



| Research Article / Araştırma Makalesi |

Comparison of Primary School English Language Curricula of Turkey and Germany (North Rhine-Westphalia, Baden Württemberg, Berlin)

Türkiye ve Almanya (North Rhine-Westphalia, Baden Württemberg, Berlin) İlkokul İngilizce Dersi Programlarının Karşılaştırılması¹

Sibel İnci², Sevilay Yıldız³

Keywords

1. Primary school English language curriculum
2. Comparative education
3. Bereday Model
4. Turkey
5. Germany

Anahtar Kelimeler

1. İlkokul İngilizce dersi programı
2. Karşılaştırmalı eğitim
3. Bereday Modeli
4. Türkiye
5. Almanya

Received/Başvuru Tarihi

19.05.2020

Accepted / Kabul Tarihi

20.11.2020

Abstract

Purpose: Comparison studies are necessary not just for the preparation but also for the successful implementation and revision of the curriculum. By comparing English language teaching in Germany, which is more successful than Turkey based on the international exam results, with English language teaching in Turkey, which has on-going problems for many years, may show the role of the curriculum in these problems. Therefore, the aim of this study is to take an in-depth look at the primary school English language curricula in Turkey and Germany (North Rhine-Westphalia, Baden-Württemberg, Berlin) to reveal the similarities and differences.

Design/Methodology/Approach: Bereday model was used as comparative education model and document analysis was applied for analysis in this qualitative study.

Findings: As a result, it was observed that language learning strategies and intercultural education do not take place in the primary school English language curriculum in Turkey whereas in the states of Germany these topics are emphasized; English curricula in the states of Germany have general framework but content is structured in units in Turkey.

Conclusions: Program design should be revised to increase teacher autonomy and intercultural and language learning strategies should be emphasized in the primary school English language curriculum in Turkey.

Öz

Çalışmanın amacı: Karşılaştırma çalışmaları sadece programların hazırlanması esnasında değil bu programların başarılı bir şekilde uygulanmasını ve revize edilmesini sağlamak açısından da gerekli ve önemlidir. Uluslararası sınavlarda Türkiye'ye göre daha başarılı olan Almanya'daki İngilizce eğitimini, uzun yıllardır sorunlarla devam eden Türkiye'deki İngilizce eğitimi ile karşılaştırmak, bu sorunlarda programın payının ne olduğunu gösterebilir. Dolayısıyla bu çalışmanın amacı, Türkiye ve Almanya (North Rhine-Westphalia, Baden Württemberg, Berlin) ilkokul İngilizce dersi programlarını derinlemesine incelemek ve aralarındaki benzerlik ve farklılıkları ortaya koymaktır.

Materyal ve Yöntem: Nitel çalışma yöntemlerinden doküman analizi uygulanarak yapılan bu karşılaştırmalı eğitim çalışmasında Bereday Modeli kullanılmıştır.

Bulgular: Araştırmanın sonuçlarına göre, Türkiye ilkokul İngilizce dersi programında, Almanya ilkokul İngilizce dersi programlarından farklı olarak dil stratejileri ve kültürlerarası eğitim gibi hedeflere yer verilmediği; ilkokul İngilizce dersi programlarının Almanya eyaletlerinde genel çerçeve olarak hazırlandığı ancak Türkiye'de içeriğin ünitelere ayrıldığı saptanmıştır.

Sonuç: Öğretmen özerkliğini artırmak için program tasarımı revize edilmeli, Türkiye'deki ilkokul İngilizce programlarında kültürlerarası ve dil öğrenme stratejilerine ağırlık verilmelidir.

¹ This article is derived from the Phd thesis written by the first author and supervised by the second author.

² **Corresponded Author**, Kocaeli University, Foreign Languages Department, Kocaeli, TURKEY; <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0945-7632>

³ Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University, Education Faculty, Educational Sciences Department, Bolu, TURKEY; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8863-2488>

INTRODUCTION

With the effect of globalization, English has been used as the lingua franca that enables individuals speaking different languages to communicate in international environments such as science, informatics, economy, travel, internet, and media (Brumfit, 2002; Crystal, 1997; Dovring, 1997). The market power of English, having an easily learnable structure at a basic level, and representing wealth and development can be seen among the reasons for the use of English as a common language (Neuner, 2002). Countries that use globalization as the main framework in their education programs have started to include English in their education programs, considering that English as a foreign language should be introduced to children at an early age as early as possible. English has become the most taught foreign language in almost all countries and at every educational level (European Commission, 2011; Eurostat, 2015; Eurydice, 2012). According to the 2013 data of Eurostat (2015), the number of students learning English as a foreign language at primary school level is 16.7 million. In their English language curricula, countries are making intensive efforts to provide a more flexible, more entrepreneurial workforce open to technology and lifelong learning required by the globalizing world (Enever & Moon, 2009). This phenomenon can also be seen as the aim of Europe to promote a multilingual, multicultural society across the continent (Jaekel, Schurig, Florian, & Ritter, 2017). As a matter of fact, starting to learn English, which has become a universal language by being spoken all over the globalized world, maybe more advantageous in terms of providing exposure to the language at an early age and being naturally acquired at an earlier age, as children start to learn more analytically as they grow (Johnstone, 2009). However, parallel to the increase in the importance of foreign language learning, it should be a priority to develop effective language teaching policies more applicable in the classroom environment (Enever & Moon, 2009). In this context, English language curricula should be designed carefully for a more successful education. These curricula reflect the educational philosophies and policies of the countries.

At the Hamburg Conference, the ministers of education came together in 1961. There were two views of early foreign language education. According to the first view, it was argued that starting to acquire a foreign language at an early age would harm the mother tongue. Therefore, they stated that starting foreign language education at an early age would be harmful. According to the latter view, they argued that language acquisition should start at the earliest age possible because of the 'Critical Period Hypothesis' that means the brain loses its elasticity at later ages (Doye & Hurrell, 1997). In line with these views, some countries implement foreign language education at an early age, while other countries have not shown this trend. Supporting foreign language education, the Council of Europe launched an action plan in March 2002 by declaring 2001 as the "European Year of Language" to increase the language awareness of the member countries and encourage them to base their education policies on multilingualism. According to the action plan of the Council of Europe, in line with the European Union (EU) language education policies, decisions have been taken to teach children not one but at least two languages at an early age and to develop at least basic skills (European Commission, 2011). In this direction, EU member countries revised their foreign language education policies and prepared reports by carrying out studies on this subject (European Commission, 2014). In the next action plan of the Council of Europe between the years 2004-2006, some issues are included for foreign language education to be effective at an early age. If the teachers are competent in teaching the younger age groups, there is an appropriate number of students in classrooms, there are suitable materials designed and, enough time is devoted to language teaching in the program, it can be successful. In the same action plan, it was stated that based on the interest and openness of children to other languages and cultures, these potentials could be made useful without leaving their linguistic development to chance.

Primary school English language curricula of countries that are members of the EU and are in the process of membership are based on the skill acquisition-based European Language Framework (CEFR, 2001), which was published in 2001 to provide standardization and shows foreign language levels. The English language curricula of European countries are organized following the language teaching approaches and methods on which this framework is based and adapted to the country's own needs. European countries has implemented reforms to lower the starting age for first foreign language education in line with the CEFR. However, the interest in early-age English language teaching in the world has also led to the formation of some pedagogical norms. Similar approaches and pedagogical advice are provided in different parts of the world, and inappropriate methods and materials are tried to be used without question. For example; although some methods such as communicative methods, student-centered education, authentic materials, and group work are not suitable for crowded classes, they are recommended to teachers (Enever & Moon, 2010). When evaluated within the context of each country's own context in line with the historical development of early English education, it is seen that they sometimes revise programs for effective education and sometimes include teacher training in line with the content. In this respect, although there are studies that generally suggest some methods and contents to increase success in every country in the literature, countries can decide in which areas they need regulations in the context of the data to be obtained by including comparison studies where they can see how they can improve their programs. Therefore, to present suggestions to improve primary school English language curriculum of Turkey, in this study, primary school English language curricula of German states (North Rhine-Westphalia, Baden-Württemberg and Berlin) and Turkey were compared in the framework of general characteristics, objectives, content, learning and teaching processes, and assessment and evaluation approaches.

English education in Turkey and the states of Germany and English education problems in Turkey

In terms of decision-making in education, systems show a significant difference in Turkey and Germany which are subject to this comparison study. In Turkey, the education system is centralized by the Ministry of National Education (MONE) and all decisions are made by MONE (Fretwell & Wheeler, 2001). Turkey has prepared Turkey Lifelong Learning Strategy Document in cooperation with the Ministry of Education and civil society organizations in 2009 and 2007-2013 under the EU Program. Then, with the 2009-2013 Lifelong Learning Action Plan, it was envisaged to continue the development of foreign language programs and to encourage learning at least two foreign languages in the formal education process (TELC & MEB, 2013). As a result of policies regarding the question of the foreign language education, in 1997, English lessons started at 4th grade in elementary school. Then in 2013-2014 English was given at an earlier age, at 2nd grade level in the whole country in Turkey. While the curriculum was designed, curricula of other countries were checked for best practices, researches in Turkey and context were taken into account. Reports were presented to Turkey's foremost research institution, Turkey Scientific and Technological Research, and with co-operation a program developed at the national level. On the other hand, German federal government consists of 16 provinces and both states and the federal government have the right to sovereignty (Bliesen, 1998). Each state is responsible for its own curricula, and education decisions are made by local institutions (Eurydice, 2015b). Depending on the state structure of Germany, these policies on early age foreign language education in some states date back to the 90's before the EU action plans. However, during this period, this practice called "Languages of the Neighbors" failed for various reasons (Kubanek-German, 2000). In general it can be said the fact that these two countries include early foreign language education as a compulsory course in primary school is not based on very old dates.

