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ABSTRACT
Training of a social actor as a new goal set by the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) necessitates a transition from the communicative approach to the action-oriented approach, a transition from training successful communicators to training social actors. Communicative textbooks, mostly, employ situations of communication (e.g. simulations, role-plays) at the end of the units, whose function is to allow the learners to reuse the language content of the unit or to enable them to make free production. A textbook prepared in accordance with the action-oriented approach, however, does not offer communication situations at the end of the unit but mini-projects, whose ultimate aim is to train social actors. This paper aims to evaluate the English textbook Mastermind used in the 8th grades of public secondary schools in Turkey in terms of the action-oriented approach. For this purpose, the characteristics of the assignment in unit 3 of the textbook Mastermind are analysed. It is argued that the function of the analysed assignment is to reuse the language content of the unit or enable the learners to make free production and it remains only as a pretext for communication. Thus, the textbook is communicative rather than action-oriented. For this reason, an alternative mini-project design is proposed to show how to make this textbook action-oriented.
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Introduction
In this article, the action-oriented approach is used to refer to what Puren (2020a) and Acar (2020a, 2020b) call social-action-based learning (SABL) since the action targeted in the action-oriented approach is social action, not speech action or speech acts of the communicative approach. Communicative interaction is the main focus of the communicative approach as well as a development in it, namely, task-based language teaching as emphasized by various task-based methodologists (Ellis, 2003; Estaire and Zanon, 1994; Nunan, 1989; Willis, 1996). Thus, the main goal is to train successful communicators who can be involved in communicative interactions with people from the target language community in short term contact situations as indicated by Van Ek’s (1975) The Threshold Level in a European-Unit/Credit System for Modern Language Learning by Adults.

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

ÖZ
Avrupa Dilleri Ortak Çerçeve Programı (ADOÇP) tarafından yeni bir hedef olarak belirlenen bir sosyal aktörün eğitimi, iletişimSEL yaklaşımda eylem odaklı yaklaşım, başarılı iletişimcilerin eğitiminden sosyal aktörlere çözümleme geçişi gerekir. İletişimsel ders kitapları, çoğunlukla, ünite sonunda, işlevi öğrencilerin ünitenin dil içeriğini yeniden kullanmalara veya özgü migli yapmalarına olanak tanımaktadır. Eylem odaklı yaklaşıma göre hazırlanmış bir ders kitabı ise ünite sonunda iletişim durumları değil, işlevi sosyal aktör yetiştirme olan mini-projeler sunmaktadır. Bu makale Türkiye’deki devlet ortaokullarının 8. sınıflarında kullanılan İngilizce ders kitabı Mastermind’ın eylem odaklı yaklaşım açısından değerlendirilmesi amaçlanmaktadır. Bu amaçla, ders kitabı Mastermind’in 3. ünitelerindeki ödevin özellikleri analiz edilmştir. İncelenen ödevin içeriğini ünitenin dil içeriğini yeniden kullanmak ve öğrencilerin özgü migli yapmalarına olanak tanımak olduğu ve sadece bir iletişim vaka olarak kabul edildiği iddia edilmştir. Dolayısıyla ders kitabı eylem odaklı olmaktan çok iletişimseldir. Bu nedenle, bu ders kitabının nasıl eylem odaklı yapılabacağını göstermek için alternatif bir mini-proje tasarımı önerilmiştir.

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

Introduction
In this article, the action-oriented approach is used to refer to what Puren (2020a) and Acar (2020a, 2020b) call social-action-based learning (SABL) since the action targeted in the action-oriented approach is social action, not speech action or speech acts of the communicative approach. Communicative interaction is the main focus of the communicative approach as well as a development in it, namely, task-based language teaching as emphasized by various task-based methodologists (Ellis, 2003; Estaire and Zanon, 1994; Nunan, 1989; Willis, 1996). Thus, the main goal is to train successful communicators who can be involved in communicative interactions with people from the target language community in short term contact situations as indicated by Van Ek’s (1975) The Threshold Level in a European-Unit/Credit System for Modern Language Learning by Adults.
CEFR (2001) and Common European Framework of Reference for Languages Companion Volume (CEFRCV, 2018), however, set a new goal for language teaching, that of training learners as social actors. This new goal is shaped by the current structure of Europe, which is multilingual and multicultural society as emphasized both by CEFR (2001) and CEFRCV (2018). Puren (2009, p.124) argues that:

