



T.C.

AKDENİZ UNIVERSITY

THE INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION

MA
THESIS

EVALUATION OF AN ENGLISH PREPARATORY
PROGRAM USING BELLON AND HANDLER MODEL

Zeynep UÇKAYA

ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

MASTER'S PROGRAM

Antalya, 2022

T.C.

AKDENİZ UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION

ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

EVALUATION OF AN ENGLISH PREPARATORY PROGRAM

USING BELLON AND HANDLER MODEL

MASTER'S THESIS

Zeynep UÇKAYA

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Simla COURSE

Antalya, 2022

DOĞRULUK BEYANI

Yüksek lisans tezim olarak sunduđum bu alıřmayı bilimsel, ahlak ve geleneklere aykırı dűşecek bir yol ve yardıma bařvurmaksızın yazdıđımı, yararlandıđım eserlerin kaynakalardan gösterilenlerden oluřtuđunu ve bu eserleri her kullanımında alıntı yaparak yararlandıđımı belirtir; bunu onurumla dođrularım. Enstitű tarafından belli bir zamana bađlı olmaksızın, tezimle ilgili yaptıđım bu beyana aykırı bir durumun saptanması durumunda, ortaya ıkacak tüm ahlaki ve hukuki sonulara katlanacađımı bildiririm.

15/09/2022

Zeynep Ukaya

AKDENİZ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜNE

Zeynep UÇKAYA 'ın bu çalışması **22/08/2022** tarihinde jürimiz tarafından Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Ana Bilim Dalı İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programında **Yüksek Lisans Tezi** olarak **oy birliği** ile kabul edilmiştir.

İmza

Başkan: Prof. Dr. Yonca ÖZKAN

Çukurova Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi,
Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi
Anabilim Dalı

Üye: Doç. Dr. Hüseyin KAFES

Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Yabancı
Diller Eğitimi Bölümü, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi
Anabilim Dalı

Üye (Danışman): Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Simla Course

Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Yabancı
Diller Eğitimi Bölümü, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi
Anabilim Dalı

YÜKSEKLİSANS/ DOKTORA TEZİNİN/ DÖNEM PROJESİNİN ADI: Evaluation of an English Preparatory Program Using Bellon and Handler Model

ONAY: Bu tez, Enstitü Yönetim Kurulunca belirlenen yukarıdaki jüri üyeleri tarafından uygun görülmüş ve Enstitü Yönetim Kurulunun..... tarihli ve.....sayılı kararıyla kabul edilmiştir.

Enstitü Müdürü

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

To begin with, I would like to express my gratitude to my thesis advisor Asst. Prof. Dr. Simla COURSE, for her invaluable advice, support, guidance and feedback throughout this research study.

I also would like to express my sincere appreciation to my lecturers Prof. Dr. Binnur GENÇ İLTER, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Özlem SAKA, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hüseyin KAFES, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mustafa CANER for their contribution to my graduate education.

I wish to express my sincere thanks to the director of Alanya HEP University School of Foreign Languages, Asst. Prof. Dr. Aslı Özkul for her great support and encouragement throughout the study.

I would also like to thank my colleagues and students at Alanya HEP University School of Foreign Languages for their participation in the study and for their sincere support and cooperation.

Words cannot express how grateful I am to my father Ali UÇKAYA and my mother Fatma UÇKAYA for their invaluable support and all of the sacrifices they have made on my behalf. I owe my deepest thank to my dear sisters, Elif UÇKAYA and Çağla UÇKAYA for everything they are, and have been and always will be for me.

I would like to thank my friends Asst. Prof. Dr. Muttalip Alçay and Ebru Sedef Alçay for their support and encouragement during my thesis and decisions I make to strive my goals. I would like to thank all of my friends for their great support. Without them, it would be really difficult to walk on this way.

Zeynep Uçkaya

ABSTRACT

EVALUATION OF AN ENGLISH PREPARATORY PROGRAM USING BELLON AND HANDLER MODEL

UÇKAYA, Zeynep

Master of Arts, English Language Teaching

Supervisor: Asst.Prof. Dr. Simla Course

August 2022, 193 Pages

This study has been designed as a formative evaluation study and aims to evaluate and improve the English preparatory curriculum at Alanya HEP University. The study was built on a mixed method case study which aimed to gather qualitative and quantitative data from a selected case. An adapted version of the Bellon and Handler (1982) curriculum evaluation model was used to evaluate the preparatory school program on the basis of four main elements of an educational program: (1) course aims and objectives, (2) course content and materials, (3) course conduct and (4) student assessment and to determine the areas that need improvement in terms of these four basic elements.

In the study, the qualitative data were obtained from a course evaluation questionnaire (Tekir, 2020), while the quantitative data were obtained from document analysis, course evaluation interviews and classroom observations. The questionnaires were applied to 64 students studying at the preparatory school in 2021-2022 academic year. The course evaluation interviews were held with 6 students and 6 language instructors of the program. Six classroom observations were also made during the second semester of the academic year. The analysis of the data obtained from multiple data collection tools was done following three steps of the Bellon and Handler (1982) evaluation model: (1) current status descriptions, (2) analysis of the data, and (3) cumulative suggestions for the improvement of the curriculum.

The results of the study illustrated that the preparatory curriculum was effective to reach the aims and objectives of the program to some extent. Yet, the program needed some improvement in terms of the four main focus areas of the research model. It was concluded that the aims and objectives of listening and speaking skills were insufficient. The content of the skill courses was not consistent with the program outcomes. The materials and activities in the curriculum were not sufficient to attract students' interests. The teaching-learning process was

mostly teacher-centered and there were some insufficient assessment tools that did not reflect students' actual success.

Some of the suggestions made by the students and instructors were: to add more audio-visual and authentic materials, to do more group work activities to foster a student-centered learning environment, to diversify the topics, activities, materials and teaching methods to meet the needs and expectations of the students and to assess the process of the students in terms of speaking grade.

Keywords: curriculum evaluation, program evaluation, learning a foreign language, case study

ÖZET

İNGİLİZCE HAZIRLIK MÜFREDATININ BELLON VE HANDLER MODELİNE GÖRE DEĞERLENDİRİLMESİ

UÇKAYA, Zeynep

Yüksek Lisans Tezi

Danışman: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Simla Course

Ağustos, 2022, 193 Sayfa

Bu çalışma biçimlendirici bir değerlendirme çalışması olarak tasarlanmış olup Alanya HEP Üniversitesi İngilizce hazırlık müfredatını değerlendirmeyi ve geliştirmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Araştırma, nitel ve nicel veriler toplamayı amaçlayan karma yöntemli bir durum çalışması üzerine kurulmuştur. Bu çalışmada üniversite hazırlık okulu programını değerlendirmek için Bellon ve Handler (1982) müfredat değerlendirme modelinin uyarlanmış bir versiyonu kullanılmıştır. Bir öğretim programını meydana getiren dört ana odak noktası temelinde; (1) dersin amaçları ve hedefleri, (2) ders içeriği ve materyalleri, (3) ders işleyişi ve (4) öğrenci değerlendirilmesi, mevcut hazırlık müfredatı değerlendirilmiş ve bu dört temel öge açısından iyileştirilmesi gereken alanların saptanması amaçlanmıştır.

Araştırmada nitel veriler ders değerlendirme anketinden (Tekir, 2020), nicel veriler ise doküman analizinden, ders değerlendirme görüşmelerinden ve sınıf gözlemlerinden elde edilmiştir. Anketler 2021-2022 eğitim-öğretim yılında hazırlık sınıfında öğrenim gören 64 öğrenciye uygulanmıştır. Altı öğrencisi ve altı dil okutmanı ile ders değerlendirme görüşmeleri yapılmıştır. Eğitim-öğretim yılının ikinci döneminde de altı tane sınıf gözlemi yapılmıştır.

Çoklu veri toplama araçlarından elde edilen verilerin analizi Bellon ve Handler (1982) değerlendirme modelinin üç adımı izlenerek yapılmıştır: (1) mevcut durum açıklamaları, (2) verilerin analizi ve (3) müfredatın iyileştirilmesi için sunulan öneriler.

Araştırmanın sonuçları, hazırlık öğretim programının program amaç ve hedeflerine bir ölçüde ulaşmada etkili olduğunu göstermiştir. Yine de programın, araştırma modelinin dört ana odak alanı açısından bir miktar iyileştirilmesine ihtiyaç duyulmuştur. Bu çalışma sonucunda dinleme ve konuşma becerilerinin amaç ve hedeflerinin yetersiz olduğu sonucuna varılmıştır. Ayrıca beceri derslerinin içeriği program çıktılarıyla uyumlu değildir. Müfredatta kullanılan materyaller ve yapılan etkinlikler öğrencilerin ilgisini çekmek için yeterli değildir. Öğretme-

öğrenme sürecinin çoğunlukla öğretmen merkezli olduğu ve öğrencilerin gerçek başarısını yansıtmayan yetersiz bazı değerlendirme araçlarının kullanıldığı sonucuna varılmıştır.

Programa daha fazla görsel-işitsel ve özgün materyallerin eklenmesi, öğrenci merkezli öğrenme ortamının teşvik edilmesi için daha fazla grup çalışmasının yapılması, öğrencileri ihtiyaç ve beklentilerini karşılayacak uygun aktivite, materyal, öğretim yöntem ve tekniklerinin programa eklenmesi ve öğrencilerin öğrenme sürecindeki performansının konuşma sınavına eklenmesi gibi programı iyileştirmeye yönelik önerilerde bulunulmuştur.

Anahtar Sözcükler: müfredat değerlendirme, program değerlendirme, yabancı dil öğrenme, vaka çalışması

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	i
ABSTRACT	ii
ÖZET	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	xi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xii

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.2 Background of the study.....	1
1.3 Problem statement	2
1.4 Research questions.....	4
1.5 Scope of the Study.....	6
1.6 Significance of the Study.....	6
1.7 Limitations and Assumptions	6
1.8 Definitions of Terms and Phrases.....	7

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction.....	9
2.2. Definition of Curriculum	9
2.3. Differences between Curriculum and Syllabus	10
2.4. Curriculum Development	11
2.4.1. Philosophy Behind Curriculum Development	11
2.4.2. Models for Curriculum Development	13
2.4.2.1. Curriculum as product.....	14
2.4.2.1.1. Bobbitt's Curriculum Model (1918).....	15
2.4.2.1.2. The Tyler Model (1942)	15
2.4.2.1.3. Taba Model (1962).....	16
2.4.2.2. Curriculum as process.....	16
2.4.2.2.1. Process Model by Stenhouse (1975)	17

2.4.2.3. Curriculum as praxis	17
2.4.2.4. Theory-based Models of Language Curriculum Development	18
2.4.2.4.1. Brown’s Model of Language Curriculum Development	18
2.4.2.4.2. Richards’ Curriculum Development Model (2001, 2013).....	20
2.5. Curriculum Evaluation.....	22
2.5.1. Types of Curriculum Evaluation	22
2.5.2. Curriculum Evaluation Approaches and Models	23
2.5.2.1. Objectives-Oriented Curriculum Evaluation Approach.....	26
2.5.2.1.1. Tyler’s Linear Model (1949)	26
2.5.2.1.2. Metfessel-Micheal Model (1967)	27
2.5.2.1.3. Provus’ Discrepancy Evaluation Model (1966)	28
2.5.2.2. Management-Oriented Curriculum Evaluation Model	28
2.5.2.2.1. Stufflebeam’s CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product) Model	29
2.5.2.2.2. The Kirkpatrick Model of Training Evaluation (1996).....	30
2.5.2.2.3. Alkin’s UCLA Evaluation Model.....	31
2.5.2.3. Expertise-Oriented Evaluation Approach	32
2.5.2.3.1. Eisner’s Educational Connoisseurship and Criticism Model (1975)	32
2.5.2.4. Consumer-Oriented Evaluation Approach.....	32
2.5.2.4.1. Scriven’s Goal-Free Evaluation Model (1991)	33
2.5.2.5. Adversary-Judicial Evaluation Approach	33
2.5.2.6. Participant-Oriented Curriculum Evaluation Approach	34
2.5.2.6.1. Stake’s Countenance (1967) -Responsive Evaluation Model (1975).....	35
2.5.2.6.2. Bellon and Handler Curriculum Evaluation Model (1982).....	36
2.5.2.6.2.1. Four Focus Areas of a Curriculum.....	36
2.5.2.6.2.2. Status Descriptions.....	38
2.5.2.6.2.3. Analysis Activities	39
2.4.2.6.2.4. Cumulative Improvement Components	39
2.6. Curriculum Evaluation Studies in Language Teaching.....	40
2.6.1. The Curriculum Evaluation Studies Abroad	40
2.6.2. Curriculum Evaluation Studies in the Turkish Context	42

CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction.....	49
3.2. Design of the Study	49
3.3. Participants and Settings of the Study	51
3.4. Data Collection Instruments	53
3.4.1. Document Analysis	53
3.4.2. Questionnaire	55
3.4.3. Interviews	57
3.4.4. Observations.....	58
3.5. Data Collection Procedure.....	59
3.6. Data Analysis.....	60
3.6.1. Quantitative	60
3.6.2. Qualitative	60

CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS

4.1. Introduction.....	64
4.2. Description of the Current Status of the Preparatory Program	65
4.2.1. Course Aims and Objectives	65
4.2.1.1. Document Analysis.....	65
4.2.1.2. Student Interviews	67
4.2.2. Course Content and Materials	71
4.2.2.1. Course Content.....	71
4.2.2.1.1. Document Analysis.....	71
4.2.2.1.2. Teacher Interviews	72
4.2.2.2. Course Materials	73
4.2.2.2.1. Document Analysis.....	73
4.2.2.2.2. Teacher Interviews	74
4.2.3. Course Conduct.....	75
4.2.3.1. Teacher Interviews.....	76
4.2.3.2. Student Interviews	76

4.2.3.3. Observations	77
4.2.4. Student Assessment.....	78
4.2.4.1. Document Analysis	78
4.1.3.2. Teacher Interviews.....	80
4.2. Evaluation of the Preparatory Program	81
4.3.1. Course Aims and Objectives	82
4.3.1.1. Questionnaires.....	82
4.3.1.2. Student Interviews	83
4.3.1.3. Teacher Interviews.....	85
4.3.2. Course Content and Materials	87
4.3.2.1. Questionnaires.....	87
4.3.2.2. Student Interviews	89
4.3.2.3. Teacher Interviews.....	93
4.3.3. Course Conduct.....	95
4.3.3.1. Questionnaire	96
4.3.3.2. Student Interviews	99
4.3.3.3. Teacher Interviews.....	103
4.3.3.4. Observations	107
4.3.4. Student Assessment.....	108
4.3.4.1. Questionnaires.....	108
4.3.4.2. Student Interviews	110
4.3.4.3. Teacher Interviews.....	112
4.3.5. Overall Evaluation.....	113
4.4. Suggestions for the Improvement of the Preparatory Program	116
4.4.1. Course Aims and Objectives	116
4.4.2. Course Content and Materials	119
4.4.3. Course Conduct.....	122
4.4.4. Student Assessment.....	124

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION, DISCUSSION AND SUGGESTIONS

5.1. Introduction.....	127
5.2. Discussions of the Results	127
5.2.1. Course Aims and Objectives	128
5.2.2. Course Content and Materials	130
5.2.3. Course Conduct	132
5.2.4. Student Assessment.....	134
5.3. Conclusion	135
5.4. Recommendations for Future Research.....	138
REFERENCES	140
APPENDICES	154
Appendix - 1 Course Evaluation Questionnaire for Students (Turkish).....	154
Appendix - 2 Course Evaluation Questionnaire for Students (English).....	163
Appendix - 3 Course Evaluation Interview Sample Questions for Students (Turkish).....	171
Appendix - 4 Course Evaluation Interview Sample Questions for Students (English)	173
Appendix - 5 Course Evaluation Interview Sample Questions for Teachers (English)	176
Appendix - 6 Sample Classroom Observation Form.....	178
Appendix - 7 Research Permit Approval From Erozan (2005)	179
Appendix - 8 Research Permit Approval for the Questionnaire from Tekir (2020).....	180
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	181

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1. Skilbeck’s framework of the ideologies underlying curriculum models (Finney, 2002: P.86)	12
Table.2.2 Curriculum Evaluation Approaches and Models.....	24
Table 4.1 The findings from thematic analysis of student interviews related to course aims and objectives	68
Table 4.2 The findings from thematic analysis of teacher interviews related to course aims and objectives	69
Table 4.3. Findings from document analysis related to the textbooks and packs.	74
Table 4. 4 The analysis of documents related to student assessment components.....	79
Table 4.6 Students’ perspectives on the effectiveness of the program aims and objectives	83
Table 4.7 The findings from thematic analysis of student interviews related to evaluation of course aims and objectives.....	83
Table 4.8 The findings from thematic analysis of student interviews related to evaluation of course aims and objectives.....	86
Table 4.9 Students’ perspectives on the course content and materials.....	88
Table 4.10 The findings from the thematic analysis of student interviews related to course content.	90
Table 4.11 The findings from the thematic analysis of instructor interviews related to course content	94
Table 4.12 The frequency of activities and methods used in the teaching-learning process.....	96
Table 4.13 Students’ perspectives on the teaching-learning process	98
Table 4.14 The thematic analysis of the interviews about student perspectives on the course conduct.	100
Table 4.15. Thematic analysis of teacher interviews related to course conduct.....	105
Table 4. 16. Thematic analysis of classroom observations	107
Table 4.17 The Perspectives of the students on the courses assessment and feedback.....	109
Table 4.18 Thematic analysis of student interviews related to student assessment	111
Table 4.19 Thematic analysis of teacher interviews on student assessment	112
Table 4.20 Thematic analysis of student interviews related to positive and negative parts of the program	115

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations	Definitions
SFL	School of Foreign Languages
ELT	English Language Teaching
CEFR	Common European Framework of Reference
PIS-101	Preparatory Integrated Skills
PLS-101	Preparatory Listening and Speaking
PRW	Preparatory Reading and Writing
LMS	Learning Management System
T	Teacher
S	Student
E	Exam
O	Observations

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introduction

This study has been conducted to evaluate how effective the English language preparatory school curriculum at Alanya HEP University is in language learning on the basis of four main focus areas of the curriculum: course aims and objectives, course content and materials, course conduct, and student assessment, and to generate some suggestions and recommendations to improve and strengthen the program for future implementations. Chapter I introduces the background of the study, the problem statement, the purpose of the study, the scope of the study, the significance of the study, limitations, and definitions of some terms and phrases in English language learning and curriculum development.

1.2. Background of the study

The participation of various learner profiles with diverse individual needs in the education system (Ger & Bahar, 2018) and the developments and innovations in educational technology in the past several decades (Demirkan, 2008) have led to significant changes in language learning, especially in English language learning context.

The need for learning a foreign language for communication and interaction in the increasingly globalized world has gained importance which leads to a need to overcome any language barriers among individuals who cannot speak a mutual language. English is the most extensively spoken native or second/foreign language around the world (Szmigiera, 2021) and in order to eliminate these barriers, teaching English as a foreign or second language has become widespread (Aydın & Zengin, 2008; Gömleksiz & Özkaya, 2012)

In addition to meeting communication needs, learning English has also a vital role in adapting to technological innovations, pursuing a productive career, learning about other

cultures, and acquiring a different viewpoint (Akpur, 2017). Teaching English as a foreign language has hereby almost become a necessity in order to keep up with today's technological and scientific changes and to eliminate the language barriers.

In addition, the recent advances in neuroscience and cognitive psychology have given new insight into when and how language learning takes place and they have also offered new ways to enhance and extend the way students learn a foreign language (Cearon & Feltes, 2020). In this respect, in an attempt to adapt these changes to the language learning process, studies for innovation and improvement of the curriculum should be done in the language curriculum. Consequently, the review, evaluation, and improvement of the current English language curricula in terms of focus on different language skills, new language learning methods, and diverse learner needs have gained importance considerably in particularly language teaching. (Richards, 2001; Murray, 2008; Alderson, 2009; Wedell, 2009).

1.3. Problem statement

In Turkey, all educational institutions ranging from elementary schools to universities, have been teaching or doing some studies to improve the learners' English proficiency, since the 1970s (Kırkgöz, 2009). Turkey's NATO membership and the start of negotiations with the European Union have led to the importance of English language teaching (Coşkun-Demirpolat, 2015). In particular, the universities pay further attention to foreign language teaching to develop better educated and more qualified individuals for their professional life (Şen Ersoy & Kürüm Yapıcıoğlu, 2015). As Kerestecioğlu (2018) suggests, a university, which teaches English, the lingua franca around the world, can positively contribute to its graduate students' finding employment in industries across different countries. English language competency has an essential role in the recruitment of individuals in Turkish companies as well. Therefore, most of the private and public universities in Turkey have been providing English as a medium of instruction partially or even fully since the beginning of the twenty-first century which has resulted in the emergence of compulsory language preparatory programs (İnal & Aksoy, 2014).

English preparatory programs aim to promote language learning for the students who need language competency and skills for their academic education in their department or for their future careers. Preparatory school education can be compulsory or optional regarding the medium of instruction given in the departments of the university. Students attending

preparatory schools receive intensive English language education in order to reach their desired language proficiency before studying their chosen English-medium department at a university.

However, the results of the end-of-year proficiency exams of the students in the English language preparatory programs are not noteworthy, despite the great amount of time, effort, and money spent on them (Karataş and Fer, 2011; Tunç, 2010; Akpur et. al.,2016). Even after graduating from the university, individuals seek language education to pursue a better career. The results of the English Proficiency Index (EPI) support the same thesis. Turkey ranks 70th among 112 countries with a low proficiency level in English (EPI, 2021).

Therefore, it is a necessity to analyze the reasons behind this inadequacy and to examine the factors which lead to this failure. Determining undesired or inadequate outcomes in the English language teaching environment and evaluating the language curriculum can provide suggestions and solutions to overcome these deficiencies while allowing the development and improvement of the curriculum. Evaluation of a language program from different perspectives plays a significant role in decision-making mechanisms, curriculum and course material designers, and teachers. Curriculum evaluations provide these elements with positive or negative feedback about the different aspects of the program and enable them to make necessary changes in the development and implementation of the program (Erarslan, 2016).

Whether the current curriculum design and syllabi meet the needs and expectations of the stakeholders including teaching staff, curriculum and material developers, administrators, and students in the program has consistently been an issue of discussion, and with the aim of improving and evaluating language preparatory programs several studies have continually been conducted in Turkish EFL context (Daylan 2001; Yılmaz, 2004; Ok, 2005; Tiryaki, 2009; Cincioğlu, 2012; Ulum, 2015, Özdoruk, 2016; Balıkcıoğlu, 2018). The review of the available literature reveals that there has been a scarcity of studies examining the English language curricula of preparatory schools in-depth and evaluating the perceptions of different stakeholders such as curriculum designers, administrators, material developers in addition to students, and language instructors.

In summary, in order to detect the deficiencies of the English language preparatory curriculum implemented at universities in the Turkish context causing failure and to improve the curriculum with the suggestions supplied from diverse perceptions, this study was conducted. The main problem of the current study was to examine to what extent the current

English preparatory curriculum is effective to enable the students to reach their desired language competency.

1.4. Research questions

The old trends of English teaching practice, since recent developments in education and technology, are no longer sufficient to meet students' needs and expectations, such as the desire to learn a language for oral proficiency rather than reading comprehension (Richards, 2001). Therefore, there has been a need to renovate and improve the teaching curriculum of the institutions to find out how effective they are in proving the learner with a productive learning environment. In an attempt to examine the efficiency of the language curricula a great deal of research has been done on the evaluation and implementation of language curriculums, especially in preparatory schools of universities which provide compulsory English education before students study their departments practicing English medium instruction.

The purpose of this study is to gather in-depth information for an illuminative and formative evaluation of the preparatory school curriculum implemented at Alanya Hamdullah Emin Paşa (HEP) University regarding the curriculum evaluation model developed by Bellon and Handler (1986). Alanya HEP University and School of Foreign Languages Preparatory Program is a recently founded program which went through several curriculum renovations and changes to decide on the most effective language program for improvement of the students' language competency in English. Therefore, the preparatory program still needs improvement and evaluation in deciding on the most sufficient curriculum to be utilised to teach English to the students to make them ready for their departmental studies in English medium instruction. Bellon and Handler's (1982) curriculum evaluation model enables the researcher to evaluate the main components of curriculum evaluation in a systematic and formative way and generate some improvement of the program by providing cumulative suggestions and recommendations from the stakeholders for each curriculum component. According to the model, the curriculum consists of four main elements which are aims and objectives of the program, organisation, operation and assessment. The model also enables in-depth evaluation of the curriculum on the basis of four main components of a curriculum which can assist the researcher to figure out the weaknesses of a program in each focus area. Bellon and Handler (1986) suggest that each of these elements should be analysed in detail by taking into consideration the different

perceptions of various stakeholders who should have active roles in planning a program to design an effective program. Therefore, Bellon and Handler (1986) was regarded to be sufficient to evaluate and improve the recently founded preparatory school program in which in-depth evaluation and suggestions of the stakeholders such as students, instructors and administrative staff can play an essential role in the strengthening of the curriculum.

In this respect, the current study focuses on analyzing the current situation of the language curriculum, the perceptions, and recommendations of different stakeholders such as curriculum and material designers, language instructors, administrators, testing units, and students of the preparatory school program in the preparatory school curriculum at Alanya HEP University to help to revise and make decisions to improve the curriculum. Multiple data collection tools were employed to access rich in-depth information about the current curriculum such as document analysis, course evaluation questionnaires with students, interviews with the students and School of Foreign Languages (SFL) instructors and classroom observations.

This study also aims to contribute to the curriculum evaluation literature and the field of English language teaching as a second or foreign language and set an example in the decisions that schools with similar programs will make in addition to providing feedback on the English preparatory program at Alanya HEP University School of Foreign Languages.

Depending on the purposes of the study, the research questions investigated in this study are as follows:

1. What is the current status of the English curriculum implemented at the preparatory school of Alanya HEP University in terms of objectives, course content and materials, course conduct, and student assessment procedures?
2. What are the students' perspectives about the English curriculum implemented at the preparatory school of Alanya HEP University in terms of its objectives, course content and materials, course conduct, and students' assessment procedures?
3. What are testing units, administrators, curriculum designers' and instructors' perspectives about the English curriculum implemented at the preparatory school of Alanya HEP University in terms of its objectives, course content and material, course conduct, and student assessment procedures?
4. What are the recommendations of stakeholders (instructors, students, administrators, testing unit, and curriculum designer) to develop and strengthen the current preparatory school curriculum at Alanya HEP University?

1.5. Scope of the Study

The current study aims at evaluating the present preparatory school curriculum and suggesting some recommendations for the improvement of the curriculum. The study was conducted at Alanya HEP University School of Foreign Languages in Antalya in the 2021-2022 academic year. The participants consisted of students and language instructors of an English preparatory school. The number of participants was 69; 64 students for questionnaires, and 5 language instructors and 6 students for interviews.

1.6. Significance of the Study

The results of the preparatory school curriculum evaluation study will contribute to the improvement and development of the current language curriculum of the preparatory school where the teacher-researcher is already working as a language instructor. With this study, it is also aimed to shed a light on the importance of curriculum evaluation and improvement studies in teaching English as a second or foreign language context by applying a rarely used curriculum evaluation model. The teacher-researcher aims to remedy the deficiency of conducting different evaluation models to evaluate language curricula in the related literature with this study. The current study also aims to set an example in the decisions that schools with similar programs will make.

The study is focused on analyzing the current situation from document analysis, students' and teachers' perceptions and classroom observations and providing some recommendations for the future development of the program by investigating the weaknesses and strengths of the current curriculum in terms of four main focus areas: goals and objectives, course content and materials, course conduct and student assessment.

1.7. Limitations and Assumptions

There are some limitations to the study. Firstly, this research is limited to the students and teachers at Alanya HEP University School of Foreign Languages English Preparatory School in the 2021-2022 academic year. The second limitation is the sample number is limited

to 64 students studying and 5 instructors working at the preparatory school. The third limitation is that the study is limited to the English preparatory school English courses.

1.8. Definitions of Terms and Phrases

Case study: It is a qualitative research method, which investigates one or more limited phenomena over a limited time with multiple data gathering instruments such as observations, interviews, and document analysis, and defines situations and themes depending on the situation within a real-life context (Creswell, 2013)

Common European Framework of Reference: It is a language framework that provides a global standardization for identifying individuals' language proficiency.

Content Analysis: Content analysis is a qualitative research technique that allows the researcher to describe the explicit communication content objectively, systematically, and quantitatively (Berelson, 1952)

Curriculum: Curriculum, is defined as an objective or set of principles that are triggered through a learning process with classroom experiences for learners (Wiles & Bondi, 1989)

Curriculum Evaluation: Curriculum evaluation in education is defined as the set of actions that constitute the process of collecting information about the implementation and effects of existing policies, curricula, courses, educational software, and other educational elements used (Gredler 1995, 13)

Document Analysis: Document analysis is a qualitative research method used to examine the common written and electronic documents in the field of study (Krippendorff, 1980).

Mixed methods case study: A mixed-method case study design is defined as a kind of mixed methods design to collect in-depth information about a unique case by using both qualitative and quantitative data collection instruments with findings (Creswell & Plano Clarke, 2018).

Language Preparatory School: A school that provides one-year language education to students before they start studying their departments at university.

Purposive Sampling: Purposive sampling also called judgment sampling is a form of non-probability sampling method used to select “information-rich” (Patton, 2001) participants who

meet particular criteria by playing a particular role or possessing some specific experience in the program (Palinkas et al., 2015).

SFL instructor: SFL instructor is a teacher who works at a school of foreign languages (SFL) of a university and teaches English as a foreign or second language.

Triangulation: It is defined as cross-checking of data obtained by using multiple data tools such as interviews, document analysis, and observations (Atkins & Wallace, 2012, p. 111; McCormick & James, 1990)

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

Chapter II investigates the definition of curriculum, the difference between a curriculum and syllabus, the philosophy behind the curriculum development, the models and types of curriculum development, curriculum evaluation, different curriculum evaluation approaches and models, and studies done in the language curriculum in detail.

2.2. Definition of Curriculum

The curriculum is one of the fundamental elements of effective schooling and teaching. Therefore, the main point of educational reforms is to encourage greater curricular standardization and consistency across states, schools, and other educational institutions to provide equal learning opportunities in every learning environment.

A curriculum is a standardized education plan that shows which subjects will be taught in schools, in what order, and how much emphasis will be placed on a topic. It covers the courses and subjects to learn, to finish school or specialize in a field. The meaning of curriculum in Latin is "a race" or "the course of a race," which in turn derives from the verb "currere", meaning "to run/to proceed" (Kelly, 2009, p.7). In addition to the word's etymology, various scholars and researchers have emphasized the significance of curriculum development in language teaching and explained the term "*curriculum*" with different definitions. Some of the interpretations of the curriculum in the field are as follows:

Numerous scholars defined curriculum and put emphasis on various aspects of it in the available literature. A curriculum is the entire process of student learning organized and conducted by an educational institution to achieve its goals (Tyler, 1957). According to Dewey (1902), a curriculum is a program that provides the continuous construction of knowledge based on standardization that extends from the student's current learning experiences to the desired learning outcomes. Tanner and Tanner (1980) also define curriculum as a systematic reformation of knowledge and experience carried out under a school or educational institution's

umbrella to increase the student's knowledge and experience on a particular subject. More specifically, Taba (1962) stated that each curriculum, regardless of its design, or purpose of use, is made up of specific components, including the description of purposes and specific objectives, the organization of teaching content, specific patterns of learning and teaching process, and evaluation of the learning output. Tyler (1957) stated that the teaching process is designed according to the objectives and content of the program. Grundy (1987) defined a curriculum as a program of activities or learning experiences done by teachers and pupils to enable the students to attain possible specific educational ends and other schooling objectives. According to Wiles and Bondi (1989) curriculum is a goal or group of principles triggered through a learning process in learning environments for learners. Moreover, a curriculum is a plan for the abilities that learners will develop, which materials will be conducted. A curriculum establishes the standards by which students will be taught and evaluated, the quality of teachers in the program. Taking into consideration these definitions, most researchers define the curriculum with four main elements namely, “goals, content, implementation, and evaluation of the program” (Pratt, 1980; Bellon & Handler, 1982; Dubin & Olshtain, 1986; Hutchinson & Waters, 1987; Johnson, 1989;).

In conclusion, a curriculum serves as a primary reference point for all educators to understand what is crucial for both teaching and learning so that every student can access a structured process in their academic studies. The design, administration, and principles of a curriculum are set up to improve student learning and simplify education. In this regard, the curriculum plays crucial role in creating an environment that is successful and productive for learning in higher education institutions (Barnett & Coate, 2005).

2.3. Differences between Curriculum and Syllabus

A curriculum can be mostly confused with a syllabus even by some educators. Syllabus originates from the Greek language, while ‘curriculum’ originates from Latin as a word. Sinclair and Renouf (1988) define a syllabus as a list of titles that shows elements chosen by a language planner or material developer to be addressed in a specific portion of a curriculum or course series. It generally consists of linguistic components and behavioral abilities and sometimes methods to be used in a course. In other words, a syllabus is a lesson plan containing a list of subjects to be taught for one study or course, including standard competence, basic competence, primary material, learning activities, indicators, evaluation, time and resources.

However, a curriculum is a set of plans and arrangements that includes objectives, the course content and materials, methods, and assessment elements to achieve specific educational goals in a program. In other words, a curriculum is a combination of factors that help plan an educational program, while a syllabus covers the portion of what subjects should be taught in a specific course. To sum up, the curriculum offers the overall framework for a course or overall program including main components namely, objectives, content, materials used, learning process and evaluation criteria while a syllabus is limited to a single subject.

2.4. Curriculum Development

Developing a curriculum is a significant component of curriculum theory. Numerous stakeholders such as curriculum and material developers, scholars analyzing the needs of the program, individuals, methodology designers, teachers and students participate in the curriculum development process actively (Johnson, 1989). The curriculum development process consists of curriculum planning, statement of the aims and objectives, defining the methods and materials to be used, implementation of the program, and implementation of the curriculum in a classroom (Johnson, 1989).

2.4.1. Philosophy Behind Curriculum Development

The philosophy or the value system behind curriculum development has been neglected despite its crucial role in overcoming educational challenges no matter what approach or method is used since every single action of a teacher arises from the ideas and values that they bring to the learning environment (White, 1988).

Clark (1987) and White (1988) put emphasis on the framework of ideologies developed by Skilbeck's (1982) approach to investigate the "value systems" underpinning educational traditions and apply them to language instruction. The three ideologies, Classical-Humanism, Reconstructionism, and Progressivism have been termed the education system, which respectively aim at transmitting the cultural heritage, making a social change, and assisting self-improvement and self-fulfillment for an individual (Skilbeck, 1982). These three traditions are associated with the structural grammar/systems approach (content model), the notional functional syllabus (the objectives model), and the process-procedural method (the process model), respectively. The main characteristics of each model and its philosophy are examined in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1 *Skilbeck's framework of the ideologies underlying curriculum models (Finney, 2002: P.86)*

Content Model (Classical Humanism)	Objectives Model (Reconstructionism)	Process Model (Progressivism)
The Main Characteristics (Values)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -It relates to the structural grammar approach (systems approach) - It is a subject-centered design. - Structural syllabus is used. -It provides a teacher-centered learning environment. - It promotes different curricula for elite and non-elite. - Education is associated with social power and elitism. - It underpins the grammar-based curriculum. - Valued cultural heritage and absolute universal knowledge can be the content. - It is the dominant philosophy of the Western education system - It generally prefers to use the grammar-translation method. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It relates to the notional functional syllabus. - It is an objectives-centered design. -Audio-lingual and notional-functional syllabi are used. - Learning is an observable change in behavior that can be measured. - Its primary purpose is to bring about social change - Education is a way of moving society to the desired position. - It is appropriate in vocational training (Kelly, 1989). - It is the basis of the Council of Europe Threshold Level Project. - It provides clear goals, easy evaluation and accountability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It relates to the process-procedural approach. - It focuses on individuals more than a nation. - It is a process-centered approach. - Process syllabus (Krashen & Terrell, 1983; Candlin, 1984) and procedural syllabus (Prabhu,1987) are used. - Teaching is a collaborative process between the teacher and students. - Its purpose is to enable the learners to make progress through self-fulfillment. - Goals are defined in the process by which the learner develops his understanding. -It moves toward a learner-centered curriculum - It focuses on the concepts of learners' needs and interests.
Shortcomings		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is too basic and old-fashioned to meet the needs of today's learners. - It ignores factors such as context, discourse models or individual needs of learners - It is unsuitable for achieving broader educational purposes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Focusing on goals hinders the development of the cognitive and affective aspects of learning and creativity - It excludes such concepts as autonomy, self-fulfillment and personal development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It can take time to develop

Today, designing a curriculum model focusing on only one philosophy mentioned previously may not be sufficient to meet the learners' communicative needs (Finney, 2002). Johnson (1989) suggested using a mixed-focus curriculum to design a communicative curriculum. A mixed-focus curriculum focuses on the subject, the process, and the course objectives. The main aim of a mixed-focus curriculum is to provide a holistic learning environment for the students. This curriculum model has three dimensions: policy, pragmatics, and participants. Policy refers to the aims of a curriculum or the desired goals and focuses on the needs of stakeholders, including learners, the planning committee, society, and teachers. Pragmatics refers to the limitations on possible outcomes and participants refer to people who participate in the decision-making process by balancing the policy (aims) and pragmatics (limitations) (Johnson, 1989). The decision-making process has four stages; designing the curriculum, setting the goals and methods to be used, implementing the program, and implementing the program in a classroom.

The first step in developing a language program is needs analysis, which aims to identify and respond to student and learning needs. According to Brindley (1989, p. 64), there are two orientations that are commonly acknowledged: process- and product-oriented interpretations of demands. A product-oriented view of needs focuses on the language necessary for a future purpose. A process-oriented view concentrates on the language required for a potential use. In the second step of the curriculum design, the course content and procedures are determined according to goals or learning objectives. In language teaching, there are many ways of expressing objectives, such as performance objectives, process-related objectives, and instructional objectives (Finnley, 2002). In the third step of curriculum design, the methods, and materials to be used are decided. The limitations are taken into consideration and the curriculum is implemented. As the last step, the curriculum is implemented in a classroom. Course content is usually presented in the form of a syllabus. Evaluation is viewed as an essential and vital aspect of the preceding phases rather than a step in the curriculum design process (Johnson, 1989). Therefore, evaluation is not added as one phase of curriculum development.

2.4.2. Models for Curriculum Development

A model is a template for curriculum planning that has been created to address demands, circumstances, or goals. Curricular designers create, restructure, or rearrange one or more essential curriculum elements to meet these objectives. These include content (matters),

evaluation, introduction, instructional strategies, learning activities, grouping techniques, resources, outputs, additions, and adaptations. (Finnley, 2002). In addition, Ornstein and Hunkins (2009) state, "Curriculum development encompasses how a curriculum is planned, implemented and evaluated, as well as what people, processes and procedures are involved" (p. 15).

