M J H

Mediterranean Journal of Humanities
mjh.akdeniz.edu.tr
I/2, 2011, 1-20

Teachers' Views on Constructivism in Turkish Primary EFL Classes

Türkiye'deki İlköğretim İngilizce Derslerinde Yapılandırmacılık Üzerine Öğretmen Görüşleri

Arif BAKLA[*]

Abstract: This study starts with a brief description of both what constructivism is, and its place in foreign language teaching literature. This literature review includes not only the theoretical dimension of the concept, but also over those practical studies with a constructivist focus. This study aims to find out how this theory is put into practice in Turkish EFL classes in primary schools. In order to obtain a robust understanding of the current situation of constructivism in primary EFL classes in Turkey, the researcher developed a survey for EFL teachers working in primary schools in the province of Konya. The data collection tool was designed to uncover issues regarding; (1) the implementation of constructivist learning principles in lessons (2) practical problems that are likely to emerge in the classroom (3) how constructivist principles are put into practice in the course books provided by the Ministry of Education. The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of the survey, analysed by using SPSS 15.0, was .752. The results revealed what English teachers, as significant stakeholders in primary school education, thought about the current situation and the practice of constructivism in primary school EFL classes. The independent samples t-test and analysis of variance results showed that there were no statistically meaningful differences between sexes except for one item in the questionnaire; similarly, no statistically significant differences were found between teachers with a BA and those with MA degrees, except for one item. Moreover, analysis has not revealed any significant differences between ELT and non-ELT graduates. The study ends with a discussion of the results of the survey.

Keywords: Constructivism, English language teacher, primary education

Özet: Bu çalışma yapılandırmacılığın temellerinin ve yabancı dil öğretimi alan yazınındaki yerinin kısa bir betimlemesi ile başlamaktadır. Alan yazın taraması bu kavramın sadece kuramsal boyutunu içermekle kalmayıp, aynı zamanda yapılandırmacılık odaklı uygulamalı çalışmalara da değinmektedir. Bu çalışma temel olarak Türkiye'deki ilköğretim okulundaki İngilizce derslerinde yapılandırmacılığın nasıl uygulandığını ortaya ortaya koymayı hedeflemektedir. Yapılandırmacılığın Turkiye'deki durumunu tam olarak anlamak için, araştırmacı Konya ilinde ilköğretim okullarında çalışan İngilizce öğretmenleri için bir anket geliştirmiştir. Bu veri toplama aracı (1) yapılandırmacılığın temel prensiplerinin sınıf içinde uygulamaya konulmasını (2) uygulama sırasında meydana gelebilecek olası problemleri (3) yapılandırmacılığın prensiplerinin Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı tarafından dağıtılmış olan kitaplarda nasıl uygulamaya konulduğunu ortaya çıkarmak için geliştirilmiştir. SPSS 15.0 ile analiz edilen anketin Cronbach Alpha değeri .752 olarak bulunmuştur. Anket sonuçları İlköğretim eğitiminde önemli bir paydaş olan İngilizce öğretmenlerinin yapılandırmacılığın şu anki durumu ve uygulanması konusunda ne düşündüklerini ortaya koymuştur. T-test ve ANOVA sonuçları anket maddelerinin biri hariç diğerlerinde cinsiyete göre istatistiksel anlamda önemli bir fark olmadığını göstermiştir. Benzer şekilde, öğretmenlerin lisans veya yüksek lisans mezunu olmaları da istatistiksel açıdan önemli bir farka sebep olmamıştır. Ayrıca, analizler İngilizce Öğretmenliği bölümü mezunu olanlar ile olmayanlar arasında da önemli bir fark olmadığını göstermiştir. Bu çalışma anket sonuçlarının tarışması ile sona ermektedir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Yapılandırmacılık, İngilizce öğretmeni, ilköğretim

[*] PhD. Candidate, Hacettepe University; Instructor at Selcuk University, arifbakla@gmail.com

The educational reform of 2005 in Turkey brought about a curricular innovation that entailed the introduction of a constructivist philosophy into foreign language classes as was the case for other lessons. This was largely because the traditional focus on the one-way transmission of knowledge from teacher to students was intended to be replaced by productive practices of learning in a constructivist environment. That is, advocates of constructivist philosophy believe that learners actively construct knowledge in their attempts to make sense of their world. The latest instructional developments in primary school EFL classrooms are investigated in this study covering both the theoretical and practical dimensions of the issue.

It is often stressed in texts on constructivism that this approach has more to do with learning than it does with teaching. As the name suggests, it involves learners' constructing knowledge on a step by step basis. This approach often focuses on how learners construct and interpret knowledge. Unlike traditional approaches in which information is passed onto learners, learners themselves gain access to information through books and from other sources. In either case, there is a one-way transmission of knowledge from a more knowledgeable source to the learners. Therefore, the intellectual process that goes on in the mind of the learner does not go beyond perception or comprehension. Why is constructivism at odds with knowledge transfer? Constructivist teachers do not transfer knowledge because each learner has to build up his or her own knowledge; concepts cannot be transferred from teacher to learner through words (von Glasersfeld, 1995; Nuthall, 2002). That's why knowledge absorption is not seen as viable among constructivists.

This study is an attempt to discover the extent to which the theory meets the practice in the Turkish primary school English classroom as far as constructivist foreign language teaching pedagogy is concerned. In other words, to find out whether constructivism is effectively practised in Turkish primary EFL classes, it attempts to expose the challenges apparent during implementation. In addition to understanding the nature of changes that occurred in teacher and learner roles in the classroom, the researcher seeks to discover the challenges involved in the implementation of the constructivist learning principles from the viewpoint of EFL teachers working at Turkish primary schools.

An Overview of Constructivism

Tobias and Duffy (2009) stress that the roots of constructivism can be traced back to an Italian philosopher, Giambattista Vico, who lived in the early 18th century (p. 3), while Murphy (1997) associates this approach with an earlier scientific mind, Socrates, who liked to ask his students to challenge various issues. It would be not wrong to claim that there is a close link between constructivist epistemology and the questioning technique of Socrates, who stressed the importance of meaning making processes through asking and answering questions. This close link is the result of our natural tendency to question all the time (Johnston, 2007). To whoever the roots are traced back to, it is clear that constructivism is a product of an eclectic philosophy that is not new.

Although the constructivist approach has a long tradition, the growing interest in constructivism can be attributed to the more recent works of some modern researchers. Among these latest researchers are two that provide us with a general framework for this issue. Ayas (2006, 5) stresses that "*constructivism entered mainstream educational thought and research in the 1970s through the work of the disciples of Piaget and Vygotsky*". The former favoured a cognitive view of constructivism, while the latter pioneered works in social constructivism. Knowledge is the natural result of learner experiences and the interaction between the learner and his/her environment. Learning is both an individual and social process. Phillips and Soltis (1998, 50) stress that Piaget's theory about how young learners build up knowledge has been a source of

inspiration for constructivism in education. Another leading figure is von Glasersfeld, who views himself as a "*radical constructivist*" (Glasersfeld, 1995). Von Glasersfeld (2000, 192) briefly explains what radical constructivism may offer for teaching, stating "*the art of teaching has little to do with the traffic of knowledge, its fundamental purpose must be to foster the art of learning*". With the help of such an explanation, that constructivism is a theory of learning rather than of teaching is again supported.

