Evaluating European Language Portfolio in Turkish Context: Teachers' Views on New Secondary Education English Teaching Program

By

[1]İsmail Yüksel and [2]Sadife Demiral

[1]PhD, AssistantProfessor, Eskisehir Osmangazi University, Faculty of Education,
Eskisehir, Turkey, Email: iyuksel@ogu.edu.tr,
[2]PhD Student, Eskisehir Osmangazi University, Gradutae School of EducationalSciences,
Eskisehir, Turkey, Email: sadifede@gmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of the study was to examine English language teachers' views on newly developed Secondary Education English Teaching Program. The study was conducted on 109 language teachers via mixed method design. Data of the study were collected through Secondary School teachers' views on SEETP scale. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the scale was .97. To analyse the quantitative data descriptive statistics, independed t test and a one-way analysis of variance and for qualitative data content analysis techniques were used. The results indicated that although teachers were moderately positive on the new SEETP, they stated that some dimensions are insufficient. Also, findings manifested that teachers indicated that course books and workbooks were prepared perfunctory, the course time was not enough, the new program was lack of materials. Further, the teachers complained on not being informed enough about new program and they added that introduction seminars on the new program were not enough.

Keywords: *New Developed English Language Program, Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, European Language Portfolio, Mixed Method,*

1. Introduction

Remarkable innovations and changes have been witnessed in English language teaching in the last decades throughout the world. Second language education programs have been re-developed worldwide in line withCommon European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) and European Language Portfolio (ELP) developed by Council of Europe. This change has also required renewed of Secondary Education English Teaching Program in order to increase the quality of foreign language teaching, ensure the students meet their own needs by using English as a communication mean, able to use the technology, learning to learn, the ability of solving the problem by using thinking skills in Turkey. In this framework the Ministry of Education in Turkey allowed the integration of the CEFR in the National Curriculum for language teaching in order to shift the Turkish education system from teacher-centered learning to a learner-centered system. In 2010-2011 academic year the Ministry of Education piloted the Secondary Education English Teaching Program at some schools. The newly curriculum was put into practice for the secondary schools in the 2011-2012 academic year. It was intended to bring comparable standards for foreign language learning and teaching and defines language learner's acquisition of the expected target, knowledge and skills with language proficiency levels. Language outcomes (listening, speaking, reading and writing) in the program were prepared by taking criteria which were determined and suggested for using in language teaching by the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (MNE, 2011; Yilmaz&Akcan, 2012). Though it has been two years of implementation of this new curriculum, there are not sufficient studies on evaluation of the curriculum. In this respect, this study aims to determine teachers' views on new curriculum qualitatively and quantitatively.

The Common European Framework (CEF) has its origin in over 40 years of work on modern languages in various projects of the Council of Europe (COE).The Common European Framework provides a common basis for the elaboration of language syllabuses, curriculum guidelines, examinations, textbooks, etc. across Europe (Clauet, 2010). It describes what language learners have to learn to do in order to use a language for communication and what knowledge and skills they have to develop so as to be able to act effectively. The description also covers the cultural context in which language is set. The Framework also defines levels of proficiency which allow learners' progress to be measured at each stage of learning and on a life-long basic(Majhanovich, Taylor, Smith & Crowley, 2011).The CEFR describes L2 proficiency as the ability to use the language across five activities (listening, reading, writing, spoken interaction, and spoken production) at six levels: A1 (breakthrough) and A2 (waystage) - basic user, B1 (threshold) and B2 (vantage) - independent user and C1 (effective operational proficiency) and C2 (mastery) - proficient user (Council of Europe, 2001; Jones & Saville, 2009).

The European Language Portfolio is defined as an organized collection of documents that individual learners can assemble over a period of time and systematically present a record of their qualifications, achievements and experiences in language learning, together with samples of their work (Gonzales, 2009). ELP focuses on developing a consistent and coherent tool that has learner-centered approach, transparency and flexibility (CMEC, 2010). The Council of Europe conceived the ELP as a means of mediating the CEFR's action-oriented approach to learners and enabling them to steer and control their own learning (Council of Ministers of Education, 2010; Little, 2011).

