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Abstract
In terms of language teaching, individuals’ ability to master their native language and grammar rules directly affects foreign language acquisition processes. Considering this situation, which is also defined as “interdisciplinary” the background of foreign language learning processes in the context of the native language should be established. The fact that an individual who has not yet learned the rules or concepts in his native language, and therefore does not have schemes in his mind, negatively affect being successful in learning foreign language for the same concept or rules. For this reason, it is necessary to ensure coordination during the acquisition of the target achievements of both disciplines by adopting an interdisciplinary approach in native and foreign language teaching. The aim of this study is to address Turkish and English curricula regarding learning outcomes of grammar and to identify outcomes of English grammar that middle school students start to learn before they enter into the learning process of their native language. The education programs of both disciplines were examined in terms of grammar acquisitions, and the target achievements that were tried to be taught to individuals in the English lesson were determined even though the Turkish language course was not started yet. Based on the data obtained, recommendations were made depending on the before-after relationship in terms of grammar acquisitions of both programs, and it was aimed to draw attention to a significant deficiency in language teaching and to contribute to drawing a correspondence between the curriculums.
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1. Introduction

Language acquisition is a process in which the performance of the learner can be severely affected according to certain critical periods. “There seems to be enough indirect evidence that language acquisition is difficult at first, at the age of six, seven or eight, and then during adolescence. When you have passed a certain age, you can get the language, but it is generally like a formation on the language you already know” (Chomsky, 2000, p. 69). Therefore, the language learning approaches of individuals
in adolescence are not similar to the learning conditions of individuals younger than themselves or the learning conditions of adult individuals.

It can be said that the effect of native language on learning foreign language is defended by two different views: First, those who argue that the native language has a negative effect on the learning of the foreign language. Second, those who argue that the inability to achieve a certain level of maturation in the native language will be a negative factor in the foreign language learning process. Sweet and Palmer, as representatives of the constructivist approach, regarded the native language (L1), implicitly or explicitly, not as an aid to learning L2, but merely as an obstacle (Ringbom, 1987, p.46). However, there are those who claim that the first view was defended based on ideological intentions. According to Auerbach (1993, p. 29), this monolingual policy interiorized in teaching English is not educational but based on political reasons.

The idea that native language may have a negative impact on foreign language learning may be true for children in early childhood, which is the critical period of language learning. It can also be accepted that using too much of the native language may prevent exposure to foreign language. However, for secondary school students who use certain rules of their native language as a master in speaking, writing and reading skills, it is inevitable to question differences and to compare the syntax and grammar rules of a foreign language with their native language. In the context of contrastive analysis, there are many studies (Rast, 2008; Eckman, 1977; Wardhaugh, 1970) on the interaction between languages in the foreign language (L2) learning process. In these studies, it was pointed out that the native language’s syntax, grammatical structures, word similarity between languages have a positive or negative effect on learning the target language. However, considering the fact that each language has similar features, it is natural to expect these similar structures to contribute to second language learning. Şimşek (2010, p. 8) states that in his research on the use of the native language in foreign language teaching, the result of the explanation of grammar rules was the first subject that teachers and students in the foreign language class most commonly approve of using native language. This result even appeared in studies investigating the opinions of many teachers and students whose native language is from different language families such as German, French, Korean, Indonesian, Japanese, Chinese, Croatian, and students and teachers supported the use of native language for the acquisition of the target language especially for grammar. These results reveal that in terms of learning outcomes of grammar, in order to comprehend the grammatical structures of the target language as well as the students’ native language explanations, the starting points are the native languages and its grammar structure.

The existence of common concepts such as adjectives, adverbs, tense and mode structures in the grammatical structure of both English and Turkish is an indication that it will be beneficial to associate with Turkish as the native language in the acquisition of the foreign language. The participants think that they had to mention the grammatical features of Turkish to teach the grammatical schemes of English is another factor supporting this view.

Chomsky (2001, p. 122) states that the dialects, which are spoken far from each other in time and space, and that are almost never understood in the first encounter, share a broad core of rules and processes, and very small changes are seen in the basic structures that seem to remain unchanged over long historical periods. By making his example even more obvious, he argues that there is a basic set of principles that do not vary even between languages that have no connection with each other.

In many studies on the problems of foreign language teaching, various factors have been mentioned. For example, there is no foreign language teaching policy and planning in our education system; lack of language teaching programs and methods specific to the structure of our country; Many examples for students, teachers or learning environments can be included in these factors (Suna & Durmuşçelebi, 2013). Another study reveals that the success to be achieved in foreign language teaching is closely
related to the method used, student motivation, student-teacher interaction, foreign language teacher training, curriculum, measurement and evaluation, culture and success in teaching native language” (Can & Can, 2014, p. 44).

