



## **Evaluation of the Lecturers' and Students' Views about Coursebook Classes at Yıldız Technical University, School of Foreign Languages, Basic English Department**

**Uğur Akpur\***

**Sertel Altun\*\***

### **Abstract**

The aim of this study is to evaluate prep class students' and lecturers' views on Coursebook classes at Yıldız Technical University, School of Foreign Languages, Basic English Department using Delphi Technique. The study group consisted of 27 lecturers who were teaching Coursebook classes in prep classes and 36 students in the academic year 2011-2012. Data were collected in two rounds of Delphi Technique. In the first Delphi questionnaire, participants were given a questionnaire including open-ended questions. Using the data gained from the first Delphi questionnaire, the second Delphi questionnaire was developed and given to the participants. The data gained from the second questionnaire were analyzed through frequency and percentage. The findings indicated that lecturers and students generally had negative ideas about Coursebook Classes at prep school.

**Keywords:** Curriculum evaluation, delphi technique, foreign languages, coursebook.

---

\* Lecturer, Yıldız Technical University, Department of Foreign Languages, İstanbul, Turkey.  
E-mail: uakpur@yahoo.com

\*\* Assist. Prof. Dr., Yıldız Technical University, Education Faculty, İstanbul, Turkey. E-mail: saltin@yildiz.edu.tr

## INTRODUCTION

Curriculum evaluation process which is closely related to curriculum development itself and one of the most important phases of it (Varis, 1996, 186) is generally defined as collecting data using some means about the effectiveness of the curriculum, comparing these data with the criteria which indicate the effectiveness of the program, commenting on them and making decisions. In other words, the data gained at the end of the evaluation process give the students important feedback about their level of reaching the objectives and give the teachers feedback about the effectiveness of the instructional activities they fulfill (Erden, 1995, 8).

Considering the fact that, during the past decades, over 50 different evaluation models have been developed and circulated (Worthen, 1987, 43), the conceptual frames that these differences are based on need to be emphasized. McNeil (2009, 227-230) classified the program evaluation models under two titles: Consensus Models and Pluralistic Models. The Consensus Models deal with the data gained during the evaluation process experimentally and give priority to experimental process. On the other hand, Pluralistic Models are generally based on humanistic and social re-constructivist approach and advocate that all the agents in the process of evaluation have to be investigated. Similarly, Cronbach (Ornstein, Hunkins, 2004, 336) also identified the scientific and humanistic approaches to evaluation as opposite extremes on an evaluation continuum.

By the same token, when the methodological preferences are taken into account in the evaluation process, qualitative and the quantitative approaches get much emphasis. Although some who favor qualitative methods are concerned that the sudden popularity and apparent simplicity of this approach have attracted innocents who employ the qualitative inquiry without understanding of its complexity or the competence it demands of its user, most advocates are delighted by its increasing acceptance and are quick to attack its weak points in the quantitative inquiry. However, critics of the qualitative evaluation often complain about the subjectivity of many qualitative methods and techniques, expressing concern that evaluation has abandoned objectivity in favor of inexpertly managed subjectivity. Recently, however, the dialogue has begun to move beyond this debate, with analysts increasingly discussing the benefits of integrating both methods within an educational evaluation study (Worthen, 1987, 51).

One of the approaches which successfully integrate qualitative and the quantitative method in the evaluation process is the Delphi Technique. Steward (2001) asserts that one is inclined to think of qualitative data as words and text and quantitative data as numbers, but when words are used so that the subject may rank or rate their responses or when the words are counted rather than understood, these words or text are generating quantitative data. Although qualitative or quantitative data are obviously allied to particular methods, in other methods, such as the Delphi, the distinction is more difficult to assert. The Delphi usually collects in its first rounds statements that represent the subjects' viewpoint but in later rounds, in order to assess or gain consensus, the subjects are asked to accept, reject, rank or rate these statements.