Faez and et al. (2011) conducted a qualitative and quantitative study about teachers' views of CEFR and according to their findings teachers' perceptions have been positive toward CEFR-informed instruction for second language classrooms in Ontario. They commented on the power and influence of "Can Do" statements in the promoting student confidence and motivation as well as increasing students' awareness of their ability. Demirel and İşisağ (2010) have emphasized the effectiveness of speaking skills program based on CEFR compared with traditional speaking skills program. Also, Karababa and Süzer (2010) have found in their study that teachers need to be consulted on various issues such as course book selection, material development and adaptation of descriptors. In addition, Üstünlüoğlu and et al. (2012) described the process of developing a new teaching program, taking CEF into consideration, at the Preparatory Program at the School of Foreign Languages and evaluated the effectiveness of the program in their study. In their findings, a significant relationship between students' proficiency scores and perception of their own competencies and a significant difference in perception of their own competence in terms of levels at the preparatory program took place.

A teacher as human resource can be a powerful instrument through which opinions about an implemented program can be increased, so further exploration can be undertake about Secondary Education English Teaching Program by taking teachers' view about the program. This study will explore the view of the secondary school teachers about newly implemented Secondary Education English Teaching Program.

For the development of the changes at the Secondary Education English Teaching Program at the desired level, it is necessary to teachers who are the implementers of the program to adopt these changes and be informed about these changes at an adequate level. This research has been accepted as important in order to determine the views of the teachers by comparing the newly implemented Secondary Education English Teaching Program implemented in 2011-2012 academic year with the previous program.

The aim of this study is to determine the opinions, expectations and suggestions of the secondary school teachers on the recently developed Secondary Education English Teaching Program. Within this framework the study investigates these questions;
   1. What are the secondary school teachers' views on Secondary Education English Teaching Program?

2. Do secondary school teachers' genders make difference in their views on the teaching learning process, activities and evaluation of 2011 SEETP?

3. Do secondary school teachers' teaching experiences make difference in their views on the teaching learning process, activities and evaluation of 2011 SEETP

4. Do secondary school teachers' teaching experiences make difference in their views on the teaching learning process, activities and evaluation of 2011 SEETP?

5. Do secondary school teachers' types of school make difference in their views on the teaching learning process, activities and evaluation of 2011 SEETP?

6. Do secondary school teachers' levels of knowledge about program make difference in their views on the teaching learning process, activities and evaluation of 2011 SEETP?

7. Does secondary school teachers' participation in seminars make difference in their views on the teaching learning process, activities and evaluation of 2011 SEETP?

8. What other opinions do the teachers report on 2011 SEETP?

2. Methodology

The study employs explanatory sequential mixed method design. In this type of research design both qualitative and quantitative data were collected and analysed. In mixed methods researchers are better able to gather and analyse considerably more and different kinds of data than they would be able to using just one approach (Fraenkel and et al.2012). In explanatory sequential mixed method researcher collects first quantitative data and then collects qualitative data to help explain or elaborate the quantitative results. In this study first teachers' view on new Secondary Education English Teaching Program were collected through a survey and then their response to open ended question was analysed.

Participants
The participants of the study consisted of 109 English language teachers working for public secondary schools in both Odunpazarı and Tepebaşı municipality boundary of Eskişehir in Turkey in 2012-2013 academic-year. The Table 1 shows the background of participants.

Table 1.Background of Participants (N=109)

Characteristic					
Gender	Male	Female			
	37 (33%)	72 (66%)			
Teaching Experience	0-5 year	6-10 year	11-15 year	16-19 year	20- year
	3 (2%)	32 (29%)	32 (29%)	16 (14%)	26 (23%)
Type of school	Science-Anatolian	General	Vocational		
	57 (49 %)	17 (15 %)	38 (34 %)		
Level of knowledge about program	inadequate	moderately adequate	quite adequate	adequate	
	3 (2%)	40 (36%)	33 (30%)	33 (30%)	

As it is seen in Table 1, 33% (37) of the teachers are male and 66% (72) of the teachers are female. Considered teachers' experience as English language teachers, 2% (3)of the teachers are experienced between 0-5 years, 29% (32) of the teachers are experienced between 6-10 and 11-15 years, 14% (16) of the teachers are experienced 16-19 years and 23% (26) of the teachers are experienced 20 years and over. Most of the teachers work at science and anatolian high schools (49%), 34% (38) of the teachers work at vocational high schools and 15% (17) of the teachers work at general high schools. Also, 2% (3) of the teachers have inadequate knowledge about the new program, 36% (40) of the teachers have moderately adequate knowledge and 30% (33) of the teachers have quite adequate knowledge and adequate knowledge.

