ISSN 1308-7177

BÜEFAD

BARTIN ÜNİVERSİTESİ EĞİTİM FAKÜLTESİ DERGİSİ

Cilt /Volume: 2 Sayı/Issue: 2 Kış/Winter 2013

Uluslararası Hakemli Dergi

- AYRI BASIM / SPECIAL EDITION -

Okt. Ömer ÖZER - Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ramazan Şükrü PARMAKSIZ

Comparative Analysis of Lower Secondary Education 3rd Grade Curriculum for English Language and the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages

-

Ortaokul 3. Sınıf İngilizce Öğretim Programı ve Avrupa Diller için Ortak Başvuru Metni'nin Karşılaştırmalı Analizi

2013/2

BARTIN UNIVERSITY JOURNAL OF FACULTY OF EDUCATION

International Refereed Journal

BARTIN ÜNİVERSİTESİ EĞİTİM FAKÜLTESİ DERGİSİ

BARTIN UNIVERSITY JOURNAL OF FACULTY OF EDUCATION

Cilt/*Volume*: 2, Sayı/*Issue*: 2, Kış/*Winter* 2013

ISSN:1308-7177

İletişim
Bartın Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi
74100 BARTIN – TÜRKİYE
e-posta: buefad@bartin.edu.tr
Tel: +90 378 223 52 19

Bartın Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (BÜEFAD), yılda iki kez yayımlanan uluslararası hakemli bir dergidir. Yazıların sorumluluğu, yazarlarına aittir.

Contact
Bartin University Faculty of Education
74100 BARTIN – TURKEY
e-mail: buefad@bartin.edu.tr
Tel: +90 378 223 52 19

Bartin University Journal of Faculty of Education (BUJFED) is a international refereed journal that is published two times a year. The responsibility lies with the authors of papers.

Kapak: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Oğuzhan KARABURGU

DİZİNLENME VE LİSTELENME / *INDEXING AND LISTING*

Bartın Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, aşağıdaki indeksler tarafından dizinlenmekte ve listelenmektedir. / ***Bartin University Journal of Faculty of Education*** *is indexed and listed by the following indexes*.

EBSCOHOST Database

Modern Language Association

Proquest Education Journals Database

Index Copernicus

New Jour Electronic Journals & Newsletters

Ulrich's Periodicals Directory

Akademia Sosyal Bilimler İndeksi

Türk Eğitim İndeksi

Araştirmax Bilimsel Yayın İndeksi

Akademik Türk Dergileri İndeksi

YAYIN DANIŞMA KURULU / *EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD*

BU SAYININ HAKEMLERİ / *REFEREES OF THIS ISSUE*

Prof. Dr. Ali YAKICI	Gazi Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Firdevs GÜNEŞ	Bartın Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Hülya ARGUNŞAH	Erciyes Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Ali DELİCE	Marmara Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Alper Cihan KONYALIOĞLU	Atatürk Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Çetin SEMERCİ	Bartın Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Emin AYDIN	Marmara Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Enfel DOĞAN	İstanbul Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Halil İbrahim BÜLBÜL	Gazi Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Işıkhan UĞUREL	Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Kürşad YILMAZ	Dumlupınar Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Nilgün YENİCE	Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Nuriye SEMERCİ	Bartın Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Savaş BAŞTÜRK	Sinop Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Şenay SEZGİN NARTGÜN	Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Tolga GÜYER	Gazi Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Yasin SOYLU	Atatürk Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Yavuz KARTALLIOĞLU	Gazi Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ahmet SAKİN	Sakarya Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ali Rıza ŞEKERCİ	Dumlupınar Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ayten ERDURAN	Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Aysun DOĞUTAŞ	Pamukkale Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ayşe Derya IŞIK	Bartın Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Burcu DUMAN	Bartın Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Bülent AYDOĞDU	Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Cemal TOSUN	Bartın Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Cengiz ÖZMEN	Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Çığıl AYKUT	Gazi Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Deniz DAĞSEVEN EMECEN	Maltepe Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Derya ÇELİK	Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Emre SATICI	Bülent Ecevit Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Etem YEŞİLYURT	Mevlana Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Güliz AYDIN	Ordu Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Handan DEMİRCİOĞLU	Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Harun ER	Bartın Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Hasan Said TORTOP	Bülent Ecevit Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Hicran ÇETİN GÜNDÜZ	Nevşehir Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Hülya KUTU	Kilis 7 Aralık Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. İrfan TOSUNCUOĞLU	Karabük Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Mehmet Altan KURNAZ	Kastamonu Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Metin DENİZ	Bartın Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Murat GENÇ	Düzce Üniversitesi

Bartın Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi Cilt 2, Sayı 2, Kış 2013, BARTIN-TÜRKİYE

Bartin University Journal of Faculty of Education, Volume 2, Issue 2, Winter 2013, BARTIN-TURKEY

İÇİNDEKİLER / *CONTENTS*

Bartın Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi Cilt 2, Sayı 2, Kış 2013, BARTIN-TÜRKİYE

Bartin University Journal of Faculty of Education, Volume 2, Issue 2, Winter 2013, BARTIN-TURKEY

İÇİNDEKİLER / *CONTENTS*

Bartın Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi Cilt 2, Sayı 2, Kış 2013, BARTIN-TÜRKİYE

Bartin University Journal of Faculty of Education, Volume 2, Issue 2, Winter 2013, BARTIN-TURKEY

İÇİNDEKİLER / *CONTENTS*

Bartın Üniversitesi
Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi
Cilt 2, Sayı 2, s. 171 - 189, Kış 2013
BARTIN – TÜRKİYE

ISSN: 1308-7177

Bartin University
Journal of Faculty of Education
Volume 2, Issue 2, p. 171 - 189, Winter 2013
BARTIN – TURKEY

doi number: 10.14686/201321986

Comparative Analysis of Lower Secondary Education 3rd Grade Curriculum for English Language and the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages*

Okt. Ömer ÖZER
Adana Bilim ve Teknoloji Üniversitesi
Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu
ozeromer.tr@gmail.com

