www.turkishstudies.net/education

Turkish Studies - Educational Sciences

eISSN: 2667-5609

Research Article / Araştırma Makalesi

INTERNATIONAL BALKAN UNIVERSITY
Sponsored by IBU

An Analysis of the English Textbook 'Let's Learn English' in terms of the Action-oriented Approach

'Let's Learn English' İngilizce Ders Kitabının Eylem Odaklı Yaklaşım Açısından Bir Analizi

Ahmet Acar*

Abstract: CEFR (Common European Framework of Reference for Languages) proposes a new goal in language teaching, that of training social actors and it is this new goal which implies a change of paradigm in language teaching, from the paradigm of communication to the paradigm of social action or from the paradigm of training communicators to the paradigm of training social actors, who can live and work together in their multilingual and multicultural societies. In this new paradigm, the paradigm of social action, communication is not an end itself but a means of social action. This paradigm change is reflected in the action-oriented approach with the implementation of mini-projects as employed by language textbooks and educational projects, which the students (with the help of their teachers) choose, design, implement themselves and thus which can not be limited by the time frame of the textbooks. This paper aims to critically evaluate the proposed project (named misleadingly as a project) in unit six of the English textbook 'Let's Learn English' used in the seventh grades of public secondary schools in Turkey and points out that it does not have the characteristics of mini-projects as implemented in a truly action-oriented approach. After this critical evaluation, an alternative mini-project design that reflects these characteristics is proposed in place of the proposed project in the textbook. Since the implementation of the action-oriented approach in language textbooks will be possible by means of well-designed mini-projects, it is suggested that the curriculum developers and textbook writers in Turkey should carefully deal with the mini-projects, which have characteristics of their own and which are different from the communicative tasks and they should give place to these mini-projects both in the curriculum and the textbooks.

Structured Abstract: The communicative approach and task-based language learning, with their focus on communicative tasks as the reference activity, are insufficient to train learners as social actors, who will live and work with foreigners in their home or target culture (as indicated by CEFR and CEFRCV with their heavy reference to plurilingualism/pluriculturalism and the action-oriented approach). Thus, to achieve the transition from the transmission of information (exchange of information) in the classroom to acting together (social action) in and/or outside the classroom, Puren (2007, 2014a, 2014b, 2017, 2018, 2019a, 2019b) proposes two forms of the application of the action-oriented approach: Educational projects, which the students choose and design themselves autonomously (with the help of the teacher) and mini-projects, which are generally given a place at the end of the textbook units or used as units of work in language curricula.

* Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Buca Eğitim Fakültesi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Ana Bilim Dalı
Dr. Lecturer, Dokuz Eylül University, Buca Faculty of Education, Department of English Language Teaching
ORCİD 0000-0001-8940-4359
ahmet.acar@deu.edu.tr

Cite as/ Atıf: Acar, A. (2020). An Analysis of the English textbook 'let's learn English' in terms of the action-oriented approach. *Turkish Studies - Education, 15*(3), 1449-1458. https://dx.doi.org/10.29228/TurkishStudies.42832
Received/Geliş: 10 April/Nisan 2020 *Checked by plagiarism software*
Accepted/Kabul: 20 June/Haziran 2020 **Published/Yayın:** 25 June/Haziran 2020
Copyright © INTAC LTD, Turkey CC BY-NC 4.0

The implementation of the action-oriented approach in English textbooks is an issue not addressed in the ELT field in Turkey. Thus, this study aims to deal with this issue by analyzing the proposed project at the end of unit six of the English textbook 'Let's Learn English' used in the public secondary schools in Turkey in terms of the action-oriented approach. It is indicated that the proposed project in the textbook does not reflect the characteristics of a mini-project, which is a means of the implementation of the action-oriented approach in language textbooks. Secondly, in place of the proposed project of the textbook, a mini-project design that truly meets the characteristics of a mini-project is suggested.

