



---

## Article Info/Makale Bilgisi

Received/Geliş: 13.08.2021 Accepted/Kabul: 03.08.2023 Published/Yayınlama: 04.11.2023

### **Scaffolding Turkish EFL Students' Grammar Learning Experiences through Output Activities**

**Elmaziye ÖZGÜR KÜFİ<sup>1</sup>**

#### **Abstract**

Students in EFL contexts have limited opportunities for using English productively in communicative activities. Based on this concern, the present study initiated the use of output activities in an evening course in Northern Cyprus and aimed to explore whether their use enhances effective use of grammatical structures by learners. To find out whether the use of output activities leads to any significant improvement in the use of grammatical forms, participating students were asked to write two compositions, one before participating in output activities and another one afterwards. Questionnaires were also administered to elicit teachers' and students' perceptions related to their grammar teaching and learning experiences respectively. Collected data were analyzed using qualitative and quantitative methodology since the study had an exploratory mixed method research design. Comparison of the analyzed data from learners' first and second compositions revealed that learners could use grammatical structures more successfully in their second compositions. Likewise, analysis of qualitative and quantitative data collected through questionnaires disclosed positive student and teacher perceptions regarding the use of output activities in the language course. Consequently, based on its positive results, the current study suggests integration of output activities into foreign language teaching practices and curricula for scaffolding students' grammar learning experiences.

**Keywords:** Teaching and learning grammar, Input, Output, Productive skills, Speaking and Writing activities

---

<sup>1</sup> Asst.Prof.Dr., Eastern Mediterranean University, Mağusa, KKTC/Kıbrıs [elmaziye.ozgur@emu.edu.tr](mailto:elmaziye.ozgur@emu.edu.tr)  
[ORCID: 0000-0001-7508-9511](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7508-9511)

# Türk Kökenli Öğrencilerin İngilizce Dil Bilgisi Öğrenim Süreçlerinin Konuşma ve Yazma Etkinlikleriyle Desteklenmesi

## Öz

İngilizce’yi kendi ülkelerinde yabancı dil olarak öğrenmeye çalışan öğrencilerin genellikle iletişimsel faaliyetlerde verimli bir şekilde dili kullanma fırsatları sınırlı olur. Bu durumu göz önünde bulunduran bu çalışma, Kuzey Kıbrıs’ta verilen bir akşam kursunda konuşma ve yazma etkinliklerinin kullanımını başlatmış ve bu etkinliklerin kurs öğrencilerinin dilbilgisi öğrenim süreçlerine bir etkisi olup olmadığını araştırmayı hedeflemiştir. Bu amaçla kurs katılımcılarından biri konuşma ve yazma etkinliklerine katılmadan önce diğeri ise etkinliklere katıldıktan sonra olmak üzere iki kompozisyon yazmaları istenmiştir. Kompozisyonlarından elde edilen verilere ek olarak araştırmaya katılan öğrenci ve öğretmenlerden kendi öğrenme ve öğretme deneyimlerine ilişkin düşünce ve duyguları anket yoluyla toplanmıştır. Toplanan veriler araştırmanın keşfedici karma yöntem araştırma tasarımına sahip olması nedeniyle nitel ve nicel metodoloji kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir. Öğrencilerin birinci ve ikinci kompozisyonlarından elde edilen bulgular, öğrencilerin ikinci kompozisyonlarında dilbilgisi yapılarını daha başarılı bir şekilde kullanabildiklerini ortaya çıkarmıştır. Benzer şekilde, anketler aracılığıyla toplanan niteliksel ve niceliksel veri analiz sonuçları, yabancı dil dersinde konuşma ve yazma faaliyetlerinin uygulanmasına ilişkin hem öğrencilerin hem de öğretmenlerin olumlu görüş paylaştığını göstermiştir. Araştırmada elde edilen olumlu sonuçlar ışığında bu çalışma, konuşma ve yazma faaliyetlerinin öğrencilerin dilbilgisi öğrenme deneyimlerini desteklemek için yabancı dil müfredatına dahil edilmesini ve yabancı dil öğretim uygulamalarında öğretmenler tarafından etkin bir şekilde kullanılmasını önermektedir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Dilbilgisi eğitim ve öğrenimi, pasif ve aktif öğrenim faaliyetleri, konuşma ve yazma becerileri

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The teaching of grammar has been a central concern in English language teaching for many years, so much so that it has been held synonymous with foreign language learning (Matsumoto, 2021). The significance of grammar in language education was underlined decades ago with the following words: “However important the other components of language may be in themselves, they are connected to each other through grammar” (Cook, 1996, p. 14). In the early days, grammar was perceived as the correct usage of the language and language teachers were expected to teach rules to enable language learners to use the language correctly. However, in 1960s this perception started to change with educators’ arguments for teaching the language as it is and not as it ought to be (Cook, 1996) and a shift from ‘prescriptive grammar’ to ‘descriptive grammar’ has been observed in foreign language teaching practices (Burton, 2020).