Research Instrument

In this study, to collect the data Secondary School Teachers' Views on New SEETP scale was administered. The scale was developed by Demirlier (2010) to collect teachers' view on newly developed English Teaching Curriculum. It consisted of three parts. The first part was about teachers' personal information. The second part aimed to collect data related to secondary school teachers' opinions on content of the curriculum, activities in the curriculum, the teaching learning process and evaluation of 2011 SEETP. In the third part, the questionnaire included open ended part for the participants to state their extra opinions about the content of the curriculum, activities in the curriculum, the teaching learning process and evaluation. This five point likert scale consisted of 32 items. The total score of for the scale was 160, the average score was 96 and the minimum score was 32. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the original scale was .93. In this study it was .97.The Cronbach's alpha of the subscales were also calculated and the Cronbach's alpha for teaching –learning subscale was .95, it was .94 for activities subscale and it was .91 for evaluation subscale.

Data Collection and Analysis Techniques

The data were collected from 109 English language teachers working for public secondary schools in both Odunpazarı and Tepebaşı municipality boundary of Eskişehirin Turkey in 2012-2013 academic year. The data of the study were analysed via descriptive statistics (frequencies, means, standard deviation), t test and one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) techniques. In order to interpret average values in the scale a standard range was developed.

1.00 – 1.80   - Strongly disagree,
1.81 – 2.60   - Disagree,
2.61 – 3.40   - Undecided,
3.41 – 4.20   - Agree,
4.21 – 5.00   - Strongly agree.

All the personal opinions of the teachers were filtered and categorized. Content analyse technique was used to analyse teachers' responses to the open ended question.

3. Results

In the study, firstly teachers' views on teaching- learning process, activities and evaluation dimensions of the SEETP were descriptively analysed. The results of teachers' view on teaching-learning process were shown in Table2.

Table 2.Secondary school teachers' views on *teaching-learning* process in SEETP

Items	N	M	SD
1. It has increased the students' interests in the English course	109	2,89	1,08
2. In class performance of students has been increased	109	3,12	,99
3. It has been developed by taking into account the age of the students	109	2,94	1,09
4. It has been prepared by taking account the topics appealing to students' interest	109	2,92	1,18
5. Teaching of grammar is not the primary aim	109	3,47	1,19
6. The active use of speaking skills is aimed	109	3,43	1,05
7. The active use of listening skills is aimed	109	3,27	1,11
8. The active use of reading skills is aimed	109	3,34	,97
9. The active use of writing skills is aimed	109	3,17	1,04
10. The students are in the center of teaching-learning process	109	3,27	1,00
11. The teaching-learning process has been based on an active process	109	3,31	1,01
12. The learning styles of the students have the priority	109	2,94	1,03
13. In the newly developed English program social interaction and interpersonal information exchange have the priority	109	3,15	1,08
Total	**109**		

As seen on the Table 2 above teachers believe that teaching of grammar is not the primary aim (M=3.47, SD=1.19)) and the active use of speaking skills is aimed (M=3.43, SD=1.05) which reveals that the students are given more opportunities to practice English instead of memorizing grammar rulers.

On the other hand, the teachers have moderately positive opinions on the active use of listening (M=3.27, SD=1.11), reading (M=3.34, SD= .97) and writing (M=3.17, SD=1.04) skills showing that teachers slightly agree on listening, reading and writing skills in the new program.However, the teachers stated some negative opinions on the teaching-learning process of the new program. They believe that it has not increased the students' interests in the English course (M=2.89, SD=1.08), it has not been prepared by taking account the topics appealing to students' interest (M=2.92, SD=1.18) and the learning styles of the students do not have the priority (M=2.94, SD=1.09) revealing that the participants do not find the new program effective in terms of learners' interests.

Descriptive analyses of teachers' views on activities of the SEETP were shown in Table3.