Teacher training in Germany and Turkey is important in terms of the comparison of the program. Institutions which are responsible for training English teachers in Turkey are the universities. Besides graduates of English Language Teaching departments of universities, graduates of English Language Literature, Linguistics and Translation and Interpretation departments can also become English teachers by taking the pedagogical formation training required to become teachers. In 1997, as a result of the nationwide education reform, English lessons were started in the 4th grade of primary school and a course called "Teaching English to young learners" was added to the programs of English Language Teaching departments. However, since 1997, no other courses on teaching English to young learners have been added to the programs of English Language Teaching departments. Instead, the English Teacher Training and Development Unit, which organizes seminars and in-service training, was established by the Ministry of National Education to increase competences and facilitate teachers' implementation of the new program (Kırkgöz, 2008). Classroom teachers can also be employed in schools where there are no English teachers. For this reason, as of 2018, the "Foreign Language Teaching" course, which consists of 3 credits for one semester, has been added to the undergraduate classroom teaching departments. In Germany, English education is provided by teachers who have been educated for primary school and English. In Germany, there is a separate training to become a teacher at primary school level and teachers are trained in at least two areas that they can teach at primary school level. Besides, teachers can find the opportunity to practice for an average of 1.5 years, both during their teacher education and before going to the schools where they will work with an internship training as the second stage of education (Gnutzmann, 2011).

Turkey's problems about the failure related to teaching English for almost half a century despite all the improvements in 1997, 2006 and finally 2013 are outlined in international indicators. For example, although students have approximately 1,296 hours of English lessons throughout their academic life in Turkey, both the national and international level in English is far below the expected levels (TEDMEM, 2013). Studies have revealed that this situation has more than one reason. The studies related to English education began to take part in the 4th grade program in 1997 showed that the methods used, physical conditions and teacher qualifications were identified as problems (Büyükduman, 2005; Kırkgöz, 2008, 2009; Kızıldağ, 2009; Topkaya & Küçük, 2010). For 2013, many problems were identified with the English language curriculum, which started to be applied to children in the 2nd grade of primary school, the age group of 7.5- 9.5. According to the studies, some of these problems can be listed as follows (Acar, 2019; Aksoy, 2020; Aldım, 2018; Alkan & Arslan, 2014; Atabey & Bulut, 2016; Aybek, 2015; Demir & Duruhan, 2015; Ekuş & Babayiğit, 2013; Fişne, Güngör, Guerra & Gonçalves, 2018; İytoğlu & Alcı, 2015; Kaya & Ok, 2016; Küçüktepe, Küçüktepe & Baykın, 2014; Merter, Şekerci & Bozkurt, 2014; Solak & Semerci, 2015; Şad & Karaova, 2015; Özudoğru & Adıgüzel, 2016; TEPAV, 2014; Yaşar, 2015; Yıldırım & Tanrıseven, 2015):

1. Criticisms about the design and content of the English language curriculum,
2. Teachers do not have competencies in English education following with the characteristics of the early age group suggested in the program,
3. In the 2013-2014 academic year, a pilot study had not been conducted before the 2nd and 3rd grade English language curricula were put into practice,
4. Inadequacy of the physical conditions and materials of the classes according to the program needs,
5. There are not adequate academic work in the field of foreign language education for children across Turkey in previous years,
6. Lower levels of proficiency in Turkey compared to other European countries.

In Turkey, taking into account studies showing that problems in general in foreign language education, in particular English education in early ages, as mentioned above, it can be said that comparison studies are needed for the detection of problems and finding solutions related to the English education for young learners by analyzing the practices in other countries. However, most of the primary school English language studies related to the curriculum have been conducted in the context of Turkey. Comparative education studies can provide lessons in terms of current pedagogical methods by looking closely at the policies and practices of other countries (Phillips, 2006). Comparison studies carried out in the world or Europe reveal important data in this sense. Countries often examine the education systems of developed countries while developing their policies regarding education systems. Therefore, the interest of policymakers and practitioners in comparative education is in a revival process to meet 21st century needs (Crossley, 2012). The axis of comparative studies has moved from the national dimension to the international dimension with globalization (Watson, 1999). Besides, international exams affect global policies and increase local and global dialectics (Arnove & Torres, 1999). These exam results are turned into a race in international league tables and are seen as the development indicators in the knowledge economy (Crossley, 2012). Considering these definitions and working methods, comparative studies are of great importance in strengthening intercultural communication. In line with these studies, countries can help each other create an environment of greater respect and tolerance by understanding each other's education systems.

One of the comparison studies of the English language curricula was by Demir and Yavuz (2014) in Turkey. In their study, English lesson programs in Finland, Japan, Korea, China (Shanghai), and Turkey were compared and demonstrated some differences and similarities. Another comparison study conducted by Fişne, Güngör, Guerra, and Gonçalves (2018) was on English lesson programs and 3rd and 4th-grade textbooks of Turkey and Portugal by using content analysis. However, the most important tool that enables an international comparison of English proficiency is an online examination application conducted by "Education First (EF)" with volunteers worldwide. According to the data, it is possible to see English proficiency in Turkey and other countries throughout the years. Besides, countries provide information on the effectiveness of their English language curricula. According to the English Proficiency Index (EPI) results of Turkey throughout the years, it ranked 41st among 60 countries in 2013. In 2014, 47th out of 63 countries, while in 2015, Turkey ranked 50th with 47.62 points among 70 countries (EF, 2014, 2015). In Europe, Turkey ranked 26th among 27 countries (EF, 2014). On the other hand, it is stated that German-speaking countries such as Austria, Germany, and Switzerland have higher levels of English in the 18-20 age range than older age groups, and English education has been more effective in recent years (EF, 2015). According to EF (2014, 2015) reports, it is seen that Germany, which is the subject of this study, ranked 10th in 2014 and 11th in 2015 with a score of 61.83, so it is among the countries with high English level. According to data of the 100 countries in 2019, Germany ranked 10th with 63.77 points, located in very high-level English, while Turkey ranked 79th with 46.81 points, located in a very low level of English (EF, 2019).

Results show that instead of increasing success in EPI, Turkey is gradually decreasing its success among other countries. According to EPI reports, the source of the problems of English in Turkey is foreign language education are grammar-oriented lessons, constant repetition of the same content and limited communicative methods. In addition, in these reports, it is emphasized that despite the hundreds of hours added to the programs, the education that is based on grammar and memorization, focuses on translation and the content is transferred in Turkish, the students' enthusiasm for language learning is lost every year. However, despite all these reports it is also referred that Turkey is open to development and teachers are so qualified and competent enough to teach communicative language so this will soon be reflected in the achievement scores of adults (EF, 2015, 2017, 2019). In Turkey, when considering the data revealed about teaching English, despite nearly 20 years, the same problems of English teaching for young learners are continuing. The studies mention general problems related to teachers' practices. Comparative studies on English language curricula with other countries can be done because quality programs can direct teachers' practices. In Turkey, the reform in programs in 2005 was carried out by examining the education systems of especially the EU countries and countries that are successful in international exams. It is stated that the English language curriculum, renewed by the Ministry of Education, was prepared by taking into account the latest methodological and technological developments and up-to-date, research-based practices regarding teaching English to children, after a comprehensive review of effective programs in use in other countries (Kırkgöz, Çelik, & Arıkan, 2016). Comparative studies can also help identify the problems, and solutions to these problems used by other countries. Selective borrowings and transfers can be made with the help of comparative studies (Crossley, 2012). Also, they can be an overview of different implications to improve the English language curriculum in Turkey. Learning about how English education for early ages conducted in European countries that have been successful in assessments can also provide some information about how successful language education should be. In this context, Germany with more experience and more success in comparison with Turkey on foreign language education for early ages, can have an important contribution to Turkey. This study may provide theoretical contributions to English teaching, which has problems for long years in Turkey, as well as, it can be a resource for experts who have active roles in designing programs, decision-makers on the education system, and program practitioners. The purpose of this study is to compare general features of English language curricula, objectives, contents, teaching and learning processes, and assessment and evaluation approaches in the states of Germany (North Rhine-Westphalia, Baden-Württemberg, and Berlin) and Turkey and to determine the similarities and differences. For this purpose, research questions are defined as follows: What are the similarities and differences of Turkey and Germany primary school English language curricula in terms of general characteristics, the objectives, content, teaching and learning processes, and assessment and evaluation.

METHOD/MATERIALS

In terms of its content, this study is a comparative educational study. The purpose of comparing the education systems or education programs of two or more countries is to reveal the similarities and differences between these countries (Phillips, 2006). Bereday model, one of the comparative education models, was used in this study. Bereday states that four steps can be used in program evaluation consisting of description, interpretation, juxtaposition, and comparison (Wojniak, 2018). According to this model, when comparing two countries, firstly, the pedagogical knowledge of these countries is defined. Then an evaluation is made in terms of their political, economic, and social contexts. In the third step, similarities and differences are revealed. In the last step, the result is reached by comparing the hypotheses put forward according to similarities and differences (Adick, 2018). In this study, our aim is not to compare the whole education system, but to compare primary school English language curricula. For this reason, firstly, the documents of the primary school English language curricula that were the subject of the study in the context of pedagogical information were compiled. Similarities and differences were determined based on the data collected about the programs, and comparisons were made by interpreting these data.

