An Investigation of Teaching-Learning Process and Measurement and Evaluation in Elementary English Course Curriculum with the Communicative Language Approach (Teachers' Views)[1]

İlköğretim İngilizce Dersi Öğretim Programının Öğrenme – Öğretme Süreci ve Değerlendirme Basamaklarının İletişimsel Dil Yaklaşımına Uygunluğunun İncelenmesi (Öğretmen Görüşleri)

Neşe KÖRHASANOĞULLARI[2], Bilge ÇAM AKTAŞ[3]

ABSTRACT: This study aimed to determine how teachers use the communicative language approach in the learning-teaching process and measurement-evaluation dimensions while implementing the 2018 Primary English Course (Grades 2-8) Curriculum. Embedded single case study design, one of the qualitative designs, was used in this study. The study group included 14 primary education English language teachers instructing different grades in public schools in Eskişehir, Turkey. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews with teachers and analyzed by content analysis. The findings demonstrated that communicative language approach could not be implemented in the classroom due to physical problems in the teaching-learning process, student reluctance and lack of readiness, teachers' initial failure to analyze the learner goals and styles, the lack of the predominant employment of the target language, partial inclusion of the activities determined by the communicative language approach in the course, preference of grammar instruction, partial utilization of group activities, the lack of using authentic materials, immediate correction of learner mistakes, inability to adopt the communicative language roles such as initialization of communication, providing resources and preference of traditional roles, and inability to measure the four basic language skills due to systemic measurement and evaluation errors.

Keywords: Primary education English language course curriculum, communicative language approach, teaching-learning process, measurement and evaluation.

---

[2] Teacher, Ministry Of National Education, Eskişehir/Türkiye, email: neseserbetci91@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-0098-4746
[3] Assoc. Prof. Dr., Anadolu University, Eskişehir / Türkiye, e-mail: bilgec@anadolu.edu.tr , ORCID: 0000-0002-2742-8184 (Corresponding Author)

ÖZ: Bu araştırmada öğretmenlerin 2018 İlköğretim İngilizce Dersi (2-8. Sınıflar) Öğretim Programı'nı uygularken öğrenme-öğretme süreci ve ölçme-değerlendirme boyutlarında iletişimsel dil yaklaşımına nasıl yer verdiklerini belirlemek amaçlanmıştır. Araştırma, nitel araştırma yöntemlerinden içiçe geçmiş tekli durum deseni ile yürütülmüştür. Araştırmanın çalışma grubunu, Eskişehir ilinde farklı sınıf düzeylerinde görev yapan 14 İngilizce öğretmeni oluşturmuştur. Öğretmenlerle gerçekleştirilen yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler yoluyla toplanan veriler, içerik analizi kullanılarak çözümlenmiştir. Araştırma sonuçlarına göre öğrenme-öğretme sürecinde fiziki yetersizlikler, öğrencilerin isteksizliği ve hazırbulunuşluk eksikliği, öğretmenlerin süreç başında öğrenen amaç ve stillerini analiz edecek çalışmalar yapmaması, süreç içerisinde hedef dili öncelikli kullanmaması, iletişimsel dil yaklaşımının öngördüğü etkinliklere derslerinde kısmen yer vermesi, dil bilgisi öğretimi yapmayı tercih etmesi, grup etkinliklerine kısmen yer vermesi, materyal tercihlerinde özgünlüğe dikkat etmemesi, öğrenen hatalarını hemen düzeltme yoluna gitmesi, iletişimsel dil yaklaşımının öngördüğü iletişimi başlatma, kaynak sağlama gibi rolleri benimsememesi ve geleneksel rolleri benimsemesi ve ölçme-değerlendirmede sistemsel hatalardan kaynaklı dört temel dil becerisinin ölçülememesi nedeniyle iletişimsel dil yaklaşımının sınıfa yansıtılamadığı bulgularına ulaşılmıştır.

Anahtar sözcükler: İlköğretim İngilizce dersi öğretim programı, iletişimsel dil yaklaşımı, öğrenme-öğretme süreci, ölçme-değerlendirme

1. INTRODUCTION

Due to the impact of globalization, the need to learn a foreign language has increased worldwide. As a result of this need, English has been instructed as a foreign language in Türkiye. English is accepted as the common global language of communication (Seidlhofer, 2005). Nearly 1 billion 750 million people speak English as a second language (Ekim, 2017). However, it is the third most common native language after Chinese and Spanish (Duffin, 2019). The prevalence of English among the world languages almost leads to a requirement to learn English.

The communicative language approach has been adopted as an effective method in instructional programs for several years. The approach emphasizes that curricula should also address the functional and communicative aspects of the language, and it is based on the theoretical studies of British scholars Henry Widdowson, Christopher Candlin, Christopher Brumfit and Keith Johnson (Soğuksu and Aslan, 2018). The theoretical framework of the communicative language approach is based on *communicative competence*. The concept was introduced by Hymes (1972), and was described as the knowledge of when, to whom and how to say something. In the communicative language approach, learners are expected to actively participate in learning the language and learn the language through mental processes, and trial and error (Brown, 2001; Brumfit, 1976; Richard and Rodgers, 2001). Language learning should include 'information gap' activities, role-playing activities that focus on communicating about a specific topic, and activities that aim to produce an outcome (Cook, 2001). These activities should be student-oriented and based on the functional use of the language in daily life (Berns, 1990). The concurrent development of the four basic language skills was recommended (Tomlinson, 2011) and the structural features of the language should be perceived via the activities mentioned above (Larsen – Freeman and Anderson, 2011). The use of the native language should be restricted to emphasize the communicative aspect of the target language, and the native language should be employed only when necessary (Brumfit, 1976; Demirel, 1987). Course material should include real-life objects that would initiate and sustain communications (Richard and Rodgers, 2001). As the teacher takes on the roles of guiding and initiating the communication, learners should also be active participants (Breen and Candlin, 1980). In the evaluation, various and mixed measurement methods that could measure the achievements in the target language with a holistic approach should be preferred (Ali and Farrell, 2001).

The communicative language approach was mentioned several times in the 2018 Primary Education English Language Course (Grades 2-8) Curriculum that was applied in public schools and developed by the Ministry of National Education (MEB). However, for an applied curriculum, the teaching-learning process and measurement and evaluation activities should also adopt the communicative language approach. Thus, it would be beneficial to obtain the feedback of the teachers with the practical experience in the effective employment of the approach.

In the literature, studies show that the communicative language approach is more effective in learning compared to the language training method (Ali, 2013); grammar translation method (Tayhani - Temizgöl, 2013; Temizöz, 2008); grammar-based method (Gücer Palalı, 2006) and traditional methods (Büyükkarcı, 2006; Şenel, 2021). Sevinç and Erişen (2021) also found that the extra curriculum designed according to the communicative language teaching approach led to a significant increase in students' English speaking skills. Şeker (2023), on the other hand, found in her master's study that English language teaching with the Reading and Storytelling method had a more positive effect on students' motivation than teaching with communicative language teaching. Türkben and Öncü Yiğit (2023) employed a combination of a communicative approach and an inverted classroom model in their study.

They observed that the activities they implemented increased student motivation, and decreased speech anxiety and fear in group work**.**

In the studies conducted in the literature, it was found that teachers had positive views towards the communicative language approach, but there were some problems such as lack of appropriate materials and equipment, few class hours, and lack of textbooks (Hurnutlu, 2011), weakness in teachers' English speaking skills, students' passive learning style, grammar-oriented exam system and lack of effective materials (Tanyer Çekirdekçi, 2023); some problems were found to be experienced in practice due to reasons such as crowded classes, traditional grammar-based exams and curricula, insufficient time for teachers to prepare communicative materials, insufficient use of authentic materials (Al- Asmari, 2015; Altınuç, 2012; Anani Sarab, Monfared, & Safarzadeh, 2016; Bal, 2006; Coşkun, 2011; Eveyik Aydın, 2003; Farooq, 2015; Karim, 2004; Mehmandoust, 2015; Özşevik, 2010).