## The Delphi Technique

The Delphi Technique (subsequently referred to as the Delphi) is in essence a series of sequential questionnaires or ‘rounds’, interspersed by controlled feedback, that seek to gain the most reliable consensus of the opinion of a group of experts (Haussler & Hoffmann, 1975; Caldwell, 2007; Donohoe & Needham, 2009; Lambeth, 2008). In its original form, the Delphi method is a long-range forecasting technique that elicits, refines, and draws upon the collective opinion and expertise of a panel of experts. On a practical level, the Delphi method is an alternative to formal meetings, interviews, or other face-to-face interactions. Unlike meetings where often not everyone can be present, the Delphi method allows all participants to have equal opportunity to be involved with the decision-making process (Geist, 2010). All in all, it might be defined as a social research technique whose aim is to obtain a reliable group opinion using a group of experts. It is a method of structuring communication between groups of people who can provide valuable contributions in order to resolve a complex problem. Its main characteristics are as follows:

- It is an anonymous process. The anonymity of experts is maintained throughout the process.
- It is a structured process. The information flow is coordinated by researchers. There is no direct information flow among experts.
- It is a repetitive process. The same experts are asked to respond a minimum of two times (though three to four is most common). Feedback on the previous round is synthesized and provided to participants so that they are afforded the opportunity to review change, or comment on their responses (Donohoe & Needham, 2009).

What is more, So and Bonk (2010) argues that Delphi study is a method to overcome implicit weaknesses in group communication, such as confrontation, argumentation, or dominance by a few individuals. To minimize such limitations, individuals, who are anonymous and independent, are free to express their own ideas without direct communication with each other. Instead of discussing or debating among individuals, consensus on a certain issue is achieved through a carefully designed series of surveys, facilitated by the researchers conducting the study.

The reason why The Delphi method was quickly accepted and spread rapidly is that it provided valuable solutions to problems inherent in the traditional group opinion based on direct interaction: a reduction in the influence of some undesirable psychological effects among the participants (inhibition, dominant personalities, etc.), selective feedback of the relevant information, more extensive consideration thanks to the repetition, statistical results, flexible methodology and simple execution (Landeta, 2006).

In contemporary research, the Delphi method is particularly useful when objective data are unattainable, there is a lack of empirical evidence, experimental research is unrealistic or unethical, or when the heterogeneity of the participants must be preserved to assure validity of the results (Hallowell & Gambatese, 2010).

Considering curriculum evaluation is closely related with curriculum development and it is generally defined as a process which requires collecting data, commenting on them, and making decisions, evaluation of the students' and the lecturers' views on Course book classes at prep school is of vital importance. Since % 30 of education is in English at Yıldız Technical University, evaluating the curriculum of prep school, the students' level of reaching objectives is, therefore, crucial. Getting feedback from the data collected is also thought to be beneficial for the lecturers who perform educational activities.

## **PROCEDURE**

In this study, the survey model is used.

### **Study Group**

Study group of this study consisted of 27 lecturers who were teaching Course book classes in prep classes and 36 students at Yıldız Technical University, School Foreign Languages, Basic English Department.

### **Collection and Analysis of Data**

Data were collected in two rounds of Delphi Technique. In the first Delphi questionnaire, participants were given a questionnaire including open-ended questions. Using the data gained from the first Delphi questionnaire, the second Delphi questionnaire was developed and given to the participants. Data gained from the second questionnaire were analyzed through frequency and percentage using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) 17.0 program.

## **FINDINGS**

The data gained from the lecturers' positive views about Course book classes are listed in Table 1.

Table 1 shows that 69.2 % of lecturers reported positive views about Course book. 80.7% of lecturers reported that Course book contains reading texts with universal topics; 61.5 % of them reported reading parts; 76.9 % of them reported speaking parts; 76.9 % of them reported listening parts are sufficient enough. On the other hand, 57.7 % of them expressed that reading texts are not sufficient enough.

80.5 % of the lecturers expressed that listening parts are vocalized by native speakers; 76.9 % of them reported that Course book is communication based. 88.4 % of the participants stated that the visual design of Course book enables students to follow the book easily; 84.6 % of them declared that the visual materials used in Course book enriches learning environment.