An illuminating description by Oldfather, *et al*., (1999, 13) of a constructivist learning environment informs us on how constructivist teachers, learners and the environment should be. They talk about flexible teacher and learner roles; that is, teachers are not the sole knowledgeable authority in the class, and learners take part in the lesson planning process. Since there is democracy in the classroom, learner choices are valued and supported. There is teacher guidance rather than directing. The atmosphere is a relaxed one, as if they were a family. There is no fear of being ridiculed due to the self confidence experienced by the learners who are ensured that they can reach success. In short, to create such a learning environment, teachers have to adopt a very different role. The challenge of being a constructivist teacher is clearly expressed by Brooks and Brooks (1999, 42), who said, "*Learning to be a constructivist teacher is important, but not easy*". This means that to change roles, teachers have to be trained in both theoretical and practical issues.

The philosophical theory of knowledge with a constructivist orientation presumes that learners construct their own knowledge through continuous interaction with the environment. In Brooks and Brooks' (1999, 24) terms "*idiosyncratic constructions of prior experiences*" are the basis of this interaction with the environment. This is perhaps one of the most significant tenets of the constructivist paradigm. In line with this, von Glasersfeld (1995) mentions two basic tenets of constructivism. The first is that learning is a process of knowledge construction instead of absorption. We construct knowledge based on our own perceptions and conceptions of our world; therefore, each of us constructs a different meaning or concept. Learning, in the constructivists' view, entails the construction of conceptual elements through reflection and abstraction (Glasersfeld, 1995; Nuthall, 2002; Wilson, 2003).

Unlike behaviourism, the product of positivist epistemology, constructivism is the product of a cognitive one. Having a radical constructivist orientation, von Glasersfeld (2000, 178), certainly is after education rather than training because the former includes inquiry while the latter mostly involves stimulus-response chain. Constructivism draws from the contention that knowledge is subjective rather than being interpreted in the same way by different people. Schcolnik, *et al*., (2006, 12) note that, "*the familiar and inaccurate metaphor of the mind as a container waiting to be filled is replaced by the metaphor of the mind as an agent actively seeking to satisfy its curiosity and resolve troubling issues*". To get a basic understanding of a constructivist classroom, it is perhaps better to look at the traditional (instructivist) classroom in which learners are far from critical thinking and rarely express themselves or challenge, in addition to doing excessive memorisation work. A constructivist classroom can be depicted as the one which is obviously opposed to the one mentioned above. In other words, learners in a constructivist classroom; (1) ask questions (2) think critically (3) construct meaning rather than memorising (try to deduce meaning). Constructivism tries to move learners beyond the traditional classroom in which learners are inactive. The table below summarises the basic characteristics of the constructivist learning approach in comparison with the mainstream teaching paradigm that can be referred to as "*instructivist*" or the "*traditional*" approach.

Table 1. Instructivist versus constructivist learning paradigms

Instructivist Learning	Constructivist Learning
• Learning environment passive and teacher-directed.	• Learning environment is active, learner-guided.
• Aim is to gain knowledge, to transmit knowledge or reproduce it.	• Aim is to construct knowledge, to guide learners.
• It is teacher-centred and teacher directed.	• It is learner-centred and teacher-guided.
• Courses depend on textbooks	• Courses move ahead based on learners' needs.
• Questions are asked by teachers looking for the right answer.	• Student-initiated questions are encouraged.
• It adopts a more behaviouristic approach.	• It adopts a more cognitive approach.
• Errors are indicators of non-learning, so they should be avoided.	• Errors provide insight into students' previous knowledge constructions.
• Syllabus is content-centred, rigid and linear.	• Syllabus is problem-centred, flexible and cyclical
• There is no reflection.	• Learners reflect on the learning process.
• Planning is done by the teacher.	• Planning is done by both the teacher and learners.
• Lecturing is commonly practised.	• Discussion is frequently seen.
• Learners are involved in rote learning.	• Learners are involved in research.
• It is a theory of teaching.	• It is a theory of learning.
• There is individual exercising to absorb knowledge.	• There is knowledge construction through group work.
• Knowledge is divided into parts.	• Overall understanding is significant.
• Teachers behave in a deductive manner.	• Teachers behave in an interactive manner.

(Murphy, 1997; Brooks, & Brooks, 1999; von Glasersfeld, 2000; Applefield, *et al*., 2001; Can, 2005; Çınar, *et al*., 2006; Akar, & Yıldırım, 2004.)

There are some misconceptions which are called "*myths*" by Applefield, *et al*., (2001, 46-48) about constructivist language learning: Constructivist pedagogy; (a) has no focus for learning or clear goal (b) does not include a carefully made plan (c) lacks structure for learning (d) claims that learners will spontaneously learn if they are involved in interaction (e) teacher's not lecturing in the classroom diminishes their importance. These, as Applefield, *et al*., (2001) claim, are hypothetical suppositions that should be eliminated. Constructivist lessons are not overloaded with aimless discussion activities with no focus. With clear goals in mind, constructivist teachers support student learning through a challenging or authentic activity. Teachers have to monitor discussions to deal with potential problems that may emerge during activities and guide learners. Moreover, teachers have the responsibility of facilitating learning, guiding learners, being involved in decision making about what, how and when to do what, to support learning. Because of these serious tasks, some teachers think that constructivist teachers have more responsibilities than their instructivist colleagues.

Human learning is a complex phenomenon; in Jonassen's (2009, 13) words "*a human cognitive architecture is multidimensional, that is, it must include multiple theoretical perspectives in order to explain the complexities of human learning*". However, traditional or instructivist pedagogies do not consider the multidimensionality of the learning process. Constructivist pedagogy, on the other hand, can promote language learning by providing students with alternatives and by providing meaningful and interesting language practice. In addition, errors are tolerated and seen as an important part or an indication of learning. In a constructivist learning environment, group discussion is viewed as a critical element of comprehension (Schcolnik, *et al*., 2006, 14, 16). Students learn from their peers; they also assess both themselves and their peers. Beck and Kosnik (2006), too, mention some important characteristics of constructivist

learning: Knowledge is constructed by learners; it is experience-based and social. All aspects of a person are connected. Learning communities should be inclusive and equitable (9-14).

Constructivism supports knowledge construction through reflection and discussion. Reflection and discussion entail active participation. Therefore, in a constructivist learning environment, learners actively take part in the learning process both inside and outside the classroom and they understand the importance of participation and decision making. Knowledge accumulation is not an end point; it is a point of departure for mental processes (Akar, & Yıldırım, 2004, 2). According to Akar and Yıldırım (2004, 3) constructivist activities have the following features: "*These activities entail the use of higher order cognitive skills; they should be carried out in cooperative and sharing environments. The aim of sharing is to construct knowledge through reflection, thereby contributing to conceptual familiarity. As an essential component of the learning environment, curriculum shapes how a lesson is conducted*". Schcolnik, *et al*., (2006, 16) inform us about the focus of the constructivist curriculum. Unlike an instructivist curriculum, the focus of which is on knowledge transfer rather than on task performance and knowledge application, it includes less content to be covered, but more effort to construct knowledge. In instructivist classes, planning involves what the teacher will do in the classroom, while planning constructivist learning is closely related to what the learners will do. Knowledge gains meaning as it is interpreted with the help of previous experiences.

Another significant aspect of constructivism concerns the role of the learners and teachers which are quite different in a constructivist learning environment than in a non-constructivist one. Learners have the task of exploration, interpretation and evaluation, while teachers provide learners with appropriate learning experiences rather than passing on information. The view of teachers of the constructivist approach reflects the concept of the ideal teacher because according to this theory teachers have to be co-learners and they have to be ready for professional development. The role of teachers in a constructivist learning environment vary from encouraging cooperation and self-expression to providing learners with appropriate alternatives and providing right directions.

