**ONDOKUZ MAYIS ÜNİVERSİTESİ**
**EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ**
**YABANCI DİLLER EĞİTİMİ ANABİLİM**
**DALI**

**AN EVALUATION OF THE SECOND GRADE ENGLISH**
**COURSEBOOKS ACCORDING TO THE CRITERIA OF THE CEFR**

**Yüksek Lisans Tezi**

**Emre AK**

Danışman
**Doç. Dr. Nalan KIZILTAN**

**Samsun, 2016**

**ONDOKUZ MAYIS ÜNİVERSİTESİ**
**EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ**
**YABANCI DİLLER EĞİTİMİ ANABİLİM**
**DALI**

**AN EVALUATION OF THE SECOND GRADE ENGLISH**
**COURSEBOOKS ACCORDING TO THE CRITERIA OF THE CEFR**

**Yüksek Lisans Tezi**

**Emre AK**

Danışman
**Doç. Dr. Nalan KIZILTAN**

**Samsun, 2016**

# TEZ KABUL VE ONAYI

Emre AK tarafından hazırlanan *"An Evaluation of the Second Grade English Coursebooks According to the Criteria of the CEFR"* başlıklı bu çalışma, 05.09.2016 tarihinde yapılan savunma sınavı sonucunda oy birliğiyle/oy çokluğuyla başarılı bulunarak jürimiz tarafından Yüksek Lisans Tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

İmza

Başkan:_____          _____

Üye: _____          _____

Üye: _____          _____

Yukarıdaki imzaların adı geçen öğretim üyelerine ait olduğunu onaylarım.

____/____/_____

Enstitü Müdürü (*İmza ve Mühür*)

i

# BİLİMSEL ETİK BİLDİRİMİ

Hazırladığım Yüksek Lisans Tezinin bütün aşamalarında bilimsel etiğe ve akademik kurallara riayet ettiğimi, çalışmada doğrudan veya dolaylı olarak kullandığım her alıntıya kaynak gösterdiğimi ve yararlandığım eserlerin kaynakçada gösterilenlerden oluştuğunu, yazımda enstitü yazım kılavuzuna uygun davranıldığını taahhüt ederim.

05 / 09 / 2016

Emre AK

# ÖZET

İLKÖĞRETİM İKİNCİ SINIF İNGİLİZCE DERS KİTAPLARININ AVRUPA DİL ÖĞRETİMİ ORTAK ÇERÇEVE PROGRAMI (ADOÇEP) KRİTERLERİNE GÖRE DEĞERLENDİRİLMESİ

Emre AK

Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü,

Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Ana Bilim Dalı, Yüksek Lisans, Eylül/2016

Danışman: Doç. Dr. Nalan KIZILTAN

Günümüzde ana dilin etkin kullanımının yanı sıra yabancı dilin etkin bir şekilde kullanılması da büyük önem taşımaktadır. Yabancı bir dilin kullanımı için sadece o dilin dil bilgisi kurallarının bilinmesi yeterli olmamakta, o dilde etkin iletişim kurabilmek için dinleme, konuşma, okuma ve yazma becerilerinde de belirli düzeylerde yetkinlik gerektirmektedir. Ne var ki, günümüzde birçok kişi yabancı bir dil öğrenirken hayal kırıklığına uğramaktadır. Çünkü çoğu dil öğrencisi, dil bilgisi ağırlıklı bir öğrenim sürecinden geçerek yabancı dil bilgisi ve becerilerini geliştirmeye çalışmaktadır. Müfredatı dil bilgisi kurallarının öğretimine dayalı bir yabancı dil eğitim programı ve ders kitabı ise yarardan çok zarar getirebilir. Ayrıca pek çok yetişkin yabancı dili nasıl öğreneceğine veya bir yabancı dili nasıl çalışacağına dair yeterince bilgiye sahip olmadığından veya dil becerilerini geliştirmek için bilgi ve beceri eksikliğinden dolayı yabancı dil eğitiminde güçlük çekmektedir. Öte yandan bir bireyin dil yeterliği ülkelere göre farklılık göstermektedir. Bir ülkenin değerlendirme sistemine göre başarılı olan bir birey başka bir ülkenin değerlendirme sistemine göre başarısız kabul edilebilmektedir.

Avrupa Konseyi tarafından hazırlanan Avrupa Dil Öğretimi Ortak Çerçeve Programı (ADOÇEP) genel iletişim becerileri ve dilsel beceriler için standart olarak belirlemiştir. Bu bakımdan ADOÇEP, tüm Avrupa Birliği ve birliğe aday ülkeler tarafından referans noktası olarak kabul edilmektedir. Böylece bir kişinin dil yeterliliği konusundaki uyumsuzluklar giderilmiştir. Türkiye'nin Avrupa Birliği'ne uyum sürecinde ele alınan başlıklardan birisi, 'Yabancı Dil Eğitimi ve Öğretimi'dir. Bu doğrultuda, bu çalışma ile Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı'nca hazırlanan 2. Sınıf İngilizce Ders Kitapları'nın Avrupa'da dil standartlarını belirleyen ADOÇEP'in A1 düzeyine uygunluğunun belirlenmesi amaçlanmaktadır. Ayrıca, iletişimsel ve dilsel becerilerdeki çeşitliliğe dikkat çekmek ve ADOÇEP'in daha etkin kullanımı için öğretmenler arasında farkındalık yaratmak hedeflenmiştir. Bu amaçla, Türkiye genelinde yedi coğrafi bölgedeki devlet okullarında ilköğretim ikinci sınıflarda derse giren 418 İngilizce Öğretmenine uygulanan anket ile İngilizce ders kitaplarının ADOÇEP'e ne kadar uygun olduğu tespit edilmeye çalışılmıştır.


**Anahtar Sözcükler:** ADOÇEP, Yabancı Dil Öğretimi, İlkokul 2. Sınıf İngilizce Ders Kitabı, Çocuklara Yabancı Dil Öğretimi

# ABSTRACT

## AN EVALUATION OF THE SECOND GRADE ENGLISH COURSEBOOKS ACCORDING TO THE CRITERIA OF THE COMMON EUROPEAN FRAMEWORK OF REFERENCE (CEFR)

Emre AK

Ondokuz Mayıs University, Graduate School of Educational Sciences

Department of Foreign Language Education, M.A., September/2016

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nalan KIZILTAN

In the 21st century, it is of great importance to use a foreign language efficiently as well as the effective use of mother tongue. Knowledge of the grammar of a foreign language is not sufficient to use that language, since it requires a certain level of proficiency in reading, speaking, reading and writing skills in order to be able to communicate effectively in the target language. However, many people get disappointed while learning a foreign language, as they undergo a grammar based process. A foreign language teaching program and coursebook based on grammar may be more detrimental. In addition, many language learners have difficulties in foreign language learning as they do not have the knowledge of how to learn a foreign language or how to study it and the lack of skill and knowledge to improve language skills. On the other hand, there are differences among countries whether an individual knows a language or not. Being successful or satisfactory according to assessment type of a country, a learner may be regarded as unsuccessful or poor in another country.

Prepared by the Council of Europe (CE), the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) has set the standards for general communicative and linguistic skills. In this regard, the CEFR is considered as a reference point by all the European Union members and candidate countries. Thus, it is aimed to remove the discrepancies in an individual's language proficiency. One of the topics covered in the European Union integration process of Turkey is 'Foreign Language Education and Teaching'. In this respect, this study aims to evaluate the appropriateness of second grade English coursebooks prepared by Ministry of National Education (MoNE) to the A1 level of the CEFR. Besides, it has also been intended to draw attention to the diversity in communication and language skills and to raise awareness among teachers to use the CEFR more efficiently. In this study, a questionnaire consistig of 75 questions developed by the researcher has been applied to 418 English language teachers who have been working at public schools throughout Turkey.

**Keywords:** CEFR, Foreign Language Teaching, 2$^{nd}$ Grade English Coursebook, Teaching English to Young Learners

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# LIST OF TABLES

# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

**The CEFR:** Common European Framework Of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment

**CE:** The Council of Europe

**EU:** The European Union

**MoNE:** Ministry of National Education in Turkey

**YL:** Young Learner

**SLA :** Second Language Acquisition

**FLA:** Foreign Language Acquisition

**ESL :** English as a Second Language

**EFL :** English as a Foreign Language

**ELT :** English Language Teaching

**TL :** Target Language

**L1 :** Mother tongue

**L2 :** Second Language

# CHAPTER ONE

# INTRODUCTION

## 1.1. Background to the Study

In the twenty-first century, especially in the last quarter of the century, the world has experienced very significant changes. Various universal socio-economic developments and unprecedented rapid changes in science and technology underlie these changes. As a result of these developments, there has been a huge information explosion all over the world and the knowledge produced in last 30 or 40 years has been as much as those of produced during the previous periods in the history of mankind (Gedikoğlu, 2005). There have been fundamental changes in the world which are so hard to keep up with in politics, economy, culture and social field since 90s in the world. In parallel with these developments, removal of borders in Europe, opening of internal markets, the opportunity of each European citizen to study or to work in another country have significantly increased the importance of teaching and learning foreign languages. Thomas (1996) supports the importance of English language among foreign languages by pointing out that English is an important tool for information storage and transfer in the world and 70% of e-mails, 80% of computer and 85% of all information processes have been made in English. The Council of Europe (CE) has set certain principles within the frame of changing circumstances. Namely, it is aimed that everyone in the European Union (EU) member countries is primarily supposed to use English as a Lingua Franca at a level to meet their requirements (Gündoğdu, 2005).

Education is necessary to follow the developments in the world, to modernize, to investigate possible solutions for the problems that may arise. Language at this point is very significant in several aspects. For better internalization of civilization values, good foreign language skills and cultural awareness are necessary and knowing a foreign language has an absolute prominence in communication with others (Tok and Arıbaş, 2008). Giving high priority to education in the integration process of Europe, the EU

has been paying attention both to protect the diversity of the educational traditions of member states and not to make educational programs monotonous. The aim of the cooperations among member states in the field of education is to improve the quality of education and to develop Europeanness awareness in organizations and individuals of member states (Erginer, 2009).

The commercial, cultural and historical relations among countries are some reasons behind learning a second language. English, French or Spanish are used as a common communication and working tool in the United Nations, the Council of Europe, NATO-of which Turkey is member- and in many other organizations (Demirel, 2014). The EU expects its citizens to learn at least two or more foreign languages besides the mother tongue during the compulsory education process. Additionally, being able to take advantage of individual learning and growing media are among the main objectives (Gündoğdu, 2005). According to Vašková (2008), increasing popularity of population movements and travelling requires a better knowledge of foreign languages. To know a foreign language will help one to overcome the language problems throughout life while learning languages or working out. Demirel (1990) states that there are several factors that make learning a foreign language essential, such as rapid developments in communication tools, international politics, economy and increasing number of shopping in tourism. This increasing international relations make the mother tongue inadequate, thus learning languages of other countries for communication emerges as a requirement. Speaking a foreign language has become no longer just a goal but a vehicle. Those who have a good command of a foreign language are among the people who are recruited.

Additionally, globalization has revealed the need for joint action of many countries in many areas. Expansion of the European Union and cooperation between the member states have originated from such a requirement. The aim of the Union is to create synergy by establishing partnerships between countries in all aspects of social, cultural and economic life and to reflect this synergy in an effort to raise the living standards of the people (Gedikoğlu, 2005). In recent years, especially in Europe, the concepts of plurilingualism and pluriculturalism have come to the forefront. Besides, the tendancy to regulate foreign language teaching and learning within a certain framework has emerged and the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages arose (Ataç, 2008).

The Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) brings together language learning objectives, contents, tasks, and assessments in order to support teaching and learning in general, and in particular to facilitate the selection of support and techniques for learning (Glover, 2011). It illustrates standards for language teaching and learning and is used by growing number of educational institutions and organisations throughout the world. It aims to describe comprehensively the language competence and skills which language learners are to develop in order to use the language for communication and to gain efficiency. Moreover, it defines the language proficiency levels that will show the progress of foreign language learners. In the European Union, where different culture and languages intertwine, common curricula promoting Europanness awareness in language teaching have been developed in order to protect the cultural and linguistic diversity. Though there are such preparations and alterations in candidate countries like Turkey, how these curricula are compatible with the CEFR is still being investigated (Gündoğdu, 2005).

## 1.2. Statement of the Problem

In the world, although there are quite a few languages used by communities in many different geographies, the exact number of them is still unknown. However, it is stated that threethousand or threethousandandfivehundred languages exist (Dilaçar, 1968). Despite the variety of languages, increasing international relations and nations' getting closer have led to learn another language (Demirel, 2014). "The emergence of a second language has been at the time when people's communication went beyond their local communities, namely in 'global village' time. As never happened previously, people get a second language not only as a pleasure but also to secure their jobs and as part of their education" (Ellis, 2001: 3).

By definition, "foreign language" (FL) involves all languages other than the current main language used in a country or society (Başkan, 2006:198). In Turkey, like all over the world, significance of knowing and learning a foreign language with respect to social and cultural changes and technological advances is an undeniable fact. Because of the impossibility of acquiring all languages, it has been inevitable to adopt and to learn a common language (Çakır, 2007).

Nowadays, many people are disappointed while learning a language. Many try to improve their linguistic competence through grammar-based learning process. However, a grammar-based foreign language learning does not improve their linguistic competence. According to Krashen (1982), one of basic errors of modern language teaching methods is grammar-based instruction.

Since many people do not know how to learn or do not have enough information about how to develop language skills, they have difficulty in "learner autonomy". Lately, it has become an important issue that educators and foreign language teachers focus on (Little, 2007; Benson, 2007). The focus has shifted from teachers to students in the classroom. The Turkish education system is regarded as teacher-centered, for traditional education systems are widely used (Yumuk, 2002). Learner autonomy is a must for effective language learning based on the CEFR principles (Balçıkanlı, 2008). On the other hand, the CEFR is not a grammar-based approach, it has a language skill-based system that focuses on Action-Oriented approach

According to Karababa (2005), philosophy of language teaching is that language education should not be terminated at any age. It should be continued throughout their education processes by observing the developmental stages of individuals. Without limiting it to the class, language education should continue at every stage of education and daily life with the main goal of improving the favorable communication and conscious language use in all areas. Cihan (2001) indicates that learning a foreign language at an early age has also positive impacts on children in terms of nonlinguistic behaviour and that those children who start foreign language learning in primary school period have more superior properties than those who are monolinguals. Foreign language learning makes a significant contribution to a child's personality development as well as their mother tongue. Therefore, since 1960 in many European countries foreign language teaching has taken place from primary schools and it is asserted that foreign language education is one of the most important issues in today's child pedagogy. In association with this, foreign language courses have become compulsory in primary education institutions in Turkey (Er, 2006).

### 1.3. Purpose of the Study

Today, the use of the mother tongue as well as the effective use of a foreign language is of great importance for individuals. The use of a foreign language is not just having enough knowledge of the grammatical rules of that language but also requiring a certain level of proficiency in listening, reading, speaking and writing skills to be able to communicate effectively. The CEFR prepared by the Council of Europe (CE) has set the standards for general communication skills and linguistic skills.

One of the topics handled in the integration process of Turkey to European Union is "Foreign Language Teaching and Learning ". In this regard, the purpose of this study is to determine to what extent the 2nd grade English coursebook *I Know English* prepared by the Ministry of National Education (MoNE) is appropriate for the CEFR criteria. Moreover, it aims at drawing the attention of English language teachers to the diversity in the communicative and linguistic skills and raising their awareness to the CEFR use more efficiently.

### 1.4. Scope of the Study

The Council of Europe (CE) promotes plurilingualism and pluriculturalism for the purpose of increasing cultural, social and economic interactions. Thus, foreign language teaching is highly significant in Turkey's membership process. By the help of the findings of this study, appropriateness of the English coursebook for the 2nd grades for the CEFR will be determined. This study will also contribute to the literature, since it is one of the first studies on the evaluation of a primary school coursebooks with regard to the CEFR.

### 1.5. Assumptions

2nd graders are at the beginning of foreign language learning while they are acquiring their mother tongue. The CEFR considers Al (Breakthrough) as "the lowest level of generative language use – the point at which the learner can interact in a simple way, ask and answer simple questions about themselves, where they live, people they know, and things they have, initiate and respond to simple statements in areas of immediate need or on very familiar topics, rather than relying purely on a very finite rehearsed, lexically organised repertoire of situation-specific phrases"

(CEF, 2001:33). Thus, in this study, it is assumed that the 2nd grade coursebooks should be analysed in terms of A1 level of the CEFR.

## 1.6. Limitations

Two coursebooks entitled *I Know English* and *Sunshine* have been accepted by MoNE as English language coursebooks to be used in second grades throughout Turkey in 2015-1016 academic year. In this study, the coursebook *I Know English* has been evaluated as it has been widely used, including most metropolitan cities.

## 1.7. Research Questions

1. To what extent is the 2nd grade English coursebook *I Know English* appropriate for the CEFR criteria?
2. Is the coursebook appropriate for objectives of MoNE?
3. Is the coursebook compatible with young learners' proficiency level?
4. Does the coursebook address to the needs of students?
5. Is the coursebook multi-purposed in terms of the CEFR criteria?
6. Do the school teachers' perceptions of the CEFR change according to their educational background and teaching experience?
7. Do the school teachers' perceptions of the CEFR change according to the seven regions in Turkey?

## 1.8. Definitions of Terms

**The CEFR:** The CEFR is a descriptive scheme that defines second and foreign language (L2) learning outcomes in terms of language use; it adopts what it calls an 'action-oriented' approach that focuses on what learners can do in their L2(s). (Little, 2012).

**The Council of Europe:** It was set up in 1949 to "strengthen pluralist parliamentary democracy, then still in a fragile state in a number of countries, to protect and extend human rights, to develop mutual understanding and respect between peoples and to promote cooperation among its member states in tackling common social issues" (Trim, 2010).

**Plurilingualism:** The CEFR defines plurilingualism as the ability of an individual who is competent in more than one language to switch easily from one linguistic

code to another in order to communicate effectively within a particular set of circumstances (CoE, 2001).

**Pluriculturalism:** The CEFR asserts that pluriculturalism develops when "linguistic and cultural competences in respect of each language are modified by knowledge of the other and contribute to intercultural awareness" (CoE, 2001:43).

**Common Reference Levels:** Descriptors of what a learner can do at six specific levels: A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, and C2.

# CHAPTER TWO

# LITERATURE REVIEW

## 2.1.Young Learners and Language Teaching

Phillips (1993) defines young learners as the beginning of formal education between 5-6 years and 11-12 years. Slatterly and Willis (2001) state that young learners are 7-12 years old, whereas very young learners are below 7. Scott and Ytreberg (2001) divide young learners into two groups of 5-7 and 8-11according to their abilities of perceiving concrete and abstract concepts. Ellis (2004) describes the age group of 5-11 as a target audience of foreign language education. The Ministry of National Education in Turkey (MoNE) defines young learners as the children from first year of school age from 6 to 12 years (2013).

Age has always been one of the most controversial topics in language acquisition. There is no consensus over the optimum starting age for language acquisition. Lenneberg (1967) asserts that children can only develop their instinctive capacity for language acquisition in a particular age period. Playing a key role in language acquisition, this argument is called as 'Critical Period Hypothesis' (Gordon, 2007; Johnson and Newport, 1989). Studies conducted in neurolinguistics show that the left hemisphere of the brain is more dominant in language acquisition (Gordon, 2007). Broca, which is responsible for speech production and located in the front part of the left hemisphere of the brain and affecting the language fluency and the grammatical adequacy, has been found to work differently in people who learn a foreign language at young ages (Gordon, 2007). It has been seen in the experiments that lateralisation of brain takes place significantly around the age of 6 and it continues until puberty (Gordon, 2007). It is thought that lateralisation of brain comes to a close in puberty and that elasticity of brain, which promotes language acquisition, disappears (Demirezen, 2003; Gordon, 2007; Johnson and Newport, 1989; Zhao and Morgan, 2004). Therefore, after the end of the critical period of 12-13 years "language learning and language acquisition start to be more difficult because of losing the elasticity of brain nerves" (Demirezen, 2003:8). However, contrary to this view, there are researchers advocating that the main reason

complicating the language acquisition process after puberty is increasing anxiety and decreasing positive affective characteristics of students (Krashen and Terrell, 2000).

Proponents of such a critical period in language education emphasize that children can learn a language more quickly and more effectively in this critical process (Brewster et al., 2004; Demirezen, 2003; Johnson and Newport, 1989; Robinson, 2003). According to Halliwell (1992), 3-4 and 10-13 years are the highest periods of language learning capacity. Supporting this view, Demirezen (2003) points out learning a second language from 3-4 years old to 10 years provides a great advantage for bilingualism. Doye and Hurrell (1997) who argues that an impeccable pronunciation can only be gained at early ages. During this critical period, children can acquire a foreign language more effectively and permanently when processes similar to the natural processes of mother tongue acquisition are established (Anşin, 2006). For example, Cameron (2001) states listening and speaking skills of children develop better when teaching takes place in an authentic context, while a teaching approach based on grammar rules get result later. Piaget (1971) argues that fluency and native-like pronunciation in target language do not occur in puberty or adulthood. It can be asserted that children owe these features to their "authentic, intuitive, visual, imitation-based foreign language learning strategies" (Aslan, 2008:4). As a result, as the learners, who have not reached puberty, can still use the mechanisms facilitating first language acquisition, they can acquire a second language naturallyin a critical period.

In the 21st century, the view that starting foreign language learning at an early age brings more success is the leading cause of increasing emphasis on foreign language teaching at an early age (Gordon, 2007; Liao, 2004). Accordirng to Krashen and Terrell (2000), the main reason of this is the total time allocated by young learners to learning a foreign language is longer compared with an adult (after the age of 15). In the literature, on the other hand, there are studies supporting the hypothesis that children learn more easily than adults (Aslan, 2008; Katsuyama et al., 2008). However, according to Krashen and Terrell (2000) who express that in short-term adults are faster and more successful in language learning, while children are more accomplished in long-term. Some researchers state children are more successful in pronunciation than adults but not as effective as adults in the analysis of in-text semantic relationships (Brewster et al., 2004).

The most important advantages of children in learning a foreign language is that they are "more enthusiastic and lively" (Cameron, 2001:1). Krashen and Terrell (2000) emphasize that the most important factor supporting children's language acquisition process is their positive affective characteristics. Accordingly, the attitude, motivation and self-esteem levels of children towards learning a foreign language are high, and the anxiety levels are low. In this way, "they are open to interaction in foreign language and may be exposed to more linguistic input" (Krashen and Terrell, 2000:46). Katsuyama et al., (2008) have concluded by their study applied to ongoing primary school students that young learners' aptitude and interest in foreign language is in a more positive level.

Besides, it is put forward that children can learn several languages by activating and improving their potentials they use in mother tongue acquisition. Accordingly, children can acquire a foreign language as naturally as their mother tongues if the target language is presented in authentic contexts (Gordon, 2007; Moon, 2000). In order to understand to what extent young learners can be successful in learning foreign languages, it would be better to know about the characteristics of young learners.

### 2.1.1. Characteristics of Young learners

### 2.1.1.1.General

According to Pinter (2006:2) "children;

    a. have a holistic approach to language,

    b. have lower levels of awareness of themselves as language learners,

    c. have limited reading and writing skills even in their first language,

    d. are generally more concerned about themselves than others,

    e. have a limited knowledge about the world,

    f. enjoy fantasy, imagination and movement".

