper use of punctuation marks, the sequential-explanatory design; one of the mixed method techniques, was employed. In the sequential-explanatory design, priority is given to quantitative data. Qualitative data, on the other hand, are collected to support quantitative data. The results of these two types of data are brought together in the results and discussion (interpretation) section (Creswell, 2003).

The quantitative data of the current study were obtained from pretest and posttest while the qualitative data were obtained from a semi-structured interview form made up of four open ended questions.

Sampling

The sample of the current research is comprised of the 5th, 6th and 7th graders of a elementary school in the Menteşe district of the city of Muğla in 2017-2018 school year. As the 8th graders were preparing for the high school entrance exam, they were not included in the study. In Table 1, demographic information about the study group is given.

Table 1. The demographic information on the study groups

Group		Gender			Grade		
		Male	Female	Total	5	6	7
Control	f	25	31	56	19	18	19
	%	44,6	55,4	100	33,9	32,1	33,9
Experiment	f	26	33	59	21	19	19
	%	44,1	55,9	100	35,6	32,2	32,2
Total	f	51	64	115	40	37	38
	%	44,3	55,7	100	34,8	32,2	33,0

The students in the study group were randomly selected from among all the 5th, 6th and 7th graders of the school (there are four classes in each grade). In each grade, one class was assigned to the control group and one class was assigned to the experimental group.

Data Collection and Analysis

The Pretest and posttest consist of two texts specifically prepared in such a way as to allow the students' usage of the all punctuation marks. From these texts, "Erteşsa" was used as the Pretest and "Kurnaz Sütçü" was used as the posttest. The students were asked to put the proper punctuation marks in the places indicated with round brackets. These places were determined according to punctuation marks' frequency of use. For example, the punctuation mark having the highest frequency of use is "full stop" and it was asked 20 times in the text while "dash" having the lowest frequency of use was asked 3 times in the text. In this way, each punctuation mark was asked within the texts as proportional to their frequency of use and each punctuation mark asked in the texts was scored in such a way as to give 100 points to a student putting correct punctuation marks in all the places in the texts.

In order to determine whether the students are successful on the use of punctuation marks or not, their success rate was determined for each punctuation mark as 70%. The reason for the calculation of this rate is that it has been used in the previous studies (Erdem, 2007; Bağcı, 2011). The students' scores taken for a punctuation mark were calculated by proportioning them to the highest score that could be obtained for this punctuation mark for each student. Accordingly, students who scored above 70% were considered successful in using the relevant punctuation mark, and students who failed to do so were considered unsuccessful in using that punctuation mark correctly.

The semi-structured interview form is a four-item form including the questions: 1. *Did you find this activity useful?* 2. *In which ways did you find this activity useful?* 3. *Would you recommend this activity to other students?* 4. *Do you think that the technique of narration with poetry should be used in the teaching of other subjects and if yes, for which subjects?*

The measurement tools developed as described above were submitted to the revision of three experts specialized in the related field and two Turkish teachers. Final forms of the measurement tools were given on the basis of the feedbacks received from the experts and teachers.

The data obtained from the measurement tools were digitized and transferred to computer and analyzed in a statistical program. When the data obtained from the groups were examined, it was determined

that the data showed a normal distribution and thus parametric tests were used in data analyses. In these analyses, crosstabs, success rate, frequency, dependent and independent samples t-tests, effect size, one-way variance analysis, scheffe and LSD technique were used.

Application

The current study was conducted in a elementary school in the Mentеше district of the city of Muğla in the spring term of 2016-2017 school year for three weeks, two hours a week, thus a total of six hours. For the application, a poem called "Punctuation Marks Poem" whose poet is not stated was retrieved from "<https://www.cokbilgi.com/yazi/noktalama-isaretleri-siirleri/>" (Date/Time of retrieval: 16.02.2016: 20.57) was used after having been extended by the researchers in such a way as to include all the frequently used punctuation marks suitable for narration with poetry (*full stop, comma, semi colon, question mark, exclamation mark, apostrophe, ellipsis marks, colon, quotation marks, hyphen and dash*) and all of their functions. At the beginning of the lesson, the whole poem was first read to increase the students' familiarity with the poem. Then, after reading the related lines describing each function of each punctuation mark, the students were asked the question "Which function of do you think this line expresses?" and thus the students were directed to finding the related function on their own. Then, the students were asked to give examples for the function they had detected. After that, the students wrote down the functions they had detected and the examples they gave for each function in their notebooks.

In the control group, on the other hand, the functions of the punctuation marks were explained to the students by the teacher and written on the blackboard one by one together with their examples. If there were examples given by students, those were also written on the board and the students were asked to write them down in their notebooks. Finally, the students were asked to do the activities in their workbooks, the mistakes they committed while doing these activities were corrected by the teacher and thus instructional process was completed.

Findings

Findings on the Study Group's Use of Punctuation Marks according to the Pretest Results

The first question of the current study is "What are the elementary school students' state of using punctuation marks in the control and experimental groups according to the results of the Pretest?" In order to answer this question, the number of times each punctuation mark was used incorrectly by all the students was calculated and success rates were calculated according to the frequency of asking. The obtained data are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. The success rate of each punctuation mark as for the pretest results

Control Group		Experiment Group	
Punctuation Mark	Success Rate	Punctuation Mark	Success Rate
En dash	86,30	En dash	89,83
Comma	85,60	Comma	82,65
Apostrophe	79,33	Apostrophe	76,51
Dot/point	72,32	Dot/point	71,18
Dash	51,78	Dash	64,40
Question Mark	46,43	Question Mark	53,90
Quotation Marks	41,81	Quotation Marks	49,57
Exclamation Mark	28,57	Exclamation Mark	48,31
Ellipses	22,02	Ellipses	25,42
Colons	15,56	Colons	15,25
Semi-colons	4,76	Semi-colons	8,47
Total	100	Total	100

As can be seen in Table 2, according to the success rates obtained from the Pretest, the punctuation marks in the use of which both the control and experimental group students are most successful are *dash, comma, apostrophe and full stop*, respectively. On the other hand, the punctuation marks in the use of which both the control and experimental group students are the least successful are *semicolon, colon, ellipsis marks, exclamation mark, quotation marks, question mark and hyphen*, respectively.