Several scholars defined curriculum in various ways, researched curriculum development, and designed their models. Regardless of the curriculum approach or development model used, curriculum developers cannot ignore three main components: content (subject matter), learning experiences, and objectives while planning a curriculum (Lunenburg, 2011). Considering these three main components, three main curriculum development models emerge that can be used according to their priority: curriculum as product, curriculum as a process, and curriculum as praxis. Given Aristotle's main classification of knowledge into three disciplines: the theoretical, the productive, and the practical elements, it is beneficial to take a closer look at these approaches to comprehend curriculum theory and practice (Finney, 2002). Curriculum as a syllabus or body of knowledge to be transmitted links to the theoretical discipline, the process and praxis models are close to '*practical*' discipline, and the product models link to Aristotle's *productive* discipline. The analysis of each program development model or approach based on these ideologies is discussed in the following section.

Program designs are based on various frameworks introduced by various scholars such as Tyler (1942), Brown (1995), Stenhouse (1975) and Grundy (1987). They highlighted components of curriculum development and related questions before designing a curriculum. Some of the significant ones, such as The Tyler Model, The Taba Model, the Process model of Stenhouse, and Richards and Brown's Model are examined below:

In the existing literature, curriculum development models have been analyzed under three main titles according to the priority they gave: curriculum as product, curriculum as a process, and curriculum as praxis.

2.4.2.1. Curriculum as product

Education is frequently considered a technical exercise in the product approach. The emphasis on the product approach highlights the importance of the results or outcomes in the educational setting. Therefore, the behavioral objectives are defined clearly when the curriculum is designed to serve as indicators of the learning results (Bobbitt, 1918; Tyler, 1949).

In this curriculum model, goals are set, a strategy is created, the program is implemented, and the results (products) are assessed.

2.4.2.1.1. Bobbitt's Curriculum Model (1918)

Bobbitt (1918) views the curriculum as a product and states that the curriculum is a simple system that provides the learner with the necessary skills, routines, desires, and forms of knowledge for any social class. However diverse human life is it consists of doing particular tasks. A curriculum that prepares the learners for life enables a learning environment that prepares them precisely and adequately for these particular activities. However, varied they may be, these activities can be explored in any social class, and they will be the objectives of the curriculum. The curriculum will then be the set of experiences that the students need to undergo to achieve these goals (Bobbitt, 1918). Considering Bobbitt's explanation (1918), curriculum as a product emphasizes the importance of learning outcomes or results rather than the instructional process of teachers in the classroom.

2.4.2.1.2. The Tyler Model (1942)

The Tyler Curriculum development model (1942) is also an example of a product model. Billings and Halstead (2009) define the Tyler model as a straightforward linear method for creating behavioral objectives. The technique of "invent, organize and present" was refined in his 4-step analysis. Tyler (1949, p.7) introduced four questions to analyze the curriculum:

1. What educational purposes should the school seek to attain?
2. What educational experiences can be provided that are likely to attain these purposes?
3. How can these educational experiences be effectively organized?
4. How can we determine whether these purposes are being attained?

According to Tyler, a program has three main elements. These are goals/objectives, learning experiences and assessments. Objectives represent the desired behaviors that the students are expected to acquire at the end of the program. The learning experience is the life and activities that the students need to spend to gain the desired behavior. Assessment, on the other hand, covers activities to determine to what degree the objectives are achieved. According to Tyler, these three elements are in mutual interaction (Tyler, 1949). Instructors should know that a set of curriculum objectives should be the statement of the changes that are expected to occur in students (Bobbitt, 1918; Tyler, 1949). Therefore, the goals need to be clearly defined

in the objectives section and these goals can be translated into educational objectives. The model includes the learner's active participation (Prideaux, 2003).

2.4.2.1.3. Taba Model (1962)

The Taba model (1962) is an extended version of the Tyler model. According to Taba (1962), there is a concise order to follow while developing a curriculum. She focuses on the importance of teachers' role in designing a program. Taba argues that curriculum should be actively developed by the teachers who will be teaching it. Therefore, the model is called the *grass-roots approach* and consists of 7 steps to develop a curriculum in which teachers would have major input. According to Taba (1962), the Tyler model was more of an organizational curriculum model. Taba offered the following sub-steps, which established requirements for action, using Tyler's cycle as a model: (1) "diagnosis of needs, (2) formulation of objectives, (3) choice of content, (4) organization of content, (5) choice of learning experiences, (6) organization of learning activities (7) evaluation and means of evaluation." (Taba, 1962, p. 12)

In addition, Saylor and Alexander (1974) also viewed a curriculum as a product by focusing on the learning outcomes of a program. They defined "curriculum" as "a plan for providing sets of learning opportunities to achieve broad educational goals and related specific objectives for an identifiable population served by a single school center" (Saylor & Alexander, 1974, p.6). The four steps to designing a curriculum are a statement of the goals, objectives, and domains, curriculum designing, curriculum implementation, and evaluation. The curriculum models discussed in the present section view curriculum as a product and are referred to as the traditional or rational approach.

2.4.2.2. Curriculum as process

Compared to the product approach, the process approach emphasizes providing a communicative and interactive learning environment among instructors, students, and the knowledge rather than transmission of knowledge. Therefore, the instructors' main concern is to enable the learning process and provide authentic learning experiences in the classroom and in assessment activities. The process approach stresses holistic learning rather than dividing the subject into small steps. The model consists of several components that interact constantly. It is a dynamic process that connects to Aristotle's system of practical reasoning (Stenhouse, 1975).

2.4.2.2.1. Process Model by Stenhouse (1975)

According to Stenhouse (1975), a curriculum is an attempt to convey the key ideas and characteristics of an educational concept in a way that allows for critical evaluation and efficient implementation in the classroom. In order to provide the learners with this kind of learning environment, developing a curriculum focusing on the process of interactive and communicative learning environment is necessary rather than developing a curriculum on the basis of desired objectives. In his process model, Stenhouse (1975) was not entirely opposed to achieving objectives. Instead, he disregarded the assumption that the objectives may serve as the foundation for a comprehensive model that could be used for all education components. In other words, the content, objectives, and methods emerge as a result of collaboration between instructors and students.

The process curriculum approach entails much more than just teaching a lesson and accomplishing certain goals. It outlines the events that take place as soon as the teacher steps into the classroom, as well as the actions that are taken to make teaching and learning more efficient and relevant.

2.4.2.3. Curriculum as praxis

The curriculum, according to Grundy (1987), is a plan of practices organized by teachers and students so that learners can achieve specified educational and other academic outcomes of objectives as far as possible. Grundy (1987) states that in a praxis curriculum, practice is needed not only for individuals' understanding but also for mutual understanding of the learning group. The curriculum evolves in this method through the dynamic interaction of activity and reflection.

According to the perspective of curriculum as praxis, teacher and student should be able to communicate and motivate students to face their real-world challenges in the teaching-learning environment to make students be ready for real life problems. The centre of the curriculum as praxis is taking an action. The teachers and students are encouraged to work together, reflect, and think critically while working on real problems of life which enables the learners to develop their critical thinking and reflection skills further during the learning process. While working together, they acknowledge their educational roles and the expectation of other individuals or learners.

Grundy (1987) emphasizes on the importance of analysing the learning and the learner needs and suggests giving real life situations or problems to the students regarding their needs in their learning environment. In the process, the learners are given an action to work out with a proper content in order to make the learners to reach the expected educational outcomes. The learning process and the results are analysed and evaluated regarding the continuous interaction between the students and teachers. Therefore, the curriculum develops during the learning process. In other words, the curriculum is more than just a series of instructions to be performed; it is created through an ongoing cycle in which planning, implementing, and assessing are all interconnected and linked processes (Grundy, 1987).

In the reviewed literature, the curriculum is viewed as a wider concept by scholars and thus is defined as a product, a process, and a praxis (Bobbitt, 1918; Tyler, 1949; Taba, 1962; Stenhouse, 1975; Grundy, 1987). In addition to these models, theory-based models of curriculum development are going to be discussed in the following section in the EFL context.

2.4.2.4. Theory-based Models of Language Curriculum Development

This section examines Brown's (1995) and Richards' (2001) theory-based curriculum development models in the EFL context.

2.4.2.4.1. Brown's Model of Language Curriculum Development

Brown (1995) suggested developing a language curriculum model in which the curriculum is defined as a sequence of activities that lead to the establishment of consensus among stakeholders namely, the staff, instructors, administrators, and learners. Brown (1995) suggested following six elements while designing a curriculum (p.11):

1. “needs assessment,
2. desired outcomes,
3. language evaluation,
4. materials,
5. teaching,
6. evaluation.”

In this model, the first step of curriculum design is analysing the needs of learners and other stakeholders so as to detect problems in the program and offer solutions or recommendations to them. The process of setting goals and objectives, referring to both the

expected learning outcomes and the particular skills or knowledge that the students must acquire, is facilitated by conducting a needs analysis. In addition, language testing step is included in order to evaluate how successfully the goals and objectives are met. According to Brown (1995, 21), goals are general statements about what must be fulfilled to achieve and indicate students' needs, while objectives are precise statements about what content or skills the learners must master to achieve a specific goal. The design and use of resources in the classroom are covered by the materials component. Brown (1995, p. 139, cited in Mede & Akyel, 2014, p. 4) defines materials as "any systematic description of the techniques and exercises to be used in classroom teaching." According to Brown (1995), materials that have been designed, implemented, or adjusted for a program should have clear goals, objectives, tests, and teaching methods. The support that language instructors require in order to teach effectively is covered in the fifth step as a teaching component. Finally, the last step evaluation is a continuous process of evaluating and enhancing the five elements outlined earlier.

Parallel to Brown's (1995) framework, Graves (1996, p. 13) described the following components and the related questions to be asked before designing a program:

1. "Needs assessment": What are the needs of my students? How do I evaluate them so I can deal with them?
2. "Determining goals and objectives": What are the course aims and expected outcomes? What will my students have to do or master so order to accomplish these objectives?
3. "Conceptualizing content": What will serve as the foundation of my lessons? What will my syllabus contain?
4. "Selecting and developing materials and activities": How will I teach the course? What resources and activities will I choose and develop? What are my students' roles ? What is my role as a teacher?
5. "Organization of content and activities": How will I arrange the content and activities? What methods am I going to generate?
6. "Evaluation": How will I evaluate what students have learned? How will I evaluate how effective the course is?
7. "Consideration of resources and constraints": What are the facts of my circumstance?

2.4.2.4.2. Richards' Curriculum Development Model (2001, 2013)

Richards (2001) also developed a language curriculum model in his book named *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*, which examines the factors regarding institutional, teacher, teaching and learner contexts in order to provide more effective teaching in curriculum development. As discussed before, considering some elements and following steps is seen as necessary in designing and implementing a language curriculum more effectively. When decisions about these elements are based on substantial resolutions, they will have a scientific, systematic basis. In this sense, the model developed by Richards may serve as a leading one (Cincioglu, 2012). Richards (2001) identified seven steps contributing to the language curriculum development model, which are listed in the following:

1. Needs analysis
2. Situation analysis
3. Planning goals and learning outcomes
4. Course planning and syllabus design
5. Providing for effective teaching
6. The role and design of instructional materials
7. Approaches to evaluation

Richards (2001, p. 21), in a broader manner, suggests that language curriculum development deals with the following questions:

1. What methods can be used to identify the content of a language program?
2. What are the learner needs and expectations?
3. How can the learner needs be identified?
4. How may teaching goals and objectives be developed? What do they include?
5. What contextual factors must be taken into consideration while designing a language program?
6. What variables are taken into account when creating a course's curriculum and organizational structure?
7. How can a program offer quality instruction?
8. What concerns must be taken into account while choosing, implementing, and creating educational materials?
9. How can the success of a language program be evaluated?

Richards (2013) also examines three approaches to curriculum design: “*forward, central, and backward*” design. The primary distinction between these methods is how they address input, process, and output in relation to one another. *Forward* design is an advanced design model used in foreign language teaching curriculum development. This design starts with curriculum planning, continues with the determination of teaching methods and methods, and ends with the evaluation of learning results (Richards, 2013). *Central* design starts with the classroom process and methodology. Although subjects and learning outcomes are covered when executing the curriculum, they are not explicitly outlined in advance. Many of the 'innovative methods' of the 1980s and '90s reflect the central design. The *Backward* design process begins with a needs analysis and a search for desired results. The course content and process are developed from the target behaviors. No specific educational method or philosophy is integrated when designing the curriculum. Training methods are chosen after target behaviors are determined. The Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) is a recent example of backward design.

Richards (2013) examines the curriculum model in terms of its three dimensions: input, process, and output. Input is the linguistic content of a course (curriculum), the process is how teaching is performed (method), and the output is the learning outcomes. Richards (2013) suggests that language education curriculum development may begin with “input, process, or output”. Each starting point represents various presumptions on the process and goals in which teaching, and learning are carried out. In forward design, progresses from input to process to output in a forward design. Forward design is applied at the end of the evaluation. Central design starts with the *process* and gets *input* and *output* from the classroom technique. It focuses on the progress more than input or output. Backward design starts from the *output* and then evaluates the process and then looks at problems related to input (Richards, 2013).

As a result, there has been a variety of studies on curriculum development for more than half a century, starting with Tyler (1949) and being followed by several scholars. However, the main components of curriculum development have not undergone many changes. In the literature reviewed in this study, the essential elements for designing a language framework are needs analysis, setting goals, organization of content, material development, and evaluation. Despite adding new components or steps to develop a new curriculum, curriculum developers have much in common in following the same sequence with almost the same elements to design an appropriate education curriculum.

2.5. Curriculum Evaluation

Evaluation of the curriculum in the field of education determines whether the programs have positive behavioural changes in the desired direction and to what extent they are effective.

According to Stufflebeam (1971), the evaluation process provides alternative ideas to help obtain current and usable information from stakeholders. Evaluation, according to Worthen and Sanders (1973), enables the evaluator to conclude the value of the programs, their efficiency, suitability, and usefulness. In addition, Demirel (2013) and Erden (1998) suggest that the evaluation of a designed curriculum is necessary. The information collected with scientific methods during the evaluation phase of the program not only measures the program's effectiveness but also determines whether the program development experts or the stakeholders in the decision-making process can continue the program or not, based on the findings. On the other hand, in the definition of evaluation, Brown (1989) defined curriculum evaluation as the process of obtaining detailed and up-to-date information in order to better organize the program and determine its effectiveness, in addition to systematically collecting and analyzing information, supporting the programs with the obtained data, helping the programs to improve their deficiencies, and rearranging the parts that need to be corrected. To conclude, the primary purpose of program evaluation is to provide meaningful information and data that will assist the decision-making process of the curriculum and the process of designing related policies (Patton, 1997; Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 1985; Worthen & Sanders, 1973).

2.5.1. Types of Curriculum Evaluation

Curriculum evaluation in education can be done at the beginning, during the process and at the end of the program. The appropriate type of evaluation is chosen according to the purpose. Accordingly, the evaluation made to the draft curriculum at the beginning of the program, before the program is implemented, is reflective. The evaluation made during the process is formative, and finally, the evaluation made at the end of the program is summative (Brown, 1995; Richards, 2001).

- a. *Reflective evaluation* is a curriculum evaluation approach made before the program is put into practice by collecting the opinions of experts and teachers. In this type of evaluation, the consistency of the target behaviors, the compatibility of the objectives and learning-teaching situations with the objectives, the suitability of the teaching

principles, methods and techniques used in the teaching process for the students' levels, and the validity of the assessment tools are evaluated (Turgut, 1983)

- b. *Formative evaluation* is an evaluation approach that continues during the implementation of the program, that is, throughout the learning-teaching process. In this type of evaluation, rather than just evaluate the outcomes, the evaluator can follow the cognitive development of the students and examine the effectiveness of the curriculum, provide support at the stage of problems, and improve materials and methods used by the teacher in order to reach the target goals during the implementation process of the curriculum (Turgut, 1983; Brown, 1995; Richards, 2001).
- c. *Summative evaluation* is a curriculum evaluation approach made after the program is implemented, to evaluate the outcomes of the curriculum by looking at the results of the tests and examinations or gathering viewpoints of teachers and students (Brown, 1995; Tekin, 1996; Richards, 2001) In this type of evaluation, the students are checked whether they have gained the target information at the end of the implemented program. This evaluation method is criticized by many scholars as summative evaluation neglects the fact that language learning is a process (Brown, 1995) and it also cannot explain the reason why the program is unsuccessful, what alternative methods or materials could be used to improve learning process (Cronbach, 1976; Parlett, 1975).

In summary, the common point of the reflective, formative and summative evaluation approaches is to determine to what extent the objectives of the program are achieved, how effective the content, the tools, and materials are used, and the reasons why difficulties encountered in the implementation process, and what to do to improve the program's incomplete, weak and negative aspects that do not comply with the requirements of the 21st century and how to carry out decision-making process (Fitzpatrick et al., 2004). In this respect, various program evaluation models have been designed and implemented to evaluate the education curricula.

2.5.2. Curriculum Evaluation Approaches and Models

In addition to the types of evaluation, such aspects as how the program is planned to be evaluated and which program evaluation approach will be preferred during the evaluation should be designed in advance. The reviewed literature shows that scholars with different approaches to program evaluation have distinct goals and methods, which shed light on each method. Each assessment design, approach, or model reflects its characteristics as the questions

each model asks about assessment dimensions differ. Each model and program can be effective and valuable in revealing an essential dimension of the real phenomenon (Wholey et al., 2010). Evaluation models provide a practical roadmap by providing academic advice to researchers on planning and conducting evaluation studies (Madaus & Kellaghan, 2000).

There is extensive and rich information on curriculum evaluation approaches and models in the literature. The following section presents the features of curriculum evaluation approaches and models. Uşun (2008) reviewed the literature on curriculum evaluation approaches and models and examined 35 curriculum evaluation models under 14 curriculum evaluation approaches, as seen in Table 2. In the table below, the curriculum evaluation approaches and models reviewed in the literature are categorized in detail.

Table.2.2 *Curriculum Evaluation Approaches and Models*

Approaches	Models
Objectives-oriented Curriculum Evaluation Approaches	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Tyler’s Linear Model b. Metfessel-Micheal Circle Model c. Discrepancy Evaluation Model(Provus, 1966)
Management-oriented Curriculum Evaluation Approaches	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product) Model b. The Dick and Carey Instructional Design Model c. The Kirkpatrick Model of Training Evaluation d. Realistic Curriculum Evaluation Model e. Total Quality Management Evaluation Model f. Alkin’s UCLA Evaluation Model g. Saylor, Alexander and Lewis Model
Adversary/Judicial Curriculum Evaluation Approach	Legal Evaluation Model
Utilization-Focused Curriculum Evaluation Approach	Patton’s Utilization-Focused Evaluation Model
Traditional Evaluation (TE) Approach	

Table.2.2 *Curriculum Evaluation Approaches and Models (Continued)*

Approaches	Models
Expertise-Oriented / Accreditation Curriculum	Eisner's Educational Connoisseurship and Criticism Model (1975)
Consumer-Oriented Evaluation Approach	Curriculum
Humanistic Approach	Scriven's Goal Free Evaluation Model (1991)
Postmodern Curriculum Evaluation Approach	Guba and Lincoln's Fourth Generation Constructivist Evaluation Model (1989)
Academic Evaluation Approach	Guerra Lopez's Seven Steps of Impact Evaluation model (IEP) (2010)
Collaborative Approaches	Fetterman's Empowerment Evaluation Model (EE)
Participant-Oriented Evaluation Approach	Curriculum a. Demirel's Curriculum Evaluation Model b. Stake's Responsive Evaluation Model c. Bellon and Handler Model

Fitzpatrick, Sanders, and Worthen (2004) categorized curriculum evaluation approaches under six headings: (1) objectives-oriented, (2) management-oriented, (3) expertise-oriented evaluation, (4) consumer-oriented, (5) adversary-oriented, and (6) participant-oriented curriculum evaluation.

The curriculum evaluation models developed under these approaches are as follows: Models advocating the objectives-oriented program evaluation approaches are Tyler, Metfessel-Micheal and Provus. The management-oriented curriculum evaluation approach models are Stufflebeam's CIPP model, the UCLA model and Kirkpatrick's Evaluation model. Models of the expertise-oriented curriculum evaluation approach are formal and informal expert evaluation model, criticism, panel, and educational expertise model. The curriculum evaluation model under the consumer-oriented curriculum evaluation approach is Scriven's

goal-free evaluation model. The Legal Evaluation model is developed regarding the adversary-oriented evaluation approach. Models of participant-oriented curriculum evaluation approach include Stake's evaluation matrix, respondent evaluation, participant evaluation, realistic evaluation and Bellon and Handler's curriculum model.

2.5.2.1. Objectives-Oriented Curriculum Evaluation Approach

Objectives-oriented evaluation is determined by analyzing the data obtained from the students. A judgment is made by looking at whether the previously determined goals have been achieved. In other words, the evaluation focuses on the degree to which target goals have been achieved. With the results obtained, the program can be terminated or revised. On the other hand, objectives-oriented evaluation only evaluates the students and includes limited information, whereas, for an assessment to be successful, an assessment application must provide comprehensive information. Furthermore, the evaluator may miss some results that may be important as this evaluation only focuses on the outcomes of a curriculum. An assessment made in this model is summative because decisions are made based on only the students' success. The scholars such as Tyler (1942), Metfessel and Michael (1967), Provus (1983), Hammond (1968) and Bennett (1976) have contributed to the objectives-oriented curriculum evaluation approach. These scholars and their evaluation models are described within the following sections.

2.5.2.1.1. Tyler's Linear Model (1949)

Tyler's goal-oriented linear model forms the basis of the most common models in curriculum design, development, and assessment. According to Tyler, a program has three basic elements: (1) objectives, (2) learning experiences, and (3) assessment (Tyler, 1949). In Tyler's Linear Model (1949) the desired behaviors that the students are intended to acquire as a result of the program are expressed in goals. Learning experiences are how students acquire the desired behaviors that they will need to engage in in real-life situations. Evaluation, on the other hand, covers the activities done to determine the degree of achievement of the goals. According to Tyler, these three elements interact in a continuous cycle.

The Tyler Linear Model focuses on the learning outcomes of the curriculum. If the desired goals could not be achieved as a result of the evaluation, the curriculum is improved and reshaped with the guidance of the results of the re-evaluation, or it is dropped out of use.

According to Tyler (1949), a curriculum will not be effective if its aims do not take into account the needs and interests of students, society, and the subject matter. Therefore, he stresses the objectives of the curriculum in each step of curriculum evaluation.

Tyler recommends the following steps in his objectives-oriented curriculum evaluation model: (1) Determining the objective of the curriculum, (2) Classifying the objectives, (3) Defining the goals in terms of behavior, (4) Identifying the situations that can show whether the objectives have been achieved, (5) Developing and selecting assessment techniques (6) Collecting data on students' achievements and (7) Comparing the data with the behavioral objectives.

In general, Tyler's model is designed to measure the degree to which predetermined goals and objectives are achieved. The model focuses on the product rather than the process of achieving the curriculum's goals and objectives. Therefore, Tyler's model is product oriented.

Prideaux (2003) criticized Tyler's objective-oriented model. The first criticism is that setting behavioral objectives takes a lot of effort and time. Tyler's model concentrates on behavioral goals. The student, the community, and the subject are the three sources of goals in Tyler's paradigm, and it is a difficult procedure for all three sources to agree on which goals should be addressed. As a result, Prideaux (2003) states that it is challenging to quickly come to an agreement among different parties in Tyler's model. The second criticism is that it is overly limited and requires only minimal knowledge and expertise on the part of the students. The third complaint is that, because Tyler's model is so reliant on behavioral objectives, it is difficult to set precise objectives that incorporate such specialized abilities as critical thinking and problem-solving (Prideaux, 2003). The last criticism Prideaux (2003) made is that the model is too student-centered. As a result, when teachers see the right moment to help students achieve the desired learning outcome, they are not given the chance to adjust their learning experiences.

2.5.2.1.2. Metfessel-Micheal Model (1967)

This assessment model proposed by Metfessel and Michael in 1967 was heavily influenced by Tyler's tradition. In this model, the main purpose is to evaluate education and training programs. The model aims to develop suggestions for future applications of the curriculum by evaluating the objectives, learning experiences, the process and the tools used at the end of the process. At the end of the evaluation, program evaluators look at the program's level of reaching the objectives. Popham (1993) listed the Metfessel-Michael evaluation model

in eight stages and listed these stages as follows: (1) the necessity of evaluating in the society, (2) the harmony of general and specific goals, (3) the applicability of the goals, (4) creating data collection tools suitable for the purpose of the evaluation, (5) conducting evaluation, (6) analyzing the data, (7) making interpretation of the data and (8) making suggestions.

2.5.2.1.3. Provus' Discrepancy Evaluation Model (1966)

Provus (1971) defines evaluation as the comparison of performance, and he suggests the development, improvement or discontinuation of the program according to the evaluation results. The model compares the consistency of the end product with the goals planned during the program development process. At the end of the process, an evaluation is made by comparing the program outputs (end product) with similar program outputs.

In the Provus Discrepancy model, five steps are followed to evaluate the program: (1) the objectives are determined, (2) the feasibility of these predetermined objectives are examined, (3) the ones that are inconsistent with the preset targets are determined, (4) the inconsistent objectives are corrected and improved (5) the program standards and the success of the implementation of the program are determined, (6) by comparing the objectives of the implemented program with the outputs, it is determined whether there is a difference or not (Ornstein & Hunkins, 2009).

According to the situation determined as a result of the evaluation, it is decided whether or not to move on to the next stage. In the case of determination, if the program is deficient, the problematic phase is re-applied, and the program is restarted. Goals are rearranged or the program is terminated (Ornstein & Hunkins, 2009). The adequacy of the program is checked in the phases of design, creation, process, product and cost-benefit analysis.

With the Provus differences approach evaluation model, evaluation can be made at every stage, from planning to implementation (Provus, 1971). This assessment model can be implemented at the school, district, city, or country level.

In this section, Tyler's (1942) model, Metfessel and Michael's model (1967) and Provus's (1973) model are reviewed as examples of objectives-oriented evaluation approaches.

2.5.2.2. Management-Oriented Curriculum Evaluation Model

Management-oriented curriculum evaluation approach provides information to decision-makers, which can be administrators, administrators, school administrations, and

teachers, about the applied curriculum. The information obtained from the evaluation is essential for a good decision-making process. The evaluation expert contributes to education in the best way by serving anyone who needs evaluation in education. Regarding the program's inputs, outputs, and products, decisions are taken. This strategy makes it clear who will utilize assessment results, how they will be used, and which system components will be determined by taking into consideration decisions and decision-makers regarding the program (Fitzpatrick et al., 2004).

In a management-oriented approach, the program's objectives are not the main focus. In evaluation models that advocate this approach, evaluation experts who work with the administrators closely clarify the decisions that the administrator has to make about the program. Then, it compiles enough data to fully understand the benefits and drawbacks of each potential course of action. The effectiveness of the partnership between the administrators and assessors is what determines the outcome of the evaluation process. (Fitzpatrick, Sanders, & Worthen, 2004). Theorists such as Stufflebeam (1971), Dick and Carey (1985), Kirkpatrick (1954), Mark et al. (2000), Alkin (1969), and Saylor et al. (1981) have supported the management-oriented curriculum evaluation approach. Some of these scholars and their evaluation models are described in the following subheadings.

2.5.2.2.1. Stufflebeam's CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product) Model

The CIPP evaluation model, developed by Daniel Stufflebeam, aimed to fill the deficiency of current program evaluation approaches in the 1960s (Mertens & Wilson, 2012). As one of the management-oriented curriculum evaluation approaches, CIPP Model stresses four main aspects to evaluate the curriculum: (1) context, (2) input, (3) process and (4) product. The model can evaluate the program comprehensively with the support of these four stages by collecting information about the program and providing information to program development experts or stakeholders (Stufflebeam, 1971). CIPP model systematically collects information to identify the strengths and weaknesses of a program, improve its effectiveness, and provide a plan for future implementations (Zhang et al., 2011).

The core values of the CIPP evaluation model are context, input, product, and process evaluation. Context evaluation focuses on the goals and objectives of the curriculum and analyzes the needs, resources, problems, background information and environment of the curriculum. Input evaluation emphasizes the plans of the programs, which can be categorized

as the decisions of stakeholders, strategies and methods used, and the budget and coverage of the program. Process evaluation evaluates the actions of the curriculum, such as development, implementation, observation and feedback on the curriculum. Product evaluation examines the program outcomes by looking at the impact, effectiveness, transportability, sustainability, and adjustment. During each of these four stages, specific steps are taken (As cited in Glatthorn, 1987, p. 273-274):

1. Different kinds of decisions are identified,
2. Different kinds of data needed to make these decisions are identified,
3. These data are collected
4. The criteria for determining quality are established
5. The data are analyzed on the basis of those criteria
6. The needed information is provided to decision-makers.

CIPP Model is a straightforward and user-friendly evaluation method as it provides detailed guidelines and forms enabling users a step-by-step guidance. In addition, the model concerns formative aspects of evaluation which remedy a serious deficiency of objectives-oriented evaluation approaches in addition to summative ones. It also provides rational decision-making for administrators concerned with improving curricula. One of its most important features is that it is the most popular evaluation approach used in educational research that helps managers make informed and correct decisions (Zhan et al., 2011).

On the other hand, there are some drawbacks to CIPP Model as well. That is, CIPP Model overvalues efficiency while undervaluing students' aims. It is also criticized as it can be challenging to implement and expensive to maintain (Guba & Lincoln, 1981). The model also neglects the political factors that play a large part in the decision-making process.

2.5.2.2.2. The Kirkpatrick Model of Training Evaluation (1996)

Kirkpatrick evaluation model, which advocates a management-oriented curriculum evaluation approach, is an established and accepted model that provides a structure and does not require an excessive amount of time for evaluation. The primary purpose of the Kirkpatrick assessment model is to evaluate the effectiveness of formal or informal training in industry and business (Kirkpatrick, 1996).

It is designed to evaluate vocational training and consists of four assessment levels: (1) reaction, (2) learning, (3) behavior, and (4) results. The reaction rating level, sometimes

measured as happy or smile pages, takes into account whether participants responded positively to the training or initiative. Kirkpatrick (2006) states that according to the program or initiative's learning outcomes, learning level assesses whether participants have acquired the desired information, abilities, or attitudes as a result of their involvement. The behavioral level, also known as "transfer," takes into account how much training or intervention participants' subsequent behavior in other contexts, such as the workplace, changes. The results assessment level determines if overall objectives have been fulfilled as a result of interventions and subsequent reinforcement. It is also referred to as "the organizational level assessment" and refers to anticipated long-term outcomes. Instead of come back upon expectations, the fourth level consists of return on investment.

In the model, the evaluation must always start from the first stage. Then the evaluator should pass the second, third and fourth stages. In other words, evaluation progresses gradually, starting from the response stage and continuing sequentially down. The evaluation can be completed by asking the following questions: During the reaction stage, (1) "*Did the participants like the training program?*"; in the learning stage, (2) "Did the participants learn the subjects?"; in the behavior stage, (3) "Were they able to transfer what they learned to the work environment or their daily lives?" and in the results stage (4) "Did the training program affect business results or achievements?" (Kirkpatrick, 2006, p. 76).

The evaluation can be completed by asking questions (Kirkpatrick, 2006, p. 78): "Did the participants learn the subjects in the learning phase?" or "Were they able to transfer what they learned during the behavioral phase to the work environment or their daily lives?" Moreover, ultimately, "Did the training program affect business results or achievements?"

2.5.2.2.3. Alkin's UCLA Evaluation Model (2012)

Alkin's UCLA Evaluation Model is also a model that advocates a management-oriented evaluation approach. The UCLA evaluation model examines the planning, implementation, development and validation stages (Worthen & Sanders, 1973). In this respect, the evaluation process should guide collecting information and taking the next step by analyzing the collected information (Alkin, 2012).

Alkin's UCLA evaluation model parallels some aspects of the CIPP model and consists of the following five types of assessment: "(1) systems assessment, (2) program planning, (3) program implementation, (4) program improvement, and (5) program certification" (2012, p.

5). Stufflebeam's CIPP model (1962, p. 13) compares "system assessment" to "context evaluation", "program planning" to "input evaluation", "program improvement" to "process evaluation", and "program certification" to "product evaluation".

In this section, Stufflebeam's (1971) CIPP model, Kirkpatrick's (1954) Training evaluation model and Alkin's (1969) UCLA evaluation model are examined as examples of management-oriented evaluation approaches.

2.5.2.3. Expertise-Oriented Evaluation Approach

The expertise-oriented evaluation approach evaluates, especially with professional experts, when making judgments about an institution, program, product or event. According to this approach, a program is evaluated by the relevant program development or subject expert, who will monitor the program during its implementation, test its content, determine the learning theory, and patiently select and separate the necessary information about the value of the program.

2.5.2.3.1. Eisner's Educational Connoisseurship and Criticism Model (1975)

Eisner's educational criticism program evaluation model is carried out by experts with the dimensions of evaluation, description, interpretation and evaluation made with a critical perspective (Marsh & Willis, 2007). Eisner's evaluation model includes expert criticism after the development of new programs. Program evaluation experts need to objectively collect data about what happened at the end of the curriculum implemented, the situations that could be considered necessary in this process, the reasons for these events, the opinions of the participants about the program, and the achievements of the students from the implemented program. If the purpose of the program evaluation is to obtain information about education, evaluation experts should continuously collect information and make decisions based on this collected information.

2.5.2.4. Consumer-Oriented Evaluation Approach

Consumer-oriented evaluation approach focuses on the needs of consumers and social expectations of the program rather than its objectives. This approach evaluates educational products such as textbooks, educational software, and media to determine the needs of consumers (Fitzpatrick et al.,2004)

2.5.2.4.1. Scriven's Goal-Free Evaluation Model (1991)

In the goal-free evaluation model developed by Scriven, evaluation looks at the actual impact of a program on identified needs rather than program objectives (Scriven, 1991). Instead, evaluation examines how and what the program does to meet student and learning needs. Scriven (1991) stated that the main objective of the goal-free evaluation model is to create a definition of the program, express the processes correctly and determine their importance for the program while questioning the distinction between intended and undesirable effects of the program.

Scriven (1991) plans the evaluation process in 5 stages: (1) determining the effectiveness of the program, (2) defining the relationship between cause and effect, (3) designing an evaluation checklist (Key Evaluation Checklist-KEC), (4) assessment of independent objectives and (5) needs analysis. During the evaluation process, the researcher observes without a checklist; but he accurately records all data, creates some categories and determines the importance and quality of the program. Categories emerge from observations. Instruments such as tests that the subject is aware of and instruments such as hidden cameras that a subject is unaware of can be used to collect data during the evaluation (Scriven, 1991).

Scriven's most significant contribution to this model has been the division of curriculum evaluation into two prominent roles; formative and summative evaluation. Scriven defines summative evaluation as an evaluation employed to obtain information about the program in general by only looking at students' learning levels at the end of the program. On the other hand, he defines formative evaluation as a program-developing evaluation that examines the process (Scriven, 1991).

However, used alone, Scriven's goal-free evaluation model cannot provide sufficient information to the decision-maker and should be used by experts to obtain accurate results. (Richard, 2001). Also, setting target results can be difficult and time-consuming (Scriven, 1991).

2.5.2.5. Adversary-Judicial Evaluation Approach

Adversary-Judicial approach is a curriculum evaluation approach that facilitates the use of various data sources and advocates making more effort than the traditional approach for the researcher to reveal the data (Hogan, 2007). Only summative evaluation is used and at the end of the evaluation, it seeks an answer to whether the program should be continued or terminated.

This model is built on contrasting ideas and different points of view in the assessment process, which is widely acknowledged to contain "trial, prosecution, defense, jury, accusation, and rebuttals" (Hogan, 2007, p.27).

Wolf's Judicial Model (1990) is an example of the adversary evaluation approach. The judicial model provides a complete presentation of information through the interpretation of a program based on two opposing viewpoints and assists educational decision-makers in validating the challenges of their programs. Wolf (1990) follows four steps to evaluate a program: (1) determining the topic, (2) choosing the topic, (3) preparing the evidence and (4) announcing the meeting. Both summative and formative evaluation methods can be used in this model.

2.5.2.6. Participant-Oriented Curriculum Evaluation Approach

The approaches and models reviewed in the literature emphasized evaluating the objectives, outcomes, the process and different perspectives of program stakeholders such as teachers, students and administrators. However, there have been almost no evaluation studies or models in the available literature on meeting the needs and expectations of the participants who take active roles in implementing and using the curriculum. These participants can be especially not only the teachers and students but also the administrators, program and material developers, and testing unit, who can be defined as the decision-makers of a curriculum. In an attempt to fill this deficiency, the participant-oriented evaluation approach is advocated by different scholars (Stake, 1970; Bellon & Handler, 1982)

In the participant-oriented evaluation approach, multiple judgments are taken into account rather than single judgments because evaluation models affected by this approach are not carried out according to a standard plan, they are based on an inductive reasoning method, and they use multiple data sources such as quantitative and qualitative. The approach suggests that people can see and interpret facts differently, so the details of the programs used in schools or similar education environments cannot be known precisely by anyone (Fitzpatrick, Sanders and Worthen, 2004).

The Participant-Oriented evaluation approach addresses an educational activity's problems, challenges, and outcomes by highlighting participants' perspectives. The examples of models that advocate the participant-oriented evaluation approach can be listed as follows: Parlett and Hamilton's Illuminative Evaluation Model (1976), Stake's countenance-responsive

evaluation model, Demirel's (2006) analytical curriculum evaluation model (DAPDEM) and Bellon and Handler's (1982) curriculum evaluation model.

In the following section, Stake's (1970) countenance-responsive model and Bellon and Handler's (1982) curriculum evaluation model will be examined.

2.5.2.6.1. Stake's Countenance (1967) -Responsive Evaluation Model (1975)

As an example model of a participant-oriented evaluation approach, Stake's countenance model was developed by Stake in 1970 to carry out curriculum evaluation studies in education. The model was later developed with the name Stake's responsive model (Stake, 1975). Stake (1975) stated that the evaluation should look at the activities implemented in the process of the program, the dimensions responding to the need, and different viewpoints to evaluate the program's current status. Within the scope of the participant-oriented program evaluation approach, the primary goal of this model is to meet the needs of the participants. Therefore, it is necessary to obtain information by analyzing the expectations and needs of the stakeholders and students who are the program participants to evaluate the curriculum. Rather than goals and hypotheses, the model emphasizes educational issues such as direct and indirect observation of program participation, the needs of the target audience and the learning environment for reporting. McNeill and Krajcik (2007) state that, like objective-oriented evaluation approaches, it is not sufficient to evaluate the effectiveness of a program by simply looking at its goals or outcomes. Examining the teaching-learning process is as significant as goals as well.