Data Collection and Analysis

Since each state in Germany is responsible for its own programs, three states of Germany are taken as samples in this study. In Turkey, due to the central management, the main documents discussed in the study are primary school English language curricula of Turkey and the German states (North Rhine-Westphalia, Baden-Württemberg, and Berlin). In this study, even though Germany and Turkey may have a different history, context, governance, and sociological background, there are some reasons for this comparison. First, Germany is an EU member, and Turkey is currently implementing the EU criteria in education, although it is a candidate country. According to EU language policies, both countries use CEFR Basic Level (A1) and offer English language programs at primary school level (Eurydice, 2015a; Kultus Minister Konferenz [KMK], 2013; Board of Education [TTKB], 2013).

We collected the English language curricula of the countries and conducted a document analysis. Document analysis, according to Yıldırım and Şimşek (2005), "covers the analysis of written materials that contain information about the facts and phenomena aimed to be investigated" (p.187). During the research process, the researcher collects general (newspaper, meeting minutes, official reports, etc.) or private (personal diary, letter, e-mail, etc.) qualitative documents (Creswell, 2009). With the document analysis method, the English language curricula of the countries were discussed in detail, and the expectations of the programs, in theory, were presented. Documents were obtained from the official educational ministries of the countries (Baden-Württemberg Ministerium für Kultus, Jugend und Sport, 2004; Berlin Senatsverwaltung für Bildung, Jugend und Sport, 2006; Ministerium für Schule und Weiterbildung des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen, 2008; TTKB; 2013), the OECD official training site since both countries are OECD countries, university libraries and the Higher Education Institution Thesis Center. In the research, national and international search engines, databases, and accessible articles, theses, papers, and reports were examined. After collecting all available resources, all of them were categorized and examined.

The descriptive method was used for document analysis. In this method, facts or situations are described, and the relationship between variables is described (Theisen & Adams, 1990). The data collected in the study were defined comprehensively and the environment and data in which the data were collected were analyzed in detail and in-depth. The data obtained from the documents used in this study were processed with the coding according to the elements of the program and turned into data tables. Then, comparison tables were made in terms of program elements, and the data were interpreted. To define the findings in a rich way to ensure validity, it was supported with the literature, and the findings were presented by combining the experience of the researchers in the field. To increase validity and consistency, external supervisors who did not know the research provided controls during the study process. The necessary arrangements have been made by receiving the comments and suggestions of these controllers.

In comparative educational studies, the language factor may pose a serious problem, and the translation of certain concepts from one language to another can cause problems. However, if the researcher is fluent in the language of that country, this problem can be overcome. On the other hand, this is not usually possible. For this reason, translations may be involved, but with the help of experts, validity and reliability should be provided in this regard (Phillips, 2006). Since one of the researchers in this study is an experienced English teacher, she played an important role in controlling the translations of the programs. Before working with documents of Turkey, to overcome the language problem because the English language curriculum was initially written in English, it was translated into Turkish by an English teacher. Afterward, this translation was reviewed by two English teachers and the translations were finalized. The primary school English language curricula of the German states were translated from German to Turkish by a teacher candidate who was born in Germany and completed "Abitur" education in Germany, whose mother tongue is Turkish. German curricula translations were checked by a German teacher and finalized.

FINDINGS and DISCUSSION

In this chapter, similarities and differences of primary school English language curricula of Turkey and Germany were given in tables in terms of general characteristics, objectives, contents, teaching and learning processes, assessment and evaluation in the light of the data obtained. These data are interpreted in support of the literature.

Similarities and differences in terms of general features of primary school English language curricula of German states and Turkey

Table 1 shows similarities and differences of starting date for the English language curriculum of primary school, targeted proficiency in English, the start of English lessons in primary school, and the general features such as starting age and education time in German states and Turkey.

Table 1. General features of English language curricula

	Turkey	North Rhine-Westphalia	Baden Württemberg	Berlin
Program start date and pilot studies	Program in use 2012, Revision in 2017 No Pilot study	Program in use 2008 Pilot study 2005 -2007	Old program 2004 New program 2016 Pilot study 2001-2005	Program in use 2006 No information on pilot study
Language level targeted at the end of primary school	CEFR A1	CEFR A1	CEFR A1	CEFR A1
Starting age and education time	7-7,5 2, 3, 4	6 1, 2, 3, 4	6 1, 2, 3, 4	8 3, 4, 5, 6

According to Table 1, English education starts in the 3rd grade in Berlin and the 1st grade in North Rhine-Westphalia and Baden Württemberg (KMK, 2013). In Turkey, foreign language teaching at the primary level started for the first time in 1997, in the 4th grade of primary school with changes made in the education system with the process of EU integration. Then, the age of English language education was lowered and it started to be taught in the 2nd grade of primary school in the 2013-2014 academic year (TTKB, 2013). Finally, the new primary school English language curriculum, started in 2017-2018, was opened to comments of parents and teachers by the Ministry of Education. No major changes were made in the new program in terms of content. It is stated that the linguistic and pedagogical dimensions of the program were updated in line with the opinions received from teachers, families, and academicians. Besides, "Basic Skills" and "Values Education" dimensions were added to the curriculum. Basically, the English language curriculum has been reviewed and revised following the pedagogical philosophy of basic skills and values education (MEB, 2017a). However, these programs were implemented without pilot studies.

The North Rhine-Westphalia English language curriculum has been in the 1st grade of primary schools since 2008. A pilot study was conducted between 2005 and 2007 before the program was implemented. The English language curriculum of Baden Württemberg has been in the 1st grade in primary schools since 2004. A pilot study was conducted between 2001 and 2005 before the English language curriculum of 2006 was implemented. In this study, a comparison was made with the program of 2006. In 2016, a new English language curriculum was implemented. The Berlin English language curriculum has been in the 3rd grade of primary schools since 2006. For the state of Berlin, the researchers did not find any information about a pilot study. The starting age of primary school English program in North Rhine-Westphalia and Baden-Württemberg is different from Turkey. In these two states, the English language curriculum starts as of 1st grade, and students have English lessons at the age of 6. However, the primary school program in Berlin lasts 6 years, unlike the other two states. For this reason, foreign language education starts in 3rd grade in primary school. Students in Berlin start learning English at the age of 8 and in Turkey at the age of 7-7.5 Considering the implementation period of the English language curriculum during primary school, while the English language curriculum is implemented for 4 years in the German states; English education starts in the 2nd grade in Turkey and lasts 3 years. CEFR is used to define the expected English level at the end of primary school in Turkey and Germany. According to CEFR, at the end of primary school, English level in Turkey and German states (North Rhine-Westphalia, Baden-Württemberg, Berlin) is determined as A1. The A1 level is generally defined as follows:

"Can understand and use familiar everyday expressions and very basic phrases aimed at the satisfaction of needs of a concrete type. Can introduce him/herself and others and can ask and answer questions about personal details such as where he/she lives, people he/she knows and things he/she has. Can interact in a simple way provided the other person talks slowly and clearly and is prepared to help" (CEFR, 2001).

When education received time also considered to be important in foreign language education, students in Turkey receive English at least one year less than the students in Germany states. However, in EU countries and other continents, it tends to become widespread that children are introduced to a foreign language as early as possible, facilitating language acquisition and

lowering the age of starting English education in primary school due to the inherent motivations for foreign language (Enever & Moon, 2009; Johnstone, 2009). In this context, foreign language education can start at pre-school level in Turkey by providing longer exposure to the target language to facilitate increase in language proficiency. However, it can be said that pilot implementation is necessary to be sure that English language curricula are delivered with the right methods and approaches and that teachers can use these methods competently, and also to ensure that the process is scientific.

Similarities and differences of general objectives of primary school English language curricula of German states and Turkey

Primary English language curricula of German states and Turkey have overall objectives. General objectives indicate the knowledge, skills, behaviors and attitudes that are desired to be achieved with the program. Table 2 shows the general objectives of the English language curricula.

Table 2. General objectives of the English language curricula

Turkey	North Rhine-Westphalia	Baden Württemberg	Berlin
Creating students' love of learning foreign languages	Increasing children's interest and love for foreign languages and cultures	Giving the basics of foreign language learning	Enjoying foreign language learning
Ensuring that students become users of the language by gaining communicative competence	Giving, applying and strengthening the basic knowledge of English	Developing listening and speaking skills	Providing the opportunity to speak and communicate in a foreign language
Adopting that language learning is an enjoyable process	Getting daily conversation patterns of English Acquiring language learning skills and strategies	Developing language learning strategies	Teaching and developing multilingualism Language learning strategies
Drawing attention to cultural differences	Intercultural learning	Intercultural learning	Intercultural skills

According to Table 2 primary school English language curricula in Germany states and Turkey, priority is given to an effective objective. In the curricula, the objective of "enjoying learning a foreign language" is included to develop a positive attitude towards foreign languages. In line with this objective, children are expected to develop a positive attitude by meeting a foreign language at an early age which is stated as one of the main reasons of foreign language education. In the programs, it is also emphasized that speaking and listening are the primary goals for students to acquire the basic skills of the language. For this reason, it is recommended to create authentic environments for communicative competencies. Communicative competences are among the general objectives in both countries and the functional learning of the language is highlighted.