Shin and Crandall (2014:25) say that "children are:

    a. energetic and psysically active,

    b. spontaneous and not afraid to speak out or participate,

    c. curious and receptive to new ideas,

    d. imaginative and enjoy make-believe,

    e. easily distracted and have short attention spans,

f. egocentric and relate new ideas to themselves,

g. social and interactionist".

They prefer kinesthetic learning environments to use their physical energy they have because of their age (MoNE, 2013; Moon, 2000). From eight years on, they start to ask questions constantly, they can work with friends, and learn from them (Scott ve Ytreberg, 2001).

### 2.1.1.2.Cognitive

Children possess a set of instinct, skills and characteristics to help them learn a foreign language (Halliwell, 1992). It is understood from Piaget's learning theory that children are profoundly active in learning and thinking and they naturally structure the knowledge through the experiments they face (Cameron, 2001). Without being aware of how language system is processed, they actively monitor it (Moon, 2000). According to Robert Bley-Vroman (cited in. Gordon, 2007:49), in this way children acquire a second language in a natural and intuitive way. For example, they can discover grammar rules through an inductive reasoning and can implement these rules in a creative way (Brewster et al., 2004; Moon, 2000). Learning through experiences and natural estimations lies behind their learning rather than direct explanations (Brewster et al., 2004; Halliwell, 1992). Because of these properties, Piaget describes children as active "sense-makers" (Cameron, 2001:4). While adolescents and adults are more successful especially in reading-writing skills and understanding the abstract contents in short-term, studies reveal that children are more successful foreign language students (Gordon, 2007).

The approval or appreciation of teacher rather than friends is more important for them unlike adolescents (Cameron, 2001; Harmer, 2007; Moon, 2000). They have a natural curiosity, excitement and high motivation for learning (Cameron, 2001; Moon, 2000; Ytreberg and Scott, 2001). In addition to learning a foreign language, children have a strong desire in particular to communicate with people from different cultures and to learn something new about them since they are curious, concerned and free from prejudices (Ellis, 2004). They take pleasure finding a fun element in everything (Çakır, 2004; Halliwell, 1992; Moon, 2000). Therefore, they love learning by playing (MoNE, 2013; Scott and Ytreberg, 2001).

Their attention and concentration span are highly limited (Harmer, 2007; Scott and Ytreberg, 2001). They can very quickly lose their interest to the course and can not maintain their motivation when facing difficult activities (Cameron, 2001). The main reasons for the positive attitude and motivation of the children towards the course at this age are factors that motivate them internally. Admiration of teachers, activities, tasks and materials making learning funny may be among these factors (Moon, 2000; Nikolov, 1999).

Contrary to the adolescents and adults, children can not decide by themselves what they should learn (Scott and Ytreberg, 2001). Harmer (2007) says children are generally bodily kinesthetic, they like to move and they are visual people. Gürbüz (2010) states that children acquire a language sub-consciously while adults rely on analytic abilities.

Learning takes place through concrete stimuli that appeal to multiple senses not through abstract concepts (Scott and Ytreberg, 2001). They can not separate reality from fiction until about eight years old (Scott and Ytreberg, 2001). According to Piaget's learning theory, it is impossible for children to demonstrate cognitive skills requiring abstract processes by operating rules of logic till the age of about 11 (Cameron, 2001).

**2.1.1.3.Linguistic**

If they are exposed to sufficient linguistic input, children in a normal course of development reach considerable proficiency level in terms of skills, such as listening, speaking, pronunciation and vocabulary until the age of 4-5 no matter how complex they are (Cameron, 2001; Gordon, 2007). Therefore, children who learn a foreign language at this age experience a more authentic and comfortable learning process.

"Children want to learn a language with its functional and communicative aspects" (MoNE, 2013:3). They get pleasure in communicating and talking in a foreign language both in mother tongue and in a foregin language (Halliwell, 1992; Moon, 2000). 5-7 age group children can tell what they are doing at the moment, they can talk about what they did or heard recently (Scott and Ytreberg, 2001). They are inclined to make mistakes while talking in normal conditions and are not affected as much as adults by negative emotional factors, such as anxiety (Brewster et al.,

2004; Krashen and Terrell, 2000). Adults check the formal correctness of their statements before sarting a communication, whereas children can talk in an improvised way by taking risks (Moon, 2000). This is mainly due to their ability of imitation (Brewster et al., 2004; Harmer, 2007).

Children can interpret the meaning and function of a sentence from the context and the interaction between speakers with a holistic approach even if they do not know the individual words or grammatical relationship between them (Halliwell, 1992; Moon, 2000; Scott and Ytreberg, 2001). Thus, they can successfully learn words appearing in authentic contexts and situations rather than make exercises based on memorisation (Gordon, 2007). Their imagination and creativity are extremely broad (Halliwell, 1992; MEB, 2013; Scott and Ytreberg, 2001). They can use limited linguistic in a creative way (Halliwell, 1992; Moon, 2000).

## 2.2.Teaching English to Young Learners
## 2.2.1. How Children Learn a Language?

Childhood education has a significant part in children's development and education. Knowing children and their development can be regarded as recognizing people from very beginning. The first years of life can be seen important in terms of being the basis of an individual's development and basic knowledge and skills are acquired in these years.

Foreign language or second language are generally defined as any language learned and used after the acquisition of a person's mother tongue (Mitchell et al., 2013; Gass and Selinker, 2001). These two concepts are described differently from each other in the studies on foreign language or second language. Foreign language is learned by formal teaching in an educational environment and non-native, whereas second language is defined as the language which is acquired besides mother tongue.

Foreign language learning is the learning of the rules of the new language system consisting of sound and meaning and using the language appropriate and correct within these rules (İşeri, 1999). Foreign language learning is closely associated with first language learning process. People learn a foreign language by using the knowledge, skills and habits they have acquired in their native language. Therefore, children's learning second and foreign language can be viewed by various theories. These theories based on language learning process explain foreign language

acquisition or learning. There have been different views within the following theories in terms of foreign language learning.

### 2.2.1.1.Behaviorist Theory

One of the most important proponents of behaviorist theory is B. F. Skinner. Skinner (1957) believes that behaviours are learned through classical and operant conditioning. Language is a simple form of behaviour and it can be gained with classical and operant conditioning like other behaviours. According to Skinner, children learn language by imitating sounds, sentences and conversations. It is asserted in the behaviourist theory that children learn language by imitation, reinforcement and habit formation. Skinner (1957) says that reinforcement is a highly significant element in children's language acquisition. However, behaviourist theories ignore the impact of the biological structure in language acquisition.

The basic principle of this theory for foreign language learning is to create habits. According to this theory, foreign language learning is creating habit formation as the main language. Foreign language learning includes different tasks from that of first language learning. Problems experienced in foreign language learning stem from the habits in the native language rather than the structure of the new language. A learner is inclined to transfer his habits in native language to foreign language. In the foreign language learning process, habits acquired in the mother tongue will be replacedby new ones. Language learning will be much easier if the target language has similar linguistic properties. Nevertheless, learning will be difficult if the languages have different linguistic properties (Mitchell et al., 2013).

According to behaviourist theory, learner's native language and the target language should be compared and analysed for an effective foreign language teaching. Teaching should be based on the results of comparison and analysis. These studies put forward by behaviorist theory is called as Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH). It is based on the view that learners will have less problems acquiring target language structures that are similar to those of the native language (Lightbown and Spada, 2006).

### 2.2.1.2.Innatist Theory

The innatist theory is based on Chomsky's hypothesis. Chomsky asserts that "children are biologically programmed for language learning" (Lightbown and Spada, 2006:15). Children has an innate ability to acquire language and they are programmed to learn language.

According to Chomsky (1957, 1965) children's acquisition of language, which has complex structure, and the similarity of language acquisition across cultures can only be explained by a pre-programming. Chomsky claims that children are born with a special biologic mechanism called Language Acquisition Device (LAD), providing them to learn the complicated structure of language and its grammar. LAD is a mechanism that enables automatically acquiring and constructing the rules of a language while talking to others. Chomsky believes that only LAD can explain how children acquire accurate grammar. According to him, LAD is specific to human beings.

Chomsky (1957, 1965) hypothesised Universal Grammar (UG) theory. According to UG, all languages have a series of common linguistic elements. Human beings have a system of grammar and they can use this system while learning another language. UG includes a number of theoretical principles to be applied in all languages. This theory concerns about the properties which are universal and accepted to have been in all languages.

### 2.2.1.2.1.    Krashen's Monitor Model

Developed with reference to innatist theory, Krashen's Monitor Model (1982) has a substantial role in foreign language acquisition. Krashen (1982) asserts that the processes in the first and second language acquisition are similar. In his model, Krashen tries to clarify foreign language acquisition extensively. Krashen describes his theory in terms of five hypothesis:

1. *Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis:*

According to Krashen (1982), there are two independent systems for the development of language learning: Acquisition and Learning. Acquisition takes place unconsciously and implicitly in an informal environment. Language is the result of meaningful and natural interactions. On the other hand, learning is a conscious

process and it is related with grammar rules. Learning takes place in formal environments. It necessiates being aware of grammar rules and using them.

2.  *Natural Order Hypothesis*

This hypothesis defends the idea of a specific sequence of foreign language acquisition as in the first language acquisition. According to the natural order hypothesis, grammatical structures can be predicted beforehand and acquired in an immutable order. Some rules are obtained early, while some are late. Whether through education or not, language is learned in the same order. This order is not affected by a learner's age, his first language background and exposure to the language. Natural order is a part of acquisition system and not interfered with learning system (Mitchell et al., 2013).

3.  *Monitor Hypothesis*

The 'monitor' is related with learning, not with acquisition. "It is a device for 'watchdogging' one's output, for editing and making alterations or corrections as they are consciously perceived" (Brown, 2007:294).

4.  *Input Hypothesis*

Input hypothesis claims that one can acquire a language when the input in the target language is comprehensible. It is pointed in this hypothesis that acquisition occurs in an adequate and comprehensive input environment that contain 'i+1'. "The 'i' stands for the level of the language required, and the '+1' is a metaphor for language that is just a step beyond that level" (Lightbown and Spada, 2006:37). The input must be slightly above the current knowledge of the learner.

5.  *Affective Filter Hypothesis*

"Affective filter is a metaphorical barrier that prevents learners from acquiring language even when appropriate input is available. 'Affect' refers to feelings, motives, needs, attitudes and emotiaonal states" (Lightbown and Spada, 2006:37). Krashen puts forward that desired acquisition will occur in situations where anxiety is low (Brown, 2007).

**2.2.1.3.Cognitive Theory**

Cognitive development includes the child's mental activities. Every child is born with a different structure and cognitive ability from each other. Cognitive

development is the process when an individual tries to think and to understand the environment and the world from infancy to adulthood. Cognitive theorists deal mainly with the learning element of foreign language learning. The focus is on the learner. How the human brain works and how it acquires new knowledge is needed to understand to structure foreign language learning process better. Cognitive development begins from the moment the child is born and continues in different areas. Thus, recognition of children's cognitive characteristics is vital in education.

### 2.2.1.3.1. Structuralist View

Piaget is one of the leading scientists who have influential studies on cognitive development. Piaget (1971) explains cognitive development through biological principles. According to him, development is a result of genetics and environmental interactions. Piaget asserts that the core of intelligence is the logical thinking and it develops through the mutual interaction of genetic and environmental factors. Piaget is concerned with how children think rather than quantity. The general nature of the idea is more important for him.

According to Piaget, children have biological tendencies found in all organisms. These are assimilation, accomodation and organization. 'Assimilation' is simply internalization. Mentally, it is the need to internalize the objects and knowledge in our cognitive structure. Some objects and information do not fit easily into the existing structure. Therefore, we alter the structure and this is called as 'accomodation'. A four-month-old baby may have two separate abilities as looking at the objects and catching them. Later, it combines these two movements and catches the objects seen. Organising ideas in harmonious systems is 'organization'. Piaget believes that children develop by organizing the increasingly more differentiated and more complex cognitive structures in an active configuration process.

*Sensorimotor Stage (0-2 years):* Babies learn to organize and coordinate their perceptions and senses through physical movements. Coordination of movements and senses is the basis of sensorimotor stage. An infant tries to provide this coordination with reflexes. Then it passes from reflexive stage to conscious behaviour. All children have innate reflexive behaviours. They have a great visual interest in the people and events around them.

17

*Preoperational Stage (2-7 years):* In this period, children are egocentric. They can not understand that there are perspectives outside their perceptions yet. A child sees himself at the centre of the world. What he sees or thinks is true (Yapıcı and Yapıcı, 2006). They develop memory and imagination, and do not think logically (Shin and Crandall, 2014).

*Concrete operational stage (7-11 years):* Children are less egocentric but still have an inclination to relate new ideas to themselves and their immediate surroundings (Shin and Crandall, 2014:33). They greatly improve the ability to understand the rules. They show intelligence through logical and organized thought related to concrete objects (Shin and Crandall, 2014:33).

*Formal Operational Stage (11+ years):* Children can think systematically on the basis of mental activities. Scientific reasoning can be used and abstract thinking develops. They can recognise the whole, how the components of a whole interchange and how they fit. Moreover, they are more flexible and more logical in their thinking process in this period.

### 2.2.1.3.2. Interactionist View

Russian psychologist Lev Vygotsky is the contemporary of Piaget. Vygotsky states that social environment of a child has a critical role in cognitive development. According to Vygotsky, variety of environment makes positive contribution to a child's cognitive development. The basic concept of Vygotsky's cognitive development theory is the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), which he describes as a stage between child's real development level of independent problem solving and development level of dependent problem solving under the guidance of an adult or more capable peers.

Vygotsky emphasizes the role of an adult in influencig a child's cognitive development. According to him, children's cognitive development improve when they study cooperatively with adults and other children. A child's cognitive development is not only the result of his discovery but also of the information and concepts gained from the environment (Ergün and Ersüer, 2006).

**2.3.Teaching Four Skills to Young Learners**

Language teaching comprises of four skills-listening, speaking, reading and writing- based on reception and production. Listening and reading are receptive skills, whereas speaking and writing are productive skills. These four basic language skills in language teaching are integrated with each other (Özbay, 2007). Exactly knowing a language requires the command of these skills. If there is inadequacy to use one or more of these skills, it cannot be claimed that the language is entirely learnt. Demirel (2004) mentions that foreign language teaching is a cumulative process, and it possesses cognitive behaviour and new psychomotor skills. In other words, foreign language learning is the process of gaining the skills necessary to use a language.

**2.3.1. Listening Skills**

Listening skill is the basis of language acquisition. It has a substantial role in an individual's perception of the world and his environment. It is the process of perceiving the message and interpret it (Adalı, 2003). Pinter (2006) emphasizes that English language teaching should start with the active skill of listening as children cannot read or write at all. Curtain and Dahlberg (2010) say that listening skill can be seen by many educators and scientists as the cornerstone of language development. It is the initial and basic channel by which a foreign language learner makes preliminary contact with the target language and its culture.

Listening skill is an active process based on comprehension and it includes attention, verbal and non-verbal messages (Shin and Crandall, 2014; Yangın 2002; Özbay, 2009). Listening is the first acquired and the most used skill for the rest of one's life (Cameron, 2001; Robertson, 2008). Peterson defines listening as "a multilevel, interactive event of meaning formation" (2001:88).

In literature, it is stated that listening is an intentional activity; it is different from hearing, thus, it is a kind of skill to be learned and improved by training. (Waks, 2007; Chengxing, 2005; Yalçın, 2002; Wilkie, 2001; Özbay, 2009). According to Gürgen (2008), the act of listening is the event of comprehensing messages and reacting to stimuli. The aim of teaching listening skill is to make learners to recognise the sounds in the target language, to realise the meaning changes caused by stress and intonation in a context and above all to comprehend the

message completely and accurately (Demirel, 2010).

### 2.3.2. Speaking Skills

Being a productive skill, the act of speaking is the activity of one's expressing himself verbally. It is the most effective tool in social life to communicate, to share information and knowledge, to express feelings, thoughts, imagination and observation (Demirel, 2014). On the other hand, Verhoeven (1990) sees speaking as an outstanding factor to be literate.

Speaking is the verbal submission of feelings, thoughts, wishes and design. In other words, it is the activity of expressing a subject verbaly after designing it in the brain (Sever, 2004). It is the coding and sending process of a message. It is transmitting thoughts, feelings and knowledge through language (Demirel, 2014).

The act of speaking, in foreign language teaching, comprises of comprehensionability, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and also mutual interaction. One of the general objectives of foreign language teaching is to enable students to speak the language they learn clearly.

When compared with the other skills, speaking requires much practice as Pinter (2006:55) clarifies: "We are to think and speak simultaneously, learning to speak fluently and accurately is a great trouble for learners of language. While speaking, one has to monitor the output and correct mistakes, as well as planning what to say next. Thus, speaking in a foreign language necessiates lots of practice". Cameron describes speaking as "the active use of language to express meanings so that others can make sense of them" (2001:40).

### 2.3.3. Reading Skills

The act of reading has been discussed by several scholars. Reading is a skill that has physiological, cognitive and social aspects (Demirel, 2014). Reading is an act of recognising and interpreting the symbols in a language. Additionally, it is a cognitive activity based on the process of seeing, perceiving and comprehending a text, words, phrases, punctuation and other elements (Kavcar, Oğuzkan & Sever, 2004). Özdemir (2005) defines reading as perceiving the printed words by sensory organs and then interpreting them. Reading is to recognise the letters and phrases of a text and to grasp their meanings. It is the activity of perceiving, comprehending and interpreting words, sentences with all elements (Sever, 2004).

Cameron asserts that "reading brings together visual information from written symbols, phonological information from the sounds and semantic informatin from the conventional meanings associated with the words as sounds an symbols" (2001:125).

Pinter (2006) sees reading as a holistic process which contains some skills such as predicting, recognising and guessing. Shin and Crandall state that "reading is an interactive process involving the reader, the text and the writer" (2014:159). For Goodman (2005), reading is a process of relating written symbols to oral language, of constructing meaning from written text.

### 2.3.4. Writing Skills

Writing in general takes place after listening, speaking and reading skills (Demirel, 2014). Shin and Crandall (2014) claim writing as the most ignored skill in foreign language teaching. Arıkan (2012) advocates that writing is the most troublesome skill to develop as young learners' writing habits are not completely developed in their first languages. Writing is the expression of thoughts and feelings through letters and it is the last chain of four basic language skills (Demirel 1990). Writing is a way of communication and telling our feelins, thoughts and experiences (Widdowson, 1978).

The act of writing refers to the production aspect of language learning. Language learners aim to draw up their thoughts and feelings comprehensively in the target language with the help of grammar and vocabulary. Writing is a highly complicated event consisting of planning, formulation and review processes (Murcia et al., 2004). Cameron (2001) considers writing as a tool for expressing and sharing meanings among people. For writing, one needs to make links from meaning to what he produces.

Shin and Crandall asserts that "writing for children should be seen primarily as a means of self-expression, with a focus on meaning, or as a means of reinforcing oral language development" (2014:186).

## 2.4. Historical Development of Foreign Language Teaching to Young Learners in Turkey

The Turkish individuals' introduction to Western languages dates back to the eighteenth century, when the Ottomans started to build up their recognition and abilities in military and medical fields by French participation and assistance. European-style military and medical institutions were established in which the medium of instruction was French, with teachers imported from France. The nineteenth century saw the construction of various missionary schools, most of which offered instruction in French, some in English (e.g. 'Robert College') and a couple in German and Italian (Alptekin and Tatar, 2011).

Since the establishment of the Republic of Turkey by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk in 1923, radical changes have occurred at all levels of education, including foreign language education. One significant improvement was sending numerous tertiary-level learners to Western countries to follow a variety of scholarly fields. This not just created people with skills in particular areas but additionally being familiarity with European languages, such as French, English and German in particular. (Alptekin and Tatar, 2011).

Considering the physiological and psychological processes of a child's language learning, foreign language courses started to take place 2 hours-a-week in 4th and 5th grade curriculums after 1997-1998 Education Reform. This time was determined as 4 hours in the secondary schools. In 2005, preparatory classes in high schools were removed and all high schools were increased to 4 years. Intensive language courses given in a year previously was spread over 4 years (Çakır, 2007: 42-44).

In 2013, following the revision in primary school ELT curriculum, MoNE introduced the 2nd grade coursebooks in line with curriculum objectives and also started to finance the books for all recipients of compulsory education. The two textbooks –*I Know English* and *Sunshine*- were introduced to be used in the 2nd grade public primary schools. The new curriculum objectives promote learners' communicative proficiency in English by fostering integrated development of language skills with a particular emphasis on speaking and listening; addressing students' individualized learning styles and interests; integrating content and

language integrated learning into the ELT curriculum to allow for certain cross-curricular topics to be learned in English.

## 2.5. English Language Curriculum of the Ministry of National Education (MoNE)

The instruction program for English has been set up corresponding to the general objectives of Turkish National Education as stated in the Basic Law of the National Education No. 1739, alongside the Main Principles of Turkish National Education.

So as to keep on providing a superior government funded instruction for Turkey's elementary and secondary students, periodical update of course syllabi in every single branch of field is important to keep up with recent and efficient curricula that are compatible with contemporary educational research and worldwide principles for learning. Moreover, the recent adjustments to the Turkish educational organization, which involve a move from the 8+4 model to the new 4+4+4 model, have prompted a quick requirement for the innovation of current programs. Concerning English language education, specifically, this new system commands that English instruction be administered from the second grade, instead of the fourth grade; accordingly, a novel curriculum which obliges the second and third grades is fundamental. This recently introduced second and third grade syllabi will serve as the basis for English language learning (MoNE, 2013).

In planning the new English instruction program, the principles and descriptors of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment (CEFR) were strictly adapted. The CEFR especially focuses on the requirement for leaarners to put their learning into genuine practice to promote fluency, proficiency and language retention (CEF, 2001); thus, the new model focuses on using language in an authentic communicative environment. For no language teaching methodology is seen as sufficiently adaptable to address the needs of learners at different stages and to an extensive variety of learning styles, an eclectic blend of instructional procedures has been embraced, using an actionoriented approach to provide learners to experience English as a way of communication. Accordingly, utilization of English is stressed in classroom cooperations of various

types, promoting learners to be language users, rather than students of the language (CEF, 2001).

Since the CEFR sees language learning to be a lifelong affair, developing a positive notion for English from the beginning is crucial; thus, the new educational curriculum endeavors to encourage a charming and persuading learning environment where young learners of English feel great and upheld all through the learning process. Original materials, dramatization and role play, and hands-on exercises are actualized to underline the communicative nature of English. At the second and third grades, emphasis is put on speaking and listening; while reading and writing are not taken into consideration (MoNE, 2013).

### 2.5.1. The Need for Developing Communicative Competence in English

The term communicative competence (CC) was authored by Dell Hymes (1972), a sociolinguist who was persuaded that Chomsky's (1965) thought of competence was excessively constrained. Chomsky's "rule-governed creativity" that so appropriately portrayed a kid's spreading grammar at 3 years old or 4 did not account adequately for the social and functional rules of language. Therefore, Hymes points out CC as the part of our competence that empowers us to pass on and decipher messages and to arrange implications interpersonally inside particular settings. Savignon (1983:9) expressed that "communicative competence is relative, not absolute, and depends on the cooperation of all the participants involved." It is not so much an intrapersonal subject as seen in Chomsky's initial works but rather a dynamic, interpersonal subject that can be analyzed only by means of the overt performance of two or more individualsin the process of communication.

