

Akdeniz Egitim Arastirmalari Dergisi

Volume 13, Issue 28 June 2019

mjer.penpublishing.net

ISSN: 1309-0682 (Print)

An Investigation of Turkish Cultures of Learning Within the Framework of Turkish ELT Curricula

Ahmet Acar

To cite this article

Acar, A. (2019). An Investigation of Turkish Cultures of Learning Within the Framework of Turkish ELT Curricula. Akdeniz Egitim Arastirmalari Dergisi, 13(28), 126-144. doi: 10.29329/mjer.2019.202.7

Published Online	June 30, 2019
Article Views	48 single - 53 cumulative
Article Download	150 single - 242 cumulative
DOI	https://doi.org/10.29329/mjer.2019.202.7

Pen Academic is an independent international publisher committed to publishing academic books, journals, encyclopedias, handbooks of research of the highest quality in the fields of Education, Social Sciences, Science and Agriculture. Pen Academic created an open access system to spread the scientific knowledge freely. For more information about PEN, please contact: info@penpublishing.net

This document downloaded from 94.54.16.171 [2 times] Ankara / Turkey on Tue, 07 Apr 2020 18:37:27 +0300

Pen Academic Publishing, Canakkale/Turkey
Telephone: +90 286 243 06 66 | Fax: +90 286 213 08 00 | info@penpublishing.net | www.penpublishing.net

PEN

An Investigation of Turkish Cultures of Learning Within the Framework of Turkish ELT Curricula

Ahmet Acar [1]

Abstract: Since English as an international language does not belong to a certain country or a certain culture, an appropriate methodology for teaching English as an international language should not be informed by a western methodology but by a methodology informed by the local culture of learning of a particular teaching context (for example, culture of learning of the Turkish people). For this reason, while the current communicative approach, which is often characterized by a western culture of learning, promotes a certain set of assumptions about language or language learning which must be adopted in all cultural contexts, the teaching of EIL approach suggests devising methodologies appropriate to the local culture of learning (for example, Turkish culture of learning). This paper aims to explore the Turkish students' culture of learning English. To specify the Turkish students' culture of learning English, a survey was constructed and administered to 1130 students in the second cycle (grade 8.) of public primary schools in İzmir, Turkey. The results of this survey reveal that Turkish students of English display some characteristics which are not in line with the characteristics of the communicative approach and the pedagogic principles of both 2013 and 2018 Turkish ELT curricula. The data are discussed to shed light on devising appropriate methodologies appropriate to the Turkish students' culture of learning English in Turkey.

Keywords: Cultures of learning, English as an international language pedagogy, Turkish ELT curriculum, communicative approach

DOI: 10.29329/mjer.2019.202.7

Türk Öğrenme Kültürlerinin Türk İngilizce Öğretim Programları Çerçevesinde Bir İncelemesi

Özet: Uluslararası bir dil olarak İngilizce belirli bir ülkeye veya kültüre ait olmadığı için, İngilizce'nin uluslararası bir dil olarak öğretimi için uygun öğretim yöntemi bir batı öğretim yöntemi tarafından değil öğretimin yapıldığı belirli bağlamın öğrenme kültürü tarafından (örneğin Türk'lerin öğrenme kültürü) şekillendirilmelidir. Bu sebeple bir batı öğrenme kültürü olarak betimlenen iletişimsel yaklaşım, tüm kültürel ortamlarda benimsenmesi gereken dil ve dil öğrenme ile ilgili bir dizi varsayım ileri sürerken, uluslararası bir dil olarak İngilizce'nin öğretimi yaklaşımı, yerel öğrenme kültürüne uygun (örneğin Türk öğrenme kültürü) öğretim yöntemlerinin geliştirilmesini önermektedir. Bu makale Türk öğrencilerin İngilizce öğrenme kültürlerini saptamayı amaçlamaktadır. Türk öğrencilerin İngilizce öğrenme kültürlerini belirlemek için, bir anket oluşturulmuş ve Türkiye'de İzmir ili devlet ilköğretim okulları ikinci kademeki (8. sınıf) 1130 öğrenciye uygulanmıştır. Anket sonuçları, Türk İngilizce öğrencilerinin hem 2013 hem de 2018 Türk İngilizce öğretim programlarının eğitsel prensipleriyle ve iletişimsel yaklaşımın özellikleriyle bağdaşmayan çeşitli özellikler sergilediğini ortaya koymaktadır. Veriler Türkiye'deki Türk öğrencilerin İngilizce öğrenme kültürlerine uygun öğretim yöntemleri geliştirmeye ışık tutacak şekilde tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Öğrenme kültürleri, Uluslararası bir dil olarak İngilizce öğretimi, Türk İngilizce öğretim programı, iletişimsel yaklaşım

[1] **Ahmet Acar,** Dr. Öğretim Üyesi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Buca Eğitim Fakültesi, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi ABD, İzmir, Türkiye ORCID: 0000-0001-8940-4359

İrtibat Yazarı: ahmet.acar@deu.edu.tr

This document downloaded from 94.54.16.171 [2 times] Ankara / Turkey on Tue, 07 Apr 2020 18:37:27 +0300

