



Mirici, İ. H. & Kavaklı, N. (2017). Teaching the CEFR oriented practices effectively in the M.A. program of an ELT department in Turkey. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET)*, 4(1). 74-85.

<http://iojet.org/index.php/IOJET/article/view/159/151>

Received: 12.06.2016
Received in revised form: 11.12.2016
Accepted: 12.12.2016

TEACHING THE CEFR ORIENTED PRACTICES EFFECTIVELY IN THE M.A. PROGRAM OF AN ELT DEPARTMENT IN TURKEY

İsmail Hakkı MİRİCİ
Hacettepe University
hakkimirici@gmail.com

Nurdan KAVAKLI
Hacettepe University
nurdankavakli@gmail.com

Prof. Dr. İsmail Hakkı MİRİCİ is a full time academic at Hacettepe University ELT Department in Ankara, Turkey. He was also the elected President of the World Council for Curriculum and Instruction (WCCI), and the Founder of the WCCI Turkish Chapter. He has been lecturing at Turkish universities for about 28 years. He has about 20 books and 50 articles published. He has participated in the steering committees of several national and international education projects. His main fields of studies are English Language Teaching, and Curriculum and Instruction.

Nurdan KAVAKLI graduated from Dokuz Eylül University in 2010 from the Department of English Language Teaching. She is currently working as a research assistant and a Ph.D. candidate at the department of English Language Teaching in Hacettepe University. Her interests are language endangerment, language revitalization and CEFR-oriented language testing.

Copyright by Informascope. Material published and so copyrighted may not be published elsewhere without the written permission of IOJET.

TEACHING THE CEFR ORIENTED PRACTICES EFFECTIVELY IN THE M.A. PROGRAM OF AN ELT DEPARTMENT IN TURKEY¹

Ismail Hakkı Mirici

hakkimirici@gmail.com

Nurdan Kavaklı

nurdankavakli@gmail.com

Abstract

The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment (hereafter CEFR) and the related documents are the current realities of ELT professionals, mainly in Europe, as part of the practices in their field of study. Although it is labeled as “common” and “European”, the CEFR is an internationally recognized framework worldwide. In this sense, this study aims to uncover whether the CEFR and the other related European documents such as the European Language Portfolio (hereafter ELP), as a course in M.A. classes, have reflected certain degree of effectiveness in relation to students’ expectations. Herein, students’ self-reflection forms and achievement test-retest scores were analyzed. Accordingly, the mixed method laced with both qualitative and quantitative data was implemented. The learners’ test-retest scores as achievement criteria constituted the quantitative part of the study. On the other hand, the qualitative part was composed of the learners’ self-reflection forms for the course and discussion-based self-assessment reports. The results of the study revealed the fact that the CEFR as an M.A course was internalized better on condition that the lecture was followed by self-study, self-reflection, discussion-based self-assessment as a part of review process and test-retest practices respectively, when applied whole and complete.

Keywords: CEFR, European documents, M.A. classes, ELT department, course design, self-reflection.

1. Introduction

The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching and Assessment embraces the practices of composing language syllabi, creating guidelines for curricula, setting testing and assessment criteria, selecting and designing course materials, etc. on a common ground across Europe (CoE, 2001). Elaborating the descriptives for language learners, teachers and testers in a taxonomic nature, the Framework attributes language education to a life-long basis by all means from administrative to implementative bodies. With the intention of fostering cooperation amidst professionals who are working in the field of modern languages across Europe, the Framework provides mutual understanding and recognition of language education practices in different educational systems in Europe.

¹ This study was partly presented at GLOBELT2016 Conference, which was held in Antalya/Turkey between the dates of 14-17 April 2016.

Herein, the CEFR, as an internationally recognized framework, forms the basis of current practices for English Language Teaching (hereafter ELT) academic community, as well.

Accordingly, in this study it is intended to conceptualize the CEFR as a guideline for good practice in language education pampers its adoption into the curriculum. In addition, some other related common European tools for language education are taken into consideration as part of the CEFR oriented language education. Henceforth, as a part of M.A. programs in the ELT departments in Turkey, the CEFR as a course is probed within the scope of learners' expectations, learning outcomes and course achievement via self-study, self-reflection, and discussion-based self-assessment practices. In this sense, the effectiveness of the CEFR and the allied language education tools are aimed to be uncovered as the components of a post-graduate course. The content of the CEFR, the European Language Portfolio (hereafter ELP), the current curriculum of the ELT departments in Turkey altogether comprise the course content taken as a model- here the CEFR in M.A., the current international policy in ELT departments and some sample teaching strategies that are effective for the aforementioned course achievement are scrutinized.