Fundamental work on characterizing CC was done by Michael Canale and Merrill Swain (1980), as the reference point for all considerations of CC in connection with second language education. In Canale and Swain's Canale's (1980) definition, four different parts, or subcategories, made up the development of CC. The initial two subcategories show the utilization of the linguistic system; the last two characterize the functional parts of communication.

Grammatical competence is that aspect of CC that encompasses "knowledge of lexical items and of rules of morphology, syntax, sentence-gramma semantics, and

phonology" (Canale & Swain, 1980:29). It is the competence that we associate with mastering the linguistic code of a language (Brown, 2007).

The second subcategory is discourse competence, the complement of grammatical competence in many ways. It is the ability we have to connect sentences in stretches of discourse and to sound a meaningful whole out of a series of utterances. Discourse means everything from simple spoken conversation to lengthy written texts (articles, books, and the like). While grammatical competence focuses on sentence-level grammar, discourse competence is concerned with interactional relationships (Brown, 2007).

Sociolinguistic competence is the knowledge of the sociocultural rules of language and of discourse. This type of competence "requires an understanding of the social context in which language is used: the roles of the participants, the information they share, and the function of the interaction. Only in a full context of this kind can judgments be made on the appropriatenessof a particular utterance" (Savignon, 1983:37).

The fourth subcategory is strategic competence, a construct that is exceedingly complex. Canale and Swain (1980:30) describe strategic competence as "the verbal and nonverbal communication strategies that may be called into action to compensate for breakdowns in communication due to performance variables or due to insufficient competence.". Savignon (1983:40) expresses this as "the strategies that one uses to compensate for imperfect knowledge of rules-or limiting factors in their application such as fatigue, distraction, and inattention". (pp. 40-47).

There is no doubt that the way to monetary, political and social advancement in today's society relies on the capacity of citizens to communicate successfully at a universal level, and competence in English plays an extremely significant role in this process. Besides, in spite of ceaseless endeavors at enhancing the adequacy of foreign language education in Turkey, a critical rate of students leave school without the capacity to communicate effectively in an English spoken surrounding. While it is comprehended that there are numerous variables in effect for this ongoing trouble, it is considered that one of the primary causes behind the failure of such countless Turkish students to govern competence in English lies in the situation that the language is exhibited to them as a subject to be formally obtained at school – an

academic need to be fulfilled – rather than as a means of communication. However, for a sound learning to occur, the materials in English, must be appropriate for learners' immediate needs and for their daily lives. Thus, researchers, such as Hymes (1972) and Widdowson (1978), have claimed that language learning must be implemented in context; that is, it must be utilized as a part of the course of regular connections, for genuine informative purposes, as opposed to rehearsed as a unique activity.

Therefore, with an aim of urging learners the significance of English as tool for building relationships, expresssing needs, thoughts, and so on, language learning in the new curricular model is based on communication. The communicative approach involves utilization the target language not only as an object of academic study, but as a means of communicating to others; the focus is absolutely not on syntactic structures and linguistic functions, but on authentic use of the language in an interactive context so as to achieve exact meaning (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011; Richards, 2006).

### 2.5.2. Organization of the Curriculum for Young Learners

In designing the new curricular model for English, no single teaching methodology has been selected. Rather, an action-oriented methodology was establihed international teaching standards has been accepted, considering the three principles of the CEFR including learner autonomy, self-assessment, and appreciation for cultural diversity (CEFR, 2001). By doing this, the learners are supposed to be confident and proficient users of English, creating approval for their own culture while figuring out how to comprehend and value a wide range of worldwide languages and cultures similarly to the CEFR's emphasis on plurilingualism and pluriculturalism (MoNE, 2013).

### 2.5.3. Instructional design

The model is divided into 3 learning stages in terms of the language uses, functions and learning materials that are presented. At the initial levels, containing grades 2 to 4, the major attention is paid to listening and speaking skills. Reading, writing, and and linguistic structures are not goals at this level in accordance with findings indicating that chidren learn a foreign language best through melodies, games, and hands-on exercises (Cameron, 2001). Therefore, reading and writing

tasks at the lower grade levels are limited. At these levels, learners are acquainted with English through cognates; these are accepted to give a scaffold between languages, helping learners to move from the known to unknown utilizing phrases that are effortlessly perceptible (Rodriguez, 2001). This idea is favoured by Krashen's (1982) hypothesis that language input must be interesting, relevant and comprehensible for young learners.

### 2.5.4. Instructional materials

For each level, a set of 10 sampling units is given, organized around interrelated topics. The utilization of thematic units is promoted by Hale and Cunningham (2011), who indicate that this methodology permits instructors to display new data in a way that is both related and interesting to learners, urging them to expand on existing information while in the meantime returning to prior material as a method for supporting maintenance.

Keeping in mind the goal of making a connection between language learning and daily life, the subjects for each unit have been selected to mirror thoughts and topics that are familiar to young learners; in this way, to the topics such as, family, friends, animals, holidays are drawn attention. With regards to the CEFR's emphasis on creating intercultural competence and appreciation for cultural diversity (CEF, 2001), social and cultural issues are remarked. Components of both the target culture and global cultures are introduced in a positive and non-threatening way (Elyıldırım and Ashton-Hay, 2006).

Material developers are urged to follow this model in the outline of coordinated resources that can be customized to address the needs of students in a varied scope of contexts concerning school type, sociocultural view and financial status. Moreover, current coursebooks have regularly considered flexibility in classroom application (MoNE, 2013).

### 2.5.5. Assessment

The last component of the educational programs to be considered includes assessment and evaluation of learner advancement. As proposed by the CEFR, self-assessment is underlined, learners are encouraged to see their own progress and accomplishment in the development of communicative competence (CEF, 2001). Each unit will consist of a list of objectives to be met by the students. Children are

asked to answer questions such as "What did you learn?", "What do you think you can do, all things considered, in view of what you learned in class?". In addition to self-assessment, formal evaluation will be implemented through the use of written and oral exams, tests, homework and projects to obtain a target record of students' success (MoNE, 2013).

## 2.6. The European Union and Turkey

Proposed for the first time by Winston Churchill in 1946, the Council of Europe (CE) was founded with the participation of 10 European countries as founding members in 1949. Turkey affiliated in the Council, which has 46 members today, as a founder member status in 1949.The purpose of the Council is to protect the democracy and human rights, to enhance mutual understanding among different cultured European citizens by enquiring possible solutions to basic problems seen in the European societies, such as racism, ethnic discrimination, etc. The basic policy of the Council about language is that different languages spoken in Europe are so valuable for economic, social and cultural life. How important it is to be proficient in using at least two or three of these languages is consistently emphasized (Demirel, 2010). One of the formations that supports the idea of regional integration in the world is the European Union (Gültekin and Anagün, 2006). Referring to relations between Turkey and the European Union, it seems that there is a long history of relations. Having started with Ankara Treaty in the first half of 1960s, membership negotiations carried on with an Affiliation Protocol, regulating the membership process in 1970s (Yiğit, 2010). By means of the European Union Treaty signed in 1992, the objectives of strengthening the solidarity of society without ignoring its own culture and history and of consolidating fundamental rights and freedoms were determined (Gültekin and Anagün, 2006). In 1996, relations between the parties reached an advanced stage with the Customs Unions protocol and Turkey's candidateship was accepted in 1999 Helsinki Summit (DPT, 2004).

Turkey is supposed to fulfil the European Union norms and standards for the integration and full membership process. Education has a highly substantial and vital place in these norms and standards (Yiğit, 2010). European Education Commission adopted the principle of knowing sufficiently at least two other languages except for one's mother tongue in its declaration titled "Towards Learning Society" issued in 1995 (Demirel, 2011: 22).

**2.7.Foreign Language Education Practices of the European Council**

The Socrates Programme was initiated in 1995 on the basis of Articles 149 and 150 of the EU treaty in order to provide cooperation among member countries. Socrates Programme consists of eight action fields, namely Erasmus (higher education), Comenius (formal education), Grundtvig (non-formal education), Minerva (open-distance learning), Lingua (European languages education), Observation and Innovation (monitoring of the education system and innovation in these areas), Joint Actions (Joint Actions with other European Programmes), and Accompanying Measures (Support Measures). In the 2000 meeting of the CoE in Lisbon, " to create a Europe of which sustainable economic growth is the world's most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based one and provides better job opportunities and social harmony" was aimed. As in many areas of the integration process to the European Union, Turkey has been performing demanded legal adjustments in education, too. However, only making regulations is not enough in this process. Just as in all areas of education, in foreign language education that we are going to face various culture and perception differences in adaptation of Europe's prevalent norms and standarts is an irrefutable fact (Gedikoğlu, 2005).

New foreign language curricula in European countries are expected to be appropriately prepared in accordance with the standards developed by Modern Languages Division of the Council of Europe (Demirel, 2011). This Modern Languages Division existing in the Council with the aim of spreading plurilingualism and ensuring reflections of plurilingualism on member states' educational policies has been converted into Language Policy Division. The basic philosophy of this unit is that every one has the right of language learning in terms of democratic citizenship rights. In this regard, Language Policy Division has been producing projects, organizing seminars and conducting studies in order to promote plurilingualism throughout the continent (Yiğit, 2010). Thus, all member states of the Council were agreed on commencing the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) within the scope of "the European Year of Languages 2001" (Demirel, 2011: 23).

**2.8. The Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR)**

**2.8.1. What is the CEFR?**

People have been learning, teaching, and assessing language for centuries. In this long history, there have been as many different ways of teaching as there have been ways of describing levels of language learning and assessment. Even today, schools, universities, and language academies use several different methodologies and ways to describe proficiency levels. What may be an intermediate level in one country may be an upper-intermediate level in another. Levels may vary even among institutions in the same area.

Comparing levels becomes even more difficult when comparing someone who is learning English with someone who is learning another language, for example, French. In order to facilitate both teaching and learning, we need a way to specify what our learners are able to do at certain levels. As teachers, we also need to know how these levels can guide our teaching and the way we select course books and resources. In short, we need a common language by which we can describe language learning, teaching, and assessment. In most countries there is a general agreement that language learning can be organized into three levels: basic/beginner, intermediate, and advanced. Following the recommendation of an intergovernmental Symposium "Transparency and Coherence in Language Learning in Europe" hosted by Switzerland and coordinated by Eurocentres at Rüschlikon, near Zurich in November 1991, the Council of Europe (CE) developed the Common European Framework of References for Languages to establish international standards for learning, teaching, and assessment for all modern European languages.

The CEFR is a descriptive scheme that can be used to analyse L2 learners' needs, to specify L2 learning goals, to guide the development of L2 learning materials and activities, and to provide orientation for the assessment of L2 learning outcomes. The CEFR is intended to 'promote and facilitate co-operation among educational institutions in different countries', 'provide a sound basis for the mutual recognition of language qualifications', and 'assist learners, teachers, course designers, examining bodies and educational administrators to situate and co-ordinate their efforts' (Council of Europe, 2001:5). The CEFR seeks to be comprehensive, specifying 'as full a range of language knowledge, skills and use as possible'; transparent – 'information must be clearly formulated and explicit,

available and readily comprehensible to users'; and coherent – the descriptions should be 'free from internal contradictions' (ibid.: 7).

The CEFR attempts to bring together, under a single umbrella, a comprehensive tool for enabling syllabus designers, materials writers, examination bodies, teachers, learners, and others to locate their various types of involvement in modern language teaching in relation anoverall, unified, descriptive frame of reference. It consists of 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 (Heyworth, 2006).

Since its publication in 2001, the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment (CEFR) has had a wide-ranging impact on the teaching and learning of languages around the world. Many ministries of education, local education authorities, educational institutions, teachers' associations, and publishers use the CEFR, and it will continue to have an impact for many years to come. In its own words, the CEFR "provides a common basis for the elaboration of language syllabuses, curriculum guidelines, examinations, textbooks, etc." (CEF: 2001:1). It was envisaged primarily as a planning tool whose aim is to promote 'transparency and coherence' in language education.

The CEFR is not an international standard or seal of approval. Most test providers, textbook writers and curriculum designers now claim links to the CEFR. However, the quality of the claims can vary (as can the quality of the tests, textbooks and curricula themselves). There is no single 'best' method of carrying out an alignment study or accounting for claims which are made. What is required is a reasoned explanation backed up by supporting evidence.

The CEFR is not language or context specific. It does not attempt to list specific language features (grammatical rules, vocabulary, etc.) and cannot be used as a curriculum or checklist of learning points. Users need to adapt its use to fit the language they are working with and their specific context.

The uses of the CEFR is intended to include 'the planning of language learning programmes, the planning of language certification, the planning of self-directed learning and the aim for learning programmes and certification to be global, modular, weighted and partial'(CEF: 2001:6). "The CEFR aims to provide a

common framework to steer issues such as language teaching programs, program guidelines, examinations and textbooks" (Demirel, 2009:1).

CEFR is action-oriented, student-centered and includes a political objective of encouraging several languages in order to support mobility in Europe (Heyworth, 2006:181). It serves the goal of making contribution to protecting and developing language and culture diversity in Europe by facilitating interaction and communication amnog Europeans who have different languages.

The CEFR is not a teaching programme but a reference text tries to find solution to language barriers in order to enable mobility across Europe, to strengthen international cooperation, to raise respect for individuals and multiculturalism, to facilitate access to different information sources, to improve individual relations and a deep mutual understanding.

### 2.8.2. The Criteria of the CEFR

The CEFR is comprehensive, transparent and coherent in order to carry out its functions. 'Comprehensive' means that the CEFR should insicate the entire range of knowledge and skills in language and use it as much as possible, and all users can define their goals with reference to it. The CEFR should differentiate the various dimensions of the defined language proficiency.

By the Criterion of 'transparent' it is meant that information must be clearly formulated and explicit, available and readily comprehensible to users.

By the Criterion of 'coherent' it is meant that the description is free from internal contradictions. With regard to educational systems, coherence requires that there is a harmonious relation among their components such as:

- the identification of needs,
- the determination of objectives,
- the definition of content,
- the selection or creation of material,
- the establishment of teaching/learning programmes,
- the teaching and learning methods employed,
- evaluation, testing and assessment (CEF, 2001:7).

The construction of a comprehensive, transparent and coherent framework for

language learning and teaching does not imply the imposition of one single uniform system. On the contrary, the framework should be open and flexible, so that it can be applied, with such adaptations as prove necessary, to particular situations. CEF 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,

- *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 (CEF, 2001:7-8).

### 2.8.3. Plurilingualism

One of the most prominent issues among education and culture policies set by The Council of Europe for the future of Europe's future is the language policy. The Council has determined to create a 'plurilingual and pluricultural' society as an indispensible educational goal and began to motive member states to achieve this aim (Demirel, 2005). Within this importance, the Council of Europe declared the year of 2001 as the European Languages Year in order to spread plurilingualism awareness. The purpose of this declaration is member state's protecting their language and cultural heritage and to share it with other European countries.

Plurilingualism is different from multilingualism, which is the knowledge of some languages or co-existence of different languages in a country. Multilingualism can be gained through education in formal environments or promoting students learn more languages explicitly or decreasing the dominancy of English in international contexts. However, plurilingualism is ''an individual person's experience of language in its cultural contexts expands, from the language of the home to that of society at large and then to the languages of other peoples (whether learnt at school or college, or by direct experience), he or she does not keep these languages and cultures in strictly separated mental compartments, but rather builds up a communicative competence to which all knowledge and experience of language contributes and in

33

which languages interrelate and interact" (CEF, 2001:4).

### 2.8.4. Common Reference Levels

Language proficiency criteria are classified within six categories: A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, C2. The purpose of determining criteria for each level stems from the objective to have common proficiency in the languages thought and to make these skills standard for each language. By evaluating themselves through these language level descriptors, language learners will realise their actual level and progress in language learning as well as put new objectives. Language proficiency descriptors are differently decided upon four basic language skills.

**Table 1: Common Reference Levels of the CEFR**

| Basic User | | Independent User | | Proficient User | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A1 Breakthrough | A2 Waystage | B1 Threshold | B2 Vantage | C1 Effective Operational Proficiency | C2 Mastery |

Considering the general framework, a basic user (A1, A2) is supposed to handle daily needs and be able to speak about frequently mentioned issues plainly and simply. An independent user (B1, B2) is to understand concrete and abstract topics in his field and express himself briefly by expressing his own ideas. An advanced user (C1, C2) is expected to express himself naturally and fluently, to talk about any subject, and to distinguish subtle differences in meaning. These levels are identified with "can do" statements.

| 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 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 disadvantage 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 familiaror 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 areasof 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. |

These are taken into account along with the following self- assessment grid:

**Table 3: Common Reference Levels: Self-assessment Grid (Council of Europe, 2001:26-27)**

| | | A1 | A2 | B1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Understanding** | **Listening** | I can recognise familiar words and very basic phrases concerning myself, my family and immediate concrete surroundings when people speak slowly and clearly. | I can understand phrases and the highest frequency vocabulary related to areas of most immediate personal relevance (e.g. very basic personal and family information, shopping, local area, employment). I can catch the main point in short, clear, simple messages and announcements. | I can understand the main points of clear standard speech on familiar matters regularly encountered in work, school, leisure, etc. I can understand the main point of many radio or TV programmes on current affairs or topics of personal or professional interest when the delivery is relatively slow and clear. |
| | **Reading** | I can understand familiar names, words and very simple sentences, for example on notices and posters or in catalogues. | I can read very short, simple texts. I can find specific, predictable information in simple everyday material such as advertisements, prospectuses, menus and timetables and I can understand short simple personal letters. | I can understand texts that consist mainly of high frequency everyday or job- related language. I can understand the description of events, feelings and wishes in personal letters. |
| **Speaking** | **Spoken Interaction** | I can interact in a simple way provided the other person is prepared to repeat or rephrase things at a slower rate of speech and help me formulate what I'm trying to say. I can ask and answer simple questions in areas of immediate need or on very familiar topics. | I can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar topics and activities. I can handle very short social exchanges, even though I can't usually understand enough to keep the conversation going myself. | I can deal with most situations likely to arise whilst travelling in an area where the language is spoken. I can enter unprepared into conversation on topics that are familiar, of personal interest or pertinent to everyday life (e.g. family, hobbies, work, travel and current events). |
| | **Spoken Production** | I can use simple phrases and sentences to describe where I live and people I know. | I can use a series of phrases and sentences to describe in simple terms my family and other people, living conditions, my educational background and my present or most recent job. | I can connect phrases in a simple way in order to describe experiences and events, my dreams, hopes and ambitions. I can briefly give reasons and explanations for opinions and plans. I can narrate a story or relate the plot of a book or film and describe my reactions. |
| **Writing** | **Writing** | I can write a short, simple postcard, for example sending holiday greetings. I can fill in forms with personal details, for example entering my name, nationality and address on a hotel registration form. | I can write short, simple notes and messages relating to matters in areas of immediate need. I can write a very simple personal letter, for example thanking someone for something. | I can write simple connected text on topics which are familiar or of personal interest. I can write personal letters describing experiences and impressions. |

|  |  | **B2** | **C1** | **C2** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Understanding** | **Listening** | I can understand extended speech and lectures and follow even complex lines of argument provided the topic is reasonably familiar. I can understand most TV news and current affairs programmes. I can understand the majority of films in standard dialect. | I can understand extended speech even when it is not clearly structured and when relationships are only implied and not signalled explicitly. I can understand television programmes and films without too much effort. | I have no difficulty in understanding any kind of spoken language, whether live or broadcast, even when delivered at fast native speed, provided I have some time to get familiar with the accent. |
| | **Reading** | I can read articles and reports concerned with contemporary problems in which the writers adopt particular attitudes or viewpoints. I can understand contemporary literary prose. | I can understand long and complex factual and literary texts, appreciating distinctions of style. I can understand specialised articles and longer technical instructions, even when they do not relate to my field. | I can read with ease virtually all forms of the written language, including abstract, structurally or linguistically complex texts such as manuals, specialised articles and literary works. |
| **Speaking** | **Spoken Interaction** | I can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction with native speakers quite possible. I can take an active part in discussion in familiar contexts, accounting for and sustaining my views. | I can express myself fluently and spontaneously without much obvious searching for expressions. I can use language flexibly and effectively for social and professional purposes. I can formulate ideas and opinions with precision and relate my contribution skilfully to those of other speakers. | I can take part effortlessly in any conversation or discussion and have a good familiarity with idiomatic expressions and colloquialisms. I can express myself fluently and convey finer shades of meaning precisely. If I do have a problem I can backtrack and restructure around the difficulty so smoothly that other people are hardly aware of it. |
| | **Spoken Production** | I can present clear, detailed descriptions on a wide range of subjects related to my field of interest. I can explain a viewpoint on a topical issue giving the advantages and disadvantages of various options. | I can present clear, detailed descriptions of complex subjects integrating subthemes, developing particular points and rounding off with an appropriate conclusion. | I can present a clear, smoothly flowing description or argument in a style appropriate to the context and with an effective logical structure which helps the recipient to notice and remember significance points. |
| **Writing** | **Writing** | I can write clear, detailed text on a wide range of subjects related to my interests. I can write an essay or report, passing on information or giving reasons in support of or against a particular point of view. I can write letters highlighting the personal significance of events and experiences. | I can express myself in clear, well-structured text, expressing points of view at some length. I can write about complex subjects in a letter, an essay or a report, underlining what I consider to be the salient issues. I can select style appropriate to the reader in mind. | I can write clear, smoothly flowing text in an appropriate style. I can write complex letters, reports or articles which present a case with an effective logical structure which helps the recipient to notice and remember significance points. I can write summaries and reviews of professional or literary works. |

**2.8.4.1.A1 Level**

Classified as beginning level, A1 constitutes the basic level for language learners. A person at this level is aimed to have basic necessary language proficiency/equipment to communicate and sustain it. An individual can meet his basic needs by taking the advantage of very simple sentences known by everyone in daily life. He can introduce himself or someone else. If the interlocutor speaks slowly and clearly to help him, communication takes place. Second graders are said to be at A1 level. What an A1 level learner is able to do is given in the tables below.

**Table 4: A1 Level Global Scale (CEF, 2001:24)**

| A1 Level | 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. |
|---|---|

**Table 5: Self-assessment Grid for A1 Level (CEF, 2001:26)**

|  | A1 Level |
|---|---|
| **Listening** | I can recognise familiar words and very basic phrases concerning myself, my family and immediate concrete surroundings when people speak slowly and clearly. |
| **Reading** | I can understand familiar names, words and very simple sentences, for example on notices and posters or in catalogues. |
| **Spoken Interaction** | I can interact in a simple way provided the other person is prepared to repeat or rephrase things at a slower rate of speech and help me formulate what I'm trying to say. I can ask and answer simple questions in areas of immediate need or on very familiar topics. |
| **Spoken Production** | I can use simple phrases and sentences to describe where I live and people I know. |
| **Writing** | I can write a short, simple postcard, for example sending holiday greetings. I can fill in forms with personal details, for example entering my name, nationality and address on a hotel registration form. |

**Table 6: A1- CRL Qualitative Aspects of Spoken Language (CEF, 2001:28)**

|  | A1 Level |
|---|---|
| **Range** | Has a very basic repertoire of words and simple phrases related to personal details and particular concrete situations. |
| **Accuracy** | Shows only limited control of a few simple grammatical structures and sentence patterns in a memorised repertoire. |
| **Fluency** | Can manage very short, isolated, mainly pre- packaged utterances, with much pausing to search for expressions, to articulate less familiar words, and to repair communication. |
| **Interaction** | Can ask and answer questions about personal details. Can interact in a simple way but communication is totally dependent on repetition, rephrasing and repair. |

| Coherence | Can link words or groups of words with very basic linear connectors like 'and' or 'then'. |
|---|---|

# CHAPTER THREE

# METHODOLOGY

This section consists of research method, participants and sampling, instruments, data collection and data analysis.