In addition to the points mentioned above, constructivist teachers support and promote student autonomy and initiative. They allow student responses to drive lessons. They make the necessary changes to proceed in the right manner. They use generic terminology to frame tasks such as "*classify*", "*analyze*", "*predict*", and "*create*." They not only encourage the student to student dialogue, but also student to teacher communication. Constructivist teachers support student inquiry through open-ended questions which ask for elaboration. They give learners some time to reflect on a specific point before they respond. Based on the cycle model, teachers provide learners with activities that tap their curiosity rather than strictly following a test-teach-test model (Brooks, & Brooks, 1999, 103-116). In sharp contrast with behaviourism which assigns teachers the role of transmitting knowledge and learners that of accumulating it, constructivism assigns teachers the role of a guide and facilitator. This apparent dissimilarity is clearly expressed in the lines by Schwartz, *et al*., (2009, 34), who say, "*It is often set in opposition to behaviourist methods, where external reinforcements regulate learning, as well as direct instruction, where students are told or shown what to do*". Moreover, there are no problem solving activities in behaviourist teaching approaches, but these activities form one of the most significant aspects of constructivist teaching. For Tan (2003) the roots of problem-based learning can be traced back to constructivism. Along with problem solving, constructivism supports and encourages questioning. This is because in Johnston's (2007, 85) terms, "*asking questions focuses the children's attention on the learning objectives and supports the development of understandings*".

As Windschitl (2002, 136) puts it, there are different realisations or characterisations of constructivisms by different theorists who either emphasise the cognitive processes involved in individual meaning making or of knowledge construction within a group. However, it is not

easy to make clear distinctions between these different conceptions of constructivisms such as philosophical or non-philosophical or between cognitive and non-cognitive or social (Rockmore, 2005, 29). Schcolnik, *et al*., (2006) make such a distinction between cognitive and social constructivism in the following lines:

> *Two main approaches to constructivism are cognitive constructivism and social constructivism. The former is associated with the work of Piaget and the latter with that of Vygotsky. The two approaches are not mutually exclusive, as underpinning both is the belief that students learn by constructing their own knowledge. However, the main emphasis in the two approaches is different. Cognitive constructivists concentrate on the importance of the mind in learning, whereas social constructivists focus on the key role played by the environment and the interaction between learners* (Schcolnik, *et al*., 2006, 13).

Although to date teachers have a theoretical background and knowledge of constructivist pedagogies, classroom experience and talk with colleagues have told us that in most language classes behaviourist principles have been practised for a quite a long time. Tan (2003) states that constructivism has been repeatedly stressed in teacher training and in actual teaching situations; however, the teaching and learning atmosphere is the one that does not allow for creative thinking. However, there has been substantial effort make to incorporate active learning and creative thinking into language learning curricula over the past few years. Those teaching and learning theories placing learners at the centre of attention and which require them to be active during the lessons have accumulated support. Over the last decade three significant orientations have had a deep impact on foreign language teaching in primary English classes Turkey: communicative language teaching (CLT) (Kırkgöz, 2008), the Common European Framework (Council of Europe, 2000; Council of Europe, 2001, Demirel, 2005) and constructivism (Çınar, *et al*., 2006; Akar, & Yıdırım, 2004, Sarıkaya, *et al*., 2010). The Ministry of National Education in Turkey began to pilot the constructivist approach in primary schools in 2004, and one year later it was put into practice in all primary schools. The first step that the Ministry of Education authorities followed was to help teachers to get acquainted with this philosophy of learning and the programs designed in connection with it. Being one of the most radical changes in the history of national education in Turkey, the new programs and syllabuses prepared are seen as the signs of a turning point in education (Çınar, *et al.*, 2006).

Several studies have been carried out to determine the effect of the constructivist approach on student achievement. For example, in a study by Akar and Yıldırım (2004), it was found that constructivist learning environments positively affect learner motivation. In this study, classroom interaction was found to be effective in knowledge construction although some participants expressed the opinion that they cannot learn well in group and in pair works. In a study by Çınar, *et al*., (2006), upon being asked how they view the implementation of constructivism in primary schools, teachers and administrators generally expressed positive opinions about the practical considerations, but they also stressed inadequate facilities and other physical conditions posed some challenges during the implementation process (Çınar, *et al.*, 2006, 1). Still another study, by Sarıkaya, *et al*., (2010) in science teaching, revealed that the group which was taught with a constructivist approach scored higher in the post-test and they had higher scores in the retention test. Building upon these studies, how the researcher focusses on teacher ideas and about the practice of constructivism in primary EFL classes in Turkey is explained in the following sections.

After the introduction of the new syllabuses for English classes in primary schools, the weekly teaching hours were also reconsidered. The new timetable is as follows: The fourth and fifth grades have a two-hour compulsory and a two-hour elective course, while the sixth,

seventh and eighth grades have a four-hour compulsory and a two-hour elective course. In accordance with the syllabus, the books for all grades have two sections. The first section focuses on new points (both grammatical and lexical) the second is for consolidation. The syllabus suggests that tasks or projects assigned to learners at the end of each unit can be kept in a dossier by the students, and teachers can provide feedback to those after the consolidation unit in the elective course hours. Students can also share their projects with their peers in the class (Ministry of Education, 2006).

Data Collection Tool

In the framework of this study, a 26-item survey helped the researcher to collect data. Several steps were followed in the process of survey design. Firstly, an in-depth literature review was done to examine existing studies on constructivist learning, mostly dealing with teacher opinions or constructivism in general. Particularly the studies concerning administrated surveys or checklists regarding constructivism (Çınar, *et al*., 2005; Küçüközer, *et al*., 2005; Can, 2006; Sert, 2008) were examined. Previous studies concerning constructivist learning in general and specifically what teachers thought about the implementational aspects were scrutinized to obtain an overall idea of the subject. In addition, the main issues regarding constructivist pedagogy were made clear.

Since it is often advised to carry out a small-scale qualitative study with the respondents before item construction (e.g. Dörnyei, 2003, 31), following the literature review, a homogenous group of 5 teachers who were randomly chosen to be representative of the respondents were asked to brainstorm about constructivist language pedagogy before they were asked to take part in a structured interview. The interview consisted of the following questions: (1) What is your understanding of constructivist foreign language teaching? (2) Do you think constructivist principles can successfully be put into practice in EFL classes in Turkish primary schools? (3) What are the main challenges that emerge when you try to conduct a constructivist lesson? (4) If you face any problems, what solutions can you offer to solve them? (5) Do you think the syllabus for each grade conforms to constructivist principles? (6) Does the course book that you follow conform to constructivist principles? (7) Do you think there is a clear gap between the theory and practice of constructivism in primary school English classes in Turkey? (8) In general, how do you evaluate the success of constructivist language teaching practices in primary English classes in Turkey?

The questions of the structured interview were formulated in English. They were also translated into Turkish to be used during the construction of the questionnaire and for later reference. Some of the issues mentioned by the teachers helped the researcher to formulate items during the process of item construction. For example, one of the commonly mentioned problems was that they did not have enough time to cover all the subjects assigned in the syllabus. Another was that there was a significant gap not only between theory and practice, but also between teaching and testing. In order to find out about more about these issues, items were formulated and put into the questionnaire.

