| Research Article / Araştırma Makalesi|

Aspects of Narrative Competence in Language Levels and Narrative Texts in the CEFR[1]

Diller İçin Avrupa Ortak Başvuru Metni'nde Anlatısal Metinler ve Anlatısal Yetinin Dil Düzeylerindeki Görünümü

Nermin Yazıcı[1], **İlke Altuntaş Gürsoy**[2], **Gül Deniz Demirel Aydemir**[3]

Abstract

Purpose: This study aimed to identify the genres that require second/foreign language learners to draw on their narrative competence along with the related level descriptors in the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (CEFR) and the *CEFR Companion Volume with New Descriptors*, which serve to achieve coherence in the structuring of language learning/teaching processes by standardizing the way language ability is described.

Design/Methodology/Approach: In this qualitative research, data were collected from the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (2001) and the *CEFR Companion Volume* (2018) published by the Council of Europe through document review, and a content analysis was conducted. The processes of collecting, categorizing, and preparing the data for description were carried out sequentially.

Findings: In the CEFR, written texts such as novels, personal letters, short stories, short newspaper articles (that describe events), comic strips, photo stories, travelogues, news items, biographies, cartoons, advertisements, postcards, messages, notes, e-mails, blogs and fairy tales, which can be considered as narrative texts, are mentioned. In addition, personal narratives, films, and anecdotes, which are not written genres, are also encountered. It has been found out that the level descriptors that can be functional in drawing inferences about whether the learners developed a narrative competence or not are structured gradually from level A to C in the CEFR. Upon analysis of the level descriptors regarding narrative texts and narrative competence with respect to the four skills, it has been noted that the level descriptors that can be associated with narrative texts and competence at all levels were the fewest in number regarding speaking and listening and the highest regarding reading.

Highlights: Even though other genres are not referred to directly in the CEFR, a general framework about other genres is evident in the text. The categorization of the narrativity-related level descriptors based on proficiency levels and skills is thought to contribute to the designation of the learning objectives that reflect the language-specific features of narrative structures based on the level descriptors in the CEFR, and thus to the enhancement of the quality of curriculum, materials, and activities to be developed.

Öz

Çalışmanın amacı: Yabancı/İkinci dil derslerinin tasarlanıp uygulanmasına rehberlik etmesi amacıyla Avrupa Konseyi tarafından 2001 yılında yayımlanan *Diller İçin Avrupa Ortak Başvuru Metni* (AOBM) ile birlikte 2018 yılında yine Avrupa Konseyi tarafından yayımlanmış olan *AOBM Eki*nin (the CEFR Companion Volume) anlatısal yeti gerektiren metinler ve bu metinlerle ilgili düzey betimleyicileri açısından incelenmesidir.

Materyal ve Yöntem: Nitel olan bu çalışmada veriler, doküman incelemesi yoluyla toplanmış ve içerik analiziyle çözümlenmiştir. Araştırmanın veri kaynağını, Avrupa Konseyi tarafından yayımlanan (2001, 2018) Diller İçin Avrupa Ortak Başvuru Metni oluşturmaktadır. Verilerin toplanması, kategorileştirilmesi ve betimlenmeye hazır hâle getirilmesi süreçleri sırayla yapılmıştır.

Bulgular: AOBM'de yazılı anlatısal metinlere dâhil edilebilecek olan roman, kişisel mektup, öykü/hikâye, (olayları anlatan) kısa gazete makaleleri, çizgi roman, fotoroman (photo story), gezi günlüğü, haber metinleri, biyografi, karikatür, reklam, posta kartları, iletiler, notlar, e-posta, blog, masal türlerinden söz edilmektedir. Ayrıca yazılı olmayan türlerden kişisel hikâye (anlatı), film ve anekdota da yer verilmiştir. Düzeyler açısından incelendiğinde, A, B ve C düzeylerine göre öğrenicilerin anlatısal yetiye sahip olup olmadıklarıyla ilgili çıkarım yapılmasında işlevsel olabilecek düzey betimleyicilerinin aşamalı bir şekilde yapılandırıldığı sonucuna ulaşılmıştır. Anlatısal metinlerle ve anlatısal yetiyle ilişkilendirilebilecek düzey betimleyicileri öğrenme alanlarına göre ele alındığında; anlatısallıkla ilgili düzey betimleyicisi sayısının en fazla okuma becerisinde; en az konuşma ve dinleme becerisinde yer aldığı görülmektedir.

Önemli Vurgular: Doğrudan yer verilmemiş olsa da diğer türlerle ilgili bir çerçeve sunulduğu; A, B ve C düzeylerine göre öğrenicilerin anlatısal yetiye sahip olup olmadıklarıyla ilgili çıkarım yapılmasında işlevsel olabilecek düzey betimleyicilerinin aşamalı bir şekilde yapılandırıldığı sonuçlarına ulaşılmıştır. AOBM'deki farklı ölçeklerde yer alan düzey betimleyicilerinden anlatısallıkla ilişkili görülenler, dil düzeylerine ve öğrenme alanlarına göre sınıflandırıldığı için çalışmanın, alan uzmanlarının hazırlayacağı öğretim programları ve materyallerde AOBM'deki düzey betimleyicilerinin ilgili dile özgü anlatısal yapılanış özelliklerini yansıtacak olan kazanım görünümlerinin belirlenmesine ve programların, daha özelde materyallerin ve planlanan etkinliklerin, niteliklerinin arttırılmasına katkı sağlayacağı düşünülmektedir.

[1] Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Sosyal Bilimler ve Türkçe Eğitimi Bölümü, Ankara, TÜRKİYE; https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0145-9772

[2] Jandarma ve Sahil Güvenlik Akademisi, Jandarma ve Sahil Güvenlik Fakültesi, Yabancı Diller Bölüm Başkanlığı-Türkçe Birimi, Ankara, TÜRKİYE; https:// https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1394-5778

[3] Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu, Modern Diller Birimi, Ankara, TÜRKİYE; https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1851-4179

INTRODUCTION

Increasing cultural, economic, commercial, academic, social, and intellectual interaction between different countries due to globalization reveals the need for learning additional languages more strongly than ever before. In parallel with this, it is observed that studies regarding foreign/second language learning and teaching have gained momentum in the last half-century. These studies draw on many disciplines such as literature, psychology, sociology, anthropology, and especially linguistics and education as they interrelate closely in the field of foreign/second language teaching and learning.

Competency in a language is to be able to understand the content of a perceived message by distinguishing the sounds contained in the message and finding out which combinations of the sounds distinguished are meaningful and what the meaning is, as well as to compose a message that can be understood by the recipients (Özsoy, 2012, p. 3). Given this context, the purpose of foreign/second language teaching includes structuring of teaching processes so as to enable individuals to produce meaning and communicate in a language other than their mother tongue.

The main material in the structuring of the teaching processes is the texts produced in the target language. The texts correspond to parole in Saussure's distinction between langue and parole (Saussure, 1916; trans.: Vardar, 1998), and langue can only be observed through parole, that is, texts. In this context, the importance of texts as basic teaching materials in both first and foreign/second language instruction is obvious. What is more, in the framework of communicative language teaching, texts are considered as constructs that reflect the communicative prototype of the target language.

Linguistic competence of individuals can only be observed through their reactions to the texts they receive and interpret or produce. When the role of interaction of learners with texts in foreign/second language learning and teaching processes is evaluated, it is acknowledged that the learners' familiarity with different text types shaped by various communicative purposes and the culture that surrounds them and also with the linguistic characteristics of the text types and their organizational conventions have a facilitating role in terms of establishing successful communication (Brown & Lee, 2015, p. 397; Harmer, 2007, pp. 30-32; Korkut, 2016, p. 196-197, Şenöz Ayata, 2005, p. 62). To show how and for what purpose various language structures are used in different types of texts is the language teaching itself. For this reason, it is necessary to ensure that learners encounter different types of texts in foreign/second language teaching contexts.

This study focused on narrative texts amongst many different text types. Narratives allow people to make sense of their experiences. "Their functions . . . include presentation of self, organization of autobiographical memory, socialization of children into cultural membership, and mediation of ways of thinking about problems and difficulties" (Pavlenko, 2006, s. 105). Narratives also constitute an important part of daily conversations as relating experiences, reporting events, narrating dreams and future prospects, telling fairy tales and jokes, etc. (Kaya, 2018, p. 92).

