M. SEITOVA[1]✉, A. YERGABYLOVA[2]*

[1] PhD, Assistant Professor of Khoja Akhmet Yassawi International Kazakh-Turkish University
(Kazakhstan, Turkistan), e-mail: meruyert.seitova@ayu.edu.kz
[2] Master Student of Khoja Akhmet Yassawi International Kazakh-Turkish University
(Kazakhstan, Turkistan)

ANALYSIS OF 8th GRADE STUDENTS' ENGLISH SPEAKING LEVELS ACCORDING TO CEFR

Abstract. The aim of this study is to analyse 8th grade students' English speaking levels in the academic year 2020–2021 according to the speaking criteria of the Common European Language Framework of Reference for Languages. This study also aims to identify the speaking difficulties which are experienced by the students and find out the possible problems related to being able to carry out tasks which necessitate share data on known themes and exercises such as describing experiences, events, hopes and ambitions, understanding what the discussion is about and having the option to keep the discussion going successfully. Being able to speak in English or any target language is a vital skill and can be difficult at times. For the speaking analysis, a questionnaire was administered to 32 8th grade students of N20 R. Isetov school in Turkistan, Kazakhstan in the academic year 2020–2021. The results of the questionnaires were assessed statistically. The findings in the research indicate that students think they are competent with the A1 speaking criteria the most according to the CEFR. In other words, as the students reach higher levels of competencies in their current levels (A1, A2, B1), the means that show their speaking performance levels tend to go down.

Keywords: Common European framework of reference for languages, European language portfolio, speaking level.

М. Сейтова[1], А. Ергабылова[2]

[1]PhD, Қожа Ахмет Ясауи атындағы Халықаралық қазақ-түрік университетінің
қауымдастырылған проф. м.а. (Қазақстан, Түркістан қ.), e-mail: meruyert.seitova@ayu.edu.kz
[2]Қожа Ахмет Ясауи атындағы Халықаралық қазақ-түрік университетінің магистранты
(Қазақстан, Түркістан қ.)

8-сынып оқушыларының жалпыға ортақ еуропалық тілдер анықтамалық шеңберіне сәйкес ағылшын тілінде сөйлеу деңгейін талдау

Аңдатпа. Бұл зерттеудің мақсаты 2020–2021 оқу жылында 8-сынып оқушыларының ағылшын тілін білу деңгейін Жалпыға ортақ еуропалық тілдер шеңберінің сөйлеу критерийлеріне сәйкес талдау болып табылады. Бұл зерттеу сонымен қатар студенттердің сөйлеу кезіндегі қиындықтарын анықтауға және тәжірибе, оқиғалар, үміттер мен

амбицияларды сипаттау сияқты таныс тақырыптар мен іс-шаралар бойынша тікелей ақпарат алмасуды қажет ететін тапсырмаларды орындаумен байланысты мәселелерді анықтауға әңгіме не туралы екенін түсіну және оны сәтті қолдай білуге бағытталған. Ағылшын тілінде сөйлеу немесе кез-келген басқа мақсатты тілде сөйлеу кейде қиынға соғуы мүмкін өмірлік дағды болып табылады. Зерттеуді жүргізу үшін Қазақстан республикасы, Түркістан қ. №20 Р. Исетов атындағы орта мектебінің 8-сыныбының 32 оқушысы арасында 2020–2021 оқу жылында сауалнама жүргізілді, Сауалнаманың нәтижелері статистикалық тұрғыдан талданды. Зерттеу нәтижелері көрсеткендей, студенттер Жалпыға ортақ еуропалық тілдер анықтамалық шеңберінің А1 сөйлеу критерийлері бойынша құзыретті болып табылды. Яғни, студенттердің жалпы деңгейлері (А1, А2, В1) жоғары болса да, олардың сөйлеу деңгейлерінің төмен екендігі анықталды.

Кілт сөздер: жалпы еуропалық тілдік қор, еуропалық тілдік портфолио, сөйлеу тілінің деңгейі.

