



Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (BAİBÜEFD)

Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University
Journal of Faculty of Education

2023, 23(4), 2035–2056. <https://dx.doi.org/10.17240/aibuefd.2023.-1327769>



The Curriculum of Teaching Turkish as a Foreign Language in the Light of CEFR*

CEFR Işığında Türkçenin Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğretimi Programı

Şürkiye Nur DALGAÇ¹ , Gül den TÜM² , Nezir TEMUR³ 

Geliş Tarihi (Received): 14.07.2023

Kabul Tarihi (Accepted): 01.12.2023

Yayın Tarihi (Published): 15.12.2023

Abstract: Turkish Maarif Foundation, an institute teaching Turkish as a foreign language (TFL) worldwide, is an important institution in the field. The foundation applies TFL Curriculum approved in November 2020 by the MoNE Board of Education in Türkiye. The purpose of the current study is to elucidate to what extent the Turkish as a Foreign Language curriculum utilized by Türkiye Maarif Foundation. The approved curriculum overlaps with the meta-text entitled Common European Framework of References for Languages (CEFR, 2020) as to teach languages in Europe. In the study, the outcomes for speaking and writing skills at B1 Level are taken into account as the level accepts learners as independent users. To collect qualitative data for this descriptive research, a document analysis was performed on the descriptor scales of the curricula, in terms of speaking and writing activities in the Turkish course books prepared, published and utilized by one State University in Ankara, Turkey. Findings reveal that CEFR defines more general outcomes because of its role as a meta-text providing recommendations for language teaching and learning, whereas TMF provides more details developed and deduced from these references. The reason for having more details calibrated in TMF descriptors results from the fact that it subdivides the outcome according to the contents of descriptors. Hence, the subdivided descriptors appear in high quantity calibrated separately in TMF Curriculum. Consequently, the number of outcomes calibrated in TMF is observed rather high compared to CEFR ones. Yet, there are striking results displaying how the outcomes cohere, indeed. As the studies conducted in this field appear limited, it is assumed that the current study will contribute to those working in the field.

Key words: Curriculum, Teaching Turkish as a Foreign Language, CEFR, Türkiye Maarif Foundation.

&

Öz: Yurt dışında Türkçeyi yabancı dil olarak öğreten kurumlardan biri olan Türkiye Maarif Vakfı bu alanda önemli bir kurumdur ve Kasım 2020'de MEB Talim ve Terbiye Kurulu tarafından onaylanan Yabancı Dil Olarak Türkçe müfredatını uygulamaktadır. Bu çalışmanın amacı, Türkiye Maarif Vakfı (TMV) tarafından uygulanan müfredatın B1 düzeyinde konuşma ve yazma becerilerinin kazanımlarının CEFR ile ne ölçüde örtüştüğünü ortaya koymaktır. Bu betimleyici araştırmanın nitel verilerini toplamak amacıyla, Ankara'da bir devlet üniversitesi tarafından hazırlanan, yayımlanan ve yararlanılan Türkçe ders kitaplarındaki konuşma ve yazma etkinlikleri ele alınmıştır. TMV müfredatın tanımlayıcı ölçekleri üzerinde bir doküman analizi yapılmıştır. Bulgular, CEFR'nin dil öğretimi ve öğrenimi için öneriler sunan bir üst-metin olması nedeniyle daha genel sonuçlar tanımladığını, TMV'nin ise bu referanslardan geliştirilen ve çıkarılan daha fazla ayrıntı sağladığını ortaya koymaktadır. Bunun nedeni, TMF'in CEFR'da yer alan betimleyicileri alt sınıflarının ayrıştırılarak maddeleştirilmesidir. Böylece CEFR'da tek cümle olarak görülen betimleyicilerin ayrıştırılmasıyla elde edilen alt cümleler TMF'de farklı betimleyiciler olarak listelenmiştir. Sonuç olarak, CEFR ile karşılaştırıldığında TMF'de yer alan sonuçların sayısının oldukça yüksek düzeyde olduğu ortaya konulmuştur. Ancak, kazanımların nasıl bağdaşık olduğunu gösteren şaşırtıcı sonuçlara ulaşılmıştır. Bu alanda yapılan çalışmalar sınırlı kaldığı için bu çalışmanın alanda çalışanlara katkı sunacağı varsayılmaktadır.

Keywords: Öğretim programı, Türkçenin yabancı dil olarak öğretimi, CEFR, Türkiye Maarif Vakfı.

Atf/Cite as: Dalgaç, Ş.N., Tüm, G., & Temur, N. (2023). The curriculum of teaching turkish as a foreign language in the light of CEFR. *Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 23(4), 2035-2056. [doi.org/10.17240/aibuefd.2023.-1327769](https://dx.doi.org/10.17240/aibuefd.2023.-1327769)

İntihal-Plagiarizm/Etik-Ethic: Bu makale, en az iki hakem tarafından incelenmiş ve intihal içermediği, araştırma ve yayın etiğine uyulduğu teyit edilmiştir. / This article has been reviewed by at least two referees and it has been confirmed that it is plagiarism-free and complies with research and publication ethics. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/aibuelt>

²ublished by Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University– Bolu

* This study is prepared from one part of the MA Thesis entitled "A content analysis on the curriculum of teaching Turkish as a foreign language and the mediation embodied in instructional materials".

¹ Şürkiye Nur Dalgaç, Araştırmacı, sukriyenur.abacioglu@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-6003-7249

² Doç. Dr. Gül den Tüm, Çukurova Üniversitesi, Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu, guldentum@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0001-7790-0857

³ Prof. Dr. Nezir Temur, Gazi Üniversitesi, TÖMER, ntemur@gazi.edu.tr, ORCID:0000-0002-8052-1927

1. INTRODUCTION

A set of instructional materials and curricula for teaching Turkish as a foreign language (TFL) have been developed from history up to now. Nevertheless, considering the raising power of the Turkish language in the last decades, there seem to be gaps in the exploration of the existing curricula and the related materials (Ulutaş & Kara, 2019). Taking the research by Er, Biçer and Bozkırlı (2012) into consideration, one of the listed ten problems encountered in teaching TFL is the inadequacy of curricula besides the issues with the institutions responsible for teaching TFL or the inefficacy of instructional materials in the field. After years, related issues, such as lack of standardization and cooperation between institutions in terms of curriculum, (Biçer, et al., 2014; Balcı & Melanlıoğlu, 2020; Candaş-Karababa, 2009; Demirtaş & Acer, 2016; Haznedar, 2004: cited in Biçer, 2019; Kaya & Kardaş, 2019; Kaya & Kardaş, 2020; Köse & Özsöy, 2020; Pilica, 2005; Tüm, 2021), comparisons at different levels (Ardıç, Ardıç, & Durmuş, 2023; Kaplan, 2023) or literacy (Güven & Ulusoy, 2022), writing and reading outcomes (Kara & Topbulut, 2022), diplomacy and role of TMF (Karahan, 2022; Karahan & Abbas, 2022) are thrown up respectively. Regarding all the issues in the literature, it necessitates to scrutinize TMF and the curriculum phenomenon much more as it still needs being unearthed. The curriculum phenomenon is a well-known subject investigated by many scholars and educationalists for decades, which is still ongoing. While curriculum refers to ‘the subjects studied in a school, college, etc. and what each subject includes’ (See the Cambridge Dictionary), today the meaning of curriculum became much wider. To scholars, curriculum takes content (from external standards and local goals) and shapes it into a plan for how to conduct effective teaching and learning. It is thus more than a list of topics, lists of key facts, and skills (the ‘input’). It is a map of how to achieve the ‘outputs’ of desired student performance, in which appropriate learning activities and assessments are suggested to make it more likely that students achieve the desired results (Wiggins & McTighe, 2006: cited in Richards, 2013, p. 6). Hence, a curriculum is likely to consist of all the plans concerning the learning experiences of school or educational institution. It can be actualized at three stations; *the planned curriculum* (what is aimed for students by the curriculum design), *the delivered curriculum* (what is delivered to students by instructors and organized by directors), and *the experienced curriculum* (what students learn and experience). Further, it is the ‘the result of human agency’ (Prideaux, 2003, p. 268). However, curriculum design is a work of art that is never fully contingent upon divergent theories. The results of an academic research on socialization, upbringing knowledge of education reveal that ‘diverse political ideologies and power positions of different pressure groups globally as well as locally have become decisive factors in decision making about educational issues’ (Läänemets & Kalamees-Ruubel, 2013, p. 10). Hence, with a reforming social environment, the curriculum design has also to be renewed. Therefore, the curriculum has to be fixable to changing values and expectations as to realize longevity. In an interview with Ralph Tyler by Cordero, year 1990, about his curriculum rationales, he accentuates that, in a society getting more and more complex, for every generation, education increases in importance, and underlines that a long life for a child born into this era is hardly to be possible without the correct education. Finally, with his well-known statement, ‘there has got to be a curriculum, as long there is education’ (Garduño & Arroyo, 2004, p. 16), he highlights the most significant elements of an educational system as learning ability and curriculum.