This approach allows evaluation of education and other programs by comparing program effectiveness, program uniqueness, and social diversity of people (Stake, 1970). The most crucial feature of Stake's responsive assessment is the sensitivity to critical issues and problems, especially when people are familiar with the field.

Stake (1970) stated that evaluation provides satisfactory results if planned in advance. The process to be followed for the responsive model consists of the following twelve stages: (1) determining the scope of the program, (2) an overview of the program activities, (3) determining the goals and concerns, (4) conceptualizing the current problems in the program, (5) determining the data needs, (6) the observers, selection of the jury and tools, if any, (7) observation of identified premises, processes, and results, (8) thematicization and preparation of illustrations and case studies, (9) matching and parsing of issues with the target audience,

(10) format for audience use; (11) gathering official reports, (12) talking to clients, program development staff and target audience (Stake, 1976).

The responsive approach can be applied to summative and formative assessments (Stake, 1977). Formative evaluation is functional when program developers need help monitoring the program, and no one knows what kind of problems they will encounter with it. Summative evaluation, on the other hand, may be preferred when program developers want to understand the program's activities, strengths, and shortcomings. Responsive Evaluation is preferred in pre-organization evaluation to see how much the predetermined objectives have changed (Stake, 1972). In addition, the approach enables a comprehensive description of a program. (Sorcinelli et al., 1984) and the creation of large databases (Klintberg, 1976). As a result, Responsive Evaluation allows the evaluation of programs that are limited or broad in scope and are particularly suitable for programs in transition (Rakel, 1976).

2.5.2.6.2. Bellon and Handler Curriculum Evaluation Model (1982)

Another example model advocating the participant-oriented curriculum evaluation approach is Bellon and Handler's (1982) model. Bellon and Handler developed this model in 1982 based on the evaluation models of Stake, Popham, Tyler, Eisner, Hammond, Stufflebeam and Scriven (Bellon & Handler, 1982). These models that influenced Bellon and Handler to design an evaluation model have been described in detail in the reviewed literature.

The primary purpose of the Bellon and Handler evaluation model is to improve the current educational curriculum by evaluating it in detail. Therefore, the model is also called a *design for improvement* (Bellon & Handler, 1982). For this purpose, Bellon and Handler (1982) developed a 4-stage curriculum evaluation model consisting of the components the following

1. four focus areas
2. status descriptions
3. analysis activities
4. cumulative improvement components

2.5.2.6.2.1. Four Focus Areas of a Curriculum

According to Bellon and Handler (1982), the basis of a program consists of 4 main aspects: (1) goals, (2) organization, (3) operation, and (4) outcomes. Each element in this design can be developed or adapted according to the program's current situation, depending on the

applications carried out in other elements. These four main aspects are the main focus areas of a curriculum evaluation model.

The first focus area; *goals*, refers to the learning outcomes of a program which can be defined as the desired goals to be achieved at the end of a curriculum. These goals should be established by considering the students' educational needs and expectations. In other words, program objectives should be established regarding clearly defined student needs.

The second focus area, *organization*, which corresponds to the *content* element of a program model, aims to examine and analyze a range of variables affecting a program's performance. These variables can be categorized as the specific programs offered, available resources and the way they are applied, the processes to handle communication, decision-making and planning, and the structure of a program (Bellon & Handler, 1982). More explicitly, organizational factors include all kinds of resources, processes, and programs. Resources consist of human and physical resources, and time in the curriculum organization process. Processes are essential to how an organization operates, including those for allocating resources, making decisions, and planning. The third organizational factor; programs are designed to accomplish significant academic aims and objectives. Although in many curriculum development and evaluation models in the available literature, almost no attention is paid to the effects that may arise from the organizational element, in the Bellon and Handler model, the organizational focus area is essential in the development and improvement of a program. Bellon and Handler (1982) state that all educational programs may be improved and developed if proper attention is paid to the challenges that arise from an organizational element. In the organizational part, knowing the desired goals is an important step to take in improving the program.

The third focus area, *operations*, which corresponds to the educational situations or the learning-teaching process, aims to evaluate the decisions related to planned and unplanned learning experiences. The planned learning experience includes a designed curriculum and pre-determined outcomes, and the unplanned learning experience is what happens during the instruction (Bellon & Handler, 1982). The teaching process encompasses important activities implemented in transforming the planned curriculum into the actual program experienced by the students. Therefore, the evaluators should follow a careful evaluation process to ensure that content and skills are planned and applied effectively to meet the needs of learners. The operations focus area has a direct impact on the effectiveness of a program. Thus, reviews and

evaluations of the operations area allow teachers to acquire new and effective teaching strategies that they can use to improve students' learning.

The fourth focus area of a curriculum is *outcomes*. The outcomes are the program's effect on the participants and the educational context (Bellon & Handler, 1982). The literature reveals that most curriculum evaluation models emphasize evaluating a program's outcomes. However, according to Bellon and Handler (1982), the outcomes of a program should be evaluated and analyzed much more comprehensively. They suggest that not only the expected results of a program but also the unexpected ones should be considered while evaluating a program's effectiveness. These unexpected outcomes might affect the overall program's success positively or negatively. For example, a curriculum that enables the achievement of the desired goals may have a negative impact on students' motivation or attitudes. Evaluating the effect of program outcomes on other programs, the teachers and students and reviewing the processes implemented can provide more valid and reliable information for decision-making processes for future applications.

2.5.2.6.2.2. Status Descriptions

The second main component in Bellon and Handler's (1982) evaluation model is 'status descriptions.' They state that describing the current curriculum status is necessary while making curriculum improvement plans. The status description is a brief overview that enables the evaluator to collect information about an existing program's goals, organization, operations, and outcomes (Bellon & Handler, 1982). This collected information can provide a clear picture of a program's current situation in four main areas.

In the current status description, multiple means of data collection can be used, namely, document analysis, questionnaires, interviews, or needs analysis scale (Bellon & Handler, 1982). In the status description process, gathering information from different stakeholders of a curriculum such as teachers, students, administrators, curriculum and material development units and testing units can be very useful to reach different ideas and opinions. Through this process, program evaluators can determine which area should be given more attention or which areas should be given less importance while evaluating the program (Bellon & Handler, 1982).

2.5.2.6.2.3. Analysis Activities

Analysis of the current situation is the third main element of Bellon and Handler's (1982) evaluation model. When the current status of the program has been determined, activities to examine the worth and effectiveness of the current program can be put into practice. The gathered data about the program's objectives, organization, operation, and outputs are analyzed and evaluated to reveal the practices needed to improve the curriculum.

Data collection tools such as observations, interviews, questionnaires, tests, and attitude scales are the most commonly used methods to collect the necessary data in the analysis process of the model (Bellon & Handler, 1982). The differences between the desired results of the program and its current status, which emerged during the analysis of the current situation, allow it to be decided which steps to take to improve the program (Bellon & Handler, 1982). Some improvement and adjustments in any of the four focus areas may be suggested as a consequence of the interaction between the current status and analytical activities.

2.4.2.6.2.4. Cumulative Improvement Components

The last stage of Bellon and Handler's (1982) curriculum evaluation and improvement model is '*cumulative improvement components*'. Researchers or evaluators can suggest some improvements and adjustments that include any of the four main elements of the curriculum, with knowledge and determinations gained through the interaction of current status descriptions and current status analysis.

As Bellon and Handler (1982) say: "Four cumulative improvement components are used to represent the gradual development of a set of recommendations and action plans. Following each major area of analysis, a clearer picture of the desired curriculum is obtained" (p.21). To conclude, using a curriculum to improve the effectiveness of a program plays a crucial role in increasing students' language achievements in ESL inside and outside the classroom (Parkes & Harris, 2002).

In the literature, several scholars have advocated different program evaluation approaches, designed various program models, used diverse methods, developed their evaluation models with different purposes, asked many questions and followed some steps to evaluate and develop programs. These different approaches and models reviewed in the literature can be adapted or used directly to evaluate a course or curriculum (Yel, 2009).

Bellon and Handler's (1982) model is an appropriate model for use as a curriculum evaluation or development model since the model provides a comprehensive evaluation of a curriculum program focusing on the four main elements of a curriculum and also cumulative suggestions for each element for the improvement of the curriculum. The narrowed and course-level adapted version of the Bellon and Handler curriculum development and evaluation model has been conducted to evaluate the language curricula by many researchers. (Erdem, 1999; Erozan, 2005; Yel, 2009; Mutlu, 2018, Şişman, 2019; Tekir, 2020). The four focus areas of the model, namely (1) objectives, (2) organization, (3) operations, and (4) outcomes, were adapted by these researchers at the course level and arranged as (1) course aims and objectives, (2) course content and materials, (3) course conduct and (4) course assessment, respectively.

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the effectiveness of the English preparatory school curriculum at a private university and suggest recommendations for improvement of the current program for future implementations. For this purpose, an adaptation of Bellon and Handler's Model to a course level was used. In that sense, Bellon and Handler's (1982) comprehensive curriculum evaluation model was decreased into a course-level evaluation model to examine the specific components of a typical course. In this study, Bellon and Handler's (1982) evaluation and improvement model has been preferred to evaluate the current curriculum as the model enables the researcher to analyze the difference between the expected and the current status of the curriculum in each step while providing improvements and suggestions for the curriculum in four focus areas. In addition, Bellon and Handler's curriculum evaluation model allows systematic and in-depth research on the current curriculum (Bellon & Handler, 1982).

2.6. Curriculum Evaluation Studies in Language Teaching

2.6.1. The Curriculum Evaluation Studies Abroad

In addition to various curriculum evaluation approaches and models reviewed in the literature to provide a rich and comprehensive background of curriculum evaluation around the world, there have been some research studies examining the effectiveness of the language curriculum implemented in the programs.

Rolstad et al. (2005) conducted a meta-analysis study to examine to what extent the English as a foreign language (EFL) curriculum is effectively implemented primarily in K12

schools. The research compared English language learners with native speakers of English. The results show that bilingual education for English language learners (ELLs) is more effective than English-only approaches in increasing students' academic success in English. The other studies (Willig, 1985; Greene, 1998) support the effect of bilingual education, especially in reading and math, as Rolstad et al. (2005)

There have been other curriculum evaluation studies out of the Turkey context to evaluate the current language curriculum. (Ali, 2012; Sulaiman et al., 2017; Kanokpermpoon, 2019). Ali (2012) investigated how appropriate Bangladesh's national ELT curriculum is as a learner-centered program. The researcher conducted a case study and collected data through written and website documents to compare the curriculum with the learner-centered theory. The findings showed a mismatch between curriculum objectives and learner-centered theory, and therefore the desired goals of a program diverged from actual learning outcomes.

Sulaiman et al. (2017) examined the perspectives of language instructors on the new language curriculum of national primary schools in Malaysia. The design of the study was again a case study and the data were gathered through teacher interviews. The results showed that the new curriculum provided clear goals which enable the integration of different language skills in teaching and the use of authentic materials that can be used in everyday life outside the classroom. The teachers had positive viewpoints toward the new language curriculum.

Another case study to evaluate whether the thinking skills are taught effectively in the English program of a Tai university was employed by Kanokpermpoon (2019). The researcher used Bloom's taxonomy (1956) and active learning model as a research method to analyze the curriculum and textbooks through content analysis. The findings showed that lower-order thinking skills were more common than high-order thinking skills in the textbooks, in line with Razmjoo and Kazempourfard (2012), Sadeghi and Mahdipour (2015) and Zareinan et al. (2015). However, the critical thinking skills were limited in both curriculum objectives and textbooks.

The review of the available literature on language curriculum evaluation abroad shows that most of the evaluation studies employed a case study design to evaluate the English language curriculum of schools from different educational levels.

2.6.2. Curriculum Evaluation Studies in the Turkish Context

Curriculum evaluation studies have gained importance in Turkey in the last two decades. The underlying reason for this can be that voluntary or compulsory preparatory classes emerged in the beginning of the 21st century when the medium of instruction at the faculties and schools of most of the universities in Turkey became either completely (100%) or partially (30%) English (İnal & Aksoy, 2014). In addition to educational needs, the developments in many areas have led individuals to learn a foreign language to communicate (Tornberg, 2013), pursue proper employment or global studies and participate in more diverse cultures and social environments (Skolverket, 2011). Therefore, the literature analyzed in the following focuses on the studies carried out in the last two decades to identify the recent problems causing the inefficacy of English preparatory programs, evaluate the curriculum program, and give some suggestions for the improvement of it.

The review of available literature exposed that there were scarcely a few studies conducted in curriculum development in language teaching before 2000. The studies mainly focused on needs analysis in the preparatory school curriculum of different universities to determine the needs of students, teachers, or program administrators or to evaluate the curriculum of English by comparing the needs with the curriculum outcomes (Yılmaz, 2004; Kar, 2014; Ulum, 2015; Akkuş, 2019; Gürler, 2018; Gündüz, 2018; Uçar, 2020).

On the other hand, several curriculum evaluation studies have investigated the effectiveness and success of the English Preparatory programs using different evaluation methods. Some of these evaluation studies were conducted by Erdem (1999), Erozan (2005), Özkana (2009), Yel (2009), Tunç (2010), Bayram (2011), Coşkun (2013), Inal and Aksoy (2014), Tekin (2015), Akpur, Alcı and Karataş (2016), Akpur, (2017), Mutlu (2018), Uysal (2019), Şişman (2019), Aktaş and Gündoğdu (2020), Kuzu (2020), Tekir (2020), Ayçiçek (2021), Taş & Khan (2021) and Gülsat (2021).

Some studies did not use any specific curriculum evaluation models in order to examine the effectiveness of the curriculum and suggested a new model after the evaluation, such as Özkana (2009) and Coşkun (2013). Bloom's program evaluation model (Inal & Aksoy, 2014), Peacock's evaluation model to evaluate the ELT curriculum (Zorba, 2015), Stake's Responsive evaluation model (Kaya, 2018), Richards' background design (Akdağ, 2018), Alkin's UCLA evaluation model (Gülsat, 2021) are some of the rarely used curriculum evaluation designs used in language education. The scholars who employed Stufflebeam's CIPP evaluation model to

examine the effectiveness of the English preparatory curriculum are Tunç (2010), Bayram (2011), Özdoruk (2016), Akpur et al. (2016), Özüdođru (2017), Ödemiş (2018) and Kuzu (2020).

The evaluation model of the current study, the adapted version of the Bellon and Handler Curriculum Evaluation Model, was used previously by some scholars, namely, Erdem (1999), Erozan (2005), Yel (2009), Mutlu (2018), Aktaş (2018), Aktaş and Gündođdu (2020), Şişman (2019), Tekir (2020).

The literature shows that the evaluation studies are mainly qualitative and quantitative. The researchers sometimes used mixed methods and rarely used experimental models to evaluate the language curriculum (Gökmenođlu, 2014). The studies used multiple data collection tools such as questionnaires, interviews, document analysis, and observations. The participants of the studies are mostly the students studying in the program and the teachers implementing the curriculum. In addition to teachers and students, the perspectives of other stakeholders, namely, administrators, testing units, curriculum evaluators, material developers, the lecturers from other departments, are taken into account in some studies to provide in-depth and objective information about the current curriculum (Aktaş, 2018; Özdoruk, 2016; Aktaş & Gündođdu; 2020).

The findings of the evaluation studies are as follows:

In the doctoral thesis of Erozan (2005), the researcher evaluated and made suggestions for the improvement of the undergraduate curriculum of the English Language Teaching Department by applying an adapted version of the Bellon and Handler evaluation model to the course level through evaluation questionnaires, interviews, observations, and document analysis. The study findings showed that authentic materials were not used much during the lessons, and there was not enough diversity in methods and activities. Continuity and coherence among courses need to be strengthened.

Yel (2009) examined the effectiveness of the language program at a high school level by applying an evaluation model, which was an adapted version of Bellon and Handler's and Brown's evaluation model by the researcher. The course evaluation scales were applied to the high school students and 20 language instructors to collect the data. The results determined that the course content and the materials were not interesting for the students. The program is insufficient to achieve the goals. Most of the activities are not student-centered, there were not

enough communicative activities, and the evaluation methods used are inadequate to assess students' desired learning outcomes stated the curriculum goals.

Tunç (2010) found out that the program at Ankara University Preparatory School was effective to some extent. The results showed that to increase the program's effectiveness, changes had to be made to the program's physical surroundings, its content, its resources, and its assessment criteria.

According to the study conducted by Bayram (2011) to evaluate the viewpoints of the students and teachers at the English Preparatory Curriculum at TOBB University of Economics and Technology, teachers' opinions tend to be more positive than that of the students.

The findings of a study conducted by Inal and Aksoy (2014) to analyze the Çankaya University Preparatory School curriculum support the same suggestion by Coşkun (2013). They suggested adding academic English courses to the program to prepare the students for their departments. Both the students and lecturers stated that speaking and listening activities are inadequate in the content. One of the topics that the students were dissatisfied with was that there were not enough student-centered exercises in the lessons. The instructors stated that methods such as role-playing and group work did not run to the desired level due to inadequate physical conditions.

Ulum (2015) analyzed the needs of students in a preparatory program at an English Language Teaching Department. The study aimed to identify the student needs for speaking skills. Unlike previous studies, the researcher chose the students studying in different grades. At the end of the study, the researcher concluded that there should be additional materials for speaking courses and more authentic activities for students.

In her master's thesis, Özdoruk (2016) evaluated the English Preparatory Curriculum of Yıldırım Beyazıt University School of Foreign Languages from the perspectives of instructors, students, and program development and testing unit. Results of the study indicated that the program was planned to develop the students' English skills but could not achieve this goal. Therefore, improvement of the program is necessary to develop students' listening and speaking skills. Some of the instructors mentioned the technological problems and inadequacy of extra course materials, which led the course to be book guided and monotonous.

Akpur, Alcı, and Karataş (2016) also evaluated the English preparatory class curriculum at Yıldız Teknik University. The findings showed that equal time should be allocated in the

curriculum for teaching each skill, the audio-visual materials used in the course are insufficient, and the learning environment does not provide enough collaboration and group work opportunities. According to the findings of the study, the researcher concluded that The opinions of the teachers and students regarding the other components of the instruction program, aside from the context, are not significant.

In her evaluation study, Özüdoğru (2017) assessed how effective the voluntary English Preparatory Program at Uşak University was by using CIPP model. The context evaluation revealed that neither the students nor instructors were content with the physical conditions of the school. However, the results indicated that vocabulary teaching, speaking and writing skills were not taught effectively enough and should be emphasized more sufficiently in the preparatory programs. It was also found that the most frequently teaching method used in the program was lecturing. In addition, the students had highly positive attitudes towards their language instructors. The students do not perceive themselves to be as competent in vocabulary, speaking, and writing as the stated in the curriculum's objectives.

In another case study conducted by Şişman (2019), an adapted version of the Bellon and Handler model was used to evaluate and improve the English preparatory school curriculum. The data were gathered through course evaluation questionnaires, achievement scales, student and instructor interviews and document analysis. The findings of the study illustrated that the program was not effective enough to enable the students to achieve the target learning goals, the course materials were insufficient, and the program did not provide enough student-centered learning environment. The assessment tools were insufficient to assess and show the actual language competency of the students.

Aktaş and Gündoğdu (2020) conducted a case study to evaluate how successful the English preparatory curriculum at Aydın Adnan Menderes University was. The study was designed as a “case study” and Bellon and Handler (1982) curriculum evaluation model was used as a research model to evaluate the curriculum. The findings revealed that there was no philosophy in the English preparatory curriculum. Though the students were motivated enough to learn English, at the end of the training, they were unable to achieve the desired level of language proficiency. The results showed that the lack of defined and pre-established goals and objectives for the program made it impossible to develop its many components (material, activities, and assessment). Insufficient physical facilities are another area that needs improvement. The results also demonstrated that although it was felt that communication

between the lecturer and the students was good, there should be better contact between the administration and other stakeholders. Low participation from the professors and students during the decision-making process resulted in misunderstandings. There were no extra-class activities or variety of activities. Equal importance should be given to teaching skills, especially speaking and listening. It was shown that although students initially had a high degree of willingness and motivation to learn English, this motivation decreased as a result of the grammar- and teacher-centered teaching methods. There were also some problems in the assessment which needed improvement.

Kuzu (2020) conducted an evaluation study by using Staflebeam's CIPP model to evaluate an English preparatory program. The data were collected through semi-structured interviews, questionnaires and document analysis. The participants were the students studying in the preparatory program, language instructors and two administrator-instructors. The findings showed that the participants were generally content with the effectiveness of the language program. The students mentioned that there was a strong communication between the students and instructors. However, it was found that there was a need for improvement in in-service training for instructors and in improving the motivation level of the participants. The students also complained about the early start of the presentations and suggested postponing oral presentations to the following weeks.

Tekir (2020) carried out a case study to evaluate and improve the English preparatory school curriculum and applied the adapted version of Bellon and Handler's evaluation model. The data were gathered through document analysis, course evaluation questionnaires, interviews and class observations. The results of the study indicated that more importance should be given to teaching listening and speaking skills. Some of the materials and textbooks are not proper for students' language proficiency.

Gülsat (2021) also evaluated English preparatory school curriculum using Alkin's UCLA model. Questionnaires and interviews were used as data collection tools. The questionnaires were applied to preparatory school students, the interviews were conducted with language instructors working at preparatory school and faculty lecturers teaching English medium instruction at the university. The results of the study illustrated that the participants generally had a positive attitude towards the language instructors and materials used in the program. However, there was a need for improvement in the content, books used for skill courses and the assessment procedures of the program. It was also concluded that the program

was not effective enough to enable the students to follow their departmental studies in English Medium instruction.

The effectiveness of the preparatory curriculum program can be evaluated in four dimensions; goals, materials, course conduct and evaluation. Some of the interpretations of the evaluation studies reviewed in the literature are as follows:

The results regarding the objectives and aims of the course are as follows: Curriculum outcomes did not meet students' predetermined/desired objectives. In other words, the course materials, methods, and conduct are insufficient to enable the learners to achieve the desired learning outcomes at the end of a program (Erozan, 2005; Coşkun, 2013; İnal & Aksoy, 2014; Özüdoğru, 2017; Şişman, 2019; Tekir, 2020).

The findings regarding the course materials and course conduct are: Both the students and instructors complain about the physical conditions of the teaching environment. The technological devices were inadequate in the classroom and the classrooms were small. (Tunç, 2010; Inal & Aksoy, 2014; Akpur et al. 2016; Özüdoğru 2017; Aktaş & Gündoğdu, 2020). The students and sometimes language instructors stated that speaking and listening activities and materials are not used enough in the teaching-learning process (Yılmaz, 2004; İnal & Aksoy, 2014; Ulum, 2015; Özdoruk, 2016; Akpur et al., 2016; Akpur, 2017; Özudoğru, 2017, Aktaş & Gündoğdu, 2020; Tekir, 2020). Therefore, teaching time for productive (writing and speaking) and receptive (listening and reading) skills should be balanced in the language teaching process (Akpur et al., 2016; Özüdoğru, 2017, Aktaş & Gündoğdu, 2020) In addition, some students think that the content and the materials are limited and boring. The course conduct is monotonous (Yel, 2009; Tunç, 2010; Ulum, 2015, Özdoruk, 2016). More diverse, authentic and interesting activities should be implemented in the curriculum (Erozan, 2005; Ulum, 2015, Özdoruk, 2016). The audiovisual materials were inadequate (Akpur et al., 2016). The learning environment does not provide collaboration (Akpur et al., 2016) and student-centered activities (Erdem, 1999; Yel, 2009; Inal & Aksoy, 2014). Özüdoğru (2017) also stated that lecturing was the most frequently used teaching method. The results of the evaluation studies reveal that the language curriculum should provide more opportunities to facilitate a more communicative, collaborative, and student-centered learning environment for the students (Erdem, 1999; Yel, 2009).

The findings regarding the assessment/evaluation of students' success are as follows: Some studies showed that the language program is insufficient to reach the target goals (Yel,

2009; Şişman, 2019), while others showed that the language curriculum is effective in general (Erozan, 2005). The assessment tools are not suitable for assessing students' learning outcomes (Erozan, 2005; Yel, 2009; Tunç, 2010). The assessment tools should be improved so that the program can be implemented more effectively (Yel, 2009; Tunç, 2010; Mutlu, 2018). In addition, it is stated that the content of the language curriculum is not compatible with the English that students will need in the departments they will study. Academic English lessons should be included in the program to prepare the students for their departments (Coşkun, 2013; Inal & Aksoy, 2014; Gülsat, 2021). To conclude, full collaboration and communication is needed among the program developers, the course instructors, the student and teachers throughout all dimensions of the curriculum implementation and evaluation process to attain success in the program (Mede & Akyel, 2014, Aktaş & Gündoğdu, 2020).

In this section, the available literature has been reviewed and discussed in detail to shed light on the evaluation studies done in language curriculum especially, at a preparatory school context. The following section will give some information about the methodology of the current study.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

The purpose of the current study is to explore the present situation of the aforementioned preparatory school curriculum at Alanya HEP University from the students' and language instructors' point of view, document analysis and classroom observations and provide solutions and recommendations to the weaknesses in the field.

In this section, information about the design of the study, participants and settings of the study, data collection instruments, data collection procedure and analysis are given.

3.2. Design of the Study

The current evaluation study has been designed as a formative curriculum evaluation study to evaluate the English preparatory curriculum of Alanya Hamdullah Emin Paşa University. A sequential mixed methods case study approach has been applied as its methodology through the use of quantitative and qualitative methods successively. For this purpose, an adapted version of Bellon and Handler's (1982) program evaluation model by Erozan (2005) has been used.

A case study is a detailed investigation of a particular complex and unique institution, program or system from different aspects in a real-life context. Multiple methods are used and the main aim of the study is to enable the researcher to understand a complicated phenomenon in depth (Simons, 2009). In a case study, the scenario is limited to a single unit, such as a class, a school, a case, or an event (Mertens, 2014) and the detailed data are gathered through various data collection tools over a "sustained period of time" (Creswell, 2014, p.14). In this study, problems of Alanya HEP University English preparatory curriculum were taken as a case and the limited situation was analyzed using student questionnaires, student and teacher interviews, document analysis and observations.

A mixed method case study design is defined as a kind of mixed methods design to collect in-depth information about a unique case by using both qualitative and quantitative data

collection instruments with findings (Creswell & Plano Clarke, 2018). In a sequential mixed methods case study approach, the process of the qualitative and quantitative study is done in order (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998; Creswell, 2003; Mertens 2014). This study was built on a case study and aimed to reach qualitative and quantitative data to evaluate the current preparatory curriculum of a private university in order to provide some suggestions for future implementations. As reviewed in the related literature, qualitative and quantitative approaches can be used together as research techniques in case studies (Sturman, 1994).

A variety of data collection instruments are employed in the present study in order to get more precise and decent results. As Patton (2001) suggests, to reduce the shortcomings of any single approach, utilizing various data gathering sources such as interviews, questionnaires, document analysis and observations empowers the researcher or the evaluator to cross-validate the results. In other words, triangulation reinforces a study by blending a variety of data collection techniques; subsequently, Patton (2001) claims that using a triangulation approach in research improves the validity and reliability of the evaluation conducted. In this regard, in this evaluation study triangulation design has been used by gathering qualitative data in multiple sources such as interviews, document analysis and observations as the aim was to “obtain different but complementary data on the same topic” (Morse, 1991, p. 122).

Considering the questions that the current research seeks to answer, Bellon and Handler's (1982) curriculum evaluation model was found to be the most appropriate model for its implementation and adaptation among other curriculum evaluation models reviewed in the literature since this curriculum evaluation model allows the researcher to make an in-depth formative evaluation and generate some suggestions and recommendations for each main focus areas of the curriculum which are the course aims and objectives, the course content and materials, course conduct, and assessment and student performance. Bellon and Handler's (1982) program evaluation model also aims to reach suggestions for improvement and development of the program by analyzing the current status of the program which leads the researcher to employ this model to evaluate the current curriculum.

In the current study, an adapted version of Bellon and Handler (1982) model by Erozan (2005) has been used in order to evaluate the preparatory school curriculum. Erozan (2005) made some changes to the Bellon and Handler (1982) model to adapt the evaluation model to the context of the study and current case. On this basis, the researcher has restricted the broader curriculum evaluation level to the fundamental course evaluation level to be able to examine

the specific units of an English course in the program. Erozan (2005) changed four focus areas in the original Bellon and Handler (1982) model, which were (a) goals, (b) organization, (c) operations and (d) outcomes, respectively to (a) course aims and objectives, (b) the course content and materials, (c) the course conduct (teaching-learning process) and (d) assessment and student performance. Therefore, to be able to evaluate the specific and basic units of the current preparatory school curriculum in detail, the adapted version of the Bellon and Handler model (1982) by Erozan (2005) has been used in the current study.

In the first research question corresponding to *the status descriptions* element, which is the first stage of the Bellon and Handler (1982) evaluation model, the current status of the elements of four main focus areas of the curriculum has been determined by analyzing the opinions of the students and teachers, document analysis and observations.

In the second and third research questions, which correspond with the second stage of the Bellon and Handler (1982) evaluation model (i.e. “*analysis activities*”), an analysis of the four main focus areas of the curriculum was made in line with the opinions of the students and teachers, and observations.

Finally, in the fourth research question of the current study, it was attempted to determine what needs to be done to improve the curriculum in line with the suggestions and recommendations made by the teachers and students for each focus area of the curriculum in parallel with the *cumulative improvement components* of the Bellon and Handler (1982) evaluation model.

3.3. Participants and Settings of the Study

The present study was conducted at an English preparatory school of a private university located in Antalya, Turkey, in the second term of the 2021-2022 academic year. The study group consisted of the students and teachers of the preparatory school. 64 students; 23 female and 41 male, participated in the questionnaire. The total number of the students registered in the program was 85, but almost 20 students dropped out of school due to various reasons. Six students and five teachers participated in interviews. Interviews with the teachers were conducted in English which did not cause any communication problems. On the other hand, the interviews with the students were conducted in Turkish in order to reduce the possible misunderstandings or communication problems due to low language proficiency. The aim of

the preparatory program is to improve the students' English language competency level to upper intermediate level which is equivalent to B1+ level according to CEFR (i.e. Common European Framework of Reference) by the end of the academic year. The students studying in the preparatory program study English for 30 hours a week to achieve this goal. They take 18-hour Integrated Skills (PIS-101), 6-hour Listening and Speaking (PLS-101), and 6-hour Reading and Writing courses (PRW-101). The course instructors have the right to make asynchronous courses 3 hours for PIS (101) and 2 hours each for PLS (101) and PRW (101) in a week. The asynchronous lessons are done on the university's learning management systems (LMS). The instructors give some assignments for these hours and students' assignments are graded as their attendance during these hours. The language proficiency level of the students differed from elementary to an intermediate level according to CEFR at the time when the data were gathered.

For questionnaires, as the current study has been designed as a case study, no sampling method has been used. The research population is the students enrolled at Alanya HEP University School of Foreign Languages Preparatory Program in the 2021-2022 academic year.

The interviews were administered to 6 selected students and 5 selected instructors. For the interviews, the purposive sampling method which is a form of non-probability sampling method was used to select "information-rich" (Patton, 2001) participants who meet particular criteria by playing a particular role or possessing some specific experience in the program (Palinkas et al., 2015). Due to their "representative roles," some specific students and instructors were chosen selectively to get comprehensive and various information to evaluate the curriculum in-depth. In this respect, 6 students were selectively chosen as representatives according to the various criteria such as gender, classes, their regular attendance to the courses and language proficiency level by consulting the teacher-advisors of each class. Among three classes, the most regular 3 male and 3 female students (3 of whose language proficiency is lower and 3 of whose language proficiency is higher) were chosen as the representatives of the whole preparatory school students.

Teachers were also chosen through the purposive sampling method. The selected instructors each had different years of experience in different units of the program in addition to teaching such as testing, material development, curriculum development and administration. What skills they were teaching and the number of years of teaching experience of the instructors were also taken into consideration. Five selected teachers participated in the interviews according to the criteria mentioned previously.

3.4. Data Collection Instruments

As reviewed in the available literature in order to get in-depth information to evaluate a specific language curriculum, a mixed methods case study design was suggested (Fitzpatrick et al., 2004; Erozan, 2005; Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2016; Mutlu, 2018; Aktaş, 2018; Tekir, 2020) and adaptation of Bellon and Handler (1982) curriculum evaluation model was used (Erozan, 2005; Mutlu, 2018; Aktaş, 2018; Tekir, 2020). In a mixed method case study, both quantitative and qualitative data collection tools such as questionnaires, interviews, document analysis and observations are employed to aid triangulation. In the present study both quantitative and qualitative data collection instruments were used. Quantitative data were collected through the program evaluation questionnaire while qualitative data were generated through document analysis, interviews and lesson observations. Detailed information about the data collection tools used to obtain quantitative and qualitative data in the research is given in this section.

3.4.1. Document Analysis

Document analysis is a qualitative research method used to examine the common written and electronic documents in the field of study (Krippendorff, 1980). Like other qualitative research methods, it entails the inspection and evaluation of data in order to judge, gain insight, and acquire knowledge about a specific issue (Corbin & Strauss, 2008).

In the current study analysis of the written and online documents was conducted to describe the current status of the program as the first step of Bellon and Handler's (1982) curriculum evaluation model; "status description". The documents were analysed to identify the current status of the preparatory school curriculum on the basis of four main areas of the research method; course aims and objectives, course content and materials, course conduct and student assessment. The objective in this section is to provide an overview of the current program including the main focus points of curriculum: aims and objectives, course content, course conduct and student assessment. By analyzing written and electronic documents used in the program based on four main elements of the research model, the researcher aimed to answer the first research question of the study.

The documents analysed in the study are the skill-based program curriculum, the course syllabi, the student handbook, Alanya HEP University School of Foreign Languages website, the university learning management system (LMS). To analyse these documents a framework

was prepared taking into consideration the main points of curriculum in the research method which are stated in the literature as course aims and objectives, course content and materials, course conduct and student assessment. Each document was analysed in terms of these four main titles and the data collected from document analysis aimed to describe the current status of the preparatory school curriculum. The detailed information about the written and online documents to be analyzed in the current study is given in the following subheadings.

The skill-based program curriculum: In this curriculum, the aims and objectives of each preparatory school course are determined comprehensively. Detailed information about the content, the evaluation components, the exam schedule, and the program duration are mentioned in the skill-based curriculum. The skill-based curriculum is not shared with the students.

The course syllabi: The current preparatory program consists of three-course syllabi regarding the three courses instructed: PIS - 101, PLS -101, and PRW -101 for each semester. Each syllabus includes information about the course instructors' contact details (name, email address, office number, and office hours), course aims and objectives, learning outcomes, course materials, grading (evaluation components, course policies, and weekly detailed course content. These syllabi are shared with the students as a soft copy on the school's LMS system.

The students' handbook: This handbook is designed to inform the students about the preparatory school policy and shared with them during the orientation week as a hard or soft copy in the SFL website or LMS system. The students' handbook includes detailed information about the vision and mission of the school of foreign languages preparatory program, the objectives, organization chart, units and coordinators, weekly course hours, weekly schedule, the textbook list, English preparatory program counselling system, student-instructor interview hours, course attendance, a proficiency exam, placement test, exemption, exam rules, some strategies about how to be successful in the program, HepActive student club, social and cultural activities, some facilities and contact details. The handbook is given in Turkish for the Turkish students and English for international students.

School of Foreign Languages Website: The website of the SFL consists of information about the mission, vision, and main objectives of the preparatory school, administration, academic staff, organization chart, academic studies, units (curriculum, testing, professional development

and academic and social activities unit), HepActive unit, student's guide, academic calendar, course content, timetables, exemption conditions, proficiency exam, placement test and assessment test. You can reach the website here: <https://ydyo.alanyahep.edu.tr/en>

School Learning Management System (LMS): LMS is a learning management system that provides an online platform for the students to access the necessary information about the preparatory school program details. During Covid 19 cases, the online synchronous courses are done in the school's LMS system. The assignments, weekend homework, tasks, and projects are also assigned to the students through this system. The students submit their assignments on this system. The students use the forum section for discussions and writing tasks. The preparatory school LMS system also consists of information about the weekly course schedule, timetables, the weekly course contents, the syllabus, evaluation criteria, additional course resources, calendar, and course materials. The website link to University LMS <https://lms.alanyahep.edu.tr/portal/site/!gateway/tool/!gateway-110>

3.4.2. Questionnaire

An evaluation instrument called "Course Evaluation Questionnaire" was used to obtain information based on student opinions on the four main focus areas of the English preparatory school curriculum program; (a) course aims and objectives, (b) course content and materials, (c) course conduct, and (d) student assessment.

The course evaluation questionnaire adapted by Tekir (2020) was used in this study in order to determine the characteristics of the learning environment of the English preparatory regarding four focus areas: course aims and objectives, course content and materials, course conduct and student assessment. The questionnaire was originally developed by Erozan (2005) to evaluate the undergraduate English Language Teaching (ELT) curriculum in English and Turkish. Tekir (2020) adapted the questionnaire to evaluate the English preparatory school curriculum, changed some questions, added new ones and omitted some items from the original one. As the aim of the current study was to evaluate the preparatory school curriculum, the questionnaire adapted by Tekir (2020) was used in the study. However, she did not need to translate them into English as her research group all consisted of Turkish students. Therefore, the questionnaire was translated from Turkish into English by the current researcher to avoid the misunderstanding of the items by international students. In order to determine the content

validity of the translation, two expert opinions were taken. Two experts, one in the field of English Translation and Interpretation Program, and the other in the field of English Language Teaching performed the translation and back-translation to evaluate and decide on the last version of the questionnaire. The last English version of the questionnaire was compared with the one designed by Erozan (2005).

The Turkish version of the evaluation questionnaire (Appendix 1) was completed by the Turkish students while the English version (Appendix 2) was implemented by international ones. The Turkish version of the questionnaire was implemented for the Turkish students to avoid misunderstandings of the items included.

The current survey was used as it enables the researcher to get rich data on students' perspectives on the language program on each main component of the curriculum. The questionnaire is subdivided into 5 headings each evaluating a specific focus area of the curriculum. They are 1. general background, 2. course aims and objectives, 3. course content and materials, 4. course conduct and 5. assessment and student performance respectively. Each item was given a five-point Likert type scale ranging from '5' to '1'; '5' referring to 'strongly agree', 4 referring to 'agree', 3 referring to 'not sure', 2 referring to 'disagree' and 1 referring to 'strongly disagree'.

In the first section of the questionnaire, there are 4 items that ask about the students' age, gender, the high school they graduated from, and their department to obtain information about students' background. The second section includes 11 items with some sub-items, and it is related to the course aims and objectives focus element of the research model. Desired skills to be achieved were subdivided into 8 titles: writing, reading, listening, speaking, grammar, vocabulary, independent learning skills and critical thinking skills. Participants were asked to evaluate to what extent the goals and objectives of the course were achieved in their current situation on a Likert-type scale from "5" to "1". Within the scope of the current study, the reliability statistics of the second questionnaire regarding to course aims and objectives was found as .95 ($\alpha=.96$)

The third section consists of 13 items (C1-C13) created to obtain data about the course content and materials focus element of the research model. Participants were requested to evaluate how effective the course content and materials used in the program were in facilitating students' language learning. Within the scope of the present study, the reliability statistics of the third questionnaire regarding to content of the curriculum was measured as .89 ($\alpha=.89$).