According to the Pretest Results, the State of the Control Group Students' Skills of Using Punctuation Marks in terms of Gender

Dependent samples t-test was conducted with the mean scores taken by the control group students from the Pretest to determine whether their skill of using punctuation marks varies significantly depending on gender. The results of this test are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. The t-test pretest results of control group in terms of gender difference

Gender	<i>n</i>	\bar{X}	<i>Ss</i>	<i>Sd</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>P</i>
Male	25	53,55	12,41	54	-1,653	,104
Female	31	59,87	14,54			

$p < ,05$

As can be seen in Table 3, according to the mean scores taken from the Pretest, the female students in the control group are more successful than the male students; yet, this difference is not significant [$t(54) = -1,653, p > ,05$]. Thus, it can be said that the skill of using punctuation marks correctly does not vary significantly depending on gender in the control group.

According to the Pretest Results, the State of the Control Group Students' Skills of Using Punctuation Marks in terms of Grades

One-way ANOVA analysis was conducted with the mean scores taken by the control group students from the Pretest to determine whether their skill of using punctuation marks varies significantly depending on grade level. The results of this test are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. ANOVA pretest results in control group in terms of grade

	Variance	Sum of Squares	<i>Df</i>	Mean of Squares	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>
	Between Groups	732,795	2	366,397		
PRE-TEST	In-Groups	10771,669	53	203,239	1,803	,175
	Total	11504,464	55			

According to the results of ANOVA given in the table above, the control group students' skill of using punctuation marks does not vary significantly depending on grade level.

According to the Pretest Results, the State of the Experiment Group Students' Skills of Using Punctuation Marks in terms of Gender

Table 5. The t-test pretest results of experiment group in terms of gender difference

Gender	<i>n</i>	\bar{X}	<i>Ss</i>	<i>Sd</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>P</i>
Male	23	54,23	15,73	57	-2,577	,013
Female	33	63,44	11,74			

$p < ,05$

As can be seen in Table 5, there is a significant difference between the Pretest mean score of the male students and that of the female students in the experimental group [$t(57)=-2,577, p<,05$]. In this connection, it can be said that the female students in the experimental group are more successful in using punctuation marks than the male students.

According to the Pretest Results, the State of the Experiment Group Students' Skills of Using Punctuation Marks in terms of Grades

One-way ANOVA analysis was conducted with the mean scores taken by the experimental group students from the Pretest to determine whether their skill of using punctuation marks varies significantly depending on grade level. The results of the analysis are given in Table 6.

Table 6. ANOVA pretest results in experiment group in terms of grade

	Variance	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean of Squares	F	P	The Source of Difference
PRE-TEST	Between Groups	2067,801	2	1033,900	5,926	,005	7-5
	In-Groups	9770,865	56	174,480			
	Total	11838,665	58				

As can be seen in Table 6, the mean scores taken from the Pretest by the experimental group students vary significantly depending on grade level ($F= 5,926, p<,05$). In order to determine the source of the difference, sheffe analysis was conducted and according to the result of this test, 7th graders ($\bar{X} = 65$) are more successful than the 5th graders ($\bar{X} = 51$).

Findings on the Pre-test Scores of the Control and Experimental Groups

Independent samples t Test was conducted to determine whether there is a significant difference between the mean scores taken from the Pretest by the control and experimental groups. The results of this test are presented in Table 7.

Table 7. The t-test results between the mean scores of control and experiment group

Group	n	\bar{X}	Ss	Sd	T	P
Control	56	57,05	14,46	113	-,870	,386
Experiment	59	59,38	14,28			

$p<,05$

As can be seen in Table 7, though the Pretest mean score of the experimental group students is higher than that of the control group students, this difference is not significant [$t(113)=-,870, p>,05$]. This shows that before the application, the control and experimental group students were equal.

Findings on the Study Group's State of Using Punctuation Marks according to the Results of the Posttest

Table 8. The success rate of each punctuation mark as for the posttest results

Punctuation Marks	Control Group Success Rate	Experiment Group Success Rate
Comma	82,86	87,46
En Dash	78,13	99,58
Question Mark	76,79	100
Dot/point	65,00	83,73
Exclamation Mark	52,97	69,77

Apostrophe	45,83	81,35
Dash	45,54	96,61
Quotation Mark	39,88	54,80
Colons	38,39	45,76
Ellipses	30,36	38,98
Semi-colons	4,46	32,20

As can be seen in Table 8, the punctuation marks in the use of which the control group students are the most successful in the posttest are *comma, dash and question mark*, respectively. The punctuation marks in the use of which they are the least successful are *semicolon, ellipsis marks, colon, hyphen, apostrophe, exclamation mark and full stop*, respectively. On the other hand, the punctuation marks in the use of which the experimental group students are the most successful are *question mark, dash, hyphen, comma, full stop, apostrophe*, respectively. As a very small difference remained between the success rate in the use of *exclamation mark* and the success rate of 70%, it can be said that the experimental group students were successful in the use of *exclamation mark* after the application. The punctuation marks in the use of which they are the least successful are *semicolon, ellipsis marks, colon*, respectively.

After the application, it was observed that success rates in the control group increased for some punctuation marks (*question mark, ellipsis marks, colon*) yet this increase could not reach the success rate of 70% in any of them. For the remaining punctuation marks (*comma, dash, apostrophe, full stop, hyphen, quotation marks*), the success rates were found to have decreased. In the experimental group on the other hand, success rates were found to have increased for the use of all the punctuation marks when compared to the Pretest success rates yet only the success rates in the use of *question mark, hyphen and exclamation mark* reached the success rate of 70%.

According to the Post-test Results, the State of the Control Group Students' Skills of Using Punctuation Marks in terms of Gender

Dependent samples t-test was conducted with the mean scores taken by the control group students from the posttest to determine whether their skill of using punctuation marks varies significantly depending on gender. The results of this test are presented in Table 9.

Table 9. The t-test posttest results of control group in terms of gender difference

Gender	<i>n</i>	\bar{X}	<i>Ss</i>	<i>Sd</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>P</i>
Male	25	52,80	17,43	54	-1,083	,284
Female	31	57,35	14,05			

$p < ,05$

As can be seen in Table 9, the posttest mean score of the female students in the control group is higher than that of the male students; however, this difference is not significant [$t(54) = -1,083, p > ,05$].

According to the Post-test Results, the State of the Control Group Students' Skills of Using Punctuation Marks in terms of Grades

One-way ANOVA analysis was conducted with the mean scores taken by the control group students from the posttest to determine whether their skill of using punctuation marks varies significantly depending on grade level or not. The results of this test are presented in Table 10.