To Puren (2007, 2014a, 2014b, 2017, 2018, 2019a, 2019b), there are two ways of the implementation of the action-oriented approach: Educational projects, which the students choose and design themselves autonomously (with the help and under the guidance of the teacher) and thus, which necessitate a maximum autonomy of the students in the design, implementation and evaluation phases of the project, and mini-projects, in which the students' choice is more restricted since they are predetermined by the textbook or curriculum. Since educational projects allow maximum autonomy for the students (social actors), they can not be limited by the time frame of the textbook or curriculum nor can they be imposed on the students by an outside authority (teacher, textbook or curriculum). Thus, the English textbook 'Let's Learn English' makes a category error by naming the activities proposed at the end of its units as projects. The maximum a language textbook can employ in terms of the action-oriented approach is mini-projects. When the proposed project at the end of unit six of 'Let's Learn English' is analysed, on the other hand, it is seen that it does not even meet the characteristics of mini-projects. The main reason for the mistreatment of the action-oriented approach in the textbook might be due to the information given about the action-oriented approach in the 2018 Turkish ELT curriculum for the primary and secondary schools:

> 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 (ELT curriculum, 2018: 3).

The reason for the textbook authors' misinterpretation of the action-oriented approach might be this statement of the curriculum, in which the action-oriented approach is misinterpreted as having a goal of 'allowing learners to experience English a means of communication'. As stated in this article, in the action-oriented approach (the social action perspective), communication is put at the service of social action. Thus communication is not the goal but just a means of achieving this goal, a principle which is also ignored in the so-called project proposed at the end of unit six in the textbook.

It is clear that the proposed project in the textbook, which is analysed in this article, is taken (with minor revisions) from the seventh-grade syllabus (unit six) of the 2018 Turkish ELT curriculum for the primary and secondary schools. In the seventh grade syllabus, there is a section titled 'suggested contexts, tasks and assignments' and the textbook authors adopt the proposed project given under the sub-title in this section called 'assignments': "Students organize a birthday party. They prepare a list for needs, guests and food. They also prepare an invitation card" (2018 ELT curriculum: 77). In unit six of the textbook 'Let's Learn English', the proposed project is: Follow the steps and organize a birthday party. Present your plan to the class.

Step 01. Find photos about the party.

Step 02. Stick them on a cardboard.

Step 03. Prepare a list for needs, guests and food under the photos.

Step 04. Prepare an invitation card for your party (Let's Learn English, 2018: 82).

Since the authors of the English textbooks in Turkey must follow the ELT curriculum of Turkey, it is natural that the proposed project of the textbook matches that of the curriculum but what is again another misinterpretation about the action-oriented approach in the curriculum is that the authors of the curriculum name the so-called project as 'assignment' in the curriculum while the authors of the textbook name it as a 'project', both categorizations, however, are wrong since a mini-project is neither an assignment nor a project. It is even clear that both the authors of the curriculum and the authors of the textbook are not in agreement with each other regarding naming this activity, which would be appropriately named as a 'mini-project' in terms of the implementation of the action-oriented approach in language textbooks but again, as discussed in this article,

the so-called project of the textbook is even far from meeting the characteristics of a mini-project (the same is true of the assignment suggested in the curriculum), which is the other criticism leveled against the proposed project of the textbook in this article.

Thus, it is suggested that the ELT curriculum developers in Turkey, as well as the authors of English textbooks, should present well-designed mini-projects both in the curriculum and the textbooks, otherwise, it would be rather difficult for the English teachers in Turkey to implement the action-oriented approach in/or outside the classroom.

Keywords: CEFR, the action-oriented approach, mini-projects, educational projects, language textbooks.

Öz: ADOÇP (Avrupa Dilleri Ortak Çerçeve Programı) dil eğitiminde sosyal aktörlerin eğitimi olan yeni bir hedef önermektedir ve dil öğretiminde paradigma değişimini işaret eden, iletişimsel paradigmadan sosyal eylem paradigmasına veya iletişimci eğitimi paradigmasından çok dilli ve çok kültürlü toplumlarında birlikte yaşayıp çalışabilen sosyal aktörlerin eğitimi paradigmasına, işte bu yeni hedeftir. Bu yeni paradigmada, sosyal eylem paradigması, iletişim tek başına bir hedef değil, bir sosyal eylem aracıdır. Bu paradigma değişikliği eylem odaklı yaklaşımda, dil ders kitaplarında kullanılan mini-projeler ile öğrencilerin (öğretmenlerinin yardımı ile) seçtiği, tasarladığı ve uyguladığı ve dolayısıyla ders kitaplarının zaman dilimi ile sınırlandırılamayacak olan eğitimsel projeler ile yansıtılmaktadır. Bu makale, Türkiye'deki devlet ortaokullarının yedinci sınıflarında kullanılan 'Let's Learn English' ders kitabının altıncı ünitesinde önerilen projeyi (yanıltıcı olarak bir proje olarak adlandırılmıştır) eleştirel olarak değerlendirmeyi amaçlamakta ve gerçek bir eylem odaklı yaklaşımda uygulanan küçük projelerin özelliklerini taşımadığına dikkat çekmektedir. Bu eleştirel değerlendirmeden sonra, ders kitabında önerilen proje yerine bu özellikleri yansıtan alternatif bir küçük proje tasarımı önerilmiştir. Eylem odaklı yaklaşımın ders kitaplarında uygulanmasının iyi tasarlanmış küçük projeler ile mümkün olacağından, Türkiye'deki müfredat geliştiricilerinin ve ders kitabı yazarlarının iletişimsel görevlerden farklı olarak kendine has özellikleri olan küçük projeleri dikkatle ele almaları ve hem müfredatta hem de ders kitabında bu küçük projelere yer vermeleri gerektiği tavsiye edilmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: ADOÇP, eylem odaklı yaklaşım, küçük projeler, eğitimsel projeler, dil öğretim ders kitapları