Ardıç (2019) stated that communicative activities are used less in high school 9th grade English lessons, activities based on individual and group work are not included at a sufficient level, comprehensive topics are included in the content, mostly textbooks are used as teaching materials, and the communicative language approach is not implemented very well in the classrooms. Yeni Palabıyık (2021) also found that macro policy documents are based on the eclectic model and communicative approach in foreign language teaching, but transmissive teaching and learning styles dominate in-field practices.

As the studies mentioned above on the communicative language approach suggest, it can be said that although the approach has been successful in foreign language instruction, it may fail in practice due to various problems. Most of the studies were conducted before the 2018 curriculum change. It was considered that the present study would reveal significant findings about the adoption of the communicative language approach by the 2018 Primary Education English Language Course (Grades 2-8) Curriculum and the teachers. The functionality of the curriculum was anticipated based on the teacher's views. Similarly, the present study could raise awareness of and provide professional knowledge for English language teachers. It could be suggested that the study would be beneficial in resolving the problem associated with the ineffectiveness of the communicative language approach in practice.

1.1. The Aim of the Study

This study aimed to determine how teachers included the communicative language approach in the learning-teaching process and measurement-evaluation dimensions while applying the 2018 Primary Education English Language Course (2-8th Grades) Curriculum. For this purpose, answers to the following questions were sought:

1. How do teachers implement the communicative language approach in learning and teaching?

2. How do teachers implement the communicative language approach in measurement and evaluation?

2. METHOD

2.1. Research Model

The present study is designed as a qualitative case study. A case study aims to describe and analyze a current phenomenon in detail and with a holistic approach based on more than one evidence or data source (Merriam, 2009; Yin, 1984). In this study, the embedded single-case design was used. In this design, different subunits can be included in a state (Yin, 1984). In this study, the 2018 primary education (2-8th grade) English course curriculum was considered as a situation, the learning-teaching process and measurement–evaluation dimensions in the program were accepted as sub-units and the compatibility of these sub-dimensions with the communicative language approach was investigated.

2.2. Study Group

The study group included fourteen volunteer English language teachers working in primary and secondary schools in two districts in Eskişehir province in Turkey. Participants were selected using the convenience sampling method. The convenience sampling method aims to assign available and accessible individuals (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2002). Participants lectured their classes following the new curriculum during the research. The school types and the grade levels where the teachers lectured were asked. Verbal and written consent was obtained from the English language teachers for participation. Participant data are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. *Participant Data*

Participant	Gender	Age	Teaching experience	Graduation degree	Department of graduation	In-service training on revised curriculum or language instruction approaches	School location	School type
T1	Female	30	1-5	Undergraduate	American culture and literature	In-service training programs following the new curriculum	Central district	Secondary school
T2	Female	35	11-15	Undergraduate	English teacher education program	-	Central district	Secondary school
T3	Female	42	16-20	Undergraduate	Business and Administration	In-service training programs following the new curriculum	Neighborhood	Secondary school
T4	Female	30	6-10	Undergraduate	English teacher education program	In-service training programs following the new curriculum	Neighborhood	Secondary school
T5	Female	30	1-5	Undergraduate	English teacher education program	-	Neighborhood	Primary School - Secondary school
T6	Female	35	11-15	Graduate	English teacher education program	Language instruction approaches seminar	Central district	Secondary school

T7	Female	30	6-10	Undergraduate	English teacher education program	In-service training programs following the new curriculum	Central district	Secondary school
T8	Female	28	1-5	Undergraduate	English teacher education program	-	Neighborhood	Secondary school
T9	Female	27	1-5	Undergraduate	English teacher education program	-	Central district	Secondary school
T10	Female	26	1-5	Undergraduate	English teacher education program	-	Central district	Primary School
T11	Male	32	6-10	Undergraduate	English teacher education program	-	Neighborhood	Primary School
T12	Male	27	1-5	Undergraduate	English teacher education program	-	Neighborhood	Secondary school
T13	Female	30	6-10	Undergraduate	English teacher education program	In-service training programs following the new curriculum	Neighborhood	Primary School - Secondary school
T14	Female	43	1-5	Undergraduate	English teacher education program	In-service training programs following the new curriculum	Neighborhood	Primary School - Secondary school

Participants lectured primary education classes in the 2018-2019 academic year. Participants were twelve females and two males, and their teaching experience was predominantly 1-5 years. All participants but one had undergraduate degrees and were mostly graduates of the English teacher education program. The review of attendance in in-service training programs revealed that six teachers attended revised curriculum introduction seminars, and one teacher attended a seminar on language instruction approaches. It was seen that eight teachers worked in neighborhood schools and six teachers worked in district center schools, and the teachers lectured various grade levels.

2.3. Data Collection Tools

The data were collected with semi-structured interviews and demographic information forms administered separately. The demographic information forms included questions about the teachers (gender, age, seniority, graduation degree and department of graduation, in-service training, school location, and school type). The semi-structured interview form was developed by the authors. The opinions of six experts have been obtained for the questions in the interview form. Three of these experts specialize in curriculum and instruction, while one is an academician working in the field of English language teaching. The remaining two are English teachers working in primary schools. Based on the comments, the form was revised. To determine the clarity and comprehensibility of the questions and the average interview duration, pilot interviews were conducted with three English language teachers employed in primary education schools in Eskişehir city center. Then, the form was revised once more and finalized. Eleven open-ended questions were included in the interview form.

2.4. Data Collection and Analysis

The interviews were conducted in the schools where the participants worked. The interviews were recorded with an audio recorder. The interviews audio recorded lasted between 21 and 46 minutes.

The study data were analyzed via content analysis. Content analysis is a technique that could be employed to discover visual or hidden content in communication messages (Neuman, 2009). During the data analysis, initially, audio recordings of the interviews were transcribed. Then, these were digitized, and the study data were coded based on meaningful categories. Categories emerged from the data by researchers. Then, similar codes were brought combined to obtain themes. Both authors analyzed the data separately, and the codes and themes determined by both authors were then compared. The consistency of the analysis was based on one curriculum and instruction expert's opinion to ensure the credibility of the codes and the themes. Furthermore, the coding agreement coefficient among the authors was .83 based on the Miles and Huberman formula (1994, p. 64).

2.5. Trustworthiness and Transparency

In the context of the trustworthiness of the research the following measures were taken: long-term interaction with the English teacher, continuing the data collection process until data saturation was reached, consulting expert opinion in the creation of semi-structured interview forms, and conducting pilot interviews to check comprehensibility after the forms were created. Furthermore, the interviews were recorded and transcribed without any author intervention. Transferability was ensured by detailed data presentation that included direct quotes, and the inclusion of relevant participants.

In this study, research ethics principles were observed and necessary ethics committee permissions were obtained. Within the scope of ethics committee permission; the document numbered 14149 was received on 27.02.2019 from Anadolu University Social and Human Sciences Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Committee.

3. FINDINGS

To answer the first sub-research problem, the objective is to investigate how teachers implemented the communicative language approach while delivering the primary English curriculum in teaching and learning processes. As a result of the content analysis conducted within the scope of this sub-question, 14 main themes were determined. The main themes are shown in Table 2:

Table 2. *The Communicative Language Approach In In-Classroom Applications*

Learning-Teaching Process
Planning Principles
Identification of Student Interests
Target Language Use
Learning-Teaching Activities
The Differences Between Learning-Teaching Activities Based on the Participants
Factors that Affect Material Selection

Effective-Ineffective Applications

Error Correction Methods

Participation

Grammar Instruction

Teacher Roles and Attributes

Self-Perceived Strengths of the Teacher

Difficulties in Learning-Teaching

Reasons for the Failure in the Implementation of the Communicative Language Approach

As seen in Table 2, based on teacher views, 14 themes such as planning principles in the learning-teaching process, identification of student interests, target language use, learning-teaching activities, the differences between the learning-teaching activities based on the participants, the factors that affect material selection, effective-ineffective applications, error correction methods, participation, grammar instruction, teacher roles and attributes, teachers' self-perceived strengths, difficulties in learning-teaching, and the reasons for the failure in the implementation of the communicative language approach. The findings associated with these sub-themes are presented in the following sections.

