Evaluation of Primary School 2nd Grade English Course Curriculum in Terms of Reaching Speaking Skill Objectives*

İlkokul 2. Sınıf İngilizce Dersi Öğretim Programının Konuşma Becerisi Hedeflerine Ulaşma Açısından Değerlendirilmesi

İmgehan Özkan Elgün[a*], Esed Yağcı[b]

ª*Başkent University, Ankara, Turkey*
ᵇ*Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey*

Abstract

The aim of this research is to reveal to what extend the students accomplish the speaking skill objectives in the primary school 2nd grade English course curriculum, put into practice in the 2013-2014 academic year. In this research, which is a quantitative research, pre-tests and post-tests without control group, which are quasi-experimental designs, were used. The study group of the study were 89 students studying at a lower, a middle and an upper success level of primary schools in Alanya. In order to collect data, a speaking test developed by the researcher considering the critical objectives was employed. The test was implemented at the beginning and at the end of the 2016-2017 academic year. To analyze the data, Wilcoxon signed rank test and Kruskal Wallis H test were carried out. According to the research findings, it was concluded that the level of achieving speaking skill objectives at all schools was low. Moreover, differences were found among schools in terms of attaining speaking skill objectives.

Keywords: Curriculum evaluation, 2nd grade, English course, speaking skill.

Öz

Bu araştırmanın amacı, öğrencilerin 2013-2014 eğitim öğretim yılında uygulamaya konulan ilköğretim 2. sınıf İngilizce dersi öğretim programında yer alan konuşma becerisi hedeflerine ulaşma düzeyini ortaya koymaktır. Nicel bir araştırma olan bu araştırmada yarı deneysel desenlerden kontrol grupsuz ön ve son testler kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın çalışma grubunu Alanya'da düşük, orta ve yüksek başarı düzeylerindeki birer ilkokulda öğrenim gören seksen dokuz öğrenci oluşturmuştur. Araştırmanın veri toplama aracı olarak kritik hedefler göz önünde bulundurularak araştırmacı tarafından geliştirilen konuşma testi kullanılmıştır. Testin uygulaması, 2016-2017 öğretim yılının başında ve sonunda gerçekleştirilmiştir. Verilerin analizinde Wilcoxon işaretli sıra testi ve Kruskal Wallis H testi kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın sonuçlarına göre tüm okul seviyelerinde konuşma becerisi hedeflerine ulaşma düzeyinin düşük olduğu sonucuna varılmıştır. Ayrıca konuşma hedeflerine ulaşma düzeyi açısından okullar arasında farklılıklar olduğu sonucuna ulaşılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Program değerlendirme, 2. sınıf, İngilizce dersi, konuşma becerisi.

1. Introduction

With globalization, the necessity for countries to get closer in economic, social and technological terms has emerged and countries have started to act in cooperation (Dağlı, 2007). As a result of the developing relations, the importance of communication between countries has increased and this led countries to use a common language (Erişkon Cangil, 2004). In this respect, English is accepted as the common language of business, commerce, science and academic studies (Graddol, 2006). The increase in the significance of the English language has started to direct

the education policies of the countries as well. Accordingly, Turkey is also one of the countries where teaching English has had great importance (Eveyik-Aydın, 2019).

As teaching English becomes more and more important, especially early exposure to English becomes quite essential. Considering that foreign language teaching at an early age has positive effects on the personality development of a child, foreign language education has been offered at an early age in Europe since the 1960s (Cihan, 2001). Although it is not as early as Europe, teaching English to young learners has become also important in Turkey since 1997. In this regard, Turkey has introduced English as a foreign language at primary level gradually. Firstly, in 1997 the Ministry of Education made English course compulsory from the 4th grade of primary school. Then the obligation to learn English language, which started from the 4th grade of primary school until 2013, has become compulsory from the 2nd grade since 2013 (MONE, 2013). The purpose of starting language learning from 2nd grade is to improve the listening and speaking skills in the curriculum that was put into practice in 2013 (MONE, 2013). However, although there have been improvements in English language teaching in our country, Turkey is thought to be unsuccessful in language teaching. That is, according to English Proficiency Index (EPI) (2020) Turkey ranks 69 out of 100 countries. This means that Turkey is within the very low English proficiency index.