1.1. Review of Literature

Concerning the objectives alleged by the Council of Europe (hereafter CoE) for the development of a pan-European community, the need for an international body which promotes intercultural understanding and linguistic diversity has mushroomed (Girard & Trim, 1998). Herein, with the aim of providing unity within educational and cultural matters throughout Europe, the CEFR was officially published in 2001 by the CoE. The CEFR is the general framework which highlights the common basis for language learning and teaching practices promoting learner autonomy, self-assessment and cultural diversity (North, 2000; Little, 2011). It also promotes transparency and coherence in the learning and teaching of modern languages within the scope of an action-oriented approach. Besides, the CEFR holds plurilingual and pluricultural competence as the summit of language learning outcomes; therefore, the Framework has been adopted by not only member states but also beyond Europe for foreign language instruction (Khalifa & French, 2008).

To elaborate, the CEFR offers six proficiency levels, namely A1, A2, B1, B2, C1 and C2. A levels are for the basic users whereas B levels are for the independent users. One more to add, C levels are for the proficient users of a foreign or second language. It also has plus levels of A2+, B1+ and B2+ (CoE, 2001). Providing a transparent and coherent basis for foreign language teaching and learning practices, the Framework facilitates educational mobility. Concordantly, the illustrative scales of 'can-do' descriptors are the indicatives of language competences to recognize learners' language qualifications. Within the Framework, the contexts, themes and tasks in use are also explained in detail within the scope of scaled descriptions.

In the light of these, the comparability amidst different countries is enhanced, albeit respect for various educational systems on a national-ground basis is enabled through these reference levels. For the implementation of the CEFR, some measurements are considered, though. These are named as general principles and specific measures. General principles are to be implemented by the authorities at national, local and regional levels to effectively adopt the objectives defined by the CEFR. Concerning the specific measures, authorities from aforementioned levels are expected to encourage the appropriate use of the Framework in cooperation with all stakeholders who are enrolled in language education.

Furthermore, the European Language Portfolio was developed as a corner stone for the coordination of language learning activities (CoE, 2011). Herein, Mirici (2015a: 2) states that the ELP enables learners "to monitor their own learning process on a life-long basis as

well as to develop respect for cultural identities and diversity”. Furthermore, Çelik (2013: 1873) notes that “the ELP serves as an ongoing record of language learning, encouraging learners to document their progress and providing space for self-assessment, as well as instructor feedback”. In the light of these, it can be stipulated that the ELP is the paramount resource for the accomplishment of the objectives defined by the CEFR. As one of the educational principles of the CEFR, autonomous learning can especially be promoted via such an effective and practical tool due to the fact that self-directed learning is a key factor in developing an understanding of the autonomous learning (Holec, 1981).

Notably, the ELP promotes the basic tenets of reflection, motivation and self-reflection. To attain these, the ELP makes use of its three components, namely the language passport, language biography and dossier. To elaborate, the language passport embraces learners’ knowledge of languages and experiences upon language learning processes. On the other hand, by means of language biography, learners are enabled to portray and ponder on their skills and knowledge. Finally, learners have the opportunity of recording and/or collecting their achievements via the dossier. Herein, it is to be noted that the self-assessment scales exploited by means of common reference levels are the pavements for the ELP. Therefore, the CEFR and ELP are thoroughly in interconnection.

1.2. Theoretical Background

Becoming a member state to the CoE in 1949, Turkish Republic aligned her educational principles and practices with those of its European counterparts, taking foreign language – primarily English- education as the core element (MoNE, 2005). Following the adoption of the CEFR in the early 2000s by the Turkish Ministry of National Education (hereafter MoNE), plurilingualism and pluriculturalism have been emphasized as the ultimate outcomes of foreign language learning (Mirici, 2008; 2015b). Correlatively, endorsement of links between European countries and dissemination of the CEFR standards beyond Europe are enabled. To add more, the Turkish adaptation of the ELP was designed following the 20th Standing Conference of European Ministers of Education held in Krakow, Poland between the dates of 15- 17 October 2000. Mirici (2008: 27) states that this conference was organized to “implement or create conditions favorable for the implementation and wise use of the ELP”. In this sense, the very first attempts to create the Turkish version of the ELP models were piloted within the boundaries of some private schools in Istanbul. However, as the main objective was to make it applicable by all language users, the final version for Turkish ELP models were developed for 10-14 and 15- 18 years of age groups and made available without any cost for all children at state schools via the Ministry website at <http://adp.meb.gov.tr>.