## 3.1.Research Method

This is a quantitative research aiming to determine to what extent the second grade English coursebook *'I Know English'* is appropriate for the criteria of the CEFR. According to Paksu (2010), quantitative researchis a type of research exhibiting facts and events in a quantifiable and numeric manner. Quantitative research sees "reality independent from the researcher, and it is a positivist view considering that reality can be observed, measured and analysed objectively" (Büyüköztürk et al., 2016:12). Quantitative researches try to prove the relationship between variables.

"A quantitative approach is one in which the investigator primarily uses postpositivist claims for developing knowledge, employs strategies of inquiry such as experiments and surveys, and collects data on predetermined instruments that yield statistical data" (Creswell, 2003:18).

What composes a quantitative research method includes a numeric or statistical way to inquiryscheme. Researchers normally choose the quantitative method to answerto research questions requiring numerical information (Williams, 2007). "Quantitative researchers seek explanations and predictions that will generate to other persons and places. The intent is to establish, confirm, or validate relationships and to develop generalizations that contribute to theory" (Leedy and Ormrod, 2001:102).

This study has two basic quantitative goals. One is to evaluate the coursebook in terms of the CEFR criteria. Accordingly, descriptive survey model has used, a 5 likert-type questionnaire has been implemented. "Questionnaire consists of asking the same question groups to great many school teachers via on-line, telephone or personally to him/her" (Büyüköztürk et al., 2016:12). Survey models intend to identify a situation, which existed in the past or are currently present, in its own terms. Goals in survey models are usually expressed with questions suh as, "What

was it?", "What is it?", "Why is it composed of?" and "What is it related with?" (Karasar, 2012). The second quantitative goal of this study is to investigate the relation of the CEFR criteria with English language teacher's demographic properties, such as gender, educational background, teaching experience and region where they have been teaching.

## 3.2. Population and Sampling

Population is a huge group consisting of living or inanimate beings from whom the required data to answer the questions are obtained. In other words, population can be defined as the group where the data to be used in the research are collected and the results of these data are commented (Büyüköztürk, et al., 2014). Population is a set of elements, by which the results of research are to be generalized (Karasar, 2012). Fraenkel and Wallen (2006) mentions two types of population: Target population and accessible population. The former is the ideal choice of the researcher aiming to reach all participants in a sampling but almost impossible. The latter is the realistic and accessible one. The accessible population of this study is 418 English language teachers of second grade that have been teaching at public primary schools chosen from the seven regions in Turkey since this study aims to cover the whole of Turkey.

Çıngı (1994) defines sampling as the process of selecting proper samples to determine and predict the characteristics of a population. Participants of this study are determined in terms of two sampling methods introduced by Fraenkel and Wallen (2006), Random Sampling and Non-Random Sampling. This study is expected to cover the whole of Turkey. It is intended to implement in the seven regions of Turkey, to cover English language teacher's all academis properties such as type of graduation and teaching experiences. Thus, in first stage, stratified sampling-a component of random sampling- is used. According to Çıngı (1994), stratified sampling is a sampling method that tries to determine sub-groups and accordingly to represent these groups in the rate of population's size. For stratified sampling, "firstly homogenous sub-groups that are thought to have an effect on a variable in research questions should be determined" (Büyüköztürk et al., 2016:86). Therefore, participant's working region, type of faculty they graduated and teachig experiences are taken into account besides their gender. On the other hand, in the second stage, criterion sampling, which is a purposeful sampling type of non-random sampling

method is used to determine whether the participants have adequate knowledge about the CEFR or not. Those who have studied the CEFR as a course at university, in a seminar or during an in-service traininghave been chosen as participants.

**Table 7: Distribution of the School Teachers According to Gender**

| Gender | $f$ | % |
|--------|-----|-----|
| Female | 249 | 59.6 |
| Male | 169 | 40.4 |
| Total | 418 | 100 |

As it is seen in Table 7, 249 (59.6%) female teachers and 169 (40.4%) male teachers constitute the population of the study.

**Table 8: Distribution of the School Teachers According to Their Teaching Experience**

| Year | $f$ | % |
|------|-----|-----|
| 0-5 years | 166 | 39.7 |
| 6-10 years | 88 | 21.1 |
| 11-15 years | 72 | 17.2 |
| 16-20 years | 62 | 14.8 |
| 21 years and over | 30 | 7.2 |

In Table 8, frequency and percentages of participants in terms of their teaching experience has been shown. 166 (39.7%) of participants are those who have been working as English language teachers from 0 to five years, 88 (21.1%) of them have been teaching between 6 and 10 years, 72 (17.2%) of them have an experience of 11 to 15 years, 62 (14.8%) of them have an experience of 16 to 20 years, and 30 (7.2%) of them have an experience of 21 years and over.

**Table 9: Distribution of the School Teachers According to Their Major of Graduation**

| Major of Graduation | $f$ | % |
|---------------------|-----|-----|
| Education | 243 | 58.1 |
| Sciences and Letters | 111 | 26.6 |
| Translation | 42 | 10.0 |
| Linguistics | 22 | 5.3 |

Table 9 shows the educational background frequency and percentage of the participants. Accordingly, 243 (58.1%) of participants have graduated from the Faculty of Education, 111 (26.6%) of them have graduated from the Faculty of Sciences and Letters, 42 (10%) of them have graduated from the Faculty of Translation, and 22 (5.3%) of them from Linguistics Department.

**Table 10: Distribution of the School Teachers According to Region**

| Region | $f$ | % |
|---|---|---|
| Marmara | 59 | 14.1 |
| Black Sea | 53 | 12.7 |
| Eastern Anatolia | 75 | 17.9 |
| Southeastern Anatolia | 63 | 15.1 |
| Mediterranean | 66 | 15.8 |
| Aegean | 55 | 13.2 |
| Central Anatolia | 47 | 11.2 |

As it is seen in the Table 10, there is a homogenous range in terms of regions in which participants work. That is, 59 (14.1%) of the participants have been working in the Marmara Region, 53 (12.7%) of them have been working in Black Sea Region, 75 (17.9%) of them in the Eastern Anatolia Region, 63 (15.1%) of them in the Southeastern Region, whereas 66 (15.8%) of them have been teaching in the Mediterranean Region, 55 (13.2%) of them have been teaching in the Aegean Region and 47 (11.2%) of them have been working in the Central Anatolia Region.

### 3.3. Instruments

### 3.3.1. Pilot Study

Questionnaires are mostly used in survey model researches. In this study, a scale entitled *'The Appropriateness of the Second Grade English Coursebooks According to the Criteria of The CEFR'* has been implemented through on-line and hard copy. In the literature, there is no existing scale to be used for coursebook evaluation in terms of the CEFR. This scale has been developed by the researcher. Firstly, the criteria of the CEFR have been analysed and the items in the questionnaire have been prepared according to the following ten items:

- a. Comprehensiveness,
- b. Learning and Teaching Methods,
- c. Coherence,
- d. Convenience to Teaching Program,
- e. Assessment and Evaluation,
- f. Convenience to Student Level,
- g. Determination of Needs,
- h. Four Skills,
- i. Being Multi-Purposed,

j.   Transparency (CEF, 2001:7).

Having determined the topics, the items have been prepared according to the principles given above. Three basic concepts have been taken into the consideration while preparing questions. That is, 'Can Do' statements of the CEFR for A1 level, Teaching Model of MoNE (2013) and Cunningsworth's (1995) checklist for evaluation and selection of textbook. After discussions with several professors in the field, a draft questionnaire has been prepared. It consists of 122 questions and has been applied to 423 English language teachers of second grade as a pilot study. The Cronbach Alpha value of the draft is .964.

### 3.3.1.1.Reliability

"Being objective is an essential aspect of a competent inquiry, and for this reason methods and conclusions must be examined for bias. That is, standards of validity and reliability are important in quantitative research" (Creswell, 2003:8). The reliability of the questionnaire was tested through SPSS 21 Package Program. According to Büyüköztürk et al. (2016), success of a study depends on the reliability of data obtained in the research and their results. Turgut (1990) defines reliability as the dimension of avoiding from coincidential mistakes of assessment results. Crocker and Algina (1986) describes reliability as the repeatibility of assessments aiming to assess certain topics in similar circumstances among similar population.

**Table 11: Reliability Statistics of Pilot Study**

| Number of Items | Cronbach's Alpha($\alpha$) | Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items |
|---|---|---|
| 101 | .964 | .968 |

$\alpha \geq .70$

Initally, 21 questions, whose Corrected Total-Item Correlation is <.20, were eliminated. Its Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient is ,964.

**Table 12: Total Test Score Differences Between Groups**

| | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | Sig |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Between People** | 12076.879 | 422 | 28.618 | .000 |
| **Within People** | 6511.752 | 100 | 65.118 | .002 |
| **Total** | 18588.631 | 522 | 93.736 | |

$p<.05$

Table 12 shows that there is a meaningful significance in the questionnaire.

**Table 13: Reliability Statistics for the Criteria of the CEFR**

| Criteria of The CEFR | Cronbach's Alpha(α) | Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items |
|---|---|---|
| Comprehensiveness | .949 | .95 |
| Learning and teaching Methods | .704 | .773 |
| Coherence | .949 | .95 |
| Convenience to Teaching Program | .882 | .884 |
| Assessment and Evaluation | .780 | .779 |
| Convenience to Student Level | .832 | .836 |
| Determination of Needs | .949 | .95 |
| Four Skills | .949 | .95 |
| Being Multi-Purposed | .816 | .816 |
| Transparency | .783 | .784 |

α≥ .70

On the other hand, in the pilot study, reliability analysis of the criteria mentioned above has been carried out. As is seen in Table 13, all factors are reliable since their Cronbach Alpha value is over .70.

**3.3.1.2.Validity**

"Validity shows how much assessment results reflect what we want. To what extent the target property, without interfering other properties, is assessed is the validity itself" Büyüköztürk (2014:116). For the validity of the scale used in this study, factor analysis has been implemented.

**Table 14: Factor Analysis for First 101 Questions**

| KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy | | .898 |
|---|---|---|
| Bartlett's test of Sphericity | Approx. Chi-Square | 31525.3 |
| | df | 5050 |
| | Sig. | .000 |

KMO>0.50

In Factor Analysis, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test is used to test the suitability of sampling range. If the KMO value is under 0.50, factor analysis is not carried out. Depending on KMO value, these comments can be done about the sample size:

Between 0.50 and 0.60: Bad

Between 0.60 and 0.70: Poor

Between 0.70 and 0.80: Average

Between 0.80 and 0.90: Good

Over 0.90: Excellent.

As it is seen in Table 14, factor analysis of first 101 questions is good as KMO value is .898. On the other hand, 26 more questions whose factor loading are

under .30 have been excluded since the sampling size is over 350. Finally, 75 items exist in the questionnaire.

**Table 15: Overall Reliability Statistics of Pilot Study**

| Number of Items | Cronbach's Alpha(α) | Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items |
|---|---|---|
| 75 | .968 | .968 |

α≥ .70

Table 15 shows that the pilot study is valid as its Cronbach Alpha is .968.

**Table 16: KMO Results after Excluding 26 Items**

| KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy | | .916 |
|---|---|---|
| Bartlett's test of Sphericity | Approx. Chi-Square | 24461.3 |
| | df | 2775 |
| | Sig. | .000 |

KMO>0.50

Table 16 indicates that the sampling size of questionnaire is excellent as it is .916

**Table 17: Factor Analysis after Excluding 26 Items**

| Factors | Cronbach's Alpha(α) |
|---|---|
| Factor 1 (Comprehensiveness) | .945 |
| Factor 2 (Learning and Teaching Methods) | .928 |
| Factor 3 (Coherence) | .916 |
| Factor 4 (Convenience to Teaching Program) | .972 |
| Factor 5 (Assessment and Evaluation) | .857 |
| Factor 6 (Convenience to Student Level) | .859 |
| Factor 7 (Determination of Needs) | .822 |
| Factor 8 (Four Skills) | .823 |
| Factor 9 (Being Multi-Purposed) | .756 |
| Factor 10 (Transparency) | .742 |

α≥ .70

Ten factors determimed as the criteria of the CEFR are all valid since Cronbach Alpha value of each is over .70 that can be seen in Table 17, and the explained variance is 63.196.

## 3.4. Data Analysis

The questionnaire has been applied to 418 English language teachers throughout Turkey. The questionnaire consists of 75 questions. The questions from 1 to 19 are about the comprehensiveness; from 20 to 34 are about learning and teaching methods; from 35 to 42 are about coherence; from 43 to 49 are about convenience to teaching program; from 50 to 55 are about assessment and evaluation; from 56 to 61 are convenience to the student level of English; from 62 to 65 are about needs of the students; from 66 to 69 are about four basic language skills; from 70 to 73 are about being multi-purposed and from 74 to 75 are about

transparency. 5-point Likert-type scale has been used comprising of answers as follows: Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Undecided (3), Agree (4) and Strongly Agree (5).

Data obtained from questionnaireapplied to participants have beenstatistically analysedby SPSS-21 Package Program. Descriptive statistics of participants' demographic properties have been analysed through frequency analysis. t-test has been used for gender. On the other hand, whether there is a significant difference (p<0.05) between independent variables and the CEFR is analysed through One Way ANOVA. Those who are ≤0.05 were analysed through Post Hoc test to determine where there is a significant difference.

### 3.5.Data Collection

The data for this study have been collected by a questionnaire of 75 questions. The study discusses the perceptions of English language teacher who have been working at public schools across Turkey. The questionnaire has been implemented in the seven regions in Turkey.

# CHAPTER FOUR

# FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the answers in the questionnaire have been analysed one by one according to the frequencies seen in Table 18. The questionnaire consists of 75 questions, which have been prepared in line with the criteria of the CEFR. The items from 1 to 19 are about the *Comprehensiveness* Criterion, from 20 to 34 are about *Learning and Teaching Methods* Criterion, from 35 to 42 are about *Coherence* Criterion, from 43 to 49 are about *Convenience to Teaching Program* Criterion, from 50 to 55 are about *Assessment and Evaluation* Criterion, from 56 to 61 are about *Coherence to Student Level* Criterion, from 62 to 65 are about *Determination of Needs* Criterion, from 66 to 69 are about *Four Skills* Criterion, from 70 to 73 are about *Being Multi-Purposed* Criterion and from 74 to 75 are about *Transparency* Criterion.

## Table 18: Distribution of Answers to the CEFR Criteria

| Item | Questions | Disagree | | Undecided | | Agree | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | f | % | f | % | f | % |
| 1 | Children can understand daily language in English. | 162 | 38.7 | 90 | 21.5 | 166 | 39.8 |
| 2 | Children can introduce themselves to others in English. | 153 | 36.6 | 55 | 13.2 | 211 | 50.2 |
| 3 | Children can give information in English about the place they live. | 174 | 41.6 | 97 | 23.2 | 147 | 35.2 |
| 4 | Children can talk about their likes in English. | 90 | 21.5 | 67 | 16 | 261 | 62.4 |
| 5 | Children can talk about their dislikes in English. | 92 | 24.4 | 59 | 14.1 | 257 | 61.5 |
| 6 | Children can express their possessions in English. | 116 | 27.7 | 68 | 16.3 | 234 | 56 |
| 7 | Children can understand English conversations which are slow. | 109 | 26.1 | 89 | 21.3 | 220 | 52.6 |
| 8 | Children can understand simple words they see in a visual (catalogue, poster, etc.) around. | 83 | 19.9 | 37 | 8.9 | 298 | 71.3 |
| 9 | Children can understand simple sentences they see in a visual (catalogue, poster, etc.) around. | 130 | 31.1 | 100 | 23.9 | 188 | 45 |
| 10 | Children can express themselves with simple words. | 84 | 20.1 | 40 | 9.6 | 294 | 70.3 |
| 11 | Children can express themselves with simple sentences. | 104 | 24.9 | 67 | 16 | 247 | 59.1 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | Children can ask questions in English about something they know. | 143 | 34.2 | 105 | 25.1 | 170 | 40.7 |
| 13 | Children can answer simple-structured questions about something they know. | 84 | 20.1 | 61 | 14.6 | 273 | 65.3 |
| 14 | Children can write a celebration card (holiday, festival, etc.). | 186 | 44.5 | 99 | 23.7 | 133 | 31.8 |
| 15 | Children can write short notes to someone. | 165 | 39.5 | 86 | 20.5 | 167 | 40 |
| 16 | Children can fill a form about short personal information. | 149 | 35.6 | 76 | 18.2 | 193 | 36.2 |
| 17 | Children can express themselves in English. | 132 | 31.6 | 91 | 21.8 | 195 | 46.6 |
| 18 | Children can tell objects/things which belong to them. | 95 | 22.7 | 75 | 17.9 | 248 | 59.4 |
| 19 | Children can tell their likes in English. | 82 | 19.6 | 56 | 13.4 | 280 | 67 |
| 20 | Topics in the book help children for language acquisition. | 139 | 33.3 | 83 | 19.9 | 196 | 46.8 |
| 21 | The coursebook takes theinterest of children. | 172 | 41.1 | 65 | 15.6 | 181 | 43.3 |
| 22 | There are different types of exercises and activities in the coursebook. | 165 | 39.5 | 61 | 14.6 | 192 | 45.9 |
| 23 | The coursebook is prepared for multiple intelligences | 161 | 38.5 | 80 | 19.1 | 177 | 42.4 |
| 24 | Individual differences of children are taken into consideration in the coursebook. | 172 | 41.1 | 98 | 23.4 | 148 | 35.5 |
| 25 | The coursebook is prepared for different learning styles. | 167 | 40 | 89 | 21.3 | 162 | 38.7 |
| 26 | The coursebook is prepared for different teaching styles. | 168 | 40.2 | 95 | 22.7 | 155 | 37.1 |
| 27 | The coursebook is transparent. | 164 | 39.2 | 76 | 18.2 | 178 | 42.5 |
| 28 | The coursebook motivates students to communicate with oneanother. | 147 | 35.2 | 77 | 18.4 | 194 | 46.4 |
| 29 | The coursebook motivates children's interaction to each other. | 166 | 39.7 | 88 | 21.1 | 164 | 39.2 |
| 30 | Children learn inductively. | 165 | 39.5 | 90 | 21.5 | 163 | 39 |
| 31 | A learned topic/word is repeated later. | 111 | 26.6 | 77 | 18.4 | 230 | 55 |
| 32 | The coursebook includes cultural elements of the target language. | 149 | 35.6 | 66 | 15.8 | 203 | 48.6 |
| 33 | I like the coursebook. | 199 | 47.6 | 70 | 16.7 | 149 | 35.7 |
| 34 | The coursebook is appropriate for A1 level of the CEFR. | 126 | 30.1 | 117 | 28 | 175 | 41.9 |
| 35 | Children can understand fluent conversations. | 180 | 67 | 56 | 13.4 | 82 | 19.6 |

| 36 | Children can answer complicated questions about something they know. | 290 | 69.4 | 61 | 14.6 | 67 | 16 |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 37 | Children know the concept of abstract units. | 224 | 53.6 | 90 | 21.5 | 104 | 24.7 |
| 38 | Children can tell the place they live in a foreign language. | 218 | 52.2 | 95 | 22.7 | 105 | 25.1 |
| 39 | Children can understand fast English utterences. | 307 | 73.4 | 43 | 10.3 | 68 | 16.2 |
| 40 | Children can construct complex sentences. | 303 | 72.5 | 40 | 9.6 | 75 | 17.9 |
| 41 | Children can answer hard questions. | 300 | 71.8 | 43 | 10.3 | 75 | 17.9 |
| 42 | Children can write a letter, a long note, etc. to someone. | 282 | 67.5 | 44 | 10.5 | 92 | 22 |
| 43 | The coursebook has realistic objectives. | 163 | 39 | 60 | 14.4 | 195 | 46.6 |
| 44 | The coursebook has sustainable objectives. | 165 | 39.5 | 81 | 19.4 | 172 | 41.1 |
| 45 | The coursebook aims to develop children's comprehension competence. | 158 | 37.8 | 85 | 20.3 | 175 | 41.9 |
| 46 | The coursebook aims to develop children's production competence. | 150 | 35.9 | 62 | 14.8 | 206 | 49.3 |
| 47 | The coursebook gives priority to acquisition than learning for children. | 197 | 47.1 | 76 | 18.2 | 145 | 34.7 |
| 48 | The coursebook is compatible with children's needs that motivate them. | 206 | 49.3 | 74 | 17.7 | 138 | 33 |
| 49 | The coursebook can be a core for English teaching. | 175 | 41.9 | 50 | 12 | 193 | 46.1 |
| 50 | Children prepare portfolios after units or topics. | 184 | 44 | 72 | 17.2 | 162 | 38.8 |
| 51 | Children are supposed to self-evaluate themselves. | 196 | 46.9 | 80 | 19.1 | 142 | 34 |
| 52 | I have sufficient knowledge about the CEFR. | 164 | 39.2 | 60 | 14.4 | 194 | 46.4 |
| 53 | I prepare materials that are compatible with the CEFR for children. | 160 | 38.3 | 100 | 23.9 | 158 | 37.8 |
| 54 | I can prepare lesson activities that are suitable for the CEFR. | 152 | 36.4 | 79 | 18.9 | 187 | 44.7 |
| 55 | I read the CEFR at least once. | 195 | 46.7 | 55 | 13.2 | 168 | 40.1 |
| 56 | The language used in the coursebook is suitable for children's age level. | 114 | 27.3 | 57 | 13.6 | 247 | 59.1 |
| 57 | The language used in the coursebook is suitable for children's language level. | 154 | 36.8 | 100 | 23.9 | 164 | 39.3 |
| 58 | The language used in the coursebook is suitable for children's mother tongue level. | 181 | 43.3 | 79 | 18.9 | 158 | 37.8 |
| 59 | Exercises/Activities in the coursebook are suitable for children's level. | 131 | 31.3 | 66 | 15.8 | 221 | 52.9 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 60 | Topics in the coursebook are prepared according to children's interests. | 149 | 35.6 | 72 | 17.2 | 197 | 51.2 |
| 61 | The coursebook is prepared according to children's immediate needs. | 173 | 41.4 | 81 | 19.4 | 164 | 39.2 |
| 62 | Children can use what they learn in English courses in their daily lives. | 176 | 42.1 | 72 | 17.2 | 170 | 40.7 |
| 63 | Children love learning a foreign language. | 100 | 23.9 | 71 | 17 | 247 | 59.1 |
| 64 | Children learn English enthusiasticly. | 106 | 25.4 | 73 | 17.5 | 239 | 57.1 |
| 65 | Children are active in English lessons. | 121 | 29 | 93 | 22.2 | 204 | 48.8 |
| 66 | The coursebook aims to improve children's speaking skills. | 158 | 37.8 | 74 | 17.7 | 186 | 44.5 |
| 67 | The coursebook aims to improve children's reading skills. | 176 | 42.1 | 74 | 17.7 | 168 | 40.2 |
| 68 | The coursebook aims to improve children's writing skills. | 197 | 47.1 | 63 | 15.1 | 158 | 37.8 |
| 69 | The coursebook aims to improve children's listening skills. | 157 | 37.6 | 62 | 14.8 | 199 | 47.6 |
| 70 | Visual materials are used in the coursebook. | 68 | 16.3 | 53 | 12.7 | 297 | 71 |
| 71 | Audial materials are used in the coursebook. | 130 | 31.1 | 54 | 12.9 | 234 | 56 |
| 72 | Educational materials are used in the coursebook. | 154 | 36.8 | 57 | 13.6 | 207 | 49.6 |
| 73 | Elements of different cultures exist in the coursebook. | 98 | 23.4 | 67 | 16 | 253 | 60.6 |
| 74 | Children can understand instructions in the coursebook. | 145 | 34.7 | 92 | 22 | 181 | 43.3 |
| 75 | Exercises and activities are prepared comprehensively. | 144 | 34.4 | 94 | 22.5 | 180 | 43.1 |

In the item 1, 39.8% of the English language teachers claim that children can understand daily language in English but 38.7% of them disagree on the idea. A1 level of the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) criterion expects young learners to understand daily language in English. However, the percentages of disagree and agree answers seem equal. It may be because of the lack of the daily language in the coursebook. As an example of daily language, greeting styles, some common imperatives, numbers, colours, pets and fruit items have been given. However, imperatives without phrases have been presented as *'look, write, point, read, show, open/close'*, which is far from the daily language use. They must be as follows:

Look at.....!