Do they have a good mastery of the native language or being successful in the native language contribute to the acquisition of the target language? “Success in learning a foreign language depends on reaching a certain level of maturity in the native language. The child can transfer the system of meanings he has acquired in his own language to the new language” (Vygotsky, 1998, p. 159). Initially, it is thought that the main language is Spanish, Norwegian, Chinese, Japanese, and the fact that they have created grammar rules in their minds will cause negative transfer in individuals’ learning a second language, and the target language learning processes will negatively affect them. However, scientists realized that morphological and syntactic mistakes of individuals who speak these languages whose syntax and morphological features differ from the target language English, are not related to the effect of the native language (Gordon, 2007, p. 61-62). Even though many of the thoughts put forward regarding this question are ignored, it was revealed in a semi-structured interview questionnaire applied to English teachers, where there were difficulties in perceiving the perfect tense subjects in English, which did not have a grammar equivalent in Turkish. Undoubtedly, the biggest difficulty in learning this subject is that there is no such tense in the grammatical structure of Turkish. Therefore, the ability of the individual to master the rules of the native language contributes to the acquisition of that language, no matter how different the target language’s syntax or other rules are. It is natural for an individual who aims to learn the target language to try to make sense of the experiences related to that language by comparing them with the templates he / she created in his native language.

It should not be expected that individuals who do not know the features of their native language well and who do not know the rules, will succeed in the target language acquisition, no matter how qualified a foreign language they acquired. The fact that the individual has not yet learned a term or grammar rule in his own language means that he has not acquire the mental schemes for that rule or term, that is, he does not have learning experiences and readiness. In fact, the interaction between native language and foreign language is not unilateral. In the learning process, the interaction between languages can be from the native language to the foreign language or from the foreign language to the development of the native language (Kecskes & Papp, 2000, p. 11).

In this respect, there should be a compatibility with both Turkish and English teaching programs during the teaching of grammar acquisitions, which includes the subject of the research, by class. For example, a grammar learning outcome that is aimed to be acquired in 7th grade in Turkish lesson should take place as the 5th grade learning outcome of English lesson, which may be a problem preventing learning.

The aim of this study is to draw attention to the grammar gains in English before the Turkish lesson in the curriculum and to contribute to the mutual interaction of both languages.

Interdisciplinary teaching is the only way to organize education entirely around concepts or problems, and to effectively integrate information from different fields in the processing of this concept or problem.

“Most scientists today support the Critical Period Hypothesis and believe that mother tongue can be learned only if children are exposed to language during early years. It is generally believed that the window for the language learning opportunity closes and that the language instinct is dramatically decreased around the age of puberty” (Gordon, 2007, p. 52).

1.1. Literature review

1.1.1. Approaches and Hypotheses on the Effect of L1 in L2 Teaching

“The role of the native language in the learning of another language is not a feature of the foreign language learning research discussed only in the last decade or two” (Ringbom, 1987, p. 44). “When
learning a first language, the process is relatively simple: all we have to do is learn a set of new habits as we learn to respond to stimuli in our environment. When learning a second language, however, we run into problems: we already have a set of well-established responses in our mother tongue. The SLL process therefore involves replacing those habits by a set of new ones. The complication is that the old first-language habits interfere with this process, either helping or inhibiting it. If structures in the second language are similar to those of the first, then learning will take place easily. If, however, structures are realized differently in the first and the second language, then learning will be difficult” (Mitchell & Myles, 2004, p. 31).

The trend adopted in the early stages of the second language learning process was “Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis”. Recently, Chomsky’s views on the role of the mother tongue in second language learning have changed significantly.

1.1.2. Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis

Although this hypothesis was put forward by Lado (1957), it is based on the assumption that learners tend to transfer the structures in their native language and culture to a foreign language. This assumption is based on the assumption that L2 learners will tend to transfer the formal features of their L1 to L2 expressions (Dost, 2017, p. 166). CAH was an enterprise built in the 1950s on the twin bases of structural linguistics and behaviourist psychology. The logic of CAH was relatively simple: if acquisition of the L1 involved the formation of a set of habits, then the same process must also be involved in second language acquisition, with the difference that some of the habits appropriate to the L2 will already have been acquired in the L1; others will have been acquired in the L1 but will need to be modified or eradicated in the context of the L2; and yet others will need to be acquired from scratch for the L2 (Towell & Hawkins, 1994, p. 17).

“The contrast analysis hypothesis can be expressed in two ways, the strong and the weak version. In addition to the claim that the strong version is very realistic and impractical, the weak version should provide certain possibilities in terms of usefulness. However, the weak version is also skeptical by some linguistic circles” (Wardhaugh, 1970, p. 124). Although this study will not be practiced on a student community in the context of native language and target language, it is important to mention that research and discussions have been going on for a long time regarding the fact that L1 has an effect on the acquisition of L2. However, theories have been put forward by approaching second language acquisition with a cognitive logic.

