Evaluating English for Academic Purposes II Course through the CIPP Model

Akademik Amaçlı İngilizce II Dersinin CIPP Modeliyle Değerlendirilmesi

Ahmet Erdost Yastıbaş[1], Tuğçenur Erdal[2]

Abstract

CIPP is a common program evaluation model used in educational studies to evaluate any educational program. This study aimed to evaluate the program of English for academic purposes II given in a Turkish foundation university. Therefore, it was designed as descriptive research. 23 English language instructors participated in the research. The data was collected through the adapted version of a teacher-based CIPP program evaluation scale. The data was analyzed by using descriptive statistics. The findings of the study indicated that the participants had generally positive thoughts about the context, input, process, and product dimensions of the program, but there were some weaknesses in each dimension: the relevancy of the program to the physical conditions of the classes and the students' English background knowledge in the context dimension; the course book and suggested materials in the input dimension; time allocated to study the theoretical knowledge and do the activities and uninteresting and demotivating activities in the process dimension; the individual needs of the students and not encouraging to study English for academic purposes in the product dimension.

Keywords: CIPP model, English for academic purposes, course evaluation.

Öz

CIPP, eğitim çalışmalarında herhangi bir eğitim programını değerlendirmek için kullanılan yaygın bir program değerlendirme modelidir. Bu çalışma, bir Türk vakıf üniversitesinde verilen akademik amaçlı İngilizce II dersinin programını değerlendirmeyi amaçlar. Bu nedenle, betimsel bir çalışma olarak tasarlanmıştır. 23 İngilizce öğretim görevlisi çalışmaya katılmıştır. Veriler, öğretmen temelli CIPP program değerlendirme ölçeğinin adapte edilmiş versiyonu ile toplanmıştır. Veriler, betimsel istatistikle analiz edilmiştir. Bu çalışmanın bulguları göstermiştir ki katılımcıların, genellikle programın bağlam, girdi, süreç ve ürün boyutlarıyla ilgili olarak genellikle olumlu düşünceleri vardır; fakat her bir boyutta birkaç geliştirilmesi gereken nokta mevcuttur: süreç boyutunda programın sınıfların fiziksel koşullarına ve öğrencilerin İngilizce artalan bilgilerine uygun olması; girdi boyutunda ders kitabı ve önerilen materyaller; süreç boyutunda teorik bilgileri çalışmak ve aktiviteleri yapmak için ayrılan zaman ile ilginç ve motive etmeyen aktiviteler; ürün sürecinde öğrencilerin bireysel ihtiyaçları ve İngilizceyi akademik amaçlarla çalışmayı teşvik etmeme.

Anahtar Kelimeler: CIPP modeli, akademik amaçlı İngilizce, ders değerlendirilmesi.

---

[1] English language instructor Dr., Department of Modern Languages, School of Foreign Languages, Atılım University, email: ahmet.yastibas@atilim.edu.tr, Orcid: 0000-0002-1886-7951.
[2] English language instructor, Department of Modern Languages, School of Foreign Languages, Atılım University, email: tugcenur.kavgaci@atilim.edu.tr, Orcid: 0000-0002-1076-5344.

Introduction

Since the importance of learning English has become one of the most inevitable parts of our modern age, the components of this process have gained significance. In other words, programs, curricula and syllabi are the milestones of the components. Evaluating them also contributes to the evaluation of the learning process. When it comes to program evaluation, it is principally described as the procedure of gathering information about the whole educational program, or some aspects of it so as to make decisions and further revisions about the program.

Curriculum evaluation is another aspect which needs to be considered in order to obtain better results so that language learning can become more fruitful and efficient. It can generally be described as the process of evaluating the quality of educational programs, projects, materials, and techniques (Borg & Gall, 1983) or the act of collecting and providing information for decision-makers to function effectively (Worthen & Sanders, 1987). When the reasons for program evaluation are asked, there are three main reasons that are classified by Cronbach (1991). According to Cronbach (1991), the first reason is *course improvement* which considers decisions on the fruitfulness of the instructional materials and methods, so alterations can take place if needed. As Cronbach (1991) stated, depending on the needs of students, *decisions about individuals* are taken into account to identify their deficiencies and progress and to plan the instruction, selection, and grouping for them. The last reason is *administrative regulation* that helps to find out the quality of the school system and individual teachers (Cronbach, 1991).