Introduction

Both the communicative approach and task-based language learning have, to some extent, an action perspective but this action can be referred to as speech action, which is 'an *individual* action through language on another individual…and a *linguistic action'* (Puren, 2009a: 6) in communicative interaction, 'which is talking with and acting on the other' (Puren, 2004: 20). The action-oriented approach, on the other hand, refers to the social action, 'which is an act with the others' (Puren, 2004: 20), and which goes beyond mere communicative action. For this reason, Puren (2009a, 2009b, 2018) uses the term the social action perspective to indicate the break between the communicative approach as well as task-based language learning, which are insufficient to train social actors, and the social action perspective, which is referred to in this article as the action-oriented approach. The main goal of any approach which is within the communication paradigm is to train successful communicators but the main goal in the social action perspective (the action-oriented approach) is to train social actors, who can live and work together in their democratic society, in which case communication is a means of social action. The implementation of the action-oriented approach in English teaching in Turkey can not go beyond the communication paradigm at the curriculum level and the same is true of the English textbooks, in which the proposed mini-projects (the textbooks never use this terminology) hardly meet the principles of the communicative approach let alone the social action perspective (the action-oriented approach). For this reason, this paper aims to critically evaluate the proposed project at the end of unit six of the English textbook 'Let's Learn English' and then suggests the design of a mini-project which truly reflects the principles of the action-oriented approach.

The Action-oriented Approach and Language Textbooks

Van Ek's (1975) 'The Threshold Level in a European-Unit/Credit System for Modern Language Learning by Adults', which was prepared for the Council of Europe, can be considered as a document within the communication paradigm since it intended to train language learners to reach a minimum proficiency level where they can manage communicative interactions with the target language users in short term contact situations like touristic visits. Thus, the target action referred to in this document is linguistic action, characterized as speech acts, which are necessary for communicative interactions.

CEFR (2001) (Common European Framework of Reference for Languages) and CEFR companion volume (CEFRCV, 2018), the two documents again prepared for the Council of Europe, on the other hand, set a new goal for language teaching, that of training social actors rather than successful communicators, and this new goal indicates a departure from both 'The Threshold Level' document and the communicative approach. CEFR (2001: 9) states that

> The approach adopted here, generally speaking, is an action-oriented one in so far as it views users and learners of a language primarily as 'social agents', i.e. members of society who have tasks (not exclusively language-related) to accomplish in a given set of circumstances, in a specific environment and within a particular field of action. While acts of speech occur within language activities, these activities form part of a wider social context, which alone is able to give them their full meaning.

Thus, the acts of a social actor (social agent) are not only linguistic action or speech acts as in the threshold level document but linguistic action is meaningful only in relation to social actions. In such a framework, training learners as successful communicators is not enough for them to become social actors, who need to be trained for living together harmoniously (and hence plurilingualism and pluriculturalism in the CEFR and CEVRCV) and acting together effectively (and hence the action-oriented approach in the CEFR and CEVRCV) as social actors. For this reason, Puren (2004: 20) indicates the necessity of the paradigm shift in language teaching and learning as follows:

> The European didactics that will emerge in the 2000s will have to move away from the communicative approach-as well as the task-based language learning-, moving in particular from the concept of interaction (which is talking with and acting on the other) to the concept of co-action (which is an act with others), and from the concept of interculturality (mainly referring to the phenomenon of contact between different cultures and individuals) to that of co-culturality (developing a common culture by and for collective action).