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

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

**Action-oriented Textbooks for Training Social Actors**

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

**Table 1**

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

| Communicative Task                                      | Mini-project                                                                 |
|---------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. pre-design of the task/project by the teacher/textbook | 1. at least partial design of the task/project by the students (the “design” is the “initial task”, characteristic of any project) |
| 2. single task (single instruction)                      | 2. several tasks articulated with each other (“action scenario”) with choices proposed in the form of questions or alternatives, or even according to student initiatives |
| 3. procedural logic: students are simply asked to perform the predefined tasks correctly | 3. process logic: students are asked to reflect on the tasks to be performed/in progress/after completion (metacognitive activities) |
| 4. language and cultural resources provided to students from the outset | 4. resources at least partially sought by students |
5. document processing in support logic
6. work only on the authentic documents proposed
7. exclusive use of the L2
8. the culture has no relationship other than a thematic one with the final task
9. one-time, single-use documentation and production in the corresponding teaching unit
10. individual or inter-individual (pairs) dimension of work and final production
11. management and purpose of activities only in the classroom and for internal use in the classroom
12. teacher-centred assessment focusing on language learning

5. document processing in documentation logic
6. work also on the final or even intermediate productions of the students (note-taking, drafts, provisional syntheses...)
7. use of the L1 and L1+n in the service of action (in particular, multilingual documentation and projection of the action in "society 1")
8. documentation relating in part to cultures of action (= the ways of carrying out the project, including the final production, in different cultures)
   - reflection and decision of the students on the culture of action they will implement in the proposed action
   - students' reflection and decision on the teaching-learning culture that they will implement in the classroom.
9. sustainable production (updating documentation for possible reuse, repetition of documents or tasks over several units, etc.)
10. collective dimension (large groups, group-class)
11. real projection or in simulation - but in realistic simulation - outside the classroom (school, family, society, other classes abroad...)
12. - individual and collective self-assessments (groups, group-class)
   - evaluation of the process (conducting the mini-project, group work), of the educational value (autonomy, responsibility, solidarity...), at the end of the project or even during the project (with feedback and possible modification of the continuation of the project)
   - evaluation of the social projection (interest generated, impact...)
   - proactive dimension (summary of points to be taken into account for the next mini-projects)

Table 1 points out the important characteristics of mini-projects as a form of the implementation of the action-oriented approach in language textbooks. Mini-projects are complex actions much in the case of pedagogical projects since social action is a complex action and they have a design stage with a certain level of complexity, collective autonomy and a collective self-evaluation phase (as well as an evaluation by the teacher and/or public evaluation), information management and a final product, performance or decision, which also have a collective dimension. Collectivity is an indispensable feature of mini-projects since (1) social action is by nature a collective action, (2) the learner, in the action-oriented approach, is considered as a social actor in his/her class as a mini-society and this social actor is a real citizen of this micro-society with its collective dimension. This collectivity, in the action-oriented approach, is reflected in the mini-project design, collective nature of classroom activities and the collective evaluation at the end of the mini-project. The action-oriented approach encourages group autonomy from the learners since social actors, for Puren (2016), must be autonomous and supportive in both their mini-society and outside society and if they want to be involved in a project it must be theirs and should not be imposed by an outside authority. The autonomy, in the action-oriented textbooks, is given to the social actors by offering them two mini-projects which are the variants of the same social action at the end of the textbook units so that the social actors can choose one or both of these mini-projects (Acar, 2020a) and autonomy is also reflected within the design of the mini-projects by offering the social actors choices in the substeps of the mini-project design as also emphasized in Table 1. The reuse situations and final tasks at the end of the textbook units within the communicative approach and task-based language teaching, however, do not generally present the learners with options but are strictly organized instructions. In this sense,
there is no learner autonomy in terms of social action, and limited autonomy in terms of language content.

