



## EVALUATION OF ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROGRAM - USING CIPP (CONTEXT, INPUT, PROCESS AND PRODUCT) MODEL

Ömer Gökhan Ulum<sup>i</sup>

Adana Science and Technology University, Turkey

### Abstract:

The aim of this study is to evaluate a state high school EFL Program through CIPP (context, input, process and product) model. The participants of the study include 504 students. The source of data has been obtained through a 46 - itemed questionnaire and an interview for the students. In the study, the data has been analysed using statistical techniques (SPSS 20.0). By looking at the responses to the scales displaying the program components such as context, input, process and product, it was understood that most of the students partly agreed about these components. Yet, regarding the course book of the program, the students mostly did not favour it. Furthermore, the students stated that the course time was too much and they always had the same topics in the courses, as well as hinting on the difficulty of the common exams specified in the program. At the end of the study, some recommendations were taken into consideration such as adjusting the common exams properly, implementing a variety of activities in the courses and shortening the course time in order not to discomfort the students.

**Keywords:** CIPP model; EFL program; evaluation; program; program evaluation

### 1. Introduction

An evaluation is a persistently, systematically, and gingerly collected and analysed set of data used with the aim of specifying the performance and effect of programs, sustaining liability and diagnosing extents requiring alterations or modifications, as well as development (Wall and Solutions, 2014). Evaluation is the course of deciding the scope in which aims have been achieved (Thiede, 1964). Though

---

<sup>i</sup> Correspondence: email [omergokhanulum@gmail.com](mailto:omergokhanulum@gmail.com)

evaluation has been progressively employed in many diverse public areas, covering education for around five decades, interest in evaluation and its conduction in ELT is a comparably current issue. Basically, evaluation is executed to conclude the scope of which a programme is beneficial, and to support reaching a compromise by means of determined collection of data which is examined and documented to partners owning a stake in the movement evaluated (Dermot, 2000).

Owston (2008) describes evaluation as the line of piling info as to the merit or worth of a program in order to reach conclusions on the potency of it or in order for program development. Evaluation is the course of examining the worth, merit, validity of a matter according to particular norms and objectives, in an orderly way. The examination is formed on an attentive analysis of investigation data by means of following the specified norms (Harris, 1968).

Steele (1970) defines evaluation referring the program as the process of judging the worth or value of it and how the program should be, after grasping its current condition forms the basis of the evaluation. Evaluation is judging the worth (success of reaching purposes of the program) or merit (intrinsic judgement of program value) of a program (Schrieven, 1972). Evaluation is probably the most intricate and least comprehended of the concepts. Deep-rooted in the term of evaluation, there stands "value." In evaluating something, what is done is simply participating in a course that is shaped to supply data that will aid in the way of making judgments as to a particular situation. Mainly, any evaluation course necessitates data about the situation-the broadest term in question. Being the broadest term or the umbrella term, situation considers some dimensions such as objectives, goals, standards and procedures important. In the conduction of the program evaluation, the process will produce data in terms of the worthiness, goodness, appropriateness, legality and validity of the program for which a reliable measurement has been appointed (Kizlik, 2011).

Program evaluation is useful in diverse contexts. It supplements in forming a concrete comprehension of programs aimed outcomes and student needs, or it provides an examination of the program's success. Besides, program evaluations have broadened to surround more complicated concerns, not concentrating only on forming cause and effect connections between expectations and consequences. Rather, they are to a greater extent employed to make program judgments about sufficiency, worth, performance and productivity built on various organized data gathering and examinations (Rossi and Freeman, 1993). With all these mentioned issues in mind, this study was conducted to evaluate the current case of the state high school EFL program approved by the Turkish Ministry of National Education, in terms of pre-determined dimensions as context, input, process and product by means of CIPP model.

## 2. Literature Review

Smith (1989) (as mentioned by Owen, J. M., 1999) defines a program as: ‘a set of planned activities directed toward bringing about specified change(s) in an identified and identifiable audience’ (p.47). A program is a pile of sources and activities guided through some general objectives, commonly by means of the control of a sole director or a group of directors. A program covers a finite group of activities in an organization or an intricate group of activities carried out at several locations by two or more layers of government and by a crowd of public and even independent providers. Program evaluation is the employment of arranged and planned procedures to refer inquiries about program applications and outcomes. It may contain continuing check of a program besides one - time inquiry of program mechanism or program effect. The paths or approaches implemented are set on social science research procedures and efficient measures. The area of program evaluation supplies series of actions and instruments that organisations of all types can employ to attain reliable, valid, and credible data to refer to diverse questions regarding the accomplishment of public and private programs (Wholey, Hatry and Newcomer, 2010). Evaluation is the course of activities that we conduct to grasp information to sum up if there is a requirement to make modifications or removals or welcome something in the program (Ornstein and Hunkins, 1993).

