

**REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
MUĞLA SITKI KOÇMAN UNIVERSITY
THE INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE
EDUCATION**

ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING PROGRAM

**CEFR OBJECTIVES IN LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT
AND THE REALITY CHECK ON THE GROUND:
HOW TEACHERS COPE**

MA THESIS

Hazal ÇEPİK KİRİŞ

**MUĞLA
JULY, 2016**

**REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
MUĞLA SITKI KOÇMAN UNIVERSITY
THE INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE
EDUCATION**

ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING PROGRAM

**CEFR OBJECTIVES IN LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT
AND THE REALITY CHECK ON THE GROUND:
HOW TEACHERS COPE**

MA THESIS

Hazal ÇEPİK KİRİŞ

Supervisor: ASSOC. PROF. DR. ŞEVKİ KÖMÜR

**MUĞLA
JULY, 2016**

T.C.
MUĞLA SITKI KOÇMAN ÜNİVERSİTESİ
EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ
YABANCI DİLLER EĞİTİMİ ANABİLİM DALI
İNGİLİZ DİLİ EĞİTİMİ BİLİM DALI

CEFR OBJECTIVES IN LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT AND THE REALITY
CHECK ON THE GROUND: HOW TEACHERS COPE

HAZAL ÇEPIK KİRİŞ

Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsünce

“Yüksek Lisans”

Diploması Verilmesi İçin Kabul Edilen Tezdir.

Tezin Enstitüye Verildiği Tarih: 26.08.2016

Tezin Sözlü Savunma Tarihi: 28.07.2016

Tez Danışmanı: Doç. Dr. Şevki KÖMÜR

Jüri Üyesi: Doç. Dr. Çiğdem PALA MULL

Jüri Üyesi: Doç. Dr. Recep Şahin ARSLAN

Enstitü Müdürü: Prof. Dr. Ayşe Rezan ÇEÇEN EROĞUL

2016

MUĞLA

TUTANAK

Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü'nün 21/07/2016 ve 150/1 sayılı toplantısında oluşturulan jüri, Lisansüstü Eğitim-Öğretim Yönetmeliği'nin 24.16 maddesine göre, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bilim Dalı yüksek lisans öğrencisi Hazal ÇEPİK KİRİŞ'in "CEFR Objectives in Language Assessment and the Reality Check on the Ground: How Teachers Cope" adlı tezini incelemiş ve aday 28.07.2016 tarihinde saat 13:30 da jüri önünde tez savunmasına alınmıştır.

Adayın kişisel çalışmaya dayanan tezini savunmasından sonra 50 dakikalık süre içinde tez konusu, gerekse tezin dayanağı olan anabilim dallarından sorulara verdiği cevaplar değerlendirilerek tezin başarılı olduğuna oybirliği ile karar verildi.

Doç. Dr. Şevki KÖMÜR

Tez Danışmanı

Doç. Dr. Çiğdem PALA MULL

Üye

Doç. Dr. Recep Şahin ARSLAN

Üye

YEMİN

Yüksek lisans tezi olarak sunduđum “**CEFR Objectives in Language Assessment and the Reality Check on the Ground: How Teachers Cope**” adlı alıřmanın, tarafımdan bilimsel ahlak ve geleneklere aykırı dűşecek bir yardıma başvurulmaksızın yazıldıđını ve yararlandıđım eserlerin Kaynaka’da gösterilenlerden olduđuunu, bunlara atıf yapılarak yararlanmıř olduđumu belirtir ve bunu onurumla dođrularım.


Hazal EPIK KIRIř

28/07/2016

YÜKSEKÖĞRETİM KURULU DOKÜMANTASYON MERKEZİ
TEZ VERİ GİRİŞ FORMU

YAZARIN **MERKEZİMİZCE DOLDURULACAKTIR.**

Soyadı : Çepik Kiriş

Adı : Hazal

Kayıt No: 10123462

TEZİN ADI

Türkçe: Dil Değerlendirmede Avrupa Ortak Dil Referansları Çerçeve Hedefleri ve Gerçekte Kontrolü: Öğretmenler Nasıl Başa Çıkıyor

Y. Dil: CEFR Objectives in Language Assessment and the Reality Check on the Ground: How Teachers Cope

TEZİN TÜRÜ: Yüksek Lisans

Doktora

Sanatta Yeterlilik

X

TEZİN KABUL EDİLDİĞİ

Üniversite : Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi

Fakülte : Eğitim Fakültesi

Enstitü : Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü

Diğer Kuruluşlar :

Tarih :

TEZ YAYINLANMIŞSA

Yayınlayan :

Basım Yeri :

Basım Tarihi :

ISBN :

TEZ YÖNETİCİSİNİN**Soyadı, Adı : Kömür, Şevki****Ünvanı : Doç.Dr.****TEZİN YAZILDIĞI DİL : İngilizce****TEZİN SAYFA SAYISI:vi+103****TEZİN KONUSU (KONULARI) :**

1. Whether EFL teachers achieve the CEFR assessment objectives in their assessment practices or not and if so, to what extent English teachers achieve these objectives.

2. Challenges EFL teachers encounter in achieving the assessment objectives of CEFR and strategies they use to cope with these challenges.

TÜRKÇE ANAHTAR KELİMELEER :**1. Avrupa Ortak Dil Referansları Çerçevesi (AODÇ)****2. Dil Değerlendirme****3. Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğretmenleri****4. Hedefler****İNGİLİZCE ANAHTAR KELİMELEER :****1. CEFR****2. Language Assessment****3. EFL teachers****4. Objectives****1- Tezimden fotokopi yapılmasına izin vermiyorum****2- Tezimden dipnot gösterilmek şartıyla bir bölümünün fotokopisi alınabilir****○****3- Kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla tezimin tamamının fotokopisi alınabilir****○****Yazarın imzası:****Tarih : 26../08../2016.**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to send my special thanks to my advisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şevki KÖMÜR for his invaluable support, guidance, great effort and determination in my success for managing both this thesis and through my academic life as an apprentice.

I would like to offer my sincere thanks to Prof. Dr. Nevide AKPINAR DELLAL, Assist. Prof. Dr. S. Sabriye FIĞLALI İKİZ, Research Assist. Şeyda Selen ÇİMEN for their sincerity and all instructors in the department of Foreign Language Teaching for their encouragement.

I would like to express my sincere thanks to Specialist Ali YAKAR and Assist. Prof. Dr. Seda ATA for their valuable suggestions, ideas and friendship.

It is a real debt for me to state my gratitude to Instructor Saide Umut ZEYBEK and Special Educationist Gülten ŞEN, who have a very important and valuable place in every aspect of my life and give me the greatest enthusiasm all the time, for their endless friendship.

I owe my deepest thanks to my dearest family –my parents Aynur & Tahir ÇEPİK and my sister Evindar- who are always there whenever I need them, support and trust me all the time and to my dearest husband Assoc. Prof. Dr. Erkan KİRİŞ who encourages me, contributes to my life in different aspects and always gives me an optimistic points of view.

ABSTRACT

This study investigates whether EFL teachers achieve the CEFR assessment objectives in their assessment practices or not and if so, to what extent English teachers achieve these objectives. The study also tries to reveal the difficulties EFL teachers encounter during the process of achieving these objectives and the strategies they utilize to cope with such challenges.

The data are collected via semi-structured interviews and analyzing of exam papers, which are the assessment and evaluation means of teachers. Participants consist of four different groups of teachers who are working at different middle schools in Mugla and each group includes one male and one female EFL teacher. Totally eight EFL teachers from both gender participated in this study. The data have been analyzed via content analysis method.

The research findings indicate that EFL teachers have only limited knowledge about CEFR and many of the participants only partly achieve CEFR assessment objectives in their assessment practices. According to the findings, despite the fact that CEFR includes objectives for listening and speaking skills, teachers do not assess their students' listening and speaking skills regardless of the school types. It is also concluded that TEOG exam has an important impact on teachers' assessment practices. Furthermore, this research shows that teachers encounter various challenges originating both from the students and the education system during the process of achieving CEFR assessment objectives. While they develop some strategies to cope with student-based challenges, they can do nothing for system-based challenges.

KEY WORDS

CEFR, EFL teachers, assessment, English Language Teaching, language teacher education, formative and summative assessment

ÖZET

Bu çalışma yabancı dil olarak İngilizce öğreten dil öğretmenlerinin Avrupa Dilleri Ortak Çerçeve Programı (AODÇ) değerlendirme hedeflerine ulaşip ulaşamadıklarını ve ulaşan öğretmenlerin bunu ne ölçüde başardıklarını araştırmaktadır. Çalışmada aynı zamanda öğretmenlerin bu hedeflere ulaşma sürecinde karşılaştıkları problemler ve bu problemlerle başa çıkmada kullandıkları stratejilerin neler olduğunu saptamak amaçlanmıştır.

Çalışma için veriler yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler ve öğretmenlerin ölçme değerlendirme aracı olan sınav kâğıtlarının incelenmesi yoluyla elde edilmiştir. Katılımcılar Muğla'da dört farklı ortaokulda görev yapan, bir bayan bir erkek toplam 8 öğretmenden oluşan dört farklı gruptan meydana gelmektedir. Toplanan veriler içerik analizi yöntemi kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir.

Araştırmanın sonucunda dil öğretmenlerinin Avrupa Dilleri Ortak Çerçeve Programı (AODÇ) hakkında yalnızca sınırlı bilgiye sahip olduklarını ve öğretmenlerin çoğunun AODÇ'nin değerlendirme hedeflerine sadece belli bir ölçüde ulaştığını göstermiştir. Araştırma sonunda elde edilen bulgular AODÇ de yer almasına rağmen okul türünde herhangi bir farklılık olmaksızın, öğretmenlerin öğrencilerinin dinleme ve konuşma becerilerini değerlendirmeye yönelik herhangi bir değerlendirme yapamadıklarını ve TEOG'un değerlendirme süreçleri üzerinde yadsınamaz bir etkisi olduğunu ortaya çıkarmıştır. Ayrıca öğretmenlerin AODÇ hedeflerine ulaşma sürecinde hem öğrenci hem de sistemden kaynaklanan çeşitli problemlerle karşılaştıkları; öğrenci kaynaklı sorunlara kendilerince stratejiler geliştirdikleri fakat sistem kaynaklı sorunlar karşısında bir şey yapamadıkları saptanmıştır.

ANAHTAR KELİMELER

Avrupa Dilleri Ortak Çerçeve Programı (ADOÇ), yabancı dil İngilizce öğretmenleri, değerlendirme, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi, dil öğretmeni eğitimi, biçimlendirici ve genel değerlendirme

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
ABSTRACT	ii
ÖZET	iii
CHAPTER 1	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background to the Study.....	1
1.2 Scope of the Study.....	3
1.3 Aim of the Study	3
1.4 Significance of the Study	4
1.5 Limitations of the Study.....	5
1.6 Operational Definitions.....	5
CHAPTER 2	7
LITERATURE REVIEW	7
2.1 Language Assessment.....	7
2.2 Key Terms and Principles of Assessment.....	10
2.3 Types of Assessment	11
2.4 Assessment in English for Grades 2-8, Primary and Secondary Education in Turkish Curriculum.....	14
2.5 Brief History of CEFR.....	16
2.6 The Levels in CEFR	21
2.7 The Methodological Implications of CEFR.....	24
2.8 The CEFR and Assessment.....	26
2.9 Research on CEFR.....	28

2.9.1	Research on CEFR Abroad.....	28
2.9.2	Research on CEFR in Turkish Context.....	31
CHAPTER 3		36
METHODOLOGY		36
3.1	Research Design.....	36
3.2	Participants.....	36
3.3	Instrumentation and Data Collection Procedure	37
3.4	Justification of the Use of the Instrument.....	39
3.5	Data Analysis	40
3.5.1	Coding of the Data.....	41
CHAPTER 4		44
RESULTS.....		44
4.1	Results and Discussions.....	44
CHAPTER 5		88
CONCLUSION		88
5.1	Conclusion and Implications.....	88
5.2	Suggestions for Further Research.....	89
REFERENCES		91
APPENDICES.....		98
Appendix A: Application for Ethical Approval (Formal Letter).....		99
Appendix B: Semi-structured Interview Form		100
Appendix C: Official Approval for Application.....		101

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Formal and Informal Assessment Methods	12
Table 2. Alternative and Traditional Assessment.....	14
Table 3. The Development of CEFR.....	20
Table 4. CEFR Levels	22
Table 5. Demographic Information Table.....	37
Table 6. Categorization of Data Composed for the Study	42
Table 7. Assessment Objectives of Teachers	45
Table 8. Views of Teachers on CEFR Assessment Aims	47
Table 9. Teachers' Making Use of CEFR	48
Table 10. The Extent Teachers Achieve CEFR Assessment Objectives	49
Table 11. Content Analysis of 5th Grade English Exam From School A.....	51
Table 12. Content Analysis of 5th Grade English Exam From School B.....	53
Table 13. Content Analysis of 5th Grade English Exam From School C.....	55
Table 14. Content Analysis of 5th Grade English Exam From School D.....	57
Table 15. Content Analysis of 6th Grade English Exam From School A.....	60
Table 16. Content Analysis of 6th Grade English Exam From School B.....	62
Table 17. Content Analysis of 6th Grade English Exam From School C.....	63
Table 18. Content Analysis of 6th Grade English Exam From School D.....	65
Table 19. Content Analysis of 7th Grade English Exam From School A.....	67
Table 20. Content Analysis of 7th Grade English Exam From School B.....	68
Table 21. Content Analysis of 7th Grade English Exam From School C.....	69
Table 22. Content Analysis of 7th Grade English Exam From School D.....	70
Table 23. Content Analysis of 8th Grade English Exam From School A.....	72
Table 24. Content Analysis of 8th Grade English Exam From School B.....	74
Table 25. Content Analysis of 8th Grade English Exam From School C.....	75
Table 26. Content Analysis of 8th Grade English Exam From School D.....	76
Table 27. Student-based challenges teachers encounter	78
Table 28. Education system-based challenges teachers encounter.....	81
Table 29. Teachers' strategies to cope with challenges	83

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

Learning English as a foreign language is inevitable as it serves as a lingua franca for science, technology, education, medicine, business, and diplomacy. Because of globalization and affairs with other English speaking countries, Turkish education system includes a compulsory English course starting from Grade 2 in primary schools to Grade 12 in high schools. Main goal of this language education is to help students use the target language communicatively. In order to achieve goals in language education, it is important to better understand the factors that vitally affect the teaching process as well as the difficulties that English language teachers face in language classrooms. One of these factors is assessment, which is of critical importance to both the learner and the teacher. Assessment is the process of the learner's language ability and the progress based on a collection of information obtained by using various methods and techniques. In teaching English, comprehensive assessment techniques and methods are required to provide information for the teachers to get feedback about learning and teaching process.

There are various formal and informal assessment methods which aim to assess and measure different aspects of language (see Hughes 2003). Testing is considered to be a part of the formal assessment methods and a critical component of evaluation process to achieve valid and reliable information on student's progress in the target language. Generally testing and teaching language are so integrated into each other

that it is virtually impossible to work them separately. Historically, there has been significant research interest focusing on the importance of assessment in language teaching. It is clear that assessment takes a major role in teaching and learning. At this stage Harmer (2001) explains that we need to assess students as teachers in order to observe students' performance and to evaluate the effectiveness of syllabus, methods and materials that are used in evaluating students' success. It is well accepted that evaluation is at the core of education. According to Gullickson (2000) the most common aspect of learning and teaching process is evaluation that takes place in all educational stages and has impact on development of education.

There are various kinds of assessment types and alternative assessment strategies (see Brown & Hudson, 1998). However, it is important to have certain standards in language assessments to achieve fair evaluation. Burgess and Head (2005) mention that "it is important to get a good understanding of language level and purpose of the exam"(p.15). In this regard, Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) has particular interest in language assessment to define specific criteria and policies. It is mentioned that CEFR has growing relevance to language testers and examination boards, helping to define language proficiency levels and interpret language qualifications. The main purpose of the CEFR is to provide a common basis for the elaboration of language syllabi, examinations, and textbooks (CEFR, 2001).

