



*International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching*  
Volume 6, Issue 1, March 2018, p. 424-435

Received	Reviewed	Published	Doi Number
10.09.2017	25.10.2017	30.03.2018	10.18298/ijlet.2065

**Turkish Primary School English Language Teaching Curriculum  
Innovations and Their Applications: An Integrative Research Study**

*Özlem KARAAĞAÇ TUNA<sup>1</sup>*

**ABSTRACT**

Developing a program is a process that requires a lot of effort, time, and finance. When the program developed is related to education, it becomes more important since it will affect generations of people. Therefore, it should be studied on more carefully and a lot of research should be done on it. The present study will focus on the programs developed for teaching English to primary school students, the changes in the program, studies done on the different programs applied for the primary school, and whether these studies have an effect on the developments of new programs.

**Key Words:** Primary school, English Language Teaching Curriculum, primary school program evaluation, changes in English Language Teaching curriculum.

## 1. Introduction

Education is the most important thing in a person's and a nation's life as Nelson Mandela puts it "Education is the most powerful weapon which you can use to change the world". Therefore, developing a program in education is something that should be focused on in a great detail. Every aspect of a program and the possible results it may cause should be taught upon very carefully. While developing a program, the positive and negative sides of the previous programs should carefully be analyzed and they should be developed for better. The research studies done on the previous program are an important way of analyzing the previous programs and to see what worked and what did not work with them. Moreover, not only the authorized people to develop the program but also the academics in the related area, the teachers that will apply the program and the learners should participate in the program development process. The suggestions made by these stakeholders are vital to be considered.

There are several curriculums developed for teaching English in Turkey. Kırkgöz (2007a) divides the development of English Language Education in Turkey into three periods as (1) 'a historical recognition of the introduction of English in Turkish education and its spread in the country', (2) 'the second period starts with the implementation of a major ELT curriculum reform in 1997', and (3) '2005 onwards when a number of changes were introduced in ELT as part of a government policy, in response to efforts to join the EU, seeking to standardize ELT and adapt it to EU standards'(p.217). Before the 1997 reform, the students were introduced to English courses at the 6<sup>th</sup> grade in the public

<sup>1</sup>Instructor, Pamukkale University, karaagactunaozlem@gmail.com.

schools, which was the start of secondary school. At that time, there were schools called Anatolian high schools and they were different from other state schools as they were starting teaching after the 5<sup>th</sup> grade and continued until the Higher Education period. The students used to take an entrance exam for these schools. When the students pass the exam and got the right to study in the Anatolian high schools, at the age of 11, they got a one year preparatory class where they had 24 hours of English classes per week. After the preparatory class, the students used to learn Mathematics and Science with the medium of English. Other state high schools also had compulsory English classes; however, those classes were not as intensive as the ones in the Anatolian high schools. After the mid-1980s, the importance of English increased and therefore the English medium schools like the private and Anatolian high schools also increased in number (Kırkgöz, 2007a).

The purpose of the present study is to give a detailed description of the programs developed for teaching English at the primary school level in Turkey. Another purpose of this study is to explain several studies done on the different programs launched and applied for primary school and to see the strong and weak points of the programs through the studies. The third purpose is to see if the results of the studies done on the programs were regarded while developing a new program, or if the same problems that were found out in the studies continued in the new programs.

## 2. Methodology

The English Language teaching curriculums developed for primary school from its start in 1997 until today were described through analyzing the curriculums published by the Turkish Ministry of Education and the studies done on those curriculums. Each change in the curriculum was described under a separate heading, and the studies done on each curriculum were given within the related topic. Each curriculum is compared to the previous one and it is discussed if there were differences in the results of the studies, namely, if the programs were developed in a better way than the previous ones.

## 3. Findings

### 3.1. The 1997 Curriculum Reform

In the second period, 1997, there were not any changes in the class hours of English in the high schools; just the preparatory classes were moved to the year before the 9<sup>th</sup> grade, which is the high school (Çetintaş & Genç, 2001). However, the education duration at the Anatolian high schools decreased to 4 years of a high school education from a 7 year preparatory class, secondary, and high school education. This period was the one when English courses were introduced to the primary schools starting at the 4<sup>th</sup> grade. The classes were two hours per week in the 4<sup>th</sup> and the 5<sup>th</sup> grades (Çetintaş & Genç, 2001) and they were added to the curriculum 'with the official decision of the Ministry of National Education' (Özdemir, 2007, p. 2), and the decision was 'given on September 17, 1997' (Özdemir, 2007, p. 2). At the end of the program, the students are expected to reach the intermediate level (Erdoğan, 2005). Ministry of Education suggests game based and more interesting activities, real life situations, authentic materials concrete concepts, and assessment in an integrated way (MEB, 2000: 181, Cited in Erdoğan, 2005). Erdoğan lists the main goals of the program in her thesis.

