Akdeniz Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi
Mediterranean Journal of Educational Research 2020, Cilt 14 Sayı 34, Sayfa 510-528
https://doi.org/10.29329/mjer.2020.322.24
Copyright © 2020. Açık Erişim Makale CC BY-NC-ND

A Critical Analysis of the 2014 and 2018 High Schools Elt Curricula of Turkey

Ahmet Acar [1]

Abstract: This study explores what new contributions the 2018 ELT curriculum for high schools with no foreign language preparatory classes in Turkey brought by comparing it with the previous ELT curriculum for high schools with no foreign language preparatory classes, namely, the 2014 high school ELT curriculum by utilizing document analysis as a form of qualitative research. Because of word limitation, the ELT curriculum for high schools with foreign language preparatory classes was excluded from the study and only 12th-grade syllabi in both curricula are compared. The result of the analysis indicates that many parts of the theoretical background of the 2018 ELT curriculum for high schools are copied (without citation) from the theoretical background of the 2014 ELT curriculum for high schools. The new contribution in the theoretical background of the 2018 ELT curriculum is observed to be the inclusion of 'ethics and values education', which is explained in only half of the page. There is no difference between the two curricula in terms of the treatment of needs analysis, assessment and evaluation and the use of mother tongue in the classroom. Minor revisions are observed in goal and objectives, content (syllabus), approach and method, materials and weekly class hours.

Keywords: English Curriculum For High Schools, Curriculum Evaluation, Syllabus Design, Approach and Method

Geliş Tarihi: 15.09.2020 – **Kabul Tarihi:** 02.11.2020 – **Yayın Tarihi:** 25.12.2020

DOI: 10.29329/mjer.2020.322.24

TÜRKİYE'DEKİ 2014 VE 2018 LİSELER İÇİN İNGİLİZCE DERSİ ÖĞRETİM PROGRAMLARININ ELEŞTİREL BİR ANALİZİ

Özet: Bu çalışma, Türkiye'deki 2018 yabancı dil hazırlık sınıfı olmayan liseler İngilizce dersi öğretim programını, bir önceki, yani 2014 yabancı dil hazırlık sınıfı olmayan liseler İngilizce dersi öğretim programı ile eğitim araştırmalarında nitel araştırma modelini kullanmak suretiyle karşılaştırarak getirdiği yenilikleri incelemektedir. Kelime sınırlamasından dolayı yabancı dil hazırlık sınıfı olan liseler İngilizce dersi öğretim programı çalışmadan çıkarılmış ve sadece on ikinci sınıf izlenceleri karşılaştırılmıştır. Analiz sonucu, 2018 İngilizce dersi öğretim programının birçok kuramsal bölümünün 2014 liseler İngilizce dersi öğretim programının kuramsal bölümünden alıntı yapmadan kopyalandığını göstermektedir. 2018 İngilizce dersi öğretim programının kuramsal altyapısının getirdiği yeniliğin yarım sayfada açıklanan 'etik ve değerler eğitimi' olduğu

[1] **Ahmet Acar,** Assist. Prof. Dr., Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Abd, Buca Eğitim Fakültesi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, ORCID: 0000-0001-8940-4359

Email: ahmet.acar@deu.edu.tr

gözlemlenmiştir. İki program arasında ihtiyaç analizi, ölçme ve değerlendirme ve sınıfta ana dil kullanımını ele alma konularında bir fark yoktur. Hedefler ve amaçlar, izlence (içerik), yaklaşım ve yöntem, materyaller ve haftalık ders saatleri alanlarında küçük çaplı değişiklikler gözlemlenmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Liseler İngilizce Dersi Öğretim Programı, Program Değerlendirme, İzlence Tasarımı, Yaklaşım ve Yöntem

INTRODUCTION

There are, currently, two high school English curricula in Turkey, one for high schools with no foreign language preparatory classes (science high schools and Anatolian high schools with no preparatory English class) and the other for high schools with foreign language preparatory classes (Anatolian high schools with foreign language preparatory classes, the high schools chosen as project schools and social sciences high schools). Anatolian high schools, which were established in 1955 with the name of Maarif colleges and named Anatolian high schools in 1975, had a four-year education, one year for foreign language preparatory classes and three years for further high school education. In the 2005-2006 academic year, foreign language preparatory classes in Anatolian high schools were abolished and high school education was extended to four years. After this regulation, however, some Anatolian high schools were permitted by the Ministry of National Education to have a one-year foreign language preparatory class as before and in these Anatolian high schools, education lasts five years.

In 2003, a new type of high school named social sciences high school was opened in Turkey and from then on the number of these schools increased. Duration of education in these social sciences high schools also lasts five years, one year for foreign language preparatory classes and four years for further high school education.

Besides these high schools, there are high schools in Turkey that are named project schools with a regulation accepted in 2014. Project high schools are chosen among Anatolian high schools with preparatory foreign language classes, some Anatolian high schools, social sciences high schools and science high schools. These high schools named as project schools also have a one-year preparatory foreign language class and the duration of education is five years. For all these types of high schools with foreign language preparatory classes, the Ministry of National Education published an ELT curriculum. There is, however, another ELT curriculum for high schools with no foreign language preparatory classes.

In 1964, a new type of high school named science high school was opened in Turkey. In science high schools, education lasts four years and there is no preparatory English class except those chosen as project schools. Most of the Anatolian high schools of various types (Anatolian high schools,

Anatolian fine arts high schools, Anatolian imam hatip high schools, vocational and technical Anatolian high schools, etc.) do not have one-year foreign language preparatory classes either.