CEFR offers various assessment methods and techniques for different educational purposes. Such methods and the corresponding assessment types are categorized based on various criteria including comprehensiveness, precision, and operational feasibility. It is important to determine whether language assessment in Turkish schools correspond to the CEFR criteria. Additionally, it is critical to examine the factors influencing the decision-making process of teachers during language assessment as well as the challenges they encounter during this process.

1.2 Scope of the Study

This study deals with the subjects of testing foreign language, Common European Framework, and narrows down the topic to CEFR assessment objectives and teachers' assessment practices and then to the problems teachers encounter in this process. Thus, the topics to be investigated in this study are as follows:

- (a) Investigation of EFL teachers' achieving the objectives in assessment set by Common European Framework, and to what extent English teachers achieve these objectives in their assessment practices
- (b) Investigation of the challenges EFL teachers encounter in achieving the objectives of CEFR and the strategies they use to cope with them.

1.3 Aim of the Study

The purpose of this study is to explore whether EFL teachers achieve the CEFR assessment objectives and to what extent English teachers achieve these objectives in their assessment practices. Additionally, this study also aims to investigate the challenges teachers encounter in this process and the strategies they use to cope with them. Therefore, this study seeks to find out answers to the following research questions:

- 1) Do English teachers achieve the CEFR assessment objectives in their assessment practices? If yes, to what extent do English teachers achieve these objectives in their assessment practices?
- 2) Are there any challenges EFL teachers encounter in achieving the assessment objectives of CEFR? If any, what kind of strategies do EFL teachers use to cope with these challenges?

1.4 Significance of the Study

It is a well-known fact that teachers have to make some decisions while making judgement about their students' success. Identifying how much students have learnt, monitoring the teaching process, learning students' weaknesses and helping them to improve, and ensuring that the course is recognized by external organizations/professional bodies etc. can be ranked as reasons of assessment at this point. Assessment is important in terms of improvement. According to Astin, (1991), assessment is a type of methodology of gathering, dissecting, and reviewing information to enhance learning. Astin also mentions that it is essential on the grounds that it provides for us understanding into how we may refine our projects to help them take in more. Language researchers have extensively studied how languages are learned and taught so far. However, there have been a limited number of research studies focusing on the teachers' practices during the language assessment. This research focuses on the assessment part of language education.

With the cooperation of the Council of Europe and Ministry of National Education in Turkey, some projects like CEFR have been put into practice recently. CEFR contributes to both the improvement in language teaching process and the advancement in the evaluation process of the learners but we have no clear idea about to what extent EFL teachers achieve the goals in assessment set by CEFR and the challenges they encounter in this process. Teachers assess students' success and progress but does the language assessment process in Muğla correspond to the norms set by CEFR? This study aims to explore whether EFL teacher achieve the CEFR assessment objectives and to what extent English teachers achieve these objectives in their assessment practices. Additionally, we examined the strategies teachers use to cope with the challenges encountered in this process. With this research, it became clear that there is scarcity of research on this subject in our country.

1.5 Limitations of the Study

Some difficulties in data collection process such as time, management and studying with only volunteers led to some limitations for this research and this case study was conducted on limited number of participants. Data collection tools were limited with semi-structured interviews and analysis of exam papers. This research was restricted with 2014-2015 academic year.

1.6 Operational Definitions

The study investigated CEFR and language assessment so it is necessary to know the definitions of the basic concepts related with this study. The terms to be used in this study are CEFR, assessment, curriculum, objective, evaluation, grading and testing. These definitions are presented as follows:

Common European Framework of Reference for Language Learners (CEFR or CEF) is a guideline used to describe achievements of learners of foreign languages across Europe and, increasingly, in other countries. The description also covers the cultural context in which language is set. It is intended to overcome the barriers to communication among professionals working in the field of modern languages arising from the different educational systems in Europe. (Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment) (see: http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/source/framework_en.pdf).

Assessment is defined by Huba & Fred (2000) as the following way:

“... the process of gathering and discussing information from multiple and diverse sources in order to develop a deep understanding of what students know, understand, and can do with their knowledge as a result of their educational experiences; the process culminates when assessment results are used to improve subsequent learning” (p.8).

Curriculum is defined by Hass (1987) as follows:

“...all of the experiences that individual learners have in a program of education whose purpose is to achieve broad goals and related specific objectives, which is planned in terms of a framework of theory and research or past and present professional practice” (p.5).

Objective is defined as “a specific result that a person or system aims to achieve within a time frame and with available resources”. In general, objectives are more specific and easier to measure than goals. Objectives are basic tools that underline all planning and strategic activities. They serve as the basis for creating policy and evaluating performance. (<http://www.businessdictionary.com/>)

On the other hand, Tenbrink & Cooper (2003) explain that “Educational **evaluation** is the systematic investigation, observation and interpretation of information.” (p.64)

Additionally, the concept of **grading** is defined by Munoz & Guskey (2015) as follows “Grading represents teachers’ evaluations -formative or summative- of students’ performance.” (p.64)

According to Brown (2004), **testing** is “a method of measuring a person’s ability, knowledge or performance in a given domain” (p.3)

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Language Assessment

It is necessary for teachers to know to which extent learners achieve the goals of lesson so assessment plays a crucial role in teaching a language. Language assessment cannot be isolated from the process of teaching and learning. In this sense, Lynch (2003) states assessment as “the range of procedures used to investigate aspects of individual language learning and ability, including the measurement of proficiency, diagnosis of needs, and determination of achievement in relation to syllabus objectives and analysis of ability to perform specific tasks” (p.1). According to Coombe, Folse and Hubley (2007) collecting information on ability or achievement of learners with various ways is referred to assessment. In addition to this, Ramsden (2003) claims that assessment is an integral part of educational process and it aims both to understand the outcomes of student learning and to make teaching better. On the other side, Crooks (2002) contends that the aim behind assessment is to enhance students’ learning and provide feedback related to students’ success. Assessment gives educators data with respect to the adapting needs of the students in order to give an acceptable and contemporary description of students’ present abilities, attitudes and improvement.

Apart from these explanations, Angelo (1995) summarizes the term of assessment as an ongoing process in which understanding and improving student learning is aimed. It also involves standards for learning such as systematically gathering, analyzing, and interpreting the evidence to both determine how well performance matches the expectations and to make these results explicit. Subsequently, Brown and Hirschfield (2008) explain assessment as a description of students’ achievement with the help of varied means. The goal is here to increase the quality of teaching and learning.

Consequently, it can be clearly concluded that assessment is the way of communication for teachers to connect with students' qualities, needs and desires. Assessment is used for many purposes so it can be said that assessment has different functions. In this sense, Spiller (2009) explains the functions of assessment from the points of students, teachers and institutional and professional purposes. These functions can be summarized as the following ways:

Functions of assessment for students:

Diagnostic: To empower understudies to discover their level of competency/ learning/ understanding toward the start of a course.

Feedback: To discover their advance in connection to the learning results of a course.

Learning Opportunities: To give students with the chances to create their authority of thoughts or/and practice abilities as well as capabilities through articulating them in composing/oral work or different manifestations of declaration.

Self-Evaluation: To give students encouragement to make judgements about the nature of their own work.

Motivation: To upgrade student inspiration by giving systems for creating, auditing or augmenting their understanding. For some students an arrangement of sensible due dates can likewise help them to keep captivated with the topic.

Preparation for longer term learning: To help students create the ability to self-assess, critical part for any future occupation.

Functions of assessment for teachers:

Diagnostic: Teachers can utilize assessment undertakings to determine what students bring into a course in order to make the instructing and learning receptive to students' needs and expand on existing learning.

Feedback: Teachers can pick up input on students' learning, catch false impressions, evaluate the adequacy of their instructing and make fitting alterations and adjustment.

Teaching and Learning: Educators can benefit assessment assignments as showing and learning instruments both through the way of the assignments themselves and through developmental criticism.

Promoting self-evaluation: Instructors can give input which urges students to make judgements about the nature of their own work and set them up for future cooperation in the workforce.

In addition to these functions, Spiller (2009) explains the *Functions of assessment for institutional and professional purposes* as:

“...to pass or fail; to select for entry; to select for future courses and programmes; to grade; to demonstrate institutional standards; to select for employment; to license for practice; to accredit for professional occupations”
(p.8).

2.2 Key Terms and Principles of Assessment

Assessment has some cornerstones. Brown (2004) expresses the key terms of assessment as practicality, reliability, validity, authenticity and washback. He explains that **practicality** means that an instrument of assessment should be economical, easy to apply and time efficient while **reliability** touches upon the permanency of test results. Reliability basically implies that a test would give comparable results on the off chance that it was given at an alternate time and there are lots of different factors affecting it. These factors include formats, content of the questions and the length of the exam. Additionally, **validity** alludes to the degree to which an assessment instrument measures what it says it measures. As such, test what you educate, how you show it. This term covers content, construct, and face validity concepts (Coombe & Humbley, 2003).

On the other hand, language ought to be natural as much as possible in **authenticity**. Subjects should be entertaining and tasks should be presented as real-world tasks. Another important term is **washback** and it in general refers to knowledge washing back to students as valuable findings of qualities and shortcomings. In this sense, Prodromou (1995) states that washback has an influence on the process of teaching and learning. In other words, it can be summarized as impact of assessing on teaching and learning (Brown, 2004). In the literature, washback effect is described as implicit and explicit. According to Prodromou (1995), explicit washback is usually negative and seen in the explicit use of examination papers or examples from textbooks emphasizing the skills used in exams. On the other hand, Prodromou likens implicit washback to “teaching a textbook as if it were a testbook” (p.15); however, he offers shifting a learner-centered approach with an emphasis on the language process to transform the negative washback into positive.

Additionally, assessment has also some principles. The striking principles of assessment are summarized as follows:

Assessment is an integral part of instruction and learning that means it is essential to students. It prompts objective setting and cultivates exchange/coordination with other curricular territories. Additionally, it is continuous and ongoing process which represents that it happens through all instructional exercises (perceptions, reactions, logs) and takes place methodically over a time. Moreover, it occurs in authentic and meaningful language learning processes and contexts inferring that it spotlights on joining earlier learning and new information (reconciliation of data) and targets on authentic settings and undertakings. Another principle is that assessment is a collaborative and reflective process that gives significant support to students' contribution and reflection. Furthermore, it consists of a variety of tasks utilizing a mixture of credible procedures, assignments and instruments. In addition to this it represents developmentally and culturally appropriate process. Assessment is also focused on students' strengths by recognizing what students can do. What is more, it analyses favoured learning ways and it gives information to contrast students' performances with their different performances. Additionally, it is based on how students learn. Apart from this, it supports improvement of metacognition, different intelligences and learning styles. It also benefits collaborative methods and follows current language learning models. Assessment offers clear performance targets that supports involvement of students and provides students with a feeling of accomplishment. All above this, it enables a premise for objective setting and data contrasting a student's performance with standarts determined before (Curriculum Framework for English and an Additional Language (EAL) and Literacy, Academics, and Language (LAL) Programming, 2011, p.7-9).

2.3 Types of Assessment

When the studies related with assessment are analyzed, this term can be defined as a way of gathering information about students' improvement and it is clearly stated that there are different types of assessment. As Biggs and Tang (2007) mention, assessment is like an umbrella which includes different methods and approaches. On the other side, Gravells (2013) points out that "Different subjects will require different types of assessment, which can be carried out formally or informally

depending upon the requirements” (p.28) and this explanation gives a clue about existence of different assessment types.

Furthermore, Gravells (2013) explains that **formal assessments** are to affirm accomplishment and are generally arranged and done in accordance with necessities or criteria of assessment while **informal assessment** can happen at any one time to check continuous advancement. According to Brown (2004), informal assessment can be different forms which include unintended comments, responses and feedback to students such as saying “Good job!” while formal assessment consists of specifically designed techniques giving information about students’ success.

Table 1. Formal and Informal Assessment Methods

Formal	Informal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assignments • Case studies • Essays • Examinations • Multiple-choice questions • Observations • Professional discussions and questions • Projects • Tests • Witness statements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crosswords • Discussions • Gapped handouts (Sentences with missing words) • Journals/diaries • Peer and self assessments • Puzzles and crosswords • Practical activities • Questions: Oral, written, multiple choice • Quizzes • Role plays • Worksheets

Gravells (2013, p.29).

The fundamental difference between **summative and formative assessment** connect with the aims of assessment and how the conclusions will be utilized (Chappuis & Chappuis, 2008). According to Sadler (1998), the aim of formative assessment is to provide feedback about performance and to make learning process better. In addition to this, William & Leahy (2007) define the formative assessment as follows:

“An assessment is formative to the extent that information from the assessment is fed back within the system and actually used to improve the performance of the system in some way” (p. 31).

Another way teachers gather data about students’ learning is summative assessment. According to Brown (2004), the goal of summative assessment is to measure students’ learning at the end of an instructional unit and final exams in a course or general proficiency exams are examples of this type of assessment. The following analogy illustrated by Biggs (1999) can be clear enough to explain the differences between these two types of assessment: “When the chef tastes the sauce it is formative assessment; when the customer tastes, it is summative” (p.143).

Furthermore, Coombe and Hubley (2003) discuss the assessment types from a different viewpoint and explain the differences between alternative and traditional assessment by pointing out that students are asked to show what they can do in the alternative assessment. Aschbacher (1991) states the characteristics of alternative assessment with the following ways:

- a. require problem solving and higher level thinking;
- b. involve tasks that are worthwhile as instructional activities;
- c. focus on processes as well as products;
- d. encourage public disclosure of standards and criteria; and
- e. use real-world contexts or simulations.

Similar characteristics on alternative assessment are also given by Herman, Aschbacher, & Winters (1992 in Brown & Hudson, 1998).

Table 2 on next page gives a clear frame contrasting alternative and traditional assessment:

Table 2. Alternative and Traditional Assessment

Traditional Assessment	Alternative Assessment
One-shot tests	Continuous, longitudinal assessment
Indirect tests	Direct tests
Inauthentic tests	Authentic assessment
Individual projects	Group projects
No feedback provided to learners	Feedback provided to learners
Timed exams	Untimed exams
Decontextualized test tasks	Contextualized test tasks
Norm-referenced score interpretation	Criterion-referenced score interpretation
Standardized tests	Classroom-based tests

Bailey (1998, p.207)

2.4 Assessment in English for Grades 2-8, Primary and Secondary Education in Turkish Curriculum

Lynch (1997) describes educational program as “a series of courses linked with some common goal or end product” (p.2). It is stated that Turkish teaching program for English has been arranged in line with the general principles of Turkish National Education as described in the the Basic Law of the National Education No. 1739, along with the Main Principles of Turkish National Education. This teaching program is revised in periodically to apply it in an effective way (Ministry of Education, Board of Education and Discipline, 2013).

There are different definitions of curriculum made by different researchers. Eisner (2002) defines curriculum as a term which means “what schools teach”. In addition to this, Nunan (2010) describes it as an exceptionally general idea which includes thought of the entire perplexing of philosophical, social, and administrative components which add to the arranging of an educational program. On the other hand, Richards, Platt & Platt (1993, p.94) interpret curriculum as an educational program that includes aim of program and the content.

Moreover, Nunan (1988) also clarifies the definition of curriculum by stating that it is related to the topics on what and how is to be learned, and assessed. Turkish curriculum is connected with all the definitions above and includes subject matters and content, objectives, and evaluation procedures. As Genç (2013) mentions Turkish curriculum has undertaken some policy changes and rearrangements at different times to take education level further. In 1997, Turkish curriculum was redesigned with innovations in the language policy and English became important. When English language teaching program in Turkish curriculum is analysed, it is clearly seen that it is designed according to the the principles and descriptors of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching and Assessment (CEFR). It is stated that this teaching program follows the CEFR and focuses on life-long learning, developing positive attitude toward English and takes into account comprising learner autonomy, self-assessment, and appreciation for cultural diversity like in the CEFR.