3.1. Planning Principles

The analysis of the teachers' views on planning principles revealed the sub-themes presented in Table 3:

Table 3. *Planning Principles*

Motivation
Consideration of student requests
Association of Turkish with English
Elimination of bias
Student level
Curriculum

As seen in Table 3, six sub-themes were identified in the theme of the planning principles that the teachers prioritized in the course, namely motivation, consideration of student requests, association of Turkish with English, elimination of bias, student level, and curriculum. T1 stated that (s)he always considered student requests, but implemented these requests when the time was right, and maintained the instruction based on the syllabus:

> *For instance, the children request a game hour, or every class is already planned, for example, we have to play a word game after the instruction. They have to wait for the game time in the plan. When they say let us play, we do not play games. If it is lecture time, it is lecture time. Then, it is time for the game, etc.*

3.2. Identification of Student Interests

The analysis of teacher efforts to determine the student interests revealed the sub-themes presented in Table 4:

Table 4. *Identification Of Student Interests*

Consideration of Student Suggestions
Recognition of Student Interests
Conducting Unit and Topic-Appropriate Activities
Nothing

As seen in Table 4, while some of the teachers stated that they took into account the interests and wishes of the students or tried to recognize the interests of the students, others stated that they prioritized the unit/subject or did not do anything. T12 stated that (s)he did nothing to determine student interests before the activities:

> *Well, like I said, I do not actually prepare true false questions myself. I do not prefer it. I completely follow the system, but I conduct the activities since I start the activity directly as an activity. When the children still experience difficulties... For these activities, I actually do not prepare, but I identify the difficulties directly during the activity and then distribute extra activities for that purpose. For example, I assign homework, I have a working system. There, these are things that teachers share... In fact, what I do are things like exams. Then, I determine my path. So before that, I do not do anything.*

T9 mentioned that (s)he considered student suggestions to determine student interests:

> *I let them state their views. Well, how should we do it? How to learn the words? We identify the words together, most of them are in the book. Well, some say, for example, we can play games. Teacher, let us play a game. Let us try to explain the word. Let our friends guess, or teacher, let us draw a picture and explain it with a picture.*

3.3. Target Language Use

The sub-themes in Table 5 were determined based on the findings on the use of the target language by the teachers in the class.

Table 5. *Target Language Use*

Based on the class level
Native Language Dominant
Target Language Dominant
Equal Native Language and the Target Language Use

As seen in Table 5, the target language use theme findings included the sub-themes based on the class level, the employment of either the native or target language or the equal use of both. T3 stated that the native language was used more than the target language:

I benefit less than I should from the target language. We use the native language more. Because the level of attracting children's attention is very low in the foreign language course. When I explain something in English and allow them to try to understand it, they lose interest very quickly. Thus, I can say that I use my native language more than the target language.

3.4. Learning-Teaching Activities

The analysis of the activities conducted by the teachers in the class revealed the themes and sub-themes presented in Table 6.

Table 6. *Learning-Teaching Activities*

Purposive Language Use Activities
Real Life Situations
Simple Structures
Inability to Include
Communicative Activities
Speaking Hour
Question and Answer
Repetition of Sentences
Forming Sentences
Game Play
Role Play
Activities on Four Basic Language Skills
EBA Smartboard Activities
Grammar Activities
Vocabulary Activities
Book Activities
Repetition Activities
Drawing Attention

As seen in Table 6, the learning-teaching activities conducted by the teachers included nine themes such as purposive language use activities, communication activities, activities on four basic language skills, EBA smartboard activities, grammar activities, vocabulary activities, book activities, repetition activities, and drawing attention. T14 stated that they could not include purposive language use activities in the class due to the inadequate grammar knowledge of the students.

How much do I include? Not too much. So, unfortunately, I mentioned the children, that is, my own students, stating their needs. Inadequate. So, what do we do? How do you say a desk? How do you say a book? How do you say the weather is nice today? Unfortunately, we just teach this much. We cannot go much further. But sometimes such things are discussed, of course.

T7 stated that (s)he integrated communication activities such as games or competitions in the target language in the classroom:

I organize competitions. This is obviously very motivating. Winning the competition is very important for them. Other than that, sometimes I allow them to watch movies with English

subtitles as a reward. I halt the movie every now and then and ask questions. We also play fill-in the lyrics. In fact, I never show them the lyrics before, we just listen to the song. Of course, I pay attention to the fact that the song is related to the unit. We listen to the song. Then, if they have a hard time, I turn on the lyrics with spaces, which is very entertaining.

3.5. The Difference Between the Learning-Teaching Activities Based on the Participant

The analysis of the views of the teachers on the employment of individual or group activities in the learning-teaching process revealed the sub-themes presented in Table 7.

Table 7. *The Difference Between The Learning-Teaching Activities Based On The Participant*

Group
Individual

As seen in Table 7, the data on the number of participants in the activities revealed two separate themes: group or individual activities. T4 stated that students have different levels of self-expression skills, group work requires responsibility, and students do not have such an awareness:

I can say that I cannot actually conduct many group activities comfortably. I try to conduct individual activities more. Because the way each of them expresses themselves, especially since it is a distant language for them and they experience difficulties in the target language, I employ individual activities, I allow them to write something on their own, talk about something and write something on the board. I do not think they are very successful in group activities. Because even when I allow them to share a task, they do not take responsibility…

3.6. Factors that Affect Material Selection

Factors that affect material selection by the teachers are presented in Table 8.

Table 8. *Factors That Affect Material Selection*

Technological Facilities
Attractiveness
Grade
Real Life
Learner Styles
Learner Level
Economy
Teacher Attributes

As seen in Table 8, the factors that affected teachers' material preferences were categorized under eight themes as technological facilities, attractiveness, grade, real life, learner styles, learner level,

economy, and teacher attributes. T1 stated that the technological facilities available in the classroom were the most important factor in material selection:

> *First, the technological readiness of the school is a factor. And what does that mean? It means I need to buy all the materials and bring them to the class. Also, it is not possible for me to bring any technological material to the classroom, except for the speaker.*

T4 stated that similarity to real life was a factor in selecting the learning-teaching material, and the selection of such materials would support learning by doing and communication:

> *….I don't know, in this sense, visual content, videos, or movies in real life, I think these should be used as much as possible when available. I think that really tangible things should be selected as material, things that are available in real life, content that we can visualize, videos, and films should be used often.*

3.7. Effective-Ineffective Applications

The analysis of the teachers' views on the methods and techniques they considered effective or ineffective in the learning-teaching process revealed the sub-themes presented in Table 9.

