

An Alternative Mini-project Design Proposal for the English Textbook *Mastermind*

Ahmet ACAR
Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi
ahmet.acar@deu.edu.tr
ORCID ID: 0000-0001-8940-4359

Araştırma Makalesi

DOI: 10.31592/aeusbed.833588

Geliş Tarihi: 14.02.2020

Revize Tarihi: 18.11.2020

Kabul Tarihi: 08.03.2021

Atf Bilgisi

Acar, A. (2021). An alternative mini-project design proposal for the English textbook *Mastermind*. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 7(1), 307-320.

ABSTRACT

Training of a social actor as a new goal set by the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) necessitates a transition from the communicative approach to the action-oriented approach, a transition from training successful communicators to training social actors. Communicative textbooks, mostly, employ situations of communication (e.g. simulations, role-plays) at the end of the units, whose function is to allow the learners to reuse the language content of the unit or to enable them to make free production. A textbook prepared in accordance with the action-oriented approach, however, does not offer communication situations at the end of the unit but mini-projects, whose ultimate aim is to train social actors. This paper aims to evaluate the English textbook *Mastermind* used in the 8th grades of public secondary schools in Turkey in terms of the action-oriented approach. For this purpose, the characteristics of the assignment in unit 3 of the textbook *Mastermind* are analysed. It is argued that the function of the analysed assignment is to reuse the language content of the unit or enable the learners to make free production and it remains only as a pretext for communication. Thus, the textbook is communicative rather than action-oriented. For this reason, an alternative mini-project design is proposed to show how to make this textbook action-oriented.

Keywords: English textbooks, action-oriented approach, mini-projects.

İngilizce Ders Kitabı *Mastermind* için Alternatif bir Mini-proje Tasarım Önerisi

ÖZ

Avrupa Dilleri Ortak Çerçeve Programı (ADOÇP) tarafından yeni bir hedef olarak belirlenen bir sosyal aktörün eğitimi, iletişimsel yaklaşımdan eylem odaklı yaklaşıma, başarılı iletişimcilerin eğitiminden sosyal aktörlerin eğitimine geçişi gerektirmektedir. İletişimsel ders kitapları, çoğunlukla, ünitelerin sonunda, işlevi öğrencilerin ünitenin dil içeriğini yeniden kullanmalarına veya özgür üretim yapmalarına olanak tanıyan iletişim durumlarını (örneğin simülasyonlar, rol oyunları) kullanmaktadır. Eylem odaklı yaklaşıma göre hazırlanan bir ders kitabı ise ünite sonunda iletişim durumları değil, nihai amacı sosyal aktör yetiştirmek olan mini-projeler sunmaktadır. Bu makale Türkiye'deki devlet ortaokullarının 8. sınıflarında kullanılan İngilizce ders kitabı *Mastermind*'in eylem odaklı yaklaşım açısından değerlendirilmesini amaçlamaktadır. Bu amaçla, ders kitabı *Mastermind*'in 3. ünitesindeki ödevin özellikleri analiz edilmiştir. İncelenen ödevin işlevinin ünitenin dil içeriğini yeniden kullanmak veya öğrencilerin özgür üretim yapmalarına olanak tanımak olduğu ve sadece bir iletişim vasıtası olarak kaldığı iddia edilmektedir. Dolayısıyla ders kitabı eylem odaklı olmaktan çok iletişimseldir. Bu nedenle, bu ders kitabının nasıl eylem odaklı yapılacağını göstermek için alternatif bir mini-proje tasarımı önerilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İngilizce ders kitapları, eylem-odaklı yaklaşım, mini-projeler.

Introduction

In this article, the action-oriented approach is used to refer to what Puren (2020a) and Acar (2020a, 2020b) call social-action-based learning (SABL) since the action targeted in the action-oriented approach is social action, not speech action or speech acts of the communicative approach. Communicative interaction is the main focus of the communicative approach as well as a development in it, namely, task-based language teaching as emphasized by various task-based methodologists (Ellis, 2003; Estaire and Zanon, 1994; Nunan, 1989; Willis, 1996). Thus, the main goal is to train successful communicators who can be involved in communicative interactions with people from the target language community in short term contact situations as indicated by Van Ek's (1975) *The Threshold Level in a European-Unit/Credit System for Modern Language Learning by Adults*.

CEFR (2001) and Common European Framework of Reference for Languages Companion Volume (CEFR CV, 2018), however, set a new goal for language teaching, that of training learners as social actors. This new goal is shaped by the current structure of Europe, which is multilingual and multicultural society as emphasized both by CEFR (2001) and CEFR CV (2018). Puren (2009, p.124) argues that:

“It is now a question of training citizens of multilingual and multicultural societies capable of living together harmoniously (and foreign and second language classes in France are mini-societies of this type), as well as students and professionals capable of working with others over the long term in the foreign language-culture”.

Thus, in terms of the action-oriented approach, it is no longer enough to train communicators, who will be involved in short terms contact situations as in a tourist trip, but to train citizens, who can not only live together harmoniously in their multilingual and multicultural society but also act effectively in their school and workplace. Thus, the action-oriented approach aims to prepare social actors (learners) for social action, which is “acting with the others” (Puren, 2004, p. 20), in which speech acts are just a means and not the goal.

