

REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
ÇUKUROVA UNIVERSITY
THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

**EVALUATION OF AN ENGLISH PREPARATORY PROGRAM THROUGH
THE CONTEXT, INPUT, PROCESS, AND PRODUCT (CIPP) MODEL**

ESAT KUZU

MASTER OF ARTS

ADANA / 2020

**REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
ÇUKUROVA UNIVERSITY
THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING**

**EVALUATION OF AN ENGLISH PREPARATORY PROGRAM THROUGH
THE CONTEXT, INPUT, PROCESS, AND PRODUCT (CIPP) MODEL**

Esat KUZU

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Yonca ÖZKAN

Member of Examining Committee: Prof. Dr. Erdoğan BADA

Member of Examining Committee: Prof. Dr. Leyla Mesude MARTI

MASTER OF ARTS

ADANA / 2020

To the Directorship of the Institute of Social Sciences, Çukurova University

We certify that this thesis is satisfactory for the award of the degree of Master of Arts in the Department of English Language Teaching.

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Yonca ÖZKAN

Member of Examining Committee: Prof. Dr. Erdoğan BADA

Member of Examining Committee: Prof. Dr. Leyla Mesude MARTI

I certify that this thesis conforms to the formal standards of the Institute of Social Sciences. / /2020

Prof. Dr. Serap ÇABUK

Director of Institute

Note: The uncited usage of reports, charts, figures and photographs in this thesis, whether or original quoted from other sources, is subject to the Laws of Works of Art and Thought NO:5846.

Not: Bu tezde kullanılan özgün ve başka kaynaktan yapılan bildirişlerin, çizelge, sekil ve fotoğrafların kaynak gösterilmeden kullanımı, 5846 Sayılı Fikir ve Sanat Eserler Kanunu'ndaki hükümlere tabidir.

ETİK BEYANI

Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsünde belirlenen Tez Yazım Kurallarına uygun olarak hazırladığım bu tez çalışmada;

- Tez içinde sunduğum verileri, bilgileri ve dokümanları akademik ve etik kurallar bağlamında elde ettiğimi,
- Tüm bilgi, belge, değerlendirme ve sonuçları bilimsel etik ve ahlak kurallarına uygun biçimde sunduğumu,
- Tez çalışmada yararlandığım eserlerin tümüne uygun atıfta bulunup kaynak gösterdiğimi,
- Kullanıldığım verilerde ve ortaya çıkan sonuçlarda herhangi bir değişiklik yapmadığımı,
- Bu tezde sunduğum çalışmanın özgün olduğunu,

bildirir, aksi bir durumda aleyhime doğabilecek tüm hak kayıplarını kabullendiğimi beyan ederim. / / 2020

Esat KUZU

ÖZET

BAĞLAM, GİRDİ, SÜREÇ VE ÜRÜN (BGSÜ) MODELİNİ KULLANARAK BİR İNGİLİZCE HAZIRLIK PROGRAMININ DEĞERLENDİRİLMESİ

Esat KUZU

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Ana Bilim Dalı

Danışman: Prof. Dr. Yonca ÖZKAN

Haziran 2020, 113 sayfa

Dil programı değerlendirmesi ile ilgili araştırmalar, İngilizce dil öğretiminin artan popülaritesi ile son yıllarda daha fazla önem kazanmıştır. Program değerlendirme çalışmaları ağırlıklı olarak programlar hakkında bilgi edinmek için yapılır. Bu sayede söz konusu programların paydaşları programlarının verimli çalışıp çalışmadığını veya herhangi bir iyileştirmenin gerekli olup olmadığını anlayabilirler. Bu çalışma, Türkiye'de bir yabancı dil yüksekokulunda uygulanan İngilizce hazırlık programının bileşenlerine, uygulanmasına ve etkinliğine öğrencilerin, öğretmenlerin ve yöneticilerin bakış açılarından ışık tutmayı amaçlamaktadır. Tüm sürecin değerlendirilmesinde bağlam, girdi, süreç ve ürün (BGSÜ) modeli kullanılmıştır. Hem nicel hem de nitel verileri toplamak için eşzamanlı iç içe bir strateji benimsenmiştir. Yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler, anketler ve doküman analizi veri kaynakları olarak kullanılmıştır. Çalışmada 81 öğrenci, 9 dil öğretmeni ve 2 yönetici-öğretmen katılımcı olarak yer almıştır. Tanımlayıcı istatistikler SPSS 25.0 ile analiz edilmiştir. Ortaya çıkan nitel verilerin analizi ve yorumlanması için tematik analiz yapılmıştır. Sonuçlar katılımcıların programdan büyük ölçüde memnun olduklarını göstermiştir. Temel dil becerilerinin ve öğrencilerin ihtiyaçlarının önemsendiği ortaya çıkmıştır. Öğrenciler, öğretmenler ve yöneticiler arasında güçlü iletişim ve koordinasyon bulunmuştur. Ancak, katılımcılar arasında bazı motivasyon sorunları gözlenmiştir. Akademik personel için hizmet içi eğitimler gerekli bulunmuştur. Ayrıca sonuçlar, programı daha verimli hale getirmek ve kurumun hedeflenen hedeflerini uygun şekilde ele almak için bazı iyileştirmeler yapılabileceğini ima etmiştir.

Anahtar kelimeler: İngilizce hazırlık programı, BGSÜ modeli, İngilizce dili öğretimi, program değerlendirme.

ABSTRACT**EVALUATION OF AN ENGLISH PREPARATORY PROGRAM THROUGH
THE CONTEXT, INPUT, PROCESS, AND PRODUCT (CIPP) MODEL****Esat KUZU****Master Thesis, Department of English Language Teaching****Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Yonca ÖZKAN****June 2020, 113 pages**

Research regarding language program evaluation gained more significance during recent years with the increasing popularity of English language teaching. Program evaluation studies are mainly conducted to obtain information about programs. Therefore, stakeholders of programs in question can figure out whether their programs are efficiently functioning or whether any improvement is needed. This study aims to shed light upon the constituents, implementation, and effectiveness of the English preparatory program implemented at a school of foreign languages in Turkey from students', instructors', and administrators' perspectives. The context, input, process, and product (CIPP) model was utilized during the evaluation of the entire process. A concurrent nested strategy was selected to gather both quantitative and qualitative data. Semi-structured interviews, questionnaires and document analysis were utilized as data sources. In the study, 81 students, 9 language instructors, and 2 administrator-instructors acted as participants. Descriptive statistics were analysed thorough SPSS 25.0. Thematic analysis was conducted to analyse and interpret the elicited qualitative data. The results showed that the participants were substantially satisfied with the program. Basic language skills and the students' needs were found to be considered. Strong communication and coordination existed among the students, instructors, and administrators. However, some motivational problems were observed among the participants. In-service trainings for the academic staff were found to be necessary. Additionally, the results implied that some improvements could be made to make the program more efficient and to conveniently address the targeted objectives of the institution.

Keywords: English preparatory program, the CIPP model, English language teaching, program evaluation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This academic process has been a great experience for me. During this unique process, I have learnt a lot of new things which will help me for my whole life. Of course, I should thank those who made this process easier for me.

First of all, I would like to thank my supervisor, Prof. Dr. Yonca ÖZKAN, for her constant support and guidance. She always encouraged me to do my best and trusted me during every step of this process. She was very kind to me. I would like to express my thanks to Prof. Dr. Erdoğan BADA for his valuable advice and mentorship. He was a member of the examining committee. I want to thank him for his professional insights which helped me to produce a more sophisticated thesis. I also express my gratitude to Prof. Dr. Leyla Mesude MARTI for her guidance during my undergraduate life and for her feedback on my thesis as a member of the examining committee.

I express my gratitude to Prof. Dr. Ömer PAKIŞ and Hakkari University for supporting me and their employees to conduct academic studies.

I am grateful to the academic staff and students who participated in the study. I thank Asst. Prof. Dr. Abdulkadir TURGAY, Ali DİKİCİ, and Abidin TURAN.

I would like to thank Asst. Prof. Dr. Farzan ATAY, who helped and guided me while I was writing my thesis. She trusted me and provided continuous feedback during the analysis process. I want to thank Mithat İŞÇİ for his invaluable support and help. I am also grateful to my friend Yusuf CENGİZ, who guided me to design my thesis and provided me with necessary documents. Additionally, Serhat BAŞAR deserves to be appreciated for everything he has done for me in my academic and personal life. I also want to thank my friends Yusuf ÖLMEZ, Muazzez Kübra MOR, İbrahim DUYGU, Zeynep BULUT, and Halil VAROL for always supporting, motivating, and believing in me. They have always been there whenever I need them.

I want to dedicate this study to my family, my parents Ramazan KUZU and Şengül KUZU, my sisters Bahar KUZU and Seda KUZU, and the memory of my brother Sedat KUZU.

This study was funded by Çukurova University Scientific Research Project Fund (Grant No. 12255). I would like to thank Çukurova University for their financial support.

Esat KUZU
Adana / 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ÖZET	iv
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	v
ABBREVIATIONS.....	xi
LIST OF TABLES	xii

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem.....	2
1.3. Purpose of the Study	3
1.4. Research Questions.....	4
1.5. Significance of the Study.....	4
1.6. Key Terms.....	5

CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Program Evaluation	6
2.2. The Purpose of Program Evaluation.....	7
2.3. The Need for Program Evaluation.....	8
2.4. Dimensions of Program Evaluation.....	9
2.4.1. Formative versus Summative Evaluation	9
2.4.2. Qualitative versus Quantitative Evaluation	10
2.4.3. Process-oriented versus Product-oriented Evaluation	10
2.5. The CIPP Model for Evaluation	11
2.5.1. Context Evaluation	12
2.5.2. Input Evaluation.....	13
2.5.3. Process Evaluation.....	13
2.5.4. Product Evaluation.....	14

2.6. Preparatory Programs	14
2.7. Program Evaluation Studies on Second and Foreign Language Education Abroad	16
2.8. Program Evaluation Studies on Second and Foreign Language Education in Turkey.....	22

CHAPTER III METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction.....	31
3.2. Research Design	31
3.3. Mixed Method Design	32
3.4. Data Collection Tools	33
3.4.1. Questionnaires	33
3.4.2. Interviews	34
3.4.3. Documents	35
3.5. Piloting.....	35
3.6. Participants.....	36
3.7. Data Collection Procedure	39
3.8. Settings.....	40
3.9. Data Analysis	41
3.10. Validity and Reliability.....	43

CHAPTER IV FINDINGS

4.1. Introduction.....	45
4.2. Quantitative Analysis.....	45
4.2.1. Demographic Characteristics of Participants.....	45
4.2.2. Context.....	46
4.2.2.1. Students' Views on Context.....	46
4.2.2.2. Academicians' Views on Context.....	48
4.2.3. Input	50
4.2.3.1. Students' Views on Input	50
4.2.3.2. Academicians' Views on Input	52

4.2.4. Process	55
4.2.4.1. Students' Views on Process	55
4.2.4.2. Academicians' Views on Process	57
4.2.5. Product.....	59
4.2.5.1. Students' Views on Product.....	59
4.2.5.2. Academicians' Views on Product	61
4.3. Qualitative Analysis.....	63
4.3.1. Demographic Characteristic of Participants of Interview	63
4.3.2. Perceptions Related to the Nature and Constituents of the Program.....	64
4.3.3. Perceptions Related to the Implementation of the Program	66
4.3.4. Perceptions Related to Communication and Coordination among the Parties	68
4.3.5. Perceptions Related to the Sufficiency of the Program.....	70

CHAPTER V DISCUSSION

5.1. Introduction.....	74
5.2. Research Question 1: What are the Constituents of the English Preparatory Program at the School of Foreign I-Languages?	74
5.3. Research Question 2: How is the English Preparatory Program Implemented? (Skills, Strategies, Assessment, the Hour of Practice, Textbooks).....	75
5.4. Research Question 3: How Collaborative is the Relationship between the Students, Instructors, and administrators?.....	78
5.5. Research Question 4: How Effective is the Program from the Students', Instructors', and Administrators' Perspectives?	80

CHAPTER VI CONCLUSION

6.1. Introduction.....	84
6.2. Summary of the Study	84
6.3. Conclusion	85
6.4. Limitations.....	86

6.5. Implications 87

6.6. Recommendations for Further Research 88

REFERENCES 89

APPENDICES 98

CURRICULUM VITAE 113



ABBREVIATIONS

- AED:** Applied English Department
- ANOVA:** One-Way Analysis of Variance
- AUSFL:** Anadolu University School of Foreign Languages
- BLSC:** Basic Language Skills Component
- CIP:** Context, Input, Process-Product model
- CU:** Çukurova University
- EFL:** English as a Foreign Language
- ELL:** English Language and Literature
- ELT:** English Language Teaching
- EM:** English Medium Instruction
- EPP:** English Preparatory Programs
- GPA:** Grade Point Average
- HEC:** Turkish Higher Education Council
- KTU:** Kaunas University of Technology
- SPSS:** Statistical Package for Social Sciences
- 

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. The CIPP Evaluation Model	12
Table 2. Research Design.....	32
Table 3. Distribution of Students by their Classes and Proficiency Level.....	36
Table 4. Distribution of Students by their Departments	37
Table 5. Distribution of Academicians by the Program They Graduated.....	38
Table 6. Distribution of Academicians' Years of Experience	38
Table 7. The Duration and Dates of the Interviews	40
Table 8. Distribution of the Courses by Class Hours.....	41
Table 9. Cronbach's Alpha Values for the Questionnaires	43
Table 10. Students' Gender Characteristics	45
Table 11. Academicians' Gender Characteristics	46
Table 12. Students' Views on Context.....	47
Table 13. Academicians' Views on Context.....	49
Table 14. Students' Views on Input.....	51
Table 15. Academicians' Views on Input.....	53
Table 16. Students' Views on Process	56
Table 17. Academicians' Views on Process	58
Table 18. Students' Views on Product.....	60
Table 19. Academicians' Views on Product.....	62
Table 20. Demographic Information about the Students who participated in Interviews	63
Table 21. Demographic Information about the Academicians who participated in Interviews	64

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

English has already been one of the popular languages spoken by non-native speakers. The worldwide reputation of English had a great influence on technology, education and business (Özkan, 2017). In parallel with the popularity of English, English language teaching (ELT) come into prominence in Turkey and in other countries all over the world. Considering this growing interest in English, attending English educational programs in Turkey and other countries, where English is taught as a foreign language, has been an obligatory implementation (Yıldırım & Okan, 2007). Meanwhile, the number of universities which use English medium instruction (EMI) in Turkey has gradually increased. These developments have led to the acceptance of the importance of English by vast populations, and the interest in English has continuously grown. This inclination for English resulted in the foundation of schools of foreign languages where English is compulsorily or optionally taught for a semester or year before students are allowed to take departmental courses.

English language preparatory programs have started to be designed and implemented in these preparatory schools. Correspondingly, program evaluation research has gained momentum, and "one research area has been on the evaluation of foreign language programs from either teachers' or students' point of view" (Arap, 2016, p. 2). One of the main concerns of program evaluation research is to assess the effectiveness of a program to figure out whether the program and its components function as expected and whether the intended outcomes are achieved or not. Therefore, necessary improvements can be made with the guidance of the evaluation outcomes. Systematic aspects of the program evaluation are also worth mentioning since it may shed light on future language projects and policies (Rossi, Lipsey, & Freeman, 2018). Besides, stakeholders of a program, namely students, instructors, administrators, and program designers want to be informed about how good the program is and they aim to observe the strengths and weaknesses of the program to take necessary precautions to make it more useful and sophisticated.

Program evaluation is "the process of systematically determining the quality of a program and identifying how it can be improved" (Sanders & Sullin, 2006, p.1).

Evaluation of a program is both concerned with the appraisal of achievement and the improvements (Aziz, Mahmood, & Rehman, 2018). Therefore, program evaluation provides shareholders with the necessary feedback to put a value on the program or make improvements on it. The significance of language program evaluation has increased in parallel with the popularization of language programs. In Turkey, university preparatory programs can be mentioned as one of the crucial places where learners are prepared for their future educational or professional lives. Correspondingly, a great value attached to these programs, and it has been more and more significant to investigate these language programs because program evaluation studies can answer many questions about the program in question, and can provide valuable information about the program.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

English has been the medium of education in many public and private higher education institutions in Turkey regarding that English is becoming a more and more popular language in the globalizing world and education. Therefore, these universities now provide their students with English education at preparatory programs at least one semester or year. Students at a preparatory program have to pass proficiency exit examinations before they enrol in their departments. These preparatory programs mainly aim to enhance learners' English language skills and strategies effectively and prepare them for the courses that they will take in their departments. As a result of this, whether these programs meet the needs and expectations of students and instructors becomes relatively crucial.

Although great importance is placed on preparatory programs in Turkey to bring students up to a certain level of English, it is still observed that many problems exist in these programs (Toker, 1999). It is quite significant to detect and eliminate these problems which are confronted in a program to get intended outcomes and assure effectiveness. Additionally, program evaluation research can provide significant benefits to language education considering that the goal of the evaluation is to assess to what degree a program is effective and to identify the flaws of a program which need to be changed or reorganized (Lynch, 1990).

Students, instructors, and administrators are the three crucial stakeholders of a preparatory program. That is, they are all included in the process of the delivery of a

program. Also, they directly affect the program or are influenced by it. English Language Teaching (ELT) students in the preparatory program have to go through the English preparatory program before they start studying their departmental courses while students of other departments can attend the English preparatory program optionally. Also, the program implemented in the school of foreign languages in question has not yet gone through any evaluation in terms of figuring out its effectiveness, constituents, and delivery process.

All the programs need to be subject to evaluation to ascertain whether the intended outcomes and results are being gained from them and to identify their strengths and weaknesses (Tyler, as cited in Tunç, 2010). Considering the significance attributed to evaluating language programs, evaluating the English preparatory program at the state university which is subject to this study will reveal crucial information about the constituents, delivery and effectiveness of the program. Therefore, the stakeholders will have more profound insights into the program and authorities will have a chance to reconstruct and develop a more sophisticated program by eliminating the parts of the program which do not function as expected. As a result; in this study, we aim to evaluate the English preparatory program of a school of foreign languages at a state university in the hope that it will contribute to program evaluation research literature and raise awareness of program designers, instructors, administrators and other related parties.

1.3. Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study is (1) to evaluate the constituents, effectiveness, and delivery of the program implemented at a school of foreign languages through the eyes of the instructors, students, and administrators; and (2) to provide information to the stakeholders to help the process of betterment of the current program using the Context, Input, Process, Product (CIPP) model constructed by Stufflebeam (1971). In other words; teaching environment, dimensions of the program, perceptions of the students, instructors, and administrators concerning the program aim, content, and objectives, and congruence between what is reported and what is performed in the program are subject to this study.

With reference to the purpose of the study given above, the study seeks answers to the research questions presented as follows:

1.4. Research Questions

1. What are the constituents of the English preparatory program at the school of foreign languages?
2. How is the English preparatory program implemented? (Skills, strategies, assessment, the hour of practice, textbooks)
3. How collaborative is the relationship between the students, instructors, and administrators?
4. How effective is the program from the students', instructors', and administrators' perspectives?

1.5. Significance of the Study

The importance attached to current study might be explained in many ways. To begin with, it helps both instructors and administrators who are the mediators of the program by providing necessary feedback about the implementation of the program to let them reflect upon their practice. This evaluation brings the constituents, effectiveness, and delivery process of the program to light. Therefore, it helps the academic staff to see a fuller picture of the program implemented, and it may contribute to the reconstruction and redesign process of the existing program to make it more sophisticated. The students' and instructors' views about the program are revealed in this study. The stakeholders can take notice of the findings of this study to increase the effectiveness of the program. Moreover, the study provides valuable information about the teaching environment, teaching process, materials, the nature of the program, the delivery of the program, and assessment used in the program.

As for the contribution of the study to the ELT field, this study discovers the perceptions of three crucial parties in the program implemented at school of foreign languages in question, namely instructors, administrators, and students. In this respect, this study raises the voices of the parties who are directly influenced by the program, and it becomes an informative guideline for language program designers. Besides, the study makes a valuable contribution to the portion of existent program evaluation research in Turkey through gaining insights into the stakeholders' perspectives. As a result, this study bears significance in a number of aspects, and it can be a base for further program evaluation research and guide researchers in their studies.

1.6. Key Terms

Evaluation: Systematic attempt to gather information in order to make judgments or decisions (Lynch, 1996, p.2). In this study, this term refers to the scientific process of data collection and analysis to get insights into a language program.

Program: “Any organized educational activity offered on a continuing basis” (Weir & Roberts, 1994). In this study, this term refers to any constituent that is included in an English preparatory program.

Program evaluation: The systematic collection and analysis of all relevant information necessary to promote the improvement of a program and evaluate its effectiveness within the context of the particular institutions involved (Brown, 1995, p. 218). Within the context of this study, program evaluation is used to define the whole process of investigating an English preparatory program.

English Preparatory Program: One year of mandatory or optional intensive English language course for students whose English proficiency levels are insufficient for departmental courses provided in English at university (Official Newspaper-Date: 04/12/2008 n. 27074). This term refers to an English Preparatory Program which is consisted of two semesters, and which is implemented at a school of foreign languages.

The CIPP Model: It is the shortened version of the words “context, input, process and product”, which is a model for evaluation developed by Stufflebeam (1971) to help administrators make decisions. In this study, the program under scrutiny is investigated regarding its context (nature of the program), input (content of the program), process (implementation of the program, and product (outcomes of the program).

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter provides information about program evaluation, the aim of program evaluation, the need for program evaluation, dimensions of program evaluation, program evaluation model utilized in this study, brief information about preparatory schools, and related program evaluation studies from abroad and Turkey in the field of Second and Foreign Language education.

2.1. Program Evaluation

Program evaluation research has been considered to be a crucial area to figure out how effective a program is or whether it is doing what it is intended for. Lynch (1996) contends that program evaluation is "the systematic attempt to gather information to make judgments or decisions" (p.2). Similarly, program evaluation is defined as "the process of systematically determining the quality of a program and identifying how it can be improved" (Sanders & Sullin, 2006, p.1). Worthen (1990) on the other side, views program evaluation as "the determination of the worth of a thing consisting those activities undertaken to judge the worth or utility of a program (or alternative programs) in improving some specified aspect of an educational system" (p.42). Additionally, Talmage (1982) explains evaluation as an act of reaching judgements to fix a value on a program without causing any negative effect such as eliminating the critical roles of evaluation in the process of decision-making.

Although there are many various definitions of program evaluation, these definitions are not contradictory but complementary. Rallis and Bolland (2004) touch upon this issue and remark three aspects of evaluation on which scholars agree. According to Rallis and Bolland, these aspects are (1) systematic inquiry; (2) information for decision-making; and (3) judgement of merit, worth, value, or significance.

The significance attributed to program evaluation is in a steady increase in the world. Parties included in a program want to know about the program. As for the language programs, it is a known fact that many universities both in Turkey and the other countries world have started to offer English language programs. Consequently, many questions arise with respect to the functions, delivery, and effectiveness of the

program. Thus, a great value is attached to these evaluation studies because program evaluation research provides critical information to stakeholders so that they can make betterments in the current program.

Program evaluation has many various definitions. However, there are also some aspects scholars commonly accept. Moreover, program evaluation in language education serves many aims, each of which is generally concerned with getting information about the program or helping stakeholders in the process of decision-making about the program.

2.2. The Purpose of Program Evaluation

Development and accountability form the two basic constituents describing the goals of program evaluation Weir and Roberts (1994.) According to Rea-Dickins and Germaine (as cited in Çankaya, 2015), teacher development is mentioned as the third purpose. Evaluation for accountability is subject to the justification of numerous uses of the program components (Celen, 2016). Evaluation for development, however, intends to improve the quality of a program in educational terms. Evaluation for teacher development focuses on teacher practice, and development of action research is a part of this purpose (Bodegas, 2009).

Cohen (1994), on the other hand, makes a distinction between instructional and administrative purposes of evaluation. Cohen underlines that instructional purposes of evaluation deal with the decisions about individuals' learning and success along with the functionality of various components of the program being evaluated. In contrast, administrative purposes are mostly concerned with placing individuals within language programs and with developing and organizing these language programs.