In the Official Curricular of Ministry of Education the main goals of the curriculum for 4th and 5th grades are stated as follow (MEB, 2000:182). Accordingly, at the end of the program, students will be able to

- Use the patterns of the foreign language accurately
- Read and understand the dialogues appropriate to their level
- Write the words and sentences in English
- Use English in their daily life
- Realize that there are languages different from Turkish
- Feel desire to learn a foreign language
- Feel desire to communicate in English
- Realize that English has some speech sounds different from Turkish speech sounds.

(Erdoğan, 2005, p. 70)

The table below shows the topic of each unit in the curriculum, the frequency of units, suggested course hours for each unit, and the frequency of objectives for the 4<sup>th</sup> grade English courses.

Table 1

*Units, Suggested Class Hours and the Frequencies of the objectives for Each Unit*

	NAME OF UNIT	Frequency of units %	Suggested Course hours	Frequency of objectives
UNIT 1	Greeting- Counting (1-10)	17	12	7
UNIT 2	Presenting the classroom objects- a/an	11	8	3
UNIT 3	Colors- "how many? / how much?" - "What is the time?"	11	8	3
UNIT 4	Family- Clothes	8	6	3
UNIT 5	"Whose?" - Days of the week	17	12	7
UNIT 6	Parts of the house- "Where?"	11	8	5
UNIT 7	Adjectives- Possessives	11	8	5
UNIT 8	Ability	14	10	5
TOTAL		100	72	38

*Note.* Adapted from *An Evaluation of the English Curriculum Implemented at the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> Grade primary State Schools: the Views of the Teachers and the Students*, p. 73, by V. Erdoğan, 2005.

The 1997 curriculum is the first one to talk about the communicative approach in teaching English therefore it is really important (Kırkgöz, 2007a). The focus was on the student's communication skills and the focus shifted from being teacher centered to being student centered (Kırkgöz, 2007a). However, according to the study carried out by Kırkgöz (2008), there is a gap between what the curriculum sets as objectives and what the teachers actually do in the classes. There are several reasons for this gap from the teachers' perspective as 1. The teachers did not have the training to teach young learners, 2. The understanding of the teachers of the new curriculum, 3. There is not enough guidance, and the textbooks' need of improvement, 4. The time allocated for teaching is limited, 5. Lack of resources for the teachers, 6. The need for teachers to get prepared for the classes (Kırkgöz,

2008). The researcher's suggestion for the solution of the causes of teachers' not being able to adopt to the new curriculum is, the continuous in-service training. Especially for the experienced teachers who have a 'well established teaching styles and perception of teaching English' (Kırkgöz, 2007b, p. 184), in service teacher development studies should be increased as it is more difficult for these teachers to get rid of what they have come for years to believe and experience.

Büyükduman (2005) carried out a study in order to evaluate the primary school English teaching program in terms of its general characteristics, its goals, its content and the coursebook. 54 teachers from different districts of Istanbul participated in the study by answering a questionnaire on teacher views on the general characteristics and elements of the program. According to the results of the study,

- 49.95 % of the teachers participated in the study think that the time given for each unit is not coherent with the difficulty level of the related unit.

- the students have positive attitudes towards learning English which shows that the program is successful on the affective side as suggested by Büyükduman (2005).

- 61% of the participant teachers think that the program does not guide them well however, 59.2% of them say that the sample lesson plan guide them to prepare lesson plans for the other units.

- 64.7% of the teachers participated in the study think that the objectives of the program are suitable for the age and the cognitive developments of the students.

- 48.1 % of the participated teachers believed that the objectives related to reading are accessible, however, 59.2 % believed the listening, 46.2 believed the writing, and 46.2 % believed the speaking objectives are impossible to reach. The reason why the writing and listening objectives are impossible to reach while they are actually suitable for the students' levels is given by Büyükduman (2005) as the classes' being crowded.