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

**Method**

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

**Research Design**

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

**Study Group**

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

**Data Collection Tools**

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

**Data Analysis**

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

**Research Ethics**

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

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

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

The Analysis of the Proposed Assignment in Unit 3

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

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

As stressed in this article, mini-projects are complex actions since social action is a complex action but the assignment *Prepare a poster about your favorite meal and provide the preparation process as in the sample* consists of a single instruction without any substeps leading to the final production (no action scenario in the design) and hence the design stage with a certain level of complexity is absent. Thus, the design focuses only on the product (*preparing a poster*) and lacks a process dimension and hence educational dimension is absent in the assignment. Neither is there any instruction as to whether the students will prepare the poster in pairs, groups, or as a whole class, and from the instruction, it may be understood that it is an individual activity. The final product does not
have a collective dimension so the autonomy is restricted to individual autonomy and collective autonomy is absent. The students are not presented with choices in the single instruction *Prepare a poster about your favorite meal and provide the preparation process as in the sample*, and just below the instruction, a sample poster is provided to the students, which is a single directive since the textbook writers impose on the students a poster format and thus leaves no choice for the students. In this respect, even individual autonomy is restricted in the assignment. There is no instruction related to information management or informational competence (Puren, 2008), that is, the students do not seek and manage information before preparing the poster. They are suggested to jump into preparing a poster about their favorite meal. Collective self-evaluation of the final product is also absent in the proposed assignment. There is a *self-assessment* section, which is present at the end of each unit, below the sample poster for the students to evaluate their language performance but this can-do self-assessment checklist is not enough for an evaluation of a social action, which is by nature complex and collective action. It only assesses individual language performance (not collective) and collective evaluation is absent. Thus, the proposed assignment is far from being a mini-project as a form of the application of the action-oriented approach in language textbooks. I propose an alternative mini-project design for unit three of the English textbook *Mastermind* below:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I: Share your cookbook on social media.

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

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

Conclusion, Discussion and Recommendations

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

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

“As no single language teaching methodology was seen as flexible enough to meet the needs of learners at various stages and to address a wide range of learning styles, an eclectic mix of instructional techniques has been adopted, drawing on an action oriented approach
in order to allow learners to experience English as a means of communication, rather than focusing on the language as a topic of study” (MoNE, 2018, p. 3).

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

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

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

Giriş

İletişimsel etkileşim, iletişimsel yaklaşımlar ve çeşitli görev-temelli metotçular (Ellis, 2003; Estaire ve Zanon, 1994; Nunan, 1989; Willis, 1996) da vurguladığı gibi görev-temelli dil öğretiminin, o da iletişimsel yaklaşım içinde bir gelişmedir, ana hedefidir. Bu nedenle, ana hedef Van E'kin (1975) Eşik Düzeyi Belgesi’nde belirttiği kısa vadeli temas durumlarda hedef dil topluluğundan insanlarla iletişimsel etkileşimle katılabilecek başarılı iletişimciler yetiştirme. Ancak, Avrupa Dilleri Ortak Çerçeveden Programı (ADOC, 2001) ve Avrupa Dilleri Ortak Çerçeve Programı Ek Belgesi (ADOCPEB, 2018) dil öğretimine için, öğrencileri sosyal aktörler olarak eğitme hedefi olarak yeni bir hedef belirlemiştir. Dolayısıyla, eylem-odaklı yaklaşım açısından gibi kısa süreli temas durumlara katılacak olan iletişimciler yetiştirme yetenekleri, çok dilli ve çok kültürlü toplumlarında birlikte yaşayabilen, aynı zamanda okullarda ve işyerlerinde etkin bir şekilde eylemde bulunan vatandaşlar yetiştirilecek.