In 2012, the 8+4 education system with eight years of uninterrupted compulsory primary education and four years of high school education changed into a 12-year interrupted and compulsory 4+4+4 education system with four years of primary school education, four years of secondary school education and four years of high school education. English education began in the second grade of the public primary schools in the new 4+4+4 education system. Since a new ELT curriculum for primary and secondary schools was developed and began to be implemented in 2013 to cover this change, a new ELT curriculum was developed for high schools with no foreign language preparatory classes in 2014 and began to be implemented in the 2015-2016 academic year as a continuation of the 2013 ELT curriculum for primary and secondary schools. In 2018, however, two new ELT curricula began to be implemented in Turkey: one for primary and secondary schools (grades 2-8) and the other for high schools with no foreign language preparatory classes (grades 9-12). This study aims to explore which new contributions the 2018 ELT curriculum for high school with no foreign language preparatory classes brought to English education in Turkey by analyzing and comparing all phases of 2014 and 2018 ELT curricula for high schools with no foreign language preparatory classes, namely, needs analysis, goals and objectives, the syllabus, approach and method, materials, assessment and evaluation, weekly class hours, the use of mother tongue in the classroom.

METHOD

This study utilizes document analysis as a form of qualitative research and explores which new contributions the 2018 ELT curriculum for high school with no foreign language preparatory classes brought to English education in Turkey by analyzing and comparing all phases of 2014 and 2018 ELT curricula for high schools with no foreign language preparatory classes, namely, needs analysis, goals and objectives, the syllabus, approach and method, materials, assessment and evaluation, weekly class hours, the use of mother tongue in the classroom. Because of page limitation, the ELT curriculum for high schools with foreign language preparatory classes was excluded from the study and only 12th-grade syllabi in both curricula are compared. According to Bowen (2009), document analysis is "a systematic procedure for reviewing or evaluating documents—both printed and electronic (computer-based and Internet-transmitted) material" (p. 27). The documents analysed in this study were taken from the official website of the Ministry of National Education. The research question of this study is: Which new contributions the 2018 ELT curriculum for high school with no foreign language preparatory classes brought to English education in Turkey in terms of needs analysis, goals and objectives, the syllabus (content), approach and method, materials, assessment and evaluation, weekly class hours and the use of mother tongue in the classroom?

RESULTS

Defining Needs in the 2014 and 2018 High Schools ELT Curricula

Needs analysis is the first step of what may be called a bottom-up curriculum development model, where learners' opinions are considered in the curriculum development process. According to Nunan (1988):

> 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).

Needs analysis is a procedure to gather information about learners as to their goals and objectives in learning English, what content (topics, grammar, functions, notions, etc.) they need to learn (syllabus) and how they want to learn English (learning-style preferences and preferences about methodological issues) as well as the target level of proficiency. The students, however, are not the only group who will contribute to the planning of an English curriculum. English teachers, textbook writers, inspectors, and school directors should also be consulted before the curriculum is developed. Since it is the teachers who implement the curriculum in the classroom, they know the strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum as implementers. Even Taba (1962) "advocated that curriculum development should be a bottom-up process with teachers in central roles for development and leadership" (cited in Handler, 2010, p. 33). Thus the information gathered from the teachers can shed light on developing a more effective curriculum.

Textbook writers may also contribute to the curriculum development process by sharing their experiences as to what aspects of the curriculum restrict their textbook writing process and the possible suggestions about the selection and grading of content (syllabus) and the types of activities that could make practising the content more effective (methodology) as well as the assessment techniques to test what is achieved.

Since English is learned under certain conditions and with a certain number of resources (the number of students and teachers, materials, classrooms, etc.) school directors can also contribute much to the curriculum development process by providing information about the conditions and resources, which will help to achieve the goals set in the curriculum. In the curriculum development process, it should be considered that "the goals are appropriate, not only to learner needs, but also to the constraints of the educational institution or system, and the length and scope of programme based on the syllabus" (Nunan, 1988, p. 25). The information gathered from the inspectors can also offer valuable solutions to the possible problems of curriculum implementation in the actual classrooms.

When the 2014 and 2018 ELT curricula for high schools are analysed, it is seen that neither of them is based on data gathered through needs analysis from the students, teachers, textbooks writers, school directors, and inspectors. The 2014 ELT curriculum states that

> The 9th-12th grades English curriculum was designed to meet the language needs of Turkish teachers and learners of English…The collaboration and support of all parties involved in the education system are vital in the successful implementation of the program, which will help us achieve one of the most important goals of English language teaching: guiding our students to become productive, autonomous, and innovative individuals who are effective communicators of English in the global world (p. xx).

While the curriculum claims that it was designed to meet the language needs of Turkish teachers and learners of English, the claim does not refer to a needs analysis procedure since there is no such information in the curriculum, but to meet the general language needs although it is unclear what those language needs are. The collaboration of all parties involved in the education system, on the other hand, is restricted to the curriculum implementation rather than curriculum development, that is, all parties should collaborate to successfully implement the curriculum developed by the curriculum specialists in a top-down manner.

The 2018 ELT curriculum copies and pastes the above extract without any changes (without citation on p. 19) so the arguments for the 2014 ELT curriculum are also valid for the 2018 ELT curriculum. The treatment of needs analysis in both curricula is indicated in table 1.

