




<http://www.tayjournal.com>

<https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/tayjournal>

A Comparative Analysis of Turkish and English Language Curriculum as Foreign Languages

 Nilay Çağlayan Dilber, Asst. Prof. Dr., Corresponding Author
Kırşehir Ahi Evran University, Türkiye
nilaynilaycaglayan@gmail.com
Orcid ID: 0000-0001-5314-5754

Article Type: Research Article
Received Date: 05.06.2023
Accepted Date: 11.10.2023
Published Date: 30.10.2023

Plagiarism: This article has been reviewed by at least two referees and scanned via a plagiarism software

Doi: 10.29329/tayjournal.2023.610.02

Citation: Çağlayan Dilber, N. (2023). A comparative analysis of Turkish and English language curriculum as foreign languages. *Türk Akademik Yayınlar Dergisi (TAY Journal)*, 7(3), 706-737.

Abstract

In Türkiye, many languages are taught as foreign languages, especially English, which is taught within the framework of the curriculum determined by the Ministry of National Education [MoNE] from primary education level onwards. Turkish, on the other hand, is taught as a foreign language both in Türkiye and abroad. The aim of this study is to compare the Turkish language curriculum as a foreign language with the English teaching programs in terms of basic foundations and implementation methods. The document analysis method was used to examine the MoNE Turkish Language Curriculum as a Foreign Language (MoNE, 2020), the English Course Curriculum (Primary School Grades 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8) (MoNE, 2018a), and the Secondary School English Course (Grades 9, 10, 11, and 12) Curriculum (Mone, 2018b). Through document analysis, it has been revealed that the Turkish Language Curriculum as a Foreign Language (Mone, 2020) has a greater diversity and currency of basic foundations compared to the English Curriculum. Furthermore, in terms of implementation methods, the Turkish Language Curriculum as a Foreign Language (Mone, 2020) is more detailed.

Keywords: Turkish teaching, English teaching, foreign language teaching, curriculum.

Introduction

Language, as Chomsky also indicated, is a natural ability. An individual born with the faculty of language gradually acquires it when appropriate environmental conditions are provided and linguistic inputs are generated. Certainly, just like walking or eating, acquiring language also requires a specific process. Once an individual completes certain biological and neural developments over time, they gain the competence to use language and acquire it. However, unlike acquisition, "learning" does not naturally develop as a process. Senemoğlu (2007) has summarized various definitions of learning in the literature by stating the following: learning is a relatively enduring, experience-based change in behavior or potential behavior that cannot be attributed to growth and transient changes in the body. Within the context of this definition, it becomes evident that the concepts of language acquisition and language learning entail two distinct processes with different semantic contents.

When the literature is examined, it is observed that the term "learning" is mostly used in the field of foreign language, while the term "acquisition" is preferred in the domain of native language. The acquisition of a native language takes place in a natural environment where the language is commonly spoken, within social interactions. On the other hand, foreign language learning occurs intentionally in constructed environments, often later in life, and frequently in artificial settings such as language classes (Aydın, 2016). The foreign language learning process, which does not naturally occur, requires the guidance and supervision of an instructor, following a specific curriculum with the use of certain methods, techniques, and materials (Onursal, 2019).

In the Regulation on Foreign Language Education and Instruction of the Ministry of National Education (MoNE, 2017), the purpose of foreign language education and instruction in formal and distance learning institutions is expressed as follows:

In accordance with the general aims and basic principles of National Education, the aim of education and instruction in the foreign language, considering the goals and levels of schools and institutions, is to enable individuals to acquire listening-comprehension, reading-comprehension, writing, speaking skills in the foreign language, to communicate in the language they have learned, and to develop a positive attitude towards foreign language teaching.

In line with this stated objective, foreign language curriculums and instructional materials, including textbooks and educational tools, are being developed in accordance with the foreign language teaching curriculum and educational programs. The instructional curriculum can be defined as the entirety of lesson plans, encompassing all processes related to learning and teaching, both within and outside the school context (Demirel, 2015a; Küçükahmet, 2008; Saracoğlu, 2019). In our country, foreign language teaching in institutions and schools affiliated with the Ministry of National Education is conducted within the framework of the designated existing instructional curriculums.

In Türkiye, the systematic foreign language teaching has a historical context that encompasses the Ottoman Empire era. During that period, languages such as Arabic, French, English, Persian, Bulgarian, Italian, and Greek were known to be taught, corresponding to the regions with which the empire had expanded relations. Over time, due to Türkiye's North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] membership and candidacy for the European Union, English has become the primary choice for foreign language teaching in the country (Çakır, 2017; Demirel, 1999).

With the implementation of the Eight-Year Education reform in 1997 in Türkiye, although the traditional approach to foreign language teaching, particularly English, was not completely abandoned, the decision was made to begin foreign language education in schools affiliated with the Ministry of National Education starting from the 4th grade (Haznedar, 2004). In the 2012-2013 academic year, the 4+4+4 education reform was introduced in Türkiye, which lowered the age of starting school to 5 years (1st grade of primary school) and the age of beginning foreign language learning to 6 years (2nd grade of primary school) (Bayyurt, 2014). Accordingly, the Ministry of National Education prepared the English Language Curriculum for Primary Schools, which includes grades 2 to 8, based on the principles of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages [CEFR], emphasizing a communicative and action-oriented approach (MoNE, 2013). As of 2018, the previous curriculum for primary education has been partially updated for English language teaching at the primary level. This update took into account the opinions and contributions of various stakeholders, including English teachers, universities, and non-governmental organizations, and was revised to encompass values education within the same philosophical and pedagogical principles (Yaman, 2018, p. 163). For secondary education level (high school), English language curriculums were designed specifically for Anatolian high schools after the decision to transform general high schools into Anatolian high schools in 2010. These curriculums were structured in alignment with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages [CEFR] and were finalized as the Ministry of National Education Secondary Education English Course (9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th grades) Curriculum in 2018.

In the present day, in addition to English being taught as a foreign language, Türkiye offers foreign language instruction in several other languages such as German, Chinese, French, Italian, and Arabic, alongside teaching Turkish as a foreign language. Although there is no official historical record of when Turkish as a foreign language instruction began, its origins can be traced back to the emergence of the Turkish people (Durmuş & Okur, 2013). Over the past three decades, Türkiye's active role in international relations, the increase in the number of foreign students coming to Türkiye for higher education, the prominence of Anatolia as a cradle of civilizations in terms of tourism, the popularity of Turkish TV series abroad, and Türkiye's open-door policy for incoming migrants have all made it necessary for Turkish to be used as a means of communication. As a result of these factors, the teaching of Turkish as a foreign language has become increasingly important to meet the communication needs

of various international contexts and to facilitate interaction with foreigners who are either studying, working, or visiting Türkiye. In recent times, the inclusion of Turkish language instruction in school curriculums among European Union countries, the growing interest in Turkish language and culture in all the countries along the historical Silk Road, and the international significance of the Turkish language have become evident (Demirel, 2015b, p. 6). Furthermore, with the onset of the Syrian civil war in 2011, a vast number of refugees from Syria sought asylum in the Republic of Türkiye, ranging from three-year-old children to seventy-year-old adults. As a result, Turkish has become the target language for refugees to sustain their daily lives (Melanlıoğlu, 2020). Therefore, Turkish continues to fulfill its role worldwide as both a native language spoken by millions and a foreign language taught to learners around the globe (Güzel & Barın, 2013).

Both domestically and internationally, the teaching of Turkish as a foreign language is carried out by various institutions and organizations, including the Ministry of National Education, the Presidency for Turks Abroad and Related Communities, the Türkiye Maarif Foundation, the Türkiye Diyanet Foundation, and the Yunus Emre Institute, as well as Turkish language teaching centers [TÖMER] within universities. The Ministry of National Education first published the "Turkish Language Curriculum as a Foreign Language" in 1986, followed by a revised edition in 2000. In 2015, Ankara University's Turkish and Foreign Languages Research and Application Center [TÖMER] prepared the "Turkish Language Curriculum as a Foreign Language". However, these curriculums have not been well known in the literature and have not been able to achieve standardization in the teaching of Turkish as a foreign language (Şen, 2016). Until today, the need for establishing an international standard for the teaching carried out by all these institutions has highlighted the necessity of revising the Turkish language curriculum for foreigners. Responding to this fundamental need, the Türkiye Maarif Foundation prepared the "Turkish Language Curriculum as a Foreign Language" (MoNE, 2020) based on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages [CEFR]. Subsequently, an additional protocol was signed between the Ministry of National Education and the Türkiye Maarif Foundation on 18th August 2017, in accordance with the cooperation protocol, and curriculum guidelines for teaching Turkish as a foreign language within the country were added to the existing curriculum. The curriculum is designed according to the language proficiency levels specified in the "Common European Framework of Reference for Languages" (A1, A2, B1, B2, C1) and is intended for formal education (preschool, primary school, middle school, and secondary education) as well as for general education (MoNE, 2020, p. 5). The updated curriculum is now known as the "MoNE Turkish Language Curriculum for Foreigners (MoNE, 2020)" and has been finalized.

When looking at the literature on foreign language teaching in Türkiye, various research studies are available that examine the problems, explore teacher and student perspectives, and analyze teaching materials. Additionally, there are studies that focus on foreign language curriculums. Given that the subject of this research includes English and Turkish as foreign languages, some examples of studies that investigate the curriculums for these languages are as follows: Ertem (2023) conducted a comprehensive examination of the English language curriculum at the secondary education level; Yücel et al. (2017) determined teacher perspectives regarding English language curriculums; Merter et al. (2012) and Dursun et al. (2017) identified teacher views on English language curriculums; Haznedar (2004) evaluated the English language curriculum at the primary education level; Dağıstan Yalçınkaya and Beydoğan (2019) examined the English language curriculum at the primary education level; Şahin and Aykaç (2019) conducted comparative analyses of foreign language curriculums in European

countries; Ipek Eğilmez (2018) conducted a comparative analysis of mother tongue teaching programs across countries. These studies have contributed valuable insights into foreign language teaching and its curriculums in Türkiye, offering significant contributions to the field of foreign language education. When examining the studies that focus on teaching Turkish as a foreign language, the following works can serve as fundamental examples: Aydın and Tunagür (2021), Balcı and Melanlıoğlu (2020), Erdil and Açık (2021), Kaya and Kardaş (2020), Kılıç (2021), Koyuncu (2021), have analyzed and examined the Maarif Foundation Turkish Language Curriculum (2020) from various aspects. Demirel (2015b) and Ulutaş and Kara (2019) have conducted an examination of the Turkish Language Curriculum using the example of TÖMER. Görgüç et al., (2021) have comparatively analyzed the Ministry of National Education Turkish Language Curriculum (MoNE, 2020) with the preschool curriculum and the primary school English language curriculum. Starting from the year 2020, the Ministry of National Education has prepared curriculums for teaching Turkish as a foreign language, including preschool, elementary, and secondary education levels, aligning them with international standards. Therefore, the Ministry of National Education Turkish Language Curriculum (MoNE, 2020) is a very recent and up-to-date curriculum. On the other hand, as mentioned above, English language teaching as a foreign language has been carried out in various curriculums for many years in our country. Comparatively examining the curriculums of these two languages in terms of various variables will provide a new perspective on foreign language curriculums in Türkiye. Thus, the aim of this study is to compare the Ministry of National Education Turkish Language Curriculum (MoNE, 2020) with the Ministry of National Education English Language Curriculum (Primary School Grades 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8) (MoNE, 2018a) and the Ministry of National Education Secondary School English Language Curriculum (Grades 9, 10, 11, and 12) (MoNE, 2018b). By doing so, the study aims to analyze the content of foreign language curriculums published by the Ministry of National Education in terms of their basic principles and implementation methods, and thereby contribute to the field. The following questions were investigated in the study in line with the stated objectives:

1. Do the Turkish Language Curriculum for Foreigners (MoNE, 2020) and the English Language Curriculums (MoNE, 2018a; MoNE, 2018b) differ from each other in terms of their basic principles?
2. Do the Turkish Language Curriculum for Foreigners (MoNE, 2020) and the English Language Curriculums (MoNE, 2018a; MoNE, 2018b) differ from each other in terms of their implementation methods?