М. СЕЙТОВА¹, А. ЕРГАБЫЛОВА²
¹PhD, и.о. ассоцированного профессора Международного казахско-турецкого университета имени Ходжи Ахмеда Ясави (Казахстан, г. Туркестан), e-mail: meruyert.seitova@ayu.edu.kz
²магистрант Международного казахско-турецкого университета имени Ходжи Ахмеда Ясави (Казахстан, г. Туркестан)

Анализ уровня владения английским языком учащихся 8-х классов согласно общеевропейской системе ссылок на языки

Аннотация. Целью данного исследования является анализ уровня владения английским языком учащихся 8-х классов в 2020–2021 учебном году в соответствии с критериями говорения Общеевропейской языковой базы знаний для языков. Это исследование также направлено на выявление речевых трудностей, с которыми сталкиваются студенты, и выяснение возможных проблем, связанных с выполнением задач, которые требуют прямого обмена информацией по знакомым темам и действиям, таким как описание опыта, событий, надежд и амбиций, понимая, о чем идет разговор, и уметь поддерживать его успешно. Умение говорить на английском или любом другом изучаемом языке – жизненно важный навык, который иногда может вызывать затруднения. Для речевого анализа был проведен анкетный опрос 32 учеников 8-х классов школы им. Р. Исетова № 20 г. Туркестан, Казахстан в 2020–2021 учебном году. Результаты анкетирования оценивались статистически. Результаты исследования показывают, что студентов можно считать наиболее компетентными в соответствии с критериями говорения А1 согласно CEFR. Другими словами, по мере того, как учащиеся достигают более высоких уровней компетенций на их текущем уровне (А1, А2, В1), средства, показывающие их уровень устной речи, имеют тенденцию к снижению.

Ключевые слова: общеевропейская языковая база, европейское языковое портфолио, уровень разговорной речи.

Introduction
Speaking skills constitute the greatest part of learning a foreign language. Due to the recent developments in information technology, being able to communicate has gained more value in the modern world. Therefore, language learners who have better speaking skills are bound to be more successful than less efficient ones [1]. Yet, speaking has been the skill which is mostly neglected in the teaching process. The reasons for this may vary depending on the context of teaching. The most common reason for this is, its being a complex skill to assess and score. Another challenge that can

be mentioned is learners' lack of opportunities to communicate and use the target language outside the classroom setting.

Knowing a language differs from being able to speak it. Speaking is an intelligent expertise which requires the capacity to co-work in the administration of talking turns. It additionally happens in a brief timeframe, mostly without pre-planning and the nature of grammar in spoken language is different from the grammar of written language. Therefore, teaching the grammar of a language may not be sufficient preparation for speaking that target language. All in all, speaking seems to be a great challenge for learners.

This study also aims to identify the speaking difficulties which are experienced by the students and find out the possible problems related to being able to carry out tasks which necessitate share data on known themes and exercises and activities such as describing experiences, events, hopes and ambitions, understanding what the discussion is about and having the option to keep the discussion going successfully.

The following research questions were asked to find out the speaking levels of, identify the problems the students encounter related to their speaking skills.

1. What are the speaking levels of participants of the study according to the CEFR speaking criteria?

2. What are the possible speaking problems and what are the solutions and the suggestions to solve them?

Speaking has always been at the core of language teaching. One of the reasons of it is being able to communicate in a foreign language is considered equal to knowing that language [2].The main purpose of learning how to speak is to achieve communicative proficiency. Speakers need to get the meaning across as clearly as possible and one of the factors teachers should consider is to make sure that learners reach a satisfactory level in terms of their use of the language. In this respect, speaking competence is of vital importance for both parties [3].

As commonly known, even though learners get higher levels in general, their speaking skills of interaction and production remain the same or even behind the current level they are. Therefore even though learners may have little or no difficulty understanding the utterances which are heard, they can't take part in communicative events or they can't contribute much to the information exchange taking place due to their inadequate skills of communicative performance. They also have difficulty in dealing with interactive activities such as casual conversations and informal/formal discussions or productive activities such as addressing the public. There haven't been many studies conducted related to the speaking levels of language learners based on the CEFR. The reason why the researcher chose the CEFR speaking criteria as the base of the research is that the CEFR is the most effective and recognized language assessment system in Europe.