Table 10. ANOVA post-test results in control group in terms of grade

	Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean of Squares	F	p	Source of Difference
POST-TEST	Between Groups	1543,688	2	771,844	3,420	,04	7-5
	In-groups	11962,526	53	225,708			6-5
	Total	13506,214	55				

As can be seen in Table 10, there is a grade level-based significant difference between the posttest mean scores of the control group students ($F=3,420, p<,05$). According to the results of LSD test, this difference stems from the difference between the mean scores of the 7th graders ($\bar{X} = 58,84$) and the 5th graders ($\bar{X} = 48,00$) and between the 6th graders ($\bar{X} = 59,33$) and the 5th graders ($\bar{X} = 48,00$).

According to the Post-test Results, the State of the Experiment Group Students' Skills of Using Punctuation Marks in terms of Gender

Table 11. Results of t test conducted to determine whether the experimental group students' scores taken from the posttest vary significantly depending on gender

Gender	n	\bar{X}	Ss	Sd	t	p
Male	23	73,85	13,86	57	1,170	,247
Female	33	69,52	14,30			

$p<,05$

As can be seen in Table 11, the posttest mean score of the male students in the experimental group is higher than that of the female students; yet, this difference is not statistically significant [$t(57)=1,170, p<,05$]. Thus, it can be argued that the technique of narration with poetry improved the elementary school male students' skill of using punctuation marks correctly more than female students. In this sense, the male students closed not only the gap between themselves and the female students in terms of using punctuation marks correctly but also got ahead of them through the technique of narration with poetry.

According to the Post-test Results, the State of the Experiment Group Students' Skills of Using Punctuation Marks in terms of Grade

One-way ANOVA analysis was conducted with the mean scores taken by the experimental group students from the posttest to determine whether their skill of using punctuation marks varies significantly depending on grade level. The results of this test are presented in Table 12.

Table 12. Results of ANOVA conducted to determine whether the experimental group students' scores taken from the posttest vary significantly depending on grade level

	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	p	Source of Difference
POSTTEST	Between-Groups	1938,332	2	969,166	5,599	,00	7-5
	Within-Groups	9694,075	56	173,108			6-5
	Total	11632,407	58				

As can be seen in Table 12, there is a grade level-based significant difference between the posttest mean scores of the experimental group students ($F=3,420, p<,05$). According to the results of LSD test, this difference

stems from the difference between the mean scores of the 7th graders ($\bar{X} = 63,71$) and the 5th graders ($\bar{X} = 63,71$) and between the 6th graders ($\bar{X} = 75,58$) and the 5th graders ($\bar{X} = 63,71$). Moreover, when the level of significance is examined, it is seen that the difference is greater in the experimental group than the control group.

Findings related to the Posttest Scores of the Control Group and Experimental Group

Independent samples t-test was conducted to determine whether there is a significant difference between the mean scores taken from the posttest by the control and experimental groups or not. The results of this test are presented in Table 13.

Table 13. Results of t test conducted to determine whether there is a significant difference between the posttest mean scores of the control and experimental groups

Group	<i>n</i>	\bar{X}	<i>Ss</i>	<i>Sd</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
Control	56	55,32	15,67	113	-6,495	,000	1,29
Experimental	59	71,42	14,16				

$p < ,05$

According to the data presented in Table 13, there are 16-point differences between the posttest mean scores of the control and experimental groups and this difference is statistically significant [$t(113) = -6,495$, $p > ,05$]. When the effect size is considered, it can be argued that the technique of narration with poetry had a significant effect on the difference between the posttest mean score of the control and experimental groups.

In order to decide in relation to which punctuation marks the control and experimental group students demonstrated a significant improvement in terms of correctly using them, dependent samples t-test was conducted on the Pretest and posttest mean scores of the experimental and control group students for each punctuation mark. Moreover, independent samples t-test was conducted to decide whether there were significant differences between the success rates of the control and experimental groups in the correct use of each punctuation mark. The findings obtained from these tests are presented in tables below.

Table 14. Results of dependent samples t test conducted to determine the correlation between the control group students' pretest and posttest success rates for each punctuation mark

Punctuation Mark	Test	<i>n</i>	\bar{X}	<i>Ss</i>	<i>Sd</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Full Stop	Pretest	56	72,32	17,35	55	1,63	,100
	Posttest		65,00	31,96			
Comma	Pretest	56	85,60	13,36	55	1,44	,150
	Posttest		82,86	12,46			
Semicolon	Pretest	56	4,76	21,48	55	,055	,950
	Posttest		4,46	33,40			
Question Mark	Pretest	56	46,43	35,59	55	-5,229	,000
	Posttest		76,79	28,54			
Exclamation Mark	Pretest	56	28,57	29,16	55	-5,080	,000
	Posttest		52,97	24,84			
Apostrophe	Pretest	56	79,33	25,97	55	7,172	,000
	Posttest		45,83	34,56			
Ellipsis Marks	Pretest	56	22,02	40,83	55	-1,271	,200
	Posttest		30,36	31,87			
Colon	Pretest	56	15,56	22,99	55	-4,609	,000
	Posttest		38,39	30,30			

Quotation Marks	Pretest	56	41,81	28,27	55	,322	,740
	Posttest		39,88	36,05			
Hyphen	Pretest	56	51,78	36,47	55	,684	,490
	Posttest		45,54	56,63			
Dash	Pretest	56	86,30	33,50	55	1,391	,170
	Posttest		78,13	29,02			

$p < ,05$

According to the data presented in Table 14, there is a significant difference between the control group students' pretest and posttest success rates in the correct use of *question mark* [$t(55)=-5,229 p < ,05$], *exclamation mark* [$t(55)=-5,080 p < ,05$] and *colon* [$t(55)=-4,609 p < ,05$] in favor of the posttest. On the other hand, a significant difference in favor of the Pretest was found in the correct use of *apostrophe* [$t(55)=7,172 p < ,05$]. While the decrease was observed in the success rates of correctly using *full stop*, *comma*, *semicolon*, *quotation marks*, *hyphen*, *dash*, an increase was seen in the success rates of correctly using only three punctuation marks. Yet, none of them significantly differentiated. This shows that the activities in the workbooks had positive effect on the teaching of *question mark*, *exclamation mark* and *colon*. Though not statistically significant, a positive effect was observed in the teaching of three punctuation marks. On the other hand, the same activities were found to have negative effect on the teaching of *apostrophe*. Though not statistically significant, they had negative effect on the teaching of *full stop*, *comma*, *semicolon*, *quotation marks*, *hyphen*, *dash*.

