MİLLÎ EĞİTİM ● Cilt: 48 ● Sayı: 224, (299-325)

TÜRKİYE'DEKİ 2013 VE 2018 İLKOKULLAR VE ORTAOKULLAR İNGİLİZCE DERSİ ÖĞRETİM PROGRAMLARININ KARŞILAŞTIRILMASI: 7. SINIF İZLENCELERİNİN ANALİZİ

ARAŞTIRMA MAKALESİ

Ahmet ACAR[1]

1 Dr. Öğretim Üyesi; Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Buca Eğitim Fakültesi, Yabancı Diller Eğitim Bölümü, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı, İzmir, Email: ahmet.acar@deu.edu.tr, ORCID ID: 0000-0001-8940-4359.

Geliş Tarihi: 25.12.2018 **Kabul Tarihi:** 19.07.2019

Öz: Bu çalışmanın amacı, 2018 İngilizce öğretim programının bir önceki öğretim programına yani 2013 programına kıyasla hangi yenilikleri getirdiğini araştırmak için, Türkiye'deki 2013 ve 2018 ilkokullar ve ortaokullar İngilizce dersi öğretim programlarını karşılaştırmaktır. Her iki öğretim programı detaylı bir şekilde karşılaştırılırken, kelime sınırlamasından dolayı sadece yedinci sınıf izlenceleri ele alınacaktır. Bu çalışma eğitim araştırmalarında nitel araştırma modeline dayanmış olup, 2013 ve 2018 öğretim programlarının önemli bölümlerini, yani, ihtiyaç analizi, hedefler ve amaçlar, izlence (içerik), yöntem, materyaller, ölçme ve değerlendirme, haftalık ders saatleri, sınıfta anadil kullanımı konularını analiz edip karşılaştırarak 2018 İngilizce programının Türkiye'deki İngilizce öğretimine hangi yenilikleri getirdiğini saptamak için döküman analizi kullanılmıştır. İhtiyaç analizini ele alma, hedefler, yaklaşım ve yöntem, materyal türleri ve sınıfta anadil kullanımı konularında iki öğretim programı arasında bir fark görülmemiştir. İzlence düzenlemesi, yedinci sınıflarda konu seçimi, amaçlar (amaçların farklı başlıklar altında yer alması), haftalık ders saatleri, ölçme ve değerlendirme alanlarında küçük çaplı değişiklikler gözlemlenmiştir. Kuramsal altyapının birçok bölümü her iki öğretim programında da aynı olmakla birlikte, 2018 İngilizce öğretim programına, "öğretim programında değerler eğitimi", "öğretim programında anahtar yetiler", "dil becerilerini ölçmek için önerilen sınav teknikleri", "önerilen bağlamlar ve görevler/etkinlikler" gibi bazı ilave bölümler eklenmiştir. 2013 İngilizce öğretim programının "İletişimsel işlevler ve örnek dil kullanımları" bölümü 2018 İngilizce öğretim programından çıkarılmıştır. 2018 İngilizce öğretim programı, 2013 İngilizce öğretim programının birçok bölümünü alıntı yapmadan kopyalamıştır.

Anahtar sözcükler: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı İngilizce ders programı, İngilizce dersi izlence değerlendirme, doküman analizi, program değerlendirme

A COMPARISON OF THE 2013 AND 2018 PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS ELT CURRICULA IN TURKEY: AN ANALYSIS OF 7th-GRADE SYLLABI

Abstract:

The aim of this study is to compare the 2013 and 2018 primary and secondary schools ELT curricula in Turkey in order to explore which new contributions the 2018 ELT curriculum brought compared to the previous curriculum, namely, 2013 ELT curriculum. While the two curricula are compared in detail, only the seventh-grade syllabi will be referred to due to word limitations. This study adopts a qualitative approach to educational research and hence utilizes a document analysis to find out which new contributions the 2018 ELT curriculum brought to English education in Turkey by analyzing and comparing important components of 2013 and 2018 curricula, namely, needs analysis, goals and objectives, the syllabus (content), method, materials, assessment and evaluation, weekly class hours, the use of mother tongue in the classroom. No differences were found in terms of the treatment of needs analysis, goals, approach and method, types of materials and the use of the mother tongue. Minor revisions are observed in the organization of syllabus, the selection of topics in the seventh grade, objectives (the place of objectives under different titles), weekly class hours, assessment and evaluation. While many parts of the theoretical background are identical, some additional sections are added to the 2018 ELT curriculum such as "values education in the curriculum", "key competencies in the curriculum", "suggested testing techniques for the assessment of language skills" and "suggested contexts and task/activities". The "communicative functions and sample uses of language" section of the 2013 ELT curriculum is deleted in the 2018 ELT curriculum. The 2018 ELT curriculum copies many sections of the 2013 ELT curriculum without citations.

Keywords: Ministry of National Education English curriculum, evaluation of English course syllabus, document analysis, curriculum evaluation

1. Introduction

Since the curriculum shapes the overall plan, implementation, and evaluation of the English teaching program, it plays an important role in the success or failure of English education in Turkey. From 1991 to 2018, many ELT curricula have been developed in Turkey. The reasons for the changes in the curricula are varied. The 1991 ELT curriculum covered the first three years of secondary education and there was

no English education in primary school. At that time, primary education lasted five years, secondary education lasted three years and there was a three-year high school education. In 1997, the period of compulsory education was extended to eight years. Thus, the Turkish education system consisted of eight-year primary education and three-year high school education. The teaching of English began in the fourth grade of primary education. In order to compensate for the gap in the 1991 ELT curriculum, a new ELT curriculum was written in 1997 for the fourth and fifth grades. The 1997 ELT curriculum, however, did not propose a new literature section, that is, the theoretical basis of the two curricula are the same. Instead, it added two syllabi (for 4th and 5th grades) in the same syllabus design (function, structure, and vocabulary) as the 1991 ELT curriculum, which continued to be implemented at sixth, seventh and eighth grades without any changes.

In the 2005-2006 education year, the duration of high school education was extended to four years. Thus, the new education system became an 8+4 as opposed to 8+3 education system carried out up to that date. There was no change, however, in the 8th year uninterrupted compulsory primary school education system. Still, in 2006, a new ELT curriculum was developed for the primary schools, with changes in objectives, approach, and evaluation. English education still began at the fourth grade but 2 hours of elective English courses were added to the fourth and fifth grades. Thus while in the 1997 ELT curriculum the students received 2 hours of compulsory English instruction at the fourth and fifth grades, in 2006 the students received 2 hours of compulsory English education and preferably 2 hours of elective English courses.