Harris (1968) describes evaluation as a framed course of specifying the worth, power, adequacy or glamour of a program in terms of precious standards and aims. Program evaluation is a constructed process gathering and incorporating data to lower the scale of ambivalence for stakeholders related to a given program. It mostly deals with solving problems, the outcomes of which are later covered in the data sources employed by the people having a stake in the program. That evaluations may refer to the unforeseen impacts of programs, which can influence every judgment about the programs accordingly is apparent (Mc David, Huse and Hawthorn, 2014). Evaluation for Wall (2014) is a purposeful, planned, arranged, and careful piling and examining of information, implemented with the aim of presenting the effectiveness of programs, building liability as well as pointing to parts requiring change and development. He also states that evaluation is not a one-time incident. Evaluation is an ongoing activity that has to be an integrated section of program activities. Properly formed, meticulously performed evaluations can supply significant data to document the outcomes of the program and points areas where improvements may be required. Wholey, Hatry and Newcomer (2010) put forward that sources for evaluation are simply restrained.

Planning out among evaluations should then mirror the most crucial data

requirements of decision makers. There might be several needs for data on program accomplishment. Whenever a decision has been made to form an evaluation or observing scheme for a program, there are plenty of options to be applied about the kind of approaches that will be most suitable and beneficial. Among the several diverse evaluation approaches and models, program evaluators ought to elect the most convenient one in terms of their goals and circumstances (Aliakbari and Ghoreyshi, 2013).

## **2.1. CIPP Model**

Stufflebeam (2003) defines evaluation term guiding CIPP model as the process of outlining, acquiring, supplying and employing descriptive data about the worth and merit of some object's aims, form, fulfilment, and consequences to give route to development compromises, supply liability documents, update decisions, and create comprehension of the covered experience. He also suggests that the CIPP model is formed to refer both to formative and summative evaluations. The CIPP Model (context, input, process, and product) can be employed in order for both formative and summative evaluation (Tessmer, 1993). They are formative when they proactively conform to the collection and documenting of data. They are summative when they evaluate finished program activities or performances, sum up the value meanings of related data and concentrate on accountability. CIPP model was built at the end of 60s to accomplish the evaluation requirements which oriented to the goals. In the evaluation term that was suggested by Stufflebeam, it was suggested that the evaluation ought to be gathering of scientific data to decide result. The mission of the evaluator is to gather information, plan, examine, and arrange data to opt the alternative activity and document. Besides, Stufflebeam pointed out that the activity can be performed in four sections which are about the outcome of environment (context), implementation (process) and outcome about input (product). This model is known as Context-Input-Process-Product (CIPP) model. The broadest aim of this evaluation is to describe the information, context, input and process with program product. At the same time, it is to present the existence of surrounding to reach the aim of the program (Yahaya, 2001).

Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (2007) indicate that the context, input, process, and product evaluation approach has a solid introduction to service and the fundamentals of an independent society. It demands evaluators to describe and contain proper recipients, clear up their requirements for evaluation, acquire data in forming active schemes and other services, evaluate and support to lead adequate application of service, and eventually judge the services' merit, worth and importance. The gist of

CIPP model is to supply solid data that will aid evaluators repeatedly evaluate and develop services and make practical and adequate employment of sources, duration, and technology for serving the aimed requirements of proper beneficiaries properly and justly. All four units of Stufflebeam's CIPP model have significant and essential characters in the preparation, application, and evaluation of a program (Zhang et al., 2011).

## **2.2. Context Evaluation**

The aim of context evaluation is to evaluate the total physical preparedness of the scheme, analyse if current objectives and concerns are accorded to needs, and evaluate if set purposes are efficiently susceptible to determined needs (Stufflebeam, 2003). Context evaluation covers working on the surrounding of the program. Its aim is to describe the related environment, characterise the wished and absolute circumstances connected to that environment, concentrate on not reached or not compensated needs and not found chances and identify the logic behind unmet needs. Context evaluation is indeed a circumstantial investigation. It is an interpretation of the actuality in which the persons discover themselves and an evaluation of that actuality considering what they desire to do. This interpretation phase of evaluation is a progressive action. It goes on and on to purvey standard data for the activities and achievements of the whole system (Ornstein and Hunkins, 1993). System analyses, secondary data analyses, document reviews, surveys, interviews, diagnostic tests, and the Delphi technique are the methods used in Context evaluation (Dalkey and Helmer, 1963).