Write a/an .....!

Point to .....!

Read .....!

Show .....!

Open/Close ....!, and so forth.

Besides, the coursebook presents the dialogues through the proper names as Umut, Nehir, Jackson, Sue, Mert, Oliver, Rita, Berk and Mike, which are not common either in Turkish or in English.

In the item 2, 50.2% of the English language teachers claim that children can introduce themselves to others in English but 36.6% of them disagree on the idea. The percentage of agree statement seems higher than that of disagree. It may be because of the dialogues about greetings on page 20 and the dialogues about asking age on page 39. However, the percentage of disagree (36.6%) cannot be ignored. The reason for this situation may be the lack of the other elements of introducing and giving information about countries and nationalities.

In the item 3, 35.2% of the English language teachers claim that children can give information in English about the place they live but 41.6% of them disagree on the idea. A1 level of the CEFR Criterion expects young learners to give information in English about the place they live. However, the percentage of disagree seems higher because of the topics, the sentences, the dialogues about living place or accomodation, such as *country, city, village and home, house, apartment or street, cafe, bank, museum*except for the words of *university, stadium, hotel, market, the zoo* and *restaurant* on page one.

In the item 4, 62.4% of the English language teachers claim that children can talk about their likes in English but 21.5% of them disagree on the idea; and in the item 19, 67% of the English language teachers claim that children can tell their likes in English but 19.6% of them disagree on the idea. It is understood from the answers that the coursebook is compatible with A1 level of the CEFR in terms of expressing likes.

In the item 5, 61.5% of the English language teachers claim that children can talk about thier dislikes in English but 24.4% of them disagree on the idea.It is

understood from the answers that the coursebook is compatible with A1 level of the CEFR in terms of expressing dislikes.

In the item 6, 56% of the English language teachers point out that children express their possessions in English but 27.7% of them disagree on the idea; and in the item 18, 59.4% of the English language teachers claim that children can tell objects/things which belong to them but 22.7% of them disagree on the idea. There is satisfying percentages for agreement. Despite being the basic structures, have got/has got-verbs of expressing possessions- do not exist in the coursebook.

In the item 7, 52.6% of the English language teachers indicate that children can understand slow English conversations but 26.1% of them disagree on the idea. This percentage may be the result of the simple and comprehensible language used throguhout the coursebook. The coursebook does not include sentences, such as inverted, cleft sentences etc., which may be problematic for students

In the  item 8, 71.3% of the English language teachers reveal that children can understand simple words they see in a visual around but 19.9% of them disagree on the idea. Two comments can be made for 71.3% of agree percentage, which is considerably high. First, in the units, cognate words, such as *star, motorcycle, boat, helicopter, stop, ambulance, television, hamburger, football, picnic, cake, sport, internet, radio,* etc. are used. Second, all the words in the coursebook are presented through visuals. This can help young learners to internalize the words given in the coursebook.

In the item 9, 45% of the English language teachers state that children can understand simple sentences they see in a visual around but 31.1% of them disagree on the idea. Compared with the words used in the coursebook, there are fewer sentence structures because of the language level of children both in their mother tongue and in foreign languages. Thus, this seems normal.

In the item 10, 70.3% of the English language teachers affirm that children can express themselves with simple words but 20.1% of them disagree on the idea. Besides, in the item 13, 65.3% of the English language teachers claim that children can answer simple-structured questions about something they know but 20.1% of them disagree on the idea. The reason behind these highly considerable percentages may be that the coursebook adresses to the immediate needs of children. Most of the

topics and words are appropriate for children.

In the item 11, 59.1% of the English language teachers assert that children can express themselves with simple sentences but 24.9% of them disagree on the idea; and in the item 17, 46.6% of the English language teachers claim that children can express themselves in English but 31.6% of them disagree on the idea. Students are generally active in English courses and they can talk about themselves with short and simple sentences, whereas some children cannot. Inhibition, lack of self-esteem and anxiety for speaking in a foreign language may be behind the disagree percentage.

In the item 12, 40.7% of the English language teachers reclaim that children can ask questions in English about something they know, but 34.2% of them disagree on the idea. Children are incapable of constructing interrogative sentences even in their mother tongue. Therefore, it is not easy for them to ask questions in a structurally different language. Need for an auxiliary verb for making questions, which does not exist in Turkish, and lack of question sentences and samples in the coursebook may be the reason for the answers.

In the item 14, 31.8% of the English language teachers seem to have accepted the idea that children can write a celebration card, while 44.5% of them disagree on the idea; in item 15, 40% of the English language teachers claim that children can write short notes to someone, but 39.5% of them disagree on the idea; and in the item 16, 36.2% of the English language teachers claim that children can fill a form requiring short personal information but 35.6% of them disagree on the idea. In these three questions, percentages of both agree and disagree answers are similar and not satisfying. The conflict between A1 level of the CEFR and Teaching Programme of the Ministry of National Education (MoNE). Because the CEFR expects children to write a celebration card, to fill a form requiring short notes to someone and short personal information. On the other hand, only listening and speaking activities are given attention in the teaching programme of MoNE published in 2013.

In the item 20, 46.8% of the English language teachers point out that the topics in the book help children for language acquisition, but 33.3% of them disagree on the idea; and in item 47, 34.7% of the English language teachers claim that the coursebook gives priority to acquisition rather than learning English, but 47.1% of

them disagree on the idea. Neither agreement nor disagreement seem dominant in the answers. The paradoxes existing in the coursebook may be the reason. First, the title of Unit two is *'Friends'* but the first picture of this unit is 'market' and there are words in this picture that are irrelevant to friendship, such as lemon, melon and milk. After this picture the phone /m/ is intended to teach with the word of motorcycle, which is nothing to do with friendship as well. Second, the title of Unit six is *'At the playground'* but the phone /d/ is intended to teach with the word of dinosaur, which is nothing to do with playground or games. Third, the title of Unit seven is *'Body parts'* but the phone /h/ is intended to teach with the word of helicopter, which is nothing to do with body parts. Fourth, the title of Unit eight is *'Pets'* but the sound of /r/ is intended to teach with the word of rainbow, which is nothing to do with pets. Fifth, the title of Unit nine is *'Fruits'* but the phone /l/ is intended to teach with the word of ladybug, which is nothing to do with fruits. Finally, the title of Unit ten is *Animals'* but the phone /k/ is intended to teach with the word of kite, which is nothing to do with animals.

In the item 21, 43.3% of the English language teachers think that the coursebook interests children, whereas 41.1% of them disagree on the idea; and for the item 60, 51.2% of the English language teachers claim that the topics in the coursebook are prepared according to children's interests, while 35.6% of them disagree on the idea. The answers given to this item seems so equal. The coursebook has visually designedto attract the interest of the children. However, there are repetitions of the same activity that lead to monotony.

In the item 22, 45.9% of the English language teachers state that there are different types of exercises and activities in the coursebook but 39.5% of them disagree on the idea; in the item 23, 42.4% of the English language teachers claim that the coursebook is prepared for multiple intelligences, but 38.5% of them disagree on the idea; in item 24, 35.5% of the English language teachers think that individual differences of children are taken into consideration in the coursebook while 41.1% of them do not agree on the idea; in the item 25, 38.7% of the English language teachers point out that coursebook is prepared for different learning styles but 40% of them disagree on the idea; in the item 26, 37.1% of the English language teachers claim that the coursebook is prepared for different teaching styles but 40.2% of them disagree on the idea. All these five questions are related with differences in

language learning and teaching. Neither agree answers nor disagree are dominant. They seem equal. It can be undersrood that the coursebook is not precisely prepared for different learning and teaching types.

For the item 27, 42.5% of the English language teachers declare that the coursebook is transparent, whereas 39.2% of them disagree on the idea; in the item 74, 43.3% of the English language teachers declare that children can understand instructions in the coursebook, but 34.7% of them disagree on the idea; and in the item 75, 34.4% of the English language teachers claim that the exercises and the activities are prepared comprehensively, but 34.4% of them disagree on the idea. These questions are on the transparency criteria of the CEFR. The CEFR "expects teaching programmes and coursebooks to be clearly and explicitly formulated, available and readily comprehensible to users" (CEF, 2001:7). However, the answers given to the questions seem similar. Most of the instructions are given without an explicit referrant. For instance, 'listen', 'color and trace', 'say and draw', 'match', etc. are instructions used in the coursebook. There may occur an ambiguity in comprehension. Listen to what? Match what?

As for the item 28, 46.4% of the English language teachers claim that the coursebook motivates children to communicate, but 35.2% of them disagree on the idea; and in the item 29, 39.2% of the English language teachers say that the coursebook motivates children's interaction to each other, but 38.7% of them disagree on the idea. Listening skill is given the priority and dialogues or role-playing to promote communication do not exist in the coursebook adequately. This may be the reason for why they disagree.

In the item 30, 39% of the English language teachers postulatethat children learn inductively, while 39.5% of them disagree on the idea. Normally, neither the CEFR nor the MoNE desires children to learn deductively or explicitly. Both pay attention to communication and interaction. Nevertheless, it is a reality that some English language teachers prepare children for TEOG exams in Turkey. Therefore, English may be taught deductively through grammar teaching.

For the item 31, 55% of the English language teachers allude that a learned topic/word is repeated later, but 26.6% of them disagree on the idea. The CEFR expects the coursebooks to be dynamic, being in continuous evolution in response to

experience in its use. The coursebook is prepared in cyclical model. Topics or words are repeated in other units.

As for the item 32, 48.6% of the English language teachers denote that the coursebook includes cultural elements of the target language, but 35.6% of them disagree on the idea; and in the item 73, 60.6% of the English language teachers denote that elements of different cultures exist in the coursebook, but 23.4% of them disagree on the idea. Council of Europe (CE) promotes plurilingualism and pluriculturalism. The coursebook significantly serves this aim. For example, there are flags of other nations and names in other languages.

In the item 33, 35.7% of the English language teachers mention that they like the coursebok but 47.6% of them disagree on the idea. The reason may not be just because of the coursebook itself but because of official and technical problems. The coursebook comprises of many listening activities. However, some teachers assert that they do not have the CD of the coursebook where listening tracks exist. Therefore, they sometimes have to read the dialogues thenselves and sometimes skip the activity.

In item 34, 41.9% of the English language teachers refer that the coursebook is appropriate for A1 level of the CEFR but 30.1% of them disagree on the idea. The Ministry of National Education in Turkey (MoNE) gives priority to listening and speaking skills, while the CEFR covers all language skills. The children are supposed to write short notes, to write forms requiring personal information, etc. according to the CEFR. Nevertheless, reading and writing skills are ignored by the English Teaching Program of MoNE.

The items 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41 and 42 are deliberately designed to check to what extent is the coursebook coherent. These items consist of some contradictory questions, which are just opposite the 'Can Do statements' of the CEFR, such as 'children can understand fluent conversations in English'; 'children can answer complicated questions about something they know';'children know the concept of abstract'; 'children can tell the place they live in foreign language'; 'children can understand fast English utterences'; 'children can construct complicated sentences'; 'children can answer hard questions' and 'children can write a letter, long note, etc. to someone. Totally, 64.6% of the English language teachers think that the

coursebook is coherent but 12% of them do not agree on the idea.

As for the item 43, 46.6% of the English language teachers affirm that the coursebook has realistic objectives, whereas 39% of them disagree on the idea, and in item 44, 41.1% of the English language teachers allege that the coursebook has sustainable objectives, but 39.5% of them disagree on the idea. The topics in the coursebook are mainly related with the immediate interests of the children and basic grammar structures and language skills are taken into consideration.

For the item 45, 41.9% of the English language teachers announce that the coursebook aims to develop children's comprehension competence, whereas 37.8% of them disagree on the idea. As it is known, Turkey is a huge country with its over 78 million population which includes many individual, social, economic and cultural differences. In the coursebook, there are some elements that do not adress to these differences. For example, one can see the words of university, zoo, boat, etc. But the children in rural towns and cities may not know what they are.

As for the item 46, 49.3% of the English language teachers assert that the coursebook aims to develop children's production competence, while 35.9% of them disagree on the idea. Regarding the action oriented approach of the CEFR, the coursebook is not teacher-centered. It expects students to be at the core of the activities to promote autonomous learning and production. On the other hand, instructions are generally given without referents, such as *listen!, cut!, say!*.

In the item 48, whereas 33% of the English language teachers come out with the idea that the coursebook is compatible with children's needs and motivates them, 49.3% of them disagree on the idea, besides in the item 61, 39.2% of the English language teachers say that the coursebook is prepared according to children's immediate needs, while 41.4% of them disagree on the idea. As is seen in the results, the coursebook can be said not to correspond the immediate needs of children and not to motivate them.

In the item 49, 46.1% of the English language teachers mention that the coursebook can be a basis for English teaching, while 41.9% of them disagree on the idea. Most of the CEFR criteria of A1 level have been provided in the coursebook. There are not so much irrelevant topics except for a few words. Therefore, it may be assumed that the coursebook serves as a good starting point for English language

teaching.

As for the item 50, 38.8% of the English language teachers reveal that children prepare portfolios after units or topics but 44% of them disagree on the idea, and in the item 51, 34% of the English language teachers disclose that children are supposed to self-evaluate themselves, whereas 46.9% of them do not seem to agree on the idea. There is no assessment for first, second and third graders at public schools in Turkey and they are not given any school reports. Thus, children are not expected to prepare a portfolio or self-evaluate themselves. Those teachers who try to make students prefer giving some tasks for portfolios.

In item 52, 46.4% of the English language teachers designate that they have sufficient knowledge about the CEFR, whereas 39.2% of them disagree on the idea. Althpugh the questionnaire used in this study has been especially implemented to those who have a background knowledge of the CEFR, nearly half of the teachersseem to be undecided or to disagree on the idea that they have sufficient knowledge about the CEFR. They may not know the criteria of the CEFR in detail and thus feel themselves insufficient. Besides, second graders started to learn English in 2015. Thus, English language teachers may not know or internalize the 2nd grade English programme of the MoNE.

As for the item 53, 37.8% of the English language teachers identify that they prepare materials that are suitable for the CEFR, whereas 38.3% of them do not prepare any. The percentages of answers given to this question seem so close. Socio-economic level of the students and the teachers and the physical conditions of the schools may be the causes of this situation. For them, material development consumes time and money. A teacher who lectures 30 hours lesson in a week during five days cannot prepare different materials regularly. On the other hand, there are still classrooms which are technically or physically inadequate throughout Turkey.

For the item 54, 44.7% of the English language teachers indicate that they can prepare lesson activities that are suitable for the CEFR but 36.4% of them disagree on the idea. In item 64, 57.1% of the English language teachers accept the idea that children learn English enthusiastically, while 25.4% of them disagree on the idea, and as for the item 65, 48.8% of the English language teachers say that children are active in English lessons, but 29% of them think that they are not so active in class.

The reason that lies behind these percentages may be the characteristics of young learners. Because they learn inductively, like playing games and singing songs and also they have a simple point of view.

In the item 55, 40.1% of the English language teachers remark that they read the CEFR at least once but 46.7% of them do not do it. The CEFR is a resource of 273 pages with 9 topics. The participants may not have totally read it. One who wants to learn the CEFR generally looks at 'Can Do' statements.

As for the item 56, 59.1% of the English language teachers claim that the language used in the coursebook is suitable for chidren's age level but 27.3% of them disagree on the idea. Topics are tried to be presented through concrete objects throughout the coursebook. Abstract objects and unambiguousness so not exist in the units. However, the existence of irrelevant words for children's immediate interests may be the reason of the diasgreement.

For the item 57, 39.3% of the English language teachers claim that the language used in the coursebook is suitable for chidren's language level, whereas 36.8% of them think that their language is beyond the children's language level. Childrena are still in the linguistic development process of their mother tongue. They have difficulty even in their native languages. Thus, it is highly natural for children to have linguistic problems in a foreign language.

As for the item 58, 37.8% of the English language teachers claim that the language used in the coursebook is suitable for chidren's mother tongue level, whereas 43.3% of them disagree on the idea. Children are in the progress of learning their mother tongue as well. They may not comprehend the structure and usages of their native language. Therefore, they may have some linguistic porblems.

In the item 59, 52.9% of the English language teachers claim that exercises/activities in the coursebook are suitable for chidren's level but 31.3% of them disagree on the idea. Considering the age level of the children, they generally learn inductively through games, songs and in an authentic environment. The coursebook has been designed according to these elements.

As for the item 62, 40.7% of the English language teachers admit that children can use what they learn in English courses in their daily life, but 42.1% of them disagree on the idea. Socio-economic differences among students and regions

can be clearly seen in this item. Children who have a social and economic background or opportunity can use English in their daily life. For example, learners living in İstanbul have more chance to speak in English outside the class than those living in a city of Southeastern Anatolia Region.

In the item 63, 59.1% of the English language teachers assert that children love learning a foreign language, whereas 23.9% of them think that children do not like learning a foreign language. Since children are still acquiring their mother tongue, games and songs are important in their acquisition. Therefore, in English classes games, songs and activities are used to teach them English communicatively through fun.

In the item 66, 44.5% of the English language teachers express that the coursebook aims to improve children's speaking skills, but 37.8% of them disagree on the idea, and in the item 69, 47.6% of the English language teachers show that the coursebook aims to improve children's listening skills, but 37.6% of them disagree on the idea. On the other hand, as for the item 67, 40.2% of the English language teachers reveal the fact that the coursebook aims to improve children's reading skills, while 42.1% of them disagree on the idea, and in the item 68, 37.8% of the English language teachers mention that the coursebook aims to improve children's writing skills, but 47.1% of them disagree on the idea. The MoNE gives high priority to these skills for 2nd graders and it is especially highlighted in the English teaching programme that only listening and speaking skills are focused.

For the item 70, 71% of the English language teachers claim that visual materials are used in the coursebook but 16.3% of them disagree on the idea. The coursebook includes quite many pictures. Thus, it can be said that the coursebook is visually satisfying.

In the item 71, 56% of the English language teachers think that audial materials are used in the coursebook but 31.1% of them disagree on the idea. In each unit of the coursebook, more than three listening activities exist. The problem is that some teachers, even some cities, do not have the track of these listening activities.

As for the item 72, 49.6% of the English language teachers affirm that educational materials are used in the coursebook but 36.8% of them disagree on the idea.One can see phrases and topics about human relations and values education in

the coursebook. However, national and cultural properties of our countrycan be saidto be poorly take place in the coursebook. For example, basic words of 'well done, sorry, please, etc.' are missing in the coursebook.

According to the criteria of the CEFR, the following answers in the tables below reflect the school teachers' ideas about the coursebook they have been using.

## 4.1. Tables of 'Comprehensiveness' Criterion of the CEFR

**Table 19: Frequency Table of the 'Comprehensiveness'Criterion of the CEFR**

| Answers | f | % |
|---|---|---|
| Disagree | 60 | 14.4 |
| Undecided | 134 | 32.1 |
| Agree | 224 | 53.5 |
| TOTAL | 418 | 100% |

The percentage of participants, among total number of participants (N=418), who disagree on the idea that the coursebook is appropriate for the 'Comprehensiveness' criterion of the CEFR is 14.4% (N=60), the percentage of participants who seem undecided on the idea that the coursebook is appropriate for the Comprehensiveness criteria of the CEFR is 32.1% (N=134) and the percentage of participants who agree on the idea that the coursebook is appropriate for the Comprehensiveness criteria of the CEFR is 53.5% (N=224). As it is seen in Table 19, the majority of the participants (53.5%) think that the coursebook is appropriate for the Comprehensiveness criterion of the CEFR, whereas almost half of them seem disagree and undecided. Pinter's (2006) view that children have a holistic approach to language can be seen in this criterion. Moreover, the coursebook is compatible with Krashen's monitor model. Krashen (1982) advocates that one can acquire a language when the input in the target language is comprehensible. Thus, in terms of 'i+1' input hypothesis, some topics and word used in the units of the coursebook are suitable for the level of children in Turkey. However, teachers encounter some troubbles, especially in the Eastern Anatolia and in the Southeastern Anatolia. Many children in these regions have difficulty in basic language skills even in their mother tongue. That is, they do not have the 'i'. Therefore, they cannot learn just a step beyond that level, that is '+1'.

On the other hand, in order to see whether there is meaningful significance in terms of regions, educational background and teaching experience of the participants, ANOVA and POST HOC analyses have been done.

**Table 20:Total Test Score Differences Between 'Comprehensiveness'and Regions**

| CEFR Criterion | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Comprehensiveness | Between Groups | 3.194 | 6 | .532 | 1.045 | .396 |
| | Within Groups | 208.885 | 411 | .509 | | |
| | Total | 212.079 | 417 | | | |

p<.05

It is seen in the ANOVA table that there is no significant difference between the Criterion of Comprehensiveness and Regions as F=1.04, p>.05. While there are no significant differences according to the seven regions in Turkey, the following table indicate that teachers' educational background shows significant difference

**Table 21:Descriptive Results of Total Scores for 'Comprehensiveness' According to Educational Background of the Teachers**

| CEFR Criterion | The Type of the Faculty | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Comprehensiveness | Education | 243 | 3.26 | .69209 |
| | Science and Letters | 111 | 3.27 | .71003 |
| | Translation | 42 | 2.95 | .81574 |
| | Linguistics | 22 | 3.59 | .59715 |
| | Total | 418 | 3.25 | .71401 |

**Table 22:Total Test Score Differences Between the Criterion of 'Comprehensiveness' and Educational Background of the Teachers**

| CEFR Criterion | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Comprehensiveness | Between Groups | 6.416 | 3 | 2.139 | 4.295 | .005 |
| | Within Groups | 205.663 | 414 | .498 | | |
| | Total | 212.079 | 417 | | | |

p<.05

In terms of 'Educational Background' there is a significant difference between the criterion of Comprehensiveness and educational background of the participants as F=4.29, p<.05. The type of the faculties from which the participants graduated has been compared with one another in order to determine where the difference is.