One of the commonly used curriculum evaluation models is the CIPP model developed by Stufflebeam in the late 1960s. The CIPP model is a kind of process evaluation which aims to compare the actual implementation of the program with what is intended in the program, what the implementation of the program costs, and how the participants evaluate the effort (Stufflebeam & Shinkfeld, 1985). It is based on the view that the most important purpose of evaluation is not to prove, but to improve, so it considers evaluation to be a continuing process (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1988). The aim of this evaluation model is to help administrators make good decisions on educational issues (Worthen, Sanders, & Fitzpatrick, 1997).

CIPP stands for context, input, process, and product. Context deals with the learning environment. It aims to define the environment and to indicate the judgments about the desired conditions unique to the environment, the needs that are not met and missed opportunities, and to reveal the reason(s) for the unmet needs (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1998). Therefore, context includes different aspects of a course such as its relation with other courses, external factors, the adequacy of time, need for the course, and its link with extension activities.

Input focuses on the explanation of course objectives, their alignment with the goals of the school, the alignment of course content with course objectives, and appropriateness of instructional strategies to course objectives. The purpose of input is to evaluate a program in these aspects. Thus, it can help to understand whether the implementation is adequate and inform about needed modification if the implementation is not adequate, so with this understanding and information, external audience can learn about the program and help different stakeholders including program administrators and staff to interpret the outcomes of the program (Gredler, 1996).

Process concentrates on program activities, resources, and stakeholders' roles. Its purpose is to answer several questions related to the implementation of program activities, the use of available resources, and the acceptance and implementation of the roles by the participants (Stufflebeam, 1983; Stufflebeam & Shinkfeld, 1985).

Product serves as a tool to measure, interpret, and judge what a program has attained (Stufflebeam & Shinkfeld, 1985). According to Gredler (1996), this evaluation includes negative and positive outcomes in addition to intended and unintended effects. Therefore, it can help to make a decision on the future function of the program – that is, whether a program should be continued, repeated, and/or extended to other settings (Stufflebeam, 1983; Stufflebeam & Shinkfeld, 1985).

In accordance with the explanations below, the present study aimed to evaluate the program of English for academic purposes II through the CIPP model by trying to answer the following research questions:

1. What do the English language instructors think about the program of the English for academic purposes II course?
   a. What do the English language instructors think about the context dimension of the program of the English for academic purposes II course?
   b. What do the English language instructors think about the input dimension of the program of the English for academic purposes II course?
   c. What do the English language instructors think about the process dimension of the program of the English for academic purposes II course?
   d. What do the English language instructors think about the product dimension of the program of the English for academic purposes II course?

1. Literature Review

There are eight CIPP-based program evaluation studies on English language teaching programs (ELTPs) in Turkey. Three of these studies evaluated different ELTPs in the secondary and high school (Aktı Aslan & İzci, 2017; Dinçer & Saracaloğlu, 2017; Turan, 2016). The other studies were conducted in different Turkish universities to evaluate different ELTPs (Karataş & Fer, 2009; Orhan, 2016; Ödemiş, 2018; Tunç, 2010; Yılmaz Vırlan, 2014). Aktı Aslan and İzci (2017) evaluated the ELTP with English language teachers, and Orhan (2016) made his evaluation study with the course students, while the others were conducted with both course teachers and students.

In the context dimension, five ELTPs evaluated were found to meet the students' needs from a moderate level to a satisfactory level (Dinçer & Saracaloğlu, 2017; Karataş & Fer, 2009; Orhan, 2016; Ödemiş, 2018; Turan, 2016). The course books used in two ELTPs were considered to be aligned with the purposes of the ELTPs (Aktı Aslan & İzci, 2017; Karataş & Fer, 2009), yet Aktı Aslan and İzci (2007) and Yılmaz Vırlan (2014) found that the ELTPs they evaluated had problems because of their purposes: the ones in Aktı Aslan and İzci (2007) were not relevant to the students' level of readiness, and the ones in the other study were not detailed. However, the ones in Ödemiş (2018) were relevant to the students' levels of readiness. Besides, one common weakness among the three ELTPs evaluated is that those programs did not pay enough attention to speaking (Dinçer & Saracaloğlu, 2017; Ödemiş, 2018; Yılmaz Vırlan, 2014); while Karataş and Fer (2009) found that the ELTP evaluated balanced the importance given to each language skill. In addition, according to Tunç (2010), the ELTP evaluated had necessary equipment, but crowded classes and transportation avoided using the equipment effectively, while the ELTP evaluated by Turan (2016) was considered to have been prepared without considering the physical and technological features of the school.

