



**T.C.
SÜLEYMAN DEMİREL ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
BATI DİLLERİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI**

**ADOÇEP KULLANICI ALGILARI: BİR GRUP ÖĞRETMEN
ÜZERİNE BİR ÇALIŞMA**

Fatoş ÜNLÜCAN TOSUN

0730224064

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

**DANIŞMAN
Dr. Philip GLOVER**

ISPARTA-2019



T.R.
SÜLEYMAN DEMİREL UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF WESTERN LANGUAGES AND
LITERATURE

USER PERCEPTIONS OF THE CEFR: A STUDY OF A GROUP OF
TEACHERS

Fatoş ÜNLÜCAN TOSUN
0730224064

MASTER'S THESIS

SUPERVISOR
Dr. Philip GLOVER

ISPARTA-2019



SÜLEYMAN DEMİREL ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ



YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZ SAVUNMA SINAV TUTANAĞI

Öğrencinin Adı Soyadı	Fatoş ÜNLÜCAN TOSUN
Anabilim Dalı	Batı Dilleri ve Edebiyatı, İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı ABD
Tez Başlığı	English Language Teachers Perceptions of The Language Used In The CEFR
Yeni Tez Başlığı ¹ (Eğer değişmesi önerildi ise)	USER PERCEPTIONS OF THE CEFR: A STUDY OF A GROUP OF TEACHERS

Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Lisansüstü Eğitim-Öğretim ve Sınav Yönetmeliği hükümleri uyarınca yapılan Yüksek Lisans Tez Savunma Sınavında Jürimiz 18/7/2019 tarihinde toplanmış ve yukarıda adı geçen öğrencinin Yüksek Lisans tezi için;

OY BİRLİĞİ OY ÇOKLUĞU²

ile aşağıdaki kararı almıştır.

- Yapılan savunma sınavı sonucunda aday başarılı bulunmuş ve tez **KABUL** edilmiştir.
 Yapılan savunma sınavı sonucunda tezin **DÜZELTİLMESİ**³ kararlaştırılmıştır.
 Yapılan savunma sınavı sonucunda aday başarısız bulunmuş ve tezinin **REDDEDİLMESİ**⁴ kararlaştırılmıştır.

TEZ SINAV JÜRİSİ	Adı Soyadı/Üniversitesi	Kabul/Ret	İmza
Danışman	Philip Glover, Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kabul <input type="checkbox"/> Ret	
Jüri Üyesi	Serkan Ertin, Kocaeli Üniversitesi	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kabul <input type="checkbox"/> Ret	
Jüri Üyesi	Şule Okuroğlu Özün, Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kabul <input type="checkbox"/> Ret	
Jüri Üyesi		<input type="checkbox"/> Kabul <input type="checkbox"/> Ret	
Jüri Üyesi		<input type="checkbox"/> Kabul <input type="checkbox"/> Ret	

¹ Tez başlığının DEĞİŞTİRİLMESİ ÖNERİLDİ ise yeni tez başlığı ilgili alana yazılacaktır. Değişme yoksa çizgi (-) konacaktır.

² OY ÇOKLUĞU ile alınan karar için muhalefet gerekçesi raporu eklenmelidir.

³ DÜZELTME kararı için gerekçeli jüri raporu eklenmeli ve raporu tüm üyeler imzalamalıdır.

YÖK LİSANSÜSTÜ EĞİTİM-ÖĞRETİM VE SINAV YÖNETMELİĞİ Madde 9-(8) Tezi hakkında düzeltme kararı verilen öğrenci en geç üç ay içinde düzeltmeleri yapılan tezi aynı jüri önünde yeniden savunur. Bu savunma sonunda da başarısız bulunarak tezi kabul edilmeyen öğrencinin yükseköğretim kurumu ile ilişkisi kesilir.

⁴ Tezi REDDEDİLEN öğrenciler için gerekçeli jüri raporu eklenmeli ve raporu tüm üyeler imzalamalıdır. Tezi reddedilen öğrencinin enstitü ile ilişkisi kesilir.

Bu form bilgisayar ortamında doldurulacaktır.



T.C.

SÜLEYMAN DEMİREL ÜNİVERSİTESİ

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü



YEMİN METNİ

Yüksek lisans tezi olarak sunduğum “User Perceptions of the CEFR: A Study of A Group of Teachers” adlı çalışmanın, tezin proje safhasından sonuçlanmasına kadar ki bütün süreçlerde bilimsel ahlak ve geleneklere aykırı düşecek bir yardıma başvurulmaksızın yazıldığını ve yararlandığım eserlerin Bibliyografya’da gösterilenlerden oluştuğunu, bunlara atıf yapılarak yararlanılmış olduğunu belirtir ve onurumla beyan ederim.


Fatoş İNİLÜCAN TASIĞAN
İmza
Ad Soyad
Tarih
23.07.2019

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, I would like to express my sincere gratitude and respect for my supervisor Dr. Philip GLOVER to whom I owe special thanks for his guidance, encouragement and patience throughout the completion process of my thesis. It was a great privilege and chance for me to be able to benefit from his invaluable experience, comments and suggestions. All I have learnt from him will always shed light on my way in life.

I feel indebted to the committee members Dr. Şule OKUROGLU OZUN and Dr. Serkan ERTIN for their constructive feedback which helped me reevaluate my work.

The warmest thanks go to my family. I dedicate my thesis to my husband, my daughter and my son, who have always become the source of motivation for me. It would be impossible to complete my thesis without their love, patience, understanding and sacrifice. Thank you God for the gift of their presence...

(UNLUCAN TOSUN, Fatos, *User Perceptions of the the CEFR: A Study of A Group of Teachers*, Master's Thesis, Isparta, 2019)

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to investigate how English language teachers understand the language used in the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) and how this understanding affects their viewpoints concerning language and learning. The CEFR and various European Language Portfolios (ELP) were introduced as a resource for learner-centred foreign language education by the Council of Europe in 2001. There was a great deal of interest in applying the CEFR and ELP in Turkey, as well as in many other European countries. The Ministry of National Education (MoNE) in Turkey supported the integration of the CEFR into national foreign language curriculum and declared that foreign languages curricula was renewed in accordance with the CEFR and updated curricula along with related coursebooks were introduced (MoNE, 2006). A variety of research has taken place regarding the use of the CEFR and ELP in Turkey, but none have focused on how foreign language teachers interpret the language used in the CEFR. The study uses qualitative methodology to analyse teachers' knowledge of the CEFR and how teachers understand the language in three tables (Council of Europe 2001, pages 24-29) that form the basis of CEFR levels and ELP. The themes "CEFR knowledge/awareness, application, assessment, its effect on teaching, the language used and the reasons for learning/teaching English" guide the process of qualitative analysis within the analytical framework of the study. The study results reveal that most EFL teachers, even if they have not had training about the CEFR, implement the CEFR to some extent through the foreign languages curriculum and coursebooks which are in alignment with the CEFR. The language used in the CEFR level tables has been found to be clear and understandable so that they are helpful for the users to differentiate between different levels.

Keywords: Common European Framework of Reference, European Language Portfolio, Council of Europe, Language used, The Ministry of National Education, foreign language teachers.

(UNLUCAN TOSUN, Fatos, *ADOÇEP Kullanıcı Algıları: Bir Grup Öğretmen Üzerine Bir Çalışma*, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Isparta, 2019)

ÖZET

Bu çalışmanın amacı, İngilizce öğretmenlerinin Avrupa Dilleri Ortak Çerçeve Programında (ADOÇEP) kullanılan dili ne şekilde anladıkları ve bu anlayışın onların dil ve öğrenmeye ilişkin bakış açılarını nasıl etkilediğini araştırmaktır. 2001 yılında Avrupa Konseyi (AK) tarafından öğrenen merkezli yabancı dil eğitimi kaynağı olarak ADOÇEP ve çeşitli Avrupa Dil Portfolyoları (ADP) tanıtıldı. Birçok diğer Avrupa ülkesinin yanı sıra Türkiye’de de ADOÇEP ve ADP uygulamalarına büyük ilgi gösterildi. Türkiye’de Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı (MEB), ADOÇEP’in ulusal yabancı dil öğretim programına dahil edilmesini destekleyerek yabancı dil öğretim programının ADOÇEP’e uyumlu olarak yenilendiğini bildirdi ve güncellenmiş müfredat ile birlikte ilgili ders kitapları tanıtıldı (MEB, 2006). ADOÇEP ve ADP’nin Türkiye’deki kullanımına ilişkin çeşitli çalışmalar yer aldı ancak, İngilizce öğretmenlerinin ADOÇEP’te kullanılan dili nasıl yorumladıkları üzerine odaklanan bir çalışma yapılmamıştır. Bu çalışmada, öğretmenlerin ADOÇEP konusundaki bilgilerini ve ADP ile ADOÇEP seviyelerinin temelini oluşturan üç tabloda (Avrupa Konseyi 2001, ss. 24-29) kullanılan dili nasıl anlamlandırdıklarını analiz etmek için nitel veri yöntemi kullanılmıştır. “ADOÇEP bilgisi/farkındalığı, uygulama, değerlendirme, öğretim üzerine etkisi, kullanılan dil ve İngilizce öğrenme/öğretme nedenleri” konuları çalışmanın çözümsel çerçevesi içerisinde nitel analiz sürecine rehberlik etmiştir. Araştırma sonuçları, çoğu İngilizce öğretmenin ADOÇEP konusunda herhangi bir eğitim almamış olsalar bile, ADOÇEP’e uyumlu yabancı dil öğretim programları ve ders kitapları aracılığıyla farkında olmadan da olsa ADOÇEP’i belli bir oranda uyguladıklarını ortaya koymuştur. ADOÇEP seviye tablolarında kullanılan dil, kullanıcıların farklı seviyeler arasında ayırım yapmalarına yardımcı olacak şekilde açık ve anlaşılır bulunmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Avrupa Dilleri Ortak Çerçeve Programı, Avrupa Dil Portfolyosu, Avrupa Konseyi, Kullanılan Dil, Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, Yabancı Dil Öğretmenleri.

LIST OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	i
ABSTRACT	ii
ÖZET	iii
LIST OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	viii

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem	2
1.3. Purpose of the Study	4
1.4. Significance of the Study	5
1.5. Assumptions and Limitations.....	6
1.6. Definitions of Terms	7

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. The Council of Europe and Modern Languages.....	9
2.2. The Council of Europe, The European Union and Turkey.....	10
2.2.1. Language Education Policies in Europe.....	10
2.2.2. Language Education Policies in Turkey.....	13
2.3. The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages.....	14
2.3.1. Historical Background.....	15
2.3.2. Purpose of the CEFR.....	15
2.3.3. Implementing the Action-oriented Approach.....	17

2.3.4. Plurilingualism and Pluriculturalism.....	18
2.3.5. Criticisms, Challenges and Difficulties of the CEFR.....	20
2.4. The Common Reference Levels.....	21
2.5. The European Language Portfolio.....	27
2.5.1. The ELP as Part of the CEFR.....	28
2.5.2. The ELP and Learner Autonomy.....	30
2.5.3. The ELP Implementation Studies in Turkey.....	31
2.5.4. The Use of the ELP to Encourage Plurilingualism in Pupils.....	34

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction	36
3.2. Research Method.....	36
3.3. Research Questions.....	37
3.4. Setting and Participants.....	37
3.5. Data Collection Instruments and Procedures.....	39
3.5.1. Pre-testing the Research Instruments	39
3.5.2. Interviews	40
3.5.3. Field Notes	41
3.5.4. Trustworthiness	42
3.6. Analytical Framework of the Study	42

CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Introduction	45
4.2. Methods of Data Analysis	45
4.3. Analysis and Results of the Field Notes	46

4.4. Analysis of the Interviews.....	47
4.5. Results of the Interviews.....	49
4.5.1. Results of the First Part of the Interviews	49
4.5.2. Results of the Second Part of the Interviews.....	70
4.6. Discussion	78

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Introduction.....	83
5.2. Overview and Assessment of the Study.....	83
5.3. Implications and Recommendations for Further Research	86
REFERENCES	90
APPENDICES	94
ÖZGEÇMİŞ.....	116
CURRICULUM VITAE	117

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Model English Language Curriculum (2018).....	5
Table 2. Common Reference Levels	22
Table 3. Common Reference Levels: global scale	24
Table 4. Distribution of the European Language Portfolio for Secondary Education Piloting Groups	32
Table 5. Distribution of the European Language Portfolio for Primary Education Piloting Groups	33
Table 6. Demographic Features of the Participants	38
Table 7. Results of the First Three Questions for the Second Part of the Interview	74

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CEFR : Common European Framework of Reference for Languages

CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning

CoE : Council of Europe

CoHE : Council of Higher Education

CPE : Cambridge Proficiency Exam

EFL : English as a Foreign Language

ELF : English as a Lingua Franca

ELP : European Language Portfolio

ELTP : English Language Teaching Programme

EU : European Union

ICTs : Information and Communication Technologies

KET : Key English Test

MoNE : Ministry of National Education

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

Although the CEFR has its roots in over forty years of work on modern languages, it has become so popular in the last two decades because of the changes in the methods of teaching, the description of what is to be learnt and the originality of the assessment of learning. Thus, the CEFR's emphasis on interaction with its potential for stimulating collaborative dialogue deserves attention.

It is important to note that the CEFR is not unique solely for being grounded in a communicative competence theory and it is not original in its focus on learner autonomy, both of which have already been around since the 1980s. The innovation of the CEFR is its promotion of an action-oriented approach to pedagogy and focus on learning, teaching and assessment as interdependent concepts (Faez, Taylor, Majhanovich and Brown, 2011).

The CEFR was developed by the Council of Europe to “provide a common basis for the elaboration of language syllabuses, curriculum guidelines, examinations, textbooks, etc. across Europe” (Council of Europe, 2001). The Framework comprehensively describes the ways to be followed and the necessary knowledge and competences to be developed by learners for an effective and communicative use of a language. It does so by using ‘Can Do Statements’ to describe L2 proficiency across five activities reading, writing, listening, speaking production and spoken interaction at six levels (A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, C2). Namely, CEFR descriptors focus on what learners ‘can do’ at different levels rather than what they cannot do. With these specifications, it is user-friendly and practical. That is why the CEFR has influenced the language education not only across Europe but also throughout the world. In spite of the fact that the CEFR has gained popularity and approval throughout the world, it is hard to talk about its effective implementation in Turkey (Çagatay and Gürocak, 2016). This study aims to find out, if any, the relationship between language teachers’ interpretation of the language used in the CEFR and the effectiveness of its implementation.

It has been almost eighteen years since the CEFR, along with ELP which is a substantive resource developed for its implementation, was first introduced in Turkey. Turkey supported the set of goals and objectives set by the European Union (EU) in the field of education declaring its adoption of the CEFR as the reference document in the teaching of foreign languages (Demirel, 2005). Being a new approach, the ELP and the CEFR were first piloted in 20 schools in two towns during the 2001-2002 academic year. As the next step for the implementation of the programme throughout the country. The Ministry of National Education expanded the piloting to ten towns in the 2006-2007 academic year (Sahinkarakas, Yumru&Inozu, 2010). However, apart from the in-service teacher training programmes on the CEFR for the language teachers in pilot schools, other kinds of teacher training programmes which could reach the remaining language teachers were not provided in the following years. That is the reason why there is still a lacuna whether language teachers know about the CEFR and ELP or, if so, to what extent they know about these documents and their application. This study aims to make a contribution to the understanding of the extent of this lacuna and to provide an insight in order to fill the missing points, if any, as a very necessary step for an effective application. Furthermore, the recent study investigates the perceptions of English language teachers about the language used in the CEFR and the effect of their interpretations on language learning process.

1.2.Statement of the Problem

Before the first draft of the CEFR was published in 1995, many language teachers were influenced by a traditional approach. The teacher was the authority in class. Student learning was highly controlled by teachers and limited with memorised knowledge rather than emphasizing the real usage of the target language. It meant that the old system was based more on testing knowledge than on language communicative competence, which was not valid or reliable. After that, radical changes occurred and Communicative Language Teaching rapidly became popular, which led to the communicative ability to be the goal of foreign language teaching (Beresova,2011).

Later in 1996, with the introduction of the second draft of the CEFR, teachers were confronted with a challenge. By describing different competences, the CEFR became a reminder for language teachers to think over the extension of the range of their

teaching. The introduction of the CEFR promoted real interest among language professionals in Europe. There were attempts to relate the syllabi and curricula to the common referential levels. Throughout the CEFR research and piloting period that lasted from 1993 to 1999, modern language teaching methods underwent a change from being based solely on grammar and vocabulary to contextual appropriateness of language use and the suitability of intercultural differences. These new ideas were based on referential levels, scales, and descriptors. Many training sessions were organized all over Europe with the aim of providing familiarisation with the levels, scales and descriptors (Beresova, 2011).

The power of the document across Europe is clear from the number of translations of the CEFR, which has been translated into 40 languages. The CEFR and its companion documents such as the ELP, the CEFR grids, sample tasks, illustrative samples of speaking performances, etc. have affected the view on language teaching and testing as well as curriculum designs.

The CEFR enthusiasm was felt in the national context of Turkey, too. The MoNE in Turkey declared that it had changed its educational policy according to the CEFR. There were piloting projects of the CEFR and the ELP along with teacher training programmes. However, never has it been questioned how the teachers, as the key implementers of it, understand the language used in the CEFR before.

That the CEFR is a comprehensive document seeking to cover a very large number of language teaching and learning situations means that some of its ideas may be complex. As stated by Goullier (2007), all language teachers wanting to make pedagogical choices and decisions should be guided by the CEFR. Nevertheless, a reader may be confused by the concepts and explanations presented in different chapters when he/she deals with the CEFR first. It will take several readings to get a full understanding of the Framework.

Piccardo, Berchoud, Cignatta, Mentz and Pamula (2011) state that it can be questioned whether the CEFR is “self-contained and clear enough” to be understood well or not. If language teachers do not use it as a tool, the CEFR will have no effect on real life practice of teaching and assessment. Teachers and learners will not be able to benefit from it effectively. Moreover, the CEFR may become a source of concern if it is not properly understood. Thus, this study attempts to find an answer to the question “How do

teachers, as key implementers of the CEFR, understand the language used in the framework?” and “How do teachers’ viewpoints affect the effective implementation of the CEFR?”. In the present study, answers to the research questions and the problem of the study are sought through the qualitative analysis of the themes “CEFR knowledge/awareness, application, assessment, its effect on teaching, the language used and reasons for learning/teaching English” within the analytical framework of the study.

1.3. Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of this study is to investigate how English language teachers understand the language used in the CEFR and how this understanding affects their viewpoints concerning language and learning.

The Common Reference levels are at the heart of the CEFR. The CEFR levels broadly describe what a specific language user can do ranging from basic A1-A2 through independent B1-B2 to proficient C1-C2. Thus, there are six levels of language proficiency in the framework. By providing a sound base for teachers, teacher trainers, syllabus and course designers, educational institutions and examining bodies, the CEFR levels have been widely accepted as the European standard for grading language users’ proficiency. That is why the six CEFR levels have had a major impact on language education worldwide. The reference levels have taken their place in foreign language curriculum in Turkey, too. For instance, the current (2018) foreign languages curriculum (for 2nd-8th grades) is intended to comply with CEFR levels. The following table (Table 1) is provided in the recent curriculum designed for primary and secondary educational levels of schools:

Table 1: Model English Language Curriculum (2018)

Levels [CEFR] (Hours / Week)	Grades	Skill focus	Main activities / Strategies
1 [A1] (2)	2	Listening and Speaking	TPR / Arts and crafts/Drama
	3	Listening and Speaking Very Limited Reading and Writing	
	4	Listening and Speaking Very Limited Reading and Writing	
2 [A1] (3)	5	Listening and Speaking Limited Reading Very Limited Writing	Drama / Role-play
	6	Listening and Speaking Limited Reading Limited Writing	
3 [A2] (4)	7	Primary: Listening and Speaking Secondary: Reading and Writing	Theme-based
	8	Primary: Listening and Speaking Secondary: Reading and Writing	

(MEB, 2018, p.10)

Mut (2007) indicated the understanding and implementation of the CEFR in Turkey in the following way:

Foreign language studies are very limited in Turkey in contrast to the other members of the Council of Europe and the concepts of ELP and CEF are not fully understood by the vast majority of people. In other words, there are serious problems in implementation of the ELP into language learning programmes owing to the lack of syllabi in consistent with the basic levels of CEF and tenets of ELP. Designing appropriate syllabus for reading or any other skills will contribute to the development of language teaching and learning projects in Turkey in parallel with the developments in other member countries of the Council of Europe. (pp. 3-4)

This study aims to ascertain teachers' detailed knowledge and understanding of the CEFR and ELP first. Secondly, it aims to analyze how teachers understand the language used in three tables of the CEFR (Council of Europe,2001, pp. 24-29) and what

the CEFR levels mean to them. The study intends to explore the impact of this understanding on the effective implementation of the CEFR in Turkey. It does so by taking the example of a group of EFL teachers in Isparta.

The Council of Europe's CEFR embodies the importance of "communicative language teaching", "intercultural skills" and "intercultural awareness" with the aim of helping learners to interact with speakers of other language learners and people from other cultures (Mut,2007). Having this in mind, the study focuses on the 'speaking' ability, the spoken production and interaction part of the CEFR. Illustrative samples of speaking performances of CEFR levels are used in the study in order to get an idea about what teachers understand about the language used in the CEFR and what the reference levels mean to them.

1.4. Significance of the Study

Turkey has been a member of Council of Europe since 1949 and is willing to become a member of the European Union (EU). Turkey has gone through some educational reforms in order to satisfy the criteria defined by the EU. The Ministry of Education (MoNE) and Council of Higher Education (CoHE) offered some changes and reforms in the curricula including primary, secondary and higher education foreign languages curricula.

Since the CEFR was published, it has always been of particular interest for scientific research. Even books aiming at being a guide for understanding the CEFR were published so that the philosophy of the CEFR becomes integrated into language education in Europe (Piccardo, Berchoud, Cignatta, Mentz and Pamula, 2011).

The CEFR, providing a clear definition of language learning and teaching objectives, is a guide for all teachers, teacher trainers, textbook writers, course designers, testers who are involved in language teaching and testing. Therefore, a good understanding of the CEFR by the users of it is a requirement for its correct and effective implementation. Nevertheless, never before has it been questioned whether the language used in the CEFR is understood or interpreted by the users in the way it aims to do.

Certain studies in which the students were either found not to be willing to use the ELP without teacher support (Glover, Mirici, & Aksu, 2005) or failed to identify the target language due to their lack of capacity for monitoring their own learning (Sert, 2006)

indicate the significance of the role of teaching, teacher support or training for the application of the CEFR. Under the light of such valuable findings, this study aims to investigate the current views and knowledge of English teachers in Isparta concerning the implementation of the CEFR as well as their interpretations of CEFR levels.

1.5. Assumptions and Limitations

In this study, it is assumed that qualitative data collection tools, which aim to provide an accurate profile of EFL teachers, are illustrative of sincere and honest thoughts and opinions of the participants. It is also assumed that data collection results can be generalized for all EFL teachers actively teaching at different educational levels of state schools in Turkey.

This study is limited to eight EFL teachers teaching in the local area. The limited number of participants in the study may not allow the results to be generalized throughout Turkey.

Because interview questions were prepared assuming that the respondent knows about the CEFR, certain background information related to the topic was provided for the participants who are not familiar with the Framework for the sake of effective flow and continuation of the interview.

The opinions of the respondents about the CEFR levels and the language used in the CEFR tables revealed by the current study are limited to the spoken production part of the CEFR tables and level descriptors only. They cannot be considered as representative of all language competences defined by the CEFR.

Lastly, it is assumed that the researcher remained faithful to the ethical issues throughout the research process.

1.6. Definitions of Terms

Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR): The Common Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment is a guideline providing a practical tool for setting clear standards to be attained throughout the process of language learning and for evaluating outcomes in an internationally comparable manner. The Framework, developed by the Council of Europe, facilitates educational and occupational mobility by providing a basis for the mutual recognition of language qualifications for all European languages. The CEFR incorporates scales (of

proficiency for five skills: reading, writing, listening, oral interaction, and oral presentation) on which six proficiency levels are identified and labelled as A1 (Breakthrough), A2 (Waystage), B1 (Threshold), B2 (Vantage), C1 (Effective Operational Proficiency) and C2 (Mastery) (Maninsilla and Riejos, 2007).

European Language Portfolio (ELP): The European Language Portfolio is the CEFR companion piece designed by the Council of Europe with the aim of promoting autonomous and life-long learning. The ELP comprises three obligatory components (Language Passport, Language Biography and Dossier) and it is based on the six levels and five skills described in the CEFR (Maninsilla and Riejos, 2007).

Council of Europe (CoE): Having its centre in Strasbourg, the Council of Europe was founded in 1949. The CoE is a body (with 47 member countries) conducting activities which promote linguistic diversity and language learning throughout Europe (http://www.mfa.gov.tr/avrupa-konseyi_tr.mfa).

English as a Foreign Language (EFL): In the countries, where English is a foreign language, English is often widely taught in schools but it does not play an essential role in national or social life (Broughton, Brumfit, Pincas and Wilde, 2002).

Key English Test (KET): Key English Test is one of the Cambridge ESOL examinations used to evaluate written and spoken English competences with direct reference to the common reference levels of the CEFR as an internationally acknowledged framework.

Ministry of National Education (MoNE): The term refers to a government ministry which is responsible for the supervision of public and private educational system, agreements and authorizations under a national curriculum in Turkey.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. The Council of Europe and Modern Languages

The term “English as a lingua franca” (ELF) is distinctive in that it is mostly a “contact language” between persons, from different native tongue or cultures, for whom English is the chosen foreign language of communication. In other words, ELF refers to communication in English between speakers with different first languages or to non-native speakers (Seidhhofer, 2005). This explains how English has become an international language. As more and more people learned English, the term English as a foreign language (EFL) has emerged. EFL has been affected by Communicative Language Teaching method whose goal is communicative competence for teaching target language. The Council of Europe welcomed Communicative Language Teaching for its project aiming to develop planning instruments to help teachers analyse learners’ needs and learning objectives (Van Ek and Trim, 1991).

In 1975, the book “Threshold Level”, what is now level B1, by Van Ek and Trim provided descriptions for the first level of communicative language competence. The book’s strong influence on language teaching course books and its well acceptance by communicative language programmes in Europe gave way to the publication of the book “Waystage Level” in 1990 and “Vantage Level” in 2000. These three publications were collected under a unique framework: The Common Framework of Reference for Languages (Zorba, 2012).

The CEFR’s taxonomic nature necessitates trying to manage the complexity of human language. It does so by dividing language competence into separate units. As it is indicated by the Council of Europe (2001):

In an intercultural approach, it is a central objective of language education to promote the favourable development of the learner’s whole personality and sense of identity in response to the enriching experience of otherness in language and culture. It must be left to teachers and the learners themselves to reintegrate the many parts into a healthily developing whole. (p.1)

As is understood from the statements of the Council of Europe (2001), the very basic concept and point of origin of the CEFR is language itself. Languages are also integrated into lifelong learning, which is an ultimate principle of the CEFR.

Goullier (2007) states that “The Council of Europe’s CEFR is now regularly mentioned when the subject of modern languages crops up.” The framework will enhance the transparency and promote international co-operation in the field of modern languages. By providing objective criteria that describe language proficiency, the CEFR promotes the “mutual recognition of qualifications gained in different learning contexts.” (Council of Europe, 2001).