Program evaluation is of great significance in education, especially in language learning programs because without evaluating a language program, it will not be possible to fully grasp the nature of the program. Not only the process but also the outcomes of a program must be evaluated to observe and experience the benefits (Çankaya, 2015). Also; functions, weaknesses, strengths of the program being evaluated, and the ways to improve it remain uncertain without evaluation. Furthermore; evaluation can be seen as a part of curriculum planning, and design is unaccomplished without evaluation (Hargreaves, 1989).

An educational program also contains materials and products. Therefore, examining the materials used in the program and products gained from it can be assumed to be another purpose of program evaluation (Tribble, 2000).

Evaluating a program during its delivery or after the delivery bears great significance since evaluation gives priceless data about the various part of a program and enables concerned parties to make alterations to the current program. Therefore, it is evident that evaluation in education serves many purposes.

2.3. The Need for Program Evaluation

It is possible to bring forward many reasons why the need and demand for program evaluation research continue to rise both in Turkey and the world. First of all, parties who determine the policies concerning the future of a program and who are affected by it - or stakeholders as identified by Weiss (1986) - such as program staff, administrators, foundations, non-profit funders, program designers, and citizens want to get informed about the value of these programs and make sure that necessary improvements will be made in the light of the systematic data gathered (Newcomer, Hatry & Wholey, 2010). The information gathered in the evaluation process might be used, for example, to make decisions about the resources and teaching approaches utilized in the program (Marcinkonienė, 2005). Moreover, strong and weak aspects of a program can be detected via evaluation, which helps us to eliminate the negative parts in the program (Tunç, 2010). In other words, diagnosing strengths and weakness of a program, above all, shows us which parts of the program being evaluated need to be improved. Program evaluation research guides decision-makers and program designer in the process of enhancing the quality of the existing programs and improving future programs. Nunan (1988) underlines this critical function of program evaluation by saying "no curriculum model would be complete without an evaluation component" (p. 116). Furthermore; evaluation can sometimes assist teachers to reflect on their practice and methods employed in the teaching process. That is, teachers' professional developments might also be indirectly promoted with the help of program evaluation.

Program evaluation is "the application of systematic methods to address questions about program operations and results" (Newcomer et al., 2010, p. 5). Based on this definition, it can be remarked that program evaluation functions like a conduit through which questions about the program being evaluated can be answered. These

questions are undoubtedly concerned with the running and outcomes of the program, namely its quality, delivery, appropriateness, effectiveness, outcomes and the like. To give an example of the possible questions which might be subject to a program evaluation study, Long (1984) exemplifies the following two questions for product-oriented evaluations:

1. Does program X work?
2. Does program X work better than program Y?

As the international communication language and the world's *lingua franca* of technology, science, and business, English is a crucial language to learn in Turkey because of the strategic position of Turkey in the international area (Kırkgöz, 2007a). This inclination for English in Turkey resulted in English becoming a more accessible and commonly used language in education. In addition to that, the value of language program evaluation research has increased since it is a necessity to evaluate language programs of these language schools to satisfy stakeholders of the program in question. In other words, those who are responsible for the delivery of a program, who are interested in attending the program, or who are in charge of the program want to know about the program. Therefore, they can decide the policies concerning the program, the future of the program, or whether they should invest in the program.

All programs might be evaluated to reveal mainly the quality, appropriateness, effectiveness, running, and outcomes of the program being evaluated. Program evaluation is not a choice but a necessity. In the globalizing world, the value of language programs has been increasing. As a result of this, evaluation research now puts more emphasis on these programs.

2.4. Dimensions of Program Evaluation

2.4.1. Formative versus Summative Evaluation

Highlighted by Scriven (as cited in Long, 1984), a well-known distinction between *formative* and *summative* evaluation exists in the literature. Formative evaluations are employed to enhance the quality of a program. They contribute to the betterment of a program by analysing the delivery of the program or how it is being implemented (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2011). In contrast, summative evaluations

provide information to help the process of decision-making about the expansion, adoption, and continuation of a program (Fitzpatrick, Sanders, & Worthen, 2004). It attempts to investigate the effects or outcomes of a program by describing what happens after the implementation of the program is over with a view to assessing whether the expected outcome has been achieved (Fraenkel et al., 2011). In respect to the aim of an evaluation study, questions about the functioning of a program are subject to formative evaluation. In contrast, questions about the overall quality, effectiveness, and appropriateness of a completed program are taken into consideration in summative evaluation.

2.4.2. Qualitative versus Quantitative Evaluation

The type of data is considered to be another criterion through which research is classified. According to Richards (2001), quantitative data “seek to collect information from a large number of people on specific topics and can generally be analysed statically so that certain patterns and tendencies can emerge” (p. 296). Qualitative data predominantly utilizes interviews and observations to obtain data which cannot be turned into numbers and statistics from relatively smaller sizes of samples. From this point of view, qualitative evaluation, by its nature, is more holistic, naturalistic, and explanatory; and depends more on subjective judgement or observation (Firat, 2016). Quantitative evaluation, on the other hand, depends more on test scores, checklists, surveys, self-ratings and student rankings (Richards, 2001). Program evaluation research can make use of either of these two types of evaluation or both at the same time, which can be defined as mixed-methods evaluation (Richards, 2001; Murray & Christison, 2011).

2.4.3. Process-oriented versus Product-oriented Evaluation

Another distinction in the types of evaluation is made regarding the aim of the evaluation. Process-oriented evaluation is "the systematic observation of classroom behaviour with reference to the theory of (second) language development which underlies the program being evaluated" (Long, 1984, p. 415).

The delivery process of a program is the center of process evaluation. It is performed while the program is implemented to inform whether it is functioning well. These sorts of studies provide guidance to improve existing programs. However, the

main focus of the product evaluation is on "what a program produces, chiefly in terms of learning, but sometimes also in terms of changes that the program causes in teachers' and students' attitudes, students' concepts, related intellectual skills and the like" (Long, 1984, p. 409). Therefore, product evaluation tries to figure out whether the program has achieved the expected outcomes or not and is carried out after the program has been delivered.

2.5. The CIPP Model for Evaluation

The CIPP, which is the acronym of the words "context, input, process and product", is a model for evaluation developed by Stufflebeam (1971) to help administrators make decisions. Stufflebeam (2005) emphasises that evaluation is "the process of delineating, obtaining, reporting and applying descriptive and judgmental information about some object's merit, worth, probity, and significance to guide decision making, support accountability, disseminate effective practices, and increase understanding of the involved phenomena" (p.61). The model "is configured especially to enable and guide comprehensive, systematic examination of social and educational projects that occur in the dynamic, septic conditions of the real world . . ." (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007, p. 351).

Two crucial assumptions with regard to evaluation establish the basis of the CIPP method. First, evaluation plays a critical function in stimulation and transformation; and second, evaluation is an essential constituent of the program of an institute (Gredler, 1996). In this regard, the CIPP model provides a complete picture of the program and its delivery by approaching it within the four different but complementary components. It is a decision-oriented model (Fitzpatrick et al., 2004) and considers evaluation as a process (Ornstein & Hunkins, 2004). Thus it serves as a comprehensible guideline which helps evaluators seek answers for the following fundamental questions (see Table 1) in each aspect:

Table 1.

The CIPP Evaluation Model

<i>Evaluation aspect</i>	<i>Questions asked</i>
Context	What needs to be done?
Input	How should it be done?
Process	Is it being done?
Product	Did the program succeed?

* Adapted from Zhang et al., 2011

2.5.1. Context Evaluation

Context evaluation, also known as needs assessment, asks "What needs to be done?", and guides to assess problems, assets, and opportunities within a defined community and environmental context (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). It provides a rationale for setting goals (Gredler, 1996). The main aim of context evaluation is to define the related context, portray the target population and assess its needs, identify opportunities for addressing the needs, specify problems concerned with the needs, and judge whether project goals are adequately responsive to the assessed needs (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). Context evaluation can make use of various methods such as interviews, surveys, system analyses, secondary data analyses, hearings, diagnostic tests, document reviews (Zhang et al., 2011) and the Delphi technique (Dalkey & Helmer, 1963). It is crucial to mention that identifying needs in a program can shed light upon the program objectives, given the fact that the needs mostly determine the objectives. Similarly; Zhang et al. (2011) highlight this significant function of context evaluation by saying "An effective service-learning project starts with identifying the needs of service providers (students) and the needs of the community" (p. 64). They also point out that failure of a program is generally connected to the insufficient identification and articulation of some crucial indicators like purpose, audience, resources and the like. Therefore, it is of utmost importance to comprehend that context evaluation is a cornerstone for program evaluation. It is essential to note that context evaluation has a critical role in program evaluation.

2.5.2. Input Evaluation

Input evaluation inquires “How should it be done?”, and investigates the most appropriate procedural design and educational strategies to reach the intended results (Zhang et al., 2011). The purpose of input evaluation is to make the audience to pay regard to alternatives and develop a better plan (Stufflebeam & Shrinkfield, 1985). At this point, evaluators can reconsider whether the target population is clearly defined and program objectives, instructional strategies, methods, and other strategies are decently decided to achieve the program objectives or not (Özdoruk, 2016). Through input evaluation; the policy-makers are able to settle on the usefulness of the schemes, definition of the solution strategies, and determination of appropriate assets and exercises (Yüksel, 2010). Its focal center is to identify and assess current system capabilities, to search out and critically examine possibly related approaches, and to propose additional project strategies (Zhang et al., 2011). According to Zhang et al., methods to conduct an input evaluation can be mentioned as inventorying and analysing available human and material resources, proposed budgets and schedules, and recommended solution strategies and procedural designs.

2.5.3. Process Evaluation

Process evaluation, through which the implementation of the program is monitored, inquires "Is it being done?", and supplies continuous feedback concerning the delivery process of the program (Zhang et al., 2011). The primary objective of process evaluation is to portray the continuing process to suggest necessary modifications if the implementation is inadequate (Tunç, 2010). In this aspect, program evaluation provides documentation of the whole process. Regarding this documentation, the feedback obtained from process evaluation is concerned with to what extent the planned activities are executed and to what extent participants accept and perform their roles, and whether adjustment or revision of the plan is obligatory (Zhang et al., 2011). Besides, process evaluation facilitates a comparison of the actual and intended implementation, the expenses of the implementation, and participants' opinions about the quality of the effort (Stufflebeam & Shinkfeld, 1985). Moreover, Gredler (1996) highlights two secondary functions of process evaluation. These are to provide information to external audiences who are interested in the program and to guide program staff, evaluators, and administrators in reading program outcomes

(Gredler, 1996). Some methods to conduct a process evaluation are monitoring the project's procedural barriers and unanticipated defects, eliciting extra information for corrective programmatic changes, identifying needed in-process project adjustments, documenting the project implementation process, and regularly interacting with and observing the activities of project participants (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007).

2.5.4. Product Evaluation

Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (1985, p. 176) contend that product evaluation facilitates evaluators “to measure, interpret, and judge the attainments of a program”. It asks "Did the project succeed?", and pinpoints and works out project results (Zhang et al., 2011). It can serve at least three purposes. First of all, it provides summative information which can be used to assess the merits and impacts of the service-learning project; Secondly, it provides formative information which can be used in the process of the betterment of the project for future implementation, and thirdly, it offers insights on the project's sustainability and transportability, namely, whether the project can be sustained long-term, and whether its methods can be transferred to different settings (Zhang et al., 2011). It also intends to aid stakeholders to settle whether a program ought to be proceeded, rehashed or reached out to different settings (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). Some of the methods that product evaluation utilizes are logs and diaries of outcomes, interviews of stakeholders, case studies, achievement tests, rating scales, focus groups, document/records retrieval and analysis, trend analysis of longitudinal data, analysis of photographic records, longitudinal or cross-sectional cohort comparisons, hearings, and comparison of project costs and outcomes (Zhang et al., 2011).

2.6. Preparatory Programs

The significance attributed to English in education has dramatically increased in Turkey, especially during recent years. The demand for English, which resulted from technological and scientific development, has led to English becoming a commonly used language. Moreover, the international status of English has urged universities to offer more English-oriented courses. Therefore, English took an essential place in Education. In Turkey, English is now taught almost at every formal education level. As for higher education; around 20% of the Turkish programs are in English (Arik & Arik,

2014), and the number is increasing. This means that a high number of universities provide English medium instruction (EMI) at some or all of their departments. As a result; English preparatory programs are offered to students at universities before they start their departments. The main aim of these preparatory programs is to increase the proficiency level of their students up to a certain level so that they can easily understand courses they will take in their departments with EMI.

Preparatory school students in these programs are exposed to English courses daily and intensively. Students whose majors are offered with EMI mandatorily attend these programs while other students can optionally join them. Students who want to continue their departments without attending preparatory programs have to pass the proficiency exam held prior to the start of the academic year or any other equivalent exam like TOEFL. According to official regulations; preparatory classes are offered for two terms, their weekly hours cannot be less than 20, and total class hours during a term must be more than 260 hours (Official Newspaper-Date: 04/12/2008 n. 27074). Students are grouped according to their proficiency levels at these programs. In other words, students who have the same proficiency level attend the same courses which have appropriate contents for their levels.

Student success is quite significant at these preparatory programs because these students mostly have to take a proficiency exit exam to start their departments. Additionally, they will be offered courses with EMI in their main departments. However, it is still possible to confront some problems in these programs. For example, Lamson (1974) points out that accommodation of slow learners at preparatory programs is the most significant problem. Besides, some scholars think that most preparatory programs are far from being effective. Kulemeka (1994) mentions how precious time is wasted without making any critical process in these preparatory programs.

Considering the place of preparatory programs in Turkey, stakeholders want to make sure that these programs are running well. It is also a stark reality that the success of learners in their majors which are offered in EMI depends on these preparatory programs. Every institution which offers English preparatory programs is liable for providing their students with every necessary opportunity to create a more efficient language learning process.

The popularity of English preparatory programs might be observed to increase in Turkish higher education. The success of these programs directly or indirectly influences many other factors such as student success at main departments with EMI,

healthy delivery of departmental courses, students' future professional career, and many other important issues. Therefore, eliminating available problems in these programs to increase their effectiveness becomes more critical.

2.7. Program Evaluation Studies on Second and Foreign Language Education Abroad

A formative study was conducted by Wang (1996) to evaluate the English language program in a senior school. The examined to what extent the targets of the nation-wide senior high school English language program had been achieved at the school. The necessary data was obtained through interviews, the curriculum guidelines, video-recorded classroom observations, and translating and retrieving test scores from school management information system. The results showed implementation of an essential amount of grammar-translation activities in the reading classes. However, the number of writing activities was kept relatively a few. Chinese was the medium of instruction. Therefore, the results showed that teaching methods and implementations were inconsistent with the goals of the mandatory senior school English as a foreign language (EFL) curriculum which was designed to enhance students' reading, listening, speaking and writing skills.

In Ukraine, Tarnopolsky (2000) intended to evaluate teaching writing in English. Past and presents situations, in particular, were his focal points in teaching writing. The study presented the needs analysis of EFL students in Ukraine. The results implied that it was urgent to introduce writing into EFL courses and employ a process-genre approach. Tarnopolsky suggested that a good EFL course had to be both communicative and contemporary. Moreover, he added that the teaching program had to get students involved in activities to make learning fun for them. From this point of view, the first version of the course being evaluated was found more problematic compared to the second one which included a considerable amount of writing for fun activities.

Lee (2002) aimed at evaluating a music-based educational program by utilizing Chinese and English songs to facilitate 10 adopted pre-school children and their American parents to acquire musical skills, language skills, and social and cultural awareness at the same time. A specially designed curriculum which exploited images, songs and sounds from both cultures was utilized to promote language development, raise cultural awareness in Chinese-American children, and help them to adopt

bicultural identities. The results showed a notable degree of improvement in participants' musical skills, language skills and cultural awareness.

Nam (2005) concentrated on the views of Korean English students and their educators about the new communication-based EFL educational program implemented at a Korean University. Both quantitative and qualitative data was utilized in the research. Based on the findings, it was concluded that students had seemingly some negative opinions while the teachers held positive perspectives towards the nature of the educational program. Nam also highlighted the possibility of some mismatches between the curriculum and the students' wants, which was a consequence of the flaws of the curriculum and constraints resulting from the institutional system.

Marcinkoniene (2005) evaluated the English modules at Kaunas University of Technology (KTU) in correspondence to learners' needs and course requirements to reveal the role of evaluation in the English language teaching and to make critical judgments for the sustainability of the offered courses. Marcinkoniene expected that the findings might serve to improve course programs and promote language acquisition. Two hundred thirty-four freshmen and sophomores from KTU participated in a questionnaire which served as a tool to uncover the participants' expectations and achievements and to identify their attitudes towards the implemented program and materials. With the help of the intervention, the participants became more critical and raised awareness of the learners and instructors about the significance of evaluation. Moreover, Marcinkoniene suggested that the teaching staff might be prompted to a reevaluate learning objectives, modify materials in response to unfolding students' needs, develop techniques to monitor both their and students' performance and the progress.

Al-Darwish (2006) carried out a study to have insights into the perspectives of the Kuwaiti English language teachers and their supervisors to reveal the effectiveness of the English language program supplied by the Kuwaiti Ministry of Education. Al-Darwish also wanted to investigate teachers' thoughts about their training in the new College of Basic Education (CBE) elementary English language teaching program or other teacher training programs. The results indicated that the teachers held affirmative attitudes towards communicative language teaching, but the instruction methods they followed in the settings were teacher-oriented. The teachers supported the idea that the employment of native language might be more intense. The teachers' current levels of proficiency in the English language were found insufficient. Furthermore, the teachers

complained about their inadequate college training which failed to connect the theoretical aspect of the teachers' training to practice.

Balint (2009) investigated an English language program in terms of learner satisfaction. He aimed to investigate factors affecting the learners' satisfaction in an EFL program at a university in Japan. Four hundred and forty students in a two-year program acted as participants in the study. The findings showed that level of academic, vocational language learning goals, gains in English language proficiency, and grades in the program courses were observed to influence program satisfaction. In contrast, initial English proficiency had a considerable indirect effect.

A case study was carried out by Chen (2009) to evaluate 20 English training courses offered in the Applied English Department (AED) of an institute by using CIPP (Context, Input, Process and Product) evaluation model. The four vital components, in other words, course aims and objectives, course contents and materials, course conduct and teaching-learning process, and assessment and student performance were taken into consideration while examining the courses. Qualitative data was gathered from directors of the AED, instructors, graduates, and employers of graduates through interviews, questionnaires, and the review of the available documents. The participants suggested a significant number of recommendations for improvement and change. Chen touched upon the necessity to reappraise AED structures, the students' needs, the teaching contents and methods, and assessment. A review of student feedback on instructor performance and some readjustments to the courses also seemed to be essential.

In Kuwait, a case study was conducted by Al-Nwaiem (2012) with the aim of evaluating basic language skills component (BLSC), which comprised writing, reading, and conversation courses, in the English Language Teaching (ELT) pre-service programme at a college. A sequential mixed-methods case study was utilized. Diaries, semi-structured interviews, written documents, and course evaluation questionnaires were primary data collection tools. The results obtained in the study revealed some significant flaws in the BLSC program. First of all, it was clear that the physical environment such as old buildings, shortage of learning-teaching facilities, unsatisfactory library materials, and shortage of a proper number of classrooms were found to be important shortcomings. Moreover, students expressed their dissatisfaction with content and materials. In addition to out-of-date course books, topics covered in the lessons were also found to be boring and undemanding. Al-Nwaiem also underlined that participants believed teaching methods were too traditional and teacher-centred. He

lastly noted that students harshly criticized the assessment criteria which depended on a final examination and were based on traditional philosophy.

A study was carried out by Burrio and Abdullah (2012) to evaluate the English teaching program at one of the Islamic education based English medium institute in Pakistan. Semi-structured interviews, classroom observations, and classroom recordings constituted the data collection tools. The data was analysed in terms of teachers' performance and selection criteria, textbook and testing, syllabus design, and teaching methodology. The results revealed that although the priority is religion, English was well-integrated in the teaching-learning input. The administration of the institution was found to be committed to developing students' English levels to a great extent to make them competent engineers, scientists, doctors, and pilots. Burrio and Abdullah also stressed that teachers needed some in-service training so that they could develop more sophisticated teaching skills. The syllabus also needed a redesigning by an experienced English language specialist. Based on the findings, teaching materials were mostly under preparation. However, prepared ones were found to be entirely satisfactory. Participants held positive views towards test papers when these were designed regarding the prepared teaching materials. Still, the participants underlined that test papers which were adapted or taken from somewhere else were a source of dissatisfaction. Burrio and Abdullah finally implied that the program promised a sustainable future development.

Chen (2013) evaluated the Taiwanese primary English education with respect to language policy. The study focused on the primary level of the program, which was introduced to students in grade 5. The results of the study unveiled some critical issues related to language policy. First of all, the participants explained their concerns about language policy and related curricular initiatives and underlined the need for the reappraisal of the current English language policy. Additionally, some problems in the policy concerning equity and growing diversity were revealed to exist. Moreover, the homogeneity in the equality of English language education at primary level across Taiwan and consistency of practice could not be provided in the program. Finally, the implemented curriculum was not congruent with the aforethought curriculum.

Another valuable study was conducted by Mohamadi (2013). She evaluated the general English program at Tabriz University through three questionnaires. The first questionnaire was designed to collect data regarding needs analysis from the students' point of view. The second one was to evaluate textbooks that students were using, and the third one was to investigate the methods utilized by teachers to teach the courses.

The employment of both quantitative and qualitative data provided a much crisper picture of the program. The results showed that there was a mismatch between participants' needs and the textbooks the participants received, and the type of instruction provided by teachers. As a result, it was clear that the general English course was not developed based on current ELT principles.

Another study on language program evaluation was carried out by Taqi and Shuqair (2014) to evaluate the effectiveness of a language program implemented in a college Kuwaiti college. Fifty students acted as participants in the study. The data was gathered through a pre-test and a replica test which was carried out four years later. Both tests were designed in five main categories focusing on four main language skills. The findings of the study unveiled that even though there seemed to be an improvement in the students' skills, it was trivial. Consequently, Taqi and Shuqair agreed that the results implied the presence of some significant problems in the current program.

Anghel, Cabrales, and Carro (2016) evaluated a bilingual education program designed to teach English and Spanish at the primary level. The program might be regarded as a cross-curricular one since some other subjects like History, Science, and Geography were taught in English. A standardized test was used to evaluate the sixth grades in Madrid. The results indicated an apparent adverse effect on comprehending the subjects presented in English for the children whose parents were poorly educated, specifically for those whose parents could not receive high-school education. Also, it was apparent that the program was far from reaching its objectives.

Jafari and Shahrokhi (2016) intended to investigate the effectiveness of teaching second Language grammar at Iranian high-school from students' and instructors' perspectives by employing the CIPP model during the whole process. One hundred twenty sophomores at that time of the study and 10 instructors participated in the study. Interviews with the instructors and a self-reported learner inventory formed the core of the data collected. The data made it clear that the grammar program implemented at the high school achieved what it was intended to do. Besides, the results suggested that there was a need to improve the objectives, methods, and grammar curriculum to increase its effectiveness.

By focusing on listening and speaking syllabus implemented at the Preparatory Year Program at Najran University, Mohammad and Itoo (2016) intended to reveal whether or not the aimed outcomes were achieved. They examined the contents of the listening and speaking skills to identify the gaps between students' performance and the

syllabus. A questionnaire was given to 20 EFL teachers. Also, interviews were utilized to get the participants' opinions and suggestions. Drawing on the findings, Mohammad and Itoo concluded that the syllabus met its objectives to a degree but not entirely. It was suggested that the syllabus could be revised to make it more sophisticated and reduce the gap between what was aimed at and what was achieved.

Yousif (2017) investigated the effectiveness of Afhad University English Language Preparatory Program. Considering the most important stakeholders who are directly involved in the program, novice university students and teachers participated in the study. Based on the students' and teachers' points of views, the findings revealed that the program was inappropriate to improve students' four main language skills. It was observed that students held a negative attitude toward the program. Also, it was highlighted that the textbooks used in the courses were not suitable.