Communicative activities may involve tasks such as motivating learners to compare pictures, look for similarities and differences, find out missing information, look for solutions, conversations, discussions, dialogues and role-plays, etc. The teacher's role includes being the facilitator of information and motivating learners to negotiate the meaning. Lessons are designed to provide learners with control to a certain extent because of the reality that learning is equal to having the chance to choose. Pairwork supplemented with role-play enables learners to have control and a chance to communicate efficiently.

Strategic competence refers to being able to deal with real interactive situations. It necessitates knowledge of strategies such as compensation used in case of inadequate information of rules or exhaustion and distraction. It is operated when the message is not interpreted correctly or in case of forgetting a specific word. Strategic competence includes 'verbal and nonverbal communication techniques that can be used to compensate for communication breakdowns caused by performance factors or a lack of competence'.

The Common European Framework provides a standardized framework for the creation of language syllabuses, curriculum standards, tests, textbooks, and other educational materials across

Europe. It thoroughly outlines what language learners must learn in order to use a language communicatively, as well as what information and skills they must develop in order to effectively communicate. The sense of the cultural context is also included in the definition.

The framework also determines proficiency standards that can be assessed at various levels of learning. The CEFR seeks to put professionals together in terms of connectivity and eliminate challenges created by inequalities in educational systems across Europe. It makes it easier for educational managers, course designers, instructors, instructor mentors, examining bodies, and others to access services in order to help them to keep track of their current practice and achieve their goals of meeting learners' needs.

The Common European Framework includes nine chapters and four Appendixes:

1. The Common European Framework in its political and educational context;
2. Approach adopted;
3. Common Reference Levels;
4. Language use and the language user/learner;
5. The user/learner's competences;
6. Language learning and teaching;
7. Tasks and their role in language teaching;
8. Linguistic diversification and the curriculum;
9. Assessment.

Appendix A: Developing proficiency descriptors.
Appendix B: The illustrative scales of descriptors.
Appendix C: The DIALANG scales.
Appendix D: The ALTE 'Can Do' statements.

The CEFR was written with three main aims.

- To create a metalanguage that can be used to address priorities and language levels across educational industries, national and linguistic boundaries. It was hoped that by doing so, practitioners would be able to tell each other and their clients what they needed to help learners accomplish and how they went about doing so.

- Encourage language practitioners to focus on their current practice, especially in relation to learners' practical language learning needs, the setting of acceptable goals, and learner progress monitoring.

- Agree on common reference points based on work on priorities performed in the Council of Europe's Modern Languages projects since the 1970s.

The COE language education policy is characterized by the following guiding principles:

- Language learning is for everyone: in today's Europe, all people must have the ability to extend their plurilingual repertoire.

- Language learning should be based on worthwhile, practical goals that reflect the learner's needs, desires, motivation, and skills.

- Language learning is vital for intercultural communication: it is necessary for ensuring effective interaction across linguistic and cultural barriers, as well as fostering sensitivity to other people's plurilingual repertoire.

- Language learning is a lifelong endeavor: it should promote learner accountability and independence in order to face the challenges of lifelong language learning.

- Language instruction is coordinated: it should be organized as a whole, including the development of appropriate convergences between all languages that learners have in their repertoire or wish to add to it, as well as the specification of goals, the use of teaching/learning resources and techniques, the evaluation of learner achievement, and the development of appropriate convergences between all languages that learners have in their repertoire or wish to add to it.

- Language instruction is consistent and transparent: regulators, curriculum designers, textbook writers, review bodies, teacher trainers, and students must all have the same priorities, expectations, and evaluation criteria.

- Language learning and teaching are complex, lifelong processes that adapt to experience, evolving circumstances, and use.

The CEFR is a descriptive scheme that can be used to examine L2 learners' needs, identify L2 learning objectives, direct the creation of L2 learning materials and activities, and serve as a basis for overall learning evaluation. It deals with the analysis of the language through strategies applied by learners to prompt general and communicative competences so as to accomplish activities and processes involved in the production and reception of texts, as well as the construction of discourse around specific themes, that assist them in carrying out tasks under given conditions and constraints in various realms of social life.

The descriptive scheme has two dimensions as horizontal and vertical. The vertical dimension has can-do descriptors to define six levels of communicative proficiency in three bands (A1, A2 – Basic User; B1, B2 – Independent User; C1, C2 – Proficient User).The levels have been developed as a result of a Swiss research project. It suggests nine, quite the same sized, coherent levels.