Modern languages have always had an important role. The existence of Language Policy Division of the Council in Strasbourg and the European Centre for Modern Languages in Graz, Austria is clear evidence for the importance of modern languages in the Council of Europe’s overall strategy. In the history of modern language teaching in Europe, the CEFR became a new starting point in that it constituted the first language tool embracing all modern languages (Goullier, 2007).

2.2. The Council of Europe, The European Union and Turkey

The functions of the Council of Europe (CoE) must first be clarified in order to be able to understand the purpose of the CEFR and the ELP. Having its centre in Strasbourg, the CoE is a body conducting activities related to linguistic diversity and language learning among other activities. Shortly after the CoE was founded in 1949, Turkey was invited and it obtained founding member state status. The CoE represents the first corporate connection that Turkey made with Europe after the Second World War (http://www.mfa.gov.tr/avrupa-konseyi_.tr.mfa). The European Union (EU) shares similar objectives with the CoE in the sense that they both aim permanent peace politically and collaboration and harmonization educationally. In its attempts to achieve full membership of the EU, Turkey needed to make educational reforms in foreign language education so as to meet the standards set by the EU.

2.2.1. Language Education Policies in Europe

The CoE and the EU are the two organizations which shape the language policy at a European level. The former is the older and the larger organization with 47 member countries. The Council of Europe’s activities promote linguistic diversity and language

learning. On the other hand, the European Union, a political grouping of 27 countries, and its decisions also have strong impact on education policies although it does not directly control education. Jones and Saville (2009) explain the language education policy themes as follows:

Current language education policy themes are, of course, heterogeneous: teacher training, lifelong and early learning, migrants and languages of schooling, the “language friendly school,” CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning), the use of Information and communication technologies (ICTs), and so on. However, the theme that brings these strands together at a European level is that of multilingualism. The key concepts of multilingualism and plurilingualism are presented in Council of Europe (2007). Multilingualism being a fundamental feature of European societies, language education is an important aspect of social policy, particularly regarding notions of social inclusion and shared democratic citizenship. The term plurilingualism, which focuses on the individual rather than the collective, is a specifically Council of Europe concept, not used in EU discourse. (p.52)

According to the EU whose policies aim at fostering language learning, linguistic and cultural diversity among the citizens of the EU, it is necessary for European citizens to know at least two languages in addition to their own in order to be able to reach the living, studying and working opportunities across the EU member states. The consolidation of the education policies of the Member States was the result of the indications of the Council of Europe and the European Union about the need to have proficiency in languages. It is surely beyond doubt that the publication of the CEFR was a landmark in educational policies and the consolidation of language learning and evaluation objectives (Oltra Albiach, Pardo Coy and Delgadova, 2014).

Twenty-five years before the publication of the CEFR (in 1976) the CoE and the EU requested the State Members to promote being proficient in at least one foreign language. The European Commission’s book “Teaching and Learning: towards the knowledge society” (1995) proposed that citizens can express themselves in two foreign languages at the end of compulsory schooling. The European curricula mostly refers to the acquisition of four skills and the student as the centre of language learning process (Oltra Albiach, Pardo Coy and Delgadova, 2014).

As a result of globalization, multiculturalism and multilingualism, the educational issues that the governments must address have become highly complex. Since education is related to learners' ability to use the language, governments are faced with the requirement of inventing suitable language education policies. For this kind of language policy discussion, the Council of Europe has promoted the learning of modern languages in a reoriented way. The EU consists of various nations with different languages and cultures. This means that there is a need for the integration of all these languages and cultures and providing mutual understanding among them. The foundation of "The Language Policy Division, The European Centre for Modern Languages and the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages", which are official institutions on language policy, by the Council of Europe targeted the avoidance of communication barriers among member states (Zorba, 2012). The Council of Europe comprising 47 member countries with enormous linguistic diversity and cultural histories, has adopted a policy of plurilingualism that is

not simply a linguistic policy choice at an important point in the history of Europe, ... a matter of increasing future opportunities for young people competent in more than two languages. It is also a matter of helping learners:

- to construct their linguistic and cultural identity through integrating into it a diversified experience of otherness;
- to develop their ability to learn through this same diversified experience of relating to several languages and cultures. (Council of Europe, 2001, p.134)

Thus the Council has glorified this policy in a Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) for language learning at all levels in order to get standardization for language learning and to promote co-operation among member states.

The Modern Languages Section modified its work after the European Centre for Modern Languages in Graz, Austria was established. The Modern Languages Section became the Language Policy Division and focused on language policy development to meet immediate needs of member states. The Language Policy Division piloted reference tools such as the CEFR and the ELP.

A symposium: *Transparency and coherence in language learning in Europe: objectives, evaluation, certification* was held in Rüşchlikon, Switzerland in 1991. In the

Symposium, the idea of “the introduction of a *Common European Framework of reference (CEFR)* for the description of objectives and methods for language learning and teaching, curriculum and course design, materials production, language testing and assessment and the introduction of a *European Language Portfolio(ELP)*, in which individual learners could record not only institutional courses attended and qualifications gained, but also less formal experiences with respect to as wide a range of European languages and cultures as possible.” was put forward (Trim, 2007, pp.37-38)

2.2.2. Language Education Policies in Turkey

Turkey became a member of NATO in 1952 and it has made official attempts for achieving full membership of the European Union (EU). Learning English, the world’s *lingua franca* of science and technology, is of great significance for Turkish citizens to keep up with the developments in these fields. In Turkey, English has the status of a foreign language (EFL). Kirkgoz (2007) states three periods describing the development of foreign language education in Turkey. The first period is characterized by recognition and introduction of English in Turkish education throughout the country; the second period is identified with the ELT curriculum reform in 1997, which became a landmark by introducing the concept of the communicative approach into ELT for the first time in Turkey and the third period refers to 2005 onwards, which concerns the revision of the 1997 ELT curriculum to adapt to EU standards. This last period is concerned with the introduction of the ELP and the CEFR in that it encouraged learner autonomy, highlighted the importance of gaining communicative proficiency in English and proposed performance-based assessment through *portfolios*. Thus, the recent curriculum is based on the ELP and the CEFR.

Being the *lingua franca*, the increasing demand for learning English led the governments in many countries in Europe and Asia to modify their educational policies to involve English as a compulsory subject at schools from the first year educational year on. Global demand required many countries to make necessary changes in their foreign language education policies. Accordingly, global requirements prompted Turkey to bring a major curriculum reform into action in 2012. The new education system (4+4+4) divides the educational period into four years of primary, four years of secondary and four years of high school phases. The number of hours of compulsory English lessons offered is two

class hours for 2nd, 3rd and 4th grades; three class hours for 5th and 6th grades and 4 class hours for 7th and 8th grades. Two class hours of elective English lesson are also available for 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th grades.

The new English Language Teaching Programme (ELTP) obliged English as a foreign language (EFL) to be offered compulsorily at 2nd grade, which was compulsory for 4th grades and onwards in the previous system. Focusing on meaning rather than form, authentic communicative context, an action-oriented approach, learner autonomy, self-assessment and cultural diversity, the new ELTP follows the principles and descriptors of the CEFR (Gursoy, Korkmaz & Damar, 2017).

National implementations in English language education in Turkey are mainly CEFR oriented focusing on self-assessment, action-oriented approach, cultural diversity, learner autonomy and life-long learning principles of education. Because there are similar educational goals across Europe, the European Commission supports the alignment of education policies in Europe with the Education and Training 2020 Strategy (ET 2020). The Ministry of National Education has adapted the European education policy into its own foreign language teaching programme. In order to reach this aim, the CEFR was introduced as a resource for the English language programme design and the ELP was presented for the development of self-assessment through the website at “adp.meb.gov.tr.” (Mirici, 2015).

2.3. The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages

The Council of Europe (2001) describes the CEFR as a groundwork providing “a common basis for the elaboration of language syllabuses, curriculum guidelines, examinations, textbooks, etc. across Europe.” (p.1). What language learners have to do and what knowledge and skills they have to gain in order to be able to use a language communicatively are also defined broadly. The cultural context in which the language is set, levels of proficiency enabling the analysis of learners’ progress both in short and long term on a life-long basis are covered in the description as well.

Mirici (2015) describes the CEFR as being both descriptive and prescriptive because “it describes language levels and skills in a comprehensive manner.” All linguistic, communicative and intercultural language competences are handled in the CEFR. They are all described at six levels: A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, C2. These levels are for

listening, reading, writing, spoken interaction, and spoken production skills. Each level's content is signified in the resources by Van Ek and Trim.

2.3.1. Historical Background

The studies on language date back to 1960s, which was the time when Modern Languages Project started in Europe. Publication of "Threshold Level" in 1975 gave way for the production of more communicative supplements and assessment tools. Until 1990s, language teaching and learning was influenced by a traditional approach focusing on memorised knowledge rather than the real usage of the target language for communicative purposes. It was the study of Swiss National Science Group Project, between 1993-1996, which led the appearance and official publishing of the CEFR in 2001 (Çağatay and Gurocak, 2016).

What has made the CEFR accessible worldwide is the fact that although it was originally published in English and French, it is now available in more than 40 languages, including sign language, some of which are not European languages in contrast to its name's reference to European languages (Sülü and Kır, 2014). In parallel with CoE's aim of promoting European unification and supporting social cohesion, the CEFR targeted at promoting transparency, standardization and unity in language learning, teaching and assessment across Europe. Thus the CEFR has influenced educational contexts in terms of curriculum designs, standards and examination developments at a global level going beyond the borders of Europe (Yüce, 2018).

The emergence of the communicative approach in 1970s required a certain level of proficiency to be attained by learners to assure the use of language in real life communication (Zorba, 2012). The communicative approach prompted the preparation of the CEFR between 1993 and 2000 by the CoE. The CEFR was officially adopted during the European Year of Languages in 2001. The CEFR is not a dogmatic document imposing just a single way of teaching modern languages (Goullier, 2007).

2.3.2. Purpose of the CEFR

According to Goullier (2007), the CEFR's essential purpose is to function as a descriptive tool for educational institutions involved in language teaching in different contexts to describe and compare their teaching objectives and the outcomes related to proficiency levels. Its primary aim is "to encourage transparency and comparability in

language teaching arrangements and language qualifications.” Targeting this goal, it suggests:

a common methodology for analysing and describing situations and choices in language teaching and learning; a common terminology for all languages and educational contexts; a common scale of levels of language proficiency to assist with goal-setting learning outcome assessment (p.6)

The Framework will further improve transparency of language syllabuses, language courses, language examinations, course books or curriculum guidelines by setting objectives, methods and content explicitly within a common basis. Therefore, the Framework will enhance co-operation in modern languages at an international level. By providing objective criteria for language proficiency level descriptors, the CEFR will help “the mutual recognition of qualifications gained in different learning contexts”, which will in turn aid European mobility (Council of Europe, 2001).

The CEFR actually serves the general goal of the CoE in that it promotes the efforts of teachers and learners to apply the principles of language learning systems into their own context; it explicitly describes realistic objectives and develops appropriate teaching methods, materials, suitable evaluation instruments; it promotes the development of methods and materials suitable for different types of learners to gain communicative proficiency according to their needs (Council of Europe, 2001).

As for the implications of the CEFR for teachers, the CoE has enriched a major tool to member States for “achieving transparency, mutual understanding and comparability in both teaching systems and language qualifications.” Another aim of the CEFR is to motivate modern language teachers to think about and report on their practices, experiences, methods or techniques. The Framework serves as a common language between teachers of different language and cultures from different countries and it facilitates mutual understanding, mutual enrichment, comparison of teaching choices and exchange between language teachers. While conducting the analytical approach, it must not be forgotten to take the choices of all parties, traditions and specific teaching contexts into account. When teachers of different languages come together in the same school, for instance, the advantages of this tool for promoting teamwork between them will be perceived clearly (Goullier, 2007, p.11).

2.3.3. Implementing the Action-oriented Approach

The action-oriented approach is one of the main perspectives of the concept of learning underlying the CEFR. The CEFR adopts an action-oriented approach by building language teaching and learning on communicative tasks and activities (Goullier, 2007). Its action-oriented approach is strongly linked with task-based methods. Can Do Statements of the CEFR underlines the importance for learners to perform a task using the target language through certain activities. That self-assessment grids and scales are provided for the users in the CEFR displays its being planned as a practical and action-oriented document (Council of Europe, 2001).

The ministries of education in Central and Eastern European countries began to officially recognize the common descriptor scales for competence-based teaching, learning and assessment, which gained popularity among language teachers. Assessing language competence can be thought as a major change, along with teaching, which the CEFR has brought about. Competence-based teaching and assessment in the form of national tests has currently taken the place of the assessment way of testing only grammar and vocabulary, using mother tongue grammar translation into a target language, which was previously used by language teachers from Central and Eastern Europe. The current national tests are comprised mostly of the parts reading comprehension, listening comprehension, grammar in use, writing and speaking. Apart from depending on the goal and requirements of each country, the parts of the national tests have to meet international language test standards. The changes started in primary and secondary education first, which then led the universities to go for language curricula change to prepare language teachers for the teaching of real life use of languages and to adopt action-based approach rather than knowledge-based (Beresova, 2011).

Piccardo et al. (2011) describes a learner from the action-oriented and intercultural aspect as a person who can communicate effectively in both new and well-known contexts. They are aware of intercultural perspectives and open to cultural differences. The CEFR highlights the significance of socio-cultural knowledge and intercultural awareness.

“Task” is a pivotal concept in the CEFR in which there is a whole chapter entitled “Task Description”. In the chapter task-based teaching and learning is defined as “any

purposeful action considered by an individual as necessary to achieve a given result in the context of a problem to be solved, an obligation to fulfil or an objective to be achieved.” (Council of Europe, 2001, p.157)

The study conducted by Faez, et al. (2011) focused on teachers’ perceptions of CEFR-informed instruction, namely CEFR’s action-oriented approach, and their perspectives of strengths and challenges of practising CEFR-informed instruction. The findings of the study showed an increase in motivation, self-confidence, authentic language use and autonomy of learners. Apart from positive reactions of teachers towards CEFR’s action-oriented approach, the study indicated “time restriction” and “lack of understanding the CEFR and its applicability” as major challenges teachers had to cope with (p.11).

2.3.4. Plurilingualism and Pluriculturalism

Plurilingualism is a person’s competence of being able to communicate in more than two languages. It is different from multilingualism which perceives each of the specific languages in isolation. For instance, multilingualism can be achieved just through the encouragement of pupils to learn more than one foreign language whilst plurilingualism stresses the learner’s development of a “communicative competence to which all knowledge and experience of language contributes and in which languages interrelate and interact” rather than storage of them in firmly separated mental parts (Ekşi, 2008; Council of Europe, 2001, p.4).

The description of “partial” competences referring to only a limited language knowledge (e.g. gaining only receptive skills rather than productive skills) takes place in the CEFR. On condition that such abilities are formally recognised, plurilingualism will be facilitated through the learning of a wider variety of European languages (Council of Europe, 2001). The opinion that a multicultural and multilingual Europe requires the availability of more languages for learners lays the foundation of the CEFR whose promotion of plurilingualism as an essential goal of language education policy reflects an important development in the CoE’s viewpoint of cultural and linguistic diversity appropriate for different learners and different languages (Zheng, Zhang and Yan, 2016).

Targeting the promotion of plurilingualism, the Council of Europe’s language programme has recently created the ELP

in which language learning and intercultural experiences of the most diverse kinds can be recorded and formally recognised. For this purpose, CEF not only provides a scaling of overall language proficiency in a given language, but also a breakdown of language use and language competences which will make it easier for practitioners to specify objectives and describe achievements of the most diverse kinds in accordance with the varying needs, characteristics and resources of learners (Council of Europe, 2001, p.5)

It can be concluded from what has been mentioned above that from the beginning the CEFR promotes a plurilingual approach in which learners relate a number of languages they acquire to each other in order to develop a plurilingual competence. Promoting plurilingualism with a view to encouraging everyone to be able to communicate in a few languages even if they do not have a perfect mastery on these languages is one of the essential goals of the CEFR. This does not mean low standards for language teaching and learning. It simply means taking the reality everyone faces in their day-to-day experiences into consideration (Piccardo et al., 2011). Based on the communication type demanded in different contexts, the learner can “call flexibly upon different parts of this competence to achieve effective communication with a particular interlocutor.” (Council of Europe, 2001, p.4)

Because pluricultural competence as well as plurilingual competence is regarded as another basic goal of language learning and teaching, plurilingualism is perceived as the natural outcome of plurilingualism (Celik, 2012).

Coste, Moore and Zarate (2009) describe the notion of “plurilingual competence” as deriving from the notion of plurilingualism and state that transfer of concepts from the linguistic to the cultural level is not new. The notions of “cultural screen” or “interculture” are other examples of the case. Thus the ELP serving as a tool allowing learners “to monitor their own learning process on a life-long basis as well as to develop respect for cultural identities and diversity” supports the development of plurilingualism and pluriculturalism (Mirici, 2008, p.26).

Celik (2012) investigated whether Turkey’s foreign language objectives related to plurilingualism and pluriculturalism are reflected in classroom instruction or not. In the study it is stressed that although these principles are integrated into Turkey’s national foreign language curriculum, there is little known about the implementation of them in

practice. The study revealed that English language teachers are not familiar enough with the ideas of plurilingualism and pluriculturalism and in spite of their belief in the significance of intercultural competence, they think that the standardized language curriculum does not support this approach.

2.3.5. Criticisms, Challenges and Difficulties of the CEFR

Goullier (2007) criticizes the lack of knowledge related to the CEFR. As long as language teachers are not provided with the necessary CEFR-based knowledge and they do not use it as a resource, the CEFR tends not to have any effects on day-to-day instruction and assessment. It will be impossible for teachers and students to get efficiency from it. What is more, the CEFR may just create a source of concern if it is not understood accurately.

The aim of a preliminary survey conducted by Martyniuk and Noijons (2007) between May and September 2006 was to reveal information about the use of the CEFR in as many 46 member States of the CoE as possible. According to the results of the survey about the planning and development of the curricula, the need for description of certain extra sub-levels, the recurrence and missing details in some descriptors were the issues related to the use of the common reference levels stated as the most severe problems by a great number of countries. The sceptical attitude of teaching environment towards the CEFR, the unwillingness about the acceptance of partial competences and the lack of mediation and translation skills within common reference levels were seen as obstacles. The conclusions of the survey related to the planning and development of teacher training reflected that “the CEFR was mostly useful in terms of levels, scales and descriptors and for defining the language proficiency of teachers. Better co-operation at international level was requested, leading towards more ‘standardised’, comparable and compatible outcomes for pre-service teacher training courses.” (p.6). Other issues raised frequently were the unfamiliarity of teachers due to lack of dissemination and the complexity of the document itself. The CEFR’s descriptive scheme and methodological approach were found as difficult to access and its theoretical concept as quite complex and challenging. Apart from the indefiniteness in some of the level descriptors, linking examinations to the CEFR was another issue mentioned as being difficult. When it comes to the use of the CEFR in other contexts, the problem (although it was quite an individual

problem) mentioned was the absence of a translation of the Framework into the local language.

The study examining positive impacts along with difficulties and problems of the implementation of the CEFR in Japan demonstrated that “the more it is adapted to a specific context, the greater the possibility that the CEFR will lose its validity and the original language proficiency scales will be altered in an unhelpful way.” (p.141). In other words, “The more local the standard is, the less global it becomes.” (p.150). It can be solved by creating the local standard while at the same time guaranteeing global proficiency levels. Thus the institution-wide implementation of CEFR-based foreign language curricula may bring about certain difficulties (Nagai and O’Dwyer, 2011).

Figueras (2012) addressed the challenges about content in terms of comprehensiveness and usefulness of the level of descriptors. The relevance and the validity of the descriptors were questioned from the angle of second language acquisition. Other criticisms were related to insufficient definition in that the lack of descriptors caused problems for testing, gaps and terminological incoherences in the CEFR. Therefore, the Framework was found in need of clear descriptions of the proficiency scales.

2.4. The Common Reference Levels

The reason for the CEFR to have rapidly become the standard reference for teaching and testing languages in Europe is mostly the specification of the common reference levels within the Framework. The publication of the “Threshold Level” which gives the description of an “independent language user” in the 1890s became the starting point for the CEFR levels. The “Threshold” set the ground for the specification of the two lower levels “Breakthrough” and “Waystage” and one higher level “Vantage” (Van Ek and Trim, 1991). They constructed the labels for the first four of the CEFR common reference levels:

Table 2: Common Reference Levels

ADVANCED	C2	Mastery	Comprehensive Operational Proficiency
	C1	Effective Operational Proficiency	Adequate Operational Proficiency
INTERMEDIATE	B2	Vantage	Limited Operational Proficiency
	B1	Threshold	Independent User
ELEMENTARY	A2	Waystage	Basic User
	A1	Breakthrough	Foundation

(Mut, 2007, p.40)

The idea of the common reference levels emerged from “natural levels” in terms of effective curriculum and examination levels which were described during the 1991 Rüşchliken Symposium. Description process for the CEFR levels started in 1913 with the Cambridge Proficiency Exam (CPE) giving the definition of a communicative mastery of the language as a non-native speaker as C2. After that, the first Certificate (FCE), which is still regarded as the first level of proficiency and associated with B2, was introduced by Cambridge. The “Threshold Level” (now B1) specifying the type of language needed to operate effectively was described by the CoE in 1970s, which was followed by the “Waystage” (now A2). The CoE adopted the six common reference levels for the CEFR: Breakthrough (later A1), Waystage (later A2), Threshold (later B1), Vantage (later B2), Effective Operational Proficiency (later C1) and Mastery (later C2) (North, 2007).

Taking place at the heart of the CEFR, the common reference levels are the best-known feature of the Framework. They make a comprehensive description of the levels of language learning. The common reference levels are gaining more and more importance in language teaching and assessment by providing a standard for defining language levels. Cambridge ESOL, the Goethe Institute, The Alliance Française and certain other national bodies have adjusted their examinations according to the common reference levels which also affect the indication of course book levels. The levels are also widely used as a language assessment scale in some of the European countries. Through its common reference levels, The CEFR contributes to language education policies in Europe by producing transparency in language qualifications. This is clarified at local,

national and European policy levels, which illustrates the adoption of the CEFR's scale of common reference levels broadly (Goullier, 2007).

Certain qualitative and quantitative research was conducted in order to check the viability of the descriptors. For qualitative research, workshops with teachers were carried out. In these workshops, teachers were asked to place each of sixty descriptors under the headings "conversation", "obtaining information and services" and "discussion". An extra heading was provided for the descriptors found as sub-standard or not found appropriate for any of the headings. By this way, both the clarity of the descriptors and feasibility of the categories were tested. For quantitative research the descriptors found as clear and useful were used in questionnaires. After the data analysis, each descriptor was assigned with a difficulty value on the scale. As the final step, it was necessary to divide the scale of descriptors into levels in order to clarify the starting and ending points in the levels (North, 2007).

Being rich in quantity, descriptors in the CEFR can be used as a resource for assessment because they help practitioners with specification of tasks that can assess communicative competence. Descriptors of communicative activities and descriptors of competences are differentiated, which allows to make a distinction between performance and competence assessment. Performance assessment promotes an action-oriented approach while competence assessment addresses a particular performance targeting at determination of generalizable competences. This distinction becomes important for teachers when they use the descriptors of communicative activities for the provision of performance results (rather than competence) for self-assessments or teacher-directed assessments. Descriptors of specific competences for these assessments, which can also be used for the elaboration of performance assessment criteria, should be positively and specifically expressed. When used as assessment criteria, organization of descriptors is possible in three different ways: level scales, checklists and grids. Organization of descriptors in the form of checklists or grids makes a more detailed judgement possible (Piccardo, et al, 2011).

As stressed previously, one of the principles that the CEFR essentially aims is to promote transparency across Europe in the field of modern languages. Thus, the scale of levels can be thought as the keystone within the structure. The undeniable success of the

Framework in Europe is thanks to the fact that it proposes a common scale of language competence levels for all languages, institutions and European countries. The scale comprises three sections: Basic (Level A), Independent (Level B) and Proficient (Level C). Each of the sections is divided into two levels in itself as level 1 and level 2:

Table 3: Common Reference Levels: Global Scale

Proficient User	C2	Can understand with ease virtually everything heard or read. Can summarise information from different spoken and written sources, reconstructing arguments and accounts in a coherent presentation. Can express him/herself spontaneously, very fluently and precisely, differentiating finer shades of meaning even in more complex situations.
	C1	Can understand a wide range of demanding, longer texts, and recognise implicit meaning. Can express him/herself fluently and spontaneously without much obvious searching for expressions. Can use language flexibly and effectively for social, academic and professional purposes. Can produce clear, well-structured, detailed text on complex subjects, showing controlled use of organisational patterns, connectors and cohesive devices.
Independent User	B2	Can understand the main ideas of complex text on both concrete and abstract topics, including technical discussions in his/her field of specialisation. Can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction with native speakers quite possible without strain for either party. Can produce clear, detailed text on a wide range of subjects and explain a viewpoint on a topical issue giving the advantages and disadvantages of various options.
	B1	Can understand the main points of clear standard input on familiar matters regularly encountered in work, school, leisure, etc. Can deal with most situations likely to arise whilst travelling in an area where the language is spoken. Can produce simple connected text on topics which are familiar or of personal interest. Can describe experiences and events, dreams, hopes and ambitions and briefly give reasons and explanations for opinions and plans.
Basic User	A2	Can understand sentences and frequently used expressions related to areas of most immediate relevance (e.g. very basic personal and family information, shopping, local geography, employment). Can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar and routine matters. Can describe in simple terms aspects of his/her background, immediate environment and matters in areas of immediate need.
	A1	Can understand and use familiar everyday expressions and very basic phrases aimed at the satisfaction of needs of a concrete type. Can introduce him/herself and others and can ask and answer questions about personal details such as where he/she lives, people he/she knows and things he/she has. Can interact in a simple way provided the other person talks slowly and clearly and is prepared to help.

(Council of Europe, 2001, p.24)

In terms of teaching and assessment, it must be understood that the division into the six levels in the CEFR scale is not sufficient alone to get an idea about a learner's

level of competence without observation through language activities. It is known by language teachers that learners cannot equally achieve receptive or productive skills. It is a known fact that learners can understand the basic elements of a written or spoken text in a foreign language although they cannot produce it orally, for instance. That is the reason why the scale of levels is broken down according to different language activities: listening, reading, writing, spoken interaction, spoken production (Goullier, 2007).

Thus, a learner's level of competence is described separately according to his or her abilities in each language activity. For example, a learner may be at level A1 in spoken production and at level A2 in terms of his/her reading abilities in the same language or in certain cases, learners may feel obliged to focus on one specific language activity, not the others, due to the requirements of his/her study type. This may result in imbalance between competence levels in different language activities, which should be regarded as natural (Goullier, 2007).

Functioning as a comprehensive assessment tool, the six levels of proficiency described in the Framework enables language learners to see their progress at each level. The common reference levels of proficiency form a basis for the mutual recognition of language qualifications by providing a system for the description of learners' language skills. The expression of common reference levels is in the form of "Can Do Statements", which make them more user-friendly than the concepts like "starter, elementary, pre-intermediate, etc." or numeric test scores (Mut, 2007).