Action-oriented Textbooks for Training Social Actors

Preparing social actors for two new objectives, that of living together harmoniously and acting together effectively, relate to educating citizens and professionals who can live together harmoniously and act together effectively in major domains of social life: personal, public, educational and professional. The current dominant methodology, namely, task-based language teaching, with its communicative tasks, would certainly be insufficient to realize these objectives since its main goal is to train successful communicators. The communicative approach provided learners with L2 simulated communication situations to prepare them for communicating in the real world later on. Thus, the classroom is viewed as an artificial environment. The action-oriented approach, on the other hand, views learners as social actors and the class as a real mini-society in its own right, not as an artificial environment. Social actors, in their mini-societies, are, thus, put in real social action situations rather than communication situations as in the communicative approach. To Puren (2009, 2014a, 2014b, 2014c, 2016, 2017, 2019), the goal of training social actors can be realized by pedagogical projects and mini-projects. Since pedagogical projects require maximum autonomy from the social actors (learners), they can not be limited, directed or imposed by an outside constraint like a textbook or curriculum. Mini-projects, on the other hand, can be employed by the action-oriented textbooks, and thus, they are constrained, to a certain extent, by the language textbooks. Mini-projects, however, still reflect the characteristics of pedagogical projects and their characteristics are different from those of communicative tasks, as Puren (2020b) points out in table 1 below:

Table 1
Table of Opposite Characteristics of the Conception of Action in the Communicative Approach and the Action Perspective (the version of 13/02/2020)

Communicative Task	Mini-project
1. pre-design of the task/project by the teacher/textbook	1. at least partial design of the task/project by the students (the "design" is the "initial task", characteristic of any project)
2. single task (single instruction)	2. several tasks articulated with each other ("action scenario") with choices proposed in the form of questions or alternatives, or even according to student initiatives
3. procedural logic: students are simply asked to perform the predefined tasks correctly	3. process logic: students are asked to reflect on the tasks to be performed/in progress/after completion (metacognitive activities)
4. language and cultural resources provided to students from the outset	4. resources at least partially sought by students

5. document processing in support logic	5. document processing in documentation logic
6. work only on the authentic documents proposed	6. work also on the final or even intermediate productions of the students (note-taking, drafts, provisional syntheses...)
7. exclusive use of the L2	7. use of the L1 and L1+n in the service of action (in particular, multilingual documentation and projection of the action in "society 1")
8. the culture has no relationship other than a thematic one with the final task	8. documentation relating in part to cultures of action (= the ways of carrying out the project, including the final production, in different cultures) - reflection and decision of the students on the culture of action they will implement in the proposed action - students' reflection and decision on the teaching-learning culture that they will implement in the classroom.
9. one-time, single-use documentation and production in the corresponding teaching unit	9. sustainable production (updating documentation for possible reuse, repetition of documents or tasks over several units, etc.)
10. individual or inter-individual (pairs) dimension of work and final production	10. collective dimension (large groups, group-class)
11. management and purpose of activities only in the classroom and for internal use in the classroom	11. real projection or in simulation - but in realistic simulation - outside the classroom (school, family, society, other classes abroad...)
12. teacher-centred assessment focusing on language learning	12.- individual and collective self-assessments (groups, group-class) - evaluation of the process (conducting the mini-project, group work), of the educational value (autonomy, responsibility, solidarity...), at the end of the project or even during the project (with feedback and possible modification of the continuation of the project) - evaluation of the social projection (interest generated, impact...) - proactive dimension (summary of points to be taken into account for the next mini-projects)

Table 1 points out the important characteristics of mini-projects as a form of the implementation of the action-oriented approach in language textbooks. Mini-projects are complex actions much in the case of pedagogical projects since social action is a complex action and they have a design stage with a certain level of complexity, collective autonomy and a collective self-evaluation phase (as well as an evaluation by the teacher and/or public evaluation), information management and a final product, performance or decision, which also have a collective dimension. Collectivity is an indispensable feature of mini-projects since (1) social action is by nature a collective action, (2) the learner, in the action-oriented approach, is considered as a social actor in his/her class as a mini-society and this social actor is a real citizen of this micro-society with its collective dimension. This collectivity, in the action-oriented approach, is reflected in the mini-project design, collective nature of classroom activities and the collective evaluation at the end of the mini-project. The action-oriented approach encourages group autonomy from the learners since social actors, for Puren (2016), must be autonomous and supportive in both their mini-society and outside society and if they want to be involved in a project it must be theirs and should not be imposed by an outside authority. The autonomy, in the action-oriented textbooks, is given to the social actors by offering them two mini-projects which are the variants of the same social action at the end of the textbook units so that the social actors can choose one or both of these mini-projects (Acar, 2020a) and autonomy is also reflected within the design of the mini-projects by offering the social actors choices in the substeps of the mini-project design as also emphasized in Table 1. The reuse situations and final tasks at the end of the textbook units within the communicative approach and task-based language teaching, however, do not generally present the learners with options but are strictly organized instructions. In this sense,

there is no learner autonomy in terms of social action, and limited autonomy in terms of language content.

