

## COMPARISON OF TURKEY, FINLAND AND IRELAND NATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING PROGRAMS

### TÜRKİYE, FİNLANDİYA VE İRLANDA ANA DİLİ ÖĞRETİM PROGRAMLARININ KARŞILAŞTIRILMASI

Tolga ERDOĞAN , Bilge GÖK\*

**ABSTRACT:** The aim of this study is to compare native language teaching programs in Turkey, Finland and Ireland; and to show similarities and differences among the programs of these countries. Since it is aimed at displaying the current situation as it is, descriptive model was used in this study. Qualitative research method was used in the study. The data in this study was obtained from 2009 Primary Education Turkish Course Teaching Program and Guideline (1-5 Grades), 2008 Ireland Native Language Teaching Program and 2004 Finland Native Language Teaching Program. In addition to this, literature review related to native language teaching programs of these countries were used in this study. As the conclusion of this study, similarities and differences between the native language teaching programs of Turkey, Finland and Ireland have been presented and recommendations toward native language teaching program in Turkey have been made.

**Key Words:** Native Language Teaching Programs, Comparative Education, Turkey, Finland, Ireland

**ÖZET:** Bu araştırmanın amacı, Türkiye, Finlandiya ve İrlanda ana dili öğretim programlarını karşılaştırmak ve bu ülkelerin programları arasındaki benzerlik ve farklılıkları ortaya koymaktır. Araştırmada, var olan durumu olduğu gibi ortaya koyma amacı güdüldüğünden betimsel model kullanılmıştır. Araştırma nitel araştırma yöntemi kullanılarak yürütülmüştür. Araştırmada yer alan veriler, 2009 İlköğretim Türkçe Dersi Öğretim Programı ve Kılavuzu (1-5. Sınıflar), 2008 İrlanda Ana Dili Öğretim Programı ve 2004 Finlandiya Ana Dili Öğretim Programı'ndan elde edilmiştir. Ayrıca araştırmada bu ülkelerin ana dili öğretim programlarına ilişkin alan yazın taramasından elde edilen bilgilerden yararlanılmıştır. Araştırma sonucunda, Türkiye, Finlandiya ve İrlanda ana dili öğretim programları arasında benzerlik ve farklılıklar ortaya konarak Türkiye'deki ana dili öğretim programına yönelik öneriler getirilmiştir.

**Anahtar Sözcükler:** Ana Dili Öğretim Programı, Karşılaştırmalı Eğitim, Türkiye, Finlandiya, İrlanda

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Education is a crucial element in determining the condition of a country among the countries over the world. The main objective of the education is to train individuals who can think critically, express what they think written and orally, criticize, filter what they read, interpret, turn their knowledge into applications and convey this to the others (Kolaç, 2007). Individual's using his language effectively plays an important role in fulfilling the objectives of the education.

Language is an important communication tool determining the value and the situation of the individual. Individual expresses what he sees, hears and knows through the language. Language, which determines the individual's situation and value and is the most important quality that makes an individual a human being, is the mirror of the culture, the most important determinant and tool of a civilization (Kolaç, 2008). The learning of a language which is a tool for negotiation and conveying up to date can be accomplished by means of an effective language training and teaching. According to Kavcar (1996) the main aim of language teaching is to improve individuals' thinking and communication skills. An individual's communication with the others and accomplishing the learning during their education mostly depends on his using language effectively. Using a language effectively is only possible through an effective teaching of native language (Sidekli et al., 2007). The first condition for an individual to understand himself and his environment, follow the contemporary developments and take part in a group which is qualified in terms of economy and social factors is to learn, assimilate and use his native language accurately according to its aim (Çelebi, 2007).

In general, native language of a child is a communication tool which occurs as a result of his experiences and develops through feelings, thoughts and the cultural features of the language. The child perceives and gives meaning to the world by means of this tool; and conveys his feelings and thoughts. Native language is the language in which an individual is born and grows up and learns in his parental and societal environment (Vardar, 1998). Knowing his language well has an important role in an individual's life. The adaptation of an individual to the society he is living in is closely related to his native language using skills. The teaching of an individual's native language which was acquired through culturalization is achieved through learning activities at schools (Canbulat, 2004). The mother tongue plays a crucial role as the language of identity of a group and one which probably has the greatest affective pull (Joseph, 2004). In the classroom the mother tongue can scaffold learning during group tasks where students use it for planning, discussion, brainstorming and reflection (Shameem, 2007). Also mother-tongue education can play a vital role in broader movements aimed at minority language development an improved educational effectiveness (Trudell, 2005).

Teaching native language can be defined as the processes in which the language of an individual that he learned from his mother, parents and friends is acquired through intentional culturalization according to the predefined objectives in school environment (Demirel, 2002). Learning a native language is a multi-dimensional process. Thus, native language teaching is a basic factor in individual's developing as a social being, perceiving and interpreting the world, in all educational periods starting from the primary school and achievements in different environments in his life (Kılıç, 2002). Behaviors an individual acquires in his native language are determinant factors in his achievements in not only at school but after school

and in his adaptation to his environment as well. Native language teaching is fulfilled through teaching and learning experiences organized in a classroom setting. Using a native language effectively can only be achieved by means of a successful language teaching (Kavcar et al., 1995). A successful language teaching is provided with programs which are prepared taking the developmental features of the student into consideration and with teachers who make this programs functioning (Calp, 2003).

National and international research on teaching native language in Turkey shows that the education in this field is unsuccessful and important problems are being experienced in teaching native language (Özbay, 2004; Anılan, 2004; Özyürek, 2004; Şahin, 2007; Erdoğan and Gök, 2009). Sever (2004) claimed that these problems are related to teacher training from one perspective and to basic elements of the program (objective, content, teaching methods, course materials, time and evaluation) from another. Due to the education in Turkey and these problems experienced, Turkey was on the 28<sup>th</sup> row among 35 countries according to the 2001 PIRLS results. Moreover, Turkey was on the 38<sup>th</sup> row among 49 countries in PISA 2003; and on the 37<sup>th</sup> row among 56 countries in PISA 2006 in terms of reading skills (<http://www.pisa.oecd.org/pages>; <http://timss.bc.edu/pirls2001.html>).