Table3. Secondary school teachers' views on *activities* in the SEETP

Items	N	M	SD
14. It includes activities that encourage students to speak English	109	3,13	1,09
15. The activities have been developed to appeal to students' interest	109	3,00	1,08
16. The active participation of students is provided	109	3,06	1,03
17. The activities have been developed by taking into account the individual learning styles	109	2,94	1,02
18. The program includes activities designed to improve social interaction	109	3,21	1,03
19. The program includes activities which enable students to use prediction and conclusion skills	109	3,07	1,07
20. The activities have been developed to improve students' autonomy	109	3,07	,95
21. The activities have been prepared in relation to students' learning needs.	109	2,93	1,01
22. The activities have been developed to provide using critical thinking skills	109	2,87	1,01
23. The activities have been developed to improve students' problem solving skills	109	2,78	,99
Total	**109**		

As Table 3 reveals the teachers have moderately positive opinions on the active participation of students (M=3.06, SD=1.03), encouraging students to speak English (M=3.13, SD=1.09) and improving students' autonomy (M=3.07, SD= .95) which shows that teachers think that the activities do not give enough chance for students of being active in the class and learners' autonomy is not highly promoted. On the contrary, the teachers also stated some negative opinions on the activities of the new program. They believe that the activities have not been developed to improve students' problem solving skills (M=2.78, SD= .99) and provide using critical thinking skills (M=2.87, SD=1.01) showing that they find the activities as not enough to develop students' critical thinking.

Descriptive analyses of teachers' views on evaluation process of the SEETP were shown in Table4.

Table 4.Secondary school teachers' views on evaluation process in SEETP

Items	N	M	SD
24.It has been based on the evaluation of the students' learning process	109	3,17	,98
25.The techniques methods and measurement tools used for evaluating the student are in variety	109	3,22	1,05
26.The technique methods and measurement tools are sufficient for evaluating the students' success	109	3,04	1,06
27.Students can make decisions on their studies and development	109	2,93	1,03
28.Students can make decisions on their peers' studies and development	109	2,87	1,01
29.Especially in group activities, students can make decisions not only themselves but also on their peers' studies and development	109	2,92	,95
30.The program includes performance task and projects	109	3,42	1,03
31.The portfolios are useful to follow the general success of the students and determine their attitudes towards the course	109	3,17	1,04
32.It takes time to use measurement and evaluation techniques, methods and measurement tools	109	3,30	1,05
Total	**109**		

As seen above the teachers have positive opinion on evaluation process of the new program. They believe that the program includes performance task and project (M=3.42, SD=1.03) showing that they find performance task and project in the program sufficient.Also, they think that it does not take tame to use measurement and evaluation techniques, methods and measurement tools (M=3.30, SD=1.05) indicating that they think positively on evaluation techniques and methods. Besides the teachers believe that the new program has been based on the evaluation of the students' learning process (M=3.17, SD=1.04) which shows that evaluation of students' learning process has been found sufficient by the teachers.However, the teachers stated some negative opinions on evaluation process of the new program. They do not believe that students can make decisions on their studies and development (M=2.93, SD=1.03) make decisions on their peers' studies and development (M=2.87, SD=1.01) and can make decisions not only themselves but also on their peers' studies and development especially in group activities (M=2.92, SD= .95) revealing that they think negatively on students' making decisions on their and peer' studies.

The second concern of the study was to compare teachers' views on activities in the curriculum, the teaching learning process and evaluation of 2011 SEETP according to gender, teaching experience, type of school, level of knowledge about program and participation in seminars.

The test results whether their genders make difference in their views on activities in the curriculum, the teaching learning process and evaluation of 2011 SEETP were shown on Table 5.

Table 5.Difference between secondary school teachers' opinions on activities in the curriculum, the teaching learning process and evaluation of 2011 SEETP in relation to gender.

Subscales	Gender	N	M	SD	df	t	p
Teaching-learning process	Female	72	3,20	,76	107	,58	,559
	Male	37	3,10	,97			
Activities in the curriculum	Female	72	3,04	,79	107	,58	,560
	Male	37	2,94	,95			
Evaluation	Female	72	3,10	,74	107	,15	,881
	Male	32	3,13	,89			
General	Female	32	3,12	,71	107	,40	,683
	Male	72	3,06	,90			
Total		**109**					

An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare the teaching-learning process, activities and evaluation subscale scores for males and females. There was no significant difference in teaching-learning scores for males (M=3.10, SD= .97) and females (M=3.20, SD= .76). There was no significant difference in activities scores for males (M=2.94, SD= .95) and females (M=3.04, SD= .79). Also, there was no significant difference in evaluation scores for males (M=3.13, SD= .89) and females (M=3.10, SD= .74). Thus, it can be said that, both female and male participant teachers have approximately the same opinions on the new SEETP.

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to explore the impact of teaching experience on participants views on teaching-learning process, activities and evaluation of 2011 SEETP. The test results were shown in Table6.