The field of curriculum development became sparkling by Caswell and Campbell’s work published in 1935, and was then more famously used in the titles of related books by, for instance, the masterpiece of Taba ‘Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice’ (1962). Hilda Taba and Ralph Tyler are the two curriculum specialists, who put yearlong efforts into curriculum development and discovered essential rationales for curriculum written in their masterpieces, hereby, they became the two inevitable pioneers in this area. Regarding their prominent books, Taba’s Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice published in 1962 influenced several authors in curriculum studies and is still an inspiration in the current researches of the 21st century (Läänemets & Kalamees-Ruubel, 2013). Taba (1962) endorses the curriculum model covering significant aspects, as education aims and intentions, choice of topics and subjects, school progress and management of the learning process and, the evaluation at different levels. For her, it includes a program of evaluation of the outcomes’ (p. 23). Modern curriculum theories adopt Taba’s principles and ideas for

curriculum design as her rationale consists of seven steps: starting with analysing the needs, figuring out the objectives, choosing the topics and subjects, selecting and organizing learning experience (method dimension), and finally, deciding what and how to evaluate (p. 12). Associated with Tyler's long term efforts carried out from 1933 to 1941 ending up in his Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction 'the single most influential curriculum text ever written', published in 1949 with efforts in education policy became quite remarkable (Pinar et al., 2004, p. 148). For the first time Tyler defined the curriculum as 'all the learning experiences planned and directed by the school to attain its educational goals' (Tyler, 1957, p. 79). Additionally, he bases his definition on four principles: 'educational aims, learning experience leading to the realization of those aims, organization of instruction, and evaluation', which are still taken as references by program designers for inquiries about curriculum development, as well as for teaching and training nowadays (Tyler, 1949, p. 1). Tyler suggests that the organization authorities themselves should take the responsibility for curriculum development and teachers should be the implementers. At this point he alludes to the (behavioural) objectives defining the aims;

Objectives ought to be large enough to understand. The ability of the human being is to generalize, [...], it does help you to generalize the principle behind it as something new. Otherwise it becomes like training a person to do a job, little things that they don't commonly understand. So don't get behavioural objectives [...] that there is no generalization. That's not human. Human beings generalize from their experience (Garduno & Arroyo, 2004, p. 11).

As afore-mentioned, Tyler emphasizes the teaching aims, evaluation and control, whereas Taba takes the choice of content and the organization of those to provide comprehensible learning (Läänemets & Kalamees-Ruubel, 2013). Indeed, Taba's approach to curriculum development can be characterized as inductive, while Tyler's is deductive, being rational and broader (Demirel, 1992, pp. 32-33). The common aspects of the Taba and Tyler principles were considered a new approach, the so called Taba-Tyler Model, was adopted by the Ministry of National Education (MoNE) and several universities in Türkiye. The Turkish Education System conducted an investigation concerning curriculum development models and the Taba-Tyler Approach was accepted with consensus of Turkish specialists in the basic elements of aims (objectives), content (subjects), teaching and learning process (educational background), assessment and evaluation (Demirel, 1992). Additionally, dimensions to contribute to the learner's global citizenship, pluriculturalism & plurilingualism were introduced in the structure of the curriculum, regarding not only as activities, methods, materials, physical and social learning centres, but also as dynamic processes that change and shape these components.

1.1. Curriculum and Foreign Language Teaching

Foreign language teaching and learning is getting more attention every day for reasons such as societies interacting with each other; the need for mutual cooperation; cultural, political and economic reasons; getting to know each other and moving away from prejudices; having to migrate for different reasons. Likewise, the Common European of Framework of References for Languages (CEFR) underlines the need for plurilingualism and pluriculturalism as to create common understanding and eliminate prejudices, and it provides recommendations on this issue so that societies could interact in a healthy, economic and social sense. In the same vein, CEFR (2018) deduces the 'educational' curriculum as part of an 'experiential' and 'existential' curriculum, which starts before schooling, develops alongside it, and continues after it. It encompasses all the learning experiences acquired by the individual as a social actor in establishing relations with other individuals and groups; these experiences enable each individual to develop their personality and identity and, to some extent, their linguistic and cultural repertoire (CEFR, p.1.1).

Due to geopolitical and pedagogical reasons, as well as economic and political reasons, Turkish language has gained attraction of foreign learners in many parts of the world for many years. Therefore, international student mobility in higher education has increased the number of Turkish Teaching Application and Research Centres (TÖMERs) to teach Turkish as a foreign language (TFL) day by day. In these institutions, curricula were designed regarding their objectives towards learners, and throughout years, studies to develop curricula are carried out with these institutional objectives or instructional efforts. In the preparation and development of the TFL curriculum, primarily determining the needs of foreign students is considered important because this has to be flexible rather than standardization for the TFL learners coming from different socio-cultural & pedagogical backgrounds and various geographies. Regarding the wide spectrum of their own cultures and even the other foreign languages they learned is a top priority for the program to be successful. Therefore, CEFR is accepted as the meta-text with certain features determined as multi-purpose, flexible, open, dynamic, user-friendly and non-dogmatic (TELC, 2013, p. 17). While multi-purpose means to plan and prepare opportunities in a way to cover all goals and objectives, flexible is to use various conditions, and recommend flexibility to the institutions and language teachers by the upper text. Open refers to the layout suitable for elaboration, while dynamic is expressed as the continuous improvement based on the experience of use. User-friendly means understandable and usable for utilization. Non-dogmatic, on the other hand, refers to the avoidance of unconditional non-commitment to one of the competing linguistic or pedagogical theories and didactic approaches (p. 17). In addition to the multicultural background of these learners, the selection of the experts, who will take part in the designing the program, gains importance as well. The experts are expected to know that multinational and multicultural Turkish language classes formed by students who learn Turkish abroad and in Turkey differ greatly from one another. While those who learn abroad have the characteristic of being mono-national and multilingual, those who learn in domestic institutions are of being multinational and even multicultural/multilingual. This fact makes it extremely important for the team to create the program to meet the objectives of institutions within multidisciplinary manners (Tüm, 2019).

Curriculum by Türkiye Maarif Foundation (TMF)

The Curriculum developed by Türkiye Maarif Foundation (Tr. Türkiye Maarif Vakfı) became an official one. The TFL curriculum, in accordance with CEFR (2018), aims to be a guidance in following stages: need analysis, learning objectives and outcomes, content identification and definition, choosing and preparing materials, determination of teaching and learning methods, and assessment and evaluation. The revised sections in the CEFR new edition (2018) are also reflected in TMF Curriculum (TMF, 2020, p. 12) following the values below:

- ✓ 21st Century Skills are covered under three main headings: a) Learning and innovation skills (creativity and innovation, critical thinking and problem solving, communication, collaboration); b) information, media and technology skills (information literacy, media literacy, information and communication technology literacy); c) life and professional skills (flexibility and adaptability, entrepreneurship and self-management, social and intercultural skills, productivity and responsibility, leadership and responsibility).
- ✓ TFL Curriculum aims to help students develop their intercultural communicative competencies, gain learner autonomy based on the principles of lifelong learning, and have the individual characteristics required for international mobility.
- ✓ TFL Curriculum includes human values such as justice, friendship, honesty, self-control, patience, respect, love, aesthetics, responsibility, patriotism, and benevolence. Additionally, the values produced by the societies are also taken into consideration. Thus, the program aims to improve the language competencies of learners as well as to make them sensitive toward universal and local values (TMF, 2020, p. 13).

In brief, the TFL Curriculum generally adopts a sense, immersive and thematic approach in the designing the program (ibid. p. 23) as deduced below:

- (1) Develop Turkish comprehension skills through listening/following and reading,
- (2) Improve Turkish expression skills through verbal production, verbal interaction and writing,
- (3) Improve Turkish listening, speaking, reading and writing skills in a conscious, correct and attentive manner in accordance with the rules,
- (4) Acquire non-verbal communication skills belonging to Turkish and use them correctly in communication processes,
- (5) Enrich Turkish vocabulary,
- (6) Gain cultural sensitivity and intercultural awareness through interaction,
- (7) Recognize the distinguished works of Turkish language and literature,
- (8) Develop life-long learning skills,
- (9) Acquire / develop 21st century skills with an interdisciplinary approach,
- (10) Improve their academic and special purpose Turkish language competencies (ibid. p. 22).

1.2. Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment: Companion Volume with New Descriptors (2018)

CEFR pursued by the Council of Europe changed and updated its pedagogical approaches until 2017 wherein a set of changes were contrived. In 2018, the new version or the so called ‘Companion Volume with New Descriptors’ was published (CEFR-CV). This one introduces the new extended illustrative descriptors for teaching, learning and assessment with the desire to provide quality in education. General and specific communicative competences are included: linguistic, sociolinguistic, and pragmatic. These are categorized as language activities, language strategies, language processes, (con-)text, field of language usage, and communicative task (TELC, 2013, pp. 18-19; Council of Europe, 2018, p. 30). In the same vein, the CEFR-CV (2018) introduced several new notions, for instance, additional language levels to the already existing ones (Pre-A1; Plus levels: A1+, A2+, B2+), language activities, sign language, phonology, online teaching, literature (reading as a leisure activity), pluriculturalism, and plurilingualism. Additionally, existing descriptors were extended, while new descriptors were determined (CEFR, 2018). The report by Brian North and Enrica Piccardo (2016) frankly details the Language Policy Programme project on these descriptors, that lead to one of the key functions of CEFR so as to promote inspiration for curriculum development. To CEFR, ‘language education is fundamental to the effective enjoyment of the right to education and other individual human rights and the rights of minorities’. In addition to that, ‘the development of language competences is essential for [a] social inclusion, [b] mutual understanding and [c] professional development’ (CEFR, 2018, p. 21). Therefore, this study sheds light on the questions below:

- 1- To what extent does the curriculum for teaching Turkish as a foreign language overlap with the descriptors calibrated in CEFR?
- 2- To what extent do the outcomes for speaking and writing skills in the TMF curriculum overlap with the descriptors calibrated in CEFR?