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ramazan Şükrü PARMAKSIZ
Bülent Ecevit Üniversitesi
Eğitim Fakültesi
rsparmaksiz@gmail.com

Abstract: The study conducted aimed at determining the goodness of fit between the lower secondary education 3rd grade Curriculum for English Language in Turkey and the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages that was composed by the Council of Europe to encourage other languages except for the mother tongue to be spoken and to bring foreign language instruction into conformity with some standards. The study was done in the light of significance Turkey attributes to foreign language education in the scope of harmonization efforts with the European Union and was qualitative. In the research where "the Document Review" technique was used, the Curriculum and Common European Framework of Reference for Languages were compared and contrasted in terms of objectives, content, learning and teaching process and evaluation strategies. At the end of the research, the following results were obtained: The goals of Turkish National Education and Common European Framework of Reference for Languages had a similarity at 92 percent even though the language skills were not handled on an equal basis in the Curriculum. Among all the language competences, Waystage (A2) Level was the most referenced one in the Curriculum. A1 and B1 levels were less dealt with when compared to Waystage Level. Overall Oral Production was the language competence represented with most descriptors in the Curriculum. All the assessment tools in the Curriculum were taken from the European Language Portfolio.

Key Words: Foreign Language Teaching, Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, Comparative Education, Lower Secondary School 3rd Grade English Language Curriculum in Turkey.

Ortaokul 3. Sınıf İngilizce Öğretim Programı ve Avrupa Diller için Ortak Başvuru Metni'nin Karşılaştırmalı Analizi

Özet: Avrupa'da ana dil dışında diğer dillerin de konuşulmasını özendirmek ve yabancı dil öğretiminde belli noktalarda bir standardı yakalamak amacıyla Avrupa Konseyi tarafından ortaya çıkarılan Avrupa Diller için Ortak Başvuru Metni ve Türkiye'nin Avrupa Birliği'yle uyum çalışmaları kapsamında Avrupa Konseyi'nin yabancı dile verdiği önem ışığında Ortaokul 3. Sınıf (İlköğretim 7. Sınıf) İngilizce Öğretim Programı'nın arasındaki uygunluk düzeyini belirlemeye yönelik olarak hazırlanan bu çalışma nitel bir çalışmadır. Doküman İncelemesi tekniğinin kullanıldığı araştırmada programın kazanımlar, içerik, eğitim durumları ve sınama durumları yönleri benzerlik ve farklılıklar bakımından karşılaştırılmıştır. Araştırma sonunda aşağıdaki sonuçlara ulaşılmıştır: Türk Milli Eğitimi genel amaçları ile OBM genel amaçları arasında %92 oranında uyuşma olduğu bulunmasına karşın dil becerileri İngilizce Öğretim Programı'nda eşit oranda ele alınmamıştır. Tüm dil becerileri arasında A2 düzeyi en çok değinilen düzey olmuştur. A2 ile karşılaştırıldığında, A1 ve B1 düzeylerine az değinilmiştir. Sözel üretim becerisi, öğretim programında en çok betimleyici ile temsil edilen dil yeteneği kategorisi olmuştur. Öğretim programındaki bütün değerlendirme araçları Avrupa Dil Gelişim Dosyasından alınmıştır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Yabancı Dil Öğretimi, Ortak Başvuru Metni, Karşılaştırmalı Eğitim, Ortaokul 3. Sınıf İngilizce Öğretim Programı

* This article is based on the findings from a master's thesis entitled "Comparative analysis of lower secondary education 3rd grade curriculum for English language in parallel with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages."

1. INTRODUCTION

Especially after the 90's, there have been radical changes across the globe, which are hard to keep up with, in politics, economics, culture and in social field. In parallel with these changes, removal of the borders in Europe, creation of new domestic markets, new opportunities of every European citizen such as having a right to study and work abroad have all increased the importance of foreign language teaching considerably. Within the frame of changing criteria, Council of Europe designated some principles and asked every European citizen for learning at least two or more languages together with the mother tongue in his/her compulsory basic education. In addition to these, individual learning and utilizing media opportunities are among the main goals (Gündoğdu, 2005). Despite these developments and possibilities, a number of people experience failure in their second language learning process (Rieger & McGrail, 2006).

A great many studies are in progress so as to produce new methods and techniques to promote learning (Yiğit, 2010). These developments and advances in the science, culture and technology turned our age into an age of information and communication. Consequently, a lot of countries headed towards collaborations and cooperations in economic, social, political and technological areas and at the end of this process, the phenomenon called 'globalism' emerged (Gedikoğlu, 2005). Within the scope of globalism, curricula of the countries transform as well so that they can be compatible with the other countries'. A decision made by the Turkish Board of Education in Turkey, stating the need for dissemination of European Language Portfolio all around Turkey (Demirel, 2005, 63). In this sense, Turkey has always been in determination to design her curricula in conformity with certain standards and criteria as the other European Union (EU) member and candidate countries have. When the foreign language education in Turkey considered, on the top of the criteria list is Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (Gedikoğlu, 2005).

1.1. 3rd Grade English Language Curriculum for Lower Secondary Education in Turkey

The curricula of primary and secondary schools in Turkey are determined by the Ministry of National Education (MoNE). Turkish Board of Education is responsible for the designing and implementation of the curricula. Development of curricula are pursued in accordance with the needs of individuals and the societies by taking into account the necessities of the age, the laws and decisions related to instruction and European Union's (EU) standards for education (Eurydice, 2009). So as to improve the student's ability to use the

language properly and accurately, 'the Eclectic Approach' in which all the components of the curriculum development approaches can be brought together can be usefully implemented. In this curriculum, structural, situational, process/task-based, topic-based, notional and functional approaches were used. In so doing, this versatile model can work coordinately with the European Language Portfolio (ELP). The ELP supports every language curriculum which aims at improving the communicative skills of the students (MoNE, 2006). The cyclical format was preferred so as to handle the subject at different times during the process and hereby enhance learning through systematic repetition. Students from all ages are in need of accurate input which is easy to understand, appropriate for their developmental level and repeated by means of different sources (MoNE, 2006). The curriculum not only makes use of the learning output but also the learning process. It helps the teachers monitor the student's progress by using the right assessment and evaluation methods. Achievement of secondary schools students are assessed by teachers individually considering their performance (projects, exam scores, performance homework, classroom participation, attendance, behaviours etc.) during the entire year (Eurydice, 2009).