Aziz, Mahmood and Rehman (2018) also utilized the CIPP model to evaluate educational quality at a school. The principle, heads of each wing, and teachers of various branches of a welfare school system in Rawalpindi were the participants of the study. The data for the study were gathered via document analysis, semi structured interviews and CIPP analysis. The outcomes indicated that the participants tried to guarantee education quality by employing various means such as advanced technology, effective communication, related sources, and teaching and learning strategies. Nevertheless, it was revealed that teachers had a tendency to focus on theoretical work and rote-learning. As a result, the students felt pressure and their intellectual abilities were negatively affected. Moreover, the lack of space and effective environment were found to exist because the school was located in rented buildings.

Intending to evaluate the viability of a grammar teaching program at an Iranian high school through the views of instructors and students, Dehkordi and Talebinezhad (2018) carried out a study by using the CIPP model. One hundred twenty students who were in the second grade and 10 instructors were participants of the study. The data for the study were collected through an interview targeting the instructors and a self-report student questionnaire. They utilized descriptive and inferential statistics to analyse the questionnaire and content analysis to analyse qualitative data. The findings showed that the program served well. However, the efficiency of the program reportedly increased through improving some of objectives such as the effects of grammar curriculum on productive oral skills and teaching methods.

Enkin and Correa (2018) evaluated learner teacher and perceptions of program outcomes in a foreign language major. By utilizing a mixed-method approach, they investigated feedback on teaching and learning experiences from instructors and graduating senior students in French, Spanish, and major German programs in a modern languages department. The results were categorized into four themes. Those themes were learners' connection to another culture, learners' preparation for their futures, learners' communication ability, and learners' expectations of their programs. According to the discussed findings, Elkin and Correa suggested some curricular improvements which included creating an activity where students will be able to display evidence of oral skills upon graduating, integrating more speaking and free student-student communication chances into the curriculum, giving more importance to preparing students for real-world tasks concerning the job market, providing translation and phonetics courses, and establishing service learning chances and advertising them sufficiently.

2.8. Program Evaluation Studies on Second and Foreign Language Education in Turkey

In the aspect of program evaluation, Kırkgöz (2007 b) conducted a two-year longitudinal study to revitalize the language teaching program of Çukurova University (CU). She pointed out some important aspect of the previous program. To mention but a few, it was too structure focused. When students passed the final proficiency assessment exit examination and started attending their department courses, most of them had acculturation problems. As a consequence, they could not fulfil the requirements of many courses. After evaluating the program, she concluded that the program was insufficient for the students, and it could not satisfy the stakeholders' needs and expectations. She established a new program which was more specific to students' needs and which took students' departments into account.

Muşlu (2007) intended to reveal instructors' views on the writing curriculum of Anadolu University School of Foreign Languages (AUSFL). In total, 48 writing instructors lecturing at different level proficiency courses participated in the study. Muşlu designed a questionnaire with the aim of determining the instructors' thoughts about the curriculum. She also conducted semi-structured interviews, which carried out with 40% of the instructors, to get more insights from them. After a careful analysis of

the gathered data, it was concluded that the course pack and supplemental materials utilized in the courses needed revision because a large number of the participants had the belief that they were problematic. The genre and approach utilized in the program were revealed to be coherent. The assessment tools such as portfolios, project work, and journal writing were found to enhance communication between the instructors and students. The instructors accentuated the significance of the grammar syllabus in the preparation process of writing the syllabus in addition to the need for a change of rewards and topics of the writing competition.

Küçük (2008) examined the 2006 ELT Program of fourth and fifth graders in state schools from English language teachers' perspectives. She used questionnaires as data collection instrument. The study revealed that although some of the participant teachers had favourable opinions of the program, a high number of them became all of one mind about the insufficiency of the program for English language teaching and the incoherence of the contents. Moreover, some teachers stated that the program did not take regional differences into account. One of the most notable sides of the results of the study was that more experienced teachers had more negative opinions about the program.

Karataş and Fer (2009) applied Context, Input, Process, and Product (CIPP) model to evaluate English II Program at Yıldız Technical University. The scope of their research consisted of 35 teachers and 415 students. The data was gathered through two forms of a single questionnaire with 46 items for the teachers and students. They employed independent samples t-test technique to analyse the quantitative data. The study indicated that the participants supported the components of the program- content, input, process, and product. However, some significant differences between the means of the teachers' and students' responses to certain items were observed. Therefore, the study proved that the teachers expected more regarding the components of the program, while the students held quite positive views about its components. It was also concluded that various audio-visual materials must be implemented in the activities, and the students' need must be considered regarding their business life.

The English Language Curricula implemented at the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades of Key Stage I and were evaluated by Örmenci (2009). The study aimed to have some insights into general characteristics, objectives, and content of the curricula from the teachers' point of view. The data was gathered through a designed questionnaire and analysed through the Statistical Package for Social Sciences 15.00 (SPSS). T-test and

ANOVA (One-Way Analysis of Variance) were also utilized to measure the relationship between independent variables. Additionally, Örmenci conducted some interviews with the teachers. Although the participants adopted a positive attitude towards the program, some weaknesses of the program were also highlighted. For example, the participants underlined the need for a revision of the curricula since it had some unachievable goals, insufficient class hours, intense content, and some inadequate explanation concerning evaluation.

Özkanal and Hakan (2010) carried out a study to investigate the effectiveness of the EPP program implemented at Eskişehir Osmangazi University from students' perspectives. One hundred twenty-nine students who graduated from the preparatory program in 2006-2007 participated in the study. A Likert-type questionnaire which also included open-ended questions was utilized to collect data. The results showed that the students were satisfied with the program, and the program was found to be successful in teaching English. The students held positive attitudes toward the instructors' ways of teaching. However, the physical conditions of the preparatory schools were criticised by the participants, and they explained the need for English for Specific purposes (ESP) which would offer technical English.

Düzyol (2012) evaluated the effectiveness of an induction program applied to candidate teachers by focusing on the perceptions of the stakeholders of the induction program; namely, the managers, the executers of the program, the candidate teachers, and the mentor teachers. The data was gathered through in-depth interviews with 14 candidate teachers, four program managers and four mentor teachers from six public schools. The CIPP model was utilized during the whole process. The results showed that the participants perceived the existence of some problems and challenges. These challenges were mismatches between the needs of the participants and objectives of the program, insufficient effective methods, insufficient and ineffective materials and equipment, superfluous courses in the program, unreliable and invalid exams, and inefficient program instructors.

Mammadov (2012) aimed to investigate the established policies and their elements in terms of the education of gifted K-8 students and conducted a program evaluation study on K-8 Gifted Education Program to figure out to what extent the elementary schools with gifted programs satisfy to the needs of gifted students. The study revealed that there was not sufficient documented evidence with regard to the education policies for gifted students. The study displayed lack of coherence in gifted

education policy including definition, identification and placement concerns, and teacher training and personnel preparation. Also, some worrisome issues to consider related to the lack of an effective curriculum, vulnerabilities in instructional strategies, and curriculum adjustment for satisfying academic wants and necessities of gifted learners were noticed.

Çoşkun (2013) intended to investigate the modular intensive general English language teaching program implemented at a Turkish university through an investigation of the students' and instructors' perceptions of different dimensions of the program such as materials, teaching process, and assessment. For the data collection part, a questionnaire was applied to 381 students who attended the course on the day when the data was collected. At the same time, a focus group interview was held with 22 instructors who worked at the department at that time. The quantitative data was analysed via SPSS 15.0 while the qualitative data was analysed through content analysis technique. The findings of the study showed that the modular system should not be employed since the study revealed some certain drawbacks, and it might be replaced by a more applicable system. Moreover, the study concluded that some crucial parts of the current program needed improving to increase its effectiveness.

A study was conducted by Yavuz and Topkaya (2013) to have teacher educators' insights into the English Language Teacher Education Program introduced by the Turkish Higher Education Council (HEC) in 2006. Qualitative data was gathered through a questionnaire which included open-ended questions from 18 lecturers. The data was analysed according to thematic categories, which were drawn from the questionnaire. Even though some changes which were made by HEC like the addition of some courses were supported by the participants; some severe concerns about the new program regarding the sequence, content, structure, procedure, and removal of some courses were brought into the discussion. Additionally, the participant lecturers criticized the top-down approach to redesigning the program since they perceived that the HEC excluded the stakeholders of the program such as teacher educator, student teachers, and teachers.

Vırlan (2014) utilized the CIPP model to investigate the writing curriculum of a public university preparatory school from the perspectives of students and instructors. The qualitative and quantitative data was gathered from 287 students and 23 instructors through questionnaires, interviews, observation, and review of curricula of the prep-school and materials. The result of the study indicated that the participants partially

agreed that the program was in line with its objectives. Still, the findings implied the need for improvement and adaptation in the objectives and aims of the program, materials, and physical conditions to increase its effectiveness.

Tekin (2015) carried out a study with the aim of evaluating the program of English Language Teaching (ELT) and English Language and Literature (ELL) preparatory classes at a state university in Turkey. The study also aimed at finding out the components of the program which needed improvement. The qualitative and quantitative data for the study were gathered through a questionnaire with 106 students and semi-structured interviews with the two of the prep-school instructors. The quantitative data was analysed via SPSS while the qualitative data was grouped and organized to draw conclusions about the various aspects of the program. The results of the study revealed that most of the participants were satisfied with the present program. However, they also stated that the physical conditions needed regulating. The instructors, on the other hand, put forward the idea that there was a need for a new program to enhance learners' communicative skills. The overall conclusion was that although a vast majority of the participants were pleased with the program, there was still a need for a change in the program.

Another program evaluation study was conducted by Firat (2016) to find out whether the programs of the two state and two foundation universities nurtured learners' autonomy. Namely, the study aimed at uncovering what kind of applications was being employed in the preparatory schools of these universities to develop learners' independent learning skills and strategies. Additionally, she tried to figure out instructors' beliefs concerning learner autonomy. The programs were deeply examined to uncover if it included any practices to foster learner autonomy by taking into consideration the self-directed learning stages mentioned in the framework. The data was gathered through the meetings with instructors and administrators who were in charge of designing the programs. Besides, some documents such as course syllabuses and students handbooks were analysed. She utilized the content analysis technique to analyse the collected data. The results showed that all the programs, to some extent, tried to enhance learner autonomy. Moreover; the interviews, which were conducted with five voluntary instructors from each of the four schools to have some insights into the EFL instructors' beliefs about the programs, indicated that the instructors believed idea that there was a need to modify portfolios and design more flexible programs to promote learner autonomy.

Arap (2016) intended to unveil the effectiveness of English preparatory programs at the tertiary level in Turkey, and instructors and students' ideas about English preparatory programs to see whether any mismatches existed in their perceptions. She used the CIPP model in her research. Both qualitative and quantitative data was collected from 117 English preparatory program students at four state universities. While the qualitative data that she elicited through semi-structured interviews were processed via content analysis, the data obtained through questionnaires were analysed with the help of descriptive and inferential statistics. The results showed that the scrutinized English preparatory programs at the four state universities meet the needs and expectations of the instructors and students. Still, the instructors' perceptions about the programs were observed to be more positive regarding the students' perceptions.

Özdoruk (2016) intended to examine the English language curriculum at Yıldırım Beyazıt University School of Foreign Languages by employing the CIPP model. Students, instructors, and program and texting members were included in the study. Qualitative and quantitative data was gathered. The main focus was on the context, objectives, teaching methods, appropriateness, materials of the program, and assessment. The results revealed that the program was designed to enhance the learners' macro skills. However, there was an evident need to improve it to support the students in their departments effectively. Özdoruk also noted that the participants held positive views about the instructors, materials, portfolio task, the physical conditions, and Independent Learning Center.

Özüdoğru (2017) carried out another program evaluation study to examine the effectiveness of the non-compulsory English preparatory program at Uşak University. Utilizing the CIPP model, she used an adapted questionnaire and semi-structured interviews to gather data from 208 preparatory school students and two instructors who participated in the study. Descriptive statistics were utilized to analyse the quantitative data while the qualitative data was analysed through content analysis. The results of the study indicated that both students and instructors were extremely displeased with the physical condition of the School of Foreign languages. Also, it was underlined that the program was adequately concentrated on writing skills, speaking skills, and vocabulary teaching. The most commonly used teaching method was found to be lecturing of instructors. Students expressed their satisfaction with the instructors. Finally, Özüdoğru highlighted that the students thought that they were not proficient enough in vocabulary,

speaking, and writing skills. Drawing on the outcomes elicited from the study, Özüdoğru also suggested that the program content should be improved to make it include all language skills.

Cesur and Cinkavuk (2018) evaluated second grade ELT program of the primary schools in Tokat from the perspectives of active ELT teachers. A mixed research method was employed to gather data. For quantitative data, Cesur and Cinkavuk formed a questionnaire based on the related review of the literature. On the other hand, semi-structured interviews with 10 second grade teachers at state schools were conducted to gather the qualitative data. Descriptive statistics and content analysis were utilized to analyse the data. The results revealed that the participants held affirmative attitudes towards content, objectives, general characteristics, and assessment aspects of the program. Nevertheless, the participants believed that some parts of the program could be revised and supplemented.

Cengiz (2019) evaluated an intensive English preparatory program of a private university in İstanbul. The study aimed at detecting the weaknesses and strengths of the program as well as parts to improve. He collected through student and teacher interviews and focus groups. The findings of the study showed that there was a gap between students' opinions and teachers' opinions concerning the delivery of the program. According to Cengiz; high teacher quality, instructors with different backgrounds, content classes and portfolio could be mentioned to be the strong aspects of the program. However, the study also revealed that the delivered program and the proficiency examination had a mismatch, which seemed to be the most significant weakness. The other flaws were textbooks, teachers' being non-proficient in content areas and tolerating plagiarism, and physical constraints. The suggested sides to develop, on the other hand, were introducing proficiency-related classes as the proficiency examination got closer, carrying out a material evaluation to improve and change materials if necessary, and the ways of introducing academy to the students.

Eslek (2019) designed a mixed-method study to investigate the effectiveness of the preparatory program implemented at Firat University. One hundred thirty-eight prep students, 102 prep-graduate students, and 10 instructors participated in the study. The data was collected through two questionnaires and a semi-structured interview with the language instructors. She used SPSS 22.0 for the quantitative data process. In contrast, qualitative data was processed via content analysis approach. The findings showed that the program was effective to some extent. However, significant adjustments were still

necessary to improve the quality of the program. For example, the program was found to fail to improve the learners' four main language skills in addition to grammar and vocabulary skills. The students' needs were not satisfied. Also; according to the instructors, some severe mismatches existed regarding the implementation and the objectives of the program. It was clear that they relied too much on the course book as a result of the crowded syllabi and the extreme workload was a source of demotivation for the instructors.

Bayram and Canaran (2019) examined the English preparatory program (EPP) offered at a foundation university offering education in English to uncover the strengths and weaknesses of the program. Two hundred forty-one students and 26 instructors took part in the study. Bayram and Canaran employed a mixed-method approach in their study. Collection of quantitative data was performed through a program evaluation survey, and focus group interviews with the students and instructors offered the qualitative data. The findings showed that homework assignments, exams, and the program itself were found to be the strengths of EPP while the weaknesses included extracurricular activities and online programs. The students' perceptions of the program were significantly different from the instructors' perceptions. In the study, the participant teachers suggested some improvements regarding the pacing of the program course books and other supplementary booklets, number of portfolio assignments, and the picture description part in the oral exam.

Çakır (2020) investigated students' language needs in an English preparatory program from the perspective of students and instructors. Four hundred thirty-five students, 47 instructors, and 11 EMI instructors participated in the study. Both qualitative and quantitative data was gathered from the participants. Questionnaires, focus group interviews, and individual interviews were employed to obtain data. The quantitative data was elicited through descriptive analysis. Content analysis model was utilized in processing the qualitative data. The findings indicated that prep school students and EMI instructors believed that speaking was the most significant skill in contrast to writing. However, language instructors held favourable attitudes toward integrated skill practice. Moreover, the students viewed that it was essential to do practices on listening to lectures and effective note-taking, reading course handouts, expressing ideas, making presentations, and writing essays. The students were also found to have difficulty in effective reading, making inferences, following conversations while listening, asking and responding questions, summarizing in writing,

and being active in class discussions. Çakır concluded that equal importance should be attached to all four skills in the program, necessary revisions should be made, and the students should be supported in the areas with which they believed to have trouble.

Aktaş and Gündoğdu (2020) carried out a case study to investigate English preparatory program at Aydın Adnan Menderes School of Foreign Language. The study was based on the Bellon and Handler model. A mixed-method approach was adopted to obtain data from 310 prep-students, 26 lecturers, 26 lecturers from other departments, and 24 students from other departments. A scale, questionnaires, class observations, interviews, and documents were utilized as data collection tools. The results revealed that there were neither goals nor philosophy of the preparatory program. Students were found to have high motivation toward learning English. However, they were unable to reach the desired proficiency level. Furthermore, all the participants underlined that the teaching the skill courses as inefficient. Some communication problems were observed between the administration and other parties. Aktaş and Gündoğdu suggested that professional English teaching should be added to the curriculum, and some stakeholders should be included in the decision-making process. Finally, a need to improve physical facilities was observed.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

In this chapter, the information about the overall design of the study, data collection tools, data collection and analysis procedures, participants, settings, and the rationale for the determination of each method and step are given.

3.2. Research Design

This study mainly aimed at getting insights from students, instructors, and administrators at a school of foreign languages at a state university regarding their opinions about the English preparatory program being implemented. The CIPP (context, input, process, and product) model developed by Stufflebeam (1971) was utilized in this study.

Both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods were employed in the study. Quantitative data was gathered using a Likert-scale questionnaire design by the researcher after a detailed review of the literature (see Appendix B and C). Qualitative data, on the other hand, was gathered through semi-structured interviews, which were held after the questionnaires were applied. Additionally, written documents such as the school's website, syllabuses, course books, academic calendar, and brochures were analysed to gain information about the school and settings.

This study looked for answers to four questions. How the data was collected and analysed for each question was elaborately explained in Table 2. As it can be seen in the table, the data collection tools were documents, questionnaires, and interviews. The analysis tools and methods were SPSS 25.0, *otranscribe*, and thematic analysis.

Table 2.

Research Design

<i>Research questions</i>	<i>Research tools</i>	<i>Analysis tools</i>
1. What are the constituents of the English preparatory program at the school of foreign languages?	Documents Interview	Thematic analysis
2. How is the English preparatory program implemented? (Skills, strategies, assessment, the hour of practice, textbooks)	Questionnaire Documents Interview	SPSS 25.0 <i>Otranscribe</i> Thematic analysis.
3. How collaborative is the relationship between the students, instructors, and administrators?	Questionnaire Documents Interview	SPSS 25.0 <i>Otranscribe</i> Thematic analysis
4. How effective is the program from the students', instructors', and administrators' perspectives?	Questionnaire Interview	SPSS 25.0 <i>Otranscribe</i> Thematic analysis

3.3. Mixed Method Design

Mixed-method is a procedure for integrating both quantitative and qualitative data at a stage in the research process of a single study to get more valuable insights into the problem being investigated (Creswell, 2012). The following definition is also made by Creswell and Plano Clark (2007):

Mixed methods research is a research design with philosophical assumptions as well as methods of inquiry. As a methodology, it involves philosophical assumptions that guide the direction of the collection and analysis of data and the mixture of qualitative and quantitative data in a single study or series of studies. Its central premise is that the use of quantitative and qualitative approaches in combination provides a better understanding of research problems than either approach alone (p.5).

As it is stated in the quotation, the rationale for the mixed-method research design is based on the assumption that quantitative or qualitative data on its own fails to picture the details offered by a situation (Ivankova, Creswell, & Stick 2006). Concurrent nested strategy is highlighted as one of the commonly utilized mixed-

method designs. Concurrent nested strategy is defined as gathering and analysing quantitative and qualitative data at the same time. In concurrent nested studies, one method dominates, and the other type of data is nested or embedded (Kroll & Neri, 2009). Additionally, priority is given to the first data collection approach while the emphasis on the nested approach is less (Terrell, 2012). In this study, the researcher adopted the mixed method concurrent nested strategy, and the priority is given to the quantitative data

The mixed-method research also has some strengths and weaknesses. Its strengths can be mentioned as straightforwardness and opportunities for the exploration of the quantitative results in a more detailed way. At the same time, the weaknesses are the lengthy time and feasibility of resources to gather and analyse both qualitative and quantitative data (Ivankova et al., 2006). The mixed-method design can be efficient especially when the results of quantitative data show unimagined results (Morse, 1991).

3.4. Data Collection Tools

Considering both qualitative and quantitative data was utilized in the study, various data collection tools had to be used. Thus, the study became more reliable and included more various perspectives.

3.4.1. Questionnaires

Likert-scales are considered as essential tools in psychology and social surveys in addition to being permanently valid to gather data (Dittrich, Francis, Hatzinger, & Katzenbeisser, 2007). Jack and Clarke (1998) also highlight that questionnaires can be cost-effective tools for use in data collection. Drever and Munn (1995) categorize advantages of questionnaires for a researcher into four titles as, anonymity of the respondents, efficient time management, the prospect of elevated participation, and standard questions.

For this study, two versions of a Likert type questionnaire were designed to gather data from students and academicians (see Appendix B and C). After a careful review of similar studies (e.g., Arap, 2016; Karataş, 2007; Özdoruk, 2016; Tunç, 2010; Vırlan, 2014), 52 items which aimed at measuring participants opinions concerning the program were gathered. Those items were grouped into the dimensions of Stufflebeam's (1971) CIPP model as context, input, process, and product with the guidance of an ELT

professor and an assistant professor. Some items were combined, and some were eliminated to avoid overlapping. Eventually, the number of items was reduced to seven for each dimension and 28 in total. After that, two versions of the questionnaire were designed so that the items could address students and instructors. The last versions of questionnaires were revised with the professor and assistant professor before the researcher sent it to the supervisor professor. Three open-ended questions were decided to be added at the end of the questionnaires to get further insights from participants. After the supervisor professor approved the quality of the questionnaire, a pilot study was conducted with a small sample from the population.

Regarding the results of the pilot study, some items were revised. The number of open-ended questions in the questionnaire was reduced to two by combining and revising them. Also, Cronbach's alpha value was checked after the pilot study to make sure that the questionnaire was reliable.

The final versions of questionnaires involved two parts. In the first part, the demographic characteristics of the participants were asked. The variables of the first part for the students were age, gender, class, and department. At the same time, the academicians were asked to state their age, gender, year of experience, and graduate departments. In the second part, the Likert-scale items were presented. Five-point scale was designed as "absolutely disagree", "disagree", "neutral", "agree", and "and absolutely agree". A number from 1 to 5 for each answer was respectively assigned. As a result, the questionnaire included 28 Likert-scale items and two open-ended questions, which means 30 items in total.

3.4.2. Interviews

The word interview is described by (Harrell & Bradley, 2009, p. 7) as "discussions, usually one-on-one between an interviewer and an individual, meant to gather information on a specific set of topics." Different interview methods can be utilized in collecting qualitative data. Also, interviews can be synchronous or asynchronous. Face-to-face interviews, by their nature, are examples of synchronous communication and facilitate social cues such as voice, body language, intonation, and the like (Opdenakker, 2006). Semi-structured interviews are also forms of verbal interchanges in which elicitation of information from the interviewer is obtained through questions asked by an interviewee (Longhurst, 2003). In semi-structured

interviews, the interviewer prepares a list of questions in advance. However, the questions can be revised according to the way the conversation continues.

The researcher of this study decided to conduct semi-structured face-to-face interviews in the study. Therefore, a list of questions to ask in the semi-structured interviews was prepared (see Appendix D). The aim of conducting semi-structured interviews was to support the data obtained from the questionnaires. Before conducting the interviews, two professors and an assistant professor expressed their opinions about the questions and their appropriateness. Also, a pilot study was conducted, and the participants were asked whether the questions were clear and appropriate. Based on the feedback of the participants, the interview questions were found to be appropriate. Still, some small changes were made to have more precise and direct addressing.

3.4.3. Documents

Documents such as syllabuses, textbooks, class lists, and the academic calendar, curriculum, and school website were investigated to get information regarding the school and the environment and to describe the setting and the context.