The results Turkey got in international exams like PISA and PIRLS, problems being experienced in teaching native language and rapid developments in this field have made it a necessity to make important changes. At this point, changes were made in Turkish course curriculum in primary schools 1-5 grades in Turkey. Constructivist approach was taken as the base in designing Turkish course curriculum and various approaches like multiple intelligence and student centered learning were taken into consideration. It can be claimed that national and international research and contemporary approaches in teaching native language have been effective in designing Turkish course curriculum in Turkey (MEB, 2009; Şahinel, 2005; Bekci and Erdoğan, 2007). In this context, it becomes important to determine how the countries which are advanced in teaching native language adapted contemporary approaches and developments related to teaching native language, the similarities and differences between the new Turkish course curriculum implemented in Turkey and the curricula of these countries; and to examine whether there are some parts to be taken as the model.

Nowadays, each country has its own problems related to teaching its native language all around the world. Examination of the teaching native language programs of different countries is required for the solution of these problems. Examining the educational system of a country is important from the perspective of conducting and developing programs seeing the features that is required but not available in the program of that country. It is a must to compare our own educational system with other educational systems. As a result, comparative education occurs (Demirel, 2000; Duman, 2004).

Comparative education is the field that examines educational systems in different countries to find ways to solve educational problems. It is determining and interpreting current educational problems in societies and the reasons of these problems. It can be stated that comparative educational studies contribute to the understanding our own history in the field of education, determining our current situation and planning our future in education clearly (Noah, 1984). According to Lauterbach and Mitter (1998), the rationale of the comparative educational research is mostly to see the countries' own situation and to make decisions according to this in reconstruction of these countries' educational programs.

### **1.1. The Aim and the Significance of the Study**

Native language teaching has an important role in educational policies. In International Native Language Teaching Organization studies, it was concluded that problems related to native language teaching were similar in almost all countries. In addition to view that native language teaching is a national education which enables countries to teach their own language to the new generation; and through this they transfer their culture, there are common qualities and objectives of native language teaching for all nations. The objective of native language teaching in all countries is to train individuals who comprehend what they read and listen; think on what they comprehend; and convey what they think in written and oral form. Due to its common qualities and objectives, native language teaching can be an international topic to study on (Karababa, 2005; Erdem, 2007).

The aim of this study is to compare native language teaching programs in Turkey, Finland and Ireland; and to show similarities and differences among the programs of these countries. In the study, the main reason why the native language teaching program in Turkey was compared to the one in Finland and Ireland is that these two countries are considerably successful in international exams. Finland came the first in PISA 2000 and 2003 in terms of reading skills; and the second in PISA 2006. Ireland came the seventh in PISA 2003; the sixth in PISA 2006 (<http://www.pisa.oecd.org/pages/>). In the light of this study, it is thought that determining the similarities and differences between Turkey, which aimed at being integrated with European Union, and Finland and Ireland, which take place among the countries of European Union and are successful in native language teaching, particularly in international exams, will contribute to the curriculum design studies related to native language teaching in Turkey.

## **2. METHOD**

### **2.1. The Method of the Study**

Since it is aimed at displaying the current situation as it is, descriptive model was used in this study, which aimed at determining similarities and differences among the native language teaching programs comparing the programs of Turkey, Finland and Ireland.

Qualitative research method is used in this study. Qualitative research is the research in which the qualitative data collection methods like observation, interview and document analysis are used and a qualitative process is conducted to reveal the perceptions and incidents in realistic and naturalistic way in their natural setting (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2006).

### **2.2. Data Resources**

In this study Primary Education Turkish Course Teaching Program and Guidelines (1-5 Grades), Ireland Native Language Teaching Program and Finland Native Language Teaching Programs have been examined. Primary Education Turkish Course Teaching Program and Guideline (1–5 Grades) was prepared in 2005, Ireland Native Language Teaching Program was prepared in 1999 and Finland Native Language Teaching Program was prepared in 2004. The data includes the updated and revised versions of these programs [2009 Primary Education Turkish Course Teaching Program and Guideline (MEB, 2009), 2008 Ireland Native Language Teaching Program (NCCBE, 2004) and 2004 Finland Native Language Teaching Program (PSC, 2008)]

### 2.3. Data Collection and Analysis

In this study 2005 Primary Education Turkish Course Teaching Program and Guidelines (1-5 Grades), 1999 Ireland Native Language Teaching Program and 2004 Finland Native Language Teaching Programs have been examined under the titles of general aims, approach they are based, objectives, content, teaching and learning process, measurement and evaluation. In addition the literature about the native language programs of these countries has been referred.

The data obtained in this study was analyzed through “document analysis” method. Document analysis includes the analysis of the written materials including information about the incidents and events to be studied (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2006). This data collection method also includes a special approach which is called as content analysis and requires an investigation of various forms of communication systematically in order to document the patterns objectively. In selection of documents the closeness to the research topic is taken into consideration; however, programs, course books, course draft, letter, etc. can be evaluated in the field of education (Wilsing, 2002). Document analysis is generally conducted in five stages (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2006);

1. Accessing to the documents,
2. Controlling the authenticity of the documents,
3. Comprehending the documents,
4. Data analysis,
5. The utilization of the data

In the study, after reviewing the literature about the teaching programs of countries, programs were investigated in terms of general objectives, approach taken as the basis, objective, content, learning-teaching process and measurement and evaluation dimensions in accordance with the document analysis method and the similarities and differences were revealed.

## 3. FINDINGS AND COMMENTARY

### 3.1. The Comparison of Native Language Teaching Programs of Turkey, Finland and Ireland in Terms of “General Objectives”

When the general objectives in the programs of Turkey, Finland and Ireland were examined, some of the general objectives in these three countries were found to be similar and some were different. General objectives in three countries were found to be similar in terms of developing basic skills of the language, attitudes toward the native language, developing mental and higher level thinking skills. However, although there were some objectives related to developing societal and cultural features in the general objectives of Turkey and Finland programs, there was no statement related to this objective in Ireland program. It can be seen that general objectives in Turkey program were mostly related to cognitive domain, but the general objectives in Finland and Ireland programs were mostly related to affective domain. Moreover, compared to the other two countries’ programs, the general objectives in Turkey program were more detailed and more specific statements were available; and the statements similar to these general objectives took place in the targets of the course in other countries’ programs.