In the English language curricula of German states, language learning strategies and intercultural learning are the general objectives and they are emphasized strongly. In Turkey, in general objectives of the 2013 English language curriculum, cultural differences and learning strategies are mentioned only to draw attention. However, in addition to the content of foreign language education, intercultural education, which provides knowledge about other cultures, openness and empathy towards other cultures, critical approach to intercultural issues, ready to place one's own judgments in a wider perspective and encourage the ability to establish relationships with people from different cultures (Göbel & Helmke, 2010) is one of the general features of the CEFR framework. Among the general objectives of the English language curriculum for the early age group, it can be said that insufficient emphasis on intercultural education that can improve children's tolerance to differences and not including strategies that will facilitate language learning may reduce the interest in foreign language teaching and even lead to language learning failure in later years.

Similarities and differences of content of English language curricula of German states and Turkey

There are some similarities and differences between the primary school English language curricula of German states and Turkey in terms of the content of the program. These similarities and differences are given in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 3. Content of English language curricula

Turkey	North Rhine-Westphalia	Baden Württemberg	Berlin
Listening Speaking	Oral communication	Language proficiency and learning strategies	Listening comprehension / listening - visual comprehension

(Intercultural learning) (Compensation strategies)	Listening comprehension / listening-visual comprehension Participation in conversations Linked conversations <i>Reading</i> <i>Writing</i> (Limited and teacher corrects the mistakes) Language transfer Intercultural learning Their way of life understanding and comparison Using language Using linguistic tools Pronunciation and intonation Word memory and linguistic tools Grammar Spelling Methods Learning strategies and studying techniques Media usage Language awareness	Communication strategies and activities Comprehending strategies Comprehension activities (Listening-Reading not available until the end of 2nd grade) Production strategies and activities Production strategies Production Speaking (Writing does not exist until the end of 2nd grade) Interaction Strategies and activities Interaction strategies Verbal interaction Use of linguistic tools Pragmatic proficiency Dictionary proficiency Phonological proficiency Grammar proficiency General Competencies World knowledge Sociocultural knowledge Intercultural competence	Speaking Reading Reading out loud Writing Use of linguistic tools Competency Model Content <i>Intercultural skills</i> Attitude development Getting information Getting perspective <i>Language Skills</i> Perception skills (seeing, hearing, reading) Speaking and writing <i>Methodical Skills</i> Learning strategies Texts and media usage
---	--	--	---

In subject-focused programs, the subject area is divided into certain units, and content information is transferred. In student-centered programs, the content is determined according to the needs of the student. A curriculum design needs not to be subject-oriented or only student-centered (Ornstein & Hunkins, 2004). In Turkey, it is stated that the content is structured as skill-based divided into units, and also the needs of the students were taken into account. A subject-based program was considered by program designers to be the most appropriate design to enter the child's world by creating a context to present appropriate structures and vocabulary elements. It was predicted that the subject-based program structure leaves room for adaptation and allows for adjustments. It is also stated that the program aims to create a dynamic framework that enables students to use English as a meaningful and real-life interaction to become global citizens (Kırkgöz, Çelik, & Arıkan, 2016). In the states of Germany, English language curricula are designed as subject-based frameworks in line with skills. Content is transferred through themes, and the skills are not associated with these themes in the curricula. It can be said that autonomy is left to teachers and provides flexibility in German states. In Turkey, the English language curriculum limits the autonomy of teachers because it is too detailed and the outcomes are associated with each unit although it targets to be dynamic. One of the reasons for this program design can be differences in teacher training in Turkey and Germany. As previously mentioned, teachers in the German states have the opportunity to have at least 1.5 years of teaching practice before and after they graduate and imply the program. However, in Turkey, the graduates have limited opportunity to meet the students for teaching practice before graduation, and even they do not know which age group they will face. In this sense, it can be said that the programs are preferred to be designed more detailed and in a way to restrict teachers in Turkey.

According to Table 3, although they show similarities in terms of prioritizing listening and speaking skills, there is an important difference between the curricula of the two countries. While it is expected to reach the concrete, observable behavior for these skills at the end of each unit in Turkey curriculum, German states, using a broader perspective, focus on the skills at the end of 2 years period. For example, in North Rhine-Westphalia and Baden Württemberg, language skills are expressed in the frameworks as competency expectations at the end of the 2nd and 4th grades. In Berlin, the 3rd and 4th grade standards are shown together. The general objectives of these units are described separately for each skill area, and the competencies to be acquired to achieve these goals are explained. For this reason, A1 level skills are not defined separately for each grade in the German states. It can be said that this approach makes it easier for the teacher to adapt to pedagogical understandings such as the silent period, which means giving time to the input process, and gives importance to the process.

The competencies of English language curricula in German states and Turkey are given in relation to skill objectives, outcomes, or behaviors. For example, in the English language curriculum in Turkey, the general objectives of the curriculum are given, and the outcomes of the unit expected to be gained are stated in the unit structure. Skills to achieve these objectives are expressed in the outcomes. In the "Words" unit, the objective of "telling people what we know" is given with the outcome of "being able to distinguish common words in Turkish and English" in listening skill, and the outcome of "using the right words to describe certain objects, people and animals" in speaking skill. There is no unit organization in the English language curricula in German states. In the North Rhine-Westphalia English language curriculum, for the "listening" skill, the objective "They understand the audio and visual texts that contain simple expressions in the vocabulary, they understand familiar words and basic patterns about their environment when they are spoken slowly and clearly" is given with competency expectations (kompetenzerwartungen) "They understand sentences used in the classroom". In the English language curriculum in Baden-Württemberg, the objective of

"listening" is given by the competency expression (kompetenzen) "They can understand the speeches supported by the teacher with gestures and mimics in the lesson". For the "listening" skill objective in the English language curriculum in Berlin, "They can distinguish English from other languages." They can describe some elements of the language. If spoken slowly and simply, they can understand simple matters" is given with the outcome "Understands the description of people and certain objects".

It is seen that the English language curricula of the German states designed as frameworks are associated with areas such as intercultural education, world knowledge, sociocultural knowledge, and media. Particularly, competencies determined for intercultural skills and language learning strategies are included. Intercultural education is seen as the main objective in German schools. In this sense, when the competencies of the curricula of the German states are examined, it can be said that students' being open to other cultures is more important. After the '70s, due to the immigrant population and social diversity, differences in education, as well as equality and recognition of other cultures, have become an important principle (Allemann-Ghionda, 2011). The extent to which intercultural learning is included in programs and textbooks, and teachers' own experiences of the target culture, significantly affect the way children view other cultures in the classroom environment (Byram, Esarte-Sarries, & Taylor, 1990). In their studies on intercultural learning in foreign language education, Göbel and Helmke (2010) found that teachers with intercultural experience are more beneficial for their students in intercultural education. For this reason, teachers should give importance to intercultural learning, which increases the motivation of children towards language learning, strengthens intercultural understanding, and provides empathy towards others (Buttjes, 1991). In this context, it can be said that the intercultural experiences of English teachers who implement the program are important. The 2012-2013 English language curriculum of Turkey states that intercultural awareness needs to be taught as a means of cultural diversity appreciation (Kırkgöz, Çelik, & Arıkan, 2016). English not only includes dialogues between native and non-native speakers, but also includes a wide variety of dialogues between non-native speakers, and it is not a set of codes abstracted from its culture (Alptekin, 2002; Günday & Ayca, 2018). In this sense, it is stated that the cultural and intercultural aspects of the language of the program are also emphasized but the focus is both on the target culture and on home and world cultures (Kırkgöz, Çelik, & Arıkan, 2016). However, in the 2012 English language curriculum of Turkey, there is "Intercultural Awareness" with a total of only 3 outcomes. These outcomes were limited to very basic topics such as "They will be able to greet others in other languages in addition to Turkish and English"; "They will be able to say 'thank you' in different languages"; and "They will be able to recognize the traditional clothes and flags of different countries". In the general objectives of the primary school English language curriculum, which started in the 2017-2018 academic year, intercultural learning is mentioned, but the outcomes for intercultural learning are not included. In the area of intercultural learning in North Rhine-Westphalia, there are outcomes such as "They collect materials about English-speaking countries (such as pictures, posters, texts) to understand their daily lives"; "They organize these materials"; "They learn about everyday life in English-speaking countries (family, leisure time, school)"; "They know which songs, poems they sing, what games are played and which fairy tales are told in English-speaking countries". In Baden-Württemberg "They understand how different languages are"; "They make cultural comparisons and see the areas of similarity and differences, and they describe them by speaking in German. It attracts their attention, and they want to expand their knowledge" are the competence statements. In the English language curriculum of Berlin, it is stated that intercultural learning is a lifelong process shaped by other subjects and extra-curricular experiences. It is stated that only practical application in daily life can provide information about whether the objectives of intercultural learning are achieved. For this reason, year-specific standards are not shown in the program framework, but intercultural education constitutes one pillar of the skill-modeled structure in the general introduction of the program. Intercultural competence in this model consists of attitude development, knowledge acquisition, and perspective acquisition dimensions.

In the English language curriculum of Turkey, in the context of language learning strategies, the same approach is used as intercultural learning. In the English language curriculum of Baden Württemberg, which includes language learning strategies in the most effective way, there are outcomes for strategies for each skill. For example, for comprehension skills, "They can understand texts, sentences, and words based on daily life, situation, event or phrases"; "If they know another language, they can understand unknown words with the help of that other language"; "They can express themselves by experimenting with different combinations with the structures they know"; "Read and write short texts (they can take notes, use self-correction options, produce texts using text drafts)" competence statements are included. In Turkey's 2012-2013 English language curriculum, there are language learning strategies with only a small number of compensation strategies, and only a few outcomes were given. For example; "They will be able to say that they do not know the answer to the question"; "They will be able to ask the speaker for explanation to repeat what they said"; "They will be able to ask others to speak more slowly and repeat what they said"; It includes outcomes such as "Students can ask the English for words they do not know". In the primary school English language curriculum, which started in the 2017-2018 academic year, learning strategies are not included in the learning outcomes. However, learning strategies in foreign language learning have an important effect on students' academic achievements and attitudes. For example, Baş (2011) noted that teaching-learning strategies in English lessons for 8th-grade students have a positive effect on students' academic achievement, metacognitive awareness levels, and attitudes towards the lesson. For this reason, it can be said that the use of strategies can be increased by increasing the self-regulation and self-efficacy of students with language learning strategies teaching at early ages.