As it is understood from the statistics as well, foreign language education is a problem in Turkey. Especially improving students' speaking skill is really a controversial issue. However, as Hartono (2018) said speaking skill is a crucial part of mastering a language. Also, recently it has been thought that knowing a language means knowing how to speak the target language instead of how to read and write (Fihriah, 2016). Hence developing speaking skill in EFL classes has gained much importance and accordingly there has been a lot of research focusing on both teaching speaking to young learners and different parts of L2 speaking both in Turkey and other countries (Tumanggor, Heriansyah, & Inayah, 2018; Soureshjani & Riahipour, 2012; Bozkurt, 2019; Lengerlioğlu, 2019; Balım, 2020). Despite speaking skill is given importance with the studies as well, it is still a big problem. In this context, it can be said that the effective evaluation of curriculum can help overcome the deficiencies and problems while teaching speaking skills. That is, the purpose of curriculum evaluation is to make a decision about the quality of the program and quality of students after the implementation of the curriculum (Orhan Kasak, 2018). Accordingly, in order to implement a program successfully, the deficiencies and the sources of those deficiencies should be explained, and necessary corrections should be done (Demirel, 2012). There have been different curriculum evaluation and models in the literature. although there have been different studies related to curriculum evaluation especially for the 2nd grade English course, these studies were mostly conducted by getting the opinions of the teachers who implemented the program (Bayraktar, 2014; Çiftçi Cinkavuk, 2017; Demir & Duruhan, 2015; Erarslan, 2016; Süer, 2014; Yaşar, 2015; Özden, 2019). However, to make more accurate evaluation about the program, the extent to which the students have reached the objectives of the curriculum should also be revealed as well as the feedback from the teachers' opinions. However, there are few studies in the literature that reveal to what extent students achieve especially speaking skill objectives (Özüdoğru, 2017; Özüdoğru, 2016). Hence, the gap in the literature related to evaluating 2nd grade English course curriculum in terms of accomplishing speaking skill objectives, presents the need and importance of this study.

In this regard, the aim of this study is to reveal the level of attaining the speaking objectives in the primary school 2nd grade English course curriculum. Accordingly, the following questions answers' have been sought.

1. What is the level of reaching the speaking skills objectives in 2nd grade primary school curriculum?
   1.1. Is there a significant difference between students' English speaking test scores that they got at the beginning and the ones they got at the end of the year?
   1.2. Is there a significant difference among the students' English speaking test scores in terms of success level of schools?

2. Method

As the method of the study from the trial models quasi-experimental design, pre-post-test without control group was used. Participants in this design first take a pre-test, then they take a post-test at the end of the teaching process (Marsden & Torgerson, 2012). It is one of the pre-trial models which an independent variable is applied to a randomly selected group (Karasar, 2010). There is no randomness and matching. The pattern can also be defined as a single factor in-group or repeated measures pattern. The significance of the difference between the pre-test and post-test values of a single group in the pattern is tested. In this context, two different tests were implemented to the students to measure their speaking skill at the beginning and at the end of second semester in order to reveal to what extent the students reached the objectives of the second grade English course curriculum at the end of the 2016-2017 academic year. The reason for not using the control group in this study is that the students were not subjected to

compulsory English learning process before the 2nd grade of primary school. That is, all students started to learn English at the same time, and they learn the language by following the same curriculum.

2.1. Study Group

  Second grade primary school students in three different primary schools in Alanya, Antalya are the study group of this research. Accordingly, one class from each level of school was included in the study. In determining the schools, maximum diversity sampling was used. That is, the average of success and standard deviations of the 2013-2014 Transition Exam from Basic Education to Secondary Education (TEOG) of the schools in Alanya, published on the official website of the Ministry of National Education, were taken as criteria. Schools with 1 standard deviation above the arithmetic mean are identified as "upper success level", schools that are between 1 standard deviation above and 1 standard deviation from the arithmetic mean as "middle success level", and schools with 1 standard deviation below the mean are "lower success level". Besides TEOG results, the distribution of female male students and the technological opportunities of schools were considered. Because of the cost, applicability and time limitation one school was chosen from each level of school.