---

The transition from prescriptive to descriptive grammar has been a gradual process. Prescriptive grammar was mainly popular when grammar translation method was used. At the time, accuracy was of prior importance. Grammar was taught deductively and a rule-based curriculum was implemented as there was no place for communication in the language teaching syllabi in those days (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011). Similarly, when the audio-lingual approach was adopted in English language teaching, grammatical structures were sequenced from basic to more complex and “mimicry of forms and memorization of certain sentence patterns were used extensively to present rules inductively” (Celce-Murcia, 1991, p. 460). Linguists in those day were referred to as structuralists because they mainly focused on form, and they overlooked the meaning or the function of language structures. As they focused on language structures by confining their use to discrete sentences rather than larger units of discourse, they were also called sentence linguists (Cook, 1992). Structuralist view of language was later challenged by text linguists who claimed that focusing only on language forms restricts the scope of linguistics since the context, mind, and achieving meaning are important factors to be considered in language acquisition. Despite the emphasis on discourse-based approaches by text linguists, even after the communicative revolution, many EFL teachers have continued to focus on language structures while providing input in English language classes.

Different views have been articulated regarding the impact of input activities on foreign language learning in the literature. For instance, Krashen noted that language is acquired by receiving comprehensible input (Lightbown & Spada, 2013). Related to Krashen’s input hypothesis, Ellis (1997) has stated that for language acquisition to take place, input should contain forms and structures that are just beyond the learner’s language competence and for input to become intake, input should be processed by the learner’s internal mechanisms. To this end, the use of output activities has been suggested because while engaging students in the production of written or spoken discourse, these activities enable learners to notice and learn specific language structures (Izumi & Bigelow, 2000). Izumi and Bigelow (2000) explain how this process works with the following words: “production forces the learner to pay attention to the forms with which intended messages are expressed” (p. 243). Based on this rationale, the use of output activities is recommended for helping students to realize linguistic features in the input and for turning their implicit knowledge about language structures into explicit knowledge during the language learning process (Ellis, 1990; Izumi & Bigelow, 2000). Ellis (1990) explains why output activities are important in language learning by sharing the following reasons given by Swain:

- 1) the learner may be ‘pushed’ to use alternative means where there is communication breakdown, in order to express a message precisely, coherently, and appropriately,

- 2) using (as opposed to simply comprehending) the language may force the learner to move from semantic processing which is characteristic of the early stages of SLA to syntactic processing,
- 3) the learner has a chance to test out hypotheses about the L2.

(Ellis, 1990, p. 159)

These reasons clearly show that grammar teaching should not only involve “labeling the parts with their names and giving the rules that explain in words how they may be combined” (Cook, 1996, p.16) but also scaffolding students to recognize language structures when spoken, identifying their written form, understanding their meaning in context as well as using them in spoken and written discourse in a meaningful way. To this end, students should be provided with various opportunities for using language structures productively and teachers should be provided with guidance on different kinds of output activities and the ways of integrating them into their daily teaching practices. This need was underlined many years ago by Borg (1998) who said “the teaching of grammar in the absence of well-founded guidelines is like a landscape without bearings” (p. 11). Based on concerns related to the absence of guidelines in foreign language education, the present study aimed to raise awareness of ELT practitioners working in the Turkish education system as regards the need for balancing the use of input and output activities in grammar teaching.

As teaching practices are expected to be aligned with an exam-oriented education system, Turkish EFL teachers are mainly concerned with training their students for language exams that include close-ended questions rather than teaching them how to use English productively in speaking and writing activities. Their preference of input activities to output may be related to a set of factors like teachers’ preexisting schema regarding language learning, their feeling incompetent with communicative activities, having limited class time or the demands coming from the stakeholders. In addition, language teachers teaching crowded classes may find grammar teaching through input activities easier because these activities are generally mechanical sentence-level activities which are more manageable while teaching large class sizes (Hughes & McCarthy, 1998). Despite the practicality of input activities in teaching grammar to large student populations, output activities are significant for providing students the opportunity of using the language productively because as noted in the literature, “understanding new forms is not enough; learners also need the opportunity to produce them” (Shehadeh, 2001, p. 434). In this regard, there is a need for research studies that focus on the use of grammatical forms under different conditions in different contexts (Burton, 2020). Considering this research gap, this study intended to find out whether the use of output activities has a positive effect on language learning processes by specifically focusing on the use of the 'comparative form'. To this end, the study aimed to

---

answer the following research question: “Can Turkish EFL students' use of the 'comparative form' be improved through output activities?”