INTRODUCTION

The unprecedented spread of English throughout the world has resulted in different varieties of English in different sociolinguistic contexts. The denationalization and renationalization of English (Kachru, 1985; McKay, 2002) indicate the fact that in the present day English is not essentially used to communicate with native speakers but is used as an international language mostly among non-native speakers. Such being the case native English speakers' norms of appropriate language use may not only be unnecessary but also irrelevant for the non-native speakers who are involved in cross-cultural communication in English in the global context. Traditionally, however, learning English as a foreign language meant learning it to communicate with native speakers, taking native speakers as ideal models of language use and learning the cultural conventions of the native speakers. The present sociolinguistic profile of the users and uses of English in the world led some researchers (e.g. Alptekin, 2002; McKay, 2002, 2003; Nunn, 2011) to reexamine common ELT assumptions and gave way to a new methodology characterized as English as an international language pedagogy, which rejects the adoption of a single universal methodology for all cultural contexts but rather suggests devising methodologies appropriate to the local culture of learning. This paper aims to explore the Turkish students' culture of learning English and discusses to what extent the students' expectations and attitudes regarding the nature of language learning and teaching, perceptions of the roles of teachers and students, qualities valued in teachers and students and preferred type of activities match with those stated in the Turkish ELT curriculum and then it discusses the data to shed light on devising methodologies appropriate to the Turkish students' culture of learning English in Turkey.

Review of the Literature

Communicative Language Teaching

The communicative approach is generally regarded as an approach which aims to develop the students' communicative competence in English, a term developed by Hymes and later refined by Canale (1983). The adoption of communicative competence within the communicative approach resulted in a focus on the rules of use (the appropriate use of language in appropriate situations) rather than the rules of usage (the rules of grammar). The students are expected to master the knowledge and ability to use the language as the native speakers use it in real life. Thus the ideal model for the students is considered to be the native speaker whose norms of appropriate language use the students would learn as Alptekin (2002) states:

The communicative approach considers target language-based communicative competence to be essential in order for foreign language learners to participate fully in the target language culture. As such, the target language culture and its inhabitants, the native speakers, are elements crucial to the success of the teaching model. Learners are not only expected to acquire accurate forms of the target

This document downloaded from 94.54.16.171 [2 times] Ankara / Turkey on Tue, 07 Apr 2020 18:37:27 +0300

language, but also to learn how to use these forms in given social situations in the target language setting to convey appropriate, coherent, and strategically-effective meanings for the native speaker (p. 58).

Thus the classroom activities focused on real-life language use which is aimed to be achieved by means of authentic materials used in authentic situations created in the classroom, which would, in turn, enable the students to use English as native speakers do in native speakers' context of language use. Such classroom activities which would enable the students to communicate meaningfully in English are generally in the form of role plays, dialogues, information-gap activities, games and jigsaw activities, which are mainly carried out in pairs or groups. Such pair work and group work activities will generate interaction and communication among students. In this respect, the communicative approach can be characterized as a learner-centered approach to language learning. According to Richards (2006), in the communicative approach, "the center of attention shifts from the teacher to the student. This shift is generally known as the move from teacher-centered instruction to learner-centered instruction" (p. 24). The teachers, on the other hand, act as facilitators and monitors (Richards, 2006) who try to create authentic communicative situations for the students to use language communicatively.

Many of these assumptions and practices display western cultural features. "Western notion of the 'teacher-as-facilitator' as being an ideal teacher/student relationship" (Ellis, 1996, p. 216), "English-only approach to presentation and practice that is such a prominent feature of the British EFL tradition" (Swan, 1985, p. 85), learners as active participants in the learning and hence learner-centered methodology as the ideal way of learning for the students, the use of authentic materials, native speakers as the ideal models for the students, native speaker culture as the target culture to teach are among features which make the communicative approach a western methodology.

English As an International Language Pedagogy

The spread of English to new un English contexts has resulted in varieties of English in these sociolinguistic contexts. Kachru (1985) views this spread of English in terms of "three concentric circles representing the types of spread, the patterns of acquisition and the functional domains in which English is used across cultures and languages" (p. 12). He classifies these circles as the inner circle, the outer circle, and the expanding circle. The inner circle represents the traditional bases of English where English is used as the primary language like the USA, the UK, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. The outer circle includes countries such as India, Nigeria, Singapore, where English is used quite intensively and extensively in the daily lives of the people and has developed new norms of language use and usage. The expanding circle includes countries such as Turkey, Japan, China, and Israel, where English is not used in the daily lives of the people but rather functions as an international language.

This document downloaded from 94.54.16.171 [2 times] Ankara / Turkey on Tue, 07 Apr 2020 18:37:27 +0300

The studies of institutionalized non native varieties of English (Kachru, 1985, 1990, 1992) advocates the consideration of these varieties in their own right without any comparison to the native speaker varieties and the term world Englishes is used to represent such varieties such as "Indian English", "Singaporean English", and "Nigerian English", a classification which brought to "the English language a unique cultural pluralism, a variety of speech fellowships..and linguistic diversity" (Kachru, 1990, p. 5) . English is no longer the language owned by the native speakers but also the language of the non-native speakers who use and adapt it in their own sociocultural and sociolinguistic contexts. Thus, "Kachru argues for the recognition of variations (in the use of English in the outer circle) from the native standard English as innovations rather than mistakes or errors, of outer circle Englishes as local standard Englishes rather than interlanguages and ultimately urges for these Englishes to be taken as pedagogical models in these local contexts" (Acar, 2007, p. 69).

While the communicative approach considers the native speaker norms of language use as the only appropriate use of English, the native speaker based notion of communicative competence as the ultimate goal for learners to achieve and the western cultures of learning as the most effective way of learning, McKay (2002, 2003) successfully questions such an orientation and outlines the basic premises of teaching English as an international language as: Since English is an international language it cannot be linked to a specific country or culture, in other words, English is denationalized. Since the learners of English have certain goals in learning English they do not need to master native speaker competence. The target culture to teach in the classroom should not mainly be native speaker culture and western cultures of learning underlying the communicative approach are not the most effective way of teaching. She contends that Since EIL by definition no longer belongs to any one nation or culture, it seems reasonable that how this language is taught should not be linked to a particular culturally influenced methodology; rather the language should be taught in a manner consistent with local cultural expectations. In short, an appropriate EIL methodology presupposes sensitivity to the local cultural context in which local educators determine what happens in the classroom (McKay, 2003, p. 17).