2. METHOD

2.1. Research Design

The descriptive study embarks on investigating TFL curriculum and comparing it with the descriptors of CEFR at B1 Level. Hereby, the steps are planned qualitatively implemented threefold: ‘skimming (superficial examination), reading (thorough examination), and interpretation’, which is a combination of thematic and content analysis (Bowen, 2009). Content hereby is regarded as the calibrated descriptors of

CEFR. Each descriptor in the curricula is categorized and tabularized respectively in the tables as to accomplish to go with lines in productive skills at B1 level.

2.2. Data Tools

The data tools utilized in the study are documents comprised as follows:

- 1- Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment: Companion Volume with New Descriptors published in 2018 by the Council of Europe (CEFR-CV),
- 2- Curriculum for Teaching Turkish as a Foreign Language, published in 2020 by the Türkiye Maarif Foundation (TMF)

In this study, the outcomes of productive language skills (Speaking and Writing skills and their sub-categories 'Spoken Interaction', 'Spoken Production' & 'Written Interaction', 'Written Production') at B1 level in the TFL curriculum by TMF (2020) are investigated, documented, and interpreted regarding their relation with CEFR (2018). The reason is twofold. The reason for why B1 level is chosen is that the learner becomes an 'independent user', who gains an improved ability to be productive to write and go beyond the basic breakthrough (CEFR, 2020, pp. 36-37). The reason why outcomes or namely descriptors in both TMF and CEFR are taken into account is to see the overlapping them respectively. The curriculums are important to meet the needs of the institutions and CEFR is a meta-text to recommend the levels with their descriptors. Hence, so as to delve into the in-depth insights of TMF Curriculum, it requires to unearth to what extent it covers the recommended demands. The TFL curriculum by Türkiye Maarif Foundation (TMF, 2020) is purposively chosen the data as of the latest and the newest updated official curriculum to teach Turkish language nationwide and worldwide. The curriculum prepared and developed by experts of various interdisciplinary fields such as program development and assessment experts also received public approval by Turkish Board of Education of MoNE. As to shed light on the outcomes in-depth, the productive language skills at level B1 constituted the focus wherein the outcomes were displayed in Table 1 below:

Table 1.

Distribution of Outcomes at B1 Level in the Curriculum by TMF and CEFR

Language Skill	Language Level B1		
	TMF (2020)	CEFR (2018) Observed	Expected
Spoken Production (SP)	51	22	39
Spoken Interaction (SI)	47	51	81
Written Production (WP)	-	12	25
Written Interaction (WI)	66	13	27
Total	164	98	172

Source: (TMF, 2020, p. 37; CEFR, 2018)

As displayed in Table 1, all the outcomes in TMF curriculum at B1 level are each outlined one by one in detail so that each 'Can do' expression only contains one activity or theme. Upon the analyses of the outcomes in CEFR, a great number of those appear as only one defined in one sentence although they indicate more than one achievement (activity or theme). Thus, to facilitate the comparison of the TMF curriculum and the CEFR, these achievements are each separated and formed to a single 'Can do' outcome. For example, the descriptor 'Can describe dreams, hopes and ambitions.' implies the description of 'dreams', 'hopes', and 'ambitions'. Therefore, it is separated into three individual/independent outcomes: 1) Can describe dreams., 2) Can describe hopes., and 3) Can describe ambitions. Since the descriptors for Written Interaction and Written Production skills (as given in the CEFR) are unseparated into two but presented as Writing skills (i.e. Yazma means 'writing' in TMF), only one number of outcomes (n=66) is provided. The original descriptors are defined as 'Observed' in the table above, with the number of

outcome sentences starting with 'Can'. The indicated outcomes determined in these sentences, namely the separated descriptors, are given as 'Expected' in the table above. Herewith, the number of expected coloum is much higher than of observed ones. The number of outcomes observed in the CEFR (n=98) is almost doubled as displayed in the expected ones (n=172) through analysis at B1 Level. Consequently, the distribution of outcomes in TMF and CEFR are figuratively close to each other (TMF=164; CEFR=172). The three language experts delve into all descriptors given in the category regarding both curricula and reach agreement and concensus for intra and interreliability.

Additionally, in CEFR, all the related descriptors at B1 Level were collected in only one scale for each skill, namely, Spoken Production, Spoken Interaction, Written Production and Written Interaction, as displayed in Table 2.

Table 2.*Descriptors of B1 Level Spoken Production*

B1	SPOKEN PRODUCTION DESCRIPTORS
	OVERALL SPOKEN PRODUCTION
	Can reasonably fluently sustain a straightforward description of one of a variety of subjects within his/her field of interest, presenting it as a linear sequence of points.
	SUSTAINED MONOLOGUE: DESCRIBING EXPERIENCE
	*Can clearly express feelings about something experienced and give reasons to explain those feelings.
	Can give straightforward descriptions on a variety of familiar subjects within his field of interest.
	Can reasonably fluently relate a straightforward narrative or description as a linear sequence of points.
	Can give detailed accounts of experiences, describing feelings and reactions.
	Can relate details of unpredictable occurrences, e.g. an accident.
	<i>Descriptors of B1 Level Spoken Production</i>
	Can relate the plot of a book or film and describe his/her reactions.
	Can describe dreams, hopes and ambitions.
	Can describe events, real or imagined.
	Can narrate a story.
	SUSTAINED MONOLOGUE: GIVING INFORMATION
	Can explain the main points in an idea or problem with reasonable precision.
	Can describe how to do something, giving detailed instructions.
	*Can report straightforward factual information on a familiar topic, for example to indicate the nature of a problem or to give detailed directions, provided he/she can prepare beforehand.
	SUSTAINED MONOLOGUE: PUTTING A CASE (E.G. IN DEBATE)
	Can develop an argument well enough to be followed without difficulty most of the time.
	*Can give simple reasons to justify a viewpoint on a familiar topic.
	*Can express opinions on subjects relating to everyday life, using simple expressions.
	Can briefly give reasons and explanations for opinions, plans and actions.
	*Can say whether or not he/she approves of what someone has done and give reasons to justify this opinion.
	PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS
	Can deliver short, rehearsed announcements on a topic pertinent to everyday occurrences in his/her field which, despite possibly very foreign stress and intonation, are nevertheless clearly intelligible.
	ADDRESSING AUDIENCES
	*Can give a prepared presentation on a familiar topic within his/her field, outlining similarities and differences (e.g. between products, countries/regions, plans).
	Can give a prepared straightforward presentation on a familiar topic within his/her field which is clear enough to be followed without difficulty most of the time, and in which the main points are explained with reasonable precision.
	Can take follow up questions, but may have to ask for repetition if the speech was rapid.

In Table 2, the descriptors reflect the outcomes already defined in the 2001 version of the CEFR (e.g. Can take follow up questions, but may have to ask for repetition if the speech was rapid.), whereas the ones with a small starlike symbol (*) represent the redefined or added descriptors to the revised 2018 CEFR-CV, namely the new Companion Volume (e.g. Can give a prepared presentation on a familiar topic within his/her field, outlining similarities and differences.). All the outcomes of each activity expressed in capital for the Spoken Production skill are given in one table, hereby. The rest of these can be found in the descriptor scales in the CEFR (<https://rm.coe.int/cefr-companion-volume-with-new-descriptors-2018/1680787989>). The content of these outcomes was 1) skimmed and 2) read as the first steps of document analysis referring to their definition and importance. To Bowen (2009), for a superficial examination the

skimming procedure is crucial and for a thorough examination a detailed reading through has to be realized. Secondly, for the use of examination a comparative table was established and the TMF aspect was added to portray the accordance between the two curricula.

Below CEFR gives the explicit explanations of contents and concepts including a definition of the activity provided in CEFR for all the skills and activities in Figure 1, it provides no descriptor scales for every level separately as exemplified in Figure 2 below.

Sustained monologue: giving information

Sustained monologue: giving information is a new scale concerned with explaining information to a recipient in a long turn. Although the recipient may well interrupt to ask for repetition and clarification, the information is clearly unidirectional; it is not an exchange. Key concepts operationalised in the scale include the following:

- ▶ type of information: from a simple description of an object, or directions, through straightforward factual information on a familiar topic, to complex professional or academic procedures;
- ▶ degree of precision: from simple descriptions, through explaining the main points with reasonable precision and communicating detailed information reliably, to making clear distinctions between ideas, concepts and things that closely resemble one another.

Figure 1. *Spoken production skill at B1 level (CEFR, 2020, p. 63)*

Giving Information for Spoken Production Skills is as follows:

SUSTAINED MONOLOGUE: GIVING INFORMATION	
C2	<i>No descriptors available; see C1</i>
C1	Can communicate clearly detailed distinctions between ideas, concepts and things that closely resemble one other. Can give instructions on carrying out a series of complex professional or academic procedures.
B2	Can communicate complex information and advice on the full range of matters related to his/her occupational role. Can communicate detailed information reliably. Can give a clear, detailed description of how to carry out a procedure.
B1	<i>Can explain the main points in an idea or problem with reasonable precision.</i> <i>Can describe how to do something, giving detailed instructions.</i> Can report straightforward factual information on a familiar topic, for example to indicate the nature of a problem or to give detailed directions, provided he/she can prepare beforehand.
A2	Can give simple directions from place to place, using basic expressions such as 'turn right' and 'go straight' along with sequential connectors such as 'first,' 'then,' and 'next.'
A1	Can give a simple description of an object or picture while showing it to others using basic words, phrases and formulaic expressions, provided he/she can prepare in advance.
Pre-A1	<i>No descriptors available</i>

Figure 2. *Descriptor scale for the sustained monologue (Source: CEFR, 2018, p. 71)*

For a sophisticated understanding of the descriptor contents during the data analysis procedure, the outcomes contextualized and presented in the TMF curriculum for all grades and levels were taken into account, as instantiated below, in Figure 3.