**Table 1. Lecturers' positive views about course book classes**

	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		Total
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	F	%	
1. Course book contains reading texts with universal topics.	–	–	2	7,7	3	11,5	16	61,5	5	19,2	
2. A unit in Course book contains reading skills necessary for learning English.	1	3,8	2	7,7	7	26,9	14	53,8	2	7,7	
3. A unit in Course book contains writing skills necessary for learning English.	2	7,7	13	50,0	7	26,9	3	11,5	1	3,8	
4. A unit in Course book contains listening skills necessary for learning English.	–	–	4	15,4	2	7,7	17	65,4	3	11,5	
5. A unit in Course book contains speaking skills necessary for learning English.	–	–	4	15,4	3	7,7	14	53,8	6	23,1	
6. Listening parts in Course book are vocalized by native speakers.	–	–	1	3,8	2	7,7	10	38,5	13	50,0	
7. Course book is communication-based.	2	7,7	–	–	4	15,4	16	61,5	4	15,4	
8. Course book meets students' individual needs.	–	–	9	34,6	6	23,1	8	30,8	3	11,5	
9. The visual design of Course book enables students to follow the book easily.	1	3,8	–	–	2	7,7	16	61,5	7	26,9	
10. The visual materials used in Course book enriches learning environment.	–	–	2	7,7	2	7,7	15	57,7	7	26,9	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2,2</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>14,1</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>14,5</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>49,4</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>19,8</b>	<b>261</b>

The data gained from the lecturers' negative views about Course book classes are listed in Table 2.

**Table 2. Lecturers' negative views about coursebook classes**

	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		Total
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	F	%	
1. Course book is not grammatically sufficient.	–	–	3	11,5	–	–	12	46,2	11	42,3	
2. The instructions of exercises in Course book are not clear enough.	4	15,4	14	53,8	1	3,8	5	19,2	2	7,7	
3. Course book must be taught more detailed and much more time must be allocated to it.	1	3,8	2	7,7	2	7,7	8	30,8	13	50,1	
4. Course book does not go parallel with the questions in exams.	1	3,8	5	19,2	5	19,2	8	30,8	7	26,9	
5. Course book does not include enough vocabulary exercises.	–	–	3	11,5	1	3,8	14	53,8	8	30,8	
6. Skipping some parts of Course book makes the book insufficient.	–	–	3	11,5	5	19,2	13	50,0	5	19,2	
7. Materials used in Course book do not go parallel with the questions in exams.	2	7,7	7	26,9	3	11,5	11	42,3	3	11,5	
8. Not teaching the Course book thoroughly reduces the effectiveness of the program.	1	3,8	2	7,7	2	7,7	9	34,6	12	46,2	
9. Preparing quizzes by lecturers in Course book classes causes some problems in view of standardization.	–	–	1	3,8	1	3,8	8	30,8	16	61,5	
10. Course book is not suitable considering prep school's objectives.	2	7,7	4	15,4	5	19,2	13	50,0	2	7,7	
11. Lecturers' opinions are not taken into account when choosing the Course book.	2	7,7	8	30,8	3	11,5	6	23,1	7	26,9	
12. Course book is difficult for beginners.	–	–	5	19,2	1	3,8	7	26,9	13	50,0	
13. Course book is not taught efficiently because the classrooms are overcrowded.	–	–	2	7,7	–	–	14	53,8	10	38,5	
14. Reading texts in Course book are not up-to-date and interesting.	7	26,9	11	42,3	1	3,8	5	19,2	2	7,7	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>5,4</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>19,2</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>8,2</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>36,7</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>30,5</b>	<b>364</b>

Table 2 shows that 67.2 % of lecturers stated negative views about Course book classes. 88.5 % of lecturers reported that Course book is not grammatically sufficient; by the same token, 69.2 % expressed that the instructions of exercises in Course book are not clear enough. 80.9 % of them also stated that Course book must be taught more detailed and much more time must be allocated to it.

57.7 % of lecturers reported that Course book does not go parallel with the questions in exams; 84.6 % of them stated that Course book does not include enough vocabulary exercises. Likewise, 69.2 % of them claimed that skipping some parts of Course book makes the book insufficient; 53.8 % of them denoted that materials used in Course book do not go parallel with the questions in exams. 80.8 % of them advocated the idea that not teaching the Course book thoroughly reduces the effectiveness of the program. What is more, 92.3 % of lecturers claimed that preparing quizzes by lecturers in Course book classes causes some problems in view of standardization.