General objectives in native language teaching programs of Turkey, Finland and Ireland were given in Table 1 according to their similar features.

**Table 1: General Objectives in Native Language Teaching Programs of Turkey, Finland and Ireland**

Turkey	Finland	Ireland
1. Developing listening, speaking, reading, writing, visual reading, visual presentation language skills	1. Developing and diversifying reading, writing and communication skills	1. Developing child's listening, speaking, reading and writing skills
2. Make students like Turkish and use accurately and effectively	2. Increasing students' interests in language, literature and interaction	2. Helping child to develop a positive attitude towards the language used in speaking, reading and writing
3. Developing mental skills like thinking, comprehending, ordering, categorizing, investigating, associating, criticizing, guessing, analyzing-synthesizing and evaluating skills	3. Developing mental skills like thinking, implication, analyzing, associating previous knowledge with the newly learned ones, constructing information	3. Developing child's mental skills and the capacity for expressing himself by means of Oral Language, reading and writing activities.
4. Developing scientific, critical and creative thinking, self-expressing, communicating, cooperating, problem solving and enterprising skills.	4. Developing skills like reading efficacy, self-expression, imagination and creativity	4. Providing child's development in affective, imaginative and aesthetic way through Oral Language, reading and writing activities
5. Providing development in terms of personal, social, cultural, economical and political perspectives.	5. Supporting individual, social and societal developments	
	6. Creating opportunities for constructing their own identities and respecting themselves through diversifying their communication by means of reading and writing	5. Developing child's self confidence in listening, speaking, reading and writing activities
6. Enable students give importance to national, spiritual, moral, historical, cultural, social and artistic values and strengthen their national feelings and ideas	7. Make students become an individual who is an active communicator, a reader mastering his own culture and influencing the society	
7. Make students acquire reading and writing interest and habit		6. Making the child an independent reader and author
*8. Developing skills to criticize messages given by the mass media tools	*8. Developing interaction skills and enable students utilize language and literature and adapt changing communication environments	*7. Making the child interested in comprehending and communication; and supporting and maintaining his interest
*9. Developing reading, discovering intertextual meaning and learning skills using information technology		
*10. Developing vocabulary through		

- 
- developing intertextual reading skills
- \*11. Make students know Turkish and world culture through written and oral works
  - \*12. Developing skills like information searching, discovering, interpreting and constructing in their mind
  - \*13. Developing accessing, utilizing and producing information skills
- 

(MEB, 2009; NCCBE, 2004; PSC, 2008)

\* Different general objectives in Turkey, Finland and Ireland program

### **3.2. The Comparison of Native Language Teaching Programs of Turkey, Finland and Ireland in Terms of the “Approach Taken as the Basis”**

It can be seen that constructivist approach was taken as the basis in the programs of the three countries when the Turkey, Finland and Ireland programs were investigated in terms of the approach taken as the basis. While it was explicitly stated that constructivist approach was taken as the basis for Turkey program, it was implicitly stated with the statements related to the constructivist approach in Finland and Ireland programs. Moreover, it can be seen that cultural issues and learning environments were also given importance in the construction of the knowledge in Finland program. However, no statements like this took place in Turkey and Ireland programs.

Approach that was taken as the basis in Turkey program was stated with the following statements (MEB, 2009):

*In addition to the fact that constructivist approach was taken as the center in Turkey (1-5) Teaching Program, various educational approaches like multiple intelligence and student centered learning were benefited as well. Constructivist approach which is based upon student centered learning gives importance to student participation and teacher guidance in learning process.*

Approach that was taken as the basis in Finland native language teaching program was stated as follows (NCCBE, 2004):

*The basis for national basic program is shaped as construction of knowledge and abilities in individual and societal process. Although general principles are the same for everyone, learning is particularly dependent upon learner’s construction of knowledge, motivation and habits of learning and studying. Learning is situational so it should be given importance to the diversity of the learning environment.*

Approach that was taken as the basis in Ireland program was stated as follows (PSC, 2008):

*The main principles of Ireland teaching program are child’s knowledge and experience construct the basis of his learning, child’s being active in his learning, learning includes guided activities and discovery method, developing high level thinking skills, taking collaborative learning as the basis considering the individual differences.*

### **3.3. The Comparison of Native Language Teaching Programs of Turkey, Finland and Ireland in Terms of the “Acquisitions/Targets”**

When Turkey, Finland and Ireland programs were examined in terms of acquisitions/targets, it was seen that acquisitions related to the learning domains like

listening, speaking, reading, writing, visual reading and visual presentation took place at all levels (1-5 grades) in Turkey program. In Finland program, as for the targets to be accomplished interaction skills, reading and writing skills and literature and relations with language at 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> levels; communication skills, interpreting and evaluating various texts, skills for producing texts and using them for different purposes, language, literature and relations with other cultures at 3<sup>rd</sup> to 5<sup>th</sup> levels took place. In addition to this, which knowledge, skills and features students should have at the end of the levels were explicitly stated under the same skill fields. In Ireland program, targets were not grouped but stated in general; however, these targets were given as grouped as two levels (1<sup>st</sup>-2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>-4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> grades) in content part of the program. Similar acquisitions/targets in Turkey, Finland and Ireland programs are given in Table 2.

**Table 2: Similar Acquisitions/Targets in Native Language Teaching Programs of Turkey, Finland and Ireland**

Turkey	Finland	Ireland
He states his feelings, opinions and dreams orally. He writes essays describing his feelings, opinions and dreams.	They get accustomed to express themselves orally. They associate their imagination and realities by means of their experiences.	He conveys his feelings, opinions and dreams in speaking, discussion, writing activities whether they are real or imaginative.
He tells his experiences and memories.	They know how to tell their observations and experiences while a small group of audience is watching them.	He explains and interprets his experiences in oral language activities.
He writes stories, poems, diary, anecdotes and celebration cards, etc.	He learn to create a text both orally and written.	He composes his own poem and writes his own story. He writes in different genres related to his life both in school and after school.
He does free reading. He reads to get some information. He reads newspapers and magazines. He reads anecdotes, riddles and tongue twisters for entertainment.	He learns to choose reading materials related to his interests and read books related to his reading skills. He learns to choose reading materials appropriate to different objectives.	He reads reading materials appropriate to his level and rich. He discovers entertaining parts of the language and enjoys them.
He talks taking the audience and the setting into consideration. He gives supportive and explanatory examples in his talks.	He uses oral and written statements in various schools settings like individual, small group and classroom discussions. They make efforts to reply while they are talking and react to their opinions and questions in discussions.	He writes and talks for different audiences and different aims. He supports his ideas and presents them orally and written.