“Language is a versatile, highly developed system that enables the transfer of thoughts, feelings and wishes to others by making use of the elements and rules that are common in a society in terms of sound and meaning” (Aksan, 2015, p. 55). Grammar is the study that reveals the functioning of a language and the order it offers, especially covering the syntax with morphology (Vardar, 2007, p. 73). The fact that basic language skills should also be compatible with grammar rules places grammar teaching in a central position (Aytas & Cечен, 2010, p. 78). Aside from the curriculum of the Turkish and English lessons, the models in which the lessons that can be considered far apart in learning processes will support each other’s target achievements under the concept of “cross curricular teaching” are discussed and put forward.

1.1.3. Purpose and significance of the study

The main purpose of this research is to prove that the level of readiness in L1 affects the learning performance in L2 positively or negatively. Grammar issues in Turkish and English curricula were discussed. Accordingly, by comparing the grammar learning outcomes in the curricula of both courses, the grammar learning outcomes that the students learn in L2 without learning them in L1 were determined. Firstly, grammar learning outcomes, which were taught in L2 curriculum before L1 curriculum, were determined. Thus, the grammar subjects that the students learned in L2 before they learn them in L1 were determined. In order to understand whether this situation affects L2 learning
performance negatively, obtaining data from learning-teaching processes was aimed. For this reason, a semi-structured interview form was applied for grammar acquisition by referring to the observations of English teachers on the subject. For this reason, a semi-structured interview form on grammar acquisition was applied to learn the observations of English teachers on the subject. Thus, the theoretically obtained data was compared with the data in the practical field to determine its accuracy. With this comparison and verification process, the internal consistency of the research was tried to be achieved. The results reveal that if the grammar learning outcomes in the L1 curriculum are taken to earlier grade levels, the readiness of students for teaching English will be supported by the native language. Also, English teachers will need less to mention L1 in order to teach the learning outcomes of L2.

1.2. Research questions

In the research, answers to the following questions were sought for:

1. What are the grammar subjects included in the L2 curriculum before those of L1 are taught?
2. What do teachers think about whether the process of L2 acquisition can be supported by modifications on the curriculum of L1 concerning learning outcomes of grammar?
3. What are the issues that English teachers have difficulty with regard to topics, activities and learning outcomes related to grammar depending on native language teaching? What are the reasons for teachers’ difficulties in these subjects?
4. Do the grammar subjects that are claimed, depending on L1, to be hard to teach by teachers correspond to the subjects determined in the curriculums?

2. Method

This research was designed on qualitative research methods and data collection ways are based on two different sources: 1. Curriculum of Turkish and English lessons 2. Subjective comments made by teachers of English on a semi-structured interview form. In qualitative research is conversational, flexible and fluid, and the purpose is achieved through active engagement by interviewer and interviewee around relevant issues, topics and experiences during the interview itself (Mason, 2002, p. 225). Curriculum (Turkish and English) was scanned by document analysis method, which is one of the qualitative research methods in the context of grammar subjects and learning outcomes. “Qualitative research in which qualitative information gathering methods such as observation, interview and document analysis are used, and a qualitative process is followed in order to reveal perceptions and events in a natural and realistic manner” (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2016, p. 10). “Document review involves the analysis of written materials that contain information about the phenomenon or facts intended to be investigated” (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2016, p. 189). Textbooks on history and social issues, educational materials written for children are among the documents that can be used in the document analysis method in the field of social science (Seggie, Bayyurt, & Ulutas, 2017, p. 294). Accordingly, the learning outcomes that students encountered as a language learning outcomes in English teaching were determined before they got Turkish courses. How many grades these achievements take place in both English and Turkish are presented in tables.

Based on these data, the hypothesis of the research is on the grammar issues that students encounter in foreign language learning processes without acquiring them in their native language learning activities. It is thought that this situation may create a problem in learning or that the topics will be seen primarily in Turkish lessons will also contribute to foreign language education. It is believed that the learning
outcomes parallelism to be provided between the curriculums will be beneficial for the acquisition of both languages.

Another component of the research data is semi-structured interview forms applied to English teachers. The semi-structured interview is a qualitative data collection strategy in which the researcher asks informants a series of predetermined but open-ended questions. The researcher has more control over the topics of the interview than in unstructured interviews, but in contrast to structured interviews or questionnaires that use closed questions, there is no fixed range of responses to each question (Given, 2008, p. 810).

A form aimed at obtaining data from experiences regarding the situations arising in the English language learning activities was applied to ten English teachers with at least ten years of teaching experience, depending on the students’ inability to master their language skills. The findings obtained from the form and the curriculum were compared. Thus, an alternative data source was provided about the research problems and the reliability of the data obtained from the curriculum was confirmed by comparing it with the form data.