## 2. METHOD

### Research Design

The study was conducted as a small-scale action research, and it included one independent and one dependent variable. The independent variable comprised of writing activities which required students to use the comparative form in a productive way after being exposed to input. It is a discrete, dichotomous variable since the teacher either made use of these activities in the language course or did not use them at all. The dependent variable concerned students' use of the ‘comparative form’ in their writings. The study also included some extraneous variables such as the teacher’s teaching style, methods or the effect of the lesson time on the participants. As the study had an exploratory mixed method research design, it involved the use of both qualitative and quantitative methodology (Ivankova et al., 2006). The former was employed for analyzing the use of comparative forms in students’ compositions and responses of participating students and teachers to open-ended questions and the latter included participants’ responses to the close-ended questions. Qualitative data regarding the use of output activities for improving students’ grammatical competence were analyzed using content analysis and quantitative data were analyzed by using descriptive statistics.

### Research Context

The context where the present research was conducted was an evening course offered to the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC) community. This evening course was initiated because of the high demand coming from different bodies such as state schoolteachers, university personnel and staff working in different occupational fields in the community. Headway Pre-Intermediate was used as the main course-book and a set of complementary materials was used to engage course participants in more productive language activities, namely speaking and writing. A specific B1 level class was purposefully selected as the case of this study based on two reasons. Primary reason was the ‘comparative form’ being included in its syllabus, and the second reason was the teaching time of this structure in the instructional program, which coincided with the timing of the present study. Although two or three classes could have been included to get more reliable results, this wasn’t viable since the ‘comparative form’ had already been introduced to the students in other B1 level classes and the students in these classes had been asked to do writing and speaking activities which required them to make use of this form. The course took place in the building of the Language School situated in Famagusta, Northern Cyprus.

## **Participants**

The participants of the study were adult learners who had volunteered to take an evening course to improve their English language skills. The participants were selected by using 'cluster selection' technique because the study was conducted in one class and the class was selected as a whole. Thus, the same time and conditions were provided for all the students in this class. The participants were placed in this class based on their placement test results and they took a progress test and a speaking test at the end of the course. At the beginning of the course, the selected class included ten course participants; however, this number dropped to six towards the end of the course. As this research study was carried out towards the end of the course program, the study sample size consisted of only six participants. On the whole, two female and four male course participants took part in this research study. One of the female participants was a teacher with one year of teaching experience and the other was a doctor with five years of experience in the profession. The male participants had different jobs. One of them ran a restaurant, another had a travel agency, the other had a shop and the last one had a refrigeration, air conditioning services and repair shop. The ages of the participants ranged between 22 - 57. All the participants were enthusiastic learners as they enrolled on this evening course voluntarily and expressed their satisfaction with the course by saying that they enjoyed the lessons.

## **Data Collection and Analysis**

Students' compositions, a student questionnaire and a teacher questionnaire were used as data collection instruments. The main data collection instrument was participating students' compositions. Students were asked to write a comparative essay right after being exposed to input and another one after participating in output activities. Their first and second compositions were compared to see if they were able to use the comparative form more effectively after being involved in various speaking and writing activities.

Two questionnaires were administered to the participating students. They were asked to fill in the first questionnaire right after being exposed to input and writing their first essays and they were requested to complete the second questionnaire after writing their second essays (Please see Appendix A). The questions in these questionnaires aimed at eliciting participating students' perceptions and feelings about their learning experiences related to the 'comparative form'. Another data collection tool employed in the study was the teacher questionnaire. This questionnaire was administered to the teachers who had recently taught B1 level students and those who were involved in the design of complementary output activities for B1 level teaching program (Please refer to Appendix B). Both questionnaires were shared with a colleague and an expert in the field of ELT in order to ensure their validity. Additionally,

---

the researcher collaborated with a colleague while designing data collection instruments to ensure reliability of data collection and analysis procedures and replicability of the study (Cohen et al., 2000).