North (2009) states that the CEFR offers common reference levels to assist communication within national and linguistic boundaries. The CEFR's approach for providing a conceptual framework is made up of "a taxonomic descriptive scheme "including language use, communicative competences and language activities" and of "a set of common reference levels" which describe proficiency categories at six levels (A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, C2) in the scales of illustrative descriptors. Thus, the Framework proposes a reference tool for the elaboration of levels to adopt "proficiency stepping stones" appropriate for different contexts. Although many people are familiar with the common reference levels and they are also seen as curriculum levels at least in European context, the CEFR is not regarded as a very flexible framework. (p.358)

The CEFR had a direct effect on the adoption of transparent standards for different instructional bodies throughout many countries in Europe. For example, Italy brought portfolios and examinations targeting CEFR levels; Finland related teacher-centred assessments of several instructional institutions to the CEFR between 2001 and 2007; England adopted CEFR-based descriptors in order to promote life-long learning (North, 2009).

The CEFR was originally developed following the recommendation of the Symposium “Transparency and Coherence in Language Learning in Europe” held in Zurich in 1991. The essential goal of the Symposium was to relate language courses and assessments in Europe to each other via a common framework. Till then, many course or school certificates included statements such as “intermediate level”, “Foundation French”, “Grade C” or “4.5”, etc. Relating such results to each other was quite hard as the way were stated was not transparent enough. The fact that no institutions would be able to be familiar with the meaning of every single course’s results caused a lack of coherence in reporting results. The expectation from a common reference framework was assisting to relate courses and exams to each other so that the “transparency and coherence” could be attained. The CEFR aimed to provide a tool showing learners where they are rather than telling them where they should be (North, 2007).

The fact that there was a call for guidance in the area of linking assessments to the CEFR led the CoE to generate a manual “Relating Language Examinations to the CEFR: Learning, Teaching, Assessment (CEFR)”, which proposes specification of the context, “standardisation” of the interpretation of the CEFR levels and “empirical validation” for the results to relate to the CEFR. Being a descriptive scheme, the CEFR defines relevant language activities and qualities along with a set of common reference levels describing proficiency at six levels. Communicative language activities and communicative language competences are at the core of the scheme. Communicative language activities are set in three categories (reception, interaction and production) each of which is subdivided for spoken and written type. Communicative language competences are set in three categories (linguistic, pragmatic and socio-linguistic competences) each of which has sub-headings. Learner achievement is defined by the CEFR common reference levels through these communicative language activities and communicative language competences in 54 illustrative scales (North, 2007).

2.5. The European Language Portfolio

Mirici (2015) describes the ELP and its significance according to the explanations of the Council of Europe (2001) as follows:

The ELP is a self-assessment tool based on the CEFR. It was developed by the Language Policy Unit of the Council of Europe to promote plurilingual and multicultural European citizenship identity through supporting learner autonomy, plurilingualism and intercultural awareness and competence. It allows its holders to keep the record of their linguistic and intercultural achievements and experiences gained both inside and outside of the classroom environment. (p.4)

Like the CEFR, the ELP was officially launched in 2001 after it was piloted in fifteen European countries. The ELP provides language learners with the approaches and tools offered in the CEFR. The ELP can be interpreted as a mate for learners accompanying them throughout the language learning process. As stated by Goullier (2007), the ELP enables users to

- record all their language skills, experiences in using their different languages, stays in other countries or regions and contacts with speakers of languages other than their mother tongue(s), so as to be able to present them to a third party;
- develop their language learning autonomy, eg. by thinking about how they are doing things and by learning self-assessment;
- progress towards genuine plurilingualism. (pp.6-7)

The ELP comprises three parts:

- 1) **Language Passport:** It is a file including brief records of information about the learner's linguistic identity, the formal language competences attained, important L2 use experiences, the self-assessment of the learner's current proficiency in L2 as well as the learner's level in languages they know or they are acquiring.
- 2) **Language Biography:** It encourages reflection on self-assessment and what has been achieved. It also helps the definition of language learning goals, assists the learner to monitor his/her progress, to record the development of his/her skills and to reflect on intercultural experiences.

- 3) **Dossier:** It asserts the levels and experiences through certain selected work it contains, which reflects the learner's language competences and achievements best (Terzi, 2006; Goullier, 2007).

After the development of the first European Language Portfolios (ELPs) in the mid-nineties, over fifteen Council of Europe (CoE) member states underwent the piloting process of various ELP models between 1998 and summer 2000. A number of studies and guides aiming successful implementation of the ELPs in various contexts followed the introduction of the ELP in the European Year of Languages (2001) throughout Europe. The "Guide for Developers of a European Language Portfolio" by Schneider and Lenz (2001) is among these guides. The need for the publication of such guides is indicative of the fact that the ELP has many implications or ways of implementation changing according to each unique educational and teaching context.

ELPs are changeable according to the country or educational context in which they are used. Nevertheless, all have to be examined by a European Validation committee by whom they are assigned with an accreditation number. In spite of the variety in ELPs, they preserve their European nature (Goullier, 2007, p.7).

2.5.1. The ELP as Part of the CEFR

First, it is necessary to clarify the relationship between the CEFR and the ELP. The two are inseparable pedagogically. The CEFR is aimed at language teaching policymakers and the ELP is intended for learners. There is not a difference in approach but in perspective. Therefore, each should be handled according to the specific context. It is clear from the objectives of the ELP that this document (ELP) does not convey the full advantages of the CEFR. It should not be forgotten that the ELP is not intended for authors of teaching materials or language examination organizers, for instance. It should also be underlined that the term "pupils" comprehensively refers to language learners and ELP users. This document may be said to be intended for teachers who have pupils they are responsible for. However, neither the CEFR nor the ELP is targeted exclusively at schools as the Council of Europe is for all Europeans whether children, adolescents or adults. That is why the ELP includes only some of the ideas of the CEFR and it cannot replace a reading of the CEFR. Making a decision about using the CEFR or the ELP for language teachers is, in fact, making a choice about the means to reach their goals whether

they be “the encouragement of pupil involvement in language learning, providing pupils with the means of setting goals for themselves, developing their autonomy, recording their language progress, valuing success” or “giving a meaning to language learning.” That kind of learning is unattainable without embracing European and international cultures and openness to the world as a whole. This process can be intensified by teachers through the help of the CEFR and the ELP which present all classroom activities, teaching and assessment from a European perspective (Goullier, 2007, p.4).

The basic motive that led to the development of the ELP is the fact that the CEFR emphasizes individual learning, learner autonomy and life-long learning. With its format the ELP makes recording and formal recognition of language learning and intercultural experiences possible. Developing learner autonomy through goal setting and self-assessment, providing a report which illustrates the learner’s achievements and experiences are basic functions of the ELP. The need for the introduction of a European Language Portfolio is explained by the Council of Europe (2001) in the following way:

The Portfolio would make it possible for learners to document their progress towards plurilingual competence by recording learning experiences of all kinds over a wide range of languages, much of which would otherwise be unattested and unrecognised. It is intended that the Portfolio will encourage learners to include a regularly updated statement of their self-assessed proficiency in each language. It will be of great importance for the credibility of the document for entries to be made responsibly and transparently. Here reference to CEF will be particularly valuable. (p.20)

The common reference levels of the Council of Europe are crucial for the ELP. They set the ground for learner self-assessment in the language passport and they serve as a reference tool for the achievement of learning objectives in the language biography. The use of “checklists” as an instrument in planning and assessment is helpful in ELPs. The checklists based on the common reference levels make a more detailed description of language proficiency competences than overviews like the self-assessment grid thereby enabling the specification of concrete objectives. Along with describing concrete and helpful objectives, the fact that checklists allow learner self-assessment attracts many learners and teachers (Mut, 2007; Schneider and Lenz, 2001).

The European Language Portfolio should be regarded as one of the projects of the Council of Europe in the field of modern languages. That is why every ELP is a tool for carrying out the aims of the CoE such as the promotion of mutual understanding among European citizens, transparency and coherence in language learning, respecting different cultures and lifestyles, the protection of linguistic and cultural diversity, the development of plurilingualism, the language learning and the capacity for autonomous language learning. Even if it can be thought that the ELP covers the same ground as the CEFR, the case is not so. In spite of the fact that the ELP, being one of its first practical applications, helped the CEFR with the expansion of its basic views; it cannot be viewed as a substitute for curriculum, course books or language exams (Schneider and Lenz, 2001).

2.5.2. The ELP and Learner Autonomy

The ELP is regarded as the CEFR companion piece designed to promote learner autonomy. It is asserted in the CEFR that “autonomous learning can be promoted if ‘learning to learn’ is regarded as an integral part of language learning, so that learners become increasingly aware of the way they learn, the options open to them and the options that best suit them.” (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 141)

Another reference to the ELP made by the CEFR is through the statements of the ability to use and organize materials for autonomous learning, the awareness of learners’ own strengths and weaknesses, being competent in the identification of one’s own needs and goals (pp. 107-108). The CEFR also has autonomous learning among its general approaches for modern language instruction and learning, which requires learners to acquire a second or foreign language “autodidactically, by (guided) self-study, pursuing negotiated self-directed objectives and using available instructional media” (p.143). As it is understood from this statement, the teacher is recognised as a guide who can assist the learner to develop strategic competence, to set autonomous learning objectives, to provide him/her with appropriate instructional media and to plan the most suitable learning and teaching strategies for the learner’s needs.

The ELP has two functions. “The Reporting Function” following the Council of Europe’s aim of promoting individual mobility and relating national or local qualifications to internationally accepted standards means the role of the ELP to display the learner’s language competences. It aims at providing extra information about learner

experiences and language achievements. “The pedagogical function” coinciding with the Council of Europe’s focus on learner autonomy and life-long learning represents the intention of the ELP to make language learning process more transparent for learners and to assist them to take more responsibility of their own learning as well as developing their capacity for self-assessment (Mut, 2007).

The action research conducted by Espana Perez (2015) in Spain aimed to analyse and synchronize assessment and evaluation implementations with language learning and acquisition in order to improve the quality of language learning by promoting autonomous learning ability. The ELP was used as a reforming tool for the evaluation and assessment system included in the research. With the intention of determining whether strategic learning through the ELP could be a valid evaluation and assessment system, the ELP was planned to be used as a classroom based assessment tool within this system framework based on the vital competence “learning to learn”. Thus, a kind of student-centred approach is adopted in the research in which student voices and active involvement of the student in the analysis and assessment of his/her own learning process and skills are regarded as the key point for successful learning.

2.5.3. The ELP Implementation Studies in Turkey

The Council of Europe officially launched the implementation of the ELP in 2001 with the dissemination of the “European Year of Languages”. After taking part in the piloting phase of the ELP since 2001, The Ministry of Education in Turkey, as a member state of the CoE, officially launched the ELP in the educational year 2009-2010. The MoNE underwent a reform in terms of foreign languages curricula, development of the Turkish ELP model and improvement of the quality of language instruction in the educational system in order to fulfil the requirements of the CoE related to the ELP and the CEFR. In an attempt to comply with the recommendations of the CoE about the necessary support, in the introduction of the ELP, which is to be provided by the ministers of education of all member States; The CoE Language Portfolio Special Expertise Commission was formed under the co-ordination of Ozcan Demirel from the University of Hacettepe. This commission presented a seminar in 2001 to thirty EFL teachers from the ELP pilot provinces Antalya and Ankara. The piloting process of the ELP in Turkish foreign languages educational system started at 24 piloting schools at secondary

educational level in these pilot provinces. The introduction of the ELP went on with organization of in-service trainings for piloting teachers and a seminar, held in 2001 in Ankara, as a result of which a sample ELP model was established for Turkish high school students. The sample ELP model developed by the Turkish ELP Project Committee for high school students was published with the name “European Language Portfolio-Avrupa Dil Gelişim Dosyası” (Egel, 2009). The ELP implementation process started at the beginning of 2002-2003 educational year in 20 piloting schools and in 2004, the number became 30 throughout nine different provinces of Turkey as can be seen in detail in the table below cited from Demirel (2005):

Table 4: Distribution of the European Language Portfolio for Secondary Education Piloting Groups

City	No. of schools	No. of teachers	No. of students
Ankara	12	24	486
Antalya	7	14	224
İstanbul	5	10	285
İzmir	1	2	76
Adana	1	2	80
Gaziantep	1	2	72
Bursa	1	2	48
Edirne	1	2	46
Düzce	1	2	40
Total	30	60	1,357

The second ELP Commission in Turkey was formed with the aim of designing a junior ELP model (for children aged 05-09 and 10-14) which was piloted in 15 primary schools.

Table 5: Distribution of the European Language Portfolio for Primary Education Piloting Groups

City	No. of schools	No. of teachers	No. of students
Ankara	7	28	357
İstanbul	4	16	285
İzmir	1	4	86
Gaziantep	1	3	66
Bursa	1	3	54
Düzce	1	3	36
Total	15	56	884

(Demirel, 2005)

After the meeting in Krakow, Poland in 2000, the member States of the Council of Europe agreed to integrate the CEFR and ELP into the foreign language implementations in their education system. Therefore, the Ministry of Education designed the foreign languages curricula in alignment with the CEFR. The recent curricula (MoNE, 2018), designed for grades from 2nd to 8th, has the following introduction section:

In designing the new English language curriculum, the principles and descriptors of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment (CEFR) were closely followed. The CEFR particularly stresses the need for students to put their learning into real-life practice in order to support fluency, proficiency and language retention (CoE, 2001); accordingly, the new curricular model emphasizes language use in an authentic communicative environment. As no single language teaching methodology was seen as flexible enough to meet the needs of learners at various stages and to address a wide range of learning styles, an eclectic mix of instructional techniques has been adopted, drawing on an action oriented approach in order to allow learners to experience English as a means of communication, rather than focusing on the language as a topic of study. Therefore, use of English is emphasized in classroom interactions of all types, supporting learners in becoming language users, rather than students of the language, as they work toward communicative competence (CoE, 2001). (p.3)

The recent curricula (MoNE, 2018), designed for 9th, 10th, 11th and 12th grades, also claims to have been designed in accordance with the CEFR in the following lines:

This curriculum has been designed in accordance with the descriptive and pedagogical principals of The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). Therefore, the language proficiency levels are reflected as A1, A2 (Basic Users) and B1, B2 (Independent Users). The approach adapted is an action-oriented approach since in this curriculum, the target language (English) is seen as a vehicle for communication rather than a lesson to study. The main goal of the new 9th-12th grades English Curriculum is to engage learners of English in stimulating, motivating, and enjoyable learning environments so that they become effective, fluent, and self-directed users of English. In order to achieve the goals of the curriculum and for successful implementation, it's of great importance that all the leading stakeholders (learners/users, teachers, administrators, material designers) in education collaborate. (p.4)

2.5.4. The Use of the ELP to Encourage Plurilingualism in Pupils

According to the Council of Europe (2001), the CEFR supports the learning or teaching objectives “in terms of the development of the learner’s general competence” emphasizing the significance of these objectives towards the attainment of plurilingual and pluricultural competence (p.135). Furthermore, in order to become “a fully competent user of a language”, the acquisition of the knowledge and competences necessary for carrying out tasks or activities meeting the learners’ needs in a particular context is obligatory for them (p.131)

To put it another way, learners are required to acquire certain abilities and competences including general competences, declarative knowledge, attitudes, skills and know-how or ability to learn, which are specified in the CEFR. (p.135) The ability to learn takes place in the CEFR as one of the general competences stated as “the ability to observe and participate in new experiences and to incorporate new knowledge into existing knowledge, modifying the latter when necessary” (p.106).

The ELP is designed to promote the key features of effective learning such as autonomous learning and self-assessment. The ELP was developed and piloted by the Language Policy Division of the Council of Europe, in Strasbourg, between 1998 and 2000. After that it was introduced as a tool to foster the development of plurilingualism and pluriculturalism. The ELP takes all of the learner’s language and intercultural

learning into consideration both inside and outside formal educational context (Mut, 2007).



CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

The present study aims to investigate perceptions related to the language used in the CEFR by using a qualitative method as the research technique. This chapter outlines the methodology of the study presenting the research method, research questions, data collection instruments and procedures.

3.2. Research Method

Being naturalistic and contextual, qualitative approaches are used by researchers extensively. The focus of qualitative research is on the examination of a specific topic in natural settings. Qualitative research approaches are in search of the interpretation of a topic with respect to the meanings people bring to them. Thus, qualitative research appears as a valuable tool for obtaining insights into experiences and the meaning attached to them by selected individuals. In contrast to quantitative research seeking for the answers of questions “who, where, how many, how much”, qualitative research addresses process-oriented questions like “why” and “how”. Moreover, qualitative data have numerous positive characteristics. The fact that they reveal natural information enables researchers to increase their understanding of a certain topic. Additionally, qualitative data are often obtained through the techniques such as direct observation or interview carrying the influence of the local context (Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2007).

Creswell (2007) provides the following definition:

Qualitative research begins with assumptions, a worldview, the possible use of a theoretical lens, and the study of research problems inquiring into the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem. To study this problem, qualitative researchers use an emerging qualitative approach to inquiry, the collection of data in a natural setting sensitive to the people and places under study, and data analysis that is inductive and establishes patterns or themes. The final written report or presentation includes the voices of participants, the reflexivity of the researcher, and a 'complex description and interpretation of the problem, and it extends the literature or signals a call for action. (p.37)

Qualitative research was used in this study because a need for a more detailed understanding of the issue ‘perceptions related to the language used in the CEFR’ was felt after the literature review about it including quantitative theories which cannot adequately capture the complexity of the problem being examined. This detail was considered possible to be seized through direct interactions with people engaging in the real life implementation of the CEFR. The need for understanding the contexts in which the participants address or handle the issue was also felt. Beyond quantitative research related theories providing just a general picture of issues without telling about why people responded in the way they did, the present study carrying out qualitative research has helped to reveal about deeper thoughts and behaviours governing the participants’ responses. For these reasons, following a qualitative approach was seen as a better fit for the research problem of the present study.

3.3. Research Questions

The answers to the following research questions are searched in the present study:

- 1) What do English language teachers know about the CEFR?
- 2) How do teachers, as key implementers of the CEFR, understand the language used in the Framework?
- 3) How does this interpretation affect their outlook regarding language and learning?

3.4. Setting and Participants

Gill, Stewart, Treasure and Chadwick (2008) state that informing the respondents about the study details and ethical principles such as anonymity and confidentiality is required before an interview. This will increase the likelihood of honesty. Interviews should take place at the most suitable times and familiar locations for the interviewees. Familiarity will help them relax, which in turn results in a more productive interview.

Having this knowledge in mind, the selection of the individuals taking part in the interviews were made from willing ones who were considered not to be hesitant to speak and share ideas. The selection of setting was made in a way that would make it possible for the participants to answer freely. The interviews were conducted in the places chosen by the participants as long as the physical setting determined was a quiet location free from possible distractions for the audio-recording to be accurately conducted. The

interview dates and times were also arranged according to the preferences of the participants.

The research questions of the recent study were investigated through face-to-face interviews with eight English language teachers actively teaching at state schools in one of the provinces of Turkey. One of the benefits of the study is that the interviewees are from different educational levels of schools (one is from high school, one from primary school and six from secondary school). Thus, there are representations of all educational levels in the study.

The researcher collected background information from the participants before the interviews. The related information included gender, age, educational background, department of graduation and teaching experience. Each interviewee was labelled with a code like “P-1, P-2, ..., P-8” in order to get the consent and confidence of the participants. In this coding system, “P” stands for the participant and the numbers stand for each different participant. The demographic features of the participants are presented in the table (Table.6) below:

Table 6: Demographic Features of the Participants

PARTICIPANTS	GENDER	AGE	EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND	DEPARTMENT OF GRADUATION	TEACHING EXPERIENCE
P-1	MALE	36	BACHELOR'S DEGREE	ELT	10 YEARS
P-2	MALE	39	BACHELOR'S DEGREE	ELT	13 YEARS
P-3	FEMALE	31	BACHELOR'S DEGREE	ELL	7 YEARS
P-4	FEMALE	34	BACHELOR'S DEGREE	ELT	12 YEARS
P-5	FEMALE	35	BACHELOR'S DEGREE	ELT	13 YEARS
P-6	MALE	36	BACHELOR'S DEGREE	ELT	13 YEARS
P-7	FEMALE	36	BACHELOR'S DEGREE	ELT	13 YEARS
P-8	FEMALE	30	BACHELOR'S DEGREE	ELL	6 YEARS

3.5. Data Collection Instruments and Procedures

The research questions in the study were answered through the semi-structured interviews conducted with eight EFL teachers teaching at state schools in one of the provinces in Turkey. The researcher also utilized the field notes taken before and after the interviews through face-to-face interactions with the interviewees. The data collection instruments and the reasons why they were found as the most appropriate tools in seeking for the answers to the research questions are explained in detail throughout this chapter.

3.5.1. Pre-testing the Research Instruments

The qualitative data collection tools (semi-structured interview and the interview) were piloted with the aim of gaining insights for the actual interviews. The pilot semi-structured interview lasted about fifteen minutes. Certain questions of the semi-structured interview were detected whilst some others were improved to elicit more relevant answers.

The visual stimulus (speaking sample video) used for getting respondents' understanding of the CEFR levels and level descriptors took about five minutes. The interviewee watched the video by taking notes about his/her understanding of the CEFR level descriptors present in the sample video. After watching the video, the interviewee was asked about his/her thoughts about the speaking CEFR level in the video with his/her reasons. The interviewee was then provided with tables of the CEFR levels (common reference levels) related to spoken production and asked to explain and compare them with his/her own understanding with the descriptors on the tables. Lastly, the speaking level in the sample video was announced. The process of assessing and explaining the speaking sample using the CEFR tables took about eight minutes. The pilot study of the interview necessitated the improvement of certain specific interview questions.

A digital recorder was used to record all the interviews. Piloting the data collection tools helped the researcher to obtain additional information so that they can be further improved before the actual study.

3.5.2. Interviews

Using interviews in research is regarded as significant in that being a part of life itself they emphasize human embeddedness (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2000, p.267). Since the purpose of the research interview is to explore the experiences, beliefs, or views of individuals on specific subject matters, they are most appropriate when detailed insights from individual participants are required (Gill, et al., 2008, pp.291-295). That is why it is crucial to take certain factors which may differ from one interview to another in practice into account. Mutual trust, the interviewer's control, the respondent's uneasiness in a possible deep questioning or the meaning of many questions' probability of being interpreted relatively different by different respondents are some examples of these factors.

Research interviews employ interpersonal skills such as questioning, conversing and listening. The main purpose of research interviews is to listen attentively to what is being said in order to acquire more knowledge about the study topic. Another principle of practice for research interviews is to ask questions that are likely to get as much information about the study topic as possible. The interviewer should address aims and objectives of the research. In a qualitative interview, questions should be neutral, sensitive and understandable. Starting with easier questions and then proceeding to more difficult or sensitive ones is generally the best way. This can help with generating rich data for the further development of the interview as the respondents will feel at ease and build up confidence (Gill, et al., 2008, pp.291-295).

Verbatim transcription of interview data, which is thought to be integral to the analysis and interpretation of verbal data, has become a common data management strategy in qualitative research. In many research fields since verbal data are accepted as extremely beneficial, interviews have become an increasingly used tool for collecting information for various purposes (Halcomb & Davidson, 2006). That is why the necessity for verbatim transcription of all audio-recorded interview data aroused for the management of audio-recorded interview data.

Because they promote interactive dialogues between participants and researchers, interviews have become a widely accepted means of data collection in many research fields. Thanks to the relationship it facilitates between the parties and its emphasis on

exploration of human phenomena, interviews have come to be a popular data collection method. However, details related to the management of interview data and the process of transcription are often poorly described in published research in spite of the broad application of interviews in research studies. Although generally insufficient information on the process of interview data transcription is provided, many researchers report in their studies that they audio-record interviews and then transform the audiotaped data into written text in some way. This may be considered as a gap in terms of the reliability and validity of the research process (Halcomb & Davidson, 2006). On the other hand, description of the transcription process as well as the presentation of transcriptions are used in order to ensure reliability and validity in the present study.

A complete transcript will probably provide the most useful data concerning how it was transformed into written text before the analysis process. This helped to analyse interview transcripts in order to reveal related information from attitudes and thoughts of the respondents standing as a model that represents a wider range of the CEFR users.

3.5.3. Field Notes

The field notes are regarded as one of the major resources of qualitative research in that they provide reflections, opinions and the researcher's own biases through the descriptions of people, places, conversations or activities they include. From the mental, jotted and full types of field notes, mental field notes consisting of observations or discussions and jotted field notes including a few words to remember an event have been utilized in the study. The reason for not using the fully field notes which contain everything during the study was not to interrupt the natural flow of the conversations. Rather than descriptive field notes focusing solely on the description of observations or scenes, analytic field notes taking account of the researcher's feelings, interpretations, reflections and analysis of the events in addition to descriptions were used in this study (Catal, 2012).

Making field notes during and immediately after each interview showing thoughts and observations can also help in the data analysis process. The researcher took notes before and after each interview. No notes were taken during the interviews to avoid the risk of disrupting the flow of the interviews. These notes described anything that attracted the researcher's attention throughout the interview process.

3.5.4. Trustworthiness

Researchers in qualitative inquiries are generally required to show that their study is credible, plausible and valid. Researchers often employ at least one of the validity procedures of triangulation, member checking, peer reviews, thick description or external audits within their study report results. Throughout the study it is assumed that validity is not related to the data but it is mostly related to the inferences made from the data. In contrast to quantitative research in which the concern of researchers is mostly numerical inferences or content validity of interpretations of scores, qualitative researchers establish a viewpoint of validity based on the views of people participating in a study. A qualitative researcher has the assumption that reality is socially constructed within the way how participants perceive it to be. Thus, the accurate presentation of the participants' perceptions of reality in the study is regarded as crucial. There is a search for the ways of making the participants actively involved in an assessment process in which the interpretations can reflect and represent them as accurately as possible (Creswell & Miller, 2000).

The researcher tried to give a representation of the respondents' thoughts and feelings in a systematic but honest way. Verbatim transcriptions of audio-recordings ensured the accuracy of representation of thoughts and meanings generated by the participants. This assisted the verification of data accuracy without having to contact participants directly.

3.6. Analytical Framework of the Study

In this study, aims and objectives are set in advance and shaped by the information requirements of the study. The structured topic of the study guides the process of the identification and analysis of the patterns within the qualitative data derived from the interviews. Thus, certain principles of the framework approach, which enabled the researcher to explore data in depth for the enhancement of the analytical process, are adopted as a means of qualitative data. In the initial stages of setting the analytical framework, significant themes are identified thereby making the process of data analysis transparent through the illustration of the linkage between the stages of analysis. Within the framework approach data analysis is explicitly described, which enhances the

credibility of findings. The principles of the framework approach coincide with the principles of undertaking qualitative analysis. Up to now, the steps of the principles of transcribing the interviews, being immersed within the data to obtain detailed insights of the phenomena being explored have been completed in the study. From this section on, principles of developing a data coding system and linking codes of data to form encompassing categories/themes leading to the development of the research topic will be explained and applied (Smith and Firth, 2011; Gale, Heath, Cameron, Rashid and Redwood, 2013).

The analytical framework of the present study systematically and explicitly applies the principles of undertaking qualitative analysis to a series of interconnected themes guiding the process. These interconnected stages enabled the researcher to move back and forth across the data till a coherent account was reached. This resulted in the refinement of the following themes, which are regarded as important for the data in relation to the research questions, leading to the development of a conceptual framework:

- 1) EFL teachers' knowledge about the CEFR
- 2) The extent of applicability of the CEFR and the ELP
- 3) Integration of the CEFR and the ELP into tests or exams (The use of the CEFR and the ELP in language assessment process)
- 4) Perceptions/Viewpoints of EFL teachers related to the CEFR effect on language teaching
- 5) EFL teachers' perceptions about the language used in the CEFR
- 6) Reasons for teaching/learning English

Each line, phrase or paragraph of the transcript was taken into account for the development of codes and categories. All the data relevant to each category were identified and examined through constant comparison. Throughout the analysis process of the study, data could be examined and referenced by these identified themes (Pope, Ziebland and Mays, 2000).