Group interviews (structured, semi-structured, or structured) include a data collection method based on querying multiple people at the same time (Thorpe & Holt, 2008, p.122). These forms provide both fixed choice answering and the ability to go deeply in the relevant field. It provides opportunities such as easy analysis, giving the interviewee the opportunity to express himself and providing in-depth information when necessary (Büyüköztürk, Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz, & Demirel, 2019, p.159). The data in the forms were revealed by content analysis method. “Content analysis is done to determine the existence of certain words or concepts in a text or a set of texts” (Büyüköztürk, Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz, & Demirel, 2019, p.259).

In order to check the expediency, understandability and applicability of the prepared interview form, opinions were received from the field experts. An interview form was prepared in line with the experts’ suggestions. Internal validity (credibility) was tried to be maintained by keeping the duration of the interviews conducted in the research long and the consistency of the findings obtained and the compatibility with the conceptual framework were checked in order to increase the credibility of the data. The credibility of the research was tried to be increased by making direct quotations from the interview form. In order to increase the internal reliability (consistency) of the research, direct reference to the finding samples was made.

2.1. Instrument(s)

The semi-structured interview form, which is one of the data collection tools of the research, is aimed at determining whether the grammar proficiency (or deficiency) in native language teaching affects the performance of foreign language teaching in accordance with the aims of the research. However, if there is an impact, it aims to obtain it from the English teachers who carry out the learning processes on which subjects this is due to curriculum programs. After the form was prepared, it was examined by two field experts from the English language teaching departments. After the form was prepared, it was examined by two field experts from the English teaching department, in the light of their feedback, the form was finalized. In order to ensure the reliability of the form, the opinions of the field experts were calculated using Miles and Huberman’s (1994) formula (Reliability = consensus /consensus + disagreement). According to this formula, the reliability of the form was calculated as 0.91 and it was considered to have sufficient reliability. Then, the pilot scheme of the form was carried out and the status of serving/not serving the assessment tool was tested practically. In the light of the feedback from the experts, the form is put into final form. To ensure the internal validity (credibility) of the data obtained from the form, the duration of the interviews was kept long and the consistency of the findings obtained and the
compatibility with the conceptual framework were checked to increase the credibility of the data. In order to increase the credibility of the data, the consistency of the findings obtained and their compatibility with the conceptual framework were checked. Additionally, to increase the external validity (transferability) of the research, the research process has been described in detail.

2.2. Sample / Participants

In addition to the data related to the curricula of the research, data were obtained from English teachers with a semi-structured interview form. In this regard, the research has population and sample. The population of the research is composed of English teachers who are on duty and have at least ten years of experience. The sample of the study includes ten teachers, who are determined by simple random sampling method. The fact that the teachers have at least ten years of work experience has been determined as the sample criterion.

2.3. Data collection and analysis

In the study, Turkish and English curriculums were analysed by document analysis method, one of the qualitative research methods. From the 4th grade level, grammar subjects that were included in the English Teaching Program as a target acquisition before the Turkish lesson were determined. Accordingly, students encounter the topics of modals (can, must, may), simple present tense, adjectives, simple past tense, present continuous tense, comparisons and adverbs in English lessons before encountering Turkish lessons. It is thought that bringing forward these subjects to the previous levels in the Turkish Education Program as a grade level will contribute to ensuring the succession between languages and increasing the positive interaction between native language and foreign language teaching processes.

Another data obtained in the study is the semi-structured interview form implemented to the English teachers. The semi-structured interview form prepared on the subject was implemented to English teachers and the reliability of the findings obtained from the programs was tried to be confirmed and new data were obtained.

3. Result

In this section, firstly, the learning outcomes in the Turkish and English curriculums were compared. The subjects taught in the English lesson before the Turkish lesson in the 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th grades are presented in the tables with the learning outcomes.

In another section, the data obtained from participants are included. Then, whether the data obtained from both interviews and curriculums support each other and the research hypothesis was examined.

3.1. Results related to Turkish and English Curricula

| Functions & Useful Language and Language Skills and Learning Outcomes | Subject of Grammar | Turkish Course Teaching Program |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| E4.3.S2. Students will be able to deliver a simple, brief speech about abilities with an initial preparation.) (MONE, 2018b, p. 42). | Modals (Can/ Can’t) | T.7.3.10. Students will be able to distinguish simple, derived and compound verbs (MONE, 2018a, p. 56). |
Making simple inquiries

Do you like dancing?
— Yes, I do.

Do you like watching cartoons?
— No, I don’t (MONE, 2018b, p. 42).

Simple Present Tense

E4.4.S2. Students will be able to engage in simple conversations about likes and dislikes. (MONE, 2018b, p. 42).

Simple Present Tense

E4.7.L1. Students will be able to identify other people’s jobs and likes in a short, simple oral text.
E4.7.S1. Students will be able to talk about other people’s jobs and likes in simple conversations.)
— I’m a doctor. I work at a hospital (MONE, 2018b, p. 45).