Table 15. Results of dependent samples t test conducted to determine the correlation between the experimental group students' pretest and posttest success rates for each punctuation mark

Punctuation Mark	Test	n	\bar{X}	Ss	Sd	t	p	Cohen's d
Full Stop	Pretest	59	71,18	19,34	58	-2,841	,000	,50
	Posttest		83,73	29,58				
Comma	Pretest	59	82,65	14,87	58	-2,143	,030	,35
	Posttest		87,46	11,83				
Semicolon	Pretest	59	8,47	23,64	58	-4,462	,000	,76
	Posttest		32,20	36,86				
Question Mark	Pretest	59	53,90	27,10	58	-13,066	,000	2,4
	Posttest		100	,000				
Exclamation Mark	Pretest	59	48,31	26,61	58	-5,156	,000	,88
	Posttest		69,77	21,32				
Apostrophe	Pretest	59	76,51	26,89	58	-1,160	,000	,20
	Posttest		81,35	20,78				
Ellipsis Marks	Pretest	59	25,42	40,74	58	-2,232	,020	,37
	Posttest		38,98	34,51				
Colon	Pretest	59	15,25	24,58	58	-6,047	,000	,78
	Posttest		45,76	31,04				
Quotation Marks	Pretest	59	49,57	29,94	58	-,927	,350	
	Posttest		54,80	41,87				
Hyphen	Pretest	59	64,40	35,48	58	-5,295	,020	,82
	Posttest		96,61	26,03				
Dash	Pretest	59	89,83	28,53	58	-2,593	,010	,25
	Posttest		99,58	3,25				

$p < ,05$

According to the data given in Table 15, a statistically significant increase was observed in the experimental group students' posttest success rates in the correct use of *full stop* [$t(58)=-2,841$ $p<,05$], *comma* [$t(58)=-2,143$ $p<,05$], *semicolon* [$t(58)=-4,462$ $p<,05$], *question mark* [$t(58)=-13,066$ $p<,05$], *exclamation mark* [$t(58)=-5,156$ $p<,05$], *apostrophe* [$t(58)=-1,160$ $p<,05$], *ellipsis marks* [$t(58)=-2,232$ $p<,05$], *colon* [$t(58)=-6,047$ $p<,05$], *hyphen* [$t(58)=-5,295$ $p<,05$], *dash* [$t(58)=-2,593$ $p<,05$]. An increase was also observed in the success rate of the correct use of *quotation marks*, but this difference was not found to be significant.

When the effect sizes are examined, it is seen that the technique of narration with poetry had a large effect on the skill of correctly using *hyphen*, *exclamation mark* and *question mark* and a moderate effect on the skill of correctly using *full stop*, *comma*, *semicolon*, *apostrophe*, *ellipsis marks* and *dash*.

Table 16. Results of independent samples t test to determine the differences between the control and experimental groups' posttest success rates for each punctuation marks