The literature review, and brainstorming done by the teachers on the issue and interviews helped the researcher to obtain a clear understanding of the main points of constructivist pedagogy to construct statements that contained both the theoretical and practical aspects of the issue. 30 Likert items were designed to that end. A five-point scale, including the expressions "*Strongly agree*", "*Agree*", "*Disagree*", "*Strongly disagree*" and "*No idea*" accompanied these statements to label what teachers thought. A descriptive title was provided at the top of *the* page to provide the respondents with an initial impression. Moreover, at the beginning of the attitude scale form, what respondents are required to do was explained briefly so as to provide clear-cut directions to follow. The following table gives more specific information about the data collection tool.

Table 2. Layout of the Survey

Sections	The Points Surveyed	Items
I	Personal Information	(Name, sex, graduation, teaching experience, etc.)
II	Constructivist in-class practices	10 Likert items
III	Ideas about constructivism	10 Likert items
IV	Evaluation of the course book in terms of constructivism	10 Likert items

The introductory paragraph of the survey asked the respondents to fill in information only if they were willing to do so. In the section that followed the introduction, some personal information was sought, since stratification may reduce sampling errors. In other words, information about age, sex, school, usually provides the researcher with more detailed analysis of the responses minimizing errors of sampling. However, it was ensured that the information gathered would be used for no other purpose than writing an article. In this way, possible psychological barriers that might interfere with their responses were eliminated. The following parts give detailed information about how this tool was formed and validated.

The Likert items designed in the questionnaire fall in general into four broad categories. These categories include; (1) The applicability of constructivist principles in primary EFL classes (2) Problems that are likely to emerge during in-class applications (3) The evaluation of the course book (4) Overall success of constructivism in EFL classes in Turkish primary schools (See Appendix A for the survey). To validate the survey, firstly, expert advice was sought on each item. This contributed to the face validity of the survey. After the survey was finalized, it was administered to 15 people as a part of the piloting process. Most of the respondents in the piloting process completed the questionnaire with the researcher, which helped to detect ambiguous items and potential pitfalls. Moreover, since the survey consisted of five-point Likert-type scales, Standardized Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of the survey was calculated for each item in addition to the overall survey. In the pilot study, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient value for the survey was 678 if three items were deleted. Below are the deleted items: (1) I prompt student inquiry by asking open-ended questions. (2) I mostly depend on the course book during the lessons. (3) There are rote-learning activities in the book.

Participants

The validated version of the questionnaire was administered to 81 teachers working in primary schools in Konya. Most of these teachers were females (53 teachers) though some of them did not provide information that revealed their sex. Very few of them have completed an MA (7 teachers) and only one teacher was pursuing a doctoral degree though he had not yet completed it. In addition, though most of the respondents were graduates of ELT departments, a considerable number of them (13 teachers) had chosen to work as English teachers although they were graduates of non-ELT departments. In the previous decade, most of the primary school English teachers were not ELT graduates since there was a need for a considerable number of English teachers within the body of the Ministry. Fortunately, there has been a serious increase in the number of English teachers who are graduates of ELT departments in Turkey. This quantitative development in teacher education is expected to have a positive effect on the teaching of English in primary schools. One drawback in research regarding the demographic analysis of English teacher groups in Turkey is that there are more females than males in the profession. Accordingly, the sampling in the study has to reflect the demographic realities of the group in question. In the case of the English teachers surveyed in this study, the number of male teachers was 15 plus several more (assuming that one or two of the respondents who did not reveal their sex and other personal information were males). In the analysis to determine whether there is a

meaningful difference between male or female teachers in terms of the responses to each item in the survey, it seemed rather difficult to find meaningful differences due to this disparity between male and female respondents.

Data Analysis

SPSS 15.0 was also used to carry out statistical procedures to analyse the results. Overall scale internal consistency reliability was estimated. That is, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for the questionnaire was .733 if one of the items was deleted (Item 23). The reliability coefficient for the survey was .696 before the deletion of the item mentioned above, so one item which had the highest negative value for the corrected item-total correlations (the Item 23) was deleted to render the survey more reliable. Considering that the Cronbach's Alpha value above 6 is considered acceptable in the literature (e.g. George, & Mallery, 2003), this survey seems to be of acceptable reliability.

Following the analysis concerning validation, the frequency analysis was carried out to reveal what the respondents thought about each item in the questionnaire. Then, in order to determine if there are meaningful differences between male and female respondents and between ELT graduates and non-ELT graduates, statistical analysis included independent samples t-test. The item that asked about the degree held by the respondent was also analysed through this test since there were no teachers with a Ph.D. degree although it was written as an option for this item, so two options were left for the item in question. The results of this analysis are the point that I turn to in the following section.

Results and Discussions

The results of the questionnaire were analysed to obtain detailed information about the ideas of the English language teacher on constructivist language pedagogy. Frequency distribution and the percentage of each item in the survey is given in the tables below. Though there might be genuine reasons for the given distribution of a specific item, some reasons make themselves clear. These potential reasons are discussed in the paragraphs below the tables.

Table 3. Frequencies of the items on actual classroom practices

Items 1-10	**Always**		**Frequently**		**Sometimes**		**Rarely**		**Never**		**Missing**	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Item-1	14	17.3	30	37.0	25	30.9	6	7.4	5	6.2	1	1.2
Item-2	27	33.3	38	46.9	12	14.8	2	2,5	1	1.2	1	1.2
Item-3	13	16.0	39	48.1	26	32.1	2	2.5	0	0	1	1.2
Item-4	65	80.2	10	12.3	4	4.9	0	0	0	0	2	2.5
Item-5	16	19.8	23	28.4	32	39.5	8	9.9	1	1.2	1	1.2
Item-6	27	33.3	41	50.6	9	11.1	1	1.2	2	2.5	1	1.2
Item-7	24	29.6	40	49.4	14	17.3	2	2.5	0	0	1	1.2
Item-8	6	7.4	29	35.8	30	37.0	12	14.8	2	2.5	2	2.5
Item-9	9	11.1	29	35.8	31	38.3	11	13.6	1	1.2	0	0
Item-10	23	28.4	35	43.2	18	22.2	4	4.9	0	0	1	1.2

Being a significant aspect of a constructivist classroom, learners' taking part in the planning process seems to be readily accepted and practised by teachers; only 6.2 per cent of the respondents never give learners the chance to be involved in planning. With reference to making learners autonomous researchers (Item-2), the respondents are apparently willing to support and encourage learner involvement on individual research. It follows from this that teachers agree with the idea that learners have to reach reliable sources of data on their own. By getting reliable information, learners may become involved in knowledge construction by synthesizing the old and the new.

The next item (Item-3) which surveys the frequency of the use of problem solving activities in the classroom has collected responses that can be regarded as good news in terms of constructivist teaching. This is because problem-based pedagogy is one of the basic tenets of constructivism. No respondent says that they never incorporate problem solving activities into their regular teaching. Some 70 per cent of the respondents highly value problem-solving activities. Though individual understanding of the term "*problem-solving activities*" might vary, the data here signify that teachers are coming to realise the significant aspects of, at least, the theoretical dimensions of constructivism. In a similar vein, nearly all respondents (92.5 per cent) responded they encourage their students to ask questions. Problem solving and questioning are significant factors in knowledge construction because these are the essential components to synthesize previous and new knowledge.