3.5. Piloting

As mentioned above, the researcher conducted a pilot study in the same population after having designed the tools for the data collection to ensure the reliability and appropriateness of the tools. Seven students and three instructors who were excluded from the main study participated in the pilot study. In the pilot study, both questionnaire and interview questions were given to the participants. The participants were requested to answer the questionnaires while they were supposed to give feedback on the open-ended interview questions. Cronbach's alpha values for the questionnaires were checked. According to the SPSS 25.0 results, Cronbach's alpha value for the student questionnaire was .888, while it was .980 for the academician questionnaire. After the pilot study, some of the items in the questionnaires were revised. The open-ended questions listed in the questionnaires were updated. Drawing on the feedback from the participants, a few minor revisions were also performed on the semi-structured interview questions.

As for the interview questions, the participants of the pilot study were asked to state if the interview questions were clear and appropriate. All of the participants stated

positive opinions about the interview questions. After the pilot study, some small changes were made to have better addressing.

Also, a part of the data and results obtained in this study was presented and published in an international conference (Kuzu & Özkan, 2020).

3.6. Participants

Students, instructors, and administrators at the school of foreign languages took part in this study. The preparatory school comprised five classes (see Table 3). The English proficiency levels of these classes were at A1 and A2. Eighty-one students participated in the study in total. Thirty-six (44.5%) of these students were at A2 proficiency level while 45 (55.5 %) of them were at the A1 level of proficiency level.

Table 3.

Distribution of Students by their Classes and Proficiency Levels

Class	Proficiency level	f	%
Prep-1	A2	20	24.7
Prep-2	A2	16	19.8
Prep-3	A1	19	23.5
Prep-4	A1	13	16.0
Prep-5	A1	13	16.0
Total		81	100.0

As it is demonstrated in Table 4, 36 students (all the students who were at level A2) were from the department of English Language Teaching, the only mandatory program at the preparatory school. The rest of the students (45 in total) were from the departments of Archaeology, Gastronomy, Computer Engineering, Computer Programming, International Trade, Dentistry, Dialysis, Electricity and Energy, Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Physiotherapy, Public Relations and Publicity, Economics, Construction Technology, Business Management, Machine Programming, Finance, Molecular Biology and Genetics, Health Tourism Management, Sociology, Agricultural Economics, History, Tourism and Hospitality Management, Turkish Language and Literature, Veterinary Medicine, and Agricultural Engineering.

Table 4.
Distribution of Students by their Departments

<i>Department</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
Archaeology	1	1.2
Gastronomy	1	1.2
Computer Engineering	5	6.2
Computer Programming	8	9.8
International Trade	2	2.5
Dentistry	1	1.2
Dialysis	1	1.2
Electricity and Energy	2	2.5
Electrical and Electronic Engineering	1	1.2
English Language Teaching	36	44.4
Physiotherapy	1	1.2
Public Relations and Publicity	2	2.4
Economics	1	1.2
Construction Technology	2	2.5
Business	1	1.2
Machine Programming	1	1.2
Finance	1	.2
Architecture	3	3.7
Molecular Biology and Genetics	1	1.2
Health Tourism Management	1	1,2
Sociology	1	1.2
Agricultural Economics	2	2.4
History	1	1.2
Tourism and Hospitality Management	2	2.5
Turkish Language and Literature	1	1.2
Veterinary Medicine	1	1.2
Agricultural Engineering	1	1.2
Total	81	100.0

When it comes to the academic staff, 11 academicians who were teaching in the preparatory program acted as participants in the study. Two of the academicians were

also instructor-administrators. That is, they were teaching English courses in the program; however, they also had administrative duties. One of them was the vice-principal, and the other was the head of the department of Basic English, which was the department responsible for the management of the courses in the preparatory program. The distribution of academicians by the program they graduated is presented in Table 5. As is seen from Table 5, four instructors (36.4%) graduated from English Language Teaching (ELT) departments while 2 of them (18.2%) from departments of Translation and Interpreting. In contrast, five (45.5%) of them had graduated from faculty of letters.

Table 5.

Distribution of Academicians by the Program They Graduated from

<i>Department</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
English Language Teaching	4	36.4
Translation and Interpreting	2	18.2
English Literature and Language	5	45.5
Total	11	100.0

Academicians' years of experience were also obtained in the study. As it is demonstrated in Table 6, the number of academicians who had 0 to 5 years of experience was 2 (18.2%). The number of academicians who had 6 to 10 years of experience was 6 (54.5%). The number of academicians who had 11 to 15 years of experience was 2 (18.2%). Also, one academician (9.1%) had over 15 years of experience.

Table 6.

Distribution of Academicians' Years of Experience

<i>Experience</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
0-5 years	2	18.2
6-10 years	6	54.5
11-15 years	2	18.2
Over 15 years	1	9.1
Total	11	100.0

In addition to those, 15 participants (10 students, 3 instructors, and 2 administrators) who participated in the questionnaires voluntarily participated in the semi-structured interviews. Students who participated in the interviews were chosen equally from each class (1 female and 1 male). Three instructors (1 female and 2 male) and 2 male administrators (a vice-principal and head of the Basic English Department) also agreed to participate in the interviews.

3.7. Data Collection Procedure

After the necessary permission issues were handled, the researcher got in contact with the management of the school of foreign languages. The data collection procedure was decided to take place as predetermined. However, the school management disagreed with implementing the questionnaires by hand because they thought that it would hinder the teaching process. Therefore, online versions of the questionnaires were prepared. Those questionnaires were opened to access through e-mail from 19/12/2019 to 25/12/2019. Students and instructors were also informed about the questionnaires and were encouraged to participate in the study. Additionally, participants signed a consent form (see Appendix A). At the end of the process, 81 students (50 female and 31 male) and 11 instructors (4 female and 7 male) answered the questionnaires.

The semi-structured interviews, on the other hand, were carried out face-to-face. Two students (1 female and 1 male) from each class were chosen to take part in the interviews. The participation was based on voluntariness. As a result, 10 students from five classes participated in the interviews. Additionally, three instructors (1 female and 2 male) and two male administrators voluntarily participated in the interviews. All the participants of the interviews were chosen among those who answered the online questionnaires. The duration of the interviews was ranging from 5 minutes to 14 minutes as is shown in Table 7. The interviews were conducted individually, and the whole process was recorded to be transcribed later.

Table 7.

The Duration and Dates of the Interviews

<i>Participants</i>	<i>Duration</i>	<i>Date</i>
Student I	6 minutes	December 26 th , 2019
Student II	12 minutes	December 26 th , 2019
Student III	11 minutes	December 26 th , 2019
Student IV	11 minutes	December 26 th , 2019
Student V	10 minutes	December 26 th , 2019
Student VI	8 minutes	December 26 th , 2019
Student VII	5 minutes	December 26 th , 2019
Student VIII	5 minutes	December 26 th , 2019
Student IX	14 minutes	December 26 th , 2019
Student X	11 minutes	December 26 th , 2019
Instructor I	10 minutes	December 27 th , 2019
Instructor II	8 minutes	December 27 th , 2019
Instructor III	6 minutes	December 27 th , 2019
Administrator I	9 minutes	December 27 th , 2019
Administrator II	8 minutes	December 27 th , 2019

3.8. Settings

This study was carried out at a school of foreign languages of a state university in the 2019-2020 academic year. The current students, instructors teaching in the program, and the administrators responsible for implementing the program participated in the study. The school of foreign languages has two departments, the department of Modern Languages and the department of Basic English. The department of Modern Languages is responsible for teaching English courses offered at the main departments of the university. The department of Basic English, however, is in charge of the courses in the English preparatory program. The preparatory program also constitutes two different programs as an optional and mandatory program. ELT students are educated in the mandatory program while students from other departments attend the optional program. ELT students start the program from A2 English proficiency level while students in the optional program have to start from A1. The rationale for this implementation is that ELT students are accepted to the university after they take an

English exam. The preparatory program is implemented for 16 weeks for each semester, 32 weeks in total. The program has 24 weekly class hours. A modular course system is adopted in the program. The distribution of the courses by class hours is demonstrated in Table 8.

Table 8.

Distribution of the Courses by Class Hours

<i>Course name</i>	<i>Class hours</i>
Main course (grammar integrated)	16 (12 + 4)
Reading and writing	4
Speaking and listening	4
Total	24

As can be seen in Table 8, the main course is taught 16 hours a week. However, four hours of this course are allocated to grammar teaching. The skill courses are also taught four hours a week in an integrated way. Reading and writing course is taught together in the same way speaking and listening course is offered. Each course has its textbook which is designed in a skill-integrated way as the courses are offered. When it comes to the assessment, students have to take quizzes, midterms, and final exams for each semester. However, students in the optional program do not take the final exam since they do not have to pass through a proficiency exit examination to attend their department. Students who will take the proficiency exit examination have to be successful for both two semesters.

Additionally, they have to attend 85% of the courses and have at least 70 Grade Point Average (GPA) out of 100. Sixteen instructors and 107 active students are available in the program. A principal, a vice-principal, and a manager are in charge of the implementation of the preparatory program.

3.9. Data Analysis

The quantitative and qualitative data was analysed in two phases and in a complementary way. The questionnaires were analysed through Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) 25.0. First of all, the appropriateness and missing data was controlled. It was observed that all the participants answered the questionnaires

thoroughly. Therefore, the descriptive statistics were analysed to tabularize frequencies, valid percentages, means, and standard deviations.

Qualitative data, on the other hand, were analysed through thematic analysis. Thematic analysis is described as "a qualitative method for identifying, analysing, and reporting patterns within a data corpus" (Scharp & Sanders, 2019). Also, a theme is "a pattern that captures something significant or interesting about the data and/or research question" (Maguire & Delahunt, 2017, p.3356). Qualitative data collection mostly relies on interpretations, and thematic analysis is viewed as the most fitting for any study which seeks to discover using interpretations (Alhojailan, 2012). Various approaches to thematic analysis are identified in the literature (Alhojailan, 2012; Boyatzis, 1998). This study adopted the six-step framework suggested by Braun and Clarke (2006). This framework adopts a step by step approach to analysing qualitative data. These steps are described as follows:

1. *Familiarizing with your data*: Read and re-read the transcripts.
2. *Generating initial codes*: Organize the data in a meaningful way, start coding the transcripts.
3. *Searching for themes*: Look for themes. It is possible to combine some codes under a theme.
4. *Reviewing themes*: Revise and develop the prior themes which are identified in step 3.
5. *Defining and naming themes*: Explain the core of what each theme is about.
6. *Producing the report*: write up your conclusions regarding the aim of your analysis.

Accordingly, the tape-recorded interviews were transcribed using *otranscribe*, an online site for transcribing the audio material into written documents. Afterwards, the six-step framework identified above was employed. The answers to the open-ended questions at the end of the questionnaires were also analysed through thematic analysis. That is, the findings were interpreted in an integrated way. The final version of the emergent themes was explained in parallel with the research questions.

3.10. Validity and Reliability

Although the scholars in the field of English Language Teaching approved the appropriateness and usefulness of the questionnaires and interview questions, some additional applications were made to minimize the threats to the study. First of all, the Cronbach's alpha values for each dimension and the entire test were checked. As demonstrated in Table 9, these values for the student questionnaire were .729 for context, .687 for input, .826 for process, .742 for product, and .907 for the entire test. The values for the academician questionnaire were .892 for context, .747 for input, .843 processes, .627 for product, and .937 for the entire test. All the values are above the acceptable value (.60).

Table 9.
Cronbach's Alpha Values for the Questionnaires

<i>Components</i>	<i>S. Q</i>	<i>A. Q</i>
Context	.729	.892
Input	.687	.747
Process	.826	.843
Product	.742	.627
The entire test	.907	.937

"A mixed-method approach, utilizing two or more data collection methods whose validity and reliability problems counterbalance each other, enables us to triangulate in on the 'true' result" (Abowitz & Toole, 2010, p.11). Also, mixed-method research has been supported for the two following reasons: to improve the theoretical prepositions and to have a less biased picture of the phenomenon (Webb, Campbell, Schwartz, & Sechrest, 1966 cited in Grafton, Lillis, Ihantola, & Kihn, 2011). Therefore, this study utilized a mixed-method approach to minimize validity and reliability problems and draw more accurate conclusions. Necessary precautions were taken during the whole research process, including data analysis. The data collection tools were piloted, favourable opinions of ELT scholars were received, the data collection process was administered carefully, and the data was analysed in details. Participants were asked to state if the items of the questionnaires and interview questions were clear and appropriate in the pilot study. The items and questions were kept as short and

concise as possible. The items in the questionnaires were divided equally into the CIPP dimension to increase face validity. The questionnaires were administered online to decrease the possibility of random answers by the participants. The interviews were done in a relaxed environment to minimize the pressure on the participants.

Moreover, both questionnaires and interviews were conducted in Turkish because almost all the participants were native or native-like speakers of Turkish. More complete answers were expected to be obtained in this way. The quantitative data was analysed through SPSS 25.0. At the same time, thematic analysis was utilized for the analysis of the qualitative data. The researcher double-checked the findings, and negotiation was ensured among the experts and community

In addition to the triangulation of the data, the triangulation of participants was also adopted in this study. Students, instructors, and administrators participated in the study so that the data was collected from three different perspectives.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

4.1. Introduction

In this chapter, the findings from the data gathered through questionnaires and interviews are presented. Both quantitative and qualitative data was utilized in this study. SPSS 25.0 was used to analyse the quantitative data. Qualitative data was analysed through thematic analysis.

4.2. Quantitative Analysis

Quantitative data was gathered through two Likert-type questionnaires. The questionnaires were two versions of the same questionnaire. One version was designed and adapted for the students. The other version of the questionnaire was for the academicians, namely instructors and administrators.

4.2.1. Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Eighty-one English preparatory students participated in the questionnaire. Fifty (61.7%) of them were female, and thirty-one (38.3%) were male. The information about the students' distribution by gender is presented in Table 10.

Table 10.

Students' Gender Characteristics

<i>Gender</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
Female	50	61.7
Male	31	38.3
Total	81	100.0

In Table 11, the academicians' distribution by gender is given. As can be seen in the table, four (36.4%) female and seven (63.6%) male academicians gave their responses to the questionnaire.

Table 11.

Academicians' Gender Characteristics

Gender	<i>f</i>	%
Female	4	36.4
Male	7	63.6
Total	11	100.0

4.2.2. Context**4.2.2.1. Students' Views on Context**

Frequencies, percentages, item means, and standard deviations of the students' responses for Context part are presented in Table 12. The highest mean was found 4.43 for context while the lowest mean was 4.08. The average mean, however, was 4.19.

As illustrated in Table 12, the results revealed that 81.4% (n=66) of the students agreed (n=36, 44.4% absolutely agree; n=30, 37.0% agree) that *the content of the English preparatory program is up to date*. However, 6.1% (n=5) of the students disagreed (n=4, 4.9% disagree; n=1, 1.2% absolutely disagree) while 12.3% of the students (n=10) remained neutral. The mean score was 4.18, and the standard deviation was .92.

A great majority of the students (n=73, 90.2%) agreed (n=31, 38.3% absolutely agree; n=42, 51.9% agree) that *the English preparatory program is designed to improve basic English skills*. 4.9% (n=4) of the students disagreed (n=3, 3.7%; disagree n=1, 1.2% absolutely disagree), and 4.9% (n=4) were neutral. The mean score was 4.22. The standard deviation was .80.

Also, 82.7% (n=67) of the students agreed (n=28, 34.6% absolutely agree; n=39, 48.1% agree) that *the objectives of the English preparatory program are clear and straightforward*. 3.7% (n=3) of them disagreed (n=2, 2.5% disagree; n=1, 1.2% absolutely disagree). 13.6% (n=11) remained neutral. The mean for this item was 4.12 while the standard deviation was .82.

Sixty-eight (84%) of the students agreed (n=28, 34.6% absolutely agree; n=40, 49.4% agree) that *the content of the English preparatory program is in line with the program objectives*. One of them disagreed (n=1, 1.2% disagree) while 14.8% (n=12) were neutral. The mean was 4.17, and the standard deviation was .72.

Table 12.

Students' Views on Context

ITEMS	Absolutely	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Absolutely	Total	M	SD
	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree			
1. The content of the English preparatory program is up to date.	36	30	10	4	1	81	4.18	.92
	44.4%	37.0%	12.3%	4.9%	1.2%	100%		
2. The English preparatory program is designed to improve basic English skills.	31	42	4	3	1	81	4.22	.80
	38.3%	51.9%	4.9%	3.7%	1.2%	100%		
3. The objectives of the English preparatory program are clear and straightforward.	28	39	11	2	1	81	4.12	.82
	34.6%	48.1%	13.6%	2.5%	1.2%	100%		
4. The content of the English preparatory program is in line with the program objectives.	28	40	12	1	0	81	4.17	.72
	34.6%	49.4%	14.8%	1.2%	0%	100%		
5. The objectives of the English preparatory program suitable for my level.	28	37	12	3	1	81	4.08*	.86
	34.6%	45.7%	14.8%	3.7%	1.2%	100%		
6. Preparatory program courses take into account my needs and expectations.	30	37	9	5	0	81	4.13	.84
	37.0%	45.7%	11.1%	6.2%	0%	100%		
7. The courses in the English preparatory program are complementary to each other.	45	30	3	2	1	81	4.43*	.78
	55.6%	37.0%	3.7%	2.5%	1.2%	100%		
							4.19	
							Average mean	

The agreement percentage to the item *the objectives of the English preparatory program suitable for my level* was 80.3% (n=65 in total; n=28, 34.6% absolutely agree; n=37, 45.7% agree). 4.9% (n=4) disagreed (n=3, 3.7% disagree; n=1, 1.2% absolutely disagree) while 14.8% (n=12) were neutral. The mean score for this item was 4.08, and the standard deviation was .86. This statement had the lowest mean score for this part.

Sixty-seven students agreed (n=30, 37% absolutely agree; n=37, 45.7% agree) that *preparatory program courses take into account my needs and expectations*. Five of

the students disagreed (n=5, 6.2% disagree), and 11.1% (n=9) remained neutral. The mean of the item was 4.13, and the standard deviation was .84.

A significant majority of the students (n=75, 92.6%) agreed (n=45, 55.6% absolutely agree; 30, 37.0% agree) that *the courses in the English preparatory program are complementary to each other*. The disagreement was 3.7% (n=2, 2.5% disagree; n=1, 1.2% absolutely disagree). The number of the students who stayed neutral was three (3.7%). This item had the highest with 4.43 mean for context. The standard deviation was .78.

4.2.2.2. Academicians' Views on Context

Academicians' views on Context are given in Table 13. The highest mean of this part was 4.45, and the lowest meant was 3.72. The average mean, on the other hand, was 4.03.

A significant majority of the academicians (n=9, 81.9%) agreed (n=4, 36.4% absolutely agree; n=5, 45.5% agree) that *the content of the English preparatory program is up to date* while 2 of them disagreed (n=1, 9.1% disagree; n=1, 9.1% absolutely disagree). The mean score was 3.90 while the standard deviation was 1.30.

All academicians (n=11, 100%) agreed (n=5, 45.5% absolutely agree; n=6, 54.5%) that *the English preparatory program is designed to improve basic English skills*. This item had the highest mean score for context dimension with 4.45. The standard deviation was found .52.

A vast majority of the academicians (n=9, 81.8%) agreed (n=3, 27.3% absolutely agree; n=6, 54.5% agree) that *the objectives of the English preparatory program are clear and straightforward*. One academician disagreed (9.1% absolutely disagree). One of them (9.1%) remained neutral. The mean score was 3.90, and the standard deviation was 1.13.

A significant number of the academicians (n=9 81.8%) agreed (n=2, 18.2% absolutely agree; n=7, 63.6% agree) that *the content of the English preparatory program is in line with the program objectives* while 9.1% of them disagreed (1, 9.1% absolutely disagree) to the item. Moreover, one (9.1%) academician was neutral. The mean of the item was 3.81, and the standard deviation was found to be 1.07.

Table 13.

Academics' Views on Context

ITEMS	Absolutely Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Absolutely Disagree	Total	M	SD
1. The content of the English preparatory program is up to date.	4 36.4%	5 45.5%	0 0%	1 9.1%	1 9.1%	11 100%	3.90	1.30
2. The English preparatory program is designed to improve basic English skills.	5 45.5%	6 54.5%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	11 100%	4.45*	.52
3. The objectives of the English preparatory program are clear and straightforward.	3 27.3%	6 54.5%	1 9.1%	0 0%	1 9.1%	11 100%	3.90	1.13
4. The content of the English preparatory program is in line with the program objectives.	2 18.2%	7 63.6%	1 9.1%	0 0%	1 9.1%	11 100%	3.81	1.07
5. The objectives of the English preparatory program suitable for the students' levels.	2 18.2%	9 81.8%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	11 100%	4.18	.40
6. Preparatory program courses take into account the students' needs and expectations.	2 18.2%	6 54.5%	1 9.1%	2 18.2%	0 0%	11 100%	3.72*	1.00
7. The courses in the English preparatory program are complementary to each other.	5 45.5%	5 45.5%	0 0%	1 9.1%	0 0%	11 100%	4.27	.90
							4.03	
							Average mean	

All academicians agreed (n=2, 18.2% absolutely agree; n=9, 81.8% agree) that *the objectives of the English preparatory program suitable for the students' levels*. The mean of the item was 4.18 while the standard deviation was found .40.

Eight academicians agreed (n=2, 18.2 absolutely agree; n=6, 54.5 agree) that *preparatory program courses take into account the students' needs and expectations*. Two academicians disagreed (18.2% disagree) to this statement while only one (9.1%) remained neutral. This item had the lowest mean score for this part with 3.72. The standard deviation was 1.00.

The agreement to the statement *the courses in the English preparatory program are complementary to each other* was 91.0% (n= 5, 45.5% absolutely agree; n= 5, 45.5% agree). However, only one academician disagreed (9.1% disagree). The mean score for this item was 4.27, and the standard deviation .90.

4.2.3. Input

4.2.3.1. Students' Views on Input

Students' views on Input are illustrated in Table 14. The highest mean in this part was 4.44 while the lowest mean score was 3.86. The average mean was also found to be 4.21.

A high number of the students (n=73, 90.1%) agreed (n=41, 50.6% absolutely agree; n=32, 39.5% agree) that *the classes are suitable for teaching English lessons*. 1.2% (n=1) of the students disagreed (n=1, 1.2% disagree) while 8.6% (n=7) remained neutral. The mean score the item was 4.38. The standard deviation was .75.

A significant number of the students agreed (n=32, 39.5% absolutely agree; n=36, 44.4% agree) to the item *I have the opportunity to express my thoughts in English in lessons*. The disagreement percentage was 3.7% (n=3, 3.7% disagree). However, 10 of them (12.3%) were neutral. The mean score was 4.19. The standard deviation was .79.

An important majority of the students (n= 56, 69.2%) agreed (n=25, 30.9% absolutely agree; n=31, 38.3% agree) that *the materials in the English preparatory program (textbook, additional copy, reading texts, PowerPoint presentations, video) are interesting and sufficient*. 9.9% of the students disagreed (n=5, 6.2% disagree; n=3, 3.7% absolutely disagree) while 21.0% (n=17) of them remained neutral. The mean score was 3.86. The standard deviation, on the other hand, was 1.04. This statement had the lowest mean score for this part.

Table 14.

Students' Views on Input

ITEMS	Ab sol	Ag ree	Ne utr	Di sa	Ab sol ute	T ot	M	SD
8. The classes are suitable for teaching English lessons.	41 50.6%	32 39.5%	7 8.6%	1 1.2%	0 0%	81 100%	4.38	.75
9. I have the opportunity to express my thoughts in English in lessons.	32 39.5%	36 44.4%	10 12.3%	3 3.7%	0 0%	81 100%	4.19	.79
10. The materials in the English preparatory program (textbook, additional copy, reading texts, PowerPoint presentations, video) are interesting and sufficient.	25 30.9%	31 38.3%	17 21.0%	5 6.2%	3 3.7%	81 100%	3.86*	1.04
11. The textbook used in the program is suitable for my level.	35 43.2%	26 32.1%	12 14.8%	6 7.4%	2 2.5%	81 100%	4.06	1.05
12. Homework and in-class activities (group work, group discussions, role play, etc.) given in the learning-teaching process improve my English skills.	37 45.7%	33 40.7%	7 8.6%	3 3.7%	1 1.2%	81 100%	4.25	.86
13. The presentations we make in the lessons contribute to learning English.	42 51.9%	28 34.6%	6 7.4%	4 4.9%	1 1.2%	81 100%	4.30	.90
14. The examples and exercises given by our teachers in the lessons make it easier to learn English.	42 51.9%	33 40.7%	6 7.4%	0 0%	0 0%	81 100%	4.44*	.63
							4.21	
							Average mean	

A high number of the preparatory students agreed (n=35, 43.2% absolutely agree; n=26, 32.1% agree) that *the textbook used in the program is suitable for my level*. In contrast, eight of them disagreed (n=6, 7.4% disagree; n=2, 2.5% absolutely

disagree), and 12 of them (14.8%) were neutral. The mean of the item was 4.06. The standard deviation was 1.05.