**Table 23: Post Hoc Table for 'Comprehensiveness' and Educational Background of the Teachers**

| CEFR Criterion | (I) The Type of the Faculty | (J) The Type of the Faculty | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Comprehensiveness | Translation | Education | -5.89355 | 2.24121 | .044* |
| | | Science and Letters | -6.17439 | 2.42894 | .055 |
| | | Linguistics | -12.15801 | 3.52866 | .004* |

p<.05

According to Post Hoc comparisons using the Scheffé,a significant difference between the faculties of education and translation is on behalf of education faculty as the mean score of education (X=3.26) is higher than translation (X=2.95). For the undergraduate students take courses on pedagogy in each term of pre-service teacher education programs, they are supposed to internalise 'who to teach, what to teach and how to teach' concepts better than others. On the other hand, the significant difference between linguistics and translation is on behalf of linguistics as the mean score of linguistics (X=3.59) is higher than that of translation (X=2.95). What lies behind this percentage may be that competences such as grammatical, discourse, sociolinguistic and strategic have been paid more attention in linguistics departments, while types of translation and translation techniques are the core of translation departments.

According to the teaching experience of the teachers, the following tables can be discussed.

**Table 24: Total Test Score Differences Between 'Comprehensiveness' and Teaching Experience of the Teachers**

| CEFR Criterion | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Comprehensiveness | Between Groups | 4.078 | 4 | 1.020 | 2.019 | .091 |
| | Within Groups | 208.001 | 413 | .505 | | |
| | Total | 212.079 | 417 | | | |

p<.05

Additionally, in terms of 'Teaching Experience' there is no significant difference at the level of 'Comprehensiveness'criterion as F=2.01, p>.05.

**Table 25: Independent t-test Results for Comprehensiveness**

| Gender | N | Mean | Std. deviation | F | t | df | p |
|--------|-----|------|------|------|------|-----|------|
| Female | 249 | 3.27 | .70 | .096 | .898 | 415 | .370 |
| Male | 169 | 3.21 | .73 | | | | |

p<.05

An independent samples t-test has been conducted to determine whether there is a significant difference between female and male participants in terms of the 'Comprehensiveness' criterion of the CEFR. As p>.05 (p=.370), in terms of gender, no significant difference has been detected.

## 4.2. Tables of 'Convenience to Learning and Teaching Methods' Criterion of the CEFR

**Table 26: Frequency Table of the 'Convenience to Learning and Teaching Methods' Criterion of the CEFR**

| Answers | f | % |
|---------|-----|------|
| Disagree | 125 | 29.8 |
| Undecided | 128 | 30.7 |
| Agree | 165 | 39.5 |
| TOTAL | 418 | 100% |

The percentage of participants, among total number of participants (N=418), who disagree on the idea that the coursebook is appropriate for the 'Convenience to Learning and Teaching Methods' criterion of the CEFR is 29.8% (N=125), whereas the percentage of participants who are undecided on the idea that the coursebook is appropriate for the 'Convenience to Learning and Teaching Methods' criterion of the CEFR is 30.7% (N=128) and the percentage of participants who agree on the idea that the coursebook is appropriate for the 'Convenience to Learning and Teaching Methods' criterion of the CEFR is 39.5% (N=165). These percentages may indicate that some second language acquisition theories may be ignored in the coursebook. For example, according to behaviorism, children acquire language by imitation, reinforcement and habit formation. However, the coursebook was generally designed for Communicative Approach. Total Physical Response (TPR), which includes reinforcement, is missing in the coursebook.

In order to see whether there is a meaningful significance in terms of regions, educational background and teaching experience of the participants, ANOVA and POST HOC analyses as follows:

**Table 27: Total Test Score Differences Between 'Convenience to Learning and Teaching Methods' and Regions**

| CEFR Criterion | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Learning and Teaching Methods | Between Groups | 7.635 | 6 | 1.272 | 1.916 | .077 |
| | Within Groups | 273.017 | 411 | .664 | | |
| | Total | 280.651 | 417 | | | |

p<.05

As seen in the ANOVA table, there is no significant difference between the criterion of Learning and Teaching Methods and regions where the participants have been working as F=1.91, p>.05.

**Table 28: Total Test Score Differences Between 'Convenience to Learning and Teaching Methods' and Educational Background of the Teachers**

| CEFR Criterion | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Learning and Teaching Methods | Between Groups | 3.070 | 3 | 1.023 | 1.526 | .207 |
| | Within Groups | 277.581 | 414 | .670 | | |
| | Total | 280.651 | 417 | | | |

p<.05

It is seen in the ANOVA table that there is no significant difference between the criterion of Learning and Teaching Methods and educational background of the participants as F=1.52, p>.05.

According to the teaching experience of the teachers, the tables are given:

**Table 29: Total Test Score Differences Between 'Convenience to Learning and Teaching Methods' and Teaching Experience of the Teachers**

| CEFR Criterion | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Learning and Teaching Methods | Between Groups | 4.530 | 4 | 1.133 | 1.694 | .150 |
| | Within Groups | 276.121 | 413 | .669 | | |
| | Total | 280.651 | 417 | | | |

p<.05

No significant difference between the criterion of Learning and Teaching Methods and teaching experience of participants has been detected as F=1.69, p>.05.

**Table 30: Independent t-test Results for Learning and Teaching Methods**

| Gender | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | F | t | df | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Female | 249 | 2.95 | .80 | .416 | -2.161 | 416 | .031 |
| Male | 169 | 3.13 | .84 | | | | |

p<.05

An independent samples t-test has been conducted to determine whether there is a significant difference between female and male participants in terms of the 'Learning and Teaching Methods' criterion of the CEFR. There is a significant difference between genders as $p<.05$ ($p=.031$). For $X_{male}=3.13$ (sd=.84) is higher than $X_{female}=2.95$ (sd=.80), the significant difference is on behalf of males.

### 4.3. Tables of the 'Coherence' Criterion of the CEFR

**Table 31: Frequency Table of the 'Coherence' Criterion of the CEFR**

| Answers | $f$ | % |
|---|---|---|
| Disagree | 270 | 64.6 |
| Undecided | 95 | 22.7 |
| Agree | 53 | 12.7 |
| TOTAL | 418 | 100% |

The percentage of participants, among total number of participants (N=418), who disagree on the idea that tha coursebook is appropriate for the 'Coherence' criterion of the CEFR is 64.6% (N=270), whereas the percentage of participants who are undecided on the idea that the coursebook is appropriate for the 'Coherence' criterion of the CEFR is 22.7% (N=95) and the percentage of participants who agree on the idea that the coursebook is appropriate for the 'Coherence' criterion of the CEFR is 12.7% (N=53). According to Table 31, most of the participants (64.6%) think that the coursebook is not coherent. In terms of 'Coherence' criterion of the CEFR, there is no semantic link among some topics in the coursebook. For instance, the headline od the second unit is *Friends*. There is a picture of some children seeming that they are friends. However, on the second page of the unit a market figure consisting of fruit and beverage pictures exists, which is nothing to do with friendship.

In order to see whether there is a meaningful significance in terms of the regions, the educational background and the teaching experience of the participants, ANOVA and POST HOC analyses have been given below.

**Table 32: Descriptive Results of Total Scores for 'Coherence' According to the Seven Regions in Turkey**

| CEFR Criterion | Region | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Coherence | Marmara | 59 | 2.44 | .90657 |
| | Black Sea | 53 | 2.17 | .70465 |
| | Eastern Anatolia | 75 | 2.16 | .95453 |
| | Southeastern Anatolia | 63 | 2.38 | 1.08087 |
| | Mediterranean | 66 | 2.11 | 1.07836 |
| | Aegean | 55 | 2.58 | .84479 |
| | Central Anatolia | 47 | 2.01 | .61394 |
| | Total | 418 | 2.26 | .92762 |

**Table 33: Total Test Score Differences Between the Criterion of 'Coherence' and Seven Regions**

| CEFR Criterion | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Coherence | Between Groups | 14.010 | 6 | 2.335 | 2.783 | .012 |
| | Within Groups | 344.806 | 411 | .839 | | |
| | Total | 358.817 | 417 | | | |

p<.05

It is seen in the ANOVA table that there is a significant difference between the criterion of Coherence and region where the participants have been working as F=2.78, p<.05. The type of the region, where the participants have been working has been compared with one another in order to determine where the difference is.

**Table 34: Post Hoc Table for 'Coherence' Criterion**

| CEFR Criterion | (I) Region | (J) Region | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Coherence | Aegean | Marmara | .14326 | .17168 | .981 |
| | | Black Sea | .40965 | .17630 | .235 |
| | | Eastern Anatolia | .42182 | .16260 | .130 |
| | | South Eastern Anatolia | .19888 | .16903 | .903 |
| | | Mediterranean | .46818 | .16723 | .078 |
| | | Central Anatolia | .57118 | .18194 | .030* |

p<.05

According to Post Hoc comparisons using the Scheffé; the significant difference between Aegean region and Central Anatolia region is on behalf of Aegean region, as the mean score of Aegean region (X=2.58) is higher than that of

Central Anatolia region's (X=2.01).

**Table 35: Total Test Score Differences Between the Criterion of 'Coherence' and Educational Background of the Teachers**

| CEFR Criterion | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Coherence | Between Groups | 4.050 | 3 | 1.350 | 1.575 | .195 |
| | Within Groups | 354.767 | 414 | .857 | | |
| | Total | 358.817 | 417 | | | |

p<.05

It is seen in the ANOVA table that there is no significant difference between the Criterion of coherence and educational background of participants as F=1.57, p>.05.

According to the teaching experience of the teachers, the following tables are given:

**Table 36: Total Test Score Differences Between the Criterion of 'Coherence' and Teachers' Teaching Experience**

| CEFR Criterion | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Coherence | Between Groups | 1.346 | 4 | .337 | .389 | .817 |
| | Within Groups | 357.471 | 413 | .866 | | |
| | Total | 358.817 | 417 | | | |

p<.05

It is seen in the ANOVA table that there is no significant difference between the criterion of Coherence and teaching experience of participants as F=.38, p>.05.

**Table 37: Independent t-test results for Coherence**

| Gender | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | F | t | df | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Female | 249 | 2.29 | .87 | 4.932 | .663 | 416 | .507 |
| Male | 169 | 2.23 | 1.00 | | | | |

p<.05

An independent-samples t-test has been conducted to determine whether there is a significant difference between female and male participants in terms of the 'Coherence' criterion of the CEFR. As p>.05 (p=.507), there is not any significant difference between genders.

## 4.4. Tables of the 'Convenience to Teaching Program' Criterion of the CEFR

**Table 38: Frequency Table of the 'Convenience to Teaching Program' Criterion of the CEFR**

| Answers | $f$ | % |
|---|---|---|
| Disagree | 156 | 37.4 |
| Undecided | 122 | 29.1 |
| Agree | 140 | 33.5 |
| TOTAL | 418 | 100% |

The percentage of participants, among total number of participants (N=418), who disagree on the idea that the coursebook is appropriate for the 'Convenience to Teaching Program' criterion of the CEFR is 37.4% (N=156), while the percentage of participants who are undecided on the idea that the coursebook is appropriate for the 'Convenience to Teaching Program' criterion of the CEFR is 29.1% (N=122) and the percentage of participants who agree on the idea that the coursebook is appropriate for the 'Convenience to Teaching Program' criterion of the CEFR is 33.5% (N=140).The Ministry of National Education (MoNE) promotes a cyclical curriculum. That is, what is taught earlier should be repeated later. In this sense, it can be said that the coursebook is coherent as the topics and units of the coursebook are rehearsed later again. On the other hand, here is a suggestion for teachers written in the English Learning Model of MoNE:

- *Talk to parents and suggest that they learn what their children learn at school. They should sing togetherfor fun or use the expressions they learn at school during their time at home.*

One of the biggest problems in the teaching of English is that what is learnt at school is not used outside the classrooms. Long and perpetual holidays and lack of an environment to use English may be causes. Besides, most of teachers complain about parents' indifference to the children. They are supposed to regularly visit the school and monitor the development processes of their children, yet especially in rural areas this may be impossible.

In order to see whether there is a meaningful significance in terms of regions, educational background and teaching experience of the participants, ANOVA and POST HOC analyses have been given below.

**Table 39: Descriptive Results of Total Scores for 'Convenience to Teaching Program' According to the Seven Regions in Turkey**

| CEFR Criterion | Region | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Convenience to Teaching Program | Marmara | 59 | 3.14 | .84182 |
| | Black Sea | 53 | 2.74 | .89362 |
| | Eastern Anatolia | 75 | 2.84 | .93965 |
| | Southeastern Anatolia | 63 | 2.89 | .92099 |
| | Mediterranean | 66 | 3.22 | .97953 |
| | Aegean | 55 | 3.04 | .86558 |
| | Central Anatolia | 47 | 2.83 | .89362 |
| | Total | 418 | 2.96 | .91825 |

**Table 40: Total Test Score Differences Between the Criterion of the 'Convenience to Teaching Program' and the Seven Regions**

| CEFR Criterion | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Convenience to Teaching Program | Between Groups | 11.492 | 6 | 1.915 | 2.315 | .033 |
| | Within Groups | 340.112 | 411 | .828 | | |
| | Total | 351.604 | 417 | | | |

p<.05

It is seen in the ANOVA table that there is a significant difference between the criterion of 'Convenience to Teaching Program' and region where the participants have been working as $F=2.31$, $p<.05$. The type of the region, where the participants have been working, has been compared with one another in order to determine where the difference is.

**Table 41: Post Hoc Table for 'Convenience to Teaching Program' Criterion**

| CEFR Criterion | (I) Region | (J) Region | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Convenience to Teaching Program | Black Sea | Marmara | -2.79245 | 1.20513 | .238 |
| | | Eastern Anatolia | -.71245 | 1.14268 | .996 |
| | | Southeastern Anatolia | -1.01468 | 1.18689 | .979 |
| | | Mediterranean | -3.38336 | 1.17450 | .043* |
| | | Aegean | -2.04700 | 1.22569 | .636 |
| | | Central Anatolia | -.64352 | 1.27585 | .999 |

p<.05

According to Post Hoc comparisons using the Scheffé; the significant

difference between the Black Sea region and the Mediterranean region is on behalf of the Mediterranean region as the mean score of the Mediterranean region (X=3.22) seems higher than that of the Black Sea region's (X=2.74).

**Table 42: Total Test Score Differences Between the Criterion of the 'Convenience to Teaching Program' and Educational Background of the Teachers**

| CEFR Criterion | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Convenience to Teaching Program | Between Groups | .535 | 3 | .178 | .210 | .889 |
| | Within Groups | 351.069 | 414 | .848 | | |
| | Total | 351.604 | 417 | | | |

p<.05

It is seen above that there is no significant difference between the criterion of Convenience to Teaching Program and educational background of participants as F=.21, p>.05.

**Table 43: Total Test Score Differences Between the Criterion of the 'Convenience to Teaching Program' and the Teachers' Teaching Experience**

| CEFR Criterion | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Convenience to Teaching Program | Between Groups | 4.144 | 4 | 1.036 | 1.232 | .297 |
| | Within Groups | 347.460 | 413 | .841 | | |
| | Total | 351.604 | 417 | | | |

p<.05

It is seen in the ANOVA table that there is no significant difference between the criterionof Convenience to Teaching Program and teaching experience of participants as F=1.23, p>.05.

**Table 44: Independent t-test Results for 'Convenience to Teaching Program'**

| Gender | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | F | t | df | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Female | 249 | 2.84 | .93 | 3.766 | -3.340 | 416 | .001 |
| Male | 169 | 3.14 | .86 | | | | |

p<.05

An independent samples t-test has been conducted to determine whether there is a significant difference between female and male participants in terms of the 'Convenience to Teaching Program' criterion of the CEFR. There is a significant difference between genders as p<.05 (p=.001). For $X_{male}$=3.14 (sd=.86) is higher than that of $X_{female}$=2.84 (sd=.93), the significant difference is on behalf of males.

**4.5.Table of the 'Assessment and Evaluation' Criterion of the CEFR**

**Table 45: Frequency Table of the 'Assement and Evaluation Criterion' of the CEFR**

| Answers | $f$ | $\%$ |
|---------|-----|------|
| Disagree | 145 | 34.7 |
| Undecided | 118 | 28.2 |
| Agree | 155 | 37.1 |
| TOTAL | 418 | 100% |

The percentage of participants, among total number of participants (N=418), who disagree on the idea that the coursebook is appropriate for the 'Assessment and Evaluation' criterion of the CEFR is 34.7% (N=145), the percentage of participants who are undecided on the idea that the coursebook is appropriate for the 'Assessment and Evaluation' criterion of the CEFR is 28.2% (N=118) and the percentage of participants who agree on the idea that the coursebook seems appropriate for the 'Assessment and Evaluation' criterion of the CEFR is 37.1% (N=155). Since first, second and third graders are not given school report at the end of terms, a formal assessment for the second graders is not applied. The CEFR highlights self-assessment and learners are encouraged to see their own progress (CEF, 2001). However, the coursebook does not contain any self-assessment grid or form at the end of each unit. Moreover, the coursebook does not support the use of the European Language Portfolio (ELP), which is designed to promote key features for effectivelearning to take place such as self-directed learning as well as self-evaluation.

In order to see whether there is a meaningful significance in terms of vairables, ANOVA and POST HOC analyses have been given below.

**Table 46: Total Test Score Differences Between the Criterion of 'Assessment and Evaluation' and the Seven Regions**

| CEFR Criterion | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|----------------|--|----------------|-----|-------------|------|------|
| Assessment and Evaluation | Between Groups | 2.390 | 6 | .398 | .457 | .840 |
| | Within Groups | 358.464 | 411 | .872 | | |
| | Total | 360.854 | 417 | | | |

p<.05

It is seen in the ANOVA table that there is no significant difference between the Criterion of Assessment and Evaluation and the region where the participants

have been working as F=.45, p>.05.

**Table 47: Total Test Score Differences Between the Criterion of 'Assessment and Evaluation' and Educational Background of the Teachers**

| CEFR Criterion | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Assessment and Evaluation | Between Groups | 1.860 | 3 | .620 | .715 | .544 |
| | Within Groups | 358.995 | 414 | .867 | | |
| | Total | 360.854 | 417 | | | |

p<.05

It is seen in the ANOVA table that there is no significant difference between the criterion of Assessment and Evaluation and the educational background of participants as F=.71, p>.05.

**Table 48: Total Test Score Differences Between the Criterion of 'Assessment and Evaluation' and Teaching Experience of the Teachers**

| CEFR Criterion | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Assessment and Evaluation | Between Groups | .942 | 4 | .235 | .270 | .897 |
| | Within Groups | 359.913 | 413 | .871 | | |
| | Total | 360.854 | 417 | | | |

p<.05

It is seen in the ANOVA table that there is no significant difference between the criterion of Assessment and Evaluation and teaching experience of the participants as F=.27, p>.05.

**Table 49: Independent t-test Results for 'Assessment and Evaluation'**

| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | F | t | df | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Female | 249 | 2.93 | .94 | .110 | -.101 | 416 | .919 |
| Male | 169 | 2.94 | .92 | | | | |

p<.05

An independentsamples t-test has been conducted to determine whether there is a significant difference between female and male participants in terms of the 'Assessment and Evaluation' criterion of the CEFR. As p>.05 (p=.919), there is no significant difference between genders.

### 4.6.Tables of the 'Convenience to Student Level' Criterion of the CEFR

**Table 50: Frequency Table of the 'Convenience to Student Level Criterion' of the CEFR**

| Answers | *f* | % |
|---------|-----|---|
| Disagree | 110 | 26.4 |
| Undecided | 129 | 30.8 |
| Agree | 179 | 42.8 |
| TOTAL | 418 | 100% |

Another CEFR Criterion is Convenience to Student Level, which has also been analysed through the perceptions of English language teachers. The percentage of participants, among total number of participants (N=418), who disagree on the idea that the coursebook is appropriate for the 'Convenience to Student Level' criterion of the CEFR is 26.4% (N=110), the percentage of participants who are undecided on the idea that the coursebook is appropriate for the 'Convenience to Student Level' criterion of the CEFR is 30.8% (N=129) and the percentage of participants who agree on the idea that the coursebook is appropriate for the 'Convenience to Student Level' criterion of the CEFR is 42.8% (N=179). The percentage of positive answers seems higher. However, children face some problems in terms of Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH). The CAH puts forward that learners will have less problems during second language learning if the structures are similar to those of mother tongue. Structural differences between Turkish and English, indefinite pronoun of 'the' and suffixes of '-s' and '–ing' are so problematic for second grade children.

In order to see whether there is meaningful significance in terms of regions, educational background and teaching experience of the participants, ANOVA and POST HOC analyses have been given below.

**Table 51: Descriptive Results of Total Scores for the 'Convenience to Student Level' According to Seven Regions in Turkey**

| CEFR Criterion | Region | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|----------------|--------|---|------|----------------|
| Convenience to Student Level | Marmara | 59 | 3.13 | .63809 |
| | Black Sea | 53 | 2.91 | .76765 |
| | Eastern Anatolia | 75 | 3.06 | .92873 |
| | Southeastern Anatolia | 63 | 2.95 | .92865 |
| | Mediterranean | 66 | 3.42 | .85398 |
| | Aegean | 55 | 3.16 | .98366 |
| | Central Anatolia | 47 | 2.86 | .78095 |
| | Total | 418 | 3.08 | .86524 |

**Table 52: Total Test Score Differences Between the Criterion of 'Convenience to Student Level' and Seven Regions in Turkey**

| CEFR Criterion | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Convenience to Student Level | Between Groups | 12.921 | 6 | 2.153 | 2.957 | .008 |
| | Within Groups | 299.260 | 411 | .728 | | |
| | Total | 312.180 | 417 | | | |

p<.05

It is seen in the ANOVA table that there is significant difference between the criterion of Convenience to Student Level and region where the participants have been working as F=2.95, p<.05. Type of region, where the participants have been working, has been compared with one another in order to determine where the difference is.

**Table 53: Post Hoc Table for 'Convenience to Student Level' Criterion and Seven Regions in Turkey**

| CEFR Criterion | (I) Region | (J) Region | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Convenience to Student Level | Black Sea | Marmara | -1.32683 | .96895 | .818 |
| | | Eastern Anatolia | -.93384 | .91874 | .950 |
| | | Southeastern Anatolia | -.26146 | .95428 | 1.000 |
| | | Mediterranean | -3.04717 | .94432 | .023* |
| | | Aegean | -1.52899 | .98548 | .713 |
| | | Central Anatolia | .30389 | 1.02581 | 1.000 |
| Convenience to Student Level | Mediterranean | Marmara | 1.72034 | .91730 | .498 |
| | | Black Sea | 3.04717 | .94432 | .023* |
| | | Eastern Anatolia | 2.11333 | .86409 | .182 |
| | | Southeastern Anatolia | 2.78571 | .90179 | .035* |
| | | Aegean | 1.51818 | .93475 | .667 |
| | | Central Anatolia | 3.35106 | .97718 | .012* |

According to Post Hoc comparisons using the Scheffé; the significant difference between the Black Sea region and the Mediterranean region is on behalf of

the Mediterranean region as the mean score of the Mediterranean region (X=3.42) is higher than that of the Black Sea region (X=2.91). On the other hand, the significant difference between the Mediterranean region and the Southeastern Region is on behalf of the Mediterranean region as the mean score of the Mediterranean region (X=3.42) is higher than that of the Southeastern region (X=2.95). Moreover, the significant difference between the Mediterranean region and the Central Anatolia Region is on behalf of the Mediterranean region as the mean score of the Mediterranean region (X=3.42) is higher than that of the Central Anatolia region (X=2.86).