It is clear that the communicative approach and task-based language learning, with their focus on communicative tasks as the reference activity, are insufficient to train learners as social actors, who will live and work with foreigners in their home or target culture (as indicated by CEFR and CEFRCV with their heavy reference to plurilingualism/pluriculturalism and the action-oriented approach). Thus, to achieve the transition from the transmission of information (exchange of information) in the classroom to acting together (social action) in and/or outside the classroom, Puren (2007, 2014a, 2014b, 2017, 2018, 2019a, 2019b) proposes two forms of the application of the action-oriented approach: Educational projects, which the students choose and design themselves autonomously (with the help of the teacher) and mini-projects, which are generally given a place at the end of the textbook units or used as units of work in language curricula. Educational projects can not be limited and directed by the time frame of a textbook or curriculum since social actors must be as autonomous as possible in designing, implementing and evaluating their projects autonomously and collectively. The students, while carrying out educational projects, search for, select, organize, analyze, interpret and evaluate information (what Puren (2008) calls informational competence or what Horton (2007) calls information literacy) rather than receiving information by the teacher or

textbook as passive recipients. Thus, information management, autonomy (both individual and collective) and collectivity (both in designing, managing and evaluating the complex actions) are indispensable characteristics of projects as indicated by Puren (2007). The preference for real action in the social action perspective marks another departure from the communicative approach, which gives plenty of place to simulated situations of communicative language use (full of artificial simulations). Training social actors, however, can not be possible only through artificial simulations, where the learners pretend to act rather than acting. Thus, Puren (2009b: 132) argues that in the action-oriented approach, "although simulated projects will still be necessary, the perspective of social action leads to a preference for real projects". The other characteristic of the project in the action-oriented approach is that communication is put at the service of action, which also indicates the shift of paradigm from communication to social action since in the action-oriented approach communication is not the goal but just a means.

Since educational projects can not be limited and directed by the time frame of a textbook or curriculum, mini-projects are generally given a place at the end of the textbook units or used as units of work in language curricula. Mini-projects, however, still reflect the characteristics of educational projects since mini-projects also have a design stage, which is followed by the actual realization of this design (implementation) to give a final product (or to make a final collective decision), which is evaluated collectively. Autonomy and collectivity are also important characteristics of mini-projects. While autonomy in mini-projects is not as high as educational projects since the mini-projects are designed by the textbook authors or curriculum developers and hence presented to the students in a predetermined manner, there is still autonomy given to the students during the implementation of subtasks of the mini-projects: the students are often given choices in the subtasks within the mini-projects. Besides, in the implementation of the subtasks in the mini-projects, collectivity is often stressed although there are subtasks which the students carry out individually (like seeking and managing information) and collectivity is also present in the evaluation of the mini-project. Concerning the issue of real or simulated action, there is again preference for real action in mini-projects. While simulated mini-projects are also present in the action-oriented approach, the students are generally encouraged to seek ways to make the simulated action a real action. As in educational projects, in mini-projects, the students seek and manage information (what Puren (2008) calls informational competence or what Horton (2007) calls information literacy), thus informational competence is another characteristic of mini-projects. Finally, in mini-projects, communication is put at the service of social action: The sub-tasks lead to a final social action, which is a final product or the collective choice of the whole class. In this respect, a mini-project has a design stage with the above characteristics, which are different from the characteristics of a communicative task, which is generally put at the service of reusing the language forms introduced in the unit.

Method

In this study, document analysis is used as a form of qualitative research. Document analysis is defined by Bowen (2009: 27) as "a systematic procedure for reviewing or evaluating documents—both printed and electronic (computer-based and Internet-transmitted) material". The activity which is titled as a project in unit six of the English textbook 'Let's Learn English' used in the seventh grades of public secondary schools in Turkey is critically evaluated in terms of the action-oriented approach and it is pointed out that the so-called project in the textbook does not have the characteristics of mini-projects as implemented in a truly action-oriented approach. Besides, an alternative mini-project design that reflects these characteristics is proposed in place of the so-called project proposed in the textbook. The research question of this study is: Does the activity named as 'project' proposed in unit six of the English textbook 'Let's Learn English' used in the seventh grades of public secondary schools in Turkey reflect the characteristics of mini-projects as implemented in a truly action-oriented approach and how can this activity be transformed into a mini-project?