In the input dimension, Dinçer and Saracaloğlu (2017), Karataş and Fer (2009), Turan (2016), and Yılmaz Vırlan (2014) revealed in their ELTP studies that the materials used were insufficient, ineffective, uninteresting, difficult for learning, irrelevant to the students' levels of readiness, or could not be relevant to the physical and technological conditions of the school. Similarly, not stating the objectives clearly caused the input not to meet the teachers' expectations and not to achieve the improvement expected (Tunç, 2010). On the other hand, the materials in the ELTPs evaluated by Atkı Aslan and İzci (2017) and Ödemiş (2018) were considered to get the students' attention, to be in line with the course objectives, or to promote language skills. In Orhan's study (2016), the materials in the ELTP were found to have a moderate level quality and lack the materials promoting speaking.

In the process dimension, the processes of the two ELTP were implemented were found to be implemented without experiencing several problems in Aktı Aslan and İzci (2017) and Karataş and Fer (2009). Likewise, Orhan (2016) revealed that the program evaluated had a moderate level of quality in terms of communicating with teachers, their lecturing, and use of materials. Yet, the processes in the other evaluated ELTPs experienced problems because of program overload, lack of time and materials (Dinçer & Saracaloğlu, 2017; Tunç, 2010; Yılmaz Vırlan, 2014), assessment tools irrelevant to the students' levels of English (Tunç, 2010), technological facilities, lack of extracurricular activities (Turan, 2016), and materials irrelevant to the course objectives (Yılmaz Vırlan, 2014) and not promoting students' participation (Ödemiş, 2018). Despite this, the activities and methods used in the ELTPs were considered to be effective (Ödemiş, 2018), communication with the teachers was good (Tunç, 2010), and interaction and classroom management were found to be good (Turan, 2016).

The product dimension of almost every ELTP evaluated was problematic because the students in the programs could not produce what was expected from them (Dinçer & Saracaloğlu, 2017; Orhan, 2016). In addition, the products did not meet the expectations especially in terms of speaking and/or listening (Aktı Aslan & İzci, 2017; Orhan, 2016; Ödemiş, 2018; Tunç, 2010; Yılmaz Vırlan, 2014) as well as writing (Ödemiş, 2018). Besides, the product dimension of three ELTPs were found out not to be benefitted enough and meet the students' individual needs (Ödemiş, 2018), not to encourage students to learn, work in groups and use what they learnt (Karataş & Fer, 2009), and to meet the course objectives moderately (Orhan, 2016). However, Turan (2016) revealed that the aviation ELTP contributed to the students' English and helped the students to achieve course objectives to a certain extent.

2. Methodology

2.1. Research Design

A study aims to describe a phenomenon as it was in the past or is now (Karasar, 2009). In another definition, Büyüköztürk, Kılıç Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz, and Demirel (2009) explained it as describing the case or phenomenon thoroughly and cautiously. Accordingly, the present study aimed to describe the curriculum of English for academic purposes II based on the thoughts about the instructors on the curriculum, so descriptive research design was employed in this study.

2.2. The Course Evaluated: English For Academic Purposes II

The course is a four-hour obligatory English course for the students of English-medium departments. A digital course book is used in the course, and students study English for academic purposes through their mobile devices. It is generally based on academic reading and writing. It also includes academic speaking and listening. In accordance with these, the course aims to achieve the following objectives in each skill:

In reading, students are expected to

1. identify sentence functions,
2. identify main idea(s) and supporting details,
3. locate specific information,
4. recognize referents/substitution words,
5. summarize sections of a text, and
6. guessing meaning from the context.

In writing, students are expected to

1. write a graph description,
   a. plan and draft a graph description,
   b. write a well-organized graph description with an introduction, body and conclusion, and
   c. use linkers appropriately.

In speaking, students are expected to

1. give mini presentations.