Table 1. Needs analysis before planning the curriculum

2014 ELT curriculum	2018 ELT curriculum
no needs analysis before developing the curriculum*	no needs analysis before developing the curriculum*

*There is neither a needs analysis survey result in the curriculum nor any research document related to needs analysis given in references

Goals and Objectives

Writing goals and objectives is the second stage of a curriculum development process. Brown (1995) argues that

> A logical outcome of determining the needs of a group of language students is the specification of goals, that is, general statements about what must be accomplished in order to attain and satisfy students' needs…Objectives, on the other hand, are precise statements about what content and skills the students must master in order to attain a particular goal (p. 21).

Thus, a logical way to determine the goals of learning English in the curriculum is to conduct a needs analysis where learners are asked why they want to learn English among their other preferences (e.g. methodological). In cases where the learners are not asked why they want to learn English as in

Turkey, it is the curriculum specialists who set the goals for the learners, in which case the goals set by the curriculum specialists may mismatch those of the Turkish learners of English. Indeed, in a study conducted by Acar (2018), the learners' most favorite answer to the question of why they want to learn English is to find a good job in the future while the curriculum does not indicate such a goal. The 2014 ELT curriculum states the goal in the following way:

> The main goal of the new 9th-12th Grades English Curriculum is to engage learners of English in stimulating, motivating, and enjoyable learning environments so that they become effective, fluent, and accurate communicators in English. (p. ii)…Following the same communicative focus in the 2nd-8th Grades English Curriculum, the curriculum designed for the 9th-12th Graders is intended to foster communicative skills in English among learners (p. iv).

The 2018 ELT curriculum takes the same quote (p. 4-5) (except one phrase 'self-directed users of English' instead of 'accurate communicators in English') from the 2014 ELT curriculum in relation to the goal for the learners. The communicative needs of Turkish learners of English are justified in the 2014 curriculum because English is a lingua franca in today's world but the targeted competence in the curriculum is said to be communicative competence as put forward by Hymes (1972) and Canale and Swain (1980) (p. iv). Justifying the communicative needs of Turkish learners' of English because English is a lingua franca in today's world, and setting the goal for Turkish learners of English as communicative competence as put forward by Hymes (1972) and Canale and Swain (1980) is a controversy since English as a lingua franca studies and/or English as an international language pedagogy (Alptekin, 2002; Jenkins, 2003, 2006; McKay, 2002, 2003; Seidlhofer, 2001, 2004) are against adopting native speaker based notion of communicative competence as the goal of teaching English as a lingua franca (ELF) or teaching English as an international language (EIL). There are, even, many goal proposals for ELF/EIL pedagogy as alternatives to the communicative competence model as put forward by Hymes (1972) and Canale and Swain (1980) (e.g. Acar, 2010; Alptekin, 2002; Cook, 1999; Nunn, 2005, 2007, 2011; McKay, 2002, 2003), which are totally ignored by the developers of the 2014 ELT curriculum, who still focus on interaction with native speakers as the curriculum states: "Videoconferencing done with native speakers can also increase the confidence and improved motivation among language learners (Wu & Marek, 2011)" (p. vi). When the issue is that of ELF and/or EIL, the 2014 curriculum can not detach itself from the communicative approach since it still focuses on the notion of communicative competence. The main reason is that some ELT researchers in Turkey who deal with the issues of ELF and/or EIL (e.g. Karakaya & Hatipoğlu, 2017) do not take into consideration that ELF and/or EIL pedagogy require a different type of competence other than the communicative competence. Karakaya & Hatipoğlu (2017), for example, in their study "Attitudes of EFL teachers in Turkey context towards teaching English varieties in their lessons", argue that

> English language teachers, constituting one of the most important language sources and the primary interlocutors in the classrooms, have an important impact on forming and assuring these views to be realized in the classrooms. Their attitudes towards the teaching varieties of English are of importance. They are in the position to judge their students' language output and affect their students' communicative competence (p. 41).

The arguments adopted in the 2018 curriculum, which justify the communicative needs of Turkish learners of English because English is a lingua franca in today's world and which set the communicative goal of Turkish learners of English as communicative competence are directly taken from the 2014 ELT curriculum (without citation). Thus, the same criticism leveled against the 2014 ELT curriculum is also valid for the 2018 ELT curriculum. Besides setting communicative competence as a goal, both the 2014 and 2018 ELT curricula also have non-language goals such as developing learner autonomy, learner collaboration and learner reflection in their own learning.

What the 2018 ELT curriculum presents as a new goal, which is absent in the 2014 ELT curriculum, is related to ethics and values education. The 2018 curriculum aims to raise the students' awareness of universal, national, moral, humane and cultural values and ethics by integrating the objectives and sample usages into the curriculum in accordance with this goal and also by embedding the key values into the themes and topics of the syllabi. However, when the objectives and sample usages in both the 2014 and 2018 ELT curricula are compared as in the following paragraphs, not much difference is observed between the two curricula. As to the themes in the 12th-grade syllabi, only two themes out of ten in both curricula are different while the others are the same as will be explained in more detail in section 1.3. (syllabus). In this respect, how the 2018 ELT curriculum embedded the key values into the themes and topics of the syllabi is a matter of debate. The second problematic issue related to the treatment of key values is that democratic value, which is closely related to the action-oriented approach, is not mentioned. While the curriculum claims to be based on the common European framework of references for languages (CEFR) and adopts the action-oriented approach, there is no mention of democracy as a value.