Concerning the practices of Turkey on language learning, the adoption of the Framework into the curriculum through exploitation is to be explained within the scope of its practicality by language learners and/or users in the classroom environment. Herein, language learning strategies that they apply during the language learning process is to be enlightened. Herein, language learning strategy, as a term, is defined as “... any sets of operations, steps, plans, routines used by the learner to facilitate the obtaining, storage, retrieval, and use of information.” (Wenden & Rubin, 1987: 19). Herein, Richards and Platt (1992) state that language learning strategies are composed of premeditated behaviors and/or thoughts which help learners to better understand and learn new information. According to Stern (1992), when learners consciously engage in activities, they direct themselves to certain goals to achieve by means of aforementioned strategies. Accordingly, it is a crystal clear fact that language learners apply these strategies while processing new information or performing tasks. This is, in essence, to find the easiest and shortest way to process new input and face task-difficulty in language learning environment.

Notably, researches in the field of language learning strategies date back to the 1960s. In this context, it is to be noted that with the arrival of cognitive psychology, the researchers have directed their ways to language learning strategies (Williams & Burden, 1997). Within the scope of language learning strategies, the vital point is to “identify what good language learners report they do to learn a second or foreign language, or, in some cases, are observed doing while learning a second or foreign language.” (Wenden & Rubin, 1987: 19). Accordingly, Aaron Carton penned ‘The Method of Inference in Foreign Language Study’ in 1966, which was accepted as the first attempt of publication in the field.

Following Carton, in 1971, Rubin focused on strategies exploited by successful learners so that less successful learners could also apply those kinds of strategies during language learning process. During this period, Rubin (1975) pointed out that strategies were made up of two processes, namely those contributing directly and those contributing indirectly to the process of language learning. Underpinned by the concept of language learning, the taxonomy of strategies was created by many scholars (Wenden & Rubin 1987; O’Malley et al., 1985; Oxford, 1990; Stern, 1992; Ellis, 1994, etc.). However, the most notable ones are mentioned briefly below assuming that the categorizations do not go through a radical change in what follows.

As a pioneer in the field of language learning strategies, Rubin (1987) classified strategies applied by learners, either directly or indirectly, into three as learning strategies, communication strategies and social strategies. Oxford’s (1990) classification of language learning strategies was composed of two main classes as direct and indirect, which later paved the way toward six subdivisions in total, each having three. To name, direct strategies were composed of memory, cognitive and compensation strategies. On the other hand, indirect strategies were composed of metacognitive, affective and social strategies. Moreover, O’Malley et al. (1985) divided language learning strategies into three main subcategories as metacognitive, cognitive and socio-affective strategies. One more to add, Stern’s (1992) classification of language learning strategies had five main concern as management and planning, cognitive, communicative-experiential, interpersonal and affective strategies.

In the light of these, this study also encompasses the learners’ strategy use while studying for the second achievement test. Accordingly, they wrote their own discussion-based self-assessment reports and self-reflection forms. During this period, they made use of learning, communication and social strategies defined by the classification of Rubin (1987). In this context, within the scope of learning strategies, learners exploited cognitive and metacognitive strategies. To elaborate, they applied clarification, deductive reasoning and inductive inferencing as a part of cognitive learning strategies laced with communication and social strategies to practice and discuss their knowledge while they were writing their discussion-based self-assessment reports. To add more, while writing their self-reflection forms, learners applied self-management and prioritizing skills to accomplish the goals previously set by course objectives as a part of metacognitive learning strategies. Additionally, they reported their self-direct language learning experiences within these forms, as well.

2. Methodology

Within the scope of this study, a non-experimental research utilizing mixed method was employed. Accordingly, the quantitative data was gathered by means of learners’ achievement test-retest scores of the related course. On the other hand, the qualitative part was composed of learners’ self-reflection forms for the related course and discussion-based self-assessment reports on it. In the light of these, aims of the study, instruments for data

collection and data analysis procedure were discussed below in detail as a path toward findings and discussion part.