In the implementation of the action-oriented approach in language textbooks in terms of mini-projects, Puren (2009) and Maurer and Puren (2019) argue that there is a need for giving priority to real actions rather than simulated actions as in the communicative approach since the best way to train social actors is to involve them in real social actions in their mini-society (classroom). Since communication, in the action-oriented approach, is not the goal but just a means at the service of social action, unit objectives should be stated in terms of social action objectives rather than functional-notional objectives. Thus, “social-action-based textbook unit design differs from a communicative unit design since it is a unit of social action rather than a unit of communication” (Acar, 2020a, p. 35). This is also reflected in the characteristics of mini-projects: communication, in the mini-projects, is not the ultimate goal but just a means at the service of social action. The ultimate goal of training learners as social actors has an educational dimension. This means that the sole function of mini-projects can not be allowing learners to reuse the language content of the unit and hence they can not remain only as a pretext for communication.

Method

In this section, detailed information about the research design, study group, data collection tools, data analysis, and research ethics is given.

Research Design

In this study, document analysis as a qualitative research method is used to analyse the characteristics of the assignment (which would be a mini-project in terms of the action-oriented approach) in unit 3 of the English textbook *Mastermind* used in the 8th grades of public secondary schools in Turkey in terms of the action-oriented approach.

Study Group

Since the analysis of all the assignments at the end of all the units in the textbook will exceed the page limitation, the assignment in unit 3, selected randomly among all the assignments at the end of the textbook units, is chosen for an in-depth analysis.

Data Collection Tools

In qualitative research, common data collection techniques are interview, observation and document analysis (Baltacı, 2019). Document analysis, according to Bowen (2009, p.27), is “a systematic procedure for reviewing or evaluating documents—both printed and electronic (computer-based and Internet-transmitted) material”.

Data Analysis

The data that are put to a detailed analysis are the characteristics of the assignment proposed in unit 3 of the English textbook *Mastermind*. Thus, the research question of this study is: Does the proposed assignment in unit 3 of the English textbook *Mastermind* reflect the characteristics of mini-projects?

Research Ethics

Since the study uses document analysis, it does not need ethics committee approval.

Findings

An Analysis of the 8th Grade ELT Textbook *Mastermind* in terms of the Action-oriented Approach

The English textbook *Mastermind* is used by the students at the average age of 13 in the 8th grades of public secondary schools in Turkey. In the assignment section of each unit of the textbook, the students are offered one or two activities which are named *assignments*. This poses a problem in terms of the action-oriented approach since the so-called final tasks at the end of the action-oriented textbook units are neither tasks nor assignments but mini-projects. One of these assignments in *Mastermind* is *preparing a visual dictionary*, which is an individual assignment, introduced in unit 1 and extended throughout all the other units as *keeping expanding the visual dictionary*. The other activities accompanying this assignment vary from one unit to the other. Thus, the students are not offered two mini-projects which are variants of the same action but two assignments that the students must carry out without any option. All the units are organized around topics, which must have been social actions in terms of the action-oriented approach, in other words, the units are not guided by social actions but by topics such as *friendship* (unit one) and *teen life* (unit two). Unit objectives are stated in terms of functions and notions. The objectives of unit 3, for example, are stated as *describing simple processes, expressing preferences, making simple inquiries*, which are communicative objectives rather than action objectives, which indicate that the textbook is communicative rather than action-oriented. Thus, the assignments offered at the end of the textbook units serve these communicative objectives.

The Analysis of the Proposed Assignment in Unit 3

In unit 3, *in the kitchen*, the proposed assignment other than *keep expanding your visual dictionary* is “Prepare a poster about your favorite meal and provide the preparation process as in the sample” (İlter, İzgi, Özdemir, Yeter and Yünlü, 2018, p. 42). The sample poster is, then, provided to the students just below this instruction. Below this sample poster, there is a section titled *self-assessment*, which is present at the end of every unit, where individual students evaluate themselves through a self-assessment checklist.

The so-called assignment *Prepare a poster about your favorite meal and provide the preparation process as in the sample* can even be criticized from a communicative perspective since there is no instruction as to whether the student or students will present the poster to the class and the other students will show any reaction to the presentation (the presence of interaction). From the instruction, it is understood that the student(s) will prepare a poster about his/her/their favorite meal and provide the preparation process and then the activity comes to an end. In terms of the action-oriented approach, it is not clear for whom the poster is prepared and what the objective of preparing a poster about one’s favorite meal is (it does not have a social projection). This poster could have been relevant if the final product is displayed in a school exhibition where the parents and other teachers are invited and their reactions to the posters are received. In the instruction, there is no information as to where the poster will be displayed. Although the CEFR criteria are given for evaluating the language performance of each student, there are no criteria for a collective self-evaluation of the social action. Thus, the only function of the proposed assignment is to provide the students with free production or to allow them to reuse the language content of the unit. Even the free production does not involve the students in oral communicative interaction since the result is only a written product, which does not involve any interaction (providing the preparation process of their favorite meal in the poster).