In 2012, there was a transition from the 8+4 education system to a new 4+4+4 education system. Thus compulsory education was extended to twelve years from eight years. Instead of an eight-year uninterrupted compulsory primary education, the new system consisted of an interrupted and compulsory four-year primary, four-year secondary and four-year high school education. In this new system 66 months (5.5 years) old children are enrolled in primary education. English education beginning at the fourth grade in the 8+4 education system began at the second grade in the new 4+4+4 education system and a new ELT curriculum covering these changes was developed and began to be implemented in 2013.

In 2018, a new ELT curriculum was developed for the primary and secondary schools although there were no changes in primary and secondary school English educational system. It is also important to note that in the fifth grade of the public secondary schools a new intensive English language teaching program was piloted in 2017-2018. While this new intensive English teaching program in the 5th grade of public secondary schools had been expected to be compulsory throughout Turkey, it was made optional in the 2018-2019 academic year. The 2018 ELT curriculum for the primary and secondary schools, however, was not written to cover this change. Rather, a new ELT curriculum was written in 2017 for the fifth grades. This paper aims to compare the

2013 and 2018 primary and secondary ELT curricula to find out which new contributions the 2018 ELT curriculum brought by analyzing important components of the 2013 and 2018 curricula, namely, needs analysis, goals and objectives, the syllabus (content), method, materials, assessment and evaluation, weekly class hours, the use of mother tongue in the classroom. At the syllabus level, only seventh-grade syllabi (selected randomly among different syllabi in the 2013 and 2018 curricula) were compared since evaluating all the syllabi for each grade will exceed the page limitation.

2. Research method

This study adopts a qualitative research and a document analysis method was used as a research method to find out which new contributions the 2018 ELT curriculum brought to English education in Turkey by analyzing and comparing important components of 2013 and 2018 curricula, namely, needs analysis, goals and objectives, the syllabus (content), method, materials, assessment and evaluation, weekly class hours, the use of mother tongue in the classroom. Bowen (2009) defines document analysis as "a systematic procedure for reviewing or evaluating documents—both printed and electronic (computer-based and Internet-transmitted) material" (p.27). The documents used in this study were taken from the official website of the Ministry of National Education and the data were obtained through document analysis. The central question of this research is:

1. Are there any differences between the 2013 and 2018 primary and secondary schools ELT curricula of Turkey in terms of needs analysis, goals and objectives, the syllabus (content), method, materials, assessment and evaluation, weekly class hours and the use of mother tongue in the classroom.

For this purpose, the 2013 ELT curriculum and 2018 ELT curriculum were analysed and compared to find out whether the 2018 ELT curriculum differs from the 2013 ELT curriculum and offers new solutions to the problems of English language teaching in Turkey.

3. Findings

The comparison in this section covers a needs analysis, goals and objectives, the syllabus (content), method, materials, evaluation, weekly class hours and the use of mother tongue in the classroom.

3.1. Defining needs in 2013 and 2018 primary and secondary schools ELT curricula

The first issue to be addressed is whether the 2013 and 2018 ELT curricula meet the needs and interests of the primary and secondary school students (that is to say, which topics they would like to study or which activities they would like to be involved in). According to Brown (1995), a curriculum development process consists of six phases: Conducting a needs analysis, setting goals and objectives, designing tests, de-

veloping materials, teaching, and doing program evaluation. Nunan (1988), similarly, argues that

It is possible to study the curriculum of an educational institution from a number of different perspectives. In the first instance, we can look at curriculum planning, that is at decision making, in relation to identifying learners' needs and purposes; establishing goals and objectives; selecting and grading content; organizing appropriate learning arrangements and learner groupings; selecting, adapting, and developing appropriate materials, learning tasks, and assessment tools and evaluation tools (p.4).

As Nunan states in the above quote, the curriculum development process begins with a needs analysis, which would, in turn, affects the rest of the curriculum, mainly, objectives, syllabus, the selection of an appropriate method and specifying the materials.

Many curriculum development processes, however, neglect this important phase of the curriculum and disregard the students' English language learning needs. Rather, the curriculum is written by a group of people, thus this process can be called a top-down curriculum development. Brooker and Macdonald (1999) state that

Whether students have an opportunity to contribute meaningfully to centrally developed school curricula is a question that deserves close study…At best, learners' opinions are sought only after significant decisions (e.g. the selection of legitimate content) have already been made and the curriculum has been determined by officially approved persons (Aronowitz and Giroux 1993) (p. 83).

Indeed, in a study exploring the students' English language needs, Acar (2018) indicated many conflicts between the principles of the 2013 ELT curriculum and the students' preferences in learning English. These conflicts mainly relate to the students' aim in learning English and the aim adopted in the curriculum, the students' methodological choices (the types of activities) and the types of activities adopted in the curriculum, as well as the use of the mother tongue in instruction. This study indicates the gap between the students' preferences and those of the curriculum developers in a Turkish context.

Many studies suggest teachers' involvement in the curriculum development process. (See for example Handler, 2010). Taba was against Tyler's (1949) suggestions that "curriculum should be created by curriculum specialists at the district level but advocated that curriculum development should be a bottom-up process with teachers in central roles for development and leadership" (Taba, cited in Handler, 2010, p. 33). Concerning English teachers and their role in the curriculum development process in the primary and secondary schools in Turkey, however, it can be said that teachers'needs and voices are not considered in the curriculum development process either (e.g. Saracaloğlu, Yılmaz, Çengel, Çöğmen, Karademir, Kanmaz, 2010). There are excep-

tions, though, at higher levels of education like that of Anadolu University School of Foreign Languages, which offers intensive preparatory English programs at Anadolu University and following Taba (1962), this institution actively involves teachers in the curriculum development process (Aydın, 2017). Besides, 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).

As far as the primary and secondary schools are concerned, on the other hand, English teachers in mainstream schools usually take on the role of implementers of a curriculum. In other words, they do not take part in the planning phase of the ELT curriculum but have a role in the implementation phase, that is, in the classroom. In the curriculum evaluation process carried out by the Turkish Ministry of National Education, the teachers are also given evaluation forms to evaluate the curriculum. Again this is only after the curriculum is implemented rather than before the curriculum is planned and there are some doubts as to whether these results are taken into consideration in developing the new curriculum. For example, in a study conducted by Saracaloğlu et al. (2010) related to the elementary teachers' views about their roles in curriculum development and evaluation process in the case of Denizli, teachers report the following (P represents participants, that is, teachers):

P2: It is hard to say this study has a lot of contribution. I do not think that something has been changed because of our study. Actually, if they would take into consideration our opinions more, they could solve some problems easier.