2.1. Research Objectives

This study was conducted with the aim to uncover whether the CEFR as a course in M.A. classes reflected certain degree of effectiveness in relation to students' expectations and learning outcomes. In this context, answers to the following research questions were sought:

1. What are the learners' achievement test scores at the very beginning just after the course?
2. According to learners' discussion-based self-assessment reports, which key points are composed?
3. According to learners' self-reflection forms, how is the CEFR course defined and evaluated?
4. Is there a statistically significant difference between the learners' achievement scores after the test-retest implementation following these steps?

2.2. Participants and Setting

The participants of the current study included M.A. students recruited from the ELT department of a state university in Turkey. The participants all attended to the CEFR course during the 2015-2016 Fall Semester. To elaborate, the participants were composed of female students at the ratio of 83.3% ($n=10$), and male students at the ratio of 16.7% ($n=2$).

2.3. Measuring Instruments

With the aim to scrutinize the learners' achievement from the CEFR as a M.A. course, an achievement test was conducted twice: first, just after the course; and second, after the discussion-based self-assessment reports and the evaluation of the self-reflection forms. The aforementioned test was composed of three subparts. Accordingly, the first part was constituted by 30 multiple choice test items. The second part was constituted by 15 True-False test items. As a last step, the third part was constituted by 10 constructed response test items demanding for short-answers to the completion task. Herein, it was to be noted that any kind of problematic data entry was prevented by means of two raters, who were in action as controllers for the answer-check during the coding process.

As the same test was applied twice, test-retest implementation was considered to calculate internal consistency. In that, if a test was applied twice after certain period of time, correlation values between these two tests were to be taken as the reliability value. In this sense, the correlations between the test scores were adopted as the internal consistency value. As a need for the interpretation of non-parametric correlations, Spearman's rho was conducted with the estimation of .794 ($p = .002$).

To add more, learners' discussion-based self-assessment reports during the learning process and self-reflection forms at the end of the course were gathered to elicit the significant points in course achievement. Herein, discussion-based self-assessment reports as the facilitator of learning were marked just after the course achievement was assessed by means of a pre-test. Until the period at which learners were delivered the post-test, they were guided toward self-study and in-group discussions in tow. Additionally, it was to be noted that the perceptions of learners on the CEFR as a M.A. course were probed by means of self-reflection forms.

2.4. Data Collection and Analysis

The quantitative data gathered was analyzed by using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences Version 20. To measure participants' course achievement, the tests applied were taken into consideration as pre- and post-tests. As the sample group was restricted and normality was not enabled, non-parametric tests were conducted. Amidst them, Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test was applied to tackle the question whether there was a significant difference between the learners' test-retest scores after two implementations. All the numerical results were presented in tables.

On the other hand, the qualitative part was analyzed by means of thematic analysis to put forward perceptions of learners' on the CEFR course in a holistic way. Accordingly, two types of data entry were considered. The first part was composed of learners' discussion-based self-assessment reports, through which they could evaluate their own learning process. Besides, the second part was composed of learners' self-reflection forms, which were constituted by their perceptions of the CEFR as a course in M.A. program. The data gathered through these channels were coded by two raters independently to provide interrater reliability within. The coding was done regarding the consistency and relevancy between learners' reports named by the raters. During this process, the codes were appointed according to the concepts directed by the data. It was followed by the detection of similarities and differences between learners' statements within a thematic framework in order to stabilize relationships. As a last step, the system for thematic arrangement was precipitated in order to syllogize and explain the gatherings.

3. Findings and Discussion

As mentioned above, it is aimed within the scope of this study to uncover whether the CEFR, as a course in M.A. classes, has reflected certain degree of effectiveness in relation to students' expectations. In the light of these, the below mentioned research questions were answered, each in detail with the results highlighted by the data analysis procedure.