- Most of the teachers participated in the study think that the book used in the program is satisfactory in terms of presenting the information, the uses of the pictures in the book, and the suitability of the examples to the students' culture. However, the teachers say that the book does not fit the program objectives and it needed more examples.

- The teaching methods are found suitable for the primary school children; however, since the classes are crowded, they are not applicable.

- The program needs more guidance for testing and evaluation.

As a result of the study, Büyükduman (2005) makes some suggestions. Some of these suggestions are:

- The primary school English teaching program should be more detailed.

- The tapes and the cassettes that are suggested by the program to be used should be present in all schools.

---

- A book on different question types and exercises related to the topics in the program should be prepared and suggested to the English teachers.

- Since some of the teachers are not graduates of ELT departments, the program should include English teaching techniques, approaches and methods.

- A book/books should be written by MNE on teaching English to Young learners that include different games and songs, or some of the present books should be offered for this purpose.

- The MNE should prepare in-service seminars and workshops on teaching English to young learners for the teachers teaching at the primary school.

The last suggestion mentioned above was also supported by Özdemir (2007) as 'This was the first time teachers at public schools would teach English to young learners. Young learners had different needs and characteristics. Therefore, teaching English to young learners required different approaches, methodology, materials and evaluation procedures' (p. 2). Thus, it can be concluded that the teachers needed in-service training to teach young learners especially in those years when the curriculum included young learners for the first time.

In the study he conducted with English teachers and inspectors from 14 different cities from seven different regions in Turkey, Er (2006) has also found out similar results with Büyükduman (2005). The results of Er's (2006) study also say that the time given for the curricula is not enough, the objectives of the curricula is not possible to reach, and the testing part of the curricula needs to have more guidance are the same results found out by Büyükduman.

Erdoğan (2005) found out similar results as the teachers think that the content of the course and the objectives are coherent, however two hours per week is not enough to apply the program and reach the objectives. Another result was found out that the students are happy to learn English at the 4<sup>th</sup> grade. This result was the same with the result found by Büyükduman, however, Büyükduman asked the opinions of the teachers, and Erdoğan asked the opinions of the students. Therefore, it can be said that both the teachers and the students think that it is good for the students to learn English at the 4<sup>th</sup> grade and thus, the program is successful on the affective domain.

Mersinligil (2002) also studied on the evaluation of the same program by interviewing 16 administrators from different schools, by delivering questionnaires to 705 students in those schools and also by observing to triangulate the findings. The results of the study showed that the evaluation should be changed and developed, the quality of the teachers should be increased, the educational tools should be improved to be more technological, the parents and the students should be made conscious about learning English. Another result was that the teachers teaching young learners should be trained well was a similar result that was put forward by Büyükduman (2005), and Özdemir (2007). After the 1997 program was introduced, the ELT programs at the Universities added courses on teaching English to young learners (Kırkgöz, 2007a), however, the already graduated teachers still needed to have some training on the topic.

As a different point of view, Genç and Çetintaş (2001) suggested the preparatory class to be drawn back to the earlier age, not 15 years old as it is done in the 1997 curriculum but 11 years old like it was before the curriculum was written.

According to the results of the studies done on the 1997 program introduced by NME, there are some deficiencies of the program concerning its general characteristics, objectives, content, running and evaluation aspects (Seçkin, 2011). Therefore, as a result of the studies done on the evaluation of the program introduced on 1997-1998 academic year NME decided to renew it through a new program introduced on 10.02.2006 (Seçkin, 2011). This is the third period mentioned by Kırkgöz (2007a).

### 3.2. 2006 Curriculum

This new curriculum is called as the “revision of the 1997 curriculum’ by Kırkgöz (2007a, p. 224). As she describes the change in the curriculum, Kırkgöz (2007a) says that the new version was more extensive, it had comprehensive theoretical information on ELT; give various activities to be used with the 4th and the 5th grade students such as songs, plays, games and drawing and coloring activities. She finds it interesting for MNE to add the theoretical component that is talking about “curriculum design issues, selection of appropriate teaching materials for different grades, the distinction between language acquisition and language learning and how young learners (Grade 4–5 students) and adolescents (Grades 6–8 students) learn foreign languages” (Kırkgöz, 2007a, p 224). However, this was exactly what the studies done before suggested about. As it is mentioned above, Büyükduman (2005) suggested MNE to have a more detailed program, to give some Teaching techniques for the non ELT graduate teachers, and to prepare a book on activities to be used with young learners. As it can be seen in the changes done on the curriculum, MNE changed and added these parts to the new version of the curriculum. The new curriculum has 3 hours of English courses for the 4<sup>th</sup> grade. The objectives of the courses are written in the program published by the head council of education and morality on 10.02.2006.