In assessment part, it can be noticed that Turkish curriculum also fosters self-assessment to support students for monitoring their own advancement, as recommended by CEFR. Every unit will incorporate a rundown of accomplishments to be met by the students and this will be changed over to self- evaluation agendas which ask learners/users to survey their own gaining from an action-based viewpoint. It can be explained that it will prompt students to answer the following questions: “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?” Notwithstanding self-assessment, formal assessment will be brought out through the utilization of composed and oral exams, tests, homework assignments and tasks keeping in mind the end goal to give a target record of students’ achievement. Suggested assessment types for all stages used in this teaching program are categorised as follows: project and portfolio evaluation (student-teacher cooperation), pen and paper tests (including listening and speaking skills), self-and peer evaluation, teacher observation and evaluation (MoNE, Board of Education and Discipline, 2013).

In teaching program, the fundamental purpose of teaching English for all grades is expressed one by one and the levels of target users are highlighted clearly. It also includes tables consisting of the parts which involve Unit/Theme, Communicative Functions and Skills, Suggested Lexis/Language Use, Suggested Text and Activity Types and Assessment. It can be explicitly observed that skills are expressed like the ‘Can Do’ statements as in CEFR and assessment part is pointed out literally.

2.5 Brief History of CEFR

Common European Framework is a document created to encourage reflection and communication about every aspect of language learning, teaching and assessment and it was published in the year of 2001, the European Year of Languages by the Language Policy Division of the Council of Europe. Common European Framework of References has growing impact on language teaching and learning worldwide with its deep-rooted background. Teachers, teacher trainers, course designers, material writers, examiners, education authorities, and also learners are addressed in CEFR as it provides a common framework for teaching, learning and assessment. There are different interpretations of CEFR but it is stated as follows:

“It provides a common basis for the elaboration of language syllabuses, curriculum guidelines, examinations, textbooks, etc. across Europe. It describes in a comprehensive way what learners have to learn to do in order to use a language for communication and what knowledge and skills they have to develop so as to be able to act effectively” (Council of Europe 2001, p.1).

On the other hand, Heyworth (2006) highlights that CEFR has two main closely linked aspects, the ‘Common Reference Levels’ on the one hand, and a detailed description of an action-oriented view of language learning and teaching on the other. Furthermore, the intention of Common European Framework is stated as to overcome the boundaries

to correspondence among experts working in the field of language emerging from the different systems of education in Europe (Council of Europe 2001, p.1).

Another important point about CEFR is that ever since its introduction in 2001, it has been utilized as a part of a substantial number of diverse settings and by distinctive gatherings of learners, educators and assessors, both inside and outside Europe (Mader & Urkun, 2010). Fulcher (2004) highlights that the CEFR is being benefited in a great extent as a means of harmonization for language teaching, learning and assessment. Apart from these explanations, Burgess and Head (2005) point out that CEFR is an outcome of Council of Europe's work carried out over years to establish an agreement in terms of teaching and learning of different languages.

According to North (2007) CEFR is a kind of means which gives classifications and levels that educators can make detailed growth or contract as per the needs of their setting. The purpose is for the ones who use CEFR to embrace exercises, skills and capability venturing stones that are suitable to their nearby connection, yet can be identified with the more noteworthy plan of things and in this way conveyed all the more effectively to associates and stakeholders. He also adds that CEFR is aimed to give a scheme that empowers individuals to say where they were, not a determination letting them know where they should be. In addition to this, Gouillier (2006) explains the goals of CEFR by stating that its main aim is to empower transparency and comparability in terms of language teaching arrangements and qualifications of language. CEFR also presents a common methodology, common terminology and a common scale of language proficiency levels. On the other hand, Taylor & Jones (2006) express the key role of CEFR in language and education policy throughout the world. They mention that inside Europe it is accepted to serve policy goals of fostering linguistic diversity, transparency of qualifications, mobility of labour, and lifelong language learning. Beyond Europe, it is consistently received to assist characterization of language proficiency levels with resulting implications for local pedagogy and assessment.

When CEFR is analyzed, it is seen that it includes nine chapters:

Chapter 1: The Common European Framework in its political and educational context

Chapter 2: Approach adopted

Chapter 3: Common Reference Levels

Chapter 4: Language use and the language user/learner

Chapter 5: The user/learner's competences

Chapter 6: Language learning and teaching

Chapter 7: Tasks and their role in language teaching

Chapter 8: Linguistic diversification and the curriculum

Chapter 9: Assessment (www.coe.int/lang-CEFR)

Generally it is always talked about what the CEFR is but it is also needed to be aware of what the CEFR is not. University of Cambridge (2011) indicates what the CEFR is not by mentioning that it is neither a context specific nor a curriculum. Its use needs to be adapted to fit the language specific context of users.

Additionally, Heyworth (2006) highlights the history of CEFR by mentioning it has its origin in over 40 years of work on modern languages in various projects of the Council of Europe (COE) and brief history of CEFR is explained by University of Cambridge (2011) as:

“The CEFR is the result of developments in language education that date back to the 1970s and beyond, and its publication in 2001 was the direct outcome of several discussions, meetings and consultation processes which had taken place over the previous 10 years.” (p.5)

Apart from all these, North (2008) summarizes CEFR as it is not a method and it should be thought more than six levels of proficiency. It also gives an opportunity to see different perspectives of planning, teaching and assessment and look at how they all link up.

In other respects, University of Cambridge (2011) also emphasizes that the CEFR is additionally a requirement for a typical global structure for language learning which would encourage co-operation among instructive organizations in distinctive nations, especially inside Europe. It was likewise believed that it would give a sound premise to the common distinguishment of language capabilities and help learners, educators, course originators, inspecting bodies and instructive heads to arrange their own struggles inside a more extensive casing of reference.

On the other hand, Taylor & Jones (2006) discuss CEFR from four different perspectives: historical, conceptual, empirical and evolutionary. Firstly, the historical perspective of CEFR is explained as its origin dates back to the beginning of 1970s when the Waystage and Threshold levels are tried to develop for language teaching purposes.

Secondly, conceptual perspective is explained that conceptual levels of framework have been formalised with familiar labels such as intermediate or advanced. Empirical perspective is explained by North & Schneider (1998) cited in Taylor & Jones (2006) like the following way:

“Shared understanding among teachers, publishers and language testers enabled the framework concept to function quite well without extensive underpinning from measurement theory and statistics; but measurement theory has become increasingly important as attempts have been made to validate aspects of the CEFR empirically (North & Schneider 1998, North 2000a) and to link assessments to it (North, 2006b)” (p.3).

Lastly, in evolutionary process CEFR is mentioned as an ongoing process which will keep on evolving as experience develops among the individuals who use it in different ways and connections, and as they consider that utilization.

The table 3 shows the development of CEFR historically:

Table 3. The Development of CEFR

1960s and 1970s	Emergence of the functional/notional approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council of Europe's Modern Languages projects start in the 1960s and (following the 1971 intergovernmental symposium in Rüschiikon) include a European unit/credit scheme for adult education. It is in the context of this project that the concept of a 'threshold' level first arises (Bung 1973). • Publication of the Threshold level (now Level B1 of the CEFR) (van Ek 1975) and the Waystage level (van Ek, Alexander and Fitzpatrick 1977) (now Level A2 of the CEFR). • Publication of <i>Un niveau-seuil</i> (Coste, Courtillon, Ferenczi, Martins-Baltar and Papo 1976), the French version of the Threshold model. • 1977 Ludwigshafen Symposium: David Wilkins speaks of a possible set of seven 'Council of Europe Levels' (North 2006:8) to be used as part of the European unit/credit scheme.
1980s	The communicative approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communicative approach becomes established. Attitudes to language learning and assessment begin to change. Greater emphasis placed on productive skills and innovative assessment models. The concept of levels is extended in practice.
1990s	The development of the Framework and a period of convergence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1991 Rüschiikon intergovernmental symposium 'Transparency and Coherence in Language Learning in Europe', the outcome of which is the setting up of an authoring group and an international working party. • Authoring group comprises head of the Language Policy Division, Joe Shiels plus John Trim, Brian North and Daniel Coste. Key aims are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to establish a useful tool for communication that will enable practitioners in many diverse contexts to talk about objectives and language levels in a more coherent way - to encourage practitioners to reflect on their current practice in the setting of objectives and in tracking the progress of learners with a view to improving language teaching and assessment across the continent. • Publication of revised and extended Waystage and Threshold, and first publication of the Vantage level which sits above these at Level B2 of the CEFR (van Ek and Trim, 1990a/1998a, 1990b/1998b, 2001). • Pre-Waystage level called Breakthrough developed by John Trim.
2000s	Using the Framework and the emergence of the 'toolkit'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2001 final draft published simultaneously in English and French (Council of Europe). • 2001 European Language Portfolio launched. • CEFR translated into at least 37 languages. • 'CEFR toolkit' developed including manuals, reference supplements, content analysis grids and illustrative samples of writing and speaking. • Council of Europe encourages development of Reference Level Descriptions for specific languages.

Development of the CEFR (University of Cambridge, ESOL Examinations, 2011, p.5).

2.6 The Levels in CEFR

The proficiency levels of CEFR consist of six levels from A1 to C2. It can be said that these levels are the core of CEFR. The common reference levels did not become evident randomly. It is stated as follows:

“One of the aims of the Framework is to help partners to describe the levels of proficiency required by existing standards, tests and examinations in order to facilitate comparisons between different systems of qualifications. For this purpose the Descriptive Scheme and the Common Reference Levels have been developed. Between them they provide a conceptual grid which users can exploit to describe their system.” (Council of Europe, 2011, p.21)

Council of Europe (2011) explains that it is needed for a scale of reference levels in a common framework to meet four criteria: context-free and context relevant, based on theories and user-friendly, objectively determined and adequate number of levels. Two of these four criteria are related with descriptive issues and two of them are related with measurement issues. In descriptive issues it is stated that a framework ought to be context free in order to generalise conclusions from different situations. It also should be context-relevant in order to translate relevant contexts to each other. In measurement issues, it is explained that specific exercises and skills are needed to determine objectively to abstain from systemizing errors and should be adequate number of levels in order to show progression. It is also pointed out that to reach these criteria is difficult but they can be met with the help of both qualitative, quantitative and intuitive methods.

As mentioned above, CEFR has a significant role in language teaching and learning as it describes learner levels. In this sense, Little (2007) says that the descriptors of CEFR levels are always positive as well as clear and they always never refer to what a learner can do. Common European Framework includes six broad levels describing what a learner can do. These levels do not belong to a specific language. In other

words, it can be utilized with basically any language and can be utilized to measure up accomplishment and learning crosswise over languages. The Global Scale is focused around the statements defining what a learner can do. The statements of “can do” are positive and show what a learner is able to do in other words, they do not describe what a learner cannot do or does something wrong. From this characteristic, even learners at the lowest level think that learning is valuable and they can reach language targets (Teachers’ Guide to CEFR, nd).

Table 4 shows the levels of CEFR:

Table 4. CEFR Levels

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.

CEFR, 2001.

In this context, the framework consists of vertical and horizontal dimensions. The vertical one covers progression and the the latter dimension shows the different contexts of teaching and learning (University of Cambridge, ESOL Examinations, 2011). In addition, North (2007) clarifies the descriptors of CEFR levels and these levels can be summarized like the following ways:

A learner at the **A1 LEVEL** can interact in a straightforward manner, ask and answer basic inquiries regarding themselves, where they live, individuals they know, and things they have, start and react to straightforward articulations in ranges of quick need or on extremely recognizable themes, as opposed to depending simply on a practiced collection of (tourists) expression.

Learners of **A2 LEVEL** can welcome individuals, ask how they are and respond to news; handle short social trades; ask and answer addresses about what they do at work and in available time; make and react to welcomes; examine what to do, where to go and make plans to meet; make and acknowledge offers. They can also make basic exchanges in shops, post business locales or banks.

B1 LEVEL learners can give or look for individual perspectives and assessments in a casual talk with companions; express the principle point he/she needs to make conceivably; continue going fathomably, despite the fact that stopping for syntactic and lexical arranging and repair is exceptionally clear, particularly in more extends of free generation.

Learners at **B2 LEVEL** can represent and maintain notions in dialog by giving significant clarifications, contentions and remarks; clarify a perspective on a topical issue giving the points of interest and inconveniences of different choice.

Level C1 is characterised with expressing learners' themselves smoothly and spontaneously, very nearly easily; having a great charge of an expansive lexical collection permitting crevices to be promptly overcome with circumlocutions. There is minimal clear hunting down interpretations or shirking systems - just an adroitly troublesome subject can ruin a common, smooth stream of dialect.

Learners at **C2 LEVEL** are highly successful learners and use language rather effectively.

Apart from these levels, CEFR also includes many illustrative descriptions and scales such as self assessment grids. Self assessment grids include three categories (understanding, speaking, writing) and four sub-categories (listening, reading, spoken interaction, spoken production, writing) in six levels from A1 to C2.

2.7 The Methodological Implications of CEFR

CEFR goes beyond describing levels as it has various methodological implications. At this point, according to Goullier (2007) CEFR declares that it is not prescriptive. It doesn't suggest the selection of a specific linguistic school or a particular methodology to the instruction of modern languages.

The CEFR is **flexible**, which means that the program of language and certification can be global, modular, weighted and partial. The CEFR is planned to be connected adaptably, so you can adjust it to any learning system (Cambridge ESOL, 2011).

The CEFR is **action-oriented**. Language is used to perform social or communicative acts. It can be said that learning language should be based on language use. (Council of Europe, 2007) According to Nunan (1988) action means task so action oriented means task-based oriented. The CEFR concentrates on what learners do to

effectively accomplish task regarding language skills; it doesn't portray what they think about language (Gouiller, 2006).

The CEFR is '**Can Do**' in approach. As stated in Saskatchewan Common Framework of Reference (2013), the CEFR illustrative scales portray what learners can do at diverse levels of language learning; they are not planned to be utilized as appraising scales for appraisal undertakings at any one level or crosswise over levels. Nor are they expected to be utilized specifically as a part of a classroom; the illustrative scales can be referenced in learning conclusions that are additionally Can Do in methodology and are gone for gathering your learners' specific needs.

The CEFR operates **both vertically and horizontally**. To reference the CEFR in your educational program, you have to take a gander at what learners do as per the vertical and horizontal (Cambridge: ESOL, 2011).

The CEFR concentrates on '**act effectively**'. It depicts what learners need to do to act successfully in their setting; needs analysis is at the centre (North, 2008).

The CEFR is a **work-in progress** which means that language learning is a lifelong process. It provides support and it wait for learners that they will assume responsibility for their own learning (Hogan, 2012).

Additionally, Council of Europe (2001) explains the criteria CEFR must possess as follows:

“The CEFR should be

- Multi-purpose: usable for the full variety of purposes involved in the planning and provision of facilities for language learning
- Flexible: adaptable for use in different circumstances The Common European Framework in its political and educational context.

- Open: capable of further extension and refinement.
- Dynamic: in continuous evolution in response to experience in its use.
- User-friendly: presented in a form readily understandable and usable by those to whom it is addressed.
- Non-dogmatic: not irrevocably and exclusively attached to any one of a number of competing linguistic or educational theories or practices.” (p.7)

2.8 The CEFR and Assessment

According to Bailly, Gremmo & Riley (2002), assessment has an integral part in acquiring a language as it refers to a judgement on something the learner finish doing. According to North (2008), it is amazing that language educators still give grades by checking the errors as in the 1950s and according to him it is also suprising to test language skills without assessing speaking ability. He implies that assessment should be linked to CEFR. In this sense, assessment covers a great part in Common European Framework. In assessment part of CEFR, three concepts are seen as basic. These are validity, reliability and feasibility. The Council of Europe (2011) explains these terms as follows.