P3: Nominally we give some information every end of the year. We evaluate the curriculum. However, I think that they even do not take it into consideration.

P6: All this study is grounded on some positive intent. In the process, they are taking our opinions. However, the revised curriculum is not even close to our advice. So, I do not think that this study is a functional one.

P7: Before this curriculum implemented, they gave some seminars, and they took our opinions. They said ok, the books will be edited according to your opinions. Then, we realized that the books haven't changed. We did study a lot, we gave our opinions, but they even have not taken them into consideration. (p. 2439)

When the 2018 Turkish ELT curriculum is analyzed, neither any data nor any reference can be found as to whether the textbook writers, school directors, and inspectors are consulted when the new curriculum is developed. School directors can give valuable data as to the physical conditions of the school, class population, student grouping and if there are enough English teachers to carry out the English classes within

the class hours set in the curriculum. Inspectors can also provide data based on their inspection as to how far the curriculum is implemented successfully by the teachers and school directors, and to the related problems observed. Textbook writers, on the other hand, are those who are supposed to write the textbooks according to the syllabi and methodology offered in the curriculum. In this respect, they are bound by the curriculum. Their opinions are valuable with respect to different phases of the curriculum such as the selection and number of topics as well as the types of activities in the curriculum. Thus it can be said that there is a lack of coordination between curriculum developers and students, teachers, textbook writers, inspectors, and school directors in the ELT curriculum development process in Turkey.

In a nutshell, with regard to needs analysis before curriculum development, the 2013 ELT curriculum does not mention any needs analysis application. The 2018 ELT curriculum, on the other hand, states that "the present revision, not a drastic one, primarily aims at updating the program with regards to the views obtained from the teachers, parents, and academicians" (p.3). While the curriculum claims that it was developed by considering the opinions of the teachers, parents, and academicians, these opinions are not documented in a table, which does not enable us to see what these opinions are and which aspects of the previous ELT curriculum (2013 curriculum) were changed according to these opinions, nor is there any reference given in the references indicating the presence of such documented research.

It is also important to note that when a draft version of the 2018 ELT curriculum was first published in 2017, a wide range of groups such as non-governmental organizations, English teachers and academicians were consulted and their opinions about the draft version were taken (Kaplan, 2017). This is, however, only after the curriculum was developed rather than before the curriculum was planned. Moreover, another interesting point is that the draft version of the 2018 ELT curriculum which was published in 2017 and the original version which was published in 2018 are the same, although, according to Kaplan (2017), 998 new suggestions related to the draft were emailed to the Ministry of National Education by these groups.

As for the students' English language needs, the 2018 ELT curriculum is not based on such a needs analysis. Thus, what was taken as a basis to shape the new curriculum (a needs analysis or some other criteria) is a matter of debate. The 2018 ELT curriculum states that

In designing the new English language curriculum, the principles and descriptors of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment (CEFR) were closely followed. 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 (p. 3).

Again the 2018 curriculum goes on to claim that

Basically, the curriculum was reviewed and revised in line with the pedagogic philosophy of both basic skills and values education, which has been a minor revision in that the English language education curriculum focuses on developing the language skills and proficiency without any concrete course content (p. 3).

CEFR seems to have had an impact on the development of both the 2013 and the 2018 ELT curricula rather than the views obtained from the teachers, parents, and academicians. Even if such groups were consulted as in the case of the draft version of the 2018 ELT curriculum, this is only after the curriculum was written. It is also important to note that the views obtained from different groups about the draft did not lead to any revision in the original version of the 2018 curriculum. In fact, the only revision made on the draft version of the 2018 curriculum is the exclusion of the section "Sample Communicative Functions and Suggested Useful Language." The 2018 ELT curriculum, on the other hand, was revised in accordance with basic skills and values education as well as the notion of key competencies, which is only a minor revision as the developers of the curriculum admits.

In short, when investigated in terms of the inclusion of needs analysis in the curriculum development process, it is seen that neither the 2013 nor the 2018 secondary school ELT curriculum made use of needs, opinions, and expectations of students, teachers, textbook writers, inspectors, and school directors. In this case it seems authorities planned all phases of the curriculum, namely, goals and objectives of learners for learning English (why to learn English), the selection and grading of content (what to learn or syllabus), the type of activities to be employed in the classroom (how to learn English or methodology), materials, assessment and evaluation.

Table 1. Needs, Opinions, and Expectations of Students, Teachers, Textbook Writers, Inspectors and School Directors Before Planning the Curriculum

2013 ELT curriculum	2018 ELT curriculum
no needs analysis and opinion survey before planning the curriculum*	no needs analysis and opinion survey before planning the curriculum*

*There is no needs analysis survey result in the text, neither is there any research document given in references.

3.2 Goals and objectives

Goals are general statements about the students' desired level of achievement in English. These will provide a rationale for the course or programme (Nunan, 1988, p. 24). Objectives, on the other hand, are more specific statements about the students' performance in English. Mager (1975), an influential proponent of performance objectives, sees them as curriculum 'signposts' which indicate our destination (Nunan, 1988, p. 65).

When the 2013 ELT curriculum is investigated, it can be seen that it includes both an affective goal and a communicative goal. As an affective goal, the 2013 curriculum states that "developing a positive attitude toward English from the earliest stages is essential; therefore, the new curriculum strives to foster an enjoyable and motivating learning environment where young learners/users of English feel comfortable and supported throughout the learning process" (2013 ELT curriculum, 2013, p. II).

The curriculum also adopts a communicative goal:

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)

To emphasize this communicative ability, the 2013 ELT curriculum states that "students listen and speak just as they would in a target language community" (p. VII). On the next page, this sentence is repeated in Turkish as "Öğrenciler gerçek yaşamda o dili konuşan insanlar gibi dinleme ve konuşma eylemlerinde bulunurlar" (p. VIII). Firstly, when we consider that the 2013 (2-8) ELT curriculum aims to take the primary and secondary school students to A2 proficiency level in English, it would be unrealistic to expect "the students to listen and speak just as they would in a target language community". Secondly, if we intend "Turkey's citizens to communicate effectively on an international level" (2013 ELT curriculum, p. II), then our students do not need to "listen and speak just as they would in a target language community" since they will not use English in the target language community but on an international level as stated in the curriculum (also see Acar, 2010; Alptekin, 2002; McKay, 2002, 2003; Nunn, 2005, 2007, 2011)

The 2018 ELT curriculum also adopts the same affective and communicative goals expressed with the same sentences as in the 2013 ELT curriculum (without any citation). In this respect, the criticism leveled against the 2013 ELT curriculum regarding this issue is also valid for the 2018 ELT curriculum.