The use of narrative texts in foreign/second language classes prepares learners for the oral and written narratives or communicative situations they may encounter in real life. The competencies of the learners in this respect are frequently emphasized by researchers. As a matter of fact, Pavlenko (2006, p. 107) puts forth the concept of L2 (second language) narrative competence. As Pavlenko puts it, the term suggests a native-like interpretation, organization, and narration of personal and fictional narratives by second-language users.

The features of the narrative text type such as being the most long-established and common type of discourse, its distinctiveness among other text types, functionality in preparing the learners for real-life narratives, roles in communication, and in enabling the learners to connect and socialize with the society and culture in which they live reveal its significance in foreign/second language teaching. This study emphasized the importance of the knowledge of genre conventions and narratives and aimed to identify the genres that require second/foreign language learners to draw on their narrative competence along with the related level descriptors. In order to realize this goal, the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (CEFR) (Council of Europe, 2001) and *CEFR Companion Volume with New Descriptors* (Council of Europe, 2018), which serve to achieve coherence in the structuring of language learning/teaching processes amongst and beyond the member states of the Council of Europe by standardizing the way language ability is described, were analyzed. To this end, answers to the following questions were sought:

· What text types mentioned in the CEFR require learners to draw on their narrative competences?

· What are the level descriptors regarding the texts that call for narrative competence across common reference levels (A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, C2) in the CEFR?

· What are the level descriptors in the CEFR regarding the texts that call for narrative competence across four skills?

In order to answer these questions, firstly, a theoretical framework was presented on the concept of text, texts in language teaching, text types, and narrative texts. Then, the CEFR was analyzed to determine how narrative texts and the related level descriptors are presented. Finally, the findings were interpreted in light of the theoretical framework that had been established.

Texts and Language Teaching

Saussure (1916; trans.: Vardar, 1998) discussed two different dimensions of language by pointing to the concepts of *langue* and *parole*. As Kuzu (Culler, 1976, as stated in Kuzu, 2016, s. 240) explained, the former refers to the same value and semantic

field as the predetermined, rigid rules and materials of the language from the perspective of its users. The latter, parole, is brought about by the elements of a language that foresees the same meaning for everyone with the other language elements they relate to when the personal preferences are at stake. Therefore, it creates different layers of meaning and is regarded as a more personal field. Rifat (2013, p. 26) stated that language is social and speech is individual. According to Rifat, parole is the specific and variable realization of the language system. In other words, it can be considered to be the concrete form of the language in use. Drawing on these, it is possible to interpret parole as texts produced in the language, as mentioned in the introduction.

In the definitions of text offered within the scope of linguistics, communication is emphasized as the purpose. Günay (2007) stated that a written or oral document without a specific communication function is not a text. According to Keçik and Uzun (2004, p. 23), text is a unit of communication, and complete communication takes place through well-structured texts. Uçan (2008, p. 37) and Yazıcı (2004, pp. 10-11) also underscored that in order for a piece of writing to be considered a text, it must reveal its communicative purposes and produce meaning. The communicative purposes of a text vary according to the context in which it is used, the form of verbal or written interaction between the sender and the receiver, and the expectations of the receiver specific to the communicative functions of the text.

In the definitions of text provided in the disciplines of Turkish literature and Turkish language education, the elements that make up a text and integrity of these elements are foregrounded. Therefore, a text is considered as a tangible entity that is formed by gradual articulation and interveawing of its elements that have integrity (Adalı, 2003, p. 21; Akbayır, 2013, p. 189; Özdemir, 1983, p. 32). The text describes a meaningful pattern and a whole created through language (Güneş, 2013, p. 2).

Although there is no single definition of text, definitions such as a unit larger than a sentence or a series of sentences are not valid because the communicative function of texts is ignored in such definitions (Dilidizgün, 2017, p. 21). Texts have different functions in communication and consequently in social life and language teaching process. Since different communicative purposes require different text types, teaching text types is essential in language teaching. In the literature, studies showing the relationship between knowledge of text type and reading comprehension and writing (Oktar & Yağcıoğlu, 1993; Çakır, 2001; Temizyürek, 2008; Yıldırım et al. 2010; Lüle-Mert, 2016) provide arguments for teaching them.

Text Types

Different types of texts enable language learners to encounter different structures of the language, forms of expression, and perspectives. The text type that becomes evident in line with the communicative purposes of the text determines the language use specific to the genre. Since a story and an article have different communicative purposes and are in different forms, their reception and production also differ. In other words, the type of text determines how the learner will interact with and approach it. The learner's knowledge of and experience about the genre constitutes an important starting point for the comprehension and interpretation of a text at hand, and that is why it is a necessity for learners to encounter different text types or genres and develop awareness about them and structures related to them (Canlı & Bozkurt, 2019).

In the literature, text type definitions arising from different approaches or disciplines are presented, and different criteria for the classification of text types are encountered. As researchers in linguistics, Keçik & Uzun (2004, p. 18) state that the main distinction that helps identify a genre is its communicative purpose. In addition, the stylistic differences that characterize the genre and the frameworks of expression required by the genre reveal the text's communicative purposes. Genres are shaped according to the schematic structures and the purpose of the authors. Yazıcı (2004, pp. 10-11) also affirms the opinion that the communicative purposes of a text determine its genre.

In linguistics literature, text types are defined by criteria such as the author's intention, the organization of the text, and the purpose of communication. Some of these classifications are as follows: descriptive discourse, narrative discourse, explicative discourse, persuasive and expository discourse (Uzun, 2011b, s. 167)[4]; narrative, argumentative, expository-explicative, and directive texts (Korkut, 2016); descriptive, narrative, explicative and persuasive texts (Kıran & Eziler Kıran, 2007); narrative, conversational, poetic, functional, informative, instructive, professional texts, telecommunication, and press texts, warning texts, boards, banners, posters (Günay, 2007); descriptive, narrative, explicative, persuasive, conative texts (Dilidüzgün, 2017).

In the classifications of text types made in the disciplines of Turkish language and literature education, informative, usable, instructive, and literary or fictional texts are found as the most common types. For example, Aktaş & Gündüz (2004) classified texts as form writings (curriculum vitae, petition, letter, report, announcement, announcement), instructive texts, and literary texts. Adalı (2003) mentioned fictive/fictional, usable/informative texts. Temizkan (2009) discussed a tripartite distinction regarding event-based texts, information-based texts, and poetry. In the curricula that guide the educational practices, genres are presented as follows: In the Turkish Lesson (1-8th Grades) Curriculum (MEB, 2019a, p. 17), they are presented under three categories: narrative texts, informative texts, and poetry. In the Secondary Education Turkish Language and Literature Lesson (9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th grades) Curriculum (MEB, 2018, p. 18), they are grouped under the headings: poetry, narrative literary texts, theater, and informative (instructive) texts. In the internationally recognized PISA, which provides assessment measures for secondary school students, six types were defined: description, narration, exposition, argumentation, instruction, and transaction (MEB, 2019b, pp. 32-33).

---

[4] Uzun, 2011b, s. 165-166. can be referred to for further information on the relationship between discourse and genre.

Genres such as memoir, biography, autobiography, diary, travelogue, epistolary writing, social media post, blog, and news are included in the scope of informative texts in Turkish classes (1st-8th Grades) in the Turkish Language and Literature Curriculum. To illustrate, books such as "Bir Bilim Adamının Romanı" (A Scientist's Novel) by Oğuz Atay and "Allahın Süngüleri -Reis Paşa" (The Bayonets of God - Reis Pasha) by Atilla İlhan are biographies. "My Left Foot" by Christy Brown, "Bir Dinozorun Anıları" (Memoirs of a Dinosaur) by Mina Urgan, and "My Childhood" by Maxim Gorky are autobiographies. "Frankfurt Seyahatnamesi" (Travel Notes from Frankfurt City) by Ahmet Haşim is an example of a travelogue. "Bir Sürgünün Anıları" (Memories of an Exile) by Aziz Nesin is a memoir. "Canım Aliyem" (Aliye, My Beloved) by Sabahattin Ali and "On Üç Günün Mektupları" (Letters of Thirteen Days) by Cemal Süreya can be given as examples of epistolary novels. These genres, which indeed have a narrative aspect, were categorized as informative texts based on their reference to reality. In other words, whether they are fictional or not was taken into consideration rather than their linguistic style. In this context, it would be appropriate to refer to the question Bozkurt (2018) asked in her article on the problem of classifying text types in reading and writing education: "Can literariness be a meta conceptual classification term?". She stated that generally, a tripartite classification, which is encountered as narrative/story, informative/instructive, and poetry, is made, and many genres are excluded in the classifications made by criteria such as the medium of publication of the text (such as the genres developed around the newspaper), the form of the text is written in (such as prose or verse), the source of the information presented in the text (reality/fiction), and whether the text is written or spoken, or some genres do not represent the category they are in in such cases. She conceded that the meaning of the concept of text type is narrowed due to such classifications.