Validity is the term with which the Framework is concerned. A test or evaluation can be said to have legitimacy to the extent that it can be showed that what is really evaluated (the build) is the thing that, in the connection concerned, ought to be evaluated, and that the data picked up is a precise representation of the capability of the candidates concerned. Reliability is a specialized term. It is essentially the degree to which the same rank request of learners is reproduced in two different (genuine or reenacted) organizations of the same assessment.

Additionally, there are three ways CEFR can be used and these ways are explained in Council of Europe (2001:78) as ‘What is assessed?’ that means the content of tests and exam specifications; ‘How performance is interpreted?’ that includes the

criteria for determining learning attainments; and lastly ‘How comparisons can be made?’ that describe the levels of proficiency and enable comparisons.

On the other hand, there are a wide range of sorts and conventions of appraisal. It is a misstep to expect that one methodology (e.g. an open examination) is fundamentally better in its instructive impacts than an alternate approach (e.g. instructor appraisal). It is to be sure a real preference of a set of normal guidelines that they make it conceivable to relate distinctive types of evaluation to each other (Council of Europe, 2001).

Additionally, there are many assessment types mentioned in CEFR from achievement assessment to self-assessment. These are explained in detail. When the CEFR is investigated, it is clearly understood that to assess four skills is important to decide the level learner takes part. In addition to this, the descriptor levels of CEFR also show assessment criteria for four skills with the help of ‘can do’ statements. Council of Europe (2001) shows how the descriptors can be presented in terms of using assessment criteria as three following ways:

- “• Firstly, descriptors can be presented as a scale often combining descriptors for different categories into one holistic paragraph per level. This is a very common approach.
- Secondly, they can be presented as a checklist, usually with one checklist per relevant level, often with descriptors grouped under headings, i.e. under categories. Checklists are less usual for live assessment.
- Thirdly, they can be presented as a grid of selected categories, in effect as a set of parallel scales for separate categories. This approach makes it possible to give a diagnostic profile. However, there are limits to the number of categories that assessors can cope with” (p.181)

To sum up, CEFR takes into account reliability, validity and feasibility as well as asking what is assessed, how performance is interpreted and how comparisons can be made. These levels also show the criteria set by CEFR (Council of Europe, 2001).

2.9 Research on CEFR

2.9.1 Research on CEFR Abroad

When research studies on CEFR in abroad are analyzed, it is clearly seen that there are many different studies that consist of review documents. Different aspects of CEFR are studied in various contexts and evaluated in detail. These different studies are summarised below:

Some researchers focus on basic principles of CEFR. For example, North (2006) gives a clear description of CEFR in his review study. In this study, the issues of origin and purpose of the CEFR, descriptive scheme, common reference levels and curriculum as well as assessment are dealt with. It is stated that CEFR is a reference tool providing categories and levels that educational professionals can adapt it according to their needs. It is also concluded that CEFR suggests an action-oriented approach that teaches what people need. In addition to this study, Figueras (2012) also gives a clear outline on CEFR and its impact on language teaching, learning and assessment in his research ten years after CEFR's publication. The researcher deals with the issues on influence and characteristics of CEFR levels, changing teaching and assessment practices and challenges raised by CEFR. The issues mentioned in his study outline two areas: responsibility of users and pedagogy and how it can be developed and development of CEFR-based curriculum.

Similarly, Little (2007) gives a clear overview about CEFR in his study by pointing out the importance, impact and status of CEFR and describing the theoretical soundness, innovativeness and consistency of this framework. It is clearly expressed that CEFR demonstrates three challenges for future. These challenges are ranked as

follows: the levels of CEFR describe L2 proficiency while the language policy in Council of Europe concentrates on plurilingualism. The second one is about extent to which the CEFR levels can be adapted to the needs of younger learners. The last one is related to using CEFR to bring curricula, pedagogy and assessment connection with one another.

Additionally, Fulcher (2010) gives a historical and critical commentary of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages in his study. The researcher describes a clear picture for the history of CEFR and development of its scales. The problem with framework and the dangers of institutionalisation are explained with reviewing the related studies. It is also stated that the CEFR in the way of political and social agendas can have an impact on language testing.

In another study by Weir (2005), limitations of CEFR in terms of developing comparable examinations and tests are touched on. The researcher states that “Can Do” statements in CEFR can be achieved at each level but it is also highlighted that CEFR is insufficient, uncoherent, uncomprehensive and not transparent in terms of language testing now. It is concentrated that description scales must define the construct to be tested and failure to clarify the theory-based validity parameters and these scales also should restrict the attempts to link separate assessment. It is also reflected that further studies need to explore whether the parameters examined in this study either independently or in structure can help better ground the qualifications in capability spoken to by every level on the CEFR scales.

In their study, Moonen, Stoutjesdijk, Graaf % Corda (2013) deal with foreign language teachers’ teaching and assessment practices in terms of CEFR in Dutch secondary education. The aim of this research is to identify the impact of the CEFR master plan on foreign language teachers’ teaching and assessment practice and on curriculum development and try to find out answers the research questions related with this topic. The data are collected via questionnaire filled by 373 teachers and interviews of 18 teachers selected randomly. The results show that teachers working

in upper secondary education have much more knowledge than teachers working in lower secondary education. It is also stated that the majority of teachers use a textbook related to CEFR and teachers appreciate that CEFR makes it possible to compare FL proficiency across Europe. The results are discussed in light of curriculum development and educational change and it is explained that Dutch FL teachers have a clear understanding of CEFR and it is seen as a tool to compare target language proficiency in an international level. However, using CEFR in daily teaching and assessment practice in most cases are limited.

On the other hand, Beinhoff (2014) investigates the description of speech development and perceptive skills in the level descriptors of CEFR in her study. The aim of this research is stated as to explore whether there are any differences in speech perception between learners and different CEFR proficiency levels and if there are any differences to reveal any general trends of what might constitute these differences. 20 German and Spanish learners of English volunteer in this exploratory study respond to the recorded speech samples. The findings indicate that proficiency levels and L1 background have impact on intelligibility and partly approve the thought of a linear progression as given in the CEFR.

In his review study, Papageorgiou (2014) gets a handle on the issues of how different assessment tools around world are aligned with the CEFR levels and investigates the areas that need refinement such as why and how CEFR levels are selected in policy making. In conclusion, the researcher states that there are many research approaches including both qualitative and quantitative techniques on alignment with CEFR but there are some points that need to be discussed. It is highlighted that scales and descriptors should offer language teachers, learners and users an opportunity to understand the meaning of assessment better. Content validity and various language learning theories should be considered while designing assessment tools.

Another study conducted by Piccardo (2012) discusses the complexity of assessment by giving a description its several layers and dimensions in CEFR and investigates the

needs and challenges practitioners face in the assessment process. It is also aimed to show potential impact of the CEFR on assessment cultures in different context. Data are collected within the ECEP Project of the Council of Europe and within its extension in the Canadian context. The results give a clear description to understand why the CEFR can be seen as a relevant awareness raising tool in the assessment and beyond.

Furthermore, Nagai & O'Dwyer (2011) explore how the CEFR has been applied in language education in Japan describing positive effects as well as difficulties and potential problems. In this review study, the results show that CEFR has deep impact on three issues: score translation, improvement of language education in Japan and establishment of Japan standards of foreign language proficiency. It is stated that CEFR and Can Do statements are used as assessment, goal setting and reflective tools to develop a plan and courses.

2.9.2 Research on CEFR in Turkish Context

The related literature on CEFR in Turkish context is discussed with various aspects by different researchers.

Demirezen & Bakla (2007) aim to design a waystage reading syllabus and to test how different waystage is from mainstream reading syllabuses in preparing learners for daily tasks and boosting their overall reading proficiency in their study. Participants consist of 87 teachers and 455 learners. Two distinct questionnaires are applied to find out ideas of learners and teachers on subject-headings text types and designed CEF-based syllabus is used to treatment group while control group study from various elementary course books. The researchers reach the following results: CEF-based syllabus is more successful in preparing language learners to perform survival tasks and they are more suitable for the needs of learners who have the idea of using foreign languages for tourism and work.

Çelik (2012) handles the importance of plurilingualism and pluriculturalism for foreign language education in his study. He describes cultural and linguistic diversity of CEFR and mentions the Turkish Ministry of National Education's highlighting of these terms with the aim of integrating the principles of the CEFR in foreign language instruction. Çelik states that language teachers give little attention to these issues and taking this fact into account he designs this study to reveal whether elementary-level language instructors in Turkey are familiar with these concepts; their implications and ELP and they see a place for these competences in Turkish classroom or not. The researcher uses a case study design and participants consist of five Turkish instructors of English. Data are collected via open-ended questions to obtain detailed information. The results of the study indicate the overall lack of awareness of the respondents and absence of sufficient resources for developing plurilingualism and pluriculturalism. This study also shows that although Ministry of National Education states the promoting these competences, very little advance is done to this objective in Turkey. Furthermore, it is concluded that participants are favourable toward developing intercultural awareness in their students and some of them make individual efforts to do it although there are some inadequacies of curriculum and the lack of familiarity with the MoNE adaptation of the ELP.

In another study by Üstünlüoğlu, Zazaoglu, Keskin, Sarayköylü & Akdoğan (2012), the aim is to portray the process of building up a new teaching programme by taking CEFR into account, at the Preparatory Programme at the School of Foreign Languages, İzmir University of Economics as well as to assess the effectiveness of the program. Participants consist of 236 freshman students and 48 staff members from 5 different faculties. Data are collected via a scale researchers developed from the objectives of their study. The findings indicate that there is an important relationship between students' proficiency scores and impression of their own particular skills. It is also found that selecting objectives according to CEFR and integrating academic skills into these objectives led to a more advanced quality preparatory programme meets the expectation of students but teachers and focus group students think that the program still should be improved in some areas.

In another study, Hismanoğlu (2013) investigates whether the new English Language Teacher Education curriculum promotes prospective EFL teachers' awareness of the CEFR. He discusses the integration of the European Language Portfolio and The Common European Framework of Reference into the ELTE curriculum in Turkey. To obtain data, a questionnaire was utilized and participants consisted of 72 prospective EFL teachers. The results of the study revealed that the majority of the prospective EFL teachers are aware of the CEFR, read it and get a course on CEFR or related subjects. It is also concluded that most of the participants see their lecturers as reflecting CEFR characteristics into their courses and their teaching program is CEFR-specific in their institution. From the findings, it can be clearly seen that participants are conscious of the CEFR and ELP should be included into English language teacher education curriculum. This study also shows that the majority of the participants understand the content of the CEFR and ELP and when they start their teaching profession, they can adjust these documents to their teaching.

Furthermore, Özer & Parmaksız (2013) aim to determine the goodness of fit between the lower secondary education 3rd grade curriculum for English Language in Turkey and Common European Framework. The document review technique is used in this research and CEFR and curriculum is compared in terms of objectives, content, learning and teaching process and evaluation strategies. The results show that the goals of Turkish curriculum and Common European Framework of Reference for Languages have similarities at 92 percent and A1 and B1 levels are less dealt with when they are compared to A2 level. It is also stated that all the assessment tools in the curriculum are taken from European Language Portfolio.

On the other hand, Yüksel & Demiral (2013) aim to identify views of English Language Teachers on newly developed Secondary Education English Teaching Program. The researchers express that second language education programs have been revised in line with CEFR and ELP. The purpose of this study is to examine the thoughts, expectations and suggestions of the secondary school teachers on newly

developed Secondary Education English Teaching Program. The participants consist of 109 English language teachers working in secondary schools and data are collected via secondary school teachers' views on SEETP scale and mixed method design is used to analyse data. The results indicate that teachers are positive on new teaching program but at the same time they express that there are some insufficient dimensions of new program. It is also found that teachers think course and work books are prepared as perfunctory and they don't find course time is enough. Furthermore, there are complaints on lack of introduction seminars on new program.

On the other hand, İlin (2014) emphasizes the importance of the CEFR's adoption by various countries and changing curriculum design based on this framework for teaching English in Turkey. The researcher mentions that to provide in-service teachers to become familiar to framework, education programmes have been implemented and two new courses were added to language education programme in keeping with this innovation. The aim of this study is to reveal the perceptions of student-teachers on CEFR in terms of efficacy, feasibility and reality in Turkish ELT context. Participants consist of 59 student-teachers studying forth semester in the ELT department and data are collected via field notes of the weekly discussion meetings and reflective essays of student-teachers on CEFR. The findings of the study reveal that student-teachers see CEFR quite efficient in terms of different aspects such as its positive changes in the language teaching system, curriculum, coursebooks, materials, teacher-student roles and its communicative approach. Although participants find CEFR efficient enough, they don't think that CEFR can be used feasibly in Turkish context mainly due to teacher qualities in Turkey. The pros and cons of CEFR are evaluated and results give positive remarks compared to negative ones and it is seen that negative criticism is about irrelevance of framework to Turkish context not about CEFR itself. In addition, student-teachers anticipate that MoNE should plan in-service education programmes by which teachers can refresh their knowledge and be educated about the most recent advancement in the field.

In another study, Kır & Sülü (2014) aim to determine language teachers' view on the use of CEFR and try to find out what language teachers know about CEFR; how they apply the issues stated in this reference tool and their thoughts on the applicability of the document. The participants consist of 46 teachers teaching at different levels and institutions from 18 different cities and data is collected via questionnaire. The results indicate that more than half of the participants are aware of the CEFR but most of the teachers don't follow EU studies in foreign language education. Teachers think that CEFR document should have been integrated into teacher education. It is clearly concluded that 33 % of teachers apply the issues stated in the reference tools but the rest of them doesn't take into considerations the issues. The findings show that teachers either don't give importance to these issues or they are not aware of them. It can be inferred that teachers need in-service training on CEFR and teacher training programs should educate teachers about CEFR and how to use it effectively in their teaching professions.

The next study carried out by Cephe & Toprak (2014) gets a handle on testing the aspects of CEFR. The researchers highlight that CEFR has a crucial role in language testing but state that developing and aligning tests to the CEFR should be evaluated critically. From this point of view, Cephe and Toprak aim to investigate the practical considerations and potential problems related to the CEFR in terms of language testing and to discuss some practical implications for language teachers on test generations and alignment. The researchers review the different studies concerned with CEFR and its use in language testing and draw the following conclusions from the studies they have analysed: CEFR takes effortful research for making use of it because it wasn't specifically designed for language testing. CEFR can be used to decide the goals for teaching and assessment but there can be some deficiencies terms of validity. Now CEFR isn't used to develop comparable tests alone but can help to decide whether tests are comparable or not. It is also stated that using CEFR levels may be useful to report what a learner can do.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the information on the method of study. Method, participants and data collection procedures of study are analysed and then information on data analysis is presented.

3.1 Research Design

The present descriptive research represents qualitative case study with its aim. Dörnyei (2007) points out that “qualitative research is concerned with subjective opinions, experiences and feelings of individuals and thus explicit goal of research is to explore the participants’ point of view of the situation being studied.” (p.38). As Seliger & Shohamy (1989) state, aim of descriptive research is to describe a natural teaching environment. It can be summarized that our research in this study is case in design, qualitative in terms of the type of data used, and descriptive in its analysis.

3.2 Participants

The data in this study were gathered from four groups of participants. Each group consists of two English teachers, one male and one female and each group of teachers work at different middle schools in Muğla. Total eight English teachers were included in this study.

These four groups of participants have similar educational background. Among these participants, two of them have MA degrees and the others have BA degrees. Their teaching experience in the field ranks from 2 months to 18 years. Table 3 below shows the detailed background information of participants. They are ranked from Teacher 1 to Teacher 8 as T1 to T8.

Table 5. Demographic Information Table

	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	T7	T8
Gender	M	F	M	F	F	F	M	F
Age	43	32	43	40	23	32	49	40
Education Level	BA	MA	BA	BA	BA	BA	BA	MA
Experience in field	17 years	10 years	18 years	15 years	2 months	10 years	18 years	16 years

The reason behind this selection of these four different schools is that it is intended to conduct this study with the schools from different parts of the city. Collecting the data from these different schools makes it possible to compare and contrast the results between the schools and teachers and to gather broader and various results. Obtaining the data from these eight non-native English teachers is based on their willingness to participate in this study in accordance with the nature of this investigation.