The piloting phase helped the researcher to identify certain interview questions that needed to be improved and to obtain data necessary for estimating the requirements of the actual study.

The first interview phase helped to obtain data about the knowledge of EFL teachers concerning the CEFR and the ELP. This part also gave insight into the recent course books and the curriculum which came out to be in alignment with the CEFR. The facts that teachers can identify parts of the CEFR-related parts of course books and that the course books include communicative language activities are also revealed in the first interview part. Although the course books include parts about self-assessment, they are partially applied due to various reasons. The data helping with getting an idea about the perceptions of EFL teachers of the CEFR effect on language teaching, of the language used in the CEFR and of reasons for learning/teaching English could also be obtained via the first interview part.

Visual stimulus assisted to obtain data about the perceptions of EFL teachers concerning the CEFR level descriptors.

The second interview phase gave insight into the differences in opinions of teachers before and after using the CEFR tables. The language used in the CEFR, which was found to be clear and understandable in terms of users, could also be thoroughly commented on during the second interview part.

Field notes, which were used throughout the data analysis process, shed light on the analysis of the interviews. Field notes helped the researcher to make interpretations about the reactions of the respondents concluded from pre- and post interview interactions.

CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Introduction

In this chapter, methods, data analysis and findings of the analysis of the data obtained through the research instruments (interviews and field notes) will be presented. The present study surveyed the perceptions related to the language used in the CEFR by implementing interviews and field notes as data collection instruments. Reviewing the literature (Burnard, 1991; Zhang & Wildemuth, 2009; Mayring, 2000) assisted the researcher to decide that content analysis is the most appropriate way to analyse the data obtained through the research instruments. The reasons for using content analysis as well as the analysis and results of the research instruments will be discussed throughout the chapter.

4.2. Methods of Data Analysis

In this study, a method of qualitative interview data analysis similar to the one offered by Burnard (1991) was used. It can be described as a method of content analysis. All of the interviews carried out were recorded in full. Additionally, the whole of each recording was transcribed. Four out of eight interviews were conducted in Turkish, so the transcriptions of the Turkish ones (See Appendix 11) were translated into English.

Content analysis has been used efficiently in many kinds of research applications recently. Addressing the weaknesses of the quantitative method many studies carried out currently use qualitative contents analysis. Among many definitions made about qualitative content analysis is the one defined by Mayring (2000, p.2) as “an approach of empirical, methodological controlled analysis of texts within their context of communication, following content analytic rules and step by step models, without rash quantification” demonstrates that the focus of the content analysis is on integrated view of speech or texts and the specific contexts of them. Qualitative content analysis, which does not just mean the counting of words or getting the hidden or obvious meanings from texts, enables researchers to group the social reality related to the subject under investigation.

This study sample for qualitative content analysis involves texts, selected on purpose, which were intended to inform about the research questions being investigated. The qualitative approach adopted by the study has given way to the production of descriptions and expressions from respondents which reflect their viewpoints about the topic of the study. Thus, both the researcher and the readers of the study results may better understand the perspectives and perceptions of the producers of the text. As is the case in any qualitative content analysis, the study emphasizes special themes illustrating the range of the meanings of the phenomenon, not the statistical importance of the occurrence of the texts.

Qualitative content analysis has emerged as a useful alternative to traditional quantitative content analysis especially when the purpose of a study is to make interpretive judgements. The aim of qualitative content analysis is providing a rich description of the social reality as they are experienced in a particular setting. If the data is carefully prepared, coded and interpreted, the results of qualitative content analysis will not only support the development of new theories but also validate existing theories and provide thick descriptions of particular settings (Zhang & Wildemuth, 2009).

As a transcriber the researcher has tried to describe the interview content keeping the fact in mind that it plays a key role in both the form and accuracy of transcription. It is accepted that transcription is a part of the data analysis process and it is advised to be clearly disclosed in the methodology section of a study. Because qualitative research emphasizes the exploration of values, ideas, experiences or beliefs about the topic under investigation, data analysis techniques like conversation or discourse depend on verbatim data transcriptions. Since the text is crucial for the research design in qualitative research, bringing researchers closer to the data a verbatim record of the interview is definitely useful for data analysis (Halcomb & Davidson, 2006).

4.3. Analysis and Results of the Field Notes

Both before and after the interviews, certain notes regarded as significant were taken based on the interactions with the respondents. The field notes shed light on the analysis of the interviews. The interpretations about the reactions and reflections of the respondents taken from the field notes were written down in the analysis part of the interviews. Along with the interviews the field notes were also analysed through content

analysis and reflections based on the field notes were used throughout the data analysis process.

The field notes helped the researcher to fill in blank spaces in the interviews. Recording the interviews enabled the researcher to compare between the notes and the actual responses when necessary, which allowed to reflect on the conversation to assure adequate representation of the meanings produced by participants. Additionally, in cases where some kind of ambiguity in meaning or inconsistencies were felt, the audio-recording helped for the clarification of the intended meaning from the original source. Above all, reference back to the original recordings provided the researcher with examples to illustrate the study findings within the context of methodology section in the form of written reports.

4.4. Analysis of the Interviews

Based on the belief that everything said in an interview is said in its unique and special context, it would be a risk to cut out any string of words, which would change the meaning and which would mean the ignorance of the context. Likewise, the interviews conducted in English are presented with all grammatical and semantic mistakes made during the natural flow of conversation by the participants. If sections of interviews were cut into pieces, the real and whole meaning of the interview would get lost. Copies of the complete interviews were kept for direct reference while writing up the findings. The researcher referred directly back to the complete transcripts or original tape recordings whenever there was something that appeared unclear. This enabled the researcher to stay closer to the original meaning and contexts (Burnard, 1991).

The researcher wrote up the findings by using verbatim examples of interviews which assisted to make comparisons and contrasts. In qualitative data analysis, there appeared the problem of what to exclude from the transcription analysis. The researcher took the presence of unusable pieces which would cause ambiguity in conveying a message into account and interpretations were made in a way that appeared quite coherent to the researcher.

The interview responses were interpreted and references were made in a way that was assumed not to compromise the essence of the original meaning produced by the study participant. The transcriptions served as the primary sources of data for content

analysis. Presentation of quotations excerpted from interview transcriptions supplied further description of the identified criteria and illustration of situational contexts from which the criteria were adjusted (Zhang & Wildemuth, 2009).

After informing the participants comprehensively about the background and nature of the study, two interview protocols each consisting of 8 semi-structured questions prepared to be answered before watching the sample KET (Key English Test) speaking exam video and four questions to be answered after watching the sample video were designed. In order to be able to get the participants' consent for the further development of the research, one of the protocols was prepared in Turkish (See Appendix 3-4) and the other one in English (See Appendix 1-2). The participants were left free to choose the language they would speak in the interview. They either chose their native tongue or English. This enabled the participants to express themselves better and more freely.

Apart from the main questions, the researcher used probes when necessary in order to obtain further information about the research questions. The interviewees were informed about the audio-recording process before the interviews. Each of the interviews lasted about ten minutes on average. All of the interviewees took seventy-six minutes in total. Each of the interviews consisted of two phases. In the first phase, interviewees were asked about their opinions related to their knowledge and applicability of the CEFR. The second phase conducted after watching the sample speaking video involved questions about the CEFR level and the language used in the CEFR. The video took about four minutes, which was kept out of recording and the time allocated for watching the video was not included in the total interview time (seventy-six minutes). After the video the respondents were asked about their opinions related to the level of the speaking pattern in the video. They were not provided with the correct answer for the level. They were provided with the tables of the CEFR level descriptors and told to read them. The tables were in Turkish (See Appendix 6) for the interviews conducted in Turkish and they were in English (See Appendix 5) for the ones conducted in English. They were asked whether their opinions changed after reading the tables or not. Additionally, they gave their opinions about the language used in the CEFR level tables. The responses from the interviewees for each question are reported descriptively and sample comments from the interviews are presented as data for the study.

After the pilot interview and the first interviews, it was realized that there were certain unexpected challenges faced concerning the background information of the participants related to the topic. Because the first interviews were directly conducted without providing the respondents with certain information about the research topic, they had difficulty in commenting on the questions. That is why the respondents were provided with the study topic and purpose along with certain exemplifications. For instance, the copies of parts of the curriculum related to the CEFR and example pages from the current course books (See Appendix 7-8-9-10) in alignment with the CEFR were shown to the respondents before the interviews.

4.5. Results of the Interviews

The results of the first phase of the interviews including eight questions asked before the respondents were provided with the CEFR tables and the second part of the interviews including four questions asked after they watched the sample speaking video will be presented in this section. The interviews conducted with the first four participants (P-1, P-2, P-3, P-4) were in English and the ones conducted with the last four participants (P-5, P-6, P-7, P-8) were in Turkish. Therefore, answers of the last four participants were translated into English.

4.5.1. Results of the First Phase of the Interviews

The first interview question was “Have you received training concerning the CEFR? If you have, what kind of training was that (pre-service training, in-service training, etc.)?”. This interview question investigated the accessibility of the pre-service or in-service trainings provided by the MoNE for English language teachers. Answers elicited from the participants illustrate the fact that most of the English language teachers have not had any kind of training concerning the CEFR. Six out of eight participants stated that they do not know about the CEFR or they have not received any kind of training about it. One of the interviewees stated that she read the CEFR on her own but did not get any training. Only two out of eight participants stated that they received in-service training. Here are the extracts from the interviews for the first interview question:

P1: In 2011, I guess, I received an in-service training about the CEFR for two days. They introduced us the CEFR levels, what they include. They gave such an in-service training for us.

P2: No, I do not know about the CEFR. I have received no training.

P3: No, I have not received any training about it but we have been using it for five years in-service, in my school.... That is it.

P4: No, I have never had a training. I have heard and just read it by myself.

P5: I haven't received any kind of training. That's why, to be honest, I do not have much knowledge about it.

P6: Although it was not under the name of the CEFR, I received an in-service training about this subject, about the CEFR. There are in-service training course activities for teachers working for the Ministry of National Education. These can be either obligatory or optional. They incorporated all of the English language teachers into in-service training courses especially after the curriculum change. I received an in-service training about the subject, too. They explained us what the CEFR is, in what ways it will be useful for us, how it is explained in the curriculum a little bit... they gave information about them. Within this context we received a training with general lines in Isparta. I think it was a training received by all English teachers in all cities throughout Turkey at the time of the curriculum change. I cannot remember the year exactly, but our curriculum has changed two or three times in the last ten years, as you also know, so course books were accordingly changed, too. We received a seminar about it then.

P7: I haven't received a training on this subject. I did not receive it at university, too. Later, throughout my teaching life...I did not receive a training in the form of a seminar, too.

P8: No, I have never received any kind of training.

The responses given by the participants to the first interview question indicate the lack of accessibility of both of the pre-service and in-service training courses provided. The results support the findings of previous studies related to views, perceptions, knowledge of EFL teachers or pre-service and in-service trainings provided for them about the CEFR. Sülü and Kır (2014) revealed in their study that foreign language teachers need in-service training and workshops or conferences are advised to be organized for teachers who were found either not giving importance to the issues like culture and process-based learning strongly emphasized in the CEFR or not being aware of these issues. Yakısık and Gurocak (2018) found that EFL teachers working at state

schools have less knowledge about the CEFR when compared to the EFL teachers at private schools. Yuce (2018) states that although it was repetitively reported by different studies before, the MoNE did not take necessary steps for the problematic issue of insufficient and ineffective CEFR-based training in terms of scope and application.

The second interview question was “How do you use the CEFR in your teaching?”. This interview question targeted finding out the real life implementation of the CEFR in terms of teachers (as the implementers of it), course books and the curriculum. It also gave insight into the extent to which the course books and the curriculum are in alignment with the CEFR. The findings reveal that both the recent curriculum and the course books are arranged in accordance with the CEFR as it is also asserted by the programme that an action-oriented approach enabling EFL learners to cope with communicative problems (MoNE, 2018).

Here is the presentation of extracts gathered from the interviews for the second interview question:

P1: In my teaching, we have activities in our course books and sometimes I create my own activities as well. Especially regarding speaking and listening activities I let the students interact with each other, I let the students listen to files. So they improve their language themselves by role playing, listening to real conversations...like this.

P2: In teaching, in my lessons I use course books and the students evaluate themselves. They check their understanding and tick. I use like this.

P3: I am a primary school teacher and in 2nd, 3rd and 4th grades we have English especially on speaking-based training and teaching skills, so we use it especially in the course books. They use basic English terms and mostly speaking courses. I use game-based teaching in my lessons. So I use in this way.

P4: In some parts of our books, there are parts we should do. For example, “e-portfolio”, “checklists” parts...we do these parts and we use it in our teaching. Activity types...For example e- portfolio parts. Sometimes students repair video or video blocks, sometimes they do dialogues, pair work activities and speaking parts.

P5: There are parts, given in the course books, in the form of “peer assessment”, “self-assessment”. We are conducting pair work, group work. We can use like that, within the framework of students’ levels.

P6: In English language teaching they put the CEFR into the curriculum as it is already contained in the curriculum in a way so that it is linked with course books. Especially we can benefit from the CEFR about the competences according to the class level. For example, what is a 5th grade student supposed to learn according to the CEFR, what is expected for each competence... for basic competences...like this...What’s more, they put some examples into the English language curriculum...that is...let’s say example programmes. For example, a 5th grade student should be at level B1, let’s say, he/she should learn at least... words to be able to be a 6th grader. I use this a bit, let me say. Now I am also studying for my MA degree in the department of ELT. Because I am also studying for my MA degree and it is a bit related to my topic, I use the CEFR from this perspective. We have to use it as it is required by regulations. We have to implement the curriculum. Yet it is the complaint of all teachers that “I cannot teach different things as I am dependent on the curriculum.”. However, it is necessary to think from the perspective that being stick to the curriculum does not mean necessarily implementing what is presented in the course book sentence by sentence. You can know the main framework specified by the CEFR and develop different activities by yourself, which is also advised in the curriculum. Knowing only the main framework is sufficient. And this is, in fact, related to the level of students. I think every teacher does not have to be stick to the curriculum.

P7: I use the CEFR in English language teaching as communication...of course, I use it in the form of question-answer technique with students, about dialogue practice...

P8: Yes, we use. Because the curriculum objectives are specified according to the CEFR levels. We are trying to make the students reach the CEFR levels. We see “self-assessment” parts and “can do statements” at the end of the units of our course books. As far as I know these activities are appropriate for the CEFR.

It can be concluded from the responses of the participants to the second interview question that in all educational levels at state schools (primary, secondary and high school

levels) both curriculum and the course books have been designed in accordance with the CEFR. Almost all of the participants mentioned the effect of course books on the implementation of the CEFR. It is stated through the responses that the course books include parts such as “self-assessment”, “e-portfolio”, “checklists” or “Can Do Statements”, which are directly connected to the implementation of the CEFR and the ELP.

The participants also mentioned activities such as role playing, listening to real conversations, dialogue practices, pair and group works, question-answer drills presented in the course books. This can be seen as an indication of availability of communicative language competence principle of the CEFR in the foreign languages programme. Another point revealed in the responses is that the targeted CEFR levels for each grade is determined in the recent curriculum. Some of the teachers are aware of these levels although they do not exactly know the specified level for each grade.

The responses about the activity types show that some foreign language teaching programmes attempt to improve communicative competences of learners by putting emphasis on language skills. The interview results reveal that the course books present real life language samples thereby enhancing speaking and listening skills of learners.

As can be concluded from the responses, the recent curriculum and accordingly the course books are much more compliant with the CEFR than that of the course books of previous years. Thus, it can be stated that the curriculum tries to equip the learners with necessary skills to cope with communicative problems that they may face in their daily lives. The statements of the participants also illustrate that the curriculum and the course books were prepared in line with the communicative purposes of the CEFR. Additionally, that foreign language curriculum comprises the action-oriented approach principle of the CEFR, which help learners to overcome communicative problems, is another conclusion drawn from the answers.

The third interview question “Can you give specific examples of the CEFR influence on the course books you use for teaching in your school?” targeted at the investigation of the CEFR implementation through course books in a detailed and concrete way. The question also searched for answers to whether the EFL programme comprises the educational principle of “task-based learning and “project-based learning”

of the CEFR or not. Quotations from the interviews for the third interview question are presented below:

P1: The CEFR, of course, has influence on our course books. If we look at the old course books, (like 3 or 5 years ago) this year the CEFR has more influence on our course books. Especially there are self-assessment parts at the end of the units. There are self-assessment and portfolio parts at the end of the units. So students consider and check themselves according to the checklists and portfolios. So, I think this is the CEFR influence.

P2: Absolutely, they are influenced. You know our course books are arranged according to CEFR levels. So we are thinking about the levels and we are trying to make their levels higher. So, yes we use them, they are influenced.

P3: I can see the CEFR in the self-assessment part of the books and projects and performance home works of the students and all the course books in primary school are designed in this way. So I can see its influence as this; mostly speaking and project-based learning activities.

P4: The aims which we give students and their activities. For example, we use e-portfolio part, they make dialogues for example. We make practice exams, so we prepare them for these exams in lessons, so there are some parts for these exams in our lesson. We should and have to do them because of the exams.

P5: As I have just said, students are grouped in two or four and they are assessing themselves and their friends. We can use like that... It is limited but we can use just in the parts given in the course books. There are parts ... in the form of "self-assessment". I mean we are using but as far as they can understand. We are helping afterwards. For this we are using translation into Turkish very often of course. So we can use... we can do it without translation at a rate about %50-%60 translation and the rest by using translation. They cannot understand on their own yet, they cannot comprehend the directions completely.

P6: Certainly, I can. As our course books... have to be written in accordance with the curriculum, the Board of Education permits the course books according to this. The course books are already prepared in accordance with the CEFR. Because all of four skills reading, listening, speaking, writing are prepared according to the CEFR and the subjects in the course books are also connected

to this, it is automatically in the course books. Actually there is the CEFR in the course books. And we conduct our courses appropriately.

Of course I can give an example. For example, let's say, for writing competence...of a 5th grader in the CEFR...there is something like this if I am not mistaken...a sentence like students can use the things like preparing a poster or, I do not know, writing an invitation card basically rather than a complex essay or paragraph. The curriculum has taken the CEFR from the parts related to the student levels as I mentioned previously. Let's say...in writing it says that in the CEFR a 5th grade student (of course it does not say "the 5th grade", which is unique to our own educational system) for example a student at level B1 should be able to write a simple letter, an invitation card. Because they prepare the assessment part at the end of the unit according to this. So, in fact, we are following it. If we are giving homework from the course book, for example, it asks the student to prepare a simple movie poster at the end of the unit "movies". So we make an assessment appropriate for the CEFR.

P7: There are self-assessment parts at the end of the course books. The student assesses himself/herself about the points "I can do this.", "I cannot do this.", "I can sometimes do this" ...in the form of self-assessment. In 5th graders the sentences begin with "I can understand...". Their focus is always on what they can do. There is not much about it in the 6th grades.

P8: I teach the 5th and 6th graders. There are sentences beginning with "I can" at the end of each unit. If students think that they can do the objectives in that unit, they put a tick; if they think they cannot, they put a cross and we are trying to make the students gain the objectives pointed as cross again. Likewise, the student has the opportunity to assess himself/herself in the "self-assessment" parts.

The responses to the third interview question show that teachers can identify parts of the course books designed in compliance with the CEFR for all educational levels. It can be inferred from the examples given about activity types presented in the course books that the current course books provide learners with a theme (such as the context of a concert) to talk, write, listen to or read about. This reflects the presence of communicative language activities within the course books designed according to the daily communicative needs of learners.

Dialogue work, pair or group work are widely mentioned in the responses, which is the indication that language use for communicative purposes is emphasized in the course books. The references made by the participants to the activity types like writing an invitation card, writing a letter or preparing a poster are an evidence of the different task types in everyday language use. This shows that the selection of activity types is made according to the CEFR in that they are real life tasks or communicative pedagogic tasks as classified by the CEFR. Additionally, performance and project works aiming to get an idea about the learning process of learners are exemplifications of compliance with the project-based learning principle of the CEFR.

All of the respondents agree that the CEFR influences course books for different reasons. Some talked about its influence by exemplifying the parts of the course books including “self-assessment”, “can do statements”, “portfolio”, “checklists” parts while some mentioned the effect of the CEFR levels on the selection of the activity types. It is also stated in the answers of the respondents that the CEFR is automatically in the course books because the publication of the course books is only possible on condition that they are in alignment with the curriculum, which itself already suggests a framework based on the CEFR.

The responses illustrate that the foreign languages programme aims for the development of learners in the target language regarding the task-based learning principle of the CEFR through presentation of age-appropriate topics or activities for them. From the examples provided by the participants on tasks or other CEFR related parts of the course books, it can be said that the course books were designed according to the task-based learning principle of the CEFR enabling learners to accomplish a task they may encounter in daily use of the target language.

In conclusion, the current course books can be said to be carefully planned and designed according to the requirements of the CEFR in terms of the principles “task-based learning”, “project-based learning”, “communicative domain” along with the CEFR levels.

The fourth interview question was “How do you integrate the ELP and the CEFR into the tests or exams that you use in your school?”. The question was aimed at finding out whether the updated curriculum and related course books comprise the self-

assessment principle of the CEFR or not and, if so, whether the English language teachers can implement it in tests or examinations in real life classroom contexts or not. The answers obtained from the participants show that the course books give learners the opportunity to assess themselves in the target language through the parts such as “self-assessment”, “portfolio” or “checklists” at the end of the units in the course books. However, pre- and post interview interactions with the respondents reveal the fact that they are not carried out thoroughly due to various reasons like the unwillingness of students to assess themselves, their inability to make correct judgements about their progress without help or misdirections of the perceptions of the learners themselves as being always “good”. The related extracts from the interviews can be seen below:

P1: I do not integrate the ELP into tests or exams because they are routine materials that we give points to students. But students have portfolios for themselves. They add each work for each unit to their portfolios. I check them after they finish. The students also check each other's portfolio and they contribute to their points. They can higher their points with these portfolios. But I do not use them in exams, I use them for class-taking parts.

P2: In my lessons and exams, I use self-assessment, projects also. We always have to use that kind of things. I do not put checklists in my exams.

P3: I haven't any idea if I am using it or not because I haven't heard it before. But in second and third grades we do not have any tests or exams. We use three scales to assess students as “good, “very good” and “poor”. Only 4th class students have exams but we don't use any kinds of such techniques.

P4: In high schools, we have to do practice exam. They should include speaking, listening, reading and writing parts for basic parts of a language. But we have difficulties while doing this because classrooms are too crowded. Especially in speaking exam, there 35 students in a class, so we have great difficulty in this exam.

P5: ...Portfolio works...some specific topics are given to students at the end of each unit and we can assess them as classroom performance mark. What's more project works are given in the same way. Project marks are assessed once a year in student reports. We can assess in this way.

P6: Like this...the exams we conduct are the exams that we prepare on our own. I do try to prepare the exams following the assessment parts within the CEFR because they are related to the subjects in the course books as I have mentioned. I am trying not to follow anything else apart from the CEFR much. Because we specify the level of the students according to the CEFR, when we attempt to assess something different, this assessment turns out to be wrong. From this perspective, I implement it in the tests, exams I prepare on my own. ...If you ask whether there is a standard test we apply at school or not, the answer is “No.”. I mean an international exam or an exam with Turkey scale for example, there is not a common exam...we conduct appropriate for the CEFR. There is not an exam like this for foreign languages that the MoNE recommends us, too. Just...err...for the 8th graders...because they will attend the High School Entrance exam, they are having common pilot tests. But they are not in accordance with the CEFR because they are exams with multiple choice questions.

P7: Portfolio...at the end of the 7th grade course books, it asks for preparing a project and putting it into portfolios. They can put the projects, products into their portfolios.

P8: No, I cannot integrate them into my exams Because the ELP targets at self-assessment, to tell the truth, I do not find scoring right. Because I have to give marks in my formal exams, I cannot implement it.

The theory of the testing procedures is explained in the English language teaching curriculum (MoNE, 2018) for the levels from the 2nd grade to the 8th grade in the following way:

The theoretical frame of testing, assessment and evaluation processes is primarily based on the CEFR, in which various types of assessment and evaluation techniques are emphasized. Those are heavily centered on alternative and process oriented testing procedures. In addition, self-assessment is also emphasized, as students are encouraged and expected to monitor their own progress and achievement in the development of communicative competences (Bachman, 1990; CoE, 2001). To this end, each unit includes a list of achievements to be met by the students; this will be converted to self-assessment checklists which ask students to assess their own learning from an action-based perspective. In other words, children are prompted to answer questions such as “What did you

learn?”, “How much do you think you learned?” and “What do you think you can do in real life, based on what you learned in class?” (p.6)

Likewise, all of the respondents agreed on the availability of the parts in the course books enabling learners to manage, assess and take the responsibility of their own learning. However, they stated that they cannot integrate the ELP into formal tests or exams as they have to give points to students but rather they can use them for in-class performance evaluation, for instance.

As can be seen from the quotes above, the procedures used for self-assessment are not used in the form of summative assessments, rather they are formative assessments which are generally low stakes examinations having little or no points value. These can be the portfolios, for instance, into which the students add their work for each unit or new topics. On the other hand, it is mentioned that there is project work in the form of in- and outside-the-class tasks or formal evaluation techniques carried out through written or oral examinations, quizzes, homework assignments helping learners to observe their progress. They are usually summative assessments having high point value. We see these various assessment procedures implemented in a different way for different levels of education. For example, young learners of English (2nd and 3rd graders) are not tested by any summative testing procedures. Only formative testing ways requiring the completion of certain tasks are conducted for the assessment both in and out of the classroom, which aim to create positive attitudes towards the target language. With the 4th grade and onwards, specifically for lower secondary education (from 5th grade to the 8th grade) a variety of testing techniques including both formative and summative procedures are offered to assess language proficiency. For high schools, the presence of practice exams conducted to assess the communicative competences (speaking, listening, reading and writing) is stated in the responses.

All of the assessment types mentioned in the responses to the fourth interview question are in line with the explicit philosophy of the curriculum which offers a diverse range of testing designs including both process and product oriented testing techniques. Thus, it can be concluded that the integration of the ELP and the CEFR into the tests or exams used at schools is mostly through the course books arranged according to the

curriculum offered by the Board of Education. In the current curriculum (MoNE, 2018) testing, assessment and evaluation processes can be said to be primarily based on the CEFR whose focus is on the use of alternative and process-oriented testing procedures in addition to self-assessment. The concrete reflection of this framework of the curriculum was observed by the researcher during the analysis of the course books in terms of the integration of various types of assessment and evaluation techniques as well as self-assessment emphasized by the CEFR into the course books. In almost all of the course books for all grades, each unit consists of a list of achievements (can do statements) in the form of self-assessment checklists through which learners can answer questions about what they learnt, how much they think they learnt or what they can do in real life based on what they learnt in class in order to be able to assess their own learning from an action-based perspective (p.6-7)

As far as the responses are concerned, six out of eight participants stated that they use self-assessment through portfolios or project works. One of the participants declared that she has no idea about whether she is using it or not as she has not heard about the ELP or the CEFR before and one of them said that she cannot integrate the ELP and the CEFR into exams because she does not find scoring right for the self-assessment process.