Simple Present Tense

E4.9.L1. Students will be able to understand the main point in short, clear, simple messages and announcements (e.g., describing people and their features). Speaking
E4.9.S1. Students will be able to describe their friends and other people (family members, teachers, etc.).
E4.9.S2. Students will be able to ask and answer questions about other people’s physical characteristics.
E4.9.S3. Students will be able to talk about possessions (MONE, 2018b, p. 47).

Adjectives

According to Table 1, it was revealed that can / can’t modals, simple present tense and adjectives subjects were taught in the English lesson before they were taught in the Turkish lesson. While students learn these subjects in the 6th and 7th grades in Turkish lesson, they encounter them in the 4th grade in the English lesson.

Table 2. Learning Outcomes for English Grammar at Grade 5 and Their Equivalents in Turkish Lesson in Terms of Both Learning Outcomes and Grade Levels

| Functions & Useful Language and Language Skills and Learning Outcomes | Subject of Grammar | Turkish Course Teaching Program |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|
| Expressing likes and dislikes                                | T.7.3.9. Students will be able to distinguish the functions of inflectional suffixes. | T.7.3.9. Students will be able to distinguish the functions of inflectional suffixes. |
| What is/are your favorite class(es)?                        | Simple Present Tense | a) Verb conjugations are emphasized (MONE, 2018a, p. 56). |
| — My favorite class(es) is/are                               |                   |                                  |
| — I like English and maths.                                  |                   |                                  |
| I don’t like/dislike/hate (MONE, 2018b, p. 53)              |                   |                                  |
| Describing what people do regularly (Making simple inquiries) | Simple Present Tense | T.7.3.9. Students will be able to distinguish the functions of inflectional suffixes. |
| (MONE, 2018b, p. 53).                                       |                   | a) Verb conjugations are emphasized (MONE, 2018a, p. 56). |
stomachache. S/he feels cold and tired. S/he needs pills (MONE, 2018b, p. 54).

| Simple Present Tense | T.7.3.9. Students will be able to distinguish the functions of inflectional suffixes. a) Verb conjugations are emphasized (MONE, 2018a, p. 56). |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Asking for and giving directions
(Making simple inquiries)
Excuse me, how can I get to the city center?
— Go (straight) ahead and turn left on Uçarlı Street.
— Thanks.

| Excuse me, where is the bus station? — It’s on Papatya Street (MONE, 2018b, p. 57). | Modals (can/can’t) | T.7.3.10. Students will be able to distinguish simple, derived and compound verbs (MONE, 2018a, p. 56). |
|---------------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Sorry, can/could you repeat that, please? (Students will be able to ask for clarification by asking the speaker to repeat what has been said (MONE, 2018b, p. 57).

| Making simple suggestions — You should stay in bed. — Have a rest (MONE, 2018b, p. 54). | Modals (should, shouldn’t) | T.7.3.9. Students will be able to distinguish the functions of inflectional suffixes. a) Verb conjugations are emphasized (MONE, 2018a, p. 56). |
|---------------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

E5.7.S3. Students will be able to use utterances to express obligation (MONE, 2018b, p. 56).

| Modals (must, mustn’t) | T.7.3.9. Students will be able to distinguish the functions of inflectional suffixes. a) Verb conjugations are emphasized (MONE, 2018a, p. 56). |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

E5.8.S2. Students will be able to accept or refuse suggestions in a simple way) (MONE, 2018b, p. 57).

| Modals | T.7.3.9. Students will be able to distinguish the functions of inflectional suffixes. a) Verb conjugations are emphasized (MONE, 2018a, p. 56). |
|--------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

(E5.9.S1. Students will be able to talk about what people/animals are doing at the moment.
E5.9.S2. Students will be able to ask for permission. E5.9.S3. Students will be able to use simple utterances to describe what other people are doing at the moment. E5.9.R1. Students will be able to understand short and simple texts about what people/animals are doing at the moment.) (MONE, 2018b, p. 58).

| Present Continuous Tense | T.7.3.9. Students will be able to distinguish the functions of inflectional suffixes. a) Verb conjugations are emphasized (MONE, 2018a, p. 56). |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
According to Table 2, it was revealed that simple present tense, present continuous tense and can/could, be able to, should/shouldn’t, must/mustn’t modals subjects were taught in the 5th grade of the English lesson. However, these subjects were taught in the 7th grade of the Turkish lesson.