There is grammar teaching in the English language curricula of German states and Turkey. However, the contents of this learning area are different from each other. For example, in the English language curriculum of Turkey, there are suggested language constructs under each unit and structures specified in detail and there are examples. It can be said that the grammar knowledge expected in German states is lower than in the English language curriculum of Turkey. For example, at the end of the 2nd class in the curriculum of Turkey required grammatical structure "make simple suggestions" is given with an example like "Let's dance"; Talking about possessions" was given with examples like "Look at my nose, Point to your head." A structure that includes such directives and does not give the teacher space to use different language structures inevitably limits the teacher autonomy. The grammar structures expected to be acquired in the English language curriculum of North Rhine-Westphalia, one of the German states, are specified with very general expressions. For example, the structures to be acquired at the end of the 2nd grade in this state are given as follows; "They make simple sentences"; "They name person, object and place (first person singular and third-person singular: This is a dog, it's big.)"; "They know the regular plural structure (car-cars)", "They can make negative sentences (I don't like ..., Tom is not ...)", and "They can ask simple contextual questions (What's this?)". Cameron (2001) states that since grammar cannot be taught formally in the early age group, suitable ways should be found to convey meaningful language by using meaningful clues in the language used. In the primary school English language curricula of German states and Turkey, it is recommended to give grammar not as formal but in meaningful units. This method may be possible if the communicative method is used and supported by songs and games. In this respect, the grammatical structures suggested in the programs can be given at older ages by analyzing the language. In the early age group, they cannot comprehend abstract operations because they are in the concrete operational period. In the German states of Baden Württemberg primary school English lesson program, under the heading of the use of linguistic tools, there are pragmatic competence, verbal competence, phonological competence, and grammatical competence and also besides structural competencies in the use of language, there are other necessary competencies as well as. In the English language curriculum of Turkey, the necessary emphasis on these competencies is not given.

In the English language curriculum of Turkey, there are no writing skill objectives until 4th grade. It is expected that limited reading and writing activities are included in projects and portfolio studies, especially in the 4th grade. Reading and writing competencies are also included in the English language curricula of the German states. It is stated that the writing skill, especially starting with the 3rd grade, should not be corrected by the teacher until the 4th grade.

The English language curriculum of Berlin provides simple, intermediate, and advanced standards. These standards are given because students can go to different secondary education after primary school in the German education system. According to these levels, some of the students fulfill the simple standards in the program. Some of them are allowed to obtain intermediate and advanced standards by doing extra work. However, it is stated that the early age group cannot reach intermediate and advanced standards in terms of mental development, and 3rd and 4th-grade students are expected to reach simple standards. In this sense, it can be said that more places are given to individual differences in the education system of Berlin.

Besides, Baden Württemberg preferred interdisciplinary design in its English language curriculum renewed in 2016 and started a content-based language teaching model (Content Integrated Language Learning, CLIL) that provides English integration with other lessons by not limiting English learning to course hours. It is encouraged to use English not only in class hours but in other lessons and areas. In Turkey, although CLIL is mentioned in the English language curriculum of Turkey, it is emphasized to perform only at the secondary level.

Table 4. Units and themes of English language curricula

Turkey	North Rhine-Westphalia	Baden Württemberg	Berlin
Units	Themes		
2. grade	At home, here and there	Themes	
Vocabulary	Me and my family	Me and my family	
Friends	My friends	Body	Themes
In the class	At home and out	Clothes	Me and others
Numbers	Every day and year	At home	People
Colors	Throughout the year	Free time	Family
On the playground	Body and clothes	School	Friends
Parts of the body	Food and beverages	Daily routines	Habitat
Pets	Special days	Eating, Drinking and Shopping	Food
Fruit	Learning, study and leisure	Traveling	Young people's experiences
Animals	time	Nature and Animals	School
3. grade	At school	Additional themes	Leisure and behavior
Wheel of fortune	Request	Colors	Growing
My family	Free time	Numbers, date and time,	Nature
The people that I like	A world for us all	Years and holidays	
Feelings	Our nature	Weather forecast	
Toys and games	Our environment		
My home	Children of the World		

In my city Transportation Weather, Nature	Opening wings to a fantasy world Fantasy world Fairy tales
---	---

The primary school English language curricula of the German states and Turkey have the same educational principles. The difference in this regard is the formation of the English language curriculum of Turkey, which has units with specific objectives and consists of the outcomes of these specific objectives while Germany states primary English language curricula are designed as frameworks around themes. In other words, the behaviors that the students are expected to have are not matched with the themes, and it is expected from teachers to produce content for themes covering both classes. Also, the objectives of the English language curricula of German states are expressed in terms of competencies, behaviors, and standards. Likewise, content analysis of English language curricula and 3rd and 4th-grade textbooks of Turkey and Portugal conducted by Fişne, Güngör, Guerra, and Gonçalves (2018) shows each unit is matched with language functions in the English language curriculum in Turkey. In the same study, in the English language curriculum in Portugal, language functions are not directly specified as a separate part of the program. Also, in the study conducted by Demir and Yavuz (2014), it is stated that the qualifications to be achieved at the end of both classes in the Finnish English language curriculum are given in a general framework. In the same study in Japan, Korea, and China (Shanghai) as in Turkey, there are separate activities and communicative functions for each stage. Of course, these differences in program designs should be evaluated in the context of teacher qualifications of countries. It can be said that the degree of autonomy given to English teachers is determined by the program. In this context, teachers in Turkey state that they have 'difficulty in finishing the units on time because of time constraints', and teachers have limited chances to adapt their teaching according to the requirements of their class although the program is stated to be student-centered.

In German states, the outcomes of the competence expected to be acquired are defined at the end of two years in contrast with the English language curriculum of Turkey which has outcomes at the end of each unit. This difference between the contents of the programs shapes the expectations of teachers. In the English language curriculum of Turkey, the difficulties of converting these outcomes into a skill by students are ignored and it can be said that the teacher is given the role of only evaluating these outcomes at the end of each unit. On the other hand, the holistic approach in the states of Germany allows the student to acquire this skill over time and gives the teacher a more holistic evaluation opportunity and emphasizes the process. Although, in the English language curriculum of Turkey it is stated theoretically that process is important, the approach used in designing the program can be said to be an obstacle to achieve that.

Unlike Turkey, Baden-Württemberg, and Berlin, in the North Rhine-Westphalia English language curriculum, there are themes like "At home and abroad, One World for all, Opening Wings to a Fantasy World, Fantasy World, Fairy Tales". It is seen that these additional themes seen in the North Rhine-Westphalia program will enable students to move from the local to the global, increase their awareness of global citizenship by realizing that the world is the common property of humanity, and try to gain a perspective that can develop future perspectives by developing fantasy worlds. It can be said that the development of children's imaginations gives them a vision in terms of their plans for the future and creates an infrastructure for progress.

Similarities and differences of teaching and learning processes of English language curricula of German states and Turkey

Although many situations regarding the early age group are still unknown, studies conducted in foreign language classes generally examined age-appropriate methods, attitudes, learning outcomes, and the impacts of the second language acquisition on the mother tongue. In these studies, it was determined that different practices are required for the early age group other than the methods and techniques used in foreign language education to adults (Muñoz, 2014). Children's motivation for learning, openness to different cultures, and the ability to acquire an accent can be beneficial if they can be combined with the right methods and techniques while they acquire the language. In Table 5 when teaching and learning processes of Germany states and Turkey elementary school English lesson programs are examined, it can be seen that they have the same foreign language teaching methods, approach, interdisciplinary fields, language learning strategies, and intercultural learning but with different rates.

Table 5. Learning and teaching processes of English language curricula

Turkey	North Rhine-Westphalia	Baden Württemberg	Berlin
Constructivist, humanist approach Student-centered	Constructivist, humanist approach Student-centered	Constructivist, humanist approach Student-centered	Constructivist, humanist approach Student-centered
Eclectic method, TPR	Communicative method, Silent period, TPR	CLIL	Collaborative and individual learning
Activity-based learning	Activity-based learning, Competence-based learning	Action-situation-thematic-based learning	Activity-based learning, Project-based learning
Use of language in an authentic, communicative environment	Use of language in an authentic, communicative environment	Use of language in an authentic, communicative environment	Use of language in an authentic, communicative environment

Using games, songs, picture words	Games, song, poem	Experience and game-based training	
Cultural differences	Intercultural learning	Intercultural learning	Intercultural learning
	Media usage	Media usage	Media usage
Compensation strategies	Learning strategies and studying techniques	Language learning strategies	Learning strategies

Table 5 shows that there are similarities in terms of the teaching and learning process due to the use of CEFR as a framework by primary school English language curriculum of German states and Turkey. In the English language curricula of Germany states and Turkey, the constructivist approach based on progressive philosophy and student-centered, humanist, and experience-based curriculum design is used. Common skills in the primary school English language curricula of Germany states and Turkey are listening and speaking skills. Therefore, in Turkey primary school English language curriculum proposes that the appropriate method is eclectic as these skills cannot be acquired by using a single method of teaching, and TPR and student-centered communicative methods in terms of action-based approach are encouraged to be used. The programs are designed in a spiral manner, ensuring the repetition of the acquired structure and content. In early age group programs, the necessity of making English learning enjoyable through songs and games is also underlined. Besides, the importance of project-based education in the state of Berlin is emphasized. To use these methods and approaches, teacher education becomes important because different pedagogical needs are necessary for each age group. Because of differences in the two countries' teacher training approach, when compared English teachers in Germany with the English teachers in Turkey, It can be said that they are more advantageous both because they find the possibility of implications during their trainee and also pedagogically better equipped for early ages to teach English in college where they have pedagogical instruction for the group of children.