As stressed in this article, mini-projects are complex actions since social action is a complex action but the assignment *Prepare a poster about your favorite meal and provide the preparation process as in the sample* consists of a single instruction without any substeps leading to the final production (no action scenario in the design) and hence the design stage with a certain level of complexity is absent. Thus, the design focuses only on the product (*preparing a poster*) and lacks a process dimension and hence educational dimension is absent in the assignment. Neither is there any instruction as to whether the students will prepare the poster in pairs, groups, or as a whole class, and from the instruction, it may be understood that it is an individual activity. The final product does not

have a collective dimension so the autonomy is restricted to individual autonomy and collective autonomy is absent. The students are not presented with choices in the single instruction *Prepare a poster about your favorite meal and provide the preparation process as in the sample*, and just below the instruction, a sample poster is provided to the students, which is a single directive since the textbook writers impose on the students a poster format and thus leaves no choice for the students. In this respect, even individual autonomy is restricted in the assignment. There is no instruction related to information management or informational competence (Puren, 2008), that is, the students do not seek and manage information before preparing the poster. They are suggested to jump into preparing a poster about their favorite meal. Collective self-evaluation of the final product is also absent in the proposed assignment. There is a *self-assessment* section, which is present at the end of each unit, below the sample poster for the students to evaluate their language performance but this can-do self-assessment checklist is not enough for an evaluation of a social action, which is by nature complex and collective action. It only assesses individual language performance (not collective) and collective evaluation is absent. Thus, the proposed assignment is far from being a mini-project as a form of the application of the action-oriented approach in language textbooks. I propose an alternative mini-project design for unit three of the English textbook *Mastermind* below:

A: As a whole class, prepare a cookbook with local recipes to promote Turkish cuisine to the world and share it on social media like Facebook.

B: Open up Facebook account with a title you choose (e.g. Turkish cuisine, recipes for the world, etc.). You can also seek ways to invite your peers from other countries to share their cuisine on your Facebook account. Decide collectively on a title for your cookbook which reflects the content of your cookbook and add some inspiring subtitles on the cover to reflect your class identity (e.g. best recipe suggestions from class 8A of secondary school X).

C: Search the internet as to what a recipe includes (e.g. The name of the meal, the number of people the meal can serve, ingredients and amount of ingredients, the steps of preparation instructions for cooking, the statement of cooking time, etc.) and decide collectively on the criteria for evaluating the recipes of the groups and agree on a format for your cookbook.

D: Search the internet and/or consult your parents as to which recipes best represent your local cuisine. If your parents suggest recipes in your native language, write down every detail you searched in C and translate, as a group, the parents' recipes into English. Search the internet for the relevant pictures to accompany your recipe.

E: In groups, write the recipe for your meal in the format you collectively agreed on in C.

F: In groups, present your recipes in the class.

G: The other classmates will listen to you, take notes, and evaluate your recipes by using the evaluation grid you formed collectively. Make suggestions to the groups whose recipes are not in line with the criteria and format you formed and developed collectively.

H: As a whole class put together all the recipes in a single word or PDF format.

I: Share your cookbook on social media.

J: Follow up (as a whole class) on the likes and dislikes and the comments received from people about the cookbook on the social media.

In terms of the objective of the action, this mini-project has a social dimension *As a whole class, prepare a cookbook with local recipes to promote Turkish cuisine to the world and share it on*

social media like Facebook. A mini-project is a complex action and the design stage of this mini-project reflects this complexity with the number of substeps, the number of the students (social actors) involved in this mini-project as well as the duration of the mini-project and final production which has a collective dimension. The social actors (students) are given a certain amount of autonomy since they are given choices in the substeps of this mini-project. Collectivity is highly emphasized in this mini-project in both the statement of the objective of the action (as a whole class, prepare a cookbook...) and in the substeps of the mini-project design (e.g. in groups, write the recipe for your meal). Informational competence is targeted at steps C and D since the students are encouraged to search for and manage information in these steps. There is a collective evaluation at the end of the group products (recipes). Public evaluation is also addressed in step J. Thus, collectivity is reflected in the evaluation phase. The substeps of the action scenario lead to a final social action, which is *sharing the cookbook on social media*. Thus, one important criterion of the action-oriented approach, which is putting communication at the service of social action, is met. Communication, in the action-oriented approach, is not the goal but just a means of social action. Thus, the sole function of this mini-project is not the reuse of the language content of the unit, as in the case of the proposed assignment in unit 3 of *Mastermind*, but to train social actors. One of the most important characteristics of the action-oriented approach is that there is a preference for real action rather than simulated action, and the proposed mini-project encourages the learners to carry out a real action: Preparing a cookbook with local recipes and sharing it on social media.

Conclusion, Discussion and Recommendations

The communicative textbooks employed communication situations at the end of the textbook units to enable the learners to reuse the functions and notions presented in the textbook unit. With the developments in the communicative approach (e.g. Task-based language teaching), the simulated reuse situations at the end of the unit of the communicative textbooks were replaced with final tasks as suggested by Estaire and Zanon (1994). The action-oriented approach, on the other hand, employ mini-projects at the end of the textbook units, the ultimate aim of which is not only to enable the learners to communicate in the target language but also to equip the social actors with the skills “such as personal autonomy, collective responsibility, group work, information management, negotiation, design and implementation of complex actions since these skills are important for language learners to live and work successfully in their democratic society” (Acar, 2019a, p.122).