The items 5, 8 and 9 respectively inquired about "*peer feedback*", "*peer assessment*" and "*self-evaluation*" on the part of the learners. These items reflect teachers' in-class observations of their students. The existence of such concepts in a classroom is possible with guidance from the teacher. 48.2 per cent of teachers said their students always/frequently gave feedback to each other and 39.5 per cent of them said the learners sometimes did it. Learners' peer assessment (Item 8) and self-evaluation (Item 8) received as much support as peer feedback did. Teacher support for these practices enable learners to become more autonomous. The teacher's books for the course book Spot on (Grade 6, 7 and 8) provide teachers with peer-assessment and self-evaluation forms which can be used by learners under the guidance of teachers. Judging from the figures for items 8 and 9, encouraging learners to assess their peers and themselves seems to have been highly influential. This comes to mean that guiding teachers on how to do certain tasks and providing them with necessary theoretical and practical knowledge provides more fruitful results than just telling them to do those tasks. Despite all this positive depiction, one teacher added the comment that Turkish students traditionally were not accustomed to giving negative feedback and telling their peers that their work had some deficiencies. This seems to be major drawback. As a part of the learners' taking part in the lesson planning process, learners' being allowed to reflect on the activities and materials in the classroom is quite significant. Providing involvement and awareness for learners, such practice seems to be supported by teachers, nearly 85 per cent of whom said that always/frequently/sometimes allowed their learners to reflect on their in-class work and materials (Item 7). As revealed by the 10th item, teachers assess student learning in the context of daily teaching most of the time (28.4 per cent always, 43.2 per cent frequently and 22.2 per cent sometimes). However, there is a problem in terms of regulations because although they assess their learners in the context of daily teaching, these assessments are sometimes subordinated to written assessments.

Perhaps one of the most significant principles of constructivism is to allow learners to ask questions and to challenge concepts. Most individuals' desire to challenge is demotivated after they start school. This is mostly caused by inflexibility in terms of correctness; in other words, looking for only one correct answer for a specific question. Such an approach fails to nurture children's natural curiosity from birth. This negative picture seems to have changed for the better because nearly 90 per cent of the teachers stated that they encourage flexibility in terms of correctness (Item 6).

Table 4. Frequencies of the items on actual classroom practices

Items 11-18	**Strongly Agree**		**Agree**		**No Idea**		**Disagree**		**Strongly Disagree**		**Missing**	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Item-11	27	33.3	46	56.8	3	3.7	2	2.5	1	1.2	2	2.5

Item-12	16	19.8	46	56.8	5	6.2	12	14.8	0	0	2	2.5
Item-13	33	40.7	30	37.0	5	6.2	11	13.6	0	0	2	2.5
Item-14	23	28.4	39	48.1	7	8.6	10	12.3	0	0	2	2.5
Item-15	7	8.6	19	23.5	19	23.5	22	27.2	12	14.8	2	2.5
Item-16	10	12.3	40	49.4	11	13.6	16	19.8	2	2.5	2	2.5
Item-17	17	21.0	50	61.7	6	7.4	6	7.4	0	0	2	2.5

Although approximately three-fourths of the respondents (76.6 per cent) think that it takes more time for students to learn in a constructivist class (Item-12). This agrees with the observation of Schcolnik, *et al*., (2006, 14), who contends that it takes more time to construct meaning than to adopt transferred knowledge. That's why 62 respondents claim learning in a constructivist classroom is a slower process. In line with this belief, 77.7 per cent of the respondents think that the available class time is not enough to follow a constructivist approach. Moreover, 76.5 per cent of them are of the opinion that they have more responsibilities in constructivist classes. A great majority of the respondents (61.7 per cent) state that they are experiencing problems in terms of putting theory into practice. By the same token, 82.7 percent of the respondents report that there exists a gap between theory and practice in the classroom. This finding supports the point made by Halocha's (2007, 156) that "*the theory is fine but it gets left at the door of the classroom*". It is interesting to note that despite the negative aspecs of constructivism in terms of time, responsibilities and other practical considerations, (90.1 per cent) of the teachers stated that they enjoyed teaching in a constructivist learning environment. This indicates that they are aware of the syllabuses reminding them of the suggestion that covering all subjects in the syllabus and book is not the aim of teaching (Ministry of Education, 2006). Moreover, they seemed to attach importance to constructivist pedagogy in general. They like implementing constructivist principles though they face serious practical problems.

Constructivist teaching is not easily put into practice, even by those who are experts on constructivist instruction. This is because, as one teacher worded her concern, those teachers who followed a deductive approach to teach grammar were labelled as "*knowledgeable*", and therefore, better, unlike those who followed a constructivist approach. 32.1 per cent of the teachers think that learning is "*less efficient*" in a constructivist learning environment (Item- 15). Moreover, a good number of others have no idea to express about this issue. Even if it is efficient, it seems to be the opposite due to the misconception that learning seems to have occurred only if learners are able to receive and recite information presented by teachers.

Table 5. Frequencies of the items on the course book evaluation

Items 18-26	**Strongly Agree**		**Agree**		**No Idea**		**Disagree**		**Strongly Disagree**		**Missing**	
	Freq	per cent	Freq	per cent	Freq	per cent	Freq	per cent	Freq	per cent	Freq	per cent
Item-18	10	12.3	40	49.4	4	4.9	21	25.9	5	6.2	1	1.2
Item-19	7	8.6	34	42.0	14	17.3	23	28.4	1	1.2	2	2.5
Item-20	2	2.5	41	50.6	15	18.5	16	19.8	3	3.7	4	4.9
Item-21	14	17.3	40	49.4	8	9.9	15	18.5	2	2.5	2	2.5
Item-22	6	7.4	24	29.6	16	19.8	29	35.8	3	3.7	3	3.7
Item-24	12	14.8	34	42.0	17	21.0	9	11.1	7	8.6	2	2.5
Item-25	9	11.1	36	44.4	13	16.0	15	18.5	6	7.4	2	2.5
Item-26	2	2.5	42	51.9	13	16.0	18	22.2	4	4.9	2	2.5

This final section beginning with item 18 focuses on how teachers view the course book they follow. The course books written, published and distributed by the Ministry of Education are "*Time for English*" (Grade 4 and 5) and "*Spot on*" (Grade 6, 7 and 8). These books have been

prepared in line with the syllabus by the Ministry of Education.

In Table 5, teachers' views on the course books from a constructivist viewpoint are seen. This table handles the issue from an overall scale (For more detailed information, see Appendix B, in which you can view the statistics for each book.). 61.7 per cent of the teachers observed that their learners like constructivist activities in the book (Item 18). Nearly half of the respondents (50.6 per cent) think that the activities in the course book allow learners to take decisions. 17.3 per cent of them have no idea about the issue, while 29.6 per cent think that activities in the book do not encourage decision making. This means that nearly half of the respondents either view the course book as deficient or they do not have an idea on the issue.

As important components of constructivist syllabuses, problem centred activities or those activities that make learners think are highly appreciated by teachers. Still, a good number of respondents believe that the activities in the course book are not problem centred (23.5 per cent) or some are undecided (18.5 per cent) on this issue, whereas the 66.7 per cent of the teachers surveyed revealed that the activities in the book promote thinking. Teachers think negatively about the success of the books in encouraging learners to do research on their own (Only 37.0 per cent of the respondents think that activities encourage autonomous research.)