The scales that make up the vertical dimension of the CEFR are user-based and include communicative behaviour and what learners can do in the target language. The horizontal dimension of the CEFR is related to the learners' communicative language competences, strategies and communicative activities. Just as communicative activities, competences and strategies are scaled. Yet, the scaling is based on the communicative behaviour. The horizontal axis also suggests taxonomies for evaluating language use contexts: domains, circumstances, conditions, and limitations, mental meaning, themes, communicative tasks, and purposes.

Several studies have looked for compatibility and applicability of EFL programs for different grades with the proficiency descriptors and principles of the CEFR. For example, Özer (2012) investigated the goodness of fit between the lower secondary education 3rd grade Curriculum for English Language in Turkey and the CEFR for Languages that was composed by the Council of Europe to encourage other languages except for the mother tongue to be spoken and to bring foreign language instruction into conformity with some standards [4]. Likewise, Sak (2013) tried to compare the EFL programs followed at primary education in Finland and Turkey, and their compatibility to CEFR. The findings indicated several differences and similarities in attainments and skills of the EFL programs of these two countries [5].

Shaarawy and Lotfy (2013) have a quasi-experiment in which writing was taught alongside other language skills in daily language contexts, and students were expected to perform asynchronous online tasks to extend their learning beyond classroom hours. Freshmen from one of Egypt's private universities were used in the experiment [6]. The study group consisted of twenty-one pre-intermediate students. Twenty-one pre-intermediate students were in the experimental group, which received the new CEFR course, while twenty-six other students in the same level were in the control group, which received the standard face-to-face academically contextualized course. In 70 percent of the rubrics used to rate students' writing, the experimental group outperformed the control group. The experimental group outperformed the control group in 70% of the rubrics used to grade students' writing, and there was a substantial increase in the experimental group's writing proficiency level when evaluating the outcomes of the pretest and posttest.

Nakatani (2012) investigates whether the use of communication strategies (CS) as established by the Standard European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) will help EFL students develop their communicative skills. Japanese college students took part in a 12-week computer science course. The results show that the students' test scores, use of achievement strategies, and knowledge of strategy use all improved significantly [7].

Fischer (2020) studies the principles of task-based language testing and explains in which contexts this approach might be particularly fruitful. It also presents the author's experience gained in

implementing the approach at institutional and national levels, and the challenges involved in managing this change [8].

Eizaga-Rebollar and Heras-Ramirez (2020) research the extent to which pragmatic competence as defined by the CEFR has been accommodated in the task descriptions and rating scales of two of the most popular Oral Proficiency Interviews at a C1 level [9]. The findings show that the task descriptions incorporate mostly aspects of discourse and design competence. The study shows that the tests fall to fully accommodate all aspects of pragmatic competence in the task skills and rating scales, although the aspects they do incorporate follow the CEFR descriptors on pragmatic competence.

Moreover, self-assessment aspect of the CEFR has become a research interest; many studies have investigated contributions of the CEFR in foreign language learning in terms of self-assessment. But we try to investigate 8th grade students' English speaking levels according to the speaking criteria of the CEFR.

Methodology

This study is a descriptive study that aims to determine the speaking levels of 8th grade students in Turkistan in the academic year of 2020-2021 (fall term) according to the speaking criteria of the CEFR.

Quantitative data collection can be made in many ways. A popular method of doing it is to conduct a survey using some kind of a questionnaire [10].

Findings and Discussion

As mentioned before there were 32 participants of the study. The scale has six different dimensions with a 5 point Likert type Scale. The results of the descriptive analysis were summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 – Descriptive Results for the Dimensions

Dimensions	N	Mean	SD
A1-Spoken Interaction	32	4.15	.74
A1-Spoken Interaction	32	4.00	.86
A2- Spoken Interaction	32	3.42	.78
A2- Spoken Interaction	32	3.89	.81
B1- Spoken Interaction	32	3.16	.80
B1- Spoken Interaction	32	3.00	.88

It can be seen that students have more positive opinions for A1-Spoken Interaction (M = 4.15, SD = .74) than the other dimensions.