Thus English as an international language pedagogy advocates focusing on recognizing the validity of diverse norms of language use and bilingual or even multilingual models of competence as the ultimate goal for the students (Acar, 2010; Alptekin, 2002; Nunn, 2007) and local culture of learning as the most productive way of learning.

Kramsch and Sullivan (1996) also "suggest an 'appropriate' pedagogy that takes into account both the global and local needs of learners of English" (p. 200). For Kramsch and Sullivan (1996) this appropriate pedagogy would be in line with the political motto "'Think globally, act locally', translated into language pedagogy as 'global thinking, local teaching' (Berman 1994)" (p. 200). They further contend that "the communicative teaching of English imposes on learners of English around

This document downloaded from 94.54.16.171 [2 times] Ankara / Turkey on Tue, 07 Apr 2020 18:37:27 +0300

the world discourse forms that are typical of Anglo-Saxon commercial practices, and that one should, therefore, seek to develop a pedagogy more appropriate to local conditions" (p. 200)…since "authentic native-speaker discourse in London or New York might be quite inappropriate for speakers of English in other parts of the world; what is authentic in one context might need to be made appropriate to another" (Kramsch and Sullivan, 1996, p. 199). Thus the de-linking of English from the culture of Inner Circle countries also suggests that teaching methodology has to proceed in a manner that respects the local culture of learning (McKay, 2003, p. 19).

Cultures of Learning

When defining the notion of a culture of learning, Cortazzia and Jin (1996) argue that Much behaviour in language classrooms is set within a taken-for-granted framework of expectations, attitudes, values, and believes about what constitutes good learning, about how to teach or learn, whether and how to ask questions, what textbooks are for, and how language teaching relates to broader issues of the nature and purpose of education. In many classrooms, both teachers and learners are unaware that such a culture of learning may be influencing the process of teaching and learning. A culture of learning is thus part of the hidden curriculum (p. 169).

Cortazzia and Jin (1996) focus on language classrooms in China and argue that Chinese students have a culture of learning in which there is a strong emphasis on memory, imitation and repetitive practice. "There is a strong belief that anyone can be successful in language learning-whether Chinese or English- by hard work. Again this hard work is commonly demonstrated by memorization and practice" (Cortazzia and Jin, 1996, p. 181).

Cortazzi and Jin (1996) furthermore investigated the Chinese students' views on the characteristics of a good student and a good teacher. Regarding what it means to be a good teacher they argue that the most common expectation which Chinese students have of a good teacher is that the teacher should have deep knowledge of his or her subject. In China students believe that teachers should be 'erudite', 'very learned', 'they should be able to answer all sorts of questions'. 'They should have profound knowledge, which is the most important thing'. 'The teacher is a symbol of knowledge', 'a key to the treasure house of knowledge'…This is entirely in keeping with the traditional Chinese notion that the central aim of teaching is to provide knowledge for students (Cortazzi and Jin, 1996, p. 187).

As to the characteristics of a good student, Cortazzi and Jin (1996) argue that "the Chinese students themselves believe that to be hardworking is the major characteristic of a good student. Students should be diligent in studies, 'they should study hard and soul', 'they must work hard, put the study in the first place'" (p.189).

This document downloaded from 94.54.16.171 [2 times] Ankara / Turkey on Tue, 07 Apr 2020 18:37:27 +0300

Flowerdew and Miller (1995) list the features of Confucianism which contrast with Western values in the context of L2 lectures Confucian and Western Values as They Relate to Academic Lectures (from Flowerdew and Miller, 1995, p. 348):

Confucian	Western
-respect for the authority of lecturer	- lecturer valued as a guide and facilitator
-lecturer should not be questioned	-lecturer is open to challenge
-student motivated by family and pressure to excel	-student motivated by desire for individual development
-positive value placed on effacement and silence	-positive value placed on self-expression of ideas
-emphasis on group orientation to Learning	-emphasis on individual development and creativity in learning

Based on classroom observations, LoCastro (1996), on the other hand, "characterizes English language classes in Japan as teacher-fronted, teacher-centered, and generally employing a grammar-translation method." (in McKay, 2002, p. 105)

Such studies challenge the spread of CLT on the grounds that with its western cultural values CLT may not offer the most effective way of learning in the eastern cultures. Thus rather than transferring a methodology informed by a western culture of learning into the eastern cultures, "in the teaching of EIL, local educators should have control over how English is taught, implementing a methodology that is appropriate to the local context" (McKay, 2002, p. 119).

CLT and 2013 & 2018 Turkish ELT curricula

In terms of the approach adopted, the 2013 ELT curriculum states that The CEFR particularly stresses the need for students to put their learning into real-life practice in order to support fluency, proficiency and language retention (CoE, 2001); accordingly, the new curricular model emphasizes language use in an authentic communicative environment. 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 (2013 ELT curriculum, p. II).

The above quote indicates that the 2013 ELT curriculum basically adopts an action-oriented approach along with the eclectic approach. The communicative approach is also given a special place in the curriculum, which outlines the basic assumption of the communicative approach as follows:

This document downloaded from 94.54.16.171 [2 times] Ankara / Turkey on Tue, 07 Apr 2020 18:37:27 +0300

The communicative approach entails use of the target language not only as an object of study but as a means of interacting with others; the focus is not necessarily on grammatical structures and linguistic functions, but on authentic use of the language in an interactive context in order to generate real meaning (Larsen- Freeman & Anderson, 2011; Richards, 2006) (2013 ELT curriculum, p. III).