Being parallel to the changes in curricula in 2006, the lower secondary education 3rd grade English Language curriculum (ELC) was designed in line with the idea of improving the skills of decision-making, inquisitiveness, problem-solving, utilization of information technology, communication, creative thinking and critical thinking. The puberty which is defined as the period of human development during which physical growth and sexual maturation occurs, was also taken into consideration in the curriculum (Durmuşçelebi, 2010). In the designing of the current primary school curricula, cognitive and constructivist approaches were grounded. Accordingly, alternative assessment tools such as performance assessment and monitoring emotional growth based on the cognitive learning theories were also taken notice of in the assessment and evaluation processes (Eurydice, 2009).

1.2. Common European Framework of Reference for Languages

In the recent years, the concepts of pluriculturalism and plurilingualism came to the forefront especially in Europe. Together with this, the need for giving shape to foreign language learning and teaching in a certain framework came up. As a consequence of this progressive change, the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) and ELP emerged (Ataç, 2008).

The CEFR was developed to provide a common basis for the elaboration of language syllabuses, curriculum guidelines, examinations, textbooks, etc. across Europe (Little, 2006). It describes in a comprehensive way what language learners have to learn in order to use a language for communication and what knowledge and skills they have to develop in order to be able to act effectively. The Framework also defines levels of proficiency which allow learners' progress to be measured on a life-long basis (Council of Europe, 2001). The CEFR may be used to construct a quality management system for individual purposes. The document's tables and question boxes can be used as checklists for quality planning in foreign language learning and teaching process (Barenfenger & Tschirner, 2008).

In the virtue of CEFR, instead of the fact that the mechanism in which the grammatical rules of a language are predominantly taught is replaced by the one where all language skills are taught (Demirel, 2005, 65). The CEFR aims at presenting a standard basis for a comprehensive study of language curricula, course books, curriculum instructions, examinations, etc. (Little, 2007).

Above are many functions of CEFR explained the relationship between its level descriptions and the observation of language development is tried to be clarified. Even though CEFR covers a great deal more than levels and scales, they are nonetheless prerequisite for its descriptive system. First, the CEFR's action-oriented approach is based on the principle that in performing communicative acts, strategies used to determine how to make most appropriate and effective use of our linguistic resources. Next, the levels and scales describe learning outcomes. Thirdly, the levels and scales are not an alternative grading system. They describe a succession of language learning outcomes that takes many years to achieve. Fourthly, the behavioural dimension of the highest levels implies maturity, general educational achievement and professional experience (Little, 2006).

According to the articles 149 and 150 of the Treaty on the European Union, Socrates programme was launched in 1995 so as to provide cooperation among the member countries. Socrates consists of eight actions: Erasmus (higher education), Comenius (from pre-school to secondary education), Grundtvig (adult education and other educational pathways), Minerva (open and distance learning), Lingua (teaching and learning of languages), Observation and Innovation, Joint Actions and Accompanying Measures (European Parliament, 2001). At the Lisbon European Council on 23 and 24 March 2000, the Heads of State or Government resolved to make Europe's economy the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based one

in the world, capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs, a greater social cohesion and a sustainable environment (Lehmann, 2012). Turkey, like in other fields, has launched necessary legal reforms in education during the EU harmonization process; notwithstanding legal reforms made in this process are not enough on their own. Like in all fields of education, it is an indispensable truth that we will have difference of opinion and culture gap during foreign language teaching in complying with the norms and standards which are valid in Europe (Gedikoğlu, 2005).

1.3. European Language Portfolio

New curricula of the EU countries are expected to be compatible with the standards set by the European Council, Modern Languages Division (Demirel, 2011, 55). To develop multilingualism in Europe and make this be part of the curricula of the EU member countries, Modern Languages Division, operating within the Council of Europe, was changed to Language Policy Division (Byram et al., 2002). The main concern of the Division is to emphasize that every individual has a right to learn a language within the context of democratic citizenship rights. In this sense, to promote the development of multilingualism in the continent, Languages Policy Division gives seminars and produces projects. In relation with the European Year of Languages 2001, it was decided that a widespread implementation of the European Language Portfolio should be launched by all the member countries of the European Council (Bunjes, 2002). Since becoming a member of the Council of Europe in 1949, Turkish Ministry of National Education has closely aligned its policies with those of its European counterparts, emphasizing proficiency in foreign languages (Çelik, 2013). Turkey, particularly in recent years, has exerted positive efforts in this respect (Demirel, 2011, 55).

The European Language Portfolio (ELP) has both a reporting and a pedagogic function. In its reporting function it supplements the certificates and diplomas that are awarded on the basis of formal examinations by presenting additional information about the owner's language learning experience and concrete evidence of his/her second language proficiency. In its pedagogic function the ELP is designed to promote multilingualism, raise cultural awareness, and foster the development of learner autonomy (Little, Goullier & Hughes, 2011). The portfolio consists of three related parts: Language Passport, Language Biography and Dossier.

By use of the ELP, learners' qualifications and other significant linguistic and cultural experiences can be recorded in an internationally transparent manner. Thus, it enables

learners to motivate themselves and acknowledge their efforts to extend and diversify their language learning at all levels in a lifelong context (Shiels 2001). The aim of this project is to develop individual plurilingualism and pluriculturalism. The main purpose of holding this passport for EU citizen is to underline the significance of learning first foreign language in primary education and the second in higher education (Demirel, 2011, 55). With implementation of the ELP, students will be able to take more responsibilities for their own learning process. Thus, students will develop language awareness and will be aware of what they are able to do throughout the learning stages (Demirel, 2010; İşisağ, 2008).