## **2.3. Input Evaluation**

The aim of input evaluation is to assist in defining a program through which to make required changes. In the phase of input evaluation, specialists or evaluators diagnose or form possibly related approaches. Afterwards they determine the possible approaches and set on to develop a responsive plan (Stufflebeam, 2003). Input evaluation boosts to define a program in order to refer to the diagnosed needs. It questions how it should be done. Then, it defines strategies and procedures in the field of education that will reach the asked results. Finally, its leading direction is to describe and determine new system capacity, to investigate and seriously check possibly related approaches, and to suggest extra strategies. The result of the input evaluation is a task formed to compensate the specified needs (Zhang et al., 2011). Input evaluation is designed to provide data and formed to represent how to use the sources to reach program aims (Ornstein and Hunkins, 1993). Input evaluators define the capacity of the

institutions to execute the evaluation activity; they previously regard the strategies proposed for reaching the program objectives and define ways by which a chosen strategy will be employed. Input evaluation examines peculiar dimensions of the program plan or particular ingredients of the program plan (Hunkins and Ornstein, 1998).

#### **2.4. Process Evaluation**

Process evaluation covers chances to judge regularly the scope to which the program is being implemented properly and efficiently (Stufflebeam, 2003). It is used to get feedbacks about important alterations that the determiners should foresee and surmount hardships and also to assess other decisions (Ornstein and Hunkins, 1988). Process evaluation observes the program employment process. It questions, “*Is it being done?*” and supplies a continuing control on the program’s application course. Significant purposes of process evaluation cover recording the process and supplying feedback about the scope to which the organised activities are implemented and whether arrangements or reviews of the program are essential (Zhang et al., 2011).

#### **2.5. Product Evaluation**

Product evaluation defines and covers program results, both planned and unplanned (Stufflebeam, 2003). The main role of product evaluation is to evaluate, clarify, and assess the accomplishments of a program (Stufflebeam and Shinkfeld, 1985). Product evaluation defines and covers program consequences. It questions, “*Did the program accomplish?*”. Besides, it resembles outcome evaluation. The aim of product evaluation is to evaluate a program’s results by checking their worth, merit, and significance. Its major objective is to confirm the scope to which the requirements of all the program participants were met (Zhang et al., 2011). The product evaluation could conclude whether the program should be altered, adjusted, or abolished. Moreover, it could evaluate the result of program activities. Related to the data about background, input and process, it points out analyzing the diversity between the results and a prearranged standard. It can afford the moderate definition and discussion for decision-making. The objective is to examine the plan of program in a specific classification (Tseng, Diez, Lou, Tsai, & Tsai, 2010).

#### **2.6. Purpose of the Study**

This study seeks to comprehend the EFL state high school students’ views about the high school EFL program approved by the Turkish Ministry of National Education.

With the aim of identifying the EFL state high school students' perspectives on high school EFL program, the answer was sought to the following research question:

How do the EFL state high school students perceive the EFL program?

More specifically,

- a) What are the EFL state high school students' perspectives on the context dimension of the EFL program?
- b) What are the EFL state high school students' perspectives on the input dimension of the EFL program?
- c) What are the EFL state high school students' perspectives on the process dimension of the EFL program?
- d) What are the EFL state high school students' perspectives on the product dimension of the EFL program?

### **3. Significance of the Study**

This study will help the authorities to see how adequate the current EFL program is, along with diagnosing the strengths and weaknesses of the program. By means of supplying a full picture of the program, this evaluation study will support authorities in making related changes, additions and removals in the program. It is desired that the results of the study will supply beneficial judgments regarding the sufficiency of the program and will be employed as a framework for the program development studies of the Ministry of National Education.

### **4. Limitations of the Study**

The main limitation of this study is that it is set on only students' reported data. It may be much better to ask for the teachers' opinions about the EFL program as well. A second limitation is that during the face to face interview with the students, some students may not have sincerely responded to the questions that they found tricky. In other words, some students were worried about the teachers' or directors' reactions to their answers. Therefore, they may have been uncertain to declare their real perspectives about the program.

## 5. Method

### 5.1. Participants

The students in this study were selected from the most convenient and accessible schools located in Yüreğir, Seyhan and Çukurova districts of Adana. The sample consisted of 504 EFL state high school students who were 9<sup>th</sup> class in eight state high schools scattered in Adana. Care was taken to select schools with diverse academic successes and backgrounds. In choosing the participants, the convenience sampling method was implemented as the target population was too large, and accordingly not available. Castillo (2009) puts forward that it is opted more to test the whole population, however it is not possible to cover everybody when the population is very crowded. That is why many researchers turn to sampling techniques like convenience sampling, one of the most commonly employed of all.

### 5.2. Data Collection Tools

In this research, the views of students regarding the EFL program in 2014-2015 academic year were analysed. The study was carried out through quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection. The instruments used in this study were: (1) a questionnaire, (2) an interview. The questionnaire taken from the study of Karataş and Fer (2009) was administered to 504 students while the interview was administered to 45 volunteer students opted from 504 students to specify their views about the current EFL state high school program implemented in Turkey. The questionnaire and interview were directly administered to the target group by the researcher. The interview data were evaluated and presented in the study while the data from the questionnaire were analysed by means of descriptive statistics. Research design gives a way to the problem for being researchable through formatting the study in a way that will detect precise responses to essential problems (Oppenheim, 1992).