Seventy students agreed (n=37, 45.7% absolutely agree; n=33, 40.7% agree) to the item *homework and in-class activities (group work, group discussions, role play, etc.) given in the learning-teaching process improve my English skills*. 4.9% (n=4) of them disagreed (n=3, 3.7% disagree; n=1, 1.2% absolutely disagree; 8.6% (n=7) of them remained neutral. The mean was 4.25, and the standard deviation was .86.

A significant majority of the students (n=70, 86.5%) agreed (n=42, 51.9% absolutely agree; n=28, 34.6% agree) that *the presentations we make in the lessons contribute to learning English*. The disagreement proportion was 6.1% (n=4, 4.9% disagree; n=1, 1.2% absolutely disagree). The mean score was found 4.30 and the standard deviation .90.

A very high number of the students agreed (n=42, 51.9% absolutely agree; n=33, 40.7% agree) that *the examples and exercises given by our teachers in the lessons make it easier to learn English*. Any student did not show disagreement with this item. However, 7.4% (n=6) of the students remained neutral. This item also had the highest mean score with 4.44 in this part. The standard deviation was .63.

4.2.3.2. Academicians' Views on Input

Academicians' views on Input are given in Table 15. The highest mean for input part was 4.45, and the lowest mean was 3.72. The average mean was found to be 4.16.

Six (54.6%) of the academicians agreed (n=4, 36.4% absolutely agree; n=2, 18.2% agree) that *the classes are suitable for teaching English lessons*. 18.2% (n=2) of them disagreed (18.2% disagree) while 27.3% (n=3) remained neutral. The mean score for the item was 3.72, and the standard deviation was found 1.19. This statement had the lowest mean score for this part.

A great majority of the academicians (n=9, 81.9%) agreed (n=5, 45.5% absolutely agree; n=4, 36.4% agree) that *the students have the opportunity to express their thoughts in English in lesson*. However, 9.1% of them (n=1) disagreed (n=1, 9.1% disagree) while, 9.1% (n=1) were neutral. The mean was revealed to be 4.18 and the standard deviation .98.

Nine academicians (81.9%) agreed (n=5, 45.5% absolutely agree; n=4 36.4% agree) that *the materials in the English preparatory program (textbook, additional copy,*

reading texts, PowerPoint presentations, video) are interesting and sufficient. In contrast, one (9.1%) academician disagreed (n=1, 9.1% disagree), and 1 (9.1%) was neutral about the statement. The mean was 4.09. The standard deviation was revealed to be .94.

A great number of the academicians (n=10, 90.9%) agreed (n=6, 54.5% absolutely agree; n=4, 36.4% agree) that *the textbook used in the program is suitable for the students' levels*. 9.1% of the academicians (n=1) were neutral. The mean of the item was 4.36. The standard deviation was .92.

Table 15.

Academicians' Views on Input

ITEMS	Absolutely	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Absolutely	Total	M	SD
	Agree	Disagree	Absolutely	Disagree				
8. The classes are suitable for teaching English lessons.	4	2	3	2	0	11	3.72*	1.19
	36.4%	18.2%	27.3%	18.2%	0%	100%		
9. The students have the opportunity to express their thoughts in English in lessons.	5	4	1	1	0	11	4.18	.98
	45.5%	36.4%	9.1%	9.1%	0%	100%		
10. The materials in the English preparatory program (textbook, additional copy, reading texts, PowerPoint presentations, video) are interesting and sufficient.	5	4	1	1	0	11	4.09	.94
	45.5%	36.4%	9.1%	9.1%	0%	100%		
11. The textbook used in the program is suitable for the students' levels.	6	4	0	1	0	11	4.36	.92
	54.5%	36.4%	0%	9.1%	0%	100%		

Table 15 (continued)

ITEMS	Absolutely	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Absolutely	Disagree	Total	M	SD
	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Absolutely	Disagree			
12. Homework and in-class activities (group work, group discussions, role play, etc.) given in the learning-teaching process improve the students' English skills.	6	4	1	0	0		11	4.45*	.68
	54.5%	36.4%	9.1%	0%	0%		100%		
13. The presentations that the students make in the lessons contribute to learning English.	4	5	1	0	1		11	4.00	1.18
	36.4%	45.5%	9.1%	0%	9.1%		100%		
14. The examples and exercises we give to the students in the lessons make it easier to learn English.	5	5	1	0	0		11	4.36	.67
	45.5%	45.5%	9.1%	0%	0%		100%		
								4.16	
								Average mean	

A very high number of the academicians (n= 10, 90.9%) agreed (n=6, 54.5% absolutely agree; n=4, 36.4% agree) that *homework and in-class activities (group work, group discussions, role play, etc.) given in the learning-teaching process improve the students' English skill*. Also, one academician (9.1%) remained neutral. This item had the highest mean score with 4.45. The standard deviation was found .68.

The number of the academicians who agreed that *the presentations that the students make in the lessons contribute to learning English* was 9 (n=9, 81.9% in total; n=4, 36.4% absolutely agree; n=5, 45.5% agree) while 9.1% disagreed (n=1, 9.1% absolutely disagree). One academician (9.1%) was neutral about the item. The mean score was found 4.00, and the standard deviation was 1.18.

Ninety-one percent of the academicians agreed (n=5, 45.5% absolutely agree; n=5, 45.5% agree) that *the examples and exercises we give to the students in the lessons*

make it easier to learn English. 91% (n=1) of them was neutral about the item. Moreover, the mean score was 4.36 while the standard deviation was .67.

4.2.4. Process

4.2.4.1. Students' Views on Process

Students' views on Process are illustrated in Table 16. The highest mean for process was found to be 4.23, and the lowest mean was 3.90. The average mean was 4.09.

A majority of the students (n=70, 86.3%) agreed (n=31, 38.3% absolutely agree; n=39, 48.1% agree) to the item *the program allows me to actively participate in the lesson.* In contrast, 1.2% disagreed (n=1, 1.2%) to the item. 12.3% (n=10) of them also were neutral. The mean was 4.23 while the standard deviation was .71. This item had the highest mean score in process dimension.

Seventy-two (88.9%) of the students agreed (n=26, 32.1% absolutely agree; n=46, 56.8% agree) that *subjects that are not understood during the program are repeated and supported with relevant exercises.* 3.7% of them disagreed (n=3, 3.7% disagree). Additionally, 7.4% (n=6) remained neutral. The mean of the item was 4.17, and the standard deviation was .72.

Fifty-seven students agreed (n=22, 27.2% absolutely agree; n=35, 43.2% agree) that *the program places sufficient emphasis on listening skills.* 6.1% disagreed (n=4, 4.9% disagree; n=1, 1.2% absolutely disagree) while 23.5% (n=19) were neutral about the item. The mean score for the item was 3.90, and the standard deviation .90. This statement had the lowest mean score for this part.

Most of the students (n=62, 76.5%) agreed (n=27, 33.3% absolutely agree; n=35, 43.2% agree) that *the program places sufficient emphasis on speaking skills.* 4.9% (n=4) of the students disagreed (n=3, 3.7% disagree; n=1, 1.2% absolutely disagree) while 18.5% (n=15) were neutral. The mean score was found 4.03, the standard deviation was .88.

An important majority of the students (n=66, 81.5%) agreed (n=26, 32.1% absolutely agree; n= 40, 49.4% agree) that *the program places sufficient emphasis on reading skills.* However, 6.1% (n=5) disagreed (n=4, 4.9% disagree; n=1, 1.2% absolutely disagree) while 12.3% (n=10) were neutral. The mean was revealed to be 4.06, and the standard deviation was .87.

Sixty-five students agreed (n=32, 39.5% absolutely agree; n=33, 40.7% agree) to the item *the program places sufficient emphasis on writing skills*. 6.1% (n=5) disagreed (n=4, 4.9% disagree; n=1, 1.2% absolutely disagree) while 13.6% (n=11) of them remained neutral. The mean score for the item was found to be 4.12. The standard deviation was .91.

Table 16.

Students' Views on Process

ITEMS	Absolutely	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Absolutely	Disagree	Total	M	SD
	Agree									
15. The program allows me to actively participate in the lesson.	31	39	10	1	0			81	4.23*	.71
	38.3%	48.1%	12.3%	1.2%	0%			100%		
16. Subjects that are not understood during the program are repeated and supported with relevant exercises	26	46	6	3	0			81	4.17	.72
	32.1%	56.8%	7.4%	3.7%	0%			100%		
17. The program places sufficient emphasis on listening skills.	22	35	19	4	1			81	3.90*	.90
	27.2%	43.2%	23.5%	4.9%	1.2%			100%		
18. The program places sufficient emphasis on speaking skills.	27	35	15	3	1			81	4.03	.88
	33.3%	43.2%	18.5%	3.7%	1.2%			100%		
19. The program places sufficient emphasis on reading skills.	26	40	10	4	1			81	4.06	.87
	32.1%	49.4%	12.3%	4.9%	1.2%			100%		
20. The program places sufficient emphasis on writing skills.	32	33	11	4	1			81	4.12	.91
	39.5%	40.7%	13.6%	4.9%	1.2%			100%		
21. The program places sufficient emphasis on language and vocabulary skills.	29	39	11	0	2			81	4.14	.83
	35.8%	48.1%	13.6%	0%	2.5%			100%		
									4.09	
									Average mean	

A high number of the students (n=68, 83.9%) also agreed (n=29, 35.8% absolutely agree; n=39, 48.1% agree) that *the program places sufficient emphasis on language and vocabulary skills*. However, 2.5% (n=2) of the students disagreed while 13.6% of them were neutral about the item. The mean was revealed to be 4.14, and the standard deviation was .83 for the item.

4.2.4.2. Academicians' Views on Process

The findings of the academicians' views on Process are shown in Table 17. The highest mean for this part was 4.27 while the lowest mean was 3.63. The average mean was 3.90.

Eight academicians agreed (n=3, 27.3% absolutely agree; n=5, 45.5% agree) that *the program allows the students to actively participate in the lesson*. However, 18.2% of them disagreed (n=2, 18.2% absolutely disagree), and 9.1% (n=1) remained neutral. The mean of the item was 3.63. The standard deviation was 1.43. This item had the lowest mean score for this part.

Four academicians agreed (n=2, 18.2% absolutely agree; n=2, 18.2% agree) that *subjects that are not understood during the program are repeated and supported with relevant exercises*. One academician disagreed (9.1% disagree). Interestingly, a significant majority of them (n=6, 54.5%) remained neutral about the item. The mean score was 3.45 while the standard deviation was found to be .93.

A great number of the academicians (n=10, 90.9%) agreed (n=6, 54.5% absolutely agree; n=4, 36.4% agree) that *the program places sufficient emphasis on listening skills* while only one (9.1%) academician disagreed (n=1, 9.1% absolutely disagree). The mean for the item was 4.27, and the standard deviation was 1.19. This item was also one of the two items which had got the highest mean score in academicians' process part.

Eight (72.8%) academicians agreed (n=3, 27.3% absolutely agree; n= 5, 45.5% agree) that *the program places sufficient emphasis on speaking skills*. However, three (27.3%) academicians disagreed (n=1, 9.1% disagree; n=2, 18.2% absolutely disagree). The mean was found 3.54 while the standard deviation was 1.50.

An important number of the academicians (n=9, 81.9%) agreed (n=5, 45.5% absolutely agree; n=4, 36.4% agree) that *the program places sufficient emphasis on reading skills*. In contrast, two (18.2%) academicians remained neutral about the item.

The mean for the item was revealed to be 4.27, and the standard deviation was .78. This item had the highest mean score in this part together with the item 17.

Nine of the academicians (n=9) agreed (n=4, 36.4% absolutely agree; n=5, 45.5% agree) that *the program places sufficient emphasis on writing skills*. Moreover, one academician disagreed (n=1, 9.1% disagree), and one (9.1%) remained neutral. The mean for this item was 4.9 while the standard deviation was .94.

Table 17.

Academicians' Views on Process

ITEMS	Absolutely Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Absolutely Disagree	Total	M	SD
15. The program allows the students to actively participate in the lesson.	3 27.3%	5 45.5%	1 9.1%	0 0%	2 18.2%	11 100%	3.63*	1.43
16. Subjects that are not understood during the program are repeated and supported with relevant exercises	2 18.2%	2 18.2%	6 54.5%	1 9.1%	0 0%	11 100%	3.45	.93
17. The program places sufficient emphasis on listening skills.	6 54.5%	4 36.4%	0 0%	0 0%	1 9.1%	11 100%	4.27*	1.19
18. The program places sufficient emphasis on speaking skills.	3 27.3%	5 45.5%	0 0%	1 9.1%	2 18.2%	11 100%	3.54	1.50
19. The program places sufficient emphasis on reading skills.	5 45.5%	4 36.4%	2 18.2%	0 0%	0 0%	11 100%	4.27*	.78
20. The program places sufficient emphasis on writing skills.	4 36.4%	5 45.5%	1 9.1%	1 9.1%	0 0%	11 100%	4.09	.94
21. The program places sufficient emphasis on language and vocabulary skills.	3 27.3%	6 54.5%	2 18.2%	0 0%	0 0%	11 100%	4.09	.70
							3.90	
							Average mean	

A significant number of the academicians agreed (n=3, 27.3% absolutely agree; n= 6, 54.5% agree) that *the program places sufficient emphasis on language and vocabulary skills* while 18.2% (n=2) of them were neutral about the item. The mean score for this item was 4.09, and the standard deviation .70.

4.2.5. Product

4.2.5.1. Students' Views on Product

Table 18 shows students' views on Product. The highest mean was 4.18, and the lowest mean score was 3.80. The average mean for this part was 4.05.

Sixty-four students agreed (n=22, 27.1% absolutely agree; n=42, 51.9% agree) that *the program has responded to my individual interests and needs so far*. Five students (6.2%), however, disagreed (n=3, 3.7% disagree; n=2, 2.5% absolutely disagree), and 14.8% (n=12) of them did not state a positive or negative opinion. The mean score for the item was 3.97 while the standard deviation was .89.

A majority of the students (n=53, 65.4%) agreed (n=18, 22.2% absolutely agree; n=35, 43.2% agree) that *the skills I have gained in the language so far in the program are satisfactory*. In contrast, 6.1% (n=5) of them disagreed (n=4, 4.9% disagree; n=1, 1.2% absolutely disagree). A noticeable amount of them (n=23, 28.4%) remained neutral about this item. The mean was found to be 3.80, and the standard deviation .88. This statement had the lowest mean score for this part.

The agreement to the item *the program has provided a basis for my future English needs* was 83.9% (n=68 in total; n=24, 29.6% absolutely agree; n=44; 54.3% agree). 3.7% (n=3) disagreed (n=3, 3.7% disagree) while 12.3% (n=10) were neutral about the statement. The mean score was 4.09, and the standard deviation .75.

A significant number of the students (n=67, 82.7%) agreed (n=30, 37.0% absolutely agree; n=37, 45.7% agree) that *I have been able to adequately communicate with my instructors so far*. Only four students disagreed (4.7% disagree) to this item. The number of those who remained neutral was 10 (12.3%). The mean of the item was 4.14, and the standard deviation was .82.

Sixty-six students (81.5%) agreed (n=24, 29.6% absolutely agree; n=42, 51.9% agree) that *assessment tools (visa, final, assignments, portfolio etc.) are sufficient and appropriate*. Only one student disagreed (1.2% absolutely disagree) to this item.

However, 17.3% (n=14) of the students were neutral. Moreover, the mean was revealed to be 4.08, and the standard deviation .76.

Table 18.

Students' Views on Product

ITEMS	Ab sol	Ag ree	Ne utr	Di sa	Ab sol ute	o t al	M	SD
22. The program has responded to my individual interests and needs so far.	22 27.2%	42 51.9%	12 14.8%	3 3.7%	2 2.5%	81 100%	3.97	.89
23. The skills I have gained in the language so far in the program are satisfactory.	18 22.2%	35 43.2%	23 28.4%	4 4.9%	1 1.2%	81 100%	3.80*	.88
24. The program has provided a basis for my future English needs.	24 29.6%	44 54.3%	10 12.3%	3 3.7%	0 0%	81 100%	4.09	.75
25. I have been able to adequately communicate with my instructors so far.	30 37.0%	37 45.7%	10 12.3%	4 4.9%	0 0%	81 100%	4.14	.82
26. Assessment tools (visa, final, assignments, portfolio etc.) are sufficient and appropriate.	24 29.6%	42 51.9%	14 17.3%	0 0%	1 1.2%	81 100%	4.08	.76
27. Technology has been used sufficiently in the implementation of the preparatory program so far.	34 42.0%	31 38.3%	13 16.0%	3 3.7%	0 0%	81 100%	4.18*	.83
28. According to my observations, sufficient coordination and rapport between students, teachers, and administration have been ensured throughout the program.	33 40.7%	34 42.0%	9 11.1%	2 2.5%	3 3.7%	81 100%	4.13	.97
							4.05	
							Average mean	

A vast majority of the students (n=65, 80.3%) agreed (n=34, 42.0% absolutely agree; n=31, 38.3% agree) that *technology has been used sufficiently in the implementation of the preparatory program so far*. Three students disagreed (3.7% disagree) to this item while 13 (16.0%) of them remained neutral. The highest mean

score of product dimension was revealed on this item with 4.18. The standard deviation for the item was .83.

Also, 67 students (82.7%) agreed (n=33, 40.7% absolutely agree; n=34, 42.0% agree) that *according to my observations, sufficient coordination and rapport between students, teachers, and administration have been ensured throughout the program* while 5 (6.2%) students disagreed (n=2, 2.5% disagree; n=3, 3.7% absolutely disagree). 11.1% (n=9) were neutral about the item. The mean was found 4.13, and the standard deviation was .97.

4.2.5.2. Academicians' Views on Product

Table 19 presents information about academicians' views on Product. The highest mean for this part was 4.00 while the lowest mean score was found to be 2.90. The average mean was 3.56.

Almost half of the academicians agreed (n=5, 45.5% agree) that *the program has responded to the students' individual interests and needs so far*. However, the rest (n=6, 54.5%) remained neutral about the item. The mean of the item was 3.45, and the standard deviation was .52.

Five academicians agreed (n=5, 45.5% agree) that *the skills the students have gained in the language so far in the program are satisfactory*. However, the same number (n=5, 45.5%) of them disagreed (n=4, 36.4% disagree; n=1, 9.1% absolutely disagree). Also, 1 (9.1%) academician was neutral. The mean of this item was the lowest one with 2.90 for this part. The standard deviation was 1.13.

Six academicians agreed (n=3, 27.3% absolutely agree; n=3, 27.3% agree) that *the program has provided a basis for the students' future English needs* while one (9.1%) academician disagreed (n=1, 9.1%). However, a noticeable number of them (n=4, 36.4%) remained neutral about this item. The mean score was 3.72, and the standard deviation was 1.00.

A vast majority of the academicians (n=9, 81.8%) agreed (n=1, 9.1% absolutely agree; n=8, 72.7% agree) that *the students have been able to adequately communicate with the instructors so far* while 18.2% (n=2) of them were neutral. The mean of the item was 3.90 while the standard deviation was .53.

Table 19.

Academicians' Views on Product

ITEMS	Absolutel	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Absolutel	Disagree	Total	M	SD
	y	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	y	Disagree			
22. The program has responded to the students' individual interests and needs so far.	0 0%	5 45.5%	6 54.5%	0 0%	0 0%		11 100%	3.45	.52
23. The skills the students have gained in the language so far in the program are satisfactory.	0 0%	5 45.5%	1 9.1%	4 36.4%	1 9.1%		11 100%	2.90*	1.13
24. The program has provided a basis for the students' future English needs.	3 27.3%	3 27.3%	4 36.4%	1 9.1%	0 0%		11 100%	3.72	1.00
25. The students have been able to adequately communicate with the instructors so far.	1 9.1%	8 72.7%	2 18.2%	0 0%	0 0%		11 100%	3.90	.53
26. Assessment tools (visa, final, assignments, portfolio etc.) are sufficient and appropriate.	1 9.1%	9 81.8%	1 9.1%	0 0%	0 0%		11 100%	4.00*	.44
27. Technology has been used sufficiently in the implementation of the preparatory program so far.	0 0%	9 81.8%	0 0%	2 18.2%	0 0%		11 100%	3.63	.80
28. According to my observations, sufficient coordination and rapport between students, teachers, and administration have been ensured throughout the program.	1 9.1%	6 54.5%	1 9.1%	2 18.2%	1 9.1%		11 100%	3.36	1.20
								3.56	
								Average mean	

Also, 90.9% of the academicians (n=10) agreed (n=1, 9.1% absolutely agree; n=8, 81.8% agree) that *assessment tools (visa, final, assignments, portfolio etc.) are sufficient and appropriate*. Only one (9.1%) academician remained neutral about the statement. This item had the highest mean with 4.00. The standard deviation was .44 for the item.

A very significant number of the academicians agreed (n=9, 81.8% agree) that *technology has been used sufficiently in the implementation of the preparatory program so far* while a small number of them disagreed (n=2, 18.2% disagree). The mean was 3.63 while the standard deviation was .80 for the item.

More than half of the academicians agreed (n=1, 9.1% absolutely agree; n=6, 54.5% agree) that *according to my observations, sufficient coordination and rapport between students, teachers, and administration have been ensured throughout the program*. 27.3% of them disagreed (n=2, 18.2% disagree; n=1, 9.1% absolutely disagree). Additionally, one (9.1%) academician remained neutral. The standard deviation for the item was 3.36 while the standard deviation was 1.20.

4.3. Qualitative Analysis

The qualitative analysis included the implications obtained from individual interviews. Thematic analysis was employed to analyse the data. Also, responses from open-ended questions in the questionnaires were integrated into interview data. The qualitative data was grouped under four titles.

4.3.1. Demographic Characteristic of Participants of Interview

In the following table, the information about the students who participated in the interviews was presented.

Table 20.

Demographic Information about the Students who participated in Interviews

<i>Participant</i>	<i>Class</i>	<i>Gender</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Program</i>
Student I	Prep 1	Female	23	Mandatory
Student II	Prep 1	Male	19	Mandatory
Student III	Prep 2	Female	19	Mandatory
Student IV	Prep 2	Male	19	Mandatory
Student V	Prep 3	Female	18	Optional
Student VI	Prep 3	Male	21	Optional
Student VII	Prep 4	Female	19	Optional
Student VIII	Prep 4	Male	19	Optional
Student IX	Prep 5	Female	29	Optional
Student X	Prep 5	Male	19	Optional

Ten students and five academicians voluntarily participated in interviews. Table 20 presents the demographic information concerning the participants in interviews above. As illustrated in the table, the students were chosen in equal numbers from each class. Therefore, ten students (5 female and 5 male) were chosen from five classes. The ages of the participants ranged from 19 to 29.

In Table 21, the information about the academicians who participated in interviews is presented.

Table 21.

Demographic Information about the Academicians who participated in Interviews

<i>Participant</i>	<i>Gender</i>	<i>Graduate program</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Year of experience</i>
Instructor I	Male	English Language Teaching	30	8
Instructor II	Male	English literature and language	33	10
Instructor III	Female	English literature and language	27	3
Administrator I	Male	English Language Teaching	28	6
Administrator II	Male	English literature and language	36	11

Five academicians, one female and four male, participated in interviews. Their ages ranged from 27 to 36, and their teaching experiences were 3 to 11 years. Three of

the participants graduated from departments of English Literature and Language, and two academicians graduated from departments of English Language Teaching.