Method

The qualitative research approach has been adopted in line with the aim of the study, and it has been described as the Turkish Language Curriculum for Foreigners [TURC] (MoNE, 2020), the Primary School English Language Curriculum [PriEngC] (MoNE, 2018a) and the Secondary School English Language Curriculum [SecEngC] (MoNE, 2018b). Qualitative research provides an in-depth picture of a specific individual, group, situation, or problem (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996). This research is of the nature of a case study among qualitative research models. Qualitative research is conducted to identify the natural contexts of the subject, event, phenomenon, perception, or issues under investigation, and techniques such as interviews, observations, and document analysis are generally used in qualitative research (Ekiz, 2003; Karasar, 1999; Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2013). Since the sources of research data consist of the Turkish Language Curriculum as a Foreign Language and English curriculums, document analysis

has been employed. In this context, the research constitutes a descriptive case study. A case study is a research strategy aiming to understand a social phenomenon of an individual or a small group in their natural settings. The purpose of a case study is, for example, to provide a detailed description (Bloor & Wood, 2006). In this study, a detailed comparative description of the Turkish Language Curriculum as a Foreign Language and English curriculums has been attempted.

The Source of the Data

In the study, since the data source consists of the curriculum approved by the Ministry of National Education, purposive sampling method of criterion sampling has been utilized. Criterion sampling is a sampling method in which the researcher selects a sample based on specific criteria or qualities. In this method, individuals or units to be included in the sample are chosen because they possess a certain characteristic or quality. Thus, a sample group with a significant feature related to the research question or purpose is formed (Teddlie & Yu, 2007; Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2013).

The data source of the research consists of the Ministry of National Education Turkish Language Curriculum for Foreigners [TURC] (MoNE, 2020), the Ministry of National Education Primary School English Language Curriculum (Grades 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8) [PriEngC] (MoNE, 2018a), and the Ministry of National Education Secondary School English Language Curriculum (Grades 9, 10, 11, and 12) [SecEngC] (MoNE, 2018b). TURC (MoNE, 2020) is a curriculum that includes explanations and guidelines for preschool, primary school, and secondary school levels. On the other hand, PriEngC (MoNE, 2018a) and SecEngC (MoNE, 2018b) separately address the primary school and secondary school levels in two different curriculums. Therefore, in the research, the that includes the teaching of Turkish as a foreign language is considered as a single curriculum, while the curriculum that includes English language teaching is treated as two separate curriculums as data sources.

The Data Collection and Analysis

In the study, the document analysis technique, one of the qualitative data collection methods, was used for data collection. As expressed by Yıldırım and Şimşek (2013), document analysis encompasses the analysis of written materials containing information about the phenomena under investigation. The research was conducted following the stages of document analysis. Furthermore, in order to enhance the transferability of this study, detailed descriptions were provided; the data collection process, characteristics of the data source, how they were selected, the data analysis process, and the limitations of the research were presented in detail in the study. In this way, contributions were made to the transferability of the research (Creswell & Miller, 2000).

In the data collection process, the first step involved accessing the documents. The teaching programs were accessed from the relevant access addresses of the Ministry of National Education, as indicated in the bibliography. Subsequently, the authenticity of the documents was verified. As mentioned by Bowen (2009), the documents should include independently recorded images and text, regardless of the researcher. While TURC (MoNE, 2020) is in Turkish, PriEngC (MoNE, 2018a) and SecEngC (MoNE, 2018b) have been published by the ministry in English except for certain explanatory sections in Turkish. The English curriculums were translated into Turkish by the researcher, and an expert in the field was asked to evaluate the translation. The expert confirmed that the translation of the English curriculums was the same as the original text. Thus, the authenticity of the examined documents

was ensured through this verification process. Following this, an analysis study was conducted on the teaching programs.

During the analysis phase, elements encompassing fundamental principles and the implementation manner of the curriculum were examined in all three curriculums to acquire the study's data. Additionally, apart from the aforementioned headings, the curriculums were thoroughly scrutinized in their entirety for each of the three curriculums to attain accurate information. This comprehensive analysis involved investigating the concepts and implementation methods that directly constitute the basis of the curriculum, leading to the findings.

While conducting the analysis concerning the fundamental principles, the concepts and phenomena identified as the core basis of the curriculums were subject to examination. The assessment of whether the curriculum content aligned with the specified fundamental principles was kept separate from the focus of the research. Similarly, when analyzing the curriculums in terms of their implementation methods, the explanations directly related to implementation within the curriculums were scrutinized. Furthermore, aspects such as the level of education, student age, language proficiency, duration of program implementation, and language skills to be acquired were analyzed under relevant headings in relation to the curriculum's implementation.

Ethical Permits of Research

In this study, all the rules specified to be followed within the scope of "Higher Education Institutions Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Directive" were complied with. None of the actions specified under the heading "Actions Contrary to Scientific Research and Publication Ethics", which is the second part of the directive, have been taken.

Ethics Committee Permission Information:

This research, as it involves document analysis, does not require ethics committee permission.

Findings

In this section, the findings are presented in line with the research questions, sequentially.

Findings Regarding the Fundamental Principles Included in the Analyzed Curriculums

In this section, the three curriculums have been analyzed in terms of the fundamental principles explicitly stated in the curriculums. While the term "Fundamental Principles" is directly mentioned as a heading in TURC (MoNE, 2020), in PriEngC (MoNE, 2018a) and SecEngC (MoNE, 2018b), the fundamental principles are included within the headings of "Philosophy", "Values Education", and "Key Competencies". In addition to the mentioned headings, all three have been comprehensively examined to identify the concepts directly forming the foundation (basis) of the curriculum.

Table 1. According to the fundamental principles the curriculums include

| TURC. (MoNE, 2020) | PriEngC. (MoNe, 2018a) | SecEngC. (MoNE, 2018b) |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CoE, 2018) | 1. Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CoE, 2001) | 1. Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CoE, 2001) |
| 2. Root Values | 2. Root Values | 2. Root Values |
| 3. European and Turkish Qualifications Framework | 3. European Qualifications Framework | |
| 4. 21st Century Skills | | |

When looking at Table 1, it can be observed that all three curriculums compared have both common and different fundamental bases. In all three curriculums, the most fundamental basis is expressed as the "Common European Framework of Reference for Languages" (The Common European Framework). Although the English and Turkish language curriculums express the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages in different linguistic forms, it is referred to as the same source and fundamental basis. However, as seen in the table, TURC (MoNE, 2020) includes the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages in its most recently updated form. The updates in TURC (MoNE, 2020) from "The Common European Framework (CoE, 2018)" are as follows:

The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages [CEFR] was initially published in 2001 and has been developed over time with some updates and additions to the text. These changes were published as an additional document titled "Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment Companion Volume With New Descriptors Provisional Edition" in 2018, alongside the 2001 version. Upon examining the additional document, it is evident that the descriptor criteria for all activities in the reception, production, and interaction domains have been updated. In the interaction domain, the concept of "online" has been added, and descriptor criteria have been defined for this concept. Additionally, the text for the "mediation" domain includes different criteria compared to the 2001 version, specifically for the concepts and communication activities. In terms of language proficiency, the communicative language competence section has been updated in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages [CEFR], and linguistic and pragmatic competences have been revised with the addition of phonetics to define descriptor criteria. Moreover, new descriptor criteria related to plurilingualism and pluriculturalism have been added. Additionally, while the previous version defined six language proficiency levels as A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, and C2, the updated version includes a seventh language proficiency level labeled as "A1 Pre-Level." The sections that were updated and added to the document in 2018 have been reflected in the Turkish Language Curriculum for Foreigners [TURC] in the sections concerning language use domains, communicative functions, and language objectives (MoNE, 2020, p. 6).

Based on the updated Common European Framework of Reference for Languages [CEFR] from 2018, the Turkish Language Curriculum for Foreigners [TURC] (MoNE, 2020) has linked language use domains and socio-cultural knowledge to themes, and each class and level includes these concepts. Additionally, while the concept of "mediation" is theoretically explained in the curriculum, it is also emphasized that this concept is integrated into the learning process and is considered a part of the achievements within the curriculum.

The PriEngC (MoNE, 2018a) and SecEngC (MoNE, 2018b), as stated in the curriculums themselves, were designed based on the descriptive and pedagogical principles of the Common

European Framework of Reference for Languages [CEFR] from 2001. Both curriculums have adopted the teaching approach, instructional strategies, assessment methods, and language proficiency levels in alignment with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages [CEFR] as stated in the curriculums. However, the concepts and updates introduced in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages [CEFR] from 2018 are not present in both PriEngC (MoNE, 2018a) and SecEngC (MoNE, 2018b). Therefore, although these English Language Curriculums and the Turkish Language Curriculum for Foreigners were based on the same foundational source, they may exhibit conceptual differences due to the lack of alignment with the updated version of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages [CEFR].

As seen in Table 1, another common foundation found in the examined curriculums is "core values." As of 2018, with the updated curriculum, the Ministry of National Education has introduced the term "core values" and identified ten core values associated with different disciplines, including national, spiritual, and universal values. Accordingly, "justice, friendship, honesty, self-control, patience, respect, love, responsibility, patriotism, and altruism" are the core values that should be included in the curriculums.

In all three curriculums, it is stated that each of the core values mentioned above should be instilled in students through the curriculum. In both English language curriculums, it is emphasized that those preparing the teaching materials and teachers should design the materials in a way that is suitable for the students' level and psychology to instill the core values. It is emphasized that stakeholders play a significant role in values education.

One of the other core references found in Table 1 is the "European and Turkish Qualifications Framework". The Turkish Qualifications Framework [TQF] is designed to be compatible with the European Qualifications Framework [EQF] and shows all the qualifications based on learning paths, including primary, secondary, and higher education, as well as vocational, general, and academic education and training programs and other learning pathways (TQF, 2015).

In TURC (MoNE, 2020), it is stated that the curriculum is prepared based on the European Qualifications Framework and the Turkish Qualifications Framework. Although the curriculum does not provide conceptual explanations about the contents of qualifications, it is detailed how students will be facilitated in acquiring certain qualifications in accordance with the Turkish Qualifications Framework.

In PriEngC (MoNE, 2018a), qualifications are presented under the heading "Main Competences in the Curriculum". The European Qualifications Framework is detailed in the curriculum and it is stated that the curriculum includes these qualifications. Additionally, the Ministry of National Education has emphasized the need for revision in all curriculums, including English language curriculums, to incorporate these qualifications. However, there is no specific mention or statement about the Turkish Qualifications Framework in PriEngC (MoNE, 2018a).

In SecEngC (MoNE, 2018b), it is stated that this curriculum is a continuation and includes updates and changes to PriEngC (MoNE, 2018a). However, despite the emphasis in PriEngC (MoNE, 2018a) on the need to include qualifications in all curriculums, including English language curriculums, SecEngC (MoNE, 2018b) does not include both qualifications frameworks.

In Table 1, one of the fundamental bases found in the curriculums is "21st Century Skills." Although there are different perspectives in the literature regarding what constitutes 21st Century

Skills, MoNE (2011) addresses these skills under four main themes in its publication titled "21st Century Student Profile": working methods, thinking methods, tools for work, and integration with the world. Among the examined curriculums, TURC (MoNE, 2020) is the only curriculum where "21st Century Skills" are directly expressed as a fundamental basis. The curriculum states that the selection of themes, achievements, and communicative functions are prepared considering these skills. It is explicitly stated in the curriculum that the teaching materials and activities should also incorporate these skills.

Findings Related to the Implementation of the Examined Curriculums

The findings related to the second research question, "Do the Turkish Language Curriculum as a Foreign Language and English Language Curriculums differ in terms of their implementation?" have been presented under two subheadings. In this section, the findings are not solely based on the contents under the "implementation" headings in the curriculums but are derived from the analysis of all the examined curriculums. First, the implementation of the PriEngC (MoNE, 2018a) and SecEngC (MoNE, 2018b) was discussed, followed by the implementation of TURC. (MoNE, 2020).