In the frameworks of the English language curricula of German states, intercultural learning, media use, learning strategies, and working techniques are considered as very important elements of the learning and teaching process. Although these skills are needed in the 21st century, they are not included enough in the English language curriculum of Turkey.

The use of authentic material is encouraged in terms of text types and materials to be used in the curricula of both countries. It is important to include authentic learning situations with objects, situations, and relationships that the student may encounter in his/her daily life to ensure interaction in language. For this purpose, songs, magazines, newspapers, television programs, brochures, tickets, literary texts, web pages, etc. documents can be used as authentic materials in foreign language teaching. The most important advantages of authentic materials are that authentic materials motivate students, bring real-life situations to the classroom, contribute to the transfer of culture, and are interesting. On the other hand, the disadvantages of authentic materials are that students' motivation decreases when the language used is above the students' level, the preparation phase is very time-consuming, and the cultural elements it contains are above the students' perception levels. However, it can be said that the advantages of using authentic materials are more than their disadvantages (Temizyürek & Birinci, 2016).

In the North Rhine-Westphalia English language curriculum, attention is drawn to the silent period understanding. It is emphasized that the students should be expected to receive as much input as necessary and that teachers should not force them during their silent periods. This approach is not mentioned in the English language curriculum of Turkey. The English language curriculum, which is shaped especially for speaking skills, should provide sufficient input for the output during the silent period, which is one of the principles of foreign language learning. A negative perspective should not be developed against students who are in this period. In addition, it can be stated that Baden Württemberg adopts a different approach from other states and Turkey as it uses the CLIL method that encourages the use of English in other lessons in the English language curriculum.

Similarities and differences of assessment and evaluation methods of primary school English language curricula of German states and Turkey

In terms of assessment and evaluation methods, primary school English language curricula of German states and Turkey emphasizes process according to CEFR. In Table 6, assessment and evaluation methods of the primary school English language curricula of German states and Turkey are seen.

Table 6. Assessment and evaluation in English language curricula

Turkey	North Rhine-Westphalia	Baden Württemberg	Berlin
Written, oral, exams, quizzes, homework and projects	Written and oral exams	No written exam in 1st and 2nd grade	Written assessment in 2th grade
No grading ratings	No grading ratings	Grading assessment in 3rd and 4th grade	Written assessment in 4th grade
CEFR	CEFR	CEFR	CEFR
Teacher observations, control list	Teacher observations	Teacher observations	Feedback and guidance
Self-evaluations	Self-evaluations	Self-evaluations	Self-evaluations

Evaluation is made by comment and does not affect grade progression	Evaluation is made by comment and success is important for grade progression like any other course.	Evaluation is by comment and does not affect grade progression	Evaluation is made by comment and does not affect grade progression
---	---	--	---

According to Table 6, the assessment processes of the primary school English language curricula of Germany states and Turkey shows similarities as they do not have written and oral exams, review to report is used rather than grades which do not affect the passing, they have a portfolio assessment. It is also recommended to use the Europass Language Passport (ELP).

Primary school English language curricula of Germany states and Turkey take the assessment as a process. Similarly, self-assessment and peer-assessment are used in both countries' curricula of the English language. Since active learning is closely related to learning to learn and cognitive learning, it is very important that self-assessment, which enables one to manage and question one's own learning, and peer assessment, which strengthens self-assessment skills, are among alternative assessment methods (Yurdabakan, 2011). When we look at the differences between the evaluation methods of primary school English language curricula, Baden-Wurttemberg allows written exams in 3rd grade. In Turkey, the written exam can be made in the 4th grade English class program. At the end of the academic year, there is no grade for the English course, but comments are made. These comments are in Turkey "very good", "good", "needs improvement". In the states of Germany, it is seen as open-ended comments. Besides, assessments in North Rhine-Westphalia affect passing.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this study aiming to examine and put forward the necessary recommendations for the primary school English language curricula of Turkey, it was observed that there are some similarities and differences between the English language curricula of Turkey and German states. Among the common features of the general objectives of the curricula can be listed as speaking and listening based on CEFR A1 level; Introduction to English; giving the pleasure of language learning and the use of student-centered and action-based approaches. These objectives can avoid the grammar-translation method that caused the failure in learning English for many years in Turkey and it is important to be demonstrated that this method is unsuitable for younger age groups and should not be in use in English lessons. Besides, it is quite meaningful that adopting an affective objective such as developing a love for learning a foreign language at an early age group and putting it before common cognitive goals which is common in the Turkish education system. However, it can be said that the content should be simplified to realize the game-based education needed by the early age group that the curriculum tries to support with content. Considering the hours of the lessons, instead of completing the unit, teachers should be able to design their lessons by setting general outcomes at the end of the 4th grade for the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th grade, as in German states, and to determine the time according to the needs of their students to reach these general outcomes can give positive results. In this sense, considering the silent period, it may be a solution not to assess until the end of the 4th grade. In this case, it may be easier for teachers to evaluate the process for language skills, by monitoring the development of their students and without decreasing their motivation.

According to the differences, making some more suggestions for the primary school English language curriculum in Turkey is possible. The primary school English language curriculum in Turkey is different from German states in terms of the absence of the pilot study and later age of onset. Regarding the age of onset, the longer the exposure to language, the more it can be improved, and at the same time, considering the advantages of the early age group in the direction of the 'Critical Period Hypothesis', it may be possible to reduce the age of onset to preschool. However, it should be taken into consideration that the pleasure of learning a foreign language at a much earlier age may disappear due to the implementation of the programs without pilot study and the deficiencies in teacher training.

One of the most important differences is in the program contents. While English language curricula in German states have general frameworks, in Turkey the program content was formed into units with outcomes allocated to each unit. In this way, a program that precisely draws boundaries has been created for teachers in Turkey. This curriculum approach which affects teacher autonomy to a great extent can be revised and more flexibility can be given to teachers. In this context, by examining the design of the 2016 English language curriculum of Baden-Wurttemberg, prepared on the basis of CLIL programs, an interdisciplinary approach can be adapted in Turkey. With this approach, which makes associations with other courses using an interdisciplinary pattern, the English language curriculum can provide both the functional use of the language and better language learning by the student.

Turkey's revised English language curriculum in 2017 does not have objectives regarding language strategies and intercultural education. Therefore, there are differences in some teaching processes based on these elements. To increase the independent learning skills of the students, different learning strategies should be given in Turkey. Also, it can be said that intercultural learning should be included, which will enable using English as a communication tool and being open to other cultures. Intercultural learning is particularly emphasized in the primary school English language curricula of three states in Germany. It can be seen in our study that intercultural education is seen as one of the main objectives in the English language curricula of the German states. It is underlined that increasing the intercultural awareness of individuals can make their relations with other cultures healthier and increase their cooperation. A foreign language curriculum can serve as an ideal tool to realize tolerance to diversity, not only in terms of the cultural elements of the target language but also build intercultural bridges by recognizing cultural diversity and

enable them to become global citizens. Moreover, in the 21st century, interactions with other cultures are increasing due to the increase in physical and virtual circulation. For this reason, countries should switch from a national-centered education approach to an intercultural understanding of education (Allemann-Ghionda, 2011). In this context, the necessary emphasis on intercultural learning in the curriculum of Turkey may be able to increase the intercultural awareness of children at an early age and develop tolerance. In Turkey, appropriate pedagogies and teaching materials should be developed to help students to be bilingual and intercultural individuals who function well in both domestic and international environments (Alptekin, 2002). In this respect, similar to Germany's multicultural environment, due to increasing migration in Turkey, the English language curriculum should be considered revising in terms of intercultural education.

The primary school English language curriculum of Turkey was designed by taking into account the general characteristics of the Turkish education system such as crowded classrooms, the weekly workload of teachers, technological devices provided for students, national exam preparations (Kırkgöz, Çelik & Arıkan, 2016). The curriculum should be revised according to today's conditions by controlling it again and again for its problems and strengths, and more realistic foreign language education policies should be established. As a result, it is not enough to start language learning at an early age. Quality education is not just numerical changes; it also requires qualified teachers, materials, programs, a supportive environment, and continuity (Edelenbos, Johnstone, & Kubanek, 2006). Countries need detailed comparative education studies and expert opinions for conscious policy borrowing, adaptation, and implementation while developing their curriculum in an environment that has gradually turned into a competitive league due to international large-scale examinations. Therefore, in developing the English language curriculum of Turkey, we should ensure effective participation of the curriculum development experts and academic staff. In future comparison studies, the influence of stakeholders can be analyzed by using observations and interviews. In this context, comparative education studies, analyzing other countries' policies and examining the new methods they use, should be increased due to the increasing global information flow and interaction.