The 2013 ELT curriculum states objectives within the syllabus. It should be noted that the term "objective" is not used to refer to what the students will be able to achieve

at the end of the units. These are referred to as "outcomes" rather than "objectives". The syllabus is formed of unit/theme, communicative functions, and skills, suggested lexis/ language use, suggested text, and activity types and assessment. Specific objectives in 2013 are stated in terms of skills, compensation strategies, and attitudes under "communicative functions and skills" in the syllabus. The 2018 ELT curriculum also states objectives within the syllabus. The syllabus, however, is formed of unit/theme, functions, and useful language, language skills, and learning outcomes, suggested contexts, tasks, and assignments. In this curriculum, specific objectives are also stated in terms of skills but treated under "language skills and learning outcomes". Objectives related to compensation strategies and attitudes in 2013 are removed in 2018.

Table 2. Goals and Objectives

2013 ELT curriculum	2018 ELT curriculum
Goals:	
-to develop a positive attitude in students toward English	-to develop a positive attitude in students toward English
-to develop the ability of Turkey's citizens to communicate effectively on an international level	-to develop the ability of Turkey's citizens to communicate effectively on an international level
-to enable the students to listen and speak just as they would in a target language community	-to enable the students to listen and speak just as they would in a target language community
Objectives: (7th grade) topic: appearance and personality	(7th grade) topic: appearance and personality
Listening	**Listening**
Students generally will be able to understand clear, standard speech on appearance and personality, although in a real-life situation, they might have to ask for repetition or reformulation.	E7.1.L1. Students will be able to understand clear, standard speech on appearances and personalities
Spoken Interaction	**Spoken Interaction**
Students will be able to ask and answer questions about other people's appearances and personalities.	E7.1.SI1. Students will be able to talk about other people's appearances and personalities.
Spoken Production	**Spoken Production**
Students will be able to talk about what people look like.	E7.1.SP1. Students will be able to report on appearances and personalities of other people.

Reading	**Reading**
Students will be able to understand a simple text about appearances and personalities and make simple comparisons.	E7.1.R1. Students will be able to understand a simple text about appearances and personalities, and comparisons including explanations and reasons.
Writing	**Writing**
Students will be able to write simple sentences and phrases to compare two people.	E7.1.W1. Students will be able to write simple pieces to compare people (p. 72).
Compensation Strategies	
Students will be able to relate new information to visual concepts in memory via familiar, easily retrievable visualizations.	
Attitudes	
Students will be able to display a willingness to communicate with their peers in English (p. 57).	

3.3 Syllabus

Nunan (1988) makes a distinction between curriculum which "is concerned with the planning, implementation, evaluation, management, and administration of education programmes" (p.8) and syllabus which "focuses more narrowly on the selection and grading of content" (p.8). Thus, syllabus, according to Nunan (1988), is a subpart of the planning phase of the curriculum.

In this paper, the term syllabus is used to refer to the selection and grading of content. It should also be noted here that Nunan (1988) makes a distinction between a "narrow view of syllabus design" and a "broad view of syllabus design". He argues that

The narrow view draws a clear distinction between syllabus design and methodology. Syllabus design is seen as being concerned essentially with the selection and grading of content, while methodology is concerned with the selection of learning tasks and activities. Those who adopt a broader view question this strict separation, arguing that with the advent of communicative language teaching the distinction between content and tasks is difficult to sustain." (Nunan, 1988, p.5)

Thus, syllabi in both 2013 and 2018 can be defined as a broad view of syllabus design since they include activities and tasks within the syllabus. Both curricula adopt a mixed or hybrid syllabus. The syllabus in 2013 is divided into unit/theme, com-

municative functions and skills, suggested lexis / language use, suggested text and activity types, assessment. The syllabus in 2018, on the other hand, includes unit/theme, functions, and useful language, language skills, and learning outcomes, suggested contexts, tasks, and assignments.

Table 3. Syllabus Content

2013 ELT curriculum	2018 ELT curriculum
Unit/theme	Unit/theme
Communicative functions and skills	Functions and useful language
Suggested lexis/language use	Language skills and learning outcomes
Suggested text and activity types	Suggested contexts, tasks, and assignments
Assessment	

In accordance with Nunan's (1988) definition of curriculum and syllabus, the elements included in the 2013 and 2018 syllabi in Turkey such as "suggested text and activity types", "assessment", "learning outcomes" and "suggested contexts, tasks, and assignments" are beyond the scope of syllabus design. These items are not components of the syllabus but rather of the curriculum. According to Nunan (1988), in assessment "we would try and find out what students had learned and what they had failed to learn in relation to what had been planned" (p. 4). "Learning outcomes", on the other hand, are what can be defined as "objectives" of a curriculum, which must be written at the second stage after needs analysis. The components of the curriculum are outlined by Nunan (1988) in the following table.

Table 4. Components of ELT Curriculum

A. PLANNING PHASE OF THE CURRICULUM
1. Conducting needs analysis (e.g. identifying learners' needs and purposes in learning English)
2. Establishing goals and objectives (learning outcomes)
3. Specifying the syllabus (selecting and grading content), (specifying what to teach)
4. Selecting the appropriate approach and/or method (specifying how to teach)
5. Selecting or developing appropriate materials (textbook, realia, audio materials, etc.)

B. IMPLEMENTATION

In terms of implementation, "we can study the curriculum in action as it were. This second perspective takes us into the classroom itself. Here we can observe the teaching/learning process and study the ways in which the intentions of the curriculum planners, which were developed during the planning phase, are translated into action." (Nunan, 1988, p. 4)

C. ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION

When we consider Nunan's (1988) definition of ELT curriculum, the syllabus is a sub-component of the planning phase of the curriculum, where we specify what to teach, thus we can list such components as grammar, function, notion, topic, theme, lexis, etc. in the syllabus. It is important to note that in 2013, the syllabus includes "assessment" but the 2018 ELT curriculum does not include this element in the syllabus, instead "assignments" are included. According to Nunan (1988), both "assessment" and "assignments" are elements which are beyond the scope of syllabus design. The "assessment" component in the 2013 ELT curriculum should have been placed in the last phase of the curriculum rather than the syllabus.

In the 2013 ELT curriculum, "syllabus", "methodology" (activities) and "assessment" are intermingled. In 2018, on the other hand, "learning outcomes" (learning objectives), "methodology" (tasks), "assignments" and "syllabus" are merged into one another.