Table 9. *Effective-Ineffective Applications*

Effective Applications
Personal Instruction
Forming Sentences
Translation
Activities that Include All Four Basic Language Skills
Instruction with Visuals
Games
Student-Centered Activities
Pairing
Lecturing
Ineffective Applications
Instructional Videos
Simple Instruction
Teacher-Centered Activities
Segmentation of the topics

As seen in Table 9, based on the teacher views, the methods and techniques they considered effective included 9 themes, namely personal instruction, forming sentences, translation, activities that include all four basic language skills, instruction with visuals, games, student-centered activities, pairing and lectures. The methods and techniques that the teachers considered ineffective included four themes: instructional videos, simple instruction, teacher-centered activities, and segmentation of the topics. T5 stated that the classes where the students are active contribute to learning, and the students are those who will speak the language:

> *I always focus on activities in my classes. You know, constructivist learning. The child is active in my class. I think this is effective. They will use the language. I already speak the language. Well, I try to make him use it and be active.*

T8 stated that instructional videos do not draw the attention of the students, and these videos are ineffective applications:

> *I tried something for a while. There were topical lectures on the EBA. There is a lecture by an English teacher. At one point, I changed my method and said, I wonder if I can instruct like that, you know, because it was both visual and it was the native language of the woman, I started to let them watch it, and when appropriate, we would stop and examine the sentences together. Then I realized that they did not like it. Even a few students said they did not like it, teacher, can you instruct us? When they said it would be better or something, after that, for example, I gave it up...*

3.8. Error Correction Methods

Themes associated with the methods teachers adopted in error correction are presented in Table 9.

Table 10. *Error Correction Methods*

Avoiding interventions
Correcting the pronunciation
Motivation
Self-correction
Emphasizing repetition
Asking a peer
Correction by the teacher

As seen in Table 9, the analysis of the teachers' views on the methods to correct learner mistakes revealed seven sub-themes: avoiding interventions, correction of pronunciation, motivation, self-correction, emphasizing repetition, asking a peer, and teacher correction. T7 stated that (s)he preferred to allow the students to ask their peers to correct the errors to prevent mislearning:

> *So, first of all, I try to see it completely. In other words, I expect him to tell me or write me what he thinks, and I do not interrupt. I try not to interfere at that moment. Later, I sometimes ask the class. Whether they see the errors. Then everyone's perception improves a little. I make them see it. In some topics, I make sure that not all of them see the mistake because this could lead to mislearning. Unfortunately. Due to the error. I mean, I try to correct them without demotivating them....*

T11 stated that the mistakes should be corrected immediately to prevent mislearning:

> *I correct every mistake. Yes. In other words, I often tell students how difficult mislearning would be, that is, how difficult it would be to correct after they learn. In case of an error, I provide immediate feedback stating that you need to say it like this or do it like that.*

3.9. Participation

The themes and sub-themes obtained with the analysis of the methods employed by the teachers to improve student participation in the class are presented in Table 11.

Table 11. *Participation*

Those who always participate
Personal discussion
Warning
Persuasive statements
Allowing them to explain what they know
Visuality
Diversification
Emphasis of the interests
Simplification, adjusting to the student level
Repetition
Compulsion
Peer support
Reminding the target
Reward
Participation in the activity

As seen in Table 11, the methods teachers adopted to improve student participation in classroom activities included fifteen sub-themes: those who always participate, personal discussion, warning, persuasive statements, allowing them to explain what they know, visuality, diversification, emphasis of the interests, simplification and adjusting to the student level, repetition, compulsory, peer support, reminding the target, reward, and participation in the activity. T10 mentioned that motivational words could help students participate in the class:

> *I continue with those who participate. I sometimes talk to them, you know, you will do this in the future, it will be useful, but they are a little affected by my speech. They start to get a little more involved.*

3.10. Grammar Instruction

The analysis of the teachers' views on the methods they employed in the instruction of grammar and the association of grammatical structures with four basic language skills revealed the sub-themes presented in Table 12:

Table 12. *Grammar Instruction*

Separate instruction
Relational instruction
No grammar instruction

As seen in Table 12, the grammar instruction data were analyzed in three sub-themes: separate instruction, relational instruction, and no grammar instruction. T3 stated that (s)he instructed the grammatical structures in the native language and associated them with the four basic language skills:

> *I do not instruct it as a separate course. Well, I try to use all as a whole. In the instruction of grammatical structures, first I explain it in the native language. Then, I instruct grammar in a way that would make them interpret it in English with association, I mean, not in the old-fashioned way, but by writing three or five sentences.*

3.11. Teacher Roles and Attributes

The themes of the roles adopted by the teachers are presented in Table 13.

Table 13. *Teacher Roles And Attributes*

Authority
Cheerful moderate
Entertaining
Participatory
Guide
Encouraging
Everything
Observer

As seen in Table 13, the roles and attributes adopted by the teachers were analyzed in eight themes: authority, cheerful, moderate, entertaining, participatory, guide, encouraging, everything, and observer. T3 stated that the students were bored from time to time, and (s)he adopted the role of an entertainer during these times:

> *Well, when I realize that they are bored, I try to play a motherly role and entertain them a little.*

T9 stated that (s)he often assumed the role of a guide in the class:

> *It varies based on the class. I mean, sometimes I think most of the time I am a guide, frankly. I mean, I prefer that they learn by themselves. Guide them. Let them discover by themselves. I do not know, when a vocabulary needs to be prepared, I let them do it together, let them find it, and let them learn the meaning of the words. Then we write them. Well, I try to act more like a guide.*

3.12. Self-Perceived Strengths of the Teacher

The analysis of the teachers' views on their strengths revealed the themes presented in Table 14.

Table 14. *Self-perceived strengths of the teacher*

Adaptation to the student level
Communication with the students
Exam preparation
Authority
Making the course popular
Ability to teach
Content knowledge
Changing roles

As seen in Table 14, the data on the self-perceived strengths of the teachers were analyzed in eight themes: adaptation of the student level, communication with the students, exam preparation, authority, making the course popular, ability to teach, content knowledge, and changing roles. T4 stated that her (his) communication with the students was good and (s)he felt strong in communication:

> *I think I communicate well with students. I think I mastered eye contact, body language, gestures, facial expressions, and student interests…*

3.13. Difficulties in the Learning-Teaching Process

The themes associated with the difficulties experienced by the teachers in the learning-teaching process are presented in Table 15.

Table 15. Difficulties In The Learning-Teaching Process

Indisposition
Lack of readiness
Physical difficulties
Class management
No difficulties

As seen in Table 15, the analysis of the teachers' views on the difficulties experienced in the learning-teaching process revealed five sub-themes: indisposition, lack of readiness, physical difficulties, class management, and no difficulties. T3 stated that student indisposition was the most significant challenge they experienced:

> *Now, student disposition is our biggest drawback. Well, they go home and do not do it again, well, they usually come back without homework, there is no sanction when they come without homework, they do not care about their grade, and they are not motivated even when they get low grades, students are only motivated when they like the course and the teacher. But since it is not based on repetition, they forget what they were instructed the day before, these are the main difficulties I experience.*

3.14. The Reasons for Non-Employment of the Communicative Language Approach

The analysis of the reasons for non-employment of the communicative language approach by the teachers revealed the themes presented in Table 16.

Table 16. *Reasons For Non-Employment Of The Communicative Language Approach*

School Characteristics
Determination of learner requirements
Availability of communications in the target language in the curriculum
Content

As seen in Table 16, the analysis of the teachers' views on the reasons why they could not adopt the communicative language approach revealed four themes: the school characteristics, the determination of learner requirements, the availability of communications in the target language in the curriculum, and the content. T1 emphasized that the availability of technological or non-technological facilities in the school was among the obstacles to the implementation of the approach:

> *The desks are sufficient, but apart from that, the smart boards are the only facility. Other than that, there is no tech hardware. You know, there are no coat hangers, student lockers, etc., no facilities that are available in developed or private schools, unfortunately, there are no facilities in these schools, in public schools. I cannot say anything positive except the smart board about the classrooms.*

T4 emphasized that the curriculum content should be diversified based on regional factors to reflect real-life events:

> *I think that it is more important to diversify and prepare the curricula and content based on the student level, the different conditions in the school and the region, and cultural characteristics. As I said, never in Turkey, asking questions about places outside of their region to students who never visited anywhere else in Turkey, let alone foreign lands, just because it is the topic is really difficult.*

Based on the second research problem, the adoption of communicative language approach applications in the measurement and evaluation activities was investigated. The analysis revealed 6 main themes. These themes are presented in Table 17.