Table 6. Range of secondary school teachers' opinions on activities in the curriculum, the teaching learning process and evaluation of

Subscales	Teaching experience	N	M	SD		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P
	0-5	3	3,54	,46	Between Groups	2,181	4	,545	,763	.552
	6-10	32	2,97	,85	Within Groups	74,353	104	,715		
Teaching-learning process	11-15	32	3,25	,83	Total	76,534	108			
	16-19	16	3,14	1,05						
	20-	26	3,27	,72						
Total		109	3,16	,84						
	0-5	3	3,00	,96	Between Groups	1,298	4	,325	,437	,782
	6-10	32	2,86	,88	Within Groups	77,256	104	,743		
Activities in the curriculum	11-15	32	3,10	,96	Total	78,554	108			
	16-19	16	2,92	,78						
	20-	26	3,10	,72						
Total		109	3,00	,85						
	0-5	3	3,03	,56	Between Groups	2,328	4	,582	,929	,450
	6-10	32	2,93	,80	Within Groups	65,168	104	,627		
Evaluation	11-15	32	3,20	,85	Total	67,496	108			
	16-19	16	3,03	,89						
	20-	26	3,29	,63						
Total		109	3,11	,79						
	0-5	3	3,22	,62	Between Groups	1,737	4	,434	,709	,587
	6-10	32	2,93	,80	Within Groups	63,644	104	,612		
General	11-15	32	3,19	,83	Total	65,380	108			
	16-19	16	3,04	,88						
	20-	26	3,23	,61						
Total		109	3,10	,77						

p< 0,05

As seen on Table 6 according to participants' views teachers who have teaching experience between 0-5 years have more positive attitude to teaching-learning experience subscale. Teachers having 11-15 and 20 or more years teaching experience have more positive attitude to activities subscale. Besides, teachers

having 20 or more years teaching experience have more positive attitude to evaluation subscale.A one-way between groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the impact of teaching experience on teaching-learning process, activities and evaluation subscales. There was not statistically significant difference at the $p<0,05$ level in teaching-learning process ($F_{(4-104)}$= ,76, p.= ,55), activities ($F_{(4-104)}$= ,43, p= ,78), evaluation ($F_{(4-104)}$= ,92, p= ,45) for the teaching experience. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that each group did not differ significantly from each other.

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to compare the teaching-learning process, activities and evaluation of 2011 SEETP according to type of school. The test results were shown in Table7.

Table 7. Rangeof secondary school teachers' opinions on activities in the curriculum, the teaching learning process and evaluation of 2011 SEETP according to type of school.

Subscales	Type of school	N	M	Sd		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P
Teaching-earning	Science and Anatolian	54	3,09	,84	Between Groups	1,720	2	,860	1,218	,300
	General high school	17	3,45	,76	Within Groups	74,814	106	,706		
	Vocational and technique	38	3,14	,85	Total	76,534	108			
	Total	109	3,16	,84						
Activities	Science and Anatolian	54	2,96	,87	Between Groups	,557	2	,278	,378	,686
	General high school	17	3,17	,80	Within Groups	77,997	106	,736		
	Vocational and technique	38	2,99	,86	Total	78,554	108			
	Total	109	3,00	,85						
Evaluation	Science and Anatolian	54	3,11	,77	Between Groups	,692	2	,346	,549	,579
	General high school	17	3,28	,69	Within Groups	66,805	106	,630		
	Vocational and technique	38	3,04	,86	Total	67,496	108			
	Total	109	3,11	,79						
Total	Science and Anatolian	54	3,05	,77	Between Groups	,942	2	,471	,775	,463
	General high school	17	3,32	,69	Within Groups	64,438	106	,608		
	Vocational and technique	38	3,07	,82	Total	65,380	108			
	Total	109	3,10	,77						

p<0,05

The Table 7 shows teachers who have been teaching at general high schools have more positive attitude to teaching-learning experience subscale (M= 3.45, SE= .18), activities subscale (M= 3.17, SE= .19) and evaluation subscale (M=3.28, SE= .16).A one-way between groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the impact of type of school on teaching-learning process, activities and evaluation subscales. There was not statistically significant difference at the $p<0,05$ level in teaching-learning process ($F_{(2-106)}$= 1,28, p.= ,30), activities ($F_{(2-106)}$= ,37, p= ,68), evaluation ($F_{(2-106)}$= ,54, p.= ,57) for the teaching experience. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that each group did not differ significantly from each other.

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to compare the teaching-learning process, activities and evaluation of 2011 SEETP according to level of knowledge about program. The test results were shown in Table 8.