Findings Related to the Implementation of English Language Curriculums

The Primary and Secondary Foreign Language Curriculums (MoNE, 2018a; MoNE, 2018b) are English language curriculums designed for students studying in Türkiye. Both curriculums emphasize that they are prepared considering the students' age levels, interests, and needs. Both Primary and Secondary Foreign Language Curriculums describe themselves as action-oriented, communicative, and functional curriculums with a flexible structure. Additionally, both curriculums highlight the interconnectedness between class levels and language proficiency levels. Since the English language curriculums were examined as separate curriculums, the findings related to their implementation are presented separately.

Findings regarding the implementation of the Ministry of National Education English language curriculum (primary school, grades 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8) (MoNE, 2018a): The English Language Curriculum for Primary School (Grades 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8) (MoNE, 2018a) includes students between the ages of six and thirteen. The curriculum acknowledges the wide age range and takes into account differences such as cognitive load, assessment, covered language skills, and tasks. Due to these variations, the curriculum is divided into three learning stages, considering language usage, functions, and teaching materials. The first stage includes Grades 2, 3, and 4; the second stage includes Grades 5 and 6, and the third stage includes Grades 7 and 8. According to Table 2, the English Language Curriculum for Primary School (MoNE, 2018a) aims to start language teaching at the A1 level for students in Grade 2 and reach the A2 level by the end of Grade 8. However, the curriculum does not explicitly specify which sub-levels (e.g., A1.2) correspond to which grades.

Table 2. Implementation model of the Ministry of National Education English Language Curriculum for Primary School (Grades 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8) (MoNE, 2018a).

| Grade | Age | Level (CEFR) | Implementation Period (Hours/Week) | Skills |
|-----------|---|--------------|------------------------------------|---|
| 2nd Grade | | A1 | 2 | Listening Speaking |
| 3rd Grade | | A1 | 2 | Listening Speaking Very Limited Reading Very Limited Writing |
| 4th Grade | | A1 | 2 | Listening Speaking Very Limited Reading Very Limited Writing |
| 5th Grade | | A1 | 3 | Listening Speaking Limited Reading Very Limited Writing |
| 6th Grade | It is not specified in the curriculum. | A1 | 3 | Listening Speaking Limited Reading Limited Writing |
| 7th Grade | | A2 | 4 | Listening (Primary) Speaking (Primary) Reading (Secondary) Writing (Secondary) |
| 8th Grade | | A2 | 4 | Listening (Primary) Speaking (Primary) Reading (Secondary) Writing (Secondary) |

As seen in Table 2, in PriEngC (MoNE, 2018a), the specified language levels, implementation duration, and skills to be acquired vary for each grade level. Although the curriculum is intended for children aged 6-13, the age of students according to their grades is not specified in the implementation model of the curriculum. For 2nd, 3rd, and 4th-grade students, the weekly implementation duration is stated as 2 hours, for 5th and 6th grades as 3 hours, and for 7th and 8th grades as 4 hours.

In PriEngC (MoNE, 2018a), it is emphasized that teaching practices should particularly focus on listening and speaking skills for 2nd, 3rd, and 4th grades. Looking at Table 2, it is evident that the implementation of the curriculum should include listening and speaking practices for 2nd graders, and for 3rd and 4th graders, it should include listening, speaking, very limited reading, and very limited writing practices. In these grade levels, the curriculum highlights that children will learn the language better through songs, games, and practical activities, and therefore, limited emphasis is given to reading,

writing, and grammar structures, or they are included to a limited extent. Furthermore, the curriculum mentions that homework, projects, and other extracurricular activities for 2nd graders should not exceed ten words in terms of reading and writing tasks.

For 2nd and 3rd grades, implementation recommendations are provided in a separate section in PriEngC (MoNE, 2018a). These implementation recommendations can be summarized as follows: Activities should be carried out in a known context, communication-focused, enjoyable, and educational to increase students' interest and attitude towards English. Enhancing the memorization of what is learned, particularly through songs, and motivating students to sing the songs at home are suggested. Learning between themes should be connected and related to each other. Since reading and writing are the main focus skills, notebooks should not be used in these grades. It is recommended for teachers to use headlines, emphasizing key words or phrases when speaking English.

As seen in Table 2, the skills to be acquired for 5th graders in the curriculum are listening, speaking, limited reading, and very limited writing. For 6th graders, the skills to be acquired are listening, speaking, limited reading, and limited writing. In both of these grade levels, there is a limitation on developing reading and writing skills. In PriEngC (MoNE, 2018a), the skills mentioned as "very limited" are explained to refer to simple and short oral/written texts and materials. It is also mentioned that activities involving reading and writing up to 25 words can be carried out to develop the skills described as "limited."

Looking at Table 2 for 7th and 8th grades, it can be observed that practices focusing on speaking and listening skills at the A2 level should be prioritized, followed by activities to develop writing and reading skills. The curriculum emphasizes that theme-based instructional practices are used to shape the curriculum for these grades. When looking at the achievements in PriEngC (MoNE, 2018a), it is observed that there are differences in terms of the skills to be acquired, as indicated in Table 2. The units prepared for grades 2, 3, and 4 focus on listening and speaking skills, while units for grade 5 emphasize listening, speaking, and reading skills. In grade 6 units, the focus is on listening, oral interaction, oral expression, and reading skills, and for grades 7-8, the units cover listening, oral interaction, oral expression, reading, and writing skills. In PriEngC (MoNE, 2018a), a series of 10 example units are provided for each grade level, and these units are structured around related themes. It is explained that the selected themes for each unit are based on topics from students' daily lives. The curriculum also includes explanations about the materials that can be used for each grade level, emphasizing the importance of using authentic materials, especially.

In PriEngC (MoNE, 2018a), there is a separate section that includes explanations about the general implementation of the curriculum. The implementations can be summarized briefly as follows: It is stated that communication in the classroom should be in English, but Turkish can also be used when necessary. Since the aim of English lessons is to develop students' English communication skills, teachers are advised not to correct students' communication errors immediately and to motivate them to learn. It is emphasized that parents should also be involved in the language learning process, and informing parents about students is highlighted. The importance of providing students with a love and awareness of their native language through foreign language education is also emphasized.

Findings regarding the implementation of the Ministry of National Education secondary school English course (9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th grades) curriculum (MoNE, 2018b): In the introduction section of the Secondary School English Course (MoNE, 2018b), it is stated that this curriculum is a continuation of the Primary School English Course (MoNE, 2018a). Additionally, in the Secondary School English Course (MoNE, 2018b), it is emphasized that English lessons are designed to address all aspects of communicative competence, functions, and the four language skills according to students' age levels and needs. Furthermore, the promotion of student autonomy is highlighted as an important principle in both in-class and out-of-class activities. For the development of student autonomy, it is recommended to provide support and guidance from teachers, peers, learning materials, and learning tasks rather than relying on competition.

Table 3. *Implementation model of the Ministry of National Education Secondary School English Course (9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th Grades) (MoNE, 2018b)*

| Grade | Age | Level (CEFR) | Implementation Period (Hours/Week) | Skills |
|------------|---------|--------------|------------------------------------|-----------|
| 9th Grade | 14-14.5 | A1 / A2 | 4 | Listening |
| 10th Grade | 15-15.5 | A2+ / B1 | 4 | Speaking |
| 11th Grade | 16-16.5 | B1+ / B2 | 4 | Reading |
| 12th Grade | 17-17.5 | B2+ | 4 | Writing |

In SecEngC (MoNE, 2018b), the language levels for high school students have been organized based on the needs of the students, taking into account the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. As seen in Table 3, the 9th-grade classes begin with A1 level applications, and the goal is for 12th-grade students to graduate at least at B2 level, depending on whether they go to a preparatory class or not. In PriEngC (MoNE, 2018a), it is expected that 8th-grade students graduate at A2 level. However, since the language learning levels and needs of students starting high school may vary, it is stated in SecEngC (MoNE, 2018b) that the teaching practices for 9th-grade have been adapted again according to A1 and A2 levels. Additionally, it is emphasized that the practices designed for 9th-grade students, containing A1 level content, are more advanced in terms of vocabulary and structures compared to PriEngC (MoNE, 2018a).

As seen in Table 3, SecEngC (MoNE, 2018b) has been designed for four hours per week for all classes. However, it is stated in the program that this weekly hour may vary according to institutions. The curriculum emphasizes that each lesson should start with listening and speaking activities to mimic the process of first language acquisition, and then proceed to reading and writing materials.

In SecEngC (MoNE, 2018b), there are explanations regarding the practices to be carried out at each class level as indicated in Table 3. For 9th grade, it is emphasized that linguistic practices should be conducted at the A1 level for students with lower language proficiency, and for those with higher proficiency, A2 level structures should be taught, with a focus on speaking and writing practices at the A1 level. In 10th grade, integrated language skills should be taught, and special emphasis should be given to pronunciation exercises. Throughout all class levels, both teachers and students are expected to constantly communicate in English, which is also highlighted in the curriculum.

The curriculum has been prepared with a thematic approach, and for each class, 10 themes have been included in the curriculum. In order to meet the interests and needs of the target students, the themes for each class were determined through a survey conducted with a focus group of students from grades 9 to 12. The curriculum includes syllabi for each theme, which contain language functions and useful language, language skills and achievements, as well as material and task suggestions. While it is

emphasized that all four fundamental language skills should be integrated throughout all class levels, there is a particular emphasis on practices related to speaking and listening skills, which should be predominant in the curriculum.

In SecEngC (MoNE, 2018b), the number of new words to be learned in each lesson is limited to seven in order to improve vocabulary in all class levels. The specific words to be taught in each theme are not mentioned in the curriculum; the selection of words to be taught is left to the discretion of teachers and material developers, taking into consideration the relevance to the theme.

In the curriculum designed for 9-12 grade levels, there is a particular emphasis on the use of both in-class and out-of-class teaching materials, and detailed explanations are provided about instructional materials. The curriculum aims to provide students with auditory and linguistic input through materials while also teaching the language's culture. To achieve this, the use of authentic materials such as documentaries and films is recommended. Additionally, the curriculum encourages students to use technology, and it is mentioned that online materials can also be adapted into the curriculum.

Findings regarding the implementation of the Turkish as a foreign language curriculum: The Ministry of National Education Turkish as a Foreign Language Curriculum (MoNE, 2020) has been designed for the teaching of Turkish both domestically and internationally. Therefore, variations in implementation are addressed in the syllabus and guidelines to accommodate different contexts. The curriculum includes diverse syllabi and justifies the reasons behind these variations due to differences in domestic and international settings. As mentioned in the first findings of the research, the curriculum is based on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (2018), and the descriptions of language proficiency levels in the curriculum are also derived from this framework. While the curriculum exhibits diversity in terms of domestic and international applications, age groups, and language proficiency levels, it follows a communicative approach with a focus on functional, communicative, task-oriented, and skill-based elements. Consequently, the curriculum adopts a spiral, thematic, functional, communicative, task-based, and skill-oriented approach, as explicitly stated.

The curriculum is described as flexible because the application will vary depending on the country and cultures in which it is implemented. Therefore, while the core elements under the headings of vocabulary and language structures are fundamental, the program emphasizes that different structures and words can also be taught according to the specific needs and context of each implementation location.

The Ministry of National Education's Turkish as a Foreign Language Curriculum (MoNE, 2020) includes detailed syllabi that can be applied to students' learning levels, ages, and proficiency levels both domestically and abroad. The syllabi contain essential language skills-related achievements, communicative functions associated with these achievements, language structures required by communicative functions, and the components of vocabulary relevant to the theme (MoNE, 2020, p. 16). In Table 4, the syllabi for abroad, and in Table 5, the syllabi for domestic settings, the minimum duration-based application models according to the students' learning levels are presented in the curriculum.