Punctuation Mark	Group	n	\bar{X}	Ss	Sd	t	p	Cohen's d																																																																																																																		
Full Stop	Control	115	65,00	19,34	113	-3,263	,001	,58																																																																																																																		
	Experimental		83,73	29,58					Comma	Control	115	82,86	14,87	113	-2,031	,045	,11	Experimental	87,46	11,83	Semicolon	Control	115	4,46	23,64	113	-4,221	,000	,71	Experimental	32,20	36,86	Question Mark	Control	115	76,79	27,10	113	-6,085	,000	,59	Experimental	100,00	,000	Exclamation Mark	Control	115	52,97	26,61	113	-3,897	,000	,43	Experimental	69,77	21,32	Apostrophe	Control	115	45,83	26,89	113	-3,637	,000	,91	Experimental	81,35	20,78	Ellipsis Marks	Control	115	30,36	40,74	113	-1,390	,167		Experimental	38,98	34,51	Colon	Control	115	38,39	24,58	113	-1,288	,201	,18	Experimental	45,76	31,04	Quotation Marks	Control	115	39,88	29,94	113	-2,043	,043	,38	Experimental	54,80	41,87	Hyphen	Control	115	45,54	35,48	113	-6,159	,000	1,31	Experimental	96,61	26,03	Dash	Control	115	78,13	28,53	113
Comma	Control	115	82,86	14,87	113	-2,031	,045	,11																																																																																																																		
	Experimental		87,46	11,83					Semicolon	Control	115	4,46	23,64	113	-4,221	,000	,71	Experimental	32,20	36,86	Question Mark	Control	115	76,79	27,10	113	-6,085	,000	,59	Experimental	100,00	,000	Exclamation Mark	Control	115	52,97	26,61	113	-3,897	,000	,43	Experimental	69,77	21,32	Apostrophe	Control	115	45,83	26,89	113	-3,637	,000	,91	Experimental	81,35	20,78	Ellipsis Marks	Control	115	30,36	40,74	113	-1,390	,167		Experimental	38,98	34,51	Colon	Control	115	38,39	24,58	113	-1,288	,201	,18	Experimental	45,76	31,04	Quotation Marks	Control	115	39,88	29,94	113	-2,043	,043	,38	Experimental	54,80	41,87	Hyphen	Control	115	45,54	35,48	113	-6,159	,000	1,31	Experimental	96,61	26,03	Dash	Control	115	78,13	28,53	113	-5,498	,000	,55	Experimental	99,58	3,25						
Semicolon	Control	115	4,46	23,64	113	-4,221	,000	,71																																																																																																																		
	Experimental		32,20	36,86					Question Mark	Control	115	76,79	27,10	113	-6,085	,000	,59	Experimental	100,00	,000	Exclamation Mark	Control	115	52,97	26,61	113	-3,897	,000	,43	Experimental	69,77	21,32	Apostrophe	Control	115	45,83	26,89	113	-3,637	,000	,91	Experimental	81,35	20,78	Ellipsis Marks	Control	115	30,36	40,74	113	-1,390	,167		Experimental	38,98	34,51	Colon	Control	115	38,39	24,58	113	-1,288	,201	,18	Experimental	45,76	31,04	Quotation Marks	Control	115	39,88	29,94	113	-2,043	,043	,38	Experimental	54,80	41,87	Hyphen	Control	115	45,54	35,48	113	-6,159	,000	1,31	Experimental	96,61	26,03	Dash	Control	115	78,13	28,53	113	-5,498	,000	,55	Experimental	99,58	3,25																		
Question Mark	Control	115	76,79	27,10	113	-6,085	,000	,59																																																																																																																		
	Experimental		100,00	,000					Exclamation Mark	Control	115	52,97	26,61	113	-3,897	,000	,43	Experimental	69,77	21,32	Apostrophe	Control	115	45,83	26,89	113	-3,637	,000	,91	Experimental	81,35	20,78	Ellipsis Marks	Control	115	30,36	40,74	113	-1,390	,167		Experimental	38,98	34,51	Colon	Control	115	38,39	24,58	113	-1,288	,201	,18	Experimental	45,76	31,04	Quotation Marks	Control	115	39,88	29,94	113	-2,043	,043	,38	Experimental	54,80	41,87	Hyphen	Control	115	45,54	35,48	113	-6,159	,000	1,31	Experimental	96,61	26,03	Dash	Control	115	78,13	28,53	113	-5,498	,000	,55	Experimental	99,58	3,25																														
Exclamation Mark	Control	115	52,97	26,61	113	-3,897	,000	,43																																																																																																																		
	Experimental		69,77	21,32					Apostrophe	Control	115	45,83	26,89	113	-3,637	,000	,91	Experimental	81,35	20,78	Ellipsis Marks	Control	115	30,36	40,74	113	-1,390	,167		Experimental	38,98	34,51	Colon	Control	115	38,39	24,58	113	-1,288	,201	,18	Experimental	45,76	31,04	Quotation Marks	Control	115	39,88	29,94	113	-2,043	,043	,38	Experimental	54,80	41,87	Hyphen	Control	115	45,54	35,48	113	-6,159	,000	1,31	Experimental	96,61	26,03	Dash	Control	115	78,13	28,53	113	-5,498	,000	,55	Experimental	99,58	3,25																																										
Apostrophe	Control	115	45,83	26,89	113	-3,637	,000	,91																																																																																																																		
	Experimental		81,35	20,78					Ellipsis Marks	Control	115	30,36	40,74	113	-1,390	,167		Experimental	38,98	34,51	Colon	Control	115	38,39	24,58	113	-1,288	,201	,18	Experimental	45,76	31,04	Quotation Marks	Control	115	39,88	29,94	113	-2,043	,043	,38	Experimental	54,80	41,87	Hyphen	Control	115	45,54	35,48	113	-6,159	,000	1,31	Experimental	96,61	26,03	Dash	Control	115	78,13	28,53	113	-5,498	,000	,55	Experimental	99,58	3,25																																																						
Ellipsis Marks	Control	115	30,36	40,74	113	-1,390	,167																																																																																																																			
	Experimental		38,98	34,51					Colon	Control	115	38,39	24,58	113	-1,288	,201	,18	Experimental	45,76	31,04	Quotation Marks	Control	115	39,88	29,94	113	-2,043	,043	,38	Experimental	54,80	41,87	Hyphen	Control	115	45,54	35,48	113	-6,159	,000	1,31	Experimental	96,61	26,03	Dash	Control	115	78,13	28,53	113	-5,498	,000	,55	Experimental	99,58	3,25																																																																		
Colon	Control	115	38,39	24,58	113	-1,288	,201	,18																																																																																																																		
	Experimental		45,76	31,04					Quotation Marks	Control	115	39,88	29,94	113	-2,043	,043	,38	Experimental	54,80	41,87	Hyphen	Control	115	45,54	35,48	113	-6,159	,000	1,31	Experimental	96,61	26,03	Dash	Control	115	78,13	28,53	113	-5,498	,000	,55	Experimental	99,58	3,25																																																																														
Quotation Marks	Control	115	39,88	29,94	113	-2,043	,043	,38																																																																																																																		
	Experimental		54,80	41,87					Hyphen	Control	115	45,54	35,48	113	-6,159	,000	1,31	Experimental	96,61	26,03	Dash	Control	115	78,13	28,53	113	-5,498	,000	,55	Experimental	99,58	3,25																																																																																										
Hyphen	Control	115	45,54	35,48	113	-6,159	,000	1,31																																																																																																																		
	Experimental		96,61	26,03					Dash	Control	115	78,13	28,53	113	-5,498	,000	,55	Experimental	99,58	3,25																																																																																																						
Dash	Control	115	78,13	28,53	113	-5,498	,000	,55																																																																																																																		
	Experimental		99,58	3,25																																																																																																																						

$p<,05$

As can be seen in Table 16, the experimental group students' posttest success rates in the correct use of *full stop* [$t(113)=-3,268$ $p<,05$], *comma* [$t(113)=-2,031$ $p<,05$], *semicolon* [$t(113)=-4,221$ $p<,05$], *question mark* [$t(113)=-6,085$ $p<,05$], *exclamation mark* [$t(113)=-3,897$ $p<,05$], *apostrophe* [$t(113)=-3,637$ $p<,05$], *colon* [$t(113)=-1,288$ $p<,05$], *quotation marks* [$t(113)=-2,043$ $p<,05$], *dash* [$t(113)=-6,159$ $p<,05$] and *dash* [$t(113)=-5,498$ $p<,05$] are significantly higher than those of the control group. The success rate of using *ellipsis marks* of the experimental group is higher than that of the control group, yet the difference is not significant.

When the effect sizes are examined, it is seen that the technique of narration with poetry had a large effect on the elementary school students' skill of correctly using *dash* and *apostrophe* while a moderate effect on their skill of correctly using *full stop*, *comma*, *semicolon*, *question marks*, *exclamation mark*, *ellipsis marks*, *quotation marks* and *dash*. It was found that it had a small effect on the skill of correctly using *comma* and *colon*.

Findings related to the Elementary School Students' Opinions about the Technique of Narration with Poetry

In order to support the quantitative data of the current study, a semi-structured interview form was used to determine the experimental group students' opinions about the technique of narration with poetry. Both the questions and the students' responses to these questions are presented below.

Table 17. The responses of the experimental group students' to the 1st question in the semi-structured interview form

Questions	Grade Level		5		6		7	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Did you find this activity (narration with poetry) useful?	21	0	19	0	19	0	19	0

As can be seen in Table 17, the experimental group students from all the grade levels responded as "Yes" to the first question in the semi-structured interview form. Thus, it can be argued that all the students in the experimental group found the teaching of punctuation marks with the technique of narration with poetry as useful. When the responses given to the 1st question in the semi-structured interview by some students who were randomly selected from the experimental group students (students between 59 and 115) were examined, it was observed that S.63 and S.103 said "Yes, I found it useful".