As part of the second sub-problem of the study how teachers implemented the communicative language approach in measurement and evaluation activities was targeted to be investigated. As a result of the content analysis conducted within the scope of this sub-question, 6 main themes were determined. The main themes are shown in Table 17:

Table 17. *Measurement And Evaluation*

Measurement and evaluation
Measurement tools and methods
Measurement and evaluation criteria

Process-based evaluation

Measurement–evaluation problems

Suggestions for the employment of alternative measurement–evaluation methods

The role of measurement–evaluation tools in the acquisition of the target language

As seen in Table 17, six themes were determined in the measurement and evaluation process: measurement tools and methods, measurement and evaluation criteria, process-based evaluation, measurement and evaluation problems, suggestions for the employment of alternative measurement and evaluation tools, and the role of measurement and evaluation tools in the acquisition of the target language. Detailed data on these themes are presented in the following section.

3.15. Measurement Tools and Methods

The analysis of the measurement and evaluation tools and methods preferred by the teachers revealed the sub-themes presented in Table 18.

Table 18. *Measurement Tools And Methods*

Written exam

Project

Formative evaluation

Observation Checklists

Individual

Group

As in Table 18, the analysis of the measurement and evaluation methods preferred by the teachers revealed six themes: written exam, project, formative evaluation, observation checklists, individual and group. T9 stated that (s)he preferred formative evaluation without grading but to monitor student progress, and (s)he frequently included these measurement tools and methods, especially in the eighth grade:

> *Frankly, I do a lot of follow-up evaluations. Especially in the eighth grade, the vocabulary is huge. That is why we identify the words in each unit at the beginning of the unit and determine the vocabulary with the students. You know, to determine how much they have learned, not for grading. I definitely follow up and evaluate, sometimes in written form, and sometimes verbally. This leads to comfortable learning because children do not experience grade anxiety. They are not worried. I often do follow-up evaluations, as well as follow-up tests, using my own questions.*

3.16. Measurement and Evaluation Criteria

The analysis of the criteria employed by the teachers in the evaluation of student achievements revealed the themes presented in Table 19.

Table 19. *Measurement and Evaluation Criteria*

Effort
Product
Contribution
Self-development
Neglect
Both individual and group

As seen in Table 19, the data on the criteria that teachers considered during the evaluation of student achievements were analyzed and revealed six themes: effort, product, contribution, self-development, neglect, and both individual and group. T13 aimed self-improvement of the students and stated that her/his criteria included creativity, care, lessons learned from their mistakes and learning to learn:

> *...now we will evaluate our projects. I am very curious about them. I mean, I want them to discover themselves all the time. No matter how creative they are, they can make mistakes. They are learning. Of course, they will make mistakes during the learning process. Mistakes do not matter. What matters is if they correct their mistakes. Or how truly creative they are. How careful they are. You know, my criteria include these aspects. In other words, we have to conduct both education and instruction. Teaching could happen at any point in life, but I think they should learn to learn.*

3.17. Process-Based Evaluation

Themes about the teachers' views on process evaluation are presented in Table 20.

Table 20. *Process-Based Evaluation*

Yes
No
Not sure

As seen in Table 20, the analysis of the views of the teachers on process-based evaluation revealed three themes: yes, no, not sure. T14 explained that time limitations were the obstacle in the process-based assessment:

> *So I would like to. It is definitely the real evaluation for me, but we take a shortcut. You know, this is exactly what I do with my time. But I would really like to use those other alternative evaluation methods. It is very logical, and it can lead to very good results.*

3.18. Difficulties in Measurement- Evaluation

The analysis of the difficulties experienced by the teachers in the measurement and evaluation process revealed the themes presented in Table 21.

Table 21. *Difficulties In Measurement And Evaluation*

Crowded classroom
Cheating
Misunderstanding the problems
Systemic problems
Inability to fully reflect student performance
No difficulties

As seen in Table 21, the difficulties experienced by the teachers in the measurement and evaluation process were analyzed in six themes: crowded classrooms, cheating, misunderstanding the problems, systemic problems, inability to fully reflect the student's performance, and no difficulties. T6 stated that (s)he experienced systemic problems:

> *There is a problem of passing the class in junior high. Every student knows that he or she will pass. We have several students, most of whom abuse this. I think this is associated with the system in the foreign language.*

T1 stated that the only difficulty (s)he experienced in evaluation was crowded classrooms, and although (s)he wanted to conduct individual evaluation, there was no time for it:

> *…since we have to evaluate each student individually, as you said, I grade them based on their readiness level. I definitely do not grade the students based on their comparative achievements. When a student improves, (s)he can get a hundred in my course. If (s)he never improves but (s)he is a hardworking student, (s)he will get ninety. The only difficulty is that we decide on these individuals one by one in very crowded classrooms, and it takes some time. Other than that, there is no difficulty.*

3.19. Suggestions on the Employment of Alternative Measurement and Evaluation Methods

The findings on the employment of alternative measurement and evaluation methods by the teachers revealed the sub-themes presented in Table 22.

Table 22. *Suggestions On The Employment Of Alternative Measurement And Evaluation Methods*

Exams are unnecessary
Personalized classes
Exams that focus on the four basic language skills
Portfolio
Observation

As seen in Table 22, the findings on the employment of alternative measurement and evaluation methods by the teachers revealed five sub-themes: exams are unnecessary, personalized classes, exams that focus on the four basic language skills, portfolio, and observation. T4 mentioned the need to evaluate

each student individually based on student readiness and interests in measurement and evaluation, and stated that personalized exams could be conducted:

> *Maybe if we could conduct a personalized exam rather than a written exam that included the things instructed in every topic, you know, that would be more adequate for student interest and readiness. I do not know, it is something that never is automatic, and they cannot respond automatically to these.*

T6 mentioned the need to evaluate the four basic language skills separately:

> *…There should be English teachers besides me, so on and so forth… If we have these four different skills, speaking, reading. For example, they can all be measured separately. Our exams are like that, by making one exam on each, for example, during the semester.*

T11 argued that portfolios could be employed for the students to demonstrate their knowledge:

> *What can be done? In other words, the students may be asked to produce products with their knowledge. So, like a project assignment. Like a big homework. At the end of the year or at the end of the semester, they may be asked to put together a product by combining the knowledge they learned.*

3.20. The Role of Measurement – Evaluation Tools in the Acquisition of the Target Language

The themes on the teacher views on the role of measurement and evaluation tools in the acquisition of the target language are presented in Table 23.

Table 23. *The Role Of Measurement And Evaluation Tools In The Acquisition Of The Target Language*

Effective
Ineffective
Inadequate

As seen in Table 23, the three themes of effective, ineffective or inadequate were determined based on the findings on the role of the measurement and evaluation tools in the acquisition of the target language. T9 stated that the measurement and evaluation tools were not sufficient for the acquisition of the target language:

> *I mean, the current exams, of course, measure, but I do not think this is sufficient. For example, we can measure a very small section of the child's knowledge, a very small part of it. Unfortunately, we cannot measure everything the child knows.*

The general interpretation of the study findings demonstrated that communicative language approach could not be employed in the class due to physical learning-teaching problems, student indifference and lack of readiness, teachers' failure to analyze the learner goals and styles at the beginning of the process, non-employment of the target language as a primary language, partial adoption of the communicative language approach activities in the class, the preference of grammar instruction, partial

inclusion of group activities, unoriginal material selection, immediate correction of learner mistakes, the lack of the adoption of roles such as initiating communication and providing resources, and preference of traditional roles, and the inability to measure the four main language skills due to systemic errors.