As for the treatment of topics/themes in the syllabi, both 2013 and 2018 ELT curricula include 10 topics/themes in the 7th-grade syllabus.

Table 5. Units/Themes in 7th-grade syllabi

2013 ELT curriculum	2018 ELT curriculum
Unit 1. Appearance and Personality	Unit 1. Appearance and Personality
Unit 2. Biographies	Unit 2. Biographies
Unit 3. Sports	Unit 3. Sports
Unit 4. Wild Animals	Unit 4. Wild Animals
Unit 5. Television	Unit 5. Television
Unit 6. Parties	Unit 6. Celebrations
Unit 7. Superstitions	Unit 7. Dreams
Unit 8.Public Buildings	Unit 8. Public Buildings
Unit 9. Environment	Unit 9. Environment
Unit 10. Planets	Unit 10. Planets

As seen in table 3., there are ten units in both syllabi and two units in 2013 ELT syllabus, namely, unit 6 and unit 7 were changed in 2018 ELT syllabus while the other units are kept the same. Just because two units are changed in the syllabus, 7th-grade textbooks would necessarily change, which would be a rather high-cost issue for Turkey.

3.4 Approach and Method

In terms of the approaches and methods adopted in the curriculum, 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 action-oriented approach is adopted from the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). The problem with this statement, however, is that it presents the action-oriented approach as an approach which aims to train learners to communicate in English, and thus it does not make a distinction between the action-oriented approach and the communicative approach. The second problem is that the statement does not explain how the eclectic approach should be used within the framework of the action-oriented approach.

The action-oriented approach as adopted by CEFR views students or learners as social agents /actors "who can live and work together in a long term in a multilingual and multicultural society as outlined by CEFR rather than as communicators as a short term visitor in a foreign language society" (Acar, 2019, p. 127). As social actors/agents, these students are expected to go beyond the goal of communication and to carry out social actions which can be characterized as mini-projects or projects of project pedagogy as indicated by Puren (2002, 2008, 2014). Acar (2019, p.129) explains the difference between the communicative approach and the action-oriented approach in the following way:

Thus the main characteristics of the communicative approach are its adoption of the tourist trip as the social reference situation and of exchange of information as a social reference action. The action-oriented approach, on the other hand, takes as a social reference situation the multilingual and multicultural society as in CEFR and it takes as social reference action living and working with people from different cultures in the

long term. In other words, while the communicative approach aims to prepare learners to communicate with foreigners in the short term as a tourist, the action-oriented approach aims the prepare social actors to live and work together in the long term in the multilingual and multicultural society.

Along with the action-oriented approach and eclectic approach, the communicative approach is also given a high focus in the curriculum. The developers of 2013 ELT curriculum (e.g. Kırkgöz, Çelik, and Arıkan, 2016), state in one of their articles that:

To accomplish this, the program was designed to encompass a communicative approach to language teaching, highlighting the forms and lexis of English in real-life contexts in order to create relevance in learners' daily lives. (p. 1205)

The developers of the 2013 ELT curriculum deals with the action-oriented approach as synonymous with the communicative approach. There is no guidance as to the similarities or differences between the two approaches. Acar (2019, p. 131-133) gives a comparison of the action-oriented approach and the communicative approach in a table:

Table 1. The Action-Oriented Approach and The Communicative Approach

The action-oriented approach is based on Dewey's educational notion of pragmatism with reference to socio-cognitive dimension in line with Piaget (constructivist psychology) and Vygotsky (social, collective constructivism), whose implementation is reflected in project pedagogy of Dewey, Freinet, and Decroly.	The communicative approach is based on no sound theory of learning.
The action-oriented approach goes beyond the view of language as a means of communication. It doesn't view communication as not end in itself but as a means of doing something, in other words, communication is at the service of action.	The communicative approach views language as a means of communication.
The goal of language teaching is to train social actors who will live and work together in a multilingual and multicultural society	The goal of language teaching is to train learners to meet the natives of foreign languages on a tourist trip and enable them to be involved in successful interaction.

The goal of language teaching also adopts a more general educational goal, that of educating democratic citizens as promoted by Dewey, Decroly, and Freinet.	The goal of language teaching does not have a broader educational goal beyond communication.
The social situation of reference is a multilingual and multicultural society	The social situation of reference is the target language society where the learners would take a tourist trip.
The reference activity is action (common action or co-action as in a real project).	The reference activities are simulations, role plays and various communicative activities with an emphasis on speech acts
While the action-oriented approach favors real projects and in cases in which it is not possible to carry out real projects then realistic simulations.	The communicative approach does not give any priority to realistic simulations but it consists of full of artificial simulations as well.
In the co-action perspective, it is the unity of action: "Making a poster of your favourite heroes", "Recording a radio show on animals", "Preparing a Christmas show", "Celebrating a birthday at school", "Organizing mini Olympiads at school", to use some titles from a teaching material for early English teaching, whose different didactic units are also significantly called "projects" (Puren, 2008e, p.13).	In the communicative approach, it is the unity of place ("In the street", "At the post office", "At the café"), but also behind the unity of characters, time and theme of conversion: a dialogue of a communicative textbook, they are the same people speaking for a limited time in the same place about the same thing (uniqueness of the theme of conversation) (Puren, 2008e, p.13).
The action-oriented approach aims to train learners for both individual autonomy and collective autonomy in both as groups and as whole class and this autonomy is given to the individuals and the whole class in the initial stage of a class by allowing them to choose their projects that they will work on and learners can search and add their own documents (informational competence).	The communicative approach focuses on individual autonomy by allowing the students to carry out communicative activities themselves but the activities and documents are provided to students by the teacher, in which case the students' autonomy is more restricted.

The action-oriented approach requires a co-cultural component (a culture shared by and for collective action), which is necessary for co-action, in which the focus is on common cultures of action in the multicultural environment (building a common cultural competence in cultural diversity in the sense that getting along with someone requires understanding him/her since just listening to him in communication is not enough) so the matter is not knowing who we are but what we are going to do with who we are, and what to do together both despite and with our differences.	The communicative approach requires intercultural component (the discovery of otherness and the awareness of one's own identity), which is necessary for cross-cultural communication (in a tourist trip).
Competence is both communicative competence and informational competence.	Competence is communicative competence.
In the action-oriented approach, the evaluation criterion is social action: both the process (collective action and individual participation in that collective action) of work (project) and the final product are evaluated.	The communicative approach assesses successful communication.