As to the specific objectives, both the 2014 and 2018 ELT curricula state the objectives within the syllabi in terms of listening, pronunciation, speaking, reading and writing for each theme in the syllabi. The 2014 ELT curriculum lists these objectives under the heading 'skills' but the 2018 ELT curriculum uses the heading 'language skills and learning outcomes'. Most of the themes in the 2018 ELT curriculum are adopted from the 2014 ELT curriculum, besides there are minor changes in the objectives (as seen in table 2), possibly because of the adoption of more or less the same themes from the 2014 curriculum. Theme 5 'psychology' in the 2018 curriculum, for example, is the same with theme 5 in the 2014 ELT curriculum, which is, again, 'psychology'. The goals and objectives of both curricula are shown in table 2.

Table 2. Goals and objectives

2014 ELT curriculum	2018 ELT curriculum
Goals:	
-to develop the students' communicative competence in English	-to develop the students' communicative competence in English
-to develop learner autonomy, learner collaboration and learner reflection	-to develop learner autonomy, learner collaboration and learner reflection
	-to raise the students' awareness of universal, national, moral, humane and cultural values and ethics
Objectives: (12th grade) theme 5: psychology	**(12th grade) theme 5: psychology**
Listening	**Listening**
Students will be able to catch the main points of a discussion about the relationship between colours and moods and suggestions to change mood.	
Students will be able to respond to songs reflecting different moods.	
Students will be able to compare the suggestions or different perspectives given by a psychologist/friend and respond to them.	E12.5.L1. Students will be able to list the suggestions to change mood given by a psychologist/friend in recorded text.
Students will be able to identify the speaker's mood, tone, etc.	E12.5.L2. Students will be able to identify the speaker's mood, tone, etc in a recorded text.
Pronunciation	**Pronunciation**
Students will be able to practice sentence intonation and stress.	E12.5.P1. Students will be able to practice sentence intonation and stress. Eg. Let's take a break. (rising and falling intonation)
Speaking	**Speaking**
Students will be able to ask for, offer and reply to suggestions about moods.	E12.5.S1. Students will be able to make a Roleplay between a psychologist/school counsellor and a client.
Students will be able to make comment on moods by looking at flashcards.	E12.5.S2. Students will be able to make comments on moods by looking at flashcards.
Students will be able to use different voice levels, phrasing and intonation when speaking in a variety of situations such as relaxation/meditation or in different moods.	E12.5.S3. Students will be able to use different voice levels, phrasing and intonation to give and follow instructions in different moods.
Students will be able to express and respond to feelings such as surprise, happiness, sadness, interest, indifference, etc.	
Reading	**Reading**
Students will be able to read a poem loudly by reflecting its tone.	E12.5R1. Students will be able to read a poem loudly by reflecting its tone.
Students will be able to identify specific information in a real-life text.	E12.5.R2. Students will be able to identify specific information in a real-life text.
Students will be able to sort clearly written instructions for relaxation/meditation.	

Writing	**Writing**
Students will be able to spell correctly the lexis in an appropriate context.	
Students will be able to describe their current mood / mood reflected in a poem/painting/photograph through creative writing.	E12.5.W1. Students will be able to describe their current mood / mood reflected in a song/painting/ through photograph creative writing.
Students will able to offer suggestions on a newspaper for certain problems sent by readers.	

Syllabus

In the field, there is a general distinction between curriculum and syllabus. Rogers (1989), for example, explains the distinction as

> Syllabi, which prescribe the content to be covered by a given course, form only a small part of the total school programme. Curriculum is a far broader concept. Curriculum is all those activities in which children engage under the auspices of the school. This includes not only what pupils learn, but how they learn it, and how teachers help them learn, using what support materials, styles and methods of assessment, and in what kind of facilities (p. 26).

White (1988) also views "syllabus in a subordinate position to curriculum" (p. 4) and curriculum, according to White (1988), involves needs analysis, objectives, content (syllabus), method and evaluation. Nunan (1988) also makes a distinction between curriculum and syllabus. While he defines curriculum as "the planning, implementation, evaluation, management, and administration of education programmes" (p. 8), syllabus, to Nunan (1988) "focuses more narrowly on the selection and grading of content" (p. 8). Thus, like Rogers (1989) and White (1988), Nunan (1988) also views the syllabus as a subpart of the planning phase of the curriculum.

The term syllabus is used in this paper to signify the selection and grading of content. There are, however, some other definitions of the syllabus, which refer to the selection and grading of tasks and activities (methodological content). Yalden (1984), for example, defines syllabus as:

> The syllabus replaces the concept of method, and the syllabus is now seen as an instrument by which the teacher, with the help of the syllabus designer, can achieve a degree of fit between the needs and aims of the learner (as social being and as individual) and the activities which will take place in the classroom (cited in Nunan, 1988, p. 5).

The syllabus definition of Yalden (1984), as a specification of tasks and activities, can be classified as a broad view of the syllabus, and the syllabus definition of Nunan (1988), as selection and grading of content, refers to a narrow view of syllabus design, following the distinction made by Nunan (1988). Both the 2014 and 2018 English syllabi in both curricula can be defined as a broad

view of syllabus design since both of them include activities and tasks within the syllabi. Since both syllabi include various types of content like the theme, functions, skills, tasks, etc., they can be classified as a mixed or hybrid syllabus. The syllabus in the 2014 curriculum is divided into theme, functions, skills, sample usage, suggested materials and tasks. The syllabus in the 2018 curriculum, on the other hand, comprises theme, functions and useful language, language skills and learning outcomes, suggested materials and tasks as shown in table 3.