4. DISCUSSION

This study aimed to determine how teachers included the communicative language approach in the learning–teaching process and measurement–evaluation dimensions while applying the 2018 Primary Education English Language Course (2-8th Grades) Curriculum. For this reason, the opinions of the teachers who were applying this program were consulted.

It was concluded that certain teachers preferred to use the target language or the native language in the class, and some preferred to use both equally. It was observed that the students' grade level or their interest in the course affected the language preferences of the teachers. According to Brumfit (1976), both the native language and the target language could be used in classes where the students just began to learn a foreign language within the context of the communicative language approach. However, since the main aim of the course is to develop students' communication skills in the target language, students should be encouraged to use the target language from the beginning (Richard & Rodgers, 2001). The language preferences of the teachers were consistent with the communicative language approach. In a study conducted by Yüksel (2001), it was concluded that teachers would use the native language only when necessary.

It was also seen that teachers preferred traditional methods such as lectures, translation, forming sentences with given vocabulary, or student-centered methods that holistically support language development. In communicative language approach, both traditional and student-centered methods, techniques or approaches could be used in the classroom environment (Brown, 2001). However, the employment of only traditional methods is not supported in communicative language approach. Rao (2002) concluded that traditional language instruction methods should be combined with communicative language methods. Jabeen (2014), on the other hand, reported that teachers should be independent in choosing their methods based on learner traits. Various studies demonstrated that the communicative language approach was more effective in language instruction when compared to traditional methods, techniques and approaches (Ali, 2013; Büyükkarcı, 2006; Tayhani-Temizgöl, 2013; Temizöz, 2008).

It was seen that the teachers could not conduct the integrated instruction of the four basic language skills in the course and employed only dialogues. Furthermore, grammar instruction and vocabulary activities that did not include the four basic language skills were preferred by the teachers. The communicative language approach advocates the comprehensive instruction of the four language skills throughout the language education (Larsen-Freeman and Anderson, 2011). Grammar learning occurs spontaneously during these activities (Finocchiaro and Brumfit, 1983). Teachers' activity preferences were not consistent with the principles of the communicative language approach. The study found that teachers' preference of activities that do not allow the development of the four basic language skills and their preference of traditional grammar instruction, and this is consistent with previous reports in the literature (Denkci-Akkas and Coker, 2016; Karcı Aktaş, 2012; Kozikoğlu, 2014; Soğuksu, 2013).

Teachers take account of/consider criteria such as age adequacy, interest, learning styles, economy, and real-life visuals or videos in material selection. It was also determined that teachers did not employ original and new material such as magazines, advertisements, announcements, newspapers,

maps and tables in the course. It is important to use material that supports in-classroom communications in the communicative language approach (Brown, 2001). Neglecting the employment of original, new and real material is against the principles of the communicative language approach. Denkci-Akkas and Coker (2016) similarly reported that teachers did not employ material other than dialogues or vocabulary lists, and did not use original materials in the course.

Certain teachers included work in groups or pairs in the class, while others preferred individual work. It could be suggested that not all learners take adequate responsibility in groups or pairs. In the communicative language approach, the employment of group or pair work is supported since it allows students to communicate and practice their knowledge (Richard and Rodgers, 2001). Thus, certain teachers neglected these benefits of group work. The findings of a study conducted by Soğuksu (2013) revealed that teachers did not include activities that supported the development of communication, sense of responsibility and collaboration skills. Jabeen (2014) also reported that teachers did not prefer group or pair work in the class due to time constraints, crowded classrooms and fear of losing authority. Several international studies demonstrated that group allows for learning new information and communication among learners, and group work is effective in the development of the target language (Cohen and Lotan, 2014; Dobao, 2012).

Teachers adopted diverse error correction methods such as allowing the learner to find the mistake, asking a peer, repeating with emphasis, correcting it immediately or ignoring the mistake. Since the aim is to communicate in the communicative language approach, mistakes are almost never corrected and the responsibility for the mistakes is shared (Richard and Rodgers, 2001). In the study, it was determined that teachers supported the students to take responsibility for their mistakes. This study was inconsistent with the result reported by Soğuksu (2013) that teachers corrected student mistakes by repetition, correction, expansion or elaboration.

Certain teachers adopt the roles of a guide, encourager, and participator in communicative language approach activities, while others preferred the role of an authoritarian teacher. It was determined that the principles adopted by the teachers were determined based on the roles they adopted. It was observed that certain teachers were strong in the recognition of student interests and making the students like the course, while the strength of others was in content knowledge, instruction, preparing the students for the exams, or classroom authority. According to Breen and Candlin (1980), teacher roles that are consistent with the communicative language approach initiate communications in the classroom, provide resources, guide activities, be a learner and a researcher. On the other hand, Richard and Rodger (2001) listed teacher roles as an analyzer of the needs, counselor, manager, observer, motivator and communication initiator. Thus, various roles and tasks adopted by the teachers were adequate for the communicative language approach.

The first reason why the communicative language approach was not implemented in the classroom was determined as the lack of physical hardware. Teachers stated that they could not conduct active instruction and could not establish the necessary in-classroom interaction due to the lack of equipment. In communicative language approach, it is important to organize a non-standard classroom environment that promotes interaction (Richard and Rodgers, 2001). The materials should be adequate for the classroom properties (Applebee, 1974). Classroom organization and lack of physical facilities that prevent interaction are an obstacle to the implementation of the communicative language approach. This study finding was consistent with several studies in the literature (Anani Sarab, Monfared and Safarzadeh, 2016; Bal, 2006; Jabeen, 2014; Karim, 2004; Mehmandoust, 2015). It could be suggested

that the classroom environments should be improved for the effective implementation of the communicative language approach.

Based on the study findings, the class size was one of the reasons that prevented the implementation of the communicative language approach. It was determined that when the class size was small, the class dynamics could not be achieved, and when it was crowded, it would be difficult to work with the students one-on-one. Previous studies reported that the class size should be adequate (Erarslan, 2016; Seçkin, 2011; Yüksel, 2001). Since the student interests, proficiency levels and requirements are different, teachers must be aware of these conditions and work one-on-one with the learners in the communicative language approach.

It was determined that one of the most important reasons why the communicative language approach could not be implemented in the class was the lack of student motivation. Mirici (2000) reported that students with high motivation for the course exhibited high participation and achievement levels. In the communicative language approach, learners' internal motivation to communicate in the classroom is important (Richard & Rodgers, 2001). Finocchiaro and Brumfit (1983), on the other hand, emphasized the significance of motivation in foreign language instruction.

It was determined that one of the obstacles to the implementation of the communicative language approach was the lack of learner readiness. In the communicative language approach, learner proficiency, interests and requirements should play a role in the determination of learner goals (Richard & Rodgers, 2001). Furthermore, in learning, it is necessary for learners to discover suitable learning styles and adequate learning opportunities should be available (Brown, 2001). The present study findings demonstrated that teachers did not determine learner goals or styles based on the communicative language approach requirements. Also, it was determined that the teachers only included unit-appropriate activities before the activity. Similarly, the findings reported by Jabeen (2014) demonstrated that the lack of prior knowledge was one of the obstacles encountered in the implementation of the approach.

In the study, it was observed that certain teachers considered that the curriculum partially supported communications, while others considered that it did not. The factors such as the differences between the grade levels or student profiles was effective in these different views. Teachers stated that the curriculum content was above the student level. Previous studies demonstrated that teachers considered the curriculum content too heavy (Karcı Aktaş, 2012; Seçkin 2011). Karaca (2018) analyzed the development and implementation stages of the English language curriculum implemented in the 2013 academic year and concluded that the teachers considered the curriculum successful in adapting the content to various themes and the adoption of the target language culture.