Due to the young age of the students, the lack of a measurement tool that can measure the speaking skill in a short time and collectively as other skills, and lack of generalization of the universe, the implementation of the pre-test and post-test of speaking skill were conducted randomly with students from one class in each level of schools. Considering the practicality as well, while deciding the classes first there was a meeting with the administrators of the schools. The administrators said that the students in each class have already been distributed randomly. Also, this study is a part of the dissertation, and interviews were conducted with English teachers as another part of the dissertation as well. In this regard, the classes were also chosen where those teachers were teaching. Moreover, the ratio of female and male students was considered while choosing the study group. That is, 29 students (14 female, 15 male) from upper success level; 28 (15 female, 13 male) students from middle success level and 32 (18 female, 14 male) students from lower success level were chosen for the study. Accordingly, 47 female and 42 male students, 89 students in total, formed the study group of the research.

2.2. Data Collection Tools

  A speaking test was prepared in order to collect data. To prepare the questions, first critical objectives were decided. Totally, there are 23 speaking objectives in the curriculum. However, 13 critical objectives were determined out of 23 for the speaking test. To include questions for each objective in a test which aims at revealing the level of students at the end of the learning process can cause to have more questions than students can answer and decrease the usefulness of a test. Under these circumstances, objectives which reflect students' progress and development better are chosen (Özçelik, 2010). In addition, considering the young age of the students and their concentration span and the lack of a measurement tool that can measure the speaking skill in a short time and collectively as other skills, critical objectives were chosen to evaluate their success. While choosing the critical objectives, among 23 objectives the more comprehensive ones in terms of their content were considered. Besides, objectives which requires the other objectives in terms of their content were also taken separately as critical objectives. Therefore 13 objectives were decided as critical objectives. The critical objectives are as follows:
Students will be able to

1. use the correct word to identify certain objects, people or animals.
2. use everyday expressions for greeting and meeting someone.
3. express numbers and quantities of things.
4. name the colours of things.
5. invite someone to do things along with them.
6. show and tell the names of their body parts.
7. tell someone to do things.
8. say the names of certain pet animals.
9. say where the animals are by pointing and speaking.
10. ask about and say the names of the fruits they like.
11. tell others to do things with fruits by pointing and speaking.
12. say which animals they like/don't like.
13. say what they and some animals are able to do.

  Moreover, the question numbers which assess each critical objective are given in Table 1 below.

Table 1. The objectives and question numbers in speaking test

Communicative Functions and Skills	Number
Ss will be able to use the correct word to identify certain objects, people or animals.	3
Ss will be able to use everyday expressions for greeting and meeting someone.	1,2
Ss will be able to express numbers and quantities of things.	10,11
Ss will be able to name the colors of things.	14,15
Ss will be able to invite someone to do things along with them.	18
Ss will be able to show and tell the names of their body parts.	8,9
Ss will be able to tell someone to do things.	6,7
Ss will be able to say the names of certain pet animals.	4,5
Ss will be able to say where the animals are by pointing and speaking.	12,13
Ss will be able to ask about and say the names of the fruits they like.	19
Ss will be able to tell others to do things with fruits by pointing and speaking.	20
Ss will be able to say which animals they like/don't like.	16,17
Ss will be able to say what they and some animals are able to do	21

In order to provide face validity and content validity of the tests; to ensure scientific accuracy of the questions and to measure the understandability of the questions; seven people, including one assessment and evaluation specialist, three curriculum development experts, one lecturer and two English teachers were consulted.

The pilot study of the test was conducted with the number of 25 students who were on the 3rd grade in different success level of primary schools and had already studied 2nd grade English curriculum. That is, out of eight of the students were from lower level, nine of them were middle and 8 of them from upper success level of schools. The pilot study was conducted on the last week of May in 2015. After the implementation of the pilot form of speaking test four questions were omitted according to the results of item discrimination index and one item was corrected. Then 21 questions out of 26 questions were in the final form of the test. According to the statistics of the speaking final test, the arithmetic mean is 9.96; standard deviation of the test is 4.92; its variance is 24.29; the average difficulty of the test is 0.52 and the KR-20 reliability coefficient of the test is 0.86.