The second question in the semi-structured interview form is "In which ways did you find this activity useful?". The experimental group students' responses to this question are given in Table 18.

Table 18. The responses of the experimental group students to the 2nd question in the semi-structured interview form

Question	Grade Level	5	6	7	Total
		2. In which ways did you find this activity useful?	Makes learning easier	12	8
	Makes learning permanent	8	7	5	20
	Enjoyable	11	7	4	22

Though the number of students in the experimental group is 59, as it can be seen in Table 18, there are total of 82 responses given by the experimental group. The reason for this is that some of the students gave more than one answer. Of the 21 students in the 5th grade, 12 students stated that the technique of narration with poetry *makes learning easier*, 8 students stated that it *makes learning permanent*, 11 students stated that it *makes the lesson more enjoyable*. Of the students in the 6th grade, 8 students stated that it *makes learning easier*, 7 students stated that it *makes learning permanent* and 7 stated that it *makes learning enjoyable*. When the data for the 7 graders are examined, it is seen that *making learning easier* was stated 20 times, *making learning permanent* was stated 5 times and *making lesson more enjoyable* was stated 4 times. In light of these findings, it can be argued that the use of the technique of narration with poetry in classes makes learning easier, permanent and enjoyable.

Some of the experimental group students responded to the question "In what ways did you find this activity useful?" as follows; S.70 "I found this activity useful as it makes me understand better and retain longer."; S.90 "The usefulness of this activity is that it makes learning more permanent and enjoyable."

The 3rd question in the semi-structured interview form is "Would you recommend this activity to other students?" The responses given for this question by the experimental group students are given in Table 19.

Table 19. Responses given to the third question in the semi-structured interview form by the experimental group students

Question	Grade Level					
	5		6		7	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
3. Would you recommend this activity to other students?	21	0	19	0	19	0

As can be seen in Table 19, all the students in each grade level responded to this question as “Yes”. Thus, it can be argued that when compared to the traditional method, the technique of narration with poetry is adopted more by the students; therefore, they are willing to recommend this activity to other students. Some of the responses of the experimental group students to the third question are as follows; Ö.68 “I would, because we learn better.”, Ö.91 “Yes, I would recommend.” and Ö.96 “Yes, it would be good.”

The 4th question in the semi-structured interview form is “Do you think that the technique of narration with poetry should be used in the teaching of other subjects and if yes, which subjects?”. The responses given to this question by the experimental group students are given in Table 20.

Table 20. Responses given to the fourth question in the semi-structured interview form by the experimental group students

Question	Grade Level					
	5		6		7	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
4. Do you think that the technique of narration with poetry should be used in the teaching of other subjects and if yes, which subjects?	21	0	19	0	19	0
Subjects suggested by the students						
Derivational-inflectional affixes	12					
Punctuation Marks	11					
Sound Events			12			
Types of Vocabulary			10			
Structure in the Word			7			
Structure in the Verb					10	
Verbs					7	
Adverbs					5	
Rükû, Secde, Kıyâm			1			
Equations			1			
English Words			1			

As can be seen in Table 20, all the students in the experimental group responded to the fourth question as “Yes” and that none of them gave the response “No”. Thus, it can be said that the students in the experimental group recommend the use of the technique of narration with poetry for the teaching of other

subjects. As a follow-up question, they were asked for which subjects it could be used and from the students' responses to this question, it was found that the 5th grade students recommended this technique for teaching *derivational-inflectional affixes* (f:12) and *punctuation marks* (f: 11). The 6th grade students recommended it for teaching *sound events* (f:12), *types of vocabulary* (f:10) and *structure in the word* (f:7). The 7th graders recommended it for teaching *structure in the verb* (f:10), *verbs* (f:7), *adverbs* (f:5). Some of the 6th grade students also recommended this technique for teaching subjects in other courses such as teaching the terms of *rükû*, *secde* and *kıyâm* in the religion classes or *equations* in math or words in English classes.

Some of the experimental group students' responses to the fourth question are as follows; S.86 "Yes, the technique of narration with poetry should be used for teaching derivational and inflectional affixes.", S.99 "Yes, the subject of structure in the verb should be taught with it." and S .113 "Yes, adverbs can be taught with it."

Results and Discussion

As mentioned in the introduction part of the current study, it has been determined by many studies that elementary, secondary, high school and even university students cannot use punctuation marks correctly. For this reason, punctuation marks are thought to be a sensitive subject and should be taught with a more specific teaching method or technique. In this regard, the main purpose of the current research was to investigate the effect of the technique of narration with poetry on the elementary school students' skills on the use of punctuation marks correctly. For this aim, the pretest-posttest experimental group design with a control group was administered to the elementary school students.

At the end of the study, it was determined that the technique of narration with poetry improved the skill of using punctuation marks accurately more than the traditional technique. Similarly, using an experimental design, Hamzadayı and Çetinkaya (2013) investigated the effect of dictation activities on the students' skills of using spelling rules and punctuation marks and found that the dictation activities improved the fifth grade students' skill of using spelling rules and punctuation marks. By using an experimental design, Maden (2011) compared the effect of team play tournament technique, one of the cooperative learning techniques, and the traditional teaching technique on the university students' skill of using spelling rules and punctuation marks. As a result, it was found that the team play tournament technique improved the skill of using spelling rules and punctuation marks more than the traditional technique. Yağmur-Şahin, Maden, Kardaş and Şahin (2011); in their experimental study, investigated the effect of using the group inquiry technique to teach punctuation marks on the student achievement and as a result found that the group inquiry technique made important contributions to the student achievement in learning punctuation marks. Ulaş (2010) also reported that the jigsaw technique is more effective than the classic technique for teaching punctuation marks. Kurup, Joshi and Shekhokar developed software (intelligent tutoring system) for more effective teaching of punctuation marks and used this software with children aged 10-11. As a result, they stated that children learn punctuation marks better when compared to the classic method. The results obtained from the current study and many other studies (Ergin, 2009; Karakoyun, 2010; Maden, 2013) support the idea that "the subject of punctuation marks is a sensitive subject and should be taught with a more specific teaching method or technique".

