

PAPER DETAILS

TITLE: Focus on Form in Task-Based Language Teaching: The Case of Turkish /İse Dayalı Dil Öğretiminde Biçime Odaklanma: Türkçe Örneği

AUTHORS: Betül ÇETİN

PAGES: 151-164

ORIGINAL PDF URL: <http://www.e-ijer.com/tr/download/article-file/2529212>

Focus on Form in Task-Based Language Teaching: The Case of Turkish

Dr. Betül Çetin

Dokuz Eylül University - Türkiye

ORCID: 0000-0002-0287-2924

betul.cetin@deu.edu.tr

Abstract

This study aims to reveal how task-based and form-focused language teaching materials affect success in teaching Turkish as a foreign language. The study was performed on the assumption that form-focused and task-based language teaching materials, particularly for teaching agglutinative languages, can be designed and can increase student's success; it investigated to what extent form-focused and task-based materials contribute to the improvement of the use of the target structure. Accordingly, a pretest-posttest design experiment was performed with 54 participants whose mother tongues are different, 27 of whom were placed in the experimental group and 27 in the control group. The material on teaching the (-)(y)An subject relative clause, developed in line with expert opinions encompassing form-focused input enrichment and consciousness-raising tasks, was used with the experimental group, and its contribution to learner success was measured statistically. In the control group, explication regarding the form was done in the form of presentations and no consciousness-raising activities were carried out; the group adhered to the activities in the coursebook. The pretest and posttest results of the participants in the experimental and control groups were evaluated using the SPSS 24 independent samples t-test. It was observed that after the posttest, the experimental group was more successful than the control group was. The findings show that form-focused and task-based practices are more effective in teaching Turkish, an agglutinative language.

Keywords: Task-based language teaching, Focus on form, Turkish as a foreign language, Grammar teaching



**E-International Journal
of Educational
Research**

Vol: 13, No: 5, pp. 151-164

Research Article

Received: 2022-07-06

Accepted: 2022-09-15

Suggested Citation

Çetin, B. (2022). Focus on form in task-based language teaching: the case of Turkish, *E-International Journal of Educational Research*, 13(5), 151-164. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.19160/e-ijer.1141487>

INTRODUCTION

Learning theories and findings of studies in the linguistics literature shape language teaching methods and techniques. With the development of methods, perspectives are formed and materials deemed appropriate for use in foreign language teaching come into being. The use of such materials and their evaluation afterward is of significant importance for the development of more suitable techniques. It is important to carry out experiments using the methods and techniques proposed in the literature and make recommendations for professionals working in the field in light of the findings and results to teach Turkish as a foreign language more effectively and efficiently. Accordingly, this study addresses task-based and form-focused methods of language teaching. Task-based language teaching states that language is learned through “tasks” and with inputs closest to the original language. Form-focused instruction also aims to focus on structures incidentally or perform a planned-focus-on-form without ignoring the meaning. This study was performed on the assumption that form-focused and task-based language teaching materials, particularly for teaching agglutinative languages, can be designed and can increase success; it investigated to what extent form-focused and task-based materials contribute to the improvement of usage of the target structure. This study, performed using the pretest–posttest control group design to investigate the effect of the prepared material, sought to answer the following research questions:

- Is there a significant difference between the language development pretest and posttest scores of the participants in the experimental group, who were taught using task-based and form-focused language teaching materials?
- Is there a significant difference between the language development levels of the participants in the control group and the experimental group, in the latter of which task-based and form-focused language teaching materials were used?

Further, evaluations and recommendations were made on how task-based language teaching and focusing on form can be utilized when developing the materials.

Accordingly, form-focused language teaching, task-based language teaching practices and types of tasks, and the experiment process and consequent findings were mentioned.

1. Form-Focused Language Teaching:

In the language teaching literature, the importance of input and output for the performance of information processing is emphasized (Fotos, 2001). The input can become permanent in the mind upon processing, and language can be acquired this way. The way the input is presented to the learner is crucial, whereas the way the input is presented to the learner may vary, given the individual differences between the learners and the general characteristics of the group. Producing meaningful utterances is important. Therefore, meaning and function are drawn upon in activities performed in language teaching. It is further emphasized that grammar should not be overlooked when working on meaning and function (Carter & McCarthy, 2006; Ellis, 2005; Larsen-Freeman, 2002; Long, 1991; Widdowson, 1990). Addressing the interplay between form, meaning, and function, Long (1991) introduced the concept of form-focused instruction and emphasized that dealing with only grammar rules in lessons, not considering the meaning, is not effective.

In his research on how form-focused language teaching can be performed, Ellis (2009) stated that forms can be focused on incidentally or planned-focus-on-form activities can be performed. In their study on French teaching, Ünal (2013) stated the following for planned-focus-on-form:

1. Grammatical structures are taught.
2. There is a focus on selected forms based on meaningfulness and functionality.
3. The presentation of formats is done through enriched inputs.
4. Induction is used in some cases, whereas in others, deduction is utilized.
5. The teaching process encompasses learner production; that is to say, the output is accompanied by feedback and reproduction if necessary.
6. It includes both free and controlled production.

Hamamcı and Hamamcı (2014) defined incidental focus on form as “explaining grammatical rules or usages about form at the moment when the learners express that they are having or expected to have

difficulties learning." Teachers' projections are crucial; therefore Ellis (2001) holds that preemptive focus on form can be utilized as well. Another type of incidental focus on form is reactive focus on form. In this type, the focus is placed on form consistent with learner mistakes.

In their review study, Çetin (2022) evaluated the findings of studies on error analysis in agglutinating languages with a focus on the case of Turkish, where she stated that form-focused teaching practices are suitable. However, it is not possible to comment on this without research. All the evaluations in the literature must be supported by research.