1.4. Objectives of the Study

Comparing the lower Secondary Education 3rd Grade ELC by MoNE with the CEFR poses the main problem of the study.

In scope of the research, the ELC and CEFR were compared in terms of similarities and differences in the objectives, content, teaching-learning process and evaluation process.

Especially in the last decade, bachelor's degree, associate degree and high school graduates in the EU member states have been expected to speak at least one other language than their mother tongue at the level of being able to sustain a conversation (European Commission, 2005). An approach based on teaching the language structures mostly was taken place by the one in which functionality of the language, communication and grammar were of vital importance. In addition to the grammar rules, the skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing were needed to be acquired too (Demirel, 2005, 55). In this sense, the CEFR was put together by the Council of Europe and the standards set by it have become criteria needed to be fulfilled by the states within the borders of the continent. One of the key issues of Turkey's harmonization process with the European Union is foreign language teaching. Taking into account all of these, the current point where Turkey stood was tried to be clarified in terms of the foreign language education. The purpose of this research is to analyze the MoNE Lower Secondary Education 3rd Grade Curriculum for English Language and the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages by comparing and contrasting, and hereby contribute to the ongoing conversation in the field of comparative educational research.

In accordance with this general purpose, answers were sought to the following sub-questions:

1. What are the characteristics of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages and Lower Secondary Education 3rd Grade Curriculum for English Language?

2. What are the comparisons and contrasts of the 3rd Grade Curriculum for English Language and the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages in terms of goals and objectives?

3. What are the comparisons and contrasts between the 3rd Grade Curriculum for English Language and the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages in terms of content?

4. What are the comparisons and contrasts between the 3rd Grade Curriculum for English Language and the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages in terms of learning-teaching processes?

5. What are the comparisons and contrasts between the 3rd Grade Curriculum for English Language and the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages in terms of the evaluation strategies?

2. METHODOLOGY

This study is a comparative research. In this research, the CEFR and MoNE Secondary School 3rd Grade ELC have been compared. Formerly, qualitative researches used to be conducted to support the quantitative data, yet today they solely can underpin the researches by themselves (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2008, 88). Qualitative research is described as an unfolding model that occurs in a natural setting that make it possible for the researcher to develop a level of detail from high involvement in the actual experiences (Creswell, 1994, 124). Although there are many data collection instruments in a qualitative research, the most common of them are an analysis of observation, interview and document review. All of these are also subclassified. (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003, 151; Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2008, 88). The document review was used in the study to provide comparability between the texts. Qualitative research is a process of inquiry with the goal of understanding a social or human problem from multiple perspectives; conducted in a natural setting with a goal of building a complex and holistic picture of the phenomenon of interest. In these research studies, there are no pre-determined hypotheses to test their truth and qualitative data collection instruments such as interview, observation, document review are widely used (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2008, 88).

The document review technique was utilized in the research. Reports, official documents such as books, magazines, autobiographies, documentaries and other written documents are the major data sources in this technique (Baş & Akturan, 2008, 47). Documents the informants write themselves or are written about them such as autobiographies, personal letters, diaries, memos, newsletters, proposals, codes of ethics, newspaper articles, students' case reports and folders are included in data. In the research whose major data gathering technique is participant observation and interview, documents can be used as a primary source as supplemental data (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992, 151). Data collection from different sources with regard to the phenomenon give researchers an opportunity to analyze and synthesize the different viewpoints or approaches and this will increase the validity of the study (Baş & Akturan, 2008, 48). Qualitative researchers should follow such steps like articulating the value and logic of the research to convince people of its usefulness and credibility. Besides, they are expected to refer to the research design, data collecting instruments, analyzing and planning of the research to establish the 'truth value' of the study (Marshall & Rossman, 2006).

2.1. Data Collection Instrument

In order to collect data concerning the problem of the study, specific criteria were set in advance. The data were reached by searching the databases of ERIC, EBSCOhost, Web of Science and Thesis Database of the Council of Higher Education by typing "Common European Framework", "English Language Curriculum", "Foreign Language Teaching" and "European Language Portfolio" as keywords. In the selection of the sources, the sight was set on the studies released especially after 2006. Studies on Second Languages such as French and German as well as English were taken into the scope of the study. In accordance with the criteria set, internet and written sources 1 to 6 years old in particular were searched to form the literature review. The data sources of the study are the lower secondary education 3rd Grade English Language Curriculum by MoNE and the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages by the Council of Europe.

2.2. Data Analysis

Having reached the primary sources for the study, the problem, sub-questions and objectives of the research were determined. All data were subjected to content and frequency analyses so as to reveal themes relevant to the problem. Content analysis, which is widely

used in social sciences, is encoding specific words of a text into smaller content categories and it is a technique both systematic and renewable (Büyüköztürk, 2008, 64). To find out the relation between the ELC and CEFR via using tables, frequency analysis was used. As the ELC does not have descriptors from the B2, C1 and C2 levels, they are excluded from the study. Although they were listed in relevant levels and categories, some descriptors which are listed under different names in the CEFR were not included in the analysis. In conclusion, the comparisons and contrasts of the ELC and CEFR were determined out of the data compared.

3. FINDINGS AND RESULTS

To put forth the appropriateness of lower secondary education 3rd Grade ELC used in schools of MoNE and the CEFR via comparing the level descriptors was aimed in this study:

Table 1: Overall percentages of the competences in the ELC.