Ortaöğretim B1							
2. TEMA Hayatın İçinden KAZANIMLAR							
Dinleme/İzleme		Konuşma		Okuma			
Sözlü Etkileşim		Sözlü Üretim		Yazma			
B1.D.1. Toplumsal yaşam alanlarındaki ihtiyaç ve durumlara ilişkin metinleri/konuşmaları anlar. B1.D.15. Haberlerdeki yer, kişi, konu/olay ve zamanla ilgili bilgileri ayırt eder. B1.D.3. Söz varlığı unsurlarını bağlamdan hareketle anlamlandırır. B1.D.12. Sesli ve/veya görüntülü karmaşık duyuru ve anonsları takip eder. B1.D.62. Öneri ifadelerini belirler. B1.D.63. Dinlediklerinden/izlediklerinden istenilen bilgileri seçer.		B1.SE.2. Konuşmacıdan görüşlerini gerekçe lendirmesini ister. B1.SE.15. Toplumsal yaşam alanlarındaki ihtiyaç ve durumlara ilişkin konuşmalara katılır. B1.SE.27. Tercih/teklif içeren diyaloglar kurar. B1.SE.11. Güncel olay veya haberlere ilişkin bilgi alışverişinde bulunur. B1.SE.1. Günlük ihtiyaçlarını gidermeye yönelik ayrıntılı diyaloglar kurar. B1.SE.10. Diyaloglarında öneri ifadeleri kullanır. B1.SE.25. Ayrıntılı yol ve adres tarifleri içeren diyaloglar kurar.		B1.SÜ.23. Bir konuyla ilgili görüşlerini gerekçelendirerek açıklar. B1.SÜ.22. Konuşmalarında gerekçelendirme ifadelerini kullanır. B1.SÜ.24. Konuşmalarında konuşma ortamı ve bağlamına uygun ifadeleri kullanır. B1.SÜ.44. Konuşma aşamalarına (başlama, sürdürme ve bitirme) uygun kalıp ifadeleri kullanır. B1.SÜ.26. Bir etkinlikte ilgili duyuru yapar. B1.SÜ.15. İlgili alanına giren bir konuda görüşlerini desteklenmiş sunum yapar. B1.SÜ.6. Kendini ayrıntılı biçimde tanıtır. B1.SÜ.41. Konuşmalarında beden dili unsurlarını kullanır.		B1.O.19. Bir haber metnindeki yer, kişi, konu/olay ve zamanla ilgili bilgileri belirler. B1.O.22. Metinlerdeki istek, ihtiyaç, şikâyet vb. içeren ifadeleri ve temel iletiyi belirler. B1.O.17. Karmaşık bilgiler içeren duyuru, ilan, afiş/brosür veya reklam metinlerinden ihtiyaç duyduğu bilgileri seçer. B1.O.38. Gazete, dergi ve çoklu ortamlardan ihtiyaç duyduğu bilgileri seçer. B1.O.62. Tercih/teklif bildiren cümleleri ayırt eder. B1.O.67. Bilinen ve güncel konulardaki metinleri anlar. B1.O.1. Toplumsal yaşam alanlarında kullanılan kelime ve kalıp ifadeleri tanıtır. B1.O.69. Gerekçelendirme ifadelerini belirler.	B1.Y.53. Duyuru, ilan, afiş/brosür veya reklam benzeri metinler hazırlar. B1.Y.51. Yazılarında tahmin ifadelerini kullanır. B1.Y.12. Haber metinleri yazar. B1.Y.45. Aynı kavram alanına giren kelimeleri kullanarak metinler yazar. B1.Y.44. Anahtar kelimelerden hareketle metinler yazar. B1.Y.13. Taslak oluşturarak metinler yazar. B1.Y.62. Yazılarında düşünceyi geliştirme yollarını kullanır.
İletişimsel İşlevler, Dil Yapıları, Örnek Konular, Dil İfadeleri							
İletişimsel İşlevler	Dil Yapıları	Örnek Konular					
*Haberler hakkında bilgi verme, bilgi isteme *İhtiyaçlar hakkında bilgi verme, bilgi isteme *Tercih Bildirme *Talep etme *Kişisel görüş bildirme *Öneride bulunma *Şikâyet/yakınma bildirme *Gerekçelendirme *Duyuru yapma	* -mAyI seviyorum. *İsim fiiller +...mAyI ... mAyA tercih ederim... * fakat, ancak, ama, vehayut. *Fillerde etkenlik ve edilgenlik	Okul Başkan Seçimleri (Seçim Çalışmaları) Kulüp Seçimleri/Tercihleri Okul Haberleri ve Güncel Haberler Okul Dışı Kültür Sanat, Teknoloji Haberleri ve Etkinlikler Kulüp Etkinlikleri Toplumsal Alanlar (Kafe/Kantin vb.) Ders Alanı Seçimi (Fen Bilimleri/Sosyal Bilimler vb.)					
Dil İfadeleri							
- Satranç oynamayı seviyorum çünkü ... - Satranç oynamayı-mAyA tercih ederim. *** - Müzik etkinliğine katılmak istiyorum ama/fakat/ancak *** - Sinemaya gitmek istiyorum ama/fakat/ancak hiç vaktim yok. *** - Okulda sergi açtık/ Okulda sergi açıldı. *** - Spor kulübü, her sene futbol turnuvası düzenler. - Her sene futbol turnuvası düzenlenir.							

Figure 3. Outcomes at B1 level theme 2 (TMF, 2020, p. 264)

As given in Figure 3, the outcomes related to real-life in TMF Curriculum are subcategorized within the language skills (listening/reading, speaking, and writing). As the concern of the study is for productive skills, merely speaking and writing parts are taken into account. Konuşma meaning 'Speaking', is also divided into two sub-groups, Sözlü Etkileşim 'Spoken Interaction' in seven items and Sözlü Üretim 'Spoken Production' in eight items as in CEFR. The outcomes are given in numbers as B1SE.2 and B1SÜ.23 and so on. Regarding writing, seven items are calibrated in the curriculum, reflecting the descriptors. Additionally, in the curriculum above the functional processes, linguistic structures, samples for themes, and phrases are inserted in the examples.

2.3. Data Analysis

A descriptive analysis is conducted by categorizing the productive skills within the codes, namely Spoken Production (SP), Spoken Interaction (SI), Written Production (WP), and Written Interaction (WI). Hence, in the study document analysis is applied so as to attain qualitative data. All these codes are utilized by the ones calibrated in Common

2.4. Ethical approval

In this study, all rules stated to be followed within the scope of the “Higher Education Institutions Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Directive” are followed and the approval is authorized by the Social Science Institute of Cukurova University, under the document, E-95704281-604.02.02-65603 dated on 29/03/2021. None of the actions specified under the title of “Actions Violating Scientific Research and Publication Ethics,” have not been carried out.

3. FINDINGS

3.1. Analyses of spoken production descriptors

Table 3.

Analysis of Spoken Production descriptors between CEFR and TMF

SPOKEN PRODUCTION <i>Activity</i>	CEFR		TMF	
	Matching	Non-matching	Matching	Non-matching
Overall Spoken Production	2	0	8	
Sustained Monologue: Describing Experience	16	1	48	
Sustained Monologue: Giving Information	5	0	8	No Categorization of Activities
Sustained Monologue: Putting a Case	6	2	11	
Public Announcements	1	0	4	
Addressing Audiences	5	1	9	
TOTAL	35	4	88	23/51

Table 3 reveals that two or more matching descriptors confirm an overlapping similarity between those. The non-matching outcomes represent those which could not be matched in content. In CEFR, the activities for each skill are categorized and the outcomes are given in separated tables after each type of activity, while in the TMF curriculum all the defined outcomes for the referring skill are given in one table as a whole, namely Sözlü Üretim ‘Spoken Production’. As displayed in Table 3, the frequencies of the matching and non-matching items clearly vary in numbers comparing CEFR and TMF curriculum. Firstly, the totals reveal that n=35 CEFR descriptors are regarded as matching with a frequency of n=88 TMF descriptors, which is more than 60%. The frequency n=88 gives the number of items overlapping with the n=35 outcomes, but the total number of TMF Spoken Production descriptors is actually n=51. This accentuates that particular descriptors in the TMF curriculum overlap with more than one descriptor documented in CEFR. While only 10.2% (n=4) of the Spoken Production outcomes in CEFR could not be matched, 45% (n=23) in TMF could not be found in the regarding investigated CEFR descriptor scale. Considering Overall Spoken Production, all the outcomes (n=2) could be matched with those by TMF eight (n=8) times. The first item here, being SP.1 Can reasonably fluently sustain a straightforward description of one of a variety of subjects within his/her field of interest contains description, variety of subjects, field of interest. Therefore, it could be matched with all the outcomes dealing with these contextual information (n=5 as depicted in Table 3). Right after, the highest frequency observed for the Sustained Monologue: Describing Experience is three times higher (n=48) in TMF objectives than of those (n=16) in CEFR. Here, most of the items in CEFR could be matched with more than one item of TMF as in SP.19 Can narrate a story, which contains a) a (chrono-)logical order, 2) direct/indirect speech, 3) an experienced/observed event, and 4) an

event/situation in the past. Therefore, this outcome could be, like several others in this category, matched with a variety of items of TMF. The lowest difference of the matching outcomes between CEFR and TMF curriculum can be observed in the descriptors of Sustained Monologue: Giving Information and Public Announcements with a frequency variation of three, since in Sustained Monologue n=5 CEFR outcomes could be matched with n=8 TMF outcomes and in Public Announcements only n=1 outcome could be matched n=4 times.