Pollak (2009) states that descriptive statistics illustrates the data collected from participants. Due to mirroring what actually lies in the evaluation of four components of the program in this research, as a research model the descriptive research model was implemented. Set on a descriptive research design, this paper covered the data analysis of descriptive statistics. In this paper, the data set has been analysed by means of the techniques of mean ( $\bar{x}$ ), independent samples t-test and Anova. With this regard, SPSS 20.0, a Statistical Program for Social Sciences was used to document the views of EFL state high school students in Adana-Turkey, in numerical data. With the aim of analysing the data acquired from the questionnaire, mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) was employed as a statistical technique to discover the rate of agreement as to the items on Context, Input,

Process and Product dimensions of CIPP model. For data analysis, the means and standard deviations of the students' opinions were found. As the questionnaire was based on a five-point likert scale, the means of the views of the students were employed and the point intervals were as follows; 1-1.49 as "I definitely disagree", 1.50-2.49 as "I disagree", 2.50-3.49 as "I partly agree", 3.50-4.49 as "I agree" and 4.50-5.00 as "I completely agree". The assumption of normality was tested via examining Kolmogorov-Smirnova and Shapiro-Wilk suggesting that normality was a reasonable assumption. As a result of these assumptions, t-test was used for the gender difference while one-way Anova was used for the course grade variable. Besides, Cronbach's Alpha was used in order to test the reliability of the scale. Responds from 504 participants in total were used in the analysis made.

**Table 1:** Reliability in total

Cronbach's Alpha	N
.975	46

The reliability was found %97 for the scale with 46 items. So, the scale is highly reliable.

**Table 2:** Reliability of sub-groups

	Cronbach's Alpha	Items
Context	.886	10
Input	.924	6
Process	.887	8
Product	.960	22

The reliability levels of the sub-groups in the scale are between % 88 and % 96. So, the sub-groups are highly reliable.

## 6. Data Analysis and Results

**Table 3:** T-test results of gender factor

		N	$\bar{x}$	Sd	t	p
Context	Female	177	2.75	1.16	.289	.773
	Male	327	2.72	1.12		
Input	Female	177	3.02	1.18	-.886	.376
	Male	327	3.13	1.25		
Process	Female	177	2.98	1.09	.985	.325
	Male	327	2.87	1.20		
Product	Female	177	2.79	1.10	-.559	.576
	Male	327	2.85	1.17		

By looking at the t-test results of the participants, it is clear that the gender is not an effective factor influencing the participants' perspectives on the Context and Process sections. Regarding the Context section there isn't significance in terms of gender variable,  $t(502)=.289$ ,  $p>.05$ . Besides, regarding the Process subgroup there is also no significance in terms of gender variable,  $t(502)=.985$ ,  $p>.05$ . However, when it comes to their perspectives on the Input subgroup, there is significance in terms of gender variable,  $t(502)=-.886$ ,  $p<.05$ . Lastly, when it comes to their perspectives on the Product subgroup, there is significance in terms of gender variable,  $t(502)=-.559$ ,  $p<.05$ .

**Table 4:** One way Anova results according to grade factor

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	16.118	4	4.030	2.702	0.30
Within Groups	744.155	499	1.491		
Total	760.273	503			

A=1-49 B=50-59 C=60-69 D=70-84 E=85-100

By looking at the scale and its sub-groups regarding the effect of students' grades on the students' perspectives on the program, it was seen that there was significant effect on the perspectives of the students on the Input sub-group of the scale since  $p<.05$  level [ $F(4, 499) = 2.702$ ,  $p = .30$ ]. So, it may be said that there is an effect of grade factor on the perspectives of the students on Input. In order to find out among which means there is a significant difference, Gabriel test was used and it was found that those between 85-100 ( $\bar{x}=3.32$ ) had more positive attitudes than those between 70-84 ( $\bar{x}=2.88$ ).

### 6.1. Results Pertaining to the Perspectives on the Context of the Program

In the following section, the results of the study and the findings are described based on the data obtained from the participants by means of the instruments. The results and the findings are described based on the related research questions. They are grouped under the titles of the categories from the questionnaire. Results and discussion related to the perceptions of students on English program in such categories as Context, Input, Process and Product are included in Table 5, 6, 7 and 8. In the first section of the questionnaire, there are 10 items related to results pertaining to the perspectives on the Context of the program, the aim of which is to specify the perspectives of the EFL state high school students. Table 5 clarifies the results pertaining to the perspectives on the Context of the program.