Table 8. Range of teachers' opinions on activities in the curriculum, the teaching learning process and evaluation of 2011 SEETP in relation to level of knowledge about program

Sub scales		N	M	SD		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P
Teaching-earning	inadequate	3	2,28	1,20	Between Groups	3,805	3	1,268	1,831	,146
	moderately adequate	40	3,04	,84	Within Groups	72,728	105	,693		
	quite adequate	33	3,28	,77	Total	76,534	108			
	adequate	33	3,28	,83						
	Total	109	3,16	,84						
Activities	inadequate	3	2,23	,77	Between Groups	2,002	3	,667	,915	,436
	moderately adequate	40	2,99	,91	Within Groups	76,552	105	,729		
	quite adequate	33	3,08	,74	Total	78,554	108			
	adequate	33	3,02	,88						
	Total	109	3,00	,85						
Evaluation	inadequate	3	2,44	1,22	Between Groups	1,643	3	,548	,873	,457
	moderately adequate	40	3,07	,86	Within Groups	65,853	105	,627		
	quite adequate	33	3,19	,68	Total	67,496	108			
	adequate	33	3,14	,76						
	Total	109	3,11	,79						
Total	inadequate	3	2,31	1,07	Between Groups	2,447	3	,816	1,361	,259
	moderately adequate	40	3,03	,82	Within Groups	62,934	105	,599		
	quite adequate	33	3,19	,69	Total	65,380	108			
	adequate	33	3,16	,75						
	Total	109	3,10	,77						

p< 0,05

A one-way between groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the impact of knowledge level about program on teaching-learning process, activities and evaluation subscales. There was not statistically significant difference at the p<0,05 level in teaching-learning process ($F_{(3-105)}$= 1,83, p.= ,14), activities ($F_{(3-105)}$= ,91, p= ,43), evaluation ($F_{(3-105)}$= ,87, p.= ,45) for the teaching experience. Post-hoc comparisons using the Turkey HSD test indicated that each group did not differ significantly from each other.

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to compare the teaching-learning process, activities and evaluation of 2011 SEETP according to participation in seminars. The test results were shown in Table 9.

Table 9.Range of secondary school teachers' opinions on activities in the curriculum, the teaching learning process and evaluation of 2011 SEETP in relation to participation in seminars.

Sub scales		N	M	SD		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P
Teaching-learning	none	48	3,15	,83	Between Groups	2,933	2	1,467	2,112	,126
	once	41	3,03	,83	Within Groups	73,601	106	,694		
	twice	20	3,49	,82	Total	76,534	108			
	Total	109	3,16	,84						
Activities	none	48	3,06	,83	Between Groups	,966	2	,483	,660	,519
	once	41	2,88	,88	Within Groups	77,589	106	,732		
	twice	20	3,11	,83	Total	78,554	108			
	Total	109	3,00	,85						
Evaluation	none	48	3,15	,81	Between Groups	2,421	2	1,210	1,971	,144
	once	41	2,94	,81	Within Groups	65,076	106	,614		
	twice	20	3,36	,62	Total	67,496	108			
	Total	109	3,11	,79						
Total	none	48	3,12	,78	Between Groups	1,913	2	,957	1,598	,207
	once	41	2,96	,78	Within Groups	63,467	106	,599		
	twice	20	3,33	,71	Total	65,380	108			
	Total	109	3,10	,77						

A one-way between groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the impact of knowledge level about program on teaching-learning process, activities and evaluation subscales. There was not statistically significant difference at the p<0,05 level in teaching-learning process ($F_{(2-106)}$= 2,11, p.= ,12), activities ($F_{(2-106)}$= ,66, p= ,51), evaluation ($F_{(2-106)}$= 1,97, p.= ,14) for the teaching experience. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that each group did not differ significantly from each other.