3.3 Instrumentation and Data Collection Procedure

The data collection tools of this study consist of semi-structured interviews and exam papers. With the help of these tools, it is expected to depict a detailed frame to identify whether EFL teachers achieve the objectives in assessment set by CEFR and to provide information about if there are any challenges these teachers encounter in

this process or not. Furthermore, what kind of strategies teachers use to cope with the challenges they encounter are investigated.

Fylan (2005) defines semi-structured interviews as follows:

“Semi-structured interviews are simply conversations in which you know what you want to find out about – and so have a set of questions to ask and a good idea of what topics will be covered – but the conversation is free to vary, and is likely to change substantially between participants.” (p.65)

Semi-structured interviews in this study include seven questions so as to investigate the topic in depth. These questions are formulated from general to specific to elicit the following aspects, whether EFL teachers achieve the CEFR assessment objectives on the one hand and if there are any challenges these teachers encounter in this process or not. These questions are composed based on the related literature and according to objectives of CEFR. Expert opinion was taken in the process of composing the questions. The pilot study was carried out with four EFL teachers working at secondary schools in different cities to see whether there would be any misunderstandings throughout interview questions. It was identified from the feedbacks of participants in the pilot study that semi-structured interview questions were not ambiguous and it was not necessary to make any changes since there were no misunderstandings in this part.

The clear description of the study was provided to each participant so they knew what kind of study they would be involved in. The semi-structured interviews were made with participants and notes were taken in every step for the reliability of study and data was obtained. In addition, exam papers participants prepared were collected and content analysis was applied to identify to what extent their assessment practices correspond to criteries set by CEFR. By means of this part of study, it was aimed to

make reliable comparisons between the CEFR assessment objectives and participants' assessment practices.

3.4 Justification of the Use of the Instrument

Data collection is one of the essential parts of a study. As Kajorboon (2005) points out that it is difficult to decide which method is the best for data collection. In a study, data collection can be derived from a number of methods, which include interviews, focus groups, surveys, telephone interviews, field notes, taped social interaction or questionnaires (Heaton, 2004, p.37). As O'Leary (2004) remarks that one method of data collection is not inherently better than another so the use of data collection method depends on the goals of research.

This study aims to identify to what extent English teachers achieve the CEFR objectives in their assessment practices and to investigate the challenges teachers encounter in this process and the strategies they use to cope with them. As a data collection instrument, semi-structured interviews were selected because of two primary considerations. First, this instrument is well suited for the exploration of the thoughts, experiences and perceptions of the respondents. Second, it enables to ask different relevant questions depending on the topic during the interviews to obtain detailed data.

Semi-structured interviews are explained by De Clerck, Willems, Roos & Christiane (2011) as follows:

“Semi-structured interviews combine the flexibility of the unstructured, open-ended interview with the directionality and agenda of the survey instrument. The topics of a semi structured interview are pre-determined, but most of the questions are formulated by the researcher in the interview setting. This researcher is attentive to what the interviewee says, and responds with follow-up question and probes.” (p.12)

On the other hand, Gill, Stewart, Treasure & Chadwick (2008) explains that semi-structured interviews include some key questions describing the topic to be explored as well as allowing interviewer to pursue a thought in detail.

Similarly, Kajorboon (2005) points out that in this type of interview, the researcher has a list of key themes, issues, and questions to be included and the question order can be changed based on the directions of the interview. As well as using an interview guide, some additional questions can be asked. The researcher also state that the person conducting a semi-structured interview is freer more than conducting a structured interview in which the interviewer does not have to adhere to a detailed interview guide. Additionally, Gray (2004) also emphasizes the unplanned encounters of semi-structured interviews by highlighting that this interview type gives the researchers chance to explore new paths of interviewee's opinions. In addition to this, interpretation of Corbetta (2003) on semi-structured interview also shows that this type of interview has many advantages as it provides a chance to interviewer for giving freedom for conducting the conversation whatever s/he think, asking questions or giving explanations for clarification if necessary, and establishing a conversation according the way he thinks fit.

3.5 Data Analysis

In this study, the content analysis technique was employed to analyze the obtained data. According to Gray, Williamson, Karp, & Dalphin (2007: 283), "Content analysis is a systematic attempt to examine some form of verbal or image communication such as newspapers, diaries, letters, speeches, movies or television shows". Similarly, Holsti (1969) gives a broad definition of content analysis as "any technique for making inferences by objectively and systematically identifying specified characteristics of messages" (p. 14). With a clearer definition, content analysis is a systematic, replicable method to compress many words of text into fewer content categories based on explicit rules of coding (Berelson, 1952;

Krippendorff, 1980; & Weber, 1990). On the other hand, Weber (1990) explains content analysis as a functional technique in terms of allowing researchers to discover and describe the focus of individual, group, institutional, or social attention. Furthermore, Yıldırım & Şimşek (2008: 227) state the fundamental aim of content analysis is to reach the notions and relations to be able to explain the obtained data and to interpret them by making some arrangements to be understood by the reader. In addition to this, Elo & Kynäg (2008) state the aim of content analysis as "...to attain a condensed and broad description of the phenomenon, and the outcome of the analysis is concepts or categories describing the phenomenon" (p.108).

Additionally, Yıldırım & Şimşek (2008) explain the stages to be followed in content analysis as follows:

1. Coding of the data
2. Identifying the themes
3. Arranging and defining the data according to the codes and themes
4. Interpreting the data (pp. 228-238).

The stages that were stated above have been followed successively by the researcher.

3.5.1 Coding of the Data

The coding means a systematic process in which smaller analyzable units through the creation of categories and concepts based on the data are set in order to condense data (Lockyer, 2004). Responses given by the participants in this research were coded according to categories that were emerged naturally from the data in light of research questions.

Table 6. Categorization of Data Composed for the Study

Theme	Category
Objectives of teachers for assessment	<p>student-based objectives (attainments and participation of students, using target language in daily life)</p> <p>curriculum-based objectives (subjects students learned, number of questions, using limited time efficiently, the effect of TEOG)</p>
Challenges teachers encounter in assessment process	<p>challenges derived from students (lack of motivation, using time unsufficiently, differences between exam results and classroom success, forgetting to answer some questions during the exam)</p> <p>challenges derived from teachers and education system (assessing only reading and writing skills, time constraints for assessing all skills, crowded classes, giving extra points to some students)</p>
Strategies teachers use to cope with the challenges encountered in the assessment process	<p>strategies intended for students (reviewing the subjects before exam week, warning students during the exam, explaining each part of the exam at the beginning clearly, trying to assess students according to way of expressing themselves, advising students to practice listening and watching activities)</p> <p>strategies intended for curriculum (setting clear targets before exams, checking exam papers in advance, trying to ask grammar in a minimum degree, preparing questions according to TEOG)</p>
Teachers' points of views on whether CEFR meets their assessment needs	<p>positive (CEFR meets needs and helps teachers in terms of international standards)</p> <p>negative (not possible, education system doesn't allow to apply it, realities vs CEFR)</p> <p>neutral (no idea, limited knowledge about the topic)</p>

Theme	Category
Teachers' points of views on whether the aims of CEFR in assessment are clear enough	neutral (no idea)
	positive (clear enough)
	negative (not specific)
Making use of CEFR	negative comments (not possible in terms of listening and speaking, not exactly)
	no comments (no idea, early to say something: 2 months teacher)
Achieving the CEFR objectives in assessment	negative (no achieving, not for listening and speaking, education system doesn't allow for achieving)
	neutral (no idea)

Table 6 summarizes the classification of categories for interviews on CEFR with participants.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

4.1 Results and Discussions

The findings of this study were arranged and interpreted according to relevant variables categorized in previous chapter in order to find answers to research questions described in Chapter 1 (Introduction Part). First of all, the responses collected from semi-structured interviews were presented one by one. Then, content analysis of exam papers was carried out to reveal whether teachers' assessment practices correspond to the CEFR assessment criterias or not was clarified. At the last point, findings of this qualitative analysis were interpreted in order to evaluate all the research questions.

Research Question 1: Do English teachers achieve the CEFR assessment objectives in their assessment practices?

a) If yes, to what extent they achieve these objectives?

In order to find answer to this research question the data obtained from interviews and analysis of exam papers was presented. To obtain detailed answers to the research questions, some related questions were asked to participants during interviews. First of all, the question of "Which objectives do you consider while assessing your students" is asked in order to learn teachers' own assessment objectives. In this respect, tables and direct quotations of participants below summarize the results of content analysis on whether teachers achieve the CEFR assessment objectives or not and to what extent they achieve these objectives in their assessment practices.

Table 7. Assessment Objectives of Teachers

No	Teachers' assessment objectives	f	%
1	attainments of students	8	25.8
2	subject students learned	7	22.5
3	number of questions	5	16.1
4	the effect of TEOG	4	12.9
5	participation of students	3	9.6
6	using time effectively	3	9.6
7	using language in daily life	1	3.2
Total		31	100.0

As seen in the table above, participants mostly take ‘attainments of students’ into account as objectives of their assessment in the first step. Then the list ranks from subjects students learned to using language in daily life.

While giving answer to this question, almost all the participants mention the importance of assessment as seen in the following extracts:

T1: *“It cannot be denied that assessment is the most important part of teaching a language.”*

T2: *“In my opinion, assessment is the core of teaching. Thanks to it, a teacher can see the progress of students and the effectiveness of teaching approach.”*

Participants’ responses to this question are given in the following extracts:

T3: *“There can be different styles in examinations. I mean that it changes from one teacher to another but I think that assessment must have equal standards.”*

T2: *“...to be fair in assessment process, each teacher should have a scale before exams.”*

T4: *“My assessment strategies and objectives have to be system-based. As a teacher I am aware that my students have to pass TEOG so there is no chance for me to prepare my exam questions according to structure of TEOG...”*

To learn teachers' views on assessment part of CEFR, “Do you think CEFR meets teachers' needs in assessment?” is asked and the findings are indicated with the direct quotations below:

T7: *“As CEFR has international standards, it guides teachers from many aspects including assessment.”*

T1: *“I know that our teaching program is based on CEFR and it is definitely well-prepared but the system doesn't allow us to apply it so it doesn't meet my needs neither in assessment nor in terms of other parts of teaching.”*

T4: *“Realities are different from CEFR. It is designed to meet assessment needs but it is not possible for today's situation at schools. For example, it has also self grids as well as teachers' assessment but our students aren't mature enough to evaluate themselves objectively.”*

T5: *“It meets my needs in assessment. I can follow its objectives and standards.”*

T8: *“I can give a brief and to the point answer to this question: It doesn't meet our needs. Can we apply listening or speaking in so crowded classes?”*

T2: *“All the students are different from each other so they need very different assessment styles. In terms of reading and writing I can say ‘Yes, CEFR meets my*

needs in assessment' but I cannot say the same thing for the other aspects of assessment."

Two of the participants report that they have limited knowledge on CEFR:

T6: *"To tell the truth, I have no idea what the CEFR is and what it involves in our teaching process."*

T8: *"As I am a teacher for two months, I can say that I have only limited knowledge of CEFR from my university years so I don't know whether it meets my needs in terms of assessment or not."*

As it can be understood from the remarks of participants, only two of them think that CEFR meets teachers' assessment needs. As stated above, one of the participants has no idea about CEFR and one of the participants points out that as she is at the beginning of her teaching career she cannot make comments on this question. While two of the participants say that CEFR meets their needs partially, the rest of the participants state that it is not possible to say that CEFR meets the assessment needs of teachers because of the education system.

The question of "Do you think the aims of CEFR are clear for your assessment practices?" is asked and the findings are listed in Table 8 below:

Table 8. Views of Teachers on CEFR Assessment Aims

No	Teachers' views on aims of CEFR	f	%
1	clear aims	4	50.0
2	unclear aims	3	37.5
3	no idea	1	12.5
	Total	8	100.0

Table 8 displays the views of participants about CEFR assessment aims. As seen in Table 8, most of the teachers find the aims clear enough. As mentioned before, one of the participants has no idea and knowledge about CEFR. According to the 37.5 % of the participants the assessment aims of CEFR isn't clear. Some of the views of participants are presented below:

T3: *“The aims are clear enough but we cannot apply or achieve those ones because of reasons related with school such as very crowded classes or lack of enough time.”*

T4: *“They aren't clear. They should be more specific and realistic to be applied in our classes.”*

T7: *“To be realistic, I can say that there is no problem with the aims of CEFR but there are problems to apply in.”*

“Can you make use of CEFR assessment objectives?” is asked to participants and the responses are shown in Table 9 below:

Table 9. Teachers' Making Use of CEFR

No	Making use of CEFR	f	%
1	not exactly	4	50.0
2	No	2	25.0
3	no idea	1	12.5
4	early to comment	1	12.5
	Total	8	100.0

Table 9 shows the teachers' views on making use of CEFR assessment objectives. As seen in the table above, half of the participants think that they cannot make use of

CEFR assessment objectives totally. One of the teachers has no idea again on the topic but some of the teachers state their thoughts as the following way:

T1: *“It is too early for me to say ‘Yes, I can make use of it’ or ‘No, I cannot’ because I haven’t got enough experience in this field yet as I am only teacher for two months but I remember the importance of CEFR from one of my instructors’ lesson from university and I believe that it will be a guide for my teaching process for following years.”*

T5: *“I can make use of its objectives partly. If you ask me in terms of listening and speaking I say No, but in terms of reading and writing I can make use of it.”*

T1: *“No, because we cannot assess our students’ listening and speaking skills in so crowded classes. I have to prepare my students the TEOG so I ignore CEFR aims in a great extent.”*

In this part, answers of the last question that was asked to participants “To what extent do you think that you achieve the assessment objectives set by CEFR?” are indicated on the Table 10.

Table 10. The Extent Teachers Achieve CEFR Assessment Objectives

No	the extent	f	%
1	partly (half and half)	5	62.5
2	Never	2	25.0
3	no idea	1	12.5
Total		8	100.0

Table 10 indicates that while more than half of the participants think they achieve these objectives only partially and two of the participants express totally negative comments. Five of the participants state that they can achieve the reading and writing objectives but listening and speaking parts cannot be achieved. The rest of the participants consider that because of the requirement of system and lack of suitable settings, they cannot achieve these objectives. The opinions of some participants are demonstrated below:

T7: *“It is not possible to apply CEFR’s assessment objectives totally. We cannot assess speaking or listening skills of a class consisting of 45 students.”*

T3: *“Because of the TEOG anxiety, I have to apply mostly reading comprehension and grammar test so I can achieve the objectives only in a certain degree.”*

T8: *“It is not possible to apply it in our classes so I cannot achieve it anytime.”*

As a second part of data collection and analysis, one representative exam paper from each grade per school is collected and subjected to content analysis. The tables below indicate the findings of analysis beginning with 5th grades to 8th grades. The schools are represented as follows: School A, School B, School C and School D.