Table 4. *The Ministry of National Education's Turkish as a Foreign Language Curriculum (MoNE, 2020) implementation model for abroad*

| Grade | Age | Level (CEFR) | Implementation Period | Skills |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------------|--|
| Preschool | Month 36-48 | Beginning I | 72 Hours | Listening/Viewing |
| | Month 49-60 | Beginning II | 72 Hours | Speaking |
| | Month 61-72 | Beginning III | 72 Hours | Listening/Viewing Speaking Early Literacy Skills |
| Elementary School | 7 | A1.1 | 72+72 Hours | Listening/Viewing Speaking Reading (Pre-Literacy) Writing (Pre-writing) |
| | 8 | A1.2 | 72+72 Hours | Listening/Viewing |
| | 9 | A1.3 | 72+72 Hours | Speaking |
| | 10 | A1.4 | 72+72 Hours | Reading Writing |
| Middle School | 11 | A1 | 144 Hours | Listening/Viewing |
| | 12 | A2.1 | 144 Hours | Speaking |
| | 13 | A2.2 | 144 Hours | Reading |
| | 14 | A2.3 | 144 Hours | Writing |
| High School | - | A1 | 144 Hours | |
| | - | A2 | 144 Hours | Listening/Viewing |
| | - | B1 | 144 Hours | Speaking |
| | - | B1+ | 144 Hours | Reading |
| | - | B2 | 144 Hours | Writing |
| | - | C1 | 144 Hours | |

Table 5. *The Ministry of National Education's Turkish as a Foreign Language Curriculum (MoNE, 2020) domestic implementation model*

| Grade | Age | Level (CEFR) | Implementation Period | Skills | |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| Preschool | 36-48 Month | Beginning I | 72 Hours | Listening/Viewing | |
| | 49-60 Month | Beginning II | 72 Hours | Speaking | |
| | 61-72 Month | Beginning III | 72 Hours | Listening/Viewing Speaking Early Literacy Skills | |
| Elementary School | 7-10 | A1 | A1.1 | 60 Hours | Listening/Viewing Speaking Reading (Pre-literacy) Writing (Pre-writing) |
| | | | A1.2 | 60 Hours | |
| | | | A1.3 | 60 Hours | Listening/Viewing |
| | | A2 | A1.4 | 60 Hours | Speaking |
| | | | A2.1 | 120 Hours | Reading |
| | | | A2.2 | 120 Hours | Writing |
| Middle School | 11-14 | A1 | 240 Hours | Listening/Viewing | |
| | | A2 | 120 Hours | Speaking | |
| | | A2.2 | 120 Hours | Reading | |
| High School | 15 + | B1 | 120 Hours | Writing | |
| | | A1 | 240 Hours | | |
| | | A2 | 240 Hours | Listening/Viewing | |
| | | B1 | 120 Hours | Speaking | |
| | | B1+ | 120 Hours | Reading | |
| | | B2 | 240 Hours | Writing | |
| | | C1 | 240 Hours | | |

According to Tables 4 and 5 in TURC (MoNE, 2020), different levels of implementation models are designed for each educational level for both domestic and international settings. As children encounter Turkish for the first time, the curriculum starts with the preschool level. The initial level includes A1 pre-elementary and A1 levels, targeting the appropriate achievements for the preschool period. Additionally, the developmental characteristics of preschool children provide a common ground, resulting in similar implementation models for both domestic and international settings. When preparing the curriculum for preschool, the basic principles of the MoNE Preschool Education Curriculum (2013) have been taken into consideration. Preschool practices are divided into three levels: 36-48 months, 49-60 months, and 61-72 months, based on the developmental characteristics of each age group. The curriculum includes appropriate achievements for the preschool level in accordance with their age-related developmental characteristics. According to this, there are 31 achievements for speaking skills and 31 achievements for listening skills, and early literacy skills are included for children aged 61-72 months. In addition to developing language skills in the preschool period, the curriculum aims to enhance cognitive, affective, and psychomotor skills according to the needs of children. Therefore, a spiral and play-based approach is emphasized for the preschool level in the curriculum. Syllabi have been created for each of the three levels in the preschool period. These syllabi, targeting communicative language teaching, include achievements, communicative functions, vocabulary, and language expressions. The syllabi consist of 10 themes, and each level includes achievements that build upon and repeat the previous ones. The minimum application time for each level is stated as 72 hours. The section on syllabi according to levels provides more detailed explanations for the preschool level compared to other educational levels. The curriculum includes specific details regarding general objectives, principles of Turkish language teaching, teacher's role, methods and techniques, educational environment and materials, classroom language and instructions, assessment and evaluation, and achievements for preschool Turkish language teaching practices.

According to Table 4 and Table 5, the curriculum is designed for the age group of 7-10 years both for domestic and international implementations. In the international application of the curriculum, for elementary school, level divisions (A1.1, A1.2, A1.3, A1.4) are made according to age groups within A1 level, and syllabi are prepared accordingly. In the domestic implementation, syllabi are provided for both A1 (A1.1, A1.2, A1.3, A1.4) and A2 (A2.1, A2.2) levels for elementary school. The reason for including the A2 level in the domestic implementation is explained as enabling students to be exposed to the target language in a natural environment and facilitating their adaptation to the formal education system more quickly. For the elementary school level, like other educational levels, the curriculum includes 10 different themes in the syllabi. Additionally, there is a starting/preparatory theme that covers the transition to primary school and includes preschool achievements. The skills to be acquired by students at the elementary school level include reading, writing, speaking, and listening/viewing, along with readiness skills for reading and writing. The curriculum includes the stages of phonics-based reading and writing instruction and the initial reading and writing achievements under the heading of "Reading and Writing Instruction for Primary Education." While creating the syllabi in the curriculum, the MoNE Turkish Language Curriculum and Turkish Language and Turkish Culture Curriculum are taken into consideration. Additionally, it is emphasized that phonics-based reading and writing instruction practices are applicable for the 1st grade of primary education, and for other grades, reading and writing instruction should be tailored according to the students' readiness levels. For students who are already literate in their native language, alphabet instruction will be sufficient. It is also highlighted

that initial reading and writing instruction should progress simultaneously with Turkish language instruction. When looking at the minimum application times for the primary school syllabi, there are differences between domestic and international implementations. While the minimum application time for each level is 72+72 hours in international applications, it is specified as 60 hours for A1 level and 120 hours for A2 level in domestic implementations.

The curriculum's implementation model for the 2nd stage of primary education, covering the age group of 11-14, shows differences in language levels between domestic and international implementations, as seen in Table 4 and Table 5. In international applications, the curriculum emphasizes the A2 level (A2.1, A2.2, A2.3) for middle school students, indicating that the A1 level is the starting point for new middle school students. For domestic implementations, the curriculum starts with the A1 level and continues with A2 (A2.1, A2.2), and additionally includes syllabi for the B1 level. The curriculum includes 10 different themes for both domestic and international implementations at the middle school level. For international implementations, the minimum implementation time for all levels (A1 and A2) for middle school students is set at 144 hours. For domestic implementations at the middle school level, the minimum implementation times are 240 hours for the A1 level, and 120 hours each for the A2 and B1 levels.

Looking at Table 4 and Table 5, the curriculum's implementation model for the secondary education level shows similarities in terms of targeted language proficiency levels for both domestic and international implementations. The curriculum emphasizes that the targeted level for secondary education students is B2 and that both domestic and international implementations start with a review of A1 and A2 levels. Additionally, the curriculum includes syllabi for the C1 level, which is designed to cater to specific needs of students at the implementation location and considerations like the school system for high school students. As with other levels, the curriculum for secondary education also includes 10 different themes in the syllabi. The minimum application time for international implementations for secondary education students is set at 144 hours for each level (A1, A2, B1, B2, C1). For domestic implementations targeting secondary education students, the minimum application time is set at 240 hours for the A1, A2, B2, and C1 levels, and 120 hours for the B1 and B1+ levels.

The curriculum includes 21 recommendations under the title "Suggestions for the Implementation of the Curriculum" to make the teaching of Turkish as a foreign language more effective at all educational levels. The recommendations for implementation can be summarized as follows:

The achievements are placed in a spiral and consecutive order based on the themes in the curriculum, so it is necessary to follow the themes to acquire the achievements. In grammar instruction, functionality should be prioritized over rules. All language skills should be activated and integrated through various activities and applications. Extra-curricular activities and practices should be included to involve families in the teaching process. Teachers' feedback should be constructive to enhance students' self-confidence and attitudes. In-class and out-of-class activities should be diversified. During assessment and evaluation, students' readiness and progress throughout the process should be taken into account, and assessment tools should be prepared according to their age and level. Individual work should be planned considering the characteristics of students' native languages. The use of a language other than standard Turkish should be avoided during the learning process. Cultural elements should be included in activities and materials for teaching. For students' practical use in their daily lives, sentence patterns like "Can you help me?" should be taught regardless of grammar structure. Teaching

materials for online environments should be prepared for students' use. Weekly class hours can be adjusted as needed, and additions can be made to the themes in the curriculum. The names of the themes can be changed in teaching materials.

Discussion and Conclusion

This research compared the core concepts and implementation methods of the current MoNE Turkish as a Foreign Language Curriculum (MoNE, 2020), the MoNE English Language Curriculum (Primary School Grades 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8) (MoNE, 2018a), and the MoNE Secondary School English Language Curriculum (Grades 9, 10, 11, and 12) (MoNE, 2018b). Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions have been reached:

In terms of foundational principles, all three foreign language curriculums compared, Turkish as a Foreign Language Curriculum, MoNE English Language Curriculum (Primary School Grades 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8) (MoNE, 2018a), and MoNE Secondary School English Language Curriculum (Grades 9, 10, 11, and 12) (MoNE, 2018b), consider the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages [CEFR] as the primary basis. However, a significant difference arises in the fact that the English Language Curriculums refer to the CEFR version from 2001, while the Turkish as a Foreign Language Curriculum is based on the updated version of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (2018). This distinction in the source of reference leads to conceptual differences in the structuring and content of the curriculums, even though they all originated from a common foundation.

In the analyzed curriculums, the only common foundational element is the core values. As of 2018, with the updated curriculum, the Ministry of National Education has emphasized the inclusion of core values in all educational curriculums. All three curriculums reviewed state that core values form the basis for developing the curriculums. However, none of the curriculums clearly specify in which sections the core values are included as content. In their study examining the values in the Secondary School English Language Curriculum and textbooks, Çoban and Akyol (2020) found that the curriculum's content did not fully reflect the core values. Therefore, further research on the inclusion of core values in the curriculums, considering the extent to which the foundational elements are concretely defined, would be indicative of the curriculum's basis.

Based on the analysis of foundational elements in the curriculums, it has been found that the Turkish Language Curriculum as a Foreign Language is based on both the European Framework and the Turkish Competencies Framework, while the Primary School English Language Curriculum is solely based on the European Framework. The Secondary School English Language Curriculum does not mention any foundational elements related to competency frameworks. Therefore, it can be said that the Turkish Language Curriculum as a Foreign Language is more comprehensively established based on competency frameworks.

The only curriculum that references 21st-century skills as its foundational element is the Turkish Language Curriculum as a Foreign Language. Aydın and Tangür (2021), in their study evaluating the Turkish Language Curriculum (MoNE, 2020) in terms of 21st-century skills, found that the curriculum is compatible with these skills. On the other hand, Çelebi and Altuncu (2019) assessed the achievements in the 9th-grade English Language Curriculum for secondary education in terms of 21st-century skills and concluded that the curriculum did not adequately address these skills. These studies align with the findings of the current research.

In general, when comparing the Turkish Language Curriculum as a Foreign Language (MoNE, 2020) with English Language Curriculums, it can be concluded that the content of the Turkish curriculum is constructed based on more diverse and varied foundational elements. However, it is important to note that this study focused on how the foundational elements were expressed in the curriculum. Therefore, conducting different studies that analyze how the stated foundational elements are actually reflected in the content of foreign language curriculums would provide more clarity and insight into the results.