In the 2013 curriculum, there is no guidance for the teachers and textbook writers as to how the communicative approach differs from action-oriented approach (or how the action-oriented approach is complementary to the communicative approach) and these two are presented as if they are synonymous with each other. In this case, how will the teachers add to their understanding of the communicative approach the new action perspective adopted in the 2013 ELT curriculum?

The 2018 ELT curriculum does not differ in any respect from the 2013 ELT curriculum as regards the approach adopted as it repeats the same sentences (again without any citation) used in the 2013 ELT curriculum:

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).

Just as the 2013 ELT curriculum, the 2018 ELT curriculum also adopts both the action-oriented approach, the communicative approach, and the eclectic approach. The same criticism leveled against 2013 ELT curriculum, thus, is also valid for the 2018 ELT curriculum.

Table 6. Approaches and Methods Adopted in the Curriculum

2013 ELT curriculum	2018 ELT curriculum
Communicative approach	Communicative approach
Action-oriented approach	Action-oriented approach
Eclectic approach	Eclectic approach

3.5 Materials

Under "instructional materials", the 2013 ELT curriculum criticizes the previous communicative curriculum (2006 ELT curriculum) since conventional textbooks prepared according to that curriculum allowed for too much flexibility in classroom application, as a result of which some teachers de-emphasized the communicative aspect of the tasks. Thus the 2013 ELT curriculum states that "to address this issue, teacher resource packs, which may consist of lesson plans, printed handouts, flashcards, audio-visual materials and so on, will be considered in place of textbooks, particularly at the 2nd, 3rd and 4th-grade levels." (p. IV)

The 2018 curriculum does not differ in any respect from the previous curriculum and states with the same sentence as in the 2013 curriculum (without citation) that "to address this issue, teacher resource packs, which may consist of lesson plans, printed handouts, flashcards, audio-visual materials and so on, will be considered in place of textbooks, particularly at the 2nd, 3rd and 4th-grade levels." (p. 10).

The 2013 ELT curriculum also argues that "classroom materials and teaching tools are drawn from authentic sources as much as possible in order to demonstrate English as it is used in real life." (p.III). The 2018 curriculum again uses the same sentence (without citation) to stress authentic sources and states that "classroom materials and teaching tools are drawn from authentic sources as much as possible in order to demonstrate English as it is used in real life." (p. 4). Authentic materials are particularly stressed in both curricula probably because both curricula adopt the goal that "students listen and speak just as they would in a target language community" (2013 ELT curriculum, p. VII & 2018 ELT curriculum, p. 12).

One difference between 2013 and 2018 ELT curricula in terms of materials is that while the 2013 curriculum explains specific suggested materials in detail in a chart, the 2018 curriculum lacks such a detailed suggestion.

Table 7. Materials suggested in the curriculum

	2013 ELT curriculum		2018 ELT curriculum
Main materials	teacher resource packs authentic materials		teacher resource packs authentic materials
Specific Suggested materials	Cartoons	Cards	No specific suggested materials
	Chants and Songs	Conversations	
	Fables	Illustrations	
	Fairy Tales	Notes, Memos, and Messages	
	Poems	Postcards	
	Rhymes	Biographical Texts	
	Stories	Diaries/Journal Entries	
	Advertisements	Humorous encounters	
	Captions	Jokes	
	Charts	Personal Narratives	
	Coupons	Plays	
	Instructions	Tongue Twisters	
	Lists	Brochures	
	Menus	Catalogues	
	Notices	Children's Encyclopedias	
	Picture	Dictionaries	
	Posters	Maps	
	Products (Labels, Boxes, Adverts)	News reports	
	Signs	Questionnaires and Surveys	
	Tables	Recipes	
	Weather Reports	E-mails	
	TV Programs/News	Formal Letters	
	Radio Recordings	Personal Letters	
	Podcasts	Phone Conversations	

3.6 Assessment and Evaluation

Assessment and evaluation principles of both 2013 and 2018 ELT curricula are based on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). The 2013 curriculum states that "as suggested by the CEFR, self-assessment is emphasized, as learners are encouraged to monitor their own progress and achievement in the development of communicative competence (CoE, 2001)" (p. IV). The 2018 curriculum also claims that

From this point of view, the theory of the testing procedures in the present curriculum is not different from that of learning and teaching: The theoretical frame of testing, assessment and evaluation processes is primarily based on the CEFR, in which various types of assessment and evaluation techniques are emphasized. Those are heavily centered on alternative and process-oriented testing procedures. In addition, self-assessment is also emphasized, as students are encouraged and expected to monitor their own progress and achievement in the development of communicative competences (Bachman, 1990; CoE, 2001) (p. 6).

While emphasizing self-assessment, the 2013 ELT curriculum also suggests that

In addition to self-assessment, formal evaluation will be carried out through the application of written and oral exams, quizzes, homework assignments, and projects in order to provide an objective record of students' success." (p. IV).

In short, the 2013 ELT curriculum proposes a project and portfolio evaluation, pen and paper tests, self-and peer evaluation, teacher observation, and evaluation.

The 2018 ELT curriculum, with very similar remarks as in 2013, suggests that

In addition to alternative process oriented testing techniques and self-assessment, formal evaluation will be carried out through the application of written and oral exams, quizzes, homework assignments, and projects in order to provide an objective record of students' success (p. 6).

The 2018 ELT curriculum also suggests the same assessment types as 2013; namely, project and portfolio evaluation, pen and paper tests, self-and peer evaluation, teacher observation, and evaluation. In contrast to the 2013 curriculum, the 2018 ELT curriculum suggests detailed testing techniques for the assessment of language skills.

Table 8. Types of Assessment

	2013 ELT curriculum	2018 ELT curriculum
Principles of assessment	Based on CEFR	Based on CEFR
Types of assessment	Project and portfolio evaluation Self-and peer evaluation Pen and paper tests Teacher observation and evaluation	Project and portfolio evaluation Self-and peer evaluation Pen and paper tests Teacher observation and evaluation Suggested testing techniques for the assessment of language skills

3.8. Weekly class hours and the use of the mother tongue

Minor revisions are observed in weekly class hours in the 2018 ELT curriculum of Turkey. In 2013, English education began in the second grade. There were two hours of English classes in the second, third and fourth grades. The students received four hours of compulsory English education and preferably 2 hours of elective English courses in the fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth grades. In the 2018 ELT curriculum, the minor revision relates to the fact that the students receive 3 hours of compulsory English education and preferably 2 hours of elective English courses in the fifth and sixth grades.