2. Task-Based Language Teaching Practices:

The perspectives developed within the framework of learning theories and linguistics theories further reverberated on language teaching, and methods, such as the Grammar Translation Method, Audio-lingual Method, and Direct Method, were developed. With studies emphasizing the importance of language use, "Communicative language teaching" has gained prominence. Hymes (1972) emphasizes that what enables the appropriate use of linguistic competence during communication is communicative competence. Task-based language learning, based on the cognitive learning model, rejects the argument that language is learned through memorization, imitation, and habit and argues that language is really acquired through information processing. According to this model, bottom-up and top-down processes should be addressed in unison; that is to say, language teaching should take place by matching world knowledge and linguistic knowledge (Willis, 1996). Willis (1996, pp. 10–16) separated the language acquisition process into phases, namely "Exposure, use of language, motivation, and information (instruction), which are indispensable for language learning to take place fully." It is important to expose learners to authentic language and ensure that students use the linguistic units they encounter. Learners must study in environments where they feel comfortable and are provided information on the language when necessary.

Task-based learning aims to eliminate some of the problems encountered during language teaching (Swan, 2005, p. 387). The mentioned or aforementioned problems are selection and presentation, the establishment of a knowledge base, and the development of recall and deployment. Selection and presentation refer to selecting forms the learner needs and presenting them appropriately. One of the prominent challenges of language teaching is deciding on the format in which to be presented, when, and how. What is meant by the establishment of a knowledge base is the integration of the new information stored in the long term memory into the old information and storing the new information in the long term memory in a systematic way that enables its use when needed. To eliminate this problem, the selected forms should be processed by the learner using top-down and bottom-up processes and stored in long-term memory. Recall and deployment refer to the ability to use the stored linguistic units when necessary, that is, in the appropriate context. When planning the curriculum during language teaching, the aforementioned information should be considered and the relevant problems should be eliminated. The appropriate planning of language education ensures efficient and effective teaching.

Willis (1996, p. 40) highlights that to ensure effective and efficient language teaching, certain task-based processes must take place. These processes, respectively, are pretask, where the learner familiarizes with the task itself; task cycle, where the task itself takes place; and language focus, where the use of language is focused on if necessary. Before the task, activities wherein information stored in the mind regarding the subject are recalled and learners prepare themselves for the task are performed. Preliminary activities are conducted on the context wherein the task takes place. After the preliminary activities, learners are assigned a task with which to improve their use of the language. Afterward, the phase of language focus is initiated. The duration of this phase may differ depending on the selected task type.

2.1. What is a Task? "Task" is the fundamental concept around which the syllabus of task-based language learning revolves. Considering the definitions in the literature, it is possible to define "task" as "A task is a structured plan that enhances learners' ability to develop knowledge and skills in the target language and use it during interactions" (Ellis, 2003; Richard et al., 1985;). Richard et al. (1985) define task as "Any activity that includes uses of language." Activities that foster the use of the target language in the classroom as closely as possible to the mother tongue envisage learning through interaction (Ellis, 2003, p. 4). The task does not focus solely on grammar or a specific language skill. All daily activities can

be included in task-based practices. A task fosters fluency, grammatical accuracy, and pragmatic relevance—the purposes of language learning—because it offers learners the chance to use the language consistently and in turn needs outside correction (Ellis, 2003, p. 103). A party to the communication, learners try to understand the other party and express themselves accordingly, and they can then learn how to use language differently when trying to find ways of self-expression (i.e., paraphrase, find synonyms, and define words).

Ellis and Shintani (2014, p. 135) argued that tasks are required to contain four characteristics, as follows:

1. The primary focus should be on “meaning” (i.e., learners should be mainly concerned with encoding and decoding messages, not with focusing on the linguistic form).
2. There should be some kind of “gap” (i.e., a need to convey information, express an opinion, or infer meaning).
3. Learners should largely rely on their own resources (linguistic and nonlinguistic) to complete the activity. That is, learners are not “taught” the language; they will need to perform a task although they may be able to “borrow” from the input the task provides to help them perform it.
4. There is a clearly defined outcome other than the use of language (that is, the language serves as the means for achieving the outcome, not as an end in itself).

2.2. Types of Tasks: The preferred method in grammar teaching may be proactive or reactive from the learners’ standpoint. The reactive focus on the form occurs without any prior planning and depending on the instantaneous reactions, whereas the proactive focus on the form takes place in a planned way (Park, 2005).

Tasks can be classified into two groups, namely, focused and unfocused, depending on their nature of being reactive or proactive: focused tasks are designed with the aim of teaching a specific linguistic unit, whereas unfocused tasks are designed without aiming to teach any specific structure and based solely on a theme, context, or situation. In other words, unfocused tasks are performed when the aim is to reactively focus on form, whereas focused tasks are performed to focus on the form proactively. Unfocused tasks are defined as those designed to ensure the processing of general examples, while focused tasks are tasks developed to ensure the processing of predetermined linguistic units (Ellis, 2017).

With the presentation–practice–production approach to language teaching, one of the means of providing input, the fundamental rule is to “get it done.” In task-based language teaching, regardless of the task type, the primary teacher action is to “get it done.” In general, the teacher “gets learners to do” the task.

Unfocused tasks do not aim to teach a particular linguistic unit. Explication can be provided on the linguistic unit in question to solve the problems encountered while performing a language task. The structures that learners have trouble understanding and require clarification on can be explained by the teacher. However, at the preparatory stage, the aim is not to teach a particular linguistic unit. Different activities can be designed when working on unfocused tasks. Among examples of unfocused tasks are information gap activities, reasoning gap activities, and opinion gap activities.

Prabhu (1987, pp. 46–47) grouped unfocused tasks under three categories according to the cognitive activity they encompass: (i) information gap activities, (ii) reasoning gap activities, and (iii) opinion gap activities. The term “gap” refers to the unknown and unpredictable situations between learners or between teacher and learner. Although some learners possess certain knowledge, some do not. The difference between the knowledge possessed by learners can be referred to as gap (Rees, 2002). Interest in what is known is greater than what is unknown. Knowledge that is unknown by one of the parties is a prerequisite of communication. Being unable to predict what the teacher or other learners will utter fosters more careful and motivated listening and observing of others. Therefore, it is safe to argue that the said gaps actually enable activities to take place with greater interest and enjoyment. Such practices can be utilized in focused activities as well. Ellis (2003) classified “tasks” as pedagogic, rhetorical, and psycholinguistic and highlighted the lack of consensus in the literature on the subject. He developed his cognitive classification based on the classification introduced in Prabhu (1987).