The second main finding of the current study shows that the most successful usage of the punctuation marks in elementary school students are the *dash* (89.83% success rate), *comma* (82.65%), *hyphen* (76.51%) and *full stop* (71.18%). The punctuation marks in the use of which they are the least successful are *semicolon* (8.47), *colon* (15.25%), *ellipsis marks* (25.42%), *exclamation mark* (48.31%), *quotation marks* (49.57%), *question mark* (53.96%) and *hyphen* (64.40%). The reason for their lack of success particularly in the use of *semicolon*, *colon* and *ellipsis marks* might be that elementary school students study the subjects (*elements of a sentence*, *types of sentences*

and more informative texts) including the functions of these punctuation marks mostly in the eighth grade. Similar to the current study, Topuz (2008) found the success rates of the 6th and 7th graders for each punctuation mark and found the success rates in the descending order as follows: *question mark, full stop, comma, exclamation mark, quotation marks, colon, ellipsis marks, apostrophe and semicolon*. Erdem (2007) investigated the 9th grade students' levels of using punctuation marks and found that the punctuation marks in the use of which they are the most successful with a success rate higher than 70% are *hyphen (98.8%), dash (95%), full stop (94.2%), comma (91.6%) and question mark (75.7%)* and that the punctuation marks in the use of which they are the least successful are *ellipsis marks (22.8%), semicolon (53.5%), quotation marks (63.4%), apostrophe (65.5%) and exclamation mark (67.1%)*. Except for some punctuation marks, similar results were obtained in the current study to the ones reported by Erdem (2007). As different from the current study, Erdem found a success rate as higher than 70% for the use of more punctuation marks. This might be because the ages of the students in the study conducted by Erdem are higher than those of the students in the current study.

The fact that the number of the punctuation marks used by the elementary school students is seen as unsuccessful, they are not very good at using punctuation marks. This finding is supported by many studies in the literature (Mataracı, 1998; Kalfa, 2000; Uludağ, 2002; Yıldız, 2002; Atasoy, 2009; Kara, 2010; Karagül, 2010; Çetin, 2013; Demir, 2013; İzci, 2013; Kaya, 2016). The reason for our students' being unsuccessful in the use of punctuation marks may be because of the lack of practice-oriented activities in the teaching of punctuation marks. In this connection, Aydın (2014) also stated that many mistakes are committed by elementary school students in the use of *colon, semicolon and full stop* and proposed providing students with text writing activities as the solution. As different from the current study, Uludağ (2002) investigated the frequency of committing mistakes in the use of punctuation marks in their compositions by the elementary school students and then sequenced the punctuation marks from the one in the use of most mistakes are committed to the one in the use of the least mistakes are committed as follows: *comma, full stop, semicolon, apostrophe, question mark, exclamation mark, ellipsis marks, hyphen, quotation mark and colon*. The reason for this order to be different from the one in the current study is thought by Uludağ (2002); rather than using a specially developed test to measure the students' skills of using correctly punctuation marks, preferred classifying the punctuation marks the students used in their compositions as true or false.

The third main finding of the current study is that the technique of narration with poetry had a large effect on the elementary school students' skill of correctly using *hyphen, exclamation mark and question mark*, a moderate effect on their skill of correctly using *comma, semicolon, apostrophe, ellipsis marks, and dash*. Parallel to this finding, Ergin (2009) reported that the drama method had a positive effect on the success rates of students so that they reached high level of success in the use of *question mark and dash (100% success rate), full stop (94%), hyphen and colon (92%), comma (86%), apostrophe (85%), ellipsis marks (50%), semicolon (26%)*.

The fourth main finding of the current study is that the female students were more successful than the male students in the use of punctuation marks in the Pretests. In the relevant literature (Erdem, 2007; Topçuoğlu, 2010; Bağcı, 2011) similar findings were also reported. Yet, in the posttest, the male students were found to be more successful. In the relevant literature, male students' becoming more successful than female students is not a result frequently reported; thus, it can be said that for the first time the male students became more successful than the female students on the use of the technique of narration with poetry in the current study.

The fifth main finding of the current study is that the 5th graders are less successful on using punctuation marks than the 6th and 7th graders. This might be because the 5th grade students are younger and less mature than the 6th and 7th grade students. In a similar manner, Uludağ (2002) also found that with increasing grade level, mistakes committed in the use of punctuation marks decrease.

The sixth main finding of the current study is that the elementary school students found the technique of narration with poetry useful as it *makes learning easier, permanent and enjoyable*. Therefore, they recommended it for the teaching of other subjects.

Suggestions

In light of the findings of the current study, the following items can be suggested:

1. The subject of punctuation marks requires the use of a special technique of teaching different from the ones suggested by the Ministry of National Education. Thus, the technique of narration through poetry can be used to increase elementary school students' success on using punctuation marks correctly.

2. The elementary school students were found to be unsuccessful particularly on the use of *semicolon, colon and ellipsis marks*. The reason for lack of success on the use of these punctuation marks might be that elementary school students study the subjects (*elements of a sentence, types of sentences and more informative texts*) including the functions of these punctuation marks mostly in the eighth grade. Thus, as the curriculum will be developed, these punctuation marks can be addressed after teaching these subjects.

3. It was found that for punctuation marks could be successfully used by students, they just need to be taught considering their grades. Thus, if *full stop, comma, quotation marks and dash* are studied in the 6th grade; *exclamation mark, quotation marks, question mark and hyphen* in the 7th grade and *semicolon, colon, ellipsis marks* in the 8th grade, better results can be obtained.

4. Another remarkable finding of the current study is that through the technique of narration with poetry, the male students became more successful than the female students. For the punctuation marks incorrectly used by male students, their success can be increased in the use of punctuation marks through the technique of narration with poetry.