---

	They learn to ask and reply questions and associate them with their own knowledge, experience, point of view and opinions.	
He develops his vocabulary using visuals.	He learns to study on vocabulary and visuals around the text. He develops self expression skills, gets used to evaluate his own statements and develops his vocabulary.	He develops his vocabulary.

---

(MEB, 2009; NCCBE, 2004; PSC, 2008)

When acquisitions/targets in the programs of three countries were examined in general, it can be seen that acquisitions/targets in Turkey and Ireland programs were related to developing basic skills of the language whereas in Finland program targets were related to different skills about using the language. Acquisitions in Turkey program were mostly related to developing students' cognitive skills whereas in Finland and Ireland program they were related to developing affective skills of the students. Moreover, it can be seen that targets like giving importance to the other people's cultures and being aware of them and using library did not take place in Turkey and Ireland program. Besides this, it can be stated that targets in Finland and Ireland programs were similar to the general objectives in Turkey program.

### 3.4. The Comparison of Native Language Teaching Programs of Turkey, Finland and Ireland in Terms of the "Content"

When Turkey, Finland and Ireland programs were examined in terms the content, it can be seen that Turkey program was designed according to the thematic approach. It was suggested that eight themes – four compulsory and four elective – should be taken. Moreover, content recommendations for each theme and sample activities took place in the program. Compulsory and elective themes in Turkey program are given in Table 3 (MEB, 2009).

**Table 3: Compulsory and Elective Themes in Turkey Native Language Teaching Program**

Compulsory Themes	Elective Themes
1. Atatürk	1. My Beautiful Country: Turkey
2. Our Values	2. Innovations and Developments
3. Health and Environment	3. Game and Sport
4. Individual and Society	4. Our World and Space
	5. Production-Consumption and Efficiency
	6. Imagination
	7. Educational and Social Activities
	8. Institutions and Social Organizations
	9. Natural Disasters
	10. Fine Arts

---

In Finland program, basic content was given parallel to the categorization in the targets which had been determined according to the levels. It was explicitly stated in basic contents which situations should be given and what should be taught in order to achieve the targets. Basic contents stated in the program are given in Table 4 (NCCBE, 2004).

**Table 4: Basic Contents in Finland Native Language Teaching Program**

1-2 Levels	3-5 Levels
Interaction Skills	Interaction Skills
Reading and Writing	Text Comprehension
Literature and Language	Preparing Composition and Oral Presentation
	Information Management Skills
	Tasks and Structure of the Language
	Literature and Other Culture

Content in Ireland program was designed as two levels (1<sup>st</sup>-2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>-4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup>) and all levels were constructed on the same main targets and groups. Main Target and Groups in Ireland program are given in Table 5 (PSC, 2008).

**Table 5: Main Target and Groups in Ireland Program**

Main Targets	Main Target Groups
Receptiveness to language	Oral Language Reading Writing
Competence and confidence in using language	Oral Language Reading Writing
Developing cognitive abilities through language	Oral Language Reading Writing
Emotional and imaginative development through language	Oral Language Reading Writing

When the programs of the three countries were compared in terms of the content, it can be seen that Turkey program was designed thematically which was different from the other two countries. It can also be seen that content in Finland and Ireland program was designed according to the situational and functional approach which was based on the communicative features of the language and real situations language was used. Moreover, although situations which should be given in the content were given in Finland and Ireland program, this kind of explanations were not available in Turkey program.

### 3.5. The Comparison of Native Language Teaching Programs of Turkey, Finland and Ireland in Terms of the “Learning-Teaching Process”

When Turkey, Finland and Ireland programs were examined in terms the learning-teaching process, it can be stated that explanations about the teaching-learning process, the role of the teacher in learning-teaching process, the steps of learning-teaching process, the distribution of acquisitions into learning-teaching process and the samples of handling texts were mentioned in Turkey program (MEB, 2009). It was mentioned in Turkey program that the program was designed according to the constructivist approach in order to make individuals acquire skills for making the knowledge meaningful through interpreting and produce new knowledge. In the light of this explanation, it was explicitly mentioned what kind of learning-teaching process would be designed in accordance with the approach taken as the basis.

It was not mentioned what kind of learning-teaching process would be designed in accordance with the approach taken as the basis in Finland program. It was stated that it was necessary to conduct teaching in accordance with the targets and contents determined in the program and the design of this teaching process was left to the schools and teachers. In Finland, schools were designing their own programs in the scope of the program developed by the government. It can be claimed that the fact that the designed program was a general program for the whole country and the details about implementing the program were left to schools and teachers were effective in nondisclosure of the learning-teaching process.

In Ireland teaching program, although the content was given in detail, there was no separate part for learning-teaching process in the program. Some information about teaching-learning process was found in the “introduction” and “content” parts. In the introduction part, information about language learning process was given under the heading English; explanations about the main targets and main target groups which took place in the content were made. In Ireland program, native language learning was categorized under four headings:

1. Receptiveness to language
2. Competence and confidence in using language
3. Developing cognitive abilities through language
4. Emotional and imaginative development through language

When the programs of the three countries were compared, it can be seen that learning-teaching process was explained in detail in Turkey program whereas this process did not take place as a separate part in Finland and Ireland programs. In addition to this, it can be stated that similar characteristics in learning-teaching process were mentioned since the programs of these three countries were designed according to the constructivist approach although it was not explicitly stated.