This study critically analyses the proposed assignment at the end of the 3rd unit of the English textbook *Mastermind* used in the public secondary schools in Turkey and indicates that the assignment does not carry the characteristics of mini-projects. Alternatively, a new mini-project is proposed for the mentioned unit of the textbook. To Puren (2009, 2014a, 2016, 2019), the implementation of the action-oriented approach in language textbooks is possible by means of mini-projects, which take place at the end of the textbook units. Thus, the authors of the textbook *Mastermind* seem to make an error in categorizing by labeling these actions as assignments throughout the textbook *Mastermind*. When the current English curriculum for the primary and secondary schools (Ministry of National Education [MoNE], 2018) is analysed, it is observed that unit 3 of the 8th-grade syllabus gives place to a section titled *suggested contexts, tasks and assignments*, under which the proposed assignments are *students keep expanding their visual dictionary by including new vocabulary items and students prepare a poster about their favorite meal and provide the preparation process*. These two assignments match those of the assignments of unit 3 of the English textbook *Mastermind*, which is natural since the textbook writers in Turkey must follow the English curriculum. Thus, the real source of the mistake of giving place to assignments rather than mini-projects at the end of the units in *Mastermind* is observed to be the Turkish ELT curriculum for the primary and secondary schools (MoNE, 2018). The curriculum, however, claims that it adopts the action-oriented approach in its following statement:

“As no single language teaching methodology was seen as flexible enough to meet the needs of learners at various stages and to address a wide range of learning styles, an eclectic mix of instructional techniques has been adopted, drawing on an action oriented approach

in order to allow learners to experience English as a means of communication, rather than focusing on the language as a topic of study” (MoNE, 2018, p. 3).

The attempt to employ assignments rather than mini-projects by the developers of the Turkish English Language Teaching (ELT) curriculum for the primary and secondary schools is not their sole fallacy since the goal of the action-oriented approach is also misleadingly presented as communication in this curriculum. As stated in this article, communication, in the action-oriented approach, is not the goal but a means at the service of social action. The above quote is directly copied and pasted without any citation as also stated by Acar (2019b) from page two of the 2013 ELT curriculum for the primary and secondary schools of Turkey (MoNE, 2013). Thus, the origin of this problem is the 2013 curriculum. In fact, the sources of the misinterpretation of the action-oriented approach are not limited to these two curricula of Turkey. The developers of the 2013 ELT curriculum of Turkey, Kırkgöz, Çelik and Arıkan (2016, p.1207) state that “The newly developed curriculum, in accordance with the principles of Communicative Language Teaching and the CEFR, gives primacy to spoken language in grades two through four, with the main emphasis on the development of oral-aural skills.” and with this statement, they consider the action-oriented approach as the communicative approach since within the curriculum they state the goal of the action-oriented approach as allowing learners to experience English as a means of communication. Besides, Zorba and Arıkan (2016, p.18) argue that “Task-based learning has a significant place in the CEFR. In fact, the action-oriented approach that the CEFR adopted is based on tasks”, which reflects, misleadingly, a view of the action-oriented approach as task-based learning. What is more, such inconsistencies were not even noticed by Yeni Palabıyık and Daloğlu (2016) who title their article as *English language teachers' implementation of curriculum with action-oriented approach in Turkish primary education* and by Ekşi (2017), who proposes a video link, which, she claims, provides information about the underlying methodology of the 2013 curriculum but which does not provide any single explanation about the action-oriented approach that this curriculum claims to be based on.

The very nature of the analysed assignment in the textbook *Mastermind* does not reflect the characteristics of mini-projects. The primary objective of the assignment proposed at the end of the 3rd unit of the textbook is to reuse the language content of the textbook unit rather than educating for social action. Thus, the education dimension in the proposed assignment is absent. Mini-projects in the form of the application of the action-oriented approach in language textbooks, however, have always an educational dimension besides offering reuse situations. The proposed assignment in the textbook seems to be an individual assignment carried out at home: the entire collective dimension inherent in project pedagogy is absent.

In terms of the action-oriented approach, the English textbook *Mastermind* has such fallacies that need to be revised (1) Instead of individual assignments, the textbook units should offer at least two mini-projects that meet the characteristics of pedagogical projects as much as possible. (2) These mini-projects should not only present the final product or performance (as the textbook *Mastermind* did) but also the process in the design (3) The textbook writers should state the unit objectives in terms of social actions rather than functions and notions. By proposing a mini-project design as an alternative to the proposed assignment of the 3rd unit of the English textbook *Mastermind*, this article aims to shed light on how to design mini-projects in the form of the application of the action-oriented approach in language textbooks.

Author Contribution Statement

Since the study has a single author, the author's contribution rate is 100%.

Conflicts of Interest

There is no conflict of interest in this study.