Initially, participating students were exposed to input activities through the tasks in their course-book which required only sentence-level language use. Right after being exposed to input, students were asked to write an essay and subsequently, they were exposed to output activities. In the output activities, students were asked to do some productive speaking and writing tasks such as writing a paragraph or speaking about two pictures in order to compare them. After these output activities, students were asked to write another comparative essay. Finally, the two essays were compared to see if there was any improvement in the use of the ‘comparative’ form in the course participants’ writings. In addition, the participating learners were asked to complete two questionnaires, one right after being exposed to input and another one after writing their second essay (Please see Appendix A). Like the essays, participating students’ responses given to the first and second questionnaire were compared to see if there were any changes in their perceptions regarding their learning processes. Teachers’ perceptions related to their teaching experiences and course participants’ learning processes were also collected through the use of a questionnaire. The questions in the teacher questionnaire aimed to elicit participating teachers' ideas specifically related to the employment and usefulness of output activities (Please see Appendix B).

As the data collected through student essays and the open-ended questions in the questionnaire were qualitative in nature, collected data were analyzed by using content analysis and categorizing language structures used by the course participants in tables (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Creating tables was practical for organizing the data as it enabled putting data in various categories. By means of tables, the researcher was able to synthesize the data by highlighting similarities and differences as well as significant themes that emerged from the collected data. Through the use of these analysis methods, comprehensive evaluations could be made by verifying qualitative data with quantitative results using descriptive statistics.

### 3. FINDINGS

#### **Participating students’ compositions**

Data collected through learner compositions were analyzed on an individual basis in order to compare the use of the comparative forms in each participant’s first and second composition. Inspired by the method of display used by Nobuyoshi and Ellis (1993), tables were created to investigate whether participating students made use of the comparative form and if they did, to examine whether they used the forms correctly. While displaying data regarding the use of the ‘comparative form’ in the learners’ composition, three distinct examples were chosen. Although some participants used the ‘comparative

form' more than three times in their compositions, three samples were considered to be sufficient for understanding whether there was improvement in the learner's use of the comparative form as displayed in the tables provided in the following section.

**Table 1.**

Participant 1	Composition One			Composition Two		
	<i>Avoidance</i>	<i>Correct Use</i>	<i>Wrong Use</i>	<i>Avoidance</i>	<i>Correct Use</i>	<i>Wrong Use</i>
Example 1			the tallers buildings			a biggest country
Example 2			the olders cities		is smaller than	
Example 3			people modern than			Population older and most rich than

As can be seen from Table 1, participant one could not use the comparative form correctly in the first composition at all. However, in the second composition there was some kind of improvement as s/he was able to use the comparative form correctly at one place.

**Table 2.**

Participant 2	Composition One			Composition Two		
	<i>Avoidance</i>	<i>Correct Use</i>	<i>Wrong Use</i>	<i>Avoidance</i>	<i>Correct Use</i>	<i>Wrong Use</i>
Example 1	√		a biggest university		is more crowded than	
Example 2					is bigger than	
Example 3					is warmer than	

As can be seen from the data displayed in Table 2, there was great improvement in the second participant's use of the 'comparative form' since in the first composition use of the comparative form was avoided or used incorrectly but in the second composition it was used correctly.

**Table 3.**

<b>Participant 3</b>	<b>Composition One</b>			<b>Composition Two</b>		
	<i>Avoidance</i>	<i>Correct Use</i>	<i>Wrong Use</i>	<i>Avoidance</i>	<i>Correct Use</i>	<i>Wrong Use</i>
Example 1		is bigger than			is bigger than	
Example 2		is hotter than			the most beautiful country	
Example 3		is more interesting than			is more crowded than	

When we analyse the data collected from the third participant's compositions, we can see that there was no problem regarding the use of the comparative form which reveals that the third participant could use the form comfortably and did not need to practise it further.

**Table 4.**

<b>Participant 4</b>	<b>Composition One</b>			<b>Composition Two</b>		
	<i>Avoidance</i>	<i>Correct Use</i>	<i>Wrong Use</i>	<i>Avoidance</i>	<i>Correct Use</i>	<i>Wrong Use</i>
Example 1		is bigger than			is more expensive than	
Example 2		is cheaper than			is quite noisier than	
Example 3		is more interesting for me			is as interesting as	

As can be seen from table 4, like the third participant, the fourth participant could already use the form correctly in the first composition and did not have to practise it further. In addition, this participant's use of the form 'as...as' clearly shows that s/he could use the 'comparative form' effectively.