Findings

An Analysis of the 7th Grade ELT Textbook "Let's Learn English" in terms of the Action-oriented Approach

The textbook 'Let's Learn English' is used in the seventh grades of public secondary schools (for the students at the average age of 12, who receive four hours of compulsory and two hours of elective English courses a week) in Turkey. In order to explore the approach the textbook adopts, it is necessary to investigate the approach adopted by the Turkish ELT curriculum for the primary and secondary schools (2-8 grades) since the English teachers who use this textbook are not given the teacher's book by the Turkish Ministry of National Education. English textbook writers in Turkey must follow the Turkish ELT curriculum. Regarding the approach adopted, the 2018 primary and secondary schools ELT curriculum of Turkey states that

> 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 (ELT curriculum, 2018: 3).

The curriculum adopts an eclectic mix of instructional techniques but the main approach adopted is the action-oriented approach. At the end of each unit of the English textbook 'Let's Learn English', there is a section titled 'Let's Make a Project!'. Since educational projects in the action-oriented approach can not limited and directed by the time frame of the textbook or curriculum but are chosen, designed and implemented as autonomously as possible by the students (with the help of the teacher) as stated by Puren (2014a; 2014b; 2017; 2019a; 2019b), naming these activities as 'projects' is misleading. The maximum a language textbook can include is a 'mini-project' but the textbook does not use this terminology.

The Analysis of the Proposed Project in Unit Six

In unit six "parties", the proposed project is: Follow the steps and organize a birthday party. Present your plan to the class.

Step 01. Find photos about the party.

Step 02. Stick them on a cardboard.

Step 03. Prepare a list for needs, guests and food under the photos.

Step 04. Prepare an invitation card for your party (Let's Learn English, 2018: 82).

In terms of the objective of the action, this task has a social dimension 'a birthday party' but from a methodological point of view, it doesn't have a social dimension since it is not stated if the action will be carried out in pairs or as a whole class. From the instruction, it may be understood that each student will follow the steps on his/her own e.g. 'find photos about the party' and 'stick them on a cardboard'. The criticism of this task in terms of the communicative approach is that it is not clear for whom the students are organizing a birthday party and also there is no instruction as to whether the students will send the invitation card to the guests (the guests might have been the other students in this simulated activity) and get a reply (the presence of interaction). For this reason, it is difficult to know from the instruction whether the interaction will occur or not.

The criticism of this task in terms of the action-oriented approach is that the intermediate tasks 'find photos about the party', 'stick them on a cardboard', 'prepare a list for needs, guests and food under the photos', 'prepare an invitation card for your party' do not lead to a final social action (realizing the birthday party) but end with the instruction 'present your plan to the class', which does not even involve two-way communication since 'presenting the plan to the class' does not involve

any interaction: One student or a group of students, depending on what is understood from the instruction, present(s) his/her/their plan to the class but the other students do not show any reaction to the presentation. Thus, in the so-called project of the textbook, the action is put at the service of communication since the so-called project functions only as a pretext for communication, that is, it aims to enable the students to reuse the language content of the unit. If the realization of the final social action (the birthday party) had been targeted, then the textbook should have already specified (or had the students choose) the context in which this birthday would be celebrated (in or outside the classroom) and at least a question should have been asked in the action scenario as to whether the action would be real or simulated. Since the so-called project ends with 'present your plan to the class', it is not clear whether the birthday will be realized or not. Thus, the final social action with a collective decision or action is absent. There is not a collective self-evaluation of the organization and the realization of the birthday party. Autonomy is restricted to individual autonomy and even individual autonomy is restricted since the intermediate steps do not present choices to the students. In the subtasks of mini-projects, however, the students are given choices to guide them in the process of designing their final production or taking a final collective decision. Collectivity is not stressed since, in the subtasks, there is no instruction as to whether the students will carry out the subtasks in pairs, groups, or as a whole class. Information management is limited to 'finding photos about the party' but the students are not required to seek and manage information regarding what makes a good birthday party in reality. In this respect, informational competence is very limited in the design. Thus, the so-called project in the unit does not meet the characteristics of mini-projects such as collectivity, collective autonomy, collective self-evaluation of the social action, information management and the preference for real action. Besides, the main principle of the action-oriented approach, which is 'putting communication at the service of social action' is also absent. This task, however, can be transformed into a mini-project in the following way:

A. As a whole class, organize a birthday party to celebrate the birthday of one of your classmates.

B: Discuss as a whole class why we celebrate birthdays (What's the point of a birthday party?) and how it is celebrated (How do you celebrate it in your family/community/culture?) and whether you (as a whole class) would like to realize this birthday party in reality, not as simulation.