**Table 54: Descriptive Results of Total Scores for 'Convenience to Student Level' According to the Educational Background of the Teachers**

| CEFR Criterion | Type of the Faculty | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Convenience to Student Level | Education | 243 | 3.11 | .87089 |
| | Science and Letters | 111 | 2.98 | .86350 |
| | Translation | 42 | 2.96 | .86881 |
| | Linguistics | 22 | 3.51 | .67940 |
| | Total | 418 | 3.08 | .86524 |

**Table 55: Total Test Score Differences Between the Criterion of 'Convenience to Student Level' According to the Educational Background of the Teachers**

| CEFR Criterion | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Convenience to Student Level | Between Groups | 5.974 | 3 | 1.991 | 2.692 | .046 |
| | Within Groups | 306.207 | 414 | .740 | | |
| | Total | 312.180 | 417 | | | |
| | Total | 312.180 | 417 | | | |

p<.05

As it is seen in the ANOVA table given above, there is a significant difference between the criterion of Convenience to Student Level and educational background of the participants as F=2.69, p<.05. The type of the faculty from which the participants graduated has been compared with one another in order to determine where the difference is.

**Table 56: Post Hoc Table for 'Convenience to Student Level' and the Educational Background of the Teachers**

| CEFR Criterion | (I) Type of the Faculty | (J) Type of the Faculty | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Convenience to Student Level | Science and Letters | Education | -.77889 | .59115 | .552 |
| | | Translation | .15380 | .93480 | .998 |
| | | Linguistics | -3.15356 | 1.20424 | .045* |

p<.05

According to Post Hoc comparisons using the Scheffé; the significant difference between the faculty of Science and Letters and Linguistics is on behalf of Linguistics as the mean score of Linguistics (X =3.51) is higher than that of Science and Literature (X=2.98).

**Table 57: Total Test Score Differences Between the Criterion of 'Convenience to Student Level' and Teaching Experience of the Teachers**

| CEFR Criterion | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Convenience to Student Level | Between Groups | 3.407 | 4 | .852 | 1.139 | .338 |
| | Within Groups | 308.774 | 413 | .748 | | |
| | Total | 312.180 | 417 | | | |

p<.05

As it is seen in the ANOVA table above, there is no significant difference between the criterion of Convenience to Student Level and teaching experience of participants as F=1.13, p>.05.

**Table 58: Independent t-test Results for 'Convenience to Student Level'**

| Gender | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | F | t | df | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Female | 249 | 3.03 | .85 | .603 | -1.583 | 416 | .114 |
| Male | 169 | 3.16 | .88 | | | | |

p<.05

An independent samples t-test has been conducted to determine whether there is a significant difference between female and male participants in terms of the 'Convenience to Student Level' criterion of the CEFR. As p>.05 (p=.114), there is no any significant difference between genders.

### 4.7.Tables of the 'Determination of Needs' Criterion of the CEFR

**Table 59: Frequency Table of the 'Determination of Needs'Criterion of the CEFR**

| Answers | *f* | % |
|---|---|---|
| Disagree | 105 | 25.1 |
| Undecided | 101 | 24.1 |
| Agree | 212 | 50.8 |
| TOTAL | 418 | 100% |

While the percentage of participants, among total number of participants (N=418), who disagree on the idea that the coursebook is appropriate for the 'Determination of Needs' criterion of the CEFR is 25.1% (N=105), the percentage of participants who are undecided on the idea that the coursebook is appropriate for the 'Determination of Needs' criterion of the CEFR is 24.1% (N=101) and the percentage of participantswho agree on the idea that the coursebook is appropriate for the 'Determination of Needs' criterion of the CEFR is 50.8% (N=212). Most of the topics in the coursebook mainly addresses to the immediate needs of children, such as numbers, greetings, body parts, colours, school objects, etc. However, to what extent children will use or need English is still a great problem. Some teachers generally complain that they have been trying to teach English though the children will not use it outside the school. Thus, coursebook should be designed according to regional and social differences.

In order to see whether there is a meaningful significance in terms of regions, educational background and teaching experience of the participants, ANOVA and POST HOC analyses have been given below.

**Table 60: Descriptive Results of Total Scores for the 'Determination of Needs' According to the Seven regions in Turkey**

| CEFR Criterion | Region | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Determination of Needs | Marmara | 59 | 3.39 | 1.02048 |
| | Black Sea | 53 | 3.29 | .85166 |
| | Eastern Anatolia | 75 | 3.16 | 1.00126 |
| | Southeastern Anatolia | 63 | 3.25 | .89521 |
| | Mediterranean | 66 | 3.67 | .96010 |
| | Aegean | 55 | 3.33 | 1.01955 |
| | Central Anatolia | 47 | 3.06 | .96965 |
| | Total | 418 | 3.31 | .97327 |

**Table 61: Total Test Score Differences Between the Criterion of 'Determination of Needs' and the Seven Regions in Turkey**

| CEFR Criterion | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Determination of Needs | Between Groups | 13.690 | 6 | 2.282 | 2.459 | .024 |
| | Within Groups | 381.316 | 411 | .928 | | |
| | Total | 395.006 | 417 | | | |

p<.05

As is seen in the ANOVA table that there is a significant difference between the criterion of Determination of Needs and region where the participants have been working as F=2.45, p<.05. The type of the region in which the participants have been working has been compared with one another in order to determine where the difference is.

**Table 62: Post Hoc Table for 'Determination of Needs' Criterion and Seen Regions in Turkey**

| CEFR Criterion | (I) Region | (J) Region | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Determination of Needs | Mediterranean | Marmara | 1.09040 | .69030 | .696 |
| | | Black Sea | 1.49686 | .71063 | .351 |
| | | Eastern Anatolia | 2.01333 | .65026 | .034* |
| | | Southeastern Anatolia | 1.68254 | .67863 | .170 |
| | | Aegean | 1.33939 | .70343 | .479 |
| | | Central Anatolia | 2.43262 | .73536 | .018* |

p<.05

According to Post Hoc comparisons using the Scheffé; the significant difference between the Mediterranean region and the Eastern Anatolia region is on behalf of the Mediterranean region as the mean score of the Mediterranean region (X =3.67) is higher than that of the Eastern Anatolia region (X=3.16). On the other hand, the significant difference between the Mediterranean region and the Central Anatolia Region region is on behalf of the Mediterranean region as the mean score of the Mediterranean region (X =3.67) is higher than that of the Southeastern region (X=3.06). This may be simply because of social, economical and cultural differences among regions.

**Table 63: Descriptive Results of Total Scores for 'Determination of Needs' According to the Educational Background of the Teachers**

| CEFR Criterion | Type of the Faculty | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Determination of Needs | Education | 243 | 3.33 | .94293 |
| | Science and Letters | 111 | 3.36 | 1.04372 |
| | Translation | 42 | 2.87 | .94714 |
| | Linguistics | 22 | 3.71 | .72496 |
| | Total | 418 | 3.31 | .97327 |

**Table 64: Total Test Score Differences Between the Criterion of the 'Determination of Needs' and Educational Background of the Teachers**

| CEFR Criterion | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Determination of Needs | Between Groups | 12.196 | 3 | 4.065 | 4.397 | .005 |
| | Within Groups | 382.810 | 414 | .925 | | |
| | Total | 395.006 | 417 | | | |

p<.05

It is seen in the ANOVA table that there is significant difference between the criterion of Determination of Needs and educational background of participants as F=4.39, p<.05. Type of faculty from which the participants graduated has been compared with one another in order to determine where the difference is.

**Table 65: Post Hoc Table for 'Determination of Needs' Criterion and Educational Background of the Teachers**

| CEFR Criterion | (I) Type of the Faculty | (J) Type of the Faculty | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Determination of Needs | Translation | Education | -1.86537 | .64276 | .020* |
| | | Science and Letters | -1.95624 | .69680 | .027* |
| | | Linguistics | -3.38745 | 1.01229 | .005* |

p<.05

According to Post Hoc comparisons using the Scheffé; the significant difference between faculty of translation and education is on behalf of education as the mean score of education (X =3.33) is higher than that of translation (X=2.87). Besides, the significant difference between faculty of translation and science and letters is on behalf of science and letters as the mean score of science and letters (X =3.36) is higher than that of translation (X=2.87). On the other hand, the significant difference between faculty of translation and linguistics is on behalf of linguistics as

the mean score of linguistics (X =3.71) is higher than that of translation (X=2.87).

**Table 66: Total Test Score Differences Between the Criterion of the 'Determination of Needs' and Teaching Experience of the Teachers**

| CEFR Criterion | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Determination of Needs | Between Groups | 6.113 | 4 | 1.528 | 1.623 | .168 |
| | Within Groups | 388.893 | 413 | .942 | | |
| | Total | 395.006 | 417 | | | |

p<.05

It is seen in the ANOVA table that there is no significant difference between the criterion of Determination of Needs and teaching experience of participants as F=1.62, p>.05.

**Table 67: Independent t-test Results for Determination of Needs**

| Gender | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | F | t | df | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Female | 249 | 3.33 | .94 | .990 | .401 | 416 | .689 |
| Male | 169 | 3.29 | 1.02 | | | | |

p<.05

An independent samples t-test has been conducted to determine whether there is a significant difference between female and male participants in terms of the 'Determination of Needs' criterion of the CEFR. As p>.05 (p=.689), there is no significant difference between genders.

### 4.8. Tables of the 'Four Skills' Criterion of the CEFR

**Table 68: Frequency Table of the 'Four Skills'Criterion of the CEFR**

| Answers | $f$ | % |
|---|---|---|
| Disagree | 159 | 38 |
| Undecided | 78 | 18.7 |
| Agree | 181 | 43.3 |
| TOTAL | 418 | 100% |

Whereas the percentage of participants, among total number of participants (N=418), who disagree on the idea that the coursebook is appropriate for the 'Four Skills' criterion of the CEFR is 38% (N=159), the percentage of participants who are undecided on the idea that the coursebook is appropriate for the 'Four Skills' criterion of the CEFR is 18.7% (N=78) and the percentage of participants who agree on the idea that the coursebook is appropriate for the 'Determination of Needs' criterion of the CEFR is 43.3% (N=181). The CEFR gives high priority to all language skills but thr MoNE focuses only on listening and speaking. Reading and

writing skills are totally ignored by MoNE. Therefore, a tremendous gap exist between the coursebook and the CEFR in terms of Four Skills criterion.

In order to see whether there is a meaningful significance in terms of regions, educational background and teaching experience of the participants, ANOVA and POST HOC analyses have been given below.

**Table 69: Descriptive Results of Total Scores for 'Four Skills' According to Seven Regions in Turkey**

| CEFR Criterion | Region | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Four Skills | Marmara | 59 | 3.03 | .87162 |
| | Black Sea | 53 | 2.82 | .91172 |
| | Eastern Anatolia | 75 | 2.68 | 1.14673 |
| | Southeastern Anatolia | 63 | 2.84 | 1.02106 |
| | Mediterranean | 66 | 2.95 | 1.26746 |
| | Aegean | 55 | 3.25 | .90940 |
| | Central Anatolia | 47 | 2.72 | 1.00956 |
| | Total | 418 | 2.89 | 1.0916 |

**Table 70: Total Test Score Differences Between the Criterion of 'Four Skills' and the Seven Regions in Turkey**

| CEFR Criterion | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Four Skills | Between Groups | 13.806 | 6 | 2.301 | 2.124 | .050 |
| | Within Groups | 445.198 | 411 | 1.083 | | |
| | Total | 459.005 | 417 | | | |

p<.05

It is seen in the ANOVA table that there is a significant difference between the criterion of Four Skills and region where the participants have been working as F=2.12, p<.05. The type of the region, where the participants have been working has been compared with one another in order to determine where the difference is.

**Table 71: Post Hoc Table for the Criterion of 'Four Skills' and the Seven Regions in Turkey**

| CEFR Criterion | (I) Region | (J) Region | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Four Skills | Eastern Anatolia | Marmara | -1.03141 | .54334 | .483 |
| | | Black Sea | -.38063 | .56029 | .994 |
| | | Southeastern Anatolia | -.45460 | .53360 | .979 |
| | | Mediterranean | -.81030 | .52697 | .722 |
| | | Aegean | -1.71030 | .55429 | .035* |
| | | Central Anatolia | -.09560 | .58087 | 1.000 |

p<.05

According to Post Hoc comparisons using the Scheffé; the significant difference between the Eastern Anatolia region and the Aegean is on behalf of the Aegean region as the mean score of the Aegean region (X=3.25) is higher than that of Eastern Anatolia region (X=2.68).

**Table 72: Total Test Score Differences Between the Criterion of 'Four Skills' and Educational Background of the Teachers**

| CEFR Criterion | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Four Skills | Between Groups | 1.724 | 3 | .575 | .520 | .668 |
| | Within Groups | 457.280 | 414 | 1.105 | | |
| | Total | 459.005 | 417 | | | |

p<.05

It is seen in the ANOVA table that there is no significant difference between the criterion of Four Skills and educational background of participants as F=.52, p>.05.

**Table 73: Total Test Score Differences Between the Criterion of 'Four Skills' and Teaching Experience of the Teachers**

| CEFR Criterion | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Four Skills | Between Groups | 9.878 | 4 | 2.469 | 2.271 | .061 |
| | Within Groups | 449.127 | 413 | 1.087 | | |
| | Total | 459.005 | 417 | | | |

p<.05

It is seen in the ANOVA table that there is no significant difference between the criterion of Four Skills and teaching experience of participants as F=2.27, p>.05.

**Table 74: Independent t-test Results for Four Skills**

| Gender | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | F | t | df | p |
|--------|-----|------|----------------|--------|-------|-----|------|
| Female | 249 | 2.95 | .99 | 10.149 | 1.453 | 416 | .417 |
| Male | 169 | 2.80 | 1.12 | | | | |

p<.05

An independent samples t-test has been conducted to determine whether there is a significant difference between female and male participants in terms of the 'Four Skills' criterion of the CEFR. As p>.05 (p=.417), there is no significant difference between genders.

## 4.9. Tables of the 'Being Multi-Purposed' Criterion of the CEFR

**Table 75: Frequency Table of the 'Being Multi-Purposed' Criterion of the CEFR**

| Answers | f | % |
|-----------|-----|------|
| Disagree | 73 | 17.5 |
| Undecided | 127 | 30.3 |
| Agree | 218 | 52.2 |
| TOTAL | 418 | 100% |

While the percentage of participants, among total number of participants (N=418), who disagree on the idea that the coursebook is appropriate for the 'Being Multi-Purposed' criterion of the CEFR is 17.5% (N=73), the percentage of participants who are undecided on the idea that the coursebook is appropriate for the 'Being Multi-Purposed' criterion of the CEFR is 30.3% (N=127) and the percentage of participants who agree on the idea that the coursebook is appropriate for the 'Being Multi-Purposed' criterion of the CEFR is 52.2% (N=218). As Cameron (2001) points out, children are enthusiastic and lively. Lots of visual and audial materials have been used in the coursebook to activate their motivation, to increase their self-esteem levels and to decrease their anxiety levels. From an interactionist point of view, the coursebook promotes children it interact one another.

In order to see whether there is a meaningful significance in terms of regions, educational background and teaching experience of the participants, ANOVA and POST HOC analyses have been given below.

**Table 76: Total Test Score Differences Between the Criterion of 'Being Multi-Purposed' and Seven Regions**

| CEFR Criterion | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Being Multi-Purposed | Between Groups | 1.377 | 6 | .229 | .314 | .930 |
| | Within Groups | 300.774 | 411 | .732 | | |
| | Total | 302.151 | 417 | | | |

p<.05

It is seen in the ANOVA table that there is no significant difference between the criterion of Being Multi-Purposed and region where the participants have been working as F=.31, p>.05.

**Table 77: Total Test Score Differences Between the Criterion of 'Being Multi-Purposed' and Educational Background of the Teachers**

| CEFR Criterion | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Being Multi-Purposed | Between Groups | .748 | 3 | .249 | .343 | .795 |
| | Within Groups | 301.403 | 414 | .728 | | |
| | Total | 302.151 | 417 | | | |

p<.05

It is seen in the ANOVA table that there is no significant difference between the criterion of Being Multi-Purposed and educational background of participants as F=.34, p>.05.

**Table 78: Total Test Score Differences Between the Criterion of 'Being Multi-Purposed' and Teaching Experience of the Teachers**

| CEFR Criterion | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Being Multi-Purposed | Between Groups | 4.960 | 4 | 1.240 | 1.723 | .144 |
| | Within Groups | 297.190 | 413 | .720 | | |
| | Total | 302.151 | 417 | | | |

p<.05

It is seen in the ANOVA table that there is no significant difference between the criterion of Being Multi-Purposed and teaching experience of participants as F=1.72, p>.05.

**Table 79: Independent t-test Results for Being Multi-Purposed**

| Gender | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | F | t | df | p |
|--------|-----|------|----------------|------|-------|-----|------|
| Female | 249 | 3.42 | .87 | .773 | 1.527 | 416 | .128 |
| Male | 169 | 3.29 | .81 | | | | |

p<.05

An independent samples t-test has been conducted to determine whether there is a significant difference between female and male participants in terms of the 'Being Multi-Purposed' criterion of the CEFR. As p>.05 (p=.128), there is no significant difference between genders.

## 4.10. Tables of 'Transparency' Criterion of the CEFR

**Table 80: Frequency Table of the 'Transparency'Criterion of the CEFR**

| Answers | f | % |
|---------|-----|------|
| Disagree | 141 | 33.9 |
| Undecided | 94 | 22.5 |
| Agree | 183 | 43.6 |
| TOTAL | 418 | 100% |

While the percentage of participants, among total number of participants (N=418), who disagree on the idea that the coursebook is appropriate for the 'Transparency' criterion of the CEFR is 33.9% (N=141), the percentage of participants who are undecided on the idea that the coursebook is appropriate for the 'Transparency'' criterion of the CEFR is 22.5% (N=94) and the percentage of participants who agree on the idea that the coursebook is appropriate for the 'Transparency' criterion of the CEFR is 43.6% (N=183). The topics in the coursebook is designed from the familiar to the unfamiliar and cognate words have been used as a starting point (e.g., doctor, zebra, gorilla) in order to provide children to understand topics and instructions easily. The coursebook possesses media, cultural artifacts and people as much as possible to contextualize the lessons and to keep students'interest alive.

**Table 81: Descriptive Results of Total Scores for 'Transparency'**

| CEFR Criterion | Region | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|----------------|--------|-----|------|----------------|
| Transparency | Marmara | 59 | 3.30 | .78244 |
| | Black Sea | 53 | 2.97 | .95784 |
| | Eastern Anatolia | 75 | 3.03 | 1.00113 |
| | Southeastern Anatolia | 63 | 2.95 | 1.00288 |
| | Mediterranean | 66 | 3.36 | .99825 |
| | Aegean | 55 | 2.93 | 1.02025 |
| | Central Anatolia | 47 | 2.94 | .98144 |
| | Total | 418 | 3.08 | .97621 |

**Table 82: Total Test Score Differences Between the Criterion of 'Transparency' and Seven Regions in Turkey**

| CEFR Criterion | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Transparency | Between Groups | 12.365 | 6 | 2.061 | 2.200 | .042 |
| | Within Groups | 385.030 | 411 | .937 | | |
| | Total | 397.395 | 417 | | | |

p<.05

It is seen in the ANOVA table that there is significant difference between the criterion of transparency and region where the participants have been working as F=2.20, p<.05. Type of region, where the participants have been working has been compared with one another in order to determine where the difference is.

**Table 83: Post Hoc Table for 'Transparency' According to the Seven Regions in Turkey**

| CEFR Criterion | (I) Region | (J) Region | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Transparency | Marmara | Black Sea | -3.66677 | .36635 | .035* |
| | | Eastern Anatolia | .54350 | .33686 | .674 |
| | | Southeastern Anatolia | .70541 | .35070 | .409 |
| | | Mediterranean | -.11710 | .34683 | 1.000 |
| | | Aegean | .75562 | .36283 | .365 |
| | | Central Anatolia | .73783 | .37847 | .449 |

p<.05

According to Post Hoc comparisons using the Scheffé; the significant difference between the Marmara region and the Black Sea region is on behalf of the Marmara region as the mean score of the Marmara region (X=3.30) is higher than that ofthe Eastern Black Sea region (X=2.97).

**Table 84: Total Test Score Differences Between the Criterion of 'Transparency' and Educational Background of the Teachers**

| CEFR Criterion | | Sum ofSquares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Transparency | Between Groups | 1.921 | 3 | .640 | .670 | .571 |
| | Within Groups | 395.473 | 414 | .955 | | |
| | Total | 397.395 | 417 | | | |

p<.05

It is seen in the ANOVA table that there is no significant difference between the criterion of Transparency and educational background of participants as F=.67, p>.05.

**Table 85: Total Test Score Differences Between the Criterion of 'Transparency' and Teaching Experience of the Teachers**

| | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Transparency | Between Groups | 3.413 | 4 | .853 | .895 | .467 |
| | Within Groups | 393.981 | 413 | .954 | | |
| | Total | 397.395 | 417 | | | |

p<.05

It is seen in the ANOVA table that there is no significant difference between the criterion of Transparency and teaching experience of participants as F=.89, p>.05.

**Table 86: Independent t-test Results for Transparency**

| Gender | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | F | t | df | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Female | 249 | 3.04 | .96 | 1.397 | -.884 | 416 | .377 |
| Male | 169 | 3.13 | 1.00 | | | | |

p<.05

An independent-samples t-test has been conducted to determine whether there is a significant difference between female and male participants in terms of the 'Transparency' criterion of the CEFR. As p>.05 (p=.377), there is no significant difference between genders.

# CHAPTER FIVE

# CONCLUSION

## a.     Concluding Remarks

The CEFR, which was developed by the Council of Europe (CoE) as a result of over 40 years of work on modern languages, is intended to overcome the barriers to communication among Europeans through setting some standards to teaching, learning and assessment of European languages (Council of Europe, 2001). Since 2002, the MoNE has been trying hard to adopt some principles of the CEFR. It is stated in the latest version of English language teaching programme that the criteria of the CEFR have adopted the developmental process of the curriculum for the 2nd graders. In this sense, the coursebook materials are required to be analyzed.

In this study, the coursebook *I Know English*, published in 2015 by the Ministry of National Education in Turkey (MoNE), embraces 8 out of 10criteria of the CEFR, which are *Comprehensiveness, Convenience to Learning and Teaching Methods, Assessment and Evaluation, Convenience to Student Level, Determination of Needs, Four Skills, Being Multi-Purposed and Transparency*. Whereas, *Coherence* and *Convenience to Teaching Program* criteria have been thought not to be appropriate fort the CEFR by the participants.  53.5% of the participants assert that the coursebook is Comprehensive; 39.5% of the teachers claim that the coursebook is Convenient to Learning and Teaching Methods; 64.6% of the teachers postulate that the coursebook is not Coherent; 37.4% of the teachers point out that the coursebook is not Convenient to Teaching Program; 37.1% think that the coursebook is appropriate for Assessment and Evaluation Criterion of the CEFR; 42.8% say that the coursebook is Convenient to Students' Proficiency Level; 50.8% of the teachers mention that the coursebook is appropriate for the Needs ofthe children; 43.3% of the teachers reveal that the coursebook promotes Four Skills; 52.2% of the teachers designate that the coursebook is Multi-Purposed and 43.6% of them refer that the coursebook is Transparent.

