# The effects of interactive teaching strategies on speaking skills of students learning Turkish as a second language

Tuncay Türkben [a] *

*[a] Aksaray University, Aksaray, Turkey*

## Abstract

One of the most effective teaching ways that can be used in improving speaking skills is interactive teaching strategy. Interactive teaching is a strategy that supports self-learning of student during the process as well as their development by engaging them with their peers. Students' active engagement in the in-class communication process for effective learning. This study focused on the effects of interactive teaching strategy on the improvement of speaking skills of students learning Turkish as a second language. A pre- and post-test based experimental design was employed in this study with a control and an experiment group. The participants of the study consist of C1 level students who are enrolled in the Aksaray University Turkish Education Research Center. The study was conducted during the fall semester of 2018-2019 academic year during a period of 9 weeks. Lessons were delivered in alignment with the interactive teaching strategy in the experimental group while traditional instruction methods were used in the control group. Speaking skills of students were measured with "Speaking Skills Evaluation Scale" and "Sources of Speaking Anxiety Scale." The data gathered were digitized and analyzed by using SPSS 20. software. By using the general level of students' speaking skills in the experiment and control groups, and control variable of pre-test scores of sub-dimensions and anxiety scores, an ANCOVA was completed to identify whether the mean post-test scores showed significant differences between the groups. The results showed that interactive teaching strategy improved the speaking skills of students learning Turkish as a second language.

*Keywords:* Teaching Turkish as a second language; speech training; speaking skills; interactive teaching strategy

## 1. Introduction

Humans need to communicate with the purposes of conveying feelings and thoughts, desires, meeting their needs, and exchanging information in every aspect of their lives. The main purpose of foreign language education just as in native language education is to improve an individual's comprehension and speaking skills in the target language in order to be able to communicate (Cetin, 2017, p. 362). One

---

* Tuncay Türkben. Tel.: +0-382-288-3442

 *E-mail address*: tuncayturkben57@gmail.com

of the skills an individual learning Turkish as a second language uses the most is speaking in order to continue their lives.

Speaking is an important language skill in terms of all learning fields and expressing self (Akyol, 2014, p. 23). Speaking requires skills such as choosing the right words, structuring meaningful syntax, creating prosodic structure, and articulating according to phonetic characteristics (Cetin, 2017, p. 364). There are multiple descriptions in the literature emphasizing the skills required by the speaking learning field. Speaking is defined as, "conveying our feelings and thoughts, things we see and live through words" (Ozdemir, 2016, p. 11); as "the process starting in the brain and ending with the expression of thoughts through words" (Gunes, 2014a, p. 72); "a skill, talent, habit, and art consisting of several organs in our bodies starting with brain working together in harmony" (Yalcin, 2018, p. 216); or as "a complex and interactive communication behavior with grammatical, emotional, meaningful and more generally cognitive and social dimensions (Dohen, Schwartz, & Baily, 2010, p. 477). Based on these definitions, speaking can be defined as a process that starts with designing in the brain and ending with expressing thoughts through articulation.

The most important purpose in learning a foreign language is to communicate in the target language through using comprehension and speaking skills. Compared to other language skills, speaking is emphasized as the important component in achieving the purpose of communication (Ari, 2018; Demirel, 2016; Gocer, 2015; Isisag and Demirel, 2010; Tum, 2014). Speaking skills need to be improved with different methods that are student-centered and interactive. Speaking is considered as a student-centered activity as it is organized as a language production activity. Therefore, it entails a process consisting of cognitive activities such as organizing information, pronunciation, speaking fluently and correcting mistakes. In this process, teaching strategies and methods should be selected in alignment with the program, content, and activity (Ari, 2018, p. 281-286).

In teaching Turkish as a second language, methods and techniques to be used for improving speaking skills should provide opportunities for students to communicate and interact with each other. Considering the characteristics of speaking, communicative methods stand out among different language teaching methods. Communicative methods aim for students to have communication competency outside the classroom in addition to be able to use grammar structures (Cetin, 2017, p. 375). Thus, interactive teaching strategy is one of the most effective ways in improving speaking skills in teaching Turkish both as a native and a second language.

Being able to speak the language fluently depends on the design of classrooms depending on learner autonomy. In these environments, interactive learning activities that provide opportunities for improvement are of high importance (Gocer, 2017, p.397). Several researchers emphasize that interaction is important for communication (Acıkgoz, 2011; Brown, 2001; Paulson, 1992). In constructivism and particularly in social constructivism, social interactions are emphasized frequently. The interactive teaching strategy developed based on this concept is a strategy that responds to discussion, and sharing. Students learn through their teachers and peers, improve their language, cognitive, and social skills, organize their minds and create logical thoughts. In this process, in addition to active self-learning, students support their friends' developments by interacting with them. Age and self-evaluation are important in this process. Interactive teaching strategy includes several methods and techniques such as learning based on questioning, active learning, collaborative learning, project-based learning, brain-based learning, learning through problem solving, brainstorming, discussion, and laboratory work (Acıkgoz, 2011; Cetin, 2017; Cintas Yildiz, 2015; Gunes, 2014b; Michael, 2006).

In recent years, many researchers draw attention to the importance of collaboration for interaction and to the necessity of collaborative learning. Collaborative learning environment significantly increases

interaction (Gunes, 2014b, p. 76). The interactions between students in collaborative learning is intense and long-term (Borich, 2017, p. 357).

Through collaborative learning, frequently used method in interactive learning strategy, learners' social skills and talents improve. During the process of speaking skills acquisition, events suitable for collaboration would help learners of Turkish as a second language to express their thoughts and emotions in a group without the fear of making a mistake. Also, collaboration helps students to motivate each other which would result in improving self-confidence and increasing their success (Cetin, 2017, p. 376-377).

In interactive classroom environments, students' thoughts and feelings are transferred to the learning environment through methods that allow active learning and teaching such as creative drama, role-playing, problem solving, discussion and group work, students would engage in learning more motivated. Students would have the opportunity to move freely as there is not a certain seating arrangement in the learning environment, and to communicate face-to-face by including all their emotions in the process (Aykac, 2016, p. 132). Active learning has become one of the promising fields of modern education with all the characteristics it has (Yakovleva & Yakovlev, 2014, p. 79). As interaction is one of the key components of a successful educational process, the multi-dimensional nature of an interactive and communicative classroom is suitable for students with different learning styles (Agbatogun, 2014, p. 257).

Findings obtained from the literature show that studies conducted in alignment with interactive teaching strategy are effective in the processes of learning and teaching (Aytan, 2011; Yildiz, 2014; Diveharan and Atputhasamy, 2002; Guneyli, 2007; Espino, 1999; Johnson, Johnson and Stanne, 2000; Karabay, 2005; Kardas, 2013; Kirbas, 2010; Koc, 2007; Robison, 2006; Sallabas, 2011; Sen, 2018; Yildirim, 2010; Yonez, 2012). The purpose of the current study is to improve speaking skills of students who learn Turkish as a second language. Interaction has an important place in communicative language teaching (Choudhury, 2005, p. 77). Interactive teaching strategy is thought to be effective in improving speaking skills as it includes several effective learning and teaching methods, is student-centered, and provides effective communication.