### **3.6. The Comparison of Native Language Teaching Programs of Turkey, Finland and Ireland in Terms of the “Measurement and Evaluation”**

When Turkey, Finland and Ireland programs were examined in terms the measurement and evaluation process, it is seen that it was explained giving sample measurement and evaluation tools for measurement and evaluation in Turkey program. Measurement and evaluation was an inseparable part of learning-teaching process in Turkey program. The aims of measurement and evaluation are determining the students’ achievements, situations of their development and examining the effectiveness of the teaching methods. Teachers should determine the development process, learning and language development levels of students by means of measurement and evaluation tools; and they should inform the students on these

issues. In the program, not only learning products but also learning process of the students were tracked with measurement and evaluation; and evaluating this process, activities, methods and techniques being used were changed if it was required. Turkey program took evaluation as a process which helps to determine what students know instead of determining what they do not know (MEB, 2009).

In Finland program, measurement and evaluation was divided into two parts as evaluation during the course and final evaluation. In the program, it was stated that these two evaluations had different roles. Evaluation during the course was divided into subheadings like task evaluation, study skills evaluation, the evaluation of students who need special education and the evaluation of migrant students. In the program, the evaluation during the course depends on the proofs which were appropriate to the real conditions and different. Evaluation was related to the students' learning and their learning processes in different domains. Student evaluation form was an important part which gave feedback from teachers for the process which continued as a whole. Teacher was informed about what students learned with the help of evaluation. The learning process, study skills and behaviors of students were evaluated in association with the targets of the program and the definition of the good performance. Program defined the evaluation objectives for each course and in general. Student and his parents were informed about the evaluation domains and how these domains would be implemented in the program beforehand.

In Ireland program, evaluation was a part of learning-teaching process. The main aim of the evaluation was to inform the teacher about students' learning, comprehending concepts and developing skills. According to the Ireland program, evaluation was conducted in two different ways as "evaluation for learning and the evaluation of the learning". It was aimed at recording language development in different fields through different evaluation tools for the multi-dimensional evaluation of the student. In the light of this aim, the use of product and process evaluation was mentioned. In Ireland program, the four basic skills of language was a part of evaluation process; however, evaluation included more than the language skills. The most basic aim of the program was to provide language learning and learning through the language. Therefore, learning activities given in accordance with the main targets in the program were also in the scope of the evaluation.

When the programs of the three countries were compared in terms of measurement and evaluation, it was seen that there were some similarities between the approach taken as the basis and measurement and evaluation objectives. Moreover, it was mentioned in these three countries' programs that it was required to evaluate students in the process and after the process and multi-dimensional evaluation should be conducted. It was suggested that these evaluations should be conducted with the evaluation tools like observation forms, self-evaluation forms, projects, portfolios and standard tests. Besides this, detailed and enough information about the measurement and evaluation process and what and how to evaluate in this process were not given in the programs of these three countries.

In addition to similar characteristics of three countries in terms of measurement and evaluation process, there were some different characteristics as well. Although it was mentioned in Finland and Ireland programs that the sharing information about the evaluation process with the parents and the cooperation in this process were required, there was no such explanation in Turkey program. Moreover, some parts given in Finland program like the evaluation of students who need special education and the evaluation of the migrant students did not take place in Turkey and Ireland program.

#### 4. DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In recent years, it is seen that there has been search and effort for reconstruction in the field of education in all countries. In educational policies of countries, on the one hand the culture, conditions and inputs are taken into consideration and on the other hand international measurements and standards are taken (Erdem, 2007; Uşun, 2007). In this context, some changes were made in the native language teaching programs of Finland, which is a member of European Union and gets successful results in reading skills in international exams, in 2004 and in Ireland in 1999. As for Turkey, Turkish language teaching program which was prepared in 2004 was put into practice in 2005-2006 educational years. In this study, it was aimed at comparing Primary Education Turkish Course Teaching Program and Guideline (1-5 Grades), Ireland and Finland Native Language Teaching Programs in terms of the program elements.

Firstly, Turkey, Finland and Ireland native language teaching programs were compared in terms of “general objectives”. When general objectives in three countries were examined, it was seen that there were some similarities in some parts and some differences in some other parts. Moreover, although there were some objectives related to developing societal and cultural features in the general objectives of Turkey and Finland programs, there was no statement related to this objective in Ireland program. It can be seen that general objectives in Turkey program were mostly related to cognitive domain, but the general objectives in Finland and Ireland programs were mostly related to affective domain. It can be claimed that the general objectives in Turkey program were not enough in terms of affective domain when compared to the other two countries. In the general objectives of Turkey program, statements related to the affective domain should be given importance as much as the cognitive domain.

When the programs of three countries were compared in terms of the approach taken as the basis, it can be seen that constructivist approach was taken as the basis in the programs of the three countries. In addition to this, although social and cultural elements were mentioned in Finland program in the scope of the constructivist approach, they were not mentioned in Turkey and Ireland program. When the fact that learning was not just an individual process but the environment, learning setting and societal construction were effective in learning was taken into consideration, it can be claimed that the program in Turkey is not efficient. In this context, the approach that was taken as the basis should be reconsidered and social perspectives of learning should be mentioned.

When the programs of three countries were examined in terms of acquisition/targets, it was seen that there were some similarities and difference among the programs of three countries in terms of acquisitions/targets. Besides this, when the targets in Finland and Ireland program were taken into account, it was seen that these targets were mostly related to the affective domain whereas the acquisitions in Turkey program were related to the cognitive domain. It is a point to be reconsidered that while the acquisitions related to the cognitive domain are given enough importance, the targets related to the affective domain are not given enough importance in Turkey program. Moreover, it was seen that targets like giving importance to other people’s culture and using libraries which took place in Finland program did not appear in Turkey and Ireland program. It can interpreted as the lack of acquisitions related to giving importance to other people’s cultures and using libraries which related to gaining reading habit means that the program is not efficient from these

perspectives. Program should be reconsidered and required acquisitions should take part in the program.

When the programs of three countries are compared in terms of content, it was seen that the content in Turkey program was designed according to the compulsory and elective themes and thematic approach was accepted. In this context, it can be stated that the content in Finland and Ireland program was constructed in accordance with the situational and functional approach which had been accepted by many developed countries, however, in Turkey program the content was constructed according to the thematic approach which is not appropriate to the native language learning programs and the content in the program was ambiguous. In designing the content of Turkey program, the content should be designed as appropriate to the course objectives reconsidering the approach that was taken as the basis.