The Turkish Language Curriculum as a Foreign Language and the English Language Curriculums aim to bring students at the primary and secondary education levels to similar language proficiency levels by the end of the academic year. However, both the Primary School English Language Curriculum (MoNE, 2018a) and the Secondary School English Language Curriculum (MoNE, 2018b) do not have detailed classifications (such as A1.1) regarding language proficiency levels at each grade level. The descriptions of language levels in the English curriculums are more broadly defined. In contrast, the Turkish Language Curriculum as a Foreign Language provides detailed language proficiency levels for each grade level, including the preschool curriculum. This curriculum covers language teaching both domestically and abroad, allowing for flexibility in presenting language levels. Additionally, the curriculum includes a separate list of achievements and language structures for each language proficiency level, providing convenience for educators and practitioners.

The Turkish Language Curriculum as a Foreign Language stands out from the English Language Curriculums in terms of including the Turkish language curriculum for the preschool period. For the preschool period, the curriculum defines language proficiency levels based on the updated version of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (2018) and provides detailed in-class applications. In Türkiye, English language teaching typically begins in public schools starting from the 2nd grade, which is why the English Language Curriculums examined in this study cannot be evaluated for this level. However, a different research could be conducted by comparing the Turkish Language Curriculum as a Foreign Language with the MoNE Private Preschool English Language Curriculum (MoNE, 2016) to explore differences and similarities between the curriculums.

The Turkish Language Curriculum as a Foreign Language emphasizes that it benefits from various curriculums in terms of its breadth and content. Therefore, it can be said that this curriculum contains more detailed contents compared to English language curriculums in terms of its implementation.

The analysis of the curriculums indicates that there are differences in terms of the skills to be acquired in practice. The Primary English Language Curriculum focuses on listening and speaking skills for elementary school level students. Additionally, it suggests that students may have limited or very limited exposure to reading and writing skills until they reach 7th and 8th grade. On the other hand, the Turkish Language Curriculum as a Foreign Language includes four basic skills from the 1st grade onwards, with specific achievements and practices for each skill. Evaluating the outcomes of these differences in terms of student achievement can help determine which curriculum is more effective in foreign language teaching.

The implementation durations of English Language Curriculums are provided in terms of weekly hours in both curriculums. However, in the Turkish Language Curriculum as a Foreign Language, the

minimum application duration required for each language level is specified at the class level. It can be said that the specified durations in the English curriculums are relatively shorter compared to the Turkish language curriculum as a foreign language.

As a conclusion, the Turkish Language Curriculum as a Foreign Language (MoNE, 2020) is a detailed program in terms of its implementation method, including language proficiency levels, educational levels, duration of implementation, and skills to be acquired. The program provides more detailed information on lesson plans, themes, objectives, language structures, and assessment methods for the implementation of the teaching program. This makes it more convenient for teachers, textbook authors, and instructional material creators. The program also includes more comprehensive details about the implementation compared to the English Curriculums. Although the English Curriculums also provide explanations for the implementation method, they are more limited compared to the Turkish language curriculum. Additionally, the basic foundations on which the curriculums are based show more diversity in the Turkish Language Curriculum as a Foreign Language (MoNE, 2020) compared to the English Curriculums.

Recommendations

In general, it can be concluded that the content of the Turkish Language Teaching Program as a Foreign Language (MoNE, 2020) is based on different and diverse foundations compared to the English Teaching Programs. However, this study focused on the expression of basic foundations in the programs. Therefore, different studies examining how well and in what way the foreign language teaching programs reflect the expressed basic foundations in their content will clarify the results.

The Turkish Language Teaching Program as a Foreign Language differs from the English Teaching Programs in terms of including a Turkish language teaching program for preschool education. For the preschool period, the program determines language proficiency levels based on the updated version of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (2018) and covers in-class applications in detail. English teaching, on the other hand, starts from the 2nd grade in state schools in our country; therefore, the English Teaching Programs reviewed in this study couldn't be evaluated in terms of this educational level. However, a comparison between the MoNE Private Preschool English Teaching Program (MoNE, 2016) and the Turkish Language Teaching Program as a Foreign Language can be made in a different research context.

References

- Aydın, B. (2016). Ruhdibilim, bilişsel dilbilim ve dil öğretimi [Psycholinguistics, cognitive linguistics and language teaching]. In E. Korkut & İ. O. Ayırır (Eds.), *Dil bilimleri ve dil öğretimi* [Linguistics and language teaching]. (pp. 227-260). Seçkin.
- Aydın, E., Tangür, M. (2021). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe Öğretimi Programı'nın 21. yüzyıl becerileri açısından incelenmesi [Examination of the Curriculum of Turkish as a Foreign Language in terms of 21st century skills]. *Journal of Bayburt Education Faculty*, 16(32), 349-374.
- Balcı, M., & Melanlıoğlu, D. (2020). Türkçenin yabancı dil olarak öğretimi programı üzerine [On the curriculum of teaching Turkish as a foreign language]. *Kırıkkale University Journal of Science*, 10(2), 173-198.
- Bayyurt, Y. (2014). 4+ 4+ 4 Eğitim sisteminde erken yaşta yabancı dil eğitimi [Early foreign language education in the 4+4+4 Education system]. *Proceedings of the Foreign Language Education Workshop* (12-13 October 2012), (pp. 117-127). Hacettepe Üniversitesi.
- Bloor, M., & Wood, F. (2006). *Keywords in qualitative methods: A vocabulary of research concepts*. Sage.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27-40.
- Council of Europe [CoE]. (2001). Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. modern languages division. Cambridge University.
- Council of Europe [CoE]. (2018). *The CEFR companion volume with new descriptors*. <https://rm.coe.int/common-european-framework-of-reference-for-languages>
- Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory into Practice*, 39(3), 124-130.
- Çakır, A. (2017). Türkiye'de YÖK öncesi ve sonrası yabancı dil eğitimi [Foreign language education in Turkey before and after CoHE (Council of Higher Education)]. *Journal of Language Research (JLR)*, 1(1), 1-18.
- Çelebi, M., & Altuncu, N. (2019, April 26-27). 21. yüzyıl becerilerinin İngilizce öğretim programında yeri [The place of 21st century skills in the English teaching curriculum]. 6th International Multidisciplinary Studies Congress Full Text Proceedings, 231-244. Gaziantep, Türkiye.
- Çoban, A., & Akyol, Z. (2020, February 7-8). *Değerler açısından İngilizce öğretim programı ve ders kitaplarının incelenmesi* [Analyzing English curriculum and textbooks in terms of values]. ATLAS International Congress on Social Sciences 5., 264-276. Diyarbakır, Türkiye.
- Demirel, Ö. (1999). *İlköğretim okullarında yabancı dil öğretimi* [Foreign language teaching in primary schools]. Milli Eğitim Basımevi.
- Demirel, Ö. (2015a). *Eğitimde program geliştirme kuramdan uygulamaya* [Program development in education: from theory to practice]. Pegem Akademi.
- Demirel, Ö. (2015b). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretim programı: TÖMER örneği [Turkish language teaching program as a foreign language: the example of TÖMER]. *Journal of Language*, 166/1, 5-15. <https://dspace.ankara.edu.tr/xmlui/bitstream/handle/20.500.12575/62674/22368.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- Durmuş, M., & Okur, A. (2013). *Yabancılar için Türkçe öğretimi el kitabı* [Handbook for teaching Turkish to foreigners]. Grafiker.
- Dursun, F., Bedir, S. B., & Gülcü, E. Ö. (2017). Lise İngilizce dersi öğretmenlerinin öğretim programına ilişkin görüşlerinin incelenmesi [Teachers' views on English course curriculum]. *Journal of National Education*, 46(216), 135-163.
- Ekiz, D. (2003). *Eğitimde araştırma yöntem ve metodlarına giriş* [Introduction to research methods and methodologies in education]. Anı.
- Erdil, M., & Açıık, F. (2021). Türkiye Maarif Vakfı Türkçenin yabancı dil olarak öğretimi programı ile Türkçe öğretim setlerinde dil bilgisi içeriklerinin incelenmesi [Investigation of grammar contents in Turkey Maarif Foundation's Teaching Turkish as a Foreign Language Program and in Turkish teaching sets]. *International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching*, 9(4), 129-161.
- Ertem, Z. S. (2023). Ortaöğretim İngilizce öğretim programlarındaki işlevler ve öğrenme çıktılarının bilişsel düzeylerinin değerlendirilmesi [Evaluation of the cognitive levels of functions and learning outcomes in secondary education English curricula]. *RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, (32), 1402-1418.

- Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (1996). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. McGraw-Hill.
- Güzel, A., & Barın, Erol. (2013). *Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretimi* [Turkish language teaching as a foreign language]. Akçağ.
- Haznedar, B. (2004). Türkiye’de yabancı dil öğretimi: İlköğretim yabancı dil programı [Primary foreign language learning and curriculum development in Turkey]. *Bogazici University Journal of Education*, 21(2), 15-19.
- İpek Eğilmez, N. (2018). Comparison of mother tongue teaching curriculums implemented at the middle school level in Turkey and England. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 6(10), 2384-2398.
- Karasar, N. (1999). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi* [Scientific research model]. Nobel .
- Kaya, M., & Kardaş, M. N. (2020). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretim programı üzerine bir inceleme [A study on Turkish curriculum as a foreign language]. *Social Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 4(1), 1- 20.
- Kılıç, A. (2021). Türkiye Maarif Vakfı yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretimi programı A1-A2 dinleme/izleme ve okuma/anlama kazanımlarının 21. yüzyıl okuryazarlık becerileri kapsamında değerlendirilmesi [Evaluation of Turkish Maarif Foundation Teaching Turkish as a Foreign Language Program A1-A2 listening/watching and reading/comprehension achievements in the scope of 21st century literacy skills]. *International Journal of Turkish Teaching as a Foreign Language*, 4(1), 148-164.
- Küçükahmet, L. (2008). *Öğretimde planlama ve değerlendirme* [Planning and assessment in teaching]. Nobel.
- Ministry of National Education [MoNE]. (2011). *MEB 21. yüzyıl öğrenci profili* [MoNE 21st Century student profile]. Access of date: 20.03.2023. https://www.meb.gov.tr/earged/earged/21.%20yy_og_pro.pdf
- Ministry of National Education [MoNE].(2016). *MEB özel okul öncesi İngilizce öğretim programı* [MONE private preschool English language curriculum]. Access of date: 18.04.2023. https://ookgm.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2016_06/23023701_ozel_okul_onesi_ingilizce_ogretim_programi.pdf
- Ministry of National Education [MoNE]. (2017). *MEB yabancı dil eğitimi ve öğretimi yönetmeliği* [MoNE foreign language education and teaching regulation]. Access of date: 15.04.2023. <https://mus.meb.gov.tr/www/milli-egitim-bakanligi-yabanci-dil-egitimi-ve-ogretimi-yonetmeliği/icerik/5238>
- Ministry of National Education [MoNE]. (2018a). *MEB İngilizce dersi öğretim programı (İlkokul ve ortaokul 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, ve 8. sınıflar)* [MoNE English course curriculum (Primary school 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th grades)]. Access of date:10.03.2023. <http://mufredat.meb.gov.tr/ProgramDetay.aspx?PID=327>
- Ministry of National Education [MoNE]. (2018b). *Ortaöğretim İngilizce dersi (9, 10, 11 ve 12. sınıflar) öğretim programı* [Secondary school English course (grades 9, 10, 11 and 12) curriculum]. Access of date: 20.03.2023. Access address: <http://mufredat.meb.gov.tr/ProgramDetay.aspx?PID=342>
- Ministry of National Education [MoNE]. (2020). *Türkçe’nin yabancı dil olarak öğretimi programı* [Curriculum for teaching Turkish as a foreign language]. Access of date: 10.03.2023. https://piktes.gov.tr/linkler/turkce_dil_programi.pdf
- Melanlıoğlu, D. (2020). Kardeş veya yük: Mülteci çocuk kahramanların bakış açısıyla kültürlerarası etkileşim [Brother or burden: Intercultural interaction from the perspective of refugee child heroes]. *RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, (20), 95-115.
- Merter, F., Kartal, Ş., & Çağlar, İ. (2012). Ortaöğretim İngilizce dersi yeni öğretim programının öğretmen görüşlerine göre değerlendirilmesi [The evaluation of new high school english curriculum in terms of teachers’ opinions]. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Journal of Education Faculty*, 1(23), 43-58.
- Mesleki Yeterlilikler Kurumu. (2015). Türkiye yeterlilikler çerçevesi [The turkish qualifications framework]. Access of date: 26.03.2023. https://myk.gov.tr/images/articles/editor/130116/TYC_tebliğ_2.pdf
- Onursal, İ. (2019). Yabancı dil öğretimi/öğreniminde yaş etkeni üzerine bir değerlendirme [An evaluation on the age factor in foreign language teaching/learning]. *Language Journal*, 170/1, 40-53.
- Senemoğlu, N. (2007). *Gelişim öğrenme ve öğretim kuramdan uygulamaya* [From development, learning, and teaching theory to practice]. Gönül.
- Şahin, H., & Aykaç, N. (2019). Avrupa ülkelerinde ve Türkiye’de ilkokullarda uygulanan yabancı dil öğretim programlarının karşılaştırılması [Comparison of foreign language teaching programs in primary schools in European countries and Turkey]. *Journal of National Education*, 48(1), 571-594.
- Şen, Ü. (2016). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretiminde ihmal edilmiş iki program:1986 ve 2000 programları [Neglected curricula in teaching Turkish as a foreign language: The 1986 and 2000 curricula]. *Journal of Mother Tongue Education*, 4(4), 545-558.