The opinions of the teachers related to 2011 SEETP

The participant teachers were asked to express their opinions about the new Secondary School English Teaching Program after responding the questionnaires. 35 out of 109 participants stated extra opinions on the 2011 SEETP. The Table 10 presents the findings;

Table 10.Extra opinions of the teachers related to the new 2011 SEETP (N=35)

Reported statements	N	F
Books	19	48%
Program in general	9	2,5%
Course time	8	2.2%
Materials	7	2%

As seen on Table 14,19 of the teachers think that course books and workbooks are prepared perfunctory. Also, they state that course books and workbooks are not colourful enough, especially printing is poor, and the pages separate and get lost. For instance, one of the teachers states that "…..*The books are so inadequate. Books are not at the level of the students and they do not appeal to them…. (T32)*". Another one expresses that*"....visual elements of the books are incomprehensible. Therefore, most of the activities are not possible to be performed….. (T12)*". Also, another one says that*"....structures in the books are not integrated. ....reading texts in the books are not enough….some vocabularies are not suitable for their levels…. (T9)*" and one of the teachers states that*"... the books are classified as A1.1 and A1.2 unnecessarily and almost there is no difference between the levels of these classifications….. (T32)"*
Also, general statements about the new program areadverted by the teachers. Nine teachers find the new program very useful than the previous program, but they state that it was not well enough to change the students' negative approaches towards English. For example, one of teachers states that*"...the new program is well, but it is not well enough to change the students' negative approaches towards English…. (T15)*". Another one expresses that *"...the new program is based on communicative approach, but it is put into practice without being well prepared… (T6)*". Also, another one says that*"...although the new program contains many innovations and developments…. (T18)*" and one of the teachers states that*"...the program theoretically is positive, but the applicability and practicality of the program is low… (T32)*".
Besides, eight of the teachers complain about the limitation of the course time. They state that in order to apply the new program effectively, enough time is needed and three/two lesson hours of English is not enough.

They also report that the new program is lack of materials; more audio visual materials should be included. They express that smart boards are available at schools, but there aren't any suitable e-books which can be used.

Finally, the teachers complain on not being informed enough about new program and they add that introduction seminars on the new program are not enough. The teachers have not been informed about the program's philosophy, objectives, content, teaching-learning situations and evaluation process. Therefore, major problems are experienced in implementing the program.According to data collected by survey, almost half of the teachers (48) reported that they have not attended to any seminar about new English program, the other half have either attended once or twice to such seminars.

4. Discussion and Conclusions

This study aims at finding out the views of teachers on new Secondary School English Teaching Program, which was adapted in the line with the CEFR. This work has revealed that teachers' views on the new English Program are moderately positive. According to the result of "Secondary School Teachers' Views on New SEETP Scale" of this research study six conclusions can be drawn.

The study indicates that although teachers are moderately positive on teaching-learning process subscale of the new SEETP, they think some parts are insufficient. Teachers believe that teaching of grammar is not the primary aim and the active use of speaking skills is aimed at new SEETP. As proposed by İşisağ and Demirel (2010), the experimental group which took a new speaking skills program based on CEFR was more successful than the control group which took traditional speaking program. Also, the active use of listening, reading andwriting skills are aimed at new SEETP. This in good agreement with the study of Shaarawy and Lotfy (2012) indicating that the group thought the new CEFR course had a significant development in writing proficiency level. On the other hand, they think that it has not increased the students' interests in the English course, it has not been prepared by taking account the topics appealing to students' interest and the learning styles of the students do not have the priority.

It is manifested that teachers are moderately positive activities subscale of the new SEETP; however they think some parts of the SEETP are insufficient. They believe that the activities in the new program promote the active participation of students, encouraging students to speak English and improving students' autonomy, but they are not enough. Faez and et al. (2011) also expressed in their study that teachers teaching French as a second language CEFR-informed instruction increased student motivation, built self-confidence in their learners, promoted authentic language use in the classroom and encouraged learner autonomy. On the contrary, the teachers also stated some negative opinions on the activities of the new program. They believe that the activities have not been developed to improve students' problem solving skills and provide using critical thinking skills showing that they find the activities as not enough to develop students' critical thinking.

It is revealed in the study that although teachers have moderately positive opinions on the evaluation subscale of the new SEETP, they think some parts of the content are lacking. They believe that the program includes performance task and project showing that they find performance task and project in the program sufficient. Also, they think that it does not take tame to use measurement and evaluation techniques, methods and measurement tools. Besides, the teachers believe that the new program has been based on the evaluation of the students' learning. However, the teachers stated some negative opinions on evaluation process of the new program. They do not believe that students can make decisions on their studies and development, make decisions on their peers' studies and development and can make decisions not only themselves but also on their peers' studies and development especially in group activities.

The study findings show that contrary to expectations both male and female teachers have approximately the same opinions on the new SEETP. This shows that their genders do not affect their views on SEETP. Additionally, also there was not statistically significant difference at the p<0,05 level in teaching-learning process , activities in the program and evaluation for the teaching experience, type of school, level of knowledge about program and participation in seminars. All the teachers share the same opinions. This shows that their teaching experience, type of school, level of knowledge about program and participation in seminars do not affect their views on SEETP.