In listening, students are expected to

1. listen for gist and detailed information.

Students are evaluated through both formative and summative assessment tools. They take one midterm and one final exam. They make two different individual presentations on different topics related to health and technology. They prepare a portfolio which has two different writing tasks: single-graph and two-graph writing. They do five video-based discussion tasks and two listening tasks.

2.3. Participants

23 English language instructors who taught the English for academic purposes II course participated into the research. 19 out of 23 participants were female, while the rest were male. Their ages varied between 24 and 56. Nine participants graduated from English language teaching, eight from English language and culture, four from American culture and literature, one from translation and interpretation, and one from English linguistics departments. Their teaching experience ranged between 3 and 30 years.

2.4. Data Collection Tool

The data was collected through the adapted version of the Teacher Scale for the Ninth Grade Mathematics Curriculum developed by Çimili Abat (2016). This scale was adapted taking into consideration the objectives and content of the English for academic purposes II by the researchers. Then, they shared it with one of their colleagues with a Ph.D. degree in English language teaching and the head of the department who coordinated the curriculum development study of English for academic purposes II and had an MA degree in curriculum design for the face, content, and construct validity. The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of the whole adapted scale was 0.934. The ones for the context, input, process, and product sub-scales were respectively 0.843, 0.835, 0,6, and 0.887.

2.5. Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics (i.e. frequencies and percentages) was used to analyze the collected data. SPSS 20 for Mac was used to make the descriptive analysis.

2.6. Data Collection Procedure

The data was collected in the course evaluation meeting of the English for academic purposes II course. The researchers distributed the scales to the English language instructors attending the meeting. The participants completed the questionnaire in almost ten minutes and returned it to the researchers in the meeting.

3. Findings

The first research question is about what the participants thought about the context of the English for academic purposes II course. Table 1 below presents the frequency and percentages of the participants' responses to the context-related items.

Table 1. The Frequency and Percentages of The Participants' Responses to The Context-Related Items

Evaluating Context	CD*		D		NAND		A		CA	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1. The program is relevant to the campus facilities.			2	8,7	4	17,4	9	39,1	8	34,8
2. The program is relevant to the development of problem-solving skills of the students.			2	8,7	6	26,1	14	60,9	1	4,3
3. The program is relevant for the students to use English for academic purposes.			1	4,3	4	17,4	13	56,5	5	21,7
4. The program is relevant to develop the students' academic English skills.			1	4,3	5	21,7	12	52,2	5	21,7
5. The objectives of the program is relevant to the students' English background knowledge.			7	30,4	9	39,1	6	26,1	1	4,3
6. The theoretical knowledge in the program is sufficient.			1	4,3	7	30,4	13	56,5	2	8,7
7. The objectives of the program are relevant to the needs of the students.			1	4,3	9	39,1	11	47,8	2	8,7
8. The objectives of the program are relevant to the principles of English for academic purposes.					6	26,1	13	56,5	4	17,4
9. The objectives of the program can help the students to understand the academic context.			2	8,7	9	39,1	10	43,5	2	8,7
10. The objectives of the program are clear and understandable.			2	8,7	3	13	13	56,5	5	21,7
11. The subjects in the program are relevant to the students' levels of English (B1).	1	4,3	4	17,4	5	21,7	10	43,5	3	13
12. The physical conditions of the classes are relevant to achieve the objectives of the program.	2	8,7	11	47,8	5	21,7	3	13	2	8,7
13. The objectives of the program are not necessary for the first grade students.	1	4,3	10	43,5	9	39,1	2	8,7	1	4,3

* shows that CD: Completely disagree, D: Disagree, NAND: Neither agree nor disagree, A: Agree, and CA: Completely agree.