4.3.2. Perceptions Related to the Nature and Constituents of the Program

Perceptions related to the nature and constituents of the program were examined under two titles as academic staff and the focus of the program.

Students' and academicians' perspectives about the quality of academic staff were positive. Students believed that one of the strongest sides of English courses was the instructors. They stated that instructors encouraged them to actively participate in classroom activities and discussions. Also, they underlined that speaking activities which the instructors chose were enjoyable and creative. The instructors and administrators also agreed that they had a group of dynamic and experienced academic staff. An administrator supported this suggestion with the following statement:

The academic staff is qualified. Many of them are graduates of leading universities. Also, a great majority of them conduct academic studies. I guess only one or two of us do not attend graduate programs like MA or doctorate. They are all good at teaching certain skills, and we consider this when we share courses (Administrator II, December 27th, 2019).

The statement above supports students' ideas, and it was also apparent from the statement that academic staff had notable backgrounds. For example, many of them graduated from leading universities as stated above. The findings indicated that the quality of the academic staff was emphatically underlined by many of the participants. When it comes to the focus of the program, the program was implemented in a modular system. All skills are considered. Students generally stated that they preferred to attend the program since they wanted to improve their language skills. The program had two groups of students as mentioned earlier. ELT students attended the program with an English university entrance exam. They mostly trusted in their grammar knowledge. Thus, they wanted the program to be more skill-oriented. As for the students of other departments, they mostly wanted to improve themselves in productive skills. The students and instructors promulgated that the program was appropriately structured. However, the students thought that the program could place more emphasis on the four

skill courses because ELT students were English teacher candidates. They thought that they would need those skills in their professional lives. For the students coming from other departments, on the other hand, improvement of their productive skills came to the fore as the main reason of enrolling in the preparatory program. At this point, we can state that there is an agreement between students' expectations and the focus of the program. The excerpt below gives useful clues about the aim of the preparatory program:

There are two preparatory programs here as a mandatory program and an optional program. We aim to prepare the student in the mandatory program for their department courses that they will take in English. In the optional program, however, we aim to improve learners' proficiency level up to B1 or B1 plus. The focus is on the four skills. We do not focus on grammar here. Both programs are very similar. Anyway, students come here knowing this (Instructor III, December 27th, 2019).

As stated above, the main focus of the program was on the four language skills, and it aimed to improve learners' overall competencies regardless of their departments. Although we remarked that there were two programs, those programs were the same in many ways. The only difference between them was their beginning level. When we examined the preparatory program from various perspectives, we inferred that the degree of agreement between participants' views and the focus of the program was relatively high.

4.3.3. Perceptions Related to the Implementation of the Program

Based on the analysis of interviews, students' perceptions about how the program was running were relatively positive. Perceptions about the implementation of the program were examined under two dimensions as the teaching of courses and program layout. First of all, the teaching of courses was revealed to be dependent on course books. The students and instructors mostly agreed to the fact that teaching methods and in-class activities were mostly based on course books and activities included in them. An excerpt example is given below to address the issue of teaching courses.

Regarding the teaching of courses, maybe we should improve materials because the instructors mostly stick to the materials during the teaching process. As a result, when materials are insufficient, the teaching process is negatively affected by this (Administrator II, December 27th, 2019).

Based on the statement above, we can state that classroom materials had an essential place in the way teaching occurred because the instructors generally followed course books. They might have hard times to produce creative teaching methods when the materials were insufficient. This statement also implies that the instructors did not employ various teaching methods based on second or foreign language teaching. Instead, they mostly follow instructions given in course books.

Although the instructors believed that they mostly adhered to the lesson plan, they stated that sometimes slight departures from the plan might occur. Those departures generally resulted from course reviews or clarifying of some misunderstood course topics. Moreover, the instructors sometimes allowed students to participate in free speeches during the last minutes of class hours to make them relax. A vast majority of the students participating in the interviews were satisfied with teaching methods used by the instructors. Many students highlighted that they could actively participate in in-classroom activities, and speak in English, the target language. However, participation in speaking activities was mostly dependent on classroom presentations. The instructors also used Turkish as the medium of instructions occasionally.

As for the program layout and classrooms, the preparatory program had 16 hours of main course (grammar integrated), four hours of integrated listening and speaking course, and four hours of integrated reading and writing course in the weekly schedule. As a result of this distribution, it was inevitable that main course had to be taught two to four hours on a single day. Several students complained about this situation. Although various opinions were put forward by the students, the general view was that the distribution of the courses should be more focused on skills courses. A significant excerpt example which reflects the general view of the students is presented below.

For example, I think skill courses should be more. I cannot say that there are courses ignored, but regarding we are assessed separately; we all deal with them severally. Our instructors say that previous years the hours of the skill courses were more, but it was unnecessary. Main course is 12 hours a week, and we enjoy it. Still, I believe that it can

be reduced to give weight to the skill courses because I believe that the skill courses are where we can improve ourselves. That is, they are where the real activities take place, so I believe this is important (Student IX, December 26th, 2019).

As can be seen from the excerpt from the student IX, the student mostly believed that the program gives importance to all skills. However, 12 weekly class hours for main course was a little bit too much. That was because some days more than two hours of main course had to be taught, which became boring for students. It is also important to underline that both students and academicians supported the idea that more attention to the skill courses should be paid. Another point to emphasize about the program layout was instructors' complaints about the class hours when quizzes and exams were held. The interviews indicated that quizzes and exams were held during the fourth class hour on Fridays. Therefore, instructors who had classes at the fourth class hours could not teach that week's topics, and they fell behind the planned schedule. This issue was pointed at through interviews.

4.3.4. Perceptions Related to Communication and Coordination among the Parties

Perceptions related to communication and coordination among the students, instructors, and administrators were categorized into three titles as communication and coordination, administrative issues, and students' needs.

First of all, communication among the parties was observed to be mostly positive and constructive. Communication can be dealt with from various perspectives. Student-instructor communication, student-administration communication, and instructor-administrator communication can be mentioned as these perspectives. Both students and instructors agreed that a positive relationship and communication atmosphere existed between them. The students had many chances to get in touch with their instructors anytime they wanted. They could contact them to get feedback about the courses or when they needed help about individual problems. An advisor instructor was assigned to each class to take care of the students. Therefore, we can say that student-instructor communication was found to be healthy. When it comes to student-administration communication, the study also uncovered that the school administration closely followed students' problems, and they made it easy to contact them as much as possible. A proof for this can be monthly held meetings with the preparatory students.

Additionally, the students could directly send e-mails to the administrators to explain their problems and needs or they could ask for appointments. Instructor-administrator communication seemed non-problematic. Interviews with both instructors and administrators supported this finding. The following two excerpts were taken from two different instructors:

We can say we work harmoniously, I can't say we have big problems here, but some problems exist at basic level (Instructor I, December 27th, 2019).

Honestly, I can say enough is done to deal with problems by the administration or us. There is a new administration here, so we are getting used to it (Instructor II, December 27th, 2019).

As it is seen in the excerpt from Instructor I, the instructor thought that there was not such a big communication problem among the parties. The existing problems were mostly daily ones. Therefore, we could not suggest the existence of communication problems among the instructors and administrators. The second instructor also supported that idea. The fact that the administration was new implied an adaptation process. Therefore, this adaptation process seemed to be well-administered.

Similar to the positive atmosphere among parties, interviewees put forward very constructive utterances about the coordination among them. They underlined that especially the instructors tried to work harmoniously to make the quality of teaching at a certain level. For example, it was evident from the statements of instructors and students that each instructor tried to follow synchronous teaching methods in their courses in addition to the fact that they followed complementary lesson plans.

Administrative issues were mostly related to the insufficient number of administrators. That is, only one vice-principal existed in the program. Additionally, he had other administrative duties such as being the head of the department of Modern Languages. As a result, inconveniences in administrative issues became inevitable.

As for students' needs, it seemed that students' needs were also considered in the program. Nearly all interviewees agreed to this issue. For example, it was mentioned earlier that monthly meetings were held to get ideas and suggestions from the students. A student highlighted how the school administration cared about their needs:

I think the administration considers our needs because the head of the school, Mr. organizes meetings every month, and he asks if we need anything or have suggestions. This makes me feel special because I just finished high school and when I compare here with there, I see how important we are here (Student III, December 26th, 2019).*

Apparently, the interviewee felt motivated when she joined the monthly-held meetings. The fact that the head of the school asked for their needs was another notable aspect to underline. Also, the students stated that the instructors struggled to cover topics which the students believed to be important to dwell on, and the students underlined that the instructors and administrators often asked about their needs in addition to the regular meetings.

4.3.5. Perceptions Related to the Sufficiency of the Program

The sufficiency of the program was evaluated from various dimensions. Those dimensions were beginning level of the program, motivation and expectations, evaluation and assessment, materials, in-service training and physical conditions.

Beginning level of the program, as mentioned earlier, was A2 for the mandatory program (ELT students) and A1 for the optional program (students from other departments). A placement test was applied prior to the commencement of the fall semester to distribute students equally to classes. However, some students believed that the beginning level of the program was too easy for their levels. Especially ELT students complained about that problem. However, the academicians disagreed to students' complaints because they stated that they already had difficulties in exams and quizzes. Therefore, we can state that a disagreement between the students and academicians existed about this subject.

Motivation and expectations were another point that was highlighted by interviewees. The analysis of the qualitative data implied that both students and academicians had some motivation problems. A few reasons can be mentioned for their demotivation. To start with, the program was challenging in many aspects. The instructors and administrators had very intense schedules. They had to deal with a harsh work-load. As for the students, they also had motivational problems. An evidence for the existence of demotivation can be students who quitted the program.

Why is there a lack of motivation? I think it is about students because they didn't come here against their will, so they must have come here with high motivation. Maybe, individual problems come out here. Maybe, they realize that they are in the wrong place, I don't know. As a result, they fail courses because of attendance. I have to say that there is not a scientific study to explain why they quit, but we try to get general ideas from the students (Instructor I, December 27th, 2019).

As it is apparent in the excerpt, there were a noticeable number of the students who quit the preparatory program. The instructor believed that students' severance mostly resulted from personal reasons. The administrators also agreed with that statement. To be more specific, one administrator claimed that the students who wanted to attend ELT program did not know that they had to go through a preparatory program. Therefore, he believed that their severance was inevitable. However, the data elicited from the respective tools implied that the costliness of materials like course books caused some students to quit the program.

As for students' expectations, the students participating in the classes actively believed that the program was satisfactory for them to some extent. Even though students had various expectations concerning their individual developments, the program, they believed, helped them to improve their basic language skills. A student made a comparison of two assignments he did to show how the program helped to improve his skills:

Two days ago, I found an essay which we were assigned to do. At that moment, I was also writing another essay, and I saw that there was a big difference between the two essays. I believe it is a good way to show you the improvement we have made so far (Student IV, December 26th, 2019).

The comparison of the student IV supported other participants' statements. An overwhelming number of respondents were of the opinion that the program had been designed well, and their expectations were mostly achieved. Still, it is helpful to remind that the students generally expected more focus on the skill courses.

Assessment tools and methods were also an important aspect of the interview results. Quizzes, exams, learning management system (an online platform for students to do activities), and assignments were the assessment tools used in the program. The

students had to take quizzes from each course separately. The students believed that assessment tools and method measured their skills and were appropriate for their level. The students, instructors, and administrators mostly acceded that the content of the quizzes and examinations reflected what was taught in lessons. Still, it was possible to mention some negative implications. First of all, many participants stated that there were too many quizzes. For example, one instructor complained that she could not assign homework to students because she felt that they already had too much to do. Additionally, the administrator underlined the necessity to decrease the number of quizzes. Moreover, the students and instructors mainly mentioned that speaking presentations were challenging for the students.

Students' levels are not appropriate for speaking presentations at the beginning of the program. Here, they start doing presentations in the third or fifth week. As a result, they have difficulties because they are not ready. We should change the starting week or find another way to assess their speaking skills (Instructor II, December 27th, 2019).

The excerpt pointed out a relatively important issue. The instructor believed that assessing learners' speaking skills that much early might result in inconvenient effects on students' performance. He stated that the proper time to assess this skill should be decided carefully. Many students also supported the idea that speaking exams were challenging. They underlined that the presentations and exams were held too early.

Moreover, most of the interviewees, regardless of being academicians or students, agreed that teaching materials were a strong side of the program. The content of the materials, course books and worksheets, were praised. It was revealed that materials were sufficient to effectively maintain the program. However, many students underlined that the price of the course materials was excessively high although the administrators claimed otherwise. Students highlighted that some of their friends preferred to quit the program instead of paying that price. As mentioned earlier, the instructors believed that those severances resulted from demotivation or individual reasons. Nevertheless, we see that there was a disagreement about that issue.

Additionally, the instructors and administrators agreed that there was a need for them to attend in-service training. Many of them believed that although they tried to do their best, they had some difficulties. These difficulties can be exemplified as classroom management, drawing learners' attention, and ELT teaching methods. For these

problems, the school administration stated that they were planning to organize workshop and seminars.

Finally, the teaching environment was mostly found to be appropriate. Participants' perceptions were mostly positive about classrooms. They stated that classrooms were clean and spacious enough. Also, they had a language laboratory and library. Students' perceptions of the use of technology were positive. They had lots of necessary equipment except for smart boards. Therefore, physical conditions were relatively suitable for effective teaching and learning. However, there was a problem with sound insulation. Some instructors stated that only two out of five classes had sound insulation. That might create a negative effect on the teaching process. Still, the fuller picture about the environment and other issues seemed mostly positive.



CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

5.1. Introduction

This study investigated the constituents, delivery, and effectiveness of the English preparatory program of the school of foreign languages at a state university. In this part, the results and findings of the study are discussed in detail.

5.2. Research Question 1: What are the Constituents of the English Preparatory Program at the School of Foreign Languages?

The first research question was about the constituents of the English preparatory program. This research question focused on identifying the nature of the program and having a better picture of the program being evaluated.

Based on the data analysis, the preparatory program was revealed to include two kinds of students in the preparatory program: (1) ELT students who were expected to get ready for their departmental courses offered in English and (2) students from the various departments who enrolled in the program to excel their English proficiency levels and to become more fluent in English. Thus, they could use these adopted skills in their future educational and professional lives. ELT students had to attend the program before they could attend their departments. However, students from other departments could attend the preparatory program based on voluntariness. The mandatory program was started from A2 proficiency level while the beginning level for the optional program was A1. The students were divided into classes on the basis of their achievement in the placement examination conducted prior to the studies. In the program, five classes were included. ELT students whose levels were A2 were trained in the two of those classes, and the rest three classes were for the students who voluntarily participated in the program for various purposes. The students were distributed to the classes evenly. Approximately 20 students were registered in each class. Nevertheless, the numbers sometimes changed depending on active attendance.

The preparatory program offered 24 hours of weekly English courses, which included 16 hours of grammar integrated main course, four hours of integrated reading and writing course, and four hours of integrated speaking and listening course. Thus, the

program adopted a modular system. Those courses in the program were offered in English. However, the instructors did not avoid using Turkish when they felt students' levels were too low to fully comprehend some topics. In this respect, the findings of this study supported the perspectives of the instructors in Al-Darwish's (2006) study, which suggested that using the mother tongue might be more intense. Teaching in the mother language sometimes could facilitate more effective teaching, or it might be a necessity to use the mother language because of learners' low proficiency level as noted in this study. The students had to do exams, quizzes, assignments, and online activities to pass the courses. They also had to meet certain criteria to be successful. That is, traditional and alternative assessments were utilized in the program.

The preparatory program aimed to increase learners' proficiency level up to a certain level and to prepare them for their departmental courses or their professional lives. The aim of the program seemed to be reachable as opposed to the results of Örmenci's (2009) study. The data obtained from current study also disclosed that the participants agreed on the high quality of the academic staff. The Instructors had different academic and educational backgrounds, which was highlighted to be a strong side of the program and a similar finding with Cengiz's (2019) study. They were mostly graduates of English Language Teaching, Faculty of Letters, and Translation and Interpreting. Additionally, a high number of them were conducting academic studies. The sharing of the courses was revealed to be done considering these issues. That is, the administrators assigned the instructors to the courses regarding their academic studies. All in all, the English preparatory program constituted two different programs as a mandatory program and an optional one. Twenty-four hours of the weekly schedule included a main course and integrated skill courses.

5.3. Research Question 2: How is the English Preparatory Program Implemented? (Skills, Strategies, Assessment, the Hour of Practice, Textbooks)

The second research question was about the implementation of the preparatory program. Therefore, the study investigated how the preparatory program was implemented, what kinds of skills and strategies were employed in the teaching process, and what sorts of materials were being used.

The study revealed some important points concerning how the English preparatory program was implemented and how the process was administered. First of

all, the program was found to be skill-oriented. Both quantitative and qualitative data supported that the program properly emphasized the development macro skills. Moreover, the participants believed that the program was designed to improve the students' main language skills. Although the mandatory program aimed to prepare the students for the departmental English courses and the optional program was designed to improve volunteer students' overall competences to prepare them for their future or professional lives, both programs were close to each other's regarding their aims and implementations. Another supporting proof for the program being skill-focused was the fact that the distribution of the courses. As mentioned earlier, the program adopted a modular system, and this system included all the skill courses. The teaching of the courses also was perceived to be communicative-oriented by the participants. In other words, they agreed that the courses were covered in English, the target language; and it naturally created an atmosphere that led to communication in English. Thus, it was clear that the program was designed to improve learners' English skills, which was a similar finding to Özdoruk's (2016) study. The teaching methods employed by instructors were mostly found to hinge upon course books. The students stated that their instructors relied on course books during the teaching process. They mostly perceived this situation as a positive point because it allowed them to follow the flow of the courses more easily. However, the administrators and instructors were more hesitant about it because they believed that relying too much on course books might result in insufficient creative activities and a boring teaching process. As a result of those data, it could be inferred that the teaching methods mostly hinged upon the lecturing of the instructors, a similar finding to the studies conducted by Eslek (2019) and Özüdođru (2017). Given that most of the instructors were graduates of English literature and interpreting rather than English language teaching, their lack of language teaching methods was not surprising. After all, the administration was aware of the issue, and they already stated that there was a need for in-service training for most of the academic staff.

The findings of the student questionnaire showed that the students strongly believed that the courses in the program were complementary to each other. The fact that the courses were integrated into each other also supported that the design of each course completed the other ones. The academicians, similarly, supported that the program was designed to improve main English skills. For example, the instructors who lectured the same classes struggled to keep in touch with each other to cover similar topics at the same time and to cover the topics that one of them might unintentionally

have ignored. It was clear that the participants agreed that the program was a well-designed and well-implemented program.

The students mostly perceived that the program allowed them to be active participants during the lessons. The items in the questionnaire and the elicited data from the interviews supported that the program was implemented in a way to make learners active participants. The program gave great importance to the main language skills. The questionnaire investigated the participants' perceptions of speaking, writing, reading, listening, vocabulary, and grammar skills. Additional questions about those skills were also asked in the interviews. Although all the statements related to the language skills were responded positively by the participants, the students were more satisfied with the emphasis on vocabulary skills. On the other hand, the academicians acknowledged that the program put a great emphasis on reading skills. Regarding the skill-satisfaction of the participants, this finding of the program was relatively similar to the results of the study conducted by Özüdoğru (2017), which revealed that the program adequately concentrated on writing skills, speaking skills, and vocabulary teaching.

This study also investigated the participants' perceptions of assessment. The findings manifested that the instructors employed various assessment tools like quizzes, midterm and finals, assignments, and online platforms. The academicians generally held positive attitudes towards the appropriateness of the assessment tools. Similarly, the students believed that quizzes, exams, and other assessment tools were consistent with what was taught to them in courses. They also believed that the difficulty degree of assessment tools was appropriate for students' levels. In their study, Bayram and Canaran (2019) underlined that assessment tools like exams were strengths of the program they evaluated. Their study supported the findings obtained from current study because the participants in this study uttered quite positive statements about the assessment tools. They believed that assessment tools could truly assess their proficiency levels and reveal if the students made progress. However, the participants made some suggestions to revise some aspects of the program. Those suggestions included some small changes in the distribution of courses, the number and timing of quizzes and exams, and placing more importance on some skills. The results of this study, in this respect, were comparable to Cesur and Cinkavuk's (2018). In their study, the participants also uttered positive statements; still, they suggested that some revisions could be made to have a better program.

As for the materials utilized in the program, the study unveiled that the materials employed in the program were held in high esteem by a very large percentage of the participants. The students and academicians were relatively positive about the contents of the course books and activities they included. The examples and exercises given during the lessons were appreciated by the students. Also, it was revealed that extra worksheets were provided by the instructors from time to time. It was interesting that the participants were mostly satisfied with materials as opposed to many studies in the literature (e.g., Al- Nwaiem, 2012; Düzyol, 2012; Markinkoniene, 2005; Muşlu, 2007; Vırlan, 2014). However, some scholars also found positive perspectives of participants in their studies. For example, as revealed in this study, Özdoruk (2016) highlighted that the findings indicated that the participants were mostly satisfied with the materials.

5.4. Research Question 3: How Collaborative is the Relationship between the Students, Instructors, and Administrators?

The third question was about the communication and coordination among the parties, namely students, instructors, and administrators. Therefore, this question investigated the degree of communication between them and how harmoniously they worked together.

Firstly, the questionnaires implied that the participants believed that sufficient communication and coordination were provided among the parties. There were two items related to communication and coordination in the questionnaires. Those items were rated quite positively by both students and academic staff. The qualitative data also supported the existence of secure communication and coordination. For example, many students highlighted that they could get in touch with instructors and administrators for any reason at any time they wanted. Apart from program-related issues, they could also ask for help or advice about their problems. It was revealed that more than one channel existed to contact the instructors and administrators. A supervisor instructor was assigned to each class in addition to the fact that the students could send e-mails, contact via phones, or visit their instructors and administrators during office hours. The findings obtained from the study carried out by Aziz et al. (2018) suggested that effective communication was used in the program they investigated to guarantee education quality. This study similarly revealed a positive and robust communication among the students, instructors, and administrators. The

participants' statements regarding the coordination were also relatively positive. The students underlined that the instructors made an effort to cover the course topics in a complementary way. Sometimes instructors underlined how they got information from their coworkers so that they could follow a similar way of teaching and revise necessary topics. In other words, they mostly stayed in contact and gave feedback to each other about their teaching processes to follow synchronous teachings.

Moreover, Muşlu (2007) underlined that assessment tools enhanced communication between instructors and students. This study did not examine the relationship between assessment and communication. However, as mentioned earlier, the assessment tools were viewed to be appreciated by the participants, and communication was found to be highly positive among the stakeholders. Thus, it is possible to highlight the findings of this study reached an agreement with Muşlu's study. Burrio and Abdullah (2012) concluded that the administration was committed to developing students' English levels in their study. An observed way to do that in this study could be monthly-held student meetings. With the help of those meetings, the communication with the students was provided in addition to the fact that those meetings helped the administration to get feedback about the program from the students. The students felt that they and their needs were considered because of those meetings. The participants' favourable views about the instructors and administrators were also evidence of the positive communication atmosphere. Especially, the students uttered highly positive sentences about the instructors and the administrators. The rationale for their statements was generally based on the friendly teaching and communication atmosphere. Regarding the highly interactive atmosphere, it was not a surprise that the participants were satisfied with many aspects of the program to a great extent.

Communication and coordination issues can also be considered from the instructors' and administrators' point views. Their statements about communication and coordination supported the students' positive statements about the rapport in the program in addition to the highly-rated questionnaire items. The sharing of courses, for instance, was made regarding what the instructors were good at or what they were interested in teaching. Notably, the administration highlighted that they were careful about that issue when they shared the courses. The positive perspectives of the participants towards communication and coordination opposed the findings of the study conducted by Aktaş and Gündoğdu (2020). The results of their study suggested that some kind of miscommunication among parties, especially between the instructors and

administrators existed. However, all parties in our study held relatively positive perspectives about the communication atmosphere in the program.

5.5. Research Question 4: How Effective is the Program from the Students', Instructors', and Administrators' Perspectives?

The fourth research question was about the effectiveness of the program. The effectiveness was examined from the students, instructors, and administrators' perspectives. The results were discussed carefully and in detail.