3.1. What are the learners' achievement test scores at the very beginning just after the course?

In order to find out the results of learners' achievement test scores at the very beginning just after the course following the instruction phase, descriptive statistics were applied. Accordingly, it was stipulated that learners' scores were ranked among 37 as the minimum score and 52 as the maximum score out of 55. Item by item analysis yielded the results that learners failed less within the multiple choice items ($M= 24.16/30$). However, they failed more within short-answer test item responses ($M= 7.83/10$) and true-false test item responses ($M= 11.83/15$) respectively. Additionally, the mean score was estimated as 45 ($SD= 4.03$), indicating the success rate of 81.96% as given in the table below:

Table 1. *Descriptives for pre-test scores*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pre-test	12	37.00	52.00	45.08	4.03

3.2. According to learners' discussion-based self-assessment reports, which key points are composed?

Following the implementation of the achievement test just after the instruction phase, learners were directed toward writing their own discussion-based self-assessment reports on the topics covered up to that time. Herein, learners were requested to make use of chapters

highlighted during the course. Taking the questions answered by the achievement test into account, the learners were expected to write their own reports after a short topic-discussion part. A week later, learners' discussion-based self-assessment reports were gathered. The thematic analysis conducted yielded that the topics covered, discussed and therefore reported were constituted by 7 basic components. After the thematic arrangement, these components were labeled by the raters as (i) background of the Framework; (ii) basic tenets of the Framework laced with methodological features; (iii) sub-components of the Framework; (iv) the fundamentals of language use defined by the Framework; (v) user competences targeted within the Framework; (vi) teaching and learning activities ranked; (vii) tasks in use by the Framework.

To elaborate each exclusively, background of the Framework embraced how the Framework was developed and molded by the CoE. Herein, the need for a common basis to promote pluriculturalism, international communication and European mobility was extensively touched upon. In the sequel, within the second component, methodological features were encompassed. Accordingly, the CEFR was noted as being action-oriented by taking learners as social agents during language teaching and learning process. To add more, the Framework with its principal dimensions of language activities, domains and competences was clarified. Within the third component, the levels namely A1 and A2 as basic users, B1 and B2 as independent users and C1 and C2 as independent users were defined one by one. These common reference levels were sculpted by the scales of proficiency which were depicted as user-oriented, assessor-oriented and constructor-oriented, as well. Each scale of proficiency and the cut-off points for each reference level were elaborated by the learners within this part.

For the fourth component, the fundamentals of language use were defined. Herein, domains, situations, conditions and constraints, learners'/interlocutors' mental context, communication themes, communicative tasks and purposes were touched upon. Domains were labeled as personal, public and occupational. Situations were explained within the limits of domain, namely persons, events, objects and places. Conditions and constraints were named either physical or social, such as the intelligibility of a hand-writing as physical, albeit social relations among learners as social conditions and constraints. Learners'/interlocutors' mental context was made up of the elements of state, intention, motivation and perception. Themes of communication and communicative tasks and/or purposes as the last fundamental were clarified within the scope of ludic and aesthetic use of language, or that of receptive and productive.

For the fifth component, user/learner competences which were targeted within the Framework were elaborated as general, communicative language and pragmatic competences. For the sixth component, teaching and learning activities ranked in the Framework were enlightened. Herein, particular and local needs, age and language proficiency levels, teachers' and learners' roles, and strategies adopted by learners were noted within the context of organization of the teaching and learning activities. As for the last component of tasks in use, various types of tasks were elaborated concerning the matter of cognitive and affective factors. Concordantly, some conditions and constraints were also stated such as time, goal, predictability, physical conditions and participants.

3.3. According to learners' self-reflection forms, how is the CEFR course defined and evaluated?

Learners' self-reflection forms were recruited to note how learners did define and evaluate the course. Herein, they were expected to write their forms individually within the limitation of 150-200 words. These self-reflection forms were the indicators of learners'

own learning experiences defined by their own words. In this sense, these were also kinds of feedback for themselves, the course and lecturer in tow. Some extracts from the learners' self-reflection forms in an abridged version were given below:

“Presentation of articles at the end of the semester was nice because I had the opportunity to see the different arguments and applications of the CEFR to the skills and I learned the important names for the CEFR and the ELP such as Alderson, Little and North.” (S.A.)

“We, as learners, have had a chance to involve in the course with our presentations, which has made us learn better. Apart from these benefits about the course content, our instructor has also created communication environment about our lives and world-view, which has been one of the parts of the lesson that has made me feel very happy and get motivated.” (Y.L.)

“I did take great pleasure during all of the presentations and discussions during the course. While conveying the lesson, professor's making discussions with M.A. students and his giving additional knowledge (or elaborating the highlighted/crucial issues) was helpful for me to understand the framework and the ELP better.” (E.K.)