**Table 3.** Learning Outcomes for English Grammar at Grade 6 and Their Equivalents in Turkish Lesson in Terms of Both Learning Outcomes and Grade Levels

| Functions & Useful Language and Language Skills and Learning Outcomes | Subject of Grammar | Turkish Course Teaching Program |
|---|---|---|
| (E6.2.SI1. Students will be able to ask people about their food preferences) (MONE, 2018b, p. 63). | Modals | T.7.3.10. Students will be able to distinguish simple, derived and compound verbs (MONE, 2018a, p. 56). |
| E6.3.L2. Students will be able to pick up the expressions in a dialogue comparing things. E6.3.SI2. Students will be able to ask people to compare things. E6.3.SP2. Students will be able to make comparisons between two things (MONE, 2018b, p. 63). | Comparisons | T.6.3.29. Students will be able to make inferences about what they read. Cause-effect, purpose-effect, condition, comparison, analogy, exemplification, emotional expressions, amplification are emphasised (MONE, 2018a, p. 58). |
| Describing what people are doing now (Making simple inquiries) (MONE, 2018b, p. 63). | Simple Present Tense | a) Verb conjugations are emphasized (MONE, 2018, p. 56). |
| E6.5.SP1. Students will be able to use various simple expressions to state the feelings and personal opinions about places and things. Spoken Interaction E6.5.SI1. Students will be able to talk about and express the feelings and personal opinions about places and things. E6.5.R1. Students will be able to understand general meaning in simple texts related to the feelings and personal opinions about places and things.) (MONE, 2018b, p. 65). | Simple Present Tense | T.7.3.9. Students will be able to distinguish the functions of the inflectional suffix. a) Verb conjugations are emphasized (MONE, 2018, p. 56). |
| (E6.6.L2. Students will be able to understand the time, days and dates.) (MONE, 2018b, p. 66). | Modals | T.7.3.10. Students will be able to distinguish simple, derived and compound verbs (MONE, 2018a, p. 56). |
| E6.6.L1. Students will be able to understand familiar words and simple phrases concerning people’s occupations in clear oral texts. E6.6.L2. Students will be able to understand the time, days and dates. E6.6.SI1. Students will be able to talk about occupations. E6.6.SP1. Students will be able to ask personal questions. E6.6.SP2. Students will be able to state the Dates (MONE, 2018b, p. 66). | Simple Past Tense | a) Verb conjugations are emphasized (MONE, 2018, p. 56). |
According to Table 3, it was revealed that the subject of “comparisons” was taught in the 6th grade of both Turkish and English lessons. However, considering the order of the subject, it is taught in the English lesson before the Turkish lesson. In addition, Simple Present Tense, will, must / mustn’t modals, Simple Past Tense were taught in English lessons without learning in Turkish. Students learn these subjects in the 7th grade level in Turkish lesson.

**Table 4.** Learning Outcomes for English Grammar at Grade 7 and Their Equivalents in Turkish Lesson in Terms of Both Learning Outcomes and Grade Levels

| Functions & Useful Language and Language Skills and Learning Outcomes | Subject of Grammar | Turkish Course Teaching Program |
|---|---|---|
| Making simple comparisons | E7.1.R1. Students will be able to understand a simple text about appearances, personalities, and comparisons including explanations and reasons. | T.7.1.9. Students will be able to determine ways to improve thinking used in the texts they listen and watch. |
| E7.1.W1. Students will be able to write simple pieces to compare people (MONE, 2018b, p. 72). | Comparisons | Students will be able to identify the concepts of describing, comparing and simile which are the ways to improve thinking (MONE, 2018a, p. 50). |
E7.2.L1. Students will be able to recognize frequency adverbs in simple oral texts.
E7.2.W1. Students will be able to write pieces about routines/daily activities by using frequency adverbs.
E7.2.SP1. Students will be able to talk about routines/daily activities by using frequency adverbs and giving explanations and reasons (MONE, 2018b, p. 73).

Comparisons and adverbs are included in both curricula of the 7th grade. However, these subjects are first taught in English lessons. For this reason, native language diagrams have not yet been imprinted on students' minds.

When Tables 1, 2, 3 and 4 are examined, it is seen that some of the grammar and sentence structures in both languages are given in English lessons before being taught in the native language lessons. These learning outcomes and topics are: Adverbs, comparisons, simple present tense, simple past tense, present continuous tense, modals (must / mustn’t, should / shouldn’t, can / can’t, could, couldn’t). Students can easily use these structures in everyday language, but this does not mean that grammatical structures are comprehended schematically in their minds. These data obtained from the curricula support the basic hypothesis of the research. In other words, it can be said that the students do not get enough support from the native language lessons while learning a foreign language in terms of not providing parallelism in every subject between the curricula. When the subjects that do not follow the sequence in the tables are taken into consideration, it is seen that these subjects are basic grammar subjects. Therefore, it is more important to support students’ readiness levels with the native language.

3.2. Results related to the participants

The data provided from the curricula theoretically supports the hypothesis. However, in order to verify the validity and reliability of the research, the data obtained from the implementation areas should also coincide with the data obtained from the curricula. For this reason, the data obtained by using the experiences of English teachers from their lessons were also obtained. A semi-structured interview form was created to determine what kind of problems the teachers experienced in the English language learning processes. The questions in the interview form are as follows:

“Based on your observations in the lessons, can it be said that, as the skill level of a student increases in the native language, there is an improvement in the success of the foreign language learning process?”