The program was mostly found to be effective in many aspects. These aspects can be mentioned as the design of the program, students' needs and progress, materials, physical conditions, and skills.

The participants uttered highly positive statements about the design of the program. Also, in the questionnaire, the items related to the design were rated highly. The content, objectives, and implementation of the program satisfied the participants, especially the students. The participants also believed that the program was appropriate regarding the materials, activities, and assessment. When compared with many other studies mentioned in the literature review, this study revealed the participants' positive reviews concerning many aspect of the program. For example, Al-Nwaiem (2012) revealed the dissatisfaction of the participants with content and materials in his study. Also, Chen (2009) remarked that participants of his study highlighted the need for a revision of materials. Of course, studies that supported this study can also be found in the literature. Mohammad and Itoo (2016) concluded that the goals of the program which they investigated were appropriate and clear to an important extent. Also, Dehkordi and Talebinezhad (2018) underlined that the program evaluated by them served well, and it could serve more effectively with a few small improvements.

Materials had an essential place in the preparatory program. The students and academicians agreed on the quality of the course books. The content of the materials and other additional sources were appreciated by the participants. Correspondingly, a need for extra material was not observed. The positive perceptions of the participants about the materials were also revealed in the study conducted by Özdoruk (2016). An essential part of the materials, beyond any doubt, was technology. Mostly, the participants were satisfied with technological equipment. Computers and projectors were actively used. The students and instructors agreed that they actively used

technological materials during the process of teaching and learning. In this respect, Aziz et al. (2018) revealed that technology was vital to make learning more effective and qualified. The statements of the participants of this study supported that the program took into consideration the vital role of technology in the teaching process.

As for the physical conditions, negative perspectives related to physical conditions were remarked in some studies (e.g., Cengiz, 2019; Özkanal & Hakan, 2010; Özüdođru, 2017; Tekin, 2015; Vırlan, 2014). There are also some studies like Özdoruk (2016) that found out participants' positive opinions. This study, on the other hand, revealed that physical conditions could be improved even though a sizable number of the participants were satisfied. To illustrate, the absence of sound insulation in some classes could be remarked as a critical issue. The classes were found to be appropriate for teaching English. The items in the questionnaire and the participants' statements supported the appropriateness of the teaching environment.

In this study, many students stated positive opinions about how much they and their needs were considered. They generally talked about the student meetings, individual talks with their instructors, and other constructive attitudes of their instructors and administrators. They believed that their ideas were appreciated and taken into consideration. Additionally, they thought that the instructors encouraged them to be active in classroom activities. The rapport among the stakeholders might have a favorable effect on the students' positive perceptions. Another point to mention was the focus of the program. The program was found to be skill-oriented, and it aimed to improve learners' four basic language skills. At this point, the students were generally satisfied with their developing skills. In both questionnaires and interviews, the students stated their satisfaction with the progress they made. Sometimes, they even compared their current levels to the previous ones. Although the studies conducted by Taqi and Shuqair (2014) and Tekin (2015) indicated that students' improvements were trivial in their studies, the results of this study concluded the opposite. That is, the students believed that the students made a considerable improvement when their levels were compared to their starting point. As for the academicians' perspectives about the students' improvement, they were more sceptical of it. The related item had the lowest mean of the academicians' questionnaire. When the item examined closely, it could be figure out that the academicians had a disagreement about the satisfaction of the students' progress. Nearly half of them were positive while the rest were negative about the issue. However, they believed that skill courses were taken into consideration in the

program. Özüdoğru (2017) reached a similar conclusion concerning skill orientation, which implied the program was sufficiently concentrated on writing skills, speaking skills, and vocabulary teaching. Arap (2016) also highlighted that the program she evaluated met students' needs and expectations.

The motivation of the participants was revealed to change from time to time. Similar to Eslek's (2019) study, the workload of the academic staff could sometimes cause demotivation for the academic staff. In this study, it was revealed that the academic staff had a heavy workload. As for the students' motivation, a number of students quit the program a few weeks into the first semester. The reasons for this were unknown since there was not any scientific study to investigate the issue. However, it was also apparent that some students had personal or program-related reasons. Regarding this point, there was a disagreement between the students and academicians because the academicians suggested that the reason for the students' quitting was mostly individual. The students, on the other hand, thought that there were some financial problems like the price of the course books which caused some students to quit the program.

Moreover, some participants underlined the need for the instructors to join in-service educations in terms of particular topics. The students' and instructors' statements about the teaching process gave some clues about how the teaching occurred. As mentioned earlier, the teaching was mostly based on course books. Therefore, all these issues might imply a need for in-service education, which was a similar implication of the study carried out by Burrio and Abdullah (2012).

As for the overall effectiveness of the program, the students did not show a considerable sign of dissatisfaction. In contrast, they remarked how much they liked the program, and uttered mostly favourable statements. They were also satisfied with the many aforementioned aspects of the program such as materials, assessment, academic staff, delivery of the program, communication and coordination, and the administration. It was also important to note that they offered suggestions aiming to elevate the effectiveness of the program. Still, they had favourable perspectives about the program. The academicians' views about the preparatory program were similar in many ways. They also held positive attitudes toward the program and made slight suggestions to improve the program. As a result, all the participants had very constructive thoughts about the preparatory program; they were satisfied with its effectiveness to a great extent. It was clear that the program was quite satisfactory for the participants of the

study. Regarding the overall effectiveness of the English preparatory program implemented in school of foreign languages, this study revealed similar results to studies conducted by Arap (2016), Cesur and Cinkavuk (2018), Dehkordi and Talebinezhad (2018), and Lee (2002).

To sum up, this study made it clear that the participants were mostly satisfied with the program and its effectiveness. There might be many reasons for the positive perceptions of the participants. First of all, it is important to consider the program as a whole. In other words, when a part of the program functioned well, it would probably affect the implementation of other sides of the program because the combination of all constituents and the management of the process made it a complete program. In this study, it was revealed that many aspects of the program functioned quite well, and the process could be administered as expected. Moreover, the administration and instructors were committed to developing learners' English levels and satisfying them. Correspondingly, the stakeholders generally held positive attitudes towards the program. However, it is also crucial to note that a program can always be improved and be made more sophisticated. Regarding that, some betterment can still be made to increase effectiveness and guarantee more intended outcomes. The participants were also aware that the program could still be improved. They offered some suggestions with respect to improving the program quality even if their perceptions about the program were largely positive.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

6.1. Introduction

The final chapter portrays an overall picture offered by the study. In this chapter, the study was summarized and concluded. The implications of the study and recommendations for further research are given.

6.2. Summary of the Study

This study evaluated the English preparatory program implemented in school of foreign languages at a state university. By this evaluation, it was aimed (1) to evaluate the constituents, delivery, and effectiveness of the program implemented at a school of foreign languages of a state university through the eyes of the instructors, students, and administrators; and (2) to provide information to the stakeholders to help the process of the betterment of the current program using the CIPP model. Four research questions guided this study to follow a scientific evaluation process.

Both quantitative and qualitative data collection tools were utilized in the study. Therefore, it was intended to reach more reliable and valid results. Likert-scale questionnaires were applied to gather quantitative data while interviews were conducted to obtain qualitative data. Also, some documents like school website and course books were examined to obtain information about the preparatory program. SPSS 25.0 was utilized in the analysis process of the quantitative data, and qualitative data was processed through thematic analysis.

As for the results, it was observed that the preparatory program was offered as mandatory and optional programs. The communication and coordination among the parties were relatively constructive and positive. Moreover, the program was found to be highly effective from the students, instructors, and administrators' perspectives. Nevertheless, the participants of the study articulated some solid suggestions for the betterment and the effectiveness of the program.

6.3. Conclusion

The study investigated the preparatory program in terms of the aspects of context, process, input, and product. The findings of the study uncovered valuable information about the program. First of all, A1 and A2 level students existed in the program. The program adopted a modular system which offered integrated skill courses with twenty-four hours of the weekly schedule. The courses were distributed as 16 hours of grammar integrated main course, four hours of integrated speaking and listening course, and four hours of integrated reading and writing course. Assessment tools included exams, quizzes, and assignments. The materials were course books, worksheet, and learning management system (an online platform for students to do activities).

As for the perspective of the participants, the students expressed satisfaction to a great extent with respect to the goals set by the program, the implementation of the program, the focus of the program, their needs, communication between the students and academicians, physical conditions, assessment tools, the teaching of courses, their improvements in language skills, the focus of the program, course books, technological equipment, other issues included in the preparatory program. However, they also shared their suggestions about some possible changes that could be done. The distribution of the class hours could be revised, and hours of skill courses could be increased. When it comes to instructors and administrators, the results showed similarities in many aspects, and a high degree of agreement among parties was provided. Any signs for a critical problem were not encountered. Still, it is important to bear in mind that the students' views regarding their perceived progress were more affirmative when compared with the academicians' perspectives. The academicians were sceptical about the students' improvement.

Nevertheless, some aspects of the program could be improved to increase the effectiveness of the program and to guarantee a more qualified teaching and learning process. To illustrate, a considerable number of students quit the program because of various reasons. Some participants claimed that those severances resulted from personal reasons. Some participants also disagreed that there were program-related reasons for that issue like the costliness of the course books. Also, the motivation of the students and academicians changed from time to time. The source of the demotivation was dependent on various reasons, mostly personal ones. Although that problem was not

seen that much important, some activities could be done to increase the efficiency of the program.

Another point to mention was the teaching of the courses. The findings showed that teaching mostly depended on course books. Therefore, instructors sometimes could have difficulty with employing creative in-class activities. Most of the interview participants highlighted that seminars and workshops would be held for the academic staff to increase their pedagogical knowledge.

The content of the courses were found to be consistent with exams and quizzes. Instructors mostly adhered to lesson plans. Also, it was revealed that some topics were reviewed when the students had difficulty in comprehending the current topic. Students actively participated in in-class activities. Still, some participants complained that speaking presentations were started too early. As a result, the students had difficulty in oral production. The participants suggested that speaking presentations could be started in the following weeks. One reason why the results were relatively positive was the positive and constructive communication among the parties. The participants stated that the students could reach instructors and administrators easily. Monthly held meetings with the students provided a strong base for communication. Instructors struggled to teach their courses in a complementary way with each other. This coordination also implied that the courses in the program were designed to become a whole.

6.4. Limitations

This study intended to scrutinize the English Preparatory Program implemented at a school of foreign languages of a state university in 2019-2020 academic year. Therefore, it aimed to provide systematic information about the implementation of the program in 2019-2020 academic year. Due to the official permission issues, the sample university was determined according to convenience sampling techniques. The sample from one specific university made it hard to generalize the results and findings of this study to all tertiary level preparatory schools in Turkey. Also, the participant bias might have affected the results. That is, the students and academic staff might have felt urged to state mostly positive opinions because they are the members of the institution where the study was conducted.

6.5. Implications

The increasing popularity of language teaching around the world has made program evaluation research more and more significant because program evaluation provides information to stakeholder and authorities. Drawing on the results obtained from the evaluation, the program and its implementation could be improved in many aspects. This study aimed to provide information about an English preparatory program. Also, the study intended to contribute to the process of the betterment of language programs, and the English language teaching literature.

A well-designed language program needs to consider a large number of criteria. Questions like whether or not the program is current or whether or not the program follows current approaches in language could be answered through evaluation studies.

This study revealed that the English preparatory program in question was a current and well-designed one. Therefore, it satisfied the expectations and needs of the stakeholders to a considerable degree. The participants mostly agreed on the quality of the program regarding its objectives, content, materials, activities, assessment, implementation, and other issues. Nevertheless, some improvements could be made to increase the effectiveness and guarantee the quality of education. The distribution of weekly class hours could be revised, and the hours of skill courses could be increased. Some seminars and workshops could be organized for the academic staff. A more proper time for exam and quizzes could be determined. Motivational activities could be added to the current program so that the students and academic staff could be more willing to learn and teach. Although the participants were generally satisfied with the technological equipment, some more technological devices like smart boards could be integrated into teaching process. Moreover, sound insulation could create a healthier teaching environment.

In conclusion, this study revealed some important information about the English preparatory program. The information about the constituents, delivery, and effectiveness of the program was obtained. Various components were determined to be efficient in the administration of the program. Stakeholders could utilize the information obtained from the study as a leverage to revise the current program. The findings could also help language program designers in the process of designing more sophisticated programs.

6.6. Recommendations for Further Research

Although this study followed a delicate and systematic approach during the whole process, more sophisticated studies could be designed to reach more detailed conclusions. For example, this study was specific to a particular English preparatory program. The data could be gathered from various 8couniversities to reach generalizable results. Also, other stakeholders like graduates of the program could be included to have a fuller picture of the program. Classroom observations could be done to have insights into the teaching process and classroom environment.



REFERENCES

- Abowitz, D. A., & Toole, T. M. (2010). Mixed method research: Fundamental issues of design, validity, and reliability in construction research. *Journal of construction engineering and management*, 136(1), 108-116.
- Aktaş, C. K., & Gündoğdu, K. (2020). An extensive evaluation study of the English preparatory curriculum of a foreign language school. *Pegem Eğitim ve Öğretim Dergisi*, 10(1), 169-214.
- Alhojailan, M. I. (2012). Thematic analysis: A critical review of its process and evaluation. *West East Journal of Social Sciences*, 1(1), 39-47.
- Al-Darwish, S. (2006). *An investigation of teachers' perceptions of the English language curriculum in Kuwaiti elementary schools*. (Doctoral dissertation), University of Denver, the USA.
- Al-Nwaiem, A. (2012). *An evaluation of the language improvement component in the pre-service ELT programme at a college of education in Kuwait: A case study*. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Exeter, Exeter, England). Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/10036/3720>
- Anghel, B., Cabrales, A., & Carro, J. M. (2016). Evaluating a bilingual education program in Spain: the impact beyond foreign language learning. *Economic Inquiry*, 54(2), 1202-1223.
- Arap, B. (2016). *An investigation into the implementation of English preparatory programs at tertiary level in Turkey*. (Master's thesis). Çukurova University, Adana, Turkey.
- Arik, B. T., & Arik, E. (2014). The role and status of English in Turkish higher education: English is the language of instruction in around 20% of the programs in Turkish universities. *English Today*, 30(4), 5-10.
- Aziz, S., Mahmood, M., & Rehman, Z. (2018). Implementation of CIPP Model for quality evaluation at school level: A case study. *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, 5(1), 189-206.
- Balint, D. M. (2009). *Factors affecting learner satisfaction in EFL program evaluation*. (Doctoral dissertation). Temple University, Pennsylvania, USA). Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/305016072?pq-origsite=gscholar>

- Bayram, İ., & Canaran, Ö. (2019). Evaluation of an English preparatory program at a Turkish foundation university. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 15(1), 48-69.
- Bodegas, I.D.N. (2009). Doing programme evaluation: Quantitative and qualitative approaches and the notion of participatory evaluation, *Memorias Del V Foro De Estudios En Lenguas Internacional*, ISBN 978-607-9015-05-3.
- Boyatzis, R. E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: thematic analysis and code development*. Sage.
- Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 3, 77-101.
- Brown, J. D. (1995). *The elements of language curriculum*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Buriro, G. A., & Abdullah, M. (2012). Teaching of English in an Islamic Education Based English-Medium Institute: A Programme Evaluation. *International Research Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 40(40), 193.
- Celen, K.M. (2016). *Program evaluation of an English language teacher education practicum: Insights from supervisors, student teachers, and graduates*. (Master's thesis). Boğaziçi University, İstanbul, Turkey.
- Cengiz, Y. (2019). *An Evaluation of a University-Based Intensive English Program: Insights of Students and Teachers*. (Master's thesis). Bogaziçi University, İstanbul, Turkey.
- Cesur, K, Cinkavuk, E. Ç. (2018). An Evaluation of Second Grade English Language Teaching Program of Primary School: Tokat Case. *Erzincan Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 20(3), 749-766.
- Chen, A. H. (2013). An evaluation on primary English education in Taiwan: From the perspective of language policy. *English Language Teaching*, 6(10), 158–165.
- Chen, Chun-Fu (2009) *A case study in the evaluation of English training courses using a version of the CIPP model as an evaluative tool*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/2912/>
- Cohen, A. D. (1994). *Assessing Language Ability in the Classroom*. Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.
- Coskun, 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).

- Creswell, J. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Creswell, J.W. & Plano Clark, V.L. (2007) *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Sage, Thousand Oaks, California.
- Çankaya, P. (2015). *An evaluation of the primary 3rd grade English language teaching program: Tekirdağ Case*. (Masters' thesis) Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale, Turkey.
- Çakır, F. K. (2020). *Perceptions of students and instructors on the English language needs of preparatory school students at a state university*. (Master's thesis). Marmara University, İstanbul, Turkey.
- Dalkey, N., & Helmer, O. (1963). An experimental application of the Delphi method to the use of experts. *Management science*, 9(3), 458-467.
- Dehkordi, M. E., & Talebinezhad, M. R. (2018). A CIPP approach to evaluation of grammar teaching program at a high school in Iran. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 5(2), 241-260.
- Dittrich, R., Francis, B., Hatzinger R. & Katzenbeisser, W. (2007). A paired comparison approach for the analysis of sets of Likert-scale responses. *Statistical Modelling* 7(1), 3-28. doi:10.1177/1471082X0600700102.
- Drever, E., & Munn, P. (1995). *Using questionnaires in small-scale research: A teacher's guide*. Glasgow: The Scottish Council for Research in Education.
- Düzyol, M. A. (2012). *The effectiveness of induction program for candidate teachers*. (Master's thesis). Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Enkin, E., & Correa, M. (2018). Evaluating learner and teacher perceptions of program outcomes in the foreign language major. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 15(1), 66-80.
- Eslek, F. (2019). *An evaluation of compulsory English preparatory program through the perspectives of students and instructors at the school of foreign languages at Firat university*. (Master's thesis). Çukurova University, Adana, Turkey.
- Fitzpatrick, J.L, Sanders, J.R., & Worthen, B.R. (2004). *Program evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines*. (3rd edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education Inc.
- Firat, A. D. (2016). *An evaluation of English preparatory schools' programs in terms of learner autonomy*. (Master's thesis). Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey.

- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2011). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Humanities/Social Sciences/Languages.
- Grafton, J., Lillis, A. M., Ithantola, E. M., & Kihn, L. A. (2011). Threats to validity and reliability in mixed methods accounting research. *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management*, 8(1), 39-58.
- Gredler, M.E. (1996). *Program evaluation*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Hargreaves, P. (1989). DES-IMPL-EVALU-IGN: An evaluator's checklist. In R. Johnson (Ed.), *The second language curriculum*, (Cambridge Applied Linguistics, pp. 35-47). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9781139524520.005
- Harrell, M. C., & Bradley, M. A. (2009). *Data collection method: Semi-structured interviews and focus groups*. Rand National Defense Research Inst santa monica ca .
- Ivankova, N. V., Creswell, J. W., & Stick, S. L. (2006). Using mixed-methods sequential explanatory design: From theory to practice. *Field Methods*, 18(1), 3-20.
- Jack, B., & Clarke, A. M. (1998). The purpose and use of questionnaires in research. *Professional Nurse (London, England)*, 14(3), 176-179.
- Jafari, S., & Shahrokhi, M. (2016). A cipp approach to evaluation of grammar teaching programs at Iranian high-schools: A case study. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 3(3), 199-223.
- Karataş, H., (2007). *Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi modern diller bölümü İngilizce II dersi öğretim programının öğretmen ve öğrenci görüşlerine göre bağlam, girdi, süreç ve ürün (CIPP) modeli ile değerlendirilmesim*. (Master's thesis). Yıldız Technical University, İstanbul, Turkey.
- Karataş, H., & Fer, S. (2009). Evaluation of English curriculum at Yildiz Technical University using CIPP model. *Egitim ve Bilim*, 34(153), 47-60.
- Kirkgöz, Y. (2007a). English language teaching in Turkey: Policy changes and their implementations. *RELC journal*, 38(2), 216-228.
- Kirkgöz, Y. (2007b). Innovation as a curriculum renewal process in a Turkish university in A. Rice (Ed.), *Revitalizing an Established Program for Adult Learners*, (pp. 135-160). Alexandria, Virginia.

- Kroll, T., & Neri, M. (2009). Designs for mixed methods research. In S. Andrew & E. J. Halcomb, (Eds.), *Mixed Methods Research for Nursing and The Health Sciences*, (pp. 31-49). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Kulemeka, I. (1994). *Language options for education in multilingual society*. London: Unvin.
- Kuzu, E. & Özkan, Y. (2020) A study of English preparatory program evaluation: Perspectives from stakeholders. In T. Nağıyeva (Ed.), *Atlas international congress on social sciences 6*. Proceedings of 6th Conference of Atlas International Congress on Social Sciences (pp. 81-91). Batumi, Georgia.
- Küçük, Ö. (2008). *An evaluation of English language teaching program at key stage I and the opinions of teachers regarding the program*. (Master's thesis) Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi, Çanakkale, Turkey.
- Lamson, H. (1974). *Intensive language and cultural immersion: A cooperative method*. *FLA* 7. 668-73.
- Lee, L.L. (2002). *Music education as a means for fostering young children's knowledge of dual cultures*. (Doctoral dissertation). Columbia University, New York.
- Long, M. H. (1984). Process and product in ESL program evaluation. *Tesol quarterly*, 18(3), 409-425.
- Longhurst, R. (2003). Semi-structured interviews and focus groups. *Key methods in geography*, 3(2), 143-156.
- Lynch, B. K. (1990). A context adaptive model for program evaluation. *TESOL quarterly*, 24(1), 23-42.
- Lynch, B. K. (1996). *Language program evaluation: Theory and practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Maguire, M., & Delahunt, B. (2017). Doing a thematic analysis: A practical, step-by-step guide for learning and teaching scholars. *AISHE-J: The All Ireland Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 9(3).
- Mammadov, S. (2012). *The education of gifted K-8 students in Turkey: policy analysis and program evaluation*. (Master's thesis). Boğaziçi University, İstanbul, Turkey.
- Marcinkoniene, R. (2005). Lessons to be learnt from the course evaluation: A case study of Kaunas University of Technology. *Studies About Languages*, 7, 1648-2824.

- Mohamadi, Z. (2013). Program evaluation on general English course: A case study at Tabriz University. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 6(4), 1285-1290.
- Mohammad, T., & Itoo, B. A. (2016). Evaluation of listening and speaking syllabus in EFL situation at the preparatory year program. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*, 7(1), 490-504.
- Morse, J. M. (1991). Approaches to qualitative-quantitative methodological triangulation. *Nursing Research* 40(2), 120–123.
- Murray, D. E. & Christison, M. (2011). *What English language teachers need to know. Volume II: facilitating learning*. Routledge: New York.
- Muşlu, M. (2007). *Formative evaluation of a process-genre writing curriculum at Anadolu university school of foreign languages*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Anadolu University, Eskişehir, Turkey.
- Nam, J. M. N. (2005). *Perceptions of Korean language students and teachers about communication-based English instruction: Evaluation of a college EFL curriculum in South Korea*. (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Ohio State University, Columbus.
- Newcomer, K. E., Hatry, H. P., & Wholey, J. S. (2010). Planning and designing useful evaluations. *Handbook of practical program evaluation*, Jossey-Bass, A Wiley Imprint 989 Market Street, San Francisco.
- Nunan, D. (1988). *The learner-centred curriculum: A study in second language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Opdenakker, R. (2006). Advantages and disadvantages of four interview techniques in qualitative research. In *Forum qualitative sozialforschung/forum: Qualitative social research*, 7(4).
- Ornstein, Allan C., and Hunkins Francis P. (2004). *Curriculum: Foundations, principles and issues*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice Hall.
- Örmenci, D. N. (2009). *An evaluation of English language curricula implemented at the 4th, 5th, and 6th grades in respect of teachers' opinions*. (Master's thesis). Trakya University, Edirne, Turkey.
- Özdoruk, P. (2016). *Evaluation of the English language preparatory school curriculum at Yıldırım Beyazıt University*. (Master's Thesis). Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.