Yöntem

Bu çalışmada, Türkiye’deki devlet ortaokullarının sekizinci sınıflarında kullanılan İngilizce ders kitabı Mastermind’ın 3. ünitesindeki ödevin özellikleri (eylem-odaklı yaklaşım açısından mini-proje olarak) eylem-odaklı yaklaşım açısından analiz etmek için nitel araştırma yöntemi olarak belge analizi kullanılmıştır. Ders kitabındaki tüm ünitelerin sonundaki tüm ödevlerin analizi sayfalarına sınırlamasını açığa çıkaran, ders kitabının sonundaki tüm ödevler arasında rastgele seçilen 3. ünitedeki ödev, derinlemesine bir analiz için seçilmiştir. Bowen’a (2009, p.27) göre doküman analizi, “hem basılı hem de elektronik (bilgisayar tabanlı ve internete aktarılan) materyalleri incelemek veya değerlendirmek için sistematik bir prosedür” Çalışma belge analizi kullandığından etik kurul onayına ihtiyaç duymamaktadır. Bu araştırmanın ana sorusu şudur: İngilizce ders kitabı Mastermind’ın 3. ünitesindeki önerilen ödev mini-projelerinin özelliklerini yansıtmaktadır mı?

Bulgular

Sözde ödev En sevdiğiniz yemek hakkında bir poster hazırlayın ve örnekteki gibi hazırlık sürecini yazın, öğrenci veya öğrencilerin posteri sınıfına sunup sınıfa sunmayacağına ve diğer öğrencilerin sunuya herhangi bir tepki verip vermemeyeceğini (etkileşimin varlığı) ilişkin bir talimat olmadığı için iletişim açısından bile eleştirilebilir. Yönergeden, öğrenci(ler)in en sevdiği yemek hakkında poster hazırlayarak hizmet sürecini yazaçaları ve ardından etkinliğin sona erceği anlamaktadır. Eylem-odaklı yaklaşım açısından, öğrencinin kime hazırdığını ve en sevdiği yemek hakkında poster hazırlamının amacı ne olduğunu (sosyal bir projeksiyon yok) net değildir.

Bu makalede vurgulandığı gibi, mini projeler karmaşık eylemlerdir çünkü sosyal eylem karmaşık bir eylemdir, ancak kitapta sunulan ödev nihai üretim gösterecektir alt adımdan bir eachermeyen tek bir talimatın oluşturulundur (tasarımda eylem senaryosu yoktur) ve bu nedenle belirli bir karmaşılık düzeyine sahip tasarım aşaması yoktur. Böylece, tasarım yalnızca ürüne odaklanmaktadır (posteri hazırlama ve bir süreç boyutundan yoksundur ve bu nedenle ödevde eğitim boyutu yoktur. Öğrencilerin posteri çifte halinde mi, gruplar halinde mi yoksas bütün bir sınıf olarak mı hazırlanacaklarına dair herhangi bir talimat yok ve yönergeden bunun bireysel bir etkinlik olduğu anlaşılmaktadır. Nihai ürünler kolektif bir boyutu yoktur, bu nedenle özellikle bireysel özellikle sınırlıdır ve kolektif olarak seçilir. Bilgi yönetimi veya bilgi yerleştirmi ile ilgili bir talimat da yoktur (Puren, 2008), yani öğrenciler posteri hazırlanıdan önce bilgiyi araştırıp yönetmezler. Öğrenciler hemen en sevdiği yemek hakkında bir poster hazırlanamısını bir kişinin önerisi için vermiş olsa da, sosyal eylemin toplu bir öz değerlendirilmesi için herhangi bir kriter yoktur. Bu nedenle, öğrencilerin ödevin tek işlevi, öğrencilerin serbest üretimi sağlamak veya ünitenin dil içeriğini yeniden kullanmalarına olanak sağlamaktır. Serbest üretim bile öğrencileri sözü ile iletişimde dahil etmemektedir çünkü
sonuç, herhangi bir etkileşim içermeyen (posterde en sevdikleri yemeğin hazırlanma sürecini yazma) yalnızca yazılı bir üründür. İngilizce ders kitabı Mastermind’ın 3. ünitesi için önerilen alternatif mini-proje şu şekildedir:

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

B: Seçtiğiniz bir başlıka Facebook hesabı açın (örn. Türk mutfağı, dünya mutfağı için tarihler vb.). Diğer ülkelerdeki akranlarınızın Facebook hesabınıza mutfağınızı paylaşmaya davet etmenin yollarını da arayabilirsiniz. Yemek kitabınız için yemek kitabınızın içeriğini yansıtan bir başlıkla topluca toplanın ve kapaga sınıf kimliğini yansıtan ilham verici alt başlıklar ekleyin (örneğin X ortaokulu 8A sınıfından en iyi yemek tarifleri önerileri).