Fludernik (2000) presented the most useful framework for the purpose of this study in the literature: In her proposed classification, in which she adopted a functional approach based on spoken discourse, she established a three-level narratological model consisting of *macro-genre*, *genre,* and *discourse mode* categories. The macro-genre level consists of "the functions of communication" (Fludernik, 2000, p. 280). She identified five macro-genres: narrative, argumentative, instructive, conversational, reflective. At the genre level, "traditional genre expectations" (Fludernik, 2000, p. 280) come into play, and novels, plays, films, myths, sermons, letters, poems, manuals, etc. are considered to be at this level. The discourse mode level is related to the surface structure of the texts. "On this level, the function, for instance of an argumentative or descriptive passage, within the schema of the specific genre is at issue" (Fludernik, 2000, p. 280). Reporting, orientational passages, imperatives, dialogue, word plays, expositional sentences, argumentative passages, etc. belong to the category of discourse mode. They form textlinguistic units in a genre-specific scheme and do not have a straightforward relation to genres and macro-genres (Fludernik, 2000, p. 283). Defining the concept of discourse mode separately can be seen as an effort to overcome the difficulty in delineating the macro-genres. Thus, for example, the presence of a descriptive passage in a narrative text can be explained not by the intertwining of genres but by the presence of different modes of discourse within the text (if not post-modern or etc.). Drawing on this idea, all three levels, the discourse mode, the genre, and the macro-genre level, were taken into account while selecting the narrative level descriptors in the CEFR in the present study.

Narrative Texts

Narrative texts include time, setting, characters, a series of events, and a narrator. The defining feature that distinguishes them from other text types is that the narrator is particularly recognizable (Toolan, 1998). In narrative texts, there are two levels in which the series of events or the story are told, and the point of view is given: story and discourse (Koç, 1983). For these two levels, the concepts of *mimesis* and *diegesis*[5] were used during the times of Plato and Aristotle. Russian formalists, on the other hand, used the concepts of *fabula* and *sjuzet* to refer to the same concepts (Chatman, 2008, p. 18). Chatman (2008, p. 17, 21) stated that a narrative includes the content or chain of events and entities (characters, elements of time and space) at the story level and that at the level of discourse, the way the content is conveyed is expressed. The story is the *what* of a narrative, and the discourse is the *how*.

Whether the narratives contain reality or fiction is one of the issues emphasized in the literature. Prince (1982) defined narratives as the recountings of real or fictional events. Bal (1977) drew attention to a similar distinction by asserting that narrative studies are carried out in two separate branches, namely general narratology and literary narratology (Bal, 1977; as stated in Rimmon-Kenan, 2007, p. 44). In line with these views, Bozkurt (2018, p. 94) presented the narrative texts in two categories: fictional and based on real life. The fictional ones are short stories, novels, fairy tales, epics, fables, jokes, myths, movie/tv series scripts, theater plays, comics, etc. The ones based on real-life are memoirs, diaries, personal experience narratives, blogs, biographies/autobiographies, narrative sections of travelogues, narrative sections of letters, game commentaries, narrative sections in historical texts, narrative sections in documentary texts, news items, witness texts, etc. Therefore, it should be noted that narratives that refer to reality are distinct from fictional narratives, that narrative texts do not only consist of literary texts, and that not every narrative has literary content (Bozkurt, 2018, p. 94). As Uzun stated, narrative discourse includes a wide variety of text type denominations ranging from oral narratives produced in daily life to fictional narratives presented in written form (2011a, p. 183).

---

[5] The concept of mimesis is mentioned in Plato's *State* (Trans.: Saraçoğlu & Atayman, 2005), and the concept of diegesis is mentioned in Aristotle's *Poetics* (Trans.: Rifat, 2015).

Labov, who revealed the textual structure of the narrative based on oral narratives and created a point of reference for many narrative analyzes, defined narratives as "one method of recapitulating past experience by matching a verbal sequence of clauses to the sequence of events which (it is inferred) actually occurred" (Labov, 1972, pp. 359-360). According to the prototype Labov created by taking the constituent functional parts of the narrative into account, in the rhetorical schema of narrative texts developed in every aspect, elements such as abstract, orientation, complicating action, evaluation, result, and coda can be found. He noted that all these elements are optional, except for the complicating action. He also put that they can be ordered in complex ways or be connected to each other. Intertwining can also be observed. Labov stated that these elements basically constitute an answer to the following questions (Labov, 1972, p. 370):

a. Abstract: what was this about?

b. Orientation: who, when, what, where?

c. Complicating action: then what happened?

d. Evaluation: so what?

e. Result: what finally happened?

This rhetorical schema presented by Labov is shaped by the communicative intentions targeted on the receiver (reader/listener) and the channel of communication (Yazıcı, 2013, p. 98). The schema is important for the present study, as the narrative texts, which are frequently encountered in education and foreign/second language teaching practices, and some of the level descriptors in the CEFR will be included in the scope of narrative level descriptors to be presented as one of the findings of the study based on their association with certain elements in this schema.

Narrative Texts and Narrative Competence in a Foreign/Second Language

As Riessman claimed, telling stories about past events is a universal human action (as stated in Uzun, 2011a, p. 183). In this context, narrative texts are functional both as content and activity, as well as being the types of texts needed in many other ways in foreign/second language learning. Wajnryb (2003) stated that it is possible to provide the three basic conditions for language learning put forward by Willis (1996) through stories (or narrative texts), which are exposure, use, and motivation. With the use of narrative texts in classrooms, learners are exposed to the language, experience using the language, and are motivated by the interest/curiosity that narrative texts cultivate. Cortazzi (1994) stated that narrative texts and narrative analysis could have a wide variety of functions in the context of foreign language teaching in terms of instructor and learner. Instructors can use narrative analysis to identify appropriate points in the text for "prediction, sequencing, gap filling, editing, and story completion tasks" (Cortazzi, 1994, p.165). A narrative model like Labov's can be functional in assessing learners' written and oral narratives and coming up with story-based activity ideas. Such a model can also guide learners in creating their own stories. Additionally, Cortazzi (1994) noted that oral narrative activities are invaluable in language learning classrooms. Classroom interaction often gives learners the chance to briefly respond to conversations initiated by others. However, telling a story or relating an experience will allow learners to have an extended turn without being interrupted. He said that the need for teachers to make extensive use of written narratives such as picture books, traditional stories, contemporary stories, along with oral storytelling, is also advocated in the literature for learners of all age groups.

Access to the conventional narrative texts in the target language is of utmost importance for foreign/second language learners because, as Wajnryb (2003) put it, "we cannot assume that the skill of achieving a recount, an anecdote, a postcard or a joke is easily transportable from one language to another, as the conventions of these narrative types tend to be highly language- and culture-specific" (p.11). Evaluating the studies in the literature, Pavlenko stated that the narratives produced by second language learners comply with the conventions of the narratives in the target language when the conventional narrative structures in the first language and the second language are similar (Berman 1999; Ordóñez 2004; Rintell 1990; Viberg 2001; as stated in Pavlenko, 2006, p. 109). Also, in cases where the narrative structures in the first language and the second language are different, learners can acquire new structures as well (Maeno 1995, as stated in Pavlenko, 2006, p. 109). Therefore, it is necessary to expose learners to as many narrative texts as possible and teach the conventions and structures of narrative texts in the target language. However, as Pavlenko (2006) explained, second language teaching programs rarely focus on the teaching of narrative structures, prioritizing linguistic or pragmatic competence in classroom practices. However, this can be explained by a few different factors, such as the limited time and the false belief that learners who can make correct sentences can put these sentences one after the other and form a narrative. She also stated that it is frequently encountered that learners who are successful at the sentence level fail to come up with narratives that are appropriate for the language and culture because narrative competence does not exactly overlap with linguistic competence and "does not fully correlate with measures of syntactic complexity or vocabulary size" (McCabe & Bliss 2003, as stated in Pavlenko, 2006, p. 105).

As stated in the introduction, narrative competence refers to the second language users' "ability to interpret, construct, and perform personal and fictional narratives similarly to a reference group of native speakers of the target language" (Pavlenko, 2006, p. 107). Pavlenko mentioned three components of this competence: structure, evaluation and elaboration, and cohesion (Pavlenko, 2006, p. 107). Learners who can operationalize these three elements in their narratives in a way that will be accepted by the speakers of the target language can be considered to have narrative competence.