REFERENCES

- Adorno, T.W. & Nicholzen, S.W. (1990). *Punctuation Marks*, Antioch Review, 48 (3), 300-305.
- Ağca, H. (2006). *Yazılı Anlatım*. Ankara: Gündüz Eğitim ve Yayıncılık.
- Atasoy, F. O. (2009). *Türkçede Noktalama: Sorunlar - Çözümler – Teklifler*, Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Aydın, İ. (2014). Türkçe Öğretiminde Yazılı Anlatım Çalışmalarındaki Sorunlar Üzerine Bir İnceleme. *KMÜ Sosyal ve Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 16 (Özel Sayı I), 166-170.
- Bağcı, H. (2011). İlköğretim 8. Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Noktalama İşaretleri ile Yazım Kurallarını Uygulayabilme Düzeyi. *Turkish Studies - International Periodical For the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 6 (1), 693-706.
- Bayrav, S. (1998). *Filolojinin Oluşumu*, İstanbul: Multilingual Yayınları.
- Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research Design: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.
- Çetin, A. (2013). *İlkokul 4. Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Yazım ve Noktalama Kurallarını Uygulama Düzeyleri*, Yayımlanmamış Yüksek lisans Tezi, Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Antalya.
- Demir, T. (2013). Yazma Becerisine Yönelik Kazanımların Ortaokulda Gerçekleşme Düzeyi, *Okuma Yazma Eğitimi Araştırmaları*, 1 (1), 45-56.
- Eker, S. (2002). *Çağdaş Türk Dili*, Grafiker Yayınları, Ankara.
- Erdem, H. (2007). *Dokuzuncu Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Yazım ve Noktalama Kurallarına Ulaşma Düzeyi*. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Ergin, S. (2009). *İlköğretim 8. Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Noktalama İşaretlerini Kullanma Becerileri*. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek lisans Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Hamzadayı, E. ve Çetinkaya, G. (2013). Dikte Uygulamalarının 5. Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Yazım ve Noktalama Kurallarını Uygulama Becerilerine Etkisi. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 9 (3), 133-143.
- https://books.google.com.tr/books?hl=tr&lr=&id=Msuaodkpleac&oi=fnd&pg=pa177&dq=punctuation+marks+in+writing&ots=Kqjwncnbko&sig=D4t6l6dc0f4bms06prwjzrrfq_k&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=punctuation%20marks%20in%20writing&f=false
- İzci, G. (2013). *İlköğretim 5. Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Okumaya Yönelik Tutumları İle Noktalama İşaretlerini Uygulama Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi*, Yayımlanmamış Yüksek lisans Tezi, Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Antalya.
- Jones, B.E.M. (1994). *Exploring the role of punctuation in parsing natural text*, Coling '94 Proceedings of the 15th conference on Computational linguistics, 1, 421-425.
- Kalfa, M. (2000). *Noktalama İşaretlerinin Türkçe Öğretimindeki Yeri ve Önemi*, Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Kara, E. (2010). *Yazım, Noktalama Ve Dil Bilgisel Becerileri Kazandırma bakımından 6. 7. 8. Sınıf Öğrenci Çalışma Kitaplarının İncelenmesi*, Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Erzincan Üniversitesi, Erzincan.
- Karagül, S. (2010). *İlköğretim 6-8. Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Türkçe Dersi Öğretim Programında Belirtilen Yazım Ve Noktalama Kurallarını Uygulayabilme Düzeyi*, Yayımlanmamış Yüksek lisans Tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, İzmir.

- Karakoyun, M. E. (2010). *İlköğretim 5. Sınıf Öğrencilerine Noktalama İşaretlerinin Öğretiminde İşbirlikli Öğrenme Tekniklerinden JıgsawI'in Akademik Başarıya Etkisi*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Atatürk Üniversitesi, Erzurum.
- Karatay, H. (2011). "Süreç Temelli Yazma Modelleri: Planlı Yazma Ve Değerlendirme." (Ed.: Murat Özbay). *Yazma Eğitimi içinde* (s. 21-43), Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Kaya, E. (2016). *Samsun İlindeki Ortaokul Öğrencilerinin Noktalama İşaretlerini Kullanma Düzeyleri (Çarşamba Örneği)*, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek lisans Tezi, On Dokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi, Samsun.
- Kurup, L., Joshi, A. & Shekhokar, N. (2016). *Intelligent Tutoring System for learning English punctuation*. 2016 International Conference on Computing Communication Control and automation (ICCUBEA). Hindistan: IEEE Yayıncılık.
- Maden, A. (2013). *Aktif Öğrenme Tekniklerinin İlköğretim 6. Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Yazım Ve Noktalama Kuralları Başarısı ve Derse Karşı Tutumlarına Etkisi*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Atatürk Üniversitesi, **Erzurum**.
- Maden, S. (2011). Takım Oyun Turnuva Tekniğinin Yazım Kuralları Ve Noktalama İşaretleri Eğitiminde Kullanımı. *E-International Journal Of Educational Research*, 2 (3), 52-67.
- Mataracı, E. (1998). *İlköğretim Okullarında 1. Kademe 5. Sınıf Öğrencilerinin İmla Ve Noktalama İşaretleriyle İlgili Bilgi Ve Beceri Düzeyleri*, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Onan, B. (2006). *Ses Olgusunun Denetlenebilirliği Bağlamında Dil Becerilerinin Geliştirilmesinde Etkili Olduğu Düşünülen Fonolojik Yönlendiriciler: Noktalama İşaretleri*, TÜBAR-XX, 141-163.
- Özşavlı, M. (2017). *Akran Geri Bildiriminin Türkçeyi Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğrenen Öğrencilerin Yazma Becerisine Etkisi*, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi, Hatay.
- TDK. (2005). *Yazım Kılavuzu*, Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Topçuoğlu, F. (2010). Öğretmen Adaylarının Noktalama İşaretlerini Kullanabilirlik Düzeyleri. *III. Uluslararası Dünya Dili Türkçe Sempozyumu Bildirileri*, İzmir.
- Topuz, A. (2008). *Uşak İli Sivasslı İlçesi 6. ve 7. Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Noktalama İşaretlerini Kullanmada Bilgi-Beceri Düzeylerinin Tespiti*, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, Afyon.
- Uçgun, D. (2007). Konuşma Eğitimi Etkileyen Faktörler, *Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 22 (1), 59-67.
- Uludağ, E. (2002). İlköğretim İkinci Kademe Öğrencilerinin Yazım ve Noktalama Kurallarını Uygulama Beceri Düzeyleri., *Erzincan Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 4 (1), 97-114.
- Vardar, B. (2002). (2002). *Açıklamalı Dilbilim Terimleri Sözlüğü*, İstanbul: Multilingual Yayınları.
- Yağmur-Şahin, E., Maden, S. ve Şahin, A. (2011). Noktalama İşaretlerinin Öğretiminde Grup Araştırması Tekniğinin Öğrenci Başarısına Etkisi. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 8 (12), 257-268.
- Yıldız, Z. (2002). *Değişik Öğretim Kademelerindeki Öğrencilerin Yazım ve Noktalama Kurallarını Uygulama Düzeyleri*, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi, Isparta.