Learning a foreign language can be considered as a process that requires intensive work as learning a language entails mastering the four fundamental skills of the target language. The communication need observed in individuals aiming to learn a foreign language is frequently met through speaking skills among others. This leads language learners to prioritize learning of speaking skills. The emphasis put on speaking skills by language learners caused several issues to emerge and one of these issues is the speaking anxiety. It is thought that speaking anxiety increases due to the emphasis put on speaking skills and the lack of and challenging exercises during the process of acquisition as speaking is instantaneous and involves different processes such as thinking, organizing, ordering, and articulating with correct words. The reason for issues to arise is the requirement of having these processes in order (Ozdemir, 2013, p. 5). According to Pong (2010, p. 78), the effort to use a language in accordance with its rules causes individuals to feel incompetent in correct pronunciation which causes additional anxiety in students. In fact, studies focusing on speaking anxiety show that speaking anxiety is associated with speaking tendency and that the reaction towards speaking has negative effects on the quality and success of speaking. This causes in students the avoidance of speaking, and not willing to speak (Melanlioglu and Demir, 2013, p. 392). Additionally, as students would feel freer in an interactive learning environment, their levels of anxiety would decrease, and anxiety would not be an obstacle in learning anymore.

It is certain that important steps have been taken in teaching Turkish as a second language with modern methods. However, the issues related to teaching materials in the field continue and textbooks

are still the most important material in this field. Saglik (2018) conducted a study to identify whether the speaking skills included in textbooks of Turkish for foreigners are consistent with the competency measures of European Language Development file. In the study, they found that the speaking skills activities do not contribute sufficiently towards academic life. In the literature, there are no empirical studies found focusing on the effects of interactive teaching strategy on speaking skills in teaching Turkish as a second language. In this study aiming to improve speaking skills of students learning Turkish as a second language, the textbook activities were structured around the interactive teaching strategy, the classroom environment was designed to encourage students to interact and a learning and teaching environment in which students are active throughout the process was created. This study will contribute to the body of knowledge in the field.

### 1.1. Purpose of the Study

This study aims to investigate the effects of the teaching program prepared in alignment with the interactive teaching strategy on the speaking skills of C1 level student learning Turkish as a second language. The research question guiding this study is; "Does the interactive teaching strategy have an effect on speaking skills in teaching Turkish as a second language?" In alignment with the purpose of the study, following hypotheses were developed:

1. In teaching Turkish as a second language, when the total pre-test scores of students in the experiment group in which the interactive teaching strategy is implemented, and students in the control group in which traditional teaching methods are implented, in the "Speaking Skills Evaluation Scale" are controlled for, there is a significant difference between the post-test scores in the experiment group.

2. In teaching Turkish as a second language, when the total pre-test scores of students in the experiment group in which the interactive teaching strategy is implemented, and students in the control group in which traditional teaching methods are implented, in *introduction to speech* in "Speaking Skills Evaluation Scale" are controlled for, there is a significant difference between the post-test scores in the experiment group.

3. In teaching Turkish as a second language, when the total pre-test scores of students in the experiment group in which the interactive teaching strategy is implemented, and students in the control group in which traditional teaching methods are implented, in *development of speaking* in "Speaking Skills Evaluation Scale" are controlled for, there is a significant difference between the post-test scores in the experiment group.

4. In teaching Turkish as a second language, when the total pre-test scores of students in the experiment group in which the interactive teaching strategy is implemented, and students in the control group in which traditional teaching methods are implented, in *the results of speaking* in "Speaking Skills Evaluation Scale" are controlled for, there is a significant difference between the post-test scores in the experiment group.

5. In teaching Turkish as a second language, when the total pre-test scores of students in the experiment group in which the interactive teaching strategy is implemented, and students in the control group in which traditional teaching methods are implented, in *body language* in "Speaking Skills Evaluation Scale" are controlled for, there is a significant difference between the post-test scores in the experiment group.

6. In teaching Turkish as a second language, when the total pre-test scores of students in the experiment group in which the interactive teaching strategy is implemented, and students in the control group in which traditional teaching methods are implented, in *being able to apply external structure components of language* in "Speaking Skills Evaluation Scale" are controlled for, there is a significant difference between the post-test scores in the experiment group.

7.  In teaching Turkish as a second language, when the total pre-test scores of students in the experiment group in which the interactive teaching strategy is implemented, and students in the control group in which traditional teaching methods are implented, in the "Sources of Speaking Anxiety Scale" are controlled for, there is a significant difference between the post-test scores in the experiment group.

## 2. Method

### 2.1. Research Design

In this study, the effects of teaching done through interactive teaching strategy and traditional teaching method in teaching Turkish as a second language on the speaking skills of C1 level students were tested. The research design employs a pre- and post-test control group model to identify the effect of teaching structured according to the interactive teaching strategy on the speaking skills of students.

The test model is structured with dependent (result, problem), independent (tested assumption), and control (potential causes that are not tested)  and the data predicted by the measure criteria identified in the scientific method are produced and evaluated under the control of the researcher. The test is completed under the control of the researcher either in artificial or natural environments. The purpose of the research with experimental models are expressed through hypotheses. Such studies always include comparisons. In this mode, there are two groups randomly assigned. In both groups, pre- and post-experiment measurements are taken (Karasar, 2017). Due to random assignment, this design is strong in terms of internal validity (Christensen, Johnson, & Turner, 2015, p. 269). The symbolic view of the research is shown in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Classical Test Model

| Group | Measurement$_1$ | Intervention | Measurement$_2$ |
|---|---|---|---|
| Control | Pre-$_1$ | – | Post-$_1$ |
| Experiment | Pre-$_2$ | Interactive Teaching Strategy | Post-$_2$ |

*Pre: Pre-test, Post-: Post-test*

As stated in Table 1, activities are carried out in line with the interactive teaching strategy in the experimental group, while traditional teaching methods are used in the control group.

### 2.2. Participants

The participants consisted of 50 international and advanced level (C1) students who learn Turkish at the Aksaray University Turkish Education Application and Research Center. One class was assigned randomly as the experiment group (24 students) and the other class as the control group (26 students). The distribution of participants based on gender is 44% female and 56% male. The proportion of those from the Asian continent is 96%, with 4% from the African continent. When the distribution is examined according to age groups, the proportion of people aged 18-21 is 60%, the proportion of people aged 22-25 is 26%, and the proportion of people aged 26-29 is 14%. 10% of the participants are in Turkey for 1 month, 46% are in Turkey for 3 months, 12% are in Turkey for 6 months, 10% are in Turkey for 1 year, and 22% are in Turkey for more than 1 year. When the distribution is examined according to their mother tongue, they are in Turkmen with a maximum of 60%, followed by Arabic with 22%. Azerbaijani is 6%, Persian and Somali are 4%, and Uzbek and

Russian are 2%. According to their countries, 64% of the participants were Turkmenistan, 10% were Syria, 6% were Azerbaijan, 4% were Djibouti, Palestine, Iraq and Syria and 2% were Afghanistan, Iran, Qatar and Yemen.