The twenty-fourth item covers how successful the teacher's book is in terms of guiding teachers to follow a constructivist approach. 56.8 per cent of the respondents state that the teacher's book is good at guiding the teachers on this issue, but 21 per cent of them have no idea. The last two items question the whether the book is compatible with the syllabus provided by the Ministry of Education and whether the books comply with constructivist principles. The responses to the former item mostly centre on agreement and strong agreement (55 per cent); those for the latter mostly reflect agreement (51.9 per cent Agree, only 2.5 per cent strongly agree).

In addition to all these descriptive statistics gained through this study, to determine whether there is a significant difference between male and female teachers and between ELT graduates and non-ELT graduates, independent samples t-test was carried out; for teaching experience analysis of variance was done. In terms of gender, there was a meaningful difference only for the fourth item in the questionnaire (See Table 6 below) in favour of females. Similarly, there was not a meaningful difference in terms of graduation (an ELT or non-ELT department) but there was a significant difference in terms of the degree held (BA or MA) for the 15th item (See Table 7 and 8). In terms of gender, graduation and the degree held by the teacher, there is a disparity given by the respondents in this study. That is, the number of teachers with an MA degree in the primary schools is not more than 5 to 10 per cent. By the same token, the number of male teachers is always smaller than females in the profession. In short, the disparity in the numbers of teachers mentioned above somehow seems to be representative of the whole population. Finally, teaching experience did not have a significant effect on the views of the respondents (See Table 9).

Table 6. The effect of sex as a variable

	Sig. (2-tailed)								
Item 1	,569	Item 7	,440	Item 13	,254	Item 19	,879	Item 26	,676
Item 2	,767	Item 8	,699	Item 14	,094	Item 20	,891		
Item 3	,262	Item 9	,882	Item 15	,524	Item 21	,220		
Item 4	**,**028	Item 10	,191	Item 16	,967	Item 22	,234		
Item 5	,182	Item 11	,741	Item 17	1,00	Item 24	,127		
Item 6	,268	Item 12	,346	Item 18	,897	Item 25	,617		

Grouping Variable: Sex (2-tailed sig= $p<0,05$)

Table 7. The effect of graduation as a variable

	Sig. (2-tailed)								
Item 1	,395	Item 7	,147	Item 13	,536	Item 19	,932	Item 26	,951
Item 2	,759	Item 8	,364	Item 14	,080	Item 20	,385		
Item 3	,687	Item 9	,867	Item 15	,814	Item 21	,624		
Item 4	,393	Item 10	,244	Item 16	,972	Item 22	,596		
Item 5	1,000	Item 11	,746	Item 17	,492	Item 24	,582		
Item 6	,232	Item 12	,676	Item 18	,973	Item 25	,528		

Grouping Variable: Graduation (ELT vs. non-ELT) (2-tailed sig= $p<0,05$)

Table 8. The effect of a degree as a variable

	Sig. (2-tailed)								
Item 1	,337	Item 7	,100	Item 13	,817	Item 19	,374	Item 26	,730
Item 2	,484	Item 8	,882	Item 14	,669	Item 20	,751		
Item 3	,325	Item 9	,894	Item 15	,015	Item 21	,295		
Item 4	,965	Item 10	,478	Item 16	,276	Item 22	,537		
Item 5	,446	Item 11	,125	Item 17	,398	Item 24	,906		
Item 6	,375	Item 12	,130	Item 18	,987	Item 25	,385		

Grouping Variable: Degree (BA versus MA) (2-tailed sig= $p<0,05$)

Table 9. The effect of teaching experience as a variable

	Sig. (2-tailed)								
Item 1	,965	Item 7	,943	Item 13	,847	Item 19	,092	Item 26	,377
Item 2	,144	Item 8	,536	Item 14	,119	Item 20	,633		
Item 3	,497	Item 9	,693	Item 15	,052	Item 21	,547		
Item 4	,858	Item 10	,184	Item 16	,038	Item 22	,213		
Item 5	,925	Item 11	,363	Item 17	,060	Item 24	,942		
Item 6	,902	Item 12	,940	Item 18	,775	Item 25	,524		

Grouping Variable: Teaching experience (Less than 2 years, 3-10, 11-20 and 21 or more years) (2-tailed sig= $p<0,05$)

Since this study is limited to the teachers in the province of Konya, Turkey, large-scale studies may provide more reliable and detailed results. Prospective researchers might focus on more specific issues such as what makes it difficult to implement constructivist principles in the classroom so that feasible solutions can be worked out. It should be remembered that about 50 per cent of the respondents had problems regarding this issue.

What teachers are currently experiencing in Turkish primary school is something between the desire to renew their approach and serious experiences of practical challenges. It takes some time to adapt oneself to paradigm shifts in pedagogies. Furthermore, it is always rather difficult to put theory into practice. This claim is equally valid for the case of constructivism, the basic principles of which are quite divergent from the mainstream ways of teaching foreign languages. Windschitl (2002) notes;

> *One of the most powerful determinants of whether constructivist approaches flourish or flounder in classrooms is the degree to which individual teachers understand the concept of constructivism. Without a kind of working understanding, teachers cannot be expected to link*

> *constructivist objectives for learning with appropriate types of instruction and assessment or to adapt constructivist principles to their particular classroom contexts* (Windschitl, 2002, 138).

Practise is even more difficult for teachers whose students desire to seek clear explanations for abstract grammar points. That is, how learners view their teachers is also important because, for example, one teacher said, "*The teachers who purely practice instructivist pedagogy are viewed as knowledgeable, while those having a constructivist orientation are seen as inefficient*". This is because constructivist classrooms neither emphasise knowledge transmission nor they are after discovery learning.

Conclusions

For a long period of time formalist approaches to language teaching have deluged the language teaching profession in Turkey until recently when there was an attempt at introducing constructivism into the foreign language curricula of primary schools in 2005. The roots of the curricular shift can be traced back to the frequently expressed but never practised belief that learners should learn to learn and be involved in the learning process. This belief works in harmony with one of the basic premises of the constructivist schools of thought; that is, learning by knowledge construction rather than knowledge absorption. The way teachers view how learners gain knowledge; that is, what they think as to whether learners passively receive information or build up knowledge, deeply affect and shape the nature of how a lesson proceeds. Such a difference in theoretical and practical view determines whether a teacher is following an instructivist or constructivist approach. However, it is not an easy job to conform to the latter. Brooks and Brooks (1999) tell us why is rather difficult to become a constructivist teacher:

> *"For many educators, becoming a constructivist teacher requires a paradigm shift. Becoming such a teacher means much more than appending new practices to already full repertoires. For many, it requires the willing abandonment of familiar perspectives and practices and the adoption of new ones"* (Brooks, & Brooks 1999, 25).

Similarly, White (2001, 70) makes the point that to make changes in perspectives, getting accustomed to these changes is significant. Changes begin in theoretical aspects; then they are seen in practical points. In order for the curricular changes to take place, teachers should try to get a full understanding of the theoretical issues regarding constructivism though being acquainted with the theory is rarely sufficient for successful implementation. Teachers should also be willing to implement the constructivist principles in the classroom. This actually covers the motivational aspect of teaching on the part of the teachers.

As the overall study has told us, the transition from instructivist teaching to constructivist pedagogies necessitates effort and time because such transition entails clear models to follow, theoretical knowledge and practical experience, in addition to motivation on the part of both teachers and learners. Finding others who have experience helps in this transition, because few or no instructors have themselves been taught in a constructivist classroom before, and it is sometimes difficult to depict how a constructivist class operates or to guess all the challenges one might experience. Primary school English teachers in Turkey seem to have come to an understanding of constructivism in an overall sense though they have serious difficulties in terms of practice. One tentative conclusion from this survey can be that teachers perhaps need more in-service training on how to put constructivist principles into practice in the classroom. This might help them to eliminate persistent problems.