Students who complete the 4th grade are expected to show the following linguistic competence levels:

Students will

- a. Have a very basic range of simple expressions about personal details and needs of a concrete type.
- b. Have a basic vocabulary repertoire of isolated words and phrases related to particular concrete situations.
- c. Show only limited control of a few simple grammatical structures and sentence patterns in a learnt repertoire.
- d. Pronounce a very limited repertoire of learned words and phrases intelligibly though not without some effort.
- e. Copy familiar words and short phrases e.g. simple signs or instructions, names of everyday objects, names of shops and set phrases used regularly.
- f. Spell his/her address, nationality and other personal details.
- g. Establish basic social contact by using the simplest everyday polite forms of greetings and farewells; introductions; saying please, thank you, sorry, etc.

h. Manage very short, isolated, mainly pre-packaged utterances, with much pausing to search for expressions, to articulate less familiar words, and to repair communication. (MEB, 2006, p. 61)

The new curriculum still focuses on communication and the improvement of communicative skills of the students. It is still more learner and learning centered than being teacher centered, it focuses on autonomy of the students, and it accepts “process-oriented approaches” (MEB, 2006, p. 21) and “gives more importance to thinking skills” (Zehir Topkaya & Küçük, 2010 p. 53). The role of the teacher is again “the facilitator of the learning process” (Kırkgöz, 2007a, p 224). The curriculum also suggests teaching through cross-curricular model therefore it will be possible to teach English not in an isolated way but in context (MEB, 2006). Another change was in terms of assessment, because the new curriculum talks about portfolios as a way of assessment (Kırkgöz, 2007a). One of the problems found out in the studies done on the evaluation of the previous curriculum was on the assessment phase of it, and this part of the new curriculum is a solution for that problem, too. The problem mentioned by the teachers in Büyükduman’s (2005) study was that the testing should not be different from what is expected to be taught in the classes, and if the classes are expected to be communicative, the assessment should be the same. Therefore, the new curriculum tries the assessment to be more communicative than the previous version through portfolios.

Zehir Topkaya and Küçük (2010) carried out a study with 72 primary school teachers at the state schools to find out their opinions about the content, the general characteristics and the aims of the 2005 ELT curriculum of the 4<sup>th</sup> and the 5<sup>th</sup> grades. The results of the study showed that the teachers participated in this study believed that the new curriculum was better than the 1997 curriculum. However, it still had some problems. Some of the problems of the new curriculum were similar to the ones found out for the previous one. For instance, the results of the Zehir Topkaya and Küçük’s (2010) study show that the teachers complain about the applicability of the new program because of the large numbers of students in the classes, too much content to cover in a limited time, and the lack of the tools at the schools to be used for the implementation of the program. These results were also found out by Büyükduman (2005), Erdoğan (2005), and Er (2006) in their evaluations of the 1997 program. Another result of the study done by Zehir Topkaya and Küçük (2010) was that the teachers were not totally satisfied with the coursebook of the 2006 curriculum which is also similar to what is found by Büyükduman (2005) about the 1997 curriculum. The teachers in Büyükduman’s study were satisfied with the book but they thought that it was not in accordance with the program and it did not have enough examples. While the teachers in Zehir Topkaya and Küçük’s study think that the objectives of 2006 program are not suitable for the cognitive and emotional development of the students, the teachers in Büyükduman’s study said just the opposite for the 1997 program. This means that the previous program was better than the new one in terms of being coherent with the age groups of the targeted learners. Other problems of the 2006 program found out by Zehir Topkaya and Küçük (2010) are: 1. Activities are again insufficient in number, 2. the sequence of the content from easy to difficult is not always applied in the program, 3. the integration of four skills is not present all the time, 4. Not all of the teachers attended the seminars on the new program and the participated ones said that the seminars were not useful, and 5. As in the previous program, the in-service training is still a missing point. As a result of these findings, the researchers make some suggestions: 1. “more financial investment should be considered for the provision and a successful implementation of the new program” (Zehir Topkaya, Küçük, 2010, p. 61), 2. “while developing a new teaching program, physical

conditions (technological devices, number of students in a class, etc.) should be considered more realistically and reflected in the program accordingly” (Zehir Topkaya, Küçük,2010, p. 61), 3. The program should give more information about the ideals it supports, and 4. The program should explain the classroom implications of more games, activities and different tasks.