According to Table 1, 73,9% of the participants thought that the facilities of the campus are relevant to the program. More than half of the participants (*f*=15) agreed that the program is relevant to develop the problem-solving skills of the students. Similarly, more than half of them (*f*=18) mentioned that the students can use English for academic purposes in the program. Accordingly, the program is believed to be suitable for developing the students' academic English skills by 73,9% of the participants. Though 30,4% of them disagreed that the program is relevant to the students' English background knowledge, the same amount of them agreed with this. That the theoretical knowledge in the program is sufficient for the students is agreed by most of the participants (*f*=15). Half of the participants (56,5%) agreed that the objectives of the program are suitable to the needs of the students. In addition, the objectives of the course are thought to be appropriate to the principles of English for academic purposes by 17 participants, to help the students to understand the academic context by 12 participants, and to be clear and understandable by 18 participants. While 56,5 of the participants approved that the subjects in the program are appropriate to the English levels of the students, 21,7% did not approve this. 56,5% of them disagreed with the item that the physical conditions of the classes are relevant to the objectives of the course. Finally, 47,8% of them did not approve the idea that the objectives of the program are not necessary for the first grade students, while 39,1% neither agreed nor disagreed with the idea.

Table 2. The Frequency and Percentages of The Participants' Responses to The Input-Related Item

Evaluating Input	CD*		D		NAND		A		CA	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1. The objectives of the program are in alignment with the goals of the university.					3	13	16	69,6	4	17,4
2. Required sources are available at the university.			6	26,1	7	30,4	8	34,8	2	8,7
3. Required materials are available at the university.			5	21,7	8	34,8	7	30,4	3	13
4. The course book gets students' attention.	3	13	10	43,5	8	34,8	2	8,7		
5. The course book is relevant to the students' levels of English.			12	52,2	8	34,8	3	13		

Item	CD f	CD %	D f	D %	NAND f	NAND %	A f	A %	CA f	CA %
6. The course book is in align with the objectives of the program.			4	17,4	11	47,8	7	30,4	1	4,3
7. Suggested teaching strategies are compatible with the objectives of the program.			1	4,3	5	21,7	16	69,6	1	4,3
8. Suggested teaching methods and techniques enable to achieve the objectives.			1	4,3	5	21,7	14	60,9	3	13
9. Suggested materials in the program get the students' attention.	2	8,7	7	30,4	8	34,8	6	26,1		
10. Suggested materials promote students' learning.			4	17,4	6	26,1	10	43,5	3	13

* shows that CD: Completely disagree, D: Disagree, NAND: Neither agree nor disagree, A: Agree, and CA: Completely agree.

As seen in Table 2, almost all of the participants (*f*=20) agreed that the objectives of the program are aligned with the goals of the university. While 26,1% of them disagreed that the required sources are available at the university, 43,5% of them agreed with this item. Similarly, 21,7% of them did not think that the required materials are available at the university, but 43,4% thought that they are available. Half of the participants (56,5%) did not think that the course book gets the students' attention, and the course book is considered to be irrelevant to the students' levels of English by 52,2% of them. While eleven participants neither agreed nor disagreed that the course book is aligned with the objectives of the program, eight participants agreed that it is aligned. 73,9% of them agreed that suggested teaching strategies are compatible with the objectives of the course and suggested teaching methods and techniques enable to achieve the objectives. 39,1% of them did not agree that suggested materials get students' attention, while 26,1% of them thought that they get their attention. However, 56,5% of them believed that suggested materials promote students' learning.

Table 3. The Frequency and Percentages of The Participants' Responses to The Process-Related Item

Evaluating Process	CD* f	CD* %	D f	D %	NAND f	NAND %	A f	A %	CA f	CA %
1. The allocated time for the program is sufficient to achieve the objectives.	1	4,3	1	4,3	9	39,1	7	30,4	5	21,7
2. The allocated time for studying the theoretical information in the program is sufficient.			3	13	10	43,5	8	34,8	2	8,7
3. The allocated time for the activities in the program is sufficient.			5	21,7	10	43,5	6	26,1	2	8,7
4. The implementation of the activities given in the course book is student-centered.			2	8,7	5	21,7	16	69,6		
5. The activities made in the program are individual.			6	26,1	9	39,1	8	34,8		
6. The program has group work activities.	1	4,3			6	26,1	13	56,5	3	13
7. The activities in the program are boring for the students.			4	17,4	11	47,8	8	34,8		
8. The program has activities that improve students' problem solving skills.			1	4,3	7	30,4	14	60,9	1	4,3
9. The activities in the program help the students to learn by discussing.			3	13	3	13	16	69,6	1	4,3
10. The activities in the program improve the students' information and communication skills.			1	4,3	3	13	17	73,9	2	8,7
11. The activities in the program increase the students' motivation.			5	21,7	15	65,2	3	13		
12. The assignments given are compatible with the objectives of the program.					6	26,1	13	56,5	4	17,4

* shows that CD: Completely disagree, D: Disagree, NAND: Neither agree nor disagree, A: Agree, and CA: Completely agree.