In brief, the ELP and the CEFR take place in classrooms even if they do not appear in the form of formal exams or they are not used deliberately/consciously or directly by teachers.

The fifth question “Should the CEFR influence the teaching methods, course books and exams?” aimed to investigate perceptions and viewpoints of EFL teachers related to the effect of the CEFR and its use on language teaching. The results show that all of the participants agreed on that the CEFR should influence the teaching methods, course books and exams. Although a number of teachers indicated that they did not know what the CEFR is before the interviews, after they were provided with general information about the CEFR along with example pages of certain course books including the ones they use everyday and the CEFR-related parts of the curriculum according to which they conduct their courses; all of them expressed their opinions about the necessity of the CEFR influence on language teaching. The opinions expressed by the participants can be found in the following quotes:

P1: Of course the CEFR is now acknowledged by many countries worldwide, so they influence teaching methods, course books but in our country they do not influence exams because we and the Ministry of Education still only test reading and comprehension. We do not have speaking and listening in our tests or exams unfortunately but we see that the CEFR influences teaching methods and course books. It should influence the exams that we do and the Ministry of Education does, because to test speaking and listening is very important that's why our students maybe cannot speak or cannot understand what they listen easily. It is because of this, I guess. So it should influence.

P2: Of course, I think they should influence the teaching methods, course books and exams so that we can decide the students' levels and so we can make their levels higher.

P3: Yes, it should influence because at this time English should be taught practically, so the course books and teaching methods shall be designed according to the CEFR and primary school students use English in a very simple way. They can use basic terms about English or they can say...tell us what they have, what colour something is, how many...something is. So it should influence, I think.

P4: Sometimes it should influence according to students' aims, schools, the levels of the students. Yes, it depends on the levels of the students, if they have a good background information, for example we do the speaking parts greater but if they don't have background information we have great difficulty.

P5: ...it can, of course, be more effective on course books but for exams...I think we need some time for this to be established. I mean, because students cannot comprehend completely yet...because our course hours are not sufficient for this, as well... because anxiety for marks in the exams is extremely dominant... I think it may be not in the exams but during lessons. That is, it can be assessed as classroom performance mark but I do not think it will be appropriate at all to assess directly as marks. I mean there is at least a little more time for that. I think it is just early, I mean... Because children... cannot react objectively due to their ages, I think. I mean they say that they can do, so it becomes a bit problematic to evaluate it with marks.

P6: It should...and it is already influencing as I have just said. As I have said, the course books must already...be written according to the curriculum. The writers think about the CEFR related to the selection of the topics or activities in the course books they will write. So, it influences. And that it influences them is what should be. Because the CEFR is now like the thing... the main plan of the countries in which foreign languages are taught; that is, it is something accepted everywhere, something standardised, a standard framework. And the presence of such a framework is necessary, I think. If there were not such kind of a framework...it could not be...for example a person from Turkey will work in Europe, according to what? I mean if we do not follow the CEFR, that person will not be able to accommodate there this time. That's why it is necessary not only during the education but after the education as well. I say that it is necessary for assessment and evaluation.

P7: Because the CEFR regards self-assessment as significant, it should definitely influence because the child can see his/her missing points. It should also influence in terms of communication as well. In fact, its expansion is good, every stage of it will be useful for students, of course.

P8: It should definitely influence. Because there are some objectives and levels specified and put in front of us. So somehow we need to determine whether we can reach them or not. And this makes it much easier.

The responses indicate that the CEFR should have an influence on teaching methods and course books for the reasons of the necessity for communicative and practical use of the target language. Because the CEFR stresses communicative language teaching and learning, the interviewees stated the essentiality of the effect of a world-wide standard framework like the CEFR on language learning and instruction through teaching methods and course books. However, it is specified that the CEFR does not influence exams especially in Turkey because the exams conducted both by teachers and the MoNE in secondary educational levels only test reading or comprehension skills rather than speaking or listening, which is stated as a possible reason for failure in learning a foreign language communicatively in Turkey. This viewpoint advocates that exams should also be influenced by the CEFR. On the other hand, one of the respondents ascertains the need for some more time for the CEFR to be effective on exams due to the

reasons of insufficient course hours, high level of anxiety for marks in the exams and the students' not being ready for complete self-assessment without teacher support. The alternative assessment methods offered by the CEFR are regarded as inappropriate to be scored and an idea of using the CEFR-based assessments not in the exams but during course hours as classroom performance evaluation because students cannot react objectively especially in the case of self-assessment.

Some other opinions put forward the need for a standard framework and level descriptors for the determination of the extent to which the targeted objectives are reached.

The sixth interview question was “How do your students assess themselves using the CEFR?”. The question searched for the availability of the ways of self-assessment such as unit-based self-assessment tools, checklists, various European Language Portfolios or product files. Here is the presentation of the extracts from the responses to the sixth interview question:

P1: They keep portfolios, they do a work, a project, a study or whatever you say at the end of each unit. They put them in their portfolios. They assess them with each other with students and I also assess them. And at the end of each unit there is a small self-assessment part. They do it as well, so they assess themselves. I guess it is a CEFR method.

P2: The students use portfolios. They put their works into their files and so they can see how they are developing. They see the beginning of herself/himself and the end of himself/herself, so they can realize the differences.

P3: The course books have assessment parts but I don't think students use these parts effectively. When I help them they can assess themselves. I tell point five if you are good or if you are not good point zero.

P4: There are some checklists in our course books. Students are usually unwilling to do them but we ask these questions to them. They put tick for these checklists, so they can assess themselves.

P5: ... As I have said... they can assess themselves in the self-assessment parts comprising 5-6 sentences but to what extent it is objective is open to question... I mean it is not that objective because children think that they are very good, they

always tick the choices like “I can do it” or “well done”. However, more different results may arise when we do assess, that’s why I do not think those parts are objective.

P6: It is possible in this way...As I have said, if I give an example from the course book, there are now self-assessment parts, checklists at the end of the course books. They tick the checklists like “I could learn specific skills.”, “I could learn well.” or “I am not very good.” Which are provided through 4-5 basic lines at the end of each unit. There is such a self-assessment part. They both fill this part and I do tell them to assess themselves...we sometimes conduct peer assessment as well. From this perspective... I use the CEFR.

P7: I conduct a quiz at the end of each unit and I collect them. I evaluate the process of student progress.

P8: Yes, the students find the chance at the end of each unit to assess themselves through the self-assessment parts and can do statements related to the objectives of the unit. When I check those parts after the class hours, I also help him/her later if he/she cannot reach the related objective.

It can be understood from the extracts above that all of the participants agreed on the presence of the parts related to self-assessment at the end of the units in the course books and their value with regards to the evaluation of student progress. Portfolios, project work, checklists, can do statements are the common ways exemplified for the use of self- assessment. Most of the participants asserted that the self-assessment parts can be carried out effectively whilst some others pointed out the inefficiency of these parts because of the reasons like unwillingness and inability of students to assess themselves without teacher help. One of the participants mentioned these parts as not being objective since the students often perceive themselves as “very good” and they always tick the choices like “I can do it” or “Well done”.

Another way expressed by a participant was to check the self-assessment or the can do statements parts after class hours so that she could help the student to reach the related objective on condition that the student thought he/she could not achieve an objective.

The indications of the responses to the sixth question illustrate that both the curriculum and course books enable the students to assess themselves through unit-based self-assessment tools at the end of each unit, which is a sign of the alignment of the current foreign language programme with the CEFR. However, how effectively it is used varies from teacher to teacher. It can be concluded from both the interview results and pre- or post-interview interactions with the participants that some of the teachers use the self-assessment tools as they find them useful while some others prefer skipping the related parts and some use them just because they take place in the course books without knowing that they are using the CEFR.

The seventh interview question was “How do you describe the language used in the CEFR?”. The question attempted to find out whether the participants have read the CEFR or not, whether they are familiar with the CEFR or not and, if so, whether they had difficulty in understanding the CEFR or not and whether the language of the CEFR is clear enough to be comprehended by the users well or not. The interview responses to the question are presented below:

P1: They showed/ told us in the in-service training. The language is OK. It is understandable. There could be more explanations, examples maybe but I think it is OK.

P2: I have not read the CEFR.

P3: I haven't read the CEFR, so I don't have any idea about it.

P4: I think it is good, useful, especially basic parts, for example at first steps it is useful and easy for all students so they can do it and they want to do it but in upper levels they have difficulty, so they are unwilling.

P5: ... because I do not have much knowledge, to tell the truth, I do not know how I can describe now. So I will not be able to help about this subject.

P6: ... It has especially two versions. In English teaching curriculum there are both English and Turkish versions. I read it there. Do you mean the language used in terms of shape? Understandable? I think for anyone who graduated from the ELT or who deals with foreign languages if he/she completed his/her bachelor's degree...it is understandable. I mean...the references are also given. If you mean the students, I do not think they are aware of it much...Because we do not say to students, for example, that “You have to reach a specific level.” Or “Your level

is this according to the CEFR.” We are not explaining to them something like that. But they understand “can do statements”. Because the course books are written suitable for their levels, we do not have any problems. That is...in the form of simple sentences. Let me give an example from the 5th graders. For instance, it says “I can...write five different words about movies.”. Because they are the sentences suitable for their own levels, they do not experience a problem. Yes, there can be some words they do not know. I do explain them. But the sentence structures are generally simple, in a form they can understand.

P7: There are checklists. Some students, it changes according to their levels, can carry out the evaluation quite well. For example, they can understand the part “Always” and point it but some students are not aware of the case much. The students generally can understand these sentences because the words related to the recent topics they have learnt are used in these sentences. The sentences are appropriate for their levels.

P8: I cannot comment on this as I haven’t read the CEFR.

Four out of eight participants stated that they did not read the CEFR, therefore they could not comment on the language used in the CEFR. One of the participants answered the question as far as the information provided via the in-service training he received is concerned. The language used in the CEFR was evaluated in terms of students and teachers separately. Most of the comments were made on the level of descriptors within the CEFR.

From the perspective of teachers, the language used in the CEFR is found clear and understandable. Nevertheless, the need for more examples and explanations for a more comprehensible framework is expressed. The students are thought as not being aware of the levels or descriptors, for instance. Because they are not informed about a framework like the CEFR and the levels it offers, the language used in the Framework is evaluated according to the CEFR-related parts of the course books in the case of the grades from the 2nd to the 8th classes. “Can Do Statements” and “Checklists” are found appropriate for the level of students. The interviewees point out the fact that certain unknown words may appear at times and they cope with the problem either by explaining those words or by letting the students use a dictionary. As for the students at high school, the level of clarity in the language used is regarded as being dependent on the students’

levels. It is found understandable for upper levels whilst it becomes more and more complex for lower levels.

The eighth interview question “Do you think learning English is important? Why? Why not?” investigated the viewpoints of EFL teachers regarding learning of English. The reason of searching for the exploration of answers to such a general question is that different beliefs and attitudes teachers hold about learning English may influence what and how they teach. EFL teachers’ interpretations about this question are proposed to unearth their outlook regarding language and learning. Here are the responses of the teachers regarding their opinions about learning English:

P1: Of course it is important. Because it is a worldwide language now. You can communicate with everyone around the world via English so our students should learn it as well very good. That is our hope.

P2: Yes, of course it is very important. Especially in our developing world it is very important so people should learn English. In every part of the world English is used so it is very important, I think.

P3: It changes. It depends on families, students, interests. But I think yes, it is important. We are in a transcultural age, so students should explain themselves in any language or in a second language at least. So I think yes, they should learn English and they should practise it. Practising is much more important than learning it.

P4: For me it is important because I am an English teacher. But if you ask this another person or another teacher, for example a history teacher, maybe he will say it is not important. So it changes from person to person, from perspective of people.

P5: We are discussing it a lot with our students, too. They ask “Teacher, why are we learning English? Let them learn Turkish if it is so necessary to communicate.” We cannot explain this in any way. I mean... because it is a common language used in the world, of course learning English is very important. ...Especially we are going abroad, for example, or we are going to different cities. We need to communicate with other people... that is, English is the only key for communication in the world, I think we have to learn English...but...because there is the understanding of “I understand, but I cannot speak” in our country. I mean

more importance should be given to speaking but it is not so possible...I mean there are exams...in the form of tests...I teach higher level of classes, for example I am teaching 8th graders, they want to skip listening parts at once. We are not doing so, of course, but these students understand its value later because we are continuously getting feedback from our graduate students studying at departments of English language teaching. They say "Teacher, we see now how right you were" but I attribute this to exam anxiety. Okay, they learn but they have difficulty in expressing themselves. There is a situation like this but I also think it is really important.

P6: ...There are many kinds of answers that can be given to this. I think it is necessary to ask a question like "Learning of what other languages apart from English is important in your life?" instead of the question "Is learning English important, why?" should be asked because learning English...how can I say?... has gone beyond being a need and it has become a necessity in our country just as the case in many other countries. Because our students are also encountering with English at almost every field. For example, even when they want to play a game on mobiles there appears an English menu before them. Moreover, it sometimes makes the process more convenient for us. I mean it has come into every field of our lives. I am not evaluating just in terms of education...that is media, publications, I do not know, we confront with it everywhere. What do they call it? "Lingua franca". It has become a common language, the common language of the world. That's why learning it is very important, I think. Just writing like I know English, at intermediate level, I know a little, I know well on CVs does not express anything. It is necessary to learn English well. If your goal is making a good career, I think it is necessary to add other languages besides it.

P7: Learning English, learning a language...if it were not important, they would not say "A language is a person; two languages are two persons.". English is a world language. Everybody, everything is connected to English. We see English in, I do not know, even a very small belonging, so it means that it is very very important. Why is there English in everything rather than another language? Like this, I mean...I do not know...another thing is that learning a language is enjoyable. The person gains more self-confidence. Like this...I mean...a person

learns cultures different from his/her own. English is different from Turkish. The person learns a different language, comprehends different structures from every perspective...when someone goes abroad, he/she thinks that I can do this, I can speak...It also gives happiness...like this. English also arises in the exams nowadays, let's not even mention it, it is already a known fact... like this.

P8: It is definitely important in terms of being able to express oneself as an English teacher. English is a language accepted as "lingua franca" at every part of the world. So I believe that everyone, regardless of their age, needs to know not only English but also a few other languages. I say that it is definitely important.

As can be seen in the expressions above, all of the participants, except for one who stated an opinion that its level of importance is changeable from person to person, regard learning English as very important. There is an emphasis on English as a "lingua franca", a world-wide language being the only key for communication around the world. Another point stressed is the necessity of learning English in order to be able to catch up with the improvements in our developing world. One of the CEFR's principles "plurilingualism" also takes place in the responses through statements of the need to learn other foreign languages apart from English. Learning English is found important with the reason of the enlightenment that will be gained through learning another culture, which coincides with the CEFR's principle "pluriculturalism".

The matter of learning English just in theory and difficulties in practical use of English is handled, too. The understanding "I understand, but I cannot speak" in Turkey, along with debates and criticisms on the inefficiency of English education, is addressed. The reasons for this problem are referred to as crowded classrooms, unwillingness of the students who find listening or speaking parts of English courses time-consuming since they are preparing for an exam in the form of a test consisting of multiple questions, which are unable to assess these skills.

To sum up, EFL teachers regard learning English as important but they state that they cannot conduct activities based on the CEFR due to various reasons like exam anxiety, crowded classrooms or changeable levels of students although they are aware of the fact that learning English means being able to communicate via English.

4.5.2. Results of the Second Phase of the Interviews

After the first part of the semi-structured interview, the respondents watched a KET (Key English Test) speaking exam video sample in level A2. The reason for the selection of the of the sample video of an exam in level A2 was that it is a common level specified in all educational levels' (primary, secondary and high school) curriculum. The questions asked after watching the video and the responses transcribed are presented along with their results below:

The first question after watching the video was “What level is the speaking pattern in the video?”. The question attempted to find out the perceptions of the participants related to the CEFR levels given their background knowledge, if any, about the CEFR levels. Responses of the interviewees to the question are presented in the following extracts:

P1: It is the basic level, I think. Because they spoke of their daily lives, what they like. They answered simple questions. It is like A1 or A2, between maybe. One student was better. Gustav spoke better but the other Mexican student's level was a bit lower. That's the speaking pattern in the video, I guess. The second student Gustav is maybe A2 but the Mexican student is A1. One of the students answered better and the other lower.

P2: I think the pattern in the video is level A2.

P3: I think it is B1 level. According to the teacher's questions and she asks “why” questions especially, so I think It is B1.

P4: Maybe at the start of the video, I think it is A1 but as it continues, it goes on it becomes more complex. I think A2 maybe.

P5: I think it is level B1. I decided so while watching.

P6: ...When I thought about the CEFR first, it seemed to me that it could be level A2. It seemed like Gustav spoke a bit more fluently, without waiting. But the level of Louis seemed like A1 to me.

P7: I think the level is A1.

P8: I thought the level as A1 when I first watched the video but as the video went on I decided the level as A2.

As mentioned before, after watching the sample video the participants gave their responses to the first question about the level of the speaking pattern without being provided with the tables of the CEFR level descriptors. Only one of the participants made a definite decision on the level of the speaking pattern as A2, which is the level of the sample KET speaking exam. Two of the participants stated their opinions about the level as being between A1 and A2 asserting that the students in the video are in different levels. Two interviewees argued about that the level is different at the start of the sample conversation and it becomes a different level through the end of the conversation. They declared that at the start of the video it was level A1 but it seemed as level A2 as the conversation proceeded and the sentences became more complicated. Two of the participants expressed their opinions about the level as B1 and one of them decided on level A1.

The conclusion that can be drawn from the assertions is that teachers do not have common opinions on the CEFR levels in general. They either remain indecisive shuttling between two different levels or they are delivering an opinion far from the level in question.

The second question “Why do you think it is level?” aimed to investigate the reasons the participants would set forth related to the CEFR level they expressed to be used in the sample speaking video. The question also targeted at finding out whether the teachers are familiar with the CEFR level descriptors which enable the users to make a differentiation between and among different levels or not. Here are the quotes from the participants putting forward their reasons for their assertions about the CEFR level in the sample speaking pattern:

P1: Mexican student could not say what he actually thought of. He could not say what he thought. He always used the same words, same patterns, that's why I think his level was a bit lower. But Gustav, the second student used several different words. In one question he said that he did not understand the question and wanted the question to be repeated. But still he answered better. That is why his level may be A2 and Mexican student is A1.

P2: Because both of the boys can describe simple terms, their family, other people. They talk about other people and living conditions, their educational background, present/recent job. So I think they are A2 level.

P3: The teacher's questions are a bit complex for the students. She is asking the reasons or she wants detailed information about their school, homeland for example. So I think the level is B1.

P4: At the beginning, the basic questions "what's your name", "how do you spell" Yes, I think because of this it is A1 but it continues it asks their father's job, their schools, their styles, how do you travel to school, so I think it is A2.

P5: Because I think there were a bit complex, complicated sentences. Especially the sentences with "How long" made me think that the level may be B1. ...But after I saw the table, my opinion has changed.

P6: Because Louis reacted, answered slowly and after thinking a lot. Gustav was...like more confident, it seemed to me that the words he used were wider. Especially in his answers he gave to the questions about his family. Therefore, I thought that Gustav is a bit better.

P7: I thought that the sentence structures are simple. They are not complex.

P8: The sentences started to be much more complex through the end of the video. That he introduces himself, spells his name at the beginning...I thought that it is level A1. Later on, because the speech became a bit more complicated with the information he gave about his school and family, I thought the level as A2.

It can be understood from the reasons presented that some of the expressions like "describing simple terms", "their family", "other people", "living conditions", "educational background", "recent job", "their school", "homeland", "introducing oneself, "spelling names" coincide with the statements used in the CEFR level descriptors tables. The questions such as "What is your name?", "How do you spell...?", or the ones beginning with "How long?" were other prompts that helped teachers make their decisions. Additionally, the participants utilized certain other prompts like the variety or number of patterns and words, the competence of asking for repetition, asking for reasons or detailed information, complexity level of questions and answers, the state of confidence, silent thinking time used by the students in the sample speaking video.

The third question asked after the participants read the CEFR tables was “After reading the CEFR level descriptors, what do you think about the speaking level in the video?”. The question’s aim was to reveal any change in opinions of the participants related to the level in the speaking video after they were provided with the tables of the CEFR level descriptors. The results were supposed to give insight into the extent to which EFL teachers are aware of and familiar with the CEFR levels specified in the curriculum they implement in their daily teaching experiences. The responses of the interviewees to the question can be found in the following extracts:

P1: They both talked about their jobs, their family and living conditions. Gustav said that his school is far from where he lives and he comes by a taxi to school, etc. The level of both is not the same because Gustav answered the questions better. He gave more examples, used more phrases and sentences so Gustav is maybe level A2. But Mexican student is between A1 and A2, more A1. Because he uses simple phrases and all the time the same phrases and sometimes could not explain what he wanted to. So in-between A1 and A2 I can say. After I read the descriptors my opinions stay nearly the same.

P2: My opinion is the same. Their level is A2.

P3: After reading, I have changed my opinion as level A2. Because as it is written they are describing their families, living conditions... So it is level A2.

P4: Yes, I think the same. Because it says simple phrases to describe “where I live” and “people I know” ... simple phrases and it is A2... my family, other people, educational background, yes because... I think the same.

P5: Now that I think it is level A2. Because, the information given there meshes together with ... level A2. They understood easily and gave examples when the teacher spoke slowly. He gave good answers about his school, too...Because he gave answers to the questions having short and clear answers, I thought it is level A2.

P6: My opinion has changed a bit. That is, I thought that both of them are level A2. Especially when I look at the thing about spoken production here in the CEFR, yes they are at a level that they can maintain the conversation. There was not an interruption at least. They answered the questions, yes level A2.

P7: After reading the sample, there are the most basic personal and family information, shopping, jobs...I have changed my opinion as A2 after reading them.

P8: I was in-between A1 and A2 before reading the descriptors, I have decidedly made up my mind about the level as A2. The descriptors helped me to differentiate between the two.

It is remarkable that all of the participants, except for one expressing that the students taking the KET speaking exam in the sample video are at different levels, made their decisions about the level as A2, which was the level in the sample speaking pattern. Thus, it can be concluded that the descriptors assisted the participants to differentiate between the levels. The descriptors can be defined as being clearly indicated in a way that is helpful for the users to relate the levels to the descriptors.

The results of the first three questions for the second part of the interview (the part after watching the sample speaking exam video) are summarized in the table (Table 7) below:

Table 7: Results of the First Three Questions for the Second Part of the Interview

PARTICIPANTS	THE RESPONSE BEFORE READING THE CEFR DESCRIPTORS	REASON	THE RESPONSE AFTER READING THE CEFR DESCRIPTORS	REASON	CHANGE IN OPINION
P1	Basic level, A1 or A2, between maybe. One of the students is level A1 and the other is A2.	One of the students answered better by using different words while the other student used the same patterns.	In-between A1 and A2.	Both of the students talked about their jobs, family and living conditions. But still Gustav answered better with more phrases, so he is A2. Mexican student is more A1 as he uses the same phrases all the time and he sometimes cannot explain what he wants to.	Nearly the same.

P2	Level A2.	Students can describe simple terms about their family and other people.	Level A2.	No reasons available.	The same.
P3	Level B1.	The teacher's questions are a bit complex for students. She is asking for reasons as well as detailed information.	Level A2.	As it is written, they are describing their families, living conditions,...	Changed.
P4	At the start of the video it is level A1, as the video goes on and becomes more complex, it is A2.	At the beginning basic questions like "What is your name?", "How do you spell...?" are asked. So it is A1 at the start. But later on questions about jobs, their schools, their ways of travelling appear. So it is A2.	Level A2.	Because it says simple phrases like "where I live" and "people I know", "my family", "other people", "educational background",...	Changed.
P5	Level B1.	The sentences are a bit complex, complicated. Especially the questions beginning with "How long?" made me think the level may be B1.	Level A2.	Because the information given meshes together with level A2. They understood easily and gave examples when the teacher spoke slowly. He gave good answers about his school. Because of short and clear answers...	Changed.
P6	Level A2. One of the students is like Level A1.	Louis answered slowly and after thinking a lot. Gustav seemed more confident and answered with a wider range of words. So, Gustav is better, level A2, I think.	Level A2.	They are at a level that they can maintain the conversation. There was not an interruption.	Changed.
P7	Level A1.	The sentence structures are simple, not complex.	Level A2.	Basic personal and family information, shopping, jobs...	Changed.
P8	At the start I thought the level as A1 but as the video went on	I thought the level as A1 at the beginning of the video when	Level A2.	I was in-between A1 and A2 before reading the	Changed.

	I decided the level as A2.	students introduced themselves, spelled their names, Later on, when the speech became more complicated with the information given about schools and families, I thought the level as A2.		descriptors, I have decidedly made up my mind about the level as A2. The descriptors helped me to differentiate between the two.	
--	----------------------------	--	--	--	--

The fourth interview question asked after watching the sample video was “How do you find the language used in the tables?”. The question aimed at finding out the answer to the main research question in the study. In other words, it investigated the perceptions related to the language used in the CEFR tables. The participants who had background information beforehand or read the CEFR either on his/her own or in the curriculum gave their responses according to their knowledge in addition to the tables provided during the interviews. However, the rest of the participants who asserted that they had no idea about the CEFR or they had not read it before although they are somewhat familiar with the Framework made interpretations based solely on the CEFR tables provided during the interviews. Here are the quotes by the respondents regarding their comments on the language used in the CEFR:

P1: The CEFR explanation table is OK. I can understand it but it would be better if it would give some more examples. There are a few examples. Because I am an English teacher it is easy for me to understand but for a normal person, a beginner I think they may not clearly understand what is meant to but for me it is OK.

P2: I think the language is appropriate for the level. So A2 level students can use or can talk about those things. So it is proper I think. For students' levels it is quite proper and clear.

P3: For me it is not complex. It is ... can be understood but I don't think everybody can understand it in the same way as I think. It can be changed in a simple way and it can be made much more clear, maybe.

P4: According to me it is easy and understandable for me but if you ask to my students especially according to their background information they may say it is hard, it is difficult or it is not understandable. Yes, it changes the level of the

student I think what will they say. It changes according to their level. For me, according to me it is clear and understandable

P5: Quite understandable, clear expressions have been given. That is, as I compare it with my students, I think they are understandable, clear expressions suitable for students' speaking, comprehension and writing levels.

I am thinking of improving myself about this topic and getting information about it. Because I did not have much knowledge. Now that I have seen that we really use it in our course books as well. I am thinking of using it much more and getting more information about it.

P6: ...In terms of the instructor or learner? ...Yes, the language used seems to be more... being written for the instructors. I mean, maybe the learner can also understand but I am looking at some words especially, I wonder whether some words are appropriate for that level or not. Because similar words... that is, I am not talking about the specific words. For example, the word "detail" is also used in the level A1. There are similarly difficult words in other levels, too. It seems more likely to have been prepared for the instructor. I mean, it seems to me that the sentences here can be made easier in terms of the learner. Because when you look at one of the sentences, there is a sentence comprising 4-5 lines. Maybe the learner may not understand exactly at what level he/she is by reading it from here. It seems to me like it has been prepared for the instructor a bit...Some words are difficult without using a dictionary. I mean words like "exchange", "immediate" arise. I think these words are a bit difficult for level A2. He/She will need to use a dictionary.