3.2. Analysis of spoken interaction descriptors

Table 4.

Analysis of Spoken Interaction descriptors between CEFR and TMF

SPOKEN INTERACTION <i>Activity</i>	CEFR		TMF	
	Matching	Non-matching	Matching	Non-matching
Overall Spoken Interaction	9	2	16	
Understanding an Interlocutor	1	1	1	
Conversation	9	3	13	
Informal Discussion	10	2	19	
Formal Discussion	3	1	8	
Goal-Oriented Co-Operation	8	2	23	No Categorization of Activities
Obtaining Goods and Services	6	2	12	
Information Exchange	10	0	12	
Interviewing and Being Interviewed	7	1	11	
Using Telecommunications	3	1	8	
TOTAL	66	15	123	20/47

In Table 4, similar analysis of descriptors for Spoken Production Skill regarding the frequencies is observed to overlap with TMF outcomes. Apparently, CEFR items in total (n=66) is close to twice (n=123) with TMF items. While 15 out of 66 CEFR Spoken Interaction outcomes could not be matched, 20 out of 47 TMF outcomes listed for this skill are characterized as different and could therefore not be linked with any CEFR descriptor. The number of non-matching CEFR descriptors ranges up to a maximum of n=3 in the Conversation Activity while in Information Exchange all (n=10) the items could be matched with TMF outcomes (n=12). In Conversation activity, the outcome of SI.20 Can enter unprepared into conversations on familiar topics is unidentified in any outcome defined in the TMF curriculum and is, hence, one of the non-matching items. The highest frequency which could be linked is remarked in the activity Goal-Oriented Co-Operation with n=8 CEFR outcomes matching with n=23 TMF outcomes. Hereby, for instance, SI.43 Can explain why something is a problem and SI.45 Can compare and contrast alternatives are identically identifiable with three TMF items (SI.43=SE.23, SE.24; SI.45=SE.26, TMF, 2020: 59) taking justification and comparing/contrasting into account. Another example is SI.78 Can use telecommunications for everyday personal or professional purposes, provided he/she can ask for clarification from time to time in the activity Using Telecommunications. This outcome could be considered as similar with five TMF outcomes noticing 'telecommunication', 'professional purpose', 'asking for', 'clarification', and 'asking questions' all together. Thus, this item could be matched with five TMF items, elucidating the difference between CEFR and TMF items (n=3; n=8).

3.3. Analysis of written production descriptors

Table 5.

Analysis of matching Written Production descriptors between CEFR and TMF

WRITTEN PRODUCTION <i>Activity</i>	CEFR		TMF	
	Matching	Non-matching	Matching	Non-matching
Overall Written Production	2	0	40	No
Creative Writing	11	1	56	Categorization
Written Reports and Essays	10	1	60	of Activities
TOTAL	23	2	156	27/67

Table 5 reveals that the analysis for writing skills is realized regarding only one scale, namely Writing 'Yazma' in TMF, by combining the descriptor scale for Written Production and Written Interaction. Nevertheless, one table is constituted for the collected data of Written Production and one for Written Interaction. Since the outcomes of these skills are unseparated but gathered in one table by TMF, the total number of descriptors in TMF is identical (n=67). According to the findings emerged, the number of matching items by TMF is at least six times higher than those of CEFR, as given in the activity Written Reports and Essays (CEFR: n=10; TMF: n=60). Alike, the total of matching TMF items (n=156) are almost seven times higher than those of CEFR (n=23). To clarify, the outcome WP.12 Can write a description of an event—real or imagined in the activity Creative Writing contains 1) indirect speech, 2) news about an event, 3) description in general, 4) description of a particular event, 5) writing about an event in the past, 6) a real/imagined event experienced in daily life, and 7) writing about something observed. As a result, one item in CEFR similarly appears seven times in TMF (see URL 2). Most of CEFR outcomes can be matched with more than three TMF items which make these data clearer. The number of non-matching items ranges between a minimum of two in CEFR (n=2) and a maximum of 27 in TMF (n=27). An example for non-matching items is WP.24 Can state reasons for actions in Written Reports and Essays which is a specified outcome and could therefore not be identified this way.

3.4. Analysis of written interaction descriptors

Table 6. Analysis of Written Interaction descriptors between CEFR and TMF

WRITTEN INTERACTION <i>Activity</i>	CEFR		TMF	
	Matching	Non-matching	Matching	Non-matching
Overall Written Interaction	5	2	28	No
Correspondence	14	0	56	Categorization
Notes, Messages and Forms	6	0	12	of Activities
TOTAL	25	2	96	40/67

To Table 6, TMF items appear twice more than the matching ones in CEFR for the activity Notes, Messages and Forms (CEFR: n=6; TMF: n=12). Further, the results for matching items in Correspondence demonstrate a quadrupled value in TMF as 14 CEFR items overlap with 56 TMF items. Following example delivers evidence for these striking cases: CEFR descriptor WI.12 Can give detailed accounts of personal feelings and experiences indicates indirect speech; an experience in daily life/in the past; an experienced observation/feeling; feelings, impressions and experiences in general, thus, overlaps with seven TMF items. Alike the outcome WI.1 Can convey information and ideas on abstract as well as concrete topics in Overall Written Interaction implies 1) conveying information and ideas in general, 2) abstract topics, and 3) concrete topics which is very extensive in meaning and content. Therefore, this outcome overlaps with 16 items, which consequently confirms that five (n=5) CEFR items can be matched with exactly 28 (n=28) TMF

items. On the other side, there are a set of non-matching items in both scales examined. While in CEFR B1 Written Interaction scale 7.4% (n=2) of the items were unmatchable, in the TMF B1 Writing scale 59.7% (n=40) of the items do not overlap with regarding Written Interaction descriptors. Hereby, the total number of linked TMF items ranges almost four times higher than CEFR items. In order to give a general overview about these analyses, a table of the totals is given in the next section.

3.3. Analysis of matching and non-matching descriptors

Table 7.

Analysis of Totals of Matching and Non-matching Descriptors between CEFR and TMF

Productive Skills	CEFR		TMF	
	Matching	Non-matching	Matching	Non-matching
Spoken Production	35	4	88	23/51
Spoken Interaction	66	15	123	20/47
Written Production	23	2	156	27/67
Written Interaction	25	2	96	40/67
Total	149	23	463	110/232

Table 7 displays that the numbers of matching CEFR descriptors frankly do not overlap with the numbers of matching TMF items but rather they do differ from each other to a high degree. The frequencies are not even similar or close to each other. As given in Table 7, the numbers of matching TMF items are at least about twice higher than the numbers of matching CEFR descriptors as found for Spoken Interaction (CEFR: n=66; TMF: n=123). The highest score in Written Production is with a deviation of 85,26%. Overtly, 23 CEFR outcomes overlap with 156 TMF items. Furthermore, the data obtained for Spoken Production deliver obviously a difference of 60,23% (CEFR: n=35; TMF: n=88), while the overlapping TMF items are nearly quadrupled in Written Interaction (CEFR: n=25; TMF: n=95). Besides, the non-matching items are again more in the TFL curriculum with a minimum of 20 (n=20/40) and a maximum of 40 (n=40/67), whereas the numbers in CEFR are very low ranging between n=2 and n=15. Indeed, these results substantiate that CEFR Companion Volume and TFL curriculum by TMF clearly differ from each other quantitatively and qualitatively.

4. DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

The efforts on the research question considering TMF curriculum compared with CEFR prove that CEFR apparently formed a basis to a particular extent reading in depth the content of the TMF curriculum, especially the outcomes. Regarding the relation between the two documents scrutinized, the outcomes by TMF are apparently more extended, specified and detailed. In other words, more than one outcome is originally joined together in one descriptor using connectives and convoluted gerund infinitive clauses, or commata in CEFR. Yet, TMF asserts every single outcome in one separate descriptor, which inclined a high number of descriptors by TMF but a lower number by CEFR. As to match CEFR outcomes with the TMF ones in a feasible and realistic way, the outcomes combined to one statement have to be analysed by separating into its components to turn to a descriptor matchable with more than one TMF outcome. The findings prove that even a separated outcome is still general and it embodies more than one TMF outcome. This suggests that a descriptor defined by CEFR appears as various outcomes by TMF, since TMF notably adopts a more detailed and classified style within seven separated descriptors for one descriptor calibrated in CEFR (TMF, 2020, p. 59). These give the teachers and all users of TMF curriculum (teacher, material developer, assessment designer, and so on.) an idea and direction for targeted choosing and preparing instructional materials and even assessing the outcomes of the learners through details and classifications (pp. 64-65). In addition, findings frankly yield proof on the fact that the same TMF outcome could be matched several times with CEFR descriptor, resulting in an increase of frequency in items. On the other hand, the references by CEFR set the users free while adapting the descriptors, hereby, the instructors or

curriculum developers have the opportunity to direct themselves and adjust the references to their conditions.