Table 11. Content Analysis of 5th Grade English Exam From School A

ITEM	CONTENT DOMAIN	CONTENT CATEGORY	COGNITIVE PROCESS	ASPECT OF LANGUAGE
1	English	Grammar: Simple Present Tense	1. Choosing the correct answer (understand) 2. Answering the questions (analyze/understand)	Grammar
2	English	Vocabulary related to illness and nationalities	1. Matching the pictures with correct words (Vocabulary) 2. Remembering knowledge form long memory (vocabulary)	Vocabulary
3	English	Grammar: Simple Present Tense / Time Expressions	1. Answering multiple choice questions (understand)	Grammar Vocabulary
4	English	Grammar: Prepositions	1. Matching the expressions with pictures (understand) 2. Completing the sentences with correct items (understand/analyze)	Grammar
5	English	Grammar: Modals can/cannot	1. Interpreting pictures (understand)	Grammar

ITEM	CONTENT DOMAIN	CONTENT CATEGORY	COGNITIVE PROCESS	ASPECT OF LANGUAGE
6	English	Vocabulary: nouns	1. Completing the missing letters of words (vocabulary) 2. Remembering knowledge form long memory (vocabulary)	Vocabulary
7	English	Grammar: Modals should/shouldn't	1. Understanding a paragraph and giving advice (understand)	Reading Grammar
8	English	Vocabulary related to daily activities	Vocabulary	

Table 12. Content Analysis of 5th Grade English Exam From School B

ITEM	CONTENT DOMAIN	CONTENT CATEGORY	COGNITIVE PROCESS	ASPECT OF LANGUAGE
1	English	Grammar: Modals should/shouldn't	1.Choosing the correct answer (Understand)	Grammar
2	English	Vocabulary: nouns	1. Matching the pictures with correct words (Vocabulary) 2. Remembering knowledge form long memory (vocabulary)	Vocabulary
3	English	Grammar: Simple Present Tense – Time Expressions	1. Matching the expressions with suitable pictures (understand)	Grammar Vocabulary
4	English	Grammar: Simple Present Tense	1. Understanding a paragraph and answering questions (understand/analyze)	Grammar Reading
5	English	Grammar: Prepositions	1. Completing sentences with correct expressions (understand)	Grammar
6	English	Vocabulary related to daily activities	1. Interpreting the pictures (vocabulary) 2. Remembering knowledge form long memory.(vocabulary)	Vocabulary

ITEM	CONTENT DOMAIN	CONTENT CATEGORY	COGNITIVE PROCESS	ASPECT OF LANGUAGE
7	English	Grammar: Modals can / cannot	1. Circling the correct answers (understand)	Grammar
8	English	Vocabulary related to parts of day	1. Completing the missing letters of words (vocabulary) 2. Remembering knowledge form long memory.(vocabulary)	Vocabulary

Table 13. Content Analysis of 5th Grade English Exam From School C

ITEM	CONTENT DOMAIN	CONTENT CATEGORY	COGNITIVE PROCESS	ASPECT OF LANGUAGE
1	English	Grammar: Modals should/shouldn't	1.Choosing the correct answer (Understand)	Grammar
2	English	Vocabulary: nouns	1. Matching the pictures with correct words. (Vocabulary) 2. Remembering knowledge form long memory. (vocabulary)	Vocabulary
3	English	Grammar: Simple Present Tense – Time Expressions	1. Matching the expressions with suitable pictures (understand)	Grammar Vocabulary
4	English	Grammar: Simple Present Tense	1. Understanding a paragraph and answering questions (understand/analyze)	Grammar Reading
5	English	Grammar: Prepositions	1. Completing sentences with correct expressions (understand)	Grammar
6	English	Vocabulary related to daily activities	1. Interpreting the pictures (vocabulary) 2. Remembering knowledge form long memory.(vocabulary)	Vocabulary

ITEM	CONTENT DOMAIN	CONTENT CATEGORY	COGNITIVE PROCESS	ASPECT OF LANGUAGE
7	English	Grammar: Modals can / cannot	1. Circling the correct answers (understand)	Grammar
8	English	Vocabulary related to parts of day	1. Completing the missing letters of words (vocabulary) 2. Remembering knowledge form long memory.(vocabulary)	Vocabulary

Table 14. Content Analysis of 5th Grade English Exam From School D

ITEM	CONTENT DOMAIN	CONTENT CATEGORY	COGNITIVE PROCESS	ASPECT OF LANGUAGE
1	English	Grammar: Simple Present Tense – Time Expressions Vocabulary related to daily activities	1. Completing the sentences with correct expressions (Understand) 2. Remembering knowledge form long memory (vocabulary)	Grammar Vocabulary
2	English	Grammar: prepositions	1. Answering the multiple choice questions (understand)	Grammar
3	English	Grammar: Modals should / shouldn't	1. Giving advice (understand-analyze)	Grammar
4	English	Grammar: Simple Present Tense	1. Understanding a paragraph and put it an order by giving numbers (understand/analyze)	Grammar Reading
5	English	Vocabulary related to capitals and natioanalties	1 Answering multiple choice questions (vocabulary) 2. Remembering knowledge form long memory (vocabulary)	Vocabulary

ITEM	CONTENT DOMAIN	CONTENT CATEGORY	COGNITIVE PROCESS	ASPECT OF LANGUAGE
6	English	Grammar: Prepositons	1. Completing the sentences with correct expressions	Grammar
7	English	Vocabulary related to illness	1. Matching the word with the pictures (vocabulary) 2. Remembering knowledge form long memory (vocabulary)	Vocabulary
8	English	Vocabulary: nouns	1. Completing the missing letters of words (vocabulary) 2. Remembering knowledge form long memory (vocabulary)	Vocabulary
9	English	Grammar: Modals Can- cannot	1. Choosing correct answer (understand) 2. Interpreting a table (understand-analyze)	Grammar
10	English	Grammar: like-dislike	1. Understanding a dialogue and choosing the correct expression (understand-analyze)	Grammar Reading

When 5th grade exam papers collected from four different schools are analyzed and compared, it is revealed that teachers follow the curriculum in their assessment practices in terms of suggested topics. Their assessment processes are similar to each other regardless of school type. They use almost the same methods based on writing and reading skills and exams include different types of question formats. These assessment types do not evaluate listening and speaking skills, although CEFR and curriculum include assessment practices focused on all skills. Some questions deal with more than one language aspect.



Table 15. Content Analysis of 6th Grade English Exam From School A

ITEM	CONTENT DOMAIN	CONTENT CATEGORY	COGNITIVE PROCESS	ASPECT OF LANGUAGE
1	English	Grammar: be going to	1. Answering multiple choice questions (Understand)	Grammar
2	English	Vocabulary related to seasons	1. Matching the pictures with correct words. (Vocabulary) 2. Remembering knowledge form long memory. (vocabulary)	Vocabulary
3	English	Vocabulary related to emotions	1. Understanding a paragraph (understand) 2. Matching the expressions with correct words. (understand- analyze)	Reading Vocabulary
4	English	Grammar: Comperatives	1. Completing the sentences with correct expressions (understand/analyze)	Grammar
5	English	Grammar: Simple Present Tense	1. Reading a passage and answering questions (understand/analyze)	Grammar

ITEM	CONTENT DOMAIN	CONTENT CATEGORY	COGNITIVE PROCESS	ASPECT OF LANGUAGE
6	English	Vocabulary related to weather forecast	1. Interpreting the pictures (vocabulary) 2. Remembering knowledge form long memory.(vocabulary)	Vocabulary
7	English	Grammar: How many / how much	1. Answering the questions (understand)	Grammar
8	English	Vocabulary: nouns	1. Correcting the false letters of words (vocabulary) 2. Remembering knowledge form long memory.(vocabulary)	Vocabulary
		Grammar: Wh questions	1. Answering the questions (understand)	Grammar
9	English	Grammar: like-dislike	1. Interpreting pictures (understand)	Grammar
10	English	Grammar: be going to	1. Answering multiple choice questions(understand)	Grammar

Table 16. Content Analysis of 6th Grade English Exam From School B

ITEM	CONTENT DOMAIN	CONTENT CATEGORY	COGNITIVE PROCESS	ASPECT OF LANGUAGE
1	English	Grammar: have got / has got	1. Completing a dialogue (Understand - analyze)	Grammar
2	English	Vocabulary related to seasons and month of the year	1. Matching the pictures with correct words. (Vocabulary) 2. Remembering knowledge form long memory. (vocabulary)	Vocabulary
3	English	Grammar: quantifiers: A lot of – some	1. Answering multiple choice questions (understand)	Grammar
4	English	Grammar: Simple Present Tense	1. Reading a passage and put them in order (understand/organize) 2. Finding the grammatical mistake and correcting them (understand-analyze)	Grammar Reading
5	English	Vocabulary: nouns	1. Interpreting the pictures (vocabulary) 2. Remembering knowledge form long memory (vocabulary)	Vocabulary

Table 17. Content Analysis of 6th Grade English Exam From School C

ITEM	CONTENT DOMAIN	CONTENT CATEGORY	COGNITIVE PROCESS	ASPECT OF LANGUAGE
1	English	Vocabulary related to month of the year	1. Completing the missing letters of words (vocabulary) 2. Remembering knowledge form long memory (vocabulary)	Vocabulary
2	English	Grammar: be going to	1. Answering multiple choice questions (understand)	Grammar
3	English	Grammar: How many / how much	1. Completing a dialogue (understand-analyze)	Grammar
4	English	Grammar: Simple Present Tense	1. Understanding a paragraph and answering questions (understand-analyze)	Grammar Reading
5	English	Vocabulary related to weather forecast and seasons	1. Matching the words with pictures (vocabulary) 2. Remembering knowledge form long memory (vocabulary)	Vocabulary
6	English	Grammar: there is/ there are	1. Interpreting the pictures (understand)	Grammar

ITEM	CONTENT DOMAIN	CONTENT CATEGORY	COGNITIVE PROCESS	ASPECT OF LANGUAGE
7	English	Grammar: Have got / has got	1. Reading a paragraph and highlighting correct option (understand- analyze)	Grammar Reading
8	English	Vocabulary: nouns	1. Correcting the spellings of words (vocabulary) 2. Remembering knowledge form long memory (vocabulary)	Vocabulary

Table 18. Content Analysis of 6th Grade English Exam From School D

ITEM	CONTENT DOMAIN	CONTENT CATEGORY	COGNITIVE PROCESS	ASPECT OF LANGUAGE
1	English	Grammar: Simple Present Tense	1. Understanding a paragraph and answering questions (understand-analyze)	Grammar Reading
2	English	Vocabulary related to feelings	1. Matching the words with pictures (vocabulary) 2. Remembering knowledge form long memory.(vocabulary)	Vocabulary
3	English	Grammar: Comperatives	1. Completing the sentences with correct answers (understand-analyze)	Grammar
4	English	Vocabulary related to weather forecast	1. Answering multiple choice questions (vocabulary) 2. Remembering knowledge form long memory.(vocabulary)	Vocabulary
5	English	Vocabulary: nouns	1. Completing the blanks with correct words (vocabulary) 2. Remembering knowledge form long memory.(vocabulary)	Vocabulary

ITEM	CONTENT DOMAIN	CONTENT CATEGORY	COGNITIVE PROCESS	ASPECT OF LANGUAGE
6	English	Grammar: quantifiers: some – any	1. Answering questions (understand)	Grammar
7	English	Vocabulary related to seasons	1. Reading a paragraph and highlighting correct option (understand-analyze)	Grammar Reading
8	English	Grammar: Simple Present Tense Grammar: how much – how many	1. Choosing the correct answer (understand) 2. Completing the sentences (understand)	Grammar
9	English	Grammar: be going to	1. Interpreting pictures (understand)	Grammar
10	English	Grammar: Simple Present Tense	1. Understanding a paragraph and answering questions (undertand/analyze)	Grammar Reading

Analyses of 6th grade exam papers from each school show that teachers practice suggested topics presented in the curriculum in their assessment processes. Their assessment practices resemble each other no matter what the school type is. All the exam papers above, which are based on evaluating writing and reading skills as well as grammar structure, include questions in different formats. It is clear that assessment of listening and speaking skills are ignored in all school types although both CEFR and curriculum include assessment practices focused on all skills. It is seen that some questions are deal with different aspects of language.

Table 19. Content Analysis of 7th Grade English Exam From School A

ITEM	CONTENT DOMAIN	CONTENT CATEGORY	COGNITIVE PROCESS	ASPECT OF LANGUAGE
1	English	Grammar: Simple Past Tense	1. Understanding a paragraph and answering questions (understand/analyze)	Grammar Reading
2	English	Grammar: Comperatives	1. Filling the blanks with correct forms (understand)	Grammar
3	English	Vocabulary related to physical appearance	1. Describing pictures (vocabulary) 2. Remembering knowledge form long memory.(vocabulary)	Vocabulary
4	English	Grammar: Adjectives	1. Completing the sentences with correct answers (understand)	Grammar
5	English	Grammar: prefer – should	1. Answering multiple choice questions (understand)	Grammar
6	English	Vocabulary related to personalities	1. Matching the pictures with words (vocabulary) 2. Remembering knowledge form long memory.(vocabulary)	Vocabulary
7	English	Grammar: Wh questions	1. Answering the questions (understand)	Grammar

Table 20. Content Analysis of 7th Grade English Exam From School B

ITEM	CONTENT DOMAIN	CONTENT CATEGORY	COGNITIVE PROCESS	ASPECT OF LANGUAGE
1	English	Grammar: Adjectives	1. Filling the blanks with correct answers (understand)	Grammar
2	English	Vocabulary related to physical appearance and personality	1. Understanding a paragraph and answering related questions (analyze-understand) 2. Remembering knowledge from long memory.(vocabulary)	Vocabulary Reading
3	English	Grammar: Simple Past Tense	1. Completing a dialogue with suitable forms of verbs (understand)	Grammar
4	English	Grammar: Comperatives	1. Choosing the correct answers (understand)	Grammar
5	English	Grammar: prefer – should	1. Matching the pictures with correct answers (understand)	Grammar

Table 21. Content Analysis of 7th Grade English Exam From School C

ITEM	CONTENT DOMAIN	CONTENT CATEGORY	COGNITIVE PROCESS	ASPECT OF LANGUAGE
1	English	Vocabulary related to physical appearance	1. Interpreting pictures (vocabulary) 2. Remembering knowledge form long memory.(vocabulary)	Vocabulary
2	English	Grammar: Adjectives	1. Matching the pictures with correct adjectives (understand)	Grammar
3	English	Grammar: Simple Past Tense	1. Filling the blanks with suitable answers (understand)	Grammar
4	English	Grammar: Articles	1. Putting the correct answers (understand)	Grammar
5	English	Grammar: prefer – should	1. Matching the pictures with statements (understand)	Grammar
6	English	Vocabulary related to personalities	1. Matching the pictures with words (vocabulary) 2. Remembering knowledge form long memory.(vocabulary)	Vocabulary
7	English	Grammar: Wh questions	1. Answering the questions	Grammar

Table 22. Content Analysis of 7th Grade English Exam From School D

ITEM	CONTENT DOMAIN	CONTENT CATEGORY	COGNITIVE PROCESS	ASPECT OF LANGUAGE
1	English	Grammar: prefer – should	1. Filling the blanks with suitable answers (understand)	Grammar
2	English	Grammar: Adjectives	1. Matching the adjectives with opposite meanings (understand)	Grammar
3	English	Vocabulary related to personalities and physical appearance	1. Classifying the words into correct category (vocabulary) 2. Remembering knowledge from long memory (vocabulary)	Vocabulary
4	English	Grammar: Simple Past Tense	1. Understanding a paragraph and answering related questions (understand-analyze)	Grammar Reading
5	English	Grammar: Articles	1. Completing sentences with suitable answers (understand)	Grammar
6	English	Grammar: Wh questions	1. Answering questions from the chart (understand)	Grammar

ITEM	CONTENT DOMAIN	CONTENT CATEGORY	COGNITIVE PROCESS	ASPECT OF LANGUAGE
7	English	Vocabulary: Nouns	1. Finding the right answer (vocabulary) 2. Remembering knowledge form long memory.(vocabulary)	Vocabulary
8	English	Grammar: Comperatives	1. Interpreting a table (understand-analyze)	Grammar
9	English	Grammar: but – because	1. Completing sentences with suitable answers (understand)	Grammar
10	English	Vocabulary related to physical appearance	1. Choosing the correct answer 2. Remembering knowledge form long memory.(vocabulary)	Vocabulary

When 7th grade exam papers gathered from four different schools are analyzed and compared, it is seen that teachers' assessment practices are suitable to the suggested topics presented in the curriculum. Assessment processes from different types of schools are more or less similar. These exams include different question types with different formats that are based on assessment of grammar, reading and writing skills. Even if CEFR and the curriculum promote to assess all the skills, it is clear that listening and speaking are ignored in this stage. There are some questions dealing with more than one aspect of language.

