The evaluation of the 7th grade English curriculum according to the Eisner's educational connoisseurship and criticism model[1]

Esen Çetin, *Adnan Menderes University,* Turkey, *ctnesen1985@gmail.com* ORCID: 0000-0002-9759-2342
Kerim Gündoğdu, *Adnan Menderes University,* Turkey, *gundogduk@gmail.com* ORCID: 0000-0003-4809-3405

Abstract. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the 7th grade English curriculum developed in 2013 and revised in 2018 by considering the similarities and differences of the elements of a curriculum with the Eisner's Educational Connoisseurship and Criticism Model, Within the scope of the research, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 8 teachers delivering 7th grade English lessons; 27 students, 19 parents and 3 school principals from three schools selected by considering different socio-economic level variation in Aydın city center. Besides, semi-structured observation form was developed to observe the curriculum implementation process of the English lesson. In addition to interview and observation data, document analysis was also applied. Document-based data were collected through the 2013 and updated 2018 English curriculum (primary and secondary school grades 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8) and both booklets curricula. Data were analyzed by descriptive analysis. As a result, the English teachers stated that the revision towards the whole curriculum was positive but it was very limited. Accordingly, it considers the reduction of learning outcomes in the renewed curriculum to be positive. Although teachers expect some additional arrangements to be made in some elements of the renewed curriculum, they find the curriculum generally well-structured and feasible. In line with the data obtained from parents and students, it was emphasized that the chance to use English effectively in real environment was given to students and teachers. In addition, the fact that effective use of language is challenging in terms of four language skills is observed from the practices.

Keywords: English curriculum, educational criticism model, curriculum evaluation, English teaching

INTRODUCTION

The need for a foreign language has increased with the intensive international interaction and globalization as a result of economic and technical developments arising from the industrialization of Europe (Elaldi and Gömleksiz, 2011). Knowledge of a foreign language is accepted as a necessity in a multilingual and multicultural world due to the development of international relations, increasing trade volume, and the development of information and communication technologies in the increasingly shrinking world (Doğan, 2008; Ekuş and Babayiğit, 2013; Erişkon, 2004).

With the Council of Europe announcing the year 2001 as the European Year of Languages, the development of awareness of language and multilingualism in particular has become one of the key learning outcomes in the field of education and culture. It is thought that member countries will become more conscious of becoming members of communities by protecting their own languages. Also, the cultural heritage will be shared and disseminated with other countries. In this way, it is thought that learning more than one language will increase tolerance among people living in different languages and cultures and also will enable people to understand each other better. Thus, it is expected that communication and interaction will be strengthened and these goals can provide a different perspective to foreign language education and training (Demirel, 2005; Güler, 2005; Hanbay, 2015; İşisağ and Demirel, 2010; Sığırcı, 2015).

With all these developments, the disappearance of the boundaries between different cultures change the social interaction of the people and especially technology facilitates the acceleration of this change. Day by day, the interdependence of individuals has created a common symbolic code. As Kumaravadivelu (2006, cited by Oberheu 2010) points to this code, people from different countries have entered into intense communication globally with each other through internet technologies, one of the dizzying developments witnessed by human beings, and the name of this language is generally English. English is the most widely taught foreign language in education at EU level. On average, one in three children learn English today. English and German and French follow respectively. At secondary level, English, French, German, Russian and Spanish make up 95% of language teaching in many countries (Eurydice, 2008: 11; cited by Üner, 2010). At this point, English is accepted as the common language (lingua franca) in international communication, science, technology and business world (Block & Cameron, 2002; Crystal, 1996; Doğançay-Aktuna, 1998; İyitoğlu & Alcı, 2015; Kaypak & Ortaçtepe, 2014; Krashen, 1982; Nikolov & Djigunović, 2006; Nunan, 2003; Sung, 2014; Tinsley & Comfort, 2012). Therefore, Turkey has increased emphasis on foreign languages and has made foreign language education compulsory in almost all stages of schooling (Gömleksiz & Özkaya, 2012; Karcı & Gundogdu, 2018). However, it is clear that learning and teaching foreign languages is not easy at all. This research carried out in the direction of the impairment is discussed in Turkey's success in foreign language teaching. The reasons for the low success in teaching English in the literature are the lack of equipment use of technology and motivation; lack of environment to speak English, low interest of teachers and students; high class availability; factors such as educational policies and the relationship between mother tongue and foreign language can be shown (Haznedar, 2010). Differences between theory and practice in foreign language education are also important factors that prevent success in English classrooms. In this respect, it is clear that when developing foreign language education curriculum, it is necessary to act with a curriculum approach based on the proximity to life principle. This situation can contribute positively to the effective use and development of foreign language teaching technology and in this way a more efficient and functional foreign language teaching can be realized (Yaşar, 1990: 94-95).

Although the factors arising from the individual, process or environment prevent the achievement of the desired success in foreign language teaching; the use of foreign language in daily life should be based on a more functional curriculum. In this respect, it is expected that the existing curriculum should be developed in accordance with the requirements of the age. Thus, the results obtained will be evaluated and shed light on the next curriculum studies. As in all other subjects, success in foreign language teaching can only be understood after an effective, scientific and systematic assessment. The elements of a curriculum should be evaluated and assessed on a continuously, depending on the results of the curriculum. Curricula are developed, implemented and re-evaluated in order to obtain more effective and efficient results within the framework of the results to be obtained from such evaluations (Ertürk, 2013; Varış, 1988). Through this process, the continuity of the curriculum, changes and corrections to be made or the termination of the curriculum is decided. In this respect, curriculum evaluation studies emerge as a very important data source for evaluating the efficiency of updated curricula.

It is crucial to determine the requests, expectations and problems related to the curriculum during the evaluation in terms of the total value it adds to the curriculum. Therefore, in this research, two different English curricula developed and organized for different reasons in the recent years have been evaluated from the perspective of student-teacher interaction within the framework of Eisner's Educational Connoisseurship and Criticism Model (Nordin & Whalström, 2019). Eisner (1985), whose special field of study is art education and curriculum, has looked at education in an artistic context. The curriculum evaluator is similar to an art expert/critic and the curriculum evaluation process is similar to an artistic critic (Erden, 1998). With this in mind, the educational value of the curriculum was tried to be revealed through the Eisner's Model. The renewed curricula allow students to cooperate with teachers in the selection of content and topics during the preparation of the curricula, taking their individual characteristics into account. Parents and school heads, which are other parts of this system, are

as important and valuable as teachers and students in evaluating the curriculum. Teaching is an art work and teaching has different senses that it can think of as art. Because teachers make decisions based on the abilities that emerge during the process, such as the same painters, composers, actresses and dancers. Teachers' activities are not limited to some patterns and routines, but rather to abilities and unexpected (unpredictable) creativity. Achievements are created in the process. Teaching is a human process. In this process, the teacher interacts with the student (Eisner, 1985). According to Eisner, the main difference between expertise and criticism is that expertise is the art of comprehension and criticism is the art of explanation. Specialization is a privileged skill. It consists of the skills to determine and comprehend the characteristics of a particular phenomenon. It is important in understanding the essence of the subject it brings criticism.

Eisner defines evaluation as a process with a wide range of functions, and evaluates evaluation in four different dimensions. The first dimension, 'description', is basically an effort to reveal, portray and identify the characteristics of educational experiences. Although there is no sharp distinction between the first dimension and the second dimension, 'interpretation', there is a difference in emphasis and focus. In the third dimension, 'evaluation', it is important to evaluate the educational process as it exists. In the fourth and final dimension, 'theming', the themes of the data obtained from criticism (research) are presented as a summary. The task of the educational critic is to define recurring messages and create themes. These themes emerge by filtering the situations encountered (Karakuş-Özdemirci, Aksoy & Ok, 2019; Kumral, 2010; Kumral and Saracaloğlu, 2011; Sıcak & Arsal, 2013).

English language teaching has a long tradition in Turkey and the importance of this language has increased much more than the others. However, it is a question that a country with such a long history in foreign language education cannot reach the level it deserves in language education. Since the 1997-1998 academic year, foreign language courses have been made compulsory from the fourth grade of primary schools. With the change made in 2012 with the 12-year compulsory education system (4+4+4) introduced in 2012, the English curriculum was updated in 2013 and became compulsory in schools starting from the second-grade level. Lastly, the draft curriculum was presented to teachers and parents in 2017, starting from 2018-2019 education year, it was added to the weekly course schedules for four hours. Two major changes were made to the 2018 English curriculum and three sub-titles were updated in each of the two main categories (MoNE [MEB], 2018). What distinguishes the 2018 curriculum from the previous curriculum is the expansion of certain sub-categories, such as review of the curriculum in terms of values education, testing, evaluation, and recommendation. Research on the effectiveness of this curriculum has not yet been conducted. In this respect, it is thought that new curricula need to be evaluated from different perspectives with a holistic and critical eye.

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the 7th grade English curriculum developed in 2013 and revised in 2018 by considering the similarities and differences of the elements of a curriculum with the Educational Connoisseurship and Criticism Model.

METHOD

In this qualitative in-depth multiple case study (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2016), three public school from three different socio-economic levels (SEL) was selected. These schools were named lower, middle and upper levels and determined according to the data based on educational statistics of Efeler district in Aydın province. In all three schools, interview data were collected by focusing on similar dimensions as much as possible. Lower and upper schools were chosen for the observation sessions only.

Participants

The main feature of the curriculum evaluation model is to apply to the diversity of expert participants and to evaluate the curriculum from different stakeholders' perspectives. Therefore, the study group was determined according to the 'maximum variation sampling' technique. Eight teachers, 27 students, 19 parents and three school principals which were from

three different schools in Aydın were participated to the study. In this respect, the opinions of the voluntary English teachers were considered as the expert criticizers, as well as other stakeholders. Although expertise is of primary importance in this research, it is also important to utilize different data sources and techniques in scientific research in order to reveal the objectivity.

Data Collection

To ensure validity and reliability in the data collection phase and to provide a richer data collection, 'triangulation' has been utilized (Yıldırım&Şimşek, 2016). The main data of the study were collected by the researchers in parallel format semi-structured interview forms for teachers, students, parents and school principals. For the interviews, a total of four parallel format separate forms, which consisted entirely of open-ended questions, were developed for the participants. A total of 4 hours and 24 minutes of audio was recorded for the interviews,

According to Eisner (1998), the educational critic should not only depend on the data obtained from the interviews, but also ongoing process should be observed and the resulting comments should be included to construct the themes. In this respect, in-class processes were observed in terms of teachers' and students' reflections about the lesson in addition to class environment, experiences and interpretations. Two teachers from two classes representing upper and lower SEL school were determined voluntarily with the official permission of the school principals. In the middle SEL school it is not allowed to do the class observation of a teacher. Therefore, the observations are limited two SEL classrooms only. The observations were conducted in appropriate hours for a total of 20 hours two schools. Since the administrators and teachers did not allow the use of video and audio-recording devices for classroom observations, semi-structured observation form was used to collect the data manually. In addition to interview and observation data, in order to check compliance and non-compliance document analysis was conducted to compare the current 2018 English curriculum (primary and secondary school grades 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8) and former (2013) curriculum. They were descriptively analyzed and used to explain differences.

Data Analysis

Descriptive analysis was conducted in this study. Descriptive analysis is a type of analysis in which the sub-learning outcomes of the research are predetermined or by taking the questions or dimensions into consideration used in the interview and observation processes (Hatch, 2002; Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2016). In addition to nature of two curriculum overall, the basic elements of a curriculum (objectives, content, implementation, and evaluation) were taken into consideration during the analysis. The problems faced by the teachers during the implementation of the curriculum and suggestions for the effective implementation of the curriculum were also considered as the themes of the study.

Related interviews were given together with key excerpts obtained from students, school principals and parent. For teachers, 'PT' was used to symbolize 'participant teacher', and 'L-PT1' (teacher from lower level school 1) according to the Socio-Economic Level (SEL) of the schools they work in. It was expressed as M-PT1 (teacher from middle level school) and U-PT1 (teachers from upper level school 1). For students, 'S' was used to symbolize the expression 'student', and according to the SELs of the schools they were attending; 'SL1' (students from lower level school 1), 'SM1' (students from middle level school 1) and 'SU1' (students from the upper secondary school 1). 'P' was used to symbolize 'parent' for parents, and 'LP1' (parents from lower level school), MP1 (parents from middle level school 1) and 'UP1' (parent from upper level school 1) according to the SELs of the schools they are attending. For school principals, the term 'PP' was used to symbolize participatory principal, and LPP (principal from lower level school), MPP (principal from middle school 1) and UPP (principal from upper school).

RESULTS

In the analysis of the data, it was tried to collect data depending mainly on the elements of a curriculum under four consecutive stages of the curriculum evaluation model followed. These findings have been presented with these stages. While revealing the findings in this part of the study, it was tried to give direct quotations from the participants' views or observations that best explain or contradict the situation in a holistic and enriched way. As a result of the analysis, different codes, categories and themes were obtained from the interviews with different groups.

Description Stage

In the descriptive stage, which is the first of the dimension, it was tried to describe the former and updated 7th grade English curriculum through the expert and participant opinions in relation to different categories.

Functionality of the Language

The most important emphasis made by teachers in line with the data obtained for the need for curriculum revision is 'functionality of language'. It can be said that the effective use of communicative skills in line with the data obtained from teachers, students, school principals and parents regarding the functionality of the curriculum depends on the effective implementation of the language. All stakeholders agree on this matter. According to the teachers, the way to use the foreign language effectively is to adapt the daily spoken language to real life. They expressed their hopes that the updated curriculum basically aimed at this. It has been shared that success will be possible with a curriculum that will help students realize the information given in theory. Simplification of the learning outcomes was also welcomed. The views of teachers from two different school levels are as follows:

> L-PT2: This is a general problem in Turkey. English cannot be taught to students even after years. Especially students have problems of speaking English. They can't express themselves. Unfortunately, the information remains at the grammar level. In exams we still have to ask "am, is, are, do, does and fill in the blanks activities" Maybe you can develop a system based on more understanding.

> U-PT2: Our students are inefficient in working day by day. The ministry has found these learning outcomes more for students than I think. I think that if they reduce the learning outcomes, they can be achieved. So they might have reduced the learning outcomes in order to achieve the goal.

School principals did not attend the introductory seminar about the renewed curriculum at the beginning of the semester. English teachers were aware of this situation. Principals working in middle and upper SEL schools stated that their schools attach special importance to the English curriculum as they are the pilot school[1] of 5th grade English lessons. They stated that they had a close dialogue with their English teachers. The views of the principal from three different school levels are as follows:

> LPP: I just have no idea about English curriculum. In general, I know that all curriculum have been changed. All of our teachers participated in the new curriculum introduction seminars in all branches at the beginning of the semester. But I didn't receive any in-service training.

> MPP: Yes, I have knowledge, but the information I received was not through a channel such as in-service training that was officially given to me.

> UPP: I have some information. However, I did not receive in-service training. I got the conversations I had with my English teacher friends and the feedback from the conversations I had with them. Since our school is a pilot school, I also attached importance to English.

---

[1] Foreign language based education was launched in the 5th grade of some secondary schools, not in all secondary schools throughout Turkey for the 2017-2018 academic year.

According to parents, the aim of learning a foreign language is to speak this language effectively and fluently in daily life. They expressed that students who know and use the foreign language well will be successful in university and business life. The majority of the parents stated that their children could not find the necessary and sufficient environment to use English effectively and efficiently in daily life. They stated that they mostly use English while watching or listening to foreign songs, movies, videos. The views of parents from three different school levels are as follows:

L-P1: Not much. Because there's no place for us to go. My son cannot use this language.

M-P4: It helps him to speak English well, and it will help him get a job.

U-P10: This course aims to teach students English effectively and enable them to speak this language effectively and fluently in daily life.

The students stated that the main purpose of learning English was to improve their language skills by speaking this language effectively. They emphasized that they want to have the ability to understand and speak English comfortably in any environment where they have the opportunity to use a foreign language (abroad, etc.). They think that there will be opportunities to use English effectively in educational and business environments that shape their future. However, most of the students stated that there is a limited environment that they can use English in their daily life. The views of students from three different school levels are as follows:

L-S8: To facilitate communication with foreign people by speaking English.

M-S5: I never talked to strangers. I don't use it anywhere else outside of school anyway.

U-S1: In the future, foreign language will be of great importance, especially in occupations. And since English is the universal language, everyone will need to know it in the near future.

U-S2: I moved to Aydın from Alanya. I spoke to foreigners many times because the number of tourists in Alanya is very high. For example, I gave information about our school to the tourists who came to school when I was in 3rd grade.

Learning Outcomes

The most important difference put forward by the teachers in the new curriculum is that the number of learning outcomes in the new curriculum is reduced compared to the previous curriculum. After a careful analysis of the former and updated English curricula in this study, it was noted that some learning outcomes (objectives) in the 'Appearance and Personality' unit have been extracted. In the 'Sports' unit 'making simple inquiries', 'describing the frequency of actions', describing what people do regularly, talking about past events (telling people what we know). 'Giving explanations/reasons in the 'Biographies' unit was removed from the unit. 'The Giving explanations/reasons in the Television' unit have been removed from the 'Making simple inquiries' unit. 'Giving and responding to simple instructions' in the 'Parties unit' have been removed from the unit; 'Arrangements, 'Making arrangements' and 'sequencing actions' has been added to the unit. 'Making simple inquiries', 'Making simple suggestions', and 'Talking about possessions' in the 'Superstitions' unit were removed from the unit. 'Describing what people do regularly', 'Making simple suggestions', 'Talking about plans', 'Talking about past events' removed from the Public Buildings unit. 'Telling and responding to simple instructions' and 'Telling someone what to do' in the Environment unit have been removed. Finally, 'Making simple inquiries' was added to the Planets unit.

According to the teachers, the locations and names of some units have changed in the curriculum where the learning outcomes are simplified. Furthermore, the activities proposed in the renewed curriculum are not much different from the activities in the old curriculum. Besides, the activities proposed in both curricula consist of 'true-false' questions, 'fill in the blank' activities and reading activities. The views of teachers from three different school levels are as follows:

L-PT1: 'Making simple inquires' is removed from Unit 1. The order of Units 2 and 3 have been changed. The topics are progressed according to learning difficulties. The learning outcome numbers are slightly lighter. 'Suggestion' has been removed in the 4th unit. 'Giving explanations' and 'making simple inquires' outcomes have been removed from 5th unit. In the 6th unit, two new learning outcomes called 'making arrangements' and 'sequencing' have been added. Explanation and reason' learning outcomes also have been reduced in unit 8. 9th and 10th units' learning outcomes are almost same.

M-PT1: Looks more logical. Learning outcomes are reduced. The level is low. I think it would be useful. The content for the students also seems a little more simplified.

U-PT1: It is good to reduce the learning outcomes. The aim is to save students from this intensive curriculum by reducing the number of learning outcomes.

Daily speaking skills based on student needs are one of the most emphasized sub-themes. According to the teachers, English patterns used in daily life should be emphasized in the curriculum. In addition, it is indicated that English curriculum prepared with communication skills and language skills that require learning a foreign language and using it effectively in real life situations should be given more space. The views of teachers from three different school levels are as follows:

L-PT1: I don't think they can understand and use daily life skills. I think it changes from time to time. The goal here is to use it to communicate in real life. As the number of units was reduced, books were switched to listening, reading, writing and speaking activities to use the language in real life. This was more beneficial for our students.