2.2.1 *Information gap activities* comprise the transfer of information from one person to another, from one form to another, or from one place to another (Ellis, 2003, p. 213). In knowledge gap activities, learners transfer the knowledge they possess on a given subject to their fellow learners, the whole class, or their teachers. This knowledge consists of what they say, write, or visually present, that is unknown or unpredictable to the other(s). For knowledge gap activities, teachers design materials that address the gaps and the question of how to establish communication-based on the gaps in question.

2.2.2 *Reasoning gap activities* involve making new inferences from the given information and presenting own supported ideas about a given subject. In such activities, which generally involve the use of reasoning to solve an existing problem, language is indispensable to resolving the problem in question. Just like knowledge gap activities, reasoning gap activities can be performed as focused tasks as well.

2.2.3 *Opinion gap activities* involve the determination and utterance of a personal opinion or preference. Learners are required to use language to convey their opinions. In doing so, the production can take place in writing or verbally, that is, learners can utter their opinions through writing or speaking. In performing such activities, learners may be asked questions involving phrases like "what do you think about?" "is. or. better?" to convey their opinions.

Focused tasks are those designed to teach a particular linguistic unit. Unfocused tasks can be classified under the following groups.

In tasks identified as structure-based production tasks by Loschky and Bley-Vroman (1993, p. 141), the focused linguistic unit can be utilized in the task itself. The peculiarity of these tasks is that the structure to be taught is used while performing the task. Such tasks can also be performed without using the linguistic unit in question; however, in the organization of the task, a path that ensures the natural use of the structure in question should be followed.

Among structure-based production tasks are dictogloss activities (Ellis, 2003). In dictogloss activities, short texts involving the structure to be taught are played to the learners (Wajnryb & Maley, 1990). Students are asked to take notes while listening to the recording. Next, the learners work in groups to rewrite the text in line with the notes they took. Here, the aim is not to rewrite the original text but to reproduce the content. Dictogloss activities are effective in accelerating the utilization of syntactic abilities in general rather than teaching a certain grammatical structure (Ellis, 2003, p. 156).

Comprehension tasks are performed to draw attention to the focus structure. This type of task assumes that acquisition takes place through information processing (Ellis, 2003, p. 158). To ensure acquisition by the learner, activities in which the linguistic unit to be taught is used intensively are designed. In comprehension tasks, unlike consciousness-raising tasks, usually, the aim is to perform implicit teaching. Attention is paid to the structures, but no open explanation is made. After the activity is completed, an explicit presentation is made, if necessary. Intense repetition is performed using visual and auditory materials to draw the learners' attention to the structure on which the focus is placed. One of the techniques used in these tasks is input enrichment where the structure on which focus is placed is heavily involved in written or spoken texts, the said structure in written texts is presented to the learner in bold, italic, underlined, or different colors or sizes. Then, to expose the learner to the structure, they are asked questions in which the focused structure is presented in a different way.

Consciousness-raising tasks are performed by drawing attention to the linguistic units to be taught and by helping the learner detect the structure on which focused is placed. The most prominent difference between consciousness-raising tasks from comprehension tasks is that the former is used to explicitly instruct the learners on the structure on which focus is placed.

Considering task-based and form-focused materials in teaching Turkish as a foreign language are examined, it is seen that the studies mostly consist of reviews and suggestions. For instance, Şahin (2019) discussed task-based language teaching in terms of speaking skills and made suggestions. Özgen (2008) handled task-based language teaching within the cognitive approach framework and suggested some materials. When we look at the studies on language teaching in general and teaching Turkish as a foreign language in particular, we believe that form-focused materials in task-based language teaching will increase student success. However, studies are generally reviews and recommendations. The findings of

this study are important for the evaluation of task-based and form-oriented materials as the materials need to be applied and evaluated.

METHOD

In this study, to evaluate the effectiveness of form-focused and task-based foreign language teaching practices with a focus on Turkish within the framework of the research questions, the pretest–posttest experimental design, deemed suitable by Karasar (2012), was used. The process steps of the experiment carried out as part of the study are given in Table 1.

Table 1. *Process steps of the experiment*

	Group	Test	Process	Test
Experimental group	27 participant	pretest	study	posttest
Control Group	27 participant	pretest	study	posttest

1. Stages of the Experiment

- Structure-based production tasks and form-focused course materials were developed from the tasks on which focus was placed. The opinions of the experts who have carried out theoretical and practical studies in the field of teaching Turkish as a foreign language regarding the course materials designed were asked, and accordingly, necessary adjustments were made.
- The opinions of the experts who have carried out theoretical and practical studies in the field of teaching Turkish as a foreign language regarding the pretest and posttest drawn up were asked, and accordingly, necessary adjustments were made.
- As stated in the letter E-87347630-659-245033 dated 22/4/2022, ethics committee approval was obtained from the Ethics Committee of Dokuz Eylül University, indicating the appropriateness of the experiment.
- The pretest–posttest design was adopted in the study, the experimental and control groups of which consisted of 27 participants.
- The pretest and posttest results of the participants in the experimental and control groups were evaluated using the SPSS 24 independent samples test.

2. Participants

The study was carried out with the participation of 54 learners who completed the Turkish Level B1 course at Dokuz Eylül University Language Research and Teaching Center (DEDAM), of whom 27 were placed in the experimental group and 27 in the control group. Learners' age, gender, and mother tongue were not taken as a variable. While forming the classes, attention was paid to distributing learners from different countries and with different mother tongues to different classes. The participants are Turkish learners from countries such as Russia, Iran, Ghana, Guinea, Ethiopia, South Sudan, Egypt, and Kazakhstan who came to Turkey an average of 8 months ago and have been taking Turkish classes for 30 hr a week. Until the experiment, the participants had taken 550 hr of Turkish lessons.

3. Materials

A pretest was performed to measure the participants' level of knowledge of the *-(y)An* subject relative clause, a relative clause, which had not been formally instructed in the classroom before. Turkish is an agglutinative language, and all functions are coded through suffixes. The *-(y)An* subject relative clause is added to the verb to ensure consistency between the person and the tense (Göksel & Kerslake, 2005, pp. 438–439).