Table 3. Syllabus content

2014 ELT curriculum	2018 ELT curriculum
Theme	Theme
Functions	Functions and useful language
Skills	Language skills and learning outcomes
Sample usage	Suggested materials and tasks
	Suggested materials and tasks

Following the definitions of curriculum and syllabus given by Rogers (1989), White (1988) and Nunan (1988), the syllabus is a sub-component of curriculum and it is concerned with the selection and grading of content such as grammar, function, notion, and lexis, etc. In this regard, 'suggested materials and tasks' sections in both syllabi and the 'objectives' listed under 'skills' in the syllabus of the 2014 curriculum and under 'language skills and learning outcomes' in the syllabus of the 2018 curriculum are beyond the scope of syllabus design. They are not part of the syllabus but curriculum design. Thus, in both the 2014 and 2018 ELT curricula, 'objectives', 'syllabus', 'methodology' (tasks) and 'materials' are merged into one another.

The second point to be noted is that the seemingly different organization of the two syllabi suggests at first sight that the 2018 ELT syllabus made radical changes related to content. However, what the 2018 ELT syllabus did was combining the elements listed under the titles 'functions' and 'sample usage' of the 2014 syllabus under a new heading: 'Functions and useful language'. In the 12th-grade syllabus of the 2014 curriculum, for example, unit 5 'psychology' lists the functions 'describing mood', 'making suggestions to change negative mood', 'following and giving instructions' under the heading 'functions' and it lists sample usages such as 'I feel exhausted and I can't concentrate', 'let's take a break' under the heading 'sample usage'. What the 2018 ELT curriculum did was copying and combining these same functions and sample usages of the 2014 ELT syllabus under a new heading: 'Functions and Useful Language'. Very minor revisions are observed in these functions and sample usages. The same copy-and-paste procedure is also valid for 'themes' and 'suggested materials and tasks' sections, this time without any minor revisions, that is, both themes (psychology in both syllabi) and items listed under 'suggested materials and tasks' sections of both syllabi (5th unit of 12th-grade syllabi) are totally the same. The themes in the 12th-grade syllabi of both the 2014 and 2018 curricula are listed in table 4.

Table 4. Themes in 12th-grade syllabi

2014 ELT curriculum	2018 ELT curriculum
Unit 1. Music	Unit 1. Music
Unit 2. Friends	Unit 2. Friendship
Unit 3. Jobs	Unit 3. Human rights
Unit 4. Coming soon	Unit 4. Coming soon
Unit 5. Psychology	Unit 5. Psychology
Unit 6. Favours	Unit 6. Favors
Unit 7. News stories	Unit 7. News stories
Unit 8. The Environment	Unit 8. Alternative energy
Unit 9. Technology	Unit 9. Technology
Unit 10. Manners	Unit 10.Manners

Table 4 shows that there are ten units in both syllabi and only two units in the 2014 syllabus, namely, unit 3 and unit 8 were changed in the 2018 syllabus while the other units were kept the same (if unit 2 'friends', which became 'friendship', and Unit 6 'favours', which became 'favors', are not considered as changes). Since two units were changed in both syllabi while the other units were kept the same, 12th-grade English textbooks would also change and this would be a high-cost issue for Turkey. Besides, given the claim of the 2018 ELT curriculum about ethics and values education as "these values should not be considered as a separate entity. They should be embedded into the themes and topics of the syllabi" (p. 9), how these values are embedded into the themes of the 12th-grade syllabus of the 2018 curriculum, which are almost the same with the 12th-grade syllabus of the 2014 curriculum, is a matter of debate.

Approach and Method

The 2014 ELT curriculum states the approach adopted as:

> In designing the new 9th-12th grades English curriculum an eclectic approach to language teaching and learning methods was adopted. No single teaching method was entirely followed or left out during the development of the curriculum (p. vii).

The 2018 ELT curriculum copies the same quote above on page 13 (without any citation). While an eclectic approach is presented as the adopted approach in the 2014 curriculum, the promoted activities in the curriculum such as communicative, experiential, task-based, collaborative activities indicate the dominance of the communicative approach. Likewise, the adopted goal in the 2014 curriculum is to develop the students' communicative competence in English, which is the goal of the communicative approach:

> The new 9th-12th Grades English Curriculum was designed to take all aspects of communicative competence into consideration in English classes by addressing functions and four skills of language in an integrated way and focusing on "How" and "Why?" in language rather than merely on "What?" (2014 ELT curriculum, p. iv).

The 2018 ELT curriculum copies the same quote above on page 5 (without any citation). In the 2014 curriculum, there is both implicit and explicit emphasis on the communicative approach (the adoption of communicative competence, communicative activities, a focus on functions, learner autonomy, authentic materials, performance objectives, and communicative assessment), which is adopted by the curriculum as the primary approach along with an eclectic approach. The same is true of the 2018 curriculum.