**Table 5:** Perspectives on the Context of the English Program

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
1. The objectives of the curriculum are appropriate for the students' preliminary knowledge of English.	504	3.0873	1.26441
2. The total duration of the curriculum is adequate.	504	3.0655	1.43434
3. The curriculum has measurable objectives.	504	2.9623	1.17655
4. The course book of the curriculum is appropriate for the students' level.	504	2.9048	1.45128
5. The difficulty level of the topics in the curriculum complies with their duration.	504	2.8611	1.28478
6. The objectives of the curriculum meet the needs of the students regarding English.	504	2.8452	1.25950
7. The content of the course book is comprehensible.	504	2.8274	1.34946
8. The reading, writing, listening and speaking skills are balanced well in the curriculum.	504	2.7540	1.27329
9. The curriculum is appropriate for the improvement of the students' language skills.	504	2.6468	1.35472
10. The course book attracts the students' attention.	504	2.4643	1.30098
Valid N (listwise)	504		

For the 1<sup>st</sup> item, regarding *The objectives of the curriculum are appropriate for the students' preliminary knowledge of English*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 3.08. This score indicates that Item 1 is the most agreed item by the EFL students. The participants partly agree about the item, though.

For the 10<sup>th</sup> item, regarding *The course book attracts the students' attention*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 2.46. This score indicates that Item 10 is the least agreed item by the EFL students. The participants do not agree with the item.

For Item 2, regarding *The total duration of the curriculum is adequate*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 3.06. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

For Item 3, regarding *The curriculum has measurable objectives*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 2.96. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

For Item 4, regarding *The course book of the curriculum is appropriate for the students' level*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 2.90. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

For Item 5, regarding *The level of the difficulty of the topics in the curriculum complies with their duration*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 2.86. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

For Item 6, regarding *The objectives of the curriculum meet the needs of the students regarding English*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 2.84. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

For Item 7, regarding *The content of the course book is comprehensible*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 2.82. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

For Item 8, regarding *The reading, writing, listening and speaking skills are balanced well in the curriculum*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 2.75. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

For Item 9, regarding *The curriculum is appropriate for the improvement of the students' language skills*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 2.64. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

Related to the total perspectives on the Context of the program, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score is 2.83. So, it is clearly seen that the participants partly agree about the Context of the program, in total.

## 6.2. Results Pertaining to the Perspectives on the Input of the Program

In the second section of the questionnaire, there are 6 items related to results pertaining to the perspectives on the Input of the program, the aim of which is to specify the perspectives of the EFL state high school students. Table 6 clarifies the results pertaining to the perspectives on the Input of the program.

**Table 6:** Perspectives on the Input of the Program

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
11. The class work of the curriculum has positive effects on the students' language skills.	504	3.2004	1.29900
12. The class work of the curriculum helps the students learn easily.	504	3.1746	1.30349
13. The audio visual materials of the curriculum have positive effects on the students' language skills.	504	3.1587	1.26531

---

14. The class work of the curriculum attracts the students' attention.	504	3.1210	1.29659
15. The audio visual materials of the curriculum attract the students' attention.	504	3.0754	1.34441
16. The audio visual materials of the curriculum help the students learn easily.	504	2.9881	1.42397
Valid N (listwise)	504		

---

For the 11<sup>th</sup> item, regarding *The class work of the curriculum has positive effects on the students' language skills*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 3.20. This score indicates that Item 11 is the most agreed item by the EFL students. The participants partly agree about the item, though.

For the 16<sup>th</sup> item, regarding *The audio visual materials of the curriculum help the students learn easily*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 2.98. This score indicates that Item 16 is the least agreed item by the EFL students. The participants partly agree about the item, though.

For Item 12, regarding *The class work of the curriculum helps the students learn easily*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 3.17. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

For Item 13, regarding *The audio visual materials of the curriculum have positive effects on the students' language skills*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 3.15. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

For Item 14, regarding *The class work of the curriculum attracts the students' attention*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 3.12. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

For Item 15, regarding *The audio visual materials of the curriculum attract the students' attention*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 3.07. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

Related to the total perspectives on the Input of the program, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score is 3.11. So, it is clearly seen that the participants partly agree about the Input of the program, in total.

### 6.3. Results Pertaining to the Perspectives on the Process of the Program

In the third section of the questionnaire, there are 8 items related to results pertaining to the perspectives on the Process of the program, the aim of which is to specify the perspectives of the EFL state high school students. Table 7 clarifies the results pertaining to the perspectives on the Process of the program.

**Table 7: Perspectives on the Process of the Program**

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
17. The number of the formative tests applied during the curriculum is enough.	504	3.2381	1.38684
18. When necessary, revision is included in the curriculum.	504	3.1925	1.28791
19. The consolidating homework is given to the students about the newly learned topics.	504	3.1865	1.28338
20. The curriculum enables the students to participate in the course actively.	504	3.0972	1.26604
21. During the curriculum, the time spent on solving the students' problems about English is enough.	504	2.9524	1.35745
22. Sufficient exercises are done about each new topic in the curriculum.	504	2.8690	1.36802
23. The curriculum has activities in which all language skills can be applied.	504	2.8353	1.26690
24. The program has activities suitable for pair and group work.	504	2.8115	1.27765
Valid N (listwise)	504		

For the 17<sup>th</sup> item, regarding *The number of the formative tests applied during the curriculum is enough*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 3.23. This score indicates that Item 17 is the most agreed item by the EFL students. The participants partly agree about the item, though.