Table 2 also shows that 57.7 % of the participants expressed the idea that Course book is not suitable considering prep school's objectives. On the other hand, lecturers responses are not clear to comment on the item which expresses the idea that lecturer's opinions are not taken into account when choosing the Course book. While 34.6 % of them disagreed with the statement, 23.1 % of them was neutral and 42.3 % of them agreed with the statement. Correspondingly, 76.9 % of them reported that Course book is difficult for beginners; 92.3 % of them expressed the idea that Course book is not taught efficiently because the classrooms are overcrowded. However, 69.2 % of them did not agree with the idea that reading texts in Course book are not up-to-date and interesting.

The data gained from the students' positive views about Course book classes are listed in Table 3.

Table 3 shows that 83.3 % of students expressed that there must be 'answer key part' at the end of Course book. 61.1 % of them stated that the visual elements in Course book are interesting. 55.6 % of the participants claimed the idea that listening parts in Course book are understandable and 66.7 % of them responded that there must be a section which includes vocabularies and their meanings at the end of every unit. 80.3 % of them declared that they find grammar summary at the end of the book useful. 77.7 % of them reported that technological equipment must be used frequently in Course book classes. Likewise, 77.7 % of them agreed with the idea that materials which go parallel with Course book must be prepared.

While 44.4 % of the students stated that they are happy with Course book classes, 33.4 % of them denoted that they are not. 22.2 % of the participants were neutral. Likewise, 33.3 % of them expressed that Course book classes have improved their English. 44.4 % of the participants responded negatively to this statement. 22.2 % of them was neutral. On the other hand 88.8 % of them agreed with the idea that there must be more 'everyday English' in Course book.

**Table 3. Students' positive views about course book classes**

	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		Total
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	F	%	
1. There must be 'answer key part' at the end of Course book.	–	–	4	11,1	2	5,6	16	44,4	14	38,9	
2. Visual elements in Course book are interesting.	1	2,8	3	8,3	10	27,5	18	50,0	4	11,1	
3. Listening parts in Course book are understandable.	6	16,7	14	38,9	3	8,3	10	27,8	3	8,3	
4. There must be a section which includes vocabularies and their meanings at the end of every unit.	1	2,8	9	25	2	5,6	13	36,1	11	30,6	
5. I find grammar summary at the end of the book useful.	4	11,1	–	–	2	5,6	18	50,0	12	33,3	
6. Technological equipment must be used frequently in Course book classes.	2	5,6	2	5,6	4	11,1	21	58,3	7	19,4	
7. Materials which go parallel with Course book must be prepared.	–	–	2	5,6	6	16,7	16	44,4	12	33,3	
8. I think Course book classes have improved my English.	5	13,9	7	19,4	8	22,2	13	36,1	3	8,3	
9. I am happy with Course book classes.	4	11,1	12	33,3	8	22,2	10	27,8	2	5,6	
10. There must be more 'everyday English' in Course book.	1	2,8	1	2,8	2	5,6	16	44,4	16	44,4	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>6,6</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>15,0</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>13,1</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>42,0</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>23,3</b>	<b>360</b>

The data gained from the students' negative views about Course book classes are listed in Table 4.



**Table 4. Students' Negative Views about Course book Classes**

	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		Total
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	F	%	
1. I am not happy with the idea that Course book is sold with on-line passwords.	–	–	–	–	–	–	4	11,1	32	88,9	
2. Content of Course book is not sufficient.	–	–	2	5,6	4	11,1	23	63,9	7	19,4	
3. Grammar exercises in Course book are not sufficient.	2	5,6	4	11,1	3	8,3	18	50,0	9	25	
4. Vocabulary exercises in Course book are not sufficient.	–	–	4	11,1	5	13,9	21	58,3	6	16,7	
5. I find reading texts in Course book boring.	–	–	22	61,1	5	13,9	7	19,4	2	5,6	
6. The language of Course book is difficult.	1	2,8	23	63,9	6	16,7	5	13,9	1	2,8	
7. Materials in Course book are more than needed.	6	16,7	20	55,6	3	8,3	7	19,4	–	–	
8. Grammar is not emphasized enough.	1	2,8	3	8,3	3	8,3	20	55,6	9	25,0	
9. Subjects in Course book and in exams are different.	2	5,6	12	33,3	4	11,1	14	38,9	4	11,1	
10. I find reading texts in Course book difficult.	–	–	23	63,9	8	22,2	5	13,9	–	–	
11. Enough time is not allocated to Course book.	–	–	11	30,6	5	13,9	14	38,9	6	16,7	
12. Course book does not meet my expectation.	1	2,8	8	22,2	7	19,4	17	47,2	3	8,3	
13. Course book web site is not useful.	2	5,6	5	13,9	3	8,3	13	36,1	13	36,1	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3,2</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>29,2</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>11,9</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>36,0</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>19,7</b>	<b>468</b>