- Teddlie, C., & Yu, F. (2007). Mixed methods sampling: A typology with examples. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 1*(1), 77-100.
- Türkiye Maarif Vakfı. (2020). *Türkçenin yabancı dil olarak öğretimi programı* [The Turkish language teaching program as a foreign language]. Access of date: 10.03.2023. https://www.turkiyemaarif.org/uploads/Turkcenin_Yabanci_Dil_Olarak_Ogretimi_Programi_2_Baski.pdf
- Ulutaş, M., & Kara, M. (2019). TÖMER Türkçe öğretim programları okuma kazanımlarının bilişsel stratejiler açısından incelenmesi [Analysis of Turkish language curriculums' reading acquisitions of Turkish teaching centers in terms of cognitive strategies]. *Journal of Language Education and Research, 5*(2), 232-250.
- Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2013). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri* [Qualitative research methods in social sciences]. Seçkin.
- Yücel, E., Dimici, K., Yıldız, B., & Bümen, N. T. (2017). Son 15 yılda yayımlanan ilk ve ortaöğretim İngilizce dersi öğretim programları üzerine bir analiz [An Analysis of the primary and secondary school English language curricula published over the last 15 years]. *Ege Journal of Education, 18*(2), 702-737.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

Contribution Rate of Researchers

Author 1: 100%

Conflict Statement

In the research, there are no situations or relationships that could constitute a conflict of interest for the author.



Genişletilmiş Türkçe Özet

<http://www.tayjournal.com>

<https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/tayjournal>

Yabancı Dil Olarak Türkçe ve İngilizce Öğretim Programlarının Karşılaştırmalı Bir Analizi

Giriş

Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı [MEB] tarafından “Yabancı Dil Olarak Türkçe Öğretimi Programı” ilk kez 1986 yılında, ardından 2000 yılında hazırlanmıştır. 2015 yılında da Ankara Üniversitesi Türkçe Öğretim Merkezi [TÖMER] tarafından “Yabancı Dil Olarak Türkçe Öğretimi Programı” hazırlanmıştır. Ancak bu programlar, alanyazında çok iyi bilinmemekle birlikte Türkçenin yabancı dil olarak öğretilmesinde standartlaşmayı da sağlayamamıştır (Şen, 2016). Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı tarafından Türkçe’nin yabancı dil olarak öğretimi, 2020 yılından itibaren okul öncesi de dahil olmak üzere ilköğretim ve ortaöğretim kademelerine göre öğretim programı hazırlanarak uluslararası alandaki standartlara uygun hale getirilmeye başlanmıştır. Dolayısıyla MEB Türkçenin Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğretim Programı (MEB, 2020), çok yeni ve güncel bir program olma niteliği taşımaktadır. Ülkemizde İngilizcenin yabancı dil olarak öğretimi ise uzun yıllardır çeşitli öğretim programları dahilinde yapılmaktadır.

Türkiye’de yabancı dil öğretimine dönük alanyazın çalışmalarına bakıldığında hem Türkçe hem İngilizce öğretim programları açısından yabancı dil öğretimini ele alan çalışmalar (Aydın ve Tunagür, 2021; Balcı ve Melanlıoğlu, 2020; Dursun vd., 2017; Erdil ve Açık, 2021; Ertem, 2023; Haznedar, 2004; Kardaş, 2020; Kılıç, 2021; Koyuncu, 2021; Merter vd., 2012; Yücel vd., 2017) yer almaktadır. Ancak yapılan bu araştırma ile yeni olan Türkçenin Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğretimi Programı (MEB, 2020) ile İngilizce dersi öğretim programlarının çeşitli değişkenler açısından karşılaştırmalı olarak incelenmesi, Türkiye’deki yabancı dil öğretim programlarına karşılaştırmalı olarak yeni bir bakış açısı getirecektir. Dolayısıyla bu çalışma ile MEB Türkçenin Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğretim Programı (MEB, 2020) ile MEB İngilizce Dersi Öğretim Programı (İlkokul ve Ortaokul 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 ve 8. sınıflar) (MEB, 2018a) ve MEB Ortaöğretim İngilizce Dersi (9, 10, 11 ve 12. sınıflar) Öğretim Programı’nı (MEB, 2018b) temel dayanak

ve uygulanma biçimleri açısından karşılaştırmak amaçlanmaktadır. Belirtilen amaç doğrultusunda araştırmada şu soruların yanıtları aranmıştır:

1. Türkçenin Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğretimi Programı (MEB, 2020) ile İngilizce Öğretimi Programları (MEB, 2018a; MEB, 2018b), temel dayanaklar açısından birbirinden farklılık göstermekte midir?

2. Türkçenin Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğretimi Programı (MEB, 2020) ile İngilizce Öğretimi Programları (MEB, 2018a; MEB, 2018b), uygulanma biçimleri açısından birbirinden farklılık göstermekte midir?

Yöntem

Nitel araştırma yaklaşımı benimsenen bu çalışma, durum araştırması niteliğindedir. Araştırmanın veri kaynağını, MEB Türkçenin Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğretim Programı [TYDÖP] (MEB, 2020), MEB İngilizce Dersi Öğretim Programı (İlkokul ve Ortaokul 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 ve 8. sınıflar) [İlkİÖP] (MEB, 2018a) ve MEB Ortaöğretim İngilizce Dersi (9, 10, 11 ve 12. sınıflar) Öğretim Programı [OrtaİÖP] (MEB, 2018b) oluşturmaktadır. Bu nedenle amaçsal örnekleme yöntemlerinden ölçüt örnekleme kullanılmıştır.

TYDÖP (MEB, 2020), okul öncesi, ilköğretim ve ortaöğretim düzeylerinin üçüne de dair açıklamalar ve yönergeler içeren bir öğretim programıdır. İlkİÖP (MEB, 2018a) ve OrtaİÖP (MEB, 2018b) ise ilköğretim ve ortaöğretim düzeylerini iki farklı öğretim programında ele almaktadır. Bu nedenle araştırmada, yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretimini içeren program, tek bir öğretim programı olarak; İngilizce öğretimini içeren program ise iki ayrı öğretim programı olarak veri kaynağını oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmada verilerin toplanmasında nitel veri toplama yöntemlerinden doküman analizi incelemesi tekniği kullanılmıştır. Yıldırım ve Şimşek' in (2013) ifade ettiği gibi doküman analizi, araştırılması amaçlanan olgu ve olgular hakkında bilgi içeren yazılı materyallerin analizini kapsamaktadır. Öğretim programlarına, kaynakçada da belirtilen Milli Eğitim Bakanlığının ilgili erişim adreslerinden ulaşılmıştır. TYDÖP (MEB, 2020), Türkçe olarak; İlkİÖP (MEB, 2018a) ve OrtaİÖP (MEB, 2018b) ise Türkçe olan bazı açıklama bölümlerinin dışında İngilizce olarak bakanlık tarafından yayımlanmıştır. Araştırmacı tarafından İngilizce öğretim programları Türkçeye çevrilmiş ve bir alan uzmanından çeviriyi değerlendirmesi istenmiştir. Alan uzmanı, İngilizce öğretim programına ilişkin çevirinin orijinal metinle aynı olduğunu belirtmiştir. Böylelikle incelenen dokümanların orijinallik kontrolü sağlanmıştır. Ardından programlar üzerinde analiz çalışması yapılmıştır.

Çalışmanın verilerini elde etmek için her üç öğretim programında da temel dayanaklar ve programın uygulanma biçimi alt başlıklarını içeren ögeler incelenmiştir. Bununla birlikte her üç program için doğru verilere ulaşabilmek için yukarıda belirtilen başlıkların dışında programlar bütünüyle de incelenmiş ve programa doğrudan dayanak (temel) oluşturduğu ifade edilen kavramlar ve öğretim programlarının uygulanma biçimleri analiz edilmiştir. Temel dayanaklara ilişkin analiz yapılırken, programlara temel dayanak oluşturduğu ifade edilen kavram ve olgular incelemeye alınmıştır. Programların içeriklerinin programlarda belirtilen temel dayanaklara uygun olup olmadığına yönelik inceleme, araştırmanın inceleme konusu dışında tutulmuştur. Yine sözü edilen öğretim programları uygulanma biçimleri açısından analiz edilirken, programlarda doğrudan uygulamaya dair açıklamalar incelenmekle birlikte uygulamaya dair öğrenim düzeyi, öğrenci yaşı, dil seviyesi, programın uygulanma süresi, kazandırılacak dil becerileri başlıkları altındaki veriler analiz edilmiştir.

Bulgular

Araştırmanın soruları doğrultusunda incelemesi yapılan üç öğretim programı, ilk olarak programlarda açıkça ifade edilen temel dayanaklar açısından analiz edilmiştir. “Temel dayanaklar” ifadesi TYDÖP’de (MEB, 2020) bir başlık olarak doğrudan yer almaktayken; İlkİÖP’de (MEB, 2018a) ve OrtaİÖP’de (MEB, 2018b) “temel felsefe”, “değerler eğitimi”, “anahtar yeterlilikler” başlıklarının içerisinde temel dayanaklara yer verilmiştir. Her üç program da yukarıda belirtilen başlıkların dışında bütünüyle incelenerek, programa doğrudan dayanak (temel) oluşturduğu ifade edilen kavramlar açısından da incelenerek bulgulara ulaşılmıştır.

İncelemesi yapılan öğretim programlarının içerdikleri temel dayanaklara ilişkin bulgular şu şekilde özetlenebilir:

Her üç programda da ortak ve farklı temel dayanaklar yer almaktadır. Her üç programda da en temel dayanak, Avrupa Dilleri Ortak Çerçeve Programı (The Common European Framework) olarak ifade edilmektedir. İngilizce öğretim programlarında ve Türkçe öğretim programında Avrupa Dilleri Ortak Çerçeve Programı farklı biçimlerde dilsel olarak ifade edilse de (TYDÖP’de Diller için Avrupa Ortak Başvuru Metni (CoE, 2018), İngilizce öğretim programlarında Avrupa Dilleri Öğretimi Ortak Çerçeve Programı (CoE, 2001) biçiminde) aynı kaynak, temel dayanak olarak işaret edilmektedir. Ancak TYDÖP’de (MEB, 2020) Avrupa Dilleri Ortak Çerçeve Programı 2018 yılındaki güncellenmiş biçimiyle yer almaktadır.