For the 24<sup>th</sup> item, regarding *The program has activities suitable for pair and group work*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 2.81. This score indicates that Item 24 is the least agreed item by the EFL students. The participants partly agree about the item, though.

For Item 18, regarding *When necessary, revision is included in the curriculum*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 3.19. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

For Item 19, regarding *The consolidating homework is given to the students about the newly learned topics*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 3.18. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

For Item 20, regarding *The curriculum enables the students to participate in the course actively*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 3.09. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

For Item 21, regarding *During the curriculum, the time spent on solving the students' problems about English is enough*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 2.95. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

For Item 22, regarding *Sufficient exercises are done about each new topic in the curriculum*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 2.86. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

For Item 23, regarding *The curriculum has activities in which all language skills can be applied*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 2.83. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

Related to the total perspectives on the Process of the program, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score is 3.01. So, it is clearly seen that the participants partly agree about the Input of the program, in total.

#### 6.4. Results Pertaining to the Perspectives on the Product of the Program

In the fourth section of the questionnaire, there are 21 items related to results pertaining to the perspectives on the Product of the program, the aim of which is to specify the perspectives of the EFL state high school students. Table 7 clarifies the results pertaining to the perspectives on the Product of the program.

**Table 8:** Perspectives on the Product of the Program

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
25. The curriculum increases the students' vocabulary knowledge in English.	504	3.2321	1.33603
26. The curriculum motivates the students to learn English.	504	3.1607	1.26898
27. The projects assigned according to the curriculum affect the students' language skills positively.	504	3.0952	1.28257
28. The curriculum helps the students to acquire the habit of studying English.	504	3.0556	1.27090
29. The curriculum forms a basis for the students' future needs related with English.	504	3.0417	1.28311
30. The curriculum helps the students to acquire the knowledge of English they need for various business areas.	504	3.0258	1.31111
31. The curriculum contributes to the students' work related with their fields.	504	3.0238	1.26720

32. The curriculum helps the students to acquire the knowledge of English they need for their fields of study.	504	3.0040	1.30908
33. The curriculum meets the students' existing needs related with English.	504	2.9921	1.24365
34. The curriculum gives the students the opportunity to use their knowledge.	504	2.9504	1.25462
35. The curriculum helps the students to acquire the habit of studying in groups.	504	2.9405	1.22937
36. The students' improvement of English listening skills is satisfactory.	504	2.8948	1.22874
37. The students' improvement of English writing skills is satisfactory.	504	2.8929	1.22451
38. The curriculum complies with the students' courses in their fields of study.	504	2.8909	1.23806
39. The students' improvement of English reading skills is satisfactory.	504	2.8750	1.22849
40. The students' improvement of English grammar is satisfactory.	504	2.8452	1.22103
41. The students' improvement of English speaking skills is satisfactory.	504	2.8214	1.23881
42. The knowledge of English the students acquire at the end of the curriculum is satisfactory.	504	2.8095	1.22085
43. The curriculum meets the students' individual interests.	504	2.7738	1.21963
44. The curriculum meets the students' characteristics needs.	504	2.7520	1.19309
45. The English skills the students acquire at the end of the curriculum are satisfactory.	504	2.7401	1.20218
46. The curriculum meets the students' individual needs.	504	2.6508	1.28188
Valid N (listwise)	504		

For the 25<sup>th</sup> item, regarding *The curriculum increases the students' vocabulary knowledge in English*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 3.23. This score indicates that Item 25 is the most agreed item by the EFL students. The participants partly agree about the item, though.

For the 46<sup>th</sup> item, regarding *The curriculum meets the students' individual needs*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 2.65. This score indicates that Item 46 is the least agreed item by the EFL students. The participants partly agree about the item, though.

For Item 26, regarding *The curriculum motivates the students to learn English*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 3.16. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

For Item 27, regarding *The projects assigned according to the curriculum affect the students' language skills positively*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 3.09. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

For Item 28, regarding *The curriculum helps the students to acquire the habit of studying English*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 3.05. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

For Item 29, regarding *The curriculum forms a basis for the students' future needs related with English*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 3.04. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

For Item 30, regarding *The curriculum helps the students to acquire the knowledge of English they need for various business areas*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 3.02. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

For Item 31, regarding *The curriculum contributes to the students' work related with their fields*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 3.02. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

For Item 32, regarding *The curriculum helps the students to acquire the knowledge of English they need for their fields of study*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 3.00. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

For Item 33, regarding *The curriculum meets the students' existing needs related with English*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 2.99. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