P7: The language is not so easy. There can be shorter and more simple sentences, more various examples can be given.

P8: I have found successful, understandable and clear. The language used is quite simple and clear. Because now that I have understood the CEFR better, I think that the use of it will be very useful.

Three of the participants explained that the language used is quite "proper", "understandable", "clear" or "simple" in terms of the users. One of them described the language as being "not complex" and understandable but gave an opinion about a possible

change in order to make it more simple, which would result in a much clearer language. One of the participants expressed that the language used is “not so easy” and advised the use of shorter and more simple sentences along with “more various examples”. Similarly, another participant mentioned about the necessity for more examples due to the reason that it is not equally understandable for every user. For example, what is meant may not be clearly understandable for a beginner while it is quite simple for the participant himself as he is an English teacher. Another point addressed by one of the respondents is the fact that the level of clarity or comprehensibility of the language depends on the level of the students and their background information. That is, as expressed by the respondent, the users of lower levels or the ones lacking the necessary background information can find the language “hard”, “difficult” or “not understandable” although it is clear and understandable for herself.

The matter of evaluating the language used in terms of the instructor and the learner separately was revealed by one of the respondents. It is asserted that the tables are more likely to have been prepared for the use of the instructors most. Whilst some expressions may be understandable for the learners, some words like “exchange” or “immediate” may be difficult without using a dictionary for the example level A2, for instance. Therefore, it is proposed that the expressions should be simplified since there are instances in which a sole sentence comprises up to four or five lines, which would be hard for learners to comprehend the intended meaning.

4.6. Discussion

As mentioned previously, a series of interconnected themes guide the qualitative analysis process in the study. This section presents the refinement of these themes considered as significant about the data in relation to the research questions.

The first theme is about the results regarding EFL teachers’ knowledge about the CEFR. The study results point out that still, in 2019, six out of eight EFL teachers state that they do not know about the CEFR and they have not had any kind of training related to the CEFR although it exists within the curriculum and the course books they use in their daily teaching implementations. The study results confirm that necessary steps about the problematic issue of the CEFR-related training, which are insufficient and ineffective

in terms of scope and application, have not been taken by the related authorities although it was repetitively reported and suggested by various studies before.

The second theme is concerned with the extent of applicability of the CEFR and the ELP. The study findings reveal that both the recent curriculum and the course books have been designed in accordance with the CEFR through the adoption of an action-oriented approach. It is clear from the explanations that the curriculum and the units within the course books are connected to “can do statements” aiming to develop learners’ self-regulative learning skills, which illustrates the effective implementation of learner-centred practices suggested by the CEFR and the ELP. From the activity types mentioned by the teachers it can be concluded that there is an observable attempt to transform teacher-centred knowledge driven courses into learner-centred communicative courses. The foreign language programme involving course objectives in the form of CEFR can do statements can be said to have been developed as an integrated programme for all four skills. The reactions of teachers about the case appear to be positive towards the implementation of a can-do statements-based curriculum.

The third theme is related to the integration of the CEFR and the ELP into tests or exams. In other words, it is related to the use of the CEFR and the ELP in language assessment process. As far as the study results are concerned, the ELP and the CEFR take place in real life teaching and learning environments especially via course books even if they do not appear in the form of formal exams. Alternative assessment methods offered by the CEFR are found as inappropriate for the scoring of exams and the use of the CEFR-based assessment types in the form of classroom performance evaluation rather than in written exams is offered by the participants in the study due to the inability of students to react objectively specifically in the case of self-assessment.

General viewpoints of the participants suggest that the teachers feel that it is not right to score self-assessment results. This perspective is in parallel with the CEFR principle that the proficiency level of the language user should be described by positive and concrete behavioural terms and that “can do statements” provide information which could not be received through the score or a grade on a test. The study results include signs for the use of the CEFR and in particular “can do descriptors” as an assessment type or goal-setting in the curriculum and course books. However, there should also be

developments about how “can do descriptors” can be used for score interpretation of exams, because teacher reactions imply that they do not have an idea about how to use “can do descriptors” in exams.

The study results confirm the findings of previous studies in that the learning stage includes defining the content and correlating to relevant “can do statements”, which leads to self-assessment. One of the participants in the study stated that she checks the answers of students to checklists/self-assessment parts after class hours in order to be able to help them to complete the parts perceived as missing or unaccomplished by the students. Although this is not practised consciously by the teacher, it coincides with the research offering re-practice of a task after the completion of the task-specific self-assessment checklists and a second completion of the checklist before a review (O’Dwyer, 2010).

The fourth theme is centred around perceptions and viewpoints of EFL teachers related to the CEFR effect on language teaching. All of the participants in the study expressed their opinions about the necessity of the CEFR influence on language teaching. The requirements for communicative and practical use of the target language and the essentiality of the effect of a world-wide standard framework like the CEFR on language learning and instruction are among the reasons stated about the necessity of the CEFR influence. As can be concluded from the study results, EFL teachers think that the CEFR should have an influence on teaching methods and course books for these reasons. On the other hand, it is pointed out that the CEFR does not have an effect on exams. Insufficient course hours, high level of anxiety for marks in the exams and the students’ not being ready for complete self-assessment without teacher support are the reasons considered to hinder the effective implementation of the CEFR in the exams. In Turkey, exams almost never test speaking or listening (except for the recent application of practice exams just in high schools), which is stated as a possible reason for failure in learning a foreign language communicatively. That the CEFR should also influence the exams is advocated by this viewpoint.

The fifth theme is concerned with EFL teachers’ perceptions about the language used in the CEFR. The language used specifically in the CEFR tables of level descriptors was evaluated. From the perspective of teachers, the language used in the CEFR is defined as clear and understandable. On the other hand, making possible changes in order to make

the language simpler and clearer as well as providing more various examples on the descriptors is proposed so as to make the tables equally understandable for every user. That is the reason why the language used is evaluated in terms of the instructor and the learner separately. When looked at from the viewpoint of the students, the state of clarity of the language used is considered as changeable according to the level of students. Although the language is found understandable for upper levels, it becomes more complex for lower levels. The tables are perceived as to have been prepared mostly for the use of instructors due to the presence of certain words like “exchange” or “immediate” whose meanings would probably be hard for learners to comprehend without the support of the teacher or a dictionary. In addition to those, for learners to be able to grasp the intended meaning the need for simplification of the expressions, which are generally in the form of long sentences comprising up to four or five lines, arises according to the perceptions of EFL teachers about the language used in the CEFR.

“Can do statements” and the way they are expressed are questioned by the researcher within the framework of revealing an idea about the language used in the CEFR because both teachers and students are more familiar with them than any other part of the CEFR. They can be regarded as the reflection of the level descriptors tables. Additionally, by some previous studies like Nagai and O’Dwyer’s search (2011) “can do statements” are believed as a starting point for the implementation of the practices and principles that the CEFR implies.

The study results also reveal the fact that EFL teachers do not share common ideas about the CEFR levels in general as far as their background information about the Framework is concerned. Either they seem to be indecisive shuttling between two separate levels or their guesses about the levels remain far from the level in question. This is an indication of that the implications of CEFR level descriptors do not seem to be engraved in teachers’ minds although the levels are intertwined in the curriculum and the course books they use in daily teaching. That is why necessary trainings (in the form of distance trainings, in-service trainings or workshops) regarding not only the CEFR but also the CEFR level descriptors exclusively should be provided for the teachers as the real life implementers of them.

A remarkable result reached by the study is that all of the teachers (except for one who claimed that the two students in the sample video are at different levels) came to an agreement on the exact level in the sample speaking pattern after they were provided with the CEFR tables. This is a case implying the availability of clearly defined level descriptors which assist the users to relate the levels to the descriptors.

The sixth theme is about the reasons for teaching or learning English. Another remarkable point related to the study results is that EFL teachers regard learning English as very important and they are aware of the fact that learning English means being able to use it communicatively. Among the most notable reasons stated by EFL teachers for teaching and learning English are the widely-accepted role of English as a “lingua franca”, the requirement of learning English to be able to keep up with the improvements in the developing world, promoting plurilingualism because of the need for learning foreign languages other than English as well as the need for being competent in pluriculturalism through learning about and understanding other cultures. On the other hand, the pre- and post-interview interactions with the teachers reveal the fact that the pressure of learning modern languages other than English in Turkey is quite weak. While English is a compulsory subject in schools from the second grade on, other modern languages are taught at only some private schools in Turkey. That is why it is hard to talk about the exact presence of the CEFR’s impact to promote plurilingualism in Turkey.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Introduction

This chapter presents a general overview of the study by providing a brief look at the CEFR and EFL teachers' perceptions about the language used in the CEFR (exclusively the CEFR tables). The study findings are also briefly assessed and lastly implications and recommendations for further research are presented in the chapter.

5.2. Overview and Assessment of the Study

In parallel with the rising popularity of Communicative Language Teaching, which regards communicative ability as the main goal of foreign language teaching, the CEFR was published by the Council of Europe as a framework emphasizing the real-life usage of the target language and communicative competence by describing different language competences. Apart from putting emphasis on communicative competence and learner autonomy, which have been popular in language learning and instruction since the 1980s, the CEFR brought the innovation of an action-oriented approach and common referential levels, scales and descriptors.

The CEFR and its companion documents like the ELP have influenced the view of language teaching and testing as well as curriculum design in Turkey, as is the case throughout Europe. Turkey's desire to achieve full membership of the EU and significance of learning English as a "lingua franca" in order to keep up with the developments in science and technology in the world were among the reasons for Turkey to modify its foreign languages education policy according to the CEFR.

All language teachers were advised to take the CEFR as a guide for making pedagogical choices or decisions. However, it was emphasized that the CEFR should be understood well by both teachers and learners to be able to benefit from it effectively on real life practice of teaching and assessment. Therefore, the recent study attempts to find an answer to the question of whether the CEFR is known sufficiently for an effective application and whether it is clear enough to be understood or not. The answer to this question found at the end of the study is that six out of eight EFL teachers said that they

do not know about the CEFR or have not received any kind of training about it, which illustrates the lack of accessibility of both pre-service and in-service training courses provided. Although there were applications related to bringing the foreign language curriculum and course books in compliance with the CEFR, there seems to be deficiencies in the provision and accessibility of necessary trainings to all EFL teachers who are the key implementers of the CEFR.

Firstly, the background of the study explaining the appearance and importance of the CEFR with their reasons and objectives was dealt with. The problem leading to the study was stated in terms of the application of the CEFR and teachers as key implementers of it. The purpose of the study was clarified as investigating EFL teachers' understanding of the language used in the CEFR and the effect of this understanding on language and learning. The significance and uniqueness of the study as well as assumptions and limitations about it were defined.

Secondly, the relationship between the CEFR and the CoE along with their connection with modern language teaching was explained. The relationship among the Council of Europe, the European Union and Turkey was clarified in terms of understanding the purpose of the CEFR and the ELP. Language education policies in Europe and in Turkey were handled. The CEFR was defined with its goals and innovations, historical background and purpose of the CEFR as well as the action-oriented approach it adopts were reviewed. The notions of plurilingualism and pluriculturalism, which are taken as a basic goal of language learning and teaching by the CEFR, were defined. Criticisms, challenges and difficulties of the CEFR were dealt with. The Common Reference levels, the best-known feature of the CEFR for becoming the standard reference for teaching and testing languages, and their content was presented. The ELP was defined along with the parts it is comprising, the relationship between the ELP and the CEFR was made clear through the explanations about the ELP as part of the CEFR. The use of the ELP with the aim of promoting learner autonomy and encouraging plurilingualism in pupils was explicated.

Thirdly, the methodology of the study was outlined. A qualitative research approach was adopted in search of the interpretations of the language used in the CEFR with respect to the meanings EFL teachers bring to them. Qualitative data was obtained

through the interviews conducted with EFL teachers currently teaching at different educational levels of state schools. Interviews and field notes were used as data collection instruments. Research instruments were pre-tested before the actual interviews. Interviews consisted of two parts. In the first part, participants answered eight questions prepared with the aim of eliciting their knowledge about the CEFR and the ELP as well as their viewpoints regarding language and learning. After the first part of the interview, participants watched the sample KET speaking exam video and answered four questions related to their opinions about the level in the video and the language used in the CEFR tables. Verbatim transcription of all audio-recorded interview data was used as data management strategy. The researcher utilized the interviews and field notes in order to find the answers of the research questions in the study.

One of the main intentions of the study was to explore and analyse how teachers understand the language used in the tables of the CEFR and what the CEFR levels mean to them. According to the qualitative research results, it was revealed that EFL teachers show indecisiveness about the exact level of a sample speaking exam prepared in alignment with the CEFR levels. Only one of the participants made a definite decision about the exact level in the sample whilst the others remained in-between two levels or made incorrect guesses. However, their reasons about their decisions on the level were compatible with some of the statements used in the CEFR level descriptors although they cannot relate them to relevant levels. Given that EFL teachers lack the sufficient knowledge of both the CEFR and CEFR levels, CEFR-based language teaching can be said to be far from effective implementation in Turkey. Therefore, before EFL teachers are donated with the necessary and detailed knowledge about the Framework, it is not possible to talk about the relationship between the EFL teachers' interpretations about the language used in the CEFR and the effectiveness of its implementation. Nevertheless, it can be said that teachers are implementing the CEFR and the ELP consciously or unconsciously via the CEFR-based curriculum and the course books. The ones who know about the CEFR tend to carry out a more effective application. The ones who do not know about the CEFR also play a role in the implementation of the CEFR as far as the curriculum and course books require them to make their applications accordingly. In sum, given that different beliefs and attitudes teachers hold about learning English may influence the way they teach and their interpretations unearth their outlook with regards

to language and learning. EFL teachers regard learning English as important but it is stated that it is not always possible to conduct activities based on the CEFR because of various reasons like exam anxiety, crowded classrooms and changeable levels of students although teachers are aware of the fact that learning English means being able to communicate via English.

As for the evaluation of the language used in the CEFR tables after being provided with the tables, the language was found to be clear and understandable in general. The language was evaluated in terms of the instructor and the learner separately. The CEFR tables are perceived as being prepared for the use of the instructors most as they include certain words and expressions which may be hard or too long to comprehend for learners without teacher or dictionary support. On the other hand, it can be concluded that the language used in the CEFR can be described as being clearly indicated and comprehensible in a way that they are helpful for the users to differentiate between levels and to relate the levels to the related descriptors.

In brief, findings of the present study reveal that EFL teachers are aware of the CEFR levels by name although they do not know the Framework as a notion. If they are given the chance of being donated with the necessary and detailed knowledge about the Framework, the CEFR can be implemented effectively and thoroughly. At this stage, it can be said that the CEFR is applied partially since its implementation seems to be limited with just the “can do statements” part of the Framework rather than being used in the form of assessment. Lastly, CEFR levels appear not to be fully understood by teachers. Teachers seem to underestimate the levels assuming that the levels require too much from learners, which also hinders the effective implementation of the CEFR.

5.3. Implications and Recommendations for Further Research

The study results imply that EFL teachers’ attitudes towards the basic ideas of the CEFR are positive and current foreign language programmes in Turkey are based on the approach advocated by the CEFR. However, teachers encounter certain educational challenges during the implementation process. For instance, the expectations of students or parents may oblige teachers to prepare learners for certain exams, which obviously do not correspond to the main principles of the CEFR. Another factor can be the complexity of the CEFR itself, which probably hinders its effective implementation. Although it is

intended to be comprehensible for everyone, pre- and post-interview interactions in the study reveal that some of the teachers who are familiar with the CEFR either learnt/heard about it from outside sources rather than the original document itself or found the reading of it hard to pursue till the end. Furthermore, most of the teachers do not know the CEFR itself while some of them find it difficult or not right to take the CEFR assessment-related issues into account fully for formal exams and classroom assessment of learners' competence although they are familiar with the levels of competence.

This study has taken just the speaking (spoken production) part of the CEFR tables as a sample for obtaining interpretations of EFL teachers related to the language used in the CEFR or CEFR level tables specifically. Further research can be done on the other parts (reading, listening, writing) so as to get an idea about teachers' views related to the CEFR level of written KET exam samples, for instance.

Analysis of the first theme 'knowledge of EFL teachers about the CEFR' revealed the implications that the CEFR is a global framework appealing to all teachers throughout the world although it was essentially proposed at a European level and it has worldwide validity. Although the teachers do not know the CEFR as a notion, they are aware of the levels. They apply the principle of the CLT, which actually forms the basis of the idea behind the CEFR. As for the recommendations which may be helpful for future researchers related to the elicitation of the first theme, they can select equal numbers of teachers from the ones who know about the CEFR and who do not, so that perceptions and interpretations of these two distinct groups could be compared. In this study, randomly selected teachers were interviewed. That is why, there occurred a condition of imbalance in terms of the numbers of teachers who are familiar and who are not familiar with the CEFR, which hindered to make comparisons between these two groups of teachers. Additionally, interviews with more EFL teachers in number or even group interviews may help to generalize the results for larger educational contexts. Action research can also be recommended to be conducted with a group of volunteer teachers who do not know about the CEFR yet. They can be offered a training programme about the CEFR. Pre- and post-training programme differences about the changes in teachers' viewpoints regarding language and teaching can be analysed.

Analysis of the second theme ‘the extent of applicability of the CEFR and the ELP’ has implications regarding the implementation of the Framework. The effect of the CEFR and the ELP can be said to be embedded in the educational system through the adoption of an action-oriented approach and learner-centred practices within the coursebooks and the curriculum. On the other hand, study results imply the existence of a partial application since EFL teachers mostly implement just the “can do statements” parts of the CEFR during the courses rather than using them for assessment. From the perspective of teachers, it may be seen as a matter of regarding the CEFR or the ELP as a learning tool rather than an assessment tool.

According to the analysis of the third theme ‘integration of the CEFR and the ELP into tests or exams (the use of the CEFR and the ELP in language assessment process)’, the study results imply that scoring self-assessment results is not found right, which is compatible with the CEFR principle of describing the proficiency level of the language user with positive and concrete behavioural terms. “Can Do Statements” provide information which could not be received through the score or a grade on a test and they take place in the curriculum and course books. However, teachers seem not to have an idea about how to use “can do descriptors” in exams. That is the reason why certain developments are required about how “can do descriptors” can be used for score interpretation of exams. Further study offering suggestions for the ways of using “can do descriptors” for score interpretation of exams can be done.

Analysis of the fourth theme ‘perceptions and viewpoints of EFL teachers related to the CEFR effect on language teaching’ revealed that EFL teachers have positive views regarding the essentiality of the effect of a world-wide standard framework like the CEFR. The CEFR influence can be observed on teaching methods and course books whilst exams are not truly influenced by the CEFR because they hardly ever test communicative competence. This case is regarded as the possible reason for failure in learning a foreign language communicatively. Thus, the recent application of practice exams in high schools can be expanded through the testing of speaking or listening in primary and secondary education as well.

Analysis of the fifth theme ‘EFL teachers’ perceptions about the language used in the CEFR’ revealed the indecisiveness of teachers about the levels implying that CEFR

level descriptors cannot easily be differentiated by teachers. Therefore, necessary training (in the form of distance trainings, in-service trainings or workshops) related both to the CEFR and CEFR level descriptors exclusively should be offered for teachers. In addition to this, certain changes should be made in order to make the language used in the CEFR tables simpler and clearer. More various examples of the descriptors should also be provided so as to make the tables equally understandable for every user.

Analysis of the sixth theme ‘reasons for teaching and learning English’ implies that learning English communicatively is regarded as quite important by teachers with the reasons of the necessity of learning a “lingua franca” and the promotion of plurilingualism and pluriculturalism. Teaching of other modern languages except for English may also be expanded through state schools, which is now available at only some private schools in Turkey.

REFERENCES

- Béřešová, J. (2011). The impact of the Common European Framework of Reference on teaching and testing in Central and Eastern European context. *Synergies Europe*, 6, 177-190.
- Broughton, G., Brumfit, C., Pincas, A., & Wilde, R. D. (2002). *Teaching English as a foreign language*. Routledge.
- Burnard, P. (1991). A method of analysing interview transcripts in qualitative research. *Nurse education today*, 11(6), 461-466.
- Cagatay, S., & Gurocak, F. U. (2016). Is CEFR really over there. *Procedia-Social and Educational Sciences*, 232, 705, 712.
- Catal, A. (2012). *The Effect of the European Language Portfolio on Second Language Writing Skills*. (Unpublished MA Thesis), Ataturk University, Erzurum.
- Celik, S. (2012). Plurilingualism, Pluriculturalism, and the CEFR: Are Turkey's Foreign Language Objectives Reflected in Classroom Instruction? *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70, 1872-1879.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). Research methods in education 5th edition. London, RoutledgeFalmer.
- Coste, D., Moore, D., & Zarate, G. (2009). Plurilingual and pluricultural competence. *Language Policy Division. Strasbourg: Council of Europe*.
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press from http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/Framework_EN.pdf
- Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory into practice*, 39(3), 124-130.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). Qualitative inquiry and research method: Choosing among five approaches.
- Demirel, Ö. (2005). *Avrupa Konseyi dil projesi ve Türkiye uygulaması. Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 167. http://dhgm.meb.gov.tr/yayimlar/dergiler/Milli_Egitim_Dergisi/167/index3-demirel.htm
- Egel, I. P. (2009). The yesterday and today of the European Language Portfolio in Turkey. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies*, 9(1).
- Eksi, G. (2008). *A Suggested Syllabus for the ELT Preparatory Students at Gazi University in Accordance with CEF B2 (VANTAGE) Level*. (Unpublished Phd Thesis), Gazi University, Ankara.
- España-Pérez, C. (2015). Reforming Language Teaching and Learning: Strategic Learning and Assessment Through the European Language Portfolio.
- Faez, F., Majhanovich, S., Taylor, S. K., Smith, M., & Crowley, K. (2011). The power of “Can Do” statements: Teachers’ perceptions of CEFR-informed instruction in French as a second language classrooms in Ontario. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14(2), 1.

- Figueras, N. (2012). The impact of the CEFR. *ELT journal*, 66(4), 477-485.
- Gale, N. K., Heath, G., Cameron, E., Rashid, S., & Redwood, S. (2013). Using the framework method for the analysis of qualitative data in multi-disciplinary health research. *BMC medical research methodology*, 13(1), 117.
- Gill, P., Stewart, K., Treasure, E., & Chadwick, B. (2008). Methods of data collection in qualitative research: interviews and focus groups. *British dental journal*, 204(6), 291.
- Glover, P., Mirici, I.H., & Aksu, M.B. (2005). Preparing for the European Language Portfolio: Internet connections. *TOJDE*, 6(1). Retrieved from <http://tojde.anadolu.edu.tr>
- Goullier, F. (2007). Council of Europe tools for language teaching. *Paris: Les Editions*
- Gursoy, E., Korkmaz, S. C., & Damar, E. A. (2017). English Language Teaching within the New Educational Policy of Turkey: Views of Stakeholders. *International Education Studies*, 10(4), 18.
- Halcomb, E. J., & Davidson, P. M. (2006). Is verbatim transcription of interview data always necessary? *Applied nursing research*, 19(1), 38-42.
- Jones, N., & Saville, N. (2009). European language policy: Assessment, learning, and the CEFR. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 29, 51-63.
- Kirkgoz, Y. (2007). English language teaching in Turkey: Policy changes and their implementations. *RELC journal*, 38(2), 216-228.
- Leech, N. L., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2007). An array of qualitative data analysis tools: a call for data analysis triangulation. *School psychology quarterly*, 22(4), 557.
- Mansilla, P. Ú., & Roldán Riejós, A. M. (2007). The european framework of languages: a piloting sample of cross-curricular strategy. *Higher Education in Europe*, 32(2-3), 193-202.
- Martyniuk, W., & Noijons, J. (2007). Executive summary of results of a survey on the use of the CEFR at national level in the Council of Europe Member States. *Strasbourg: Council of Europe*.
- Mayring, P. (2000). Qualitative content analysis. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 1(2). <http://217.160.35.246/fqs-texte/2-00/2-00mayring-e.pdf> [Accessed: February, 2019].
- MEB. (2018). Ortaöğretim İngilizce Dersi Öğretim Programı (9, 10, 11 ve 12. Sınıflar). Ankara: Talim ve Terbiye Kurulu Başkanlığı.
- MEB. (2018). English Course Book 5. Ankara: Ozgun Publications.
- MEB. (2018). Moonlight English Course 7. Ankara: Dikey Publications.
- MEB. (2018). Upswing English Student's Book 8. Ankara: Tutku Publications.
- MEB. (2018). English 10 Course Book. Ankara: Gizem Publications.
- Ministry of National Education, (2006). English Language Curriculum for Primary Education, Ankara, Turkey: MEB Publications.

- Mirici, I. H. (2008). Development and validation process of a European language portfolio model for young learners. *Online Submission*, 9(2), 26-34.
- Mirici, İ. H. (2015). Contemporary ELT practices across Europe and in Turkey. *International Journal of Language Academy*, 3(4), 1-8.
- Mut, Ö. (2007). A suggested reading syllabus for students at proficiency level B2-vantage defined in common european framework of reference for languages. *Unpublished MA Thesis, Ankara: Hacettepe University, Institute of Social Sciences*
- Nagai, N., & O'Dwyer, F. (2011). The actual and potential impacts of the CEFR on language education in Japan. *Synergies Europe*, 6, 141-152.
- North, B. (2007). The CEFR: Development, theoretical and practical issues. *Babylonia*, 1(07), 22-29.
- North, B. (2009). The educational and social impact of the CEFR in Europe and beyond: a preliminary overview. *Language testing matters: Investigating the wider social and educational impact of assessment*, 357-378.
- O'Dwyer, F. (2010). Can do statements at the centre of involving learners in the self-assessment, goal-setting and reflection learning cycle. *MS Schmidt, N. Naganuma, F. O'Dwyer, A. Imig and K. Sakai (eds.)*, 218-234.
- Oltra-Albiach, M. A., Pardo-Coy, R. M., & Delgadová, E. (2015). Spanish/FL in Slovakia. A historical and methodological approach. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 178, 180-184.
- Piccardo, E., Berchoud, M., Cignatta, T., Mentz, O., & Pamula, M. (2011). Pathways through assessing, learning and teaching in the CEFR. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Pope, C., Ziebland, S., & Mays, N. (2000). Qualitative research in health care: analysing qualitative data. *BMJ: British Medical Journal*, 320(7227), 114.
- Sahinkarakas, S., Yumru, H. & Inozu, J. (2010). A case study: two teachers' reflections on the ELP in practice. *ELT Journal*, 64(1), 65-74
- Schneider, G., & Lenz, P. (2001). *European language portfolio: Guide for developers*. Modern Languages Division.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2005). English as a lingua franca. *ELT journal*, 59(4), 339-341.
- Sert, N. (2006). EFL student teachers' learning autonomy. *Asian EFL Journal*, 8(2), 180-201.
- Smith, J., & Firth, J. (2011). Qualitative data analysis: the framework approach. *Nurse researcher*, 18(2), 52-62.
- Sulu, A., & Kir, E. (2014). Language Teachers' Views on CEFR. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching*, 1(5).
- Terzi, C. (2006). *Implementing the European Language Passport Standards into Advanced Reading Course at the ELT Department, Gazi University*. (Unpublished MA Thesis), Gazi University, Ankara.
- Trim, J. L. (2007). Modern languages in the Council of Europe 1954-1997. *Council of Europe Language Policy Division*.