As given above, learners did take delight in presentations through which they had chance to involve in individual classroom applications. These kinds of implementations enabled them to contextualize the topics and differentiate the views around the world. These general cultural studies within the scope of CEFR also led learners to have good grasp of cultural knowledge of the adoption of CEFR into the Turkish EFL context. Moreover, learners were content with the practices of discussion-based self-assessment and self-reflection. They claimed that applying written exams as an only remedy to define learner achievement was not that much didactic for themselves as stated below:

“I found pre and post self-assessment very beneficial because they made me revise the whole framework each time.” (C.Z.)

“Although the framework may be difficult for me to comprehend every single piece of information, theories, and viewpoints, I really like that we have a chance to learn them cooperatively. Also, the way we reflect on our learning through reflections instead of a merely written exam is really a good idea in that our lecturer wants us to learn effectively.” (G.S.)

Moreover, learners scrutinized the importance of lecturer's attitudes as an effective factor for achievement. Herein, they stated that positive attitudes of the course lecturer mushroomed as an agent for drawing learners' attention to the course content. As a professional in the field, the lecturer was respected both for his attitudes towards learners and pedagogical-content knowledge. It was also observed that the variation of techniques applied by the lecturer enabled them to better understand the topics covered during the course as below-mentioned:

“One more to add is coming for our lecturer's attitude towards us as well as his way of lecturing. He had such positive attitudes towards us that it was impossible to lose attention during the lectures.” (L.K.)

“I owe a huge thank to the lecturer of the course for his contributions to the course and his attitudes towards us as all these helped us a lot. It was just like having a guide who was also a model for us during the lessons.” (I.T.)

“The way our lecturer shared his knowledge and experiences with us was memorable.” (E.K.)

Holistically, it was observed that learners were pleased with the way lecturer chose. The topics were relevant and the coherence between the topics enabled learners to better internalize the course content. Moreover, learners were given opportunities to make presentations during the course. In this sense, they were involved in the course as active participants. As learning more about the CEFR, learners were also provided discussion-based activities in a communicative environment. Herein, the attitudes of the lecturer played an effective role as all of the self-reflections forms ended up with the kind behaviors and good-humored nature of the lecturer as a leading element of success.

3.4. Is there a statistically significant difference between the learners' achievement scores after the test-retest implementation following these steps?

The achievement test which was applied just after the instruction was applied again following learners' collaborative group works and individual self-study to create discussion-based self-assessment reports and self-reflection forms respectively. In this context, the estimated mean score for the second test was 49.83 out of 55 (SD= 3.21), indicating the success rate of 90.6%. Herein, the minimum score was calculated as 43 whereas that of maximum was calculated as 54. Correlatively, in order to find out whether there was a statistically significant difference between the learners' achievement scores after the test-retest implementation following these steps, as the data required the use of a non-parametric test in use, the Wilcoxon Signed-Ranks Test was conducted. Accordingly, the results indicated that there was a statistically significant difference between the scores of these two tests as the second test results were higher than those of first; $Z = -3.086$, $p < .05$ as given in the table below:

Table 2. *Wilcoxon signed-ranks test statistics^a*

	Test1- Test 2	Median
Z	-3.086 ^b	46.00
Assymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	50.50

^aWilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

^b Based on negative ranks

As seen above, the test-retest implementation indicated differentiated results for the second test. Accordingly, the results of the second test were higher than those of the first. Herein, it was stipulated that the applications conducted after the first test such as discussion-based self-assessment reports and self-reflection forms would surely help learners to have higher scores from the second test. It was to be noted that learners' strategy use during these activities also triggered success for the test-retest implementation. As learners were provided not only expository but also discovery learning environment, the success rate was blossomed as being much higher for the second implementation.

4. Conclusion

Within the scope of this study, it is aimed to reveal whether the CEFR oriented language teaching practices, as a course in M.A. classes, has reflected certain degree of effectiveness in relation to students' expectations. As mentioned above, learners' achievement scores from test-retest implementation are laced with their own discussion-based self-assessment reports and self-reflections forms. Herein, learners are provided different types of learning

environments in which they can make use of various learning strategies. Accordingly, below mentioned issues have proliferated.

It is to be noted beforehand that the CEFR is adopted by not only European countries but also others as it is an internationally recognized framework. In essence, it is the current reality of the ELT academic community. In this sense, the internalization of the Framework and the related European documents, especially by the professionals who are working in the field of English language teaching and the student-teachers who are studying at the department of English language teaching, occurs as a must more than a need. As the CEFR and the ELP are de facto the common basis for language teaching today, the CEFR oriented English language teaching practices as a course in M.A. programs in ELT departments has a significant role beneath.