	A1	A2	B1
Linguistic Competence	--	38,5	4,3
Writing Competence	33	42,9	--
Reading Competence	--	36,3	--
Listening Competence	--	50	--
Communicative Language Competence	15	60,6	3,2
	9,60%	45,63%	1,50%

1. Both the lower secondary education 3rd Grade ELC which was first implemented in the 2008-2009 School Year and the CEFR encourage project papers and portfolios built by students. By means of the ELP, both the ELC and CEFR follow a process-based approach. Within this approach, the aim of reviewing and reinforcing the structures by using the cyclical format is pursued. Although there are references in the ELC to building portfolios, references to using language passports are less than sufficient. Furthermore, Mirici (2008) points out that few teachers are aware of the Turkish adaptation of the ELP made available to all Turkish citizens through MoNE website.

2. When compared in terms of general purposes, 11 out of 12 general purposes of the ELC can be found in the CEFR too. 83% of the above-mentioned purposes of the ELC are at A2 level and 8,33% is at B1 level. Although the curriculum is based on general purposes in the Basic Law of National Education, it is also in parallel with the CEFR's general purposes with a high percentage (92%).

3. When the content of the ELC and CEFR were compared:

a) The competences in the ELC are listed in 8 categories in the CEFR. When all the categories which have descriptors regarding levels are taken into consideration, the ELC meets 53,84% of the A2 level and 7,69 of the B1 levels in the CEFR.

b) All the descriptors in the ELC belonging to listening skill are at A2 level and they meet 50% of the descriptors in the listening field in the CEFR. Among all of these, "Watching TV and Film" and "Understanding a Native Speaker Interlocutor" are the ones which are represented in the ELC with all their descriptors.

Table 2: Overall percentages of the categories of the CEFR and ELC in terms of listening.

	LISTENING	A2		
		CEFR	ELC	%
1	Overall listening comprehension	2	0	0
2	Understanding conversation between native speakers	1	1	100
3	Listening as a member of a live audience	--	--	--
4	Listening to announcements and instructions	2	1	50
5	Listening to audio media and recordings	1	--	0
6	Watching TV and film	2	2	100
	TOTAL	8	4	50

c) All the descriptors in the ELC with respect to the reading skills are at A2 level and meet 36,3% of the descriptors in the CEFR.

Table 3: Overall percentages of the categories of the CEFR and ELC in terms of reading.

	READING	A2		
		CEFR	ELC	%
1	Overall reading comprehension	2	1	50
2	Reading correspondence	2	0	0
3	Reading for orientation	3	2	66,7
4	Reading for information and argument	1	0	0
5	Reading instruction	2	0	0
6	Identifying cues and inferring (spoken & written)	1	1	100
		11	4	36,3

d) The descriptors in the ELC with regard to the writing skills are at A1 level (25%) and A2 level (75%). The ELC which mostly covers A2 level in every skill, places relatively heavy

emphasis on A1 level by covering 33% of the relevant part in the CEFR. The distribution of descriptors at mostly A2 level and relatively fewer at A1 level share similarity with the findings of Yiğit's (2010).

Table 4: Overall percentages of the categories of the CEFR and ELC in terms of writing.

WRITING	A1			A2		
	CEFR	ELC	%	CEFR	ELC	%
Overall written production	1	0	0	1	1	100
Creative writing	1	0	0	4	2	50
Reports and essays	--	--	--	--	--	--
Planning	--	--	--	1	0	0
Compensating	--	--	--	2	0	0
Monitoring and repair	--	--	--	--	--	--
Overall written interaction	1	1	100	1	0	0
Correspondence	1	1	100	1	0	0
Notes, messages & forms	1	0	0	2	1	50
Note-taking	--	--	--	--	--	--
Processing text	1	0	0	2	2	100
TOTAL	6	2	33,3	14	6	42,9

e) The descriptors in the ELC concerning overall spoken production meet 15% of A1, 60,6% of A2 and 3,2% of B1 levels in the CEFR. All in all, it can easily be suggested that the descriptors in the ELC are mostly at A2 level. This result bears a strong resemblance to the overall spoken production results found by Yiğit (2010) by making reference to A2 level descriptors in general.

Table 5: Overall percentages of the categories of the CEFR and ELC in terms of overall spoken production (Özer, 2012).

	OVERALL SPOKEN PRODUCTION	A1			A2			B1		
		CEFR	ELC	%	CEFR	ELC	%	CEFR	ELC	%
1	Overall oral production	1	0	0	1	1	100	1	0	0
2	Sustained monologue: describing experience	1	1	100	8	6	75	8	0	0
3	Sustained monologue: putting a case	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	0	0
4	Overall oral production	1	0	0	1	1	100	1	0	0
5	Sustained monologue: describing experience	1	1	100	8	6	75	8	0	0
6	Sustained monologue: putting a case	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	0	0
7	Public announcements	-	-	-	1	0	0	1	0	0
8	Addressing audiences	1	0	0	4	3	75	2	0	0
9	Overall spoken interaction	2	0	0	4	4	100	5	0	0
10	Understanding a native speaker interlocutor	2	0	0	3	1	33	1	0	0
11	Conversation	3	0	0	8	3	37,5	4	0	0
12	Informal discussion	-	-	-	6	3	50	8	0	0
13	Formal discussion and meetings	-	-	-	3	2	66,7	3	0	0
14	Goal-oriented co-operation	2	0	0	4	1	25	6	0	0
15	Transactions to obtain goods and services	2	0	0	8	5	62,5	3	0	0
16	Information exchange	4	1	25	10	6	60	6	1	17
17	Interviewing and being interviewed	1	0	0	2	2	100	4	0	0
18	Taking the floor	-	-	-	3	2	66,7	2	1	50
19	Co-operating	-	-	-	1	1	100	4	0	0
20	Spoken Fluency	1	1	100	2	0	0	2	0	0
21	Asking for clarification	-	-	-	3	3	100	1	0	0
		20	3	15	71	43	60,6	63	2	3,2

4. CEFR serves a function by enabling learners express theoretical basis for their learning in their own way and wants learners pursue some communicative goals for this purpose. To carry out communicative tasks, users have to engage in communicative language

activities and operate communicative strategies. The ELC, like the CEFR, considers learners as an active component of the instruction process and supports this process by means of material usage aiming at communication. As for the physical conditions of the language classes, most of the classes are insufficient in technological aids.