Seçkin (2011) carried out another study with 15 4<sup>th</sup> grade English teachers to evaluate the 2006 program through interviews. The teachers participated in the study said that the program’s making students active is the strongest, while its being overloaded, and asking the teachers to do a lot of things in a limited time is the weakest characteristic of it. There are two major suggestions made by the teachers in this study, which are actually suggested in most of the studies done on the evaluation of both the 1997 and 2006 programs is that, allocating more time for the English lesson, so that the topics can be covered efficiently, and decreasing the number of the students in the class. The participant teachers also complain about the attainments of the program’s being too much focusing on reading and writing. They suggest them to focus more on listening and speaking skills and to be related to daily life. Moreover, the teachers say that the attainments should have the characteristics to help the students like to learn languages. Similar to the results found out by Zehir Topkaya and Küçük (2010), Seçkin’s (2011) study also found out that the teachers find the information given on the program was insufficient. Furthermore, similar to what has been found out by the previous studies done on 1997 program (Büyükduman, 2005, Er, 2006), the participant teachers of this study also mentioned that the 2006 program lacks the assessment tools that should be provided for the teachers.

From what has been covered until now, it can be seen that the change in the curriculum have some positive differences, however, most of the problems have not been solved yet. For instance, in the 2006 curriculum, there was a lot of pedagogical information given to the teachers which was missing in the 1997 curriculum, and the suggestion for testing moved to be more communicative through the portfolios. However, the time allocated for the classes, the class size, the lack of tools, the in-service trainings, lack of extra materials –although they are provided more in the 2006 program still have not changed although they were mentioned in the studies done previously on the 1997 program. Furthermore, the pedagogical information in the 2006 program, although it is present, still needs to be developed according to the teachers in Seçkin’s (2011) study.

### 3.3. 2013 Curriculum

A new version of the English Teaching curriculum was introduced on 01.02.2013 by MNE. Through this new curriculum, English lessons started to be given at the 2<sup>nd</sup> and the 3<sup>rd</sup> grades at the primary schools in addition to the 4<sup>th</sup> grades. The program suggested for the 2<sup>nd</sup> and the 3<sup>rd</sup> grades mostly focuses on listening and speaking, reading and writing is included in a really limited way into the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade’s program (MEB, 2013). As it is stated by Alkan and Arslan (2014), the 2<sup>nd</sup> grade English program says that the purpose of the English classes is to use the language for real communication purposes, to help the students develop positive attitudes towards English, and suggests to use as much English as possible in the classes and use games, songs, and hand crafts, and to evaluate the students through projects, portfolios, paper and pen exams, self and peer evaluation and teacher observations. The educational attainments of the 2<sup>nd</sup> grade English classes are the colors, numbers, classroom objects, animals, fruits, parts of body, rooms and furniture, greeting, introducing oneself, and describing objects(MEB, 2013). Reading and writing activities are limited to 10 words and they are done through homework, projects or portfolios, out of the class (MEB, 2013).

The purpose of the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade English classes is to enlarge the topics covered in the 2<sup>nd</sup> grade through the educational attainments of family and relatives, adjectives used to describe people, the buildings and living spaces in the city, weather conditions, basic verbs in conversations, animals, vehicles, feelings, toys, rooms and tools used (MEB, 2013). Again game based activities, Total Physical Response, picture dictionaries, painting, cutting and gluing activities will be used (MEB, 2013). The reading and writing phase is the same with the 2<sup>nd</sup> grade curriculum.

The learning attainments of the 4<sup>th</sup> grade English course are the foods and drinks, colors, numbers, free time activities, daily activities, jobs, work places, clothes, weather conditions, physical and personal features, countries and nationalities, asking for permission, requesting and answering the requests, posing the basic needs, giving simple commands, talking about things that can/cannot be done, talking about routines, likes and dislikes, basic daily communication activities (MEB, 2013).

The teachers in the study done by Seçkin (2011) on the previous curriculum wanted the focus on reading and writing to decrease and the focus on listening and speaking to increase, and they also suggested the program to help students like to learn language, and the present program seems to do so.