The analysis of each item of "A1-Spoken Interaction" is as follows:

Q1: I can introduce somebody as well as using simple greetings and leave taking expressions.

The results show that about 62% of the participants strongly agree that they can introduce somebody and use basic greetings and leave taking expressions; moreover, 27% of the participants agree with this item. About 7% of the participants strongly disagree or disagree with the statement. In addition to these, there are 4.4% who are neutral.

Q2: I can ask and answer simple questions, as well as make and respond to simple statements about topics that are both familiar and popular.

The results show that most of the participants, about 82%, strongly agree or agree that they can ask and answer simple questions, as well as make and respond to simple statements about topics that are

both familiar and popular. About 7% of the participants strongly disagree or disagree with the statement. The rest of the participants are neutral.

Q3: I can make myself understood in a concise manner, but I depend on my partner to repeat and rephrase what I mean, as well as to assist me in saying what I want.
The results show that 35 % of the participants strongly agree and about 44% of the participants agree with the statement. About 7 % of the participants strongly disagree or disagree. Moreover, The rest of the participants are neutral.

Q4: Easy transactions can be made with pointing or other movements to help what I mean.
The results show that about 41% of the participants strongly agree that Easy transactions can be made with pointing or other movements to help what I mean. Parallel to this, about 36% of the participants agree with the statement.15% of the participants who are neutral. In addition to these, about 8 % of the participants strongly disagree or disagree with the statement.

Q5: I'm good with amounts, quantities, prices, and deadlines.
The results show that about 36% of the participants strongly agree and about 38% of the participants agree that they are good with amounts, quantities, prices, and deadlines. About 7% of the participants strongly disagree or disagree. Moreover, 18.8% participants are neutral.

Q6: I can both ask for and give things to people.
The results show that most of the 38% the participants agree that they can both ask for and give things to people and 34% of the participants strongly agree with the statement. About 8% of the participants strongly disagree or disagree with the statement; also 20% of the participants are neutral.

Q7: I will ask people questions about where they live, who they know, what they have, and so on, and I will answer those questions if they are phrased slowly and clearly.
The findings indicate that 84 percent of the participants strongly agree or agree with the argument. Neutrality is expressed by 10.3 percent of the participants. Approximately 7% of those surveyed strongly disagree or disagree with the state.

Q8: I can use time expressions such as "next week", "last Friday", "in November", and "at three o'clock."
The results show that 56% of the participants strongly agree and 28% of them agree that they can use time expressions. 10.3% who are neutral about the statement. In addition to these 6% of the participants strongly disagree or disagree with the statement.

Q9: I can have simple conversations such as greeting.
The results show that 55.3 % of the participants strongly agree and about 29 % of them agree that they can have simple conversations such as greeting. The 8 % who are neutral about the statement. In addition to these, about 9 % of the participants strongly disagree or disagree with the statement;

Q10: I can make and accept apologies
The results show that about 57% of the participants strongly agree and about 27% of them agree that they can make and accept apologies. 10% of the participants are neutral about the statement. In addition to these, 5% of the participants disagree and only 2% of them strongly disagree that they can make and accept apologies.
The analysis of each item of "A2-Spoken Production" is as follows:

Q11: I can talk about and describe myself and my family.
The results show that about 56% of the participants strongly agree that they can talk about themselves and their family; moreover 31% of the participants agree with this item. About 8% of the participants strongly disagree or disagree with the statement. In addition to these, there are 6% participants who are neutral.

Q12: I can give basic descriptions of events.

The results show that about 37% of the participants strongly agree or agree that they can give basic descriptions of events. In addition to these, 34% who are neutral. About 21% of the participants strongly disagree or disagree with the statement.

Q13: My educational history, as well as my current or most recent work, can be identified.
The results show that 32% of the participants strongly agree and about 41.3% of the participants agree with the statement. Moreover there are 16% of participants who are neutral. 11% of the participants strongly disagree or disagree.

Q14: In a simple manner, I can explain my hobbies and interests.
The results show that about 47% of the participants strongly agree that they can describe their hobbies and interests in a simple way. Parallel to this, 36% of the participants agree with the statement. 10% are neutral. In addition to these, about 7% of the participants strongly disagree or disagree with the statement.