2.3. Data Analysis

To determine the level of achieving speaking skill objectives, the levels of reaching each objective in the pre-tests and post-tests were calculated for the students studying at different level of schools. In order to determine whether there is a significant difference between the pre-tests and post-tests scores of students in terms of the level of reaching speaking skill objectives, the normality assumption was first examined. Since the data sets were not distributed normally, the Wilcoxon signed rank test, a nonparametric technique, was used to determine whether there was a significant difference between the scores gathered. In addition, the data sets were divided into groups according to school success level in order to determine these differences in subgroups formed according to school success level and Wilcoxon signed rank tests were conducted.

To determine whether there is a significant difference between the students studying at different success level of schools in terms of the level of reaching the speaking skills objectives, it was first examined whether the scores gathered showed normal distribution in the upper, middle and lower success levels. It is observed that only the scores of the students at upper level school in the post-test show a normal distribution, while the other scores are not normally distributed. A nonparametric test is used when even a total score does not show a normal distribution. Therefore, the differences were analysed with the Kruskal Wallis H test.

4. Findings

In order to determine the level of accomplishing the speaking skill objectives in the program, the levels of reaching each objective in the test for the students in the lower, middle and upper success level in the pre-test and post-test are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Levels of achieving speaking skill goals in pre-test and post-test

Question	Lower level		Middle level		Upper level		Total	
	Pre test	Post test	Pre test	Post test	Pre test	Post test	Pre test	Post test
Question 1	0.50	0.97	0.96	1.00	0.90	1.00	0.78	0.99
Question 2	0.13	0.73	0.39	0.50	0.62	0.62	0.38	0.62
Question 3	0.07	0.13	0.04	0.21	0.14	0.52	0.08	0.29
Question 4	0.07	0.70	0.11	0.79	0.48	0.90	0.22	0.79
Question 5	0.07	0.27	0.07	0.71	0.14	0.55	0.09	0.51
Question 6	0.00	0.17	0.04	0.61	0.03	0.38	0.02	0.38
Question 7	0.00	0.03	0.04	0.39	0.00	0.24	0.01	0.22
Question 8	0.03	0.23	0.04	0.79	0.00	0.79	0.02	0,60
Question 9	0.00	0.43	0.04	0.43	0.00	0.66	0.01	0.51
Question 10	0.07	0.17	0.04	0.29	0.00	0.28	0.03	0.24
Question 11	0.00	0.03	0.04	0.18	0.00	0.41	0.01	0.21
Question 12	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.21	0.31	0.38	0.10	0.23
Question 13	0.07	0.10	0.00	0.25	0.28	0.31	0.11	0.22
Question 14	0.00	0.10	0.21	0.29	0.24	0.48	0.15	0.29
Question 15	0.00	0.10	0.18	0.32	0.21	0.45	0.13	0.29
Question 16	0.00	0.07	0.00	0.29	0.03	0.28	0.01	0.21
Question 17	0.00	0.07	0.00	0.25	0.03	0.24	0.01	0.18
Question 18	0.10	0.60	0.25	0.79	0.38	0.86	0.24	0.75
Question 19	0.03	0.17	0.00	0.32	0.34	0.45	0.13	0.31
Question 20	0.00	0.30	0.00	0.86	0.03	0.59	0.01	0.57
Question 21	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.43	0.00	0.28	0.00	0.26

According to Table 2, it was determined that students who took pre-test at the lower level could not reach any objectives at the beginning of the teaching process. Students in middle and high level schools reached the second objective measured by question 1 as 0.75 and above at the beginning of the teaching process.