5. The ELC used the categories and descriptors found in the CEFR in order that learners as well as teachers can assess and evaluate the progress they have made. While reporting the learners' language acquisition, it pursues a goal of determining generalisable language competences out of a particular written or spoken performance. Accordingly, together with stating the criteria for the attainment of a learning objective, teacher and self-assessment are advised. As the teaching methods and techniques have to be in accordance with assessment tools throughout the teaching-learning process, all the assessment tools in the ELP were borrowed. The ELC pursues a goal of detecting process-based generalisable language competences and authentic assessment methods which are scale-based or performance-based and pay regard to individual differences.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In relation with the results, the following can be suggested to contribute the future discussion in the literature:

1. The 3rd Grade ELC which follows a process-based approach should be made to make more use of the language passport which constitutes one of the three dimensions of the ELP.

2. As collaboration is preferred between student, teacher and parents in an efficient learning process, a study should be conducted upon the attitudes of these three pillars of education towards the Council of Europe, ELP, CEFR and second language teaching in public schools of the MoNE.

a. Descriptors related to listening, reading and overall spoken production predominantly belong to A2. In addition to this, they rarely belong to A1 and B1 levels. Of all the descriptors concerning the writing skills, the descriptors of A1 level constitute 25% of the all and this requires a detailed study of the ELC's sub-goals with respect to the writing skills.

b. A similar study should be carried out to determine the distribution of the categories and descriptors in each level used in lower secondary education 4th grade and high school curricula for English language.

3. In the scope of the opinion reached through studying the relevant literature that the learning environment for English Language is technologically insufficient, further studies regarding the appropriateness of the physical conditions in public schools and necessary improvements should be done so that communicative and interactive activities can be carried out more efficiently.

4. As miscellaneous common and authentic assessment tools are suggested in the CEFR, at what level the candidate teachers at faculties of education learn these tools and how efficiently the incumbent teachers use them should be investigated. Accordingly, relevant pre-service and in-service training opportunities should be provided for the teachers.

References

Ataç, B. A. (2008). *Özgün Değerlendirme Tekniği Bağlamında Avrupa Dil Gelişim Dosyası Uygulamalarının Okuma Becerisine Etkisi*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ankara University. Ankara.

Barenfanger, O. and Tschirner, E. (2008). Language Educational Policy and Language Learning Quality Management: the Common European Framework of Reference. *Foreign Language Annals*. 41(1), 81-101.

Baş, T. and Akturan, U. (2008). *Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri Nvivo7.0 ile Nitel Veri Analizi*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayınları.

Bogdan, R. and Biklen, S. K. (1992). *Qualitative Research for Education: an introduction to theory and methods*. Boston: Pearson-Allyn and Bacon.

Bunjes, U. (2002). European Year of Languages 2001: Final Evaluation Report. Council of Europe. Strasbourg: Language Policy Division.

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E. K., vd. (2008). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. (2nd ed.) Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Byram M, Gribkova B. and Starkey H. (2002). Developing the Intercultural Dimension in Language Teaching. Brussels: Language Policy Division.

Council of Europe (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Modern Languages Division, (1st ed.) Strasbourg: Cambridge University Press.

Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research Design: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. ThousandOaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Çelik, S. (2013). Plurilingualism, Pluriculturalism, and the CEFR: Are Turkey's Foreign Language Objectives Reflected in Classroom Instruction? *Procedia, Social and Behavioral Sciences* 70, 1872-1879.

Demirel, Ö. (2005). Avrupa Konseyi Dil Projesi ve Türkiye Uygulaması. *Milli Eğitim Üç Aylık Eğitim ve Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*. 33(167).

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

Demirel, Ö. (2011). *Yabancı Dil Öğretimi*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayınları.

Durmuşçelebi, M. (2010). Evaluation of Turkish Education Programs. *Education*. 131(1), 73-82.

European Commission (2002). *European Report on Quality Indicators of Lifelong Learning. Fifteen quality indicators*. Brussels: European Commission.

European Commission (2005). Europeans and Languages. http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_237.en.pdf (Access Date: December 5, 2012).

European Parliament (2001). European Parliament Fact Sheets: Education, Vocational Training and Youth Policy. http://www.europarl.europa.eu/factsheets/4_16_0_en.htm (Access Date: June 5, 2012).

Eurydice (2010). Avrupa'da Eğitim ve Öğretim Sistemlerinin Yapısı. Turkish Eurydice Unit. http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/eurybase/structures/041_TR_TR.pdf (Access Date: December 5, 2011).

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

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

İşisağ, K. U. (2008). Analysis of Common European Framework of Reference for Languages in terms of Linguistics. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*. 4(1), 105-122.

Lehmann, W. (2012). The Treaty of Lisbon. http://www.europarl.europa.eu/ftu/pdf/en/FTU_1.1.5.pdf (Access Date: December 12, 2012).

Little, D. (2006). The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: content, purpose, origin, reception and impact. *Language Teaching.* 39(3), 167-190.

Little, D. (2007). The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Perspectives on the making of Supranational Language Education Policy. *The Modern Language Journal*. 91(4), 645-655.

Little, D., Goullier F. and Hughes G. (2011). *The European Language Portfolio: The Story So Far (1991-2011)*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Marshall, C. and Rossman, G. (2006). *Designing Qualitative Research*. (4th ed.) California: Sage Publications.

Mirici, İ, H. (2008). Development and Validation Process of a European Language Portfolio Model for Young Learners. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*. 9(2), 26-34.

MoNE (2006). English Language Curriculum for Primary Education (4th, 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th grades). http://ttkb.meb.gov.tr/program2.aspx/?width=900&height=530&TB_iframe=true (Access Date: November 3, 2011).