REFERENCES

Akar, H., & Yıldırım, A. (2004). Oluşturmacı Öğretim Etkinliklerinin Sınıf Yönetimi Dersi'nde Kullanılması: Bir Eylem Araştırması. [Use of Constructivist Learning Activities in Classroom Management Course: An Action Research] Sabancı Üniversitesi, İyi Örnekler Konferansı. http://www.erg.sabanciuniv.edu/iok2004/bildiriler /Ali%20Yildirim.doc (Retrieved: 10.12.2009).

Applefield, J., Huber, R., & Moallem, M. (2001). Constructivism in theory and practice: Toward a better understanding. *High School Journal, 84*, 35-53.

Ayas, C. (2006). An Examination of the Relationship between the Integration of Technology into Social Studies and Constructivist Pedagogies, *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology (TOJET), 5* (*1*).

Beck, C., & Kosnik, C. (2006). *Innovations in Teacher Education: A Social Constructivist Approach*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.

Brooks, J. G., & Brooks, M. J. (1999). *In search of understanding: The case for constructivist classrooms*. New York: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Can, T. (2006). Oluşturmacılık ve Yabancı Dil Dersleri, Eğitimde Çağdaş Yönelimler-3: *Yapılandırmacılık ve Eğitime Yansımaları. Conference Proceedings*, 29th. April, 2006, 282-288.

Council of Europe (2000). *European language portfolio (ELP)*: *Principles and guidelines*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Education Committee.

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

Çınar, O., Teyfur, E., & Teyfur, M. (2006). İlköğretim Okulu Öğretmen ve Yöneticilerinin Yapılandırmacı Eğitim Yaklaşımı ve Programı Hakkındaki Görüşleri. *İnönü University Journal of Faculty of Education, 11*. Malatya.

Demirel, Ö. (2005). Avrupa Konseyi Dil Projesi ve Turkiye uygulaması [European Language Portfolio and Application in Turkey]. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi, 33* (*167*), 65-80.

Dörnyei, Z. (2003). Questionnaires in Second Language Research, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

von Glasersfeld, E. (1995). *Radical Constructivism: A way of Knowing and Learning*. London: The Falmer Press.

von Glasersfeld, E. (2000*). Problems of constructivism*. Ed. L. P. Steffe, & P. W. Thompson. *Radical Constructivism in Action Building on the Pioneering Work of Ernst von Glasersfeld*, 1-9. London: Routledge.

Halocha, J. (2007). Developing investigative work/enquiry. Ed. J. Johnston, J. Halocha, & M. Chater, *Developing teaching skills in the primary school* (154-173). Berkshire, England: Open University Press.

Jonassen, D. (2009). Reconciling a human cognitive architecture. Ed. S. Tobias, & T. M. Duffy. *Constructivist instruction: success or failure?,* 13-33. New York: Taylor & Francis.

Johnston, J. (2007). Questioning. Ed. J. Johnston, J. Halocha, & M. Chater. *Developing teaching skills in the primary school*, 81-98. Berkshire, England: Open University Press.

Kırkgöz, Y. (2008). A case study of teachers' implementation of curriculum innovation in English language teaching in Turkish primary education. *Teaching and Teacher Education 24*, An *International Journal of Researches and Studies*, 1859-1875. Elsevier Science.

Küçüközer, H., Bostan, A., Kenar, Z., Seçer, S., & Yavuz, S. (2008). Evaluation of six grade science textbooks according to constructivist learning theory. *Elementary Education Online, 7(1),* 111-126.

Mayer, R. E. (2009). Constructivism as a Theory of Learning versus Constructivism as a Prescription for Instruction, Ed. S. Tobias, & T. M. Duffy. *Constructivist instruction: success or failure?,* 184-200. New York: Taylor & Francis.

Murphy, E. (1997). *Constructivism: From philosophy to practice*. Eric Digest, (ED444966). Record details, http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebportal/

Ministry of Education (MEB) (2006). *English Language Curriculum for Primary Education (Grades 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8).* Ankara: Devlet Kitapları Müdürlüğü Basımevi.

Nuthall, G. (2002). Social constructivist teaching and the shaping of students' knowledge and thinking. *In J. X Social Constructivist Teaching*, 43-79, Elsevier Science.

Oldfather, P., West, J., & White, J. (1999). *Learning Through Children's Eyes: Social Constructivism and the Desire to Learn.* Washington, DC: Routledge.

Phillips, D. C., & Soltis, J. F. (1998). *Perspectives on learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Reinfried, M. (2000). *Can radical constructivism achieve a viable basis for foreign language teaching?* Available at: http://webdoc.gwdg.de/edoc/ia/eese/artic20/marcus/8_2000.html Retrieved 19 November, 2009.

Rockmore, T. (2005). *On constructivist epistemology*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

Sarıkaya, M., Güven, E., Göksu, V., & Aka, E. İ. (2010). The impact of constructivist approach on students' academic achievement and retention of knowledge. *Elementary Education Online, 9* (*1*), 413-423. http://ilköğgretim-online.org.tr

Savin-Baden, M., & Wilkie, K. (2006). *Problem-based learning online*. New York: Open University Press.

Schcolnik, M., Kol, S., & Abarbanel, J. (2006). Constructivism in Theory and in Practice. *English Teaching Forum, 44 (4),* 12-21. Washington.

Schwartz , Daniel L . Robb L., & Lewis, S. (2009). Constructivism in an Age of Non-Constructivist Assessments. Ed. S. Tobias, & T. M. Duffy. *Constructivist instruction: success or failure?*, 3-11. New York: Taylor & Francis.

Sert, N. (2008). Constructivism in the elementary school curricula. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education, 4(2),* 291-316. Çanakkale: Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University.

Smith, J. (2001). Modelling the social construction of knowledge in ELT teacher education. *ELT Journal, 55* (*3*), 221-227; doi:10.1093/elt/55.3.221. Oxford.

Sotillo, Susana M. (2002). Constructivist and collaborative learning in a wireless environment. *Teachers of English to Speakers to other Languages Journal, 11*(*3*), 16-20. Virginia, Alexandria.

Tan, O. S. (2003). *Problem-based learning innovation: Using problems to power learning in the 21st century*. Singapore: Cengage Learning.

Tobias, S., & Duffy, T. M. (2009). The Success or Failure of Constructivist Instruction: An Introduction. Ed. S. Tobias, & T. M. Duffy. *Constructivist instruction: success or failure?*, 3-13. New York: Taylor & Francis.

Weasenforth, D. (2002). Realizing constructivist objectives through collaborative technologies: Threaded discussions. *Language Learning and Technology*, 6 (*3*), 58-86.

White, H. B. (2001). Getting started in problem-based learning. Ed. B. J. Duch, S. E. Groh, & D. E. Allen. *The power of problem-based learning,* 69-78. Sterling, Virginia: Stylus Publishing.

Wilson, K. (2003). A social constructivist approach to teaching reading: turning the rhetoric into reality. *16th Educational Conference*. Melbourne.