The fourth section of the questionnaire focused on course conduct (i.e. teaching-learning process) with two subsections. The first subsection aimed to evaluate how often teaching activities and methods were used in the preparatory school program. To this end, the students were asked to indicate the frequency of the use of each activity type in the courses as “always”, “frequently”, “sometimes”, “rarely” and “never”. In the current study, the reliability statistics of the fourth questionnaire regarding to methods and activities used in the program was measured as .84 ($\alpha=.84$). The second subsection contained 14 items and aimed to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of the teaching-learning process. In the scope of the current study, Cronbach’s Alpha of the second subsection of the fourth questionnaire regarding the learning and teaching progress of the program was found .90 ($\alpha=.90$).

The fifth and the last section of the questionnaire consisted of 17 items (P1-P17) in order to obtain data about the student assessment focus element of the research model. Participants were requested to evaluate the assessment system in used to measure students’ performance in the preparatory program. In the current study, the reliability statistics of the fifth questionnaire regarding the assessment of the program was found as .90 ($\alpha=0.90$)

3.4.3. Interviews

Interviews are the most frequently used qualitative data collection methods to obtain in-depth information about a specific issue or case (Mason, 2002; Talmy, 2010). In other words, interviews may be utilized as the primary technique of collecting rich information which is relevant to the research goals (Cohen et al., 2007). They are commonly used to acquire detailed data about the backgrounds of respondents, thoughts, viewpoints, and comprehension of a particular phenomenon (Burns, 2009). The interview can provide detailed answers to the research questions and clarify any misunderstandings that may arise as a result of the analysis of questionnaires. Interviews can be divided into three types: structured interviews, semi-structured interviews, and unstructured interviews.

In the current study, semi-structured interviews were conducted with six students and five instructors. Semi-structured interviews are conducted by following a flexible interview protocol which enables the researcher to ask some follow-up questions to get access to in-depth and richer information about the respondents’ opinions or ideas on a specific topic instead of asking structured and preset questions (Nunan, 1992). The semi-structured interviews employed in the current study aimed to make the respondents evaluate the program and make

suggestions for the improvement and development of the current program. In addition to the four main points of the program evaluation research model; course aims and objectives, course content and materials, course conduct, and student assessment, an overall evaluation sub-title was added to interviews to acquire general suggestions for the improvement of the current program.

For the objectives of this study, the semi-structured interview form was adapted from Erozan (2005), by omitting some questions and combining others. The interviews questions were formulated regarding the four main focus areas of the research model after reviewing the literature and a sample interview form consisting of guiding questions to be used during the interviews was prepared (see Appendix 3, 4, 5). Interviews were administered to the students and course instructors. For Turkish students, the Turkish version of the students' interviews (see Appendix 3) and for the international students, the English version of the interviews (see Appendix 4) were administered. The interviews with the course instructors were held in English (see Appendix 5). The interviews consisted of 26 questions in total with 6 subtitles; 6 for the course aims and objectives, 5 for course content and materials, 5 for course conduct, 5 for student assessment and 3 for overall evaluation.

3.4.4. Observations

In addition to document analysis, questionnaires and student and teacher interviews, class observations were made to aid triangulation of the study for validity and reliability of the current study (Fraenkel and Wallen, 2005). 6 class observations were conducted in 4 different classes of the current preparatory program to watch the real teaching-learning environment and process. As there were three different courses conducted in the program, two observations in different classes were done for each course to improve the reliability of the observation results. The observations were made in the spring term of the 2021-2022 academic term for two months.

In each observation, a different language instructor teaching different skills was observed to evaluate the current status of the program in four main focus areas. Before the observations, each instructor was informed about the purpose of the observation in general. The proper observation dates were scheduled by the observer and the instructor together.

Course aims and objectives, course content and materials, teaching-learning process, teacher-student and student-student relation and evaluation or the feedback were observed in a real-life environment during the observations. An observation form was prepared to be used

during the classroom observations on the basis of these elements. The observation form (Appendix 6) was filled out with the information about materials and methods used, the activities done and the student and instructor roles during the observations as well.

3.5. Data Collection Procedure

In the current study, data were collected through document analysis, course evaluation questionnaires, interviews, and course observations.

In order to describe the current status of the program considering four main elements of the research model, written and electronic documents used in the program such as the school of foreign languages website, university Learning Management System (LMS), preparatory school curriculum and syllabi and student handbooks, course books, tasks, and progress evaluation exams (PEE) were analyzed and examined. The document analysis process was conducted between December 2021 and January 2022. After defining the current status of the course, a program evaluation questionnaire designed by Tekir (2020) was applied to 64 students out of 85 enrolled in the program in the spring semester of the 2021-2022 academic year. 21 students dropped out of school due to various reasons. The course evaluation questionnaires, which took twenty minutes on average, were applied to the students after the third PEE (Process Evaluation Exam) in April. After the questionnaires, interviews were also conducted with 6 of the students participating in the research in the last two weeks of April. After completing the interviews with students, interviews were also held with 5 SFL teachers teaching at the institution in the 2021-2022 academic year in May 2022. These interviews were audio-recorded with the permission of the students and instructors. The length of each interview ranged from 40 to 50 minutes. Afterward, the interviews were listened to and transcribed by the researcher. The interviews with the students were made in Turkish in order to reduce the possible misunderstandings or communication problems due to low language proficiency. During the second semester, 6 lesson observations were also carried out in four of the preparatory school classrooms. The observer sat at the back of the classroom without making any noise and filled out the observation form during the observations. The lessons took 50 minutes. The students were informed about the observation by their course instructors an hour before the observations were made. As the students were used to being observed during the classes due to some professional development studies of the instructors, and the teacher-researcher was already teaching at the preparatory school and the students knew her well, the learners were relaxed and

comfortable during the observations. The researcher also collected copies of course materials and assessment instruments such as grading rubrics, quizzes, tasks and projects from different course instructors.

3.6. Data Analysis

In the current study, which was designed as a case study, multiple data collection instruments were used such as document analysis, questionnaires, interviews, and class observations to improve the reliability and validity of the study by applying triangulation (Patton, 2001). In this section, the analysis of each data collection tool will be presented.

3.6.1. Quantitative

In the study, program evaluation questionnaires applied to the students were analyzed and interpreted with the descriptive analysis method. The descriptive analysis method can be defined as the organization, classification, comparison of qualitative data, and summarizing with a holistic understanding (Cohen et al., 2007). The questionnaire questions were analyzed by means of descriptive statistics and the SPSS version of 23 was utilized to analyze the Likert scale data by presenting the frequencies and means for each item.

3.6.2. Qualitative

The interviews obtained from the students and SFL teachers in the research were evaluated by a content analysis method. Content analysis is a frequently used analysis method in the field of social sciences, especially in educational studies (Neuendorf, 2017; Loomis et al., 2022). The main objective of content analysis studies is to guide further academic studies within the scope of the subject discussed and to determine the general trend related to the subject. Content analysis can be conducted in three different methods: Meta-analysis, meta-synthesis (thematic content analysis) and descriptive content analysis (Çalık & Sözbilir, 2014).

Before analyzing the data obtained from student and teacher interviews, the written and electronic documents were analyzed. Descriptive analysis was used to analyze those documents. After coding the data, a thematic framework was prepared based on the curriculum evaluation research model developed by Bellon and Handler (1982) used in the current study. While preparing the framework the key themes and sub-themes were also created regarding the

four main focus areas of the research model: course aims and objectives, course content and materials, course conduct and student assessment. Then the obtained and coded data from the document were processed into the framework and analysed according to four main components of curriculum evaluation model reviewed in the literature. Lastly, the findings were described and interpreted. The data obtained from the documents were coded as DA, DB, DC, DD, and DE, referring to skill-based curriculum, course syllabi, student handbooks, school of foreign languages website, and university learning management system (LMS) respectively. The data obtained from the documents to describe the assessment criteria and the content of the exams were coded as E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, E6, E7 and E8, referring to PIS quiz, PIS project, PLS listening quiz, PLS speaking task, PRW reading task or quiz, PRW writing task, progress evaluation exams (PEE) and proficiency exam respectively. The findings obtained from the document analysis aim to answer the first research question of the study by describing the current situation of the English preparatory program on the basis of four main focus areas of the research model. The coding checks of the document analysis was done by two lecturer who are expert in the field of qualitative studies.

In order to examine the answers received from the students and course instructors during the interviews, a content analysis was made. Yıldırım and Şimşek (2016) stated that the data organized with descriptive document analysis should be examined in more depth with content analysis. By conducting content analysis, concepts and themes that were not noticed during the descriptive analysis can be revealed and the concepts and facts that remain hidden in the data can be determined (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2016). The descriptive document analysis made previously, and the four main focus areas of the evaluation model used in the study shaped the framework of the analysis of the interviews. Firstly, the recorded interviews were transcribed, and the answers given by the Turkish students were translated into English. In order to collect and evaluate the codings holistically, an interview analysis chart was prepared by the researcher. The student and teacher answers were examined in detail. The obtained data were coded regarding the evaluation and suggestions made for the four main points of the research, the course aims and objectives, the course content and materials, course conduct, and student assessment, and then the themes were identified. The answers received from the participants were examined in detail and a descriptive analysis was made by quoting the answers given by the participants within the themes created under the four main focus areas of the research study. After the analysis, these themes and the answers given in the data arrangements were examined in detail and the researcher created re-themes in order to examine the views of the students and

instructors on the current English preparatory program in depth. The categorization of the codes was done and decided how they fitted on the coding frame. The themes which came up the most and the least were identified, and the ones mostly used were used as a code to classify the themes. The coding checks of the interviews were done by two experts in the field of qualitative studies. The answers of the six students were coded as SA, SB, SC, SD, SE, and SF while the answers of the five instructors were coded as TA, TB, TC, TD, and TE.

As a last qualitative data analysis procedure, six classroom observations made in the second semester of the academic year were analyzed with descriptive content analysis. Observations can provide reliable data to support the findings obtained from document analysis and interviews and enable the researcher to observe the real-time learning environment (Patton, 1990). In this respect, in order to aid the triangulation of the data obtained from the document and interview analysis, the classroom observations were analyzed. An observation form was prepared on the basis of four main areas specified in the evaluation model. The data gathered from all observations were grouped under these main focus areas. The key themes and sub-themes from the observer notes taken on the observation form were taken into consideration while creating a framework to analyze the obtained data. The key themes from the observation forms were utilized to cross-check the document analysis, questionnaire and interview results acquired from the students and SFL instructors. The observations of the six classes were coded as CA, CB, CC, CD, CE, and CF.

In the current study, as the teacher-researcher was already a teacher at the preparatory school whose language curriculum was attempted to evaluate, the researcher had the opportunity to be in the study environment for a long time, which helped the researcher to avoid prejudices and develop a deep understanding of the culture, language, and viewpoints of the study group (Holloway & Wheeler, 1996). Available literature also suggests that prolonged involvement ensures the establishment of mutual trust and friendly environment and receiving more accurate answers (Streubert & Carpenter, 2011). In an attempt to improve the credibility of a study, various methods such as member checking and peer briefing can be used in addition to prolonged involvement, for the trustworthiness of the study (Holloway & Wheeler, 1996). In this study, member checking was also applied to the respondents. The students and teachers were asked whether the findings of a study accurately reflected their own thoughts after the researcher analyzed the qualitative data collected through interviews or observations. During the analysis of the data, the researchers may reach different results from the collected data due

to some subjective assumptions or misunderstandings of the data. In both cases, a confirmation mechanism with respondents can help to understand how adequate the results are to represent the truth (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2013). Therefore, applying member checking is an important method to improve the credibility of qualitative analysis (Lincoln & Guba, 1981). Last method used to ensure the credibility of qualitative analysis was peer briefing. Peer debriefing is defined as asking people who have general knowledge about the research subject and who are experts in qualitative research methods to analyze the research in various dimensions to avoid any misconceptions about the subject (Creswell, 2003). In this respect, expert opinions were obtained from two experts in the field of qualitative research methods about the design of the current research, the collected data and their analysis.

For the dependability of the study, a triangulation method was used. The interviews were carried out both with the teachers and students to aid data triangulation by asking both samples the same questions about the same topic. The data were collected through the means of multiple data collection tools such as interviews, document analysis and class observations to aid triangulation as reviewed in the literature (Streubert ve Carpenter, 2011).

In conclusion, detailed information has been given about the methodology of the current study regarding the design of the study, participants and settings of the study, data collection instruments, data collection procedure and analysis are given. In the following section, the findings of the research study are combined and presented regarding the research questions.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

4.1. Introduction

In Chapter IV, the results of the study are analyzed and presented in the light of the data gathered through multiple data collection tools, namely curriculum evaluation questionnaires, student and teacher interviews, document analysis and classroom observations. The findings are presented under three categories according to the research questions. Under each research question, the results are classified based on four focus areas in Bellon and Handler's (1982) evaluation model: course aims and objectives, course content and materials, course conduct and student assessment.

The purpose of the study was to evaluate and improve the current English preparatory curriculum in a private university. To this end, the following research questions are investigated:

1. What is the current situation of the English curriculum implemented at Alanya HEP University School of Foreign Languages preparatory school in terms of objectives, course content and materials, course conduct, and student assessment procedures?
2. What are the students' perspectives about the English curriculum in terms of its objectives, course content and materials, course conduct, and student assessment procedures?
3. What are testing units, administrators, curriculum designers' and instructors' perspectives about the English curriculum in terms of its objectives, course content and materials, course conduct, and student assessment procedures?
4. What are the recommendations of stakeholders (instructors, students, administrators, testing units, and curriculum designers) to develop and strengthen the current preparatory school curriculum?

4.2. Description of the Current Status of the Preparatory Program

In this section, the data obtained from student and teacher interviews and document analysis (course syllabi, program curriculum, textbooks, the School of Foreign Languages Website, the university learning management system (LMS), and student handbooks) are analyzed and presented to describe the current situation in the preparatory program. This section aims to investigate answers to the first research question:

1. What is the current situation of the English curriculum implemented at the preparatory school in terms of objectives, course content and materials, course conduct, and student assessment procedures?

In the current status description stage, the results are categorized into four subtitles regarding the four focus areas of the research model: course aims and objectives, course content and materials, course conduct and student assessment.

4.2.1. Course Aims and Objectives

4.2.1.1. Document Analysis

In this section, to describe the current aims and objectives of the preparatory program, the teacher and student interviews, the written and online documents are analyzed and represented based on the data collected through skill-based curriculum, course syllabi, student handbooks, university SFL (School of Foreign Languages) website and university learning management system (LMS). The aims and objectives of the current curriculum are as follows:

The analysis of written and online documents, curriculum and website of the preparatory school reveals that the main aim of the program is to help the students to reach the desired English proficiency level to start studying at their department. The expected level the students are required to reach is intermediate, B1+ level according to CEFR (Common Framework of Reference) by the end of the academic year. To this end, the students are expected to have intermediate English language competency in four skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing. It is specifically stated in student handbooks that:

At the end of the program, the students will be able to follow daily or academic conversations in and out of the classroom to express their knowledge, emotions, opinions, and experiences, including the conversations related to their interests and professions orally

and in writing, follow a long speech on professional and academic topics and take notes on its outline and details, handle formal and informal correspondence, write short articles on various topics, understand the outline of texts written in professional and academic fields.

Document analysis of the student's handbooks and the SFL website also reveals that apart from language skills, the program aims to improve students' critical thinking and integrated skills as well as self-confidence, language awareness, communication, and self-study skills.

In the skill-based curriculum, the aims and objectives of each preparatory school course are determined comprehensively for each week. The level of the courses starts with A2 (elementary level) and the students are expected to have B1+ (Intermediate) level at the end of the program in all skills. According to the analysis of the course syllabus, The PIS-101 (Integrated Skills) course aims to:

improve students' grammar and vocabulary knowledge, reading, listening, speaking and writing language skills in an integrated way. More specifically, the students fulfilling this course will be able to: describe experiences and share their opinions about a topic, write emails for different purposes, give reasons, results, and examples and, make discussions both in written and oral forms, understand the main ideas and details in written articles and audio texts, take notes while listening and reading at the end of the program. The PIS (101) course syllabus supports these aims and objectives.

Regarding the document analysis of the course syllabus and curriculum, PLS-101 is designed to improve students' listening and speaking skills. In this respect, it is specified in the course syllabus that:

PLS-101 course aims to teach the students how to use different listening and note-taking strategies, respond by understanding the contexts they listen to, and share their thoughts about daily issues and interests correctly and fluently, as well as create the necessary vocabulary for them to understand what they are listening to. according to the course syllabus, at the end of the PLS-101 course, the expected outcomes that the student will reach at the end of the PLS course are defined as: listening to the academic text and answering comprehension questions, taking notes while listening, understanding the tone and attitude of the listener, to understand listening texts about different academic topics, to understand word and sentence stress, intonation, to understand connected speech, to understand the main idea and details in listening texts about different educational topics, to

start, continue and end a debate, or a talk in different environments, to give a presentation, and to use pragmatic language.

The analysis of the course syllabus shows that the PRW-101 course is designed to improve the reading and writing skills of the English Preparatory Program students. It provides essential vocabulary, reading strategies, referencing, and inference techniques for reading comprehension as well as a paragraph, and essay writing strategies, at the academic level. The main objectives of the PRW-101 course are defined in the course syllabus as:

to scan and skim an academic text, to understand the main idea and details in an academic text, to use the context to guess the meaning of unknown words, to make references from an academic reading text, to make inferences about academic reading text, to summarize an academic text, to annotate while reading, to understand essay organization, to write an opinion essay, to write cause effect essay, to write problem solution essay and to write a comparison essay.

According to the finding obtained from the document analysis, although the skill-based course objectives are stated in all written and website documents of the school of foreign languages in detail, the objectives such as the high-order and critical thinking skills and self-study skills are not specified clearly on the course syllabi except the student handbooks. In addition, the main objectives of the curriculum are not determined either in the skill-based curriculum or the course syllabi; they are only stated in the students' and teachers' handbooks.

4.2.1.2. Student Interviews

The thematic analysis of the question about the objectives of the program obtained from 6 students is demonstrated in Table 4.1. The findings show that the aims and objectives of the current preparatory school curriculum are to help the students reach the desired language proficiency to be successful in their academic and department courses, improve the students' speaking, reading, writing and listening skills, and teach the students how to use the English language fluently and accurately orally and in writing. Student B also states that the program tries to improve their attendance to the lessons to help them be successful.

Table 4.1 The findings from thematic analysis of student interviews related to course aims and objectives

Themes	Codes	S A	S B	S C	S D	S E	S F
Program Objective	ready for department	✓	✓	✓		✓	
	use English fluently	✓		✓	✓		
	use English accurately			✓			✓
	Attendace					✓	
	improve language skills	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
PIS -101 Objective	Grammar	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Listening	✓					
	vocabulary	✓	✓			✓	✓
	speaking		✓		✓		✓
	Reading	✓			✓		✓
	writing		✓	✓		✓	
PLS- 101 Objective	Listening	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	note-taking	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
	while listening		✓		✓		✓
	speaking	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
PRW-101 Objective s	reading	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	writing	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Writing paragraph Essays	✓		✓	✓		

According to the findings obtained through thematic analysis of student interviews, the aim of PIS-101 course is to teach them all language skills which are speaking, listening, reading, writing in addition to use of English skills such as grammar and vocabulary. However, two students state that the PIS-101 course aims to improve their grammar and vocabulary knowledge and reading skills. Most of the students agree on the aims and objectives of the PLS-101 course which aims to improve their listening, note-taking, while listening and speaking skills, and the PRW-101 course which aims to improve their reading and writing skills. Three students state that they learn how to write paragraphs and essays in PRW-101 courses.

4.2.1.3. Teacher Interviews

The thematic analysis of the question about the objectives of the program obtained from 5 language instructors is demonstrated in Table 4.2. The thematic analysis of the teacher interviews illustrates that the program's objective is to improve students' language competency in four main language skills to help them in their academic studies and daily life in an integrated way.

Table 4.2 *The findings from thematic analysis of teacher interviews related to course aims and objectives*

Themes	Codes	T A	T B	T C	T D	T E
Program Objectives	improve language skills listening, speaking, reading, writing	✓	✓	✓		✓
	to help students reach B1+ level	✓		✓	✓	
	To make students be ready for their department studies			✓		
	to improve students' independent learning skills		✓		✓	
	critical thinking skills		✓			

Instructor A expresses the program's main objectives as overall and skill-based objectives and explains as follows:

The program has overall and skill-based objectives. The program's overall objectives are to obtain basic English language skills, improve students' reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills, and improve students' use of English. The skill-based objectives for the students are to improve their receptive skills like reading and listening in general and academic contexts to express themselves in both written and oral language in general and an academic context (TA).

Two instructors also focus on improving students' critical thinking and independent learning skills as the aims and objectives of the program in addition to language skills. Teacher B states

TB: *“Apart from improving our students’ language proficiency, we aim to improve our students’ self-study, the use of technology in language learning, and the high order thinking skills.”*

When asked about the aims and objectives of each course specifically, PIS-101 course instructors share the same idea that the course aims to improve each language skill holistically. PIS -101 course teacher A explains the main objective of the course is to improve students' receptive skills; listening and reading and productive skills; speaking and writing in addition to the use of English knowledge:

TA: *“PIS-101 course aims to develop the students' receptive and productive skills and provide them the necessary grammar and vocabulary knowledge at the intermediate B1+ level. We expect the students to express themselves in writing and orally in their future academic departments.”*

The PLS (101) course instructor explains that the course aims to improve the students' listening and speaking skills by teaching them some listening, and note-taking strategies, doing some listening activities for the main idea and the details of the texts and giving them the necessary vocabulary and strategies for expressing themselves orally.

This course aims to improve students' listening and speaking skills. In this course, we aim to improve the skills of using different listening and note-taking strategies, sharing their thoughts about daily issues and interests correctly and fluently, as well as acquiring the necessary vocabulary for them to understand what they are listening to. (TC)

Likewise, the course instructor (Teacher B) states briefly that the PRW-101 course aims to develop Prep school students' reading, writing, and critical thinking skills and explains the detailed objectives of the course as follows:

By the end of the fall term, the students are expected to make simple, compound and complex sentences about general topics and write well-organized paragraphs using different formats on general/ everyday issues like culture, lifestyle, health, communication, and so on. For the reading component of the course, the students are expected to use various reading strategies and techniques to understand the main idea, details, and purpose of the texts around 300-400 words, understand pronoun references, and guess the meaning of the words in context. By the end of spring term, on the other hand, the students are expected to understand long academic or scientific reading articles, make inferences about these articles for the reading component and be able to write academic essays in a variety of formats, and summarize long academic articles with their sentences.

4.2.2. Course Content and Materials

This section represents the course content and materials used in the current curriculum. The relevant data were gathered through document analysis and teacher interviews.

4.2.2.1. Course Content

4.2.2.1.1. Document Analysis

To describe the current situation of the course content covered in the preparatory program, the written and online documents including information about the course content, which are the skills-based curriculum, the course syllabi and the university management system are analyzed. According to the document analysis, the curriculum provides detailed information about the content to be covered each week. Findings show that the PLS-101 and PRW-101 syllabi include comprehensive information about the topics to cover each week, however, PIS (101) syllabus only gives some information about which unit of the book is covered for each week.

The findings also show that the topics are generally synchronously covered in each preparatory school course. That is, if a unit about health is covered in PIS -101 course in the week, the same topic is covered in both PLS-101 and PRW-101 courses in the same week. The topics and themes covered in the program are as follows: likes and dislikes, food, shopping, health, education, technology, environment, and global issues. In addition, these topics and themes are covered by integrated skills activities, namely reading, listening, writing, discussing and making conversations, and dialogues.

The document analysis of the course syllabi illustrates that in the PIS-101 course, basic vocabulary and grammar structures, namely, tenses, gerund and infinitive, model forms, and conditionals, are covered. The content of the PLS- 101 consists of listening for specific information, main ideas, and details, identifying contrasting ideas, taking notes on details while listening, giving presentations, making discussions and debates, and talking about daily or academic topics. On the other hand, The PRW-101 course generally consists of writing a thesis statement, supporting ideas, and writing different types of essays, namely, cause-effect, advantages and disadvantages, comparison, and opinion essays in the correct format, in addition to presenting the basic vocabulary structures, scanning and skimming a text, reading for the main ideas and comprehension, making references and inferences.

The analysis of the university learning management system (LMS) illustrates that the content of the preparatory courses is shared weekly on the university LMS system under each course. The objectives of each course and the topics and themes to be covered are given briefly every week.

4.2.2.1.2. Teacher Interviews

Data analysis of the interviews held with the instructors illustrates that the course content is prepared with the collaboration of curriculum units and course instructors based on the objectives of the preparatory school program and the textbooks. Teacher A who is also the director of the SFL and TB who is also working in the curriculum development unit support this statement.

TA: *“The curriculum development units work with the course teachers to decide which topics we should cover and which books we will use in the program.”*

Instructor A and Instructor B agree that PIS-101 courses include some grammatical structures and other skills with appropriate topics. Instructor D states that apart from the grammar topics, the PIS-101 course consists of some topics that can be used in everyday language.

TA: *“Grammar topics including end of B1+ level are included in the lesson, in addition to other skills.”*

TD: *“PIS- 101 course covers grammatical structures such as articles, time tenses, reported speech, and relative clauses; the vocabulary structures such as word formation, nouns, verbs, adjectives and speaking, writing, reading, and listening skills.”*

TD: *“PIS-101 is a kind of general English course, so it focuses on the themes and topics that students may come across in their daily life such as technology, health issues, contemporary global problems, and so on.”*

According to the analysis of instructor interviews, the PRW-101 course covers teaching some reading and writing strategy activities as well as everyday English topics for the first term and global issues such as nature and economy for the second term. Instructor B explains the content of the course in detail:

PRW-101 course mainly aims to cover every day English topics such as likes/dislikes, education, sports, cultural activities, etc. in the first semester, so the students get the general knowledge of reading and expressing themselves in written form about the topics they are familiar with. However, in the second semester, as the students already get to the level of the beginning of B1, they start to cover themes like environmental problems, economics, political issues, etc., so they can get ready for more academic topics that they will need to cover when they start their departmental courses. (TB)

To sum up, the document analysis shows that the topics and themes covered in the program are as follows: likes and dislikes, food, shopping, health, education, technology, environment, and global issues. In addition, these topics and themes are covered by integrated skills activities, namely reading, listening, writing, discussing and making conversations, and dialogues. The teacher interviews support the same statement.

4.2.2.2. Course Materials

4.2.2.2.1. Document Analysis

The document analysis shows that all the course syllabi and students' handbook gives information about the coursebooks, and additional materials used in the courses.

As the course materials, the document analysis shows that for the PIS-101 course, the A2, B1, and B1+ levels of Roadmap by Pearson and the grammar pack, which includes some grammar and vocabulary exercises, are used for two terms. Each book consists of ten units; some are omitted from the book. The grammar pack is used as supplementary material, which

has the grammar and vocabulary revisions for each week that are compatible and coherent with the topics covered in the book that week. In addition to the textbooks and grammar pack, the weekend homework is given to the students every two weeks.

For the PRW-101 course, Prism Reading & Writing 1 and 2 by Cambridge University Press is used as reading material. Introductory material for the first week, writing packs, and sample essay handouts are provided as course materials in addition to Prism Reading and Writing textbooks.

In PLS 101, Prism Listening and Speaking Intro and 2 by Cambridge University Press are used as the course materials. The textbooks and supplementary materials used in the preparatory program are given in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3 Findings from document analysis related to the textbooks and packs.

Courses	Materials	
PIS – 101	Textbook	Roadmap A2, B1, B1+ (Pearson)
	Supplementary Material	Students Grammar Pack (grammar and vocabulary)
PLS – 101	Textbook	Prism Intro and 2 Listening & Speaking (Cambridge University Press)
	Supplementary Material	Extra Video, listening activities, and handouts
PRW-101	Textbook	Prism 1 ve 2 Reading and Writing (Cambridge University Press) and Readers
	Supplementary Material	Writing pack (first semester) Handouts for writing (second semester)

4.2.2.2.2. Teacher Interviews

Findings of the analysis of the teacher interviews show that instructors also use some additional materials in their courses in addition to the books and packs. All instructors state that they use extra material for their courses. TA states that in addition to the textbooks, she uses

online textbook platforms regularly. TD and TE support that they also use online materials for revision.

TA: *“We use some materials such as My English Lab and CLMS actively to assign homework and give extra materials to the students for practice.”*

Instructor C reports that she uses some handouts, additional listening, and video activities related to the curriculum objectives. Instructor D emphasizes the proficiency level difference of the students while choosing a material.

TC: *“Apart from Prism listening and speaking book, I use extra handouts, listening and video activities in the lessons.”*

TD: *“As the students with higher proficiency levels complete the activities earlier than the low-level ones, I prepare extra materials for them, I generally prepare extra handouts and give some online activities on My English Lab.”*

Instructor E uses some Web.2 materials and games during the courses. Instructor B focuses on the needs of the students on choosing a course material.

TB: *“Thus, I believe that as I know what we expect from our students in the courses, the material is not that essential. I can change it while using, omit it, or develop it regarding the needs of the students continuously. “*

TE: *“I use games and Web2 materials in my lessons.”*

To conclude, analyzed documents and teacher interviews show that except for the information about the textbooks and student packs there is no written information about the audio-visual materials used in the curriculum. The

4.2.3. Course Conduct

The analysis of course syllabi, curriculum, student and teacher handbooks, and the website of the preparatory school shows that there is no written information about the course conduct. The relevant data were only gathered through student and teacher interviews and classroom observations.

4.2.3.1. Teacher Interviews

The analysis teacher interviews illustrates that the general process of course conduct includes pre, while, and post activities no matter which course they are in. TA adds using some process writing method in her writing lessons.

It depends on the course, lesson, objective, and for the PRW-101 course, I can say I try to use lead in, pre-reading, while reading, and after reading phases for the reading component of the course in general. For the writing, I use process writing for my all lessons (TA).

Types of interactions used in the classroom are lecturing (teacher-talk), close-ended teacher questioning, individual work, pair work, and group work are stated by instructors as activities used in the teaching-learning process. TB, TC, TD agree that they use teacher talking (t), teacher-student (t-s), student-student (ss), and student activities (s) interactions during the teaching-learning process. Instructor C adds that teachers are the initiators who ask closed and open-ended questions to the students to make them participate actively in the lessons.

TB: *“While doing reading and writing activities, I try to use teacher-students, students-students, and teacher-student interactions.”*

TC: *“To be honest, I mostly use teacher lecturing in my lessons. Because when I want them to work in groups or in pairs, they do not pay enough attention. I need to give instructions, and explain the new topics to the students.”*

While teaching grammar, I explain the rules, give example sentences, and ask questions to the student. So I am more active than the student. The students listen to me and some of them take notes but, to make them active, I elicit answers from them, I want them to do the activities together and discuss their answers. (TD)

4.2.3.2. Student Interviews

The analysis of student interviews shows that the interactions used in the classroom are lecturing, individual study, pair work, and group work. The students state that while explaining the grammatical rules or skills strategies and giving instructions, teachers are active and talking, the teacher asks the students to work on their own, in pairs or groups. The students state that they work in groups especially in speaking activities. Students' answers also confirm the use of teacher-active, student-student, and teacher-student interactions in the learning environment. Student D explains:

Our teachers explain us the topics of the lesson in the beginning of the lesson, they give us some grammatical rules and tells us which exercises to do. While doing the exercises they sometimes ask us questions to answer, to work in pairs and groups in speaking activities. We ask questions to each other with my friends (SD).

In terms of teacher and student roles during the course conduct, instructors state that the teachers are in the role of an instructor, helper /guide, and facilitator in the teaching-learning process. TB also adds that teachers have some roles as mentors, assessors, and learners.

TB: *“Teacher aims to behave as the source, mentor, help, facilitator, assessor and of course learner with the students while the students are expected to be the centre of the class, autonomous learner and peer-teachers to each other.”*

On the other hand, the students state that the teachers serve as an instructor, guide/helper, and facilitator or motivator who encourages students learning.

SF: *“Our teachers teach us the grammar rules, writing rules, how to do the exercises. When I don’t understand, they help me and ask me more questions...Our advisor tries to motivate me to do better in the following exam.”*

The analysis of teacher interviews shows that some of the students are passive, and some are active, autonomous learners and peer teachers to each other in the classroom. TA supports that the teachers and students are active during the classes. TD states that some of the students are always passive in the lesson.

TA: *Both the teacher and the students are active equally.*

TD: *Some of my students are mostly passive during my lessons. I try to motivate them to attend the activities, but they prefer sleeping or playing on their phone.*

4.2.3.3. Observations

The analysis of the observations shows that during the teaching and learning process, teacher-active, teacher-student, student-students, and student-active are the forms of interaction used in the learning environment. The data obtained from six different classroom observations show that almost all of the teachers start the lessons by explaining the topic of the course and giving some instructions to students. The students follow the instructions and do the exercises given by the teachers on their own. Then the teachers ask the students to compare their answers in pairs and discuss the answers with students. While the students were working individually

or in pairs the teachers were monitoring, and some teachers were helping the students who needed some assistance to do the exercises. After comparing the answers, the teachers elicited the answers from the students, and asking some direct questions to the students. The teachers sometimes ask the students to work in groups of two or three particularly in post speaking activities. To sum up, the teachers are observed as instructors, monitor, guide, facilitator to provide a communicative learning environment for the students during the teaching-learning process. The students are observed as active participants, passive-listeners, and a few explorers during the classroom observations.

4.2.4. Student Assessment

4.2.4.1. Document Analysis

The analysis of the written and online documents shows that four PEEs (Process Evaluation Exam), quizzes, projects, or tasks for each course are applied during the academic year to evaluate students' success. At the end of the academic year, a proficiency exam is applied to the students to evaluate student success in the preparatory school. The evaluation criteria of the preparatory program obtained through document analysis of the skills-based curriculum are demonstrated in Table 4.4.

According to the document analysis, a task or a project is assigned to the students for each course in each semester. For each semester, a quiz, and a task each affect the overall success score of the courses by 25% are applied to the students to assess their performance in the PIS -101 and PLS-101 course. The total weight of PIS-101 and PLS-101 quiz and task results on the end of course success is 20% each. Two tasks for the fall term and three tasks for the spring term each affect the overall success score of the course by 20 % and are applied to the students to assess their reading and writing performance in the PRW-101 course. The total weight of PRW-101 course tasks on the end-of-course success is 10%. In addition to the quizzes and tasks, two common exams called PEE (Performance Evaluation Exam) are applied to the students each semester. According to the document analysis, the students should take four Progress Evaluation Exams in an academic year. The total weight of four PEE exams is 50% for end-of-course success.

Table 4. 4 *The analysis of documents related to student assessment components*

COURSE	FALL SEMESTER	SPRING SEMESTER	WEIGHT (EACH)	WEIGHT (TOTAL)	Total
PIS-101	1 quiz 1 project	1 quiz 1 project	25 %	20 %	
PLS-101	1 listening quiz 1 speaking task	1 listening quiz 1 speaking task	25 %	20 %	50%
PRW-101	2 tasks (reading and writing components)	3 tasks (reading and writing components)	20 %	10 %	
COMMON EXAMS	PEE-1 PEE-2	PEE-3 PEE-4	12,5 %	50 %	50%
PROFICIENCY EXAM			100 %	100 %	

Table 4.5 demonstrates the content, and the skills assessed in each evaluation tool obtained through document analysis of the student handbook are demonstrated. According to the document analysis the PIS-101 quiz consists of questions measuring grammar and vocabulary knowledge. PIS-101 task includes making a presentation assessing students' vocabulary and grammar knowledge and speaking skills. PLS-101 course listening quiz is applied to the students to evaluate their while listening and note-taking skills. PLS-101 speaking task aims to measure students' speaking skills, grammar and vocabulary knowledge. PRW-101 tasks aim to assess students' reading and writing skills. PEE exams include note taking and while listening, reading comprehension, grammar, vocabulary and writing and speaking sections. Proficiency Exam consists of listening, reading and use of English, writing and speaking exam sections.

Document analysis also reveals that both formative (process) and summative (end-of-course) evaluations are conducted to assess students' success in the program. In the process, a quiz, a project, or a task for each course is assigned to the students; at the end of a course, four progress evaluation exams (PEE) and a proficiency exam are applied to the students to evaluate student success in the program.

Table 4.5 *The findings from thematic analysis related to exam content.*

Themes	Codes	E1	E2	E3	E4	E5	E6	E7	E8
Exam Content	Grammar	✓	✓				✓	✓	✓
	Vocabulary	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓
	Presentation		✓		✓				
	While listening			✓				✓	✓
	Note Taking			✓				✓	✓
	Speaking		✓		✓			✓	✓
	Writing Paragraph						✓	✓	✓
	Writing Essay						✓	✓	✓
	Reading Comprehension					✓		✓	✓
The time	in the process	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
	at the end of the program							✓	✓

4.1.3.2. Teacher Interviews

The analysis of the teacher interviews shows that quizzes, tasks, projects, proficiency exams, progress evaluation exam and proficiency exam are used to assess student performance during the preparatory program. TA states using summative and formative evaluation in the program with their statements.

We both use formative assessment tools and summative assessment tools in the prep program. As formative tools, we had a quiz. And we also assigned a project. As summative tools, we have progress evaluation exams periodically and we will have a proficiency exam at the end. (TA)

TB mentions using the product and process evaluation, self-evaluation, teacher feedback, peer correction, and a rubric to evaluate students' writing skills.

The PRW-101 course, I use both process writing and product writing, so for the process writing part constructive feedback from the teacher, peer check, and self-check is used for assessment. For the product writing- the graded tasks of the course- standard assessment focusing on a pre-determined rubric is used. I think this evaluation is beneficial as it gives the chance to students to see their mistakes/ weak parts on the way and correct/ improve problematic areas before the summative assessment (TB).

TC, TD, and TE all mention the quizzes, tasks, and presentations in addition to exams as the program evaluation tools. TC explains the use of presentations and quizzes for each term to measure the students' listening and speaking performance.

Students were responsible to make one presentation and one quiz in each term. For presentations, they choose their group and choose one of the three topics. One week was given to prepare a presentation as a group of 3 or 4. Each student was graded individually and their coordination among them was part of the grading system. For quizzes, they listen and answer the related questions. The first term, it included while listening questions. (TC)

TD states that quizzes and projects are used to evaluate the students' integrated skills in the PIS-101 course.