## 2.3. *Data Collection*

Two data collection instruments were used in the study. In order to identify the level of speaking skills of students, contents were determined by taking the competency levels identified by the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR, 2018) into consideration. The identified topics were presented to ten experts in the field of Turkish education and to two experts in the field of scale evaluations. The experts were asked to evaluate the topics between 1 (not appropriate) and 5 (very appropriate). The topics that received high scores from the experts were selected and the rest were eliminated. Thus, the validity of speaking topics was established. Due to the possibility of memorization of topics in prepared speeches, topics were presented before the class time and speeches were done without preparation. The topics asked in the pre-tests were not used in the post-tests. Speeches were audio recorded with the consent of students.

In order to evaluate the student speeches, the "Speaking Skills Evaluation Scale" developed by Sallabas (2011) was used. In developing the scale, first the scales in the literature were reviewed. The scale consists of 28 items with the sections of "Introduction to Speech, Body of the Speech, Conclusion of the Speech, Body Language and Being Able to Apply the External Structure Components." In the scale, there were three scores with 3 being "yes", 2 being "partially" and 1 being "no." Three experts in the field including the author of this article evaluated and scored the student speeches. The scores obtained were analyzed by using SPSS software. In statistical procedures, to identify the scorer reliability, in-class correlation coefficient was calculated and found to be .863. The analysis showed that the relationship between scorers was high. In the current study, this evaluation scale was used to evaluate the student speeches in pre- and post-test by three experts in the field.

To measure speaking anxiety of students, the "Sources of Speaking Anxiety Scale" developed by Ozdemir (2013) was used. As a result of the pilot study, expert feedback and analyses, the survey instrument consisted of 4 dimensions and 17 items. The factor analysis completed on the scale resulted in 4 factors. 5 items constituting the first factor were grouped under the "Individual Characteristics" section, 4 items constituting the second factor were grouped under "Prejudgment", 5 items constituting the third factor were grouped under "Belief of Helplessness", and 3 items constituting the fourth factor were grouped under "Perspective" categories. The internal consistency coefficient of Cronbach Alpha for these factors are; 0.80 for the 1st factor, 0.71 for the 2nd factor, 0.59 for the 3rd factor, and 0.57 for the fourth factor while 0.80 for the scale overall. Therefore, each factor in the scale was at an acceptable level. A reliability analysis was completed, and a Cronbach Alpha coefficient was calculated to identify the reliability levels of the scales used in the study.

**Table 2.** Results of the Reliability Analysis of Scales Used in the Study

|  | Cronbach Alpha |
| --- | --- |
| Sources of Speaking Anxiety Scale | 0.912 |
| Speaking Skills Evaluation Scale | 0.932 |
| *Introduction of Speech* | 0.887 |
| *Body of Speech* | 0.725 |
| *Conclusion of Speech* | 0.899 |
| *Body Language* | 0.756 |
| *Being Able to Apply the External Structure Components of Language* | 0.923 |

## 2.4. *Data Analysis*

In the study, the speaking skills scores of students in the control and experiment groups were measured with pre- and post-tests. In repeated measures, An ANCOVA analysis was completed to find out whether post-test means show significant difference between the groups by taking speaking skills of students in control and experiment groups at a general level and the pre-test of dimensions and anxiety scores as the control variable. Analyses were completed at the 95% confidence level with using SPSS 20 software.

## 2.5. *Experimental Process*

This study aimed to improve the speaking skills of students learning Turkish as a second language through interactive teaching strategy. The study was conducted 7 hours per week for a period of 7 weeks in the 2018-2019 academic year. A pre-test and a post-test were performed before and after the intervention. The research was completed in 9 weeks. A literature search was performed to prepare a conceptual framework before the intervention. The activities in textbooks for C1 level Turkish Education issued by Yunus Emre Institute were structured around interactive teaching strategy. Activities prepared for speaking outcomes were centered around active learning and collaborative-based method and techniques. Class materials, classroom environment and design were aligned with the methods and techniques to be used to provide a safe space for students to share their thoughts and feelings in a group setting without being concerned about making mistakes. Methods such as conceptual maps, question & answer, marketplace, comics, butter-bread, fishbone, speaking circle, aquarium, snowball, buzz, small group discussion that contribute to interactive learning were used. Additionally, creative drama method which contributes to individuals' personal development and learning process was used actively to improve speaking skills. Textbook activities were re-structured around methods to improve speaking skills and engaging students actively such as role playing, dramatization, gossip circle, and role card. At certain times, students who are native Turkish speakers were included in these activities with the purpose of improving international students' practical speaking skills. In the control group, the lessons were delivered with traditional methods.

## 3. Results

In this section, the findings obtained by analyzing the data collected for the purpose of testing the tests are given.

### 3.1. *First Research Sub-Question*

The first research question was: "*In teaching Turkish as a second language, when the total pre-test scores of students in the experiment group in which the interactive teaching strategy is implemented, and students in the control group in which traditional teaching methods are implented, in the "Speaking Skills Evaluation Scale" are controlled for, there is a significant difference between the post-test scores in the experiment group.*" In testing this sub-question, a one-way covariance analysis (ANCOVA) was completed.

The mean scores of pre- and post-tests of students in "Speaking Skills Evaluation Scale" are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3.** Mean Scores of Pre- and Post-tests of Students in "Speaking Skills Evaluation Scale"

|  | Pre-Test | | Post-Test | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | Control | Experiment | Control | Experiment |
| Introduction to Speech | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.6 | 5.7 |
| Body of Speech | 11.6 | 10.9 | 11.9 | 16.2 |
| Conclusion of Speech | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.5 | 5.6 |
| Body Language | 12.4 | 12.3 | 12.8 | 16.2 |
| Being Able to Apply the External Structure Components of Language | 21.8 | 20.0 | 22.8 | 31.6 |
| **Speaking Skills Evaluation (general)** | **52.0** | **49.6** | **54.7** | **75.3** |

According to the results shown in table 3, the mean test scores of students in the experiment group was 49.6 before the intervention while it increased to 75.3 after the experiment. The mean test scores of students in the control group was 52.0 before the intervention while it increased to 54.7 after the experiment. According to the results of the speaking skills evaluation, a significant increase in the success of experiment group students was seen while the increase in the control group was very low.

An ANCOVA was completed in repeated measurements to identify if there is a significant difference in pre-test mean scores between the groups when the pre-test of speaking skills was used as a control variable.