The 2018 ELT curriculum uses the same expressions with the 2013 ELT curriculum in terms of the approach it adopts:

The CEFR particularly stresses the need for students to put their learning into real-life practice in order to support fluency, proficiency and language retention (CoE, 2001); accordingly, the new curricular model emphasizes language use in an authentic communicative environment. 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 (2018 ELT curriculum, p. 3).

Thus, there is no difference between the 2013 and 2018 ELT curricula of Turkey in terms of the approach adopted. In both curricula, the dominance of the communicative approach (as well as the action-oriented approach) can be clearly observed. It should also be noted that there is not any explanation of the difference between the action-oriented approach and the communicative approach in both curricula and both approaches seem to be presented as the same entity, which is not the case. Action-oriented approach differs from the communicative approach although they are complementary. Saydı (2015) claims that "The action approach is conceived as a collaborator adjusting the communicative approach…on the other hand, the action-oriented approach adopts a technique that orients the learner to be more of a social actor: the learner is encouraged to use the language of learning in society itself, in order to carry out an action, solve a problematic situation or promote a fact" (p. 14). Puren (2014), on the other hand, claims that the communicative approach and action oriented perspective are two genetically opposed entities although they are in some way complementary. To Puren (2014), while the communicative adopts communication as a goal in itself, action oriented approach aims to enable the learners to live and work together in their society. While the former focuses on exhance of information, the latter focuses on acting with others as social agents in the society.

Continuous emphasis on the necessity of the use of authentic materials, pair work and group work activities as the basic activities to involve the students in real life communication in the classroom, the need to develop the students' communicative competence, the necessity of avoiding the

This document downloaded from 94.54.16.171 [2 times] Ankara / Turkey on Tue, 07 Apr 2020 18:37:27 +0300

use of the mother tongue as much as possible are the assumptions which mean transferring a western culture of learning to a new unEnglish sociolinguistic context.

One important feature of these curriculum development processes in Turkey is that the goals of learning English and methodologies which would be adopted are specified without asking the students their aim in learning English or their preferred type of activities. Thus the curriculum development process in Turkey is what may be called a top-down curriculum development in which the authorities set goals for the students and specify the type of methodology without specifying the students' cultures of learning. Some institutions at a higher level like that of Anadolu University School of Foreign Languages may be an exception in this context since they develop their curriculum on the basis of several components as Aydın (2017) states that While Taba (1962) model is taken as a basis in Anadolu University School of Foreign Languages, not a single component is considered as the center, rather institutional experience, student profile, the needs of the students, the opinions of the teachers and all the resources at hand play a central role equally in the curriculum development process (p.14-15).

METHODOLOGY

Design of the study

Quantitative research design, which is conducted to explore the Turkish students' culture of learning English, was employed in this study.

Participants

Participants of the study consist of 1130 students in the second cycle (grade 8.) of public primary schools in İzmir, Turkey. Eighteen different primary schools and 1130 eighth-grade students from these schools were chosen randomly from six different districts in İzmir, namely, Karşıyaka, Karabağlar, Konak, Gaziemir, Bornova, and Buca.

Data Analysis

The statistical analyses were carried out using the SPSS software program.

Data Collection Tool

To specify the Turkish students' culture of learning English, a likert type questionnaire which consists of a five-point scale (strongly disagree, disagree, partly agree, agree, strongly agree) was used in this study. The questionnaire had been piloted by 180 students before being conducted to 1130 students. The reliability factor was found to be .737. The original questionnaire was developed in English by the researcher but it was translated into Turkish for the students to understand the items well.

This document downloaded from 94.54.16.171 [2 times] Ankara / Turkey on Tue, 07 Apr 2020 18:37:27 +0300

Data Analysis and Results

Students' aim in learning English

The first item in the questionnaire asked the students' aim in learning English.

Table 1. Students' Aim in Learning English

Items	strongly disagree %	disagree %	partly agree %	agree %	strongly agree %
I learn English to find a good job in the future.	5.2	3.7	24.5	28.6	38.0
I learn English because it is a compulsory school subject.	27.1	28.8	18.3	14.2	11.6
I want to learn English because it will help me use the internet (searching for information in English, writing emails in English etc.).	9.5	12.0	29.9	25.1	23.5
I want to learn English for daily communication.	6.5	11.5	21.3	27.3	33.4
I learn English because of family pressure.	69.0	19.5	4.7	2.8	4.0
I want to learn English because Turkey will join the EU.	26.5	25.7	22.7	15.0	10.3

From Table 1, it can be observed that the students' favorite reason for learning English is to find a good job in the future. Their second favorite reason is learning English for daily communication and their third choice is learning English thinking that it will help them use the internet. Since the percentages of the results for these three items are close to each other, these three items can be considered as the goals of the students in learning English. In Turkey, however, since English is not used in the daily lives of the people, the students' desire to learn English for daily communication may indicate their expectation to be able to express themselves in English in a possible communicative situation or that knowing a language for them means using it for daily communication.

The students also indicate that they find learning English necessary since they disagree with the items that they learn English because it is a compulsory school subject or that they learn English because of family pressure.

In 2013 and 2018 ELT curricula of Turkey, the principles of The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages are followed, which indicates that the curriculum development in Turkey adopts the standards set by the European Union probably because there is an expectation that Turkey will be a member of the European Union in the future. While the basic motivation for the curriculum developers in Turkey is the European Union, table 1 indicates that most of the students disagree with the item "I want to learn English because Turkey will join the EU."