References

- Acar, A. (2019a). The Action-oriented approach: Integrating democratic citizenship education into language teaching. *English Scholarship Beyond Borders*, 5(1), 122-141.
- Acar, A. (2019b). A comparison of the 2013 and 2018 primary and secondary schools ELT curricula in Turkey: An analysis of 7th-grade syllabi. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 48(224), 299-325.
- Acar, A. (2020a). Social-action-based textbook design in ELT. *English Scholarship Beyond Borders*, 6(1), 27-40.
- Acar, A. (2020b). The implementation of educational projects in social-action-based learning. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, 11(4), 599 – 617.
- Baltacı, A. (2019). Nitel araştırma süreci: Nitel bir araştırma nasıl yapılır?. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 5(2), 368-388.
- Bowen, G.A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27-40.
- Council of Europe (CoE). (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Council of Europe (CoE). (2018). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. Companion volume with new descriptors*. Retrieved from <https://rm.coe.int/cefr-companion-volume-with-new-descriptors-2018/1680787989> in 24.10.2020.
- Ekşi, G. Y. (2017). Designing curriculum for second and foreign language studies. In A. Sarıçoban (Ed.), *ELT methodology* (pp. 39-60). Anı Yayıncılık: Ankara.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Estaire, S. and Zanon, J. (1994). *Planning classwork: A task-based approach*. Oxford: Heinemann.
- İlter, B., İzgi, İ., Özdemir, E.Ç., Yeter, A.T. ve Yünlü, Z.T.Ç. (2018). *Mastermind- student's book*. Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- Kırkgöz, Y., Çelik, S. and Arıkan, A. (2016). Laying the theoretical and practical foundations for a new elementary English curriculum in Turkey: A procedural analysis. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 24(3), 1199-1212.
- Maurer, B. and Puren, C. (2019). *CECR: par ici la sortie!* France: Editions des archives contemporaines.
- Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı (MEB) [Turkish Ministry of National Education (MoNE)]. (2013). *İlköğretim kurumları (ilkokullar ve ortaokullar) İngilizce dersi (2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 ve 8. sınıflar) öğretim programı [Primary education institutions (primary and secondary schools) English language teaching program (Grades 2-8)]*. Ankara: T.C. Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı.
- Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı (MEB) [Turkish Ministry of National Education (MoNE)]. (2018). *İngilizce Dersi öğretim programı (ilkokul ve ortaokul 2,3,4,5,6,7 ve 8. sınıflar) [English language teaching program (primary and secondary schools grades 2,3,4,5,6,7 and 8)]*. Ankara: T.C. Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı.

- Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Puren, C. (2004). *De l'approche par les tâches à la perspective co-actionnelle*. Retrieved from <https://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2004a/> in 26.10.2020.
- Puren, C. (2008). *La perspective de l'agir social sur les contenus de connaissance en classe de langue: de la compétence communicative à la compétence informationnelle*. Retrieved from <https://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2008b/> in 26.10.2020.
- Puren, C. (2009). *La nouvelle perspective actionnelle et ses implications sur la conception des manuels de langue*. Retrieved from <https://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2009g/> in 26.10.2020.
- Puren, C. (2014a). *Approche communicative et perspective actionnelle, deux organismes méthodologiques génétiquement opposés... et complémentaires*. Retrieved from <https://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2014a/> in 26.10.2020.
- Puren, C. (2014b). *La pédagogie de projet dans la mise en œuvre de la perspective actionnelle*. Retrieved from <https://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2014b/> in 27.10.2020.
- Puren, C. (2014c). *Différents niveaux de l' « agir » en classe de langue-culture: corrigé du tp sur la notion de « compétence »*. Retrieved from file:///C:/Users/user/Downloads/054-2_Niveaux_agir__notion_comp%C3%A9tence_corrige%C3%A9_TP.pdf in 27.10.2020.
- Puren, C. (2016). *De l'approche communicative à la perspective actionnelle: exercice de décodage d'une « manipulation génétique » sur une tâche finale d'unité didactique d'un manuel DE FLE*. Retrieved from <https://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2016a/> in 26.10.2020.
- Puren, C. (2017). *Opérations cognitives (proaction, métacognition, régulation) et activités fondamentales (rétroactions, évaluations) de la démarche de projet*. Retrieved from <https://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2017a/> in 27.10.2020.
- Puren, C. (2019). *De la tâche finale au mini-projet: Un exemple concret d'analyse et de manipulation didactiques*. Retrieved from file:///C:/Users/User/Downloads/PUREN_2019f_Tache_finale_a_mini-projet%20(1).pdf in 28.10.2020.
- Puren, C. (2020a). *From an internationalized communicative approach to contextualised plurimethodological approaches*. Retrieved from <https://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2020c-en/> in 28.10.2020.
- Puren, C. (2020b). *Table of opposite characteristics of the conception of action in the communicative approach and the action perspective*. Retrieved from <https://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2014a/> in 28.10.2020.
- Van Ek, J. A. (1975). *The threshold level*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Willis, J. (1996). *A framework for task based learning*. Harlow: Longman.
- Yeni-Palabiyik, P. and Daloğlu, A. (2016). English language teachers' implementation of curriculum with action-oriented approach in Turkish primary education classrooms. *Journal on English Language Teaching*, 6(2), 45-57.

Zorba M.G. and Arıkan A., (2016). A study of Anatolian high schools' 9th grade English language curriculum in relation to the CEFR. *Uşak Üniversitesi Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2(2), 13-24.