**Table 5.**

Participant 5	Composition One			Composition Two		
	<i>Avoidance</i>	<i>Correct Use</i>	<i>Wrong Use</i>	<i>Avoidance</i>	<i>Correct Use</i>	<i>Wrong Use</i>
Example 1			Famagusta very more comfortable		is bigger than	
Example 2		is hotter than			is colder than	
Example 3		is more beautiful than			is drier and hotter than	

When the ‘comparative forms’ used by the fifth participant are analyzed, it can be seen that s/he had slight problems in the first composition but was able to use them more appropriately in the second composition. Thus, it can be claimed that the use of output activities in between the two compositions was effective for this course participant.

**Table 6.**

Participant 6	Composition One			Composition Two		
	<i>Avoidance</i>	<i>Correct Use</i>	<i>Wrong Use</i>	<i>Avoidance</i>	<i>Correct Use</i>	<i>Wrong Use</i>
Example 1	√				is bigger than	
Example 2		is colder than			is more crowded than	
Example 3					is hotter and wetter than	

As displayed in Table 6, there was improvement in the sixth participant’s use of the ‘comparative form’ as well, since the use of comparative form was avoided in the first composition whereas two comparative adjectives were used appropriately in this participant’s second composition.

To sum up, data displayed in the above tables clearly show that learners’ use of ‘comparative forms’ in their compositions showed variations. It was observed that while there was a dramatic improvement in one participant’s performance, there was no improvement in the performance of another participant as s/he could already use the form effectively. However, when the performance of all the participants is considered, it can be seen that more than half of the participants benefited from the output activities as they could use the form more comfortably in their second compositions.

---

### **Participating students' perceptions**

The questions in the questionnaires aimed at eliciting study participants' perceptions regarding their learning processes. When their responses given to questions in the first questionnaire are analyzed, it can be seen that one participant reported that s/he was not ready to write the composition, two of them reported finding the composition topic difficult and one of them did not share any opinions or feelings. In their responses to the same question in the second questionnaire, two participants reported that they found the first composition difficult. One of these participants related the difficulty of the writing topic to the lack of productive practice which is the focus of this study. Analysis of all responses to the third question in the second questionnaire shows that all the participants except one (who made no comment) found the topic of the second composition easy. This finding may be interpreted as the positive effect of output activities on the learners' productive language use.

When responses to question four are analyzed, it can be seen that all the students reported that they liked the activities they participated in the language course. Interestingly, when they were asked about the specific materials they liked, half of them reported that the materials which required them to use English productively in speaking and writing activities were more useful than the ones in the course-book. These findings confirm that all activities, whether input or output, sentence-level or discourse-based, are necessary in teaching a grammatical structure. While input activities provide the opportunity for introducing and presenting language structures, output activities give students the opportunity to productively use language structures in written or spoken discourse.

### **Participating teachers' perceptions**

The teachers who were requested to complete the questionnaires consisted of two groups. The first group included teachers who had recently taught in a B1 level program and the second group comprised of teachers who were involved in the design of the output activities for B1 syllabus. The rationale behind having two teacher groups was to ensure objectivity. It was thought that eliciting only the ideas of course designers would have meant only considering one side of the story in the evaluation of these materials. The number of teachers in both groups was four. As described earlier, the questions in the teacher questionnaire aimed to elicit teachers' ideas on the use and usefulness of output activities, which were added to B1 syllabus to complement the course-book.

Analysis of teacher responses indicated that both teacher groups had more or less similar views related to the use of output activities. Most of them said that the input activities in the book could be used for presentation and practice mainly at sentence level, whereas the activities in complementary materials could be used to help students to gradually move from sentence-level writing to essay writing.

Responses given to question two disclose that all the teachers liked both the input and output activities as they thought that a balance could be reached in their use. This is further clarified by teacher responses to the third question since the majority of participating teachers reported that ‘providing productive tasks and more practice’ was helpful in making the students understand the importance of using a grammatical structure in writing or speaking. The teachers also stated that idea generation was not a problem for their students while writing their essays since the writing topics given in the study were topics which the course participants could personalize with. In line with students’ responses, participating teachers reported that they found all the activities useful with the following words: ‘the more activities the students are involved in, the better’. Although all the teachers expressed their satisfaction with all the activities, when they were asked to specify the materials which they liked the most, the majority pointed out the output activities. In brief, all the participants had positive perceptions related to the use of output activities in the course.