Özer, Ö. (2012). Comparative Analysis of Secondary School 3rd Grade English Language Curriculum in Parallel with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. Unpublished master's thesis, Bülent Ecevit University, Zonguldak, Turkey.

Parmaksız, R. Ş., Hitit, H. and Aksar N. (2012). İlköğretim İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Öğretim Programında Yer Alan Kazanımları Gerçekleştirmede Karşılaştığı Güçlükler. Paper presented at *İkinci Ulusal Eğitim Programları ve Öğretim Kongresi*. Bolu University, 27-29 September 2012, Bolu, Turkey.

Rieger, A. and McGrail E. (n.d.). Understanding English Language Learners' Needs and the Language Acquisition Process: Two Teacher Educators' Perspectives. In *Understanding ELL*. http://www.urbanschools.org/pdf/understanding_ell.pdf (Access Date: January 18, 2013).

Shiels, J. (2001). *The Modern Languages Projects of the Council of Europe and the development of language policy*. Berlin, University of Freie. http://userpage.fu-berlin.de/elc/bulletin/7/en/shiels.html (Access Date: July 4, 2012).

Yıldırım, A. and Şimşek, H. (2008). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayınları.

Yiğit, C. (2010). *Avrupa Diller için Ortak Başvuru Çerçevesi ile İlköğretim 6.Sınıf İngilizce Öğretim Programının Karşılaştırmalı Analizi*. Unpublished master's thesis, Gaziantep University. Gaziantep.

GENİŞ ÖZET

Dünyada özellikle 90'lı yıllardan sonra siyaset, ekonomi, kültür ve toplumsal alanda izlenmesi güç köklü değişimler yaşanmaktadır. Bu gelişmelere koşut olarak Avrupa'da sınırların kalkması, iç pazarların açılması, her Avrupa vatandaşının bir başka ülkede öğrenim görme ve çalışma hakkı gibi olanaklara kavuşmuş olması yabancı dil öğretimin önemini önemli ölçüde arttırmıştır. Değişen bu koşullar çerçevesinde Avrupa Konseyi bazı ilkeler belirlemiş ve her Avrupa vatandaşının zorunlu eğitim sürecinde ana dili yanında en az iki ya da daha fazla yabancı dil öğrenmesini istemektedir. Avrupa'da ana dil dışında diğer dillerin de konuşulmasını özendirmek ve yabancı dil öğretiminde belli noktalarda bir standardı yakalamak amacıyla Avrupa Konseyi tarafından Avrupa Diller için Ortak Başvuru Metni hazırlanmıştır. Türkiye'nin Avrupa Birliği'yle uyum çalışmaları kapsamında yabancı dile verdiği önem ışığında Ortaokul 3. Sınıf (İlköğretim 7. Sınıf) İngilizce Öğretim Programı'nın Ortak Başvuru Metni'ne uygunluk düzeyini belirlemeye yönelik olarak hazırlanan bu çalışma nitel bir çalışmadır. Araştırmada kullanılan doküman incelemesi, araştırma problemine ilişkin olarak yazılı ve görsel dokümanların incelenmesi daha zengin ve kapsamlı bir çıkarım sağlanması açısından önemlidir. Olguya ya da olaya ilişkin çok çeşitli kaynaklardan bilgi toplanması değişik bakış açıları ve yaklaşımların da incelenmesi ve sentezlenmesine olanak sağlayarak ve araştırmanın geçerliliğini artırmaktadır.

Araştırmada, Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı (MEB) Ortaokul 3. Sınıf İngilizce Öğretim Programı (İÖP) ile Ortak Başvuru Metni'nin (OBM) amaçlar, içerik, öğrenme ve öğretme durumları ve sınama durumları bakımından benzerlik ve farklılıkları ortaya konulmaktadır. Doküman İncelemesi tekniğinin kullanıldığı araştırmada programın kazanımlar, içerik, eğitim durumları ve sınama durumları yönleri benzerlik ve farklılıklar bakımından karşılaştırılmıştır. Veri toplamak amacıyla araştırma problemine uygun ölçütler takımı geliştirilmiştir. Araştırmanın temel çalışma alanı ve veri kaynağı 2001 yılında Avrupa Konseyi tarafından yayınlanan "Diller için Ortak Başvuru Metni: Öğrenme, Öğretme, Değerlendirme" ve Türk Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı'nın OBM'yi göz önünde bulundurarak hazırladığı Ortaokul 3. Sınıf için İÖP'den oluşmaktadır. Öncelikle, 2006 ve sonrasında yayımlanan ulusal ve yurt dışında yapılmış araştırmalar temel alınarak alan yazını taranmış ve araştırmanın problemi, alt problemleri ve amaçları belirlenmiştir. Toplanan verileri açıklayabilecek ilişkilere ulaşmak amacıyla içerik analizi ve sonrasında frekans analizi kullanılmıştır. İçerik analizi, belirli kurallara dayalı kodlamalarla bir metnin bazı sözcüklerinin daha küçük içerik kategorileri ile özetlendiği sistematik ve yenilenebilir bir tekniktir. Verilerin çözümlenmesinde frekans analizi tekniğinden yararlanılarak tablolar yapılmıştır. B2, C1 ve C2 düzeyleri 3. sınıf İÖP'nin hedef kitlesine yönelik olmadığından ötürü çalışmaya katılmamıştır. Düzey ve kategori olarak benzer olmasına karşın OBM'dekinden başka başlık altında yer alan betimleyiciler tablolarda gösterilmelerine karşın sayısal olarak çözümlemeye katılmamıştır.

2008-2009 öğretim yılında ikinci kademede uygulanmaya başlayan ve aynı genel amaçları izleyen Ortaokul 3. Sınıf İÖP ve OBM'nin her ikisi de proje ödevleri ve öğrenciler tarafından dosyalar tutulmasını

desteklemektedir. Avrupa Dil Gelişim Dosyası (ADGD) ile hem İÖP hem de Başvuru Metni süreç odaklı bir yaklaşımı izlemektedir. İÖP'de portfolyo tutulmasına ilişkin pek çok gönderme bulunmasına karşın dil pasaportuna ilişkin o oranda değinme görülmemiştir.