**Table 4.** Mean Scores and Standard Deviation values of Post-Tests in Speaking Skills Evaluation

| **Group** | **Mean** | **Std. Deviation** | **N** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Control | 54.7 | 6.3 | 26 |
| Experiment | 75.3 | 6.0 | 24 |
| Total | 64.6 | 12.1 | 50 |

The mean score of the control group is 54.7 while 75.3 for the experiment group. It was found that the mean scores of the students in the experiment group were significantly higher than the students in the experiment group.

A Levene's Test for equality of variances was completed and homogeneity of variance was supported ($p > 0.05$).

**Table 5.** Results of the Levene's Test for Equality of Variances

| F | sd1 | sd2 | P |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1.600 | 1 | 48 | 0.212 |

An ANCOVA was completed in repeated measurements to identify if there is a significant difference in post-test mean scores between the groups when the pre-test of speaking skills was used as a control variable. The results are presented in Table 6.

**Table 6.** ANCOVA Results for the Post-Test Scores in the Speaking Skills Evaluation Scale

| Source | Type II Sum of Squares | sd | Mean Square | F | p | Partial Eta Square |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Corrected Model | 5670.957[a] | 2 | 2835.5 | 90.8 | 0.000 | 0.794 |
| Interaction | 1115.2 | 1 | 1115.2 | 35.7 | 0.000 | 0.432 |
| Speaking Skills Evaluation (Pre-test) | 355.5 | 1 | 355.5 | 11.4 | 0.001 | 0.195 |
| **Group** | **5656.0** | **1** | **5656.0** | **181.2** | **0.000** | **0.794** |
| Error | 1467.4 | 47 | 31.2 | | | |
| Total | 215538.0 | 50 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 7138.3 | 49 | | | | |

*p<0,05

The results in table 6 show that there is a significant difference in speaking skills evaluation between the groups in post-test comparison and the mean scores for the experiment group is significantly higher than the control group (F(1-49)=181.2, p= .000). This finding can be interpreted as the speaking skills of students changed due to the interactive teaching strategy without making a distinction between the groups. The analysis results showed that the speaking success scores of students in both groups had significant differences before the intervention. Thus, the common effects of being in different groups (control and experiment) and the factors of repeated measures were found to be significant. The results indicate that implementation of interactive teaching strategy is more effective than traditional education methods in teaching Turkish as a second language.

### 3.2. Second Research Sub-Question

The second sub-question was: "*In teaching Turkish as a second language, when the total pre-test scores of students in the experiment group in which the interactive teaching strategy is implemented, and students in the control group in which traditional teaching methods are implented, in introduction to speech in "Speaking Skills Evaluation Scale" are controlled for, there is a significant difference between the post-test scores in the experiment group.*" An ANCOVA test was completed to identify if there is a significant difference between the groups in post-test mean scores when the pre-test of introduction of speech is used as the control variable.

**Table 7.** Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for the Post-Test in the Introduction to Speech Dimension

| Group | Mean | Std. Deviation | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| Control | 3.6 | 1,0 | 26 |
| Experiment | 5.7 | 0,6 | 24 |
| Total | 4.6 | 1,4 | 50 |

According to the results presented in table 7, the post-test mean scores of the control group is 3.6 while the mean score is 5.7 for the experiment group. The results of the Levene's test for equality of variances are presented in Table 8.

**Table 8.** Levene's Test for Equality of Variances

| F | sd1 | sd2 | p |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0.007 | 1 | 48 | 0.932 |

A Levene's Test for equality of variances was completed and homogeneity of variance was supported (p>0.05).

**Tablo 9.** ANCOVA Results for the Post-test Scores of Introduction to Speech Dimension

| Source | Type II Square Sum | Sd | Mean Square | F | p | Partial Eta Square |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Corrected Model | 69,285[a] | 2 | 34,6 | 78,6 | 0,000 | 0,770 |
| Interaction | 27,1 | 1 | 27,1 | 61,5 | 0,000 | 0,567 |
| Introduction of Speech (Pre-Test) | 12,6 | 1 | 12,6 | 28,6 | 0,000 | 0,378 |
| **Group** | **53,6** | **1** | **53,6** | **121,5** | **0,000** | **0,721** |
| Error | 20,7 | 47 | 0,4 | | | |
| Total | 1148,0 | 50 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 90,0 | 49 | | | | |

*p<0,05

According to the results of post-test comparison of the groups shown in table 9, there is a significant difference in introduction to speech and the mean scores of the experiment group are higher than the control group means (F (1,49) = 121.5, p= .000). This finding indicates that scores for "introduction of speech" for students in both groups are different regardless of measurement (pre- and post-intervention). This finding shows that when there is no distinction of groups (experiment and control), students' success in "introduction of speech" change due to the interactive teaching strategy. Thus, the interactive teaching strategy in teaching Turkish as a second language is an important factor in improving students' "introduction of speech" skills compared to traditional methods.

### 3.3. Third Research Sub-Question

The question was stated as: "*In teaching Turkish as a second language, when the total pre-test scores of students in the experiment group in which the interactive teaching strategy is implemented, and students in the control group in which traditional teaching methods are implemented, in development of speaking in "Speaking Skills Evaluation Scale" are controlled for, there is a significant difference between the post-test scores in the experiment group*." An ANCOVA test was completed to identify if there is a significant difference between the groups in post-test mean scores when the pre-test for "body of speech" is used as the control variable.

**Table 10.** Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Post-Test in "Body of Speech"

| Group | Mean | Std. Deviation | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| Control | 11,9 | 1,5 | 26 |
| Experiment | 16,2 | 1,6 | 24 |
| Total | 14,0 | 2,7 | 50 |

The results presented in table 10 show that the mean score of the control group is 11.9 while it is 16.2 for the experiment group in "body of speech." The results indicate a significant increase in success for the experiment group while the increase for the control group was lower.

A Levene's Test for equality of variances was completed and homogeneity of variance was supported (p>0.05).

**Table 11.** Results of the Levene's Test fo Equality of Variances

| F | sd1 | sd2 | p |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4,573 | 1 | 48 | 0,038 |

To identify whether the post-test mean scores between the groups show a significant difference, an ANCOVA test was completed and the results are presented in Table 12.

**Table 12.** ANCOVA Results for the Post-Test Scores in the "Body of Speech" Dimension

| Source | Type II Sum of Square | Sd | Mean Square | F | p | Partial Eta Square |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Corrected Model | 247.842[a] | 2 | 123.9 | 57.6 | 0.000 | 0.710 |
| Interaction | 54.4 | 1 | 54.4 | 25.3 | 0.000 | 0.350 |
| Introduction of Speech (Pre-Test) | 18.7 | 1 | 18.7 | 8.7 | 0.005 | 0.156 |
| **Group** | **247.5** | **1** | **247.5** | **115.0** | **0.000** | **0.710** |
| Error | 101.1 | 47 | 2.2 | | | |
| Total | 10121.0 | 50 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 349.0 | 49 | | | | |

*p<0,05

In the post-test comparison, there is a significant difference between the groups in the body of speech. The means of the experiment group is significantly higher than the means of the control group (F (1,49) = 115.0, p= .000). This finding shows that when there is no distinction of groups (experiment and control), students' success on the "body of speech" changes due to interactive teaching strategy. In other words, this indicates that interactive teaching strategy is more effective than traditional methods in teaching Turkish as a second language.