Overall, the analysis of data collected through learner compositions and the questionnaires reveals that output activities were effective in promoting the use of the ‘comparative form’ in English. In other words, results of the present study have indicated that students got more competent with the use of the comparative form after participating in output activities in the course. In addition, all the research participants had positive perceptions since both participating students and teachers reported that the use of output activities was not only helpful but also enjoyable.

#### **4. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Triggered by the observation that not having the opportunity of using the language productively has a negative effect on students’ grammar learning experiences in EFL contexts, the present study initiated the use of output activities in an evening course offered by a language institution in North Cyprus. The aim of the study was to explore whether integration of output activities in grammar teaching can promote active use of language structures by learners. To this end, the study made use of two approaches and focused on participating students’ learning processes of the comparative form. Initially, the sentence-based approach which included the use of input activities in the course-book was adopted in the study. Following this, the discourse-based approach which involved implementation of output activities via complementary materials was put into practice. To find out whether the use of output activities leads to any significant improvement in the use of the comparative form, participating students were asked to write two compositions, one before the implementation of output activities and another one after participating in the output activities which required them to use the target structure.

The analysis of data collected through learners’ first and second compositions showed that most of the learners could use the comparative form more successfully in their second compositions. This

---

finding indicates that output activities influence students' grammar learning experiences positively. In line with this positive outcome, in their responses to the questionnaire questions, both the course participants and teachers expressed that they found the use of output activities beneficial. Therefore, based on study participants' positive perceptions and qualitative and quantitative data analysis results, the present study recommends the use output activities in language programs for helping students not only to learn grammar structures but also to actively use them in written and spoken discourse.

Admittedly, the findings of this study cannot be generalized to larger student populations due to its small sample size. To be able to draw definite conclusions related to its finding, the study has to be replicated with larger sample sizes and with different linguistic features. Another limitation of this study is related to the analysis of students' composition by only one evaluator. If two or more evaluators had been involved other than the researcher, the objectivity as well as the reliability of the research results would have been increased. However, due to time constraints it was not possible to involve other evaluators in the analysis procedures of the study. Learners' personal characteristics can also be considered as a limitation of this study since different factors like learner interest in the composition topic or attitude to productive activities might have influenced learners' performance.

Despite these limitations, present study is significant in that its findings confirm that the use of output activities can make EFL learners' implicit abilities which are difficult to observe more explicit (Ellis, 1985). Results of the present study can also encourage English language teachers working in EFL contexts to reflect on the use of discourse-based and traditional approaches in their grammar teaching practices and to evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of using both approaches in their own teaching contexts. In a similar vein, benefiting from the present study results, EFL teachers may try to raise learners' awareness of their own performance and create a sense of involvement for their learners by enabling them to be more active in the language learning process.

As indicated in recent studies and by the findings of the present study, it is quite important to integrate both input and output activities into the syllabus of English teaching programmes. When it comes to the evaluation of learning, tests seem to be the only option in many Turkish educational institutions. Years ago, experts noted that an examination should test what is taught (Hamilton, 2011) and a test should aim at evaluating "grammatical, discourse, sociolinguistic, and illocutionary competence as well as strategic competence" (Brown, 1987, p. 265). This practice should be reflected in the practices of EFL teachers working in the Turkish education system as well. Otherwise, Turkish learners are bound to face difficulties while trying to use the target language for genuine communication or relating to their thoughts and feelings in their interactions.

It is obvious that further research is needed to discuss the effects of output activities on learning. Since studies on output activities in Turkish EFL contexts are scarce, it is hoped that this study will inspire researchers to conduct further studies which will focus on the use of output activities in language classes in different educational settings. These studies might focus on different structures or as Ellis (1998) suggests, they may investigate cognitive processes that learners undergo while learning a grammar structure. Further research may also investigate teachers' grammar teaching experiences since "very little research has explored how teachers arrive at decisions about what grammar to teach and when and how" (p. 57). Future studies on teachers' grammar teaching practices can shed light onto their decision taking processes while teaching grammar. Consequently, with further empirical evidence, it may be possible to minimize problems faced in grammar teaching experiences of Turkish EFL teachers and to scaffold Turkish students studying in EFL contexts in their attempts to use grammatical structures productively to communicate in English.