When the programs of three countries were compared in terms of learning-teaching process, it was seen that how this process would be organized was explained in Turkey program while there was not enough explanation about this process in Finland and Ireland programs. The reason for this difference can be interpreted with the fact that the programs in Finland and Ireland were basic programs prepared by the government and the details about the implementation of the program were left to schools and teachers. As for Turkey, all explanations and instructions about the implementation of the program were prepared by the government and the schools were carrying out this program. In this context, it can be interpreted as the fact that the learning-teaching process is explained in detail in Turkey program and the same implementations are applied in all schools which have different socio-economic and cultural features is preventing the efforts to make the program more effective. Learning-teaching process should be redesigned according to the different types of schools which are at different levels; and various choices should be presented to the teachers.

When the programs of these three countries were compared in terms of measurement and evaluation process, both process evaluation and product evaluation were mentioned in three programs in the light of the constructivist approach; and the necessity of conducting multi-dimensional evaluation was stated. Besides this, not detailed and enough explanations related to the measurement and evaluation process were made in the programs of the three countries. Although the sharing of evaluation process with the parents and the necessity of cooperation were mentioned in Finland and Ireland programs, there was no such explanation in Turkey program. Moreover, some parts given in Finland program like the evaluation of students who need special education and the evaluation of the migrant students did not take place in Turkey and Ireland program. The explanation of measurement and evaluation process in detail in Turkey program for different levels and situations can be effective in making this process more efficient.

This study was carried out with aim of comparing the native language teaching programs of Turkey, Finland and Ireland. The study is limited with the native language teaching programs of these countries. In the light of the findings of this study, further research related to comparing the native language teaching program of Turkey with other countries, overcoming the lack and problems about the elements of the program and the problems in implementing the program can be carried out.

## REFERENCES

- Anılan, H. (2004). *Beşinci sınıf öğrencilerinin türkçe dersinde okuduğunu anlama becerisiyle ilgili hedef davranışların gerçekleşme düzeyi* (Fifth grade students' levels of target behaviors fulfillment related to comprehension skill in turkish course). Paper presented at the 11th education sciences congress, University of Gazi, Ankara.
- Bekci, B. ve Erdoğan, T. (2007). Türkiye ve ırlanda'daki anadil öğretim programlarının karşılaştırılması (The comparison of native language teaching programs in Turkey and Ireland). *Proceedings of the 3th Social Sciences Education Congress*, 681-686.
- Calp, M. (2003). *Özel Öğretim Alanı Olarak Türkçe Öğretimi* (Turkish Language Teaching as a Special Education Field). Erzurum: Eser Ofset Matbaacılık.
- Canbulat Kutluca, A. (2004). *Türkiye ve Almanya Anadili Öğretim Programlarının Karşılaştırılması*. (The Comparison of Native Language Teaching Programs of Turkey and Germany). Master of Degree Thesis, University of Abant İzzet Baysal.
- Demirel, Ö. (1996). *Karşılaştırmalı Eğitim* (Comparative Education). Ankara: Usem Yayınları.
- Demirel, Ö. (2002). *Türkçe Öğretimi* (Turkish Language Teaching). Ankara: PegemA Yayınları.
- Erdem, A. (2007). *İlköğretim Türkçe Programı'nın Önceki Program ve İrlanda'nın Ana Dili Öğretim Programı ile Karşılaştırılması* (The Comparison of Primary School Turkish Language Teaching Program with the Previous Program and Native Language Teaching Program of Ireland). Master of Degree Thesis, University of Hacettepe.
- Erdoğan, T. ve Gök B. (2009). Türkçenin ana dili olarak öğretiminde karşılaşılan sorunlar ve bu sorunların giderilmesine yönelik öneriler: Ankara örneği. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 3 (36), 1-16.
- Joseph, J. E. (2004). *Language and Identity: National, Ethnic, Religious*. Newyork: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kavcar, C., Oğuzkan, F. and Sever, S. (1995). *Türkçe Öğretimi* (Turkish Language Teaching). Ankara: Engin Yayınları.
- Kavcar, Cahit. (1996). Anadili eğitimi (Native language teaching). *Tömer Ana Dili*, 1, 1-4.
- Kılıç, A. (2002). Bir metni farklı şekilde işlemenin anlama düzeyine etkisi (The effect of handling a text in a different way on comprehension level). *Eğitim ve Bilim Dergisi*, 27 (123), 53-61.
- Kolaç, E. (2008). *Sınıf öğretmeni adaylarının anadilimizin yaşadığı sorunlara ilişkin farkındalıkları, görüş ve önerileri* (The awareness, comments and recommendations of pre-service primary school teachers on the problems of our native language). Paper presented at the International Turkish Education and Teaching Symposium, University of East Mediterranean, Kuzey Kıbrıs Türk Cumhuriyeti.
- Kolaç, E. (2007). Sınıf öğretmeni adaylarının okuyucu profilleri (The reader profiles of pre-service primary school teachers). *Proceedings of the 6th National Primary Education Symposium*, 209-214.
- Lauterbach, U. And Mitter, W. (1998). *Theory and methodology of international comparisons*. Vocational Education and Training. The European research field Background Report 2, 3-38, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg.

- Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı. (2009). *İlköğretim Türkçe Dersi Öğretim Programı ve Kılavuzu*. (Instructional program and guideline for primary school Turkish language course teaching). Ankara: MEB Yayınları.
- National Core Curriculum for Basic Education*. (2004). Database, Retrieved March 18, 2010 from <http://www.opf.fi/english/frontpage.asp?path=447>.
- Noah, H. J. (1984). The use and abuse of comparative education. *Comparative Education Revue*, 27, 550–562.
- Özbay, M. (2004). *Yeniden yapılandırma çerçevesinde türkçe eğitimi programı ve bazı öneriler*. (Turkish language teaching program and some recommendations in the framework of reconstruction). 12<sup>th</sup> Educational Sciences Congress, University of Gazi, Ankara.
- Özyürek, R. (2004). *Okullarımızda türkçe eğitimi* (Turkish language teaching in our schools). Paper presented at the 13<sup>th</sup> Educational Sciences Congress, University of İnönü, Malatya.
- PIRLS. (2001). International report, p. 26. Retrieved April 21, 2010 from <http://timss.bc.edu/pirls2001.html>
- PISA. (2000). Literacy skills for the world of tomorrow: further results from pisa 2000, p.79. Retrieved March 11, 2010 from <http://www.pisa.oecd.org/pages>
- PISA. (2003). Technical report, p. 208, Retrieved March 19, 2010 from <http://www.pisa.oecd.org/pages>
- PISA. (2006). Science competencies for tomorrow's world executive summary, p.47 Retrieved June 17, 2010 from <http://www.pisa.oecd.org/pages>
- Primary School Curriculum*. (2008). (Curacalam na Bunscoile), Dublin, Government Publications. Retrieved April 26, 2010 from [http://www.curriculumonline.ie/en/Primary\\_School\\_Curriculum/](http://www.curriculumonline.ie/en/Primary_School_Curriculum/)
- Shameem, N. (2007). Language education needs for multilingualism in fiji primary schools. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 27, 39–60.
- Sidekli, S., Güneş F., Yangın S. and Gökbulut Y. (2007). İlköğretim ikinci sınıf öğrencilerinin sesli okuma hatalarının belirlenmesi (The determination of loud reading mistakes of second year students at primary school). *Proceedings of the 6th National Primary Education Symposium*, 195–199.
- Şahin, İ. (2007). Yeni ilköğretim 1. kademe türkçe programının değerlendirilmesi (The evaluation of the 1. Step Turkish language program). *İlköğretim Online* 6 (2), 284–304.
- Şahinel, M. G. (2005). Yeni türkçe öğretim programına göre öğrenme-öğretme ortamının düzenlenmesi. (The arrangement of learning-teaching environment according to the new Turkish language teaching program). *Proceedings of the Evaluation of New Primary School Curriculum Symposium*, 217-219.
- Trudell, B. (2005). Language choice, education and community identity. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 25 (3), 237-251.
- Uşun, S. (2007). Türkiye’de yeni uygulamaya konulan (1-5. sınıflar) ilköğretim programlarının değerlendirilmesi (The evaluation of primary school curricula which has recently been put into practice in Turkey). *Proceedings of the 6th National Primary Education Symposium*, 511-516.
- Vardar, B. (2002). *Açıklamalı Dilbilim Terimleri Sözlüğü* (Explanatory linguistics terms dictionary). İstanbul: Multilingual.

- Wilsing, A. N. (2002). *Odtü’de Öğretim Elemanlarının Öğretimde Planlama, Etkili Öğretim ve Değerlendirme Alanlarında Eğitime Yönelik Programın Etkililiği*. (The Efficiency of the Program on Training of Instructors at Metu on Instructional Planning, Effective Teaching and Assessment). Master of Degree Thesis, University of Orta Doğu Teknik.
- Yıldırım, A. and Şimşek, H. (2006). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. (Qualitative Research Methods in Social Sciences). Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.

### GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

Bu araştırmanın amacı, Türkiye, Finlandiya ve İrlanda ana dili öğretim programlarını karşılaştırmak ve bu ülkelerin programları arasındaki benzerlik ve farklılıkları ortaya koymaktır. Araştırmada, Türkiye’deki ana dili öğretim programının Finlandiya ve İrlanda öğretim programlarıyla karşılaştırılmasının başlıca nedeni, bu iki ülkenin uluslararası sınavlarda oldukça başarılı sonuçlar almasıdır. Finlandiya, 2000 ve 2003 PISA sınavında okuma becerileri bölümünde ilk sırada, 2006 PISA sınavında ise ikinci sırada yer almıştır. İrlanda ise 2003 PISA sınavında yedinci sırada, 2006 PISA sınavında ise altıncı sırada yer almıştır (<http://www.pisa.oecd.org/pages/>). Bu kapsamda yapılacak çalışma ışığında, Avrupa Birliği ile bütünleşmeyi hedef almış Türkiye’nin ana dili öğretim programının, AB’ye üye ülkeler arasında yer alan ve ana dili eğitiminde özellikle uluslararası sınavlarda başarılı ülkeler olan Finlandiya ve İrlanda ana dili öğretim programları ile benzerlik ve farklılıklarını belirlemenin, Türkiye’deki ana dili öğretimiyle ilgili yapılacak program geliştirme çalışmalarına katkı sağlayacağı düşünülmektedir.

Türkiye, Finlandiya ve İrlanda ana dili öğretim programlarını karşılaştırarak bu ülkelerin programları arasındaki benzerlik ve farklılıkları ortaya koymayı amaçlayan bu araştırmada, var olan durumu olduğu gibi ortaya koyma amacı güdüldüğünden betimsel model kullanılmıştır. Araştırma, nitel araştırma yöntemi kullanılarak yürütülmüştür. Bu araştırmada yer alan veriler, 2009 İlköğretim Türkçe Dersi Öğretim Programı ve Kılavuzu (1-5. Sınıflar), 2008 İrlanda Ana Dili Öğretim Programı ve 2004 Finlandiya Ana Dili Öğretim Programı’ndan elde edilmiştir. Ayrıca araştırmada bu ülkelerin ana dili öğretim programlarına ilişkin alan yazın taramasından elde edilen bilgilerden yararlanılmıştır. Araştırmada elde edilen veriler “doküman incelemesi” yöntemiyle analiz edilmiştir.

Araştırmada ilk olarak, Türkiye, Finlandiya ve İrlanda ana dili öğretim programları “genel amaçlar” açısından karşılaştırılmıştır. Üç ülkenin programındaki genel amaçlar incelendiğinde, programlardaki genel amaçların bazı noktalarda benzerlik gösterdiği, bazı noktalarda ise farklılık gösterdiği görülmektedir. Ayrıca Türkiye ve Finlandiya programındaki genel amaçlarda, toplumsal ve kültürel özellikleri geliştirmeye yönelik amaçlara yer verilirken, İrlanda programında bu amaçlara yönelik bir ifade yer almamaktadır. Türkiye programında yer alan genel amaçların daha çok bilişsel alana yönelik olduğu, Finlandiya ve İrlanda programlarındaki genel amaçların ise daha çok duyuşsal alana yönelik olduğu görülmektedir. Bu kapsamda, Türkiye programındaki genel amaçların diğer iki ülke programına göre duyuşsal alan açısından yeterli olmadığı söylenebilir. Türkiye programındaki genel amaçlarda bilişsel alana yönelik ifadelerin yanında duyuşsal alana yönelik ifadelere de yeteri kadar yer verilmelidir.