- Özkan, Y. (2017). Construct Shift of Pre-Service Language Teachers on Globalized English within a Turkish Context. *The Qualitative Report*, 22(1), 105.
- Özkanal, Ü., & Hakan, A. G. (2010). Effectiveness of university English preparatory programs: Eskisehir Osmangazi University foreign languages department English preparatory program. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(3), 295--305.
- Özüdoğru, F. (2017). Evaluation of the voluntary English preparatory program at a Turkish state university. *Journal of International Social Research*, 10(48). 501-509.
- Rallis, S. F., & Bolland, K. A. (2004). What is program evaluation? Generating knowledge for improvement. *Archival Science*, 4(1-2), 5-16.
- Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language education*. Cambridge: University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom.
- Rossi, P. H., Lipsey, M. W., & Henry, G. T. (2018). *Evaluation: A systematic approach*. Sage publications.
- Sanders, J. R., & Sullins, C. D. (2006). *Evaluating school programs: An evaluator's guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Scharp, K. M., & Sanders, M. L. (2019). What is a theme? Teaching thematic analysis in qualitative communication research methods, *Communication Teacher*, 33(2), 117-121.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. (1971). The relevance of the CIPP evaluation model for educational accountability. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 5, 19–25.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. (2005). CIPP model (context, input, process, product). In S. Mathison (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stufflebeam, D. L., and Shinkfield, A. J. (1985). *Systematic evaluation*. Boston: Kluwer Nijhoff.
- Stufflebeam, D. L., & Shinkfield, A. J. (2007). *Evaluation theory, models, & applications*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Talmage, H. (1982). *Evaluation of programs*. New York: Free Press.
- Taqi A. H. & Shuqair, K. M. (2014). Evaluating the students' language proficiency in the English department, college of basic education in Kuwait. *British Journal of Education*, 2(6), 1-18.
- Tarnopolsky, O. (2000). Writing English as a foreign language: A report from Ukraine. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(3), 209-226.

- Terrell, S. R. (2012). Mixed-methods research methodologies. *Qualitative report*, 17(1), 254-280. Nova Southeastern University, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida USA.
- Toker, O. (1999). *The attitudes of teaching staff and students towards the preparatory curriculum of the department of foreign languages in the University of Gaziantep*. (Master's dissertation). Gaziantep University, Gaziantep, Turkey.
- Tribble, C. (2000). Designing evaluation into educational change process. *ELT Journal*, 54(4), 319-327.
- Tunç, F. (2010). *Evaluation of an English language teaching program at a public university using CIPP model*. (Masters' thesis). Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Vırlan, A.Y. (2014). *A case study: Evaluation of an English speaking skills course in a public university preparatory school program via CIPP model*. (Master's thesis). Yeditepe University, İstanbul, Turkey.
- Wang, L.C. (1996). *A Formative Evaluation of the English Language Program in Fong-Shin Senior High School*. (Doctoral thesis). Florida State University, Kaohsiung County, Taiwan, EBSCO Host: 9700250.
- Weir, C. J., & Roberts, J. (1994). *Evaluation in ELT*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Weiss, C. H. (1986). Towards the future of stakeholder approaches in evaluation. In E. R. House (Ed.), *New directions in educational evaluation* (pp. 186–198), Thame, Oxon.
- Worthen, B. (1990). Program evaluation. H. Walberg & G. Haertel (Eds.), *The International encyclopedia of educational evaluation*. (pp. 42-47). Toronto, ON: Pergammon Press.
- Yıldırım, R., & Okan, Z. (2007). The question of global English-language teaching: A Turkish perspective. *Asian EFL Journal*, 9(4), 54-66.
- Yousif, A. A. (2017). Ahfad University English preparatory program (UPP): Friend or foe Amna Abdelgadir Yousif. *Ahfad Journal*, 34(1), 16-22.
- Yükseköğretim kurumlarında yabancı dil öğretimi ve yabancı dille öğretim yapılmasında uyulacak esaslara ilişkin yönetmelik (2008, 04 12). *Official Newspaper*, 27074, Retrieved from <https://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2008/12/20081204-13.htm>
- Yüksel, İ. (2010). *Türkiye için program değerlendirme standartlarının geliştirilmesi*. (Doctoral dissertation). Anadolu University, Eskişehir, Turkey.

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



APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: *Gönüllü Katılım Ve Bilgilendirme Formu (Türkçe)*

Bu çalışmanın amacı sizlerin Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulunda uygulanan İngilizce Hazırlık Programına dair görüşlerinizi almaktır. Çalışmaya katılım gönüllülük esasına dayalıdır. Katılımcıların kişisel bilgileri kesinlikle gizli tutulacaktır. İstememiz halinde sizden elde edilen bilgileri inceleme hakkına sahipsiniz. Çalışmada istemediğiniz bilgileriniz sizden istenmeyecektir. Çalışmayı istediğiniz zaman terk etme hakkına sahipsiniz. Çalışmayı terk ederseniz size ait bilgiler ve veriler çalışmadan çıkarılacaktır. Çalışma hakkında daha fazla bilgi sahibi olmak isterseniz esattkuzu@gmail.com adresinden araştırmacı ile iletişime geçebilirsiniz.

Araştırmacı Ad ve Soyadı: Esat KUZU

Tel: 0541 349 ** **

Yukarıda yazan bilgileri okudum, anladım. Çalışmaya gönüllü olarak katılmayı kabul ediyorum.

Katılımcı Ad ve Soyadı:

İmza:

Tarih:

APPENDIX A: Consent and Information Form (English)

The aim of this study is to get your opinions about the English Preparatory Program implemented at the School of Foreign Languages.

Participation in the study is voluntary.

The personal information of the participants will be kept strictly confidential.

If you wish, you have the right to review the information obtained from you.

Any information that you do not want to share in the study will not be asked from you.

You have the right to leave the study at any time.

If you leave the study, your information and data will be removed from the study.

If you want to have more information about the study, you can contact the researcher at esattkuzu@gmail.com.

Researcher Name and Surname: Esat KUZU

Tel: 0541 349 ** **

I have read and understood the information written above. I agree to participate voluntarily in the study.

Participant Name and Surname:

Signature:

Date:

APPENDIX B: İngilizce Hazırlık Programı Anketi (Öğrenci-Türkçe)

Değerli Öğrenciler,

Bu anket sizlerin Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulunda uygulanan İngilizce Hazırlık Programına dair görüşlerinizi almak için hazırlanmıştır. Elde edilen bulgular bilimsel araştırma amacıyla ve hazırlık programının geliştirilmesinde kullanılacaktır. Kişisel bilgileriniz kesinlikle gizli tutulacaktır. Lütfen anketteki dikkatlice okuyarak size en uygun ifadeleri işaretleyiniz ve boş ifade bırakmamaya özen gösteriniz.

Katılımınız için çok teşekkür ederim.

Esat KUZU

Çukurova Üniversitesi İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi
Hakkâri Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Araştırma Görevlisi

BÖLÜM 1

Yaşınız:.....

Cinsiyetiniz: () Kadın Erkek ()

Sınıfınız:.....

Bölümünüz:.....

BÖLÜM 2

Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu İngilizce Hazırlık Programına dair görüşleriniz.

BAĞLAM DEĞERLENDİRME		Kesinlikle katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılmıyorum	Kesinlikle katılmıyorum
1)	İngilizce hazırlık programının içeriği günceldir.					
2)	İngilizce hazırlık programı temel İngilizce becerilerini geliştirecek şekilde tasarlanmıştır.					
3)	İngilizce hazırlık programının hedefleri açık ve anlaşılırdır.					
4)	İngilizce hazırlık programının içeriği program hedefleriyle uyumludur.					
5)	İngilizce hazırlık programının hedefleri seviyeme uygundur.					
6)	Hazırlık program dersleri ihtiyaç ve beklentilerimi dikkate almaktadır.					
7)	İngilizce hazırlık programındaki dersler birbirini tamamlayıcı niteliktedir.					

GİRDİ DEĞERLENDİRME		Kesinlikle katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılmıyorum	Kesinlikle katılmıyorum
8)	Sınıflar İngilizce ders işlemek için uygundur.					
9)	Derslerde düşüncelerimi İngilizce ifade edebilme imkânı buluyorum.					
10)	İngilizce hazırlık programında yer alan materyaller (ders kitabı, ekstra fotokopi, okuma metinleri, powerpoint sunuları, video) ilgi çekici ve yeterlidir.					
11)	Programda kullanılan ders kitabı seviyem için uygundur.					
12)	Öğrenme-öğretme sürecinde verilen ödevler ve sınıf içi etkinlikler (grup çalışmaları, grup tartışmaları, rol yapma vb.) İngilizce becerilerimi geliştiriyor.					
13)	Derslerde yaptığımız sunumlar İngilizce öğrenmeye katkı sağlıyor.					
14)	Derslerde hocalarımızın verdiği örnekler ve alıştırmalar İngilizce öğrenmeyi kolaylaştırıyor.					

SÜREÇ DEĞERLENDİRME		Kesinlikle katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılmıyorum	Kesinlikle katılmıyorum
15)	Program aktif olarak derse katılmamı sağlamaktadır.					
16)	Program süresince anlaşılmayan konular tekrarlanır ve ilgili alıştırmalarla desteklenir.					
17)	Program dinleme becerilerine yeterli derecede önem vermektedir.					
18)	Program konuşma becerilerine yeterli derecede önem vermektedir.					
19)	Program okuma becerilerine yeterli derecede önem vermektedir.					
20)	Program yazma becerilerine yeterli derecede önem vermektedir.					
21)	Program dil ve kelime bilgisi becerilerine yeterli derecede önem vermektedir.					

ÜRÜN DEĞERLENDİRME		Kesinlikle katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılmıyorum	Kesinlikle katılmıyorum
22)	Program şu ana kadarki bireysel ilgi ve ihtiyaçlarıma cevap vermiştir.					
23)	Programda şu ana kadar dil konusunda kazandığım beceriler tatmin edicidir.					
24)	Program İngilizce ile ilgili gelecekteki ihtiyaçlarıma temel oluşturmuştur.					
25)	Ders hocalarımla şu ana kadar yeterli derecede iletişim kurabildim.					
26)	Değerlendirme araçları (vize, final, ödevler, portfolio vs.) yeterli ve uygundur.					
27)	Hazırlık programının şu ana kadar uygulanmasında teknolojiden yeterince yararlanılmıştır.					
28)	Gözlemlerime göre program süreci boyunca şu ana kadar öğrenci, öğretmen ve yönetim arasında yeterli koordinasyon ve uyum sağlanmıştır.					

1. Hazırlık programının güçlü ya da geliştirilmesi gerektiğini düşündüğünüz yönleri var mı? Varsa nelerdir?
2. İngilizce hazırlık programına dair belirtmek istediğiniz diğer görüşleriniz nelerdir?

APPENDIX B: *English Preparatory Program Questionnaire (Student-English)*

Dear Students,

This questionnaire has been prepared to get your views on the English Preparatory Program implemented at the School of Foreign Languages. The findings will be used for scientific research purposes and development of the preparatory program. Your personal information will be kept strictly confidential. Please read the questionnaire carefully and mark the most appropriate expressions for you and take care not to leave empty statements.

Thank you very much for your participation.

Esat KUZU

Çukurova University English Language Teaching Graduate Student
Hakkâri University Foreign Languages Education Research Assistant

PART 1

Age:.....

Gender: () Female Male ()

Class:.....

Department:.....

PART 2

Your views about the School of Foreign Languages English Preparatory Program

	CONTEXT EVALUATION	Absolutely Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Absolutely Disagree
1)	The content of the English preparatory program is up to date.					
2)	The English preparatory program is designed to improve basic English skills.					
3)	The objectives of the English preparatory program are clear and straightforward.					
4)	The content of the English preparatory program is in line with the program objectives.					
5)	The objectives of the English preparatory program suitable for my level.					
6)	Preparatory program courses take into account my needs and expectations.					
7)	The courses in the English preparatory program are complementary to each other.					

	INPUT EVALUATION	Absolutely Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Absolutely Disagree
8)	The classes are suitable for teaching English lessons.					
9)	I have the opportunity to express my thoughts in English in lessons.					
10)	The materials in the English preparatory program (textbook, additional copy, reading texts, PowerPoint presentations, video) are interesting and sufficient.					
11)	The textbook used in the program is suitable for my level.					
12)	Homework and in-class activities (group work, group discussions, role play, etc.) given in the learning-teaching process improve my English skills.					
13)	The presentations we make in the lessons contribute to learning English.					
14)	The examples and exercises given by our teachers in the lessons make it easier to learn English.					

PROCESS EVALUATION		Absolutely Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Absolutely Disagree
15)	The program allows me to actively participate in the lesson.					
16)	Subjects that are not understood during the program are repeated and supported with relevant exercises					
17)	The program places sufficient emphasis on listening skills.					
18)	The program places sufficient emphasis on speaking skills.					
19)	The program places sufficient emphasis on reading skills.					
20)	The program places sufficient emphasis on writing skills.					
21)	The program places sufficient emphasis on language and vocabulary skills.					

PRODUCT EVALUATION		Absolutely Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Absolutely Disagree
22)	The program has responded to my individual interests and needs so far.					
23)	The skills I have gained in the language so far in the program are satisfactory.					
24)	The program has provided a basis for my future English needs.					
25)	I have been able to adequately communicate with my instructors so far.					
26)	Assessment tools (visa, final, assignments, portfolio etc.) are sufficient and appropriate.					
27)	Technology has been used sufficiently in the implementation of the preparatory program so far.					
28)	According to my observations, sufficient coordination and rapport between students, teachers, and administration have been ensured throughout the program.					

1. Do you think there are any aspects of the preparatory program that are strong or need to be improved? If yes, what are these?

2. What are your other opinions about the English preparatory program?

APPENDIX C: İngilizce Hazırlık Programı Anketi (Akademisyen-Türkçe)

Değerli Akademik üyeler,

Bu anket sizlerin Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulunda uygulanan İngilizce Hazırlık Programına dair görüşlerinizi almak için hazırlanmıştır. Elde edilen bulgular bilimsel araştırma amacıyla ve hazırlık programının geliştirilmesinde kullanılacaktır. Kişisel bilgileriniz kesinlikle gizli tutulacaktır. Lütfen anketteki dikkatlice okuyarak size en uygun ifadeleri işaretleyiniz ve boş ifade bırakmamaya özen gösteriniz.

Katılımınız için çok teşekkür ederim.

Esat KUZU

Çukurova Üniversitesi İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi
Hakkâri Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Araştırma Görevlisi

BÖLÜM 1

Yaşınız:.....

Cinsiyetiniz: () Kadın Erkek ()

Mezun olunan lisans programı:

- () İngilizce Öğretmenliği
() Mütercim Tercümanlık
() İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı
() Çeviri Bilim
() Diğer (belirtiniz)

Deneyim:

- () 0-5 yıl
() 6-10 yıl
() 11-15 yıl
() 15 yıl üzeri

BÖLÜM 2
Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu İngilizce Hazırlık Programına dair görüşleriniz.

BAĞLAM DEĞERLENDİRME		Kesinlikle katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılmıyorum	Kesinlikle katılmıyorum
1)	İngilizce hazırlık programının içeriği günceldir.					
2)	İngilizce hazırlık programı temel İngilizce becerilerini geliştirecek şekilde tasarlanmıştır.					
3)	İngilizce hazırlık programının hedefleri açık ve anlaşılırdır.					
4)	İngilizce hazırlık programının içeriği program hedefleriyle uyumludur.					
5)	İngilizce hazırlık programın hedefleri öğrencilerin düzeyine uygundur.					
6)	Hazırlık program dersleri öğrencilerin ihtiyaç ve beklentilerini dikkate almaktadır.					
7)	İngilizce hazırlık programındaki dersler birbirini tamamlayıcı niteliktedir					

GİRDİ DEĞERLENDİRME		Kesinlikle katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılmıyorum	Kesinlikle katılmıyorum
8)	Sınıflar İngilizce ders işlemek için uygundur.					
9)	Derslerde öğrenciler düşüncelerini İngilizce ifade edebilme imkânı buluyor					
10)	İngilizce hazırlık programında yer alan materyaller (ders kitabı, ekstra fotokopi, okuma metinleri, powerpoint sunuları, video) ilgi çekici ve yeterlidir.					
11)	Programda kullanılan ders kitabı öğrencilerin seviyesine uygundur.					
12)	Öğrenme-öğretme sürecinde verilen ödevler ve sınıf içi etkinlikler (grup çalışmaları, grup tartışmaları, rol yapma vb.) öğrencilerin İngilizce becerilerini geliştiriyor					
13)	Derslerde öğrencilerin yaptığı sunumlar İngilizce öğrenmelerine katkı sağlıyor.					
14)	Derslerde öğrencilere verdiğim örnekler ve alıştırmalar İngilizce öğrenmeyi kolaylaştırıyor.					

SÜREÇ DEĞERLENDİRME		Kesinlikle katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılmıyorum	Kesinlikle katılmıyorum
15)	Program öğrencilerin aktif olarak derse katılmasını sağlamaktadır.					
16)	Program süresince anlaşılmayan konular tekrarlanır ve ilgili alıştırmalarla desteklenir.					
17)	Program dinleme becerilerine yeterli derecede önem vermektedir.					
18)	Program konuşma becerilerine yeterli derecede önem vermektedir.					
19)	Program okuma becerilerine yeterli derecede önem vermektedir.					
20)	Program yazma becerilerine yeterli derecede önem vermektedir.					
21)	Program dil ve kelime bilgisi becerilerine yeterli derecede önem vermektedir.					

ÜRÜN DEĞERLENDİRME		Kesinlikle katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılmıyorum	Kesinlikle katılmıyorum
22)	Program öğrencilerin şu ana kadarki bireysel ilgi ve ihtiyaçlarına cevap vermiştir.					
23)	Programda öğrencilerin şu ana kadar dil konusunda kazandığı beceriler tatmin edicidir.					
24)	Program öğrencilerin İngilizce ile ilgili gelecekteki ihtiyaçlarına temel oluşturmuştur					
25)	Şu ana kadar öğrenciler ders hocaları ile yeterli derecede iletişim kurabilmiştir					
26)	Değerlendirme araçları (vize, final, ödevler, portfolio vs.) yeterli ve uygundur.					
27)	Hazırlık programın şu ana kadar uygulanmasında teknolojidten yeterince yararlanılmıştır.					
28)	Gözlemlerime göre program süreci boyunca şu ana kadar öğrenci, ders hocaları ve yönetim arasında yeterli koordinasyon ve uyum sağlanmıştır.					

1. Hazırlık programının güçlü ya da geliştirilmesi gerektiğini düşündüğünüz yönleri var mı? Varsa nelerdir?
2. İngilizce hazırlık programına dair belirtmek istediğiniz diğer görüşleriniz nelerdir?

APPENDIX C: *English Preparatory Program Questionnaire (Academician-English)*

Dear Academicians,

This questionnaire has been prepared to get your views on the English Preparatory Program implemented at the School of Foreign Languages. The findings will be used for scientific research purposes and development of the preparatory program. Your personal information will be kept strictly confidential. Please read the questionnaire carefully and mark the most appropriate expressions for you and take care not to leave empty statements.

Thank you very much for your participation.

Esat KUZU

Çukurova University English Language Teaching Graduate Student
Hakkâri University Foreign Languages Education Research Assistant

PART 1

Age:.....

Gender: () Female Male ()

Graduate program:

- () English Language Teaching
- () Translation and Interpreting
- () English Language and Literature
- () Translation studies
- () Other(explain)

Experience:

- () 0-5 years
- () 6-10 years
- () 11-15 years
- () over 15 years

PART 2**Your views about the School of Foreign Languages English Preparatory Program**

CONTEXT EVALUATION		Absolutely Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Absolutely Disagree
1)	The content of the English preparatory program is up to date.					
2)	The English preparatory program is designed to improve basic English skills.					
3)	The objectives of the English preparatory program are clear and straightforward.					
4)	The content of the English preparatory program is in line with the program objectives.					
5)	The objectives of the English preparatory program suitable for the students' levels.					
6)	Preparatory program courses take into account the students' needs and expectations.					
7)	The courses in the English preparatory program are complementary to each other.					

INPUT EVALUATION		Absolutely Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Absolutely Disagree
8)	The classes are suitable for teaching English lessons.					
9)	The students have the opportunity to express their thoughts in English in lessons.					
10)	The materials in the English preparatory program (textbook, additional copy, reading texts, PowerPoint presentations, video) are interesting and sufficient.					
11)	The textbook used in the program is suitable for the students' levels.					
12)	Homework and in-class activities (group work, group discussions, role play, etc.) given in the learning-teaching process improve the students' English skills.					
13)	The presentations that the students make in the lessons contribute to learning English.					
14)	The examples and exercises we give to the students in the lessons make it easier to learn English.					

PROCESS EVALUATION		Absolutely Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Absolutely Disagree
15)	The program allows the students to actively participate in the lesson.					
16)	Subjects that are not understood during the program are repeated and supported with relevant exercises					
17)	The program places sufficient emphasis on listening skills.					
18)	The program places sufficient emphasis on speaking skills.					
19)	The program places sufficient emphasis on reading skills.					
20)	The program places sufficient emphasis on writing skills.					
21)	The program places sufficient emphasis on language and vocabulary skills.					

PRODUCT EVALUATION		Absolutely Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Absolutely Disagree
22)	The program has responded to the students' individual interests and needs so far.					
23)	The skills the students have gained in the language so far in the program are satisfactory.					
24)	The program has provided a basis for the students' future English needs.					
25)	The students have been able to adequately communicate with the instructors so far.					
26)	Assessment tools (visa, final, assignments, portfolio etc.) are sufficient and appropriate.					
27)	Technology has been used sufficiently in the implementation of the preparatory program so far.					
28)	According to my observations, sufficient coordination and rapport between students, teachers, and administration have been ensured throughout the program.					

1. Do you think there are any aspects of the preparatory program that are strong or need to be improved? If yes, what are these?

2. What are your other opinions about the English preparatory program?

APPENDIX D: Görüşme soruları (Türkçe)

1. Uygulanan İngilizce hazırlık programından biraz bahseder misiniz?
2. Sizce programın işleyişi nasıldır?
 - a) Programda görev alan öğretim görevlileri uyum içinde çalışıyorlar mı?
 - b) Öğretim görevlileri program dışına çıkıyorlar mı?
 - c) Yönetim, öğretim görevlileri ve öğrenciler arasındaki ilişki nasıldır?
3. Sizce programda karşılaşılan problemler nedir?
 - a) Bu problemlerin sebepleri neler olabilir?
4. Programda kullanılan materyaller ve size (öğrencilere) verilen ödevler hakkında ne düşünüyorsunuz?
 - a) Ekstra kaynaklara ihtiyaç olduğunu düşünüyor musunuz?
5. Şu ana kadar yapılan sınavların, quizlerin ve ödevlerin içeriği ve yeterliliği hakkında ne düşünüyorsunuz?
6. Hazırlık programının istenen sonuçları ne derecede verdiğini düşünüyorsunuz?
 - a) Program öğrencilere becerileri sizce yeterli derecede kazandırıyor mu?

APPENDIX D: Interview Questions (English)

1. Could you tell us a little about the English preparatory program implemented?
2. How do you think the program works?
 - a) Do the instructors in the program work in coordination?
 - b) Do the instructors diverge from the program?
 - c) How is the relationship between the administration, instructors and students??
3. What do you think are the problems encountered in the program?
 - a) What could be the causes of these problems?
4. What do you think about the materials used in the program and the assignments given to you (students)?
 - a) Do you think extra resources are needed?
5. What do you think about the content and adequacy of the exams, quizzes and assignments made so far?
6. To what extent do you think the preparatory program gives the desired results??
 - a) In your opinion, does the program provide students with sufficient skills?

CURRICULUM VITAE**PERSONAL INFORMATION**

Name : Esat KUZU
Place of Birth : Kiraz / İzmir
Date of Birth : 10/05/1994
E-mail : esattkuzu@gmail.com

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

2018-2020 Master of Arts, Çukurova University, The Institute of Social Sciences,
English Language Teaching Department, ADANA
2012-2016 Bachelor of Arts, Faculty of Education, Boğaziçi University, Foreign
Language Teaching Department, İSTANBUL

EXPERIENCE

2019- Research Assistant, Hakkari University, HAKKARİ
2016-2019 English Teacher, Ministry of National Education (MEB), ŞANLIURFA