### 3.4. Fourth Research Sub-Question

This sub-question was stated as; "*In teaching Turkish as a second language, when the total pre-test scores of students in the experiment group in which the interactive teaching strategy is implemented, and students in the control group in which traditional teaching methods are implemented, in the results of speaking in "Speaking Skills Evaluation Scale" are controlled for, there is a significant difference between the post-test scores in the experiment group.*" An ANCOVA test was completed to identify if there is a significant difference between the groups in post-test mean scores when the pre-test for "conclusion of speech" is used as the control variable.

The means and standard deviations of post-test scores in the "conclusion of speech" are presented in Table 13.

**Table 13.** Results for the Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Post-Test in the Dimension of Conclusion of Speech

| Group | Mean | Std. Deviation | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| Control | 3.5 | 0.9 | 26 |
| Experiment | 5.6 | 0.6 | 24 |
| Total | 4.5 | 1.3 | 50 |

The post-test mean score of the control group after the intervention was 3.5 while the mean score for the experiment group was 5.6. The post-test mean scores of the experiment group students are significantly higher than those in the control group. A Levene's Test for equality of variances was completed and homogeneity of variance was supported (p>0.05).

**Table 14.** The Results of the Levene's Test for Equality of Variances

| F | sd1 | sd2 | p |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1.595 | 1 | 48 | 0.213 |

**Table 15.** ANCOVA results for the Post-Test Scores in the "Conclusion of Speech" Dimension

| Source | Type II Sum of Squares | Sd | Mean Square | F | p | Partial Eta Square |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Corrected Model | 55.847[a] | 2 | 27.9 | 53.3 | 0.000 | 0.694 |
| Interaction | 51.1 | 1 | 51.1 | 97.5 | 0.000 | 0.675 |
| Conclusion of Speech (Pre-Test) | 3.7 | 1 | 3.7 | 7.0 | 0.011 | 0.129 |
| **Group** | **51.4** | **1** | **51.4** | **98.1** | **0.000** | **0.676** |
| Error | 24.6 | 47 | 0.5 | | | |
| Total | 1102.0 | 50 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 80.5 | 49 | | | | |

*p<0.05

There is a significant difference between the groups in post-test scores for conclusion of the speech. The means of the experiment group is significantly higher than the control group (F(1,49)= 98.1, p= .000). This finding indicates that the students' success in the "conclusion of the speech" changes due to the interactive teaching strategy. Thus, interactive teaching strategy is an important factor in increasing the success of students in the 'conclusion of speech.' In other words, the interactive teaching strategy was more effective than traditional teaching in improving the speaking skills of students learning Turkish as a second language.

### 3.5. Fifth Research Sub-Question

This sub-question was stated as "*In teaching Turkish as a second language, when the total pre-test scores of students in the experiment group in which the interactive teaching strategy is implemented, and students in the control group in which traditional teaching methods are implemented, in body language in "Speaking Skills Evaluation Scale" are controlled for, there is a significant difference between the post-test scores in the experiment group.*" An ANCOVA test was completed to identify

if there is a significant difference between the groups in post-test mean scores when the pre-test for "body language" is used as the control variable.

**Table 16.** Post-Test Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Body Language

| Group | Mean | Std. Deviation | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| Control | 12.8 | 1.7 | 26 |
| Experiment | 16.2 | 2.1 | 24 |
| Total | 14.4 | 2.5 | 50 |

The post-test mean score of the control group after the intervention was 12.8 while this score was 16.2 for the experiment group. The post-test mean scores of the experiment group was significantly higher than the control group.

A Levene's Test for equality of variances was completed and homogeneity of variance was supported (p>0.05).

**Table 17.** Results of the Levene's Test for the Equality of Variances

| F | sd1 | sd2 | p |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4.359 | 1 | 48 | 0.052 |

The results for ANCOVA for post-test comparison of groups in body language are presented in Table 18.

**Table 18.** ANCOVA Results of the Post-test Scores in Body Language Dimension

| Source | Type II Sum of Squares | sd | Mean Square | F | p | Partial Eta Square |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Corrected Model | 158.747[a] | 2 | 79.4 | 24.9 | 0.000 | 0.515 |
| Interaction | 45.0 | 1 | 45.0 | 14.1 | 0.000 | 0.231 |
| Body Language (Pre-Test) | 21.1 | 1 | 21.1 | 6.6 | 0.013 | 0.124 |
| **Group** | **141.1** | **1** | **141.1** | **44.3** | **0.000** | **0.485** |
| Error | 149.6 | 47 | 3.2 | | | |
| Total | 10734.0 | 50 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 308.3 | 49 | | | | |

*p<0,05

There is a significant difference between the groups in body language in the post-test comparison and the mean score of the experiment group is higher than the control group mean (F (1,49) = 44.3, p= .000). This finding shows that when there is no group distinction (experiment and control), students' success in 'body language' change due to the interactive teaching strategy. In other words, the differences in the scores of students in 'body language' stem from the interactive teaching strategy. This indicates that the interactive teaching strategy is an important factor in improving student success in 'body language.'

### 3.6. The Sixth Research Sub-Question

The sixth research question was stated as: "*In teaching Turkish as a second language, when the total pre-test scores of students in the experiment group in which the interactive teaching strategy is implemented, and students in the control group in which traditional teaching methods are implemented, in being able to apply external structure components of language in "Speaking Skills Evaluation Scale" are controlled for, there is a significant difference between the post-test scores in the experiment group.*" An ANCOVA test was completed to identify if there is a significant difference between the groups in post-test mean scores when the pre-test for "being able to apply external structure components of a language" is used as the control variable.

The mean scores and standard deviations for the post-scores in "being able to apply external structure components of a language" are presented in Table 19.

**Table 19.** Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for the Post-Scores in "Being Able to Apply External Structure Components of a Language"

| Group | Mean | Std. Deviation | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| Control | 22,8 | 3,1 | 26 |
| Experiment | 31,6 | 2,6 | 24 |
| Total | 27,0 | 5,3 | 50 |

Following the intervention, the post-test scores means of the control group was found to be 22.8 while this score was 31.6 for the experiment group. The mean score of the experiment group is significantly higher than the control group.

A Levene's Test for equality of variances was completed and homogeneity of variance was supported (p>0.05).

**Table 20.** Results of the Levene's Test for the Equality of Variances

| F | sd1 | sd2 | p |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0.235 | 1 | 48 | 0.630 |

The results for the ANCOVA to identify whether the post-test scores of students in the experiment group were significantly different in "being able to apply external structure components of a language" are presented in Table 21.