Geniřletilmiř Özet

Giriř

İletiřimsel etkileřim, iletiřimsel yaklařımın ve çeřitli görev-temelli metodların (Ellis, 2003; Estaire ve Zanon, 1994; Nunan, 1989; Willis, 1996) da vurguladıđı gibi görev-temelli dil öğretiminin, ki o da iletiřimsel yaklařım içinde bir geliřmedir, ana hedefidir. Bu nedenle, ana hedef Van Ek'in (1975) Eřik Düzeyi Belgesi'nde belirttiđi kısa vadeli temas durumlarında hedef dil topluluđundan insanlarla iletiřimsel etkileřimlere katılabilecek bařarılı iletiřimciler yetiřtirmektir. Ancak, Avrupa Dilleri Ortak Çerçeve Programı (ADOÇP, 2001) ve Avrupa Dilleri Ortak Çerçeve Programı Ek Belgesi (ADOÇPEB, 2018) dil öğretimi için, öğrencileri sosyal aktörler olarak eğitme hedefi olan yeni bir hedef belirlemiřtir. Dolayısıyla, eylem-odaklı yaklařım açasından, artık turist gezilerinde olduđu gibi kısa süreli temas durumlarına katılacak olan iletiřimciler yetiřtirmek yeterli deđil, çok dilli ve çok kültürlü toplumlarında birlikte uyumlu bir řekilde yařayabilen, aynı zamanda okullarında ve iřyerlerinde etkin bir řekilde eylemde bulunan vatandaşlar yetiřtirmek gerekmektedir.

Yöntem

Bu çalışmada, Türkiye'deki devlet ortaokullarının sekizinci sınıflarında kullanılan İngilizce ders kitabı *Mastermind*'ın 3. ünitesindeki ödevin özelliklerini (eylem odaklı yaklařım açasından mini-proje olacaktı) eylem odaklı yaklařım açasından analiz etmek için nitel araştırma yöntemi olarak belge analizi kullanılmıřtır. Ders kitabındaki tüm ünitelerin sonundaki tüm ödevlerin analizi sayfa sınırlamasını ařacađından, ders kitabının ünitelerinin sonundaki tüm ödevler arasından rastgele seçilen 3. ünitedeki ödev, derinlemesine bir analiz için seçilmiřtir. Bowen'a (2009, p.27) göre doküman analizi, "hem basılı hem de elektronik (bilgisayar tabanlı ve internete aktarılan) materyalleri incelemek veya deđerlendirmek için sistematik bir prosedürdür". Çalışma belge analizi kullandıđından etik kurul onayına ihtiyaç duymamaktadır. Bu araştırmanın ana sorusu řudur: İngilizce ders kitabı *Mastermind*'ın 3. ünitesindeki önerilen ödev mini-projelerin özelliklerini yansıtmakta mıdır?

Bulgular

Sözde ödev *En sevdiđiniz yemek hakkında bir poster hazırlayın ve örnekteki gibi hazırlık sürecini yazın*, öğrenci veya öğrencilerin posterini sınıfa sunup sunmayacađına ve diđer öğrencilerin sunuya herhangi bir tepki verip vermeyeceđine (etkileřimin varlıđı) iliřkin bir talimat olmadıđı için iletiřim açasından bile eleřtirilebilir. Yönergeden, öğrenci(ler)in en sevdikleri yemek hakkında bir poster hazırlayıp hazırlık sürecini yazacakları ve ardından etkinliđin sona ereceđi anlařılmaktadır. Eylem odaklı yaklařım açasından, posterin kime hazırlandıđı ve en sevdiđi yemek hakkında poster hazırlamanın amacının ne olduđu (sosyal bir projeksiyonu yoktur) net deđerildir.

Bu makalede vurgulandıđı gibi, mini projeler karmařık eylemlerdir çünkü sosyal eylem karmařık bir eylemdir, ancak kitapta sunulan ödev nihai üretime götüren herhangi bir alt adım içermeyen tek bir talimattan oluřmaktadır (tasarımda eylem senaryosu yoktur) ve bu nedenle belirli bir karmařıklık düzeyine sahip tasarım ařaması yoktur. Böylelikle, tasarım yalnızca ürüne odaklanmaktadır (poster hazırlama) ve bir süreç boyutundan yoksundur ve bu nedenle ödevde eğitim boyutu yoktur. Öğrencilerin posterini çiftler halinde mi, gruplar halinde mi yoksa bütün bir sınıf olarak mı hazırlayacaklarına dair herhangi bir talimat yoktur ve yönergeden bunun bireysel bir etkinlik olduđu anlařılabilir. Nihai ürünün kolektif bir boyutu yoktur, bu nedenle özerklik bireysel özerlikle sınırlıdır ve kolektif özerklik de yoktur. Bilgi yönetimi veya bilgi yeterliliđi ile ilgili bir talimat da yoktur (Puren, 2008), yani öğrenciler posterini hazırlamadan önce bilgiyi araştırıp yönetmezler. Öğrenciler hemen en sevdikleri yemek hakkında bir poster hazırlamaya giriřmektedirler. ADOÇP kriterleri her öğrencinin dil performansını deđerlendirmek için verilmiř olsa da, sosyal eylemin toplu bir öz deđerlendirmesi için herhangi bir kriter yoktur. Bu nedenle, önerilen ödevin tek iřlevi, öğrencilere serbest üretim sađlamak veya ünitenin dil içeriđini yeniden kullanmalarına olanak sađlamaktır. Serbest üretim bile öğrencileri sözlü iletiřimsel etkileřime dahil etmemektedir çünkü

sonuç, herhangi bir etkileşim içermeyen (posterde en sevdikleri yemeğin hazırlanma sürecini yazma) yalnızca yazılı bir üründür. İngilizce ders kitabı *Mastermind*'ın 3. ünitesi için önerilen alternatif mini-proje şu şekildedir:

A: Tüm sınıf olarak, Türk mutfağını dünyaya tanıtmak için yerel tariflerden oluşan bir yemek kitabı hazırlayın ve bunu Facebook gibi sosyal medyada paylaşın.