For the post-test, the students in the lower success level only reached the second objective as 0.75 and above at the end of the teaching process. The students at the middle level school, on the other hand, for the second objective, it was determined that they reached the target level at the end of the teaching process, as in the beginning of the teaching process. In addition, at the end of the teaching process in the middle level school, the objectives the five, six, eight and eleven were reached of 0.75 and above at the end of the teaching process. In the upper-level school, the second objective was reached the target at the end of the teaching process as well as at the beginning of the teaching process. In addition, in the upper-level school, the objectives five, six and eight were reached of 0.75 and above at the end of the teaching process.

When all groups are taken into consideration, students have only reached the target of 0.75 and above for the second objective at the end of the teaching process. On the other hand, when the middle and upper success level schools are considered together, for the objectives five, six and eight it was determined that they reached their targets of 0.75 and above.

In summary, at the end of the teaching process, students at lower success level school have reached 1 of the 13 objectives measured with 21 questions; students at middle success level school have reached 5 and students at upper success level school have reached 4 objectives.

In order to determine whether there is a significant difference between the scores students got at the beginning of the teaching process and the scores they got at the end of the teaching process in terms of the level of reaching the speaking skills objectives, it was first tested whether the scores gathered showed a normal distribution; It was determined from the data gathered that the distribution was not normal. After examining the normality assumption, the Wilcoxon signed rank test, which is a nonparametric technique, was used. Test results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Difference of scores gathered from speaking skill pre-test and post-test

		N	Mean Ranks	Sum of Ranks	Z	p
PostSpeakTotal	Negative Ranks	2	6.50	13.00	7.866[1]	.000
PreSpeakTotal	Positive Ranks	81	42.88	3473.00		
	Equal Ranks	4				
	Total	87				

[1] based on negative ranks

[2] based on positive ranks

According to Table 3, there is a statistically significant difference between the scores of the students in the speaking skills pre-test and post-test ($Z = 7.866$, p <0.05). When the mean ranks and rank totals of the different scores are evaluated, it is seen that the observed difference is in favour of the positive ranks - that is, the post-test scores. Students' speaking skill post-test scores were statistically significantly higher than their pre-test scores.

The results of the Wilcoxon signed ranks test conducted to determine whether the scores differ significantly in upper, middle and lower level schools are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. *The difference of the scores gathered from the listening skill pre-test and post-test in schools with different success levels*

Level		N	Mean Ranks	Sum of Ranks	Z	p
Lower	Negative Ranks	1	3.50	3.50	4.556[1]	.000
	Positive Ranks	27	14.91	402.50		
	Equal Ranks	2				
	Total	30				
Middle	Negative Ranks	0	.00	.00	4.470[1]	.000
	Positive Ranks	26	13.50	351.00		
	Equal Ranks	2				
	Total	28				
Upper	Negative Ranks	1	2.50	2.50	4.657[1]	.000
	Positive Ranks	28	15.45	432.50		
	Equal Ranks	0				
	Total	29				

[1] based on negative ranks

[2] based on positive ranks

According to Table 4, there is a statistically significant difference between the scores of the students at the lower success level school in the speaking skill pre-test and post-test ($Z = 4.556$, p <0.05). The difference seems to be in favour of positive ranks - that is, post-test scores. The speaking skill levelling post-test scores of the students at the lower success level school were statistically significantly higher than the pre-test scores.

Similarly, there was a statistically significant difference between the scores of students with both middle ($Z = 4.470$, p <0.05) and upper success level ($Z = 4.657$, p <0.05) in speaking skills pre-test and post-test. there seems to be a difference. When the mean rank and rank totals of the difference scores are evaluated, it is seen that the observed difference is in favour of the positive ranks - that is, the post-test scores. Speaking skill post-test scores of students at middle level and students at upper level schools are statistically significantly higher than pre-test scores. This situation shows that, in terms of speaking skill, the success of the students studying at schools with three success levels increased significantly at the end of the teaching process. On the other hand, although there is a statistically significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the students in all three groups; The level of reaching the objectives within the scope of speaking skills at the 0.75 level is quite low.