For Item 34, regarding *The curriculum gives the students the opportunity to use their knowledge*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 2.95. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

For Item 35, regarding *The curriculum helps the students to acquire the habit of studying in groups*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 2.94. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

For Item 36, regarding *The students' improvement of English listening skills is satisfactory*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 2.89. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

For Item 37, regarding *The students' improvement of English writing skills is satisfactory*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 2.89. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

For Item 38, regarding *The curriculum complies with the students' courses in their fields of study*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 2.89. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

For Item 39, regarding *The students' improvement of English reading skills is satisfactory*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 2.87. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

For Item 40, regarding *The students' improvement of English grammar is satisfactory*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 2.84. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

For Item 41, regarding *The students' improvement of English speaking skills is satisfactory*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 2.82. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

For Item 42, regarding *The knowledge of English the students acquire at the end of the curriculum is satisfactory*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 2.80. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

For Item 43, regarding *The curriculum meets the students' individual interests*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 2.77. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

For Item 44, regarding *The curriculum meets the students' characteristics needs*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 2.75. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

For Item 45, regarding *The English skills the students acquire at the end of the curriculum are satisfactory*, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score for this part is 2.74. This score indicates that the participants partly agree about the item.

Related to the total perspectives on the Product of the program, the mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score is 3.06. So, it is clearly seen that the participants partly agree about the Product of the program, in total.

## 6.5. Interview Results

The following table presents the views of the students related to the interview question "What are your positive views about the program?".

**Table 9: Student Views Regarding English Program**

Codes	Frequency	Quotations From Remarks of Students
Useful and appropriate for students' level, age, needs, interests, background knowledge	17	<i>I am content with our English program as I believe that English is crucial for us. Besides, English program meets my expectations.</i>
The course hours specified	7	<i>I love English and I ask for more hours for the English course.</i>

\*As a student can remark more than one to this open-ended question, numbers on the table correspond to the number of remarks.

By looking at Table 9, we can see that while a great majority of students are pleased with the sufficiency of English program, another group of students ask for more hours for the English course.

The following table presents the views of the students related to the interview question "What are your negative views about the program?".

**Table 10: Negative Student Views Regarding English Program**

Codes	Frequency	Quotations From Remarks of Students
The time for English course is too much.	28	<i>The time - 6 hours a week- for English course is too much. I want fewer hours for English, may be between 2 or 4 hours a week</i>
The course book is insufficient and does not meet our needs.	22	<i>The course book should be changed as it does not respond to our needs. It is so complicated and there are not enough activities and exercises in it.</i>
We always see the same things in the program.	19	<i>We always see the same topics. There are no topics helpful in the daily life. Speaking should be should be dominantly given.</i>
Common exams are too hard.	15	<i>In the common examinations, English is too hard. We are not tested by what we study in our English lessons.</i>
We don't have English background.	4	<i>We have been studying English since the 4<sup>th</sup> class but we still don't have English background.</i>
Teacher factor demotivates me.	3	<i>I don't like English as I don't like English teacher.</i>

\*As a student can remark more than one to this open-ended question, numbers on the table correspond to the number of remarks.

By looking at Table 10, it is clear that while a great majority of students thinks that the course hours for English are too many that they ask for less time for the English course. Another majority of students think that the course book is not efficient while another group criticize that they always see the same topics. Moreover, a big group of students complains about the difficulty of the common exams. While some students

point out that they still don't have English background, some of them suggest that teacher factor demotivates them.

The following table presents the views of the students related to the item ‘‘Do you have anything that you want to add about the program?’’.

**Table 11:** Supplementary Views Regarding English Program

Codes	Frequency	Quotations From Remarks of Students
Level differences or individual differences should be considered.	1	<i>The English levels of the students in our class show great differences.</i>
There is a lack of application in the course.	1	<i>We cannot apply the activities into real word.</i>
There is a lack of pronunciation activities.	1	<i>We don't have any opportunity related to pronunciation.</i>
There is a lack of activities.	1	<i>There should be more activities.</i>
Grammar is dominant.	1	<i>We should make different activities such as watching a film in English instead of studying grammar most of the time.</i>
There is a lack of computer integration into English course.	1	<i>We are not using computers to aid our English course.</i>

\*As a student can remark more than one to this open-ended question, numbers on the table correspond to the number of remarks.

By looking at Table 11, only one student for each item presents his/her view about the importance of individual differences, the application of activities into real world, the opportunity of pronunciation, the lack of activities, too much grammar study, the lack of computer use for the English courses.