In the second research problem, the analysis of the employment of the communicative language approach in the measurement and evaluation revealed that the teachers employed written exams and projects for measurement and evaluation. The principles of the communicative language approach emphasize adequate and meaningful use of the language (Widdowson, 1990). The ability of the learners to speak the language adequately and meaningfully could not be measured with only written exams or projects. Thus, the fact that teachers preferred only written exams in measurement and evaluation contradicted with the general objectives of the communicative language approach. Similarly, in a study conducted by Anani Sarab, Monfared and Safarzadeh (2016), it was concluded that compulsory exams were not consistent with the communicative language approach. Other studies in the literature also demonstrated that traditional methods were preferred in measurement and evaluation, inconsistent with the approach (Coşkun, 2011; Karim, 2004; Ozsevik, 2010).

In the study, it was concluded that process evaluation was employed to measure only the vocabulary knowledge of the students. Furthermore, it was determined that teachers implemented process evaluation at certain intervals for grading purposes. In communicative language approach, grammar and vocabulary include only a part of language instruction. In language development, parallel to the acquisition of pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary proficiency, it is necessary to ensure the employment of these competencies in communicative tasks (Savignon, 1991).

It was also determined in the study that the four basic language skills were not measured in the measurement and evaluation process. Based on the teachers' views, it was determined that systemic problems and crowded classes were among the reasons. These findings were inconsistent with the communicative language approach principle that learners should simultaneously develop the four basic language skills. In a study carried out by Karcı Aktaş (2012), it was concluded that teachers should measure the four basic language skills. It was also determined that the measurement and evaluation approach was independent of the classroom practices and the learners could not understand what was expected of them.

Certain teachers considered it unnecessary to use measurement and evaluation methods such as portfolios and stated that they could not regularly follow up on the portfolios. Portfolios demonstrate the development, efforts, and achievements of learners in various fields (Paulson, Paulson, & Meyer, 1991). Fidan and Sak (2012) argued that complementary measurement and evaluation methods such as portfolios allow students to exhibit their products, analyze the process, and demonstrate their high-level thinking skills. Furthermore, portfolios represent a system where learners can self-evaluate. In the communicative language approach, learners take learning responsibilities (Cook, 2001). It was observed that the measurement and evaluation approach in communicative language approach was consistent with the benefits of the portfolio evaluation; however, the teachers did not prefer the portfolios. The findings reported by İzci, Göktaş, and Şad (2014) demonstrated that teachers did not use portfolios due to their self-perception of inadequacy. Duran, Mıhlâz, and Ballıel (2013) indicated that teachers consider themselves relatively competent in alternative measurement and evaluation methods and employ these methods moderately. Similarly, Gelbal and Kelecioğlu (2007) reported that teachers considered themselves competent in traditional methods.

The study findings generally demonstrated that teachers could not implement the communicative language approach in learning-teaching and evaluation processes. It was determined that the inadequate physical facilities in the classroom and the school, the low student motivation and academic achievement, non-ideal class size, intense course content, and the traditional approach of the teachers to measurement and evaluation led to the above-mentioned findings. Gürel and Demirhan İşcan (2020) and Türkben (2019) also stated in their studies that there were problems in the implementation of the Communicative Language Approach, which was highlighted in the program.

5. CONCLUSION

Based on the present study findings, the following points could be recommended about the teaching-learning and measurement and evaluation processes based on the communicative language approach:

- Prevalent use of the target language in the class could encourage learners to speak the language.
- Four basic language skills could be instructed with an integrated approach to assist

functional language use.

- Teachers' preference for activities that would activate mental processes such as causality, problem-solving, and decision-making could support learning.
- In-classroom activities that would promote functional language use within the social context could support the communication skills of the learners and improve their motivation.
- More meaningful tasks could be assigned to the learners.
- The employment of original and new materials in the learning-teaching process could contribute to the implementation of the approach.
- Adoption of various roles by the teachers could support language instruction.
- Teacher awareness about process evaluation could be raised.
- In-service training could be organized on the communicative language approach.
- Additional resources about the approach could be sent to teachers.

This study encompasses data collected through semi-structured interviews with 14 English teachers working in the province of Eskişehir. Additionally, the study examines opinions regarding the 2018 Primary Education English Language Course (2-8th Grades) Curriculum. Therefore, the following recommendations can be made for further research.

- The research can be expanded in future studies based on the views of the participants from different regions and teachers in both private and public schools.
- Different data collection instruments could be employed for in-depth analysis of in-classroom practices.
- A measurement tool could be developed to determine the consistency of instructional applications with the communicative language approach.
- The adequacy of various course materials for the communicative language approach could be analyzed.
- The new Primary Education English Language Course (2-8th Grades) Curriculum planned to be implemented in the academic year 2024-2025 can also be examined within the context of a communicative language approach similar to this research, allowing for comparisons to be made.

REFERENCES

Al Asmari, A. A. (2015). Communicative language teaching in EFL university context: Challenges for teachers. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *6*(5), 976-984.

Ali, N. (2013). *Using communicative approach in teaching English at secondary schools in Iraq.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Ankara: Ufuk University, Social Sciences Department of English Language Teaching.

Altınuç, Z. (2012*). English teachers' perception of communicative language teaching-a qualitative research.* Unpublished Masters' Thesis. İstanbul: Yeditepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

Anani Sarab, M. R., Monfared, A. and Safarzadeh, M. M. (2016). Secondary EFL School Teachers' Perceptions of CLT Principles and Practices: An Exploratory Survey. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, *4*(3), 109-130.

Applebee, A. N. (1974). Tradition and reform in the teaching of English: A history.

Ardıç, T. (2019). *Lise 9. sınıflarda iletişimsel dil öğretiminin sınıfiçi uygulamalarda kullanımı üzerine bir durum çalışması*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Diyarbakır: Dicle Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü. Diyarbakır.

Bal, S. M. (2006). *Teachers' perceptions of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in Turkish EFL setting theory vs. practices.* Unpublished master's thesis. Adana: Cukurova University, The Institute Of Social Sciences Englısh Language Teaching.

Berns, M. S. (1990). *Contexts of competence: Social and cultural considerations in communicative language teaching.* New york, Ny: Plenum.

Breen, M., Candlin, C. N. (1980). The essentials of a communicative curriculum in language teaching. Applied Linguistics, 1, 89-112.

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. New York: Pearson Education

Brumfit, C. J. (1976). *Teaching Pupils How to Acquire Language: Some Comments on the Positions Implicit in the Preceding Two Articles.* ELT Documents (76/3).

Büyükkarcı, K. (2006). *Teaching phrasal verbs to freshman students at universities by using communicative approach.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Konya: Selçuk Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2002). *Research methods in education*. Routledge.

Cook, V. (2001). *Second language learning and language teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Cohen, E. G., Lotan, R. A. (2014). *Designing groupwork: strategies for the heterogeneous classroom third edition*. Teachers College Press.

Coşkun, A. (2011). Investigation of the application of communicative language teaching in the english language classroom: A case study on teachers' attitudes in Turkey. *Journal of Linguistics and Language Teaching, 2*(1), 85-110.

Demirel, Ö. (1987). *Yabancı Dil Öğretimi*. Ankara: Usem Yayınları.

Denkci-Akkas, F. , Coker, B. (2016). The use of communicative approach in 9th grade efl classes. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 65*, 71-90.

Dobao, A. F. (2012). Collaborative writing tasks in the L2 classroom: Comparing group, pair, and individual work. *Journal of second language writing*, *21*(1), 40-58.

Duffin, E. (2019). *The most spoken languages worldwide native speakers in millions, retrived from* https://www.statista.com/statistics/266808/the-most-spoken-languages-worldwide/ at 25.12.2018.

Duran, M., Mıhladız, G. ve Ballıel, B. (2013). İlköğretim öğretmenlerinin alternatif değerlendirme yöntemlerine yönelik yeterlilik düzeyleri. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Dergisi*, *2*(2), 26-37.