"Text" in the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages*

The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages published in 2001 and the updated *Companion Volume* published in 2018 are the efforts of the Council of Europe to ensure "quality inclusive education," which is considered a right for all citizens (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 23). This text aims to make curricula, teaching practices, and evaluations transparent and consistent within an institution and across institutions, regions, and countries (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 25). The CEFR was developed as a continuation of the language education studies of the Council of Europe in the 70s and 80s, so it built on the communicative approach presented in the study called The Threshold Level in the mid-70s and adopted the action-oriented approach (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 25). "The CEFR's action-oriented approach represents a shift away from syllabuses based on a linear progression through language structures, or a pre-determined set of notions and functions, towards syllabuses based on needs analysis, oriented towards real-life tasks and constructed around purposefully selected notions and functions" (Council of Europe, 2018, s. 26). It is basically a tool to help plan curricula, courses, and assessment processes by considering what users/learners need to do in the language as a starting point (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 26).

Language use in the CEFR is conceptualized in parallel with communicative language teaching, and according to this conceptualization, language use encompasses the actions of people who develop various general and communicative language competences as individuals or social agents. Language users and language learners engage in a number of linguistic activities, including the processes of producing and receiving text and discourse. These language activities are defined as the use of a person's communicative language competence in a certain domain in receptive or productive processing of texts in order to fulfill a task (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 9). According to this explanation, texts are one of the basic elements in the communication process. In the CEFR, a text is defined as "any sequence or discourse (spoken and/or written) related to a specific domain and which in the course of carrying out a task becomes the occasion of a language activity, whether as a support or as a goal, product or process." (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 10). This definition highlights the multidimensionality of the central role of the text in the communication process and the CEFR.

As clearly stated in the AOBM, communication is not possible without a text. All of the language activities are analyzed in line with the relation of the user/learner and the other persons involved in the communication, and the text is at the center of all kinds of linguistic communication (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 93). When evaluating whether a text can be used for a learner or group of learners, the following factors should be taken into account: "linguistic complexity, text type, discourse structure, physical presentation, length of the text and its relevance for the learner(s)" (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 165). These factors have a direct influence on shaping teaching practices.

Text Types in the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages*

In the CEFR, recognizing text types and forms is associated with pragmatic competence, which is one of the communicative competences that learners need to develop in order to be considered competent in a given language. Pragmatic competence, together with linguistic and sociolinguistic competences, contributes to the successful completion of communicative tasks. Pragmatic competences are related to "the functional use of linguistic resources," and they also concern "the learner's mastery of discourse, cohesion, and coherence, identification of text types and forms, irony and parody" (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 13). Three sub-categories of pragmatic competence have been identified. These are discourse competence, functional competence, and design competence. One of the important elements of discourse competence is text design. Text design is concerned with the way information is structured when some macro functions like description, narrative, exposition, etc. are being realized, the way stories, jokes, anecdotes, etc. are recounted, the way an argument is made in occasions like debates or courts, as well as the way written texts such as essays, letters etc. are outlined, structured, or etc. (Council of Europe, 2018, pp. 138-139). Macro functions fall within the domain of functional competence.

Macro functions such as description, narration, commentary, exposition, exegesis, explanation, demonstration, instruction, argumentation, and persuasion are presented in the CEFR in relation to the functional use of discourse or written texts (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 126). The macro-genre concept proposed by Fludernik (2000) also acknowledged macro functions. From this point of view, the learners' ability as social agents to communicate successfully in oral or written interaction situations, which are largely shaped by the cultural environment, depends on their ability to produce texts to perform macro functions. In order to achieve this, they need to be able to identify text types and know how they are designed and structured. Uzun (2011b, p. 166) stated that the communicative purposes and functions of a text become evident within the genre, and the communicative purposes determine the genre while the genre determines the discourse schema and language use specific to that text. Therefore, teaching discourse schemas and language use in connection with text types or genres will enable learners to be competent in both productive and receptive language activities. In the CEFR (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 160, 165), it is mentioned that the learners' knowledge of text types would help them to have an idea about the structure and content of a text they encounter and thus understand it. It is also stated that whether a text has a concrete (as in narratives) or abstract nature impacts the learners' comprehension.

The way texts are categorized differs from general trends when it comes to language teaching/learning. Categories such as authentic texts, texts specially designed for instructional purposes, or texts in textbooks and texts produced by learners are some of the many text categories mentioned in this field (Council of Europe, 2001, p.16). According to the CEFR, each act of using language takes place in the context of a specific situation in personal, public, professional, or educational domains. In which domain and in what situations learners may encounter texts can be a valid concern in terms of selection of the texts to be included

in the curriculum (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 45). For this reason, text types are presented in a table with regards to these four domains in the CEFR (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 48-49). According to this table, texts that learners may encounter in the personal domain include teletext, guaranties, recipes, instructional materials, novels, magazines, newspapers, junk mail, brochures, personal letters, broadcast and recorded spoken texts. The texts that may be encountered in the public domain are public announcements and messages, labels and packaging, leaflets, graffiti, tickets, timetables, notices, regulations, programs, contracts, menus, sacred texts, sermons, and hymns. Professional domain includes texts such as business letters, report memorandums, life and safety notices, instructional manuals, regulations, advertising material, job descriptions, signposting, visiting cards. Finally, authentic texts, which can possibly be those texts listed in the other domains, textbooks, readers, reference books, blackboard texts, OP texts, computer screen text, video text, exercise materials, journal articles, abstracts, dictionaries, are in the scope of educational domain. The CEFR also acknowledged a distinction between the text types associated with four different domains explained above into two as oral and written texts.

Although the text type classifications used in linguistics or literature studies have been functional in the background of the CEFR, the texts it foregrounds are those that are functional in daily life rather than literary genres such as novels, autobiographies, etc. because its action-oriented approach prioritizes communicative language activities. For example, while a ticket, as an informative text, is not given much importance in other fields, it becomes a type of text that is emphasized in foreign/second language teaching. While the collocations, "informative texts" and "narrative texts," are not encountered in the text published in 2001, the mere fact that these expressions are mentioned in the Companion Volume published in 2018 indicates that these classifications, which were thought to be functional in the background of the CEFR, are actually important reference points in the text and that they have gained more importance throughout the CEFR's developmental process.

METHOD

The present research is qualitative. Qualitative research refers to the type of research in which qualitative data collection methods such as observation, interview, and document analysis are used (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2011). Data was collected from the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (2001) published by the Council of Europe and the *Companion Volume* (2018) through document review, and a content analysis was conducted. Since the *Companion Volume* (Council of Europe, 2018) was published as complementary to the previous text (Council of Europe, 2001), both texts were included in the research. Because the updates presented in the *Companion Volume* were considered to be essential, priority was given to the updated version at points where both texts cover. The processes of collecting, categorizing, and preparing the data for description were carried out sequentially. In order for the findings to be meaningful and consistent within themselves, the analysis was carried out by the three researchers.

The first research question calls for determining the text types that require narrative competence. In order to be able to answer it, the theoretical framework established in the previous sections provides a solid basis. Among all the text types mentioned in the CEFR, texts that include the discourse dimension as well as the story as outlined by Chatman (2008), texts that are likely to include the narrative discourse mode or texts that can be included in the narrative macro-genre category due to their communicative function according to Fludernik's (2000) model, texts with a narrative macro function as stated in the CEFR, and finally, texts that overlap with the narrative genres listed under the categories of "fictional" and "based on real-life" in Bozkurt's (2018) article were considered as texts that require narrative competence based on narrative text classifications in the literature (Günay, 2007; Kıran & Eziler Kıran, 2007; Korkut, 2016; Dilidüzgün, 2017). In order to determine what the level descriptors related to the texts requiring narrative competence across levels and skills are, the scales containing descriptors in various categories in the CEFR and self-assessment scales were examined. Although these scales were not explicitly associated with narrative texts, the level descriptors that could be related to narrative texts were identified and selected to be included in the findings by the researchers. In order to identify the relevant descriptors, common reference level scales, DIALANG[6] self-assessment grids, the scales of overall spoken production, sustained monologue, overall reading comprehension, reading correspondence, thematic development, coherence, and cohesion, overall written interaction, correspondence, creative writing, understanding the interaction between native speakers, listening as a member of a live audience, listening to announcements and instructions, overall listening comprehension, reading for information and argument, identifying cues and inferring, and information exchange were analyzed. In addition to these, reading as a leisure activity and telecommunication scales presented for the first time in *the CEFR Companion Volume* published in 2018 were used.