Example (1) [Ø; Okul -a gid-en] man
 Ø school -Dat go **SbjP** man
 "the man who goes/went to school" (Kornfilt, 1997, p. 58)

As seen in Example (1), the adjective clause is formed with the suffix *-(y)An* added to the verb positioned before the noun. The affix is shown as *-(y)An*. This is because the affix used along with the *-y* sound was uttered after a verb, the last sound of which is a vowel (Example 2a) and the vowel *-A* creates vowel harmony, it is used in two different variants, *-(y)en* (Example 2b) and *-(y)an* (Example 2c).

- Example (2)
- a. [$\emptyset_i$ kitap oku-y-an] woman
 $\emptyset_i$ book read **SbjP** woman_i
the woman who reads/read book
 - b. [$\emptyset_i$ elma yi-y-en] woman
 $\emptyset_i$ apple eat **SbjP** woman_i
the woman who eat/ate apple
 - c. [$\emptyset_i$ çalış-an] woman
 $\emptyset_i$ study **SbjP** woman_i
the woman who study/studied

A material was designed by utilizing input enrichment and consciousness-raising tasks, among the tasks in the comprehension group of focused tasks employed in task-based language teaching. The materials are designed as form-focused activities. In form-focused comprehension tasks, enriched input was used and attempts were made to attract students' attention to the target structure. A theme was selected from the coursebook used in the classes of the Dokuz Eylül University Language Research and Teaching Center to be used during the activities. In both groups, the target structure was attempted to be taught within the same theme. Opinions of the experts were sought regarding the designed materials, and the suitability of the materials was evaluated. The activity of teaching the target structure was carried out in the experimental group using the developed materials and by following the path laid out in the coursebook in the control group, where explication regarding the form was done in the form of presentations, and no consciousness-raising activities were carried out; the group adhered to the activities in the coursebook. There are no tasks on input enrichment and consciousness-raising in the coursebook; there are theme-related reading materials and the presentation of the structure, along with formal activities.

FINDINGS

After the pretest was performed to determine whether the knowledge levels of the randomly selected control and experimental group members were similar, the independent samples t-test was performed using the SPSS 24 program to check whether there was a difference between the knowledge levels of control and experimental groups from the pretest to the posttest.

157

Table 2. Group Statistics for Pretest

	group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pretest	1	27	12,9259	4,54825	,87531
	2	27	12,3333	4,38529	,84395

In Table 2, the control group was assigned the code "1," and the experimental group was assigned the code "2." As can be seen, the mean pretest score of the control group was found to be 12.9 and that of the experimental group was found to be 12.3.

As is seen in Table 3, no significant difference was found between the control group and the experimental group in terms of the independent samples test ($p > .5$). These findings show that the two groups had the same level of knowledge before the experiment.

Table 3. Independent Samples Test (Pretest)

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Pretest	Equal variances assumed	,240	,626	,487	52	,628	,59259	1,21590	-1,84730	3,03248
	Equal variances not assumed			,487	51,931	,628	,59259	1,21590	-1,84737	3,03256

As stated in the introduction to the study, the research questions are “Is there a significant difference between the language development pretest and posttest scores of the participants in the experimental group, who were taught using task-based and form-focused language teaching materials?” and “Is there a significant difference between the language development levels of the participants in the control group and the experimental group, with task-based and form-focused language teaching materials used in the latter group?” To provide answers to these questions, the independent samples t-test was performed using the SPSS 24 program as no other parameters, such as age, gender, and mother tongue, were considered. Table 4 shows the mean increase rates, and Table 5 shows the results of the test performed to determine whether the increase is significant.

Table 4. *Group Statistics*

	group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Difference	1	27	1,4444	2,70801	,52116
	2	27	3,9259	4,59871	,88502

Table 5. *Independent Samples Test (statistical difference between experimental group and control group)*

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Difference	Equal variances assumed	8,985	,004	-2,416	52	,019	-2,48148	1,02707	-4,54245	-,42052
	Equal variances not assumed			-2,416	42,096	,020	-2,48148	1,02707	-4,55405	-,40891

After the experiment, an increase of 1.444 was observed in the control group, whereas this rate was found to be 3.9259 in the experimental group. There is a visible difference between the groups in terms of the extent of development, which is also indicated in Table 4.

In Table 5 are the results of the test performed to see whether this increase is significant or not: $t = 2.416$ and $p < .05$. So, there is a significant difference between the groups in favor of the experimental group.

An increase was also observed in the group where form-focused education materials were not used. The mean number of correct answers of the members of the control group increased from 12.9 to 14.3 from pretest to posttest, while it increased from 12.3 to 16.25 for the members of the experimental group. The mean number of correct answers increased more in the group where form-focused materials were utilized.

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

In this study, carried out to investigate the effectiveness of form-focused education materials in teaching Turkish as a foreign language, it was concluded that the experimental group, where task-based and form-focused materials were utilized, was more successful than the control group, where such materials were not used. The comparison of the posttest results of the participants in the experimental group and the control group shows a significant difference in terms of success in favor of the learners in the former.

Göçer and Karadağ (2020) stated in their research articles that task-based language teaching materials increased Turkish learners' achievement in language learning. No other studies were found in the literature on the effectiveness of form-focused and task-based methods in teaching Turkish as a foreign language. Therefore, the findings of this study cannot be compared with those of other studies that employed these methods in teaching another language. However, in their study carried out with learners of Spanish as a foreign language, Jourdenais et al. (1995) found that the experimental group, provided with enriched input, used the target structure more frequently than those in the control group.

did. Also, in their study, Bandar and Gorjian (2017) found form-focused tasks as increasing success in Iranian English learners. The findings of the studies carried out by Jourdenais et al. (1995) and Bandar and Gorjian (2017) are parallel to the findings of this study.

Turkish is an agglutinative language, and different affixes are used for all linguistic functions. Also, an affix has more than one function. The contention that the reason why grammar-oriented teaching was successful was that Turkish is an agglutinative language holds validity. The mother tongues of the participants of the study are different. However, in both experimental and control groups, there are native speakers of languages with similar typological characteristics. This leads to the conclusion that there is no correlation between the participants' success rates and their mother tongues. However, repeating this study with learners whose mother tongues are the same or typologically similar may lead to different results. In addition, conducting similar studies with larger groups, learners at different language proficiency levels, and with a focus on different grammatical objectives will contribute to the field.