## 7. Conclusion and Recommendations

Context, input, process and product scales serving as the components of high school English program were partly agreed by the students from an overall perspective. However, it was seen that the students disagree about that the course book attracts their attention. Parallel to this disagreement, in the interview made it was also notably suggested by the students that the course book is insufficient and does not meet the students' needs. By looking at the findings of the research, it may be recommended that the students should participate in choosing the course book of the program or the course book should be developed accordingly. It is also advisable to make a research study on the evaluation of the EFL course books used in the program. Besides, it is also

possible to recommend that the whole program should be empowered as the students partly agree about the efficiency of the overall program. Moreover, it is also clear from the findings of the interview that the majority of the students see the common exams of the program too hard and they always have the same topics in the courses of the program.

Finally, the time of English courses is too much, according to what the students have put forward. With all these findings in mind as well, some recommendations may also be taken into consideration such as adjusting the common exams properly, implementing a variety of activities in the courses and shortening the course time in order not to discomfort the students.

### **About the author**

**Ömer Gökhan Ulum** is an instructor of English at Adana Science and Technology University, Turkey. His research interests cover culture and language, applied linguistics, pragmatics, discourse analysis, and educational research.

### **References**

1. Aliakbari, M., & Ghoreyshi, M. (2013). On the Evaluation of Master of Arts Program in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) at Ilam University. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences*, 2(2s), pp-545.
2. Castillo, J.J. (2009). Convenience Sampling. Retrieved 10 Nov. 2012 from <http://explorable.com/convenience-sampling.html>
3. Dalkey, N. C., & Helmer, O. (1963). An experimental application of the Delphi method to the use of experts. *Management Science*, 9(3), 458–467.
4. Dermot, F. M. (2000). Key concepts in ELT, Evaluation. *ELT Journal*, 54(2), 210-211.
5. Harris, W. (1968). The nature and function of educational evaluations. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 46(2), 95-99.
6. Hunkins, F. P., & Ornstein, A. C. (1998). *Curriculum: Foundations, principles, and issues*.
7. Karatas, H., & Fer, S. (2009). Evaluation of English curriculum at Yildiz Technical University using CIPP model. *Egitim ve Bilim*, 34(153), 47.
8. Kizlik, B. (2011). *Measurement, assessment, and evaluation in education*.

9. Oppenheim, A.N. (1992). Questionnaire design, interviewing and attitude measurement. London: Printer.
10. Ornstein, A. C., & Hunkins, F. P. (1993). Curriculum: Foundations, principles, and issues. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
11. Owen, J.M. (1999). Program evaluation: Forms and Approaches. New York: Routledge. 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition.
12. Owston, R. (2008). Models and methods for evaluation. Handbook of Research on Educational Communications and Technology, 605-617.
13. Pollak, C. J. (2009). Teacher empowerment and collaboration enhances student engagement in data-driven environments. Teacher Empowerment and Student Engagement, 1, 1-47.
14. Rossi, P. H., & Freeman, H.E. (1993). Evaluation: A Systematic Approach. London ua: Sage.
15. Steele, S. M. (1970). Developing a Concept of Program Evaluation. Madison, Wisconsin: National University Extension Center.
16. Stufflebeam, D. L. (2003). The CIPP model for evaluation. In International handbook of educational evaluation (pp. 31-62). Springer Netherlands.
17. Stufflebeam, D. L., & Shinkfield, A. J. (2007). Evaluation theory, models, & applications. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
18. Stufflebeam, D. L., and Shinkfield, A. J. (1985). Systematic evaluation. Boston: Kluwe-Nijhoff.
19. Tessmer, M. (1993). Planning and conducting formative evaluations: Improving the quality of education and training. Psychology Press.
20. Thiede, W. (1964). Evaluation and Adult Education. Adult Education. ed. Gale Jensen et al. Adult Education Association of USA.
21. Tseng, K. H., Diez, C. R., Lou, S. J., Tsai, H. L., & Tsai, T. S. (2010). Using the Context, Input, Process and Product model to assess an engineering curriculum. World Transactions on Engineering and Technology Education. Vol, 8.
22. Wall, J. E. (2014). Program Evaluation Model. 9 – Step Process. Sage Solutions, 1-26.
23. Wholey, J. S., Hatry, H. P., & Newcomer, K. E. (2010). Handbook of practical program evaluation (Vol. 19). John Wiley & Sons.
24. Wall, J. E., & Solutions, S. (2014). Program evaluation model 9-step process. Sage Solutions. <http://region11s4.lacoe.edu/attachments/article/34>, 287(29), 209.
25. Yahaya, A. (2001). The using of model context. input, process and products (CIPP) in learning programs assessment. International Conference on Challenges and Prospects in Teacher Education. 1-4.

26. Zhang, G., Zeller, N., Griffith, R., Metcalf, D., Williams, J., Shea, C., & Misulis, K. (2011). Using the context, input, process, and product evaluation model (CIPP) as a comprehensive framework to guide the planning, implementation, and assessment of service-learning programs. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 15(4), 57-84.

Creative Commons licensing terms

Authors will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of English Language Teaching shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflict of interests, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated on the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).