We used quiz and test methods. We also asked the students to prepare a project, presentations. Our quiz was focused on grammar and vocabulary knowledge. For the projects, the students we asked them to prepare a presentation for their future holiday plan in the first term and we asked them to prepare a newspaper for the second term. (TD)

In addition to the graded assessment tools, two instructors mention teacher and peer feedback are used in the classrooms, especially for writing and speaking tasks. Instructor A states:

We give the students oral feedback during the learning while the students work on an exercise or task. We also give some written feedback to our students, especially for speaking and writing activities. We use a writing and speaking rubric to give unbiased systematic feedback. By the way, their classmates give oral feedback to the students when they present their task and exercise in the classroom. (TA)

4.2. Evaluation of the Preparatory Program

In this section, the effectiveness of the current preparatory school program from the perspectives of the students and instructors was evaluated with the analysis of student course evaluation questionnaires, student and teacher interviews and classroom observations. To this

end, the obtained data from these tools are analyzed to present answers to the second and third research questions:

2. What are the students' perspectives about the English curriculum in terms of its objectives, course content and materials, course conduct, and student assessment procedures?
3. What are testing units', administrators', curriculum designers' and instructors' perspectives about the English curriculum in terms of its objectives, course content and materials, course conduct, and student assessment procedures?

The results are categorized into four subtitles regarding the four focus areas of the research model: course aims and objectives, course content and materials, course conduct and students' assessment.

4.3.1. Course Aims and Objectives

In this section, the viewpoints of the students and teachers about the current aims and objectives are analyzed and presented on the basis of the data collected through questionnaires and interviews.

4.3.1.1. Questionnaires

School of Foreign Languages English preparatory program students' perspectives on the effectiveness of the aims and objectives of the current curriculum are presented in Table 4.6 as data based on descriptive statistics.

When the mean scores of the answers given by the students were examined, it was found that the mean of the scores ranged between 3.23 and 3.86; The mean of all items is 3.59 at the "Agree" level. According to the analysis results of the course evaluation questionnaires, the students agreed on the effectiveness of the aims and objectives of the curriculum to some extent when asked to rate the effectiveness of the aims and objectives of the program . Student's reading skills (M=3,86) is the most frequently achieved objective while speaking skills are the least achieved skill with a 3,23 mean score. The average of the items in the critical thinking skills factor is 3.77. The average of the items in the technology use factor is 3.72. It is seen that the average of the items in the writing skill factor is between 3.71. To sum up, the average means of the following aims and objectives in the questionnaire, all skills all above the average.

Table 4.6 *Students' perspectives on the effectiveness of the program aims and objectives*

Objectives	Mean \bar{x}	SD
Use of English	3,56	0,79
Writing	3,71	0,62
Reading	3,86	0,61
Listening	3,63	0,77
Speaking	3,23	1,10
Integrated Skills	3,38	0,70
Independent Learning Skills	3,50	0,66
Critical Thinking Skills	3,77	0,58
Group work	3,55	1,06
Technology use	3,72	1,23

**5: Strongly Agree, 4: Agree, 3: Not Sure, 2: Disagree, 1: Strongly Disagree*

4.3.1.2. Student Interviews

In the student interviews, almost all students responded positively to the question about the course aims and objectives. The thematic analysis of student interview questions related to the objectives of the program is demonstrated in Table 4.7.

When asked, the students listed their needs as expressing themselves in oral and written form fluently and accurately, speaking with native speakers fluently, writing well-organized essays, and reading academic articles and books. . They claimed that the course aims and objectives met the students' expectations to some extent. The students stated that they were generally content with the grammar, reading, and writing courses, whereas three students did not think they could improve their speaking skills and most of the students stated that PLS-101 course was insufficient to meet the course listening objectives as expected. SC expressed his complaint about too many book-centered and curriculum-oriented activities used in PLS courses, which were insufficient to meet students' expectations.

Table 4.7 *The findings from thematic analysis of student interviews related to evaluation of course aims and objectives*

Themes	Codes	S A	S B	S C	S D	S E	S F
Student needs	speaking with other people fluently	✓	✓	✓			✓
	express myself in speaking and writing	✓			✓	✓	
	read books in English read academic article	✓					
	improve writing		✓		✓		✓
	understand native speakers easily / watch other ppl speaking English			✓	✓		✓
	improve language skills	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Have student needs and expectations met?	Yes / To great extent	✓				✓	
	Soso / To some extent		✓	✓	✓		✓
Students are content with	Grammar objectives	✓	✓	✓			✓
	Writing objectives	✓		✓	✓		✓
	Reading objectives	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Students' complaint	Too much book activity			✓			
	Too much curriculum oriented			✓			
	Not making complex sentences in speaking Speak fluently			✓		✓	✓
	insufficient listening and note taking objectives		✓	✓		✓	✓

Student E complained that the aims and objectives of PLS-101 course are not met effectively enough in the courses:

I expected to speak more fluently and make more complex sentences in speaking, but I can't speak as fluent as I expected. I expected more activities that make us speak more and be more active in listening and speaking courses, but our teacher followed the PLS book most of the time, especially in the first term. We tried to finish the exercises rather than improve our speaking and listening skills. (SB)

Student B also expressed that there were not enough activities to revise their listening skills and shared his opinion as follows:

SB: "I also think the listening activities we do in the PLS course are insufficient. Instead of repeating answering the same kind of questions, we could have done more listening activities."

4.3.1.3. Teacher Interviews

In the interviews with instructors, they made similar comments to the students. The program aims and objectives met the students' expectations to some extent. TA stated that grammar, vocabulary and reading objectives of the program are met to a great extent.

TA: In terms of grammar, reading and vocabulary, our curriculum satisfies our needs. We need extra materials to help the students achieve writing, listening and speaking objectives.

However, instructors explained that all curriculum objectives could not be completed due to student-related factors. Teacher A expressed that the students did not attend the courses regularly, and they thought the program was overloaded for them.

Some students think that our preparatory program is quite systematic and beneficial for them to learn English sufficient to be able to pass the proficiency exam. Some say it is beyond their expectations. Some students think that it is overloaded. Whereas they expect a light year of English education they come across (maybe) the busiest academic year of their bachelor degree. So, they are disappointed. In summary, our program aims and objectives are good enough to meet students' needs to pass their exams but it may not meet students' expectations of a light academic year. (TA)

Table 4.8 *The findings from thematic analysis of student interviews related to evaluation of course aims and objectives*

Themes	Codes	T A	T B	T C	T D	T E
Do the course aims and obj. meet student expectations?	Yes / To great extent	✓		✓		
	To some extent		✓		✓	✓
Could all objectives be achieved?	Yes / to great extent			✓		
	To some extent	✓	✓		✓	✓
The reason why they couldn't be achieved	Student motivation		✓			✓
	Students aren't receptive enough				✓	
	Irregular student attendance	✓				
	Students' opinion about overloaded program	✓				
	Not enough extracurricular activities				✓	✓

Instructors B and E suggested it was because of students' motivation. TB explained that the students with high English proficiency levels were highly motivated to attend the classes and learn. In contrast, the students with low English proficiency levels were less motivated to participate in and achieve the course objectives because the course content was complex for them to understand. However, instructor D stated that the students were not as receptive as expected, which led to failure in achieving the desired goals and stated that the students are not aware of the program aims and objectives clearly and do not expect much from the program.

In addition, instructor D and E claimed extracurricular activities were inadequate to facilitate students' internal motivation.

In our program, motivated and hardworking sts are able to accomplish these objectives easily and improve their skills to the Intermediate level, which is the main target of the program, by the end of the spring term...On the other hand, most of our sts motivation level increases dramatically after 2 or 3 months they start Prep School, and almost none of these students succeed in PRW-101 course. (TB)

... the students didn't have clear expectations and goals when it comes to their preparatory education. As a result, they also didn't have an understanding of their needs. ...Aside from in-class expectations, our preparatory program couldn't meet the expectations when it comes to extra-curricular activities... In my opinion, we are trying to achieve the objectives to best of our abilities, but as the students aren't as receptive to this education as we expected, some of these skills are lacking. (TD)

TE: *“The objectives are adequate but difficult to achieve considering the students’ motivation types... the main problem is that our students do not have internal motivation to acquire English. Besides, extra-curricular activities are not enough to please our students”*

To sum up, although it was not clearly expressed in instructor interviews, many students criticized that the listening and speaking course did not meet the students' needs and expectations to a great extent.

4.3.2. Course Content and Materials

This section presents the analysis and evaluation of the students' and instructors' opinions about the course content and materials. The data to be evaluated have been gathered from multiple data collection tools, namely course evaluation questionnaires, student and teacher interviews, and classroom observations. The data were analyzed and presented in the following subsections.

4.3.2.1. Questionnaires

Based on the descriptive analysis of course evaluation questionnaires, the opinions of the students regarding the adequacy of the materials/tools used in the program are generally positive. More specifically, the results of the course evaluation questionnaire regarding the perspectives of the students on the course and materials are presented in Table 4.9.

Table 4.9 *Students' perspectives on the course content and materials*

Items	1	2	3	4	5	Mean \bar{x}	SD
	Frequency						
1. The course materials provided me with what I needed to know or do	2	9	18	24	12	3,54	1,047
2. The course materials were appropriate to my interests.	2	11	16	29	7	3,43	1,000
3. The course materials have variety.	4	9	14	27	11	3,49	1,120
4. The course materials are visually attractive	2	6	15	27	15	3,72	1,023
5. The topics and themes in the materials were interesting.	2	7	19	28	9	3,54	0,969
6. The topics are presented sequentially, i.e. building upon prior learning.	3	4	14	33	11	3,69	0,983
7. Course materials are sufficient to improve my listening skills.	9	15	13	20	8	3,05	1,268
8. Course materials are sufficient to improve my speaking skills.	9	9	15	21	11	3,25	1,287
9. Course materials are sufficient to improve my writing skills.	3	11	14	21	16	3,55	1,173
10. Course materials are sufficient to improve my reading skills.	2	9	12	25	17	3,71	1,100
11. Course materials are sufficient to improve my grammar knowledge.	1	1	14	22	27	4,12	0,910
12. Course materials are sufficient to improve my vocabulary knowledge.	4	4	10	25	22	3,88	1,139
13. Course materials are appropriate to my proficiency level in English.	5	6	15	22	17	3,62	1,195

*5: *Strongly Agree*, 4: *Agree*, 3: *Not Sure*, 2: *Disagree*, 1: *Strongly Disagree*

The average mean for all the items regarding the effectiveness and usefulness of course content and materials from the students' perspectives is 3.58. The students found the course materials the most useful and effective for improving their grammar knowledge (M= 4.12, S=

0.91) while they found course content and materials the least sufficient for improving their listening skills (M=3.05, S=1,26) with the 7th item. In addition, the sufficiency of the course materials for vocabulary knowledge, reading, writing and speaking skills was evaluated positively by the students respectively. To sum up, the results of the evaluation of the course content and materials reveal that the materials used for listening and speaking skills were as sufficient as the other skills materials to improve students' proficiency in these skills.

Moreover, the results of the course content and materials evaluation questionnaire reveal the students' neutral - agree attitude towards the other issues which were visually attractive materials (M=3.72, SD=1.02), the sequential presentation of topics (M=3.54, SD=0.98), materials' meeting the needs of students (M=3.54, S=1.04), interesting topics and themes (M= 3.54, SD= 0,96), materials variety (M=3.49, SD=1.12) and interesting course materials (M=3.43, SD=1.0).

4.3.2.2. Student Interviews

Table 4.10 displays the thematic analysis of the interviews about student perspectives on the course content. The analysis of students' interviews illustrated that the topics, themes, and skills implemented in the program were relevant and sufficient for the students in general. However, some students criticized the listening and speaking topics and themes used in PLS - 101 course, especially the ones given as homework. Almost all of the interviewed students seemed to be on common ground that the topics were insufficient to improve students' listening and speaking skills. Student B claimed that the speaking questions about the same topic were repeated many times during the courses, which made the lessons monotonous and boring. Student A supports this statement:

SA: *“We sometimes work on the same topic more than a week in speaking courses and the repetitive topics lead me to demotivate and I get bored. That’s why I don’t want to attend the courses actively.”*

Table 4.10 *The findings from the thematic analysis of student interviews related to course content.*

Themes	Codes	SA	SB	SC	SD	SE	SF
Course Content	Sufficient	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
	Insufficient			✓			
	Ins. Homework Online homework	✓		✓		✓	✓
	Ins. Listening	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
	Ins. Speaking		✓				
	first term			✓			
	Simple					✓	
	Ok		✓	✓	✓		✓
	Complex	✓					
	Difficult	✓			✓		
	dif. 1st term	✓		✓			
	dif. 2nd term				✓	✓	✓
	Relevant	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Irrelevant			✓		✓	
	Listening					✓	
	Speaking					✓	
	Boring		✓			✓	
	Listening		✓			✓	
	Interesting	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Table 4.10 *The findings from the thematic analysis of student interviews related to course content. (Continued)*

Themes	Codes	SA	SB	SC	SD	SE	SF
Materials	Satisfied good	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
	Dissatisfied						
	PLS book	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
	Books have some errors		✓				
	not enough online mat		✓		✓		✓
	not enough sample articles		✓			✓	✓
	not enough reading	✓			✓	✓	

Some of the students also pointed out that the courses were more difficult in the first semester and as they got accustomed to the learning environment and the teaching philosophy of the teachers, the topics and themes became easier to comprehend. However, some students claimed the opposite. They shared the idea that the topics and themes implemented in the three courses were overloaded and more difficult in the second semester.

Student D expresses her opinion about the overloaded program as follows:

The topics and themes were very easy for me in the first semester. I did not use to revise any of the topics when I went home after school. However, the program was overloaded in the second semester after the second PEE (Progress Evaluation Exam). We learnt many new grammar topics in a month, started to write essays instead of paragraphs, and started note-taking activities instead of while listening. They seemed too much for me. I had to go home and revise each topic to be confident in these skills. That's why I think the themes and topics of the second semester could have been given at least a month ago and can be divided equally in the semesters. (SD)

According to the analysis of the student interviews, although the students were generally content with the materials used in the program, almost all students expressed negative attitudes towards PLS course materials. All the students claimed that the topics and themes in the listening books were not appropriate for students' level, and the program was overloaded.

Student F said:

SF: *“I did not like the book we used in the PLS-101 course. It was difficult to follow, and the themes were boring. I don't feel like it allowed us a good environment to do enough listening and speaking activities.”*

Another common point stated in student interviews was the use of online materials. Almost all students stated that the online materials were inappropriate and inadequate to improve their language proficiency, especially those given for listening and writing activities. Student E expressed that some homework was assigned just to be given, not to improve their language proficiency. In addition, student A claimed that online assignment was not effective enough for practice because most students did the homework not to be written absent for online course hours. The students commented differently on the online homework assigned for the PIS course. Some students commented that the online and other homework materials were sufficient for them to revise. However, others stated that they were just a “waste of time”; they did not have any purpose for practice and improvement. The reason behind these factors can be that each class used to have its PIS-101 instructor and each course instructor can give a different kind of homework to the class.

Some students emphasized the variety of topics and themes used in the courses. They expressed that they would like to be exposed to the more daily language and learn some slang language or idioms that can help them communicate with native speakers much more quickly. However, they criticized that the program mostly focused on the formal and academic language because of preparing them for their future department studies.

Almost all of the students appreciated the use of grammar, reading and writing packs during the courses. They stated that the topics and themes in the packs were much more sufficient and detailed than the content of the textbooks and packed resources enabled them to revise the topics covered in the courses in a document. However, student F criticized the PLS 101 course for not providing any course pack to the students for revision. SF emphasized:

Our teachers provide us grammar and reading writing packs in PIS and PRW courses. I like these packs very much. Before the exam, I only study the topics from these packs. The grammar pack includes detailed grammar and vocabulary structures learned during the courses. In the writing supplementary material, we have some example essays and strategies which teach us how to write and what to focus on while writing essays. These packs are asynchronous with the courses we do during the week. However, we do not have any packs for the PLS-101 course. Before the exams, I do not know how to revise and study for listening and speaking. A pack with speaking and note-taking strategies and extra listening activities is also essential for us.

Some students stated that the courses were mostly book-oriented, which led them to get bored of following the book. The program did not have enough videos and movies to attract the students.

4.3.2.3. Teacher Interviews

The thematic analysis of the interviews held with instructors illustrate that the instructors shared the idea that most of the course content, topics, and themes were sufficient and relevant enough to meet the program objectives. Table 4.11 demonstrates the findings from the thematic analysis of instructor interviews related to course content. Instructor D stated that they prepared some extra materials when the activities and topics in the books and packs seemed insufficient or when they noticed the different needs of the learners and explained the reasons why some themes and topics were difficult, sufficient but not interesting enough for students.

Because the diversity of students' skills, some materials were too difficult or too simple depending on the level of the material. Some students had a hard time catching up with the subjects as they study everyday, learn a lot of subjects back to back. However, division of the subjects and the information given thereof are sufficient and filled with activities and exercises. If we notice there is a need to add some extra materials to cover the topic, we prepare some extra handouts or activities for students. One problem is the students' not being interested in some of the topics presented, as some of them repeat or just aren't interesting in students' point of view. (TD)

In the instructor interviews, when they were asked about the difficulty of the content, topics, and themes of the program, all of the instructors stated that the topic and themes are proper to students' proficiency levels. However, instructor D stated that, as there were some students whose levels were lower than A2 level, these students had difficulty improving their

language proficiency level as much as their classmates. Instructor A also expressed that some students enrolled in the program one or two months after the courses had started, so the ones with low English language proficiency levels could not catch up with the program's pace. Therefore, some instructors stated that they had to prepare some extra low-level materials and do some office hours with those students to remedy that gap. Instructor E emphasized:

The students who registered for the preparatory program later than their classmates had a hard time adjusting to the program; some of them tried hard and were able to catch up with their friends while the others, especially those with low English levels could not succeed and lost their motivation to follow the courses regularly. We, the instructors, did some extra make-up courses, but there were not many students to attend those courses. (TE)

Table 4.11 *The findings from the thematic analysis of instructor interviews related to course content*

Themes	Codes	TA	TB	TC	TD	TE
Course Content	Sufficient	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Simple 1 st term			✓		
	Ok	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Difficult 2 nd term			✓		
	Relevant	✓	✓			✓
	Irrelevant			✓		✓
	Boring			✓	✓	✓
	Interesting	✓	✓			✓

TA stated that the book used for PIS-101 and the materials used for PRW-101 course are good enough to improve students' language skills.

TA: *“I’m happy with the content of the book, packs and the curriculum for PIS 101 and PRW-101 course. Theme variety is sufficient. We try to pay equal time and energy to each skill.”*

TB focused on the up to date topics of the Roadmap book for PIS-101 course and she expressed that the book was interesting and good enough to improve students’ skills.

TB: *“We are using a book that has been published very recently, so I believe the course book also provides the themes/ topics that students may benefit to prepare themselves to the current world and encourages students to improve their 21st century skills.”*

The PLS-101 course instructor (TC) added that the book and its content were sufficient in the first term. Still, in the second term, there were not enough note-taking activities in the textbooks, which were Prism Intro and 2, so she prepared extra note-taking activities from different resources such as Lecture Ready 1 and 2.

TC: *“I used prism into and prism 2, books contain up-to-date topics like lifestyles, jobs, food and culture etc... But there were not enough note-taking activities in the book for the second term, so I prepared extra note taking activities.”*

In summary, although the students and instructors agreed that the course content, topics, themes, and course materials were sufficient and relevant to some extent, the students had some concerns about the topics, themes covered, and course materials implemented in the PLS-101 course. They also criticized the materials used as online homework given in three courses. However, the PRW-101 course instructor (Teacher B) states:

The material is only a guide for us, me at least, and I know that I have the right to make necessary changes and adaptations regarding the needs of my students not from one academic year to another but even from one classroom that I teach to another since the dynamics of each classroom and profiles of the students are completely different from each other. So I’m happy with my core material and my autonomy (TB).

4.3.3. Course Conduct

This section illustrates the results of the course conduct evaluation. In other words, the teaching and learning process of the current School of Foreign Languages program was evaluated in this section. To this end, the data obtained through course evaluation questionnaires, student and teacher interviews and observations were analyzed and presented.

4.3.3.1. Questionnaire

The results of the course evaluation questionnaire show that the students considered homework and assignments (item 11, $M=4.60$, $SD= .65$) as the most frequently used method, however, songs (item 16, $M=1.43$, $SD= .82$) as the least frequently method used in the classroom. The detailed descriptive analysis of the frequency of the methods used in the teaching-learning process is given in Table 4.12.

The results of the course evaluation questionnaire show that the students considered homework and assignments (item 11, $M=4.60$, $SD= .65$), teacher lectures (item 1, $M=4.49$, $SD=0.81$), questioning by the teacher (item 19, $M=4.43$, $SD=.72$), teacher correction (item 23, $M=4.29$, $SD=0.94$) and audio listening sessions (item 10, $M=4.06$, $SD=.68$) are the most frequently used methods in the learning environment. These methods are followed by pair work (item 3, $M=3.89$, $SD=0.71$), group work (item 4, $M=3.68$, $SD= .81$), reading aloud by teachers (item 15, $M=3.57$, $SD=1.32$), self-correction (item 13, $M=3.46$, $SD=1.04$) and student presentations (item 20, $M=3.46$, $SD= .95$). On the other hand, regarding the students' responses, songs (item 16, $M=1.43$, $SD= .82$), role-play (item 7, $M=1.69$, $SD= .90$), peer evaluation (item 17, $M=2.29$, $SD=1.20$), and games (item 6, $M=2.42$, $SD=1.11$) are the least frequently teaching methods used in the preparatory school curriculum.

Table 4.12 *The frequency of activities and methods used in the teaching-learning process*

Item	1	2	3	4	5	Mean \bar{x}	SD
	Frequency						
1. Teacher lectures	1	1	4	18	41	4,49	0,812
2. Silent individual work	1	18	24	19	3	3,08	0,907
3. Pair work	0	2	14	38	11	3,89	0,710
4. Group work	0	5	20	31	9	3,68	0,812
5. Discussions	5	16	18	19	7	3,11	1,134
6. Games	17	16	23	6	3	2,42	1,117
7. Role-play	34	21	7	2	1	1,69	0,900
8. Projects	1	15	26	18	5	3,17	0,928
9. Video sessions	4	9	28	16	8	3,23	1,042

Table 4.12 The frequency of activities and methods used in the teaching-learning process (Continued)

Item	1	2	3	4	5	Mean \bar{x}	SD
	Frequency						
10. Audio listening sessions	0	1	10	38	16	4,06	0,682
11. Homework / Assignments	0	0	6	14	45	4,60	0,657
12. Peer correction	6	8	22	20	9	3,28	1,139
13. Self-correction	4	5	23	23	10	3,46	1,047
14. Reading aloud by students	8	10	17	21	9	3,20	1,227
15. Reading aloud by teachers	5	12	10	17	21	3,57	1,323
16. Songs	46	14	2	2	1	1,43	0,829
17. Peer evaluation /feedback	22	16	17	6	4	2,29	1,208
18. Self-evaluation	4	10	19	19	13	3,42	1,158
19. Questioning by the teacher	0	1	6	22	36	4,43	0,728
20. Student presentations	1	8	26	20	10	3,46	0,953
21. Computer-aided activities	13	7	14	15	16	3,22	1,452
22. Translation	14	16	16	10	9	2,75	1,335
23. Teacher correction	1	2	10	16	36	4,29	0,947

**1: Never, 2: Rarely, 3: Sometimes, 4: Frequently, 5: Always*

In addition to the analysis of the methods used in the teaching-learning process, the viewpoints of the students about the efficiency of the teaching-learning process are analyzed and presented in Table 4.13.

The scores of the student responses to certain issues related to course conduct (that is teaching and learning process) range from 3.09 to 4.12. It was seen that the arithmetic mean of all items is 3.67 which implies that students are generally happy with the teaching-learning environment. The students most positively evaluated the statements about the teacher's use of audio-visual aids (M=4.12, SD= .92), effective board use (M=4.09, SD= .93) and effective teacher correction (M=4.09, SD= .82). On the other hand, the least positive attitude of students

toward the teaching and learning process was that the teacher's teaching was not interesting. (item 3 and 11) Students' scores also reveal that there was not a sufficient variety of activities in the classes (item 2, M=3.20, SD=1.12). The other analysis results are all related to the teacher and they are generally positive as follows: teacher's clear instructions (item 5, M=3.83, SD=1.00), teaching methodology (item 6, M= 3.75, SD= .95), giving sufficient feedback (item 12, M=3.72, SD=.99), encouraging students to participate (item 7, M=3,71, SD=1.07).

Table 4.13 *Students' perspectives on the teaching-learning process*

	1	2	3	4	5	Mean \bar{x}	SD
	Frequency						
1. There was an efficient use of time in class.	4	4	12	29	16	3,75	1,090
2. A variety of activities was used in the course.	4	14	21	17	9	3,20	1,121
3. The teacher was teaching in an interesting way.	7	11	15	23	9	3,25	1,212
4. It was easy to follow the teacher.	4	5	18	29	9	3,52	1,032
5. The teacher's instructions were clear.	2	5	12	29	17	3,83	1,009
6. The teaching methodology of the teacher was effective in our learning.	1	5	18	26	15	3,75	0,952
7. The teacher was encouraging us to participate in the lessons	3	7	10	31	14	3,71	1,071
8. The teacher used audio-visual aids (projector, video, TV, audio listening texts, etc.) effectively during the lessons.	2	2	6	31	24	4,12	0,927
9. The teacher was using the board effectively.	1	4	7	29	24	4,09	0,931
10. The teacher corrected our mistakes in an effective way.	0	3	10	30	22	4,09	0,824
11. The lessons were taught in an interesting way.	9	9	21	19	7	3,09	1,195
12. Sufficient feedback was given on our performance.	2	5	16	28	14	3,72	0,992

**5: Strongly Agree, 4: Agree, 3: Not Sure, 2: Disagree, 1: Strongly Disagree*

4.3.3.2. Student Interviews

The scores of the student responses to certain issues related to course conduct (that is teaching and learning process) range from 3.09 to 4.12. It was seen that the arithmetic mean of all items is 3.67 which implies that the students are generally happy with the teaching-learning environment. The students most positively evaluated the statements about the teacher's use of audio-visual aids ($M=4.12$, $SD=.92$) with the 8th item, effective board use and effective teacher correction with the 10th item. On the other hand, the least positive attitude of the students toward the teaching and learning process was that the teacher's teaching was not interesting with item 11 ($M=3.09$, $SD=1.19$) and item 3 ($M=3.25$, $SD=1.21$). Students' scores also reveal that there was not a sufficient variety of activities in the classes (item 2, $M=3.20$, $SD=1.12$). The other analysis results are all related to the teacher and they are generally positive as follows: teacher's clear instructions, teaching methodology, giving sufficient feedback, encouraging the students to participate.

In the student interviews, when they were asked about the course conduct of the program, most students seemed to be on the common ground that the learning and teaching process was effective and interesting. However, some students complained about the PLS course and commented that the teaching and learning process are sometimes boring. The thematic analysis of the interviews about student perspectives on the course conduct is demonstrated in Table 4.14.

When asked, the students stated that there was a good variety of activities in the courses, however, the activities done in the program were not interesting enough to attract students' attention. Student B complained about the course conduct of the PLS-101 courses for being book-oriented while student D mentioned they did not do extra listening and speaking activities apart from the book.

SB: *"Listening and speaking course is sometimes boring. We follow the book and the exercises on the book are always asking the same questions."*

SD: *"I think we don't do speaking and listening activities enough in the lessons. We just do the activities on the book and sometimes some note-taking activities."*

The findings of the analysis of the student interviews display that the activities were difficult, but some students mentioned they were not so difficult that they could handle. SA and SD emphasized the difficulty of writing and speaking activities. Student D stated:

The writing activities, especially article and essay ones were difficult for me, but I am not good at writing even in Turkish. We do not like writing essays very much. I can say the same thing for speaking too. As I was not used to writing or speaking in English very much, it was difficult for me in the beginning. However, our writing course instructor gave us some sample writings and asked us to analyze them and write our paragraphs or essays according to the examples and it becomes much easier to write. (SD)

Table 4.14 *The thematic analysis of the interviews about student perspectives on the course conduct.*

Themes	Codes	SA	SB	SC	SD	SE	SF
Activities	Interesting	✓	✓	✓	✓		
	PLS courses are sometimes boring		✓		✓		✓
	Simple		✓				
	PRW course is sometimes difficult	✓			✓		✓
	Ok	✓		✓	✓		
	Useful /effective	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
	Online homework is not useful			✓			✓
Teacher roles	Guide/ helper	✓	✓		✓		
	Instructor	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
	Facilitator			✓			
	Encourage	✓			✓		✓
Student roles	Passive	✓	✓			✓	
	Active	✓		✓	✓		
	Playing with theirphones / not pay attention	✓		✓			
Class rules	Don't come to lesson late	✓	✓		✓		✓
	/ you can't sign if you come late						
Activity Variety	Yes		✓	✓		✓	
	No (in the speaking and listening courses)				✓		✓

Table 4.14 *The thematic analysis of the interviews about student perspectives on the course conduct. (Continued)*

Themes	Codes	SA	SB	SC	SD	SE	SF
Teaching learning process	TTT (teacher talking time)	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
	t- s (teacher –student)	✓		✓	✓		
	Self study	✓	✓		✓	✓	
	s- s (student-student)	✓	✓		✓	✓	
	Lecturing	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
	Group work	✓			✓	✓	
	Pair work	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓

Student F also mentioned the difficulty of PRW course conduct:

My English level is not very good, I have difficulty doing even grammar and vocabulary exercises, so the skills like writing and speaking are much more difficult for me. I sometimes cannot understand the questions. Even if I understand, I cannot make sentences. The level of writing and speaking courses is challenging for me to comprehend. (SF)

In addition, most students responded positively that the activities used in the courses were useful. Only SC and SF stated that the online homework activities do not help them improve their proficiency.

SC: *“Our teachers give us online homework on MyEnglishLab and CLMS and I think some of this homework do not help us improve our proficiency level. I think they are only given to be something.”*

SF: *“I don’t like doing online homework. I don’t believe it improves my English level. I just do them not to be written absent.”*

In terms of teacher and student roles during the course conduct, the interviewed students stated that the teachers served mostly as instructors. Some students expressed that the teachers also assisted them while doing some exercises and working by themselves and tried to engage the students with the activities.

However, some students were not paying enough attention to the activities and were very passive during the learning and teaching process. Student D stated:

SD: “During the speaking activities, our teacher tries to make us talk, simplify the questions and bring some extra materials to the classroom, but my classmates just want to play on their phones or sleep.”

SC and SF stated that teachers motivated and encouraged them to participate in the lessons, however, some just teach what they need to teach.

SC: “Some teachers try to motivate me when I’m not interested in the lesson. They ask me questions. But, in some lessons I don’t even speak even once and the teacher never notices me.”

My language level is low; my teachers know it so they mostly do not try to ask questions to me. Because when they ask I don’t want to give answers. In PRW lesson it is not like this. She asks me questions, talks about daily life and tries to encourage me to talk about easy daily life activities.

According to the student interviews, most students stated that they were sometimes active and sometimes passive in the classroom. Student C expressed that he and some of his classmates participated actively in the lessons. However, he stated that they had six-hour lessons in a day which made them feel tired and less active by the end of the day. Student D and the students agree on the idea that some of their classmates preferred playing on their phones and were always passive, which demotivated the active ones.

As my English level is a little better than my friends, they do not want to talk with me, or they know I can do everything by myself while we are working in a group. They prefer on their phones and do not participate in the activities. They affect me negatively. I sometimes do not want to attend the activities enthusiastically. That’s why I do not like to work in groups. (SD)

The interviews with the students also illustrated that lecturing and teacher talk was the most used interaction type in the course conduct. Student A stated that the teachers explained the grammar rules and reading and writing strategies, asked close and open-ended questions, tried to elicit answers from the learners and gave instructions to the students to do the activities. Another student expressed that the teacher just gave instructions and wanted the students to talk with their partners without asking if the students understood the questions or not. Student F expressed:

When we cannot answer the question or do not understand it, our skill teacher, especially in speaking lessons, does not help us to understand the topic. She gets angry and passes the exercise. She can give us some examples or simplify the questions instead of passing. (SF)

In addition to the teacher lecturing, all of the student interviewees expressed that they worked and did some exercises individually, sometimes worked in pairs, and discussed some questions in a group, especially in speaking activities. Student B explained:

During the PIS-101 lessons, our teacher started the lesson by asking some questions about the day's topics, sometimes showed us some photos, and made us guess the day's topic. We did some vocabulary and grammar activities. She generally gave the instructions, and we worked independently and sometimes checked our answers with our partners. Then we discussed the answers together. Then we did some listening, reading, and speaking activities. While speaking, we worked in pairs or made a group of 3 or 4. (SB)

When asked about the variety of the activities done in the classroom, three of the students stated that there was a variety of activities done in the program, however, two students (SC and SF) expressed that the activities to improve their listening and speaking skills were not varieable enough.

According to the students' views, teacher talking (t), students' individual work (t), pair work and teacher-student (t-s) interaction forms were mostly used during the teaching-learning process. Almost all of the students mentioned teachers asked questions to the whole class or directly to an individual student and wanted them to answer the questions. The tudents also expressed that sometimes they worked in pairs and groups too.

4.3.3.3. Teacher Interviews

The analysis of teacher interviews supported some of the statements made by the students. Table 4.15 shows the thematic analysis of teacher interviews about the course conduct. Instructors made similar comments with the students on the variety of the activities used in the teaching-learning process. All instructors are on the common ground that there is a variety of activities conducted during teaching learning process.

In the interviews, almost all of the instructors shared the same idea that they used eliciting, asking questions, group work and pair work activities in the classroom. Instructor A stated:

TA: *“We did.... activities such as grammar lessons, teaching how to write, finding the main idea practices... and speaking in pairs, reading together, vocabulary trees, etc.”*

TD: *“During our PIS classes we provide a variety of exercises, as well as grammar and vocabulary knowledge, around the skills and knowledge necessary e.g. speaking, listening, reading. The materials we use are plentiful in means of extra skill-oriented exercise pages, vocabulary excrcises and a grammar bank.”*

The teachers also expressed positive attitudes towards the effective conduct of the program, while some expressed that it can change. TD states:

I believe that the teaching-learning process depends on the students as well as the instructor. In this sense, I think that the vocabulary and grammar parts of the classes get more attention from the students while their attention shifts while doing speaking or writing exercises. Depending on the day or the mood of the students, the effect of the given sections changes. While the vocabulary-grammar learning is effective, writing-speaking parts of our classes get less initiative from students. (TD)

Teachers supported the students' comments on the forms of classroom interactions. When the instructors were asked how the learning environment was, TA, TC and TE state that the teaching-learning process is both teacher-centered and student- centered. Instructor C mentions about the students' need to be guided and the importance of teacher leaded classes.

TA: *“We do some teacher-leaded activities such as grammar lessons, teaching how to write, finding the main idea practices and some student-centered activities such as speaking in pairs, reading together, vocabulary trees, etc.”*

TC: *“Our students need guidance at all times. That’s why lessons cannot be done purely student-centered. However, the students can be integrated into the lessons by letting them state their opinions and asking good follow-up questions.”*

...I preferred to plan student-centered lessons because my main aim was making the students convey the meaning of written texts and producing written materials based on the language they covered. Of course, there have been some teacher-centered learning process too. I need to give them structures to teach how to write essays. (TE)

Table 4.15 *Thematic analysis of teacher interviews related to course conduct*

Themes	Codes	TA	TB	TC	TD	TE
Activity Variety	Yes	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	No					
How was course conduct?	Mostly Effective / good enough	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Effective to some extent					
	Sometimes not effective for students		✓	✓	✓	
Teaching-learning process	Student centered		✓	✓		
	Safe / positive			✓		
	Ttt / lecturing /teacher centered	✓			✓	
	Student individual	✓				
	Interactive /s-t / s-s	✓		✓	✓	
	Learn own their own	✓			✓	
Teacher Roles	Helper / guide	✓	✓	✓		
	Active	✓	✓			
	Instructor	✓	✓	✓	✓	
	Source		✓			
	Mentor		✓			
	Assessor		✓			
	Learner		✓			
	Facilitator / support /encouraged		✓		✓	
Student Roles	Active /ask questions	✓	✓	✓	✓	
	Passive/ follow instructions			✓	✓	
	Autonomous learner		✓		✓	
	Peer teachers to each other		✓			

In addition, the responses of instructors to the interviews support the statement made by the students that the teachers are mainly in the role of instructors to students. Therefore, TD states that teacher talking time can sometimes be high in the course conduct. Almost all of the instructors stated that giving instructions, helping the students' learning process, and guiding them were their main roles of teachers during the teaching-learning process. Instructor C stated that teachers were mainly the initiators who asked closed and open-ended questions to the students to make them participate actively in the lessons.

TC: *“Teacher introduces the topic and guides them to listen and learn related words and express their ideas, and asks the students some questions to make them talk about the topic.”*

TD explains the roles of teachers as instructor, guide, encourager, facilitator and the learning and teaching process of PIS 101 course as follow:

I took initiative on expressing what I required the students to accomplish during a task. I begin classes by explaining the subject at hand, then move on to the next point, which is usually vocabulary exercises. ...Aside from that during the grammar teaching process, I give the students general information while checking their knowledge on the topic, or whatever they remember... I check them during their speaking and correct / encourage / initiate when necessary.

TB: *“Teacher aims to behave as the source, mentor, help, facilitator, assessor and of course learner with the students while students are expected to be the centre of the class, autonomous learner and peer-teachers to each other.”*

Almost all of the instructors were in the common point that some of the students just came to the classrooms not to be written absent and preferred being passive and sleeping instead of participating in the classes actively, while there were eager and active students who were responsible for their learning and took parts in the classroom activities willingly. Instructor B stated:

TB: *“The students are sometimes active learners, they ask questions, a few of them are autonomous learners and peer teachers to each other in the classroom.”*

4.3.3.4. Observations

The findings of the analysis of the classroom observations displays that teacher active, teacher-student, student-students, and student active are the forms of interaction in the learning environment. Thematic analysis of classroom observations regarding course conduct is demonstrated in Table 4.16.

The findings of the observations show that teacher talking time is very high in most of the classes. The teachers explained the structures, gave instructions, elicited answers, monitored, guided, facilitated students' learning, and provided a communicative learning environment during the teaching-learning process.

During the observations, some of the students were observed as active participants and attentive to the lessons while some of the them were observed being indifferent to the classes. They were passive and did not pay enough attention to courses and did what the teachers told them what to do. When asked to work in pairs and groups, they were reluctant to attend the activities.

Table 4. 16. *Thematic analysis of classroom observations*

Themes	Codes	OA	OB	OC	OD	OE	OF
Course conduct							
Teaching	Learning	TTT	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Process	Student individual		✓	✓		✓	✓
	Interactive (s-t) / (s-s)		✓	✓		✓	✓
Teacher roles	Instructor		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Guide		✓	✓		✓	✓
	Initiator			✓			✓
	Monitoring		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Student Roles	Most of the time Active		✓			✓	✓
	Eager to learn and participate						
	Most of the time Passive			✓	✓		
	Indifferent / reluctant						✓

4.3.4. Student Assessment

This section presents the evaluation results of the fourth component of the curriculum; the student assessment and feedback, through the analysis of different data evaluation questionnaires, student and teacher interviews, and classroom observations. The analysis of the multiple data was combined and presented in the following subsections.