Various criteria were determined for the process of associating level descriptors in the CEFR with narrative texts. Level descriptors meeting at least one of these criteria were considered to be related to narrative texts. In the process of determining criteria and relating them to narratives, first of all, level descriptors that directly refer to a narrative genre such as novel, story, etc. were identified. In addition, descriptors that are thought to have a potential to bear narrative passages or can be associated with the narrative elements in the surface structure of the texts due to the use of narrative discourse mode were identified based

---

[6] DIALANG is a project by the European Commission and its descriptors are extended and adapted to self-assessment in the CEFR. The self-assessment statements used in DIALANG were taken from the CEFR. It is an assessment system prepared for language learners who want to obtain diagnostic information and feedback about their linguistic proficiency levels. Moreover, this system gives learners advice on how to improve their language skills and aims to increase their language learning awareness and competence. (Council of Europe, 2001, s. 22, 226-229).

on the distinction made by Fludernik (2000) between genre and discourse mode. In addition, descriptors that mention the term "literary texts" as a super-category were considered appropriate to be considered in this context, as they may include narrative genres in certain situations, as explained earlier. Level descriptors related to cohesion, which is one of the three components of the concept of narrative competence that Pavlenko (2006) discussed, were also added to these. Finally, based on the narrative framework that Labov (1972) presented regarding the elements that make up a narrative, the level descriptors that encompass summarization skills, which are seen to be essential to produce narrative texts, were also selected as they can be associated with the abstract section of a narrative. Furthermore, level descriptors that refer to descriptions of persons, places, times, and situations were selected due to their relation to the orientation section. Level descriptors with an emphasis on storytelling or recounting an experience were also selected as they may be associated with complicating action section. Lastly, level descriptors including skills such as interpretation, evaluation, expressing the importance of an event, etc. were also considered as relevant due to their functionality in the evaluation section. All these descriptors were combined in the table below, in which they were classified on the basis of proficiency levels and language skills.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In the present study, the texts requiring narrative competence and the level descriptors related to these texts were analyzed and presented within the framework of research questions according to language skills and proficiency levels established in the CEFr. As a result of the analysis, the answer to the first research question (What text types mentioned in the CEFR require learners to draw on their narrative competences?) is as follows:

In the CEFR, written texts such as novels, personal letters, short stories, short newspaper articles (that describe events), comic strips, photo stories, travelogues, news items, biographies, cartoons, advertisements, postcards, messages, notes, e-mails, blogs and fairy tales, which can be considered as narrative texts, are mentioned. Besides, personal narratives, films, and anecdotes, which are not written genres, are also encountered. However, it should be noted that among these, texts such as short newspaper articles, advertisements, news items, postcards, personal letters, messages, notes, e-mails, and blogs can be counted as narrative genres only in cases when they contain narrative sections or use narrative discourse mode proposed by Fludernik (2000). However, in other cases, these genres may also be considered as informative, expository, etc., as they may have other functions.

A proficiency level-based categorization of the text types/genres mentioned in the CEFR can reveal useful information. Stories (short and simple), letters, advertisements, comics, photostories, imaginary biographies (short and simple), and postcards are mentioned in the A-level scales. Short stories, novels, comics, short news items, biographies, and travelogues are encountered in the B-level scales. In the C-level scales, the most frequently mentioned genres are letters and short/stories. It is observed that genres such as epic, fable, myth, movie/tv series scenario, memoirs, game commentaries, etc. are not mentioned in the CEFR; however, as a common framework used for many different languages and in many different contexts, its mission is to provide examples to illustrate its point rather than listing all of the possible genres. It is the responsibility of field experts to identify the genres that are specific to a given language, culture, program, and level along with competences related to them and transform them into specific objectives. As a matter of fact, some examples of use are presented for various domains in Appendix 6 (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 185-221) due to the fact that the concepts of online interaction and mediation are new to the users of the text. They mention genres such as folk/fairy tales, blogs, web talks, which were not mentioned in the previous text, and this supports the idea that genres to be used in the classroom are not limited to those mentioned in the CEFR.

The second and third research questions aimed to find out what the level descriptors regarding the texts that call for narrative competence across common reference levels (A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, C2) and four skills are in the CEFR. The answers to these research questions are presented in Table 1.[7]

Table 1. distribution of the level descriptors regarding the texts that call for narrative competence across common reference levels (A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, C2) and four skills

	READING
A1	* Can understand in outline short texts in illustrated stories, provided that the images help him/her to guess a lot of the content (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 65). * Can understand short, illustrated narratives about everyday activities that are written in simple words (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 65).
A2	* I can read very short, simple texts. I can find specific, predictable information in simple everyday material such as advertisements, prospectuses, menus and timetables and I can understand short simple personal letters (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 26). * Can understand short simple personal letters (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 61).

---

[7] While determining the distribution of the level descriptors across the four skills, the coherence and cohesion scale in the CEFR was also used; however, the level descriptors in this scale, except for the descriptor ("Can produce clear, smoothly flowing, well-structured speech, showing controlled use of organisational patterns, connectors and cohesive devices." (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 125) were not placed in the table because it is not possible to classify them under the headings of writing or speaking as they apply to both.

* Can understand basic types of standard routine letters and faxes (enquiries, orders, letters of confirmation etc.) on familiar topics (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 61).
* Can identify specific information in simpler written material he/she encounters such as letters, brochures and short newspaper articles describing events (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 63).
* Can understand what is happening in a photo story (e.g. in a lifestyle magazine) and form an impression of what the characters are like (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 65).
* Can understand short narratives and descriptions of someone's life that are written in simple words (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 65).
* Can understand the main point of a short article reporting an event that follows a predictable pattern (e.g. the Oscars), provided it is clearly written in simple language (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 65).
* Can understand much of the information provided in a short description of a person (e.g. a celebrity) (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 65).
* Can understand enough to read short, simple stories and comic strips involving familiar, concrete situations written in high frequency everyday language (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 65).
* Can follow the general outline of a news report on a familiar type of event, provided that the contents are familiar and predictable (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 63).
* Can understand texts describing people, places, everyday life, and culture, etc., provided that they are written in simple language (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 63).

B1	* I can understand texts that consist mainly of high frequency everyday or job-related language (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 167). * I can understand the description of events, feelings and wishes in personal letters (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 167). * Can understand the description of events, feelings, and wishes in personal letters well enough to correspond regularly with a pen friend (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 61). * Can understand a travel diary mainly describing the events of a journey and the experiences and discoveries the person made (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 65). * Can follow the plot of stories, simple novels and comics with a clear linear storyline and high frequency everyday language, given regular use of a dictionary (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 65). * Can understand straightforward personal letters, emails or postings giving a relatively detailed account of events and experiences (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 61). * Can read newspaper / magazine accounts of films, books, concerts etc. written for a wider audience and understand the main points (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 65). * Can follow a line of argument or the sequence of events in a story, by focusing on common logical connectors (e.g. however, because) and temporal connectors (e.g. after that, beforehand) (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 67).
B2	* I can understand contemporary literary prose (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 167). *Can read for pleasure with a large degree of independence, adapting style and speed of reading to different texts (e.g. magazines, more straightforward novels, history books, biographies, travelogues, guides, lyrics, poems), using appropriate reference sources selectively (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 65). *Can read novels that have a strong, narrative plot and that are written in straightforward, unelaborated language, provided that he/she can take his/her time and use a dictionary (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 65).
C1	* I can understand long and complex factual and literary forms of the written language, appreciating distinctions of style (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 27). *Can read and appreciate a variety of literary texts, provided that he/she can reread certain sections and that he/she can access reference tools if he/she wishes (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 65). *Can read contemporary literary texts and non-fiction written in the standard form of the language with little difficulty and with appreciation of implicit meanings and ideas (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 65).
C2	* Can read virtually all forms of the written language including classical or colloquial literary and non-literary writings in different genres, appreciating subtle distinctions of style and implicit as well as explicit meaning (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 65). * I can read with ease virtually all forms of the written language, including abstract, structurally or linguistically complex texts such as manuals, specialised articles and literary works (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 167). *Can read virtually all forms of the written language including classical or colloquial literary and non-literary writings in different genres, appreciating subtle distinctions of style and implicit as well as explicit meaning (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 65).

WRITING

A1	*Can write simple phrases and sentences about themselves and imaginary people, where they live and what they do (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 76). *Can describe in very simple language what a room looks like (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 76).