In order to determine whether there is a significant difference between the students studying at different success levels in terms of the level of reaching the speaking skill objectives, it was first tested whether the scores gathered show normal distribution in schools with upper, middle and lower success levels; It was determined from the data gathered that the distribution was not normal. Then, the Kruskal Wallis H test was used to examine whether there was a significant difference between the means. The results of this test are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. *Difference of scores gathered from speaking skill test by school success*

Level	N	Mean Ranks	H	Sd	P	Difference
Lower	30	27.30	20.666	2	.000	1-2
Middle	28	50.34				1-3
Upper	29	55.16				
Total	87					

According to Table 5, there is a statistically significant difference between the speaking skill l test scores of the students studying at schools with different success levels ($H = 20.666$, p <0.05). In order to determine which groups had a significant difference, Mann-Whitney U tests were used to provide paired comparison in subgroups. Both the speaking skill test scores of the students studying at the upper success level school (Rank Average = 55) and the speaking skill test scores of the students studying at the middle success level school (Average Rank = 50); The

speaking skill of the students studying at the lower success level is statistically significantly higher than the test scores (Mean Rank = 27). No significant difference was found between the speaking skill test scores of the students studying in middle and upper level schools.

5. Conclusion and Discussion

When the findings gathered from the speaking skill test, it was concluded that the level of reaching the objectives varies according to the level of school success. When the scores of the students in upper, middle and lower level schools were evaluated, it was concluded that the scores of the students at the end of the teaching process according to the three success level of schools have increased significantly. On the other hand, despite the increase in the students' scores at the end of the teaching process, the majority of the objectives was not reached at the expected level at the end of the teaching process for all level of schools. Specifically, when the level of reaching the speaking skill objectives is analysed according to different success level of schools, it was found that it is in favour of the upper level among the upper and lower levels. Moreover, a significant difference in favour of the middle level was found between the middle and lower levels. On the other hand, a significant difference was found between the students studying in middle and low level schools. Also, there was no significant difference between the upper and middle levels regarding students' test scores. This result partially overlaps with the study of Seçkin (2010), who found a significant difference between upper and middle levels in terms of reaching the objectives of 4th grade students in speaking test.

Although teaching speaking is one of the main purpose of the 2nd grade curriculum, according to the results of the study it can be said that the curriculum needs to be revised to improve students' speaking skill better. Also, these results pointed out that some factors may be considered while designing the curriculum. Because in some studies especially classroom factors such as crowd and lack of technological equipment are considered as negative factors which demotivate students' speaking performance (Heidari & Oghli, 2015; Ilıman, 2018). Also similar to the studies conducted in second grade level of primary schools, and the different studies conducted in different grades, it was concluded that the curriculum caused difficulties for teachers in terms of insufficient time which hinders to reach objectives in the curriculum. (Büyükduman, 2005; Er, 2006; Kırkgöz, 2006; Ilıman, 2018). Teachers who try to follow the program may not have been able to devote the time and effort required to develop a skill that requires one-on-one attention and much time, as speaking skill. Therefore, these factors can affect to get the expected results from the speaking tests.

Moreover, the difference between groups in the level of reaching speaking skill objectives may also be closely related to the affective characteristics of the students. That is, students' characteristics could affect their test performance in a negative way. Accordingly, Moon (2000) stated that positive attitude, high motivation and low anxiety level in the classroom would increase students' success. Also, in the study conducted by Şad (2011), it was found out that the most important determinants of academic success in English course were foreign language anxiety, attitude towards learning a foreign language and English lesson, and attitude towards foreign people and cultures for 4th and 5th grade students. Especially speaking anxiety is a major problem which affects students' speaking performance during the classroom (Bachore & Satenaw; Brown, 2001). According to Ilıman (2018) students' shyness has negative effects on students' speaking performance as well. Therefore, such factors can be the reasons of students' low scores in the speaking test. Besides, students' both speaking and listening skills can show difference according to where they live, their socio-economic conditions or their high schools (Barın, 1997). That is, their socio-cultural situation is also important while learning a foreign language (Gardner, Masgoret & Tremblay, 1999). In this respect, although there is no information about the socio-economic conditions of the students, they can be one of the reasons which indicate the differences among three level of schools.