In this study, task-based and form-focused teaching practices were discussed together. The findings of the study show that form-focused grammar teaching and structure-based production tasks, among task-based teaching practices, are similar in terms of their characteristics, and that activities can be designed by combining these two foreign language teaching approaches. The experiment carried out as a part of the study showed that the two perspectives can be harmonized and positive results can be achieved.

Task-based teaching materials aim to do activities similar to real-life examples of language use. Performing real-life activities prevents the language from having to be relearned in the real world after the classroom setting. As Ellis (2016) states, selective attention and consciousness-raising can be achieved with a focus on form materials. Since language is handled more functionally, it also supports the development of students' communication skills. From these perspectives, and considering the findings of the study, it is possible to say that organizing focus on form activities in task-based language teaching can make learning effective and efficient.

REFERENCES / KAYNAKÇA

- Bandar, F., & Gorjian, B. (2017). Teaching grammar to EFL Learners through focusing on form and meaning. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Learning*, 3(4), 88–96. <https://doi.org/10.5923/j.jall.20170304.02>.
- Carter, R., & McCarthy, M. (2006). *Cambridge grammar of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Çetin, B. (2022). Form-focused foreign language teaching in agglutinating languages: The case of Turkish. *Journal of Language Education and Research*, 8(1), 207–226. <https://doi.org/10.31464/jlere.1067112>.
- Ellis, R. (2001). Investigating form-focused instruction, In R. Ellis (Ed.), *Form-focused instruction and second language learning* (pp. 1–46). Blackwell Publishing.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language teaching and learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2005). Measuring implicit and explicit knowledge of a second language: A psychometric study. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27(2), 141–172. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263105050096>.
- Ellis, R. (2009). Implicit and explicit learning, knowledge and instruction, In R. Ellis, S. Loewen, C. Elder, R. Erlam, J. Philip, & H. Reinders, (Eds.), *Implicit and explicit knowledge in second language learning, testing and teaching* (pp. 3–25). Multilingual Matters.
- Ellis, R. (2016). Focus on form: A critical review. *Language Teaching Research*, 20(3), 405–428. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168816628627>.
- Ellis, R. (2017). Task based language teaching, In S. Loewen & M. Sato (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of instructed second language acquisition* (pp. 108–125). Routledge.
- Ellis, R., & Shintani, N. (2014). *Exploring language pedagogy through second language acquisition research*. New York: Routledge.
- Fotos, S. (2001). Cognitive approaches to grammar instruction, In Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a foreign language* (third edn.) (pp. 267–283). Heinle & Heinle.

- Göçer, A. & Karadağ, B. F. (2020). The importance of task-based learning method in point of communication function of language in teaching Turkish as a foreign. *ACU International Journal of Social Science*, 6(2), 58-73. DOI:10.22466/acusbd.770305
- Göksel, A. & Kerslake, C. (2005). *Turkish: A comprehensive grammar*. London: Routledge
- Hamamcı, Z., & Hamamcı, E. (2014). Form-focused instruction in foreign language teaching. *Journal of Research in Education and Teaching*, 3(1), 37-43
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence, In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected readings* (pp. 269–239), Penguin Books.
- Jourdenais, R., Ota, M., Stauffer, S., Boyson, B., & Doughty, C. (1995). Does textual enhancement promote noticing? A think-aloud protocol analysis, In R. Schmidt (Ed.), *Attention and awareness in foreign language learning*. (pp. 183–216). University of Hawaii Press,
- Karasar, N. (2012). *Scientific research methods*. Nobel Publications.
- Kornfilt, J. (2010). *Turkish*. Routledge.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2002). The grammar of choice, In E. Hinkel & S. Fotos (Eds.), *New perspectives on grammar teaching in second language classrooms* (pp. 103–118). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Long, M. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology, In K. De Bot, R. Ginsberg & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 39–52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/sibil.2.07lon>
- Loschky, L., & Bley-Vroman, R. (1993). Grammar and task-based methodology, In G. Crookes & S. Gass (Eds.), *Tasks and language learning: Integrating theory and practice* (pp. 123–167). Multilingual Matters.
- Özgen, M. (2008). From grammar to use: A proposal of developing a task-based learning material within the framework. *Language Journal*, 141, 36-54.
- Park, E. S. (2004). Constraints of implicit focus on form: Insights from a study of input enhancement. *Studies in Applied Linguistic and TESOL*, 4(2), 1-30 <https://doi.org/10.7916/salt.v4i2.1591>
- Prabhu, N. (1987). *Second language pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rees, G. (2002). *Find the gap-increasing speaking in class*. Retrieved from <https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/article/find-gap-increasing-speaking-class>.
- Richard, J. C., Platt, J., & Weber, H. (1985). *Longman dictionary of applied linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Şahin, M. (2019). *The use of task-based language teaching method in developing speaking skills of learning Turkish as a foreign language [Masters Dissertation]*. Hacettepe University.
- Swan, M. (2005). Legislation by hypothesis: The case of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics*. 26, 276–401.
- Ünal, E. (2013). The applicability of planned focus-on-form to French grammar teaching. *International Periodical for the languages, literature and history of Turkish or Turkic*, 8(10), 685–696.
- Wajnryb, R., & Maley, A. (1990). *Grammar dictation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1990). Grammar, and nonsense, and learning, In D. Moyer (Ed.), *Aspects of language teaching* (pp. 79–98). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Willis, J. (1996). *A Framework for task-based learning*. London: Longman.