A2	* Can write short, simple notes, emails and text messages (e.g. to send or reply to an invitation, to confirm or change an arrangement) (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 95). * Can write short, simple imaginary biographies and simple poems about people (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 76). * Can write very simple personal letters expressing thanks and apology (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 94). *Can tell a simple story (e.g. about events on a holiday or about life in the distant future) (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 76). *Can write an introduction to a story or continue a story, provided he/she can consult a dictionary and references (e.g. tables of verb tenses in a course book) (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 76). *Can write diary entries that describe activities (e.g. daily routine, outings, sports, hobbies), people and places, using basic, concrete vocabulary and simple phrases and sentences with simple connectives like 'and,' 'but' and 'because' (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 76).
B1	* I can write simple connected text on topics which are familiar or of personal interest. I can write personal letters describing experiences and impressions (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 26) * Can write a description of an event, a recent trip – real or imagined (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 174, 76). * Can narrate a story (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 174, 76). * Can write accounts of experiences, describing feelings and reactions in simple connected text (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 174, 76). * Can summarise, report and give his/her opinion about accumulated factual information on a familiar routine and nonroutine matters, within his field with some confidence (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 174, 77). *Can clearly signal chronological sequence in narrative text (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 76).
B2	*I can write letters highlighting personal significance of events experiences (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 27). * Can write clear, detailed descriptions of real or imaginary events and experiences marking the relationship between ideas in clear connected text, and following established conventions of the genre concerned (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 173, 76). *Can write letters conveying degrees of emotion and highlighting the personal significance of events and experiences and commenting on the correspondent's news and views (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 94).
C1	* Can write clear, detailed, well-structured and developed descriptions and imaginative texts in a mostly assured, personal, natural style appropriate to the reader in mind (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 176, 73). * I can express myself in clear, well-structured text, expressing points of view at some length (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 169). *Can employ the structure and conventions of a variety of written genres, varying the tone, style and register according to addressee, text type, and theme (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 75).
C2	* I can write clear, smoothly flowing text in an appropriate style. I can write complex letters, reports or articles which present a case with an effective logical structure which helps the recipient to notice and remember significant points. I can write summaries and reviews of professional or literary works (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 27). * Can write clear, smoothly flowing, and engaging stories and descriptions of experience in a style appropriate to the genre adopted (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 173, 76).

SPEAKING

A1	* Can produce simple mainly isolated phrases about people and places (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 69). * Can ask and answer questions about themselves and other people, where they live, people they know, things they have. Can indicate time by such phrases as next week, last Friday, in November, three o'clock (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 90).
A2	* Can tell a story or describe something in a simple list of points (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 70). * Can describe everyday aspects of his/her environment e.g., people, places, a job, or study experience (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 70). * Can describe plans and arrangements, habits and routines, past activities, and personal experiences (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 70). * Can use simple descriptive language to make brief statements about and compare objects and possessions (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 70). * Can explain what he/she likes or dislikes about something (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 70). * Can describe his/her family, living conditions, educational background, present or most recent job (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 70). * Can describe people, places and possessions in simple terms (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 70). *Can ask and answer simple questions about an event, e.g., ask where and when it took place, who was there, and what it was like (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 90).
B1	* I can narrate a story or relate the plot of a book or film and describe my reactions (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 169). * Can give straightforward descriptions on a variety of familiar subjects within his field of interest (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 70). * Can reasonably fluently relate a straightforward narrative or description as a linear sequence of points (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 70). * Can give detailed accounts of experiences, describing feelings and reactions (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 70). * Can relate details of unpredictable occurrences, e.g. an accident (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 70). * Can relate the plot of a book or film and describe his/her reactions (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 70). * Can describe dreams, hopes and ambitions (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 70).

	* Can describe events, real or imagined (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 70).
	* Can narrate a story (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 70).
	*Can clearly express feelings about something experienced and give reasons to explain those feelings (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 70).
	*Can say whether or not he/she approves of what someone has done and give reasons to justify this opinion (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 72).
	*Can give important details over the phone concerning an unexpected incident (e.g. a problem in a hotel, with travel arrangements, with a hire car) (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 92).
B2	*Can describe the personal significance of events and experiences in detail (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 70)
	*Can develop a clear description or narrative, expanding and supporting his/her main points with relevant supporting detail and examples (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 141).
C1	Can give elaborate descriptions and narratives, integrating sub themes, developing particular points and rounding off with an appropriate conclusion (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 70).
	* Can produce clear, smoothly flowing, well-structured speech, showing controlled use of organisational patterns, connectors and cohesive devices (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 142).
C2	* Can produce clear, smoothly flowing well-structured speech with an effective logical structure which helps the recipient to notice and remember significant points (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 69).

LISTENING

A1	*Can recognise concrete information (e.g. places and times) on familiar topics encountered in everyday life, provided it is delivered in slow and clear speech (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 55).
A2	*Can understand the important points of a story and manage to follow the plot, provided the story is told slowly and clearly (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 59).
B1	*Can understand the main points and important details in stories and other narratives (e.g. a description of a holiday), provided the speaker speaks slowly and clearly (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 59).
	*Can listen to a short narrative and predict what will happen next (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 67).
	*Can follow a line of argument or the sequence of events in a story, by focusing on common logical connectors (e.g. however, because) and temporal connectors (e.g. after that, beforehand) (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 67).
B2	*Can follow chronological sequence in extended informal speech, e.g. in a story or anecdote (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 56).
C1	-
C2	-

Pre-A1 level, which was framed as a new reference level in the CEFR Companion Volume published in 2018, was not included in the table above because no narrative texts or level descriptors that could be associated with narratives were encountered at this level. A1 level learners can receive and grasp the general meaning of simple and short (and slowly delivered in the case of spoken texts) texts that are about themselves or their immediate surroundings, concrete or embodying elements concretized through pictures, etc., when the time, setting, and people in the narratives are clear. They can also produce texts of a similar nature. A2 is the level with the highest number of level descriptors. Therefore, it is the level for which the highest number of level descriptors associated with narratives was provided in the table. At this level, narratives (noted as short and simple though) and narrative genres such as story, comic, photo story, short newspaper article, advertisement, and letter are mentioned for the first time. A learner at this level can follow the flow of spoken or written texts in which the events are in chronological order as well as producing very simple narratives that include descriptions of persons or places using simple connectives. An A1 or A2 level learner, who is also described as a "basic user" (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 23), cannot be said to have a narrative competence (Pavlenko, 2006) because she/he has limited resources to structure, evaluate, elaborate, and ensure coherence, and more importantly, and she/he is not proficient enough to produce an example of any genre in the target language.

A B1 or B2 level learner is described as an "independent user" in the CEFR (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 23). It can be claimed that learners at the B1 level are able to cope with more general content outside of their immediate surroundings for the first time. They can produce written or oral descriptions of events and their experiences with important details more fluently than at A levels by making connections between events. Also, at this level, learners show awareness of the conventional structures of genres for the first time (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 141). It is seen that a more independent learner is depicted in the level descriptors at the B2 level. Learners can understand and produce narrative texts at this level without being as dependent on reference sources as before. For example, they can read novels with an uncomplicated plot and only one narrator. They can evaluate the events by emphasizing the importance of the events for themselves in their narratives and can create cohesive texts in which they emphasize the relationships between the events or opinions using conjunctions. They can produce all the components in Labov's rhetorical schema at a minimum. For these reasons, it can be concluded that independent users have a developing narrative competence.

Learners at C1 and C2 levels are termed as "proficient users" (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 23). A C1 level learner can develop an elaborate oral or written narrative from orientation to coda according to Labov's (1972) schema. A learner at the C2 level can even notice the stylistic nuances of discourse, in addition to the competencies developed at the previous levels. It can be claimed that learners at this level are able to cope with complex narrative texts that involve complicated phenomena such as multiple narrators or various point of view devices and adapt them to the situation or to the culture while producing such texts. Therefore, proficient users can be said to have been equipped with the skills required for narrative competence.

When the level descriptors regarding narrative texts are analyzed with respect to the four skills, it is observed that learners can understand descriptions about themselves, people around them, their family, immediate surroundings, and events taking place in daily life in A1 and A2 levels, and the ones about feelings, wishes, experiences and events in B1 level. While there are descriptors regarding understanding short, simple, and plain texts about daily life at A1, A2, and B1 levels, the use of the word "advanced" in descriptors at B2 and C1 levels might indicate an increase in terms of the difficulty as learners can understand and evaluate long and complex literary texts at these levels. At the C2 level, there are level descriptors related to understanding, critical reading, and evaluation of abstract and complex literary texts. There can be multiple narrators in literary narrative texts, which can create unconventional structures in a narrative. The discourse of the text is noticed as much as its story. Sometimes the way the story is told gets more attention than the story itself. Therefore, it can be asserted that a learner at this level has the ability to understand narrative texts in which different literary techniques are used.