A further novel finding reveals that a set of non-matching TMF outcomes of Speaking and Writing Skills at B1 Level could be ascertained in other activities at an upper level or in the Strategy section of CEFR. Beyond that, deep interpretations are made in several descriptors of both TMF and CEFR regarding cases. It is detected that in a few cases outcomes can almost be considered as contrary to each other since the TMF encourages idiomatic use, whereas CEFR promotes for less idiomatic use.

In conclusion, this investigation proves that the separate descriptors let teachers to teach any foreign language as suggested in CEFR for the productive skills. Moreover, the desired outcomes will be reached by a standardized curriculum not only for learners as social agents but also for language instructors, administrators and institutions as also underlined by the studies in the field (Ardıç et al, 2022; Kaya & Kardaş, 2019; Kaya & Kardaş, 2020; Yüce & Mirici, 2020). In addition, TMF establishes the curriculum intended to be utilized for material development and in-class implementation besides institutionalization. TMF was specified to be related to the context, intentions, and requirements for the TFL instruction so that the instructor or any curriculum user could comprehend the meaning by feeling bound by a mandated curriculum that defines the content, skills, and values to be taught and forces them to properly follow the text book in order to realize these objectives.

References

- Ardıç, E., Ardıç, A., & Durmuş, N. (2022). Yedi İklim Türkçe ve İstanbul Yabancılar İçin Türkçe Kitaplarının Maarif Vakfı-Yabancı Dil Olarak Türkçe Öğretimi Programında Yer Alan A1 Seviyesi Dinleme Kazanımlarına Göre Karşılaştırılması. *Academic Social Resources Journal*, 7(44), 1863-1873.
- Balcı, M., & Melanlıoğlu, D. (2020). Türkçe'nin yabancı dil olarak öğretimi programı üzerine. *Kırıkkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 10(2), 173-198.
- Biçer, N., Çoban, İ. ve Bakır, S. (2014). Türkçe öğrenen yabancı öğrencilerin karşılaştığı sorunlar: Atatürk Üniversitesi örneği. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 7(19), 125-135.
- Biçer, N. (2019). Öğrenen ihtiyaçlarının belirlenmesi ve yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretiminde program geliştirme. *Yabancı Dil Olarak Türkçe Öğretimi: Politika, Program, Yöntem ve Öğretim* (Edt. E. Boylu ve L. İltar). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal* 9(2), 27-40.
- Candaş-Karababa, Z. C. (2009). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe'nin öğretimi ve karşılaşılan sorunlar. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 42(2), 265-278.
- Caswell, H. L., & Campbell, D. S. (1935). Curriculum development. (No Title).
- Çelik, S., & Erbay, Ş. (2013). Cultural perspectives of Turkish ELT course books: Do standardized teaching texts incorporate intercultural features? *Education & Science/Eğitim ve Bilim*, 38(167), 336-351.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education*. Routledge Publishers.
- Council of Europe. (2018). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume with New Descriptors*. Language Policy Programme, Education Policy Division, Education Department.
- Council of Europe. (2020). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume with New Descriptors*. Language Policy Programme, Education Policy Division, Education Department.
- Demirel, Ö. (1992). Türkiye'de program geliştirme uygulamaları. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 7(7), 27-43.
- Demirtaş, S. K. ve Acer, E. K. (2016). Türkçe öğretiminde karşılaşılan sorunlara yönelik bir değerlendirme: Passau Üniversitesi örneği. in A. Okur, B. İnce, İ. Güleç (Edt). *Yabancılar Türkçe öğretimi üzerine araştırma (177-184)*. Sakarya: Sakarya Üniversitesi TÖMER Yayınları
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007) *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative and mixed methodologies*. Oxford University Press.
- Er, O., Biçer, N. ve Bozkırlı, K. Ç. (2012). Yabancılar Türkçe Öğretiminde Karşılaşılan Sorunların İlgili Alan Yazını Işığında Değerlendirilmesi. *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim (TEKE) Dergisi*, 1(2), 51-69.
- Garduño, J. M. G., & Arroyo, G. C. (2004). El modelo curricular Tyleriano y los reconceptualistas: Entrevista con Ralph W. Tyler (1902-1994). *REDIE: Revista Electrónica de Investigación Educativa*, 6(2), 7, 1-18.
- Güven, A. Z., & Ulusoy, F. (2022). Maarif Vakfı Tarafından Hazırlanan Yabancı Dil Olarak Türkçe Öğretimi Programının Yeni Okuryazarlıklar Bağlamında İncelenmesi. *International Journal of Language Academy*, 10(2).
- Howard, J., & Major, J. (2005). Guidelines for designing effective English language teaching materials. *The TESOLANZ Journal*, 12(10), 50-58.
- Kaplan, K. (2023). Maarif Vakfı ile Ankara Üniversitesi TÖMER Tarafından Hazırlanan Yabancı Dil Olarak Türkçe Öğretim Programlarının Karşılaştırmalı İncelemesi. *Iğdır Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, (33), 66-84.
- Kaplan, H., Çimen, İ., & Balcı, E. (2022). Türkiye'nin Eğitim Diplomasinde Türkiye Maarif Vakfının Rolü. *Akdeniz Havzası ve Afrika Medeniyetleri Dergisi*, 4(2), 120-128.
- Kara, M., & Topbulut, S. D. (2022). Türkiye Maarif Vakfı Programı'nda Bulunan Okuma ve Yazma Kazanımlarının Aşamalılık ve Karşılıklık İlişisine Göre İncelenmesi. *Uluslararası Türkoloji Araştırmaları ve İncelemeleri Dergisi*, 7(1).

- Karahan, M. (2022). Bir yumuşak güç unsuru olarak maarif vakfının Türkiye'nin uluslararası ilişkilerindeki rolü (Master's thesis, Aksaray Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü).
- Karahan, M., & Abbas, Z. (2022). Türk Dış Politikasında Yumuşak Güç Kullanımı: Sahra Altı Afrika Ülkelerinde Maarif Vakfı Faaliyetleri. *R&S-Research Studies Anatolia Journal*, 5(1), 1-25.
- Kaya, M., & Kardaş, M.N. (2019). Türkçenin Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğretimi Programı 2. Türkiye Maarif Vakfı'nın Hazırladığı Program (TMV, 2019). Türkçenin Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğretimi. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Kaya, M., & Kardaş, M.N. (2020). "Yabancı Dil Olarak Türkçe Öğretim Programı Üzerine Bir İnceleme." *Kuram ve Uygulamada Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*. Vol. 4, no.1, pp. 1- 20.
- Köse, D. & Özsöy, E. (2020). Türkiye'de yabancılara Türkçe öğretiminin otuz yılı: 1990-2020. *Turkophone*, 7(2), 27-54.
- Kurt M., Balcı M., Temur N., et al (2020). Türkçenin Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğretimi Programı. İstanbul: Türkiye Maarif Vakfı.
- Läänemets, U., & Kalamees-Ruubel, K. (2013). The Taba-Tyler rationales. *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies (JAAACS)*, 9(2), 1-12.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*. Sage publications.
- North, B., & Piccardo E. (2016). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Developing illustrative descriptors of aspects of mediation for the CEFR*. Council of Europe.
- Pilica, B. (2005) The role of the foreign language course book in teaching and learning of English and Turkish as a foreign language in Turkey: A case study / Türkiye'de Türkçe'nin ve İngilizce'nin yabancı dil olarak öğretilmesinde ve öğrenilmesinde ders kitabının rolü: Bir vaka çalışması. Master's Thesis, Marmara University, İstanbul.
- Pinar, William F., William M. Reynolds, Patrick Slattery, and Peter M. Taubman (2004). *Understanding curriculum*. Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.
- Prideaux, D. (2003). ABC of learning and teaching in medicine. *BMJ*, 326(1), 268-70.
- Richards, J. C. (2013). Curriculum approaches in language teaching: Forward, central, and backward design. *Relc Journal*, 44(1), 5-33.
- Taba, H. (1962). *Curriculum development. Theory and practice*. Harcourt, Brace and World.
- TELC. (2013). *Diller için Avrupa Ortak Öneriler Çerçevesi Öğrenim, Öğretim ve Değerlendirme*. TELC GmbH.
- Tüm, G. (2019). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretiminde öğretmen profili. (16. Bölüm) *Schriften zur Sprache und Literatur III*. (Balcı, T., Öztürk, A.O., & Serindağ, E.), pp. 145-152. IJOPEC Publication: London-UK. ISBN 978-1-912503-64-3.
- Tüm, G. (2021). Reconsidering Curriculum Design for Teaching Turkish as a Foreign Language in Turkey. In Proceedings of the AATT Conference and the ADES International Symposium "Pedagogies, Challenges, and Cultural Intersections in the Turkic World". Conference proceedings book, 67-98, Washington DC/USA
- Türkiye Maarif Vakfı (2020). *Türkçenin yabancı dil olarak öğretimi programı*. İstanbul
- Tyler, R.W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Tyler, R.W. (1957). The curriculum then and now. In proceedings of the 1956 invitational conference on testing problems. Educational Testing Service.
- Ulutaş, M. ve Kara, M. (2019). TÖMER Türkçe öğretim programları okuma kazanımlarının bilişsel stratejiler açısından incelenmesi. *Dil Eğitimi ve Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5(2), 232-250. doi: 10.31464/jlere.575801.
- Yüce, E., & Mirici, İ. H. (2020). Standard setting through the CEFR in language education contexts. GLOBETSONline: International Conference on Education, Technology and Science (38).

GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

1. GİRİŞ

Tarihten günümüze kadar Türkçenin yabancı dil (TYD) olarak öğretimine yönelik bir dizi öğretim materyali ve öğretim programı geliştirilmiştir. Bununla birlikte, Türkçeye ilginin son yıllarda artış göstermesi, mevcut öğretim programlarının ve ilgili materyallerin daha derinden araştırılmasını zorunlu kılmaktadır. Alan yazındaki çalışmalar dikkate alındığında, TYD öğretiminde karşılaşılan sorunlardan birinin öğretim programlarındaki yetersizlik olduğu görülmektedir. Her ne kadar son yıllarda öğretim programları açısından standartlaşma ve kurumlararası işbirliği, farklı düzey karşılaştırmaları, okuryazarlık, yazma ve okuma kazanımları, diploması ve TMV'nun rolü gibi konular çalışılsa da öğretim programı konusunun hala gün yüzüne çıkarılmaya muhtaç olduğu ve daha fazla incelenmesi gerektiği sonucu ortaya çıkmaktadır. Öğretim programı önceleri 'bir okulda çalışılan konuları ve her konunun neleri içerdiğini' ifade ederken günümüzde çok daha geniş bir anlamı içermektedir. Kısaca, öğretim programı bir konu listesinden çok daha fazlasıdır. Öğrenci performansının 'kazanımlara' nasıl dönüşeceğinin bir haritasıdır ve bu kazanımlara ulaşma olasılığını artırmak için öğrenme etkinlikleri ve değerlendirmelerini kapsar. Bu nedenle, üç durumda gerçekleştirilebilir: planlanan öğretim programı, verilen program ve deneyimlenen program. Bununla birlikte, öğretim programlarının planlanması, hiçbir zaman farklı teorilere tam olarak bağlı olmayabilir. Sosyalleşme ve eğitimin geliştirilmesi üzerine yapılan çalışmalar 'küresel ve yerel olarak farklı siyasi ideolojiler ve güç konumlarının eğitim konularında karar vermede belirleyici faktörler haline geldiğini' ortaya koymaktadır. Bu nedenle, reforme edilen bir sosyal çevre ile birlikte öğretim programlarının yenilenmesi gerekebilir. Öğretim programının da uzun ömürlü olabilmesi için değişen değerlere ve beklentilere sabitlenebilir olması gerekir.

Hilda Taba ve Ralph Tyler öğretim programı geliştirmeye yıllarca emek veren, programın temel gerekçelerini ortaya koyan öncülerdir. Taba'nın 1962 yılında yayınlanan Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice (Program Geliştirme: Teori ve Uygulama) adlı eseri, bu alandaki çalışmalarda birçok araştırmacıyı etkilemiştir ve 21. yüzyılın güncel araştırmalarına ilham kaynağı olmaya devam etmektedir. Taba (1962), eğitimin amaçları, konu ve konuların seçimi, kurumun gelişmesi, öğrenme sürecinin yönetimi ve farklı düzeylerde değerlendirme gibi önemli yönleri kapsayan modeli desteklemektedir. Ona göre, tüm bu sonuçların değerlendirilmesi için bir programa gereksinim vardır. Modern öğretim programı kuramları, Taba'nın yedi adımdan oluşan öğretim programının ilke ve fikirlerini benimser: ihtiyaç analizi ile başlama, hedefleri oluşturma, konuları seçme, öğrenme deneyimini belirleme ve düzenlemek ve son olarak, neyin ve nasıl değerlendirileceğine karar vermedir. Tyler ise ilk kez 'kurumun eğitim hedeflerine ulaşmak için planlanan ve yönlendirilen tüm öğrenme deneyimleri' olarak tanımladığı öğretim programını dört ilkeye dayandırır: 'eğitimin amacı, bu amacın gerçekleştirilmesini sağlayan öğrenme deneyimi, öğretim organizasyonu ve değerlendirme'dir. Bu program günümüzde öğretim programının geliştirilmesinde hala referans olarak alınmaktadır. Görüldüğü gibi, Tyler, öğretimin amaçlarını, değerlendirmesini ve kontrolünü vurgularken, Taba, anlaşılır öğrenmeyi sağlamak için içerik seçimini ve bunların organizasyonunu üstlenir. Gerçekten de, Taba'nın öğretim programı geliştirmeye yaklaşımı tümevarımsal olarak nitelendirilebilirken, Tyler'inki tümdengelimli, rasyonel ve daha geniştir. Taba ve Tyler ilkelerinin ortak yönleri, MEB ve Türkiye'deki bazı üniversiteler tarafından benimsenen Taba-Tyler Modeli olarak adlandırılan yeni bir yaklaşım olarak kabul edilmiştir. Türk Eğitim Sistemi için program geliştirme modellerine yönelik bir araştırma yapılmış ve amaç (hedef), içerik (konular), öğretme ve öğrenme süreci (eğitim durumu), ölçme ve değerlendirme gibi temel unsurlarda Türkçe uzmanların oybirliği ile Taba-Tyler Yaklaşımı benimsenmiştir. Ek olarak, öğrencinin küresel vatandaşlığına, çok kültürlülüğüne ve çok dilliliğine katkıda bulunacak boyutlar, sadece etkinlikler, yöntemler, materyaller ve öğrenme merkezleri olarak değil, bu öğeleri değiştirerek şekillendirecek dinamik işlemlerdir.

Yabancı dil öğretimi ve öğrenimi, toplumların birbirleri ile etkileşim içinde olması, karşılıklı işbirliğine ihtiyaç duyması, kültürel, politik ve ekonomik nedenler, birbirilerini tanuması ve önyargılardan

uzaklaşması, farklı nedenlerle göç etmek zorunda kalması gibi nedenlerle önemlidir. Diller için Avrupa Ortak Başvuru Metni (CEFR) de ortak anlayış oluşturmak ve önyargıları ortadan kaldırmak için çok dillilik ve çok kültürlülüğe duyulan ihtiyacın altını çizmekte ve toplumların sağlıklı, ekonomik ve sosyal anlamda etkileşim kurabilmeleri için bu konuda önerilerde bulunmaktadır. Aynı şekilde, CEFR 'eğitim' programını, okuldan önce başlayan ve ondan sonra da devam eden 'deneyimsel' ve 'varoluşsal' bir durum olarak ele almaktadır. Bireyi sosyal bir aktör olarak görmekte diğer birey ve gruplarla ilişki kurmada edindiği tüm öğrenme deneyimlerini önemsemektedir. Bu deneyimler her bireyin kişiliğini, kimliğini ve bir dereceye kadar dilsel ve kültürel repertuarını geliştirmesini sağlar. Dolayısıyla, TYD öğretim programının hazırlanması ve geliştirilmesinde, farklı sosyo-kültürel ve pedagojik geçmişlerden ve çeşitli coğrafyalardan gelen yabancı öğrenciler için standartlaşmadan ziyade esnek olması gerektiğinden, öncelikle bu öğrencilerin ihtiyaçlarının belirlenmesi önemli görülmektedir. Kendi kültürlerinin ve hatta öğrendikleri diğer yabancı dillerin geniş yelpazesini göz önünde bulundurmak, programın başarılı olması için en önemli önceliktir. Bu nedenle CEFR, çok amaçlı, esnek, açık, dinamik, kullanıcı dostu ve dogmatik olmayan belirli özelliklere sahip bir üstmetin olarak kabul edilmektedir.

Türkiye Maarif Vakfı tarafından hazırlanan öğretim programında CEFR'nin yeni baskısında (2018) yer alan gözden geçirilerek yenilenmiş bölümlere de yer verilmiştir. Bu programda aşağıdaki değerler takip edilmektedir:

- ✓ 21. Yüzyıl Becerileri üç ana başlık altında ele alınmaktadır: a) Öğrenme ve yenilikçilik becerileri, b) bilgi, medya ve teknoloji becerileri; c) Yaşam ve mesleki beceriler.
- ✓ TMV Öğretim programı, öğrencilerin kültürlerarası iletişimsel yeterliliklerini geliştirmelerine, yaşam boyu öğrenme ilkelerine dayalı öğrenen özerkliği kazanmalarına ve uluslararası hareketlilik için gerekli bireysel özelliklere sahip olmalarına yardımcı olmayı amaçlar.
- ✓ TFL Öğretim programı adalet, dostluk, dürüstlük, özdenetim, sabır, saygı, sevgi, estetik, sorumluluk, vatanseverlik, yardımseverlik gibi insani değerleri içerir. Ayrıca toplumların ürettiği değerler de göz önünde bulundurulur. Böylece program, öğrenenlerin dil yeterliliklerini geliştirmenin yanı sıra evrensel ve yerel değerlere karşı duyarlı olmalarını amaçlar.

Kısaca, TYD Öğretim programının tasarlanmasında aşağıda belirtildiği gibi genel olarak anlamlı, sürükleyici ve tematik bir yaklaşım benimsenir:

- (1) Dinleme/takip etme ve okuma yoluyla Türkçe anlama becerilerini geliştirme,
- (2) Sözlü üretim, sözlü etkileşim ve yazma yoluyla Türkçe anlatım becerilerini geliştirme,
- (3) Türkçe dinleme, konuşma, okuma ve yazma becerilerini kurallara uygun, bilinçli, doğru ve özenli bir şekilde geliştirme,
- (4) Türkçeye ait sözsüz iletişim becerilerini kazanma ve iletişim süreçlerinde doğru kullanma,
- (5) Türkçenin söz varlığını zenginleştirme,
- (6) Etkileşim yoluyla kültürel duyarlılık ve kültürlerarası farkındalık kazanma,
- (7) Türk dili ve edebiyatının seçkin eserlerini tanıma,
- (8) Yaşam boyu öğrenme becerilerini geliştirme,
- (9) Disiplinlerarası bir yaklaşımla 21. yüzyıl becerilerini kazanma/geliştirme,
- (10) Akademik ve özel amaçlı Türkçe dil yeterliklerini geliştirme.