İşe Dayalı Dil Öğretiminde Biçime Odaklanma: Türkçe Örneği

Dr. Betül Çetin

Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi - Türkiye

ORCID: 0000-0002-0287-2924

betul.cetin@deu.edu.tr

Özet

Bu çalışmada işe dayalı dil öğretimi ve biçim odaklı hazırlanmış dil öğretim materyallerinin yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretiminde başarı oranına etkisini ortaya koymak amaçlanmaktadır. Eklemeli diller için biçime odaklı işe dayalı dil öğretim malzemeleri tasarlanabilir ve bu malzemeler başarıyı arttırabilir varsayımı ile ortaya çıkan bu çalışmada, malzemelerinin uygulanıp başarı oranının değerlendirilmesi amacıyla biçime odaklı işe dayalı dil öğretim uygulamalarının hedef yapının gelişimine katkısının ne oranda olduğu ortaya konulmaya çalışılmıştır. Bu amaç doğrultusunda B1 düzeyini tamamlamış ve B2 düzeyinde öğrenimlerine devam eden 27 deney ve 27 kontrol grubu olmak üzere anadilleri farklı 54 öğrencinin katıldığı bir uygulama yapılmıştır. {-(y)An} özne ortacının (subject relative clause) öğretimine yönelik olarak uzman görüşü ile şekillendirilen biçim odaklı girdinin zenginleştirilmesi ve bilinçlendirme işleri çerçevesinde geliştirilen materyal deney grubuna uygulanmış ve istatistiksel olarak başarıya etkisi değerlendirilmiştir. Kontrol grubunda biçime yönelik açıklamalar sunum şeklinde gerçekleştirilmiş ve girdinin zenginleştirilmesi ve bilinçlendirme işleri uygulanmamıştır, sadece kitaptaki etkinliklere bağlı kalınmıştır. Deney ve kontrol grubunun öntest ve sontest sonuçları SPSS 24 programı kullanarak bağımsız örneklem T-test ile değerlendirilmiştir. Yapılan sontestte deney grubunun kontrol grubundan daha başarılı olduğu görülmüştür. Bulgular çerçevesinde eklemeli bir dil olan Türkçenin öğretiminde biçim odaklı ve işe dayalı uygulamaların daha başarılı olduğu yorumu yapılmaktadır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: İşe dayalı dil öğretimi, Biçime odaklanma, Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretimi, Dilbilgisi öğretimi



**E-Uluslararası Eğitim
Araştırmaları
Dergisi**

Cilt: 13, No: 5, ss. 151-164

Araştırma Makalesi

Gönderim: 2022-07-06

Kabul: 2022-09-15

Öneri Atfı

Çetin, B. (2022). İşe dayalı dil öğretiminde biçime odaklanma: Türkçe örneği, *E-Uluslararası Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 13(5), 151-164. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.19160/e-ijer.1141487>

Genişletilmiş Özet

Problem: Öğrenme Kuramları ve Dilbilim Kuramları geliştikçe yabancı dil öğretimine yönelik bakış açıları şekillenmiş ve tarihsel süreç içerisinde Dilbilgisi Çeviri Yöntemi, İşitsel-Dilsel Yöntem, Doğrudan Yöntem, İletişimsel Dil Öğretimi, İşe-Dayalı Dil Öğretimi gibi dil öğretiminin nasıl gerçekleştirileceğini betimleyen yöntem ve teknikler ortaya çıkmıştır. Yabancı dil öğrenmenin bilgi işleme süreciyle gerçekleştiğini ortaya koyan çalışmalarla, hedeflenen dilsel birimlere yönelik girdi sunulmasının ve öğrencinin hedef yapı ile ilgili çıktılar oluşturmalarını sağlanmasının önemli olduğu vurgulanmaktadır (Fotos, 2001). Öğrencilerin bireysel farklılıkları ve grubun genel özellikleri dikkate alınarak girdinin öğrenciye sunulmuş biçimi değişiklik gösterebilir. Önemli olan öğrencilerin anlamlı üretimler gerçekleştirmesi için yönlendirilmesidir. Bu sebeple dil öğretimi etkinliklerinde anlam ve işlev ön planda tutulmaktadır. Anlam ve işlev hedeflenirken dilbilgisi öğretiminden kaçınılmayacağı belirtilir (Carter & McCarthy, 2006; Ellis, 2005; Larsen-Freeman, 2002; Long, 1991; Widdowson, 1990). Biçim, anlam ve işlev konularını ele alan Long (1991) *biçim odaklı bilgilendirme* kavramını ortaya koymuş ve anlamdan bağımsız bir şekilde sadece dilbilgisi kurallarının ele alınmasının etkili olmadığını vurgulamıştır. Biçim odaklı dil öğretiminin nasıl yapılabileceği ile ilgili araştırmalarında Ellis (2009) biçimlere rastlantısal olarak odaklanılabileceğini ya da planlı olarak biçim odaklı çalışmalar yapılabileceğini belirtmiştir. Fransızca öğretimi ile ilgili yaptığı çalışmada Ünal (2013) planlı biçime odaklanmada seçilmiş biçimler üzerinde anlamlılık ve işlevsellik temel olarak odaklanma söz konusu olduğunu ve biçimlerin sunumunun zenginleştirilmiş girdilerle sağlanabileceğini belirtmektedir.