Alkan and Arslan (2014) carried out a study to evaluate the 2<sup>nd</sup> grade English language curriculum with 163 teachers through a questionnaire. The results of the study showed that the views of the teachers on the program are generally on the positive side. When the problems about the program is focused on, similarities to the previous programs' evaluation results like the need of the objectives' revision, the teachers' not being familiar with the program, and the lack of the facilities of the schools are seen. The content of the coursebook sent by the NME to the schools is seen not to be coherent with the objectives of the program. The same results were found out about the 1997 program's coursebook by Büyükduman (2005) and Kırkgöz (2008). Therefore, the problem with the coursebook seems to continue in the present program. The suggestions made by Alkan and Arslan (2014) are 1. the program should be introduced to the teachers and other stakeholders at a satisfactory level, 2. the physical conditions of the schools should be adequate enough for the program to be carried out, and 3. guidance on testing should be included in the program.

Gürsoy et. al. (2013) carried out a study with 203 primary school English teachers through a questionnaire in order to find out their opinions about the starting age of the students to learn English, their views on teaching English to young learners, and their actual classroom applications. According to the results of the study, it can be said that the teachers in the study are contented with the language learning starting age, and they even wish it to start earlier, even in pre-school years. The same idea about the starting age was expressed by the 72 EFL teacher trainers from different state universities in another study carried out by Damar et. al. (2013).

The teachers in Gürsoy et. al.'s (2013) study agree with the curriculum about the teaching method and content of the curriculum, as they think the 2<sup>nd</sup> grade students should learn through games, songs and visual/kinesthetic activities and they should focus on listening and speaking, not reading and writing. The teacher trainers in the study carried out by Damar et. al. (2013) also say the same things with the teachers in Gürsoy et. al.'s (2013) study about the content and method of the English courses for young learners. However, the teachers' classroom applications are not coherent with what they say. "the Wilcoxon signed rank test results revealed that there are significant differences between the

participants' beliefs and their implementation" (Gürsoy et. al. 2013, p. 60). Therefore, the researchers suggest the same thing almost all researchers within this study suggested before, more in-service training for the teachers. The researchers suggest the in-service trainings to have "practical tips to implement theoretically sound language teaching to children. Contribution and understanding of teachers, parents, and other educational institutions/organizations should be supported for a successful implementation of a language policy" (Gürsoy et. al. 2013, p. 60).

Çankaya (2015) carried out a study on the 38 teachers' opinions on the new curriculum through a scale the researcher developed and a semi structured interview. The results of the study showed that the teachers were moderately satisfied with the program in general, and they are positive about starting earlier and focusing on games while teaching however, there seems to be some problems for them. The problems are similar to the previous studies mentioned like, the scarcity of materials and technological equipment, the problems with the coursebook's content, the applications of the teachers and their low readiness levels. There is one more problem mentioned, which is, the "lack of clear borders for assessment" (Çankaya, 2015, p. 56). Teachers in the study themselves stated that they needed in service training.

#### 4. Conclusion

The 1997 was the first time the Turkish education system had a written curriculum and this was a wonderfully written one. The change done in this curriculum when compared to the previous applications was only lowering the teaching of English to the 4<sup>th</sup> grade. Therefore, it was important to present, promote and market the program through this change. That was why the elective courses were only the English courses in the primary schools. This was the first time when the education system talked about communication; however, the curriculum was still focused on behaviorism with a lot of focus on lecturing, question- answer, and memorization. Moreover, even if the program were a really communicative one, the teachers were still behaviorist and they also did not have any training or experience on teaching young learners which caused problems.

When the program changed for the primary school, the teacher education programs also changed and aimed to educate high quality teachers through the four years of university education. It was then that teaching English to young learners courses were added to the curriculums. These teachers graduated first in 2002 under normal circumstances and when they just started teaching, and started to gain experience, in 2006, the curriculum changed. It changed because there was a shift from behaviorism to constructivism around the world and the Turkish Ministry of National Education did not want to fall behind the world. However, there was not enough research and there were still nationwide pen and paper exams the students needed to take. These exams did not let the teachers to be able to carry out a lot of listening and speaking.

The digestion of the new curriculum was necessary for the teachers and the parents to apply it better but the curriculum changed once more in 2013. The curriculum was written in a relatively short time. This change happened so fast that there was not enough time even for new books and the books from the 2006 curriculum were used at the beginning. CEFR is the focus for this new curriculum and self/peer evaluation was added. There need to be at least one official parent-teacher meeting per term.