C: Decide collectively on which student you will organize the birthday party for as well as the date and the place of the birthday party (in the classroom or a place outside the classroom).

D: Make an individual search on the internet and then discuss as a whole class as to what makes a good birthday party.

E: Prepare a list of needs. Allocate each task among the classmates and each student will get the necessary items.

F: Search for the close friends and/or family members and/or all the teachers of your classmate (also their contact information) for whom you are organizing the birthday party.

G: Prepare an email text or an invitation card as a whole class and send the email or the invitation card to them or call them on the phone telling them their attendance will be a surprise for the classmate and thank those who reply to you (if you realize that some of the close friends and/or family members and/or the teachers of your classmate do not know English, translate, as a whole class, your email text or invitation card into your native language (Turkish) and send the email or the invitation card to them in your native language (Turkish) or talk to them on the phone in Turkish).

H: As a whole class, realize the birthday party.

I: Do a collective self-evaluation of the organization and realization of the birthday party: What went well? What could have been done to make it better? Why? How?

The design of the mini-project involves both autonomy (the students are presented with options in the subtasks C, F, G) and collectivity (e.g. decide collectively, as a whole class). There is a collective self-evaluation of the final social action. The students are also required to search for and manage information (informational competence). The intermediate tasks of the action scenario serve the final social action, which is realizing the birthday party. In other words, all the intermediate tasks are not objectives in themselves but serve the final social action, in which case communication is put at the service of social action. Thus, the suggested mini-project is not a simple pretext for communication (reusing of the linguistic content of the unit) as in the case of communicative simulations. The students are encouraged to organize a real rather than a simulated birthday party in step B. Thus, the suggested social action is real social action.

Conclusion and Discussion

The implementation of the action-oriented approach in English textbooks is an issue not addressed in the ELT field in Turkey. Thus, this study aims to deal with this issue by analyzing the proposed project at the end of unit six of the English textbook 'Let's Learn English' used in the public secondary schools in Turkey in terms of the action-oriented approach. It is indicated that the proposed project in the textbook does not reflect the characteristics of a mini-project, which is a means of the implementation of the action-oriented approach in language textbooks. Secondly, in place of the proposed project of the textbook, a mini-project design that truly meets the characteristics of a mini-project is suggested.

To Puren (2007, 2014a, 2014b, 2017, 2018, 2019a, 2019b), there are two ways of the implementation of the action-oriented approach: Educational projects, which the students choose and design themselves autonomously (with the help and under the guidance of the teacher) and thus which necessitate a maximum autonomy of the students in the design, implementation and evaluation phases of the project, and mini-projects, in which the students' choice is more restricted since they are predetermined by the textbook or curriculum. Since educational projects allow maximum autonomy for the students (social actors), they can not be limited by the time frame of the textbook or curriculum nor can they be imposed on the students by an outside authority (teacher, textbook or curriculum). Thus, the English textbook 'Let's Learn English' makes a category error by naming the activities proposed at the end of its units as projects. The maximum a language textbook can employ in terms of the action-oriented approach is mini-projects. When the proposed project at the end of unit six of 'Let's Learn English' is analysed, on the other hand, it is seen that it does not even meet the characteristics of mini-projects. The main reason for the mistreatment of the action-oriented approach in the textbook might be due to the information given about the action-oriented approach in the 2018 Turkish ELT curriculum for the primary and secondary schools:

> 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 (ELT curriculum, 2018: 3).

The reason for the textbook authors' misinterpretation of the action-oriented approach might be this statement of the curriculum, in which the action-oriented approach is misinterpreted as having a goal of 'allowing learners to experience English a means of communication'. As stated in this article, in the action-oriented approach (the social action perspective), communication is put at the service of social action. Thus, communication is not the goal but just a means of achieving this goal, a principle which is also ignored in the so-called project proposed at the end of unit six in the textbook.