İşe Dayalı öğrenme ile amaçlanan, dil öğretimi sırasında yaşanan bazı problemlerin çözülmesidir (Swan, 2005). Söz konusu problemler seçme ve sunma, bilgi tabanı oluşturma, geri çağırma ve açığa çıkarmadır. *Seçme ve sunma* ile ifade edilen öğrencinin ihtiyaç duyduğu biçimleri seçip uygun biçimde onlara sunmaktır. Dil öğretimindeki en büyük problemlerden biri hangi biçimin, ne zaman ve hangi yolla sunulacağıdır. *Bilgi tabanı oluşturma* ile ifade edilen ise uzun süreli belleğe depolanmış eski bilgilerle yeni bilgilerin bütünleşerek uzun süreli belleğe gerektiğinde kullanılacak sistematiğe yerleştirilmesini sağlamaktır. Bu problemin çözülebilmesi için seçilen biçimlerin uygun bağlamlarla yukarıdan aşağı ve aşağıdan yukarı işleme süreçlerinin işletilerek uzun süreli belleğe yerleştirilmesini sağlamak gerekir. *Geri çağırma ve açığa çıkarma* da depolanan dilsel birimlerin gerektiğinde yani uygun bağlamda kullanılabilmesidir. Dil öğretiminde süreç planlanırken bu durumlar göz önünde bulundurulmalı ve sorun olmaktan çıkarılmalıdır. Sürecin uygun planlanması öğretimin verimli ve etkili gerçekleşmesini sağlar. Dilbilgisi öğretiminde, seçilen yol öğrenciler açısından değerlendirildiğinde *etkisel* ya da *tepkisel* olabilir. Biçime tepkisel odaklanma, anlık tepkilere bağlı olarak plansız gerçekleşirken biçime etkisel odaklanma ise planlı bir şekilde gerçekleşir (Park, 2004: 3). Etkisel ya da tepkisel olma özelliklerine göre *odaklanmamış* ve *odaklanmış işler* olarak iki başlık altında ele alınabilecek işlerde belirli bir dilsel birimin öğretilmesi hedefi ile düzenlenmiş işler *odaklanmış iş*, belirli bir yapının öğretimi amacı güdülmeden sadece tema, bağlam ya da durum temelinde oluşturulan işler *odaklanmamış işler* olarak değerlendirilir. Prabhu (1987:46-47), içerdikleri bilişsel etkinliğe göre genel olarak işleri üçe ayırmıştır: (i) bilgi boşluğu etkinliği, (ii) usamlama boşluğu etkinliği, (iii) fikir boşluğu etkinliği. Boşluk terimi, öğrenciler arasında ya da öğretmen ve öğrenci arasında bilinmeyen ve tahmin edilemeyen durumları ifade eder. Bazı öğrenciler bazı bilgilere sahipken bazıları değildir. Sahip oldukları bilgilerin farklılıkları, boşluk olarak adlandırılır (Rees, 2002). *Bilgi boşluğu* etkinlikleri, bilginin transferini içerir (Ellis, 2003: 213). Bilgi boşluğu etkinliklerinde öğrenciler belirlenmiş herhangi bir konuda sahip oldukları bilgileri grup arkadaşlarına, tüm sınıfa ya da öğretmenlerine aktarırlar. Söyledikleri, yazdıkları ya da görsel olarak ortaya koydukları, diğeri/diğerleri tarafından bilinmeyen ya da o an için tahmin edilemeyenlerden oluşur. Öğretmen, bilgi boşluğu etkinliği için boşlukların ve boşluklara bağlı olarak iletişimin kurulmasını sağlayan malzemeler hazırlar. *Uslamlama boşluğu etkinlikleri*, verilen bilgiden yeni çıkarımlar yapma, belirli bir konu hakkında kendi fikirlerini dayanaklarıyla birlikte ortaya koymayı içerir. Genelde var olan bir problemin çözümü ile ilgili akıl yürütmeyi içeren usamlama boşluğu etkinliklerinde söz konusu problemin çözümü için dil kullanmak gerekmektedir. Uslamlama boşluğu etkinlikleri de bilgi boşluğu etkinliklerinde olduğu gibi odaklanmış iş olarak da düzenlenebilir. *Fikir boşluğu etkinlikleri*, verilen durumlar karşısında kişisel bir görüşü, tercih belirlemeyi ve dile getirmeyi içerir. Öğrenciler fikirlerini yazılı ya da sözlü olarak dile getirebilirler. Bu tür etkinlikler gerçekleştirmek için öğrencilere ".... hakkında ne düşünüyorsun?" "....mı daha iyi, yoksa mu daha iyi?" şeklinde sorular sorulabilir ve öğrencilerden düşüncelerini aktarmaları

istenebilir. Diğer bir iş türü Loschky & Bley-Vroman (1993:141)'ün "yapıya dayalı iletişimsel işler olarak" adlandırdıkları işlerdir. Bu işlerde öğretilmesi hedeflenen yapının iş gerçekleştirilirken kullanılması gerekmektedir. Odaklanılan dilsel birim kullanılmadan da işin tamamlanması mümkün olabilir ama işin düzenlenişinde, odak yapının kullanımının doğal olarak gerekmesini sağlayacak bir yol izlenmelidir. *Kavrama işleri* odak olan yapıya dikkat çekmek amacıyla düzenlenir. Bu tür işler bilgi işleme ile edinimin gerçekleştiği varsayımını temel alarak ortaya konulmuştur (Ellis, 2003: 158). Öğrencinin fark etmesi için odak olan dilsel birimin yoğun olarak yer aldığı etkinlikler düzenlenir. Kavrama işlerinde bilinçlendirme işlerinden farklı olarak genellikle örtük bir öğretim gerçekleştirmek amaçlanır. Yapılara dikkat çekilmeye çalışılır, ancak açık sunum gerçekleştirilmez. Etkinlik tamamlandıktan sonra gerekliyse açık sunum yapılır. Görsel ve işitsel malzemelerle öğrencinin dikkatini odak olan yapıya çekmek için yoğun tekrar yapılır. Bu işlerin tekniklerinden biri *girdinin zenginleştirilmesidir*. Odak olan yapının yazılı ya da sözlü metinlerde çok yoğun olarak yer aldığı girdinin zenginleştirilmesi etkinliklerinde, yazılı metinlerde odak olan yapı kalın, italik, altı çizili, farklı renk ya da boyutta öğrenciye sunulabilir. Sonraki aşamada farklı biçimde sunulmuş olan yapı ile ilgili sorular sorularak öğrenci bu yapıyla karşılaştırılır. *Bilinçlendirme işleri*, odaklanılan dilsel birimlere dikkat çekilerek ve öğrenciye odaklanılacak yapıyı buldurma yoluyla gerçekleştirilir.

Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretiminin daha etkili ve verimli hale getirilebilmesi için alanyazında yer alan yöntem ve tekniklerin uygulamalarla denenmesi, bulgular ve sonuçlarla alanda çalışanlara öneriler sunulmasının önemli olduğu düşünülmektedir. Bu çalışma özellikle eklemeli diller için biçime odaklı işe dayalı dil öğretim malzemeleri tasarlanabilir ve bu malzemeler başarıyı arttırabilir varsayımı ile ortaya çıkmıştır. Bu varsayımla biçime odaklı işe dayalı dil öğretim uygulamalarının hedef yapının gelişimine katkısının ne oranda olduğu saptanmaya çalışılmıştır. "İşe dayalı dil öğretimi ve biçim odaklı dil öğretim malzemelerinin uygulandığı deney grubu öğrencilerinin, dil gelişimi düzeyleri ile ilgili öntest ve sontest puanları arasında anlamlı bir farklılık var mıdır?", "İşe dayalı dil öğretimi ve biçim odaklı dil öğretim malzemelerinin uygulandığı deney grubu öğrencileri ile kontrol grubu öğrencilerinin uygulama sonucunda dil gelişimi düzeyleri arasında anlamlı bir farklılık var mıdır?" sorularına yanıt aranmıştır.