In the light of these, in an expository learning environment, learners have been provided with lecture before first test implementation. To feed the learners' lacks, discovery learning environment has been created and laced with learners' discussions, presentations and reflections just before the second test implementation. In the end, it is concluded that the success rate is estimated as higher than the previous implementation. Herein, learners have applied learning strategies during these processes. To elaborate, learners have made use of clarification, inductive inferencing and deductive reasoning during discussions. While making presentations, they are monitoring themselves and others, as well. Besides, they have participated in conversations and practiced their knowledge together, indicating that communication and social strategies have been applied in tow. While completing their self-reflection forms, learners have applied metacognitive learning strategies by means of prioritizing and planning through self-management.

As a result, it is concluded that pure reception is not sufficient for the internalization of the CEFR as course content in M.A. programs in ELT departments. On the contrary, this study have revealed the fact that the CEFR oriented language teaching practices are internalized better on condition that the lecture is followed by self-study, self-reflection, discussion-based self-assessment as a part of review process and test-retest practices respectively, when applied whole and complete.

References

- Council of Europe (CoE). (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Council of Europe (CoE). (2011). *Intercultural experience and awareness: European language portfolio templates and resources language biography*. Strasbourg, France: Author.
- Çelik, S. (2013). *Plurilingualism, pluriculturalism, and the CEFR: Are Turkey's foreign language objectives reflected in classroom instruction?* *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70: 1872-1879. Proceedings of Akdeniz Language Studies Conference 2012. Retrieved from http://ac.els-cdn.com/S1877042813002668/1-s2.0-S1877042813002668-main.pdf?_tid=0aef02cc-eeca-11e5-a752-00000aab0f6b&acdnat=1458498903_f2bc42bd74b55979949a06355cecba2a.
- Ellis, R. (1984). *Classroom second language development*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Girard, D., & Trim, J. L. M. (Eds.). (1998). *Learning and teaching modern languages for communication: Final report of the project group (activities 1982-87)*. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe.
- Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy and foreign language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Khalifa, H., & French, A. (2008). *Aligning Cambridge ESOL examinations to the CEFR: Issues & Practice*. Paper presented at the 34th Annual Conference of the International Association for Educational Assessment, Cambridge, England.
- Little, D. (2011). *The European Language Portfolio: A guide to the planning, implementation and evaluation of whole-school projects*. Council of Europe Publishing: Strasbourg.
- Ministry of National Education (MoNE). (2005). Avrupa Konseyi dil projesi ve Türkiye uygulaması [Language project of European Council and application in Turkey]. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, [Journal of National Education], 33(167). Retrieved from http://dhgm.meb.gov.tr/yayimlar/dergiler/Milli_Egitim_Dergisi/167/index3-demirel.htm.
- Mirici, İ. H. (2008). Development and validation process of a European language portfolio model for young learners. *The Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education-TOJDE*, 9(2), 26-34.
- Mirici, İ. H. (2015a). Contemporary ELT practices across Europe. *International Journal of Language Academy- IJLA*, 3(4): 1-8. ISSN: 2342-0251.
- Mirici, İ. H. (2015b). European policy and practices in training foreign language teachers. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 30(4), ISSN: 1300- 5340.
- North, B. (2000). *The Development of a Common Framework Scale of Language Proficiency*. New York: Peter Lang.
- O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U., Stewner-Manzaneres, G., Russo, R. P., & Kupper, L. (1985). Learning strategy applications with students of English as a second language, *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 557-584.
- Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies: what every teacher should know*. New York: Newbury House Publishers.

- Richards, J., & Platt, J. (1992). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. Essex: Longman.
- Rubin, J. (1975). What the 'good language learner' can teach us? *TESOL Quarterly*, 9, 41-51.
- Rubin, J. (1987). *Learner strategies: theoretical assumptions, research history and typology*. In A. Wenden & J. Rubin (eds), 15-19.
- Stern, H. H. (1992). *Issues and options in language teaching*. Oxford: OUP.
- Wenden, A., & Rubin, J. (1987). *Learner strategies in language learning*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Williams, M., & Burden, R. L. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers: A social constructivist approach*. Cambridge: CUP.