It is clear that the proposed project in the textbook, which is analysed in this article, is taken (with minor revisions) from the seventh-grade syllabus (unit six) of the 2018 Turkish ELT curriculum for the primary and secondary schools. In the seventh grade syllabus, there is a section titled 'suggested contexts, tasks and assignments' and the textbook authors adopt the proposed project given under the sub-title in this section called 'assignments': "Students organize a birthday party. They prepare a list for needs, guests and food. They also prepare an invitation card" (2018 ELT curriculum: 77). In unit six of the textbook 'Let's Learn English', the proposed project is: Follow the steps and organize a birthday party. Present your plan to the class.

Step 01. Find photos about the party.

Step 02. Stick them on a cardboard.

Step 03. Prepare a list for needs, guests and food under the photos.

Step 04. Prepare an invitation card for your party (Let's Learn English, 2018: 82).

Since the authors of the English textbooks in Turkey must follow the ELT curriculum of Turkey, it is natural that the proposed project of the textbook matches that of the curriculum but what is again another misinterpretation about the action-oriented approach in the curriculum is that the authors of the curriculum name the so-called project as 'assignment' in the curriculum while the authors of the textbook name it as a 'project', both categorizations, however, are wrong since a mini-project is neither an assignment nor a project. It is even clear that both the authors of the curriculum and the authors of the textbook are not in agreement with each other regarding naming this activity, which would be appropriately named as a 'mini-project' in terms of the implementation of the action-oriented approach in language textbooks but again, as discussed in this article, the so-called project of the textbook is even far from meeting the characteristics of a mini-project (the same is true of the assignment suggested in the curriculum), which is the other criticism leveled against the proposed project of the textbook in this article.

Thus it is suggested that the ELT curriculum developers in Turkey, as well as the authors of English textbooks, should present well-designed mini-projects both in the curriculum and the textbooks, otherwise, it would be rather difficult for the English teachers in Turkey to implement the action-oriented approach in/or outside the classroom.

References

Bowen, G.A. (2009). Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27-40. https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027

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

Council of Europe (CoE). (2018). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume with New Descriptors*. [Online] Retrieved from https://rm.coe.int/cefr-companion-volume-with-new-descriptors-2018/1680787989.

Erdem, A. A., Balcı, T., Özdil, K. D. (2018). *Let's Learn English-Student's Book*. Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları.

Horton, F. W., Jr. (2007). Understanding information literacy: A primer. Paris: UNESCO. [Online] Retrieved from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0015/001570/157020e.pdf.

Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı (MEB) [Turkish Ministry of National Education]. (2018). *İngilizce Dersi Öğretim Programı (İlkokul ve Ortaokul 2,3,4,5,6,7 ve 8. Sınıflar) [English Language*

Teaching Program (Primary and Secondary Schools Grades 2,3,4,5,6,7 and 8)]. T.C. Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı.

Puren, C. (2004). De l'approche par les tâches à la perspective co-actionnelle. Retrieved from https://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2004a/.

Puren, C. (2007). Enseigner et apprendre les langues sur un mode qui change avec le monde: l'exemple du passage de l'approche communicative à la perspective actionnelle. Retrieved from https://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2007d/.

Puren, C. (2008). La perspective de l'agir social sur les contenus de connaissance en classe de langue: de la compétence communicative à la compétence informationnelle. Retrieved from https://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2008b/.

Puren, C. (2009a). Variations sur le thème de l'agir social en didactique des langues-cultures étrangères. Retrieved from https://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2009b/ .

Puren, C. (2009b). La nouvelle perspective actionnelle et ses implications sur la conception des manuels de langue. Retrieved from https://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2009g/.

Puren, C. (2014a). Approche communicative et perspective actionnelle, deux organismes méthodologiques génétiquement opposés… et complémentaires. https://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2014a/.

Puren, C. (2014b). La pédagogie de projet dans la mise en œuvre de la perspective actionnelle. https://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2014b/.

Puren, C. (2017). Opérations cognitives (proaction, métacognition, régulation) et activités fondamentales (rétroactions, évaluations) de la démarche de projet. https://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2017a/.

Puren, C. (2018). Différents niveaux de l' « agir » en classe de langue-culture: tp sur la notion de « compétence». Retrieved from file:///C:/Users/user/Downloads/054-1_Niveaux_agir_notion_comp%C3%A9tence_TP_v4%20(2).pdf.

Puren, C. (2019a). 'The stages of a project'. Unpublished document.

Puren, C. (2019b). De la tâche finale au mini-projet: Un exemple concret d'analyse et de manipulation didactiques.

Van, Ek J.A. (1975). *The threshold level*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.