Avrupa Konseyi tarafından takip edilen CEFR; 2018 yılında, 'Tamamlayıcı Cilt' olarak yeniden yayınlanmıştır. Bu üstmetinde, dilbilimsel, sosyodilbilimsel ve edimsel alanlar genişletilmiştir. Dil etkinlikleri, dil stratejileri, dil süreçleri, dil kullanım alanları ve iletişimsel görevler sınıflandırılmış ve birkaç yeni kavram eklenmiştir. Örneğin, hâlihazırda mevcut olan dil seviyelerine de ekler yapıldı (A1öncesi; A1+, A2+, B2+). Dil etkinlikleri, işaret dili, sesletim, çevrimiçi öğretim, edebiyat (serbest zaman etkinliği olarak okuma), çok kültürlülük ve çok dillilik eklenmiştir. Brian North ve Enrica Piccardo'nun (2016) Dil Politikası Programı projesi raporu, öğretim programı geliştirmede ilham kaynağı sağlamak amacıyla CEFR'nin temel işlevlerinden olan bu tanımlayıcıları açık bir şekilde detaylandırır. CEFR'ye göre, "dil eğitimi; eğitim hakkından ve diğer bireysel insan haklarından ve azınlıkların haklarından etkin bir şekilde yararlanılması için esastır". Buna ek olarak, 'dil yeterliliklerinin geliştirilmesi [a] sosyal içerik, [b] karşılıklı anlayış ve [c] mesleki gelişim için esastır'. Bu nedenle, bu çalışmanın amacı aşağıdaki sorulara ışık tutmaktadır:

- 1- Türkçenin yabancı dil olarak öğretimine ilişkin öğretim programı, CEFR'de belirlenen tanımlayıcılarla ne ölçüde örtüşmektedir?
- 2- TMV öğretim programında yer alan konuşma ve yazma becerilerine ilişkin kazanımlar, CEFR'de belirlenen tanımlayıcılarla ne ölçüde örtüşmektedir?

2. YÖNTEM

Bu betimsel çalışmada, TMV (2020) tarafından TYD öğretim programında yer alan B1 düzeyindeki üretimsel dil becerilerinin (Konuşma ve Yazma becerileri ve bunların alt kategorileri olan 'Sözlü Etkileşim', 'Sözlü Üretim' ve 'Yazılı Etkileşim', 'Yazılı Üretim') kazanımları CEFR (2018) tanımlayıcıları ile karşılaştırılmış, incelenmiş ve yorumlanmıştır. B1 seviyesinin seçilmesinin nedeni, öğrencinin 'bağımsız bir kullanıcı' olması, yazma ve temel becerilerin ötesinde üretken olmasıdır. Hem TMV hem de CEFR'deki kazanım ve tanımlayıcıların dikkate alınmasının nedeni, sırasıyla örtüşmeleri görmektir. Çalışmada kullanılan veri araçları iki belgeden oluşmaktadır: 1. Avrupa Konseyi tarafından 2018 yılında yayınlanan Avrupa Dilleri Ortak Çerçeve Programı: Öğrenme, Öğretme, Değerlendirme: Yeni Tanımlayıcılarla Tamamlayıcı Cilt (CEFR-CV) ve 2. Türkiye Maarif Vakfı (TMV) tarafından 2020 yılında yayımlanan Yabancı Dil Olarak Türkçe Öğretimi Öğretim Programı'dır. Türkiye Maarif Vakfı tarafından hazırlanan TYD öğretim programı, Türkçeyi yurt içinde ve dünyada öğretmek üzere en son ve en yeni güncellenen resmi öğretim programı olarak seçilmiştir.

3. BULGULAR, TARTIŞMA VE SONUÇ

TMV öğretim programları ile CEFR tanımlayıcılarının karşılaştırmalı olarak incelenmesini kapsayan bu araştırmanın sonuçları, iki belge kıyaslandığında, TMV'nın kazanımlarının daha genişletilmiş, belirlenmiş ve ayrıntılı olduğunu göstermektedir. Başka bir deyişle, CEFR tanımlayıcılarında birden fazla kazanımları birleştiren bağlaçlar ve girift cümleler virgül kullanımıyla tek bir tanımlayıcı ile sınırlı sayıda sunulurken TMV kazanımları altgrupları ayırarak birer yargı şeklinde ve nicel olarak çok sayıda verilmiştir. Bu nedenle CEFR sonuçları, TMV sonuçlarıyla uygulanabilir ve gerçekçi bir şekilde eşleştirilmiş, birden fazla TMV kazanımıyla eşleştirilebilir bir tanımlayıcıya dönüşmesi için bileşenler ayrılarak analiz edilmiştir. Bulgular, CEFR tarafından tanımlanan bir tanımlayıcının TMV tarafından çeşitli kazanımlar olarak görüldüğünü göstermektedir. Örneğin TMV, CEFR'de verilen bir tanımlayıcıyı yedi ayrı tanımlayıcı halinde daha ayrıntılı ve sınıflandırılmış bir stil benimseyebilmektedir. Bunlar, öğretmenlere ve TMV öğretim programının tüm kullanıcılarına (yerel öğretmen, materyal tasarımcı ve geliştirici, ölçme ve değerlendirmenin ilkelerinin belirlenmesi vb.) öğretim materyallerinin hedefli seçilmesi, hazırlanması ve hatta ayrıntılar ve sınıflandırmalar yoluyla öğrencilerin sonuçlarının değerlendirilmesi için daha belirgin bir fikir ve yön verir. Buna ek olarak, bulgular, aynı TMV sonucunun CEFR tanımlayıcısı ile birkaç kez eşleştirilebileceğini ve bunun da maddelerde sıklık artışına neden olabileceğini açıkça kanıtlamaktadır. Öte yandan, CEFR tarafından yapılan referanslar, tanımlayıcıları uyarlarken kullanıcıları özgür kılar, böylece

öğretmenler veya öğretim programı geliştirenler kendilerini yönlendirme ve referansları kendi koşullarına göre ayarlama fırsatına sahip olmaktadır.

Bir başka yeni bulgu, B1 Düzeyinde yer alan konuşma ve yazma becerilerinin bir dizi eşleşmeyen TMV sonucunun, bir üst düzeydeki diğer etkinliklerde veya CEFR'in strateji bölümünde tespit edilebileceğini ortaya koymaktadır. Bunun ötesinde, bulgularla ilgili olarak hem TMV hem de CEFR'in çeşitli tanımlayıcılarında kavramsal ve nitel olarak çok daha derin bulgulara da rastlanmıştır. Bazı durumlarda, TMV'nin 'deyimsel' kullanımı teşvik etmesi, CEFR'in ise 'daha az deyimsel' kullanımı teşvik etmesi nedeniyle sonuçların neredeyse birbirine zıt olarak kabul edilebileceği tespit edilmiştir.

Sonuç olarak, bu araştırma, ayrı tanımlayıcıların CEFR'da önerildiği gibi öğretmenlerin herhangi bir yabancı dili öğretmelerine izin verdiğini kanıtlamaktadır. Ayrıca, alandaki çalışmaların da altını çizdiği gibi, sadece sosyal aktör olarak ifade edilen öğrenenler için değil, aynı zamanda dil öğretmenleri, yöneticiler ve kurumlar için de standartlaştırılmış bir müfredat ile istenen sonuçlara ulaşılabilecektir (Ardıç vd., 2022; Kaya ve Kardaş, 2019; Kaya ve Kardaş, 2020; Yüce ve Mirici, 2020). Ayrıca TMV'nin, kurumsallaşmanın yanı sıra materyal geliştirme ve sınıf içi uygulama için de kullanılması hedeflenen öğretim programını oluşturduğu gözlenmiştir. TMV'nin TYD öğretimi bağlamının, ihtiyaç ve gereksinimler ile ilgili olduğu sonucuna varılmıştır. Böylece yabancı dil öğretmenleri, materyal tasarımcıları ve sınav hazırlayanlar, öğretilen içeriği, becerileri ve değerleri tanımlayan zorunlu bir öğretim programına bağlı kalacaktır. Ders kitabı veya materyallerini de öğrencilerin kazanımlarını gerçekleştirmek için daha yakından takip edeceklerdir.

ETHICAL APPROVAL

In this study, all rules stated to be followed within the scope of the “Higher Education Institutions Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Directive” are followed and the approval is authorized by the Social Science Institute of Cukurova University, under the document, E-95704281-604.02.02-65603 dated on 29/03/2021. None of the actions specified under the title of “Actions Violating Scientific Research and Publication Ethics,” have not been carried out.

Ethics Committee Approval Information:

Ethical committee = the Social Science Institute of Cukurova University

Data of ethical approval= 29.03.2021

The number of ethical approvals= E-95704281-604.02.02-65603

CONTRIBUTION OF RESEARCHERS

The contribution rate of the 1st to the research is 40%, and 2nd and 3rd authors to the research is 30%.

Author 1: Research design, data analysis, reporting.

Author 2 and 3: Determination of the method, consultancy, critical comment.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

There is no conflict of interest between the authors or any institution in the study.