As Table 3 indicates, half of the participants (52,1%) believed that the allocated time for the program is sufficient to achieve the course objectives, yet 43,5% of them neither agreed nor disagreed that the allocated time for studying the theoretical knowledge and activities in the program is sufficient. However, nine participants thought that the allocated time for studying the theoretical information in the program is sufficient, and eight agreed that the time is enough for the activities. More than half of them (*f*=19) believed that the implementation of the activities is student-centered. While only 34,8% of the participants agreed that the activities in the program are individual, 56,5% of them thought that the activities in the program support group work. Eleven participants neither agreed nor disagreed that the activities in the program are boring for the students, while 34,8% of them agreed with this item. More than half of the participants (60,9%, 73,9%, and 82,6%) thought that the activities in the program improves students' problem-solving skills, help them learn by discussing, and improve their information and communication skills in order. 65,2% of them neither agreed nor disagreed that the activities in the program increase students' motivation, while 21,7% did not agree with this item. Finally, 83,9% of them thought that the assignments in the course are compatible with the objectives of the program.

Table 4. The Frequency and Percentages of The Participants' Responses to The Product-Related Item

Evaluating Product	CD*		D		NAND		A		CA	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1. The products of the students meet their individual needs.			3	13	12	52,2	8	34,8		
2. The program meets the students' current needs related to academic English.			1	4,3	7	30,4	13	56,5	2	8,7
3. The program encourages the students to learn academic English.			4	17,4	9	39,1	9	39,1	1	4,3
4. The program enables the students to use what they learn.	1	4,3	1	4,3	5	21,7	14	60,9	2	8,7
5. The program helps the students to gain the habit of working in groups.			5	21,7	7	30,4	9	39,1	2	8,7
6. The assignments given in the program affect the students' attention to academic English positively.	1	4,3	5	21,7	9	39,1	7	30,4	1	4,3
7. The program improves the students' critical thinking skills.					8	34,8	11	47,8	4	17,4
8. The program improves the students' problem-solving skills.			2	8,7	10	43,5	10	43,5	1	4,3
9. The program improves the students' reasoning skills.			2	8,7	7	30,4	11	47,8	3	13
10. The program provides the students with the basis for their academic English needs in the future.			2	8,7	5	21,7	15	65,2	1	4,3
11. The program causes the students to pay attention to academic English.	1	4,3	1	4,3	12	52,2	8	34,8	1	4,3
12. The program improves the students' academic English skills.			1	4,3	4	17,4	16	69,6	2	8,7
13. The knowledge learnt by the students in the program is considered good.	1	4,3	5	21,7	5	21,7	10	43,5	2	8,7
14. The improvement of the students in academic English at the end of the program is considered good.			3	13	8	34,8	11	47,8	1	4,3

* shows that CD: Completely disagree, D: Disagree, NAND: Neither agree nor disagree, A: Agree, and CA: Completely agree.

As understood from Table 4, while eight participants thought that the products of the students in the program meet their individual needs, twelve participants did not agree and disagree with this item. Yet, 65,2% of them believed that the program meets the students' current needs related to academic English. Ten participants agreed that the program encourages the students to learn academic English while nine participants neither agreed nor disagreed with it. However, that the program enables the students to use what they learn is agreed by 69,6% of them. 47,8% of them agreed that the program promotes the habit of group work among the students. Though 26% of them did not agree with the item that the assignments in the program affect the students' attention to academic English positively, 34,7% of them approved it. 65,2%, 47,8%, 60,8%, and 78,3% of them thought that the program improves the students' critical thinking, problem-solving, and reasoning, and academic English skills in order. More than half of them (*f*=16) supported that the program provides the students with the basis for their academic English needs in the future. Yet, 52,2% of them did not agree and disagree with the item that the program causes the students to pay attention to academic English, while 39,1% of them agreed with it. Twelve participants considered the knowledge learnt in the program and the improvement of the students in academic English at the end of the program good, but six participants did not consider the knowledge learnt in the program as good, and three participants did not consider the improvement of the students in academic English at the end of the program good.