İlkİÖP (MEB, 2018a) ve OrtaİÖP (MEB, 2018b), programlarda belirtildiği üzere Avrupa Dilleri Ortak Çerçeve Programı’nın (2001) tanımlayıcı ve pedagojik ilkelerine göre tasarlanmıştır. Her iki programda da öğretim yaklaşımı, öğretim stratejileri, ölçme değerlendirme biçimleri, dil düzeyleri programlarda ifade edildiği biçimiyle Avrupa Dilleri Öğretimi Ortak Çerçeve Programı’na (CoE, 2001) dayandırılmıştır. Ancak yukarıda Avrupa Dilleri Ortak Çerçeve Programı’nda (CoE, 2018) yapılan güncellemeler bağlamında ortaya çıkan kavramlar ve güncellemeler İlkİÖP’nin (MEB, 2018a) ve OrtaİÖP’nin (MEB, 2018b) her ikisinde de yer almamaktadır. Bu nedenle incelenen İngilizce Öğretim Programları, Türkçenin Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğretimi Programı ile aynı temel kaynaktan hareketle hazırlanmış olsa da güncelliği karşılamadığı için programlar Avrupa Dilleri Ortak Çerçeve Programı’na göre temel dayanaktaki kavramsal açılardan farklılık sergilemektedir.

Her üç programda da kök değerlerin her birinin program aracılığı ile öğrencilere kazandırılması gereken değerler olduğu ifade edilmiştir. İngilizce öğretim programlarının ikisinde de kök değerlerin kazandırılması için öğretmen ve ders materyalleri hazırlayanlara, öğrenci seviyesine ve psikolojisine uygun bir şekilde ders materyalleri hazırlamaları gerektiği vurgulanmış ve değerler eğitiminde paydaşların da etkisi olduğu belirtilmiştir.

TYDÖP’de (MEB, 2020) Avrupa Yeterlilikler Çerçevesi ve Türkiye Yeterlilikler Çerçevesi esas alınarak programın hazırlandığı belirtilmiştir. Programda yeterliliklerin içeriklerine dair kavramsal açıklamalar yapılmasa da Türkiye Yeterlilikler Çerçevesi’ne göre programla birlikte öğrencilerin ne tür yeterliliklere sahip olmaya aracılık edileceği detaylandırılmıştır. İlkİÖP’de (MEB, 2018a) yeterliliklere “Programda Anahtar Yeterlilikler” başlığı altında yer verilmiştir. Avrupa Yeterlilikler Çerçevesi, programda ayrıntılı olarak açıklanmış ve öğretim programının bu yeterlilikleri de içerdiği belirtilmiştir. Ayrıca Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı’nın İngilizce Öğretim Programları da dahil olmak üzere tüm öğretim programlarında revizyon yaparak, programların bu yeterliliklere yer vermesi gerektiği vurgulanmıştır.

Ancak Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı tarafından ifade edilen ve bir diğer yeterlilik çerçevesi olan Türkiye Yeterlilikler Çerçevesi'ne dair bir açıklama ya da ifadeye İlkÖP'de (MEB, 2018a) rastlanılmamıştır. OrtaİÖP'de (MEB, 2018b) ise bu programın İlkÖP'nin (MEB, 2018a) devamı niteliğinde güncelleme ve değişiklikler içerdiği belirtilmektedir. Buna rağmen Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı'nın tüm öğretim programlarında yeterliliklere yer verilmesi gerektiği İlkÖP'de (MEB, 2018a) vurgulanmış olsa da OrtaİÖP'de (MEB, 2018b) her iki yeterlilikler çerçevesine de yer verilmemiştir.

İncelenen öğretim programları arasında "21. Yüzyıl Becerileri"nin temel dayanak olarak doğrudan ifade edildiği tek program, TYDÖP'dir (MEB, 2020). Programda, tema seçimi, kazanımlar ve iletişimsel işlevler arasındaki ilişkide bu becerilerin dikkate alınarak hazırlandığı belirtilmiştir. Ders materyalleri, etkinlik ve görevlerin hazırlanmasında da bu becerilerin bulunması gerektiği programda açıkça ifade edilmiştir.

Türkçenin Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğretimi Programının Uygulanma Biçimine İlişkin Bulgular

TYDÖP'de (MEB, 2020) yurt içi ve yurt dışındaki her öğrenim düzeyi için farklı dil seviyelerinde bir uygulama modelinin oluşturulduğu görülmektedir. Çocuklar Türkçe ile ilk kez karşılaşacaklarından okul öncesi dönemin başlangıç seviyesi olarak verildiği, programda ifade edilmektedir. Başlangıç seviyesi, A1 öncesi ve A1 düzeylerini içermekte olup okul öncesi dönemine uygun kazanımlara yer vermektedir. Ayrıca okul öncesi çocukların gelişim özellikleri ortaklık sağladığı için yurt içi ve yurt dışı için uygulama modelinin programda benzer olduğu, okul öncesi için program hazırlanırken MEB Okul Öncesi Eğitim Programı'nın (2013) temel ilkelerinin dikkate alındığı programda belirtilmiştir.

İlköğretim 1. kademe uygulama biçimine bakıldığında programın hem yurt içi hem de yurt dışı için 7-10 yaş grubuna yönelik olduğu görülmektedir. Programın yurt dışı uygulamasında ilköğretim için A1 düzeyinde yaş gruplarına göre seviyelendirmeler (A1.1, A1.2, A1.3, A1.4) yapılmış ve izlenceler buna göre oluşturulmuştur. Programın yurt içi uygulamasında ise ilköğretim için hem A1 (A1.1, A1.2, A1.3, A1.4) hem de A2 (A2.1, A2.2) düzeyinde izlencelere yer verilmiştir. Programda yurt içi uygulamasına A2 düzeyinin yerleştirilme sebebi, öğrencilerin hedef dile doğal ortamda maruz kalmaları ve örgün eğitim sistemine hızlı şekilde uyum sağlayabilmeleri olarak açıklanmaktadır.

Programda 11-14 yaş grubu aralığını kapsayan ilköğretim 2. kademe uygulama modeli, yurt dışı ve yurt içi uygulamalarında dil düzeyleri açısından farklılık sergilemektedir. Program, yurt dışı uygulamalarında ortaokul düzeyindeki öğrenciler için A2 (A2.1, A2.2, A2.3) düzeyinin hedeflendiğini vurgulamakta; A1 seviyesinin de yeni başlayan ortaokul öğrencileri için başlangıç seviyesi olduğunu belirtmektedir. Yurt içindeki uygulamalar içinse program, A1 seviyesi ile başlamakta A2 (A2.1, A2.2) ile devam etmekte ve ek olarak da B1 seviyesine dönük izlenceler içermektedir.

Programın ortaöğretim düzeyindeki uygulama modeli, hedeflenen dil düzeyleri açısından hem yurt dışı hem de yurt içi için benzerlik göstermektedir. Program, ortaöğretimdeki öğrenciler için hedeflenen düzeyin B2 olduğunu vurgulamakta, yurt dışı ve yurt içindeki uygulamaların A1 ve A2 düzeylerinin tekrarı ile başladığını belirtmektedir. Ayrıca uygulama yapılan yerdeki öğrenci ihtiyaçları, okul sistemi gibi özel durumlardan kaynaklı lisedeki öğrenciler için C1 düzeyini içeren izlencelerin de programda yer aldığı ifade edilmektedir.

TYDÖP (MEB, 2020), tüm öğrenim düzeylerinde hem yurt içi hem de yurt dışı uygulamalar için 10 farklı temadan oluşan izlenceleri içeriğinde barındırmaktadır. Öğrenim düzeylerine ve dil

seviyelerine göre yurt içi ve yurt dışı asgari öğretim uygulaması saatleri de birbirinden farklılık sergilemektedir. Ayrıca yaş döneminin gelişimsel özelliklerine göre programda farklı dilsel becerilere yer verilmiştir. Okul öncesi dönemine dair uygulamalar, programda 36-48, 49-60, 61-72 aylık üç farklı düzeye ayrılmıştır. Yaş döneminin gelişimsel özelliklerine göre programda okul öncesi düzeyine uygun kazanımlara da ayrıca yer verilmiştir. Dinleme ve konuşma becerilerinin yanında ayrıca 61-72 aylık çocuklar için erken okur yazarlık becerisi kazanımları da yer almaktadır.

İlkokulda öğrencilere kazandırılacak beceriler arasında okuma, yazma, konuşma ve dinleme/izlemenin yanında okumaya hazırlık ve yazmaya hazırlık becerilerinin de kazandırılması bulunmaktadır. Programda ilkokuma yazma öğretimi başlığı altında ses temelli okuma yazma öğretiminin aşamaları ve ilk okuma yazma öğretimi kazanımları belirtilmiştir. Programdaki izlenceler için okuma ve yazma öğretimi bölümleri oluşturulurken MEB Türkçe Dersi Öğretim Programı ile Türkçe ve Türk Kültürü Dersi Öğretim Programı'nın göz önünde bulundurulduğu ifade edilmiştir. Bununla birlikte ses temelli okuma yazma öğretimi uygulamalarının ilköğretim 1. kademe için geçerli olduğu, diğer kademelerde öğrencilerin hazırbulunuşluk düzeyine göre okuma yazma öğretimi yapılması gerektiği, kendi dilinde okur yazar öğrenciler için de alfabe öğretiminin yeterli olacağı vurgulanmıştır. İlk okuma yazma öğretimi ile Türkçe öğretiminin eş zamanlı olarak ilerletilmesi gerektiği de belirtilmiştir. Diğer öğrenim düzeylerinde ise dört temel dil becerisi kazandırılacak beceriler olarak programda gösterilmektedir. Programda tüm öğretim kademelerinde yabancı dil olarak Türkçenin öğretiminin daha etkili olabilmesi için 21 maddeden oluşan öneriler, "Program'ın Uygulanmasına Dair Öneriler" başlığı altında yer almaktadır.

İngilizce Öğretim Programlarının Uygulanma Biçimine İlişkin Bulgular

İlkİÖP (MEB, 2018a), altı ve on üç yaş aralığındaki öğrencilere İngilizce öğretimini içermektedir. Bu nedenle program dil kullanımları, işlevleri, öğretim materyalleri dikkate alınarak üç öğrenme aşamasına bölünmüştür. İlk aşama 2, 3 ve 4. sınıfları, ikinci aşama 5-6. sınıfları, üçüncü aşama ise 7-8. sınıfları içermektedir. İlkİÖP (2018) ile 2. sınıfta öğrencilerin A1 seviyesinde dil öğretimine başlanıp, 8. sınıfın sonunda A2 dil seviyesinde olmaları hedeflenmektedir. Belirtilen dil seviyelerinin hangi alt seviyelerinin (A1.2. gibi) hangi sınıflara yönelik olduğu programda açıkça belirtilmemektedir.

İlkİÖP'de (MEB, 2018a) her sınıf düzeyi için belirlenen dil seviyeleri, uygulama süresi ve kazandırılacak beceriler farklılık sergilemektedir. Programın hedef kitlesinin 6-13 yaş aralığındaki çocuklar olduğu programda belirtilse de programın uygulama modeli içerisinde sınıflara göre öğrenci yaşı belirtilmemiştir. Her sınıf için programın haftalık uygulama süresi farklılık göstermektedir.

İlkİÖP'de (MEB, 2018a), 2,3 ve 4. sınıflar için özellikle dinleme ve konuşma becerileri üzerine öğretim uygulamaları yapılması gerektiği vurgulanmaktadır. Öğretim programının uygulanmasında 2. sınıflar için dinleme ve konuşma, 3-4. sınıflar için dinleme, konuşma, çok sınırlı okuma ve çok sınırlı okuma yazma uygulamalarının olması gerektiği görülmektedir. 5. sınıflara kazandırılacak beceriler dinleme, konuşma, sınırlı okuma ve çok sınırlı yazmadır. 6. sınıflara kazandırılacak beceriler ise dinleme, konuşma, sınırlı okuma ve sınırlı yazmadır. Bu iki sınıf düzeyinde de okuma ve yazma becerilerinin kazandırılmasında bir sınırlama getirildiği görülmektedir. İlkİÖP'de (MEB, 2018a) çok sınırlı olarak ifade edilen becerilerin, basit ve kısa sözlü/yazılı metinleri ve materyalleri ifade ettiği belirtilmektedir. Sınırlı olarak belirtilen becerileri geliştirmek için de 25 sözcüğe kadar okuma ve yazma etkinlikleri yapılabileceği açıklaması yer almaktadır.