Regarding the students' goal of learning English, both 2013 and 2018 ELT curricula of Turkey adopt two types of goal: the first one is an affective goal and the second one is a communicative goal. Regarding the affective goal both curricula state (with the same sentences) that "developing a positive attitude toward English from the earliest stages is essential; therefore, the new curriculum strives to

This document downloaded from 94.54.16.171 [2 times] Ankara / Turkey on Tue, 07 Apr 2020 18:37:27 +0300

foster an enjoyable and motivating learning environment where young learners/users of English feel comfortable and supported throughout the learning process". (2013 ELT curriculum, p. II & 2018 ELT curriculum, p. 3).

As to the communicative goal, both curricula state (again with the same sentences) that There is no question that the key to economic, political and social progress in today's society depends on the ability of Turkey's citizens to communicate effectively on an international level, and competence in English is a key factor in this process….the new curricular model emphasizes language use in an authentic communicative environment. (2013 ELT curriculum, p. II & 2018 ELT curriculum, p. 4)

The 2013 and 2018 ELT curricula, on the other hand, do not state any goal relating to the students' need to learn English to find a good job in the future nor any goal relating to the students' need to learn English to be able to use the internet. Getting a job or getting promoted in jobs in Turkey depends largely on the test results such as YDS (foreign language exam), which is a multiple choice test requiring the ability to read and understand what is read as well as a good command of grammar. Using the internet in Turkey, on the other hand, basically requires a focus on reading and writing skills rather than listening and speaking. The basic goal of the 2013 and 2018 ELT curricula that Turkey's citizens should communicate effectively on an international level does not match with these student goals in this respect. Reading and writing skills, on the other hand, are considered as secondary skills in both the 2013 and 2018 ELT curricula but when these student goals are considered, these skills should also be considered as primary.

The goal adopted by both the 2013 and 2018 ELT curricula regarding the students' need to communicate in English is also problematic and the problem relates more to the issue of authenticity. Both curricula as they state 'emphasize language use in an authentic communicative environment.' (2013 ELT curriculum, p. II & 2018 ELT curricula, p. 3)

Authenticity in ELT, however, refers to the use of English as native speakers use it in daily life. Indeed both the 2013 and 2018 ELT curricula argue (with the same sentences) that our students must "listen and speak just as they would in a target language community" (2013 ELT curriculum, p. II & 2018 ELT curriculum, p. 12).

Given the fact that English is not used in the daily lives of the people in Turkey, and that Turkish people do not often travel to the USA or the UK, where they will use English in an authentic communicative environment, it is not a realistic goal for the Turkish learners of English. Moreover, it is a matter of debate whether the 2-8 grade-students will be able to reach such a level ever. Kramsch and Sullivan (1996) states that Interest in an appropriate rather than an authentic ELT pedagogy also stems from the realization that the teaching methodologies and materials developed in

This document downloaded from 94.54.16.171 [2 times] Ankara / Turkey on Tue, 07 Apr 2020 18:37:27 +0300

Europe or the United States could not be used in the way they were intended by their original authors once they reached Swaziland or Malaysia. Widdowson (1994, p. 387) clearly states the consequences for English language teaching: instead of a pedagogy of the authentic which '[inappropriately] privileges native-speaker use' and imposes its norms at the global level, he suggests a pedagogy of the appropriate, which revises the authentic and adapts it to local conditions*"* (p. 200).

This line of argument is more in line with the political motto "'Think globally, act locally', translated into language pedagogy as 'global thinking, local teaching' (Berman, 1994)" Kramsch and Sullivan (1996, p. 200).

Qualities Valued in Teachers and Students

Table 2 indicates the students' view of what makes a good student of English. About 74 percent of the students strongly agree with the idea that a good student of English should respect the teacher. The second most favorite characteristic is that a good student should follow the teacher and write down what the teacher says in class. Studying hard is another characteristic that the students think important. Contributing new ideas in class, speaking out when they don't agree with the teacher and studying independently outside the class are also considered to be the essential characteristics of a good student of English. Though most of the students agree with the idea that a good student is the one who should make suggestions to the teacher about running the class, the number of students who partly agree or disagree with this idea is considerably higher than the number of students who partly agree or disagree with the other items. It shows that some students are hesitant about making suggestions to the teacher as to how to run the class. Thus the Turkish students of English are socialized into a culture of learning in which a good student of English is considered as the one who respects the teacher and writes down what the teacher says in class and studies hard. It doesn't, however, prevent the students from speaking out when they don't agree with the teacher or making suggestions to the teacher about running the class. Thus the students don't consider such classroom behavior as showing disrespect to the teacher.

This document downloaded from 94.54.16.171 [2 times] Ankara / Turkey on Tue, 07 Apr 2020 18:37:27 +0300

Table 2. Characteristics of a Good Student of English

2	A good student of English:	strongly disagree %	Disagree %	partly agree %	agree %	strongly agree %
	should easily speak out when he/she doesn't agree with the teacher.	5.5	5,1	18,3	29,6	41,4
	should follow the teacher and write down what the teacher says in class.	4.4	2.5	8.1	24.8	60.3
	should study hard.	4.2	4.1	15.2	28.9	47.6
	should contribute new ideas in class.	3.5	4.1	18.6	31.3	42.5
	should respect the teacher.	2.9	1.0	3.4	18.9	73.8
	should study independently outside of class.	9.0	8.9	18.4	31.9	31.7
	should make suggestions to the teacher about running the class.	5.1	10.3	27.6	29.0	28.0