Q15: I might recall past events, such as those from last week or my most recent vacation.
The results show that about 37% of the participants strongly agree and about 42% of the participants agree that they can describe past activities such as last week or their last holiday. About 11 % of the participants strongly disagree or disagree. 11.3% are neutral.

The analysis of each item of "B1-Spoken Interaction" is as follows:

Q16: I may begin, sustain, and end a discussion about familiar or personal topics.
The results show that about 12% of the participants strongly agree that they can start, maintain and end a conversation about topics that are familiar of personal interest; moreover, 22% of the participants agree with this item. About 27% of the participants strongly disagree or disagree with the statement. In addition to these 41% who are neutral.

Q17: I may have a conversation or a debate, but I can be difficult to understand when trying to say exactly what I want.
The results show that about 30% of the participants strongly agree or agree with the statement. In addition to these, 36% are neutral, 35% of the participants strongly disagree or disagree with the statement.

Q18: When making travel plans via an agent or while traveling, I am prepared to deal with the majority of circumstances that can occur.
The results show that 10 % of the participants strongly agree and about 27% of the participants agree with the statement. Moreover, 41% are neutral. 23% of the participants strongly disagree or disagree.

Q19: I have the opportunity to ask for and obey detailed directions.
The results show that only 7 % of the participants strongly agree that they have the opportunity to ask for and obey detailed directions and also about 14% of the participants agree with the statement. 32% who are neutral. In addition to these, about 48% of the participants strongly disagree or disagree with the statement.

Q20: Surprise, satisfaction, disappointment, curiosity, and indifference are all feelings I can convey and respond to.
The results show that 21% of the participants strongly agree and about 39% of the participants agree that they can convey and respond to feelings. About 15% of the participants strongly disagree or disagree. Moreover, there are 21.6% who are neutral.

Q21: I can explain my reactions and relate the plot of a book or film.
The results show that 11% of the participants strongly agree that they can explain their reactions and relate the plot of a book or film and also 25% of the participants agree with this statement. 35% are neutral. In addition to these, about 31% of the participants strongly disagree or disagree with the statement.

Q22: I can quickly paraphrase short written passages orally, using the wording and structure of the original text.

The results show that 9% of the participants strongly agree and 29% of the participants agree that they can paraphrase short written passages in a simple way, using the wording and structure of the original text. About 28% of the participants strongly disagree or disagree. 35% who are neutral.

Q23: I can narrate a story.

The results show that about 8% of the participants strongly agree that they can narrate a story; moreover 13% of the participants agree with this item. About 53% of the participants strongly disagree or disagree with the statement. In addition to these, 27% who are neutral.

Conclusion

This study investigated the current speaking problems of 8th grade students and identified the current speaking levels of 8th grade students according to the CEFR criteria. It was also designed to inform us about the characteristics of speech, functions of speaking, how speaking skills are taught, Communicative language teaching, Communicative competence, CEFR.

The results elicited were assessed statistically. The findings of the research reveal that the peaking levels of the learners based on their teachers' and their own opinions according to the CEFR speaking criteria are as follows:

• A1 Spoken Interaction: Students: =4,27; Teachers: =4,50
• A1 Spoken Production: Students: =3,99; Teachers: =4,75
• A2 Spoken Interaction: Students: =3,58; Teachers: =3,98
• A2 Spoken Production: Students: =3,85; Teachers: =4,18
• B1 Spoken Interaction: Students: =3,31; Teachers: =3,69
• B1 Spoken Production: Students: =3,16; Teachers: =3,24

As can be seen above, the mean of spoken interaction for A1 is the highest of all three interaction levels. The spoken interaction mean of A2 is higher than B1 spoken interaction mean and B1 spoken interaction mean is the lowest of the three. Therefore it can be said that the means for spoken interaction levels decrease as the students reach higher levels of proficiency.

The study revealed that the learners feel the most competent with their A1 spoken interaction, A1 spoken production, and A2 spoken production skills respectively. Even though the learners' level is basically B1, they believe their speaking level is behind their current level.