Araştırmanın amaç ve hedefler bakımından karşılaştırıldığında, 3. sınıf için İÖP'de belirtilen 12 genel amacın 11 tanesinin OBM'de karşılığı bulunmaktadır. Belirtilen amaçların %83'ü A2 düzeyine ve %8,33'ü ise B1 düzeyine denk gelmektedir. Programın oluşturulmasında, Milli Eğitim Temel Kanunu'nda yer alan Türk Milli Eğitimi'nin genel amaçları temel alınmasına karşın aynı zamanda OBM genel amaçları ile de yüksek oranda (%92) örtüşmektedir.

Ortaokul 3. Sınıf İÖP ve OBM'nin içeriklerinin benzerlik ve farklılıklar bakımından karşılaştırılması sonucunda şu sonuçlara ulaşılmıştır: Ortaokul 3. Sınıf İÖP'de bulunan dinleme becerisi alanına ait betimleyicilerin tümü A2 düzeyindedir ve OBM'de bu alandaki betimleyicilerin %50'sini karşılamaktadır. Bunlar içinde, "Televizyon ve Film Seyretme" ve "İletişimde rol alan anadilde konuşan kişiyi anlamak" İÖP'de eksiksiz karşılanan kategoriler olmuştur. Okuma becerisine ilişkin olarak Ortaokul 3. Sınıf İÖP'de yer alan betimleyicilerin tümü A2 düzeyindedir ve OBM'de bu alandaki betimleyicilerin %36,3'ünü karşılamaktadır. Ortaokul 3. Sınıf İÖP'de yer alan yazma becerisine ilişkin betimleyiciler (%25) A1 ve (%75) A2 düzeyindedirler. Ortaokul 3. Sınıf İÖP'deki Okuma becerisine temel olarak A2 düzeyinde atıfta bulunulduğu tespit edilmiştir. Neredeyse bütün amaçları A2 düzeyinde ve bir bölümü de B1 düzeyinde olan İÖP'nin sadece yazma bölümünde A1 düzeyine de önemli ölçüde (%33) yer verdiği saptanmıştır. Sözel üretim becerisine ilişkin Ortaokul 3. Sınıf İÖP'de yer verilen betimleyiciler A1, A2 ve B1 düzeyindedirler. Ortaokul 3. Sınıf İÖP, OBM'deki sözel üretim becerisine ilişkin betimleyicilerinin A1 düzeyinde %15'ini; A2 düzeyinde %60,56'sını ve B1 düzeyinde %3,17'sini karşılamaktadır.

Başvuru Metni'nin en uygun işlevi olan dil öğrenim ve öğretim sürecine katılan herkesin kendi kuramsal temellerini ve kendi yollarını açık bir biçimde söylemelerine olanak sağlamaktır ve bu amaçla öğrenenler tarafından kazanılmasını istediği bazı iletişimsel amaçlar ve görevler vardır. İÖP de OBM gibi öğrenenlerin öğrenim ve öğretim sürecinin bir boyutu olduğunu kabul etmekte ve öğretim programları arası etkinlikler ve iletişimi amaç alan materyal kullanımı ile bu süreci desteklemektedir.

OBM'de yer alan dil yeterliğine ilişkin kategoriler ve betimleyicilere İÖP içinde de yer verilmiştir. Benzer biçimde, Ortaokul 3. Sınıf İÖP'deki değerlendirme araçlarının (dil dosyası, dil pasaportu ve dil öğrenim geçmişi) tamamı ADGD'den alınmıştır. İÖP de süreç temelli genellenebilir dil yetilerini belirleme amacı gütmekte ve bu amaçla öğrenenlerin bireysel farklılıklarını gözeten, ölçek referanslı, performans temelli özgün değerlendirme yöntemleri önermektedir.

Araştırma sonunda şu sonuçlara ulaşılmıştır: Türk Milli Eğitimi genel amaçları ile OBM genel amaçları arasında %92 oranında uyuşma olduğu bulunmasına karşın dil becerileri İÖP'de eşit oranda ele

alınmamıştır. Tüm dil becerileri arasında A2 düzeyi en çok değinilen düzey olmuştur. Sözel üretim becerisi, öğretim programında en çok betimleyici ile temsil edilen dil yeteneği kategorisi olmuştur. Ortaokul 2. Sınıf İÖP betimleyicilerinin içerik ve ağırlıkları ile Ortaokul 3. Sınıf İÖP betimleyicileri ve ağırlıkları arasında yüksek oranda benzerlik bulunmuştur. Öğretim programındaki bütün değerlendirme araçları ADGD'den alınmıştır ve İÖP buna paralel bir değerlendirme süreci yürütülmesini desteklemektedir.

Bu araştırmanın sonucunda Ortaokul 3. Sınıf İngilizce programının tüm dil becerileri ve dilbilgisi öğretimi açısında OBM'ye uygunluğu ortaya çıkarılmış ve böylece 3. Sınıf'ın dinleme, konuşma, okuma ve yazma becerileri açısından seviyesi belirlenmiştir. Bu çalışma, aynı zamanda MEB'in Temel Zorunlu Eğitim Ortaokul kademesi programlarının OBM'ye karşılaştırılması yönünden ilk çalışmalardan biri olma özelliğini de taşımaktadır. Daha önceden bu alanda yapılmış olan çalışmaların devam niteliğinde olmasının yanı sıra bu çalışma aynı zamanda MEB tarafından hazırlanan İÖP'nin, son yıllarda son derece önem kazanan ve yabancı dil programlarının şekillendirilmesinde referans konumundaki OBM'de tanımlanan dil düzeylerinin neresinde olduğu da bu çalışma ile ortaya konulmuştur.