C: Bir tarifin ne içerdüğünü internette ararın (ör. Yemeğin adı, yemeğin servis edebileceği kişi sayısı, malzemeler ve malzeme miktarı, pişirme için hazırlanma talimatlarının adımları, pişirme süresi yönergeleri vb.) ve grupların tariflerini değerlendirmeye kriterlere ve yemek kitabınızın formatının ne olacağını topluca karar verin.

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

E: Gruplar halinde, yemeğinizin tarifi C’de toplu olarak kararlaştırılmış formatta yazın.

F: Gruplar halinde tariflerinizi sınıfta sunun.

G: Diğer sınıf arkadaşlarınızın, topluca oluşturduğu tablosunu kullanarak sizi dinleyecek, notlar alacak ve tariflerinizi değerlendirecekler. Topluca oluşturduğuuz ve geliştirdiğiniz kriterlere ve biçime uygun olmayan tarifleri olan gruplara öneri de bulunun.

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

I: Yemek kitabınızı sosyal medyada paylaşın.

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

Sonuç, Tartışma ve Öneriler

İlk ve orta okullar için mevcut İngilizce programı incelendiğinde, 8. sınıf izlencesinin üçüncü ünitesinin önerilen başlamalar, görevler ve ödevler başlıklı bir bölüm yer verdiğini ve altında da öğrenciler yenti kelimeleri ekleyerek görsel sözlükleri geniştirme evrim ederler ve öğrenciler en sevdiği yemeği ikinci bir poster hazırlayarak hazırlık sürecini yazarlar şeklinde önerilen ödevler yer almaktadır. Bu iki ödevin, İngilizce ders kitabını Mastermind’ın 3. ünitesinin ödevleriyle eşleşmesi doğaldır çünkü Türkiye’deki ders kitabını İngilizce öğrenme programını takip etmelidir. Dolayısıyla, Mastermind’in ünitenin sonunda mini-projelerden ziyade ödevlere yer verme hatasının asıl kaynağını Türkiye’nin ilkokul ve ortaokul İngilizce öğretim programı olduğu görülmektedir. Türkiye’nin ilkokul ve ortaokul İngilizce öğretim programını geliştirenlerin mini-projelerden ziyade ödev verme nhiễmini, onların tek yamığıdır değil çünkü öyle bir yaklaşımın amacı da bu öğretim programında yanılış bir şekilde iletişim olarak sunulmuştur. Bu makalede belirtildiği gibi, eylem
odaklı yaklaşımda iletişim, amaç değil, sosyal eylemin hizmetindeki bir araçtır. Mastermind ders kitabındaki ödevlerin doğası da mini-projelerin özelliklerini yansıtmaktadır. Ders kitabında önerilen ödevlerin temel amacı, sosyal eylem için eğitmek yerine ders kitabı ünitesinin dil içeriğini yeniden kullanmaktır. Evde gerçekleştirilen bireysel ödevler gibi görünmektedirler: proje eğitbiliminin doğasında bulunan kollektif boyut yoktur. Eylem odaklı yaklaşım açısından, İngilizce ders kitabı Mastermind’in revize edilmesi gereken türden yanlışlıkları vardır: (1) Ders kitabı üniteleri, bireysel ödevler yerine, pedagojik projelerin özelliklerini mümkün olduğunca karşılayan en az iki mini proje sunmalıdır (2) Bu mini projeler sadece nihai ürünü veya performansı (Mastermind ders kitabı yaptığı gibi) değil, aynı zamanda tasarım süreci de sunmalıdır. (3) Ders kitabı yazarları, ünite hedeflerini işlevler ve kavramlardan ziyade sosyal eylemler açısından belirtmelidir.