4. Discussion

The participating instructors did not generally have many negative thoughts about the context of the program except the appropriateness of the physical conditions of the classes regarding the objectives of the program in line with Tunç (2010) and Turan (2016) though they thought the facilities of the campus serve the program. As the main concern of the program is to teach English for academic purposes, the results show that the program can be considered to be prepared in a good way. There are several reasons for this assumption. The program is thought to develop problem-solving skills among the students, be suitable for developing the students' academic English skills, be relevant to the principles of academic English, and promote the use of English for academic purposes. The program can do these by (a) providing the students with enough theoretical knowledge, (b) helping them to understand academic context, (c) making the objectives clear and understandable to the students and relevant to the needs of the students as found out by Dinçer and Saracaloğlu (2017), Karataş and Fer (2009), Orhan (2016), Ödemiş (2018), Turan (2016), and (d) adjusting the levels of the subjects based on the students' levels of English. Yet, it is thought to be inappropriate to the students' English background knowledge by

one third of the participants and is not considered whether it is appropriate to their English background by another one third of the participants, which is supported by the literature (Aktı Aslan & İzci, 2017).

Apart from the course book and suggested materials, the participants did not share many negative thoughts about the input dimension of the program. The input given to the students by the program can be thought to be effective because (a) its objectives are aligned with the goals of the university, (b) the required sources and materials are available at the university unlike the ELTP evaluated in Turan (2016), and (c) suggested teaching strategies, techniques, and methods are considered effective to achieve its goals. However, the course book and suggested material may affect this effort negatively as they did in the ELTPs evaluated by Dinçer and Saracaloğlu (2017), Karataş and Fer (2009), Turan (2016), and Yılmaz Vırlan (2014) because the course book is not at the students' level of English, does not get their attention like the suggested material, and is not aligned with the objectives of the program well.

Like the process dimensions of the evaluated ELTPs in the literature (Dinçer & Saracaloğlu, 2017; Ödemiş, 2018; Turan, 2016; Tunç, 2010; Yılmaz Vırlan, 2014), the process dimension of this program has some difficulties. The allocated time for the program is enough to achieve the course goals, but not to study the theoretical information and do the activities. This may affect the process dimension negatively, which is in line with the literature (Dinçer & Saracaloğlu, 2017; Tunç, 2010; Yılmaz Vırlan, 2014). Like the activities in the ELTP evaluated by Ödemiş (2018), the activities in the program can be considered to make its process dimension more effective and efficient because the activities are thought to be student-centered, improve students' problem-solving skills, help them learn by discussing, and improve their information and communication skills even though they cannot be considered motivating and interesting for the students. The activities are also believed to support group work. Besides the activities, the assignments also support the process dimension of the program positively unlike what Tunç (2010) found out because the assignments in the course are compatible with the objectives of the program.

The findings also show that the product dimension of the program meets the expectations of the participants unlike what Aktı Aslan and İzci (2017), Dinçer and Saracaloğlu (2017), Karataş and Fer (2009), Orhan (2016), Ödemiş (2018), Tunç (2010), and Yılmaz Vırlan (2014) found in the literature. There are several reasons for this assumption. The program is thought to (a) improve the students' critical thinking, problem-solving, and reasoning, and academic English skills, (b) meet their current needs related to academic English, (c) encourage them to learn academic English, (d) enable them to use what they learn, and (e) provide them with the basis for their academic English needs in the future. Similarly, the knowledge learnt in the program and the improvement of the students in academic English at the end of the program are considered good. Yet, the program has some weaknesses. It cannot be observed clearly that the products of the students in the program meet their individual needs in line with what Ödemiş (2018) found out, the assignments in the program affect the students' attention in academic English positively, and the program promotes the students' attention to academic English.

Conclusion

The program evaluation study indicated that the program of the English for academic purposes II was generally considered to be prepared in a good way in terms of its context, input, process, and product dimensions. However, each dimension has some weaknesses to be improved. The program should be adjusted to the physical conditions of the classes and improved regarding the students' English background knowledge in the context dimension. The course book and suggested materials should be re-assessed and re-evaluated carefully in the input dimension. More time should be allocated to studying the theoretical knowledge and doing the activities, and activities should be made more interesting and motivating in the process dimension. For the product dimension, the objectives of the program and assignments should be aligned with the individual needs of the students, and the program should be made more encouraging for the students to study English for academic purposes.