---

## 5. REFERENCES

- Borg, S. (1998). Teachers' pedagogical systems and grammar teaching: A Qualitative Study, *TESOL Quarterly*, 32, 9-37.
- Brown, H. D. (1987). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Burton, G. (2020). Key concepts in ELT: Grammar, *ELT Journal*, 74(2) doi: 10.1093/elt/ccaa004
- Celce-Murcia, M. (1991). Grammar Pedagogy in Second and Foreign Language Teaching, *TESOL Quarterly*, 25, 459-480.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research methods in education*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Cook, G. (1992). *Discourse*. Oxford: OUP
- Cook, V. (1996). *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*. London: Arnold
- Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding Second Language acquisition*. Oxford: OUP
- Ellis, R. (1990). *Instructed Second Language acquisition*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Ellis, R. (1997). *Second Language acquisition*. Oxford: OUP
- Ellis, R. (1998). Teaching and research: Options in Grammar Teaching, *TESO Quarterly*, 32, 39-61
- Hamilton, L. S. (2011). Testing what has been taught, *American Educator*, Winter, 47-52
- Hughes, R. & McCarthy, M. (1998). From Sentence to Discourse: Discourse Grammar and English Language Teaching, *TESOL Quarterly*, 32, 263-287.
- Ivankova, N. V., Creswell, J. W., & Stick, S. L. (2006). Using Mixed-Methods Sequential Explanatory Design: From Theory to Practice. *Field Methods*, 18(1), 3-20.
- Izumi, S. & Bigelow, M. (2000). Does output promote noticing and second language acquisition?, *TESOL Quarterly*, 34, 239-278.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. & Anderson, D. (2011). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. Oxford: OUP.
- Lightbown, P. M. & Spada, N. (2013). *How languages are learned*. Oxford: OUP.
- Matsumoto, Y. (2021). Flexibility and fluidity of grammar: Grammatical constructions in discourse and sociocultural context, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 172, 105-118.
- Miles, M. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis*. London: SAGE Publications.

Nobuyoshi, J. & Ellis, R. (1993). Focused Communication Tasks and Second Language Acquisition, *ELT Journal*, 47, 203-210.

Shenadeh, A. (2001). Self- and Other-Initiated Modified output During Task-Based Interaction, *TESOL Quarterly*, 35, 433-457.

## Geniřletilmiř zet

İngilizce dil eđitiminde dilbilgisi đretimi yıllardır o kadar nemsenmektedir ki adeta yabancı dil đrenimi ile eř tutulmaktadır. nceleri dil bilgisi eđitimi, dilin dođru kullanımını iermekteydi. Bu yzden de dil đretmenlerinden, đrencilerin dili dođru kullanmalarını sađlamak iin İngilizce derslerinde belli bařlı kuralları đretmeleri beklenirdi. Zaman ierisinde yařanan geliřmeler yabancı dil eđitiminde "kuralcı dilbilgisinden" "tanımlayıcı dilbilgisine" geiře neden olsa da teorik dil bilgisi algısındaki bu deđiřim, iletiřim devriminden sonra bile, pratik dil bilgisi đretimi uygulamalarında bir trl tercih edilmedi. Bu durumun Trk kkenli İngilizce đretmenlerinin derslerinde pek de farklı olmadığı gzlemlenmektedir nk genel olarak Trk kkenli İngilizce đretmenler dilbilgisi kurallarına ařırı vurgu yapmaktadır. Ayrıca, sınav odaklı bir sistemde ders vermek zorunda kaldıkları iin, İngilizce đretmenlerinin đrencilere İngilizceyi verimli bir Őekilde nasıl kullanacaklarını đretmek yerine, daha fazla đrencilerini sınavlara hazırlamakla meřgul oldukları grlmektedir. Bu Őekilde verilen dil eđitiminin daha kolay olduđunu sylemek mmkndr nk bu etkinlikler cmle dzeyinde ve mekanik etkinliklerdir. Bu nedenle de bu tr đretim etkinlikleri daha kolay đretilen đeler iermektedir. Ancak literatrde de belirtildiđi gibi đrencilerin dil bilgisi kurallarını anlamaktan teye giderek onları etkin olarak konuřma ve yazma etkinliklerinde kullanmaya ihtiyaları vardır. Bu nedenle, İngilizce derslerinde đrencilere dili verimli bir Őekilde kullanmaları iin mmkn olduđunca ok fırsat sađlamak gerekmektedir.