Table 3 indicates how the students view the characteristics of a good teacher of English. The data show that about sixty-nine percent of the students strongly agree with the idea that a good teacher is the one who teaches the students everything that they need to learn. The students also think that a good teacher of English is the one who should improve the students' English skills, who is very knowledgeable, knows how to teach well and knows everything about English. Having a sense of humor is another characteristics of a good teacher of English while being serious is less a favorable characteristics. The students also think that the teacher should organize the activities and they should be involved in the activities without the intervention of the teacher. This item result may seem to be conflicting with the mostly agreed item that a good teacher is the one who teaches the students everything that they need to learn. It may indicate that the students expect a presentation stage in the class where the teacher should teach them the language items that they need to learn and that they should write down what the teacher writes on the board. Later on, they would like to be involved in the activities without the intervention of the teacher. In fact tables 6 and 8 to be discussed later on indicate that most of the students find it necessary for the teacher to spare a lot of class time for instruction and to explain grammatical rules on the board. Thus the Turkish students of English are socialized into a culture of learning in which the teacher is primarily seen as a very knowledgeable person who knows everything and who teaches the students everything that the students need to learn. Thus the teacher as facilitator, which is a CLT view of teacher role adopted in the curricula, is not the only characteristics of the teacher valued by the Turkish students of English.

This document downloaded from 94.54.16.171 [2 times] Ankara / Turkey on Tue, 07 Apr 2020 18:37:27 +0300

Table 3. Characteristics of a Good Teacher of English

10	A good English teacher:	strongly disagree %	disagree %	partly agree %	agree %	strongly agree %
	should be very knowledgeable, know how to teach well and know everything about English.	4.7	2.7	8.3	21.4	62.9
	should teach me everything I need to learn.	3.1	2.6	5.2	19.7	69.4
	should organize the activities and the students should be involved in the activities without the intervention of the teacher.	4.9	6.5	17.0	28.4	43.2
	be serious.	12.3	12.4	31.6	18.1	25.7
	should have a sense of humor.	3.7	2.7	9.2	25.9	58.4
	should improve my English skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing).	2.6	1.7	6.7	24.2	64.9

Table 4 indicates that the students would like to see their teachers more as a friend than as their parents. The reason why the students mostly avoid considering their teachers as their parents could be that they perceive the teacher as a very knowledgeable person who will teach them what they need to learn in a formal setting and being a friend might mean being close to the knowledgeable person because of their admiration to this knowledge or the students might think that being close to the teacher would enable them to ask questions any time or to engage in intellectual conversation with the teacher anytime they wish.

Table 4. The students' View on the Teacher-Student Relationship

16	I like my teacher to be like my	strongly disagree %	disagree %	partly agree %	agree %	strongly agree %
	friend.	7.3	5.7	17.3	21.4	48.3
	parent.	16.4	13.1	26.9	19.1	24.5

In fact when the students were asked what they would do if they didn't understand a language point in class, as seen in table 5 the students stated that they would either ask the teacher immediately in the classroom or after the class. Thus they feel comfortable in both situations, which might indicate their desire to see the teacher more like a friend to be able to talk with the teacher any time when they don't understand a language point.

Table 5. The students' Attitudes Towards Asking Questions to the teacher in the Class

15	When I don't understand a language point I would:	strongly disagree	disagree	partly agree	agree	strongly agree
	ask my teacher immediately in the classroom.	4.7	7.7	26.9	30.5	30.2
	ask my teacher after the class.	9.1	12.8	32.9	25.2	19.9

This document downloaded from 94.54.16.171 [2 times] Ankara / Turkey on Tue, 07 Apr 2020 18:37:27 +0300

The Students' Beliefs About the Methodological Issues

Table 6 indicates that the students would like their teachers to spare a lot of class time for student activities as well as for instruction. Though it may seem that the students would prefer both teacher-centered and student-centered class it may also be interpreted as the students need presentation as well as practice while learning English.

Table 6. Student-centered or Teacher-centered Class

	Items	strongly disagree %	Disagree %	partly agree %	Agree %	strongly agree%
3	I would like my teacher to spare a lot of class time for student activities.	6.6	11.9	30.4	26.1	24.9
4	I would like my teacher to spare a lot of class time for instruction.	9.5	16.3	34.2	23.5	16.5

As to the type of activities that the students would like to be involved in the classroom Table 7 indicates that most of the students prefer pair work and group work activities as well as grammar-based activities. Most of the students, on the other hand, wouldn't like to carry out activities individually in the classroom.

Table 7. Students' Preference For Different Types of Activities

	Item	strongly disagree %	Disagree %	partly agree %	Agree %	strongly agree %
5	I like to do the activities by myself, not in pairs or groups.	25.8	29.5	21.9	10.9	11.9
6	I like to be involved in pairwork and group work activities.	7.0	6.6	17.0	30.7	38.7
7	I like to be involved in grammar-based activities.	5.8	5.2	24.2	32.1	32.7

As far as grammar-based activities involved, table 8 indicates that the students mostly prefer their teachers to explain the grammatical rules on the board, which means a deductive way of teaching grammar is favored by the students. It may also explain the situation as illustrated in Table 6 where the students would like the teacher to spare the class time for both student activities as well as for instruction. It means the students need to learn the grammar deductively, in other words, they need a presentation phase in the class, but they would also like to be involved in group work and pair work activities, in other words, they would like a practice phase which would be communicative in nature. The 2013 and 2018 ELT curricula of Turkey focus on the need to develop the students' communicative competence by largely emphasizing the use of English in classroom interactions and

This document downloaded from 94.54.16.171 [2 times] Ankara / Turkey on Tue, 07 Apr 2020 18:37:27 +0300

specifying communicative functions. Neither of the curricula gives any place to deductive grammar teaching or to grammar in their syllabus design.