Regarding the issue of the use of the mother tongue in the classroom, the 2013 ELT curriculum states that "L1 usage is not prohibited or discouraged, but it should be employed only as necessary (i.e., for giving complex instructions or explaining difficult concepts) (p. VII). The 2018 ELT curriculum uses the same sentence (without citation) related to the use of the mother tongue in the classroom and claims similarly that "L1 (first language) usage is not prohibited or discouraged, but it should be employed only as necessary (i.e., for giving complex instructions or explaining difficult concepts)" (p.12). Thus, there is not any difference between 2013 and 2018 ELT curricula in terms of the use of the mother tongue in the classroom

Table 9. Weekly Class Hours and the Use of the Mother Tongue

	2013 ELT curriculum		2018 ELT curriculum
L1 usage	L1 usage is not prohibited		L1 usage is not prohibited
	2. Grade	2 hours	2 hours
	3. Grade	2 hours	2 hours
weekly	4. Grade	2 hours	2 hours
class hours	5. Grade	4(+2*) hours	3(+2*) hours
	6. Grade	4(+2*) hours	3(+2*) hours
	7. Grade	4(+2*) hours	4(+2*) hours
	8. Grade	4(+2*) hours	4(+2*) hours

*Elective English course hour

4. The result, discussion, and recommendation

This study has compared important aspects of the 2013 and 2018 primary and secondary schools ELT curricula in Turkey: needs analysis, goals and objectives, syllabus, approach and method, materials, assessment and evaluation, weekly class hours and the use of mother tongue in the classroom. There is no difference in the two curricula in terms of the treatment of needs analysis, goals, approach and method, types of materials and the use of the mother tongue. There are some differences in the organization of syllabus, the selection of topics in the seventh grade, objectives (the place of objectives under different titles), weekly class hours, assessment and evaluation. Some new sections are added to the 2018 ELT curriculum such as "values education in the curriculum", "key competencies in the curriculum", "suggested testing techniques for the assessment of language skills" and "suggested contexts and task/activities". The "Communicative functions and sample uses of language" section of the 2013 ELT curriculum is deleted in 2018. Many parts of the theoretical background of the two curricula are totally the same. It can be said that developers of 2018 ELT curriculum copy/paste most of the sections of the previous 2013 ELT curriculum without any citation. There is a "references" section in 2018 but again the 2013 ELT curriculum is not given among the references, which misleadingly gives the impression that while the 2018 ELT curriculum was developed, 2013 ELT curriculum was not made use of.

When the themes and topics in the syllabi of both the 2013 and the 2018 curricula are investigated as shown in table 5., it is seen that there isn't much difference in theme/topic selection in both curricula: In unit 6, the theme "parties" in the 2013 curriculum changes into "celebrations" in the 2018 curriculum and in unit 7, the theme

"superstitions" in the 2013 curriculum changes into "dreams" in the 2018 curriculum, and the other 8 topics/themes are the same in both curricula. In this respect, how "values" were embedded into the themes and topics of the 2018 syllabus as different from the 2013 syllabus is a matter of question. There is not a detailed suggested framework for incorporating values education in the 2018 ELT curriculum except less than a half-page explanation about values education. The task of embedding values education into the classroom seems to be left to teachers and materials designers. In this respect, values education issue is not a radical revision in the 2013 ELT curriculum. The same is true of "key competences in the program". The 2018 ELT curriculum argues that the new syllabus includes the key competences and values as themes or topics. Again, given the fact that the topics/themes in the syllabi of the 2013 and the 2018 curricula are almost the same, how key competences were included in a new way as themes and topics in the 2018 curriculum is blurred. Other than topic/theme selection, teachers and coursebook authors are claimed to be provided with suggestions related to key competencies but which suggestions (as different from the 2013 curriculum) are specifically related to key competencies is also blurred. Thus, it is debatable how far key competences are effectively incorporated into the 2018 ELT curriculum.

In the "assessment and evaluation" section, where there is also a minor revision, the revision relates to the addition of "suggested testing techniques for the assessment of language skills" to the 2018 curriculum. The assessment types in both curricula, however, are the same and assessment and evaluation principles of both curricula are based on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR).

Such recommendations can be made for improving the ELT curriculum development process in Turkey:

1. A needs analysis survey should be conducted before preparing the curriculum to meet the needs and expectations of the students, teachers, school directors, and inspectors. Goals, objectives, syllabus, methodology, and suggestions about the materials in the curriculum should be shaped considering this survey result. It should be born in mind that about 18 million students in the Turkish educational system may not have the same goal in learning English but rather they may want to learn English for a variety of reasons and this reality should be considered in the ELT curriculum development in Turkey.

The other important point related to needs is that while the everyday spoken English may be an indispensable necessity in many EU countries, the same may not be true of Turkey, where our students do not speak English in their everyday lives. Thus which skill is most needed in the Turkish context must be specified as a result of needs analysis and that skill must be the primary skill in the curriculum.

If there is a claim on the existence of such a needs analysis survey (e.g. 2018 ELT curriculum), the data should be shared in the curriculum or the study should be cited

in the references section of the curriculum, which is absent in the 2018 ELT curriculum. If it were based on such a needs analysis, the new curriculum would follow a bottom-up curriculum development process.

2. After the curriculum is implemented, another survey should be conducted to the students, teachers, school directors, and inspectors to specify the strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum. Again the survey result should be shared with the public in a document so that the changes made in the new curriculum according to these data would be seen by the teachers and the academicians. It should be noted that some research studies indicated that the teachers' feedback messages were not taken into consideration in developing the new curriculum (e.g. Saracaloğlu et al., 2010).

3. As regards the structure of the curriculum, the terminologies "curriculum" and "syllabus" should be clearly defined and the different components of the curriculum should not be included in the syllabus. Throughout the curriculum development processes in Turkey, each syllabus content is different from each other and most syllabi in Turkish ELT curricula include elements which are beyond the scope of syllabus design.

The syllabi of 1991 and 1997 ELT curricula are formed of "function", "structure" and "vocabulary", which can all be counted as elements of a syllabus. The syllabus of 2006 ELT curriculum is formed of "topics", "skills", "context", "functions" and "tasks". The syllabus of 2013 ELT curriculum consists of "unit/theme", "communicative functions and skills", "suggested lexis/ language use", "suggested text and activity types", and "assessment". Again, "assessment", which is the last phase of a curriculum, is beyond the scope of syllabus design. The syllabus in 2018 ELT curriculum, however, is formed of "unit/theme", "functions and useful language", "language skills and learning outcomes", suggested contexts, tasks, and assignments. This time, objectives of the curriculum are listed within the syllabus as "learning outcomes". "Assignments", which are beyond the scope of syllabus design, are also given place in the syllabus.