The first research question was ''What are the speaking levels of 8th grade students according to the CEFR speaking criteria?'' The results have revealed that the learners feel competent the most with their A1 level of speaking skills. As their current level increases, their speaking skills tend to remain behind their general level. When the findings are taken into account, speaking still seems to be the skill which is neglected the most in the classroom. Classroom activities entailing the completion of interactive speaking tasks such as role-play and information gap, etc. should be included in the lessons and allow learners to take part in activities engaging in different speaking tasks. Language is for communication; therefore creating real-life situations in the classroom which would eventually improve learners' speaking skills would be beneficial.

The second research question was 'What are the possible speaking problems and what are the solutions and the suggestions to solve them?' According to the results students feel unconfident about their B1 production activities the most. Production activities are pertinent to speaking activities in which learners are required to create a speaking text to address a specific audience. Considering the findings, learners feel difficulty with more complicated speaking activities such as narrating a story or paraphrasing a written text orally. Therefore, it would be useful to diversify the speaking activities in higher levels.

The findings have also revealed that the learners are able to handle simple daily conversation such as introducing somebody or asking and answering simple questions. Yet, being able to deal with simple speaking tasks does not always lead to meaningful communication. A real-life conversation requires the knowledge of communication strategies such as turn taking or being able to use the language functionally so making the necessary changes in the curriculum and providing

various speaking task types in the curriculum might be beneficial. In addition to that, the speaking abilities of learners could be assessed via different oral exam types. Apart from asking learners to talk about a random subject, they could be involved in an interactive process such as a discussion.

In order to get our students to develop communicative efficiency, students need to be exposed to communicative activities aiming to provide the knowledge of what is appropriate and what to say in different contexts,(discourse competence),the knowledge of ability to ask for clarification and fix miscommunication (strategic competence), as well as the pace of speech, pause duration, turn-taking, and other social aspects of language usage (sociolinguistic competence), grammar, pronunciation etc. (linguistic competence). It is also of vital importance that teachers should be aware of different functions of the language while creating speaking activities which learners may need practice with. Exposing learners to speech styles (the degree of politeness depending on the participants' positions, ages, sex, and status in interactions) and different functions of speaking such as transaction (group discussions and problem-solving activities, asking someone for directions on the street, ordering food from a menu in a restaurant), interaction (narrating personal experiences, agreeing and disagreeing, confirming information), performance (giving a speech, giving a class report about a trip, making a presentation) might be beneficial in terms of helping them develop communicative competency.

REFERENCES

1. Malmir, A., & Shoorcheh, S. (2012). An investigation of the impact of teaching critical thinking on the Iranian EFL learners' speaking skill // Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 3(4). – P. 608–617.
2. Nazara, S. (2011). Students' perception on EFL speaking skill development // Journal of English Teaching, 1(1). – P. 28–42.
3. Bahrani, T., & Soltani, R. (2012). How to teach speaking skill? // Journal of Education and Practice, 3(2). – P. 25–29.
4. Omer, O.Z.E.R., & Parmaksiz, R.Ş. (2013). Comparative Analysis of Lower Secondary Education 3rd Grade Curriculum for English Language and the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages // Bartın Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 2(2). – S. 171–189.
5. Sak, Ö. (2013). A comparative analysis of English language curriculum for primary education in Turkey and Finland according to common European framework for languages. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), Abant İzzet Baysal University, Bolu.
6. Shaarawy, H. Y., & Lotfy, N. E. (2013). Teaching Writing within the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR): A Supplement Asynchronous Blended Learning Approach in an EFL Undergraduate Course in Egypt // Higher Education Studies, 3(1). – P. 123–135.
7. Nakatani, Y. (2012). Exploring the implementation of the CEFR in Asian contexts: Focus on communication strategies // Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 46. – P. 771–775.
8. Fischer, J. (2020). The underlying action-oriented and task-based approach of the CEFR and its implementation in language testing and assessment at university // Language Learning in Higher Education, 10(2). – P. 301–316.
9. Eizaga-Rebollar, B., & Heras-Ramírez, C. (2020). Assessing pragmatic competence in oral proficiency interviews at the C1 level with the new CEFR descriptors // Lodz Papers in Pragmatics, 16(1). – P. 87–121.
10. Dörnyei, Z. (2007). Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative and mixed methodologies. Oxford: Oxford University Press.