Considering all these factors affecting speaking skill performance, it can be deduced that the curriculum is not sufficient to help students achieve speaking objectives. Also, it can be concluded that there have been some points in the curriculum which needs to be reconsidered. That is, classroom hours in the curriculum may not be enough to improve students speaking performance or it can be said that the number of objectives may be so high that it is not possible to reach all the objectives in the curriculum. Also, techniques, activities, and classroom environment may not be enough to lower students' anxiety and motivate students' learning.

In this context, considering the individual differences between students, different activities to improve speaking skill and lower students' anxiety can be added to the program with practical examples and the objectives and course hours should be revised accordingly. For further studies, it can be suggested that as this study is a small-scale study a large-scale study can be conducted in different parts of Turkey. Also, this study only focused on the results of pre and post speaking test, an evaluation related to speaking skill can be made by considering the teachers' opinions or in class observations. Thus, speaking part of the curriculum can be evaluated from different angels and more

comprehensive conclusions can be reached related to classroom hours, usefulness of activities, techniques and objectives.

6. Declaration of Conflict of Interest and Contribution

İmgehan ÖZKAN ELGÜN contributed to the theoretical background, design, data collection, data analysis, findings, discussion and recommendations parts of this article produced from the first author's doctoral dissertation entitled "Evaluation of second grade English curriculum based on eclectic model". Esed YAĞCI, contributed to the design, data analysis, findings, discussion and recommendations parts of this article produced from the first author's doctoral dissertation entitled "Evaluation of second grade English curriculum based on eclectic model. The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

References

Antalya İl Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğü temel eğitimden ortaöğretime geçiş sistemi 2013-2014 öğretim yılı tüm dersler not ortalamasına göre okul sıralaması. https://antalya.meb.gov.tr/

Bachore, M. M., & Satenaw, A. (2018). An investigation into the extent and challenges of assessing students' speaking skills in selected secondary schools: the cases of Wolayita Zone, Ethiopia. *International Journal of Education, 11*(1), 78-86.

Balım, D. (2020). *Beşinci sınıf İngilizce ağırlıklı öğretim programının aydınlatıcı değerlendirme modeliyle değerlendirilmesi* (Master thesis). Pamukkale University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Denizli.

Barın, M. (1997). *Dinleme-konuşma becerilerinin önemi, dil öğretimine katkıları ve Atatürk üniversitesi ingiliz dili bölümlerinde uygulanışı* (Unpublished Phd thesis). Atatürk University, Institute of Social Sciences, Erzurum.

Bayraktar, B. (2014). *İlkokul 2. sınıf İngilizce dersi öğretim programının öğretmen görüşlerine göre değerlendirilmesi* (Unpublished master thesis). Uludağ University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Bursa.

Bozkurt, S. (2019). The effects of role-play and storytelling on the speaking performance, speaking anxiety and communication willingness of efl students (Master thesis). Marmara University, Institute of Educational Sciences, İstanbul.

Brown, H. (2001). *Teaching by principles: an interactive approach to language pedagogy*. New York: Pearson Education

Cihan, N. (2001). *Erken yaşta çok dillilik ve yabancı dil* (Unpublished master thesis). İstanbul University, Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul.

Çiftçi Cinkavuk, E. (2017). *An evaluation of 2ⁿᵈ grade English language teaching program of primary school: Tokat case* (Unpublished MA thesis). Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Educational Science Institute, Çanakkale.

Dağlı, A. (2007). Küreselleşme karşısında Türk eğitim sistemi. *D.Ü. Ziya Gökalp Journal of Education Faculty, 9,* 1-13.

Demir, O. & Duruhan, K. (2015). İlkokul 2. sınıf İngilizce dersi programı uygulamalarına ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. *International Journal of New Trends in Arts, Sports & Science Education, 4*(3), 25-36.

Demirel, Ö. (2012). *Eğitimde program geliştirme.* Ankara, Pegem.

EF Education First, (2020). EF English Proficiency Index.

Er, K. O. (2006). Evaluation of English Curricula in 4th and 5th Grade Primary Schools. Ankara *University, Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences, 39*(2), 1-25.