Yöntem: Bu çalışmada biçim odaklı ve işe dayalı dil öğretimi uygulamalarının yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretimine uygunluğunu değerlendirmesi amacıyla ve araştırma soruları çerçevesinde Karasar (2012:97) tarafından uygun olduğu belirtilen Öntest-Sontest Kontrol Gruplu Model kullanılmıştır. Öncelikle odaklanmış işlerden *yapıya dayalı üretim işleri* çerçevesinde *biçime odaklı* ders malzemeleri üretilmiş, üretilen ders malzemeleri yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretimi alanında kuramsal ve uygulamalı çalışmalar yapan uzmanlardan görüş alınarak düzenlenmiştir. Malzemenin başarıya etkisini ortaya koyacak öntest ve sontest hazırlanmış ve yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretimi alanında kuramsal ve uygulamalı çalışmalar yapan uzmanlardan görüş alınarak gerekli düzenlemeler yapılmıştır. Uygulamanın etik açıdan uygunluğuna dair yazı (Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Etik Kurul Komisyonunun 22.04.2022 tarihli E-87347630-659-245033 sayılı yazısı) alındıktan sonra 27 katılımcılı deney grubu ve 27 katılımcılı gözlem grubuyla öntest-uygulama-sontest çalışmaları gerçekleştirilmiştir.

Çalışma Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Dil Eğitimi Uygulama ve Araştırma Merkezi DEDAM'da B1 düzeyinde Türkçe öğrenim süreçlerini tamamlamış ve B2 düzeyinde derslerine devam eden 54 öğrenci (27 kontrol-27 gözlem) ile yürütülmüştür. Çalışmaya Rusya, İran, Gana, Gine, Etiyopya, Güney Sudan, Mısır, Kazakistan gibi dünyanın farklı ülkelerden Türkiye'ye ortalama 8 ay önce gelmiş ve haftada 30 ders saati ile uygulama aşamasına kadar 550 saat ders almış öğrenciler katılmıştır. Kontrol ve deney gruplarında farklı anadili konuşucusu öğrenciler rastlantısal olarak dağılmıştır. Çalışmaya katılan kontrol ve deney grubu öğrencilerinin bilgi düzeylerinin aynı olup olmadığını görebilmek amacıyla SPSS 24 programı ile Bağımsız Örneklem T-test yapılmıştır.

Bulgular ve Sonuç: Kontrol ve deney grubu öğrencilerinin bilgi düzeylerinin aynı olup olmadığını görebilmek amacıyla SPSS 24 programı ile yapılan Bağımsız Örneklem T-test sonucuna göre kontrol ve deney gruplarının arasında anlamlı bir fark olmadığı ($p>0,5$) görülmüştür. Bu durum kontrol ve deney gruplarının deney öncesinde eşit bilgi düzeyine sahip olduğunu göstermektedir. Deney grubu ile yapılan uygulamadan sonra gerçekleştirilen sontest sonuçlarına göre kontrol grubunda artış 1.444, deney grubunda ise artış 3.9259'dur. Buna göre deney grubundaki başarı artışının daha fazla olduğu görülmüştür. Kontrol grubunun öntestteki doğru sayısı 12,9'dan son testte 14,3'e, deney grubunun ön

testte doğru sayısı 12,3'ten 16,25'e yükselmiştir. İře dayalı biçim odaklı olarak tasarlanmış materyallerin uygulandığı grupta doğru yanıt sayısı daha fazla artmıştır. Artışın anlamlı olup olmadığına yönelik yapılan teste göre fark ($p < 0,05$)'tir. Bu durumda iki grubun arasındaki fark anlamlıdır. İře dayalı ve biçim odaklı materyallerin uygulandığı grubun biçim odaklı çalışmalar yapılmayan kontrol grubundan daha başarılı olduğu sonucuna ulaşılmıştır. Biçim odaklı etkinliklerin başarıyı arttırmasının sebebi Türkçenin eklemeli bir olmasından kaynaklanabilir.

Biçim odaklı ve işe dayalı öğretimin yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretimi sınıflarında başarı oranına etkisi ile ilgili daha önce yapılmış bir çalışma bulunmamaktadır. Bu sebeple yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretimi ile ilgili bulguların karşılaştırılması yapılamamaktadır. Ancak Jourdenais vd. (1995), yabancı dil olarak İspanyolca öğrenenler ile yaptığı çalışmasında zenginleştirilmiş girdi sunulmuş deney grubunun zenginleştirilmiş girdi ile karşılaşmayan kontrol grubu öğrencilerden hedef yapıyı daha fazla kullandıklarını ortaya koymuştur. Bunun yanında Bandar&Gorjian (2017) yaptıkları çalışmada İranlı İngilizce öğrenen öğrencilerde biçim odaklı çalışmaların başarıyı arttırdığını belirtmektedir. Jourdenais (1995) ve Bandar&Gorjian (2017) tarafından yapılan çalışmaların sonuçları bu çalışmanın bulguları ile paralellik göstermektedir.

Öneriler: Bu çalışma 54 katılımcı ile gerçekleştirilmiştir. Daha fazla sayıda katılımcı ile benzer çalışmalar yapmak önemlidir. Bu çalışmaya katılan öğrencilerin anadilleri farklıdır ve anadili bir değişken olarak ele alınmamıştır. Anadilleri aynı olan ya da benzer tipolojik özellikler gösteren öğrencilerle işe dayalı ve biçim odaklı malzemeler kullanılarak çalışmalar yapılmasının da alana katkı sağlayacağı düşünülmektedir.