The 2018 curriculum, as different from the 2014 curriculum, adopts the action-oriented approach stated as follows:

> The approach adapted is an action-oriented approach since in this curriculum, the target language (English) is seen as a vehicle for communication rather than a lesson to study. The main goal of the new 9th-12th grades English Curriculum is to engage learners of English in stimulating, motivating, and enjoyable learning environments so that they become effective, fluent, and self-directed users of English (p. 4).

The 2018 curriculum justifies the adoption of the action-oriented approach as "the target language (English) is seen as a vehicle for communication" (p. 4), suggesting, misleadingly, that the action-oriented approach views language as a means of communication. The problematic treatment of the action-oriented approach in the 2018 ELT curriculum for high schools is also observed in both the 2013 and 2018 ELT curricula for the primary and secondary schools as can be observed from the statement "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" (2013 curriculum, p. II & 2018 curriculum, p. 3). The basic problem of viewing the goal of the action-oriented approach as enabling the students to use English as a means of communication is also evident in the ELT literature in Turkey. Yeni-Palabıyık & Daloğlu (2016), for example, can not notice this problem in the 2013 ELT curriculum for the primary and secondary schools and title their article as "English language teachers' implementation of curriculum with action-oriented approach in Turkish primary education", which suggests the idea that the 2013 curriculum conceptualizes the action-oriented approach correctly, which is not the case. Yüce & Mirici (2019), in their study, which focuses on the 2018 high schools ELT curriculum, "investigated the participants' perceptions about whether the EFL program for 9th grade students comprises 'action-oriented approach'" (p. 1176) and argue that

> Based on the responses, it can be stated that the EFL program presents activities for language learners to overcome their communicative problems which may arise in their daily lives. According to the responses, the course materials which were designed in line with the program provide communication activities for students to prepare them for the real life situations. Thus,

it can be concluded that the EFL program involves action-oriented approach principle of the CEFR (Yüce & Mirici, 2019, p. 1177).

These remarks indicate clearly that both Yüce & Mirici and the EFL teachers in this study interpret the action-oriented approach as the communicative approach, which is not the case. Ekşi (2017) also can not notice that the action-oriented approach is misleadingly presented as having the goal of allowing learners to experience English as a means of communication in the 2013 ELT curriculum for the primary and secondary schools. Ekşi (2017), in her discussion of the methodological basis of the 2013 curriculum, shares the following link and claims that the video presents the underlying methodology of the 2013 curriculum.

https://www.eba.gov.tr/video/izle/565078d9024d45f704eadb6466176d14122ea81ed6001

The video in the link, however, does not present any information about the action-oriented approach that the 2013 ELT curriculum for the primary and secondary schools claims to adopt. One of the developers of the 2013 ELT curriculum for the primary and secondary schools, Arda Arıkan, states in one of his publications (Zorba & Arıkan, 2016) that "task-based learning has a significant place in the CEFR. In fact, the action-oriented approach that the CEFR adopted is based on tasks" (p. 18). This time, the action-oriented approach is misinterpreted as task-based learning.

Puren (2008, 2014a, 2014b, 2020) explains the main difference between the communicative approach and the action-oriented approach as the transition from training successful communicators (the communicative approach) to training social actors (the action-oriented approach). Similarly, Acar (2019, 2020a, 2020b, 2020c) also indicates the distinction between the communicative approach and the action-oriented approach. Piccardo & North (2019) also claim that "the action-oriented approach cannot be seen as synonymous with TBLT" (p. 276). The action-oriented approach views language as a means of social action, thus, communication is just a means of achieving this goal but not the goal in itself. It is also important to note that both CEFR (2001) and CEFR companion volume (CEFRCV, 2018) introduce a new goal for the language teaching field: training of a social actor, which will be achieved by the action-oriented approach. Although the 2018 ELT curriculum for high schools claims to be based on the action-oriented approach, it does not mention the goal of training learners as social actors.

Besides, the 2018 curriculum claims that "The new curriculum is different from the previous one in a sense that it focuses on values education" (p. 9) but in outlining its main difference from the 2014 curriculum, it does not consider its adoption of the action-oriented approach as a difference from the previous curriculum (the 2014 curriculum), probably because there is no chapter devoted to the explanation of the action-oriented approach in the 2018 curriculum. When investigated in detail, it is seen that one basic element of the action-oriented approach, namely, 'project', is mentioned in the 2018 curriculum as 'project-based activities', which are, however, not unique to the 2018 curriculum

but also present in the 2014 curriculum (though the 2014 curriculum does not adopt the action-oriented approach). Project-based language activities, in the 2014 curriculum, however, are considered along with the communicative activities, which suggests that projects are used as a means of communication rather than social action:

> Throughout the 9th-12th grades English curriculum students are encouraged to be involved in task-based, collaborative, and project-based language activities that would empower learners by increasing their self-esteem, autonomy, and language skills (Stoller, 2002) (2014 curriculum, p. V).

The 2018 curriculum copies the same quote from the 2014 curriculum (without citation on p. 6). Thus, the criticism is also valid for the 2018 curriculum. The other important point regarding the use of projects as an implementation of the action-oriented approach is that educational projects, according to Puren (2014a, 2014b, 2017, 2019), require maximum autonomy from the students so the students choose and design the projects themselves (under the guidance of the teacher). Thus, educational projects, in the action-oriented approach, can not be limited and directed by the time frame of the curriculum. The maximum a language curriculum can include, in the action-oriented approach, is mini-projects. While the 2018 curriculum claims to be based on the action-oriented approach, the curriculum is not guided by the mini-projects. The approaches adopted in both curricula are shown in table 5.