Table 4 shows that 55.7 % of students had negative views about Course book. It also shows that all the students were not happy with the idea that Course book is sold with on-line passwords. Likewise, 83.3 % of the participants agreed with the idea that the content of Course book is not sufficient. 75.0 % of them also stated that grammar exercises in Course book are not sufficient. 70.5% of the participants had the idea that vocabulary exercises in Course book are at the same time not sufficient. 61.1% of them found the reading texts in Course book boring.

According to Table 4, 66.7 % of students did not agree with the idea that the language of Course book is difficult. 72.3 % of them also stated that materials in Course book are not more than needed. However, 80.6 % of students denoted that grammar is not emphasized enough. 38.9 % of them reported that subjects in Course book and in exams are different. Nevertheless, 50.0 % of them agreed with the same item. This may stem from the numbers of progress tests and quizzes.

Table 4 also shows that 63.9 % of students disagreed that reading texts in Course book are difficult. However, 55.6 % of them denoted that not enough time is allocated to Course book. 55.5 % of them reported that Course book does not meet their expectation. 72.2 % of them also stated that Course book web site is not useful.

## **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Lecturers' and students' views about Course book at prep classes were analyzed in this study. According to the findings from the data gained, the lecturers and the students generally had negative ideas about Course book classes at prep school.

It is important to emphasize that in the process of curriculum development, objectives must be set in accordance with the students' needs, interests and entry behaviors, as well. On choosing the suitable book to follow, it is also of great importance to take the objectives into account.

In addition, necessary analysis must be done on part of students' needs and expectations before the development of curriculum and this makes the curriculum, in turn, more effective. Furthermore, it is recommended that the students must be informed about the content, objectives and language skills as well as the assessment criteria of the curriculum. What is more, the extra materials that are thought to supplement program efficiency must go parallel with the level of difficulty of the main course.

## REFERENCES

- Caldwell, C. (2007). School Counselor Performance Evaluation: A Delphi Study to Determine Content and Procedure for a Model Instrument. Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate School of the Texas A & M university-Commerce.
- Donohoe, H. & Needham, R. (2009). Moving Best Practice Forward: Delphi Characteristics, Advantages, Potential Problems, and Solutions. *International Journal of Tourism Research*. 11,(2009).
- Erden, M. (1995). *Eğitimde Program Değerlendirme*. Ankara: PegemA Yayıncılık.
- Geist, M. (2010). Using the Delphi Method to Engage Stakeholders: A Comparison of Two Studies. *Evaluation and Program Planning*. 33, 147–154
- Hallowell, M. & Gambatese, J. (2010). Qualitative Research: Application of the Delphi Method to CEM Research. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*. January, 2010.
- Haussler, P. & Hoffman, L. (1999). A Curricular Frame for Physics Education: Development, Comparison with Students' Interests, and Impact on Students' Achievement and Self-Concept, A Curricular Frame. *Science of Education*. (84), 689-705.
- Lambeth, J. M. (2008). *Research for Career and Technical Education: Findings from a National Delphi Study*. In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education. Texas: A&M University.
- Landeta, J. (2006). Current Validity of the Delphi Method in Social Sciences. *Technological Forecasting & Social Change*. 73, 467–482.
- McNeil, J. (2009). *Contemporary Curriculum in Thought and Action*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Ornstein, A., Hunkins, F. (2004). *Curriculum: Foundations, Principles, and Issues*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- So, H.-J. & Bonk, C. J. (2010). Examining the Roles of Blended Learning Approaches in Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning (CSCL) Environments: A Delphi Study. *Educational Technology & Society*, 13 (3), 189–200.
- Steward, J. (2001). Is the Delphi technique a qualitative method? *Medical Education*. 2001-35.
- Variş, F. (1996). *Eğitimde Program Geliştirme*. Ankara: Alkım Kitapçılık Yayıncılık.
- Worthen, B., Sanders, J. (1987). *Educational Evaluation: Alternative Approaches and Practical Guidelines*. New York: Longman.

## Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Temel İngilizce Bölümü (Hazırlık) Öğretim Görevlileri ve Öğrencilerinin Anaders Kitabı ile İlgili Düşüncelerinin Değerlendirilmesi

### Özet

**Problem Durumu:** Eğitimde program geliştirme süreci ile iç içe olan ve program geliştirme faaliyetinin önemli bir aşaması olan program değerlendirme (Varış, 1996, 186), gözlem ve çeşitli ölçme araçları ile eğitim programlarının etkililiği hakkında veri toplama, elde edilen verileri programın etkililiğinin işaretçileri olan ölçütlerle karşılaştırıp yorumlama ve programın etkililiği hakkında karar verme süreci olarak tanımlanmaktadır.

Son yıllarda özellikle değerlendirme alanında sıklıkla karşılaştığımız bilimsel yaklaşımlardan çok kişisel deneyimi ön planda tutan ve değerlendirmecinin algı, donanım ve geçmiş deneyimlerine dayanan öznel değerlendirme yaklaşımlarından (Worthen, 1987, 47) biri de Delphi tekniğidir. Bir görüş birliği sağlama aracı olarak ifade edilen Delphi tekniği bir problem durumuna farklı açılardan bakan bireylerin ya da grupların yüz yüze gelmeden uzlaşmalarını amaçlayan bir tekniktir (Şahin, 2009). Delphi tekniğinin özellikleri en genel haliyle aşağıdaki şekilde sıralanabilir:

- Delphi tekniği, birbirini izleyen, ardışık süreçlerden oluşan bir araştırma yöntemidir.
- Uzlaşma sağlama, açık tartışma yerine katılımcılar ve katılımcıların sorulara verdiği cevapların gizliliğinin korunmasıyla gerçekleştirilir. Bu şekilde karar verme süreci baskın bireyler tarafından yönlendirilebilecek bir tartışma ortamına dönüşmez.
- Katılımcılar kendi fikirlerini uzman gruba rahatlıkla iletebilirler.
- Elde edilen verilerin nitel ve nicel analizleri istatistiksel olarak ifade edilir (Landetta, 2007; Graham ve Milne, 2003).

Program değerlendirmenin herhangi bir eğitim programının etkinliği hakkında veri toplama, yorumlama ve karar verme süreci olduğu göz önünde bulundurulduğunda, Hazırlık bölümünde çalışan öğretim görevlileri ve öğrencilerin “Coursebook” dersi hakkındaki görüşlerinin değerlendirme sürecinde önemli olduğu düşünülmektedir. Öğretim dilinin en az % 30 olduğu lisans programlarında öğrenim göreceğ öğrencilerin derslerini takip edebilecek ve alanlarında araştırma yapabilecek düzeyde yazılı ve sözlü iletişim becerilerine sahip olmalarının hedeflendiği Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesinde, Hazırlık birimlerindeki ders programlarının incelenmesi, öğrencilere hedeflere ulaşma dereceleri, öğretmenlere ise gerçekleştirdikleri öğretim faaliyetlerinin etkililiği hakkında dönüt sağlaması açısından yararlı olacağı eldeki çalışmada değerlendirilmektedir.

**Yöntem:** Betimsel çalışma olan bu araştırmada, tarama (survey) modeli kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın çalışma grubunu, 2011-2012 öğretim yılında Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi, Yabancı Diller Yüksek Okulu, Temel İngilizce (Hazırlık) sınıflarında “Coursebook” dersi veren 27 öğretim görevlisi ile aynı bölüme devam eden 36 öğrenci oluşturmuştur.

Araştırmada veri toplama aracı olarak iki aşamalı Delphi tekniği uygulanmıştır. Araştırmanın başlangıcında açık uçlu soruların yer aldığı bir anket formu hazırlanmıştır. Daha sonra birinci tur için hazırlanan anket, katılımcılara gönderilmiş; birinci tur sonunda elde edilen bulgulardan yararlanılarak yeni ve daha içerikli bir anket geliştirilmiş ve katılımcılara uygulanmıştır.

**Bulgular:** Elde edilen veriler değerlendirildiğinde öğretim görevlilerinin, Coursebook dersi hakkında olumlu ifade edilen görüşlerin oranı % 69,2’dir. Buna göre öğretim görevlileri, Course book kitabındaki okuma metinlerinin evrensel konular içerdiği fikrini % 80,7 oranında paylaştıklarını; kitaptaki okuma bölümlerini % 61,5, konuşma bölümlerini % 76,9 ve dinleme bölümlerini ise % 76,9 oranında yeterli gördüklerini ifade etmişlerdir. Buna karşın söz konusu kitabın okuma bölümleri % 57,7 oranında yeterli görülmemiştir.

Diğer taraftan öğretim görevlilerinin Course book dersi hakkında % 67,2 oranında olumsuz görüş ifade ettikleri görülmüştür. Buna göre öğretim görevlilerinin % 88,5’i kitabın gramer açısından yetersiz olduğunu belirtmiştir. Öğrencilere uygulanan ankettten elde edilen verilere göre ise öğrencilerin % 83,3’ü Course book kitabının arkasında cevap anahtarı olması gerektiğini; % 61,1’i kitaptaki görsel unsurların ilgi çekici olduğunu; % 55,6’sı dinleme bölümlerinin anlaşılır olmadığını belirtmiştir.

Elde edilen verilere göre öğrenciler % 55,7 oranında Course book dersi hakkında olumsuz görüş belirtmiştir. Course book kitabının on-line şifrelerle birlikte satılmasından tamamının memnun olmadığı; aynı şekilde Course book kitabının içeriğinin de öğrencilere göre %83,3 oranında yeterli olmadığı ortaya çıkmıştır. Öğrencilerin % 75,0’ı kitaptaki dilbilgisi, % 70,5’i kelime bilgisi alıştırmalarının yetersiz olduğunu; kitaptaki okuma metinlerini % 61,1 oranında sıkıcı bulduklarını belirtmişlerdir.

**Sonuç ve Öneriler:** Elde edilen veriler değerlendirildiğinde öğretim görevlileri ve öğrencilerin Coursebook dersi ve söz konusu kitabın öğretim programı hakkında genel olarak olumsuz düşünceye sahip oldukları görülmektedir. Programın hazırlanması aşamasında öngörülen hedeflerin, öğrencilerin giriş davranışlarıyla uyumlu olması gerektiği; ders kitabının seçiminde, program hedeflerinin göz önünde bulundurulması zorunluluğu ortaya çıkmaktadır. Konu ile ilgili yapılan benzer bir araştırmada hazırlık birimlerinin ders programlarının hazırlanmasında öğrencilerin ön donanımlarının ve gereksinimlerinin saptanmasının zorunlu olduğu ifade edilmektedir (Yurtcan, 1995).

Sonuç olarak söz konusu programın hazırlanması aşamasında öngörülen hedeflerin, öğrencilerin giriş davranışlarıyla uyumlu olması gerektiği anlaşılmaktadır. Ayrıca ders kitabına göre içerik oluşturulmakta, bir diğer deyişle ders kitabı içeriği, ders programı içeriği olarak kabul edilmektedir. Buna karşın ders

kitabının seçiminde, program hedeflerinin göz önünde bulundurulması ve öğretim görevlilerinin görüşlerinin alınması zorunluluğu ortaya çıkmaktadır. Buna ek olarak, öğrencilerin beklenti ve ihtiyaçları konusunda gerekli analizlerinin yapılması, programın etkinliğini arttıracakları düşünülmektedir. Programın etkinliğine yardımcı olması beklenen destekleyici materyallerin, ders kitabı ve günlük derecesiyle paralellik taşıması gerekliliği de değerlendirilmesi gereken diğer bir konudur.

**Anahtar Sözcükler:** Program değerlendirme, delphi tekniği, yabancı diller, anaders kitabı.