**Table 21.** ANCOVA Results of the Post-Test Scores in "Being Able to Apply External Structure Components of a Language"

| Source | Type II Sum of Squares | sd | Mean Square | F | p | Partial Eta Square |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Corrected Model | 1084.490[a] | 2 | 542.2 | 86.5 | 0.000 | 0.786 |
| Interaction | 407.4 | 1 | 407.4 | 65.0 | 0.000 | 0.580 |
| Being Able to Apply External Structure Components of a Language (Pre-Test) | 105.8 | 1 | 105.8 | 16.9 | 0.000 | 0.264 |
| **Group** | **1080.8** | **1** | **1080.8** | **172.5** | **0.000** | **0.786** |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Error | 294.5 | 47 | 6.3 |
| Total | 37883.0 | 50 | |
| Corrected Total | 1379.0 | 49 | |

*p<0,05

In the post-test comparison, there is a significant difference in "being able to apply external structure components of a language" with the mean score of the experiment group being significantly higher than the control group (F (1,49) = 172.5, p= .000). When there is no group distinction (experiment and control), this finding shows that the student success in being able to apply external structure components of a language changes due to the interactive teaching strategy. This indicates that the interactive teaching strategy is an important factor in improving student success compared to the traditional method.

### 3.7. The Seventh Research Sub-Question

This question was stated as; "*In teaching Turkish as a second language, when the total pre-test scores of students in the experiment group in which the interactive teaching strategy is implemented, and students in the control group in which traditional teaching methods are implented, in the "Sources of Speaking Anxiety Scale" are controlled for, there is a significant difference between the post-test scores in the experiment group.*" An ANCOVA test was completed to identify if there is a significant difference between the groups in post-test mean scores when the pre-test for "anxiety" is used as the control variable.

**Table 22.** Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Post-Test Scores in the Anxiety Scale

| Group | Mean | Std. Deviation | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| Control | 2.8 | 0.6 | 26 |
| Experiment | 1.9 | 0.3 | 24 |
| Total | 2.4 | 0.6 | 50 |

Following the intervention, the mean score of the anxiety scale in the control group was found to be 2.8 while it was 1.9 in the experiment group.

A Levene's Test for equality of variances was completed and homogeneity of variance was supported (p>0.05).

**Table 23.** Results of the Levene's Test for the Equality of Variances

| F | sd1 | sd2 | p |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0.541 | 1 | 48 | 0.466 |

ANCOVA results for the anxiety scale in the post-test scores of the experiment group are presented in Table 24.

**Table 24.** Results of the ANCOVA for Post-Test Scores in the Anxiety Scale

| Source | Type II Sum of Squares | sd | Mean Square | F | p | Partial Eta Square |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Corrected Model | 16.400[a] | 2 | 8.2 | 91.2 | 0.000 | 0.795 |
| Interaction | 0.4 | 1 | 0.4 | 4.3 | 0.043 | 0.084 |
| Anxiety (Pre-Test) | 6.5 | 1 | 6.5 | 72.6 | 0.000 | 0.607 |
| **Group** | **8.9** | **1** | **8.9** | **99.2** | **0.000** | **0.679** |
| Error | 4.2 | 47 | 0.1 | | | |
| Total | 301.9 | 50 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 20.6 | 49 | | | | |

*p<0,05

In the post-test comparison, there is a significant difference between the groups in anxiety. The mean score of the control group is significantly higher than the experiment group (F (1,49) = 99.2, p= .000). The low mean scores in the experiment group show the effectiveness of the program implemented. Low anxiety scores are positive. In other words, the interactive teaching strategy is effective in reducing the speech anxiety of students learning Turkish as a second language.

## 4. Discussion and Conclusion

As one of the main purposes of learning a language, to speak and communicate in the target language, is te one that receives feedback the least, it is an aspect that needs to be focused on (Koksal & Dag Pestil, 2014, p. 305). There is limited research in the literature focusing on the improvement of speaking skills in learning Turkish as a second language. Additionally, no study was found that focuses on interactive teaching strategy in learning Turkish as a second language. Thus, in the current study, the effects of the interactive teaching strategy on the speaking skills of C1 level students learning Turkish as a second language were examined. The findings are evaluated and discussed in alignment with the hypotheses of the research.

When the pre-test total scores for speaking skills evaluation scale in the experiment and control groups are controlled for, there was a significant difference between the groups in post-test scores. There was a significant increase in the experiment group for all the sub-dimensions of the scale. This finding indicates that the interactive teaching strategy implemented in the experiment group had a significant effect on the speaking skills of students. The findings of the current study are supported by the results of studies in the literature focusing on interactive teaching strategies (Diveharan & Atputhasamy, 2002; Espino, 1999; Gokkaya, 2008; Karabay, 2005; Kilicarslan, 2014; Robison, 2006; Sallabas, 2011; Sivrioglu, 2014; Yildiz, 2014).

Speaking skills are important for effective communication skills. With interactive teaching strategies, it is possible to improve speaking skills of students learning Turkish both as a native and a second language. Through interactive activities, students are removed from a competitive environment and engage in the process (Slavin & Stevens, 1995). In their study focusing on the effects of drama method on speaking skills in teaching Turkish, Kiliçarslan (2014) found that the drama method is effective in improving speaking skills. In the current study, as a result of the pre- and post-test surveys, the post-test mean score of the experiment group was significantly higher than the pre-test scores. This increase is also seen in the introduction of speech, body of speech, conclusion of speech, body language and being able to apply external structure components of a language

dimensions of the scale. Sivrioglu (2014) also focused on identifying the effects of creative drama methods on the speaking skills of learners. They found that the creative drama methods implemented had a positive effect on both the speaking skills and verbal expression skills. These findings support the findings of the current study. Another study supporting the current study's findings was conducted by Sallabas (2011) which focused on improving speaking skills of elementary school students through interactive teaching strategy. They found that the interactive teaching strategies improved students' speaking skills which is similar to the current study's findings. Yildiz (2014) conducted a study focusing on the effects of interactive teaching strategy on the speaking skills of first year students in a Department of Turkish Education (according to the results of instructor, peers, and self-evaluation). The results of the study showed that according to instructors, peers and self-evaluations, speaking activities prepared in alignment with the interactive teaching strategy improved students' speaking skills. Espino (1999) in their study found that in addition to the success of students in a collaborative learning group in speaking, the students were confident and comfortable when speaking in front of the class, and that they develop confidence in using their language skills when they are accepted and supported by their peers. These studies show that the interactive teaching strategy improves language skills.