Windschitl, M. (2002). Framing constructivism in practice as the negotiation of dilemmas: An analysis of the conceptual, pedagogical, cultural, and political challenges facing teachers. *Review of Educational Research, 72 (2),* 131-175.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

The Survey

Teacher Views on the Practice of Constructivism in Turkish Primary EFL Classes

Dear colleagues,

This survey has been structured to research teacher views on the implementation of constructivist approach in EFL classes in Turkish primary schools and course books provided by the Ministry

of Education. Please note that the data collected will be used as the main data collection tool of an article on constructivism, and the contents of this form are absolutely confidential. *Any information identifying the respondent will not be disclosed under any circumstances.* There are 26 items in this survey. Please follow the instructions to complete it. Thanks in advance for your help and frank answers.

Section I: Personal Information

Name and Surname (Optional): .....

Teaching Experience (years): ( ) Less than 2 ( ) 3-10 ( ) 11-20 ( ) 21 or more	Gender: ( ) Male ( ) Female
I hold a... ( ) BA degree ( ) MA degree ( ) Ph.D. degree	
I am a graduate of... ( ) an ELT department ( ) a non-ELT department	

Section II:

This section focuses on actual classroom practices. Choose the option that suits you best.

Always : 5 Frequently : 4 Sometimes : 3 Rarely : 2 Never : 1	Always	Frequently	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
1. In my classes, the learners take part in the process of lesson planning.	5 ( )	4 ( )	3 ( )	2 ( )	1 ( )
2. I encourage my students to work or do research autonomously.	5 ( )	4 ( )	3 ( )	2 ( )	1 ( )
3. I use some problem-solving activities in my lessons.	5 ( )	4 ( )	3 ( )	2 ( )	1 ( )
4. I encourage my students to ask questions.	5 ( )	4 ( )	3 ( )	2 ( )	1 ( )
5. My students provide feedback to each other.	5 ( )	4 ( )	3 ( )	2 ( )	1 ( )
6. I encourage flexibility in terms of correctness.	5 ( )	4 ( )	3 ( )	2 ( )	1 ( )
7. I let my students reflect on our activities or materials.	5 ( )	4 ( )	3 ( )	2 ( )	1 ( )
8. My students make peer assessment.	5 ( )	4 ( )	3 ( )	2 ( )	1 ( )
9. My students make self-assessment.	5 ( )	4 ( )	3 ( )	2 ( )	1 ( )
10. I assess student learning in the context of daily teaching.	5 ( )	4 ( )	3 ( )	2 ( )	1 ( )

Section III:

In this section, we mostly deal with in-class challenges regarding constructivist pedagogy. For each item choose the option that suits your situation best.

Strongly Agree : 5 Agree : 4 No Idea : 3 Disagree : 2 Strongly Disagree : 1	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Idea	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
11. I enjoy teaching in a constructivist language class.	5 ( )	4 ( )	3 ( )	2 ( )	1 ( )
12. It takes more time for the students to learn in a constructivist class.	5 ( )	4 ( )	3 ( )	2 ( )	1 ( )
13. Available class time is not enough to follow a constructivist approach.	5 ( )	4 ( )	3 ( )	2 ( )	1 ( )
14. The responsibility of the teacher becomes heavier in a constructivist class.	5 ( )	4 ( )	3 ( )	2 ( )	1 ( )
15. In a constructivist class, learning appears "*less efficient*" than in a traditional one.	5 ( )	4 ( )	3 ( )	2 ( )	1 ( )
16. I have difficulties in putting constructivist principles into practice in my classes.	5 ( )	4 ( )	3 ( )	2 ( )	1 ( )
17. There is a gap between constructivist theory and current practice in the classrooms.	5 ( )	4 ( )	3 ( )	2 ( )	1 ( )

Section IV: The Course Book

Choose one of the course books below to evaluate it in the in the section below.

□ Time for English (Grade 4)
□ Time for English (Grade 5)
□ Spot on (Grade 6)
□ Spot on (Grade 7)
□ Spot on (Grade 8)
□ Other (Please specify: .....)

In this section you are asked to evaluate the course book you have chosen in the previous section from a constructivist viewpoint.

Strongly Agree : 5 Agree : 4 Undecided : 3 Disagree : 2 Strongly Disagree : 1	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Idea	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
18. I think the constructivist activities in the book are enjoyable for my students.	5 ( )	4 ( )	3 ( )	2 ( )	1 ( )
19. The activities in the book allow the learners to take decisions.	5 ( )	4 ( )	3 ( )	2 ( )	1 ( )
20. The activities in the course book are problem-centred.	5 ( )	4 ( )	3 ( )	2 ( )	1 ( )
21. The course book includes activities or questions that make learners think.	5 ( )	4 ( )	3 ( )	2 ( )	1 ( )

22. The course book encourages learners to do research on their own.	5 ( )	4 ( )	3 ( )	2 ( )	1 ( )
23. I think the workbook follows a constructivist approach.	5 ( )	4 ( )	3 ( )	2 ( )	1 ( )
24. The teacher's book guides the teacher well to follow a constructivist approach.	5 ( )	4 ( )	3 ( )	2 ( )	1 ( )
25. The course book is compatible with the syllabus provided by the Ministry of Education.	5 ( )	4 ( )	3 ( )	2 ( )	1 ( )
26. The course book complies with constructivist principles in general.	5 ( )	4 ( )	3 ( )	2 ( )	1 ( )

THANKS FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION

Note: Contact name and e-mail address are given below in case you need. Please feel free to get in touch to get a summary of the findings if you are interested.
E-mail Address: *arifbakla@yahoo.com*
Your E-mail Address: .....

Appendix B

Detailed Statistics about the Course Books for Each Grade

Table 6. Statistics per book (Items 18-26)

	Time for English (Grade 4)					
	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Idea	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Missing
Item-18	3	3	2	1	0	0
Item-19	0	6	1	2	0	0
Item-20	1	2	3	3	0	0
Item-21	3	5	0	1	0	0
Item-22	0	4	3	2	0	0
Item-24	0	4	2	2	1	0
Item-25	1	6	1	1	0	0
Item-26	0	4	3	2	0	0

	Time for English (Grade 5)					
	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Idea	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Missing
Item-18	0	4	0	8	2	0
Item-19	0	4	1	9	0	0
Item-20	0	7	2	4	1	0
Item-21	0	6	1	6	1	0
Item-22	0	2	2	8	1	0
Item-24	0	5	5	1	3	0
Item-25	0	5	3	4	2	0
Item-26	1	3	3	6	1	0

	Spot on (Grade 6)					
	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Idea	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Missing
Item-18	1	6	1	1	1	0
Item-19	0	5	3	2	0	0
Item-20	0	6	2	0	1	0

Item-21	3	6	0	1	0	0
Item-22	2	3	1	4	0	0
Item-24	2	5	0	2	1	0
Item-25	1	4	0	3	1	0
Item-26	0	6	1	2	1	0

	Spot on (Grade 7)					
	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Idea	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Missing
Item-18	3	5	0	2	1	0
Item-19	2	3	2	3	1	0
Item-20	1	6	3	0	1	0
Item-21	1	5	1	3	1	0
Item-22	1	3	3	3	1	0
Item-24	4	4	0	1	2	0
Item-25	1	5	4	0	1	0
Item-26	0	6	2	2	1	0

	Spot on (Grade 8)					
	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Idea	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Missing
Item-18	1	6	1	9	1	0
Item-19	1	8	3	6	0	0
Item-20	0	11	3	3	0	0
Item-21	5	7	4	2	0	0
Item-22	1	5	3	8	1	0
Item-24	3	7	6	2	0	0
Item-25	3	7	2	4	2	0
Item-26	0	9	4	4	1	0