All of the teachers stated that the native language has an important effect on foreign language learning. It has been confirmed by all teachers that the effect in question is directly proportional.

“Do you have any problems in English learning processes due to the students’ lack of knowledge of Turkish grammar? If you have, which learning outcomes are you have problems with?”

As in the first question, in this question, the teachers confirmed the correlation between the native language and the foreign language by stating that they had difficulty in obtaining certain learning outcomes depending on the native language. When asked to give examples of the issues they had difficulty, two teachers made general comments, while eight teachers made direct explanations about the issues they had difficulty with. Examples of topics given by teachers in relation to deficiencies in the native language are: Adjectives and adverbs, modals, tenses, reported speech, past tenses, frequency of time, adverbs of frequency and preposition. The examples given by the teachers mostly are in accordance with the subjects which do not have any sequences between the curricula and shown in the tables. Adverbs, tenses, and modals topics have been identified in both curricula and teacher views.
Despite not being detected in the curriculum, adjectives and prepositions are also stated as difficulties in teaching depending on the skill in the native language.

Another point that teachers complain about these issues is that they have to explain the subject in the native language and waste time in order to eliminate the lack of knowledge in the native language. For example, a teacher explains this situation as follows: “We teach these subjects before Turkish classes. Therefore students come to class without having any ideas about the subjects. To come over this problem, we teach these subjects in native language to enhance the awareness however that makes us lose time because we have to separate extra time for teaching the subject in native language and we cannot add this extra activity to the syllabus. We lose time with teaching the Turkish form of grammar subject and to compensate this gap, we have to be faster while teaching the same subject in target language.” Trying to grasp the features of a subject in both the native language and in a foreign language at the same time may cause some problems. Because the student may have difficulty trying to grasp the structure of both languages in a lesson or the student may confuse the structure of both languages.

“Do you think that the native language teaching processes have affected the English teaching process? “If you are thinking, can you give examples from your observations about this situation?”

In this question, except for one teacher, teachers think the same and gave examples of their observations, confirming that the native language lessons directly affect foreign language teaching processes. It was stated that the deficiencies caused by the native language lessons cause the following problems in foreign language.

- Trouble focusing on English and anxiety
- Difficulty in understanding and doing activities such as influencing reading comprehension and interpretation activities in foreign language, determining the main idea, and summarizing.
- Problems in activities or texts related to passive structures in L2 due to passive structures not knowing the active / passive structure of the students in L1.
- Among the subjects that students have difficulty with are modal structures and tenses. Since the perfect tense structure is not in Turkish, it is difficult for students to understand. However, if students do not know other tense well enough in Turkish, it is difficult to teach even the simple present tense in English.
- If the student is good at grammar issues in the native language, they will be more successful in finding the main ideas in English texts and discovering the clues in the activities.
- Students who do not know Object pronouns or adjectives will fail more in activities in the English lesson.
- Students who are good at native language grammar subjects can identify the context of English texts both easier and faster.
- It becomes more difficult for students who have not yet learned certain tense structures in Turkish to understand tense structures in English, and it leads to a waste of time since the learning outcomes in the Turkish lesson must be mentioned.
Table 5. Grammar Subjects Taught in L2 before L1 and Grammar Subject Examples That Teachers Have Difficulty to Teach

| Grammar Subjects determination in the Curriculum | Grammar Subject Examples That Teachers Have Difficulty in Teaching |
|------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| Modals (can/can’t, could, couldn’t, should, shouldn’t, must, mustn’t, be able to) | Modals (can/can’t, could, couldn’t, should, shouldn’t, must, mustn’t) |
| Simple Present Tense, Present Continuous Tense, Simple Past Tense | Tenses (Simple Present Tense, Present Continuous Tense, Simple Past Tense) |
| Comparisons | Object Pronouns |
| Adjectives | Adjectives |
| Adverbs | The Active/Passive Structure |

There is a great consistency between the subjects determined in the curriculum and the grammar issues that teachers give examples based on the deficiencies in L1. They claim that in all subjects except adverbs and comparisons, which are determined in the curriculum, deficiencies related to L1 have a negative effect on L2 learning performances. They even claimed that there were problems in L2 due to L1 in other skills, especially in reading comprehension and interpretation skills.

“Do you prefer to make associations by referring to the native languages of the students in order to achieve the target objectives in English lessons?”

If teachers notice a problem at the students’ readiness level related to their native language before passing a new topic, they cannot ignore it and try to acquire the relevant outcome. This is an obvious crisis for them. The method each teacher will use to overcome this crisis may be different. If this situation is handled depending on the research, the teachers’ expressing that they interiorize the rules of the native language as a method will be another indicator that the hypothesis of the research is supported in terms of practice. All the teachers to whom the interview questions were asked stated that they preferred to return to the native language and provide the background of the subject they will teach. As a justification for this method, it was stated that there are common structures in the grammatical structures of both languages and therefore it is easy to establish accordance. It has been mentioned once again that the level of knowledge in the native language directly affects foreign language skills. At the same time, teachers consider using this method as it has a significantly positive effect on students’ performance.