- Van Ek, J. A., & Trim, J. L. M. (1991). *Threshold level 1990*. Council of Europe.
- Yuce, E. (2018). *Evaluation of the High School 9th Grade English Language Curriculum of Turkey in Relation to the CEFR Principles*. (Unpublished Phd Thesis), Hacettepe University, Ankara.
- Zhang, Y., & Wildemuth, B. M. (2009). Qualitative analysis of content. *Applications of social research methods to questions in information and library science*, 308, 319.
- Zheng, Y., Zhang, Y., & Yan, Y. (2016). Investigating the practice of The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) outside Europe: a case study on the assessment of writing in English in China.
- Zorba, M.G. (2012). An evaluation of Anatolian high schools' 9th grade EFL curriculum and course materials through the principles of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. *Unpublished MA Thesis, Antalya: Akdeniz University, Institute of Social Sciences*.

INTERNET SOURCES

http://www.mfa.gov.tr/avrupa-konseyi_.tr.mfa, (Accessed: January, 2019)

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Interview Questions (The First Phase)

- 1) Have you received training concerning the CEFR? If you have, what kind of training was that (pre-service training, in-service training, etc.)?
- 2) How do you use the CEFR in your teaching?
- 3) Can you give specific examples of the CEFR influence on the course books you use for teaching English in your school?
- 4) How do you integrate the ELP and the CEFR into the tests or exams that you use in your school?
- 5) Should the CEFR influence the teaching methods, course books and exams? Why? Why not?
- 6) How do your students assess themselves using the CEFR?
- 7) How do you describe the language used in the CEFR?
- 8) Do you think learning English is important? Why? Why not?

Appendix 2: Interview Questions (The Second Phase)

- 1) What level is the speaking pattern in the video?
- 2) Why do you think it is level
- 3) After reading the CEFR level descriptors, what do you think about the speaking level in the video?
- 4) How do you find the language used in the tables?



Appendix 3: Görüşme Soruları (1. Bölüm)

- 1) Avrupa Dilleri Ortak Çerçeve Programı (ADOÇEP) konusunda eğitim aldınız mı? Aldıysanız, ne tür bir eğitimdi?(hizmet öncesi eğitim, hizmet içi eğitim, vs.)
- 2) ADOÇEP’i İngilizce öğretiminde nasıl kullanıyorsunuz?
- 3) ADOÇEP’in okulunuzdaki İngilizce öğretimi için kullanılan ders kitapları üzerindeki etkisine örnek verebilir misiniz?
- 4) Avrupa Dil Portfolyosu (ADP) ve ADOÇEP’İ okulunuzda kullandığınız testler ve sınavlara nasıl entegre ediyorsunuz?
- 5) ADOÇEP öğretim yöntemlerini, ders kitaplarını ve sınavları etkilemeli mi? Neden?
- 6) Öğrencileriniz ADOÇEP’i kullanarak nasıl öz-değerlendirme yapıyorlar?
- 7) ADOÇEP’te kullanılan dili nasıl tanımlarsınız?
- 8) İngilizce öğrenmek önemli midir? Neden?

Appendix 4: Görüşme Soruları (2. Bölüm)

- 1) Videodaki konuşma örneğinin seviyesi nedir?
- 2) Neden seviyesi olduğunu düşünüyorsunuz?
- 3) ADOÇEP seviye tanımlayıcılarını okuduktan sonra, videodaki konuşma örneğinin seviyesi hakkında ne düşünüyorsunuz?
- 4) Tablolarda kullanılan dili nasıl buldunuz?



Appendix 5: CEFR Self-Assessment Grid

		A1	A2
U N D E R S T A N D I N G	Listening	I can recognise familiar words and very basic phrases concerning myself, my family and immediate concrete surroundings when people speak slowly and clearly.	I can understand phrases and the highest frequency vocabulary related to areas of most immediate personal relevance (e.g. very basic personal and family information, shopping, local area, employment). I can catch the main point in short, clear, simple messages and announcements.
	Reading	I can understand familiar names, words and very simple sentences, for example on notices and posters or in catalogues.	I can read very short, simple texts. I can find specific, predictable information in simple everyday material such as advertisements, prospectuses, menus and timetables and I can understand short simple personal letters.
S P E A K I N G	Spoken Interaction	I can interact in a simple way provided the other person is prepared to repeat or rephrase things at a slower rate of speech and help me formulate what I'm trying to say. I can ask and answer simple questions in areas of immediate need or on very familiar topics.	I can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar topics and activities. I can handle very short social exchanges, even though I can't usually understand enough to keep the conversation going myself.
	Spoken Production	I can use simple phrases and sentences to describe where I live and people I know.	I can use a series of phrases and sentences to describe in simple terms my family and other people, living conditions, my educational background and my present or most recent job.
W R I T I N G	Writing	I can write a short, simple postcard, for example sending holiday greetings. I can fill in forms with personal details, for example entering my name, nationality and address on a hotel registration form.	I can write short, simple notes and messages relating to matters in areas of immediate needs. I can write a very simple personal letter, for example thanking someone for something.

(Council of Europe, 2001)

		B1	B2
U N D E R S T A N D I N G	Listening	I can understand the main points of clear standard speech on familiar matters regularly encountered in work, school, leisure, etc. I can understand the main point of many radio or TV programmes on current affairs or topics of personal or professional interest when the delivery is relatively slow and clear.	I can understand extended speech and lectures and follow even complex lines of argument provided the topic is reasonably familiar. I can understand most TV news and current affairs programmes. I can understand the majority of films in standard dialect.
	Reading	I can understand texts that consist mainly of high frequency everyday or job-related language. I can understand the description of events, feelings and wishes in personal letters.	I can read articles and reports concerned with contemporary problems in which the writers adopt particular attitudes or viewpoints. I can understand contemporary literary prose.
S P E A K I N G	Spoken Interaction	I can deal with most situations likely to arise whilst travelling in an area where the language is spoken. I can enter unprepared into conversation on topics that are familiar, of personal interest or pertinent to everyday life (e.g. family, hobbies, work, travel and current events).	I can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction with native speakers quite possible. I can take an active part in discussion in familiar contexts, accounting for and sustaining my views.
	Spoken Production	I can connect phrases in a simple way in order to describe experiences and events, my dreams, hopes and ambitions. I can briefly give reasons and explanations for opinions and plans. I can narrate a story or relate the plot of a book or film and describe my reactions.	I can present clear, detailed descriptions on a wide range of subjects related to my field of interest. I can explain a viewpoint on a topical issue giving the advantages and disadvantages of various options.
W R I T I N G	Writing	I can write simple connected text on topics which are familiar or of personal interest. I can write personal letters describing experiences and impressions.	I can write clear, detailed text on a wide range of subjects related to my interests. I can write an essay or report, passing on information or giving reasons in support of or against a particular point of view. I can write letters highlighting the personal significance of events and experiences.

(Council of Europe, 2001)

		C1	C2
U N D E R S T A N D I N G	Listening	I can understand extended speech even when it is not clearly structured and when relationships are only implied and not signalled explicitly. I can understand television programmes and films without too much effort.	I have no difficulty in understanding any kind of spoken language, whether live or broadcast, even when delivered at fast native speed, provided I have some time to get familiar with the accent.
	Reading	I can understand long and complex factual and literary texts, appreciating distinctions of style. I can understand specialised articles and longer technical instructions, even when they do not relate to my field.	I can read with ease virtually all forms of the written language, including abstract, structurally or linguistically complex texts such as manuals, specialised articles and literary works.
S P E A K I N G	Spoken Interaction	I can express myself fluently and spontaneously without much obvious searching for expressions. I can use language flexibly and effectively for social and professional purposes. I can formulate ideas and opinions with precision and relate my contribution skilfully to those of other speakers.	I can take part effortlessly in any conversation or discussion and have a good familiarity with idiomatic expressions and colloquialisms. I can express myself fluently and convey finer shades of meaning precisely. If I do have a problem I can backtrack and restructure around the difficulty so smoothly that other people are hardly aware of it.
	Spoken Production	I can present clear, detailed descriptions of complex subjects integrating sub-themes, developing particular points and rounding off with an appropriate conclusion.	I can present a clear, smoothly-flowing description or argument in a style appropriate to the context and with an effective logical structure which helps the recipient to notice and remember significant points.
W R I T I N G	Writing	I can express myself in clear, wellstructured text, expressing points of view at some length. I can write about complex subjects in a letter, an essay or a report, underlining what I consider to be the salient issues. I can select style appropriate to the reader in mind.	I can write clear, smoothly-flowing text in an appropriate style. I can write complex letters, reports or articles which present a case with an effective logical structure which helps the recipient to notice and remember significant points. I can write summaries and reviews of professional or literary works.

(Council of Europe, 2001)

Appendix 6: ADOÇEP Öz-değerlendirme Tablosu

		A1	A2
A N L A M A	Dinleme	Benimle, ailemle ve yakın çevremle ilgili tanıdık sözcükleri ve çok temel kalıpları, yavaş ve net konuşulduğunda anlayabilirim.	Beni doğrudan ilgilendiren konularla ilişkili kalıpları ve çok sık kullanılan sözcükleri anlayabilirim. (Örneğin; En temel kişisel ve ailevi bilgiler, alışveriş, yerel çevre, meslek). Kısa, net, basit ileti ve duyurulardaki temel düşünceyi kavrayabilirim.
	Okuma	Katalog, duyuru ya da afiş gibi yazılı metinlerdeki bildik adları, sözcükleri ve çok basit tümceleri anlayabilirim.	Kısa ve basit metinleri okuyabilirim. İlanlar, kullanım kılavuzları, mönüler ve zaman çizelgeleri gibi basit günlük metinlerdeki genel bilgileri kavrayabilir ve kısa kişisel mektupları anlayabilirim.
K O N U Ş M A	Karşılıklı Konuşma	Karşımdaki kişinin söylediklerini daha yavaş bir konuşma hızında yinelenmesi ve söylemek istediklerimi oluşturmada bana yardımcı olması koşuluyla, basit yoldan iletişim kurabilirim. O anki gereksinime ya da çok bildik konulara ilişkin alanlarda basit sorular sorabilir ve cevap verebilirim.	Bildik konular ve faaliyetler hakkında doğrudan bilgi alışverişini gerektiren basit ve alışılmış işlerde iletişim kurabilirim. Genellikle konuşmayı sürdürebilecek kadar anlamasam da kısa sohbetlere katılabilirim.
	Sözlü Anlatım	Yaşadığım yeri ve tanıdığım insanları betimlemek için basit kalıpları ve tümceleri kullanabilirim.	Basit bir dille ailemi ve diğer insanları, yaşam koşullarımı, eğitim geçmişimi ve son işimi betimlemek için bir dizi kalıp ve tümceyi kullanabilirim.
Y A Z M A	Yazılı Anlatım	Kısa ve basit tümcelerle kartpostal yazabilirim. Örneğin; Tatil kartpostalıyla selam göndermek gibi. Kişisel bilgi içeren formları doldurabilirim Örneğin: Otel kayıt formuna isim, uyruk ve adres yazmak gibi.	Kısa, basit notlar ve iletiler yazabilirim. Teşekkür mektubu gibi çok kısa kişisel mektupları yazabilirim.

(Council of Europe, 2001)

		B1	B2
A N L A M A	Dinleme	İş, okul, boş zaman vb. ortamlarda sürekli karşılaşılan bildik konulardaki net, standart konuşmanın ana hatlarını anlayabilirim. Güncel olaylar ya da kişisel ilgi alanıma giren konularla ilgili radyo ve televizyon programlarının çoğunun ana hatlarını yavaş ve net olduğunda anlayabilirim.	Güncel bir konu olması koşuluyla uzun konuşma ve sunumları anlayabilir, karmaşık tümcelerle yapılan tartışmaları takip edebilirim. Televizyon haberlerini ve güncel olaylara ilişkin programların çoğunu anlayabilirim. Standart dilin kullanıldığı filmlerin çoğunu anlayabilirim.
	Okuma	Meslekle ilgili ya da günlük dilde en sık kullanılan sözcükleri içeren metinleri anlayabilirim. Kişisel mektuplarda belirtilen olay, duygu ve dilekleri anlayabilirim.	Yazarların belirli tutum ya da görüşü benimsedikleri, güncel sorunlarla ilgili makaleleri ve raporları okuyabilirim. Çağdaş edebi düzyazıyı anlayabilirim.
K O N U Ş M A	Karşılıklı Konuşma	Dilin konuşulduğu ülkede seyahat ederken ortaya çıkabilecek bir çok durumla başa çıkabilirim. Bildik, ilgi alanıma giren ya da günlük yaşamla ilgili (Örneğin; aile, hobi, iş, yolculuk ve güncel olaylar gibi) konularda hazırlık yapmadan konuşmalara katılabilirim.	Öğrendiğim dili anadili olarak konuşan kişilerle anlaşmayı mümkün kılacak bir akıcılık ve doğallıkla iletişim kurabilirim. Bildik konulardaki tartışmalarda, kendi görüşlerimi açıklayıp destekleyerek etkin bir rol oynayabilirim.
	Sözlü Anlatım	Deneyimlerimi, hayallerimi, umutlarımı, isteklerimi ve olayları betimlemek için çeşitli kalıpları yalnız bir yoldan birbirine bağlayabilirim. Düşünce ve planlara ilişkin açıklamaları ve nedenleri kısaca sıralayabilirim. Bir öyküyü anlatabilirim, bir kitap ya da filmin konusunu aktarabilirim ve izlenimlerimi belirtebilirim.	İlgi alanıma giren çeşitli konularda açık ve ayrıntılı bilgi verebilirim. Çeşitli seçeneklerin olumlu ve olumsuz yanlarını ortaya koyarak bir konu hakkında görüş bildirebilirim.
Y A Z M A	Yazılı Anlatım	Bildik ya da ilgi alanıma giren konularla bağlantılı bir metin yazabilirim. Deneyim ve izlenimlerimi betimleyen kişisel mektuplar yazabilirim.	İlgi alanıma giren çok çeşitli konularda anlaşılır, ayrıntılı metinler yazabilirim. Belirli bir bakış açısına destek vererek ya da karşı çıkarak bilgi sunan ve nedenler ileri süren bir kpozisyon ya da rapor yazabilirim. Olayların ve deneyimlerin benim için taşıdıkları önemi ön plana çıkaran mektuplar yazabilirim.

(Council of Europe, 2001)

		C1	C2
A N L A M A	Dinleme	Açıkça yapılandırılmamış ve ilişkiler açıkça belirtilmemiş sadece ima edilmiş olsa bile uzun konuşmaları anlayabilirim. Televizyon programlarını ve filmleri fazla zorluk çekmeden anlayabilirim.	İster canlı ister yayın ortamında olsun, hiçbir konuşma türünü anlamakta zorluk çekmem. Sadece normal anadili konuşma hızında ise, aksana alışabilmem için biraz zamana ihtiyacım olabilir.
	Okuma	Üslup farklılıklarını da ayırt ederek uzun ve karmaşık, somut ya da edebi metinleri okuyabilir, ilgi alanımla alakalı olmasalar bile herhangi bir uzmanlık alanına giren makale ve uzun teknik bilgileri anlayabilirim.	Kullanım kılavuzları, uzmanlık alanına yönelik makaleler ve yazımsal yapıtlar gibi soyut, yapısal ve dilbilgisel açıdan karmaşık hemen hemen tüm metin türlerini kolaylıkla okuyabilir ve anlayabilirim.
K O N U Ş M A	Karşılıklı Konuşma	Kullanacağım sözcükleri çok fazla aramaksızın, kendimi akıcı ve doğal bir biçimde ifade edebilirim. Dili, toplumsal ve mesleki amaçlar için esnek ve etkili bir şekilde kullanabilirim. Düşünce ve fikirlerimi açık bir ifadeyle dile getirebilir ve karşımdakilerin konuşmalarıyla ilişkilendirebilirim.	Hiç zorlanmadan her türlü konuşma ya da tartışmaya katılabilir; deyimler ve konuşma diline ait ifadeleri anlayabilirim. Kendimi akıcı bir şekilde ifade edebilir, anlamdaki ince ayrıntıları kesin ve doğru bir biçimde vurgulayabilirim. Bir sorunla karşılaşırsam, geriye dönüp, karşımdaki insanların fark etmelerine fırsat vermeyecek bir ustalıkla ifadelerimi yeniden yapılandırabilirim.
	Sözlü Anlatım	Karmaşık konuları, alt temalarla bütünleştirerek, açık ve ayrıntılı bir biçimde betimleyebilir, belirli bakış açıları geliştirip uygun bir sonuçla konuşmamı tamamlayabilirim.	Her konuda bağlama uygun bir üslupla ve dinleyenin önemli noktaları ayırt edip anımsamasına yardımcı olacak şekilde konuşmamı etkili ve mantıksal bir şekilde yapılandırabilir, açık, akıcı bir betimleme ya da karşıt görüş sunabilirim.
Y A Z M A	Yazılı Anlatım	Görüşlerimi ayrıntılı bir biçimde, açık ve iyi yapılandırılmış metinlerle ifade edebilirim. Bir mektup, kompozisyon ya da rapor yazabilirim. Önemli olduğunu düşündüğüm konuları ön plana çıkararak karmaşık konularda yazabilirim. Hedef belirlediğim okuyucu kitlesine uygun bir üslup seçebilirim.	Uygun bir üslup açık, akıcı metinler yazabilirim. Okuyucunun önemli noktaları ayırt edip anımsamasına yardımcı olacak etkili, mantıksal bir yapılandırmayla bir durum ortaya koyan karmaşık mektuplar, raporlar ya da makaleler yazabilirim. Meslekî ya da edebî yapıt özetleri ve eleştirileri yazabilirim.

(Council of Europe, 2001)

Appendix 7: Sample CEFR-related Part of the 7th Grade Coursebook *Moonlight* by MoNE (2018/2019 Educational Year)

Self-check 2

Vocabulary

1 Complete the sentences. Use the words in the box.

athletics gymnastics karate swimming judo surfing

1. In women's, they compete on four pieces of apparatus.
2. One hundred metres is the shortest race in
3. They built a new pool for the Olympic Games.
4. He threw him onto the mat and won the competition.
5. You need big waves for
6. Judo and are martial arts from Japan. (3 points x 6 =/18)

Comprehension

2 Read the paragraph and mark the sentences T (true) or F (false).

11-year-old Jonathan Potts is one of Britain's karate kids. He goes to a sports centre twice a week. He takes off his grey uniform and puts on white trousers and a white jacket. Then he stands with the other students, bows to his teacher and the lesson begins.

Karate is a Japanese word. It means "empty hands." You don't need any equipment for karate - just your hands and feet. But it is also important to think in karate.

Karate is becoming very popular with British children. Even small children aged 5 or 6 can do karate. It is an exciting sport, and it is not dangerous.

Jonathan wears a white belt. It is for beginners. He wants to get a black belt in the future.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Jonathan Potts is eleven years old. | 5. British children like karate. |
| 2. He does karate at school. | 6. Small children can do karate. |
| 3. Karate is a Chinese word. | 7. Karate is dangerous. |
| 4. It means "empty head." | 8. Jonathan has got a black belt. |


(4 points x 8 =/32)

Total 50


My progress so far is...



brilliant



quite good



not great

Appendix 8: Sample CEFR-related Part of the 5th Grade Coursebook by MoNE
(2018/2019 Educational Year)

UNIT 1

ASSIGNMENT

- Prepare your timetable showing your class schedule.



CAN-DO-STATEMENTS LIST

Colour the correct boxes for you.

	Always	Sometimes	Need help!
I can understand personal information.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I can introduce myself and meet other people.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I can read picture stories, conversations and cartoons about personal information.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I can ask personal questions to people.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I can read timetables.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I can tell the names of countries, nationalities and languages.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I can give personal information about myself and my friends.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Appendix 9: Sample CEFR-related Part of the 8th Grade Coursebook *Upswing* by MoNE (2018/2019 Educational Year)

1
UNIT

FRIENDSHIP

PROJECT

1 Work in pairs. Write a dialog and then act it out. Follow the information below.

Imagine that your partner is your best friend. You invite him/her home and he/she comes over to your house. Then your dialog starts. While you prepare the dialog, you should divide it into three parts.



Part 1

Welcome your friend and let him/her come in.



Part 2

Serve food/drinks and chat. You may offer to do something fun at home.



Part 3

Say goodbye and invite him/her to come over again.

Self-Assessment

How well can you do these things? Check (✓) the boxes.

I can ...	Very Well	OK	Not Yet
understand offers and invitations.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
accept and refuse invitations.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
understand texts about friendship.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
write a letter apologizing for not attending an event/activity.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
exchange ideas and information with my friends.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Appendix 10: Sample CEFR-related Part of the 10th Grade Coursebook by MoNE
(2018/2019 Educational Year)

SELF EVALUATION CHECKLIST

Tick (√) the correct column.

THEME 1: SCHOOL LIFE	With no help	With some help	With a lot of help
I can identify expressions about school/everyday life and free time activities in short recorded texts.			
I can ask and answer questions in daily conversations using the correct intonation.			
I can introduce myself and others individually, in pairs or small groups.			
I can talk about free time activities.			
I can exchange personal information about school/everyday life and free time activities in pairs or small groups.			
I can understand short texts about school/everyday life and complete diagrams using the information in them.			
I can describe myself, my family and my habits in a paragraph.			

Appendix 11: Transcriptions of the Interviews Conducted in Turkish

Katılımcı 5 / Görüşme Soruları (1. Bölüm):

- 1) Avrupa Dilleri Ortak Çerçeve Programı (ADOÇEP) konusunda eğitim aldınız mı? Aldıysanız, ne tür bir eğitimdi? (hizmet öncesi eğitim, hizmet içi eğitim, vs.)
 - Herhangi bir eğitim almadım, o yüzden pek bir bilgim yok açıkçası.
- 2) ADOÇEP’i İngilizce öğretiminde nasıl kullanıyorsunuz?
 - Ders kitaplarında verilen bölümler var peer assessment şeklinde, self-assessment şeklinde. Pair work, group work yapıyoruz. O şekilde kullanabiliyoruz. Öğrencilerin seviyesi çerçevesinde...
- 3) ADOÇEP’in okulunuzdaki İngilizce öğretimi için kullanılan ders kitapları üzerindeki etkisine örnek verebilir misiniz?
 - Yine az önce dediğim gibi öğrenciler ikili ya da dörtlü şekilde gruplandırılıyorlar ve kendilerini ve arkadaşlarını değerlendiriyorlar, o şekilde kullanabiliyoruz.... Yine sınırlı oluyor ama sadece ders kitaplarında verilen bölümlerde kullanabiliyoruz. Self-assessment şeklinde... bölümler var. Yani yapıyoruz ama anlayabildikleri kadarıyla yapıyorlar. Daha sonra yardımcı oluyoruz. Tabii Türkçe çeviri çok kullanıyoruz bunun için, yapabiliyoruz yani... %50-60 çeviri kullanmadan, diğer kısmını da çeviri kullanarak yapabiliyoruz. Kendi başlarına evet henüz anlayamıyorlar, yönergeleri tam kavrayamıyorlar.
- 4) Avrupa Dil Portfolyosu (ADP) ve ADOÇEP’İ okulunuzda kullandığınız testler ve sınavlara nasıl entegre ediyorsunuz?
 - ... Portfolio çalışmaları... Her ünite sonunda belirli konular veriliyor öğrencilere ve bunları ders içi performans notu olarak değerlendirebiliyoruz. Bir de aynı şekilde proje ödevleri veriliyor. Proje notları da yılda bir kez karneye işleniyor. O şekilde değerlendirebiliyoruz.
- 5) ADOÇEP öğretim yöntemlerini, ders kitaplarını ve sınavları etkilemeli mi? Neden?
 - ... Ders kitaplarında, tabii, daha etkili olabilir ama sınavlarda bunun... yerleşmesi için sanırım biraz süreye ihtiyacımız var. Yani çocuklar henüz tam anlamıyla anlayamadıkları için... ders saatlerimiz de bunun için çok yeterli olmadığı için... sınavlarda not kaygısı da ... son derece hakim olduğu için bence sınavlarda değil de derste, ders esnasında olabilir. Yani, bu ders içi performans olarak değerlendirilebilir... ama direk not olarak ben pek sağlıklı olabileceğini düşünmüyorum. Yani en azından birazcık daha süresi var. Henüz erken diye düşünüyorum yani... çünkü çocuklar ... yaşları dolayısıyla sanırım böyle çok objektif de davranamıyorlar, yani yapabildiklerini söylüyorlar. Onu notla ölçmek biraz sıkıntılı oluyor o yüzden.
- 6) Öğrencileriniz ADOÇEP’i kullanarak nasıl öz-değerlendirme yapıyorlar?
 - Yani dediğim gibi, az önceki gibi... ünite sonlarında yer alan 5-6 cümlelik self-assessment bölümlerinde kendilerini değerlendirebiliyorlar ama ne kadar objektif olduğu tartışılır... Yani çok da objektif değil. Çünkü çocuklar kendilerinin çok iyi olduğunu düşünüyorlar, hepsine “I can do it.” ya da “well done” gibi kısımları işaretliyorlar fakat biz ölçünce, tabii, daha farklı sonuçlar çıkabiliyor. O yüzden çok objektif olduğunu düşünmüyorum yani o kısımların.
- 7) ADOÇEP’te kullanılan dili nasıl tanımlarsınız?
 - Yani çok fazla bilgim olmadığı için şimdi nasıl tanımlayacağımı pek bilemiyorum açıkçası... o yüzden bu konuda pek yardımcı olamayacağım.

- 8) İngilizce öğrenmek önemli midir? Neden?
- Biz öğrencilerimizle de bunu çok tartışıyoruz. “Öğretmenim biz niye İngilizce öğreniyoruz?” diyorlar. “Onlar türkçe öğrensinler madem iletişim kurmamız çok gerekiyorsa diyorlar. Bunu bir türlü anlatamıyoruz. Yani, Dünya’da kullanılan ortak bir dil olduğu için tabii ki İngilizce öğrenmek çok önemli... özellikle yurt dışına çıkıyoruz mesela ya da farklı şehirlere gidiyoruz. Diğer insanlarla iletişim kurmamız gerekiyor... yani iletişimin tek anahtarı Dünya’da İngilizce olduğu için İngilizce öğrenmek zorundayız diye düşünüyorum. Yani... ama tabii bizim ülkemizde çok fazla “anlıyorum ama konuşamıyorum” mantığı olduğu için, yani daha çok konuşmalara ağırlık verilmeli ama bu da işte pek mümkün olmuyor... yani sınavlar oluyor, test şeklinde oluyor... ben de büyük sınıflara giriyorum, sekizlere giriyorum mesela. Hemen konuşma bölümlerini, dinleme bölümlerini geçmek istiyorlar. Tabii öyle bir şey yapmıyoruz ama çocuklar bunun daha sonra kıymetini anlıyorlar çünkü mezun olup gelen öğrencilerimiz... sürekli geri dönütler alıyoruz onlardan. Bazı İngilizce öğretmenliği okuyan öğrencilerimiz var. “Hocam ne kadar haklıymışsınız.” Diyorlar ama işte bunu biraz sınav kaygısına bağlıyorum ben. Öğrenmekte, tamam, öğreniyorlar ama kendilerini ifade etmekte zorlanıyorlar. Maalesef böyle bir durum söz konusu ama gerçekten çok önemli olduğunu düşünüyorum ben de.