Ethics Committee Approval Information

Name of the committee conducting the ethical evaluation = Abant İzzet Baysal University Human Research Ethics Committee in Social Sciences

Date of ethics assessment decision = 21/7/2015

Ethics evaluation certificate issue number = 2015/89

REFERENCES

- Acar, A. (2019). Turkey'deki 2013 ve 2018 İlkokullar ve Ortaokullar İngilizce Dersi Öğretim Programlarının Karşılaştırılması: 7. Sınıf İzlencelerinin Analizi [A Comparison of the 2013 and 2018 Primary and Secondary Schools ELT Curricula in Turkey: An Analysis of 7th-Grade Syllabi]. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 48 (224), 299 - 325
- Adick, C. (2018). Bereday and Hilker: Origins of the 'Four Steps of Comparison' Model. *Comparative Education*, 54 (1), 35-48, doi: 10.1080/03050068.2017.1396088
- Aksoy, E. (2020). Evaluation of the 2017 Updated Secondary School English Curriculum of Turkey by Means of Theory-Practice Link. *Turkish Journal of Education*, 9 (1), 1-21.
- Aldım, Ü. F. (2018). *İlkokul İngilizce Öğretim Programlarının Karşılaştırılması (Finlandiya, Polonya ve Türkiye örneği) [Comparison of primary school English curriculum (Finland, Poland and Turkey sample)]*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Malatya.
- Alkan, M. F. & Arslan, M. (2014). İkinci Sınıf İngilizce Öğretim Programının Değerlendirilmesi [Evaluation of the 2nd Grade English Language Curriculum]. *Uluslararası Eğitim Programları ve Öğretim Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 4 (7), 87-99.
- Allemann-Ghionda, C. (2011). Comments on Intercultural Education in German Guidelines and Curricula. C. A. Grant, A. Portera (Edt.). In *Intercultural and Multicultural Education: Enhancing Global Interconnectedness*. New York: Routledge
- Alptekin, C. (2002). Towards intercultural communicative competence in ELT. *ELT Journal*, 56 (1), 57-64.
- Arnové, R. F. (2013). Arnove, R.F. (2003). Introduction: Reframing Comparative Education. R. F. Arnove, C. Alberto & A. Torres (Edt.) In *Comparative Education: The Dialectic of the Global and the Local* (pp.1-24). London: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Atabey, E. & Bulut, İ. (2016). İlkokul İkinci Sınıf İngilizce Dersi Öğretim Programının Uygulamadaki Etkililiğinin Değerlendirilmesi [An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of the Primary School 2nd Grade English Language Curriculum in Practice] İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 17 (3), 257-280. doi: 10.17679/inuefd.17366404
- Aybek, B., (2015). İlkokul İkinci Sınıf İngilizce Dersinin İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Görüşlerine Dayalı Olarak Değerlendirilmesi An Evaluation of Primary Education Second Grade English Course Based Upon the Views of English Teachers] *Turkish Studies*, 10 (15), 67-84. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.8765>

- Baden-Württemberg Ministerium für Kultus, Jugend und Sport (2004). *Bildungsplan 2004-Grundschule*. <http://www.bildungsplaenebw.de/site/bildungsplan/get/documents_E1204433591/lsbw/Bildungsplaene/Bildungsplaene2004/Bildungsstandards/Grundschule_Bildungsplan_Gesamt.pdf> (2015, 10 June)
- Baş, G. (2011). Öğrenme Stratejileri Öğretiminin Öğrencilerin İngilizce Dersindeki Akademik Başarılarına, Tutumlarına ve Bilişötesi Farkındalık Düzeylerine Etkisi [The Effect of Teaching Learning Strategies in an English Lesson on Students' Achievement, Attitudes, and Metacognitive Awareness] *Journal of Theoretical Educational Science*, 5 (1), 49-71.
- Berlin Senatsverwaltung für Bildung, Jugend und Sport (2006). *Rahmenlehrplan für die Grundschule und die Sekundarstufe I-Jahrgangsstufe 3-6-Grundschule-Jahrgangsstufe 7-10-Hauptschule, Realschule, Gesamtschule, Gymnasium-Englisch 1./2. Fremdsprache*. <https://www.berlin.de/sen/bildung/unterricht/faecher-rahmenlehrplaene/rahmenlehrplaene/mdb-sen-bildung-schulorganisation-lehrplaene-gr_englisch.pdf> (2015, 10 June)
- Bliesener, U., (1998). Foreign Language Teaching in Germany. I. Tapia, G. M. Blochmann (Ed.) In *Education and Science* (pp.2-32). Collected Works Serials (022) Reports – Descriptive, 141.
- Brumfit, C. (2002). *Global English and Language Teaching in the Twenty-First Century*. Occasional Paper. Centre for Language in Education, Research & Graduate School of Education, University of Southampton.
- Buttjes, D. (1991). Mediating Languages and Cultures: The Social and Intercultural Dimension Restored. D. Buttjes, M. Byram (Ed.) In *Mediating Languages and Cultures: Towards an Intercultural Theory of Foreign Language Education* (pp.17-32). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Büyükduman, F. İ. (2005). İlköğretim Okulları İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Birinci Kademe İngilizce Öğretim Programına İlişkin Görüşleri [The Opinions of Elementary School English Teachers on the English Curriculum for Elementary Schools] *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 28, 55–64.
- Byram, M. Esarte-Sarries, V. & Taylor, S. (1990). *Cultural Studies and Language Learning: A Research Report*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cameron, L. (2001). *Teaching Languages to Young Learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- CEFR (2001). *The CEFR Levels*. <https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages/level-descriptions>
- Creswell, J.W. (2009). *Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. (3. Ed.). London: Sage.
- Crossley, M. (2012). Comparative Education and Research Capacity Building: Reflections on International Transfer and the Significance of Context. *Journal of International and Comparative Education*, 1 (1), 4-12.
- Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Demir, O. & Duruhan, K. (2015). İlkokul 2. Sınıf İngilizce Dersi Programı Uygulamalarına İlişkin Öğretmen Görüşleri [Teachers' Views on Primary School 2nd Grade English Lesson Program Practices] *International Journal of New Trends in Arts, Sports & Science Education*, 4 (3). ISSN: 2146 – 9466.
- Demir, Y. & Yavuz, M. (2014). Finlandiya, Japonya, Kore, Çin (Şangay) ve Turkey'deki İngilizce Dersi Öğretim Programlarının Karşılaştırmalı Olarak İncelenmesi [A Comparative Analysis of the English Language Curricula in Finland, Japan, Korea, China (Shanghai) and Turkey] *Mediterranean Journal of Humanities*, 4 (1), 115-128. doi:10.13114/MJH.201416428
- Dovring, K. (1997). *English as Lingua Franca: Double Talk in Globalized Persuasion*. London: Praeger.
- Doye, P. & Hurrell, A. (Edt.). (1997). *Foreign Language Learning in Primary Schools (age 5/6 to 10/11)*. Germany: Council of Europe.
- Edelenbos, P., Johnstone, R. & Kubanek, A. (2006). *The Main Pedagogical Principles Underlying the Teaching of Languages to Very Young Learners Languages for the Children of Europe*. European Commission. Final Report of the EAC 89/04, Lot 1 study.
- Ekuş, B. & Babayiğit, Ö. (2013). İlkokul 2. Sınıftan İtibaren Yabancı Dil Eğitimi Verilmesine İlişkin Sınıf ve İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Görüşlerinin İncelenmesi [Investigation of Primary School Teachers' and English Teachers' Views About from Second Grade Primary School to be on Foreign Language Education About] *Researcher: Social Science Studies*, 1, 40-49. doi: 10.18301/rss.3
- Enever, J. & Moon, J., (2009). New Global Contexts for Teaching Primary ELT: Change and Challenge. J. Enever, J. Moon, U. Raman (Eds.) In *Young Learner English Language Policy and Implementation: International Perspectives* (pp.5-20). Reading, UK: Garnet Publishing.
- Enever, J. & Moon, J. (2010). A Global Revolution? Teaching English at Primary School. <<https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/events/seminars>> (2016, 1 October)
- EF (2014). *English Proficiency Index for Companies* <<http://media.ef.com/~/media/centralefcom/epi/v4/downloads/epi-c/ef-epi-c-english-191114.pdf>> (2015, 17 April)
- EF (2015). *English Proficiency Index for Companies*. <<http://media2.ef.com/~/media/centralefcom/epi/downloads/full-reports/v5/ef-epi-2015-english.pdf>> (2016, 17 January)
- EF (2017). *English Proficiency Index for Companies*. <<https://www.ef.com.tr/epi/>> (2018, 17 July)
- EF (2019). *English Proficiency Index for Companies*. <<https://www.ef.com/~/media/centralefcom/epi/downloads/full-reports/v9/ef-epi-2019-english.pdf>> (2019, 17 February)
- Eurostat (2015). *More than 80% of Primary School Pupils in the EU were Studying a Foreign Language in 2013*. Newsletter. 164/2015 – (2015, 24 September).
- European Commission, (2011). *European Strategic Framework for Education and Training (ET 2020) Language Learning at Pre-Primary School Level: Making It Efficient and Sustainable. A Policy Handbook*. <http://ec.europa.eu/languages/policy/language-policy/documents/early-language-learning-handbook_en.pdf> (2015, 23 April)