In the study, the following four variables have been checked whether they have any affect on the answers of the teachers: Regions where the teachers have been working, Educational Background of the teachers, Teaching Experience of the teachers and Gender. Firstly, a significant difference has been detected in terms of

the regions for the criteria of Coherence, Convenience to Teaching Program, Convenience to Student Level, Determination of Needs, Four Skills and Transparency, since all these criteria are at the level of $p<.05$. On the other hand, there is not a meaningful significance in the criteria of Comprehensiveness, Convenience to Learning and Teaching Methods, Assessment and Evaluation and Being Multi-Purposed at the level of $p>.05$. Thus, the coursebook shows differences according to the seven regions in Turkey. Secondly, it can be said that Educational Background of the teachers is seen not to be so affective on the answers of the teachers. A significant difference can be detected only in three criteria-Comprehensiveness, Convenience to Student Level and Determination of Needs- as $p<.05$. Accordingly, the type of the faculty from which the teachers graduated does not lead to any difference. Thirdly, Teaching Experience of the teachers does not have a meaningful significance as $p<.05$ in all criteria. And finally, according to gender, there is a meaningful significance in the Criterion of Learning and Teaching Methods as $p=.031$ and in the criterion of Convenience to Teaching Program as $p=.001$, which is highly significant. There is not any meaningful significance in the other eight criteria. Therefore, it can be claimed that gender of the teacher cannot be so significant.

The analysis of the coursebook in terms of the principles of the CEFR shows that the coursebook does promote plurilingualism as well as pluriculturalism. It provides activities related to the culture of the target language. Therefore, the coursebook seems satisfactory for plurilingualism and pluriculturalism.

A detailed analysis of the activities shows most of the activities or topics are compatible with the A1 level of the CEFR. Furthermore, there is an unequal distribution among activities that match with the objectives of the teaching program of the MoNE. Listening and speaking skills surpass reading and writing. Finally, although the coursebook provides numerous activities, the types of the activities are not varied as they ignore the second language acquisition theories. However, the coursebook can be said to be suitable for the A1 level and reflects the principles of the CEFR.

**b.    Suggestions for Further Studies**

Considering the aims and limitation of this study, some suggestions are offered for further studies. A similar study should be carried out for all other grades

in Turkey. Besides, the coursebooks that are still used should be analysed in terms of the critera and gains of the the CEFR, and they should be also chosen and used according to the learners' proficiency level. It is also suggested that how the current curriculum is applied in classrooms be investigated so that strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum can be identified. In addition, since the CEFR is adopted in the curriculum, teachers' opinions on the CEFR should be checked and the number and the quality of in-service education programs about the CEFR should be increased. Moreover, the CEFR should be offered as courses in pre-service English language teacher education programs.

Children's developmental processes, such as cognitive, linguistic and psychologic should be taken into consideration in teaching English. A coursebook for children cannot be beyond their level of language, their world and their interests. In the books, learner autonomy, to whom the Council of Europe gives high priority, should be developed.

On the other hand, teachers' opinions about the coursebooks should be periodically investigated, since they are the ones who use them most frequently. Besides, language teachers should motivate young learners to the use of English outside the classroom through tasks for portfpolio to be assessed. Last but not least, an effectiveness of the English courses should be studied from a practical perspective in relation to the theory and content related to the CEFR, and the curriculum.

# REFERENCES

Adalı, O. (2003). *Türkiye Türkçesinde Biçimbirimler.* İstanbul: Papatya Yayıncılık.

Alptekin, C. &Tatar, S. (2011). *Research on foreign language teaching and learning in Turkey (2005–2009).* Language Teaching, 44, pp 328-353    doi: 10.1017/S026144481100005X

Anşin, S. (2006). *Çocuklara yabancı dil öğretimi.* D.Ü.Ziya Gökalp Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 6, 9-20.

Arıkan, A. (2012). *Writing in Teaching English to young learners: An activity-based guide for prospective teachers.* Ankara: Norrsken Ltd. Şti.

Aslan, N. (2008). *Dünyada erken yaşta yabancı dil öğretimi uygulamaları ve Türkiye'deki durum.* Çukurova Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 35(3), 1-9.

Ataç, B. A. (2008). *Özgün Değerlendirme Tekniği Bağlamında Avrupa Dil Gelişim Dosyası Uygulamalarının Okuma Becerisine Etkisi.* Unpublished Ph. D. Thesis, Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Başkan, Ö. (2006). *Yabancı Dil Öğretimi İlkeler ve Çözümler*. İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi.

Balçıkanlı, C. (2008). *Learner autonomy (la) in EFL settings - İngilizce'nin yabancı dil olarak öğrenildiği ortamlarda öğrenen özerkliği.* Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi , 28 (3):1-16.

Benson, P. (2007). *Autonomy in language teaching and learning.* Language Teaching, 40(1): 21-40.

Brewster, J., Ellis, G. & Girard, D. (2004). *The primary English teacher's guide* (New Edition). England: Pearson Education Limited.

Brown, H. D. (2007a). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language     Pedagogy.* (3rd ed).White Plains, NY: Pearson Education Inc.

Brown, H. D. (2007b). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching.* (5th ed).White Plains, NY: Pearson Education Inc.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2016). *Sosyal Bilimler İçin Veri Analizi El Kitabı* (22.Baskı). Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık.

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E. K., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş. ve Demirel, F. (2016). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* (20. baskı). Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık.

Cameron, L. (2001). *Teaching languages to young learners*. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). *Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing.* Applied linguistics. *1*, 1-47.

Chengxing, L. (2005). *Factors affecting listening comprehension and strategies for listening class.*CELEA Journal (Bimonthly) 28(3), 113-115. www.celea.org.cn/teic/61/61-113.pdf.

Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic structures.* The Hague: Mouton.

Chomsky, N.(1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Cihan, N. (2001). *Erken Yasta Çok Dillilik ve Yabancı Dil*. Unpublished M.A. thesis, İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Council of Europe (CoE), *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learnıng, Teaching, Assessment,* Strasbourg: Language Policy Unit, 2001.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches.* 2nd Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Crocker, L., & Algina, J. (1986). *Introduction to classical and modern test theory.* Fort Worth: Holt, Rinehart and Wiston Inc.

Cunningsworth, A. (1995). *Choosing your coursebook.* Oxford, UK: MacMillan Education.

Curtain, H. & Dahlberg, C. A. (2010). *Languages and children: making the match.* Boston: Pearson.

Çakır, İ. (2004). *Designing activities for young learners in EFL classrooms.* Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 24(3), 101-112.

Çakır, İ. (2007). *Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Yabancı Dil Öğretimi Süreci.*Nüsha, Journal of Oriental Studies, (24) 38-40, Ankara.

Çıngı, H. (1994). *Örnekleme kuramı.* Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Basımevi.

Demirel, Ö. (1990). *Yabancı dil öğretmenlerinin yeterlikleri.* Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, (5)133-165.

Demirel, Ö. (2005). *Avrupa Konseyi Dil Projesi ve Türkiye Uygulaması.* Milli Eğitim Üç Aylık Eğitim ve Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi. Sayı: 167.

Demirel, Ö. (2010); *Eğitimde Program Geliştirme.* Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayınları.

Demirel, Ö. (2014). *Yabancı Dil Öğretimi.* Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayınları.

Demirezen, M. (2003). *Yabancı dil ve anadil öğreniminde kritik dönemler.* Dil Dergisi, 118, 5-15.

Dilaçar, A. (1968). *Dil, Diller ve Dilcilik.* Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları. Sayı 2639: 70, Ankara.

Doyé, P. ve Hurrell, A. (EDs). (1997). Foreign language learning in primary schools. Strasbourg: The Council of Europe.

DPT. (2004). *Bölgesel Gelişme Çalışma Grubu Raporu.* Türkiye İktisat Kongresi s2. http: //ekutup.dpt.gov.tr/ekonomi/tik2004/cilt14.pdf.

Ellis, G. (2004). *Developing intercultural competence with children in the English language class.* Tresholds, 1, 14-17.

Ellis, R. (2001). *Second Language Acquisition.* Oxford University Press: Hong Kong.

Elyıldırım, S., & Ashton-Hay, S. (2006). *Creating positive attitudes towards English as a foreign language.* English Teaching Forum, 44(4). Retrieved from http://eprints.qut.edu.au/12256/

Er, K. O. (2006). *Evaluation of English Curricula in 4th and 5th Grade.* Ankara University, Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences , 39 (2):1-25.

Erginer, A. (2009).*Avrupa Birliği Eğitim Sistemleri: Türkiye Eğitim Sistemiyle Karşılaştırmalar.* Pegem Akademi Yayınları, Ankara.

Ergün, M. ve Özsüer, S. (2006). *Vygotsky'nin Yeniden Degerlendirilmesi.* Afyon Karahisar Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 2: 269–292.

Frankel, J. R., & Wallen, N.E. (2006). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York: McGraw-Hill International Edition.

Gass, S. M., & Selinker, L. (2001). *Second Language Acquisition: An Introductory Course* (3rd ed). Madison Ave, New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Gedikoğlu, T. (2005). *Avrupa Birliği Sürecinde Türk Eğitim Sistemi: Sorunlar ve Çözüm Önerileri.* Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, Cilt 1,Sayı 1, Haziran 2005, ss. 66-80.

Glover, P. (2011). *Using CEFR level descriptors to raise university students' awareness of their speaking skills.* Language Awareness: 20:2, 121-133, DOI: 10.1080/09658416.2011.555556.

Gordon, T. (2007). *Teaching young children a second language*. USA: Praeger Publisher.

Gündoğdu, M. (2005). *Avrupa Birliği Yolunda Türkiye˝nin Yabancı Dil Politikası.* Çukurova Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi. 2(29) 120-127.

Gültekin, M., ve Anagün, Ş. S. (2006). *Avrupa Birliğinin Eğitimde Kaliteyi Belirleyici Alan ve Göstergeleri Açısından Türk Eğitim SistemininDurumu.* Sosyal Bilgiler Dergisi, 2: 145-170.

Gürgen, İ. (2008). *Türkçe Öğretimi*. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Hale, S. L., & Cunningham, S. A. (2011). *Evidence based practice using a thematic based unit for languagedevelopment.* Paper presented at the Texas Hearing Speech Language Association (TSHA) AnnualConvention, Houston, TX.

Halliwell, S. (1992). *Teaching English in the primary classroom*. Essex, UK: Longman.

Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching* (4.Edn) Harlow: Pearson Longman Limited.

Heyworth, F. (2006). *The Common European Framework.* Retrieved at 2014 from http://eltj.oxfordjournals.org

Hymes, D. H. (1972). *On communicative competence.* In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), Sociolinguistics: Selected readings (Part 2, pp. 269-293).

Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.

İşeri, K. (1999). *Dilin kazanımı ve yabancı dil öğretimi.* Retrieved at 16.04.2009 from http://host.nigde.edu.tr/kiseri/makaleler/dilinkazanimi.pdf.

İşisağ, K. U. (2008). *Sözlü İletişim Becerilerinin Gelişiminde Diller İçin Avrupa Ortak Başvuru Metni Uygulamalarının Başarıya, Tutuma ve Kalıcılığa Etkisi.* (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü).

Johnson, J. S., & Newport, E. L. (1989). *Critical period effects in second language learning: The influence of maturational state on the acquisition of English as a second language.* Cognitive Psychology, 21, 60-99.

Karababa, C. (2005). *Avrupa'da anadili öğretimi, (Türkçe ve İngilizce anadili ders kitaplarının incelenmesi ve karşılaştırılması).*Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Dergisi, Sayı 167.

Karasar, N. (2012). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi* (23. baskı). Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Katsuyama, H., Nishigaki, C., & Wang, J. (2008). *The effectiveness of English teaching in Japanese elementary schools: Measured by proficiency tests administered to seventh-year students.* RELC Journal, 39(3), 359-80.

Kavcar, C., Oğuzkan, F. ve Sever, S. (1999). *Türkçe Öğretimi.* Ankara: Engin Yayınları.

Krashen, S. (1982a). *Second language acquisition and second language learning.* New York, NY: Prentice Hall.

Krashen, S. (1982b). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition.* Oxford: Pergamon.

Krashen, S. 1985. *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications.* London: Longman.

Krashen, S. D., & Terrell, T. D. (2000). *The natural approach.* England: Pearson Education Limited.

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Anderson, M. (2011). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (3rd ed.).London, England: Oxford University Press.

Leedy, P. & Ormrod, J. (2001). *Practical research: Planning and design* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Lenneberg, E. (1967). *Biological foundations of language.* New York: Wiley and Sons.

Liao, D. (2004). *Children's EFL motivation: An investigation of 7-12 year old students in training schools in China.* Unpublished M.A. thesis, Edith Cowan University, Western Australia.

Lightbown, P. M. & Spada, N. (2006). *How Languages are Learned.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Little, D. (2007). *Language learner autonomy: some fundamental considerations revisited.* Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching. 1(1):14-29.

Little, D. (2012). *The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, the European Language Portfolio, and language learning in higher education.*

MEB. (2013). *İlköğretimKurumları İngilizce dersi (2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 ve 8. sınıflar) öğretim programı.* Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Talim ve Terbiye Kurulu Başkanlığı, 2013.

Mitchell, R., Myles, F., & Mardsen, E.(2013). *Second Language Learning Theories* (3rd ed). New York: Routledge.

Moon, J. (2000). *Children learning English.* Oxford: Macmillan Heinemann.

Murcia, M.C. (Ed.). (2004). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language.* (4th ed.). Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Nikolov, M. (1999). *'Why do you learn English?' 'Because the teacher is short.' A study of Hungarian children's foreign language learning motivation.* Language Teaching Research 3(1), 33-56.

Özbay, M. (2009). *Özel Öğretim Yöntemleri II. (2. Baskı).* Ankara: Öncü Basımevi.

Özdemir, S. (2005). *Eğitim Fakültelerinden Yeniden Yapılandırmanın Sonuçları ve Öğretmen Yetiştirme Sempozyumu.* Web: http:iogm.meb.gov.tr/files/EgtFakSempozyumS.OzdemirMETIN.doc

Phillips, S. (1993). *Young learners.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Piaget, J. (1971), *Structuralism.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

Pinter, A. 2006. *Teaching Young Language Learners.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative language teaching today.* New York, NY: Cambridge UniversityPress.

Robertson, A. K. (2008). *Etkili Dinleme,* (Çev. E. Sabri Yarmalı), İstanbul: Hayat Yayınları.

Robinson, P. (2003). *The Cognition hypothesis, task design, and adult task-based language learning.* Second Language Studies, 21(2), 45-105.

Rodriguez, T. A. (2001). *From the known to the unknown: Using cognates to teach English to Spanishspeaking literates.* Reading Teacher, 54(8), 744-746.

Savignon, S. (1983). *Communicative competence: Theory and classroom practice.* Reading, MA:Addison-Wesley.

Scott, W. A., & Ytreberg, L.H. (2001). *Teaching English to children* (14. ed). New York: Longman.

Sever, S. (2004). *Türkçe öğretimi ve tam öğrenme*. Ankara: Anı yayıncılık.

Shin, J. K., & Crandall, J. (2014). *Teaching young learners English: From theory to practice.* Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning&Heinle Cengage Learning.

Skinner, B. F. (1957). *Verbal Behavior.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Slatterly, M., & Willis, J. (2001). *English for primary teachers*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Soner, O. (2007). *Türkiye"de Yabancı Dil Eğitiminin Dünü Bugünü.* Marmara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi 7(28) 397-404.

Tok, H., & Arıbaş, S. (2008). *Avrupa Birliği'ne uyum sürecinde yabancı dil öğretimi.* İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 9(15): 205-227.

Trim, J. L. M. (2010). *The Modern Languages Programme of the Council of Europe as a background to the English Profile Programme.* English Profile Journal, 1, e2 doi: 10.1017/S2041536210000097.

Turgut, M. F. (1990). *Eğitimde ölçme ve değerlendirme metotları* (7. Baskı). Ankara: Saydam Matbaası.

Thomas, L. (1996). *Language as power: A linguistic critique of US English.* The Modern Language Journal, 80:129-140.

Vašková, V. (2008). *E-portfolio.* Brno: Masaryk University. 2-9.

Waks, L. J. (2007). *Listening and reflecting: an introduction to the special issue.* Learning Inquiry, 1(2), 83-87.

Widdowson, H. G. (1978). *Teaching language as communication.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilkie, H. (2001). *Writing, speaking and listening: the Essentials of business communication.* Oxford: Essentials.

Yalçın, A. (2002). *Türkçe öğretim yöntemleri.* Ankara: Akçağ.

Yangın, B. (2002). *Kuramdan Uygulamaya Türkçe Öğretimi.* Ankara: Dersal Yayıncılık.

Yapıcı, Ş. ve Yapıcı, M., (2006).*Çocukta bilişsel gelişim.* http://www.universitetoplum.org/text. php3?id=263

Yiğit, C. (2010). *Avrupa Diller için Ortak Başvuru Çerçevesi ile İlköğretim 6. Sınıf İngilizce Öğretim Programının Karşılaştırmalı Analizi.* Unpublished M.A. thesis, Gaziantep Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Gaziantep.

Yumuk, A. Ş. (2002). *Letting go of control to the learners: the role of the internet in promoting a more autonomous view of learning in an academic translation course.* Educational Research, 44(2):141-156.

Zhao, A.H.Q., & Morgan, C. (2004). *Consideration of age in L2 attainment-children, adolescents and adults.* Asian EFL Journal, 6(4). http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/december_04_ahqz_cm.php

# APPENDICES

# APPENDIX A

**APPROPRIATENESS OF THE SECOND GRADE ENGLISH COURSEBOOKS ACCORDING TO THE CRITERIA OF 'COMMON EUROPEAN FRAMEWORKOF REFERENCE FOR LANGUAGES (CEFR)'**

Dear participants,

This questionnaire has been prepared for the thesis entitled 'Evaluation of Second Grade English Coursebooks According to the Criteria of The CEFR' within English Language Master Programme at Ondokuz Mayıs University. Answers to the questions will only be used for the study and be confidential.

Thank you for your sincere contributions.

Emre AK

**A)** Female ( )　　　　　Male ( )

**B) How long have you been working as an English language teacher?**

0 to 5 years　　　　　( )

6 to 10 years　　　　 ( )

11 to 15 years　　　　( )

16 to 20 years　　　　( )

21 years and over　　 ( )

**C) Which faculty did you graduate from?**

Faculty of Education　 ( )

Sciences and Letters　 ( )

Translation　　　　　 ( )

Linguistics　　　　　 ( )

Other　　　　　　　 ( )

**D) Which city have you been working in?**

_____

**E) Have you ever attended a course/seminar/training etc. on the CEFR?**

Yes ( )

No ( )

**F) Which English coursebook do you use at second grade classes?**

I Know English (MEB)　 ( )

Sunshine (CEM OFSET) ( )

| | **Questions** | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Undecided | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Children can understand daily language in English. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2 | Children can introduce themselves to others in English. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3 | Children can give information in English about the place they live. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4 | Children can talk about their likes in English. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 | Children can talk about their dislikes in English. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6 | Children can express their possessions in English. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7 | Children can understand English conversations which are slow. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8 | Children can understand simple words they see in a visual (catalogue, poster, etc.) around. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9 | Children can understand simple sentences they see in a visual (catalogue, poster, etc.) around. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10 | Children can express themselves with simple words. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11 | Children can express themselves with simple sentences. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12 | Children can ask questions in English about something they know. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13 | Children can answer simple-structured questions about something they know. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14 | Children can write a celebration card (holiday, festival, etc.). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15 | Children can write short notes to someone. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16 | Children can fill a form about short personal information. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17 | Children can express themselves in English. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18 | Children can tell objects/things which belong to them. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19 | Children can tell their likes in English. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 20 | Topics in the book help children for language acquisition. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 21 | The coursebook takes the interest of children. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 22 | There are different types of exercises and activities in the coursebook. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 23 | The coursebook is prepared for multiple intelligences | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 24 | Individual differences of children are taken into consideration in the coursebook. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 25 | The coursebook is prepared for different learning styles. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| | Questions | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Undecided | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 26 | The coursebook is prepared for different teaching styles. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 27 | The coursebook is transparent. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 28 | The coursebook motivates to communicate with one another. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 29 | The coursebook motivates children's interaction to each other. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 30 | Children learn inductively. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 31 | A learned topic/word is repeated later. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 32 | The coursebook includes cultural elements of the target language. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 33 | I like the coursebook. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 34 | The coursebook is appropriate for A1 level of the CEFR. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 35 | Children can understand fluent conversations. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 36 | Children can answer complicated questions about something they know. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 37 | Children know the concept of abstract units. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 38 | Children can tell the place they live in a foreign language. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 39 | Children can understand fast English utterences. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 40 | Children can construct complex sentences. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 41 | Children can answer hard questions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 42 | Children can write letter, a long note, etc. to someone. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 43 | The coursebook has realistic objectives. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 44 | The coursebook has sustainable objectives. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 45 | The coursebook aims to develop children's comprehension competence. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 46 | The coursebook aims to develop children's production competence. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 47 | The coursebook gives priority to acquisition than learning for children. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 48 | The coursebook is compatible with children's needs that motivate them. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 49 | The coursebook can be a core for English teaching. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 50 | Children prepare portfolios after units or topics. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| | Questions | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Undecided | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 51 | Children are supposed to self-evaluate themselves. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 52 | I have sufficient knowledge about the CEFR. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 53 | I prepare materials that are compatible with the CEFR for children. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 54 | I can prepare lesson activities that are suitable for the CEFR. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 55 | I read the CEFR at least once. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 56 | The language used in coursebook is suitable for children's age level. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 57 | The language used in coursebook is suitable for children's language level. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 58 | The language used in coursebook is suitable for children's mother tongue level. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 59 | Exercises/Activities in the coursebook are suitable for children's level. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 60 | Topics in the coursebook are prepared according to children's interests. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 61 | Coursebook is prepared according to children's immediate needs. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 62 | Children can use what they learn in English courses in their daily lives. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 63 | Children love learning a foreign language. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 64 | Children learn English enthusiasticly. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 65 | Children are active in English lessons. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 66 | The coursebook aims to improve children's speaking skills. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 67 | The coursebook aims to improve children's reading skills. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 68 | The coursebook aims to improve children's writing skills. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 69 | The coursebook aims to improve children's listening skills. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 70 | Visual materials are used in the coursebook. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 71 | Audial materials are used in the coursebook. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 72 | Educational materials are used in the coursebook. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 73 | Elements of different culturesexist in the coursebook. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 74 | Children can understand instructions in the coursebook. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 75 | Exercises and activities are prepared comprehensively. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

# ÖZGEÇMİŞ

Emre AK, 29.11.1983 tarihinde Elazığ'da doğdu. Malatya Turgut Özal Anadolu Lisesi'ni bitirdikten sonra Atatürk Üniversitesi Kazım Karabekir Eğitim Fakültesi'nden 2005 yılında mezun oldu. 2016 yılında Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Ortak İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Yüksek Lisans programını bitirdi. Mezuniyetinden bu yana Araştırma Görevlisi olarak görev yapan Emre AK, iyi derecede İngilizce, orta derecede Almanca bilmektedir. Temel ilgi alanları yabancı dil, gezi-gözlem, tarih ve sosyoloji.

İletişim Bilgileri:
Email           : akemre2344@gmail.com
Telefon        : 0535 882 41 88