As seen in the history of Turkish ELT curriculum development process, the terms "curriculum" and "syllabus" are merged into one another except 1991 and 1997 ELT curricula. An appropriate syllabus design should be formed based on the needs of the Turkish learners of English and thus this process should go hand in hand with the needs analysis results.

4. If values education and key competencies would be incorporated into the curriculum, there should be a detailed suggested framework for doing this. The task of dealing with values education in the classroom should not be left to the teachers and materials designers (as done in the 2018 curriculum), who may not have deep specialization in this research area and thus may need detailed guidance, which is absent in the 2018 ELT curriculum. Values education is explained in less than half a page and there is a one-page key competencies section, where the teachers and textbook authors are not given detailed suggestions. Even the developers of the 2018 ELT curriculum

admit that "any attempt to include key competences (as well as values education) in a foreign language education program is a challenging one" (p.5). If this is the case, this task would be more challenging for the teachers and textbook writers.

5. In the Turkish educational system with limited weekly class hours of English instruction, unattainable goal statements such as "students listen and speak just as they would in a target language community" (p. 12) should not be used. The same goal statement was also adopted in the 2013 ELT curriculum. Given that another goal statement in the 2018 ELT curriculum is to develop the Turkish citizens' "ability to communicate effectively on an international level" (p.4), the students need not "listen and speak just as they would in a target language community". Speaking effectively on an international level requires a competence quite different than that of speaking like native speakers (e.g. see Acar, 2010; Alptekin, 2002; McKay, 2002, 2003; Nunn, 2005, 2007, 2011)

6. Regarding methodology, the appropriateness of the communicative approach for the students in Turkey should be explored in detail. While the principles of the communicative approach may be compatible with the students' cultures of learning English in Europe, their appropriateness for the Turkish students' culture of learning English is a matter of debate (e.g. Acar, 2018). In a study, Acar (2018) drew attention to the differences between the principles of the communicative approach and the Turkish students' views on deductive grammar teaching, their attitudes towards learning English through translation and memorization and their preference for the teachers' explanation of language points in their mother tongue. Acar (2018), for example, indicated that Turkish learners of English would like their teacher to explain grammatical rules on the board and to explain the language points in Turkish. These students also expressed that they would like to learn English by translation (by translating English words and sentences into Turkish) and to learn new words by memorization. These findings indicate that there is a mismatch between the principles of the communicative approach and the Turkish students' culture of learning English, which should be considered when choosing an appropriate method in the curriculum development process in Turkey.

References

Acar, A. (2010). On EIL Competence. *Journal of English as an International Language*, 5, 11-26.

Acar, A. (2018). Evaluating goals and methodologies in the Turkish primary school ELT curriculum. *Milli Eğitim*. 47 (219), 5-18.

Acar, A. (2019). The Action-Oriented Approach: Integrating Democratic Citizenship Education into Language Teaching. *English Scholars Beyond Borders Journal*. 5(1), 122-141.

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

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

Bowen, G.A. (2009). Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method. *Qualitative Research Journal*. 9 (2), 27-40.

Brooker, R. and Macdonald, D. (1999). Did *we* hear *you*?: issues of student voice in a curriculum innovation. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 31(1), 83-97.

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

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

Handler, B. (2010). Teacher as curriculum leader: A consideration of the appropriateness of that role assignment to classroom-based practitioners. *International Journal of Teacher Leadership*, (3)3, 32-42.

Kaplan, P. (2017). Yeni müfredata tepki: 100 bini aşkın şikayet ve öneri. Ekim 2017, http://www.pervinkaplan.com/detay/yeni-mufredata-tepki-100-bini-askin-sikayet-ve-oneri/2268.

Kırkgöz, Y., Çelik, S., Arıkan, A. (2016). Laying the Theoretical and Practical Foundations for a New Elementary English Curriculum in Turkey: A Procedural Analysis. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 24(3), 1199-1212.

Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı ¸ (MEB) [Turkish Ministry of National Education]. (1991). Ortaöğretim İngilizce dersi (ortaokullar 1,2, ve 3. Sınıflar) öğretim programı [English language curriculum for primary education (grades 4,5,6,7 and 8)]. *Milli Eğitim Bakanliği Tebliğler Dergisi,* pp. 1-32, [MEB official journal].

Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, (MEB)[Turkish Ministry of National Education] . (1997). İlköğretim okulu 4. ve 5. Sınıf Yabanci Dil (İngilizce) Ögretim Programi. [Primary Education Grades 4 and 5 Foreign Language (English) Curriculum]. Pp. 606. Milli Eğitim bakanlığı Tebliğler Dergisi, No.2481 [MEB Official Journal]

Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı ¸ (MEB) [Turkish Ministry of National Education]. (2006). *İlköğretim İngilizce dersi (4,5,6,7 ve 8. Sınıflar) öğretim programı* [English language curriculum for primary education (grades 4,5,6,7 and 8)]. Ankara: T.C. Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı.

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]. (2017). İngilizce Dersi Öğretim Programı (Taslak) (İlkokul ve Ortaokul 2,3,4,5,6,7 ve 8. Sınıflar) [English Language Teaching Program (Draft) (Primary and Secondary Schools Grades 2,3,4,5,6,7 and 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.

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.

Nunan, D. (1988). *Syllabus Design*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nunn, R. (2005). Competence and teaching English as an international language, *Asian EFL Journal*, Vol. 7/3, pp.61-74.

Nunn, R. (2007). "Redefining communicative competence for international and local communities", *The Journal of English as an international language*, Vol. 2(2), pp.7-49.

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. (2002). Perspectives actionnelles et perspectives culturelles en didactique des langues-cultures : vers une perspective co-actionnelle co-culturelle. Retrieved from (25 June 2019) https://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2002b/.

Puren, C. (2008). De l'approche communicative à la perspective actionnelle, et de l'interculturel au co-culturel. Retrieved from (25 June 2019) https://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2008e/

Puren, C. (2014). Approche communicative et perspective actionnelle, deux organismes méthodologiques génétiquement opposés… et complémentaires. Retrieved from (25 June 2018) https://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2014a/.

Saracaloğlu, S., Yılmaz, S., Çengel, M., Çöğmen, S., Karademir, Ç.A., Kanmaz, A. (2010). Elementary teachers' views about their roles in curriculum development and evaluation process: The case of Denizli. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2, 2427–2434.

Taba, H. (1962). *Curriculum development: Theory and practice*. New York: Harcourt Brace.

Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.