- European Commission, (2014). *Languages in Education and Training: Final Country Comparative Analysis*. <https://ec.europa.eu/assets/eac/education/experts-groups/2011-2013/languages/lang-eat_en.pdf> (2015, 10 April)
- Eurydice (2012). *Avrupa'da Okullarda Dil Öğretimi üzerine Önemli Veriler*. <http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/key_data_series/143TR_HI.pdf> (2015, 10 April)
- Eurydice (2015a). *Germany: Primary Education*. <https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/mwikis/eurydice/index.php/Germany:Teaching_and_Learning_in_Primary_Education#Foreign_language_teaching> (2016, 6 July)
- Eurydice (2015b). *Initial Education for Teachers Working in Early Childhood and School Education*. <https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/mwikis/eurydice/index.php/Germany:Initial_Education_for_Teachers_Working_in_Early_Childhood_and_School_Education#First_stage_of_teacher_training:_Studies_at_a_higher_education_institution> (2016, 22 September)
- Fişne, F. N., Güngör, M. N., Guerra, L. & Gonçalves, O. (2018). A CEFR-based Comparison of ELT Curriculum and Course Books used in Turkish and Portuguese Primary Schools. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 12 (2), 129-151.
- Fretwell, D. H. & Wheeler, A. (2001). *Turkey: Secondary Education and Training*. Washington DC: The World Bank.
- Gnutzmann, C. (2011). English Language Teaching in Germany: A Reflection of the National and Universal Importance of English. G. Braine (Ed.) In *Teaching English to the World: History, Curriculum and Practice*. (ss.23-35). Routledge: New York. doi: 10.4324/9781410612861
- Göbel, K. & Helmke, A. (2010). Intercultural Learning in English as Foreign Language Instruction: The Importance of Teachers' Intercultural Experience and the Usefulness of Precise Instructional Directives. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 1571-1582.
- Günday, R. & Aycan, A. (2018). The Acquisition of Intercultural Communication Skill in Foreign Language Learning. *International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching*, 6 (3), 533-545.
- İyitoğlu, O. & Alçı, B. (2015). A Qualitative Research on 2nd Grade Teachers' Opinions about 2nd Grade English Language Teaching Curriculum. *İlköğretim Online*, 14 (2), 682-696. doi: 10.17051/io.2015.73998.
- Jaekel, N., Schurig, M., Florian, M. & Ritter, M. (2017). From Early Starters to Late Finishers? A Longitudinal Study of Early Foreign Language Learning in School. *Language Learning*, 67 (3), 631-664. doi: 10.1111/lang.12242
- Johnstone, R. (2009). An Early Start: What are the Key Conditions for Generalized Success? J. Enever, J. Moon, U. Raman (Eds.) In *Young Learner English Language Policy and Implementation: International Perspectives* (pp.31-43). Reading, UK: Garnet Publishing.
- Kaya, S. & Ok, A. (2016). The Second Grade English Language Curriculum: Theory-Practice Congruence. *Pegem Eğitim ve Öğretim Dergisi*, 6 (4), 491-512, doi: 10.14527/pedagog.2016.024.
- Kırgöz Y. (2008). Curriculum Innovation in Turkish Primary Education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 36 (4), 309-322.
- Kırgöz, Y. (2009). Globalization and English Language Policy at Primary Education in Turkey. *English as an International Language Journal*, 5, 176-181.
- Kırgöz, Y., Çelik, S. & Arıkan, A. (2016). Laying the Theoretical and Practical Foundations for a New Elementary English Curriculum in Turkey: A Procedural Analysis, *Kastamonu Education Journal*, 24 (3), 1199-1212.
- Kızıldağ, A. (2009). Teaching English in Turkey: Dialogues with Teachers about the Challenges in Public Primary Schools. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 1 (3), 188-201.
- KMK (Kültürs Minister Konferenz) (2013). *Bericht "Fremdsprachen in der Grundschule – Sachstand und Konzeptionen. 2013"*. <https://www.kmk.org/fileadmin/Dateien/veroeffentlichungen_beschluesse/2013/2013_10_17-Fremdsprachen-in-der-Grundschule.pdf> (2015, 10 June)
- Küçüktepe, S. E., Küçüktepe, Ç. & Baykın, Y. (2014). İkinci sınıf İngilizce Dersi ve Öğretim Programına İlişkin Öğretmen Görüşlerinin İncelenmesi [An Investigation of Teachers' Views on the Second Grade English Course and Curriculum] *Hasan Ali Yücel Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 11 (22), 55-78.
- Merter, F., Şekerci, H. & Bozkurt, E. (2014). İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin İkinci Sınıf İngilizce Dersine İlişkin Görüşlerinin Değerlendirilmesi [Assessment of the English Teachers' Opinions on the Second Grade English Classes] *Akademik Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 2 (5), 199-210.
- Ministerium für Schule und Weiterbildung des Landes Nordrhein – Westfalen (2008). *Lehrplan Englisch für die Grundschulen des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen*. <https://www.schulentwicklung.nrw.de/lehrplaene/upload/klp_gs/GS_LP_E.pdf> (2015, 10 June)
- Neuner, G. (2002). *Policy Approaches to English*. Council of Europe, Strasbourg. <https://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/NeunerEN.pdf>. (2015, 20 Ağustos)
- Ornstein, A. C. & Hunkins, F. P. (2004). *Curriculum: Foundations, Principles and Issues*. (4. Ed.). USA: Pearson Education Inc.
- Özudoğru, F. & Adıgüzel, O. C. (2016). The Analysis of the Views of English Teachers about 2nd Grade English Language Teaching Curriculum, *E-International Journal of Educational Research*, 7 (2), 16-35. doi: 10.19160/e-ijer.12341.
- Phillips, D. (2006). Comparative Education: Method. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 1 (4), 304-319.
- Solak, E. & Semerci, H. (2015). İkinci Sınıfta İngilizce Öğretimine Yönelik Öğretmen ve Öğrenci Görüşleri [The Views of English Teachers and Students towards Learning English at the Second Grade of Elementary Schools] *Dil ve Edebiyat Eğitimi Dergisi*, 16, 1-23.
- Şad, S. N. & Karaova, M. (2015). İlkokul İkinci sınıf İngilizce Dersi bağlamında Dinleme Becerisi Öğretimi: Bir Durum Çalışması [Teaching Listening Skill within the Context of Primary School 2nd Grade English Course: A Case Study] *Eğitimde Nitel Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 3 (2), 66-95. doi:10.14689/issn.2148-2624.1.3c2s4m.

- TEDMEM (2013). *Aynı şeyi Yapıp Farklı Sonuç Beklemek (!)*. <<https://tedmem.org/mem-notlari/gorus/einsteinin-turkiyedeki-yabanci-dil-egitimi-hakkindaki-gorusu>> (2018, 8 August)
- TELC & MEB (2013). *Diller için Avrupa Ortak Öneriler Çerçevesi Öğrenim, Öğretim ve Değerlendirme [Common European Framework of Reference for Languages Learning, Teaching and Assessment]* <http://www.telc.net/fileadmin/user_upload/Publikationen/Diller_iaın_Avrupa_Ortak_öneriler_AEeraevesi.pdf> (2015, 15 April)
- Temizyürek, F. & Birinci, F. G. (2016). Yabancı Dil Öğretiminde Otantik Materyal Kullanımı [Using Authentic Materials in Foreign Language Teaching] *Bartın Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 5 (1), 54-62.
- TEPAV (2014). *Türkiye'deki Devlet Okullarında İngilizce Dilinin Öğretimine İlişkin Ulusal İhtiyaç Analizi [National Needs Analysis on the Teaching of English Language in Public Schools in Turkey]* <http://www.tepav.org.tr/upload/files/13993885191.Turkiyedeki_Devlet_Okullarında_İngilizce_Dilinin_Oğrenimine_Iliskin_Ulusal_Ihtiyac_Analizi.pdf> (2015, 15 April)
- Theisen, G. & Adams, D. (1990). Comparative Education Research. R. Murray Thomas (Ed.) In *International Comparative Education, Practices, Issues and Prospects* (pp.277-301). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Topkaya, E. Z. & Küçük, Ö. (2010). An Evaluation of the 4th and 5th Grade English Language Teaching Program. *Elementary Education Online*, 9 (1), 52-65.
- TTKB (2013). *İlköğretim Kurumları (İlkokullar ve Ortaokullar) İngilizce Dersi (2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 ve 8. Sınıflar) Öğretim Programı*. <<http://ttkb.meb.gov.tr/www/ogretim-programlari/icerik/72>> (2015, 15 February)
- Wojniak, J. (2018) George Z. F. Bereday (Zygmunt Fijałkowski) and his Comparative Method in Educational Research. SHS Web of Conferences, 48, 01050, 1-13. *ERPA International Congresses on Education 2018*. doi: 10.1051/shsconf/20184801050
- Yaşar, Ö. (2015). İlkokul 2. sınıf Fun with Teddy İngilizce Ders Kitabının Öğretmen Görüşleri Doğrultusunda Değerlendirilmesi [The Evaluation of Fun With Teddy 2nd grade English Textbook in Accordance with the Teachers' Views] *Türkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 19 (1), 329-348.
- Yıldırım, Ç. & Tanrıseven, İ. (2015). İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin İlkokul 2. Sınıf İngilizce Dersi Öğretim Programı Hakkındaki Görüşleri. *International Journal of Language Academy*, 3 (1), 210/223.
- Yıldırım, A. & Şimşek, H. (2005). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel araştırma Yöntemleri [Qualitative Research Methods in the Social Sciences]* (5.ed.) Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık
- Yurdabakan, İ. (2011). Yapılandırmacı Kuramın Değerlendirmeye Bakışı: Eğitimde Alternatif Değerlendirme Yöntemleri [The View of Constructivist Theory on Assessment: Alternative Assessment Methods in Education] *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 44 (1), 51-77.