4.3.4.1. Questionnaires

Regarding the results of the course evaluation questionnaire, the mean scores of the items evaluating the assessment and feedback component of the program ranged from 3.91 to 2.83. The detailed descriptive analysis of the course assessment and student feedback is seen in Table 4.17.

The arithmetic mean of all items is seen as 3.44 which can be implied that the students have some positive attitudes towards the program assessment and feedback while there are some negative attitudes to other items as well. For instance, the majority of the students agreed with the statement that tests included a variety of questions or tasks while the majority of the students had negative attitudes or were not sure about the statements that the exam results demonstrated their actual proficiency in speaking listening skills. The other scores of the students' responses regarding the course assessment evaluation are stated as follows respectively: The students found the amount of feedback given on their performance in the tests sufficient, the instructions on the tests were clear, the tests measured all skills equally, the instructor's grade on presentation and tasks were fair.

In the questionnaires students generally rated positively that Progress Evaluation Exams (PEE) included all the skills to be improved, the tests demonstrated the students' actual language development, test results demonstrated students' actual writing ability and reading ability, tests generally measured students' grammar knowledge, writing task results demonstrated students' actual proficiency in writing, quiz and PEE results demonstrated students' actual ability in listening skills, Quiz and PEE results demonstrated their actual proficiency in reading skills.

Table 4.17 *The Perspectives of the students on the courses assessment and feedback*

Items	1	2	3	4	5	Mean \bar{x}	SD
	Frequency						
1. Progress Evaluation Exams (PEE), projects and quizzes demonstrate my actual language development.	7	4	21	20	13	3,43	1,199
2. The instructions on the tests have been clear	3	3	14	33	12	3,74	0,973
3. Process Evaluation Exams (PEE) include all the skills to be improved.	5	5	19	24	11	3,48	1,113
4. Speaking exam results demonstrate my actual proficiency/ability in speaking skills.	14	13	17	13	8	2,83	1,328
5. Writing pack has helped me improve my writing skills	5	9	10	28	13	3,56	1,180
6. Writing task results demonstrate my actual proficiency/ability in writing skills.	8	5	23	18	11	3,33	1,183
7. The quiz and The Process Evaluation Exam (PEE) results demonstrate my actual proficiency/ability in reading skills.	12	7	16	22	8	3,14	1,283
8. The quiz and The Process Evaluation Exam (PEE) results demonstrate my actual proficiency/ability in listening skills.	8	9	19	20	9	3,20	1,224
9. The grading has been fair.	6	5	13	29	12	3,55	1,167
10. I have received sufficient feedback on my performance in the tests.	3	6	7	35	14	3,78	1,046
11. Tests generally measure my grammar knowledge.	5	11	14	24	11	3,38	1,189
12. Tests generally measure all the skills (reading, writing, speaking, listening) equally.	4	5	14	23	19	3,73	1,158
13. Tests include a variety of questions/tasks.	3	2	13	27	20	3,91	1,035
14. Tests results demonstrate my actual writing ability.	6	6	19	23	11	3,41	1,165
15. Tests results demonstrate my actual listening ability.	8	15	15	16	11	3,09	1,294

Table 4.17 *The Perspectives of the students on the courses assessment and feedback (Continued)*

Items	1	2	3	4	5	Mean \bar{x}	SD
	Frequency						
16. Tests results demonstrate my actual reading ability.	6	11	9	27	12	3,41	1,231
17. The instructor's grade on presentation and tasks has been fair.	9	4	11	22	19	3,61	1,341

4.3.4.2. Student Interviews

According to the analysis of the student interviews related to student assessment, the interviewed students seemed to be on the common ground that there was a parallel relation between course conduct and the exams. Just student D stated that the exams did not include sufficient questions to assess the students' actual grammar knowledge. Table 4. 18 demonstrates the thematic analysis of students' comments about assessment of the program.

SD: *"We learn a lot of grammar topics in the lesson. But, in the PEE exams only one or two parts are testing our grammar knowledge."*

Most of the students responded positively to the question related to the effectiveness of the student assessment tools. They thought the assessment tools show their actual success to some extent. However, some students expressed that the assessment tools did not reflect their actual success. They stated that because of exam stress and anxiety, especially in presentations, speaking, and writing exams, they panicked and could not do as well as they expected.

SA: *"I think I get excited and panicked in the exams and sometimes get lower points than my actual classroom performance."*

SF explains the reason why he thinks that exams do not reflect his actual success is high anxiety level while doing some listening, speaking, and writing skill exercises.

I can say that the exam results reflect my real ability in reading, writing, or use of English. Our exams start with the listening part. At the beginning of the exam, I am generally very excited and stressed. That's why I have difficulty concentrating on the audio playing, so I miss some parts of listening and cannot answer the questions correctly. I have the same problem with speaking too. Our teachers try to lower our stress by asking some easy

questions, but I get really anxious and afraid to make mistakes. Plus, if the speaking topic is difficult for me to talk about, I just stay silent and don't want to speak. (SF)

Table 4.18 *Thematic analysis of student interviews related to student assessment*

Themes	Codes	SA	SB	SC	SD	SE	SF
The relation between course conduct and evaluation	Parallel	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Different in grammar					✓	
Assessment Tools effective	Effective	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
	Not effective (projects and presentations)		✓				
Tools Reflect Actual Success	Yes / always						
	No /never		✓				✓
	Sometimes	✓		✓	✓	✓	
	Stress factor	✓	✓		✓		✓
Students satisfaction about their success	Anxiety/ excitement		✓				✓
	High	✓	✓	✓		✓	
	To some extent (because of irregular attendance)				✓		
	To some extent (because of self motivation)						✓
Language skills improved as expected	Vocabulary	✓	✓		✓	✓	
	Grammar	✓	✓		✓		✓
	Listening	✓	✓			✓	
	Speaking	✓	✓	✓		✓	
	Reading	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Writing	✓	✓	✓		✓	

In the interviews held with the students, the students shared the same idea that they improved their grammar, reading, writing, and vocabulary level to some extent. However, they

expressed that their speaking, writing and listening skills did not improve as they expected. Three of the students stated that they were satisfied with their success, while two commented that they were not. Student E explained it

I do not think I could improve my language proficiency as much as I expected. The courses were overloaded and difficult for me. I could not attend the courses regularly for two weeks because of Covid 19. When I missed two weeks, I could not catch up with the courses. (SE)

Student F explained that:

SF: *“The courses and exams were difficult for me. I lost my motivation and did not concentrate on the courses as much as I had to. The teachers did not try to motivate me either.”*

4.3.4.3. Teacher Interviews

The thematic analysis of teacher interviews related to student assessment show that teachers share the same idea that the assessment tools are effective to test student success to some extent. Table 4. 19 displays the findings of the thematic analysis related to teachers’ perspectives on student assessment.

Table 4.19 *Thematic analysis of teacher interviews on student assessment*

Themes	Codes	TA	TB	TC	TD	TE
Effectiveness of Assessment tools	Effective		✓			
	To some extent because of stress	✓		✓		
	Student motivation	✓				
Reflect students actual success	Last minute preparation for projects and presentations				✓	
	To a great extent / parallel / mostly accurate	✓	✓		✓	
	Not much/different		✓	✓		✓
	Stress / Anxiety	✓		✓		✓
Teacher satisfaction with students performance	Writing out of format and off topic		✓			✓
	To a great extent	✓				
	To some extent		✓	✓	✓	✓
	Listening speaking					✓
	Not satisfied with vocab, revading,	✓				✓

Teachers commented that the assessment tools may not reflect students’ actual success as the students get excited and anxious during the exam process. When the PLS -101 (TC) course

instructor was asked about to what extent the exam or presentation results reflected the students' actual performance in speaking, she made the following comment:

During the speaking exams, some of the students had exam anxiety. Although the examiners try to calm them down as much as possible by asking easy everyday questions at the beginning of the exam, some students got excited and couldn't speak as expected.
(TC)

Another important point that instructor D raised is that:

TD: *“Even sometimes assessment results do not reflect their success because of some factors such as excitement or anxiety, I think overall they reflect how successful our students really are because they are not evaluated from a single aspect.”*

When the instructors were asked whether they were content with the students' performance, most of the teachers stated that they were satisfied with students' performance to some extent.

TA: *“Yes, some of them were even above the expectations. And, of course some students were below the class average. But, they did well on average.”*

Instructor D states that she is content with students' listening and grammar skills but not satisfied with reading and vocabulary skills and explains the reason behind their failure to be successful is because of last minute preparation and studying for the exams and projects.

I am somewhat satisfied regarding their listening and grammar skills. However, their vocabulary knowledge is lacking, therefore their reading skills are also not satisfactory. My main point of dissatisfaction is the lack of self-learning and the last second studying when it comes to students. Because they didn't put the same effort during the first term, even if they began studying this term, they are not improving as we have intended them to. (TD)

4.3.5. Overall Evaluation

In this section the overall evaluation of the program is presented with the data obtained from students' and teachers' interviews. The students and instructors were asked to tell three good things that should continue to exist and three bad things that should be omitted from the program or improved in the program. The findings gained from thematic analysis of student interviews related to positive and negative parts of the program is displayed in Table 4.20.

In the interviews held with the students, the most prominent positive point that most of the students made was student-teacher communication and instructors' counselling. The

students stated that they were able to consult and reach the course instructors whenever they need. Student D stated as follows:

After the PEE exams our teachers gave us detailed feedback and advised us how and what to study more to improve our grades and English level. I think they are very useful for me and helped me see my weak parts. And also the teachers were always accessible to me when I need feedback. I appreciate it very much. (Student D).

In addition to the effective communication between the students and teachers, some students made positive comments on the group work activities (n=3), the use of grammar and writing packs (n=3) and watching videos (n=2). Intellectual games, projects, writing essays, office hours, and the coherence among the three courses are the other positive points raised by the students.

On the other hand, the students are fairly negative towards the weekly course hours of the program. Some students stated that the 30-hour program a week was overloaded. Another criticized point by the students was the PLS-101 textbook. The students thought the book was not user-friendly and it didn't include interesting topics. Student D states that the speaking topics were repetitive which led her to lose her motivation and willingness to take part in classroom discussions actively. The other negative points of the program that the students raised were the inadequacy of group work activities in the PLS course (n=3), online homework given for three courses (n=2), overloaded homework (n=2), the start and end hours of the lessons, the price of the books.

Apart from the students' opinions, the analysis of teacher interviews show that TA mentions the books, supplementary packs, and other additional materials, weekend homework, TB mentions writing pace, providing suitable content to the students, TC and TD state clearly stated course objectives, and TD adds the efficiency and the instructor friendliness of the program as the positive parts of the current program implemented in the preparatory school.

Table 4.20 *Thematic analysis of student interviews related to positive and negative parts of the program*

Themes	Codes	SA	SB	SC	SD	SE	SF	
Positive Parts	Intellectual games	✓						
	Projects	✓			✓			
	Video watching					✓	✓	
	Working in groups	✓	✓		✓			
	Writing essays	✓						
	Students packs		✓			✓		
	Office Hours		✓					
	Student-teacher communication /counseling				✓	✓	✓	✓
	There is a coherence among three courses				✓			
Negative Parts	More group works in PLS course							
	PLS textbook	✓			✓			
	Online homeworkfor PRW		✓	✓	✓			
	Some speaking questions	✓						
	Online homework for PIS					✓		
	The rule for starting and finishing hour of classes are so strict	✓						
	30 hour a week program		✓					
	Overloaded homework				✓	✓		

When they were asked about the negative points of the program, the instructors B and D stated that the program could not provide remedial /repeat courses for the weak students. TA and TD state that there was sometimes overlap between courses which made the students get tired of talking about the same topics because of parallel topics. TC and TD stated that the PIS-101 course focused on skills too much and TD added that the teachers were stuck in the curriculum more than paying attention to students' needs. TE

expressed that grouping the students according to their language levels affected the success of some students negatively.

To sum up, the evaluation of the course evaluation questionnaires, the student and teacher interviews and classroom observations reveal that although the program is effective enough to improve students' language proficiency to some extent, there are certain issues to be taken into consideration to improve the effectiveness of the program. These issues are analyzed in the following section in detail according to the suggestions of the students and instructors.

4.4. Suggestions for the Improvement of the Preparatory Program

In this section, suggestions and improvements made by the students and teachers in the program evaluation interviews conducted to effectively maintain and strengthen the current preparatory program are expressed on the basis of four main components of the program: course aims and objectives, course content and materials, course conduct and student assessment.

To this end, this section aims to answer the fourth research question of the study:

4. What are the recommendations of stakeholders (instructors, students, administrators, testing units, and curriculum designers) to develop and strengthen the current preparatory school curriculum?

4.4.1. Course Aims and Objectives

In this section, suggestions, and recommendations given by students and teachers are combined and presented regarding course aims and objective.

In the student interviews, when asked what the new goals of the program should be, most students could not give exact answers to this question, yet they suggested some arrangements and improvements in the application of some objectives especially listening and speaking ones in order to achieve the existing goals more effectively. They suggested having a more communicative learning environment by adding extra speaking activities that can enable the students to work in groups and discuss or make debates in the classroom. Student C expressed her opinion that the activities in Prism Listening and Speaking did not allow them to gain the desired objectives of speaking and listening skills determined in the curriculum.

Another student suggested changing the PLS course books and making fewer curriculum led activities. He added:

While following the book and trying to catch up with the pace of the curriculum objectives, we pass some topics faster than needed in some weeks. I think the teachers should follow the learning pace of the students, not the specific objectives. I sometimes think that the course objectives are to finish the activities on the book in the scheduled time. We neglect our main objective which is to teach us how to communicate or express our opinions easily in English.” (Student B)

The PLS-101 instructor supported this statement with her comment as follows:

TC: *“Objectives of the course were clear and understandable. Applying these objectives by using only books was impossible. That’s why there should be prepared backup materials.”*

Student E also evaluated her speaking ability. She emphasized that even though she attended the courses regularly and participated in group and pair work activities actively, she thought that she could not make complex sentences and could not speak as fluently and accurately as she desired. She suggested adding more speaking objectives to the curriculum that can help the students speak more.

The course instructor made similar suggestions with student E on the speaking and listening objectives of the course.

TC: *“Students need to focus on practicing actively. More extracurricular activities; such as games, quiz shows should be prepared that are related to our teaching aims.”*

When asked, the other teachers supported the same opinion with the students. Almost all of the instructors highlighted the need for more authentic materials (n=4), more extracurricular materials (n=2) and more daily language context to be implemented in the curriculum to help the students achieve the desired curriculum goals more effectively. PIS-101 course instructor explained:

Students need an understanding of the culture of the language that they are learning. Solely relying on books and provided texts in this context gives the students much more than they are willing to put effort into. Trying to adapt some extracurricular activities in this respect, meaning blending activities revolving around popular

culture/daily interactions such as TV shows, games, movies, etc. into our classes might add another layer to our teaching. (Teacher D)

In addition to these suggestions, some students suggested adding more objectives to the curriculum about slang language (n=2) and idioms (n=2) that they can use in the daily language apart from the academic vocabulary and language objectives.

Another significant point the students raised were the reading and writing objectives. Student B stated that there were insufficient reading objectives in the class. She claimed that when they did not read enough and work on the reading passages enough, it was difficult for her to write about a topic. Therefore, she suggested adding more reading and writing objectives to the courses.

The PRW-101 course instructors agreed with this comment to some extent by saying:

TB: *“In general, I believe we have a compact, applicable and complete reading and writing curriculum for the target exit level of the students in the Prep. school, but I think some more extensive reading skills can also be added to the curriculum.”*

To conclude, although there have not been many suggestions about adding new objectives and aims to the curriculum, the instructors and students recommended some suggestions to strengthen the efficiency of teaching these aims and objectives in the program. Instructor D suggested giving an introductory lesson during the first week of the academic year about the general rules of the English language such as the sentence structure and components of a sentence in addition to giving brief information about the objectives of each course. She added:

I think the biggest problem the students have while learning English, is not the objectives, it is just the language structure which is different from their native language, so an introductory lesson about these factors can help students' language learning process. I also believe that the students need to put more effort into self-study or should be given ways to teach themselves how to use the language from the very beginning to the end.” (Teacher D)

Instructor A who was also the director of the school of foreign languages summarized this point as the following:

TA: *“In general, there are sufficient objectives determined in detail in the curriculum to lead the students to reach the desired outcomes in each skill. It already has a big mission.*

However, the other factors such as the content, materials and conduct of the courses can be improved to teach the current goals much more effectively.”

To this end, the suggestions and recommendations given by the students and instructors about the other main components of a program, which are course content and materials, course conduct and students’ assessment are going to be presented in the following sections.

4.4.2. Course Content and Materials

This section presents the suggestions and recommendations of the students and teachers combined through course evaluation interviews about the current course content and materials used in the preparatory school.

In the interviews, when the students were asked to give some suggestions to improve and strengthen the content and materials used in the program, most of the students suggested implementing more interesting topics (n=4) that attract their interests. In terms of the materials used in the program, the students had the same common point that the topics covered in the textbooks made them get bored and lower their motivation to attend the courses more actively because of asking the same kind of questions in a different way many times (n=5). Instead, they suggested using more audio-visual materials such as videos (n=4), and short movies (n=3) that can attract their attention. Student B stated:

The topics covered in the books are detailed and repetitive. Instead of this, the topics which could help us improve our language level to a higher level could have been implemented in the courses. The topics could be more student-oriented and could be chosen according to our individual needs and interests.” (SB)

Student C also suggested adding some extra materials to encourage their creativity and explained:

I think we should use more audio-visual materials that can improve our creativity. We can watch a short video that is related to our course topic and summarize or write a review about it or we can watch half of a short movie and pause it in the half and try to continue the story or end the story with our ideas. I think this kind of activities would be useful for our creativity. (Student C)

In line with the student's answers, the instructors also emphasized the importance of providing a variety of content and materials that meet the students' needs and interests in the classroom. Instructor D put emphasis on using materials that draw the students' personal interests by explaining:

TD: *“Student’ interests and the current usage of online applications could be adapted to our materials, meaning there could be articles and videos concerning different interests such as reading, computer games, interesting facts, etc.”*

Instructor B suggests adding some department-specific (ESP) themes and topics to the preparatory school curriculum taking into consideration the main purpose of the program which is to make the students get ready for their departments. She explained:

TB: *“Of course, I don’t mean that we as English teachers should teach all terminology and main objectives of the departments to the students beforehand, but we can include more department-specific content to the program.”*

Another student suggested using more audio-visual and authentic materials in the PLS-101 and PRW-101 courses:

In listening and speaking lessons, I don’t think we did enough speaking and listening activities. There should be more videos, audio or discussions, interviews and presentations about real-life issues. Instead of trying to answer open questions that make me feel confused about what to talk about or closed-ended questions in the book, we can have some speech cards and talk about and discuss the related course topics. I can say the same problem in reading writing courses. We should have read more articles about daily issues and some daily interesting news equivalent to our language level. (SE)

Student D also added that they should have read more articles in the courses especially in PRW-101 course. She mentioned how difficult it can be for a student to find a useful reading article online as the articles may not be good for their language level.

I think we could have read more articles in the PRW-101 course about daily issues. When I want to read some news on the internet, I can’t decide if they are proper for my English level. Our teachers can choose some news or interesting facts, or articles related to our interests and levels every week, the students who want to do some extra reading activities, can read them. I think it would be useful for us. (SD)

Two PRW-101 course instructors had the same idea that there should be more authentic materials and more authentic language components for the PRW-101 courses in the program. Instructor E expressed:

TE: *“Students need to practice more with authentic materials in the context of pop culture. Then they might find the lessons more appealing compared to book-based lessons in terms of PRW.”*

On the other hand, some students expressed that they wanted to work on worksheets and other handouts (n=3). Student A explained that worksheets would help her revise the topics she learned and understand the covered topics clearly in PIS (101) courses.

Another point that the students criticized and suggested a change was the level of the topics covered in the courses (n=2). They suggested using more high-level topics or materials that would help them improve their proficiency level. For example, student A commented that they should read and work on more difficult reading articles in PRW-101 courses to improve their vocabulary knowledge. However, the students with low English proficiency levels suggested the opposite. Student F offered to use easier materials and worksheets that can help them improve their language proficiency.

In general, almost all students expressed their content with the extra materials and textbooks used in the PIS-101 and the PRW-101 courses except for the books used in the PLS-101 course. Most of the students criticized the listening and speaking books used in the PLS-101 course. They suggested using more audio-visual materials in listening and speaking courses (n=5). They suggested changing the book and preparing a pack like the ones in other courses. Student F expressed her opinion as follows:

The topics covered in Prism book were so boring and repetitive for me. As there were not enough note-taking activities, we could not practice note-taking activities enough. I think it would be very useful for us to have a listening pack as we have in PIS and PRW courses. The teacher should give more extra materials. (SF)

Another prominent negative point that the students made was the types of online homework given (n=3). The students suggested doing more interactive and creative homework that can help them improve their proficiency. Student D suggested:

Our teachers should give us more creative and interactive homework. For example, we can write a story or take a short video of an interview. We can talk to some foreigners, ask them some questions or prepare a class poster. We did this kind of homework in the PRW course,

but we just did some revision activities mostly on My English Lab for PIS course and PLS course. (SD)

As a last, when asked what changes can be suggested in the program content, instructor B focused on the use of skill-based curriculum and integrated skills curriculum together which confused some students and explained the reason as follows:

Some students consider PIS-101 course as the grammar teaching lesson only while they believe they can improve reading and writing skills only in PRW-101 and listening and speaking skills only in PLS-101 course. However, we all know very well that our core curriculum is covered in the PIS-101 course in an eclectic way and the students learn all skills and sub-skills in this course while the skill courses serve only to provide some extra strategies and practices about the points that are covered in PIS-101 course. Hence, I believe we need to design only integrated skills-based or skill-based curriculum to prevent this misunderstanding that both the lecturers and students suffer from. (TB)

In conclusion, when asked to make suggestions to improve the course content and materials of the current preparatory program, the students suggested some improvements and changes in the content of the program as listed in the following; providing more speaking materials (n=5) such as speech cards, more audio-visual materials (n=5), more note-taking materials relevant to students' level (n=4), more authentic materials (n=3), worksheets (n=3), more useful online homework (n=3), a listening pack (n=2), extra articles (n=2) and high-level reading materials (n=1), activities that encourage creativity (n=1), less written documents (n=1), changing the PLS-101 textbooks (n=1). On the other hand, the suggestions made by the instructors to improve the content and materials of the program can be listed as: more audio-visual materials (4), extra authentic course materials (3), extra materials for students' needs and interests (2), more interesting topics for the students (2), more online applications (2), more focus on grammar pack and weekend homework (1), adding some ESP themes (1), extra note-taking activities (1). Both the students and course instructors shared the same idea that interesting topics, more audio-visual and authentic materials should be added to the program to improve the effectiveness of the course content and materials.

4.4.3. Course Conduct

In this section, suggestions, and recommendations given by the teachers and students regarding the course conduct of the preparatory school program are presented.

According to the analysis of the interviews related to the suggestions about course conduct, the majority of the participants stated that the lessons were generally taught in a teacher-centered manner, but student F stated that the teachers were not the only ones responsible for that manner, and the students' indifference to the lessons caused that situation as well.

I believe that most of our teachers usually did their best in the lessons, they motivated us to participate in the lessons, and guided us, but my friends played on their phones or stayed passive. I think our teachers shouldn't allow the students to use their mobile phones during the courses. (SF)

It is also concluded that the teaching-learning process did not include sufficient group work activities, and the students suggested having more group work activities, and more student-centered and collaborative learning activities in the course conduct. They stated that they wanted to be more active in the teaching-learning process. Student B made the following suggestion on this statement.

I think some teachers neglected group activities a bit. I think such activities encourage us to express ourselves more and be more active, so teachers should give more space to such activities. They gave instructions and told us what to do. Of course, as students, we have our faults in this regard, but I think more responsibility should be given to the students by our teachers. (SB)

According to the other findings of the English preparatory student interviews, it was stated by the students that the curriculum should be updated, and the course hours should be reduced. Student C stated:

I'm happy with the current course conduct and I know some of my friends and I try to get the most from the teaching-learning process. However, the lesson hours are so long that the courses lose their effectiveness, especially the ones at the end of the day and week. We have a 30-hour course each week which means 6 hours a day. I think is too much for a week. That's why I believe reducing the course hours at least 25 hours will make the courses be conducted more productively for us. (SC)

Some students made some positive and negative comments about the communication between the students and teachers. Although most of the students stated that they had a good communication and counselling system between the teachers and students which affected their attendance and participation to the courses, one student expressed his negative opinion as follows:

We have strong communication with some of our teachers, so I want to participate in her lessons and try not to miss her lessons more. Because I know she is there for my improvement and ready to help me whenever I need her. I don't feel afraid to make mistakes or give answers even if I am not sure about them. When there is a communication breakdown, as students, we become more reluctant and avoid attending the lessons. Because I am worried to make mistakes in her courses. I don't feel comfortable. So I believe that when our communication with the teacher is strong, we do not hesitate to attend the lesson and we have a more effective learning environment. (SD)

In the interviews with the teachers, it was also suggested by all teachers that the course topics and themes should be taught in a student-centered learning environment. Some teachers also recommended that different kinds of activities should be included in the lessons to keep the participation and motivation of the students high. Instructor D stated that:

Overall, I'm happy with our program content. However, we should build up extracurricular and provide more fun activities for the students. We should make it so that they will want to join our classes rather than having to join them. We can create a free learning environment and allow them some freedom in their learning. (TD)

The other instructors suggested encouraging the students to be more responsible for their learnings and be peer teachers to each other (2) in the teaching-learning process. Teacher B stated that:

The teacher provides most of the information and TTT (teacher talking time) is very high during the courses. We also give some support, most of the students do not ask for the support themselves. So, the students should be encouraged to be autonomous learners, study the given material beforehand or ask their own questions instead of the teacher inviting them to ask for questions. (TB)

Teacher A also gave a suggestion as follows:

In general, the students should have some space to learn on their own. I think we shouldn't try to control everything in the classroom. We should guide the learning. They should get help from their teacher or friends when needed. (TA)

4.4.4. Student Assessment

In this section, suggestions, and recommendations made by the teachers and students regarding the student assessment in the preparatory program are presented.

In the interviews held with the students, the most prominent suggestion made by almost all of the students was that the end-of-course exam, that is the Proficiency exam should not be the only criteria to decide students' success. The students stated that the proficiency exam may not reflect their actual performance in the program.

One of the students made the following suggestion regarding this situation;

In my opinion, the criteria for starting the department courses should not depend on a single exam result. The students can get stressed in the exam and may not give correct answers to the questions that he/she can answer easily. I think the success of the students shouldn't be assessed like this and the students should be given another chance. (SB)

Another student supported her friends answer by her saying:

We are going to have the proficiency exam soon. Imagine that, we were very successful during two semesters, but something happened in the exam and I couldn't pass the proficiency exam, I failed. All my success is neglected. I know there is another exam in September, but it makes us a little nervous as it is perceived as the only and last chance to pass. My stress level will be high...As a class, we also thought that we have four PEE exams. After the semester finishes, we take the proficiency exam. The mean grade of the four PEEs, the quizzes, projects, and tasks we take during the year is the grade that decides if we can take the proficiency exam or not. I don't think it should be like this. We have a process that can show our success, or the average of the whole tests we have taken during the process should be evaluated to measure our success. I am able to take the proficiency exam with my average but I m again evaluated with a single exam. It is not much different from the university entrance exam we take. There is again only one exam result that decides you re successful or not. What if there are some setbacks in this exam and it is very usual and possible to be. (Student D)

Instructor B who both works in the testing unit and teaches reading and writing skills stated:

I'm happy with the current evaluation system as it gives the opportunity both for the formative and summative evaluation. Since we teach in a prep school, it would not be possible not to give an end-of-year exam to students. However, giving four different PEE exams throughout the academic year in addition to quizzes, tasks, or projects for each course can help the students follow their academic success and make necessary changes on the way to the summative evaluation. (TB)

Another student made some suggestions for the variety of the speaking courses. She suggested adding more different kinds of speaking tests in the speaking exams and expressed his opinion as follows:

SC: "I think that more various speaking tests can be done. Now it is progressing as a monologue, maybe it can be a little more interactive."

Student D also made some suggestions about the projects that the students were graded. She expressed:

We submitted a newspaper preparation project in the PIS-101 course. To be honest, I felt really sad when I learned that we did not need to present our projects in the classroom. I expected a presentation. It would be more effective and more fun for us to prepare something and present it. (SD)

Student F also suggested that their in-class speaking performance should also be taken into account in the speaking exams. He stated:

My speaking level is low; I cannot take notes in a minute which is given for us to get prepared for our speech in the speaking exams. As my English level is low, I hesitate to make mistakes and don't want to talk. But if our performance in the classroom is taken into consideration while evaluating our speaking skills, I can get some points, a few but better than taking zero. (SF)

Likewise, instructor D made the same suggestion by saying:

TD: "Participation and students' classroom performance being part of the assessment could encourage students to initiate more during their lessons."

In addition, the listening and speaking skill instructor (Teacher C) suggested adding some speaking quizzes for the next term which can help the students get accustomed to the exam atmosphere and lower their high anxiety level in the speaking.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

5.1. Introduction

The current study focuses on the evaluation and improvement of the English preparatory school curriculum at a private university on the basis of four main components of a curriculum: course aims and objectives, course content and materials, course conduct and student assessment. In this regard, the adapted version of the Bellon and Handler (1982) curriculum evaluation model by Tekir (2020) is used to evaluate the current curriculum. In this section, the results of the study will be discussed under four main curriculum components of the research model regarding the research questions with the help of previous research done in the field.

5.2. Discussions of the Results

In this section, the results of the evaluation study are discussed and compared based on the analysis of four main components of the curriculum evaluation respectively: course aims and objectives, course content and materials, course conduct and student assessment. Under each curriculum component the *current status* of the curriculum, the *evaluation* of the curriculum regarding the students and teachers' perspectives and *suggestions* made by the students and teachers are discussed respectively. The discusses research questions as follows:

1. What is the current status of the English curriculum implemented at the preparatory school in terms of objectives, course content and materials, course conduct, and student assessment procedures?
2. What are the students' perspectives about the English curriculum in terms of its objectives, course content and materials, course conduct, and students' assessment procedures?
3. What are testing units, administrators, curriculum designers' and instructors' perspectives about the English curriculum in terms of its objectives, course content and material, course conduct, and student assessment procedures?

4. What are the recommendations of stakeholders (instructors, students, administrators, testing unit, and curriculum designer) to develop and strengthen the current preparatory school curriculum?

5.2.1. Course Aims and Objectives

Regarding the first research question of the study, the results of the current status descriptions obtained through the document analysis illustrate that the aims and objectives of the program was predetermined and stated in the curriculum and course syllabi. However, in the studies conducted by Şişman (2019), Aktaş and Gündoğdu (2020), it was concluded that there was no written document stating the aims and objectives of the preparatory language curriculum they evaluated. Not having written and detailed goals and objectives of the program causes problems in forming main focus areas of the program (Aktaş and Gündoğdu, 2020). The main aim of the current program is to prepare the students for their future academic studies in their departments and to improve their English language proficiency to the B1+, CEFR (Common European Framework of Reference) level. The analysis of the curriculum and course syllabi show that skill-based objectives are determined in each course syllabi focusing on improving grammar and vocabulary knowledge of the students, reading, writing, listening and speaking skills of the learners. In a study conducted to investigate the perceptions of students, instructors, and other program stakeholders in an English Preparatory School, Mede and Akyel (2014) also stated that the main purpose of the preparatory school curriculum was to be able to master the four basic language skills of the learners and to make the students use these language skills in meaningful contexts. Apart from the four main language skills: reading, writing, listening, and speaking, critical thinking skills, language awareness, communication, and self-study skills have been specified in the skill-based curriculum and the student handbooks.

Regarding the second and third research questions, when the students were asked to evaluate to what extent the course aims and objectives have been achieved, the students evaluated the effectiveness of the aims and objectives positively to some extent and the mean of all items was over the average (M=3.59) The most positively evaluated language skill in achieving aims and objectives in the program was the reading skill (M=3.86). This finding of the study is parallel with previous studies. Şişman (2019), suggested that the reading skill objectives are the most achieved skill in the English preparatory school curriculum. A similar finding was found in studies conducted by Topçu (2005) and Tekir (2020). On the other hand,

it was concluded that the most negatively evaluated skill in achieving objectives in the current study were speaking skills with 3.23 mean score. The interviews conducted with the students supported this statement as well. The interviewed students expressed that they could not improve their speaking skills as expected. That is, it can be concluded that the finding of the questionnaires illustrates a meaningful parallelism with the ones concluded from the student interviews. The results also show that the students were not sure about the realization of speaking objectives which was supported by the instructors. The instructors and students expressed their concerns about speaking skills objectives. This finding is also supported by many studies conducted by Yel (2009), Tunç (2010), İnal and Aksoy (2014), Özdoruk (2016), and Aktaş and Gündoğdu (2020) which concluded that the curriculum is insufficient to meet the speaking objectives of the program.

The results of the questionnaires and interviews also showed that the students were generally content with aims and objectives determined for reading, writing, and grammar proficiency to some extent, however, they stated in the interviews that they could not improve their listening skills as expected. The results of the instructor interviews also show that although the instructors believed that the aims and goals of the courses were determined well enough to improve students' language skills, the students cannot reach the desired listening and speaking level at the end of the program. It can be concluded from the results that the findings about effectiveness of listening and speaking skills show meaningful parallelism across data sources. There are numerous studies that reach similar statements as well. The students and sometimes language instructors shared the common idea that the preparatory school curriculum could not enable the students to improve their speaking and listening skills as expected. (Yılmaz, 2004; İnal & Aksoy, 2014; Ulum, 2015; Özdoruk, 2016; Akpur et al., 2016; Akpur, 2017; Özudoğru, 2017, Aktaş & Gündoğdu, 2020; Tekir, 2020). The reasons behind this failure as stated by one of the students interviewed in the current study could be too many book-centered and curriculum-oriented activities used in the courses.

Regarding the fourth research question, the suggestions made by the students and teachers in the interviews for the improvement of the current preparatory program mainly focused on listening and speaking skills in order to achieve the desired goals more effectively. The students suggested providing additional speaking and listening activities instead of using the book. Likewise, Aktaş and Gündoğdu (2020) and Tekir (2020) expressed students' suggestions for adding more realistic tasks and exercises in the program to improve and check

students' listening and speaking skills. Most of the students and the PLS-101 (listening and speaking) instructor complained that the book was insufficient to achieve the speaking and listening objectives and suggested doing more extracurricular activities during the lessons. They suggested having a more communicative learning environment that can enable the students to be more active and have more chances to speak.

It can be concluded that the students and teachers were content with the aims and objectives of the program in general. However, some revisions and improvements can be made to the skill-based curriculum to state main objectives of the program. The objectives and aims of speaking and listening courses can be revised and improved to meet the needs of the students. To this end, rather than determining the program goals according to the Common European Framework of Reference, the needs analysis study can be conducted to learn the needs of the student, language instructors, and instructors from other departments, administration and other stakeholders of the curriculum both at the beginning and at the end of a course to be able to evaluate the curriculum more effectively (Bellon & Handler, 1982).

5.2.2. Course Content and Materials

Regarding the first research question of the study, the current status of the program, the document analysis shows that there is detailed content given in the course syllabi of PRW-101 and PLS-101 courses, however, the PIS-101 syllabus just includes which unit is covered each week. The topics covered in the program are education, sports, cultural activities, hobbies, environmental problems, economics, and political issues. In terms of materials used in the program, some textbooks for each lesson and some packs as supplementary materials are used in the teaching learning process. The results of the document analysis show that there is no written document giving information about the use of audio-visual and online materials. The teachers in the interviews stated that they prepared extra handouts or backup materials if needed.

As to the evaluation stage of the study seeking answers to the second and third research question, the results of the questionnaires and interviews show that the students and teachers were content with the topics and materials used in the program to some extent however, there were some weak items that need to be taken into consideration. According to the results of the questionnaires, the students found course materials used to improve their grammar knowledge (M=4.12) more useful and effective than the other materials. The least effective and useful

materials were the ones used to improve their listening skills (M=3.05). The findings of the interviews also support this conclusion. The students complained about the insufficient listening materials which were agreed upon by the instructors. However, the interviews made with the instructors did not support the same opinion. Erozan (2005) also concluded in the study to evaluate the English Language Teaching department curriculum that the materials used in listening and reading courses were not sufficient enough to improve students' proficiency in those skills. Likewise, Yılmaz, (2004), İnal and Aksoy (2014), Ulum (2015), Özdoruk (2016), Akpur et al. (2016), (Akpur,2017), Özudođru (2017) and Aktaş and Gündođdu (2020), Tekir (2020) evaluated language curricula of different language educational institutions and concluded that the students and sometimes language instructors shared the same idea that speaking and listening activities and materials were not sufficiently used to enable the learners to be more competent in these skills.

Another finding concluded from student interviews was that there was a disagreement about the difficulty of the topics covered in the first and second semesters. It is concluded that the topics and themes are overloaded and not covered enough to meet the desired objectives in the second term, whereas the time allocated for the topics and themes in the first term was longer than needed. It is also concluded in other studies that teaching time for use of English, productive and receptive skills was not balanced in the language teaching process and not divided equally (Akpur et al., 2016; Özudođru, 2017, Aktaş & Gündođdu, 2020).

The interviews held with the students and instructors also illustrate that the topics covered in the three courses are mostly the same and synchronous which made students get bored and demotivate students' attendance to the courses. The stated were agreed on the repetitive topics covered in PLS-101 course.

Another notable finding of the present study was insufficient material used in the course conduct which led the students to lose their motivation to learn. Similar findings can be found in other studies that activities and materials used in the teaching-learning process were insufficient and not used effectively (Yılmaz, 2004; İnal & Aksoy, 2014; Ulum, 2015; Özdoruk, 2016; Akpur et al., 2016; Akpur,2017; Özudođru, 2017, Aktaş & Gündođdu, 2020; Tekir, 2020). The course instructor's comment supported this statement. However, in another study, Güneş (2009) concluded that the content of the curriculum was appropriate to meet the needs of the students. Both the students and teachers stated that there were not enough audio-visual and authentic materials that can make the courses more interesting. The students complained

about doing activities from the books and some handouts. Based on the findings, it can be noted that all participants emphasized the deficiency of audio-visual and authentic materials. Some other studies have reached the same conclusions. Akpur, Alcı, and Karataş (2016) also evaluated the English preparatory class curriculum at Yıldız Teknik University. The findings showed that the audio-visual materials used in the course are insufficient to attract the students' attention. The audio-visual materials were inadequate. Likewise, Erozan (2005), Ulum (2015), and Özdoruk (2016) stated in their research studies that there was not a variety of authentic, and interesting activities implemented in the preparatory school curriculum they evaluated.