Table 23. Content Analysis of 8th Grade English Exam From School A

ITEM	CONTENT DOMAIN	CONTENT CATEGORY	COGNITIVE PROCESS	ASPECT OF LANGUAGE
1	English	Grammar: too – enough	1. Completing sentences with correct answers (understand)	Grammar
2	English	Vocabulary: Nouns	1. Matching the pictures with the words (understand) 2. Remembering knowledge from long memory.(vocabulary)	Vocabulary
3	English	Grammar: Present Perfect Tense	1. Choosing the right answer (understand)	Grammar
4	English	Grammar: Ordinal numbers	1. Answering multiple choice questions	Grammar
5	English	Grammar: Modals	1. Understanding a paragraph and filling the blanks (understand-analyze)	Reading Grammar
6	English	Vocabulary: Nouns	1. Interpreting the pictures (vocabulary) 2. Remembering knowledge from long memory (vocabulary)	Vocabulary

ITEM	CONTENT DOMAIN	CONTENT CATEGORY	COGNITIVE PROCESS	ASPECT OF LANGUAGE
7	English	Vocabulary related to multiple intelligence	1. Reading a paragraph and summarizing it with own vocabulary (understand-analyze)	Reading Writing
8	English	Grammar: Wh questions	1. Matching the questions with answers (understand)	Grammar

Table 24. Content Analysis of 8th Grade English Exam From School B

ITEM	CONTENT DOMAIN	CONTENT CATEGORY	COGNITIVE PROCESS	ASPECT OF LANGUAGE
1	English	Grammar: Past Continuous Tense	1. Understanding a paragraph and answering the questions (understand-analyze)	Grammar Reading
2	English	Vocabulary: Nouns	1. Matching the pictures with the words (vocabulary) 2. Remembering knowledge from long memory.(vocabulary)	Vocabulary
3	English	Grammar: Modals	1. Completing the sentences with right answer (understand)	Grammar
4	English	Grammar: Present Perfect Tense	1. Answering multiple choice questions (understand)	Grammar
5	English	Grammar: too-enough	1. Interpreting a chart (understand)	Reading Grammar

Table 25. Content Analysis of 8th Grade English Exam From School C

ITEM	CONTENT DOMAIN	CONTENT CATEGORY	COGNITIVE PROCESS	ASPECT OF LANGUAGE
1	English	Grammar: Wh questions	1. Answering questions (understand)	Grammar
2	English	Vocabulary: Nouns	1. Choosing the correct answer from options (vocabulary) 2. Remembering knowledge from long memory (vocabulary)	Vocabulary
3	English	Grammar: Past Continuous Tense	1. Understanding a paragraph and finding grammatical errors (understand-analyze)	Grammar Reading
4	English	Grammar: Present Perfect Tense	1. Completing the sentences with correct expressions (understand)	Grammar
5	English	Grammar: Modals	1. Circling correct answer (understand)	Grammar
6	English	Vocabulary: Nouns	1. Finding the meanings of the words (vocabulary) 2. Remembering knowledge from long memory (vocabulary)	Vocabulary

Table 26. Content Analysis of 8th Grade English Exam From School D

ITEM	CONTENT DOMAIN	CONTENT CATEGORY	COGNITIVE PROCESS	ASPECT OF LANGUAGE
1	English	Grammar: Present Perfect Tense	1. Choosing the right answers (understand)	Grammar
2	English	Vocabulary: Nouns	1. Matching the pictures with correct words (vocabulary) 2. Remembering knowledge form long memory.(vocabulary)	Vocabulary
3	English	Grammar: Past Continious Tense	1. Understanding a paragraph and answering questions (understand-analyze)	Grammar Reading
4	English	Grammar: time expressions: just /yet/ already	1. Completing the sentences with correct expressions (understand)	Grammar
5	English	Grammar: too-enough	1. Filling the blanks with correct answers (understand)	Grammar
6	English	Vocabulary: Nouns	1. Finding the words according to its description (vocabulary) 2. Remembering knowledge from long memory (vocabulary)	Vocabulary

ITEM	CONTENT DOMAIN	CONTENT CATEGORY	COGNITIVE PROCESS	ASPECT OF LANGUAGE
7	English	Grammar: Ordinal numbers	1. Interpreting a table (understand)	Grammar
8	English	Grammar: should-shouldn't	1. Giving advice to the situations (understand)	Grammar
9	English	Writing	1. Writing a paragraph about Atatürks' life (analyze-understand)	Writing
10	English	Grammar: Making suggestions	1. Completing a dialogue with suitable answers (understand)	Grammar

As seen in the tables above, there are questions in different formats to assess students in each exam. It is explicit that the questions generally deal with the grammar or vocabulary aspect of language. There are also some questions which deal with either reading and grammar or reading and vocabulary together. Pictures, tables, graphics and drawings are used in all the grades and most of the questions include instructions both in English and in Turkish. All the questions accord with the subjects presented in the syllabus. Although each unit in the curriculum includes self-assessment practices to promote students for monitoring their own learning progress as suggested in the CEFR, teachers apply only formal assessment such as written exams.

Research Question II: Are there any challenges EFL teachers encounter in achieving the assessment objectives of CEFR?

a) If any, what kind of strategies do EFL teachers use to cope with these challenges?

The results of the challenges EFL teachers encounter are classified in two points as seen in the tables below:

Table 27. Student-based challenges teachers encounter

Challenges
1. Differences between students' classroom participation and assessment results
2. Lack of motivation of students
3. Problems related to exams (such as using time sufficiently, forgetting to answer some questions)
4. Giving some students extra points (to respectful, hardworking ones)

I. Challenges stemming from students:

As seen in the Table 27, participants touch on four main problems they encounter from top to down differences between participation and assessment results of students, students' lack of motivation, problems related to exams and giving some students extra points. Teachers' point of views in this aspect are presented with their following statements below:

Differences between participation and assessment results

Some of the teachers state that there are differences between students' participation in classroom activities and their exam results. It is clearly understood from teachers' extracts that although some students are good in terms of participation in classroom activities, they fail at exams.

T7: *“Some of our students have to work outside after school. They are good at in practice and they participate in the activities in class but their assessment results are bad because they need to earn money and they work so they have no time to repeat the learnings and they forget. If I assessed these students according to CEFR objectives, I wouldn’t be fair.”*

T4: *“Exams don’t reflect the students’ real success because there are some students who feel anxious during the assessment process and this situation causes to failure but their participation to activities in class is very good. But I have to take into account exam results as the assessment results.”*

Lack of motivation

Teachers report that students aren’t motivated enough in terms of performing different assessment techniques teachers present.

T5: *“I am aware that there are also different assessment forms in CEFR such as self-assessment grids but our students cannot mark these grids objectively and it is resulted from lack of motivation. They aren’t mature enough to assess themselves.”*

T1: *“When I try to give my students a project as a part of assessment, they always complain and they don’t want to do. I know that their family members complete their projects generally. Our students aren’t motivated to learn something or to develop themselves.”*

Problems related to exams

It is stated that there are some challenges that take place in the process of assessment as showed below

T6: *“During the assessment process, I mean exams, our students have difficulty in using time effectively. Although we give students enough time to complete all the*

questions, sometimes we cannot take the exact results, because they cannot reach all the questions in time.”

T10: *“Some of the students fail to notice some questions and they answer incompletely or they skip another question and forget to answer that one although we explain all the parts at the beginning of the exam.”*

Giving some students extra points

Some teachers highlight that they give extra points to some students (those who try to learn something or have respectful behaviours) to encourage them whatever their exam results are.

T3: *“I think that as teachers we should motivate our students to learn. Even if some of the students aren’t good at in exams and classroom activities, I give them extra points while evaluating so as to encourage them for learning. If they think that ‘I am not good at English’, they quit learning.”*

T2: *“There are some students who aren’t successful according to CEFR objectives but if they try to learn something or have respectful behaviours, I give them extra point to promote learning.”*

II. Challenges stemming from education system:

Table 28. Education system-based challenges teachers encounter

Challenges
1. Effect of TEOG
2. Time constraints
3. Crowded classes
4. Some school rules

Table 28 summarizes the challenges encountered by teachers deriving from the system. They mention mostly the effect of TEOG and then limited-time, crowded classess and some school rules are followed.

Effect of TEOG

Most of the teachers state that TEOG effects their way of assessment. They think that they have to prepare students for this exam so they generally follow this exam's assessment procedure in classroom assessment practises.

T3: *"I have to prepare my exam questions similar to TEOG format because students' achieving this exam is important for their following years so I generally ask multiple choice questions mostly based on reading comprehension."*

T5: *"There is no question to assess students' speaking and listening skills in TEOG so when I try to make the activities related to these skills, my students complain and they say that 'There is no question in TEOG like this way' and they don't want to do activities. Their parents also say the same thing!"*

Limited time (Time Constraints)

Teachers mention that period given for a lesson is not sufficient enough to assess all the skills of students.

T8: *“It is not possible for me to assess my students’ four skills because there isn’t enough time. Speaking and listening take too much time and I have to teach subjects overall so it is a big problem.”*

T2: *“We have limited hours and it is expected to assess our students from the aspects of listening, speaking, writing and reading as well as grammar. Does it sound possible?”*

Crowded classes

According to teachers, too crowded classes affect teaching-learning process negatively as stated in the following extracts:

T10: *“I have classes consisting of at least 42 students. How can teaching-learning and assessment process be effective?”*

T7: *“I tried to assess listening skills of my students one day, my class was too much crowded that this caused too much noise and it was the last time I did it.”*

Rules related to School

Teachers point out that some school rules they have to carry out affect their assessment process and some of them explain this situation like that way:

T1: *“There is a rule in our system something like that ‘If a student gets 30 from his sit-down exam, you shouldn’t give his oral exam 80 point’. I don’t find this rule*

right because getting a low mark from sit-down exam doesn't mean that this student is unsuccessful."

T6: *"Even if a student has too much absence, he can pass the class. There are some students who come rarely but they can pass even if they get low marks from the lesson. It is not fair to other students who come the lesson regularly and do their homework."*

a) If any, what kind of strategies do EFL teachers use to cope with these challenges?

Table 29. Teachers' strategies to cope with challenges

No	Teachers' strategies	f	%
1	setting clear targets before exams	19	34.55
2	checking exam papers in advance	8	14.55
3	warning students during exam	7	12.73
4	giving time to review the subjects before exam week	6	10.91
5	clarifying what to do at the beginning of exam	5	9.09
6	advising to practice listening	5	9.09
7	trying to assess with alternative techniques	5	9.09
Total		55	100.00

As seen in the table above, teachers mostly prefer setting clear targets before exams as coping strategy. Checking exam papers in advance and warning students during the exam are among the most chosen strategies by teachers.

The first result of the present study shows that teachers see the assessment part as the core of teaching and learning process. According to Gardiner (1994), "Assessment is essential not only to guide the development of individual students but also to monitor and continuously improve the quality of programs, inform prospective students and their parents, and provide evidence of accountability to those who pay our way." (p.109). Teachers also state that assessment is the reflection of teaching and learning in terms of both students and teachers.

According to the results, it can be clearly said that only few of the teachers consider that CEFR can meet assessment needs of teachers overall. However, North (2006) highlights that CEFR is a concentra-like reference tool providing categories and levels that educational professionals can adopt according to their needs. On the other hand, participants in this study state that it is impossible for them to say CEFR meets their assessment needs, while 25 % of the participants express that CEFR meets teachers' assessment needs only partially.

As a result it is found that teachers have limited knowledge on CEFR and they can achieve its assessment objectives only partially. The findings of this research have similarities with the findings of a study on views' of language teachers about CEFR by Kır and Sülü (2014). In those of the studies, it is clearly noticed that foreign language teachers need in-service training on CEFR. And what's more, it is also concluded from the research that teachers encounter some challenges in achieving CEFR assessment objectives in their practices. Similar to this result, Piccardi's (2012) study also shows that most of the participants find a big gap between the CEFR and the effective implementation of it.

It is also revealed that when questions related to CEFR and its assessment objectives are asked to participants, teachers know CEFR and its importance in teaching a language more or less. However, it is surprising that there is also teachers who have no idea about CEFR, although current English curriculum is based on it. As Karaata (2007) points out, in-service training courses for English language teachers should be increased and professionally designed with the cooperation of universities.

According to the results, it can be clearly said that only few of the teachers consider that CEFR can meet assessment needs of teachers overall. However, North (2006) highlights that CEFR is a concentra-like reference tool providing categories and levels that educational professionals can adopt according to their needs. On the other

hand, participants in this study state that it is impossible for them to say CEFR meets their assessment needs, while 25 % of the participants express that CEFR meets teachers' assessment needs only partially.

The current study reveals that many of the participants achieve the assessment objectives set by CEFR but only in a certain degree. While the objectives of reading and writing skills are achieved, listening and speaking parts are ignored. It is an interesting conclusion that there are some teachers who state that they cannot achieve none of the objectives under no circumstances. As stated in the study of Moonen, Stoutjesdijk, Graaf and Corda (2013), using CEFR in daily teaching and assessment practice in most cases is limited.

It is also found that CEFR assessment aims are generally found clear enough but many of the teachers highlight that they cannot apply these aims in their classes because of some reasons related with school. However, there are also some teachers who believe that these aims should be more specific and practicable. Similar to this result, Weir (2005) stresses that CEFR isn't transparent in terms of language assessment and the description scales should restrict the attempts to link separate assessment. It becomes clear that views of teachers related to CEFR are not so positive and it is stated that realities in classrooms are different from those of CEFR.

Additionally, teachers complain about crowded classes and it can be concluded that this situation affects teachers' assessment practices too. According to teachers, the main reasons lying behind their failing to achieve the listening and speaking assessment objectives of CEFR are crowded classes and lack of time. As Yücel (2007) states that there are different factors which cause the failure of ELT programs in schools such as inefficient course hours, the poorest time for listening and speaking activities and densely populated classrooms in general. Most of the teachers give the similar suggestions to improve the current situation. They state that lesson hours should be increased and the number of the students in a class should be

decreased to make learning and teaching process effective as well as to achieve the whole assessment objectives of CEFR.

Another interesting result is that TEOG has an important impact on both teachers' assessment practices and their classroom activities. Teachers generally ask multiple choice questions in their assessment practices suitable to the format of TEOG. As this exam doesn't include any type of speaking and listening question, teachers focus on grammar and reading comprehension topics for the most part.

The results of content analysis of teachers' assessment practices indicate that although secondary school English syllabus, that is based on CEFR, involves the skills of reading, writing, listening and speaking; there is no question to test speaking and listening skills of students. According to the results, it is concluded that students' speaking and listening skills aren't assessed. As North (2008) highlights that it is very astonishing that any secondary school teacher still gives grades by only counting mistakes without assessing some skills.

Another point concluded from the study is that assessment in secondary schools are mostly based on sit-down examinations conducted by teachers. While Gravell (2007) highlights that different subjects need different assessment types depending on the requirements. In this study it is seen that teachers don't use different assessment types so much.

Additionally, results demonstrate that there is no big gap or difference about teachers' achieving CEFR assessment objectives by the school type. It is usually thought that teaching and learning process of schools in good conditions are a bit different from other ones. It is seen that assessment practices and views of teachers in all schools are more or less similar. There are differences in numbers of exam questions from one school to another but teachers' manner of assessment application resembles to each other. Similar to this result, the study of Kır and Sülü (2014) also

point out that teachers' approach to follow the issues in CEFR are mostly similar regardless of the school type and educational level.

On the other hand, it is concluded that teachers encounter some challenges resulting from both students and school issues in the process of practising CEFR assessment objectives. It is clear that their strategies to cope with these challenges are mostly based on exam-oriented issues not to get rid of the challenges. School-based problems cannot be solved by teachers but they can do something related to student-based problems. For example, a teacher mentions students' lack of motivation but she can do nothing to make her students motivated.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, a clear frame of conclusion and implications of the research is given and then suggestions for further studies in the field are presented.