Another finding related to reading is that the number of level descriptors related to narrativeness is the highest in reading among four skills. During reading, schemas related to the content of the text in long-term memory, reading processes (decoding, skimming, inferencing, summarizing), and their types (Bayat, 2018) are activated. Therefore, this process requires the learner to perform many operations simultaneously and have relevant competencies. The fact that the number of level descriptors is the highest in reading can be associated with the fact that learners can achieve more in receptive skills than productive skills.

As for the writing skill, there are descriptors about making simple sentences about themselves, the people around them, their families, places where they live, and events at A1 and A2 levels, and descriptors about relating experiences and events are encountered at B1 and B2. In the C1 and C2 level descriptors, the expression "advanced" is used, as in the descriptors for reading, and an emphasis is put on clarity, comprehensibility, and fluency in descriptors referring to writing fictional letters, imaginary texts, stories, etc. It is thought that these point to an increase in the difficulty of descriptions and the fictional quality of the writings. While basic users are expected to produce simple and short texts, proficient users are depicted as users who have the potential to produce literary texts that involve fiction, imaginary elements, or narrative aspects, or who can operationalize different structures and rules according to the style, genre or theme of the text as well as use different styles or even criticize literary works.

Writing is a multidimensional and complex process as it includes many cognitive processes. In the writing process, learners' knowledge of the background and the world interact with many skills (related to styles in the target language; vocabulary, syntax and grammatical structures; cultural specificities, point of view, etc.). Writing, which is one of the productive skills, also requires higher-level thinking. It is observed that the difficulties of level descriptors in writing increase in C1 and C2 since this skill develops later than receptive skills (Keser, 2018, p. 89) and requires more cognitive processing at advanced levels.

A wider variety in terms of descriptions has been found in the scope of speaking at A1 and A2 levels. There are level descriptors regarding describing oneself, the people around, one's family, the place one lives in, daily events, one's living conditions, education, job, possessions, plans, habits, and experiences. Speaking is needed in all domains in life and thus has a wider functionality. The diversity of descriptors related to speaking, especially at the basic level, in the CEFR is compatible with its wider functionality in daily life. It can be said that B1 and B2 level learners have the capacity to be able to tell the theme and plot of a story or movie and express their feelings, dreams, passions, reactions and experiences. At C1 and C2 levels, the difficulty of tasks increases. Speaking, as a productive skill, develops later, like writing, because the coding process is more difficult than decoding for learners (Doğan, 2009; Keser, 2018). Therefore, advanced learners are expected to be able to come up with elaborate and comprehensible descriptions or narratives on complex subjects according to the CEFR.

Regarding listening, descriptors at A1 and A2 levels that are related to being able to recognize concrete issues concerned with daily life and also to being able to follow the theme and plot of a story are presented in more detail as being able to understand the main points, details and the sequence of events in narratives at B1 and B2 levels. In addition, emphasis is placed on short narratives and understanding slow and clear speech at these levels. It is noteworthy that while the competencies of C1 and C2 level learners were possible to identify for other skills, no narrativity-related level descriptors that can be included in the table for the listening skill could be found in the CEFR.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Narrative texts deserve special attention for the role they play in developing the narrative competences of learners, which are crucial in communicating in the target language and within the community speaking that language. However, in the CEFR published in 2001 and the Companion Volume published in 2018, a framework regarding different text types has not been established, and scales specific to text types have not been developed. Therefore, in this study, the scales containing the information and level descriptors in the CEFR were examined, and the information about narrative texts and level descriptors thought to be guiding in the context of foreign/second language teaching were selected and brought together.

In line with these, one conclusion drawn in the study is that the CEFR mentions some genres that can be considered as narrative, such as stories, letters, novels, imaginary texts, and provides level descriptors that can be associated with these genres. What is more, level descriptors mentioning advertisements, comics, photo stories, biographies, postcards, travelogues, news items, personal narratives, films and anecdotes are few. Based on these results, considering their importance in language teaching, it is thought that the level descriptors related to narrative texts are limited. However, although genres such as epic, fable, myth,

movie/tv series script, memoir and game commentary are not directly included in the text, culture-specific genres and other narrative texts can be included in the programs by the users (program developers and language teachers) of the CEFR, taking the requirements of the context and the needs of the learners into account, and can be defined clearly in specific objectives considering that the mentioned genres are given as examples since the CEFR is a general framework.

Another conclusion reached is that presentation of the reading as a leisure activity scale, which is introduced in the CEFR Companion Volume has resulted in an increase in the number of level descriptors that can be related to narrative texts and competence. Although new scales and level descriptors related to narrative texts regarding all of the four skills were added to the CEFR in 2018, the number of the new descriptors that relate to listening and speaking is higher than those relating to reading and writing. This can be interpreted as an adjustment to compensate for the insufficiency of the text published in 2001 regarding oral skills; however, when the two texts in question were evaluated together, it is found out that the level descriptors that can be associated with narrative texts and competence at all levels are the fewest in number regarding speaking and listening, and the highest regarding reading. Considering the abundance of narrative genres based on fiction in literature in which written production is essential, this result regarding reading is not surprising.

It is observed that the level descriptors that can be functional in making inferences about whether or not the learners have narrative competence are structured gradually in the CEFR, in parallel with the A, B, and C levels defined as basic user, independent user, and proficient user levels. Thus, while it is possible to maintain that a learner at A level has very limited narrative competence, a learner at B-level has started to develop this competence and is on the way to perfect it. Not surprisingly, C-level learners are expected to demonstrate a high level of narrative competence.

It is necessary to acknowledge that the CEFR, as a common framework, makes general statements about language teaching/learning theories and practices and points to the diversity of possibilities rather than cover all the possible situations or answer all the questions. Keeping in their minds that the CEFR is just a guide, program developers, textbook writers, and language teachers can benefit from a wider variety of narrative texts in the programs, books, materials, or lessons they prepare in line with the approach of the CEFR and their own teaching context, and they can come up with a number of activities to develop narrative competence. If researchers clarify the narrative competence-related sub-skills in the form of objectives, define them through language-specific features, engage in academic studies researching these in detail, and focusing on different genres, they would contribute significantly to the field.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Statements of publication ethics

We hereby declare that the study has not unethical issues and that research and publication ethics have been observed carefully.

Author contribution statements

The presented idea was conceived by the first author and developed further by the three authors. The second and the third authors reviewed the literature, collected and prepared the data for analysis, and reported the study. In order to assure consistency, analysis of the data was carried out by the three researchers. All authors discussed the results and contributed to the final manuscript. The third author also translated the final manuscript, which was originally written in Turkish.

Researchers' contribution rate

The study was conducted and reported with equal collaboration of the researchers.

Ethics Committee Approval Information

Due to the facts that the study was conducted before 2020 and involved document analysis, approval of an ethics committee was not obtained.

REFERENCES

Adalı, O. (2003). *Anlamak ve anlatmak*. İstanbul: Pan Yayıncılık.

Akbayır, S. (2013). *Cümle ve metin bilgisi*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayınları.

Aktaş, Ş. & Gündüz, O. (2004). *Yazılı ve sözlü anlatım kompozisyon sanatı*. Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları.

Aristoteles. (2015). *Poetika- şiir sanatı üzerine.* (S. Rifat, Çev.). İstanbul: Can Yayınları.

Bayat, N. (2018).Yapılandırmacılık. (H. Ülper Çev. & Ed.). *Okumaya genel bir bakış* içinde (s. 63-94). Ankara: Pegem Yayınları.

Bozkurt, Ü. (2018). Okuma ve yazma eğitiminde metin türlerini sınıflama sorunsalı ve çoklu/karma türlerin öğretimiyle ilgili öneriler. N. Uzun (Ed.), *Türkçenin eğitimi-öğretiminde kuramsal ve uygulamalı çalışmalar* içinde (s. 75-99). İstanbul: Okan Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Brown, H. D., & Lee, H. (2015). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (4th ed.). New York: Pearson.

Canlı, S. & Bozkurt, Ü. (2019). Çocuklar için felsefe dizilerinde metin yapısı görünümleri. *Türkçe eğitimi ve çocuk edebiyatı kurultayı bildirileri kitabı* (s. 523-531). Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Yayınları, 645.