As to the suggestion phase of the current research model conducted to answer the fourth research question, for PLS-101 course there is a common agreement among all the participants on suggesting using more audio-visual and authentic materials for more listening and speaking materials. Similar suggestions were made in other curriculum evaluation studies. They suggested that more diverse, authentic and interesting activities should be implemented in the curriculum (Erozan, 2005; Ulum, 2015, Özdoruk, 2016). The last suggestion made by one of the instructors was to add some departmental courses (ESP-English for Specific Purposes) to the preparatory program to make the students more familiar with their future academic studies which can meet the expectation and needs of the students. The scholars, Coşkun (2013) and İnal and Aksoy (2014) also concluded that academic English lessons should be included in the program to prepare the students for their departments.

To this end, it can be concluded that the satisfaction level of the students with the course content and materials used in the program is generally over average. However, regarding the comments of the students and language instructors, more listening and speaking activities can be added to the curriculum, more audio-visual and authentic materials can be used during the courses, and instead of out-of-date topics more attractive topics such as pop culture ones can be used. For the PLS-101 course, the textbooks can be changed or a listening pack including some listening and speaking strategies, and extra note-taking activities can be prepared.

5.2.3. Course Conduct

As to the current status, the findings of the course conduct of the evaluated preparatory curriculum illustrate that no information has been given about the teacher and student roles, the interaction between them or the methods and techniques used in the teaching-learning process in any written or electronic document.

As to the evaluation stage of the study, the most prominent finding about the course conduct is that all of the stakeholders of the curriculum agreed that the teacher-lecturing and teacher-talking time was the most used interaction. Therefore, it can be noted that the teaching-learning process in the preparatory program was mostly teacher-centered. The questionnaire, interview and classroom observation results support the same statement. There is a meaningful parallelism in the findings of the student-teacher relation across data sources. Likewise, Özüdoğru (2017) also stated that lecturing was the most frequently used teaching method used in the classroom.

The interviews illustrate that the teacher was mostly in the role of a decision maker and lecturer who gave instructions to the students, controlled the classroom activities and chose the students to answer her questions. The reason why the teacher was more active than the students can be because of insufficient communicative activities used in the classroom. The student viewpoints and classroom observations support this statement. Akpur et al. (2016) obtained very similar results from their study which concluded that the learning environment did not provide collaborative activities for the students which made the course more teacher-centered (Akpur et al., 2016). The study findings also show that the number of group works that support whole class participation was insufficient. Likewise, the studies carried out by Erdem (1999), Yel (2009), Inal and Aksoy (2014), and Özüdoğru (2017) concluded that the group works were not enough in the classes to make the students more active and suggested some student-centered activities. The classroom observations supported the same statement. Except for a few students, most of the students were passive and did not pay enough attention to courses and some of them only followed the instructions during the observations. However, the activities may not be the main reason why the teaching-learning process was mostly teacher-centered. Some students may not want to attend the courses however interactive the courses are implemented due to their individual preferences. The reasons behind them are too many book-centered and curriculum-oriented activities in the classrooms, which are insufficient to meet students' expectations. On the other hand, it was concluded that there was a strong communication between teachers and students. Aktaş and Gündoğdu (2020) and Kuzu (2020) also concluded the communication between the students and teachers were strong.

As to the suggestion stage, both the students and teachers suggested doing more interactive, interesting, and group work activities in the classroom that can motivate them to participate in the courses eagerly. Two instructors suggested giving some responsibility to the

students to support them as more autonomous learners. It was stated that the students should take responsibility for their learning and learn how to be independent learners. Other participants suggested providing more extracurricular and fun activities that include some pop culture to make them join the courses more actively.

To conclude, the results and findings of the analyzed data show that the students and instructors are content with the course conduct / teaching-learning process of the curriculum. On the other hand, there have been notable comments made by the students that should be taken into consideration to improve and strengthen the effectiveness of the course conduct area of the preparatory curriculum. Most of the students mentioned about boring and monotonous learning environment in the class which can be caused by teacher-centered and book-oriented courses implemented in the classrooms. More group work activities, more extracurricular activities and more collaborative and self-study activities can be done and added to the curriculum so that a more independent, more learner-centered and interactive learning environment can be provided for the students.

5.2.4. Student Assessment

In the status description stage, regarding the findings of the document analysis and teacher interviews, there are both formative and summative assessment tools used in the current preparatory program. It can be said that the students were measured according to both product and process. The performance of the students was measured with the quizzes, tasks, and projects in the process while their success was measured with the Progress Evaluation Exam results and end-of-year exam results (proficiency exam) as a product.

In the evaluation stage, the results of the questionnaires and interviews showed that the students had mostly positive attitudes toward the assessment tools. However, in the studies conducted by other scholars it was found that the assessment tools are not suitable for assessing students' learning outcomes (Erozan, 2005; Yel, 2009; Tunç, 2010). Almost all participants stated that the exams did not only test their grammar or vocabulary knowledge but also their other language. Most of the students were also on the common ground that the exam results reflect their actual success. However, there were some contradicting ideas about the end-of-year proficiency exam. Although most of the instructors were content with the assessment tools, some students criticized the speaking exams and the proficiency exams. The students stated that the proficiency exam should not be the only criteria to finish preparatory school successfully.

They thought neglecting their whole performance and success during the academic year was unfair. The students also supported that there can be other factors such as stress, anxiety, being off-topic or out of format in writing and speaking exams which can affect their success negatively. The instructors supported the possibility of these factors but claimed that it was a necessity for preparatory schools to make an end-of-course exam.

In the suggestion stage, a student suggested that the teachers can grade the students' performance in the courses to add some extra points to the speaking exam which may not be effective because of students' anxiety levels. One instructor supported this suggestion by offering to grade students' classroom performance. Some of the students suggested being graded with the exams they took during the teaching-learning period to decide their success.

In addition, it is stated that the content of the language curriculum is not compatible with the English that the students will need in the departments they will study. Academic English lessons should be included in the program to prepare the students for their departments (Coşkun 2013, Inal & Aksoy,2014; Gülsat, 2021). To conclude, full collaboration and communication is needed among the program developers, the course instructors, the student and teachers throughout all dimensions of the curriculum implementation and evaluation process to attain success in the program (Mede & Akyel, 2014, Aktaş & Gündoğdu, 2020).

Regarding the results of the data analysis, most of the participants were generally content with the student evaluation area of the preparatory school curriculum. However, there have been some complaints about the assessment criteria of the program. The students stated that they did not want to be graded and assessed as successful or unsuccessful on the basis of a single exam result and focused on their high anxiety level, especially in the listening and speaking exams. Although the proficiency exam criteria cannot be omitted from the program as the preparatory schools have to evaluate students' success with an end-of-year exam to decide the success or failure of the students as stated in The Council of Higher Education (2019), the students can be given extra speaking and listening quizzes to relieve and lower their anxiety and stress levels before the exams.

5.3. Conclusion

During the evaluation process of the current language preparatory program, no major problems were experienced. The evaluation method, the variety of data collection tools and

suggestions for each main focus area of a curriculum enable the researcher to collect in-depth information about the current preparatory program in which the teacher researcher is already working as a language instructor.

The teacher-researcher who is already working at the current school as a language instructor claims that there is a big relationship between the success of a program and its curriculum. Evaluation of a language curriculum sheds a light on the teaching-learning process which also enables the researcher to detect the weaknesses and strengths of the program and helps to improve and renovate it if necessary for more effective future uses.

The model can be adapted and changed according to different purposes and can be used in different contexts from a macro level to a micro level. However, there are some drawbacks to the model as well. The model is so comprehensive and needs a great amount of time and effort to implement effectively. It allows the researcher to do process evaluations as well as product evaluations of the curriculum. During the process, the analysis procedure should be scheduled well in advance and conducted in order to get rich and reliable data.

The main argument and purpose of the current study was to evaluate and generate some suggestions for the improvement of the English preparatory school curriculum at a private university on the basis of four main components of a curriculum: course aims and objectives, course content and materials, course conduct and student assessment. In this regard, the adapted version of the Bellon and Handler (1982) curriculum evaluation model by Tekir (2020) is used to evaluate the current curriculum. The evaluation model used in the current study provides a comprehensive evaluation of an educational program on the basis of its main components and sheds a light on the analysis of weaknesses and strengths of a curriculum that supports the development and enhancement of future curriculum implementations. The evaluation enabled the researcher to put forward a variety of suggestions and recommendations to improve and strengthen the program for future uses.

The findings regarding the four focus areas of the research model used to evaluate the current preparatory program show that the current English preparatory curriculum is effective to reach the target goals to some extent. However, the detailed analysis and suggestions made by the stakeholders of the program illustrate that the aims and objectives, course content and materials, course conduct, and assessment tools need to be improved on the basis of the suggestions made during each step of the evaluation process so that the program can be implemented more effectively (Yel, 2009; Tunç, 2010; Mutlu, 2018).

It is concluded that the preparatory program evaluated is effective to enable the students to achieve the target outcomes to some extent. The findings demonstrate that there is a meaning parallelism across the data sources. It is found that the curriculum provides detailed aims and objectives predetermined according to the CEFR for each course implemented in the program. However, there is a need to improve speaking and listening objectives in the program. In addition, the reading skills are not extensively determined in the program.

It can be said that the current preparatory curriculum provides a variety of content some of which may need some revision and improvement to attract students' interests. Moreover, it is concluded that speaking and listening activities and materials are not used enough in the teaching-learning process. The data collected from different sources also support the same statement. It is also stated that the grammar topics are overloaded in the second semester. Therefore, it can be suggested that teaching time for use of English, in addition to productive and receptive skills should be balanced in the language teaching process and divided into both semesters equally. Moreover, it is discovered that the number and the topics of the articles for reading skills are insufficient and need some revision and improvement. It can be suggested to add more articles regarding the students' interests and needs. The results also show that the materials used during the teaching-learning process are sufficient in general. Yet, it is concluded that some of the materials need a change and enhancement. The findings of the different data sources support the same statement. The results indicate that there is a need to use more authentic and audio-visual materials in the classroom to fill the gap that the textbooks cannot compensate especially for the PLS-101 course. The findings illustrate a meaningful agreement across various data sources. It is also found that the courses are mostly teacher-centred, and teacher lecturing takes most of the course conduct. The finding is also supported by all data sources. It can be recommended to provide more group work, and interactive activities to facilitate a more communicative, collaborative, and student-centred learning environment for the students. It is also concluded that the students are not as independent learners as expected. More online materials and activities on the learning management system and guided activities can be implemented in the program to foster students' autonomous learning and make them take the responsibility for their own learning. It is also suggested to provide self-checklists and self-evaluation activities to improve students' self-study skills.

Additionally, the student assessment in the program is sufficient enough to measure students' performance in each skill equally, however, some improvement may be needed for

the testing of speaking skills. The findings show a meaningful parallelism across different data sources. Yet, it is not clearly concluded that the preparatory program gives the students a chance for self-evaluation, peer feedback, or peer assessment. It is suggested to use modelling and give some visuals to encourage the students to evaluate each other's performance. What's more, it is discovered that the students are content with the counselling system of the program.

Finally, it can be concluded that the current preparatory program support students' achieving the target outcomes to some extent. However, the program needs to be developed and improved by taking into consideration the suggestions and recommendations of the curriculum stakeholders which are the students, the language instructors, the director of the school of foreign languages, the testing units, and curriculum and material designers working in the current preparatory school.

5.4. Recommendations for Future Research

As the main purpose of the study is to evaluate the curriculum of the preparatory school the teacher-researcher is currently working at as a language instructor and investigate some suggestions and recommendations to improve and enhance the current preparatory program for future uses, the sample size is restricted to the total number of the students studying in the preparatory program in 2021-2022 academic year. In future studies to decrease the margin of error, a context with a higher population of participants could be chosen.

In addition, this study is confined to the preparatory school stakeholders' perspectives who are the students, language instructors, director of the school of foreign languages, testing units, curriculum, and material developers. For future studies, the perspectives of lecturers from different departments, the students who graduated from the preparatory school, and continuing their departmental studies could be taken to obtain a broader point of view.

Moreover, to evaluate how effective the current preparatory school curriculum is to meet the learner's needs and expectations, some questions were asked to the students and instructors about their needs and expectations during the interviews. To obtain detailed and more systematic information about the needs of the learners and other stakeholders, a need analysis can be conducted before the program is evaluated.

Furthermore, in this study, to evaluate and improve the current curriculum the overall evaluation of the program was conducted. In further studies, the course-based evaluation can be made by using the same evaluation model which can provide more detailed information about the weaknesses and strengths of the preparatory school curriculum.

Overall, with the current study, the teacher-researcher aims to shed a light on the importance of curriculum evaluation and improvement studies in teaching English as a second or foreign language context by applying a rarely used curriculum evaluation model. Bellon and Handler's (1982) curriculum evaluation model enables the researcher to evaluate the main components of curriculum evaluation in a systematic and formative way and generate some improvement of the program by providing cumulative suggestions and recommendations from the stakeholders for each curriculum component. With this study, the researcher aims to remedy the deficiency of conducting different evaluation models to evaluate language curricula in the related literature.

REFERENCES

- Akdağ, A.I. (2018). A different approach to teaching French as a foreign language at preparatory school: From curriculum development to practice. *Inönü University Journal of the Faculty of education*, 19(3), 231-239. DOI: 10.176779/inuefd.33109.
- Akpur, U. (2017). Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi hazırlık öğretim programının değerlendirilmesi [Evaluation of preparatory curricula implemented at Yıldız Teknik University]. *Cumhuriyet International Journal of Education*, 6(4), 441-457.
- Akpur, U. Alci, B., & Karatas, H. (2016). Evaluation of the Curriculum of English Preparatory Classes at Yildiz Technical University Using CIPP Model. *Educational research and Reviews*, 11(7), 466-473.
- Aktaş, C. K. (2018). *Aydın Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Okulu İngilizce hazırlık programının Bellon ve Handler Modeline göre değerlendirilmesi: Bir durum çalışması. [Evaluation of Aydın Adnan Menderes University Foreign Languages English Preparatory school curriculum according to Bellon and Handler Model: A case study]. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Aydın Adnan Menderes University.*
- Aktaş, C. K., & Gündoğdu, K. (2020). An extensive evaluation study of the English preparatory curriculum of a foreign language school. *Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction*, 10(1), 169-214.
- Alderson, J. C. (2009). Air safety, language assessment policy, and policy implementation: The case of aviation English. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 29, 168-187.
- Ali, M. (2012). Revisiting English Language Teaching (ELT) Curriculum Design: How Appropriate is Bangladesh Higher Secondary Level National ELT Curriculum as a Learner-Centred One?. *Iiuc Studies*, 7, 283-296.
- Alkin, M. C. (Ed.) (1969). The use of behavioral objectives in evaluation: Relevant or irrelevant? (ED035067). ERIC.<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED035067>
- Alkin, M.C. (2013). *Evaluation roots: A wider perspective of theorists' views and influences* (2nd ed.). SAGE publications.
- Atkins, L., & Wallace, S. (2012). *Qualitative research in education*. Sage Publications.
- Ayçiçek, B. (2021). Integration of critical thinking into curriculum: Perspectives of prospective teachers. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 41, 100895.

- Aydın, S., & Zengin, B. (2008). Yabancı dil öğreniminde kaygı: Bir literatür özeti [Anxiety in foreign language teaching: A review study]. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 4(1), 81-94.
- Balıkçıoğlu Akkuş G. (2018). *A study of the needs analysis of English preparatory class students at university level and the evaluation of readymade and non-readymade teaching materials*. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Hacettepe University, Ankara.
- Barnett, R., & Coate, K. (2005). Engaging the curriculum in higher education. *The Society for Research in Higher Education*. Open University Press.
- Bayram, I. (2011). *TOBB Ekonomi ve Teknoloji Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Bölümü İngilizce Hazırlık Programının Öğretmen ve Öğrenci Görüşlerine Göre Değerlendirilmesi, (The evaluation of the English Preparatory Curriculum at TOBB University of Economics and Technology Department of Foreign Languages from teachers' and students' point of view)*, [Unpublished master's thesis]. Ankara University, Ankara.
- Bellon, J. J., & Handler, J. R. (1982). *Curriculum development and evaluation: A design for Improvement*. Hunt Publishing Company.
- Bennett, J. (2003). *Evaluation methods in research*. Bloomsbury Publishing
- Berelson, B. (1952). *Content analysis in communication research*. Free Press.
- Bloom, B.S. (ed.) 1956. *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: the Classification of Educational Goals Handbook I: Cognitive Domain*. David McKay Co.
- Bobbitt, F. (1918). *The curriculum*. Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Brindley, G. (1989). The role of needs analysis in adult ESL programme design. In. R. Johnson (Ed.). *The Second Language Curriculum* (p. 35-70). Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, J. D. (1989). Language program evaluation: A synthesis of existing possibilities. *The second language curriculum*, 222-241. Cambridge University Press
- Brown, J. D. (1995). *The elements of language curriculum: A systematic approach to Program development*. Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Burns, A. (2009). Action Research. In: Heigham, J., Croker, R.A. (eds) *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics*. Palgrave Macmillan, DOI: 10.1057/9780230239517_6

- Çalık, M., & Sözbilir, M. (2014). Parameters of content analysis. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 39(174), 33-38.
- Cearon, I. F., & Feltes, H. P. de M. (2020). *Neuroscience role in the foreign language teaching and learning*. *Ciências & Cognição*, 25(1), 43–60.
- Cincioğlu, A. (2012). *Instituteal factors as a component of language curriculum development: perspectives of English preparatory class lecturers at public and private universities in İstanbul*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. İstanbul University, İstanbul.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education*. Routledge.
- Coşkun, A. (2013). An investigation of the effectiveness of the modular general English language teaching preparatory program at a Turkish university. *South African Journal of Education*, 33(3), 1-18.
- Coşkun – Demirpolat, B. (2015). *Türkiye'nin dil öğretimiyle imtihanı: Sorunlar ve çözüm önerileri*. İstanbul: Turkuaz Matbaacılık.
- http://file.setav.org/Files/Pdf/20150707131308_131_yabancidil_web.pdf
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Sage Publishing.
- Cronbach, L. (1976). 'Course Improvement Through Evaluation' in Golby et. al. 1976
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Creswell, J.W. (2013). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J. H. (2014). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. (5th ed.) Pearson.
- Creswell, J., & Plano Clark, V. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*, (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Daylan, S. (2001). *A Syllabus design for the basic English classes in the preporatory program at Abant İzzet Baysal University*. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Abant İzzet Baysal University, Bolu.

- Demirel, Ö. (2013). *Kuramdan Uygulamaya Eğitimde Program Değerlendirme* [Curriculum Development in Education- from Theory to Practice], PegemA Yayıncılık.
- Dewey, J. (1902). *The child and the curriculum*. University of Chicago Press.
- Dick, W., & Carey, L. (1985). *The systematic design of instruction*. (2nd ed.). Scott, Foresman.
- Dubin, F., & Olshtain, E. (1986). *Course design: Developing programs and materials for language learning*. Cambridge University Press.
- EPI (2021). *English Proficiency Index*. <https://www.ef.com.tr/epi/> accessed in December 2021.
- Eisner, E.W. (1975). "Instructional and Expressive Objectives". Golby, M. and Greenwald, J. (eds.) *Curriculum Design*. Croom Helm and Open University Press.
- Erarslan, N. (2016). Microstructural investigation of subcritical crack propagation and fracture process zone (FPZ) by the reduction of rock fracture toughness under cyclic loading. *Engineering Geology*, 208, 181-190.
- Erdem, H. E. (1999). *Evaluating the English language curriculum at a private school in Ankara: A case study*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- Erden, M. (1998). *Eğitimde program değerlendirme* (3rd ed.). Anı Yayıncılık.
- Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2005). *How to design and evaluate research in Education* (5th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Finney, D. (2002). The ELT curriculum: A flexible model for a changing world. *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*, 69, 79.
- Fitzpatrick, J. L., Sanders, J. R., & Worthen, B. R. (2004). *Program evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines* (3rd ed.). Allyn and Bacon.
- Ger, U., & Bahar, M. (2018). Learning a language and studying content in an additional language: Student opinions. *International Journal of Educational Methodology*, 4(1), 29-35.
- Glatthorn, A. A. (1987). *Curriculum leadership*. Harper Collins.
- Gökmenoğlu, T. (2014). Geniş açı: Modeller ve yaklaşımlar açısından Türkiye’de program değerlendirme çalışmaları. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instructional Studies*, 4(7), 55-70.

- Gömleksiz, M. N., & Özkaya, Ö. M. (2012). Yabancı diller yüksekokulu öğrencilerinin İngilizce konuşma dersinin etkililiğine ilişkin görüşleri [Views of foreign languages school students on effectiveness of EFL speaking lessons]. *Electronic Turkish Studies*, 7(2), 496-513.
- Graves, K. (1996). A framework of course development processes. (K. Graves Ed.) *Teachers as course developers* (p. 12-38). Cambridge University Press.
- Greene, J. P. (1998). *A meta-analysis of the effectiveness of bilingual Education*. Thomas Rivera Policy Institute.
- Gredler, M. E. (1995). *Program evaluation*. Pearson.
- Grundy, S. (1987). *Curriculum: Product or praxis*. The Falmer Press.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1981). *Effective evaluation*. Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Gülsat, E. (2021). *Evaluation of English preparatory school curriculum at başkent university using Alkin's Ucla evaluation model*. [Unpublished master's thesis]. METU, Ankara.
- Gündüz, C. (2018). *A study on perceived needs of vocational school students learning English*. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Çukurova University, Adana.
- Gürler, İ. (2018). *Evaluation of the current curriculum in elt departments from the perspectives of lecturers and students: A needs analysis*. [Unpublished Doctoral Thesis]. Atatürk University, Erzurum.
- Hammond, H. K. (1968). Phototube Response Evaluation. *Applied Optics*, 7(5), 985-985.
- Hogan, R. L. (2007). The historical development of program evaluation: Exploring past and present. *Online Journal for Workforce Education and Development*, 2(4), 5.
- Holloway, I., & Wheeler, S. (1996). *Qualitative research for nurses*. Blackwell Science Ltd.
- Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purposes: A Learner-centered approach*. Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511733031>
- İnal, B., & Aksoy, E. (2014). Çankaya Üniversitesi hazırlık sınıfı İngilizce öğretim programının değerlendirilmesi. *Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 3(3), 85-98.
- Johnson, R. K. (1989). *The Second language curriculum*. Cambridge University Press.

- Kanokpermpoon, M. (2019). Thinking skills in practice: A case study of an English curriculum at a Thai University. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 12(2), 49-63.
- Kar, İ. (2014). *An English language needs analysis of obligatory English preparatory program students at İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Universtiy*. [Unpublished master's thesis]. İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Karataş H., & Fer S. (2009). Evaluation of English curriculum at Yıldız Technical University using CIPP model. ERIC <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1099998.pdf>
- Karataş, H., & Fer, S. (2011). CIPP evaluation model scale: development, reliability and validity. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 592-599.
- Kaya, S. (2018). *Evaluation of the middle school English language curriculum developed in 2012 utilizing Stake's countenance evaluation model*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- Kelly, A. V. (2009). *The curriculum: Theory and practice*. SAGE Publications Limited.
- Kerestecioğlu, F. (2018). Eğitim dili olarak İngilizce: Neden ve nasıl, *Panoromo Khas Dergisi*, 29,1.
- Kırkgöz, Y. (2009). Globalization and English language policy in Turkey. *Educational Policy*, 23 (5), 663-684.
- Kirkpatrick, D. (1996). Revisiting Kirkpatrick's four-level-model. *Training & Development*, 1, 54-57.
- Kirkpatrick, D.L., & Kirkpatrick, J.D. (2006). *Evaluating training programs: The four levels* (3rd ed.). Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Klintberg, I. (1976). A responsive evaluation of two programs in medical education. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 2 (1), 23-30.
- Krippendorff, K. (1980). *Content Analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Sage.
- Kuzu, E. (2020). *Evaluation of an English preparatory program through the context, input, process and product (CIPP) model*. [Unpublished master thesis], Çukurova University, Adana.

- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1981). *Effective evaluation: Improving the usefulness of evaluation results through responsive and naturalistic approaches*. Jossey-Bass.
- Loomis, A., Davis, A., Cruden, G., Padilla, C., & Drazen, Y. (2022). Early childhood suspension and expulsion: A content analysis of state legislation. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 50(2), 327-344.
- Lunenburg, F.C. (2011). Curriculum Development: Inductive Models. *Schooling*, 2(1), 1-8.
- Madaus, G. F., & Kellaghan, T. (2000). Models, metaphors, and definitions in evaluation. In D. L. Stufflebeam, G. F. Madaus ve T. Kellaghan (Eds.), *Evaluation models viewpoints on educational and human services evaluation* (2nd ed.). Kluwer Academic Publishers Group.
- Mark, M. M., Henry, G. T., & Julnes, G. (2000). *Evaluation: An integrated framework for understanding, guiding, and improving policies and programs*. Jossey-Bass.
- Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative Researching*. (2nd ed.). Sage ISBN 0 7619 7428 8.
- Marsh, C. J., & Willis, G. (2007). *Curriculum: Alternative approaches, ongoing issues* (4th ed.). Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Mede, E. (2012). *Design and evaluation of a language preparatory program at an English medium university in an EFL setting: A case study*. [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. Yeditepe University, İstanbul.
- Mede, E., & Akyel, A. (2014). Design of a language preparatory program: A case study. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, 10 (3), 643-666.
- Mertens, D. M., & Wilson, A. (2012). *Program evaluation theory and practice*. Guilford Press.
- Mertens, D. M. (2014a). A momentous development in mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 8(1), 3-5.
- Mertens, D. M. (2014b). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods*. Sage.
- McCormick, R., & James, M. (1990). *Curriculum evaluation in schools* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Michael, W. B., & Metfessel, N. S. (1967). A paradigm for developing valid measurable objectives in the evaluation of educational programs in colleges and universities.

Educational and Psychological Measurement, 27(2), 373–383.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/001316446702700215>.

- Morse, J. M. (1991). *Approaches to qualitative-quantitative methodological triangulation*. *Nursing Research*, 40(2), 120-123.
- Murray, G. (2008). Pop culture and language learning: Learners' stories informing EFL. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 2(1), 2-17.
- Mutlu, G. (2018). A program evaluation study of the main course at a preparatory program: A case study. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, 9(3), 202-239.
- Neuendorf, K. A. (2017). *The content analysis guidebook*. Sage.
- Nunan, D. (1992). Sociocultural aspects of second language acquisition. *Cross Currents*, 19(1), 13.
- Ok, S. (2005). *The analysis of English preparatory program based on the needs assessment of problem-based learning and regular groups in a foreign language-medium Institute*. [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. Dokuz Eylül University, İzmir.
- Ornstein, A., & Hunkins, F. (2009). *Curriculum: Foundations, principles, and issues* (5th ed.). Allyn & Bacon.
- Ödemiş, I.S. (2018). *The evaluation of english curriculum of a college using context input process product (CIPP) model*. [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. Eskişehir Osmangazi University.
- Özdoruk, P. (2016). *Evaluation of the English language preparatory school curriculum at Yıldırım Beyazıt University*. [Unpublished mater's thesis]. METU, Ankara.
- Özkanal, Ü. (2009). *The evaluation of English preparatory program of Eskişehir Osmangazi University foreign languages department and a model proposal*. [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. Anadolu University, Eskişehir.
- Özüdoğru, F. (2017). Evaluation of the voluntary English preparatory program at a Turkish state university. *Journal of International Social Research*, 10(48), 501-509.
- Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful Sampling for Qualitative Data Collection and Analysis in Mixed Method Implementation Research. *Administration and policy in mental health*, 42(5), 533–544.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-013-0528-y>

- Parkes, J., & Harris, M. (2002). The Purposes of a Syllabus. *College Teaching*, 50, 55-61. 10.1080/87567550209595875.
- Parlett, M. 1975. "Evaluating Innovations in Teaching". Golby, M. and Greenwald. 1976, J. (eds.) *Curriculum Design*. Croom Helm and Open University Press.
- Parlett, M., & Hamilton, D. (1976). *Evaluation as illumination*. In Tawney, D (Ed.) *Curriculum evaluation today: Trends and implications*. SCRS.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. SAGE.
- Patton, M. Q. (1997). *Utilization-focused evaluation: The new century text* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Patton, M. Q. (2001). Evaluation, knowledge management, best practices, and high quality lessons learned. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 22(3), 329-336.
- Popham, W. J. (1993). *Educational evaluation*. Allyn and Bacon.
- Pratt, D. (1980). *Curriculum, design, and development*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Provus, M. N. (1983). *Discrepancy evaluation*. McCutchan.
- Provus, M. M. (1971). *Discrepancy evaluation for educational program improvement and assessment*. McCutchan.
- Prideaux, D. (2003). Curriculum design. *British Medical Journal*, 326, 268 - 270.
- Rakel, R. (1976). A summary: responsive evaluation and family practice. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 2 (1), 35-36.
- Razmjoo, S. A., & Kazempourfard, E. (2012). On the representation of Bloom's revised taxonomy in Interchange coursebooks. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, 4(1), 171–204.
- Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (2013). Curriculum Approaches in Language Teaching: Forward, central, and backward design. *RELC Journal*, 44(1), 5–33.
- Rolstad, K., Mahoney, K., & Glass, G. V. (2005). The big picture: A meta-analysis of program effectiveness research on English language learners. *Educational policy*, 19(4), 572-594.

- Sadeghi, B., & Mahdipour, N. (2015). Evaluating ILI advanced series through Bloom's revised taxonomy. *Science Journal*, 36(3), 2247–2260.
- Saylor, J. G., & Alexander, W. M. (1966). *Curriculum planning for modern schools*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Saylor, J. G., Alexander, W. M., & Lewis, A. J. (1981). *Curriculum planning for better teaching and learning*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Scriven, M. (1991a). *Evaluation thesaurus*. Sage.
- Scriven, M. (1991b). Pros and cons about goal-free evaluation. *Evaluation Practice*, 12(1), 55-62.
- Simons, H. (2009). *Case study research in practice*. Sage
- Sinclair, J., & Renouf, A. (1988). A lexical syllabus for language learning. *Vocabulary and language teaching*, 140, 60.
- Skolverket (National Agency for Education) (2011). *Curriculum for the compulsory school, preschool class and the recreation centre, 2011* (English version). <http://www.skolverket.se/publikationer?id=2687>.
- Sorcinelli, G., Parsons, M., & Halpern, E. (1984). Naturalistic responsive evaluation: a new methodology for evaluating health and safety in education. *Lifelong Learning*, 8 (1), 4-6.
- Stake, R. E. (1967). The Countenance of Evaluation. *Teachers college records*; 68, 452-540.
- Stake, R. E. (1970). Objectives, priorities, and other judgment data. *Review of educational research*, 40(2), 181-212.
- Stake, R. E. (1972). *An Approach to the Evaluation of Instructional Programs*. (ED064350). ERIC <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED064350>
- Stake, R. (1976). A theoretical statement of responsive evaluation. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 2 (1), 19-22.
- Stake, R. E. (1977). *Responsive evaluation*. University of Illinois Press. 11:106–109.
- Stake, R. (2004). *Standards-based & responsive evaluation*. Sage Publications.
- Stenhouse, L. (1975). *An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development*. Heinemann.

- Storey, C. W. (2007). Insights into Language Curriculum Development. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 4, 86–107.
- Streubert, H. J., & Carpenter, D. R. (2011). *Qualitative Research in Nursing*. (5th ed.). Lippincott Williams ve Wilkins.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. (1971). *Educational evaluation and decision making*. Peacock.
- Stufflebeam, D. L., & Shinkfield, A. J. (1985). *Systematic evaluation*. Kluwer-Nijhoff.
- Sturman, A. (1994). Case study methods Educational Research, Methodology, and Measurement: an International Handbook.
- Sulaiman, T., Muniyan, V., Madhvan, D., Hasan, R., & Rahim, S. S. A. (2017). Implementation of higher order thinking skills in teaching of science: A case study in Malaysia. *International Research Journal of Education and Sciences (IRJES)*, 1(1), 2550-2158.
- Szmigiera, M. (2021). Most spoken languages in the world. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/266808/the-most-spoken-languages-worldwide/>
- Şen Ersoy, N., & Kürüm Yapıcıoğlu, D. (2015). İsteğe bağlı İngilizce hazırlık programının öğrenci ve okutman görüşlerine göre değerlendirilmesi [Evaluation of optional English language preparatory curricula according to views of teachers and students]. *Journal of Qualitative Research in Education*, 3(3), 7-43.
- Şişman, Y. S. (2019). *Evaluation of tertiary English preparatory curriculum: A case study*. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Necmettin Erbakan University, Konya.
- Taba, H. (1962). *Curriculum development: Theory and practice*. Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Talmy, S. (2010). Qualitative Interviews in Applied Linguistics: From Research Instrument to Social Practice. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 30, 128 - 148.
- Tanner, D., & Tanner, L. N. (1980). *Curriculum development: Theory into practice* (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan.
- Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (1998). *Mixed methodology: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Sage.
- Taş, T., & Khan, Ö. (2021). Complying with the English language curriculum in Turkey: Speaking activities in local and international coursebooks: Speaking activities in local

- and international coursebooks. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, 13(3), 3495-3512.
- Tekin, M. (2015). Evaluation of a preparatory school program at a public university in Turkey. *Journal of International Social Research*, 8(36).
- Tekir, S. (2020). Evaluation of English as a foreign language program in Turkey (Application of Bellon and Handler Model) in *Academic Studies in Social Sciences* (183-209). Iype Cetinje.
- Tiryaki, S. A. (2009). *The perceptions of the program coordinators, instructors and the students on the present curriculum of Ankara University School of Foreign Languages English Language Preparatory Program*. [Unpublished master thesis]. Hacettepe University, Ankara.
- Topçu, T. (2005). An investigation of the effectiveness of the theme-based curriculum in the 2003-2004 academic year at the Department of Basic English at METU. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- Tornberg, U. 2013. "What Counts as "Knowledge" in Foreign Language Teaching and Learning Practices Today? Foreign Language Pedagogy as a Mirror of its Time." *Nordic Journal of Modern Language Methodology* 2 (1): 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.46364/njmlm.v2i1.77>
- Trimillos, R. D. (1976). Evaluating the Arts in Education. A Responsive Approach. Edited by Robert Stake. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1975. *NASSP Bulletin*, 60(397), 118–118.
- Tunç, C. (2010). Stability and bounded of solutions to non-autonomous delay differential equations of third order. *Nonlinear Dynamics*, 62(4), 945-953.
- Turgut, M. F. (1983). *Program Değerlendirme: Cumhuriyet Döneminde Eğitim*. Milli Eğitim Basımevi.
- Tyler, R. W. (1942). General Statement on Evaluation. *Journal of Educational Research*, 35, 492-501.
- Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. University of Chicago Press.
- Tyler, R.W. (1957). *The curriculum then and now*. In *Proceedings of the 1956 Invitational Conference on testing Problems*. Educational Testing Service. p.79.

- Uçar, F. (2020). *The evaluation of students' and teachers' perceptions on the EFL curriculum of vocational high schools: A needs analysis*, [Unpublished master's thesis]. Çukurova University, Adana.
- Ulum, Ö. G. (2015). A needs analysis study for preparatory class elt students. *European Journal of English Language Teaching*, 1(1), 14-29.
- Uşun, S. (2008). Introduction and comparison of different program evaluation approaches. *Muğla Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, (21), 199-218.
- Uşun, S. (2016). *Eğitimde Program Değerlendirme Süreçler – Yaklaşımlar ve Modeller* (2. Baskı). Anı Yayıncılık.
- Uysal, D. (2019). Problems and solutions concerning English language preparatory curriculum at higher education in view of ELT instructors. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research*, 6(2), 452-467.
- Wedell, M. (2009). *Planning for educational change: Putting people and their contexts first*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Wholey, J. S., Hatry, H. P., & Newcomer, K. E. (2010). *Handbook of practical program evaluation*. Jossey-Bass
- Wiles, J., & Bondi, J. (1989). *Curriculum development: A guide to practice*. C.E. Merrill Publishing Company.
- Willig, A. C. (1985). A meta-analysis of selected studies on the effectiveness of bilingual education. *Review of Educational Research*, 55(3), 269-318
- Worthen, B. R., & Sanders, J. R. (1973). *Educational evaluation: Theory and practice*. Charles A. Jones.
- Yel, A. (2009). *Evaluation of the effectiveness of English courses in Sivas Anatolian High School*. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2013). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. (9. Ed). Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2016). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. (10th ed.). Seçkin Yayıncılık.

- Yılmaz, F. (2004). *An English language needs analysis of preparatory class students at Gaziosmanpaşa University*. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Bilkent University, Ankara.
- YÖK (2022). Yükseköğretim Kurumlarında Yabancı Dil Öğretimi ve Yabancı Dille Öğretim Yapılmasında Uyulacak Esaslara İlişkin Yönetmelik Yabancı Dil Öğretimi Mevzuatı. <https://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/File/GeneratePdf?mevzuatNo=21475&mevzuatTur=KurulmVeKurulmYonetmeligi&mevzuatTertip=5>
- Zareian, G., Davoudi, M., Heshmatifar, Z., & Rahimi, J. (2015) An evaluation of questions in two ESP coursebooks based on Bloom's revised taxonomy of cognitive learning domain. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 3(8), 313–326.
- Zhang, G., Zeller, N., Griffith, R., Metcalf, D., Williams, J., Shea, C., & Misulis, K.E. (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, 57-84.
- Zorba, Ş. (2015). *Evaluating the undergraduate English language teacher education program at Eastern Mediterranean University* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Eastern Mediterranean University (EMU)-Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi (DAÜ)).

APPENDICES

Appendix - 1 Course Evaluation Questionnaire for Students (Turkish)

ALANYA HEP ÜNİVERSİTESİ YABANCI DİLLER YÜKSEKOKULU İNGİLİZCE HAZIRLIK PROGRAMI ELEMENTARY VE PRE-INTERMEDIATE GRUPLARI PROGRAM DEĞERLENDİRME ANKETİ

Sevgili öğrenciler,

Adım Zeynep Uçkaya ve Akdeniz Üniversitesi'nde İngiliz Dili Eğitimi programında yüksek lisans öğrencisiyim. Yüksek lisans tezim için Alanya HEP Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksek Okulu Hazırlık sınıflarında okuyan öğrencilerin mevcut İngilizce hazırlık müfredatını değerlendirmesi üzerine bir araştırma yapmaktayım. Gerekli bilgileri elde edebilmek için sizden aşağıda verilen anket sorularımı dikkatli bir şekilde cevaplamanızı rica ediyorum.