B: Seçtiğiniz bir başlıkla Facebook hesabı açın (örn. Türk mutfağı, dünya mutfağı için tarifler vb.). Diğer ülkelerdeki akranlarınızı Facebook hesabınızda mutfaklarını paylaşmaya davet etmenin yollarını da arayabilirsiniz. Yemek kitabınız için yemek kitabınızın içeriğini yansıtan bir başlığa topluca karar verin ve kapağa sınıf kimliğinizi yansıtacak ilham verici bazı alt başlıklar ekleyin (örneğin X ortaokulu 8A sınıfından en iyi yemek tarifi önerileri).

C: Bir tarifin ne içerdiğini internette araştırın (ör. Yemeğin adı, yemeğin servis edebileceği kişi sayısı, malzemeler ve malzeme miktarı, pişirme için hazırlama talimatlarının adımları, pişirme süresi yönergesi vb.) ve grupların tariflerini değerlendirme kriterlerine ve yemek kitabınızın formatının ne olacağına topluca karar verin.

D: Hangi tariflerin yerel mutfağınızı en iyi temsil ettiğini öğrenmek için internette araştırma yapın ve/veya ebeveynlerinize danışın. Ebeveynleriniz ana dilinizde yemek tarifleri önerirse, C'de aradığınız her ayrıntıyı yazın ve grup olarak ebeveynlerin tariflerini İngilizceye çevirin. Tarifinize eşlik edecek ilgili resimleri internette arayın.

E: Gruplar halinde, yemeğinizin tarifini C'de toplu olarak kararlaştırdığınız formatta yazın.

F: Gruplar halinde tariflerinizi sınıfta sunun.

G: Diğer sınıf arkadaşlarınız, topluca oluşturduğunuz değerlendirme tablosunu kullanarak sizi dinleyecek, notlar alacak ve tariflerinizi değerlendirecektir. Topluca oluşturduğunuz ve geliştirdiğiniz kriterlere ve biçime uygun olmayan tarifleri olan gruplara önerilerde bulunun.

H: Bütün bir sınıf olarak tüm tarifleri tek bir word veya PDF formatında bir araya getirin.

I: Yemek kitabınızı sosyal medyada paylaşın.

J: Sosyal medyada yemek kitabı hakkında insanlardan gelen beğeni ve beğenmemeleri ve yorumları (tüm sınıf olarak) takip edin.

Sonuç, Tartışma ve Öneriler

İlk ve orta okullar için mevcut İngilizce programı incelendiğinde, 8. sınıf izlencesinin üçüncü ünitesinin *önerilen bağlamlar, görevler ve ödevler* başlıklı bir bölüme yer verdiği ve altında da *öğrenciler yeni kelimeleri ekleyerek görsel sözlüklerini genişletmeye devam ederler* ve *öğrenciler en sevdikleri yemek hakkında bir poster hazırlayarak hazırlık sürecini yazarlar* şeklinde önerilen ödevler yer almaktadır. Bu iki ödevin, İngilizce ders kitabı *Mastermind*'ın 3. ünitesinin ödevleriyle eşleşmesi doğaldır çünkü Türkiye'deki ders kitabı yazarları İngilizce öğretim programını takip etmelidir. Dolayısıyla, *Mastermind*'ın ünitelerinin sonunda mini-projelerden ziyade ödevlere yer verme hatasının asıl kaynağının Türkiye'nin ilkökul ve ortaokul İngilizce öğretim programı olduğu görülmektedir. Türkiye'nin ilkökul ve ortaokul İngilizce öğretim programını geliştirenlerin mini-projelerden ziyade ödev verme girişimi, onların tek yanlılığı değildir çünkü eylem odaklı yaklaşımın amacı da bu öğretim programında yanılıcı bir şekilde iletişim olarak sunulmuştur. Bu makalede belirtildiği gibi, eylem

odaklı yaklaşımda iletişim, amaç değil, sosyal eylemin hizmetindeki bir araçtır. *Mastermind* ders kitabındaki ödevlerin doğası da mini-projelerin özelliklerini yansıtmamaktadır. Ders kitabında önerilen ödevlerin temel amacı, sosyal eylem için eğitmek yerine ders kitabı ünitesinin dil içeriğini yeniden kullanmaktır. Evde gerçekleştirilen bireysel ödevler gibi görünmektedirler: proje eğitbiliminin doğasında bulunan kolektif boyut yoktur. Eylem odaklı yaklaşım açısından, İngilizce ders kitabı *Mastermind*'in revize edilmesi gereken türden yanlışlıkları vardır: (1) Ders kitabı üniteleri, bireysel ödevler yerine, pedagojik projelerin özelliklerini mümkün olduğunca karşılayan en az iki mini proje sunmalıdır (2) Bu mini projeler sadece nihai ürünü veya performansı (*Mastermind* ders kitabının yaptığı gibi) değil, aynı zamanda tasarımda süreci de sunmalıdır. (3) Ders kitabı yazarları, ünite hedeflerini işlevler ve kavramlardan ziyade sosyal eylemler açısından belirtmelidir.