7-8. sınıflar için A2 düzeyinde öncelikle konuşma ve dinleme becerilerinin ardından yazma ve okuma becerilerinin geliştirilmesine yönelik uygulamaların yapılması gerektiği programda görülmektedir. Programda 7-8. sınıflarda tema bazlı öğretim uygulamalarıyla, bu sınıfların programlarının şekillendirildiği ifade edilmektedir.

İlkİÖP'ye (MEB, 2018a) kazanımlar açısından bakıldığında ise kazandırılacak beceriler açısından sınıf düzeylerine göre kazanımlarda farklılık olduğu görülmektedir. 2, 3 ve 4. sınıflar için hazırlanmış ünitelerde dinleme ve konuşma becerilerine yönelik kazanımlar; 5. sınıflar için hazırlanmış ünitelerde dinleme, konuşma ve okuma becerilerine yönelik kazanımlar; 6. sınıflar için hazırlanmış ünitelerde dinleme, sözlü etkileşim, sözlü anlatım ve okuma becerilerine yönelik kazanımlar; 7-8. sınıflar için hazırlanmış ünitelerde ise dinleme, sözlü etkileşim, sözlü anlatım, okuma ve yazma becerilerine yönelik kazanımlar yer almaktadır.

OrtaİÖP'de (MEB, 2018b) 9. sınıflar A1 düzeyinde uygulamalar ile başlamakta, 12. sınıftaki öğrencilerin de hazırlık sınıfına gidip gitmeme durumlarına göre en az B2 düzeyinde mezun olmaları hedeflenmektedir. İlkİÖP'de (MEB, 2018a) 8. sınıf öğrencilerinin A2 düzeyinde mezun olmaları beklenmektedir. Ancak ortaöğretime başlayan öğrencilerin dil öğrenme düzeyleri ve ihtiyaçları farklılık sergileyebileceği için OrtaİÖP'de (MEB, 2018b) 9. sınıflardaki öğretim uygulamalarının A1 ve A2 seviyelerine göre yeniden uyarlandığı ifade edilmektedir. Yine 9. sınıflar için belirlenen A1 seviyesini içeren uygulamaların İlkİÖP'ye (MEB, 2018a) göre sözcük bilgisi ve yapılar bakımından daha ileri düzeyde olduğu programda vurgulanmaktadır.

OrtaİÖP (MEB, 2018b), tüm sınıflarda haftada dört saat olarak tasarlanmıştır. Ancak belirtilen bu haftalık saatin kurumlara göre de farklılaşabileceği, programda belirtilmektedir. Programda, her dersin birinci dil edinimi sürecini taklit etmek amacıyla dinleme ve konuşma etkinlikleriyle başlayıp ardından okuma ve yazma materyallerine geçecek şekilde sıralanması gerektiği belirtilmektedir.

OrtaİÖP'de (MEB, 2018b) tüm sınıf düzeylerinde söz varlığını geliştirmek için her derste öğrenilecek yeni kelime sayısı, yedi ile sınırlandırılmıştır. Temalarda hangi kelimelerin öğretilmesi programda belirtilmemiş, öğretilmesi kelime seçimi temaya uygun olarak öğretmenlere ve ders materyali hazırlayanlara bırakılmıştır.

Tartışma ve Sonuç

Temel dayanaklar açısından karşılaştırması yapılan yabancı dil öğretim programlarının her üçü de Avrupa Dilleri Ortak Çerçeve Programı'nı en temel dayanak olarak ifade etmektedir. Ancak İngilizce Öğretim Programlarının 2001 yılında hazırlanan Avrupa Dilleri Ortak Çerçeve Programı'nı dayanak olarak göstermesi, Türkçenin Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğretimi Programının ise Avrupa Dilleri Ortak Çerçeve Programı'nın (CoE, 2018) güncellenmiş biçimini dayanak olarak göstermesi, programlarda temel dayanaklar açısından ifade edilen kavramlarda (örnek: aracılık kavramı) farklılıkların ortaya çıkmasına neden olmuştur. Bu nedenle incelenen İngilizce Öğretim Programları, Türkçenin Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğretimi Programı ile aynı temel kaynaktan hareketle hazırlanmış olsa da güncelliği karşılamadığı için Avrupa Dilleri Ortak Çerçeve Programı'na göre kavramsal açılardan farklılıklar sergilemektedir.

İncelemesi yapılan programlarda temel dayanaklar açısından ortaklık sağlayan tek dayanak, kök değerlerdir. 2018 yılı itibarıyla yenilenen öğretim programlarıyla birlikte Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı, kök değerlerin tüm öğretim programlarında yer alması gerektiğini belirtmiştir. İncelemesi yapılan her üç program da kök değerlerin programın hazırlanmasında temel oluşturduğunu ifade etmektedir. Ancak

kök değerlerin programların tam olarak hangi bölümlerine içerik olarak yerleştirildiği hiçbir programda net olarak ifade edilmemektedir. Çoban ve Akyol (2020) değerler açısından Ortaöğretim İngilizce Öğretimi Programını (MEB, 2018) ve ders kitaplarını inceledikleri çalışmalarında, programın içeriğinin kök değerleri tamamıyla yansıtmadığı sonucuna ulaşmışlardır. Bu nedenle farklı araştırmalarla programların temel dayanak olarak gösterdiği kök değerleri bulundurma durumlarının incelenmesi, programlarda yer alan temel dayanak ifadesinin ne kadar somutlaştırıldığına göstergesi olacaktır.

21. Yüzyıl Becerileri'nin temel dayanak olarak gösterildiği tek program, Türkçenin Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğretimi Programı'dır. Aydın ve Tangür (2021), Türkçenin Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğretimi Programı'nı (MEB, 2020) 21. Yüzyıl- Becerileri açısından inceledikleri çalışmalarında programın 21. yüzyıl. becerileri ile uyumlu olduğu sonucuna ulaşmışlardır. Çelebi ve Altuncu (2019) ise ortaöğretim 9. sınıf İngilizce Öğretim Programı'ndaki kazanımları 21. yüzyıl becerileri açısından değerlendirdikleri araştırmada, programda bu becerilere yeteri kadar yer verilmediği sonucuna ulaşmışlardır. Yapılan bu çalışmalar, araştırmada elde edilen sonuçlarla da uyum sağlamaktadır.

Türkçenin Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğretimi Programı ile İngilizce Öğretimi Programları, ilköğretim ve ortaöğretim düzeyindeki öğrencileri öğretim yılının sonunda benzer dil seviyelerine ulaştırmayı hedeflemektedir. Ancak hem İlköğretim İngilizce Dersi Öğretim Programı'nda (MEB, 2018a) hem de Ortaöğretim İngilizce Dersi Öğretim Programı'nda (MEB, 2018b) sınıf düzeylerinde dil seviyelerine ilişkin detaylı bir düzenleme (A1.1., A2.2. gibi) bulunmamaktadır. İngilizce öğretim programlarındaki dil düzeylerine dair tanımlamalar daha genel kapsamdadır. Oysaki Türkçenin Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğretimi Programı'nda okul öncesi programı da dahil olmak üzere her sınıf seviyesi için dil düzeyleri detaylı bir şekilde sunulmuştur. Bu program hem yurt içi hem de yurt dışında dil öğretimini içerdiği için dil seviyelerinin sunumlarında da esneklik olduğu görülmektedir. Ayrıca program her dil seviyesine göre kazanımları ve dil yapıları listesini ayrıca içeriğinde barındırarak uygulayıcılar açısından kolaylık sağlamaktadır.

Türkçenin Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğretimi Programı (MEB, 2020) hazırlanırken programın genişliği ve içeriği bakımından pek çok öğretim programından da yararlandığı vurgulanmaktadır. Bu nedenle bu programın İngilizce öğretim programlarına göre uygulanma biçimi açısından daha ayrıntılı içerikleri barındırdığı söylenebilir.

İncelemesi yapılan programlara, uygulamada kazandırılacak beceriler açısından bakıldığında farklılıklar olduğu sonucuna ulaşılmıştır. İlköğretim İngilizce Dersi Öğretim Programı'nda (MEB, 2018a) ilköğretim düzeyi için kazandırılması hedeflenen becerilerin dinleme ve konuşma olduğu görülmektedir. Ayrıca programa göre, öğrencilere 7. ve 8. sınıfa gelene kadar okuma ve yazma becerileri ile de sınırlı ya da çok sınırlı düzeyde öğretim uygulamaları gerçekleştirilmektedir. Ancak Türkçenin Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğretimi Programı (MEB, 2020), 1. sınıftan itibaren dört temel beceriye dönük kazanım ve uygulamalara yer vermektedir. İki program arasındaki bu farklılığın sonuçlarının öğrenci başarısı açısından değerlendirilmesi, yabancı dil öğretimi bakımından hangi programın daha verimli olduğunu gösterebilir.

İngilizce Öğretim Programlarının uygulanma süreleri, her iki programda da haftalık saat üzerinden verilmiştir. Türkçenin Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğretimi Programı'nda ise sınıf düzeyinde belirtilen dil seviyesinin öğretimi için gerekli asgari uygulama süresi verilmiştir. İngilizce öğretim programlarında

belirtilen sürelerin Yabancı Dil Olarak Türkçe Öğretimi Programı'na oranla daha kısa olduğu söylenebilir.

Sonuç olarak, Türkçenin Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğretimi Programı (MEB, 2020), uygulama biçimine göre dil seviyeleri, öğrenim düzeyleri, uygulama süresi ve kazandırılacak beceriler açısından ayrıntılı bir programdır. Ayrıca bu programda öğretim programının uygulanmasına dönük izlenceler, temalar, kazanımlar, dil yapıları listesi, ölçme değerlendirme biçimleri daha detaylı bir biçimde yer almaktadır. Bu sebeple program öğretmenler, ders kitabı ve öğretim materyali hazırlayanlar için kolaylık sağlayıcı, uygulamaya dönük ayrıntılar içermektedir. İngilizce Öğretim Programlarında da uygulanma biçimine dönük açıklamalara yer verilse de Türkçe öğretimi programına göre daha sınırlı kalmaktadır. Programların temel aldığı dayanaklar da Türkçenin Yabancı Dil Öğretimi Programı'nda (MEB, 2020) İngilizce öğretim programlarına göre daha fazla çeşitlilik ve güncellik göstermektedir.

Öneriler

Genel olarak bakıldığında Türkçenin Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğretimi Programı'nın (MEB, 2020) içeriğinin İngilizce Öğretimi Programlarına göre daha farklı ve çeşitli dayanaklardan temel alınarak oluşturulduğu sonucuna ulaşılabilir. Ancak bu çalışmada temel dayanaklar, programda ifade edilme durumları açısından ele alınmıştır. Bu nedenle incelemesi yapılan yabancı dil öğretimi programlarının ifade edilen temel dayanakları içeriklerine ne kadar ve nasıl yansıtıklarını inceleyen farklı çalışmalar, sonuçların netliğini ortaya çıkaracaktır.

Türkçenin Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğretimi Programı, okul öncesinde Türkçe öğretimi programını içermesi bakımından İngilizce Öğretimi Programlarından farklılık sergilemektedir. Okul öncesi dönem için programda Avrupa Dilleri Ortak Çerçeve Programı'nın (2018) güncel halinden hareketle dil seviyeleri belirlenmiş ve sınıf içi uygulamalar detaylı olarak ele alınmıştır. İngilizce öğretimi, ülkemizde devlet okullarında 2. sınıftan itibaren gerçekleştirildiği için incelemesi yapılan İngilizce Öğretim Programları bu öğrenim düzeyi açısından değerlendirilememiştir. Ancak MEB Özel Okul Öncesi İngilizce Öğretim Programı (MEB, 2016) incelenerek programlar arası bir karşılaştırma, farklı bir araştırmada yapılabilir.