Table 5. Approaches and methods adopted in the curricula

2014 ELT curriculum	2018 ELT curriculum
Eclectic approach	Eclectic approach
Communicative approach	Communicative approach
	Action-oriented approach

Materials

Both the 2014 and 2018 curricula include a section titled ‘instructional materials’. All arguments about materials in the section ‘instructional materials’ in the 2018 curriculum are directly copied (without any citation) from the section ‘instructional materials’ in the 2014 curriculum.

The 2014 curriculum also includes a section ‘the use of technology and blended learning in English classes’ (p. vi-vii), in which the use of instructional technology in English teaching is highly suggested such as chat rooms, mobile-assisted language learning (MALL) devices, blogs, virtual worlds and video conferencing. The 2018 curriculum also includes a section ‘the use of technology and blended learning in English classes’ (p. 15-16), which directly copies the whole section without any change (without citation) from the 2014 curriculum.

In the table presenting suggested materials (2018 curriculum, p. 17), however, while the 2018 curriculum adopts the specific suggested materials from the 2014 curriculum (p. xviii) (as shown in

table 6), it also adds some new materials (as shown in the following paragraph) in addition to the suggested materials in the 2014 curriculum.

Table 6. Common suggested materials in the 2014 and 2018 curricula

Movies, TV/radio recordings, commercials, podcasts, infographics, PPP presentations, Wikis, blogs, E-mails, animations, virtual environments, comics, maps, road signs, posters, tables, timelines, medicine prospectus (patient information leaflets in 2018 curriculum), brochures, advice columns, invitee lists, advertisements, shopping lists, product catalogues, recipes, coupons, call center dialogues, transportation schedule boards, notes/messages, planners, postcards, letters, short documentaries, short lectures, interview recordings, dialogues, phone conversations, songs, websites, synchronous and asynchronous CMC, online/offline newspapers/magazines, online/offline pictures, picture albums, realia ('real objects' written incorrectly as 'real objectives' in both 2014 and 2018 curriculum), flashcards/picturecards/wordcards, song lyrics, charts/graphs, graphic organizers, application forms, cvs/letters of intention, poems, plays/drama, surveys, short stories, biographies, diary entries, reflection reports, peer and self evaluation checklists, jigsaw readings, descriptive texts, expository texts, narratives, compare and contrast paragraphs, argumentative texts

The 2018 ELT curriculum replaces 'medicine prospectus' in the 2014 curriculum with 'patient information leaflets' and adds more materials like v-logs, simulations, animation makers, games/fun, travel guides, greeting cards, tickets, announcements, contests/quiz shows, illustrations, myths/rhymes, collaborative stories, cause and effect texts, persuasive texts, menus.

Assessment and Evaluation

Regarding assessment and evaluation, the 2014 curriculum includes a section titled 'assessment' and the 2018 curriculum includes a section titled 'assessment and evaluation'. The 2018 curriculum copies all arguments about assessment and evaluation (without citation) from the 2014 curriculum and adds just two new sentences in the whole section. The types of assessment adopted by both curricula are shown in table 7.

Table 7. Types of assessment

2014 ELT curriculum	2018 ELT curriculum
a mixture of alternative, traditional, and electronic assessment types	a mixture of alternative, traditional, and electronic assessment types

"Any type of student output can be assessed in language classes, but the main assessment types suggested in the curriculum are evaluating listening/speaking skills via Discussion Time activities and/or Video Blogs (V-logs) and evaluating the integration of all four language skills as well as the other components of language such as lexis, structure, and pronunciation via Tech Pack, pen-paper inclass exams, or E-portfolios" (2014 curriculum, p. ix, 2018 curriculum, p. 11).

Weekly Class Hours of Compulsory English Education and the Use of the Mother tongue

In weekly class hours, there is a minor revision in the 2018 ELT curriculum and this revision is only observed in the ninth grades. In the 2014 curriculum, the students received six hours of

compulsory English education in ninth grade but in the 2018 curriculum, there are four hours of English instruction at this grade. Regarding the tenth, eleventh and twelfth grades, the students receive four hours of compulsory English education in both the 2014 and 2018 curricula.

As to the issue of the use of the mother tongue in the classroom, both the 2014 (p. xi) and 2018 (p.10) curricula state that "students communicate in English in the classroom at all times", which shows that there is no place for the use of the mother tongue in the classroom. Thus, the 2014 and 2018 ELT curricula do not show any difference regarding this issue as seen in table 8.

Table 8. Weekly class hours of compulsory English education and the use of the mother tongue

		2014 ELT curriculum	2018 ELT curriculum
L1 usage		L1 usage is prohibited	L1 usage is prohibited
	9. Grade	6 hours	4 hours
	10. Grade	4 hours	4 hours
weekly	11. Grade	4 hours	4 hours
class hours	12. Grade	4 hours	4 hours

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The result of the study indicates that most of the theoretical aspects of the 2018 ELT curriculum for high schools are copied (without citation) from the theoretical aspects of the 2014 ELT curriculum for high schools. In the references section of the 2018 curriculum, the 2014 curriculum does not take place, which gives the impression that the 2014 curriculum was not made use of while developing the new 2018 curriculum.

The 2018 curriculum as different from the 2014 curriculum introduces 'ethics and values education', which is explained in only half of the page. Considering the heavy copy-and-paste procedure in the 2018 curriculum, how is 'ethics and values education' incorporated into the gist of the 2018 curriculum as different from the 2014 curriculum is a matter of debate. The other problem is that democratic value, which is the focus of CEFR (2001) and the action-oriented approach, which the 2018 curriculum claims to adopt, is not given any place in the 2018 curriculum.

2018 curriculum also differs from the 2014 curriculum by its inclusion of the action-oriented approach but, this time, the treatment of the action-oriented approach is restricted to one sentence: "The approach adapted is an action-oriented approach since in this curriculum, the target language (English) is seen as a vehicle for communication rather than a lesson to study" (p. 4). This treatment of the action-oriented approach, however, is misleading since the action-oriented approach does not hold the view that the target language is a means of communication but rather suggests that the target language is a means of social action, in which case, communication is not the goal but the means of achieving this goal as explained coherently by Puren (2008, 2014a, 2014b). The problematic treatment of the action-oriented approach is not only present in the 2018 ELT curriculum for high schools but also in the 2013 and 2018 ELT curricula for the primary and secondary schools as well as in the

studies of the ELT researchers in Turkey (e.g. Ekşi, 2017; Yeni-Palabıyık & Daloğlu, 2016; Yüce & Mirici, 2019; Zorba & Arıkan, 2016). In this respect, while the action-oriented approach is mentioned by name, its principles are not reflected in the 2018 ELT curriculum for high schools. The other two approaches adopted by the 2018 curriculum, namely, an eclectic approach and the communicative approach are also adopted by the 2014 curriculum.

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.

Acar, A. (2020a). Transforming communicative tasks into mini-projects. *Elementary Education Online*, 19 (3), 1660-1668.

Acar, A. (2020b). An analysis of the English textbook 'let's learn English' in terms of the action-oriented approach, *Turkish Studies – Educational Sciences*, 15(3), 1449-1458.

Acar, A. (2020c). Social-action-based textbook design in ELT. *English Scholarship Beyond Borders*, 6 (1), 27-40.

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

Bowen, G.A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal, 9*(2), 27-40.

Brown, J. D. (1995). *The elements of language curriculum.* Heinle and Heinle Publishers: Boston.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1*, 1-47.

Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(2), 185-210.

Council of Europe (CoE). (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Council of Europe (CoE). 2018. *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. Companion volume with new descriptors*. Retrieved from https://rm.coe.int/cefr-companion-volume-with-new-descriptors-2018/1680787989

Ekşi, G. Y. (2017). Designing curriculum for second and foreign language studies. In A. Sarıçoban (Ed.), *ELT Methodology (pp. 39-60).* Anı Yayıncılık: Ankara**.**

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.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. Pride & J. Holmes, (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269- 93). Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Jenkins, J. (2003). *World Englishes*. London: Routledge.

Jenkins, J. (2006). Points of view and blind spots: ELF and SLA. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 16*(2), 137-291.

Karakaya, N. & Hatipoğlu, Ç. (2017). Attitudes of EFL teachers in Turkey context towards teaching English varieties in their lessons. *Journal of Educational and Instructional Studies in the World*, 7(3), 41-48.

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 (ilkokullar ve ortaokullar) İngilizce dersi (2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 ve 8. sınıflar) öğretim programı [Primary education institutions (primary and secondary schools) 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 (ilkokul 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.

Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı¸ (MEB) [Turkish Ministry of National Education]. (2014). Ortaöğretim İngilizce Dersi (9, 10, 11 ve 12. sınıflar) Öğretim Programı [English Language Teaching Program (High Schools Grades 9, 10, 11 and 12)]. Ankara: T.C. Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı.

Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı¸ (MEB) [Turkish Ministry of National Education]. (2018). Ortaöğretim İngilizce Dersi (9, 10, 11 ve 12. sınıflar) Öğretim Programı [English Language Teaching Program (High Schools Grades 9, 10, 11 and 12)]. Ankara: T.C. Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı.

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

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

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

Piccardo, E., & North, B. (2019). *The Action-oriented approach: a dynamic vision of language education.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

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

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

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

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

Puren, C. (2019). De la tâche finale au mini-projet:un exemple concret d'analyse et de manipulation didactiques. Retrieved from file:///C:/Users/User/Downloads/PUREN_2019f_Tache_finale_a_mini-projet%20(1).pdf

Puren, C. (2020). From an internationalized communicative approach to contextualised plurimethodological approaches. Retrieved from https://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2020c-en/

Rogers, T. (1989). Syllabus design, curriculum development and policy determination. In R. K. Johnson (ed.), *The second language curriculum*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 24-34.

Seidlhofer, B. (2001). Closing a conceptual gap: The case for a description of English as a lingua franca. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *11*(2), 133-58.

Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca. Annual *Review of Applied Linguistics*, *24*, 209-239.

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

White, R. V. (1988). *The ELT curriculum*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Yeni-Palabiyik, P., & Daloğlu, A. (2016). English language teachers' implementation of curriculum with action-oriented approach in Turkish primary education classrooms. *Journal on English Language Teaching*, (6)2, 45-57.

Yüce & Mirici (2019). A qualitative inquiry into the application of 9th grade EFL program in terms of the CEFR. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 15(3), 1171-1187.

Zorba M.G., & Arıkan A., (2016). A study of Anatolian high schools' 9th grade English language curriculum in relation to the CEFR. *Uşak Üniversitesi Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2(2), 13-24.