The study indicates that the teachers think that course books and workbooks are prepared perfunctory, the course time is not enough, the new program is lack of materials; more audio visual materials should be included. Also, they express that smart boards are available at schools, but there aren't any suitable e-books which can be used. Further, the teachers complain on not being informed enough about new

program and they add that introduction seminars on the new program are not enough. This confirms previous findings in Şahinkarakaş et al (2009) study. They have stated that although the teachers were resistant to the new English Program, they developed positive attitude towards the program after involving in a program where teachers internalized newly introduced concept and practices in the CEFR. For program amendments to be implemented successfully by the teachers, it is a must to have in-service education program. Also, the content of the new program must be supplemented by extra materials especially technological devices. Further studies, which take students' view into account will need to be undertaken.

References

Clouet, R. (2010). TheApproach of theCommonEuropean Framework of Reference forLanguages: SomeConsiderationsConcerningItsPuttingintoPractice in Translation and InterpretingFaculties in Spain. *Rla-Revista De LinguisticaTeorica Y Aplicada, 48*(2), 71-92.

CMEC. (2010). Working with Common European Framework of Reference for Languages in the Canadian Context: Guide for policy-makers and curriculum designers. Available at http://www.cmec.ca/docs/assessment/CEFR-canadian-context.pdf. Accessed in 25 December 2012

Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Council of Ministers of Education (2010). *Working with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. CEFR in the Canadian Context.* (http://www.cmec.ca/docs/assessment/CEFR-canadian-context.pdf)

Demirlier, H. (2010). *Students' and Teachers' Attitudes Towards the Newly Developed Curriculum of Primary Schools.* Master Thesis at Muğla University, Muğla.

Faez, F., Majhanovich, S., Taylor, S., Smith, M., & Crowley, K. (2011). The Power of "Can Do" statements: Teachers' Perceptions of CEFR-informed Instruction in French as a Second Language Classrooms in Ontario. *The Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, s. 1-19.

Fraenkel, J., Wallen, N., & Hyun, H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gonzalez, J. A. (2009). Promoting student autonomy through the use of the European Language Portfolio. *Elt Journal, 63*(4), 373-382.

İşisağ, K., & Demirel, Ö. (2010). Diller İçin Avrupa Ortak Başvuru Metni'nin Konuşma Becerisinin Gelişiminde Kullanılması. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, s. 190-204.

Jones, N.,&Saville, N. (2009). European Language Policy: Assessment, Learning, and theCefr. *AnnualReview of AppliedLinguistics, 29*, 51-63.

Karababa, C., & Saraç, S. (2010). Practitioners' Evaluation On the Procedural Aspects of an English Language Portfolio. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning*, s. 13-18.

Little, D. (2006). The Common European Framework of Reference forLanguages: Content, purpose, origin, reception and impact. *Language Teaching*, s. 167-190.

Little, D. (2011). The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: A research agenda. *language teaching*, 44, 381-393.

Majhanovich, S., Taylor, S., Smith, M., &Crowley, K. (2011). ThePower of "Can Do" statements: Teachers' Perceptions of CEFR-informedInstruction in French as a Second Language Classrooms in Ontario. *CanadianJournal of AppliedLinguistics, 14*(2), 19p.

MNE. (2011). *English Language Curriculum for Secondary Education.* Ankara: NEM.

Shaarawy, H. Y., & Lotfy, N. E. (2013). Teaching Writing within the Common European Framework ofReference (CEFR): A Supplement Asynchronous Blended LearningApproach in an EFL Undergraduate Course in Egypt. *Higher Education Studies*, s. 123-135.

Şahinkarakaş, Ş., Yumru, H., & İnözü, J. (2010). A case study: two teachers 'reflections on the ELP in practice. *ELT Journal*, s. 65-74.

Üstünlüoğlu, E., Akgül Zazaoğlu, K. F., Keskin, M. N., Sarayköylü, B., & Akdoğan, G. (2012). Developing a CEF Based Curriculum: A Case Study. *International Journal of Instruction*, s. 115-127.

Yilmaz, S.,& Akcan, S. (2012). ImplementingtheEuropean Language Portfolio in a Turkishcontext. *EltJournal, 66*(2), 166-174.