Katılımcı 5 / Görüşme Soruları (2. Bölüm):

- 1) Videodaki konuşma örneğinin seviyesi nedir?
 - Bence B1 olduğunu düşünüyorum. İzlerken o kanıya vardım.
- 2) Neden seviyesi olduğunu düşünüyorsunuz?
 - Çünkü biraz kompleks, karışık cümleler vardı. “How long?” lu cümleler özellikle B1 olabileceğini düşündürdü bana... Ama tabloyu gördükten sonra fikrim değişti.
- 3) ADOÇEP seviye tanımlayıcılarını okuduktan sonra, videodaki konuşma örneğinin seviyesi hakkında ne düşünüyorsunuz?
 - Artık A2 olduğunu düşünüyorum. Çünkü orada verilen bilgilerle birlikte...A2 uyuyor... Tane tane konuştuğunda öğretmen kolayca anlayıp örnekler verdiler. Ailesiyle ilgili sorularda... güzel cevaplar verdi, okuluyla ilgili olan sorularda yine aynı şekilde... Kısa ve net cevabı olan sorularla ilgili cevaplar verdiği için A2 olduğunu düşündüm.
- 4) Tablolarda kullanılan dili nasıl buldunuz?
 - Gayet anlaşılır, net ifadeler verilmiş. İşte öğrencilerin konuşma, anlama seviyelerine, yazma becerilerine... gerçi biz sadece konuşma metnine göre değerlendiriyoruz ama diğerlerini de ben kendi öğrencilerimle karşılaştırdığım için net, anlaşılır ifadeler kullanıldığını düşünüyorum.

Katılımcı 6 / Görüşme Soruları (1. Bölüm):

- 1) Avrupa Dilleri Ortak Çerçeve Programı (ADOÇEP) konusunda eğitim aldınız mı? Aldıysanız, ne tür bir eğitimdi? (hizmet öncesi eğitim, hizmet içi eğitim, vs.)
 - Bu konuda, CEFR konusunda, yani ADOÇEP adı altında olmasa da hizmetiçi kurs faaliyetleri oluyor milli eğitimde çalışan öğretmenlere. Bunlar zorunlu da olabiliyor, isteğe bağlı da. Bu konuda aldım, özellikle müfredat değişikliği olduktan sonra İngilizce öğretim programında, hizmet içi kurslara İngilizce

öğretmenlerinin hepsini dahil ettiler. Orada bize biraz anlattılar işte bu CEFR nedir... ne işimize yarayacak, müfredatta nasıl anlatılmış, onunla ilgili bilgiler verdiler. Bu bağlamda aldık, genel hatlarıyla, Isparta'da. Sanırım zaten bütün Türkiye'de, bütün illerde İngilizce öğretmenlerinin müfredat değişikliği olduğunda aldığı bir kurstu. Yılımı tam hatırlamıyorum ama bizim müfredatımız son on yıl içinde iki-üç defa değişti, siz de biliyorsunuz, dolayısıyla ders kitapları da değişti. O zaman almıştık bununla ilgili seminer.

2) ADOÇEP'i İngilizce öğretiminde nasıl kullanıyorsunuz?

- ADOÇEP'i İngilizce öğretiminde, zaten müfredatımızın, öğretim programımızın içinde olduğu için ders kitaplarıyla ilişkilendirilmiş bir şekilde öğretim programına koymuşlar. Özellikle CEFR'ı sınıf düzeyine göre, işte 5. sınıftaki bir öğrenci, atıyorum, İngilizce becerilerinde ADOÇEP'e göre ya da CEFR'a göre diyelim neleri öğrenmeli, hani beklenen nedir, her beceri için işte ana beceriler için o şekilde, oradan yararlanabiliyoruz. Hatta İngilizce öğretim programına örnek... bazı örnekler de koymuşlar yani daha doğrusu örnek programlar diyelim. 5. sınıf öğrencisi işte şu düzeyde, atıyorum, CEFR'da B1 düzeyine sahip olmalı, en az şu kadar kelime öğrenerek 6. sınıfa geçmeli gibi. Oradan ben biraz yararlanıyorum diyeyim. Şimdi kendim de yüksek lisans yapıyorum ayrıca, İngilizce öğretmenliği bölümünde. Kendim de yüksek lisans yaptığım için, konuyla da biraz ilgili olduğu için bu bakımdan kullanıyorum CEFR'ı. Zaten yönetmelik gereği de kullanmak da zorundayız. Öğretim programını uygulamak zorundayız. Gerçi bütün öğretmenlerin şikayetidir "Müfredata bağlı kaldığım için farklı şeyler öğretemiyorum" diye ama şu bağlamda düşünmek lazım, müfredata bağlı kalmak demek illa atıyorum bir ders kitabındaki şeyi cümlesi cümlesine uygulamak değil, o CEFR'ın işte ADOÇEP'in belirlediği ana çerçeveyi bilip siz kendiniz, zaten orada öğretim programında da yazıyor, kendiniz farklı aktiviteler geliştirebilirsiniz. Sadece ana çerçeveyi bilmek yeterli. O da işte biraz düzeyi oluyor çocukların, ona göre aslında her öğretmen müfredata bağlı kalmak zorunda da değil diye düşünüyorum.

3) ADOÇEP'in okulunuzdaki İngilizce öğretimi için kullanılan ders kitapları üzerindeki etkisine örnek verebilir misiniz?

- Tabii, verebilirim. Zaten bizim ders kitaplarımız... özellikle bu öğretim programına uygun şekilde yazılmak zorunda olduğu için Talim Terbiye ona göre ders kitabına izin veriyor. Zaten CEFR'a göre hazırlanmış ders kitapları. Tüm o four skills işte reading, listening, speaking, writing hep CEFR'a göre hazırlandığı için, zaten ders kitabında işlediğimiz konular da bununla bağlı olduğu için otomatikman ders kitaplarında olmuş oluyor., aslında ADOÇEP var ders kitaplarında. Biz de ona uygun şekilde dersleri işliyoruz. Örnek verebilirim tabii, mesela atıyorum CEFR'da diyelim ki 5. sınıf öğrencisi writing'de diyelim yazma becerisinde... şöyle bir şey geçiyoe yanlış hatırlamıyorsam, cümle geçiyor işte basit şekilde öğrenciler complex essay ya da paragraph değil de mesela bir poster hazırlama ya da ne bileyim bir davetiye yazma gibi şeyleri kullanabilirler diyor. Bunu şurdan almış öğretim programı, CEFR'I hani demin demiştim ya öğrenci seviyeleri ile ilgili bölümleri var, atıyorum writing'de demiş ki, CEFR'da tabii 5. sınıf demiyor o bizim eğitim sistemimizde olduğu için, orada seviye olarak diyor mesela B1 seviyesindeki bir öğrenci writing'de en azından basit bir mektup, bir davetiye yazabilmeli. Zaten bununla ilgili bu ünitelerin sonundaki değerlendirme kısımlarını da buna göre hazırladıkları için dolayısıyla aslında ona uymuş

oluyoruz. Biz ödev verdiğimizde ders kitabından ödev veriyorsak, mesela diyor ki ünitenin sonunda “movies” diye bir ünitemiz var “filmler” ünitesi. Basit bir film afişi hazırlasın öğrenci diyor, dolayısıyla bu... ADOÇEP’e uygun bir değerlendirme yapmış oluyoruz.

- 4) Avrupa Dil Portfolyosu (ADP) ve ADOÇEP’İ okulunuzda kullandığınız testler ve sınavlara nasıl entegre ediyorsunuz?
 - Şöyle...kendi yaptığımız sınavlar bizim kendi hazırladığımız sınavlar az önce söylediğim gibi kitaptaki işlediğimiz konularla ilgili olduğu için bir de bu CEFR’ın içindeki değerlendirmelerle ilgili, ben kendi adıma konuşayım, onlara uyararak sınav hazırlamaya çalışıyorum. CEFR’ın dışında bir şey çok izlememeye çalışıyorum. Zaten öğrencilerin seviyesini de bu CEFR’a göre belirlediğimiz için, farklı bir şey ölçmeye kalktığımızda yanlış oluyor yaptığımız değerlendirme. O bakımdan, kendi hazırladığım testlerde, sınavlarda onu uyguluyorum. Ha... şöyle dersiniz ki “Standart bir test var mı uyguladığınız bunun için okulda?” ... yok. Hani uluslararası bir sınav ya da Türkiye ölçekli, atıyorum ADOÇEP’e uygun bir sınav hani ortak olarak yaptığımız bir şey yok. Ha...Milli eğitimin bize önerdiği öyle bir yabancı dil için bir sınav da yok. Sadece şey oluyor 8. sınıflara yönelik, onlar LGS sınavına girecekleri için ortak deneme sınavları oluyor. Onlar da çoktan seçmeli olduğu için çok uyumlu olmuyor.
- 5) ADOÇEP öğretim yöntemlerini, ders kitaplarını ve sınavları etkilemeli mi? Neden?
 - Etkilemeli... Zaten etkiliyor da az önce söylediğim gibi. Dediğim gibi ders kitapları zaten... İngilizce öğretim programına uygun yazılmak zorunda olduğu için, dolayısıyla yazarlar ADOÇEP’i düşünerek hani konuların ya da etkinliklerin seçiminde o şekilde kullanıyorlar yazacakları ders kitaplarında. Dolayısıyla etkiliyor. Etkilemesi de doğru. Çünkü CEFR hani tüm yabancı dil öğretilen ülkelerin artık bir şeyi gibi... ana bir planı gibi, yani her yerde kabul edilen bir şey, standartlaşmış bir şey, standart bir çerçeve. Böyle bir çerçevenin de olması lazım bence. Böyle bir çerçeve olmazsa işte, şey olmuyor... uluslararası bazda atıyorum Türkiye’den bir kişi Avrupa’da çalışacak, neye göre? Hani biz o CEFR’a uymazsak bu sefer orada uyum sağlayamayacak. Onun için gerekli yani. Sadece eğitimde değil, eğitim sonrasında da gerekli. Ölçme ve değerlendirme için de gerekli diyorum.
- 6) Öğrencileriniz ADOÇEP’i kullanarak nasıl öz-değerlendirme yapıyorlar?
 - Şöyle mümkün oluyor. Dediğim gibi, yine kitaptan örnek verirsem, ders kitaplarının sonunda artık... self-assessment kısımları var, checklistler var, her ünitenin sonunda dört-beş ana hatıyla o üniteye belli becerileri öğrenebildim, iyi öğrenebildim ya da işte çok iyi değilim gibi o checklistleri işaretliyorlar. Öyle bir öz-değerlendirme kısmı var. Hem onu dolduruyorlar, hem ben söylüyorum kendinizi değerlendirin diye... akran değerlendirmesi de yapıyoruz bazen. O bakımdan ADOÇEP’i de kullanmış oluyoruz.
- 7) ADOÇEP’te kullanılan dili nasıl tanımlarsınız?
 - Yani özellikle iki versiyonu var. Bu hem İngilizce öğretim müfredatında, hem İngilizce hem Türkçe versiyonu da var. Orada okudum. Kullanılan dil... hani şekil açısından mı diyorsunuz? Anlaşılır? Bence İngilizce öğretmenliğinden mezun olan ya da yabancı dille uğraşan biri eğer hani lisansını tamamladıysa, anlaşılır. Yani... referanslar da verilmiş zaten. Öğrencileri kastediyorsanız, onların çok haberi olduğunu düşünmüyorum. Hani biz çünkü öğrencilere bir şey anlatırken

hani buradaki gibi şöyle anlatmıyoruz hani “Sizin belli bir düzeye gelmeniz lazım” işte “ADOÇEP’te sizin düzeyiniz şudur” ... öyle ablatmadığımız için. Ama “can do statements” ı anlıyorlar. Onlar zaten seviyelerine uygun yazıldığı için kitaplar, onda hiç bir sıkıntı yaşamıyoruz. Yani basit cümleler şeklinde. Zaten, atıyorum mesela beşlerden örnek vereyim: “I can write five different words about movies” diyor mesela. Kendi düzeylerine uygun cümleler olduğu için bir sıkıntı çekmiyorlar. Yine ufak tefek hani bilmedikleri kelimeler olabiliyor. Onları ben söylüyorum. Ama genel olarak cümle yapıları basit, onların anlayabileceği şekilde.

- 8) İngilizce öğrenmek önemli midir? Neden?
- Yani artık şimdi buna bir sürü farklı cevap verilebilir. Bence “İngilizce öğrenmek önemli midir, neden?” sorusunun yerine “İngilizce dışında hangi dilleri öğrenmek sizin hayatınızda önemli?” gibi bir soru sormak lazım. Çünkü, İngilizce öğrenimi yaa... ülkemizde de bir sürü ülkede olduğu gibi artık bir nasıl diyeyim... bir ihtiyaç olmaktan çıktı, gereklilik oldu yani. Çünkü hemen hemen her alanda İngilizce ile öğrencilerimiz de karşılaşılıyor. Bugün en basit, atıyorum, cep telefonundan bir oyun oynayacakları zaman bile karşılıklarına İngilizce bir menu geliyor. Hatta bazen o bize kolaylık da sağlıyor. Yani artık hayatımızın her alanına girmiş. Sadece eğitim açısından bakmıyorum yani basın, yayın, ne bileyim her yerde karşımıza çıkıyor. İşte ne diyorlar? Lingua franca... ortak bir dil olmuş. Dünya’nın ortak dili. Öğrenmek artık o yüzden çok önemli diye düşünüyorum. Sadece CV’lere hani “İngilizce biliyorum”, “Orta seviyede”, “Az biliyorum”, “İyi biliyorum” ...bence bir şey ifade etmiyor. İngilizce yi iyi öğrenmek lazım. Eğer hedefiniz iyi bir kariyer yapmaksa, onun dışında başka dilleri de eklemek lazım diye düşünüyorum.

Katılımcı 6 / Görüşme Soruları (2. Bölüm):

- 1) Videodaki konuşma örneğinin seviyesi nedir?
 - Yani ilk CEFR’ı düşündüğümde sanki A2 olabilir gibi geldi. Gustav biraz daha sanki akıcı, beklemeden konuşuyor gibi geldi. Ama Louis’inki sanki daha A1 gibi geldi.
- 2) Neden seviyesi olduğunu düşünüyorsunuz?
 - Çünkü Louis çok düşünerek ve yavaş reaksiyon Verdi, cevap Verdi. Gustav böyle daha kendinden emindi, kullandığı kelimeler daha geniş gibi geldi bana. Ailesiyle ilgili özellikle sorulara verdiği cevaplarda. O yüzden gustav biraz daha iyi gibi düşündüm.
- 3) ADOÇEP seviye tanımlayıcılarını okuduktan sonra, videodaki konuşma örneğinin seviyesi hakkında ne düşünüyorsunuz?
 - Değişti biraz. Yani ikisi de A2 seviyesinde diye düşündüm. Özellikle burada o spoken interaction’la ilgili şeye baktığımda ADOÇEP’deki, evet, o conversation’ı devam ettirecek seviyeler yani. Kesinti olmadı en azından bir interruption olmadı. Soruları cevapladılar. A2, evet.
- 4) Tablolarda kullanılan dili nasıl buldunuz?
 - Kendi... yani eğitimci açısından mı yoksa öğrenen açısından mı? ... Evet, kullanılan dil sanki daha çok... öğreticiye yönelik yazılmış gibi. Yani belki öğrenen de anlayabilir ama bazı kelimelere bakıyorum özellikle, bazı kelimeler acaba o seviyeye uygun mu? Çünkü o kelimelerin benzeri yani özel kelimelerden

bahsetmiyorum. Mesela “detail” kelimesini A1’de de kullanmış. Atıyorum işte diğer seviyelerde de benzer zor kelimeler var. Sanki biraz daha öğreticiye yönelik hazırlanmış gibi. Yani buradaki cümleler öğrenen açısından biraz daha basitleştirilebilir gibi geliyor. Çünkü cümlenin birine bakıyorsunuz 4-5 satırlık cümle var. Belki anlayamayabilir öğrenen hangi seviyede olduğunu buradan tam okuyarak anlamayabilir. Sanki öğretici açısından hazırlanmış gibi geldi bana biraz... Sözlük kullanmadan bazı kelimeler zor. Yani “exchange”, “immediate” gibi kelimeler geçiyor. A2 seviyesi için bu kelimeler bence biraz zor. Sözlük kullanması gerekir.

Katılımcı 7 / Görüşme Soruları (1. Bölüm):

- 1) Avrupa Dilleri Ortak Çerçeve Programı (ADOÇEP) konusunda eğitim aldınız mı? Aldıysanız, ne tür bir eğitimdi? (hizmet öncesi eğitim, hizmet içi eğitim, vs.)
 - Bu konuda bir eğitim almadım, üniversitede de almadım. Daha sonra öğretmenlik hayatım boyunca seminer olarak da almadım bir eğitim.
- 2) ADOÇEP’i İngilizce öğretiminde nasıl kullanıyorsunuz?
 - ADOÇEP’i İngilizce öğretiminde communication olarak, iletişim anlamında tabii ki çocukların birbirleri ile soru sorup cevap vermesi olarak kullanıyorum. Dialog konusunda, soru cevap örnekleri...
- 3) ADOÇEP’in okulunuzdaki İngilizce öğretimi için kullanılan ders kitapları üzerindeki etkisine örnek verebilir misiniz?
 - Ders kitaplarının sonunda kendini değerlendirme bölümleri var. Çocuk kendisi hakkında “şunu yapabilirim”, “şunu yapamam”, “şunu bazen yapabilirim” gibi konularda kendini değerlendiriyor self-assessment şeklinde. Cümleler “I can understand” ile başlıyor, hep yapabildikleri üzerine beşinci sınıflarda. Altıncı sınıflarda çok yok.
- 4) Avrupa Dil Portfolyosu (ADP) ve ADOÇEP’İ okulunuzda kullandığınız testler ve sınavlara nasıl entegre ediyorsunuz?
 - Portfolio... Yedinci sınıfların kitaplarının sonunda proje hazırlayıp portfolyonuza koyun diye bahsediliyor. Hazırladıkları projeleri, ürünleri portfolyolarına koyabiliyorlar.
- 5) ADOÇEP öğretim yöntemlerini, ders kitaplarını ve sınavları etkilemeli mi? Neden?
 - Tabii ki ADOÇEP kendini değerlendirmeye önem verdiği için, çocuk kendi eksiklerini görebildiği için etkilemeli. Yine communication’da da etkilemeli. Aslında çılımı güzel, tabii ki her bir aşaması çocuklara faydalı olur.
- 6) Öğrencileriniz ADOÇEP’i kullanarak nasıl öz-değerlendirme yapıyorlar?
 - Her ünite sonunda quiz yapıp bunları biriktiriyorum. Öğrenci gelişim sürecini değerlendiriyorum.
- 7) ADOÇEP’te kullanılan dili nasıl tanımlarsınız?
 - Checklists var, bazı öğrenciler (seviyeye göre değişiyor) çok iyi değerlendirme yapabiliyor. “Always” bölümüne örneğin anlayıp işaret koyabiliyorlar ama bazıları çok farkında değil. Öğrenciler genelde anlayabiliyorlar bu cümleleri çünkü en son öğrendikleri konu ile alakalı kelimeler kullanılıyor bu cümlelerde. Cümleler seviyelerine uygun.

- 8) İngilizce öğrenmek önemli midir? Neden?
- İngilizce öğrenmek, dil öğrenmek hani “Bir dil bir insan, iki dil iki insan” demezlerdi önemsiz olsaydı. Ki İngilizce Dünya dili. Herkes, her şey İngilizce ile alakalı. En ufak bir ... ne diyeyim eşyada bile İngilizce görüyoruz. Demek ki çok çok önemli. Neden neden başka bir dil değil de her şeyde bir İngilizce var? ...O şekilde yani bir de ne bileyim dil öğrenmek zevkli olur, insanın kendine güveni artar. Bu şekilde yani ...kendinden farklı kültürleri tanır insan. İngilizce Türkçeden farklı. Farklı bir dil öğrenir, farklı dil yapılarını kavrar, her açıdan... İşte yurt dışına gittiği zaman “ben bunu yapabiliyorum, konuşabiliyorum”. O da bir mutluluk verici...bu şekilde... Zaten günümüzde İngilizce sınavlarda çıkıyor, ondan hiç bahsetmeyelim zaten bilinen bir şey... o şekilde.

Katılımcı 7 / Görüşme Soruları (2. Bölüm):

- 1) Videodaki konuşma örneğinin seviyesi nedir?
 - Bence seviye A1.
- 2) Neden seviyesi olduğunu düşünüyorsunuz?
 - Cümle kalıplarının kolay olduğunu düşündüm, complex değil.
- 3) ADOÇEP seviye tanımlayıcılarını okuduktan sonra, videodaki konuşma örneğinin seviyesi hakkında ne düşünüyorsunuz?
 - Örneği okuduktan sonra A2'deki en temel kişisel ve ailevi bilgiler, alış-veriş, meslek var. Onları okuyunca fikrimi A2 olarak değiştirdim.
- 4) Tablolarda kullanılan dili nasıl buldunuz?
 - Dil çok kolay değil. Daha kısa ve daha basit cümleler olabilir. Daha çeşitli örnekler verilebilir.

Katılımcı 8 / Görüşme Soruları (1. Bölüm):

- 1) Avrupa Dilleri Ortak Çerçeve Programı (ADOÇEP) konusunda eğitim aldınız mı? Aldıysanız, ne tür bir eğitimdi? (hizmet öncesi eğitim, hizmet içi eğitim, vs.)
 - Hayır, hiç eğitim almadım.
- 2) ADOÇEP'i İngilizce öğretiminde nasıl kullanıyorsunuz?
 - Evet, kullanıyoruz. Müfredat kazanımları ADOÇEP seviyelerine göre belirlendiği için biz de ADOÇEP seviyelerine öğrencileri ulaştırmaya çalışıyoruz. Kitaplarımızın ünite sonlarında öz değerlendirmeler ve “can do statements” görüyoruz. Bu etkinlikler ADOÇEP'e uygun bildiğim kadarıyla.
- 3) ADOÇEP'in okulunuzdaki İngilizce öğretimi için kullanılan ders kitapları üzerindeki etkisine örnek verebilir misiniz?
 - Beşinci ve altıncı sınıflara giriyorum. Her ünite sonunda “I can” ile başlayan cümleler var. Öğrenciler o ünitedeki kazanımları yapabildiyse “tick”, yapamadıysa “cross” atıyorlar ve biz de “cross” olan kazanımları tekrardan öğrenciye kazandırmaya çalışıyoruz. Aynı şekilde self-assessment kısımlarında öğrenci kendini değerlendirme şansı buluyor.

- 4) Avrupa Dil Portfolyosu (ADP) ve ADOÇEP'İ okulunuzda kullandığınız testler ve sınavlara nasıl entegre ediyorsunuz?
- Hayır, sınavlarıma dahil edemiyorum. Çünkü ADP öz değerlendirme hedeflediği için açıkçası ben puanlama yapmayı doğru bulmuyorum. Resmi sınavlarımda da not vermek durumunda olduğum için uygulamıyorum.
- 5) ADOÇEP öğretim yöntemlerini, ders kitaplarını ve sınavları etkilemeli mi? Neden?
- Kesinlikle etkilemeli. Çünkü, önümüze konulan bazı hedefler ve belirlenen seviyeler var. Dolayısıyla, bizim bunlara ulaşip ulaşamadığımızı bir şekilde saptamamız gerekiyor. Bu da, bunu daha çok kolaylaştırıyor.
- 6) Öğrencileriniz ADOÇEP'i kullanarak nasıl öz-değerlendirme yapıyorlar?
- Evet. Öğrenciler her ünite sonunda ünite kazanımlarıyla ilgili "can do statements" ve "self-assessment" larda öğrenci kendini değerlendirme şansı buluyor. O kısımları ders sonrasında kontrol ettiğimde, eğer çocuk bu kazanımı sağlayamadıysa, sonrasında ben de yardımcı oluyorum.
- 7) ADOÇEP'te kullanılan dili nasıl tanımlarsınız?
- ADOÇEP'i okumadığım için yorum yapamıyorum.
- 8) İngilizce öğrenmek önemli midir? Neden?
- Kesinlikle önemlidir. Bir İngilizce öğretmeni olarak öncelikle kendini ifade edebilme adına şu an Dünya'nın her yerinde "lingua franca" olarak kabul edilmiş bir dil İngilizce. Dolayısıyla, yediden yetmişe herkesin sadece İngilizceyi değil, birkaç dil bilmesi gerektiğine inanıyorum. Kesinlikle önemlidir diyorum.
- Açıkçası, çok bildiğim bir konu değildi. Ben de sizinle bir şeyler öğrendim, teşekkür ediyorum.

Katılımcı 8 / Görüşme Soruları (2. Bölüm):

- 1) Videodaki konuşma örneğinin seviyesi nedir?
- Videoyu ilk izlediğimde seviyenin A1 olduğunu düşündüm ama video devam ettikçe A2 olduğuna karar verdim.
- 2) Neden seviyesi olduğunu düşünüyorsunuz?
- Cümleler sonlarda iyice karışıklaşmaya başladı. Başta kendini tanıtmayı, ismini spell yapması...A1 seviyesi diye düşündüm. Sonrasında okulu ve ailesi ile ilgili verdiği bilgilerle konuşma biraz daha karmaşıklaştığı için A2 seviyesi olduğunu düşündüm.
- 3) ADOÇEP seviye tanımlayıcılarını okuduktan sonra, videodaki konuşma örneğinin seviyesi hakkında ne düşünüyorsunuz?
- Tanımlayıcıları okumadan önce A1 mi A2 mi diye gidip gelirken, okuduktan sonra A2 olduğuna kesin karar verdim. Tamamlayıcılar ikisi arasında net ayırım yapmama yardımcı oldu.
- 4) Tablolarda kullanılan dili nasıl buldunuz?
- Başarılı, anlaşılır ve net buldum. Kullanılan dil gayet basit ve net. ADOÇEP'i şu an daha iyi anladığım için kullanılmasının çok da faydalı olacağını düşünüyorum.

ÖZGEÇMİŞ

KİŞİSEL BİLGİLER

Ad, Soyad: Fatoş ÜNLÜCAN TOSUN
Cinsiyet: Bayan
Doğum Tarihi: 01.01.1984
Medeni Durum: Evli
Uyruk: T.C

İLETİŞİM BİLGİLERİ

Adres Bilgileri: Ayazmana mah. 232 Şevket Savlu cad. Kardeş sitesi, B Blok,
Kat:2 Merkez/ISPARTA
Ev Tel.: -
Cep Tel: 05058656081
E-posta: fatosunlucantosun32@hotmail.com

EĞİTİM BİLGİLERİ

Üniversite: Marmara Üniversitesi (2006)
Lise: Antalya Karatay Yabancı Dil Ağırlıklı Lisesi (2002)

İŞ DENEYİMİ

2006-...: MEB Yahya Kemal Beyatlı Ortaokulu
(İngilizce Öğretmeni)

CURRICULUM VITAE

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Name, surname: Fatoş ÜNLÜCAN TOSUN
Gender: Female
Date of Birth: 01.01.1984
Marital Status: Evli
Nationality: Turkish

CONTACT INFORMATION

Address: Ayazmana mah. 232 Şevket Savlu cad. Kardeş sitesi, B Blok, Kat:2
Merkez/ISPARTA
Phone Number: 05058656081
E-mail: fatosunlucantosun32@hotmail.com

EDUCATION

Üniversite: Marmara Üniversitesi (2006)
Lise: Antalya Karatay Yabancı Dil Ağirlikli Lisesi (2002)

WORK EXPERIENCE

2006-...: MEB Yahya Kemal Beyatlı Ortaokulu
(İngilizce Öğretmeni)