Chatman, S. (2008). *Öykü ve söylem- filmde ve kurmacada anlati yapisi (story and discourse: narrative structure in fiction and film)*. (Ö. Yaren, Çev.). Ankara: De Ki Basım Yayım.

Cortazzi, M. (1994). Narrative analysis. *Language teaching*, 27(3), 157-170. doi:10.1017/S0261444800007801

Council of Europe (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: learning, teaching, assessment*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe/Cambridge University Press.

Council of Europe (2018). *Common European framework of reference for languages: learning, teaching, assessment, companion volume with new descriptors*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Çakır, Ö. (2001). Metinlerin sözbilim yapısının temel eğitim düzeyinde metin işlemleme süreçlerine etkisi. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 26 (121), 45-50. Retrieved, March 18, 2020 from http://egitimvebilim.ted.org.tr/index.php/EB/article/view/5252/1420.

Dilidüzgün, Ş. (2017). *Metindilbilim ve Türkçe öğretimi- uygulamalı bir yaklaşım*. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Doğan, Y. (2009). Konuşma becerisinin geliştirilmesine yönelik etkinlik önerileri. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi,* 7 (1), 185-204. Retrieved, March 5, 2020 from https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/256509

Eziler Kıran; A. (1990). Dilbilim-göstergebilim ilişkiler. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları*, 51-62. Retrieved, February 23, 2020 from http://dad.boun.edu.tr/tr/download/article-file/303001.

Fludernik, M. (2000). Genres, text types, or discourse modes? narrative modalities and generic categorization. *Style*, *34*(2), 274-292. Retrieved, January 20, 2020 from www.jstor.org/stable/10.5325/style.34.2.274.

Günay, D. (2007). *Metin bilgisi*. İstanbul: Multilingual.

Güneş, F. (2013). Türkçe öğretiminde metin seçimi. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, 1 (1), 1-12.

Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching* (4th ed.). London: Pearson.

Kökpınar Kaya, E. (2018). Şimdi'nin etkileşimsel anlatılardaki anlatıcı odaklı görünümleri: Bir söylem belirleyicisi olarak şimdi üzerine bir inceleme. In Y. Aksan & D. Aksan (Haz.), *Türkçede yapı ve işlev şükriye ruhi armağanı* (s. 91-111). Ankara: BilgeSu Yayıncılık.

Keçik, İ. & Uzun, L. (2004). *Türkçe sözlü ve yazılı anlatım*. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Keser, S. (2018). *Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretiminde konuşma becerisinin geliştirilmesinde karşılaşılan güçlükler.* Unpublished M. A. Thesis, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Anabilim Dalı Anabilim Dalı, Ankara.

Kıran, Z. & Eziler Kıran, A. (2007). *Yazınsal okuma süreçleri*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.

Koç, A. A. (1983). Anlatı yapısının kavramsal ve dilsel gelişimi. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 51-60. Retrieved, March 9, 2020 from http://dad.boun.edu.tr/tr/issue/4537/289846.

Korkut, E. (2016). Metin dilbilimi ve dil öğretimi. E. Korkut & İ. Onursal-Ayırır (Ed.), *Dil Bilimleri ve Dil Öğretimi* (s. 173-226). Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.

Kuzu, F. (2016). Söz (parole)-dil (langue) dönüşümü çerçevesinde şiir dili (klâsik türk şiiri bağlamında). *Ekev Akademi Dergisi*, 20(65), 239-252. Retrieved, April 1, 2020 from http://www.ekevakademi.org/Makaleler/411397553_11%20Fettah%20KUZU.pdf.

Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the inner city: studies in the black english vernacular*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lüle Mert, E. (2016). The awareness of 8th graders towards particular genres of fairytale and story. *Journal of international social research*, 9(42), 1258-1264. Retrieved, February 21, 2020 from https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/cd9d/7156a2148c7d7539616f2ce99e6d88c0c41f.pdf?_ga=2.111736896.517272466.1587334927-1850994960.1587334927.

Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı (2018). *Ortaöğretim Türk dili ve edebiyatı dersi (9, 10, 11 ve 12. sınıflar) öğretim programı*. Ankara: MEB Yayınları. Retrieved, December 23, 2019 from http://mufredat.meb.gov.tr/Dosyalar/201812103715395-T%C3%9CRKD%C4%B0L%C4%B0EDEB%C4%B0YAT%20PROGRAM.pdf.

Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı (2019a). *Türkçe dersi (1-8. sınıflar) öğretim programı*. Ankara: MEB Yayınları. Retrieved, December 23, 2019 from http://mufredat.meb.gov.tr/Dosyalar/201957163922530T%C3%BCrk%C3%A7e%20%C3%96%C4%9Fretim%20Program%C4%B1%20201 9.pdf.

Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı (2019b). *PISA 2018 Türkiye ön raporu- eğitim analiz ve değerlendirme raporları serisi no: 10*. Retrieved, December 23, 2019 from http://pisa.meb.gov.tr/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/PISA_2018_Turkiye_On_Raporu.pdf.

Oktar, L. & Yağcıoğlu, A. S. (1993). Metnin retorik yapısının okuma anlama becerisi üzerindeki etkileri. *VII. Dilbilim kurultayı bildirileri kitabı* (s. 171-179).

Özdemir, E. (1983). *Yazı ve yazınsal türler*. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları.

Özsoy, S. (2012). Dil ve dilbilim. A. S. Özsoy & Z. Erk Emeksiz (Ed.), *Genel Dilbilim I* içinde (s. 2-17). Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayını, 2378.

Pavlenko, A. (2006). Narrative competence in a second language. In H. Byrnes, H. Weger-Guntharp & K. A. Sprang (Ed.), *Educating for Advanced Foreign Language Capacities* (s. 105-117). Washington D. C.: Georgetown University Press.

Platon. (2005). *Devlet*. (C. Saraçoğlu & Veysel Atayman, Çev.). İstanbul: Bordo Siyah Yayınları.

Prince, G. (1982). *Narratology: The Form and Functioning of Narrative*. Berlin, New York, Amsterdam: Mouton Publishers.

Rifat, M. (2013*). XX. yüzyılda dilbilim ve göstergebilim kuramları 1. tarihçe ve eleştirel düşünceler*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Rimmon-Kenan, S. (2007). Afterthoughts, almost twenty years later. In M. Bal (Ed.), *Narrative Theory (Vol. I)* (s. 42-55). London and New York: Routledge. (Orijinal yayımlanma tarihi 2002).

Saussure, F. (1916). Cours de linguistique generale. (B. Vardar, Çev.), 1998, *Genel Dilbilim Dersleri*. İstanbul: Multilingual.

Şenöz Ayata, C. (2005). *Metindilbilim ve Türkçe*. İstanbul: Multilingual Yayınları.

Temizkan, M. (2009). *Metin türlerine göre okuma eğitimi*. İstanbul: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Temizyürek, F. (2008). Farklı türlerdeki metinlerin ilköğretim 8. sınıflarda okuduğunu anlamaya etkisi. *Eğitim Araştırmaları*, 30, 141-152.

Toolan, M. J. (1988). *Narrative: a critical linguistic introduction*. London and New York: Routledge.

Uçan, H. (2008). *Dilbilim, göstergebilim ve edebiyat eğitimi*. Ankara: Hece Yayınları.

Uzun, L. (2011a). Anlatı çözümlemesi. In A. S. Özsoy & Z. Erk Emeksiz (Ed.), *Genel Dilbilim II* (s. 182-210). Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi.

Uzun, L. (2011b). Metindilbilim: temel ilke ve kavramlar. In A. S. Özsoy & Z. Erk Emeksiz (Ed.), *Genel Dilbilim II* (s. 152-181). Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi.

Wajnryb, R. (2003). *Stories: Narrative activities for the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yazıcı, N. (2004). *Anlatı metinlerinde ön ve arka planı belirginleştiren dilsel görünümler: Türkçe üzerine gözlemler*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Ankara Üniversitesi Türkçenin Eğitimi ve Öğretimi Anabilim Dalı, Ankara.

Yazıcı, N. (2013). Deli Dumrul'da anlatının düzenlenişi ve retorik şemanın görünümü. *Milli Folklor*, 25(98), 87-99.

Yıldırım, K., Yıldız, M., Ateş, S. & Rasinsky, T. (2010). İlköğretim beşinci sınıf Türk öğrencilerinin metin türlerine göre okuduğunu ve dinlediğini anlama düzeyleri. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 10 (3), 1855-1891.

Yıldırım, A. ve Şimşek, H. (2011). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayınları.