

# English Education Policy in Turkey

Yasemin Kırkgöz

**Abstract** The present article, which sets a global perspective, investigates foreign language education policy and planning (LPP) with reference to major education reforms that have taken place in Turkey. Adopting the six-point *language-in-education planning framework* developed by Kaplan and Baldauf (1997, 2003), the study focuses on the following issues: the geographical and historical context in which the LPP has developed in the Turkish context; motivation at the national and global levels that have been crucial in driving policy actors to introduce English in the medium of instruction (MOI) policy; roles and influences of the external/international as well as the national/indigenous LPP actors and organizations and their involvement in the LPP; the different goals – both linguistic and non-linguistic – set by relevant actors; implementation processes that are facilitated by the development of English LPP, and finally some insights are given into the educational outcomes of LPP at the micro-level. The article relies on empirical studies, education policies and relevant official documents as sources of data. Çukurova University is taken to illustrate how this institute of higher education has responded to the influences of globalization and internationalization at the micro level.

**Keywords** Education policy • Foreign language • Globalization • Internationalization • Language-in-education planning framework • Turkey

## 1 Introduction

It is true to point out that foreign language education-in policy and planning (LPP) and the medium of instruction (MOI) cannot be decontextualized from its social, geographical and historical context. An emphasis on this situatedness gives an opportunity to explore different aspects of policy and policy implementation. In other words, language policy does not exist in a vacuum; rather, it has a socio-historical identity (Hamid et al. 2013b).

---

Y. Kırkgöz (✉)

Faculty of Education, University of Çukurova, Adana, Turkey

e-mail: [ykirkgoz@cu.edu.tr](mailto:ykirkgoz@cu.edu.tr)

Hence, an overview of the various aspects of LPP and the MOI need to provide adequate descriptions of this context. Similarly, a particular language policy may have a long history and understanding the current state of the policy may require taking a historical perspective (Pennycook 1998). It is within the various layers of the context that the policy dynamics can be fully understood.

This study investigates LPP issues and the MOI, with reference to the major curriculum reforms that have taken place in Turkey in foreign language (English) education utilizing the *six-point language-in-education planning* framework developed by Kaplan and Baldauf (1997, 2003). Drawing on their framework, the study focuses on the following issues:

1. The geographical and historical context in which the LPP and MOI has developed in the Turkish context;
2. Motivation, that is forces at the national and global levels that have driven LPP actors to introduce a particular language (English) or MOI policy in the Turkish context. Globalization and the global spread of English are the main reasons for introducing English and English as the medium of instruction (EMI) in Turkish context as in many other many polities;
3. Actors and agency, i.e. this point relates to specifying roles and influences of the external/international as well as the national/indigenous LPP actors and organizations and their involvement in the LPP. An appropriate understanding of MOI policies requires specifying LPP actors involved in the policy and how they exercise their agency (Hamid et al. 2013b). Actors are understood to be political authorities at the macro level represented by various state agencies including the ministry of education, and school teachers and educators who are involved in sense-making and enacting MOI policies, with agency for policy enactment in the micro context;
4. Articulation of differing goals – both educational (linguistic) and non-educational (non-linguistic) – set by relevant actors;
5. Implementation processes that are facilitated by the development of English LPP such as curriculum and materials; and,
6. Finally, insights into the educational outcomes of LPP at micro-level in Turkey.

With a comprehensive focus vis a vis the six criteria, this investigation focuses on the context of education – primary, secondary and higher education – in Turkey, in addition to MOI policies and their implementation.

## ***1.1 Geography and History***

According to the first point in Kaplan and Baldauf (1997, 2003)'s framework, LPP and MOI need to be contextualized within its social, geographical and historical context. Accordingly, a brief overview of the geopolitical context of Turkey helps us to situate foreign language-in-education policies and policy dynamics, in addition to appreciating the impact of globalization and the role English plays in Turkey's

foreign LPP. Turkey occupies a very vital strategic geopolitical location in the world; with 97 % of its total land area of 814.578 km<sup>2</sup> in Asia and 3 % in Europe, Turkey stands as a bridge between the two continents. English is the language most widely used as a *lingua franca* of communication among non-native English speakers (NNES); an essential tool for globalization and internationalization. The English language is increasingly important as a means of communication and interaction among different cultures; for increasing trade relations; for key sectors such as tourism and for individual job prospects. Given Turkey's ambitions to become one of the ten largest economies in the world by 2023, a workforce proficient in English language skills is crucial to enable integration of Turkey with the global economy. It has positive effects on Turkey's long-term economic growth potential through increasing its innovation capacity, the main driver of long-term economic growth (Vale et al. 2013, p. 11).

In Turkey, language policy making has seen tremendous changes in the last century. Unlike such countries as India, Pakistan, and China, which have had long colonial language policy histories, since the establishment of the Turkish Republic in 1923, Turkey has responded to the global influences of English in its education system through a planned education policy. Education is given a priority as the most important factor in attaining the level of the European countries (Grossman et al. 2007). With the implementation of policy to open to up to the Western world and the drive for modernization and internationalization, there have been several official measures to promote foreign language education, resulting in the spread of English Language Teaching (ELT) in the country. Turkish is the national and official language. In a NNES context, English holds the status of a foreign language (EFL), and is the only compulsory foreign language at all levels of education, as in China, Japan, and the Middle East.

## 1.2 Motivations, Goals, Actors and Agents

In their framework, Kaplan and Baldauf, draw essential distinctions between the motivations underlying LPP, including the need to reconcile competing goals for LPP, and the actors and agents that ultimately plan, justify, and implement language education policy. As the three factors in this equation are integrally related, they bear examining as a co-relational unit. Globalization as well as an array of local and international forces has played a role in motivating the establishment of MOI programs. In Turkey, the underlying motivations that drove LPP actors to prioritize English as the most prominent foreign language could be seen as bidirectional: linguistic and non-linguistic. Linguistic goals were driven by the benefits that acquiring proficiency in English would yield in developing human capital to communicate at the international level for economic, social, and business relations. At the national level, English has enormous prestige mainly due to its instrumental value – a means of gaining access to better education and a more prestigious job with good benefits and prospects for promotion (Kırkgöz 2005; Staub and Kırkgöz 2014). It could be

argued that the perceived language needs for national development and economic competitiveness in an increasingly globalized world tend to be the most powerful drivers in Turkey, as in many Asian polities (Chua 2010; Coleman 2011; Hamid 2010; Hsieh 2010). The non-linguistic goals relate to the underlying social, political and economic ambitions of Turkey to raise the overall standard of living of its citizens and to participate in a globalized economy through internationalization of education.

The introduction of two major language policy acts in 1983 and 1984 laid the foundations of foreign language planning. The 1983 Foreign Language Teaching and Learning Act laid the foundation for regulations concerning foreign language teaching in schools. The Act states that the language of instruction in Turkish secondary and high schools is Turkish, and all the decisions concerning foreign language teaching at these schools are vested in the Turkish Ministry of National Education [Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı (MEB)], which has the responsibility of centrally administering the English language curriculum and syllabi to be followed at these schools (Kırkgöz 2009).

After the mid-1980s, with the impact of the forces of globalization on education through the English language, highly competitive English-medium private and state secondary schools – Anatolian high schools and so-called Super English Language High Schools – were established to enhance the English-speaking capacities of Turkish youth. Admission to these schools was achieved through a centrally administered qualification exam. Unlike other schools offering 3-year education, the period of education in these schools was 4 years. The first year provided an intensive English language education, and in subsequent years, subjects in the curriculum such as mathematics and science were offered in English.

At the level of higher education, since the approval of The Higher Education Act in 1984, Turkey has maintained the policy of foreign language medium education. The 1984 policy document implicitly stated the instrumental value of English as a medium of teaching and learning. The enactment of this 1984 policy led to the spread of the English language, leading to an expansion in the number of English-medium universities, and a decrease in emphasis on other foreign languages such as German and French. As internationalization and globalization pushed the English as the medium of instruction agenda forward in many institutions of higher education in Turkey, the issue of the MOI – whether to use English or Turkish as the principal medium of instruction – was discussed at the macro policy level. It was in 1996 that the Turkish Higher Education Council [Yüksek Öğretim Kurumu (YOK)] (1996) established an initial list of criteria to be met in order for a university or a department to offer English as its MOI. This encouraged many universities in Turkey to offer EMI programs with the aim of developing national human capital with proficiency in English. This has coincided with the larger national, and global trend of massification through the expansion of private higher education (Mizikaci 2011; Staub 2016), ostensibly generating a significant increase in English language speakers. In the case of universities providing Turkish MOI, English language was incorporated as a compulsory component of the curriculum (Kırkgöz 2009).

In fact, Turkey was not unique in its LPP. Research on LPP and policy shows that the process of globalization has had direct and immediate consequences for language policies in education and that globalization has impacted the spread of EMI to the NNES Asian countries including Korea (Byun et al. 2011), Bangladesh (Hamid et al. 2013a), Taiwan (Hsieh 2010), and China (Hu and Alsagoff 2010).

The previous section focused on the historical development of English and LPP in Turkey, and motivation functioning at the national and global levels to introduce English in the education system, the different goals set by the relevant actors. To respond to global changes and become globally competitive, there emerged a need for education reforms to enable the country to keep pace with worldwide realities. The following section, therefore, discusses macro-level policy responses to the forces of globalization with reference to the major education reforms in the Turkish context with national as well as international actors playing a significant part.

## **2 Implementation of Language Policy**

Three major curriculum reforms have taken place in Turkey in relation to foreign language (English) education: The first curriculum innovation in ELT took place in 1997; the second curriculum innovation in the year 2005 when further changes were introduced in the ELT curriculum as part of the government policy to harmonize education with that of the European Union (EU) norms (Kırkgöz 2007b), and the latest curriculum innovation was initiated in 2012 to be implemented in the 2013–2014 academic year.

### **2.1 *The 1997 Curriculum Innovation***

The different linguistic and non-linguistic goals set by relevant actors played an important role in initiating the 1997 curriculum innovation. In fact, the initiatives for the 1997 curriculum innovation was supported by the external funding from the World Bank, which also funded similar reforms in nearby countries, including Hungary and Romania (World Bank 1999). Between 1994 and 1997, YOK, in cooperation with the MEB, took on improvement programs in teacher education (Grossman et al. 2007) through the establishment of a 4-year – National Education Development Project – a major curriculum innovation project which aimed at improvement of Faculties of Education in Turkey to enhance the quality of teacher education. As a result of this project, in 1997, the curricula of teacher education programs were restructured (Kırkgöz 2007a, b).

The 1997 curriculum innovation holds significance in Turkish education history because it resulted in a number of changes. The pre-service teacher education component of the National Education Development Project, implemented by YOK, had several dimensions. The most important was the development of newly designed

teacher education curricula in 13 subject areas, of which English language was one. Towards the end of the project, new programs and courses were instituted, leading to a change in the composition of departments of the faculties of education, and revision of the course contents (YOK 1998; Grossman et al. 2007). In addition, the number of methodology courses and the teaching practice time in primary and secondary schools were increased to provide teacher candidates with hands-on experience in schools (Kırkgöz 2006).

### 2.1.1 Curriculum Innovation in Primary and Secondary Education

Parallel to The National Education Development Project, within pre-service teacher education, were a number of changes enacted by the MEB in primary and secondary education. Until 1997, the education system in Turkey consisted of a 5-year primary, 3-year secondary, and a 3-year high school education. Güven (2008) notes that following the worldwide commitment to basic education, in 1997 Turkey, pushed by international bodies, adopted 8-years of schooling to prepare an agenda for improving the quality of education and delivering mass compulsory education. At the level of primary education, one major impact of the 1997 curriculum innovation was to integrate primary and secondary education into a single stream, extending the duration of compulsory primary education from 5 to 8 years (Kırkgöz 2006, 2008a, b).

Turkey was faced with the same set of complex contemporary demands characteristic of societies responding to changing social, economic and political circumstances (OECD 2005). The governments of many countries in the Asia-Pacific region, such as China, Hong Kong, Malaysia, Japan, Korea, and Taiwan were also involved in curriculum innovation by introducing English as a compulsory subject at younger ages, as part of their national policy of globalization and internationalization of the education system (Nunan 2003). A similar change took place in Turkish primary education as Turkey sought to improve its schools to better respond to higher social and economic expectations. Thus, a further consequence of the 1997 reform was the introduction of English to young learners in grades 4 and 5, thus shifting the introduction of English from secondary to primary schools in order to provide a longer exposure to foreign language (MEB 1997). The policy received support throughout the country from primary schools and parents.

The major motivating forces underlying this decision were officially stated by the MEB in its policy document as follows:

Turkey's political and economic ambitions and the nation's desire to keep up its relations with foreign countries using English, particularly with countries of the European Union (MEB 1997, p. 606 author translated).

The 1997 curriculum innovation, at the primary level education, brought about innovative practices. First, the new policy initiative introduced communicative language teaching (CLT), borrowed from 'Western' approaches to ELT, into the education system (Kırkgöz 2006, 2008a, b). The objectives for learning English in primary

education were stated by the MEB as the development of learners' communicative capacity to prepare them to use the target language for communication through various classroom activities. Another effect of the curriculum was a change in teaching practice. Introduction of the CLT led to a shift in pedagogy from the traditional teacher-centered transmission oriented paradigm to student-centered teaching with a view to promote communicative language proficiency of the learners (Kırkgöz 2007a). Along with this, the role of the teacher was seen as a guide and a facilitator of the learning process, addressing students' different learning styles, and helping the development of their communicative performance in English (Kocaoluk and Kocaoluk 2001).

At the management level of the curriculum innovation were a number of national actors, working in close cooperation with the non-state international actors (Giddens 2001), to facilitate the implementation of change in teacher education curriculum. The involvement of national and international actors in the education reform complemented various change efforts initiated by the MEB and YOK, the two major intra-national governmental organizations that collaborated closely to facilitate innovation. YOK, an autonomous body, had the responsibility to administer the planning, co-ordination and supervision of higher education within the provisions set forth in Higher Education Law, and MEB had a similar responsibility to carry it out at the primary and secondary levels of education.

The cooperation of international actors involving experienced teacher educators was critical in supporting the new teacher education policy in Turkey. The curriculum developmental work involved 15 experienced teacher educators from different faculties of education in Turkey, working with 17 counterpart teacher educators from the United States, the United Kingdom, and Sweden. The team of consultants worked on needs analysis leading to the definition of objectives and content of the curriculum. Next, was the production of curriculum materials, the need to review and comment on the writing as it progressed, as well as the need to plan and teach training courses, and conduct trials of the materials. The team cooperated with the Project Co-ordination Unit appointed by the Turkish government to lead and oversee the development of the project. The curriculum reform involved 34 faculties of education in Turkey at the start of the project in 1995, rising to 42 by its end, including all faculties in the project's developmental work. In order to achieve nationwide implementation of the curriculum, the ideas generated by the project were disseminated throughout Turkey, first via curriculum books and workshops, later through other project vehicles (Grossman et al. 2007).

### **2.1.2 Innovation in Teacher Education Curriculum**

While the directions of the education reforms vary from the widespread development of curriculum standards to implementation practices, one common feature of reform movements is that they are generally initiated on the claim that something is wrong with the current state of affairs, and that the existing system is deficient in its goals, accomplishments and responsiveness to global changes. Another frequent

assumption of educational reformers, conceived as a “problem” in need of revision, is that practicing teachers have not received sufficient – or the right kind of pre-service or in-service teacher professional development. As a result, government officials often call for reforms in teacher education (Güven 2008).

As noted by Dang et al. (2013) in relation to Vietnam’s policy of teacher education, reforms in teacher education are needed, if the education system is to respond to the call for the development of qualified teachers who can act as active agents in implementing the national language education plan. Similarly, in the Turkish context, policies enacted in 1997 called for continual adjustments on Turkish foreign language education policy, leading to a number of further changes, beginning in 2005 and continuing until the recent education reform. The following section discusses teacher education policy initiatives undertaken in 2005.

In the Turkish context, YOK specifies in its policy document the underlying reasons for the renewal of the 1997 curriculum as follows:

During the last eight years after the implementation of the 1997 curriculum, various conferences, workshops and symposiums held by the MEB and universities have indicated that the 1997 teacher education curriculum remained quite inadequate in preparing teacher candidate for the contemporary teaching profession (YOK 2014, p. 4; author translated)

The need to enhance the quality of qualified English language teachers has been expressed in a succession of language policy and planning developments. The political rhetoric has been that teacher candidates have not acquired sufficient competencies; i.e., the knowledge and skills needed for the teaching profession important for an expanding, competitive worldwide economy. For this reason, it was considered that the teacher education curriculum be renewed and restructured in order to raise the teacher standards as well as student performance in primary and secondary schools. In fact, this claim was confirmed by research findings indicating a gap between 1997 curriculum rhetoric and classroom implementation. At the primary level, Kırkgöz (see 2006, 2007a, b, 2008a, b), through a range of studies, investigated the impact of the 1997 curriculum initiative on Turkish state primary schools in terms of how well curriculum objectives put forward for the teaching of English at the macrolevel are projected into micro teaching level, and the teachers’ use of methodology in facilitating young learners’ acquisition of English. Teachers as implementers of the policy at the micro-level, remained unable to create the proposed communicative learning environment, as suggested by the policy documents. Thus, the translation of the policy from the macro level into the micro level was not in conformity with policy expectations.

Akar (2010) found that prospective Turkish university teachers felt themselves well equipped to cope with rapidly changing knowledge and were able to develop innovative curricula in their subject areas but were still concerned about how to teach in line with student-centered active-learning approaches. Issues of policy translation also emerged from the Indonesian study by Zacharias (2013) who showed that teachers felt constrained in their implementation of MOI policy in the school context.

## 2.2 *The 2005 Curriculum Innovation*

### 2.2.1 **Revision of the Primary ELT Curriculum**

In 2005, the primary ELT curriculum was revised by a Turkish team of curriculum specialists (MEB 2006). In addition to strengthening the communicative dimension of language teaching, the curriculum incorporated global trends by introducing other Western-derived educational approaches, thereby making a significant pedagogical change in classrooms. The 2005 curriculum accommodates a ‘constructivist approach’ to teaching and learning, ‘active learning’, ‘use of tasks’, ‘multiple intelligences theory’ and ‘content and language integrated learning’ to enable certain non-language cross-curricular subjects such as geography, music, and sports to be learned through English. In addition, performance-based assessment was introduced to offer an update for the assessment system proposed by the EU (see Kirkgöz 2007a, 2012 for details). In short, the 2005 English language and curriculum reform programs were motivated by the desire to align education programs with those of the EU.

As seen by Garcia and Menken (2010), school teachers and educators are actors with crucial agency for policy enactment in a micro context. At the micro level, in order to elicit teachers’ perceptions of the revised curriculum and to develop a picture of teachers’ classroom implementation, Kirkgöz (2012) conducted a multiple case study research. Participating in the study were 60 primary school teachers of English in primary grades 4 and 5, in 50 different state primary schools in one province in Turkey. The results of the study revealed that, overall, teachers had a positive perception of the revised curriculum. The findings with regard to how well the principles underlying the 2005 curriculum manifested in teachers’ classroom instruction indicated that 20 of the 60 participant teachers were transmission-oriented, 11 were interpretation-oriented, and 29 eclectic. This finding indicates that a changing trend from the transmission-oriented towards eclectic-oriented teaching seems to be taking place in Turkish foreign language classrooms, with many teachers trying to adapt the new teaching methods to their specific classroom contexts.

Following each education reform, English textbooks are updated. A textbook writing team, consisting of experienced ELT experts, assumes the responsibility of writing textbooks, under the leadership of the MEB, the responsible body for coordinating the production of textbooks in primary schools. Several textbooks with MEB approval were introduced in grade 4 state primary schools in 2005 and a single-textbook *Time for English* for Grade 5. The MEB also started to finance the books for all recipients of compulsory education. Textbooks play a crucial role in language education, functioning as agents of change. As argued by Hutchinson and Torres “the importance of the textbook becomes even greater in periods of change” (1994, p. 315).

Hence, an investigation into the responses of the students and teachers into the textbook-in-use provides insights into the extent to which curriculum objectives are implemented at the teaching level through the agency of textbooks. In another study,

Kırkgöz (2011) evaluated four English textbooks which were approved for use in grades 4 and 5 by the MEB in state primary schools after the 2005 curriculum renewal process. Perception data was gathered from 617 grade 4 and 5 students, and 124 teachers, from 54 primary schools in one province in Turkey. It was found that the grade 4 textbooks, *Trip1* was the most appropriate one followed by *Texture* and *Time for English*. While several favorable aspects were identified of the grade 5 textbook, *Time for English*, two shortcomings emerged: complexity and learnability of the language items. Overall findings indicated that the four English textbooks were well-designed to serve as potential agents for curriculum change.

### 2.2.2 Innovation of the Secondary Education Curriculum

At the level of secondary education, a number of changes in ELT policy took place. The decision was taken by the MEB to abolish the 1-year English language preparation program (ELPP) offered in Anatolian, Super English Language High Schools and most private schools offering intensive English language programs. In addition, the duration of education in all secondary schools was increased from 3 to 4 years, and English language was spread across the 4-year secondary education curriculum in order to achieve standardization in ELT in all types of schools (Kırkgöz 2007b). The removal of the English language preparation class received nation-wide criticism.

To assess the impact of this curriculum reform, an exploratory study was conducted to elicit perceptions of teachers ( $n = 170$ ) who had already worked in one of the aforementioned secondary schools, and students ( $n = 851$ ) who had received a 1-year intensive ELPP during their secondary education; at the time of the survey all participating students were receiving university education (Kırkgöz 2010). The survey findings revealed that while ELPP offered students several advantages as “constituting a foundation of English” and “contributing to students’ current university education”, the students in the open-ended section of the survey reported several disadvantages. Many students reported that receiving a 1-year ELPP had been a waste of time...an intervention in their education continuum; after receiving ELPP they experienced difficulties in adapting to non-English content classes. Students also complained that they had mainly received a grammar focused English language education. The majority of the students and over half the teachers expressed their support for abolishing ELPP owing to several unfavorable effects resulting from the program. Regarding the new ELT curriculum, spreading English across the 4-year secondary education was considered to be necessary in providing a better quality ELT. Both teachers and students agreed that the implementation of the 1997 ELT curriculum in which English language teaching starts at an early age at the primary school, would, in the long-run, be highly beneficial to Turkish learners of English.

### 2.2.3 Renewal of the Teacher Education Curriculum

The need for reform in English language teaching in Turkish schools foregrounds the role of pre-service English as a foreign language (EFL) teacher education. According to YOK policy, as a result of the aforementioned reasons, curricular changes at the primary level to be implemented from the 2003–2004 teaching year were to be supported by a corresponding teacher education program. As a consequence, there was a need to improve the quality and content of the English language teacher education programs.

Unlike the 1997 teacher education curriculum, which was developed by a Turkish team of experts in consultation with international teacher educators, the 2005 teacher education curriculum was mainly developed by the involvement of the national actors under the supervision of YOK. In consultation with the administrators of the faculties of education and the faculty staff, a study was undertaken by YOK to deal with the shortcomings of the teacher education program that had been in effect for the previous 8 years.

A working team of 25 academics was involved in the curriculum renewal process. These national actors, in consultation with the faculty deans, worked on identifying objectives of the new curriculum and renewing the content of the core courses, prepared a draft new-teacher-education curriculum during a 7-day workshop, “Curriculum Development in the Faculties of Education” (March 5–11, 2006). As the aim was to involve and consult the opinion of as many stakeholders as possible, also participating in the workshop were educators from the MEB to offer suggestions for the content of the curriculum. The draft curriculum document finally received approval by YOK on July 21, 2006, and was to be implemented from the 2006–2007 teaching year. Rather than changing all teacher education courses, the decision was taken to simply update some courses (YOK 2014).

A list of courses, descriptions of course contents, and course credits was determined. A flexible arrangement was made in the composition of education programs; 50 % of the courses were allocated to education (subject-matter knowledge), 30 % to professional education (pedagogical knowledge), and 20 % to general culture. In the revised teacher education curriculum, emphasis was put on teaching communication, problem-solving, critical thinking, interpersonal and lifelong-learning skills. The revised teacher education curriculum was built on the conviction that language teacher education is a life-long process. What is needed, according to this argumentation, is to educate prospective teachers who are themselves capable of solving problems so that they can help students to solve problems. It is also stressed in the curriculum document that teacher education subjects be related to those corresponding programs prepared by the MEB, and enriched with real life examples.

There were also ideological and political reasons underlying this curriculum reform. The priority which was given to education accelerated in the context of Turkey’s EU candidacy resulting in a new period of change and innovation in teacher education curriculum (Grossman et al. 2007). To meet the challenges of globalization and European integration, there was a need to harmonize teacher education programs to EU standards. In particular, the EU teacher education program

had a great impact on the new curriculum, as stated by YOK, “Another important feature of the new curriculum is that it corresponds, in many aspects, with teacher education programs in EU countries” (2014, p. 4). The revised English teacher education program was implemented during the 2006–2007 academic year.

A number of studies have been carried out to evaluate the new pre-service English teacher education programs in different universities in Turkey. Coşkun and Daloğlu (2010) evaluated the pre-service English teacher education program in a recently-established university from the perspective of 55 final-year student teachers and three university instructors. The data collected through questionnaires and interviews revealed that although participating instructors and student teachers shared common views about some components of the program, their opinions differed concerning the balance among linguistic and pedagogic competencies. The instructors shared the common thought that the new program puts greater emphasis on student teachers’ pedagogic competence, but is insufficient to improve their linguistic competence. Student teachers stated that the pedagogic side of the program needs to be improved, highlighting the importance of increasing the effectiveness of the School Experience course offered during the final year to promote experiential learning. While accepting that this evaluation study was based on participants’ subjective judgments about the current English teacher education program, the researchers called for further research in order to gain broader insights into the effects of the new teacher education program.

Taking only one component of the teacher education program into consideration, Kızıltan (2011) investigated prospective EFL teachers’ perceptions of only the ‘Language Acquisition’ course. The results indicated that the participants held positive views about the importance of this course for their teaching careers. However, they stated that they needed some preliminary courses on linguistics prior to taking this course. In a similar study, Hismanoğlu (2012) surveyed 72 student teachers regarding their teacher education program. The study revealed that the program met the needs and expectations of the student teachers to a large extent, yet failed to develop their higher level thinking skills such as problem solving, creative thinking, and critical thinking.

In a recent study, Yavuz and Topkaya (2013) sought to understand 18 ELT teacher educators’ evaluations of the changes in the teacher education program. The teacher educators participating in the study were from five different state universities. They considered certain changes in the program as positive, such as the extension of the course ‘Approaches and Methods in ELT’, which was previously offered as a single course but is currently offered as consecutive courses during the two academic semesters. Positive reactions were given to the introduction of new courses such as ‘Public Speaking and Presentation’ and ‘Drama’, as well as the convergence of ‘Course Book Analysis and Material Evaluation’. However, teacher educators were surveyed expressed their concerns regarding the sequence of certain courses in the whole teacher education program. To illustrate, they stated that ‘Research Skills’ course, currently offered during the spring semester of the second year, should be allocated in the subsequent years since students are not cognitively ready

to cope with this course in the early stages of their teacher education program and this course requires practical experiences to prepare small-scale research designs.

### **2.3 The 2013 Education Reform**

In 2012, a transition from the former model of 8 years of primary education followed by 4 years of secondary education was replaced with the new educational model called “4 + 4 + 4”, in which each 4-year-education corresponds to primary, elementary and secondary education. Such a structural change has led to the need for redesigning educational programs. With respect to English language education, this language planning goal resulted in lowering the starting age at which English is to be taught from grade 4 (age 9) to the current grade 2 (6–6.5 years of age). The teaching time devoted to English was increased, and textbooks were updated.

The need to enhance English language proficiency of Turkish school leavers has been one of the major concerns of actors involved in language policy and planning developments. The MEB, in cooperation with The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey [Türkiye Bilimsel ve Teknolojik Araştırma Kurumu (TUBITAK)] prepared an action plan to revitalize the primary ELT curriculum, which emphasized English language proficiency of the young Turkish adults as one of the key factors in national development. The revised curriculum, prepared by a Turkish team of specialists highlights the need for developing communicative competence in English as in the following statements:

There is no question that the key to economic, political and social progress in contemporary Turkish society depends on the ability of Turkish citizens to communicate effectively on an international level, and competence in English is a key factor in this ability. Yet, despite continual efforts at improving the effectiveness of language education in Turkey, a significant percentage of students leave school without the ability to interact successfully in an English-language medium. While it is understood that there are many variables at work in this ongoing problem, it is believed that one of the main reasons for the failure of such a large number of Turkey’s students to master competence in English lies in the fact that the language is presented to them as a subject to be learned in school – an academic requirement to be met – rather than as a means for communication (MEB 2013, p. ii).

In order to enhance communicative competence of Turkish young learners of English, the new curriculum adopts a new model, as stated by the same curriculum document:

In designing the new ELT curriculum, the principles and descriptors of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR): Learning, Teaching, Assessment were closely followed (CoE 2001). Accordingly, the new curricular model emphasizes language use in an authentic communicative environment, drawing on an action-oriented approach in order to allow learners to experience English as a means of communication as learners work toward achieving communicative competence. At the second and third grade levels, speaking and listening are emphasized; while reading and writing are incorporated in higher grades as students become more advanced. Throughout each stage, developmentally appropriate learning tasks provide a continued focus on building the learner autonomy and problem-solving skills that are the basis for communicative competence (MEB 2013, p. ii).

This curriculum is intended to integrate the most recent methodological and technological developments and current, research-based practices related to the teaching of English to young learners (Kırkgöz et al. 2016). In addition, the English curricular model takes into account -learner autonomy, self-assessment, and appreciation for cultural diversity- as the three descriptors of the CEFR. In doing so, it was expected that learners will become confident and proficient users of English, develop an appreciation for their own culture and value a broad spectrum of international languages and cultures. The new ELT primary curriculum was put into practice during the 2013–2014 teaching year for grades 2 and 5, and in subsequent years for grades 3 and 6, and then grade 4 and 7.

As stated in an earlier section, a workforce proficient in its English speaking ability enhances a country's connectivity to the rest of the world, resulting in a higher innovation capacity, greater and more sustainable regional integration and more revenues from various sectors including education, tourism and textile. The early introduction of foreign language instruction from Grade 2 should in time demonstrate a powerful multiplier effect which will impact positively on all subsequent learning right up to and including tertiary level study (Vale et al. 2013).

The six criteria in the Kaplan and Baldauf (1997, 2003) framework relates to the educational outcomes, that is, insights into the implementation of policies in practice. Kırkgöz and Yaşar (2014) investigated teachers' perceptions of the early foreign language learning curriculum in Turkish state primary education, challenges teachers encounter in teaching younger age and their preparedness to teach it. Teachers included in the study were all those primary teachers of English teaching grade 2 classes in state schools in one province in Turkey. While the findings revealed a high level of teacher acceptance of the new grade 2 primary ELT curriculum, research findings also pointed to gaps in teachers' perceptions of readiness to teach younger learners.

Discussions on how to improve the teaching and learning of English has been an ongoing issue from the primary to tertiary level in Turkey. In partnership with the MEB and the Economic Policy Research Foundation (TEPAV), the British Council carried out a large-scale research, *The Turkey National Needs Assessment (TNNA)*, into the teaching of English in state schools covering Primary, Middle, High and Vocational English language teaching in Turkey between February- July 2013 (Vale et al. 2013). The report concluded that Turkey is underperforming in the area of ELT and that this 'deficit' results from inadequate teaching in primary and secondary schools. Despite efforts to address gaps in education provision through the introduction of the 4 + 4 + 4 system, the reality is that very few students are able to achieve even basic communicative competency in state schools.

Furthermore, the report states that this English deficiency could threaten Turkey's economic development as in the following quote:

Turkey is yet to catch up with competitor economies in its level of English language proficiency. Turkey consistently ranks very low on various measures of English language speaking. For example, the 2013 English Proficiency Index (EPI) developed by English First puts Turkey 41st out of 60 countries. In 2012, the average total Test of English as a

Foreign Language (TOEFL) score of both native Turkish speakers and residents of Turkey was 75 over 120, similar to countries which do not have a Latin alphabet, such as Sudan and Ethiopia (Vale et al. 2013, p. 15).

The report identifies two main reasons underlying the relatively low level of success in English language teaching and learning in the state primary and secondary levels of educational system:

The first relates to the teachers. It was observed that most (80 + %) English teachers have the professional competence and language skills to deliver effective language lessons. However, teachers observed were teaching English as a ‘subject lesson’, and not, as a language of communication. As a result, students fail to learn how to communicate and function independently in English.

Another reason is the students. Despite the potential of the teachers and a positive classroom environment, the competence level in English of most (90 + %) students across Turkey was found to be rudimentary – even after 1000+ hours (estimated at the end of Grade 12) of English classes. Whereas the expected level of the student graduate from High School in Grade 12 was at least B2 level in English.

Although the MEB policy aimed for human capital development through English, achieving this goal was found to be seriously hindered by the inadequate English proficiency base of students graduating from the Turkish state schools. Based on the findings of the needs assessment across Turkish state schools, the main recommendation offered by the report to address the problems is to develop a comprehensive and sustainable system of in-service teacher training for English teachers to raise teachers’ competences regarding contemporary ELT methodologies and outcomes. It is expected that this pool of permanent teachers, when motivated and further trained, will take forward positive transformational change in schools from teaching grammar’, as is currently employed by the English teachers to teaching English as a tool of communication.

The quality and effectiveness of EMI versus native language instruction in higher education worldwide has been an issue of concern for LPP scholars. Kırkgöz (2014) investigated the perceptions of two comparable groups of final-year engineering students at a Turkish institution of higher education: one has received Turkish medium of instruction (TMI), and the other English medium of instruction (EMI). The positive-oriented perceptions of EMI students included *enhancing English language skills, gaining access to primary sources in English and keeping up with global developments in their disciplines*. Students anticipated instrumental benefits EMI would offer upon graduation i.e., getting higher-paid jobs. On the other hand, TMI students reported comprehending disciplinary knowledge more easily, learning in detail, and achieving long-lasting retention. TMI students, while not experiencing any specific problems in the acquisition of disciplinary knowledge, expressed concerns that might arise from TMI. For those whose English proficiency was limited, studying from English sources posed difficulties. Additionally, students expressed concerns over the prospects of getting jobs requiring high level English proficiency.

Similar to the study conducted at the primary to high school levels, another study was undertaken by The British Council in partnership with TEPAV, into English language provision in ELT in the higher education level in Turkey in 2015. About 38 universities in 15 cities across Turkey were visited and leadership teams and academic staff were surveyed, supported by class observations. While the study identifies numerous good initiatives in Turkish universities, it also reveals the challenges faced by teachers and learners of English at tertiary level.

Related to the MOI, findings revealed that while EMI universities have traditionally been more favored in comparison to universities without EMI, as the current English proficiency levels of both academic staff and students restrict effective learning, there are strong arguments for strengthening the quantity and quality of Turkish medium of instruction programs.

It was found that the English proficiency levels of EMI academics generally meet international standards, but problems exist in some universities in finding enough academics with adequate levels of English to meet current requirements or expand EMI programs. The main point focused in the research was the question of how English language teaching in Turkey may be improved in order to produce students with the foreign language skills necessary to contribute meaningfully to the ambition to position Turkey as one of the top ten global economies by 2023. The recommendation given was to provide improved EMI teaching training for EMI lecturers to enable them to take responsibility for their students' learning by adopting a range of language and technological strategies.

### **3 Turkey's Internationalization Dimension**

In addition to Turkey's efforts to respond to globalization by EMI and by including English as a compulsory subject in school curricula, globalization is also manifested by internationalization, "a subtle response that not only affects academic programs, faculty, and students, but also creates new administrative structures and privileges" (Stromquist 2007, p. 81). An articulated goal for higher education in Turkey is the internationalization of education, which is associated with international standards systems, and covers a wide range of services, from study abroad and recruitment of international students, to combinations of partnerships abroad, internationalized curriculum, and research and scholarly collaboration.

A historical overview of Turkey's internationalization efforts shows that since 1999, Turkey has taken important steps to respond to the demands of the European Union's Copenhagen Criteria (Sozen and Shaw 2003). In 1999, the European ministers of education held a conference in Bologna, Italy to unify the European university degrees to ensure readability, transparency of degrees, and credit systems in order to gain international standards. With the signing of the Bologna Declaration in 2001, Turkey has undertaken to enact reforms in the framework of this integration process. Thus, 'Bologna' serves as a standard-setting instrument in Turkey, as in other countries.

The Report published by YOK (2007), *Towards the European Higher Education Area: The Bologna Process* discusses attempts to adjust Turkish higher education to international standards, covering the following main points: (1) The European Higher Education Area (EHEA), (2) Approval of the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS), (3) Students and academic exchange and mobility, and (4) Establishing an accreditation and quality assurance system in teacher education.

Student and academic exchange and mobility are an important component of the internationalization process. Within the process of the Bologna Declaration, several measures were taken to improve mobility of students and academic staff. Turkey participated in the mobility programs in accordance with the conditions laid out in the Framework Agreement of 26 February 2002 between the European Community and the Republic of Turkey under the terms and conditions set out in the Memorandum of Understanding. The Memorandum took effect in April, 2004. Turkey established the appropriate structures for the coordinated management of the implementation of the mobility program actions, including the Leonardo da Vinci II, Socrates II and Youth programs, to facilitate the free movement of students, teachers, trainees, trainers, university administrators, and other eligible persons between Turkey and the Member States of the Community.

In 2002, a National Office under the State Planning Organization was opened, acting as a national agency for the administration, promotion, supervision, and evaluation of European education programs. Upon signing the work plan with the European Commission, full Turkish participation and integration in EU programs was achieved from the end of 2005. Since then, the Socrates, Leonardo and the Erasmus mobility programs have been operating in Turkish universities, and international offices have been established in universities to deal specifically with such programs.

In line with the Bologna Declaration agreement, another change introduced in higher education is related to the national quality assurance system, lack of which causes quality-quantity discrepancies among the institutes of higher education at the national level, and diminishes the overall competitive effectiveness of Turkish institutions at the international level. The establishment of ‘The Turkish National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education’ was initiated in 2005 by YOK with the goal of ‘harmonization’ of institutes of higher education in Turkey to the EU, making it compatible with the framework of qualifications of the European Higher Education Area. The commission of National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education was established consisting of ten members – seven from YOK and three professors from different universities – to collaborate with a “working group”, which consisted of 13 Turkish actors to develop the National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education in Turkey (NQF-HETR) between 2006 and 2008. The framework was developed in terms of “knowledge and understanding”, “applied knowledge”, “competencies”, and “learning outcomes” to be acquired by an undergraduate as well as a postgraduate student. The effort to improve and coordinate the sharing of experience in the development of national qualifications frameworks was chaired by YOK (2009).

YOK disseminated NQF-HETR via its website (<http://tyyc.yok.gov.tr>). The institutions were required to design programs locally in conformity with this new framework. To illustrate, taking the Turkish National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education as a frame of reference, institutes of teacher education in Turkey designed the content of each course to equip prospective teachers with the necessary skills, knowledge, and other competencies; as a result, this led to greater transparency and portability of qualifications.

Another change taking place in higher education includes approval of the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) and Diploma Supplement, which were developed to increase the international competitiveness of the institutes of higher education, to make student exchange easier, study programs comparable and to lead to standardization in degrees, as stipulated by the Bologna process. Turkish universities responded favorably to such instruments to improve the compatibility of the Turkish degree system with the Bologna Process and to enable institutions to recognize each other's qualifications. Currently, the ECTS credit system is being applied in universities under the supervision of YOK.

An investigation into the web pages of the majority of Turkish universities clearly indicates that universities in Turkey mention internationalization in their current mission statements, and include it in their strategic plans. In the following section, I will illustrate Turkey's efforts to internationalize its higher education with reference to Çukurova University.

## 4 The Case of Çukurova University

The Turkish government's globalization and internationalization orientations directly affected Çukurova University (CU), as it did all other institutions of higher education in Turkey. Established in 1973 as a state university, CU is ranked among the top 500 in the World Universities and the top 5 in the country. A total of 1900 academic staff is employed to train a total of 44,000 students ([www.cu.edu.tr](http://www.cu.edu.tr)).

The university's response to globalization manifested itself in the establishment of EMI programs. The decision to offer EMI in at least 40 % of the courses in the Department of Economics and the Department of Business Administration was taken by the university senate in 1983. This was followed with two more faculties. In the engineering faculty, The Department of Electrical and Electronics and Mechanical Engineering embarked upon offering all their subject courses in EMI starting from the 1990–1991 Academic year (Kırkgöz 1999).

Internationalization is an articulated goal for CU, as evidenced from the following statement:

Çukurova University values the importance of internationalization and aims to enhance its international profile to include European and non-EU countries. To reach this target, our Erasmus and International Student Office put great efforts on choosing potential partner universities that have a common vision and mission in line with our internationalization strategy (<http://international.cu.edu.tr/en/policy.asp>).

To pursue these objectives, the Internationalization Division of the International Office was established to foster international cooperation and exchanges. The office serves to facilitate internationalization at the University by establishing partnerships with various institutions, arranging study abroad periods for the students, receiving international exchange students and organizing the mobility of university staff. The exchange programs offered by the university include the Erasmus Exchange program, and the two recently introduced Farabi and Mevlana Exchange programs. The Farabi Exchange program aims at the exchange of students and academic staff in Turkey to continue their education at an institute of higher education other than their own for a period of one or two semesters. The Mevlana Exchange program aims at making provision for the exchange of students, at undergraduate and graduate levels, between a Turkish institute of higher education and a higher education institution in any country outside of the EU.

The university gives high priority to internationalization and sees itself as uniquely positioned to develop ties with other nations in scholarly cooperation. CU has already achieved numerous landmarks in internationalization: it has 351 partnership agreements with institutions in 23 European countries, mainly in Germany, Poland and Italy. In addition, The University is involved in partnerships with universities of non-European countries including Africa, Far East and America in order to increase its rank amongst the world universities and attract more students, in alignment with the university vision towards internationalization.

The university has been awarded with a diploma supplement by the European commission, which is crucial for the visibility of certificates of CU graduates. It is expected that this diploma supplement will be recognized by EU countries and attract more incoming students. In addition, as part of its efforts to accelerate the process of internationalization, CU is engaged in increasing its networks/partnerships with approximately 50 neighboring countries involved in the Bologna process.

## 5 Concluding Remarks

Basing an investigation on Turkey as a single country case study, this chapter investigated LPP and the practice of MOI in the context of major education reforms in primary, secondary and higher education in Turkey. In investigating the LPP issues and the MOI put forward in this article, the *six-point language-in-education planning framework* developed by Kaplan and Baldauf (1997, 2003) was used as a framework.

It can be concluded that the pressures to conform to a wider international education agenda have necessitated adjustments in Turkish foreign language education. Through a planned LPP and MOI, Turkey has striven to respond systemically to the challenges brought about by globalization and internationalization through the kind of reform initiatives implemented at macro and micro policy levels. Although education reforms are embedded in Turkish national, political and economical

dynamics, the extent and direction of these reforms informed education policies, shaping to fit the unique Turkish context into which they are introduced. The role and influences of the external/international as well as the national/indigenous organizations including the government, YOK, MEB and the universities at macro level and teachers at micro level has played a significant role in facilitating the implementation process of these reforms in the Turkish context, despite the existence of a disconnect between policy and practice.

**Acknowledgement** I would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their suggestions and insightful comments on an earlier draft of this paper. I am particularly grateful to Assist Prof Dr. Donald Staub for his editorial review, invaluable comments and contributions.

## References

- Akar, H. (2010). Globalization and its challenges for developing countries: The case of Turkish higher education. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 11, 447–457.
- Byun, K., Chu, H., Kim, M., et al. (2011). English-medium teaching in Korean higher education: Policy debates and reality. *Higher Education*, 62(4), 431–449.
- Chua, S. K. C. (2010). Singapore's language policy and its globalised concept of Bi(tri)lingualism. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 11(4), 413–429.
- Coleman, H. (Ed.). (2011). *Dreams and realities: Developing countries and the English language*. London: British Council.
- Coşkun, A., & Daloğlu, A. (2010). Evaluating an English language teacher education program through Peacock's model. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(6), 23–42.
- Council of Europe (CoE). (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dang, T. K. A., Nguyen, H. T. M., & Le, T. T. T. (2013). The impacts of globalisation on EFL teacher education through English as a medium of instruction: An example from Vietnam. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 14(1), 52–72.
- Garcia, O., & Menken, K. (2010). Stirring the onion: Educators and the dynamics of language education policies (looking ahead). In K. Menken, & O. Garcia (Eds.), *Negotiating language policies in schools: Educators as policymakers* (pp. 249–261). New York: Routledge.
- Giddens, A. (2001). *Sociology* (4th ed.). London: Blackwell.
- Grossman, G. M., Onkol, P. E., & Sands, M. (2007). Curriculum reform in Turkish teacher education: Attitudes of teacher educators towards change in an EU candidate nation. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 27(2), 138–150.
- Güven, I. (2008). Teacher education reform and international globalization hegemony: Issues and challenges in Turkish teacher education. *International Journal of Human and Social Sciences*, 3(1), 8–17.
- Hamid, M. O. (2010). Globalisation, English for everyone and English teacher capacity: Language policy discourses and realities in Bangladesh. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 11(4), 289–310.
- Hamid, M. O., Jahan, I., & Islam, M. M. (2013a). Medium of instruction policies and language practices, ideologies and institutional divides: Voices of teachers and students in a private university in Bangladesh. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 14(1), 144–163.
- Hamid, M. O., Nguyen, H. T. M., & Baldauf, R. B., Jr. (2013b). Medium of instruction in Asia: Context, processes and outcomes. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 14(1), 1–15.
- Hismanoğlu, S. (2012). Prospective EFL teachers' views on English language teacher training program. *Journal of Research in Education and Teaching*, 1(2), 330–341.

- Hsieh, P. J. (2010). The impact of globalisation on foreign language education policy in Taiwan – Policy initiatives and industrial demand. *The International Journal of Educational and Psychological Assessment*, 5(2), 237–254.
- Hu, G., & Alsagoff, L. (2010). A public policy perspective on English medium instruction in China. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 31(4), 365–382.
- Hutchinson, T., & Torres, E. (1994). The textbook as agent of change. *ELT Journal*, 48(4), 315–328.
- Kaplan, R. B., & Baldauf, R. B., Jr. (1997). *Language planning: From practice to theory*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Kaplan, R. B., & Baldauf, R. B., Jr. (2003). *Language and language-in-education planning in the Pacific Basin*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Kırkgöz, Y. (1999). Knowledge acquisition from L2 specialist texts. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Aston University, England
- Kırkgöz, Y. (2005). Motivation and student perception of studying in an English-medium university. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 1(1), 101–123.
- Kırkgöz, Y. (2006). Teaching EFL at the primary level in Turkey. In M. McCloskey, M. Dolitsky & J. Orr (Eds.), *Teaching English as a foreign language in primary school* (pp. 85–99). Alexandria: TESOL, Inc.
- Kırkgöz, Y. (2007a). Language planning and implementation in Turkish primary schools. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 8(2), 174–191.
- Kırkgöz, Y. (2007b). English language teaching in Turkey: Policy changes and their implementations. *RELC Journal*, 38(2), 216–228.
- Kırkgöz, Y. (2008a). Curriculum innovation in Turkish primary education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(4), 309–322.
- Kırkgöz, Y. (2008b). A case study of teachers' implementation of curriculum innovation in English language teaching in Turkish primary education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24, 1859–1875.
- Kırkgöz, Y. (2009). Globalization and English language policy in Turkey. *Educational Policy*, 23(5), 663–684.
- Kırkgöz, Y. (2010). Evaluating curriculum reform in Turkish secondary education. In L. E. Kattington (Ed.), *Handbook of curriculum development* (pp. 455–463). New York: Nova.
- Kırkgöz, Y. (2011). An evaluation of English textbooks in Turkish primary education: Students' and teachers' perceptions. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 44, 188–206.
- Kırkgöz, Y. (2012). Exploring teachers' implementation of the recent curriculum innovation in ELT in Turkish primary education. In T. Muller, S. Herder, J. Adamson, & P. Brown (Eds.), *Innovating EFL teaching in Asia* (pp. 181–195). Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kırkgöz, Y. (2014). Students' perceptions of English language versus Turkish language used as the medium of instruction in higher education in Turkey. *Turkish Studies – International Periodical for The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 9(12), 443–459.
- Kırkgöz, Y., & Yaşar, M. (2014, April 24–26). A survey on teachers' perceptions of the new ELT program and their readiness to apply this program. In *Abstracts of the 1st Eurasian Educational Research Congress*, University of İstanbul, İstanbul.
- Kırkgöz, Y., Çelik, S., & Arikan, A. (2016). Laying the theoretical and practical foundations for a new elementary English curriculum in Turkey: A procedural analysis. *Kastamonu Education Journal*, 24(3), 1199–1212.
- Kızıltan, N. (2011). Pre-service EFL Teachers' attitudes towards language acquisition courses. *The Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 7(1), 2–86.
- Kocaoğlu, F., & Kocaoğlu, M. S. (2001). *İlköğretim okulu program 1999–2000* [Primary education curriculum 1999–2000]. İstanbul: Kocaoğlu Publishers.
- Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı (MEB) [Turkish Ministry of National Education]. (1997, August 18). İlköğretim ve Eğitim Kanunu [The primary education and education act]. *Resmî Gazete* [Official journal]. No. 23084. General Directorate of the Turkish Ministry, Ankara.

- Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı (MEB) [Republic of Turkey, Ministry of National Education]. (2006). *English language curriculum for primary education grades 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8*. Ankara: T.C. Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı.
- Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı (MEB) [Republic of Turkey, Ministry of National Education]. (2013). *İlköğretim Kurumları (İlkokullar ve Ortaokullar) İngilizce Dersi (2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 ve 8. Sınıflar) Öğretim Programı* [Elementary (primary and lower secondary) English language teaching program (Grades 2–8)]. Ankara: T.C. Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı
- Mizikaci, F. (2011). Isomorphic and diverse features of Turkish private higher education. *PROPHE Working Paper Series*, 18, 2–10.
- 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.
- OECD. (2005). *Education at a glance: OECD indicators 2005*. Paris: OECD Publications.
- Pennycook, A. (1998). *English and the discourses of colonialism*. London: Routledge.
- Sozen, S., & Shaw, I. (2003). Turkey and the European Union: Modernizing a traditional state. *Social Policy and Administration*, 37(2), 108–120.
- Staub, D. (2016). University education in developing economies: Access, competition, and neglect. In R. Papa & A. Saitis (Eds.), *Building for a sustainable future in education: Brick by Brick*. Springer (in press).
- Staub, D., & Kırkgöz, Y. (2014, March 20–22). Motivation and student perceptions of success at English medium universities in Turkey. In *Abstracts of English Scholars Beyond Borders*, University of Dokuz Eylül, İzmir.
- Stromquist, N. P. (2007). Internationalization as a response to globalization: Radical shifts in university environments. *Higher Education*, 53, 81–105.
- Vale, D., Özen, E. N., Alpaslan, İ. B., et al. (2013). *Turkey national needs assessment of state school English language teaching*. Ankara: TEPAV.
- Yavuz, A., & Topkaya, E. Z. (2013). Teacher educators' evaluation of the English language teaching program: A Turkish case. *Novitas-ROYAL*, 7(1), 64–83.
- Yüksek Öğretim Kurumu (YOK) [Turkish Higher Education Council]. (1996). Yükseköğretim kurumlarında eğitim-öğretimin yabancı dille yapılması [Foreign language medium education at higher education]. *Resmî Gazete* [Official Journal], No. 22598, April 1. General Directorate of the Turkish Ministry, Ankara.
- Yüksek Öğretim Kurumu (YOK) [Turkish Higher Education Council]. (1998). *Eğitim Fakülteleri Öğretmen Yetistirme Programlarının Yeniden Düzenlenmesi* [Restructuring of the teacher education programs of education faculties]. Ankara [[http://www.yok.gov.tr/duyuru/yok\\_strategy\\_kitabi.pdf](http://www.yok.gov.tr/duyuru/yok_strategy_kitabi.pdf)]. Accessed 9 July 2011.
- Yüksek Öğretim Kurumu (YOK) [Turkish Higher Education Council]. (2007). *Türkiye'nin yüksek öğretim stratejisi* [Higher education strategy of Turkey] ([http://www.yok.gov.tr/duyuru/yok\\_strategy\\_kitabi.pdf](http://www.yok.gov.tr/duyuru/yok_strategy_kitabi.pdf)). Accessed 9 July 2011.
- Yüksek Öğretim Kurumu (YOK) [Turkish Higher Education Council]. (2009). *Türkiye Yükseköğretim Ulusal Yeterlikler Çerçevesi Ara Raporu* [National qualifications framework for higher education in Turkey] (<http://tyyc.yok.gov.tr>). Accessed 9 July 2011.
- Yüksek Öğretim Kurumu (YOK) [Turkish Higher Education Council]. (2014). *Eğitim fakültelerinde uygulanacak yeni programlar hakkında açıklama* [Report on the New Education Programs of the Faculties of Education] ([http://www.yok.gov.tr/documents/10279/49665/aciklama\\_programlar/aa7bd091-9328-4df7-aafa-2b99edb6872f](http://www.yok.gov.tr/documents/10279/49665/aciklama_programlar/aa7bd091-9328-4df7-aafa-2b99edb6872f)). Accessed 18 Mar 2014.
- Zacharias, N. T. (2013). Navigating through the English-medium-of-instruction (EMI) policy: Voices from the field. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 14(1), 93–108.