Table 8. The Students' View On Deductive Grammar Teaching

	Item	strongly disagree %	Disagree %	partly agree %	Agree %	strongly agree %
11	I like my teacher to explain grammatical rules on the board.	3.9	2.1	9.4	27.3	57.3

Table 9 indicates that most of the students would like to learn English through translation and memorization and also that they would like to learn new words by memorization. This is an interesting result in that while the students favor group work and pair work activities they also place high importance on the necessity of translation and memorization when learning grammar and new words in English. It is a clear indication of the fact that the students do not adopt the principles and procedures of the communicative approach uniformly but that they have their own preferences which display a variety of procedures, some of which conflict with the principles of the communicative approach. Thus the Turkish learners of English display a culture of learning in which they place an emphasis on pair work and group work, the teaching of grammar deductively, learning English by translation, learning the new words by memorization and a methodology in which there is a place for presentation of language items and practice of them in pairs and groups.

Table 9. The Students' Attitudes Towards Learning English Through Translation and Memorization

	Item	strongly disagree %	Disagree %	partly agree %	agree %	strongly agree %
13	I like to learn English by translation (by translating English words and sentences into Turkish).	5.0	4.8	15.3	27.6	47.3
14	I like to learn new words by memorization.	5.8	6.5	20.7	28.0	38.8

The other important point relates to the use of the mother tongue in the classroom. Table 10 indicates that most of the students would like their teacher to explain the language points in Turkish and are against their teacher to speak only English in class.

Table 10. The students' Attitudes Towards The Use of The Mother Tongue in Class

	Item	strongly disagree %	disagree %	partly agree %	agree %	strongly agree %
8	I like my teacher to explain the language points in Turkish.	6.4	4.0	17.5	24.3	47.8
9	I like my teacher to speak only English in class.	32.8	25.7	24.7	6.9	9.9

This document downloaded from 94.54.16.171 [2 times] Ankara / Turkey on Tue, 07 Apr 2020 18:37:27 +0300

As for the treatment of student errors, table 11 indicates that most of the students would like their teachers to correct their mistake immediately when they make a mistake. This is in conflict with the 2013 and 2018 ELT curricula which argue (with the same sentence) that "errors are not addressed during communication, so as not to disrupt the flow; problem areas are noted by the teacher and addressed at a later time through practice and reinforcement" (2013 ELT curriculum, p. VII & 2018 ELT curriculum, p. 12). The students' wish for their teachers to correct their mistakes immediately may be the result of their view of the teacher as the most knowledgeable person who teaches the students everything that they need to learn.

Table 11. The students' Attitudes Towards The Teacher's Treatment of Student Errors

	Item	strongly disagree %	Disagree %	partly agree %	agree %	strongly agree %
12	I like my teacher to correct my mistake immediately when I make a mistake.	4.3	4.2	13.5	29.0	49.0

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Although the 2013 and 2018 ELT curricula claim to based on the action-oriented approach, they remain dependent on the communicative approach and there is not any special section devoted to the action-oriented perspective depicting its principles in both curricula. The communicative approach, most of whose principles are thus present in the 2013 and 2018 ELT curricula of Turkey, promotes a certain set of assumptions which are considered to be valid in all cultural contexts. Among these are the adoption of the native speaker based notion of communicative competence in English as the goal for the students, the role of the teacher as facilitator which is considered to be the ideal teacher role, the learner-centered methodology as the ideal way of learning for the students and the use of the target language in the classroom as the ideal medium of communication in teaching language. Such features mostly display a western culture of learning (Ellis, 1996; Kramsch and Sullivan, 1996; McKay, 2002; Swan, 1985) whose appropriacy should be questioned in the other cultural contexts. Since English as an international language does not belong to a certain country or culture it is no longer the language owned by the native speakers but also the language of the non-native speakers who use and adapt it in their own sociocultural contexts. Similarly teaching English as an international language should not be informed by a western methodology but by a methodology informed by the local culture of learning of a particular teaching context. Thus the teaching of EIL suggests devising methodologies appropriate to the local culture of learning.

The results of this survey reveal that Turkish students of English display some characteristics which are not in line with the characteristics of the communicative approach and the pedagogic principles adopted in both 2013 and 2018 Turkish ELT curricula. Regarding the aim of learning

This document downloaded from 94.54.16.171 [2 times] Ankara / Turkey on Tue, 07 Apr 2020 18:37:27 +0300

English, the students find it necessary to learn it thinking that it will help them find a good job in the future. Learning English for daily communication and to be able to use the internet are the other reasons for learning English. 2013 and 2018 curricula, on the other hand, neither state any goal relating to the students' need to learn English to find a good job in the future nor do they aim to enable the students to be able to use the internet. While there is an emphasis for learning English for daily communication in the curriculum, reading and writing skills are considered as secondary, which are, however, important for the students if they aim to learn English in Turkey to get a better job or to be able to use the internet.

When stating its communicative orientation both 2013 and 2018 ELT curricula state that The communicative approach entails the use of the target language not only as an object of study, but as a means of interacting with others; the focus is not necessarily on grammatical structures and linguistic functions, but on authentic use of the language in an interactive context in order to generate real meaning (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011; Richards, 2006) (2013 ELT curriculum, p.III & 2018 ELT curriculum, p.4).