Ekim, B. A. (2017). *Globalizition and democracy: the galabolization of English*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. İstanbul: Galatasaray Üniversitesi iktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Siyaset Bilimi Bölümü.

Erarslan, A. (2016) *An evaluation of second grade English Language curriculum : teachers' perceptions and issues in implementation*. Unpublished doctoral disertation, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi, Çanakkale.

Eveyik-Aydin, E. (2003, March). *EFL teacher's voice on communicative language teaching.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. Baltimore, Maryland. Retrived from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED476748 at 04.12.2023.

Farooq, M. U. (2015). Creating a communicative language teaching environment for improving students' communicative competence at EFL/EAP university level. *International Education Studies*, *8*(4), 179-191.

Fidan, U. M. ve Sak, I. M. (2012). İlköğretim öğretmenlerinin tamamlayıcı ölçme değerlendirme teknikleri hakkında görüşleri. *Bartın Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *1*(1), 174-189.

Finocchiaro, M., & Brumfit, C. (1983). *The functional-notional approach: From theory to practice*. Oxford University Press, 200 Madison Ave., New York, NY 10016.

Gelbal, S. ve Kelecioğlu, H. (2007). Öğretmenlerin ölçme ve değerlendirme yöntemleri hakkında yeterlik algıları ve karşılaştıkları sorunlar. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi.* 33: 135-145.

Gücer Palalı, T. (2006). *The Use of communicative activities in senior and junior high school* .Unpublished master's thesis, Konya: Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

Gürel, E., Demirhan İşcan, C. (2020). Reviewing the 9th grade English curriculum with Stake's responsive evaluation model according to teachers opinions. *Cukurova University Faculty of Education Journal*, 49(1), 501-554. https://doi.org/10.14812/cuefd.623396

Hunutlu, Ş. (2011). *Communicative language teaching in Turkey: teachers' views and classroom practices*. Unpublished Masters' Thesis. Erzurum: Atatürk Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In (LBPride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics*. Harthondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books.

İzci, E., Göktaş, Ö., Şad, S. N. (2014). Prospective Teachers' Views and Perceived Efficacy Regarding Alternative Measurement and Evaluation. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi;* 15(2): 37-57.

Jacobs, G. M., and Farrell, T. S. C. (2001). Paradigm shift: Understanding and implementing change in second language education. *TESL-EJ*, *5*, 1.

Jabeen, S. S. (2014). Implementation of Communicative Approach. *English Language Teaching*, *7*(8), 68-74.

Karaca, B. (2018). *A study of Turkey's primary and middle school english curricula: teachers' and program designers' perceptions/Türkiye'deki ilkokul ve ortaokul İngilizce öğretim programı üzerine bir çalışma: öğretmen ve program uzmanlarının görüşleri.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Erzurum: Atatürk Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.

Karcı Aktaş, C. (2012). *Ortaöğretim dokuzuncu sınıf İngilizce öğretim programının öğretmen görüşlerine göre değerlendirilmesi.* Unpublishied masters' thesis. Aydın: Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

Karim, K. M. R. (2004). *Teachers' perceptions, attitudes and expectations about Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in post-secondary education in Bangladesh.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Canada: University of Victoria, the Department of Curriculum and Instruction.

Kozikoğlu, İ. (2014). Ortaokul 7. sınıf İngilizce öğretim programının değerlendirilmesi. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*.

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

Mehmandoust, N. (2015). *A comparative study on the perception of communicative approaches: the case of Turkey and Iran.* Unpublished master's thesis. Ankara: Gazi University, Institute of Educational Science.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: a guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. sage.

Mirici, İ. H. (2000). A research on foreign language (English) curriculum of primary school 4th & 5th graders in our country. *Gazi Üniversitesi Dergisi*, *20*(1), 107-118.

Neuman, W. L. (2009). *Understanding research*. Pearson.

Ozsevik, Z. (2010). *The Use of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT): Turkish EFL Teachers' perceived difficulties in ımplementing CLT in Turkey.* Published MA Thesis. Urbana: University of Illinois, Teaching of English as a Second Language.

Palalı, T. G. (2006). *The Use of communicative activities in senior and junior high school* .Unpublished master's thesis,Konya: Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

Paulson, F. L., Paulson, P. R., & Meyer, C. A. (1991). What makes a portfolio a portfolio. *Educational leadership*, *48*(5).

Rao, Z. (2002). Chinese students' perceptions of communicative and non-communicative activities in EFL classroom. *System*, *30*(1), 85-105.

Richards, J.C., Rodgers, T.S. (2001): Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching, Cambridge University Press, New York.

Savignon, S. J. (1991). Communicative language teaching: State of the art. *TESOL Quarterly, 25*(2), 261-277.

Seçkin, H. (2011). İlköğretim 4. sınıf İngilizce dersi öğretim programına ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, *8*(2), 550-577.

Seidlhofer, B. (2005). English as a lingua franca. *Oxford.*

Sevinç., B.; Erişen, Y. (2021). İletişimsel dil öğreitmi yaklaşımıyla oluşturulan İngilizce öğretim tasarımı programının İngilizce konuşma tutum ve becerisine etkisi. *Türkiye Eğitim Dergisi*, 6(1):86-109.

Soğuksu, A. F. Y. (2013). *Ortaöğretim İngilizce dersi öğretim programındaki iletişimsel yaklaşımın sınıf içi uygulamalara yansıması.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.

Soğuksu, F., Aslan, B. (2018). İletişimsel yaklaşımın onuncu sınıf ingilizce dersinde sınıf içi uygulamalara yansıması. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *18*(1), 468-492.

Şeker, S. A. (2023). *A comparison of the communicative language teaching (CLT) and teaching proficiency through reading and storytelling (TPRS) methods on the motivation of the EFL students*. Unpublished masters' thesis. İstanbul: İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi, Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü.

Şenel, A. (2021). *Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretiminde iletişim temelli dil öğrenme stratejilerine uygun etkinliklerin dinleme becerisine yönelik başarıya etkisi.* Unpublished masters' thesis. Nevşehir: Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

Tanyer Çekirdekçi, S. (2023). Problems faced by Turkish efl teachers' implementıng communicative language (clt) in their classes. Unpublished master's thesis.İstanbul: Istanbul Aydın Üniversitesi, Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü.

Tayhani Temizgöl, T. (2013). *The effects of grammar translation method and communicative language teaching on vocabulary teaching*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. İzmir: Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.

Temizöz, H. (2008). *Yabancı dil öğretiminde dilbilgisi çeviri yöntemi ve iletişimci yaklaşım uygulamalarının öğrencilerin öğrenme becerisi üzerindeki etkisi.* Unpublished masters' thesis. Malatya: İnönü Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

Tomlinson, B. (Ed.). (2011). *Materials development in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

Türkben, A. (2019). *Dokuzuncu sınıf İngilizce dersi öğretim programına ilişkin öğretmen ve öğrenci görüşleri* Unpublished masters' thesis. Ankara:Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.

Türkben, T., Yiğit, K. Ö. (2023). Ters-yüz sınıf modeli ile desteklenmiş iletişimsel yaklaşımın türkçe öğrenen yabancı öğrencilerin konuşma becerilerine etkisi. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 19/(1), 28-50.

Widdowson, H.G. (1990). Aspects Of Language Teaching. New York: Oxford University Press.

Yeni Palabıyık, P. (2021). *Foreign language education policy in practice: English as a foreign language instruction at a public high school in Turkey*. Unpublished doctorol disertation. Ankara: Ortadoğu Teknik Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

Yin, R. (1984). *Case study research*. Beverly Hills.

Yüksel, A. (2001). *İlköğretim okulu dördüncü sınıfta İngilizce derslerinin planlanması ve uygulanmasına ilişkin bir değerlendirme (Elazığ ili örneği)*. Unpublished masters' thesis. Elazığ:Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.