M-PT1: All the learning outcomes we have made on the book without using them are empty. Yes, they overlap, but because they don't use the language, they don't know where to use it. For example, in the building public buildings unit students were able to make meaningful sentences about this. They took a self-timer with them. They met with the mayors of the Aydın. They prepared performance assignments, and when they did it, they sat more comfortably when they took it out and used it. But how much do they use? Of course it is discussed.

U-PT2: It overlaps on some subjects, though not much. More patterns can be used in daily life. The place has directions but there are no idioms to express themselves about emotions. The current goal is to give things they can use in everyday life, but we cannot use idioms, for example. No abbreviations. That's why they find it hard to use in everyday life.

Content

As it can be seen from Table 1, the number of units of the 7th grade English curriculum in both 2013 and 2018 curricula consist of 10 similar units. Biographies and Sports units in both curricula have been relocated. The name of the 6th unit in the 2013 curriculum was changed from the 'Parties' to the 'Celebrations' unit in the 2018 curriculum. 'Superstitions' unit was changed to' Dreams' unit.

Table 1. *Comparison of 2013 and 2018 English curriculum in terms of units*

2013 curriculum	2018 curriculum
1. Appearance and Personality	1. Appearance and Personality
2. Biographies	**2. Sports**
3. Sports	**3. Biographies**
4. Wild Animals	4. Wild Animals
5. Television	5. Television
6. Parties	**6. Celebrations**
7. Superstitions	**7. Dreams**
8. Public Buildings	8. Public Buildings
9. Environment	9. Environment
10. Planets	10. Planets

Some of the themes/topics mentioned in the curriculum are selected from daily life and simple topics (Wild Animals, Sports, Sports, Planets, etc.) that students can easily understand and comment on, and some of them are current but require general culture (Environment). In the 2013 curriculum, the recommended assessment types for all language skills are the same. In the 2018 curriculum, it was understood the necessity of using different assessment methods for all language skills and different assessment techniques were proposed for reading, writing, speaking and listening skills which are four basic language skills. In summary, it is observed that the updated curriculum is a more student-centered, activity-based and more functional one that is suitable for a constructivist approach to develop all four skills in cases where the readiness of the students is not high and is not compulsory to do the assessment. The 2018 curriculum more emphasizes on values education. Teachers are expected to adopt and blend these values, which are universal and national, to the themes and themes in the curriculum. How to use these values in the curriculum is not clear and completely left to the teacher. In the new curriculum, 'Function and Skills' were separated and changed to 'Functions&Useful Language'. 'Language Skills and Learning Outcomes' took part in the curriculum as a separate section. The Lexis teaching in the 2013 curriculum was transferred to the 'Function and Skills' section. The curriculum 'Suggested Text and Activity' section of the former curriculum was updated and named as 'Suggested Contexts, Tasks and Assignments'. The reflections of the development of technology on education are inevitable. In this context, blogs and weblogs (internet blogs) which will improve students' language skills have been added to the context section of the renewed curriculum. The locations and names of some units have been changed in the renewed curriculum. According to the teachers, the content or topics in the English textbook are appropriate for the student level in both the previous and current curriculum. Examples of case studies and individuals suitable for daily life make it easier to achieve learning outcomes. In addition, the content of the renewed curriculum includes current topics. The views of teachers from three different school levels are as follows:

> L-PT1: From time to time, people and events from the curriculum they watch in their daily lives are included in the content. They are more interested if a favorite TV show or a favorite football player or singer is present.

> M-PT2: When content is close to daily life, it is easier to teach when it is related to what they have already learned. It must draw attention! Because this age group is so messy. Their use of devices such as phones and tablets has reduced the level of attention of these children. There is a lot of compatibility with student level compared to the past, but this time students are not suitable. They love the lesson, but we have to keep their attention alive. This is exhausting us.

> U-PT2 Dialogue studies have been reduced. I am doing a lot of memorization and animation. It will surely remain in their memories. Mold sentences remain in mind. The content is kept up to date (footballers, etc.). It attracts children's attention.

Ideal English learning environment

Teachers' dreams are to create environments where they can use English more effectively to learn effective foreign languages. In line with the possibilities, they think that they will achieve more success by providing overseas experience and seminar studies on how to speak foreign language effectively. In the absence of such an environment, it was reported that it would be beneficial to regularly listen to foreign music, watch cartoons, series films or animations and expose them to language in the classrooms established as a language laboratory. In addition, it may be a solution for students to communicate with foreign students through foreign technology. They think that such an environment will be possible with the lack of class sizes, the creation of level classes, the activation of learning, the increase of class hours, and the continuation of activities in a classroom in which students can move freely. The views of teachers from three different school levels are as follows:

> L-PT2: I would like a classroom with plenty of materials, a language laboratory, where students can freely enjoy all kinds of visuals freely. I would love to get cartoon or curriculum

that is appropriate English speaking their peers. I used to decorate my class with flashcards (colorful, illustrated word cards). I would provide it with a variable wall. After 2 or 3 weeks that wall will change. Let the students know that they will change. I always want them to listen to English songs in the classroom. It is very important for speech. Let the songs play.

M-PT3: I would like to have a seminar with English teachers and students or seminars with students abroad in countries where English is dominant. The fact that the language can be taught is really possible by learning that language. Our teachers lack much in this regard. I think abroad is a must for an English teacher. Most importantly, I would like them to have conversations with people who speak one-to-one, even if they can't go and bring native speakers (native English speakers) to make it more permanent for him or the children.

U-PT3: It would be really nice to have a language laboratory. Conversations with foreigners via Skype contribute to language development. I would prefer to lecture in a classroom where video series activities can be done easily and there are plenty of activities.

The majority of students want English lessons to be more fun. Supported by visual and audio materials, games, stories, picture books, picture worksheets, movies and activities are full of speech; they want an ideal English learning environment in which the number of units is reduced, the content is enriched, and the hours are increased. In addition, as teachers say, students want to be in an environment where they can speak English. The views of students from three different school levels are as follows:

U- S9: I wish I could speak English more easily. Because I'm having a hard time. I'd like places for us to speak English. It would be nice if we could go abroad.

M-S1: If I had the chance to practice this curriculum, I would have forbidden to speak Turkish and I would have had plenty of listening and reading activities in English. I would focus on vocabulary teaching, and I would have all the questions answered in turn. So everyone would have attended the class at the same rate.

U-S8: I would like to go to foreign countries. I wonder how they talk there. I'm afraid I can't talk when I see a foreigner.

Interpretation Stage

The interpretation is the second stage of the Eisner's Model and provides clarity as to why and how the educational process proceeds. In this section, it is provided to reveal the reasons of the situation put forward in the description stage and to explain them. In this section, the experiences of the participants have been tried to be utilized and quotations are given in order to understand them better.

Instructional materials

In the light of the questions directed to teachers about resource use, the categories of the functionality of textbooks, curriculum-material harmony, lack of visual and auditory materials emerged under the sub-theme "Teaching Materials". According to teachers, textbooks written by Turkish Teachers are used as the main resource in the classroom and it is not possible to use any supplementary books. Textbooks and student books are not geared towards reading, writing, listening and speaking activities with real language skills. According to teachers, textbooks should be supported with richer materials. A more critical attitude towards teaching materials is generally observed. The views of teachers from three different school levels are as follows:

L-PT1: In addition to our books, we do not receive any material or materials. If we look at foreign publications, the teacher sends workbooks. This includes writings, quizzes, additional games, and flashcards. We cannot enforce source books.

M-PT2: Books are not rich. Our books during our student years were much more beautiful. It was rich in content, now there are many repetitive exercises in these books. The questions in the book and the questions in the 'workbook' are the same. We do question and answer,

we fill in the blanks. We do speaking activities. Sometimes for 'speaking' events, I put topics into these surprise eggs. We try to get out of there and talk, but the resources are insufficient.

U-PT3: It does not offer a great source in our own school book. Source books are forbidden, I cannot recommend any source book. If we support the book, we still get the test book, we study test much. It is not real learning outcome.

Teachers see smart boards as the secondary resource they use most as a tool. Through the activities on the EBA (Education-Information Network supported by the the Ministry of National Education) via smart board, textbooks are supported and the interest of the students is kept alive. They watched videos from smart board and stated that they could reach all kinds of activities such as story reading, listening and playing games at any time thanks to the internet. The opinions of teachers from three different school levels are as follows:

L-PT2: Thanks to the FATIH project, we have smart boards in all our classes. So English is a great material. It is possible to reach a wide range of different materials.

M-PT1: We have resources. For now, our biggest assistant is smart boards. We don't have a language lab. It would be better for us to listen to the texts with the help of headphones. Children find books very boring. There is no explanatory side. It's not understandable.

U-PT2: We use EBA. We have a smart board. This year the EBA signed a protocol with a good foreign language institution. It includes visuals, videos and games that interest children. I also benefit it from time to time.

Teachers also want reading corners, posters, paintings, and flashcards and role cards to improve their foreign language skills and to keep them in their hands for every achievement. They emphasized that the visuals should be provided regularly with the panels that can be constantly worn and updated. In addition, teachers agreed that the classes supported by visual and auditory materials would increase the use of foreign languages stated that they were constantly in search of materials and activities in order to diversify the course. It can be said that supplementary resources such as flashcards, real objects, pictures and posters are constantly being prepared and met by the teachers. The views of teachers from two different school levels are as follows:

L-PT1: Visual material may be more diversified. Books may have more illustrated exercises. Listening texts can be simpler and at a level that children can understand. The teacher may be given an extra activity package. I would like the events to be ready as in private schools. This is necessary to create consistency for each class level.

M-PT2: When we try to create every activity by ourselves, we have difficulty. We get tired. However, I think that a language class equipped with materials, books, dictionaries, supplementary resources, teacher activities and the internet will be help us for a better job.

As in teachers 'statements, textbooks, student workbooks, and dictionaries are the main sources of students' use of resources. The second largest source is the worksheets and activity papers that teachers bring from outside to ensure subject repetition. Similarly, students see smartboards as another helpful resource in the classroom with the most applications. Other sources are not used. In addition, the students stated that they used the EBA to repeat the subject. According to students it can be said that the use of resources is sufficient. The views of students from three different school levels are as follows:

L-S5: Actually enough. I use the internet and dictionary at home. There are school books at school. We also practice and test the worksheets brought by our teacher.

M-S9: When our teachers bring different activities to the classroom, we complete the activities with the book from smart board. Our teacher sometimes opens 'Morpa Campus' or I use an EBA at home. And my mom got a test book for the exam. I'm using it. Sounds good enough.

M-S6: I use EBA for repeat at home. Other than that, we do not use any other resources.

U-S3: There is a smart board and a book. Our teacher gives me copy paper.

School principals also expressed similar views on the use of English teachers' resources. They stressed that both material constraints and restrictions in practice caused limited resource use. School principals stated that this gap was tried to be covered by smart boards compared to previous years. The opinions of the principals from three different school levels are as follows:

LPP: I think they will benefit from smart boards. I know that they use appropriate materials in their course.

MPP: There are insufficient materials available, additional books, journals, etc. can be taken to realize much more effective learning. I know this with the demand from my teachers. However, it is not possible to reach all sources due to both financial conditions and some restrictions. There are some English teachers who use technological materials most effectively. I can observe that. But, of course, the integration of some materials into it can take things to a better level.

UPP: I don't think they have access to a lot of tools, materials and laboratories. However, to alleviate this disadvantage, a number of materials were loaded on the smart boards that were already in collaboration with the students. I know that there isn't any lab. They use smart boards. There is a more flexible resource opportunity for Grade 7 than other years.

Methods and techniques

Although teachers sometimes use "grammar-translation method" and "direct teaching" methods while teaching grammar and vocabulary, they do not want to prefer these methods; however, they had to use these methods in the direction of the curriculum. The views of teachers from three different school levels are as follows:

L-PT1: I have to admit, there are times when I teach the course directly. I give it to the finest detail both in grammar and usage. Then, I support the exercises with activities in the classroom. I would like to tell in class with the suggestion method. It would be better with such light music.

M- PT2: The communicative approach should be basic. I start the class with activity. I also teach grammar. What I expect from my students is to increase their speaking skills, to improve their communication skills, but to measure them with a centralized test like TEOG (high school entrance exam). In the 8th grade, we have to focus more on the test than on communicative skills. That's why we focus on reading and memorizing words.

U-PT3: You should not speak Turkish during breaks or lessons. However, we cannot do this with an exam-evaluated system or a system with grade anxiety. We're also worried. Even though the grammar evaluation is not much compared to the past, this time it turned out to be memorizing words. This time we do plenty of word expression.

Stating that they prefer student-centered approaches, teachers expressed that they start the course with warm-up activities and try to keep the interest of students alive and prefer to use the communicative approach. Among the techniques most commonly used by teachers are demonstration, question and answer, drama and role-playing, and educational games. According to the teachers, in order to create an effective language environment, by increasing the diversity of methods and techniques, they should be able to teach and master the subject first. In doing so, they emphasized that they should be very knowledgeable about technology and make self-criticism. The views of teachers from three different school levels are as follows:

L-PT1: I use student-centered approaches. I include role-playing activities. I'm trying to get the students involved, but we're still out of our old habits. As technology progresses, we need to keep up with them. They will either teach us or subject them to compulsory seminars. Our biggest problem is that we as an English teacher do not learn and teach on the spot.

M-PT3: We should try to use as student-oriented approach. We should put the sentence together and then work for the student to perceive it. After the initial activities, I want the students to mark the different learning outcomes they see in their reading passages.

U-PT1: I usually ask the students to use them at home after giving the words. They form one simple sentence at a very simple level. I'm getting the word bag.

Interdisciplinary approach

As a result of the interviews with teachers, teachers stated that they were in continuous cooperation and connection with the other lessons while they were teaching English. According to the teachers, the lessons are totally considered. The learning outcome not obtained in any course will affect the other lessons. According to the teachers, the most important interdisciplinary relationship between English and Turkish is Turkish lesson. The views of teachers from three different school levels are as follows:

L-PT1: We make a reminder about the elements of the Turkish lesson. The past tense is an example. In our first unit they had to know what the adjective was in the first place when processing the physical appearance. For example, we have studied comparative adjectives close to the Turkish lesson. When we talk about Atatürk's life, we cooperate with the Social Studies course. There's a connection. It must be.

M-PT1: It is difficult to tell the time in English to the child who does not fully understand the concept of time in Turkish. So, we need to co-operate with this course. In the 5th and 6th grades students they weren't able to learn the time. They were only able to learn to read the analog clock. So, this requires linking to other courses.

U-PT3: Of course, there is benefit in the establishment. In the new education curriculum, it is envisaged that all courses will be achieved by using the learning outcomes together. So we want to increase it. We are teaching in the 7th grade using common subjects. Biography, television units are examples. In the wild animals unit, we've touched on a bit of science.

Duration/lesson hours

The teachers working in the middle SEL and upper SEL group schools, there is a total of 6 hours of instruction in the form of 4 hours "Foreign Language" and 2 hours "Elective Foreign Language". Therefore, they stated that they did not have any difficulties in processing and raising the subjects. The teachers in the lower SEL group stated that only a certain part of the students (20 people) were exposed to this course for 2 more hours as an elective course, and the majority of the students were exposed to 4 lessons per week in English. They emphasized that 4 lessons were not enough. The common opinion of all teachers is that it will not be possible to learning outcome language skills effectively with a minimum of lecture hours; however, it will be sufficient for teaching vocabulary and grammar. The views of teachers from three different school levels for these different situations are as follows:

L-PT1: The more the language learning is repeated, the better it is for a nail to crash. Lessons are sometimes inadequate. It may be sufficient for the processing of topics. There is only one class in the elective course. There are 20 people in all 7th graders who choose to study English. Only these students expose English for six hours. The other students have 4 hours. It is not enough for effective and efficient processing.

M- PT1: That is enough for us as we did the elective in 2 hours.

U-PT1: That is inadequate for the activities but we are lucky. We are able to do the elective in 6 hours. I couldn't have done it for four hours.

In general, the students expressed their interest in this course and expressed a positive opinion about increasing the course hours. The views of students from three different school levels are as follows:

L-S6 Lesson time seems insufficient to me. We need to do more. Course hours should be increased.

M-S6 It seems to change according to the subjects. It is usually enough. We had more English classes before.

U-S3 Our lecture hours were more than before. It was more fun. There is no time for fun activities. So it must be increased.

Parents stated that the children wanted to devote more time to this lesson. However, they emphasized the necessity of other courses like mats and science into consideration and working equally. They also stated that due to the importance of the English course, the hours should be increased. The views of parents from three different school levels are as follows:

L-P4: Of course, it takes time, but not enough.

M-P5: It devotes as much time as it does for other classes. Since the system is based on exams, students are working outcome-oriented rather than learning-oriented. I think that if the class hours increase, they may more exposed English in class and move forward.

U-P10: There are many hours of English lessons in private schools. They shouldn't see us anymore. The more time he spends, the better for him. He is aware of this but needs at least 1 hour each day to be good. The burden of other courses may interfere with this from time to time.

Implementation process challenges/issues

When the difficulties and problems encountered while learning a foreign language are evaluated together, it can be said that the students have the most difficulty in establishing English sentences. In addition, since they transfer the grammar rules used in learning the mother tongue to the English structure, they have problems in using the correct place of sentences. They say that they speak with Turkish expressions while having sentences and they have difficulty in memorizing new words. The students find it difficult to pronounce words, which in turn leads to shyness in English speaking. The views of students from three different school levels are as follows:

L-S3: I cannot form some sentences. I sometimes find it hard to pronounce.

M-S8: I have difficulty when there are words that I do not know or when I cannot establish the correct word.

U-S9: Now I have difficulty in pronunciation. We read some words as they are written. So most students do that, including me…

School principals do not consider the professional problems of English teachers different from those of other branch teachers. In general, English teachers and other branch teachers have similar problems. According to the principals, they stated that the problems of English teachers stem from the general structure of the English course that English is generally taught mainly with grammar, that weight is not given much to speak, and that the renewed curriculum repeat itself continuously and do not undergo a holistic or fundamental change. The opinions of the principals from three different school levels are as follows:

LPP: There were problems generally about the curriculum. I hope the problems will be reduced with the renewed curriculum.

MPP: I think they can have the problems that all our teachers have in general. However, I often see an indifference to the lessons due to problems such as the perception of English as too technical and the lack of awareness and dedication of the parents.

UPP: I don't think English teachers have different professional problems than other teachers. There is not much activity for our children to speak English. We constantly teach our children English grammar. However, we do not teach our children to speak English. We only expect to speak English. We do not expect to analyze an author's language. There is not much work for them. In addition, the English language curricula are insistent except for a few changes.

Measurement and evaluation

It is seen that most of the exams that teachers make to evaluate student achievement are written exams. These exams mostly consist of multiple choice, true-false, fill in the blanks, matching questions that measure grammar and vocabulary. The teachers stated that they had note anxiety and anxiety in raising students for the 8th grade central examination system; As

the curriculum progresses in this direction, they express that they mainly do this type of exams. According to teachers, these exams should not be considered as a real criterion for assessing whether the achievements have been achieved. Only the teachers in the upper SED schools from three different categories of schools stated that they had audited this skill by adding some of the listening activities included in the textbook to the exams. The views of teachers from three different school levels regarding assessment and evaluation are as follows:

> L-PT1: We do not ask questions directly on the questions that the student can establish himself / herself. We do testing, fill in the blanks or matching. When we ask about this style, children find it more fun and can do it more easily. I think it would be better if there were practical exams.

> M-PT2: Measurement makes a few suggestions with evaluation but does not say how it should be. We're not actually evaluating. Central exams always leave the dimension of evaluation. We have to work for him. These exams usually consist of tests and classical exams.

> U-PT2: Students study one, two days or 1 week before the written exams. After that day, he doesn't care much about the exam and what they have learnt before are forgotten. But when they are comprehended visually and audibly, they will not be forgotten and there will be no need for an exam.

> U-PT1: In order to measure listening skills, we make an evaluation of 20-25 points in our exams either by repeating a part of the book that is not made from the book or the same part previously done. This is the first five minutes of the written exam.

Evaluation made according to the answers obtained from the students, the majority of the students (22 students) see the exams as a criterion to measure the success of the courses. They evaluate their success according to the high scores they take. It is noteworthy that the students asked for evaluation of their observational performance as well as their exam scores. 7 students who did not want to evaluate their course success only by exam, emphasized that assessment should be done through oral speech. The views of students from three different school levels are as follows:

> L-S3: I understand the exams and in-class performance. Exams must be done. Because I want to see my success.

> M-S9: The teacher expresses ıf I am successful or not. I think there must be both written exam and speaking exam.

> U-S7: When I take notes between 100 and 90, I think I understand the subject. Exams must be done.

Interest and attitude towards the Lesson

When the students were asked which unit topics they were most interested in / did not attract during the year, the data that emerged formed the findings that emphasized the content in the same way. Almost all of the subjects of common interest were 'Superstitions! 'Party', 'Planets' and 'Sport' units. They stated that they liked the content of these units very much and they found it interesting and fun. It can be said that these units are highly supported by visual materials. The unit, which the students see as boring and difficult, is the "Biography" unit, which can be said to be one of the units where grammar teaching is done most. Some of the views of students from three different school levels are as follows:

> L-S3 'Superstitions' is my favorite topic. The words were easy. It was interesting. I don't like the biography unit.

> M-S3 I liked the 'Television' unit and there are television curriculum that we can easily understand and know. There's no unit I don't like.

> U-S4 My favorite topics are the subjects I can practice much. Because, I understand these things better.

When the parents were asked about the attitudes and interests of the students in the English course, they stated that their children were interested in learning this course; they wanted to improve their language skills with movies and music. Below are some parent opinions from three different school levels:

L-P3: He has an interest in learning English. She says she does. She follows foreign channels, movies, and music. She does her homework on time, and her grades are good.

M-P4: He likes listening to English songs and watching movies. When he learns something different, when he arrives at home and he tells something new.

U-P1: He has a good attitude towards learning a foreign language. However, he cannot constantly study English. He works for his other classes, but always strives to learn a foreign language.

Evaluation Stage

This stage examines the values that the English curriculum provides to the educational process in terms of its structure and functioning. According to the former (2013) curriculum, the improvements that the updated curriculum brings to the educational environment and the educational value of these improvements, the role of preparing students for the use of foreign languages and the factors affecting this are presented.

The curriculum structure

In a common text for justification for renewing the former curriculum from the second to the eighth grade is stated as follows:

"The current curriculum has been updated with 2 main changes and 3 subheadings in each of the 2 main categories:

1. Review of the theoretical framework;

a) Review of the curriculum in terms of values education,

b) Evaluating basic language skills as themes,

c) Expansion of certain specific sub-categories such as testing, evaluation and recommendation.

2. For each grade level;

a) Review / renewal of target language skills and grammar awareness,

b) Updating content / assignments and activities,

c) General update and analysis of the curriculum in terms of language use and rules" (MoNE, 2018, 4).

The English curriculum has been updated in line with the principles and descriptors of learning, teaching and assessment in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CERF). 2013 and 2018 curricula adopt a communicative approach. According to the curriculum, it is necessary to provide interaction based on the necessary language skills in order to learn the target language. The communicative approach also requires the use of the target language as a means of interacting with others; The focus requires the use of language in real contexts in an interactive context to create a real meaning, not on language knowledge structures and linguistic functions (Larsen-Freeman and Anderson, 2011, cited in Richards, 2006). In this context, as emphasized by the stakeholders in the research, the main purpose of language learning is to use the target language effectively. It can be said that the aim of using English in current life in 2018 curriculum is a positive development in terms of the implementation of the curriculum.

In the updated curriculum, as in the 2013 curriculum, students are expected to be more flexible by using the eclectic method instead of a single language teaching method to improve language skills. There is no point in separating the different components (pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary, etc.) of the language (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). Language should not be divided into parts such as pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary. The updated curriculum focus on communication rather than teaching grammar rules, and the contexts in which language and language are used are mostly chosen from real life (Demirtaş & Erdem, 2015). The

more communicative skills students are directed to use, the more compelling they feel to use the language and the more they begin to use the language in its original context without turning to grammatical structures (Paker, 2012).

As one of the major features that differentiates the 2018 curriculum from the curriculum in practice, the necessity of using different assessment methods for all language skills in line with the feedback from teachers was understood and different assessment techniques were proposed for 4 basic language skills. In the curriculum where process evaluation is at the forefront, the curriculum also includes alternative evaluation techniques such as portfolio evaluation, project evaluation, performance evaluation, creative drama tasks, classroom newspaper/social media projects, magazine performance, and. However, these evaluation techniques are not specifically mentioned in each theme (MoNE, 2018).

In the implementation of the 2013 English course curriculum, the criticism of teachers to have time problems was taken into consideration in the new curriculum. In this context, it can be said that the 2018 curriculum has been made to reduce the content density. While preparing the content of the curriculum, 'proximity to daily life 'was taken into consideration. As a result of the interviews, although the curriculum offered pictures, posters, authentic materials and drawing activities, the teachers did not consider them sufficient and expected them to be presented as prepared resources. In order to realize all of these, it is necessary to train foreign language teachers in terms of effective material preparation techniques as the most important dimension. According to Işık (2008), undergraduate education and in-service training should be reviewed and teachers equipped with sufficient field knowledge. This will help to achieve the learning outcomes. This should also be taken into account in in-service training activities.

As a result, teachers have an effective role in the implementation and functioning of the curriculum and in maintaining continuity. Teachers' views on the curriculum are very valuable, given the fact that they are the most important stakeholders in acquiring foreign language competences. However, a system in which only the curriculum is effective alone and the teacher is seen only as a practitioner will not be efficient in ensuring the continuity of the curriculum. The most important task for teachers is to comprehend all the structural and functional changes envisaged in the curriculum and to take advantage of the flexibility of the curriculum to produce solutions that can prevent problems that may arise in the implementation process of language teaching. Otherwise, it is not possible for the renewed curriculum to be effective or perfect each time.

Observations regarding the implementation phase of the curriculum

Among the schools that are divided into two groups as lower-upper according to their socio-economic/demographic levels, classes in one of the upper and lower schools based on the volunteerism of teachers were selected and observation studies were carried out in these classes. Two teachers were observed. The observations were carried out in the spring semester of the 2017-2018 academic year, with a total of 20 hours of 10 lessons per school. Since the video recordings were not allowed during the observation, the observations were recorded by the field notes kept by the observer. Observed schools are expressed as L1 (the classroom in lower level school) and U1 (the classroom in lower level school).

The L1 is a full-day school, 1.5 km from the city center, in the central district of Efeler. The school starts at 08:30 and ends at 15.05. There are two school buildings in the school garden. Heating is provided by central heating system. The school has a medium-size garden where students can easily perform all kinds of activities. There are 43 teachers and 641 students in the school. Due to the location of the school, dents generally come from families with lower or middle socio-economic level. There are 24 classrooms in the school. There are also a science laboratory, a workshop classroom, an IT (Computer) class, and a canteen. There are smart boards with internet access in every classroom in the school.

U1 is also a full-day school in Efeler central district, 2 km from the city center. The school starts at 08:40 and ends at 15.15. There are also two school buildings in this school garden. Heating is provided by central system. The school also has a quite large garden where students can easily perform all kinds of activities. There are 92 teachers, 1649 students, and 50

classrooms. The school has a music class, a visual arts class, a conference hall, a workshop class and a canteen. Due to the location of the school, students generally come from families with middle or high socio-economic level. There are smart boards with internet access in every classroom in the school.

Preparing students for class

Some activities that were observed during the lessons in the U1 classroom increased the students' interest towards the course and attracted their attention. The teacher working at U1 started the lesson by completing the preparation stage before starting the lesson in the first hour of all the lessons. It was observed that the teacher used the starting activities effectively and posed warming questions to the students each time. The teacher starts the lesson by checking the homework after preparing the students for the lesson. When teacher entered the class, asked in English how the students were, what they had done the previous day and how they felt. Teacher wanted to see the worksheets he had given to the students as homework; asked if they did their homework and why they did not do it in English. At the end of the course, students who did and did not do their homework were recorded in teacher's personal notebook.

When the observation findings in the L1 were evaluated, it was seen that the teacher started with the introduction or warm-up of the class but could not provide this systematically every time. The socio-economic level of the class is low and its size is slightly lower than that of the U1 School. It is observed in this school, where no English pilot curriculum system is applied, the students' readiness and interest towards the lesson are less than the students in U1 School. The teacher can raise the tone to maintain control in the classroom from time to time. This situation affects teacher motivation and lesson duration. The teacher asks the students input questions, but only some of the students are involved in the class. It can be said that he / she uses the starting activities effectively; however, it can often be carried out with students who can interact with or have higher levels of achievement. The teacher starts the class after checking the homework given after preparing the students for the lesson. In one of the observations, when the teacher entered the classroom, she waited for a while in the middle of the classroom. The students speak very loudly. After the sound level in the classroom had decreased, she greeted the students. She wanted the students to learn how they felt today. Taking advantage of the weather conditions of the day, she asked the students in English through gestures and facial expressions. She made the drawings on the blackboard by saying the English answers of the Turkish students and showed his English in writing.

Learning-teaching process

Teacher in the U1 (TU) benefits from different methods and techniques such as narration, discussion, case study, demonstration, problem solving, brain storming, demonstration, question-answer, role-playing, drama-creative drama, simulation, dual and group work, educational games, jigsaw and dialogue. TU accomplishes all skill activities given in the textbook by using the smart board effectively and finishes in time. In addition to textbook, TU also supports the lesson with the materials apart from out of curriculum. TU showed a vocabulary game which enabled all students to actively participate in the subject repetition. With the words coming out of closed toy egg boxes, the students set up sentences in English. At the end of the game, the teacher rewarded the students. Based on the observation findings, although there are a few students who are bored in the classroom and do not want to participate in the activities, UT can actively get any student to involve in the class and encourages students who were not willing to participate. She often us the questions of "*Can you understand what we're going to do at this activity now? Can you share what you understand with your friends*?"

According to the findings obtained from the observations, there were short-term disciplinary problems caused by student interaction in the classroom or students' lack of understanding of the instructions; however, it was observed that the teacher could effectively control the classroom in a short time. The demographic characteristics of the students can also be thought to help the teacher in classroom control. Exam anxiety or grading make students

active listeners. The teacher asks questions such as "Can everyone hear me easily in class?" The teacher uses speaking skills which is accepted as one of the most important skills related to the four main areas of English effectively in the classroom, and the lessons are taught in English. She asks in Turkish only when she demands the meaning of an English word. Students can easily communicate in English and understand instructions.

> Teacher: "Do you know what 'city hall' means? (Teacher asked in English)

> Students: "Belediye Binası"(students answers in Turkish)

> Teacher: Yes. City hall.

In the teaching/learning process of the L1 classroom, the teacher (LT) mostly uses methods and techniques such as narration, demonstration, question-answer, role-playing, educational play and dialogue. LT does all the activities given in the textbook. However, they cannot practice their real language skills equally with all students. It was observed that during the course some of the students did not listen to the lesson, they stayed in touch with the lesson to the extent that they could respond with the insistence and encouragement of the teacher, most of them put their heads in line and fell asleep, chatted with their friends or got up and moved up without permission. LT constantly strives to attract students to the class by stating that "Are you ready for the lesson?" or "Please be quiet!" Apart from the textbook, LT often supports the course with the materials from outside. An effective classroom environment can be created when students engage in written materials. LT gives all instructions in English, followed by a Turkish translation. There is a constant demand from students in this direction, such as "Would you like to translate?" or "Do you want to translate?". The teacher asked the questions "Who wants to translate in English and explain it in Turkish?"

Evaluation

In the evaluation of grammar skills, the teacher of U1 classroom (UT) who applied to the 'written exam, also asks questions about finding synonyms and contrasting words, fill in the blanks, finding the words that correspond to the picture about the text in order to measure the vocabulary of the students. UT attaches more importance to process evaluation. In addition to their grammar skills, UT states that they can only measure their listening skills at a low rate. The UT uses short conversations, dialogues, conversations for listening skills; for speaking skills, interview, drama, (group work or pairs). UT also frequently uses some of the suggested studies in the curriculum for reading skills, finding the main idea, finding titles and writing skills and evaluating language skills such as letters, messages, writing, invitations.

Like UT, LT conducts a written examination for grammar skills and vocabulary, asks questions about finding synonyms and antonyms, fill in the blanks, finding words that correspond to the picture, and editing. LT gives more importance to product evaluation. In-class performance of students is also limited. In addition, LT prepares the students much for the central exams. In exams, they mostly ask questions such as testing, fill in the blanks, matching, and Turkish meaning of the English word, reading comprehension and answering questions.

In summary, the observations related to the classrooms' physical environment of L1 and U1 schools showed that there are fixed, double sitting rows in L1 and U1. In both classes, students sit in the traditional order in which the rows are lined up one after the other. In both classrooms, there is limited space and strict seating arrangement that prevent students moving freely and supporting face-to-face communication, enabling group or pair work. Even if the classes are not organized for communication, both teachers try to teach in their classes as much as possible. Class size is higher in U1, than L1. However, this situation does not cause further disciplinary problems. Although the size of L1 is smaller, LT has to warn students a little more verbally than UT. In terms of technological possibilities, both classes have similar characteristics.

It may be claimed that in general, students' attitudes and attitudes towards English classes are high in the observed classes. However, it is observed that student achievement profile of U1 and lower L1 classes slightly differs. The primary reason for this may be that

families have a higher profile of SEL (and the environment in which the school is located), that they understand the importance of foreign language learning and that they are experiencing intense exam anxiety among families. Because they constantly motivate and support their children for learning a foreign language. More than half of the students in the U1 class actively participate in the lesson actively. In addition to family interest and attitudes, another factor in the success of the students can be seen as the foreign language pilot training of students in U1 School. 15 hours of English in the 5th grade made a difference on the students in U1 School and caused the students to improve their listening and speaking skills to a great extent. Students in the U1 class are more willing to engage in communicative activities. In the L1 class, this desire is observed to be lower among the students. In U1 class, all activities can be completed on time. This can be attributed to student achievement, as well as to class hours. There is a total of 6 hours of English language lessons with elective courses at U1 School. In L1 class, it is thought that the lower level of readiness of students compared to U1 class and having a total of 4 hours of English practice as a lesson hours cause the activities to be partially completed.

Theming

The themes obtained within the scope of the research were combined with the results in order to describe the relationships between the data and presented and discussed within the framework of the related literature.

It is the responsibility of the teacher to effectively prepare for the preparation, presentation, functioning and feedback of the lesson. The teacher who performs his/her responsibility effectively will have the ability to intervene directly in case of any problems during the process. In such an environment, the student who is free from fear and anxiety will be able to express himself/herself easily and perform the necessary communicative language skills. Dellal and Çınar (2011) similarly stated that a teacher who could not explain the activity well could cause an entire activity to be a wasted time for the students. According to the views of the stakeholders, the main purpose of learning English should be to understand and speak English effectively. Teachers in this study think that the way to learn an effective foreign language is to create environments where students can use English more. However, in line with the opinions of teachers, students and parents, the field of using the foreign language occurs only in the school environment and this opportunity cannot be provided outside the school. In this case, every individual using English should be able to relate this language to daily life, and this association should be realized by being exposed to this language frequently in the environments where the foreign language is spoken. Looking at the literature on these results, Babacan (2016) emphasized the lack of living space when speaking English; Küzeci (2015), on the other hand, described the best environment for language skills development as the country where foreign language is used. Paker (2006) emphasized that in order to develop the ability to use the language, it is necessary for students to take place frequently in the environments where foreign language is spoken visually and audibly; Kaçar and Zengin (2009) stated that the primary and realistic goal of language learning is to improve speaking skills. These statements and findings are similar to the results of this curriculum evaluation research.

According to students and parents, another aim of learning English is to develop the ability to actively use the language in the educational and business environment. Students who know and use the foreign language well will be successful in university and business life. In the study conducted by Turan (2016) with high school students, it was concluded that the aim of the curriculum was to play a foreign language in the future and to prepare for the profession. In the literature, there are other studies (Davras and Bulgan, 2012; Kaçar and Zengin, 2009; Şen Ersoy, 2015) that have similar results with the current study.

The new curriculum, in which the achievements are reduced, follows a hierarchical sequence that is consistent with each other, consistent with the student level and from simple to difficult. While considering the learning outcomes, it should be taken into consideration that the way to use the foreign language effectively can be developed skills by using daily language in real life conditions. According to Kaçar and Zengin (2009), the primary and realistic goal of

language learning is speaking. Dinçer (2013) similarly stated that the priority goal of the curriculum is skill development. What this means is that four language skills are effectively used at the same rate. In this study, it is seen that the content in the previous and updated curriculum contains more current and interesting topics than the teachers. Alkan and Arslan (2014) and Dinçer (2016) conclude that the content of the curriculum is appropriate for the interests and needs of the students in their studies.

Teachers use textbooks, student aids, teacher's guide books and smartboards as the main resource in the classroom. During interviews with school principals and teachers, it was concluded that financial constraints caused limited use of resources for English teachers at school. In this case, it can be said that teachers should be provided with additional activities as well as textbooks and visual material such as flashcards. Karcı and Akar-Vural's (2011) study supports these findings and suggestions. There are also studies on the same subject that reach similar conclusions about the above-mentioned main sources, financial constraints and the need for additional resources for teachers (Akkuş, 2009; Aküzel, 2006; Arı, 2014; Erdem, 2016).

Students demand a book supported by audiovisual materials and games, stories, songs, illustrated activities and illustrated worksheets to be given along with the books. Thus, it may be claimed that one of the most effective ways of contributing to the foreign language environment is to expose the students to very different and excessive variables. Similar to these results, Küçüktepe, Küçüktepe and Baykın (2014) and Çakır (2004) concluded that while learning a foreign language, classroom activities aimed at songs, games and hand skills created an entertaining learning environment which contributes to language learning. The use of tools and materials constitutes the basic structure of each curriculum. This is even more effective in language teaching. Difficulties in this regard will bring difficulties in the implementation of the curriculum. Teachers stated that they experienced difficulties in almost every curriculum developed so far during the implementation of the curriculum. The reason for this was seen as incomplete and inadequate material. As Richards and Rogers (2001) point out, the teacher sees the time spent in the course as a process of language acquisition and provides regular and continuous input using all kinds of materials and activities. An evaluation of the process of preparing students to use foreign language skills can be said to determine the way the curriculum is handled by the teacher. With the updated curricula, the theoretical curriculum structure has relatively eliminated the problem. However, implementation problems still remain. The most important of these is the deficiencies and inadequacies in the tools and method techniques used. Failure to create environments in which effective communication skills can be used and the system based on the central exam can also be mentioned as problems in practice. The central exam-based system, which is shown among the reasons for student failure, is focused on testing as teachers have stated, is an obstacle to gaining full language skills. Individuals who cannot transfer grammar structures to real life environments are not considered to have used the language in a real sense. The main goal of teaching is that individuals can communicate in the language they have learned (Nunan 1988).