5.1 Conclusion and Implications

The aim of this study was to find about EFL teachers' achieving the assessment objectives set by CEFR and to what extent teachers achieve these objectives in their assessment practices and to identify challenges EFL teachers encounter in achieving the objectives and their strategies to cope with these challenges. The results of this study revealed important conclusions pertaining to the issues in concern. Several conclusions can be drawn out according to the results of study;

First of all, language teachers have generally limited knowledge on CEFR. Inservice training about the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages; learning, teaching, assessment should be organized to language teachers.

Secondly, it is clear that teachers either cannot achieve CEFR assessment objectives or they achieve only partially. How to make use of CEFR in their assessment practices should be provided for language teachers clearly. Teachers also encounter

some challenges in this process such as crowded classes, lack of time and not making listening and speaking. Some school regulations should be arranged in this point. To make assessment process more effective and to assess students in terms of four skills, lesson hours should be increased while density of classess should be decreased. Furthermore, teachers should use alternative assessment techniques to assess their students rather than sit-down examinations.

Thirdly, the TEOG has major impact on language education so its effect should be considered and awareness of both teachers and students should be raised at this stage point.

5.2 Suggestions for Further Research

This study investigated EFL teachers' achieving CEFR assessment objectives, the challenges they encounter in this process and their strategies to cope with these challenges. Concerning the scope of this study, the implications of this study may help different parties such as English language teachers, program designers and developers in the field in terms of developing new strategies to increase the efficiency of assessment process. Furthermore, the findings of this research may set an example in the field of English language teaching for further studies. Suggestions for further studies are listed below:

- The data elicitation instrument was preferred as semi-structured interviews and content analysis of assessment practices for various reasons mentioned in the methods chapter. However further studies can be conducted by using different data elicitation techniques such as questionnaires, observations etc.
- The present study is conducted with limited sample size including 8 participants, further studies can be conducted with larger sample size to obtain generalizable results.

- In future studies, perspectives or performances of students can be included to see the results from different points of views.
- This study is conducted by EFL teachers working at middle schools in Muğla and further studies can be conducted with teachers working at different educational stages in different cities.



REFERENCES

- Angelo, T. (1995). Reassessing (and defining) Assessment. *The AAHE Bulletin*, 48(2), 7-9.
- Aschbacher, P. R. (1991b). Performance Assessment: State Activity, Interest, and Concerns. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 4(4), 275-288.
- Astin, A.W. (1991). *Assessment for Excellence: The Philosophy and Practice of Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education/Oryx Press Series on Higher Education.
- Bailey, K. M. (1998). *Learning About Language Assessment: Dilemmas, Decisions, and Directions*. Pacific Grove [Calif.: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Bailly, S. & Gremmo, M-J. Et Riley, P. (2002) Guide À L'usage Des Apprenants Adultes. In J. Trim (Ed.) *Cadre Européen Commun De Référence Pour Les Langues: Apprendre, Enseigner, Évaluer*. Strasbourg: Conseil De l'Europe, pp. 55-82.
- Beinhoff, B. (2014). The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: A European Framework for Foreign Language Speech Development? *Language Value*, 6(1), 51-73.
- Berelson, B. (1952). *Content Analysis in Communication Research*. Glencoe, Ill: Free Press.
- Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (3rd Ed) (2007) . *Teaching for Quality Learning at University*. Maidenhead: Open University Press/McGraw Hill.
- Biggs, J. (1999). *Teaching for Quality Learning at University*. Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Brown, G.T.L., & Hirschfeld, G.H.F. (2008). Students' Conceptions of Assessment: Links to Outcomes. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 15(1), 3-17.
- Brown, H. D., (2004). *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.
- Brown, J. D., & Hudson, T. (1998). The Alternatives in Language Assessment. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(4): 653-675.
- Burgess, S., & Head, K. (2005). *How To Teach For Exams. Essex, UK: Pearson Education Ltd.*

- Cephe, P. T., & Toprak, T. E. (2014). The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Insights for Language Testing. *Journal Of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 10, 79-88.
- Chappuis, S., & Chappuis, J. (2008). The Best Value in Formative Assessment [Electronic version]. *Educational Leadership*, 65, 14-19.
- Coombe, C. A., & Hubley, N. J. (2003). *Assessment Practices*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Coombe, C. A., Folsie, K. S., & Hubley, N. J. (2007). *A Practical Guide to Assessing English Language Learners*. Ann Arbor, Mich: University of Michigan.
- Corbetta, P. (2003). *Social Research Theory, Methods and Techniques*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Council of Europe (2001). *The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crooks, T. J. (2002). Educational Assessment in New Zealand Schools. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 9(2), 237-253.
- Curriculum Framework for English as an Additional Language (EAL) and Literacy, Academics and Language (LAL) Programming (2011). Retrieved from: <http://www.edu.gov.mb.ca/k12/cur/eal/framework/>
- Çelik, 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.
- De Clerck, H.M., Willems, R., Timmerman, C., & Carling, J. (2011). Instruments and Guidelines for Qualitative Fieldwork, EUMAGINE Project. Retrieved from: <http://www.eumagine.org/outputs/PP6B%20Instruments%20and%20guidelines%20for%20qualitative%20fieldwork.pdf>.
- Demirezen, M., & Bakla, A. (2007). Testing the Efficiency of a CEF-based Waystage (A2-level) Syllabus. *Reading Matrix*, 7(2) 81-96.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Eisner, E. (2002). The Three Curricula That All Schools Teach. In E. W. Eisner (Ed.), *The Educational Imagination: On The Design And Evaluation Of School Programs* (pp. 87–107). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.

- Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2008). The Qualitative Content Analysis Process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62(1), 107-115.
- Figueras, N. (2012). The Impact of the CEFR. *ELT Journal*, 66(4), 477-485.
- Fulcher, G. (2004). Deluded by Artifices? The Common European Framework And Harmonization. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 1(4), 253 - 266.
- Fulcher, G. (2010). The Reification Of The Common European Framework Of Reference (CEFR) and Effect-Driven Testing. *Advances in Research on Language Acquisition and Teaching*, 15-26.
- Fylan, F. (2005). Semi-Structured Interviewing. In Miles, J. and Gilbert, P. (Eds.), *A Handbook of Research Methods for Clinical and Health Psychology* (pp. 65-77). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gardiner, L. (1994) Redesigning Higher Education: Producing Dramatic Gains in Student Learning, ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report.
- 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), 291-295.
- Goullier, F. (2007). “The Common European Framework of Reference For Languages (CEFR) and the Development of Language Policies: Challenges and Responsibilities” Strasbourg, 6-8 February 2007, Language Policy Division, Intergovernmental Language Policy Forum.
- Government of Manitoba. (2011). Curriculum Framework for English as an Additional Language (EAL) and Literacy, Academics, and Language (LAL) Programming. <http://www.edu.gov.mb.ca/k12/cur/eal/framework/index.html>.
- Gravells, A. (2013). *The Award in Education and Training*. London: Learning Matters SAGE.
- Gray, D. E. (2004). *Doing Research in the Real World*. SAGE Publications. London.
- Gray, P. S., Williamson, J.B., Karp, D. A., & Dalphin, J. R. (2007). *The Research Imagination: An Introduction to Qualitative and Quantitative Methods*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gullickson, A. (2000). The need for student evaluation standards [On-line]. Available: www.wmich.edu/evalctr/jc.
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching*. Essex, England: Longman.

- Hass, G. (1987). *Curriculum Planning: A new approach* (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Heaton, J. (2004). *Reworking Qualitative Data*. London: Sage Publications.
- Herman, J. L., Aschbacher, P. R., & Winters, L. (1992). *A Practical Guide to Alternative Assessment*. Alexandria, Va.: Association For Supervision And Curriculum Development.
- Heyworth, K. (2006). The Common European Framework, *ELT Journal*, 60(2), 181-183.
- Hismanoğlu, M. (2012). Does English Language Teacher Education Curriculum Promote CEFR Awareness of Prospective EFL Teachers? Proceedings Of The 3rd World Conference On Learning, Teaching And Educational Leadership (WCLTA-2012) (pp. 938-945). Brussels, Belgium: Maison N.-D. Chat d'Oiseau, 25-28 October, 2012.
- Hogan, J. M. (2012). The CEFR and ELT in Australia: Getting them together. NEAS 16th Annual ELT Management Conference. Available at: <http://www.neas.org.au/conference/presentations/conf12Hogan.pdf>.
- Holsti, O.R. (1969). *Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Huba, M. E., & Freed, J. E. (2000). *Learner-Centered Assessment on College Campuses - Shifting the Focus from Teaching to Learning*. Boston, Allyn and Bacon.
- Hughes, A. (2003). *Testing For Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ilin, G. (2014). Student-Teacher Judgements on Common European Framework: Efficacy, Feasibility And Reality. *Journal Of Language And Literature Education* 9, 8-19.
- Kajorboon, A. B. (2005). Using Interviews as Research Instruments. Retrieved from <http://www.culi.chula.ac.th/e-journal/bod/annabel.pdf>.
- Karaata, C. (2007). "Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı'nda Görevli İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Hizmet İçi Eğitimi İle İlgili Öneriler" Ağıldere, S. & Ceviz, N. (Ed.) Türkiye'de Yabancı Diller Ulusal Kongresi, Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi, 663-671.
- Krippendorff, K. (1980). *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Little, D. (2007). The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Perspectives On The Making Of Supranational Language Education Policy. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(4), 645-655.
- Lockyer, S. (2004). *Coding Qualitative Data*. In M., S. Lewis-Beck, A. Bryman, T. Futing Liao (Eds.) *The Sage Encyclopedia of Social Science Research Methods*. London: Sage Publications Inc.
- Lynch, B. K. (1997). *Language Program Evaluation: Theory and Practice*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Lynch, B. K. (2003). *Language Assessment and Program Evaluation*. Edinburgh Textbooks in Applied Linguistics Series (A. Davies & K. Mitchell, Eds.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Mader, J., & Urkun, Z. (2010). Putting The CEFR to Good Use. Canterbury: IATEFL. TEA SIG/EALTA Conference Proceedings (pp. 50-57).
- Moonen, M., Stoutjesdijk, E., De Graaff, R., & Corda, A (2013). Implementing CEFR In Secondary Education: Impact on FL Teachers' Educational and Assessment Practice. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 23 (2), 226-246.
- Munoz, M. A., & Guskey, T.R. (2015). Standards-Based Grading and Reporting Will Improve Education. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 96(7), 64-68.
- North, B. (2007). The CEFR Illustrative Descriptor Scales. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(4), 656 – 659.
- North, B. (2008). The CEFR Levels and Descriptor Scales in Taylor, L. and Weir, C. J. (Eds) *Multilingualism and Assessment*, *Studies in Language Testing* 27, Cambridge: UCLES/Cambridge University Press.
- North, B. & Schneider, G. (1998). Scaling Descriptors For Language Proficiency Scales. *Language Testing*, 15(2), 217–262.
- Nunan, D. (1988). *The Learner-Centred Curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D. (2010). *The Learner-Centred Curriculum: A Study in Second Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Dwyer, F., & Nagai, N. (2011). The Actual and Potential Impacts of the CEFR on Language Education in Japan. *Synergies Europe*, 6, 141-152.
- O'Leary Z. (2004). *The Essential Guide To Doing Research*. London: Sage Publications.

- Özer, Ö., & Parmaksız, Ş. R. (2013). Comparative Analysis of Lower Secondary Education 3rd Grade Curriculum for English Language and the CEFR. *Bartın University Journal of Faculty of Education*, 2(2), 171-189.
- Papageorgiou, S. (2014). Issues in Aligning Assessments with the Common European Framework of Reference. *Language Value*, 6(1), 15-27.
- Piccardo, E. (2012). Multidimensionality of Assessment in the Common European Framework of References for Languages. (CEFR). *Working Papers*, 4, 37-54.
- Prodromou, L. (1995). The Backwash Effect: from Testing to Teaching. *Language Testing* 1995, 49 (1): 13-25.
- Ramsden, P. (2003). *Learning to Teach in Higher Education*. London & New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Richards, J. C., Platt, J., & Platt, H. (1993). *Longman Dictionary Of Language Teaching And Applied Linguistics*. New York: Longman.
- Sadler, R. (1998). Formative Assessment: Revisiting the Territory. *Assessment in Education*, 5, 77-84.
- Saskatchewan Ministry of Education (2012). A Guide to Using the Common Framework of Reference (CFR) with Learners of English as an Additional Language (EAL). Regina, SK: Government of Saskatchewan. Retrieved 28-10-2013, from: <http://www.education.gov.sk.ca/guide-to-using-cfr-with-eal>
- Seliger, H. W., & Shohamy, E. (1989). *Second Language Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Spiller, D. (2009). *Assessment: Feedback To Promote Student Learning*. Teaching Development Unit. University of Waikato.
- Sülü, A., & Kır, E. (2014). Language Teachers' Views on CEFR. *International Online Journal Of Education And Teaching (IOJET)*, 1(5), 358-364.
- Taylor, L., & Jones, N. (2006). Cambridge ESOL Exams and the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR). *Research Notes*, 24 , 2-5.
- Teachers' Guide to CEFR (ND). Pearson: Longman. Available at: <http://www.euddansk.dk/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/cefguide.pdf>.
- TenBrink, T., & Cooper, J. M. (2003). *An Educator's Guide to Classroom Assessment*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- University of Cambridge ESOL Examinations, Using The CEFR: Principles Of Good Practice, October 2011: <http://www.cambridgeenglish.org/images/126011-using-cefr-principles-of-good-practice.pdf>.

- Üstünlüoğlu, E., Akgül Zazaoglu, K. F., Keskin, M. N., Sarayköylü, B., & Akdoğan, G. (2012). Developing a CEF Based Curriculum: A Case Study. *International Journal of Instruction*, 115- 127.
- Weber, R. P. (1990). *Basic Content Analysis*. 2nd ed. Newbury Park, CA.
- Weir, C. J. (2005). *Language Testing And Validation: An Evidence-Based Approach*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- William, D., & Leahy, S. (2007). A Theoretical Foundation For Formative Assessment. In J. McMillan, H. (ed.) *Formative Classroom Assessment: Theory into Practice* (pp. 29-42). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2008). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. Seçkin Yayıncılık: Ankara.
- Yücel, E. (2007). “Devlet Okullarında Yürütülen Yabancı Dil Eğitime Eleştirel Bir Bakış” Ağıldere, S. & Ceviz, N. (Ed.) *Türkiye’de Yabancı Diller Ulusal Kongresi*, Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi, 1069-1075.
- Yüksel, İ., & Demiral, S. (2013). Evaluating European Language Portfolio in Turkish Context: Teachers’ Views on New Secondary Education English Teaching Program, *International Journal of Social Sciences and Education*, 3(4), 904-916 [EI- Wilson].



APPENDICES

Appendix A: Application for Ethical Approval (Formal Letter)



Appendix B: Semi-structured Interview Form

Questions

- 1) Which objectives do you consider while assessing your students?
- 2) Do you think CEFR meets teachers' needs in assessment?
- 3) Do you think the aims of CEFR are clear for your assessment practices?
- 4) Can you make use of CEFR assessment objectives?
- 5) To what extent do you think that you achieve the assessment objectives set by CEFR?
- 6) Are there any challenges EFL teachers encounter in achieving the assessment objectives of CEFR?
- 7) If any, what kind of strategies do EFL teachers use to cope with these challenges?

Appendix C: Official Approval for Application



KİŞİSEL BİLGİLER

Adı Soyadı: Hazal ÇEPİK KİRİŞ

Doğum Tarihi: 27.08.1989

EĞİTİM VE AKADEMİK BİLGİLER

Lise: Tarsus Yabancı Dil Ağırlıklı Lisesi

Lisans: Çukurova Üniversitesi

Yabancı Dil: İngilizce, Fransızca

MESLEKİ BİLGİLER

2013 : Aksaray Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Araştırma Görevlisi

2013 - : Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Araştırma Görevlisi