The survey results also indicate that the Turkish learners of English are socialized into a culture of learning English in which they value pair work and group work activities as well as grammar-based activities and in which they believe in the necessity of translation and memorization in learning English. They also believe that the teacher should explain the grammatical rules on the board, which means a deductive way of teaching grammar is important for the students. Such characteristics of the students' culture of learning are mostly in conflict with the assumptions of the 2013 and 2018 curricula in that although pair work and group work activities are given place in the curriculum there is no emphasis on grammar-based activities nor any place for memorization or translation. There is also no principle favoring the deductive way of teaching grammar. Both 2013 and 2018 curricula state (with the same sentence) that "..attention to the formal aspects of language is an essential element in the construction of meaning; therefore, it is necessary to consider these in the context of communicative language learning. However, in accordance with Cameron's (2001) contention that children's grammatical knowledge of a language emerges naturally through "the space between words and discourse" (p. 18), the structural features of English are handled implicitly as learners/users develop communicative skills, rather than addressed as a separate issue." (2013 ELT curriculum, p. III-IV & 2018 ELT curriculum, p. 9)

Thus the way the teaching of grammar is dealt with in the curricula is in conflict with the students' culture of learning English.

The students also indicate that they would like the teacher to spare the class time for both student activities as well as for instruction. While it may be interpreted as indicating the students favor

This document downloaded from 94.54.16.171 [2 times] Ankara / Turkey on Tue, 07 Apr 2020 18:37:27 +0300

both student-centered and teacher-centered class it can also be interpreted as indicating they value a presentation phase in the class as well as activities in which they practice a language item taught in the presentation.

The Turkish students of English also have a culture of learning in which a good student of English is the one who respects the teacher, writes down what the teacher says in class and studies hard. They also favor contributing new ideas in the class as well as speaking out when they don't agree with the teacher. As to their beliefs about what makes a good teacher the students believe that a good teacher is the one who teaches the students everything that they need to learn. The students also think that a good teacher of English is the one who should improve the students' English skills, who is very knowledgeable, knows how to teach well and knows everything about English.

All these results indicate that Turkish students have certain believes about why they learn English or how they would like to learn English, which forms their culture of learning English. As discussed in the paper these results are mostly in conflict with the assumptions about language and language learning adopted in the Turkish ELT curricula. The main reason of this is that the curriculum development process in Turkey is what may be called top-down curriculum development in which the students are not asked why and how they want to learn English, which results in the imposition of standards set by the authorities, ignoring the students' culture of learning English. An appropriate EIL pedagogy, on the other hand, suggests devising appropriate methodologies appropriate to the local culture of learning. Thus the current ELT curriculum of Turkey needs to be revised by taking into consideration the Turkish students' culture of learning English.

REFERENCES

Acar, A. (2007). Standards and competence in English as an international language pedagogy. *Journal of English as an International language*, 2, 65-81.

Aydın, B. (2017). Türkiye'de Hazırlık Okullarında Yaşanan Sorunlara Bir Çözüm Önerisi: Anadolu Üniversitesi Örneği. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Alptekin, C. (2002). Towards intercultural communicative competence in ELT. *ELT Journal, 56*(1), 57-64.

Canale, M. 1983. 'From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy' in J. C. Richards and R. W. Schmidt (eds.). *Language and Communication*. London: Longman.

Cortazzi, M., & Jin, L. (1996). Cultures of learning: Language classrooms in China. In H. Coleman (Ed.), *Society and the language classroom* (pp. 169-206). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, G. (1996). How culturally appropriate is the communicative approach? *ELT Journal*, 50(3), 213-218.

Flowerdew, J. and Miller, L. (1995). On the notion of culture in second language lectures. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(2), 345-374.

Kachru, B.B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk and H. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures* (pp. 11-30). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

This document downloaded from 94.54.16.171 [2 times] Ankara / Turkey on Tue, 07 Apr 2020 18:37:27 +0300

Kachru, B.B. (1990). World Englishes and applied linguistics. *World Englishes*, 9(1),3-20.

Kachru, B.B. (1992). Models for non-native Englishes. In B.B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (2nd ed.) (pp. 48-74). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Kramsch, C. and P. Sullivan. **(**1996). 'Appropriate pedagogy'. *ELT Journal,* 50(3), 199–212.

McKay, S.L. (2002). *Teaching English as an international language: Rethinking goals and approaches.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McKay, S. L. (2003). Toward an appropriate EIL pedagogy: Re-examining common ELT assumptions. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 13*(1), 1-22.

Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı¸ (MEB) [Turkish Ministry of National Education]. (2013). İlköğretim Kurumları (İlkokullar ve Ortaokullar) İngilizce Dersi (2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 ve 8. Sınıflar) Öğretim Programı [Elementary (Primary and Lower Secondary) English Language Teaching Program (Grades 2-8)]. Ankara: T.C. Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı.

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)]. Ankara: T.C. Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı.

Nunn, R. 2011. 'From Defining to Developing Competence in EIL and Intercultural Communication.' *Journal of English as an International Language*, 6/1: 21-46.

Puren, C. (2014). Approche communicative et perspective actionnelle, deux organismes méthodologiques génétiquement opposés… et complémentaires. Retrieved from (17 March 2018) https://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2014a/.

Richards, J.C. (2006). *Communicative Language Teaching Today.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Saydı, T. (2015). L'approche actionnelle et ses particularités en comparaison avec l'approche communicative, *Synergies Turquie*, 8, 13-28.

Swan, M. (1985). A critical look at the Communicative Approach (2). *ELT Journal*, 39(2), 76-87.

This document downloaded from 94.54.16.171 [2 times] Ankara / Turkey on Tue, 07 Apr 2020 18:37:27 +0300