Erarslan, A. (2016). *An evaluation of second grade English language curriculum: teachers' perceptions and issues in implementation* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Educational Science Institute, Çanakkale.

Erişkon Cangil, 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. *İstanbul University Journal of Hasan Ali Yücel Faculty of Education*, 2, 273-282.

Fikriah, F. (2016). Using the storytelling technique to improve English speaking skills of primary school students. *English Education Journal, 7*(1), 87-101

Gardner, R. C., Masgoret, A. M., Tremblay, P. F. (1999). Home background characteristics and second language learning. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology,* 419-437.

Heidari, A. & Oghli, H. S. (2015). De-motivational factors of speaking English: A case of Iranian high school students. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World (IJLLALW), 9*(3), 115-122.

Graddol, D. (2006). *English next: Why global English may mean the end of'English as a foreign language.* British Council Publications.

Hartono, (2018). The effects of storytelling technique on students' speaking achievement. *SELL Journal, 3*(2), 183-188.

Karasar, N. (2010). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi.* Nobel Yayıncılık : Ankara

Kırkgöz, Y. (2006). Teaching EFL at the primary level in Turkey. M.L. McCloskey, J. Orr ve M. Dolitsky (Editörler), *Teaching English as a foreign language in primary school* (s. 85-99). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Lengerlioğlu, Y. (2019). *The effects of TV series as curricular activities on speaking skills of English language learners.* (Öaster thesis). Hacettepe University, Department of Freign language Education, Ankara.

Marsden, E. J., & Torgerson, C. J. (2012). Single group, pre- and post- research designs: Some methodological concerns. *Oxford Review of Education*, *38*(5), 583-616.

MONE (2013). *İlköğretim kurumları (ilkokullar ve ortaokullar) İngilizce dersi (2, 3,4, 5, 6, 7 ve 8. sınıflar) öğretim programı.*Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı.

Moon, J. (2000). *Children learning English.* Oxford: Macmillan Heinemann.

Orhan Karsak, G. H. (2020). Eğitimde program değerlendirme kapsamında uzman yönelimli değerlendirme modeli'ne genel bir bakış. *The Journal of Academic Social Science, 6*(66), 161-176Özçelik, D. A. (2010). *Test hazırlama kılavuzu.* Ankara: Pegem Akademi

Özçelik, D. A. (2013). *Okullarda ölçme ve değerlendirme*. *Öğretmen el kitabı* Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık.

Özüdoğru, F. (2016). *İlkokul 2. sınıf İngilizce öğretim programının diller için Avrupa ortak başvuru metni doğrultusunda aydınlatıcı değerlendirme modeli ile değerlendirilmesi* (Unpunlished Phd thesis). Anadolu University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Eskişehir.

Özüdoğru, F. (2017). İlkokul ikinci sınıf İngilizce öğretim programı kapsamında dinleme ve konuşma becerilerinin öğretimi. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Journal of Education*, *42*, 189-210.

Seçkin, H. (2010). *İlköğretim 4. sınıf İngilizce dersi öğretim programının değerlendirilmesi* (Unpublished Phd thesis). Hacettepe University, Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara.

Süer, S. (2014). *İlkokul 2. sınıf İngilizce dersi öğretim programının öğretmen görüşlerine göre değerlendirilmesi (Diyarbakır ili örneği)* (Unpunlished master thesis). Dicle University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Diyarbakır.

Şad, S. N. (2011). *İlköğretim birinci kademe İngilizce öğretim programının çocuklara yabancı dil öğretiminin duyuşsal hedeflerini gerçekleştirme düzeyi* (Unpublished Phd Thesis). İnönü University, Institute of Educational Sciences , Malatya.

Şevik, M. (2008). Avrupa ülkelerinde ilköğretim birinci kademe zorunlu yabancı dil öğretiminin karşılaştırılması. *Ankara University Journal of Educational Sciences, 41*(1), 135-162.Yaşar, Ö. (2015). İlkokul 2. sınıf fun with teddy İngilizce ders kitabının öğretmen görüşleri doğrultusunda değerlendirilmesi. *The Journal of Turkish Social Studies, 19*(1), 329-348.