A similar English for academic purposes course in a different Turkish university can be evaluated by following the methodology presented in the study. The adapted instrument can enable the managers and/or coordinators of such courses to understand what actually happens in the classes according to the information given by course instructors. Such an attitude can promote the involvement of course instructors in the decision-making process related to the syllabus and/or curriculum of such courses. Thus, such programs can be improved in terms of content, input, process, and product.

The findings of the present study can be used to develop an English for academic purposes course in a different Turkish university. It can enable program/course developers to understand what kind of objectives can be taught in an English for academic purposes course, how these objectives can be met, what can work, and what cannot work in the classes, depending on the experiences of course instructors as the implementers of this course. Therefore, program/course developers can develop this course by considering these issues in the content, input, process, and product dimensions of the course.

References

Aktı Aslan, S. & İzci, E. (2017). Evaluation of secondary school English teaching program according to the remarks of teachers with context, input, process and product (CIPP) model, *İnönü University Journal of the Faculty of Education, 18*(2), 33-44. DOI: 10.17679/inuefd.323402

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, O. E., Karadeniz, S., & Demirel, F. (2009). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Borg, W. R. & Gall, D. (1983). *Educational research*. Newyork: Longman.

Coşkun, A. & Daloğlu, A. (2010). Evaluating an English language teacher education program through Peacock's model. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *35*(6), 24-42.

Cronbach, L. J. (1991). Course improvement through evaluation. *Teachers College Record*, 64, 672-683.

Çimili Abat, E. Z. (2016). *9. sınıf matematik dersi öğretim programının bağlam, girdi, süreç, ürün değerlendirme modeline göre değerlendirilmesi* (Unpublished master's thesis). Akdeniz University, Antalya, Turkey.

Dinçer, B. & Saracaloğlu, A. S., (2017). 7. sınıf İngilizce öğretim programının Stufflebeam'in bağlam-girdi-süreç-ürün (CIPP) modeline göre değerlendirilmesi. *Qualitative Studies (NWSAQS)*, 12(2):1-24, DOI: 10.12739/NWSA.2017.12.2.E0032.

Gredler, M. E. (1996). *Program evaluation*. Prentice Hall.

Karasar, N. (2009). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Karataş, H. & Fer, S. (2009). Evaluation of English curriculum at Yildiz Technical University using CIPP model. *Education and Science*, *34*(153), 47-60.

Ödemiş, İ. (2006). *Meslek yüksekokulu İngilizce öğretim programının bağlam girdi süreç ürün (CIPP) modeli kullanılarak değerlendirilmesi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Eskisehir Osmangazi University, Eskişehir, Turkey.

Orhan A. (2016). *Uzaktan eğitimle yürütülen yabancı dil dersi öğretim programının bağlam, girdi, süreç ve ürün (CIPP) modeli ile değerlendirilmesi* (Unpublished master's thesis). Düzce University, Düzce, Turkey.

Ornstein, A. C. & Hunkins, F. P. (1988). *Curriculum: Foundations, principles and issues*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Şahin, V. (2006). *Evaluation of the in-service teacher training program "The Certificate for Teachers of English" at the Middle East Technical University School of Foreign Languages* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (1983). The CIPP model for program evaluation. In G. F. Madaus, M. S. Scriven, & D. L. Stufflebeam (Eds.), *Evaluation models* (pp.117-141). Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff Publishing.

Stufflebeam, D. L. & Shinkfield, A. J. (1985). *Systematic evaluation*. Boston: Kluwe-Nijhoff Publishing.

Tunç, F. (2010). *Evaluation of an English language teaching program at a public university using CIPP model* (Unpublished master's thesis). Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.

Worthen, B. R. & Sanders, J. R. (1987). *Educational evaluation*: *Alternative approaches and practical guidelines*. New York: Longman.

Worthen, B. R., Sanders, J. R., & Fitzpatrick, J. L. (1997). *Program evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines*. New York: Longman.

Yılmaz Vırlan, A. (2014). A case study: evaluation of an English speaking skills course in a public university preparatory school program via CIPP model (Unpublished master's thesis). Yeditepe University, İstanbul, Turkey.