When the data related to the effects of interactive teaching strategy on students' speaking anxiety, a significant difference was found between the groups in post-test comparisons. The mean scores of the control group in anxiety scale were significantly higher than the means of the experiment group. The low mean scores of post-tests in the experiment group indicates the effectiveness of the intervention. Kilicarslan (2014) showed that creative drama methods were effective in reducing the speaking anxiety levels of students. These findings are supported by the current study's findings. There is a close relationship between learning and anxiety which is one of the fundamental and universal emotions (Varişoglu & Varişoglu, 2014, p. 56). Anxiety impacts language learners. Particularly the level of anxiety being above normal affects individuals negatively when learning a language. For those who learn Turkish as a second language, high level of anxiety creates difficulties during the learning process and that's why it needs to be eliminated. Considering the conditions of learning and the structure, speaking can be considered as a fundamental skill that may create anxiety in learners (Ozdemir, 2013). When the literature in the field is reviewed, speaking skills are the second skillset that students have difficulty with, after writing skills. One of the factors contributing to these difficulties is speaking anxiety (as cited in Sen & Boylu, 2015). According to Woodrow (2006), speaking anxiety has a weakening effect on verbal performances of language learners. In a study conducted by Rashid (2017), it was shown that students learning Turkish as a second language had speaking anxiety. The role and importance of strategies, methods, and techniques used to reduce students' anxiety levels are significant. Learning and teaching environments in which students can express themselves freely play an important role in reducing speaking anxiety.

As a result, based on the findings of this experimental study, textbook activities of C1 Turkish as a second language, and the teaching strategy structured in alignment with the interactive teaching strategy had a positive and significant effect on improving speaking skills.

Suggestions brought in line with the results of the research, and some suggestions for practical and research to be conducted can be included. The classrooms should be designed in a way that allows effective in-class interaction so that the interactive teaching strategy can be implemented in learning environments effectively. Education programs and textbooks should be revised in alignment with the interactive teaching strategy. Also, textbooks should be supported by visual and audio materials in addition to workbooks and grammar books. Experimental studies can be conducted in classrooms with different levels of students learning Turkish as a second language. The effects of the interactive teaching strategy on the improvement of speaking and other language skills can be researched. Creating a positive classroom environment is important in reducing anxiety stemming from foreign language learners'

personalities. In an environment in which friendships are sincere and teachers are friendly and positive, the person learning the language will feel comfortable. It is important to include practices in improving speaking skills. An environment should be designed to allow students to recognize their mistake and to give an opportunity to correct the mistake during a speech. It is important for teacher to stay away from thoughts and judgements that would impact students negatively in classrooms. Thus, teachers should offer a good and effective guidance. Activities and practices to improve speaking skills should not be limited to in-class activities and practices only. For this purpose, environments that learners can apply in their daily lives should be created.

## References

Acıkgoz, K.U. (2011). *Active learning.* Izmir: Bilis Publishing.

Agbatogun, A. O. (2014). Developing Learners' Second Language Communicative Competence through Active Learning: Clickers or Communicative Approach? *Educational Technology & Society*, *17* (2), 257–269.

Akyol, H. (2014). *Turkish teaching methods (7th Edition).* Ankara: Pegem Academy Publishing.

Aykac, N. (2016). *Principles and methods of teaching.* Ankara: Pegem Academy Publishing.

Ari, G. (2018). Speech training. M. Durmus and A. Okur (Eds.), *In the Handbook of Teaching Turkish as a Foreign Language (pp.277-293).* Ankara: Grafiker Publishing.

Aytan, T. (2011). *The effects of active learning techniques on listening ability*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Selçuk University, Konya.

Borich, G. D. (2017). *Effective teaching methods*. (Trans. Ed.: M. B. Acat). Ankara: Nobel Publishing.

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy.* White Plains (2 Ed.). N.Y.: Pearson Education.

Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. Structured overview of all CEFR scales. https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages. Date of access: 15.08. 2018.

Christensen, L. B., Johnson, R. B. & Turner, L.A. (2015). *Research Methods Design and Analysis.* (Trans. Ed.: A. Aypay). Ankara: Ani Publishing.

Choudhury, S. (2005). Interaction in second language classroom. *BRAC University Journal*, Vol. II, No.1, pp. 77-82.

Cetin, D. (2017). Language skills - expression (speech and writing skills)] H. Develi and others (Eds.), *In the Handbook on Teaching Turkish as a Applied Foreign Language (pp. 359-424)*. Istanbul: Kesit Publishing.

Cintas Yildiz, D. (2015). Effect of interactive teaching strategy on speaking skills of the students who study in department of turkish education. *Journal of Language Education and Research*, 1(1), 14-43.

Demirel, O. (2016). *Foreign language teaching (9th Edition)*. Ankara: Pegem Academy Publishing.

Diveharan, S., & Atputhasamy, L. (2002). An attempt to enhance the quality of cooperative learning through peer assesment. Journal of Educational Enquiry, *3 (2),* 72-85.

Dohen, M. Schwartz, J. & Bailly, G. (2010). Speech and face-to-face communication. *Speech Communication,* (52), 477–480.

Espino, C. M. (1999). Promoting language proficiency and academic achievement through cooperation. *ERIC Document Reproduction Service.* No: ED 436983. Date of access: 30.12.2018.

Gocer, A. (2015). Improvement of speaking skills in teaching Turkish as a foreign language. *Trakya University Journal of Social Sciences*, 17 (2), 21-36.

Gocer, A. (2017). *Turkish special teaching methods (2nd Edition).* Ankara: Pegem Academy Publishing.

Gokkaya, H. (2008). *Talking ability emend availability of tongue twisters.* (Unpublished master's thesis). Abant Izzet Baysal University, Bolu.

Gunes, F. (2014a). *Turkish teaching approaches and models.* Ankara: Pegem Academy Publishing.

Gunes, F. (2014b). Teaching strategies. F. Güneş (Ed.), *In Teaching Principles and Methods (pp.61-92)* Ankara: Pegem Academy Publishing.

Guneyli, A. (2007). *The impact of active learning approach on improving the literacy in native language teaching.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ankara University, Ankara.

Johnson, D.W. Johnson, R.T.; & Stanne, M. B. (2000). Cooperative learning methods: A Meta-Analysis. *http://www.co-operation.org/pages/ci-methods.html.* Date of access: 30.12.2018.

Isisag, K.U. & Demirel, Ö. (2010). The use of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages on developing the speaking skills, *Education and Science*, *35 (156),* 190-204.

Karabay, A. (2005). *The effects of cooperative learning activities on the listening and speaking skills of elementary school fifth grade students in Turkish language course.* (Unpublished master's thesis). Çukurova University, Adana.

Karasar, N. (2017). *Scientific Research Method Concepts Principles Techniques (32th Edition).* Ankara, Turkey: Nobel Publishing.

Kardas, M. N. (2013). *The effect of cooperative learning method on written expression skills of prospective primary education teachers.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Atatürk University, Erzurum.

Kiliçarslan, R. (2014). *The effects of drama method on speaking skills in education of Turkish as a foreign language.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale.