İngilizce'yi kendi lkelerinde yabancı dil olarak đrenmeye alıřan đrencilerin genellikle iletiřimsel faaliyetlerde verimli bir Őekilde dili kullanma fırsatları sınırlı olur. Yabancı dili verimli bir Őekilde kullanma fırsatına sahip olmamanın, konuřma ve yazma gibi etkinliklerde đrencilerin dilbilgisi bilgilerini etkin olarak kullanamamasına sebep olduđu gzlemiyle tetiklenen bu arařtırma, Kuzey Kıbrıs'ta verilen bir akřam kursunda konuřma ve yazma etkinliklerinin kullanımını devreye sokarak bu etkinliklerin đrencilerin dilbilgisi đelerini daha etkili kullanıp kullanılmadığını arařtırmayı hedeflemiřtir. Bu etkinliklerinin kullanımının đrencilerin dilbilgisi yapılarını, bilhassa zellikle karřılařtırmalı dilbilgisi đelerini, konuřma ve yazma etkinlerinde daha etkin bir Őekilde kullanmalarına yol aıp amadığını đrenmek iin bu arařtırmada akřam kursuna İngilizcelearini geliřtirmek iin gnll olarak katılan yetiřkin đrencilerden iki kompozisyon yazmaları istenmiřtir. Bu kompozisyonlardan ilki karřılařtırmalı dilbilgisi yapısının hemen đretilmesinden sonra diđeri ise đrencilerin bu yapıyı etkin bir Őekilde kullanmalarını gerektiren konuřma ve yazma faaliyetlerinden sonra yazılmıřtır. đrenci kompozisyonlarının yanında đretmen ve đrencilerin dilbilgisi đretme ve đrenme deneyimleriyle ilgili duygu ve dřncelerini đrenmek amacıyla katılımcı đrenci ve đretmenlerden anket sorularına cevap vermeleri istenmiřtir.

đrenci kompozisyon ve anketlerde yer alan aık ulu sorular yoluyla toplanan veriler nitel nitelikte olduđundan bu arařtırmada ođunlukla nitel analiz yntemleri kullanılmıřtır. Veri analizi ařamasında đrenci kompozisyonlarından toplanan veriler tablolara yerleřtirilerek her bir katılımcı đrencinin birinci ve ikinci kompozisyonunda kullandıkları karřılařtırmalı dil bilgisi yapıları incelenmiř ve đrencilerin birinci ve ikinci kompozisyonları arasında bu yapı kullanımı aısından herhangi bir fark olup olmadığına bakılmıřtır. Buna ek olarak, anketler aracılıđıyla elde edilen đrenci ve đretmen algıları, anket soru cevapları nicel ve nitel yntemler kullanılarak incelenmiřtir.

Veri analiz sonuları İngilizce derslerinde Trk kkenli đrencilerin konuřma ve yazma etkinlikleri akabinde karřılařtırmalı dil bilgisi yapısını daha fazla ve dođru bir Őekilde kullandıklarını gstermiřtir. Bir bařka deyiře bu

araştırma öğrencilerin ikinci kompozisyonlarında dilbilgisi yapılarını daha başarılı bir şekilde kullanabildiklerini ortaya koymuştur. Bu bulguların yanında bu çalışmaya katılan tüm öğrenci ve öğretmenler İngilizce derslerinde kullanılan konuşma ve yazma faaliyetlerinin kendileri için yararlı olmakla kalmayıp eğlenceli de olduğunu söyleyerek konuşma ve yazma etkinlikleriyle ilgili olumlu görüş dile getirmişlerdir. Özet olarak bu çalışmadaki veri analiz sonuçları katılımcı öğrencilerin konuşma ve yazma faaliyetlerine katıldıktan sonra yazmış oldukları İngilizce kompozisyonlarda karşılaştırmalı yapıyı daha başarılı bir şekilde kullandıklarını göstermiştir. Araştırma bulguları, İngilizce derslerinde uygulanan konuşma ve yazma etkinliklerinin Türk kökenli öğrencilerin yalnızca dilbilgisi yapılarını öğrenmelerine değil, aynı zamanda bunları yazılı ve sözlü söylemde de daha aktif olarak kullanmalarına yardımcı olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Bu bulgular ışığında bu çalışma, İngilizce'nin yabancı dil olarak kullanıldığı ortamlarda konuşma ve yazma faaliyetlerinin yabancı dil eğitimi müfredatlarına dahil edilmesini ve İngilizce öğretmenlerinin bu faaliyetleri öğrencilerinin dilbilgisi öğrenme deneyimlerini desteklemek amacıyla sıklıkla kullanmalarını tavsiye etmektedir.