The most helpful resource for teachers is the smart board. According to the data obtained from the school principals, it was concluded that smart boards offer teachers visual and auditory richness and enable them to benefit from technology. In classes supported by technological infrastructure, students' interest will increase and therefore the quality of education will increase. There are studies confirming similar results in the literature (Aküzel, 2006; Çelik, 2009; Dinçer, 2016; Kandemir, 2016; Orakçı, 2012; Topkaya & Küçük, 2010; Turan, 2016). A language laboratory supported by physical facilities and technology will help to carry out the curriculum effectively. In addition, reading corners, posters, pictures, flashcards, role cards and continuously updated and boards are required in these classes. There are studies in the literature with similar findings (Babacan, 2016; Duran and Cruz, 2011; Erdem, 2016; Manny-Ikan & Dagan, 2011; Turan, 2016) and are similar to the results of the present study.

As a result of the interviews with the students, it was observed that their interests and attitudes towards English course were high. In addition, they were expected to increase the number of hours. The students in the middle SEL and upper SEL groups take elective foreign language course hours and a total of 6 course English courses. The teachers working here

consider the course hours sufficient to realize the learning outcomes in the curriculum. On the other hand, the majority of students in lower SEL are exposed to a total of 4 hours of English lessons per week. However, the teachers in the lower SEL School think that the 4 hours did not meet the curriculum adequately. As a result, in order to realize an effective foreign language teaching, 4 language skills must be met at the same rate. Therefore, students should be exposed to more English. According to students, achieving is the most practical way to go through the increased course hours. As in this study, it is seen that there is not enough time to apply for the educational status in the literature (Akkuş, 2009; Aküzel, 2006; Alkan & Arslan, 2014; Doğan, 2009; Kandemir, 2016; Küçüktepe, Küçüktepe and Baykın, 2014; Turan, 2016).

Centralized exams in the LGS (High School Entrance Exam) type of exam lead teachers, students and parents to think and act with focusing on the exam. Anxiety caused by exam content leads teachers and students to test-type questions. From the interviews with teachers, it is seen that written exams are mostly applied in the assessment of student success. These exams, which are prepared according to student level, consist of multiple choice questions, true and false, fill in the blank and matching questions, which mostly measure reading, grammar and vocabulary. As a result, these exams are mostly exam types that measure student success. They do not evaluate them effectively. It is also far from measuring real language skills. Dinçer (2016) concluded that teachers could not use process-based alternative/complementary assessment techniques.

The methods used by teachers in implementing the curriculum are 'grammar-translation method' and 'direct way'. Among the techniques most commonly used by teachers are demonstration, question and answer, drama, role-playing, and educational games. According to the data obtained, the teachers are aware of the methods and techniques used in foreign language teaching. When necessary, they use these methods and techniques; however, they could not give up the traditional methods. Haznedar (2010) concluded that teachers were familiar with the methods of communication and language use, but the classroom practices were different. Dinçer (2016) concluded that teachers did not apply some of the methods and techniques.

Difficulties and problems faced by the students while learning the language are the inability to use the place of sentences correctly and speaking with Turkish expressions when establishing sentences. Examples of other difficulties and problems include memorizing words, mis-pronouncing words, and shyness in speaking. Similarly, Arı (2014) and Erdem (2016) found that students were shy and had difficulty in speaking English. Parents stated that their children mostly use the foreign language while watching or listening to foreign songs, movies, videos. The student responses show that they need to develop speaking and listening skills. Turan (2016) reached a similar result in his research with 11th grade students expressing that they need most to develop is listening and speaking skills. Besides, Babacan (2016) suggested that students do not want to be educated in standard patterns in their study with 9th grades. They can integrate dance, drama, group works, plays, music activities, theatrical works and artistic works according to their interests while learning English.

As a result, the teacher who plays the role of an orchestra conductor in the classroom, is responsible for the implementation of all activities in the curriculum, how the material selection and use should be, and up to the assessment of the student. When the curriculum is considered as a whole, the student and stakeholders concerned, which is the primary source affected by the implementation of the curriculum, should also play a role. Students with high levels of readiness, parents and school principals who support the teaching process are expected to support teachers in the implementation of the curriculum. Otherwise, as in other areas, failure in a foreign language will be inevitable. As Paker (2012) similarly states, although children receive an average of 1400 hours of English instruction, 700 hours at primary level and 700 hours at high school, 90% will still remain at the beginning level at the end of the 1400-hour curriculum. English teachers are in constant cooperation and connection with other tutors. The content are chosen in such a way that students can relate to what they have learned in other lessons. As a result, the support of each other and the organization of the curriculum in a certain hierarchical order will ensure that the achievements in the other courses are achieved

effectively. Similarly, Küçüktepe, Küçüktepe and Baykın. (2014) and Çakır (2004) concluded that the English course content co-operate with other courses in a similar way.

Although the English teachers demanded arrangements in certain elements of the renewed curriculum, they stated that the change between the previous curriculum and the new curriculum was not significantly different. In addition, when they reviewed the revised curriculum, they found it generally good and feasible. It can be said that the curriculum can be implemented more effectively considering the suggestions they bring. Teachers are of the opinion that the developed curricula are more responsive to the needs. Similar results regarding the former curriculum are found in the relevant literature (Alkan and Arslan, 2014; Kandemir, 2016; Küçüktepe, Küçüktepe and Baykın, 2014).

Based on the results of the research, the following recommendations can be made:

• The content should be arranged together with the learning outcomes in order to reach them. In order to meet the foreign language needs of the students, it will be beneficial to include more expressions containing daily speaking skills in the content.

• The content should be prepared in a way that will create a funny educational and language environment for students and encourage students to speak English. Subjects that are found to be boring in the content that are not appropriate for the student level or that do not attract the attention of the students can be removed from the curriculum with an overall evaluation.

• The activities should be selected according to the learning characteristics, age and level of the students. The activities need to be more student-centered, easily applicable in the classroom and organized to enable students to use the lesson actively.

• Language laboratories or language classes, supported by visual and auditory materials, will help eliminate the difficulties associated with speaking and listening skills. In these classes, students can use smart boards or computers, watch English movies, listen to music, and read newspapers, books and magazines appropriate to their level.

• Activities should be organized in a way that encourages communicative learning. Activities should be tailored to improve students' listening and speaking skills. In order to develop listening and speaking skills, which are the two most important skills in communication, teachers should attend seminars, in-service trainings, congresses and conferences which include new approaches in education, and take teaching methods and techniques in practice.

REFERENCES

Akkuş, Ö. (2009). *Türkiye'de İngilizce öğrenim ve öğretiminde karşılaşılan sorunlar (Sivas ili örneği). (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi)*. Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. Sivas.

Aküzel, G. (2006). *İlköğretim 4-8. sınıflarda yabancı dil öğretimindeki başarısızlık nedenlerinin incelenmesi (Adana Örneği).* Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Adana.

Alkan, F. M. & Arslan, M. (2014, Ekim). İkinci sınıf İngilizce öğretim programının değerlendirilmesi. *3. Ulusal Eğitim Programları ve Öğretim (EPÖDER) Kongresinde sunulan* sözlü bildiri. Gaziantep.

Arı, A. (2014). İlköğretim altıncı sınıf İngilizce dersi öğretim programına ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. *Kuramsal Eğitimbilim Dergisi*, 7(2), 172-194.

Babacan, T. (2016). *Dokuzuncu sınıf İngilizce dersi öğretiminin bütüncül eğitime göre değerlendirilmesi.* Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi, Osmangazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü. Eskişehir.

Block, D. & Cameron, D. (2002). *Globalization and language teaching.* London and New York: Routledge.

Çakır, İ. (2004). Designing activities for young learners in EFL classrooms. *Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 24*(3), 101-112.

Çelik, İ. G. (2009). *İlköğretim okulları 4. sınıf İngilizce dersi öğretim programının değerlendirilmesine ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri.* Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Aydın.

Crystal, D. (1996). The English language today. D. Graddol, D. Leith ve J. Swann (Ed.) *English: History, diversity and change* (s. 29-32). New York: Routledge.

Davras, G.C. & Bulgan, G. (2012). Meslek Yüksekokulu (MYO) öğrencilerinin İngilizce hazırlık eğitimine yönelik tutumları: Isparta MYO Turizm ve Otel İşletmeciliği örneği. *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi*, *13* (2), 227-238.

Dellal, A. N. & Çınar, S. (2011). Yabancı dil eğitiminde iletişimsel yararcı yaklaşım, öğretmen rolleri, davranışları ve sınıf içi iletişim. *Dil Dergisi,154*, 21-36.

Demirel, Ö. (2005). Avrupa Konseyi dil projesi ve Türkiye uygulaması. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 33, 16. https://dhgm.meb.gov.tr/yayimlar/dergiler/Milli_Egitim_Dergisi/167/index3-demirel.htm adresinden 17.12.2018 tarihinde alınmıştır.

Demirtaş, Z. & Erdem, S. (2015). 5.sınıf İngilizce dersi öğretim programı: Güncellenen programın bir önceki programla karşılaştırılması ve programa ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. *Sakarya University Journal of Education*, *5*(2), 55-80.

Dinçer, B. (2013). *7. sınıf İngilizce öğretim programının Stuflebeam'in Bağlam - Girdi - Süreç - Ürün (CIPP) modeline göre değerlendirilmesi.* Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi, Aydın Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Aydın

Dinçer, A. M. (2016*). İlkokul ikinci ve üçüncü sınıf İngilizce dersi öğretim programlarının sınıf içi uygulamalara yansımaları.* Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Doğançay-Aktuna, S. & Kızıltepe, Z. (2005). English in Turkey. *World Englishes, 24* (2), 253-265.

Doğan, A. (2008). Lise öğrencilerinin İngilizce öğrenimlerini etkileyen yabancı dil kaygısı. *Ankara Üniversitesi, Dil Dergisi, 139*, 48-67.

Doğan, İ. (2009). *İngilizce öğretmenlerinin mesleki yeterlilik algıları ve İngilizce öğretiminde karşılaştıkları sorunlar.* Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Yeditepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Duran, A. & Cruz, M. (2011). The interactive whiteboard and foreign language learning: A Case Study. *Porta Linguarum*, *15*, 211-231.

Eisner, E. W. (1985). *The educational ımagination: On the design and evaluation of school programs.* New York: Macmillan Publishing.

Ekuş, B. & Babayiğit, Ö. (2013, Kasım). *İlkokul 2. sınıftan itibaren yabancı dil eğitimi verilmesine ilişkin sınıf ve İngilizce öğretmenlerinin görüşlerinin incelenmesi.* IV. Ulusal İlköğretim Bölümleri Öğrenci Kongresinde sunulan sözlü bildiri, Nevşehir.

Erdem, S. (2016). *Ortaokul-lise öğrencilerine ve İngilizce öğretmenlerine göre İngilizce öğretiminde karşılaşılan sorunlar.* Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Sakarya Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Sakarya.

Erden, M. (1998). *Eğitimde program değerlendirme* (3.Baskı). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Erişkon, C. B. (2004). Küreselleşme ve Avrupa Birliği yabancı dil eğitim politikaları ışığında 2000'li yıllarda Türkiye'de yabancı dil ve yabancı dil öğretmeni yetiştirme politikalarına bir bakış. *Hasan Ali Yücel Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *1*(2), 273-282.

Ertürk, S. (2013). *Eğitimde program geliştirme* (6. Baskı). Ankara: Edge Akademi Yayıncılık.

Gömleksiz, Elaldı, (2011). Yapılandırmacı yaklaşım bağlamında yabancı dil öğretimi. *Turkish Studies - International Periodical For the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkish* 6(2), 443-454.

Gömleksiz, M. N. & Özkaya, Ö. M. (2012). Yabancı diller yüksekokulu öğrencilerinin İngilizce konuşma dersinin etkililiğine ilişkin görüşleri. *Turkish Studies - International Periodical For The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkish Volume*, *7*(2), 495-513.

Güler, G. (2005). Avrupa Konseyi ortak dil kriterleri çerçeve programı ve Türkiye'de yabancı dil öğretim süreçleri. *Trakya Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *6*(1) 89-106.

Hanbay, O. (2015). Çocuklara yabancı dil öğretimi uygulama ve araştırma merkezi Model önerisi. *International Journal of Language Academy*, *3*(3), 219-232.

Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings.* New York: State University of New York Press.

Haznedar, B. (2010, Kasım). Türkiye'de yabancı dil eğitimi: Reformlar, yönelimler ve öğretmenlerimiz. *International Conference On New Trends in Education and Their Implications Kongresinde sunulan sözlü bildiri*, 11-13 Kasım 2010, Antalya.

Işık, A. (2008). Yabancı dil eğitimimizdeki yanlışlar nereden kaynaklanıyor? *Journal of Language and Linguistics. 4* (2), 15-26.

İşisağ, K. U. & Demirel, Ö. (2010). Diller için Avrupa ortak başvuru metninin konuşma becerinin gelişiminde kullanılması, *Eğitim ve Bilim Dergisi*, *35*(156), 190-204.

İyitoğlu, O. ve Alcı, B. (2015). A qualitative research on 2nd grade teachers' opinions about 2nd grade English language teaching curriculum. *İlköğretim Online, 14*(2), 682-696.

Kandemir, A. (2016). *İlkokul 2. sınıf İngilizce öğretim programının katılımcı odaklı program değerlendirme yaklaşımıyla değerlendirilmesi.* Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Denizli.

Kaçar, I. G., & Zengin, B. (2009). İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenenlerin dil öğrenme ile ilgili inançları, öğrenme yöntemleri, dil öğrenme amaçları ve öncelikleri arasındaki ilişki: öğrenci boyutu. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *5*(1), 55-89.

Karakuş Özdemirci, Ö., Aksoy, A. N., & Ok, A. (2019). Evaluation of human rights, civics and democracy curriculum through Eisner's evaluation framework. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.16986/HUJE.2019051813

Karcı, C. & Akar-Vural, R. (2011). Birleştirilmiş sınıflarda zorunlu İngilizce dersinin yürütülmesine ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. *İlköğretim Online, 10*(2), 593-607.

Karcı, A. C. & Gündoğdu, K. (2018). Dinleme-konuşma dersine ilişkin öğretim elemanları ve öğrencilerin görüşleri (Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi YDYO Örneği). *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim Dergisi*, *7*(1), 509-527.

Kaypak, E. & Ortaçtepe, D. (2014). Language learner beliefs and study abroad: A study on English as a lingua franca (ELF). *System, 42*, 355-367.

Kumral, O. (2010). *Eğitsel eleştiri modeli ile eğitim fakültesi sınıf öğretmenliği öğretim programının değerlendirilmesi-Bir Durum Çalışması.* Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi*.* Aydın Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Aydın.

Kumral, O. ve Saracaloğlu, A. S. (2011). Eğitsel eleştiri modeliyle sınıf öğretmenliği meslek bilgisi dersleri programının değerlendirilmesi. *E-Journal of New World Sciences Academy.* 6(1), 106-114.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon Press Inc.

Küçüktepe, C., Küçüktepe, E. S. & Baykın, Y. (2014). İkinci sınıf İngilizce dersi ve programına ilişkin öğretmen görüşlerinin incelenmesi. *Hasan Ali Yücel Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi,* 11(22), 55-78.

Küzeci, D. (2015). Yabancı dil seçimi ve yabancı dil politikaları. *Kazım Karabekir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *30*, 13-26.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techiniques and principles in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press: China.

Manny-Ikan, E., & Dagan, O. (2011). Using the interactive white board in teaching and learning-an evaluation of the smart classroom pilot project. *Interdisciplinary Journal of E-Learning and Learning Objects, 7*, 249-273.

MoNE (2018). *İngilizce dersi öğretim programı (İlkokul ve Ortaokul 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 ve 8. sınıflar). MEB:* Ankara.

Nikolov, M. & Djigunović, J. M. (2006). Recent research on age, second language acquisition and early foreign language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 26*, 234-260.

Nordin, A & Wahlström, N. (2019). Transnational policy discourses on 'teacher quality': An educational connoisseurship and criticism approach. Policy Futures in Education, 17(3) 438–454 .

Nunan, D. (1998). *Second language teaching and learning*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Nunan, D. (2003). The Impact of English as a global language on educational policies and practices in the Asia-Pacific Region. *TESOL Quarterly, 37* (4), 589-613.

Oberheu, N. M. (2010). *Globalization and English language pedagogy*. Colorado State University.

Orakçı, Ş. (2012). *İlköğretim 7. sınıflar için uygulanan 2006 İngilizce öğretim programının öğretmen görüşlerine göre değerlendirilmesi. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi.*Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Özel, T. R. (2011). *İlköğretim İngilizce dersi öğretim programlarının uygulanmasında karşılaşılan güçlüklerin belirlenmesi (Ankara ili örneği).* Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Paker, T. (2006, Eylül). Çal bölgesindeki okullarda İngilizce öğretiminin sorunları ve çözüm önerileri. *Çal Sempozyumunda sunulan sözlü bildiri*, 1-3 Eylül 2006 Denizli, ss. 684-690.

Paker, T. (2012). Türkiye'de neden yabancı dil (İngilizce) öğretemiyoruz ve neden öğrencilerimiz iletişim kurabilecek düzeyde İngilizce öğrenemiyor? *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 32. 89-94.

Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative language teaching today*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sıcak, A. & Arsal, Z. (2013). Evaluation of the lesson unit of let's learn about the world of organisms in the elementary school fifth-grade course of science and technology with respect to the educationalcriticism model. *Karaelmas Journal of Educational Sciences*, 157-175.

Sığırcı, İ. (2015). Türkiye'nin üyeliği açısından Avrupa Birliği dil ve kültür politikaları. *International Journal of Language Academy*, 3(3), 83-97.

Sung, C. C. M. (2014). English as a Lingua Franca and global İdentities: Perspectives from four second language learners of English in Hong Kong. *Linguistics and Education, 26*, 31-39.

Şen Ersoy, N. & Kürüm Yapıcıoğlu, D. (2015). İsteğe bağlı İngilizce hazırlık programının öğrenci ve okutman görüşlerine göre değerlendirilmesi. *Eğitimde Nitel Araştırmalar Dergisi,* 3(3), 7-43.

Tinsley, T. & Comfort, T. (2012). *Lessons from abroad*: *International review of primary languages.* Research Report. Reading: CfBt Education Trust.

Topkaya, E. & Küçük, Ö. (2010). An evaluation of 4th and 5th grade English language teaching program. *İlköğretim Online*, *9*(1), 52-65.

Turan, Y. (2016). *11. sınıf havacılık İngilizce programının Stufflebeam'in CIPP (Bağlam-Girdi-Süreç-Ürün) modeli kapsamında değerlendirilmesi. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi).* Osmangazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Eskişehir.

Üner, G. (2010). *Avrupa Birliği ülkeleri ve Türkiye'de ilköğretim birinci kademe İngilizce öğretim programlarının karşılaştırmalı olarak incelenmesi (Finlandiya ve Hollanda Örneği)*. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Varış, F. (1988). *Eğitimde program geliştirme*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi.

Yaşar, Ş. (1990). Yabancı dil öğretiminde çağdaş program anlayışının benimsenmesi. *Anadolu Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 3*, 89-96.

Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2016). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri* (10b.). Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.