Kirbas, A. (2010). *Effect of the collective learning method on the improvement of listening skills of primary school eighth.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Atatürk University, Erzurum.

Koc, C. (2007). *The effects of active learning on reading comprehension, critical thinking and classroom interaction.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Dokuz Eylül University, Izmir.

Koksal, D. & Dag Pestil, A. (2014). Turkish speaking teaching as a foreign language. A. Şahin, (Ed.), *In the Teaching Turkish as a Foreign Language.* Ankara: Pegem Academy Publishing.

Melanlioglu, D. & Demir, T. (2013). A study on the validity and reliability of the Turkish form of speech anxiety scale for foreign Turkish learners. *International Journal of Social Science*, *6(3),* 389-404.

Michael, J. (2006). Where's the evidence that active learning works? *Advances in Physiology Education,* (30), 159–167.

Ozdemir, E. (2013). *The speech anxiety's the sources of the people learning Turkish as a foreign language*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Dokuz Eylül University, Izmir.

Ozdemir, E. (2016). *Eloquence*. Ankara: Bilgi Publishing.

Paulston, C. B. (1992). *Linguistic and communicative competence: Topics in ESL*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Pong, K (2010). Learners' Anxieties on Posting Their Own Speeches on Youtube.com: Facilitative or Debilitative? In Selected Papers from the Third Conference on College English. Colleğe English: Issues and Trends, 3, 73-100. http://flc.nccu.edu.tw/Conference/3rd/05.pdf

Robison, D. F. (2006). *Active learning in a large enrollment introductory biology class: problem solving, formative feedback and teaching as learning*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), Brigham.

Rashid, A.W. (2018). *An investigation into the speaking anxiety of Afghan students learning Turkish as a foreign language*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Dokuz Eylul University, Izmir.

Saglik, H. (2018). *An evaluation of the speaking skill activities held in the Turkish for foreigners course books in line with European language portfolio*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Yildiz Technical University, Istanbul.

Sallabas, M. E. (2011). *The impact of active learning on primary school second level students? speaking skills*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Gazi University, Ankara.

Sivrioglu, S. (2014). *The effect of creative drama to speaking skills in teaching Turkish as a foreign language*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Ankara University, Ankara.

Slavin, R. E. & Stevens, R. J. (1995). The cooperative elementary school: effects on students' achievement, attitudes, and social relations. *Amercan Educational Research Journal, 32* (2), 321-351.

Sen, U. & Boylu, E. (2015). Evaluation of speaking anxiety of Iranian learners learning Turkish as foreign language, *Mustafa Kemal University Journal of Graduate School of Social Sciences*, *30,* 13-25.

Sen, E. (2018). *The effect of active learning in teaching Turkish as a foreign language to improve productive skills (Gem sample)*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University, Nevşehir.

Tum, G. (2014). Phonological problems encountered in multinational classrooms in teaching turkish as a foreign language, *H. U. Journal of Education*, *29 (2),* 255-266.

Yakovleva, N.O & Yakovlev, E.V. (2014). Interactive teaching methods in contemporary higher education. *Pacific Science Review*, *16,* 75-80.

Varısoglu, C. & Varısoglu, B. (2014). Anxiety of learning a foreign language. A. Şahin, (Ed.), *In the Teaching Turkish as a Foreign Language pp.49-64*. Ankara: Pegem Academy Publishing.

Woodrow, L. (2006). Anxiety and speaking english as a second language. *RELC Journal*, *37 (3),* 308-328.

Yalcin, A. (2018). *Methods of teaching Turkish in light of recent scientific developments*. Ankara: Akcag Publishing.

Yildiz, D. (2014). *Effect of interactive teaching strategy on speaking skills of the students who study in department of Turkish education*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), Necmettin Erbakan University, Konya.

Yönez, H (2012). *The effect of cooperative learning approach on the primary school 8th grade students' attitudes to the course in Turkish class and basic language skills*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Gazi University, Ankara.

Yildirim, K. (2010). *The effects of cooperative learning on certain variables related to reading, parents?, and studens? opinions toward cooperative learning.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Gazi University, Ankara.

# Etkileşimli öğretim stratejisinin yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrenen öğrencilerin konuşma becerilerine etkisi

## Öz

Konuşma becerisinin geliştirilmesinde kullanılabilecek en etkili öğretim yollarından biri, etkileşimli öğretim stratejisidir. Etkileşimli öğretim, öğrencinin süreçte aktif olarak kendi öğrenmenin yanı sıra, arkadaşlarıyla da etkileşim halinde olarak onların da gelişimlerini desteklediği bir stratejidir. Etkili bir öğrenme için sınıf içi iletişim sürecine öğrencilerin aktif katılımının sağlanması gerekmektedir. Bu çalışmada, etkileşimli öğretim stratejisinin yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrenen öğrencilerin konuşma becerilerini geliştirmeye etkisi araştırılmıştır. Araştırmanın modeli, gerçek deneme modellerinden "ön test son test"e dayalı deney ve kontrol gruplu deneysel bir çalışmadır. Araştırmanın çalışma grubunu, Aksaray Üniversitesi Türkçe Öğretimi Uygulama ve Araştırma Merkezi'nde öğrenim gören C1 düzeyindeki öğrenciler oluşturmaktadır. Araştırma 2018-2019 eğitim öğretim yılının güz döneminde 9 haftalık bir süreçte gerçekleştirilmiştir. Deney grubunda etkileşimli öğretim stratejisi doğrultusunda ders işlenirken kontrol grubunda geleneksel öğretim yöntemleri kullanılmıştır. Öğrencilerin konuşma becerileri, "Konuşma Becerisi Değerlendirme Ölçeği" ve "Konuşma Kaygılarının Kaynakları Ölçeği" kullanılarak değerlendirilmiştir. Araştırmadan elde edilen veriler bilgisayar ortamına taşınarak SPSS 20. Yazılımı ile analiz edilmiştir. Deney ve kontrol grubundaki öğrencilerin konuşma becerisi genel düzeyi ile alt boyutlarının ve kaygı skorunun ön testinin kontrol değişkeni olarak alınarak son test ortalamasının gruplara göre anlamlı düzeyde farklılık gösterip göstermediği tekrarlı ölçümlerde ANCOVA analizi ile incelenmiştir. Elde edilen sonuçlara göre, etkileşimli öğretim stratejisinin yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrenen öğrencilerin konuşma becerilerini geliştirdiği sonucuna ulaşılmıştır.

*Anahtar sözcükler*: *Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretimi; konuşma eğitimi; konuşma becerisi; etkileşimli öğretim stratejisi*

**AUTHOR BIODATA**

Tuncay Türkben works as an instructor at Aksaray University, Department of Turkish Education. He completed his doctorate in Gazi University, Department of Turkish Education (2017). He has published numerous papers in various refereed international journals and presented papers in national and international symposia. His areas of interest are Turkish education, teaching Turkish as a foreign language and children's literature.