The problem with all of the programs was that the involvement of the related academicians and teachers was not present and there was a resistance to change. The research shows that all three programs have similar problems as the teachers' not being able to apply the program because they were not ready. There needs to be more training for the teachers and the teachers should be motivated to attend these trainings. Moreover, the necessary tools to be used to apply the curriculum should be available and the class sizes should be checked up. In short, the curriculums might be perfectly written, however, as long as the facilities and the teachers are the same, there cannot be a huge change. Thus, it can be said that making the curriculum is not enough on its own, it should be seen if it is truly followed or not.

## References

- Alkan, M. F., Arslan, M. (2014). Evaluation of the 2nd Grade English Language Curriculum. *Uluslararası Eğitim Programları ve Öğretim Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 4 (7).
- Büyükduman, F.İ. (2005). İlköğretim okulları İngilizce öğretmenlerinin birinci kademe İngilizce öğretim programına ilişkin görüşleri. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 28:55-64.
- Çankaya, P. (2015). An Evaluation of the Primary 3rd Grade English Language Teaching Program: Tekirdağ Case. Unpublished MA thesis, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi, Çanakkale.
- Çetintaş, B., Genç, A. (2001). Foreign Language Teaching at Anatolian High Schools Following the Educational Reform. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi* 20, 51 – 56.
- Damar, E. A., Gürsoy, E., & Korkmaz Çelik, Ş. (2013). Teaching English to Young Learners: Through the Eyes of EFL Teacher Trainers. *ELT Research Journal*, 2013, 2(3), 95-110.
- Er, K.O. (2006). İlköğretim 4. ve 5. sınıf İngilizce öğretim programlarının değerlendirilmesi. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 39, 2,1-25.
- Erdoğan, V. (2005). An evaluation of the English language curriculum implemented at 4th and 5th grade primary state schools: the view of the teachers and the students. Unpublished MA Thesis, Mersin University, Mersin.
- Gürsoy, E., Korkmaz, S.Ç., & Damar, A. E. (2013). Foreign language teaching within 4+4+4 education system in Turkey: Language teachers' voice. *Eğitim Araştırmaları-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 53/A, 59-74.
- Kırkgöz, Y. (2007a). English Language Teaching in Turkey: Policy Changes and Their Implementations. *RELC*, 38(2) 216-228.
- Kırkgöz, Y. (2007b). Language Planning and Implementation in Turkish Primary Schools. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 8(2), 174-191.
- Kırkgöz, Y. (2008). Curriculum Innovation in Turkish Primary Education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 36,4, 309-322.
- Mersinligil, G. (2001). İlköğretim 4. ve 5. sınıflarda uygulanan İngilizce dersi öğretim programının değerlendirilmesi (Adana ili örneği). Unpublished PhD thesis, Fırat University, Elazığ.
- MEB (2006). İlköğretim İngilizce dersi (4, 5, 6, 7 ve 8. sınıflar) öğretim programı. 10.02.2006 tarih ve 2582 sayılı Tebliğler Dergisi. Retrieved from [http://ttkb.meb.gov.tr/program2.aspx\\_on15.03.2016](http://ttkb.meb.gov.tr/program2.aspx_on15.03.2016).
- MEB (2013). İlköğretim Kurumları (İlkokullar ve Ortaokullar) İngilizce Dersi (2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 ve 8. sınıflar) öğretim programı. 01.02.2013 tarih ve 6 sayılı Tebliğler Dergisi. Retrieved from [http://ttkb.meb.gov.tr/program2.aspx\\_on15.03.2016](http://ttkb.meb.gov.tr/program2.aspx_on15.03.2016).

- Özdemir, F. E. (2007). An Evaluation of Time for English 4, the 4<sup>th</sup> Grade English Coursebook for Public Schools. Unpublished MA thesis, METU, Ankara.
- Seçkin, H. (2011). İlköğretim 4. Sınıf İngilizce Dersi Öğretim Programına İlişkin Öğretmen Görüşleri. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*. 8, 2, 550-577.
- Zehir Topkaya, E., Küçük, Ö. (2010). An Evaluation of 4th and 5th Grade English Language Teaching Program. *Elementary Education Online*.9, 1, 52-65.