Üç ülkenin programı temel alınan yaklaşım açısından karşılaştırıldığında, üç ülkenin programında da yapılandırmacı yaklaşımın temel alındığı görülmektedir. Bununla birlikte

Finlandiya programında yapılandırıcılık kapsamında sosyal ve kültürel yöne vurgu yapılırken, Türkiye ve İrlanda programında bu konuyla ilgili herhangi bir vurgu yapılmamıştır. Öğrenmenin sadece bireysel bir süreç olmadığı ve içinde bulunulan çevrenin, öğrenme ortamının ve toplumsal yapının öğrenmede etkili olduğu gerçeği göz önüne alındığında, Türkiye'deki programın bu konuda yeterli olmadığı söylenebilir. Bu kapsamda, Türkiye programındaki temel alınan yaklaşıma ilişkin açıklamalar tekrar gözden geçirilmeli ve öğrenmenin sosyal yönüne vurgu yapılmalıdır.

Üç ülkenin programları kazanım/hedefler açısından incelendiğinde, üç ülkenin programında da kazanım/hedefler açısından benzer ve farklı yönlerin olduğu görülmektedir. Bunun yanında Finlandiya ve İrlanda programında yer alan hedefler incelendiğinde bu hedeflerin daha çok duyuşsal alana yönelik olduğu, Türkiye programındaki kazanımların ise daha çok bilişsel alana yönelik olduğu görülmektedir. Türkiye programında bilişsel alana yönelik kazanımlara yeterince yer verilirken, duyuşsal alana yönelik kazanımlara yeterince yer verilmemesi üzerinde düşünülmesi gereken bir noktadır. Ayrıca Finlandiya programında yer verilen diğer insanların kültürlerine önem verme ve kütüphaneyi kullanmayla ilgili kazanımlara Türkiye ve İrlanda programında yer verilmediği görülmektedir. Türkiye programında diğer insanların kültürlerine önem verme ve okuma alışkanlığı kazandırmaya yönelik kütüphane kullanımıyla ilgili kazanımlara yer verilmemesi programın bu açıdan yeterli olmadığı şeklinde yorumlanabilir. Program bu açıdan tekrar gözden geçirilerek gerekli ve çeşitli düzeydeki kazanımlara yer verilmelidir.

Üç ülkenin programı içerik açısından karşılaştırıldığında, Türkiye programında içeriğin zorunlu ve seçmeli temalara göre oluşturulduğu ve konu merkezli (tematik) yaklaşımın benimsendiği görülmektedir. Finlandiya ve İrlanda programında ise durumsal ve işlevsel yaklaşım benimsenerek temel içerikler belirlenmiştir. Bu kapsamda, Finlandiya ve İrlanda programında yer alan içeriğin birçok gelişmiş ülke tarafından benimsenen durumsal ve işlevsel yaklaşıma uygun olarak yapılandırıldığı, Türkiye programının ise ana dili öğretim programlarına uygun olmayan konu merkezli bir yaklaşımla yapılandırıldığı ve programda içeriğin belirsiz olduğu söylenebilir. Türkiye programında içeriğin düzenlenmesinde temel alınan yaklaşım tekrar gözden geçirilerek içerik dersin amaçlarına uygun hale getirilmelidir.

Üç ülkenin programı öğrenme-öğretme süreci açısından karşılaştırıldığında, Türkiye programında bu sürecin nasıl organize edileceğinin açıklandığı, Finlandiya ve İrlanda programında ise bu sürece ilişkin yeterli açıklamalar yapılmadığı görülmektedir. Bu farklılığın sebebi; Finlandiya ve İrlanda programının devlet tarafından hazırlanan temel program olması ve programın uygulanmasına ilişkin ayrıntıların okullara ve öğretmenlere bırakılması şeklinde yorumlanabilir. Türkiye'de ise programın uygulanmasına ilişkin tüm açıklama ve yönlendirmeler devlet tarafından hazırlanmakta ve okullar bu programı uygulamaktadırlar. Bu kapsamda, Türkiye programında öğrenme-öğretme sürecinin ayrıntılı bir şekilde açıklanarak tek tip olarak verilmesi farklı sosyo-ekonomik ve kültürel özelliklere sahip okullarda aynı uygulamaların yapılmasına ve öğrenme-öğretme sürecini daha etkili hale getirilmesine engel olabileceği şeklinde yorumlanabilir. Türkiye programında yer alan öğrenme-öğretme süreci farklı düzey ve türlerdeki okullara yönelik olarak düzenlenerek öğretmenlere farklı seçenekler sunulmalıdır.

Üç ülkenin programı ölçme ve değerlendirme açısından karşılaştırıldığında ise, üç programda da yapılandırıcı yaklaşım kapsamında hem süreç hem de ürün değerlendirmeye vurgu yapılmış ve çok yönlü değerlendirme yapılması gerektiği üzerinde durulmuştur. Bunun yanında üç ülkenin programında da ölçme ve değerlendirme sürecine ilişkin ayrıntılı ve

yeterli açıklamalara yer verilmemiştir. Finlandiya ve İrlanda programında değerlendirme sürecinin ailelerle paylaşılması ve bu süreçte işbirliği yapılması gerektiği vurgulanırken, Türkiye programında böyle bir açıklamaya yer verilmemiştir. Ayrıca Finlandiya programında yer alan özel eğitime gereksinim duyan öğrencilerin değerlendirilmesi ve göçmen öğrencilerin değerlendirilmesi gibi bölümler Türkiye ve İrlanda programında yer almamaktadır. Türkiye programında da ölçme ve değerlendirme sürecinin çeşitli düzeylerde ve durumlarda ayrıntılı olarak açıklanması bu sürecin daha verimli olması açısından etkili olabilir.