4. Discussion

In this study, an examination was made in terms of sequentially between L1 and L2 curricula, and it was determined as the basic point to understand whether or not the grammar learning outcomes at the class levels of the L1 curriculum would benefit L2 teaching. Based on this point, the questions of the research were sought by obtaining data from both the curriculum and the teachers. Thus, it is aimed to contribute to the literature by presenting the findings on how the native language has an effect in second language teaching. Accordingly, it is possible to give the following answers to the sub-problems of the research. As emphasized in the findings section, some of the learning outcomes in the L1 curriculum are given after the L2 curriculum. These learning outcomes are adverbs, comparisons, simple present tense, simple past tense, present continuous tense, modals (must / mustn’t, (should, shouldn’t, can / can’t, could, couldn’t). Teachers have difficulties in teaching many subjects, especially these subjects. As a
justification, they state the proficiency level of the students in L1. At the same time, in order to overcome this problem, they have to refer to L1 and even directly explain the grammar subject in L1. Otherwise, they cannot make a very significant progress in their target achievements.

Based on these findings, it can be said that if the learning outcomes about grammar of the Turkish curriculum are sequentially listed with the English curriculum, there will be fewer problems in teaching English lessons depending on the native language skills and the English curriculum will be more functional. Especially if the same subjects are included in the same class level in L1 and L2, the contribution of the native language will be further increased. Students will learn the same topic in their English lesson shortly after learning a grammar topic in their native language. Thus, both the structuring of knowledge between languages will be enabled and an interdisciplinary understanding will be established between Turkish and English curricula. Therefore, learning outcomes of grammar should be updated according to grade levels in order for the Turkish curriculum can have a more functional structure in terms of interdisciplinary and it can contribute more to L2 learning. According to the Table 5, the grammar subjects that are claimed, depending on L1, to be hard to teach by teachers correspond mostly to the subjects determined in the curriculums, which is another indication that updates in grammar outcomes of L1 curriculum will support teaching process of L2 curriculum.

While English teachers already have many target achievements in their curriculum that they are responsible for, they have to deal with deficiencies in students’ native language skills, which forces them to spend more time and energy. Arranging both curriculums consecutively will eliminate this problem.

5. Ethics Committee Approval
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L1’in L2 öğrenimine etkisi açısından dil bilgisi müfredat kazanımlarının karşılaştırılması ve öğretmenlerin görüşleri

Öz

Dil öğretim süreçlerinin başarılı ilerleyebilmesi için belirli hususlarda hazırlık bulunmuş olması gerekmektedir. Dil öğretimi açısından bireylerin ana dillerini ve onun dil bilgisi kurallarına hakim olabilmesi özellikle yabancı dil edinim sürecini doğrudan etkilemektedir. “Disiplinler arasılık” olarak da tanımlanan bu durumun göz önünde bulundurularak yabancı dil öğrenme süreçlerinin ana dil bağlamında alt yapısının oluşturulması gerekir. Ana dilinde var olan kuralları veya kavramları henüz edinmemiş buna bağlı olarak da zihinde şemalar oluşmamış bir bireyin yabancı dilde aynı kavrama veya kavramlar yönelik öğrenme çabasına girmesi öğrenmeyi olumsuz yönde etkileyecek bir durumdur. Bu nedenle ana dil ve yabancı dil öğretiminde disiplinler arası bir yaklaşımlı benimsenerek her iki disiplinin de hedef kazanımlarının edinilme sırasında coordinasyon sağlanması gerekmektedir.

Bu çalışmada Türkçe ve İngilizce öğretim programları dil bilgisi kazanımları bakımından incelenerek ortaokul öğrencilerinin ana dillerinde henüz öğrenme sürecine girmeden İngilizce dersinde öğrenmeye başladıkları dil bilgisi ile ilgili kazanımların tespit edilmesine çalışılmıştır. Her iki disiplinin öğretim programları dil bilgisi kazanımları bakımından incelenerek sınıf seviyesi açısından Türkçe dersinde henüz öğrenme sürecine geçilmemesine rağmen İngilizce dersinde bireylere kavramla çalışma olanaklar tespit edilmiştir. Elde edilen verilerden hareketle her iki programın dil bilgisi kazanımları açısından öncelik-sonraki ilişkisine bağlı olarak tavsiyelerde bulunulmuş ve dil öğretiminde önemli bir eksikliğe dikkat çekilmeye çalışılan öğretmen programları arasında paralellik sağlanmasına katkıda bulunmuştur.

Anahtar sözcükler: Türkçe dersi müfredatı; İngilizce dersi müfredatı; dil bilgisi; hazırlık bulunmusalı; disiplinler arasılık.
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