Bu anket sizin devam ettiğiniz “Elementary” ve “Pre-Intermediate” programlarıyla ilgili görüşlerinizi belirlemek için değerlendirme amaçlı geliştirilmiştir. Mevcut hazırlık eğitimi programı, hedefleri, içerik ve materyalleri, işlenişi ve değerlendirme sistemi olmak üzere dört ana bağlamda değerlendirilecektir. Fikirlerinizi açıkça ve gerçekçi bir biçimde ortaya koymanız bu çalışma için oldukça önemlidir. Vereceğiniz cevaplar yoluyla toplanacak olan veri Alanya HEP Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu İngilizce Hazırlık programı kapsamında yer alan derslerin iyileştirilmesi için büyük önem taşımaktadır. Kimliğiniz ve cevaplarınız kesinlikle gizli tutulacaktır. Anket sonuçları sadece araştırma amaçlı kullanılacaktır.

Katılımınız ve işbirliğiniz için teşekkürler.

Zeynep UÇKAYA
Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu Hazırlık Programı
Öğretim Görevlisi
İngiliz Dili Öğretimi Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi

**Elementary ve Pre-Intermediate Grupları
Hazırlık Programı Değerlendirme Anketi**

Aşağıdaki soruları uygun şekilde cevaplayınız veya “X” ile işaretleyiniz.

I. GENEL ÖZGEÇMİŞ:

1. Yaşınız:
2. Cinsiyetiniz: Erkek Kadın
3. Mezun olduğunuz lise:
 Devlet Okulu (Anadolu) Özel Okul Mesleki ve Teknik Lisesi
 Diğer (Belirtiniz) _____
4. Alanya HEP üniversitesindeki bölümünüz: _____

II. PROGRAM HEDEFLERİ

1. Elementary ve Pre- Intermediate programlarına devam etmeniz sizin aşağıdaki dil becerilerinden hangilerini kazanmanızda yardımcı oldu? Uygun bölümü “X” ile işaretleyiniz.

	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılmıyorum	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum
	5	4	3	2	1
1.1.1 Uygun ve doğru dil yapılarını kullanabiliyorum (tenseler, modallar özne yüklem uyumu gibi)					
1.1.2 Konuya uygun kelimeleri, birlikte kullanıldığı diğer kelimelerle (collocation) beraber kullanabiliyorum.					
1.1.3 Bağlaçları doğru kullanabiliyorum.					
1.2.1 Konu cümlesi (topic sentence) yazabiliyorum.					
1.2.2 Konu cümlesini destekleyecek cümleler yazabiliyorum. (supporting sentences)					
1.2.3 Fikirler ve cümleler arasında geçişi sağlayabiliyorum.					
1.2.4 Bir konu hakkında fikir üretebiliyorum.					
1.2.5 Yazmadan önce düşüncelerimi bir taslak çerçevede organize edebiliyorum (outline).					
1.2.6 Geribildirim (feedback) aldıktan sonra yazdığım şeyi düzeltebiliyorum.					

	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılmıyorum	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum
	5	4	3	2	1
2.1.1 Bir metindeki ana fikirleri anlayabiliyorum.					
2.2.1 Bir metindeki ana fikir, yardımcı fikirler ve sonuç fikri arasındaki ilişkiyi anlayabiliyorum.					
2.3.1 Bir metnin yazılma amacını anlayabiliyorum.					
2.3.2 Bir metnin hangi okuyucu kitlesi için yazıldığını anlayabiliyorum.					
2.3.3 İlk kez gördüğüm bir metni orta düzey bir hızda ve algılamayla okuyabiliyorum. (dakikada 70 kelime ve 70% ini anlayarak)					
2.4.1 Okuduğum metinle ilgili çıkarımlarda bulunabiliyorum.					
3.1.1 Dinlediğim metinlerin ana fikirlerini anlayabiliyorum.					
3.1.2 Dinlediğim metinlerin amacını anlayabiliyorum.					
3.1.3 Dinlediğim metindeki ana fikri yardımcı fikirlerden ayırabiliyorum.					
3.2.1 Dinlediğim metinlerdeki sonuç bölümünü ayırt edebiliyorum.					
3.3.1 Sözlü komutları anlayıp yerine getirebiliyorum					
3.3.2 Bir konuşmayı dinlerken not alabiliyorum.					
4.1.1 Kendimi makul bir akıcılık ve anlaşılabilirlikle ifade edebiliyorum.					
5.1.1 Okuma metinlerindeki bilgiyi özetleyebiliyorum					
5.2.1 Dinlediğim bir dersi/konferansı özetleyebilirim.					
5.2.2 Dinleme metninde verilen bilgileri grafik formatına çevirebiliyorum.					

	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılmıyorum	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum
	5	4	3	2	1
5.3.1 Dinleme ve okuma metnindeki bilgileri karşılaştırabiliyorum.					
5.3.2 Bu metinlerdeki bilgiler birbirini destekliyor mu yoksa birbiriyle çelişiyor mu anlayabiliyorum.					
5.4.1 Dinleme ve okuma metinlerinden edindiğim bilgileri konuşurken kullanabiliyorum.					
5.4.2 Dinleme ve okuma metinlerinden edindiğim bilgileri yazarken kullanabiliyorum					
6.1.1 Kendime kısa ve uzun vadeli öğrenme hedefleri koyabiliyorum.					
6.2.1 Dil öğrenmedeki güçlü ve zayıf yönlerimi görebiliyorum.					
6.3.1 Öğrenme stratejilerim etkilimi değilmi değerlendirebiliyorum.					
6.4.1 Farklı öğrenme stratejileri kullanarak öğrenme hedeflerime ulaşabiliyorum.					
7.1.1 Gerçeği (fact), düşünceden (opinion) ayırabiliyorum.					
7.1.2 Somut düşüncüyü soyuttan ayırabiliyorum.					
7.1.3 Herhangi bir metinde eksik kalan bir bilgiyi tahmin edebiliyorum.					
7.1.4 İstatistik bilgileri anlayabiliyorum.					
7.1.5 Grafik gösterimleri anlayabiliyorum					
7.2.1 Yeni bilgiyi önceki bilgi ve/veya fikirlerle ilişkilendirebiliyorum.					
7.2.2 Bir bilginin konuyla alakalı veya alakasız olduğunu anlayabiliyorum.					
7.2.3 Yeni bir materyali/bilgiyi kişisel tecrüberimle ilişkilendirebiliyorum.					

	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılmıyorum	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum
	5	4	3	2	1
8.1.1 Motivasyonu yüksek aktif bir dil öğreneyi oldum					
8.2.1 Bireysel çalışma becerilerini kullanabiliyorum					
9.1.1 Akademik etik uygulamalardan haberdarım. (intihal gibi (plagiarism)).					
10.1.1 Grup üyesi olarak etkili çalışabiliyorum.					
11.1.1 Dil öğreniminde teknolojiyi kullanabiliyorum (İngilizce kullanarak Power Pointte etkili sunum yapmak gibi).					

III.DERSİN İÇERİĞİ VE MATERYALLER:

1. Aşağıda verilen Elementary ve Pre-intermediate grup programlarıyla ilgili konulardaki düşünceleriniz nedir?

	Kesinlikle katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılmıyorum	Kesinlikle katılmıyorum
	5	4	3	2	1
1.Ders materyalleri, bilmek veya yapmak istediğim her şeyi kapsıyordu.					
2. Ders materyalleri ilgi alanlarıma uygundu.					
3.Ders materyallerinde çeşitlilik vardı.					
4. Ders materyalleri görsel olarak ilgi çekiciydi					
5. Ders materyallerindeki konu ve temalar ilgi çekiciydi					
6.Ders materyallerinde, önceki ve sonraki bölümler arasında süreklilik/ilişki vardı.					
7.Ders materyalleri dinleme becerilerimi geliştirmek için uygundu.					
8. Ders materyalleri konuşma becerilerimi geliştirmek için uygundu.					
9. Ders materyalleri yazma becerilerimi geliştirmek için uygundu.					
10. Ders materyalleri okuma becerilerimi geliştirmek için uygundu.					
11.Ders materyalleri dil bilgisi (gramer) bilgimi geliştirmek için uygundu.					
12. Ders materyalleri kelime bilgimi geliştirmek için uygundu					
13. Ders materyalleri İngilizce seviyeme uygundu.					

IV. DERSİN İŞLENİŞİ, ÖĞRENME-ÖĞRETME SÜRECİ:

1. Elementary ve Pre-intermediate sınıflarında aşağıdaki aktiviteler ve metotlar hangi sıklıkla kullanılmıştır? Uygun bölümü “X” ile işaretleyiniz.

	Her zaman	Sık sık	Bazen	Ara sıra	Hiç
	5	4	3	2	1
1. Öğretmenin ders anlatması					
2. Tek başına sessiz çalışma					
3. İkili çalışma					
4. Grup halinde çalışma					
5. Tartışmalar					
6. Oyunlar					
7. Rol yapma					
8. Projeler					
9. Video gösterimi					
10. Ses kaydı dinleme					
11. Ödev					
12. Öğrencilerin birbirlerinin hatalarını düzeltmesi					
13. Öğrencilerin kendi hatalarını düzeltmesi					
14. Öğrencilerin yüksek sesle okuması (read aloud)					
15. Öğretmenin yüksek sesle okuması					
16. Şarkılar					
17. Öğrencilerin birbirlerini değerlendirmesi					
18. Öğrencinin kendini değerlendirmesi					
19. Öğretmenin soru sorması					
20. Öğrenci sunumları					
21. Bilgisayar destekli aktiviteler					
22. Çeviri					
23. Öğretmenin öğrenci hatalarını düzeltmesi					
Diğer (Belirtiniz) :					

2. Lütfen Elementary ve Pre-intermediate sınıflarında öğretim-öğrenim süreci (teaching-learning process) ile ilgili görüşlerinizi belirtiniz. Uygun bölümü “X” i e işaretleyiniz.

	Kesinlikle katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılmıyorum	Kesinlikle katılmıyorum
	5	4	3	2	1
1. Sınıfta zaman verimli kullanılıyordu					
2. Derste çok çeşitli aktiviteler yapılıyordu.					
3. Ders ilgi çekici bir şekilde anlatılıyordu.					
4. Dersi takip etmek kolaydı.					
5. Ne yapmamız gerektiğiyle ilgili verilen açıklamalar (instruction) anlaşılırdı.					
6. Öğretmenin öğretme yöntemi (methodology) öğrenmemizde etkiliydi.					
7. Derse katılmak için teşvik ediliyorduk.					
8. Derste projeksiyon, televizyon, video, ses dosyaları gibi gereçler etkili bir şekilde kullanılıyordu.					
9. Derste tahta etkili bir biçimde kullanılıyordu.					
10. Yaptığımız yanlışlar etkili ve anlaşılır bir şekilde düzeltiliyordu.					
11. Dersler ilgi çekici bir şekilde işleniyordu.					
12. Yaptığımız çalışmalarla (performanslarla) ilgili olarak bize yeterli bilgi (feedback) veriliyordu.					

V. DEĞERLENDİRME VE ÖĞRENCİ PERFORMANSI:

1. Aşağıda Elementary ve Pre-intermediate gruplarında yapılan değerlendirme konularıyla ilgili görüşlerinizi belirtiniz. Uygun bölümü “X” ile işaretleyiniz.

	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılmıyorum	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum
	5	4	3	2	1
1. Süreç Değerlendirme Sınavları (PEE), projeler ve kısa sınavlar (quiz) yabancı dil gelişimimiz hakkında doğru bilgi veriyor.					
2. Sınavlardaki açıklamalar (instruction) açık ve anlaşılır.					
3. Süreç değerlendirme sınavları kazandırılmak istenilen tüm becerileri kapsıyor.					
4. Konuşma sınavından aldığım notlar benim konuşma becerilerindeki gerçek başarıyı yansıtıyor.					
5. Yazma dersinde kullanılan çalışma dosyası (writing pack) yazma becerimin gelişmesini sağladı.					
6. Yazma ödevlerinden aldığım not benim okuma becerilerindeki gerçek başarıyı yansıtıyor.					
7. Kısa sınav (quiz) ve süreç değerlendirme sınav (PEE) larından aldığım notlar benim okuma becerilerindeki gerçek başarıyı yansıtıyor.					
8. Kısa sınav (quiz) ve süreç değerlendirme sınav (PEE) larından aldığım notlar benim dinleme becerilerindeki gerçek başarıyı yansıtıyor.					
9. Değerlendirme adildi.					
10. Sınavlardaki performansım ile ilgili olarak yeterli bilgi (feedback) aldım.					
11. Sınavlar ağırlıklı olarak dil bilgisi (grammar) bilgimi ölçüyor.					
12. Sınavlarda bütün becerilere (reading, listening, speaking, writing) eşit şekilde yer veriliyor.					
13. Sınavlarda farklı soru şekillerine yer veriliyor.					
14. Sınavlar benim gerçek yazma becerimi ölçüyor.					
15. Sınavlar benim gerçek dinleme becerimi ölçüyor.					
16. Sınavlar benim gerçek okuma becerimi ölçüyor.					
17. Öğretmen notunun (instructor grade) adil verildiğini düşünüyorum. (sunum ve proje notları)					

Appendix - 2 Course Evaluation Questionnaire for Students (English)

ALANYA HEP UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES ENGLISH PREPARATORY PROGRAM ELEMENTARY AND PRE-INTERMEDIATE GROUPS PROGRAM EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear students

My name is Zeynep Uçkaya and I am a student in Master's of Art in English Language Teaching at Akdeniz University. For my thesis, I am doing evaluation study of English preparatory curriculum of the School of Foreign Languages at Alanya HEP University. To obtain the necessary information, can you please answer the questions carefully?

This questionnaire has been designed to collect your opinions about English preparatory program for "Elementary" and "Pre-Intermediate" groups for evaluation purposes. The program will be evaluated in terms of its features such as objectives, content and materials, course conduct, assessment, and relationship with other courses.

It is absolutely important that you express your opinions clearly and realistically. The data to be collected through your responses will be of great value of the improvement of Alanya HEP University School of Foreign Languages English Preparatory Program.

Your identity and individual responses will be kept strictly confidential, and the results of the questionnaire will be used only for research purposes.

Thank you for your participation and cooperation.

Zeynep UÇKAYA
School of Foreign Language, Preparatory Program
Teaching Assistant
English Language Teaching Master Student

Elementary and Pre-Intermediate Groups Program Evaluation Questionnaire

Please complete the following and mark the appropriate section with an “X”.

I. GENERAL BACKGROUND:

1. Your age:
2. Your Sex: Male Female
3. The high school you graduated from:
 Anatolian High School College Vocational and Technical School
 Other (Please specify) _____
4. Department you are studying at Alanya HEP university:
 Computer Engineering Communication and Design Architecture
 Tourism Management Gastronomy and Culinary Arts

II. COURSE AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

1. Which of the following language skills did your attendance at Elementary and Pre-Intermediate programs help you gain? Mark the appropriate section with an “X”.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	5	4	3	2	1
1.1.1. I can use appropriate and correct language structures (tenses, modals, subject verb agreement)					
1.1.2. I can use the words appropriate to the topic together with other words that are used together. (collocation)					
1.1.3. I can use conjunctions/linkers correctly and appropriately					
1.2.1. I can write a topic sentence					
1.2.2 I can write supporting points for a topic sentence					
1.2.3 I can connect ideas and sentences in writing I can write coherent sentences?					
1.2.4 I can produce ideas about a topic					
1.2.5 I can make an outline of a paragraph to organise my ideas.					

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	5	4	3	2	1
1.2.6 I can correct the errors in a written work (a paragraph) after receiving feedback.					
2.1.1 I can identify / understand the main idea(s) in a text					
2.2.1 I can understand the relationship between the main idea, supporting ideas, and conclusion idea in a text					
2.3.1. I can understand the purpose of writing a text					
2.3.2 I can understand for which audience a text is written.					
2.3.3 I can read a text that I see for the first time at a moderate speed and perception. (70 words per minute and understanding 70%)					
2.4.1 I can make inferences about the text I read.					
3.1.1 I can understand the main ideas of the texts I listen to					
3.1.2 I can understand the purpose of the text I listen to.					
3.1.3 I can distinguish the main idea from the supporting ideas in the text I listen to.					
3.2.1 I can distinguish / differentiate the conclusion part of the texts I listen to.					
3.3.1 I can understand and follow oral instructions.					
3.3.2 I can take notes while listening to a speech					
4.1.1 I can express myself in a reasonable fluent and clear way.					
5.1.1 I can summarize the information in a reading text.					
5.2.2.1 I can summarize a lecture/conference I have listened to.					
5.2.2 I can transform the information into a graphic form in a listening text.					

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	5	4	3	2	1
5.3.1 I can compare information in listening and reading texts.					
5.3.2 I can understand whether the information in these texts supports or contradicts each other.					
5.4.1 I can use the information I gained from listening and reading texts while speaking.					
5.4.2 I can use the information I gained from listening and reading texts while writing					
6.1.1 I can set long and short term learning goals for myself.					
6.2.1 I can see my strengths and weaknesses in language learning					
6.3.1 I can evaluate whether my learning strategies are effective or not.					
6.4.1 I can reach my learning goals by using different learning strategies					
7.1.1 I can differentiate between a fact and an opinion.					
7.1.2 I can understand the difference between concrete thinking and abstract thinking.					
7.1.3 I can guess missing information in any text					
7.1.4 I can understand statistical information					
7.1.5 I can understand graphics					
7.2.1 I can relate new information to previous knowledge and/or ideas					
7.2.2 I can understand whether information is relevant or irrelevant to the topic					
7.2.3 I can relate new material/information to my learning experience					
8.1.1 I became an active language learner with high motivation					

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	5	4	3	2	1
8.2.1 I can use self-study skills.					
9.1.1 I am aware of academic ethical practices (like plagiarism).					
10.1.1 I can work effectively as a group member					
11.1.1 I can use technology in language learning (such as making effective PowerPoint presentations using English)					

III. COURSE CONTENT AND MATERIALS

1. What are your thoughts on the following Elementary and Pre-intermediate group programs?

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	5	4	3	2	1
1. The course materials provided me with what I needed to know or do.					
2. The course materials were appropriate to my interests.					
3. The course materials have variety.					
4. The course materials are visually attractive					
5. The topics and themes in the materials were interesting.					
6. The topics are presented sequentially, i.e. building upon prior learning.					
7. Course materials are sufficient to improve my listening skills.					
8. Course materials are sufficient to improve my speaking skills.					
9. Course materials are sufficient to improve my writing skills.					
10. Course materials are sufficient to improve my reading skills.					
11. Course materials are sufficient to improve my grammar knowledge.					
12. Course materials are sufficient to improve my vocabulary knowledge.					

IV. COURSE CONDUCT /TEACHING-LEARNING PROCESS:

**1. How often are the following activities and methods used in Elementary and Pre-intermediate groups?
Mark the appropriate section with an “X”.**

	Always	Frequently	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
	5	4	3	2	1
1. Teacher lectures					
2. Silent individual work					
3. Pair Work					
4. Group Work					
5. Discussions					
6. Games					
7. Role-play					
8. Projects					
9. Video sessions					
10. Audio listening sessions					
11. Homework / Assignments					
12. Peer correction					
13. Self-correction					
14. Reading aloud by students					
15. Reading aloud by teachers					
16. Songs					
17. Peer evaluation / feedback					
18. Self evaluation					
19. Questioning by the teacher					
20. Student presentations					
21. Computer-aided activities					
22. Translation					
23. Teacher correction					
Other (Please specify) :					

2. Please express your opinion about the teaching-learning process in Elementary and Pre-intermediate groups. Mark the appropriate section with an “X”.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	5	4	3	2	1
1. There was an efficient use of time in class.					
2. A variety of activities was used in the course					
3. The teacher was teaching in an interesting way.					
4. It was easy to follow the teacher.					
5. The teacher’s instructions were clear.					
6. The teaching methodology of the teacher was effective in our learning.					
7. The teacher was encouraging us to participate in the lessons.					
8. The teacher used audio-visual aids (Projector, video, TV, audio listening texts, etc.) effectively during the lessons.					
9. The teacher was using the board effectively.					
10. The teacher corrected our mistakes in an effective way.					
13. The lessons were taught in an interesting way.					
14. Sufficient feedback was given on our performance.					

V. ASSESSMENT AND STUDENT PERFORMANCE

1. Please express your opinion about assessment system in Elementary and Pre-intermediate groups .

Mark the appropriate section with an “X”.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	5	4	3	2	1
1. Progress Evaluation Exams (PEE), projects and quizzes demonstrate my actual language development.					
2. The instructions on the tests have been clear.					
3. Process Evaluation Exams (PEE) include all the skills to be improved.					
4. Speaking exam results demonstrate my actual proficiency/ability in speaking skills.					
5. Writing pack has helped me improve my writing skills.					
6. Writing task results demonstrate my actual proficiency / ability in writing skill.					
7. Quiz and The Process Evaluation Exam (PEE) results demonstrate my actual proficiency/ ability in reading skills.					
8. Quiz and The Process Evaluation Exam (PEE) results demonstrate my actual proficiency/ ability in listening skills.					
9. The grading has been fair.					
10. I have received sufficient feedback on my performance in the tests.					
11. Tests generally measure my grammar knowledge.					
12. Tests generally measure all the skills (reading, writing, speaking, listening) equally.					
13. Tests include a variety of questions/tasks.					
14. Tests results demonstrate my actual writing ability.					
15. Tests results demonstrate my actual listening ability.					
16. Tests results demonstrate my actual reading ability.					
17. Instructor’s grade on presentation and tasks has been fair.					

Appendix - 3 Course Evaluation Interview Sample Questions for Students (Turkish)

BÖLÜM I -Ders Hedefleri

1. İngilizce hazırlık programı beklentilerinizi ve ihtiyaçlarınızı ne derece karşıladı
2. Hangi beklentileriniz/ihtiyaçlarınız karşılandı, hangileri karşılanmadı? Örnek veriniz
3. Hazırlık programının hedefleri nelerdi? (Gerekirse öğrencilere hedeflerden birkaçı hatırlatılacak)
4. Bu hedeflerin tümüne ulaştığınıza inanıyor musunuz? Lütfen açıklayınız.
5. Sizce, bu programın hedefleri neler olmalıydı? PIS (101), PLS (101) ve PRW (101) dersleri öğrencilerin ne gibi bilgi ve becerilerini geliştirmeyi hedeflemelidir? Bu konuyla ilgili önerileriniz nelerdir?
6. Bu programda karşılanabilecek olan, ancak karşılanmayan, okuma, konuşma, yazma, dinleme, dil bilgisi ve kelime ile ilgili ihtiyaçlarınız nelerdir?

BÖLÜM II – Program İçeriği ve Materyaller

1. Bu programda işlenen konular ve becerilerle ilgili görüşleriniz nelerdir? (yeterli/yeterli değil, kolay/tamam/zor, ilgi alanlarıma, yaşıma ve İngilizce seviyeme uygun/uygun değil, vb.)
2. Bu programda daha başka ne gibi konular ve beceriler işlenmeliydi?
3. Ders materyalleri (ders kitapları, teksirler, vb.) ile ilgili ne düşünüyorsunuz? kullanılan materyallerle ilgili iyi olan ve iyi olmayan noktalar nelerdi? PS: Öğrencilere derslerde kullanılan bazı materyal örnekleri gösterilecek ve bunlarla ilgili görüşleri sorulacak.
4. Ders materyallerinde ne gibi değişiklikler yapılmalıdır? Derslerdene gibi materyaller kullanılmasını isterdiniz? (PS: Bu soru bir önceki sorunun devamıdır)
5. Program içeriğinde (işlenen konular, beceriler, vb.) ne gibi değişiklikler öneriyorsunuz?

BÖLÜM III - Dersin İşlenişi

1. Öğrencilere gözlemler sırasında belirlenen bazı aktiviteler hatırlatılacak ve “PIS; PRW ve PLS dersleride daha başka ne gibi aktiviteler ve alıştırmalar yaptınız?” sorusu sorulacak.
2. Bu aktiviteler ve alıştırmalar hakkındaki düşünceleriniz nelerdir? (eğlenceli/sıkıcı, basit/zor /tamam, okuma becerilerimizi ve kelime bilgimizi geliştirmede yararlı/yararsız, vb.)
3. Bu derslerde öğrenmenize daha fazla yardımcı olabilecek ne gibi aktiviteler ve alıştırmalar yapılmasını isterdiniz?
4. Derslerde öğretmen ve öğrenci rolleri nasıldı? Sizce nasıl olmalıydı? (Her bir ders için görüş alınmalı- PIS, PRW, PLS)
5. Sınıf kuralları veya rutinleri var mıydı? Derslerde çeşitlilik (aktiviteler açısından) var mıydı? Bu konulardaki düşünceleriniz nelerdir?
6. Program süresince öğretme-öğrenme süreci nasıldı? Dersler nasıl işleniyordu? Öğretmen nasıl öğretiyordu? Öğrenciler nasıl davranıyorlardı?
7. Programdaki öğretme-öğrenme süreci sizce nasıl olmalıdır? Dersler nasıl işlenmelidir? Öğrenciler ve öğretmen sizin en iyi şekilde öğrenebilmenizi sağlamak için ne yapmalıdırlar, nasıl davranmalıdırlar? Önerilerinizi belirtiniz.

BÖLÜM IV – Değerlendirme

1. Derslerde yapılanlarla sınavlarda sorulanlar arasında nasıl bir ilişki vardı? Paralel mi, farklı mı?
2. Derslerde kullanılan ölçme değerlendirme yöntemleriyle (sınavlar, yoklama sınavları, ödevler, vb.) ilgili görüşleriniz nelerdir?
3. Değerlendirme sonuçları (notlarınız) gerçek başarılarınızı/performansınızı ne derece yansıtıyor?
4. Sizce, bu programda öğrencilerin başarıları/performansları ne şekilde ölçülmelidir? Ne gibi değerlendirme yöntemleri kullanılmalıdır?
5. Program süresince göstermiş olduğunuz başarıdan/performanstan memnun musunuz? Sizce dil becerileriniz beklediğiniz şekilde gelişti mi? Bu dersi aldıktan sonra performansınız nasıl olmalıdır?

BÖLÜM V – Genel Değerlendirme

1. Bu dersle ilgili en iyi üç şey neydi? Bu derste bulunmaya devam etmesi gereken olumlu noktalar nelerdir sizce?
2. Bu dersle ilgili iyi olmayan 3 şey neydi? Bu derste bulunmaması gereken olumsuz noktalar nelerdir sizce?
3. Bu dersi öğrencilerin ihtiyaçlarına daha iyi cevap verir duruma getirmek, daha yararlı yapmak için neler öneriyorsunuz? Bu dersle ilgili ne gibi değişiklikler yapılmalıdır?

Appendix - 4 Course Evaluation Interview Sample Questions for Students (English)

PART I

Course Aims and Objectives

- 1- To what extent did the program in terms of PRW, PLS and PIS courses meet your expectations/needs?
- 2- Which of your expectations/needs have been met, and which ones have NOT been met?
- 3- What were the objectives/aims of PRW, PLS and PIS? (If they do not remember, students will be provided some course objectives to remind them the rest)
- 4- Do you believe that you have achieved all these objectives? Please explain.
- 5- What should have been the objectives/aims of these courses? What should these courses aim to develop in students? What are your suggestions?
- 6- What are your needs in terms of reading, writing, listening, speaking and use of English that could have been met (but haven't been met) in this program?

PART II

Course Content and Materials

1. What do you think about the topics/themes and skills covered in this program? (sufficient/insufficient, simple/OK/difficult/relevant/irrelevant to your interests, proficiency level, age, etc.)
2. What other topics/themes and skills should have been covered in this course?
3. What do you think about the course materials (course pack, textbook (s), handouts, etc.)? What was good and not so good about the materials you were working with in this course? PS: Students will be provided some samples of materials and asked their opinions/thoughts about those specifically.
4. What changes should be made to the course materials? What kinds of materials you would like to be used in this course? (PS: this question follows from the previous item)
5. What changes do you suggest in the program content (topics/themes, skills, etc.)?

PART III

Course Conduct

1. The interviewer supplies some sample tasks/activities identified during the observations and also asks “What other activities/tasks you have done in this course?”
2. What do you think about these activities/tasks? (interesting/boring, simple/difficult/OK, useful/not useful for improving your reading (and vocabulary) skills, etc.)
3. What kind of activities/tasks you would like to have been used in this course to help you learn more?
4. What are the student and teacher roles in this course? How should they have been?
5. Were there any class rules, routines and variety in the lessons? What do you think about these issues?
6. How was teaching-learning process in the course? How were the lessons conducted? How did the teacher teach? How did you (students) behave?
7. How should teaching-learning process be in this course? How should the lessons be conducted? What should the teacher and other students do which would help you the most in this course? Please indicate your suggestions.

PART IV

Student Assessment

1. How was the relationship between the classroom practice (what was done in the lessons) and the evaluation (i.e. what was required in the tests or assignments)?
2. What do you think about the assessment tools (e.g. exams, assignments, etc.) used in this program?
3. To what extent do the assessment results reflect your actual success/performance?
4. How should students’ performance/success in this program be measured? Which assessment methods should be used?
5. Are you satisfied with your success/performance in this program? Have your reading, writing, listening, speaking skills and vocabulary improved, as you expected? How should your performance be after taking this course?

PART V – Overall Evaluation

1. What were three positive/ good things about PIS(101), PRW(101) and PLS (101) courses? Three things that should continue to exist in this course?

2. What were three negative/ not so good things about PIS (101), PRW (101) and PLS (101) courses? Three things that should NOT continue to exist in this course?
3. What changes do you suggest in the preparatory program to make this course better and more useful?

Appendix - 5 Course Evaluation Interview Sample Questions for Teachers (English)

Part I – Course Objectives

1. What were the objectives/aims of the course PIS 101?
2. Do you believe that all these objectives have been achieved? Please explain.
3. Should there have been other objectives of this course? If yes, what should have been these objectives/aims? What should PIS 101 course aim to develop in students? What are your suggestions related with course objectives?
4. To what extent, do you think, PIS 101 met your students' expectations and needs?
5. What do you think your students still need in terms of?

Part II – Course Content

1. Which topics/themes and skills were covered PIS 101 course?
2. Which other topics/themes and skills should have been covered in this language program What changes do you suggest?
3. What changes do you suggest in the program content?
4. What materials did you use in this program What was good and not so good about the materials used in this course?
5. Should some changes be made in the course materials? What changes should be made? What kinds of materials would have been more effective in students' learning?

Part III – Course Conduct

1. How was teaching-learning process in the program? How did you conduct the lessons?
2. What kinds of activities/tasks were done in the lessons?
3. Do you believe that you provided variety in terms of activities/tasks?
4. Do you believe that the conduct of the lessons, teaching-learning process, was effective?
5. How should teaching-learning process be in this program? How should lessons be conducted? What kinds of activities/tasks should be done?
6. What were the student and teacher roles in this course? How should they have been?

Part IV – Evaluation/Assessment

1. Which assessment tools did you use in this program? What do you think about these assessment tools? Were they effective?

2. To what extent do the assessment results (students' grades) reflect your students' actual performance/success?
3. How should students' performance/success be measured in this program? Which assessment methods do you suggest to be used?
4. Are you satisfied with your students' performance/success in this course? Have their reading skills and vocabulary improved as you expected?

Part V – Overall Evaluation

1. What was positive/good about the program? Which aspects should continue to exist (shouldn't be changed) in this course?
2. What was negative/not so good about the program? Which aspects should NOT continue to exist in this course? What are the things that need to be changed?
3. What are your suggestions for making this program more effective and useful, better adjusted to students' needs? What are your suggestions for improvement?

Appendix - 6 Sample Classroom Observation Form

COURSE OBSERVATION FORM

Course: _____

Class: _____

Date: _____

Level: _____

Time: _____

TIME	COURSE AIMS AND OBJECTIVES	COURSE CONTENT AND MATERIALS	COURSE CONDUCT TEACHING LEARNING PROCESS	TEACHER ROLE TEACHER – STUDENT RELATION	STUDENT ROLE STUDENT – STUDENT RELATION	EVALUATION / FEEDBACK

Appendix - 7 Research Permit Approval From Erozan (2005)

3.11.2021 20:17

Gmail - Ölçek Kullanma İzni



zeynep uçkaya ·

Ölçek Kullanma İzni

3 ileti

zeynep uçkaya

25 Ağustos 2021 09:42

Alıcı:

Merhaba Fatoş Hocam,
Ben Zeynep Uçkaya. Alanya Hamdullah Emin Paşa Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu hazırlık programında öğretim görevlisi olarak görev yapmaktayım. Aynı zamanda Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisiyim. Tez konum olarak hazırlık sınıflarındaki müfredatın değerlendirilmesi alanında çalışıyorum. 2005 yılında yayınlanan " EVALUATING THE LANGUAGE IMPROVEMENT COURSES IN THE UNDERGRADUATE ELT CURRICULUM AT EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN UNIVERSITY: A CASE STUDY " başlıklı doktora çalışmamızı okudum ve izniniz olur ve uygun görürseniz tarafınızca hazırlanmış Program Değerlendirme Ölçeklerini hazırlık programına adapte ederek kendi tez çalışmamda kullanmak isterim.
İyi çalışmalar dilerim,
Zeynep Uçkaya

Fatoş Erozan

9 Eylül 2021 11:55

Alıcı:

Zeynep hocam merhaba,

Geç dönüşüm için kusura bakmayınız. Ölçeklerimi referans vererek kullanabilirsiniz. Başka bir sorunuz olursa yardımcı olmaya çalışırım. Kolaylıklar dilerim.

Fatoş Erozan

From: zeynep uçkaya

Sent: 25 August 2021 09:42

To: Fatoş Erozan ·

Subject: Ölçek Kullanma izni

Appendix - 8 Research Permit Approval for the Questionnaire from Tekir (2020)

3.11.2021 20:16

Gmail - Ölçek Kullanma İzni



zeynep uçkaya

Ölçek Kullanma İzni

3 iletici

zeynep uçkaya

24 Ağustos 2021 11:41

Alıcı:

Merhaba Sibel Hocam,
Ben Zeynep Uçkaya. Alanya Hamdullah Emin Paşa Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu hazırlık programında öğretim görevlisi olarak görev yapmaktayım. Aynı zamanda Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisiyim. Tez konum olarak hazırlık sınıflarındaki müfredatın değerlendirilmesi alanında çalışıyorum. 2020 yılında yayınlanan "Evaluation of English as a Foreign Language Program in Turkey" makalenizi okudum ve siz de uygun görürseniz Erozan(2020) tarafından hazırlanmış Program Değerlendirme Ölçeğinin tarafınızca hazırlık programına uyarlanmış halini kendi tez çalışmamda kullanmak isterim. Fakat çalışmanızda ölçeğin tamamına ulaşamadığım için ölçeğin bütün halini benimle paylaşırsanız çok mutlu olurum.
İyi çalışmalar dilerim,
Zeynep Uçkaya

Serpil Tekir

24 Ağustos 2021 16:28

Yanıt Adresi: -

Alıcı:

Merhaba Zeynep Hocam,

Anketi ben revize edip kullanmıştım. Siz de tabii ki bu halini kullanabilirsiniz. ekte anketi gönderiyorum.
Kolay gelsin.

Serpil Tekir

[Alınılan metin gizlendi]

--

Serpil TEKİR

Lecturer, PhD

Middle East Technical University

School of Foreign Languages

Department of Basic English

06800 Çankaya Ankara/TURKEY

CURRICULUM VITAE

ÖZGEÇMİŞ

Kişisel Bilgiler:

Adı Soyadı: Zeynep Uçkaya

Doğum Yeri ve Tarihi:

Eğitim Durumu:

Lisans Öğrenimi: Akdeniz Üniversitesi İngiliz Dili ve Eğitimi

Yüksek Lisans Öğrenimi: -

Bildiği Yabancı Diller: İngilizce, Almanca (A2)

Bilimsel Faaliyetler: -

İş Deneyimi:

Çalıştığı Kurumlar:

- 2014-2017 Alanya Alaaddin Keykubat Üniversitesi, İngilizce Okutmanı
- 2017 -2019 Alanya Amerikan Kültür Dil Okulları, İngilizce Öğretmeni
- 2019 - Alanya Hamdullah Emin Paşa Üniversitesi, İngilizce Okutmanı

İletişim:

E-Posta Adresi:

Tarih: 29.08.2022



TOPLANTI TARİHİ : 23.12.2021
TOPLANTI SAYISI : 17
KARAR SAYISI : 456

Üniversitemiz Eğitim Fakültesi Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü **Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Simla COURSE**'nin danışmanlığını, **Zeynep UÇKAYA**'nın araştırmacılığını üstlendiği, *"Üniversitelerdeki İngilizce Hazırlık Sınıfı Müfredatının Bellon ve Handler Modeline Göre Değerlendirilmesi"* konulu çalışmanın, fikri hukuki ve telif hakları bakımından metot ve ölçeğine ilişkin sorumluluğun başvurucaya ait olmak üzere, proje süresince uygulanmasının etik olarak **uygun olduğuna** oy birliği ile karar verilmiştir.

Prof. Dr. Hilmi DEMİRKAYA
Kurul Başkanı

Başkan
Prof. Dr.
Hilmi DEMİRKAYA

Başkan Yrd.
Prof. Dr.
Sibel MEHTER AYKIN

Üye
Prof. Dr.
Ebru İÇİGEN

Üye
Prof. Dr.
Nurşen ADAK

Üye
Prof. Dr.
Sibel PAŞAOĞLU YÖNDEM

Üye
Prof. Dr.
Taner KORKUT

Üye
Prof. Dr.
Gökhan AKYÜZ

BİLDİRİM

Hazırladığım tezin/raporun tamamen kendi çalışmam olduğunu ve her alıntıya kaynak gösterdiğimi taahhüt eder, tezimin/raporumun kâğıt ve elektronik kopyalarının Akdeniz Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü arşivlerinde aşağıda belirttiğim koşullarda saklanmasına izin verdiğimi onaylarım:

- Tezimin/Raporumun tamamı her yerden erişime açılabilir.
Tezim/Raporum sadece Akdeniz Üniversitesi yerleşkelerinden erişime açılabilir.
- Tezimin/Raporumun yıl süreyle erişime açılmasını istemiyorum. Bu sürenin sonunda uzatma için başvuruda bulunmadığım takdirde, tezimin/raporumun tamamı her yerden erişime açılabilir.

15/09/2022

Zeynep UÇKAYA

EVALUATION OF AN ENGLISH PREPARATORY PROGRAM USING BELLON AND HANDLER MODEL Tez Teslim

ORIGINALITY REPORT



MATCH ALL SOURCES (ONLY SELECTED SOURCE PRINTED)

8%

★ etd.lib.metu.edu.tr

Internet Source

Exclude quotes On

Exclude matches < 5 words

Exclude bibliography On

**EVALUATION OF AN
ENGLISH PREPARATORY
PROGRAM USING
BELLON AND HANDLER MODEL**

Uçkaya, Zeynep

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Ana Bilim Dalı

Tez Danışmanı: Dr. Öğr. Görevlisi Simla Course

08.2022, 193 Sayfa