

Evaluating an English Preparatory Program using CIPP Model and Exploring the Motivational Beliefs for Learning

Görkem Erdoğan
Beykoz University, Turkey

Enisa Mede
Bahçeşehir University, Turkey

Abstract

The purpose of the present study was to evaluate the English Preparatory School Language Program in a Turkish state university. Specifically, the perceptions of students and instructors for Stufflebeam's Context Input Process Product (CIPP) model were investigated and the motivational beliefs of students for learning were examined. To meet these objectives, Stufflebeam's (1971) CIPP evaluation model was used to find out the perceptions of the two groups of participants about the current program as well as the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ) developed by Pintrich et al., (1993) was administered to the students to discover their motivational beliefs for learning. The quantitative data were obtained through questionnaires administered to 54 students and 33 instructors and the qualitative data were gathered via semi-structured interviews carried out with 10 students and 5 instructors. The findings of the study revealed that although the participants were content with materials, assessment, and the teaching methods, there was a need to develop speaking and listening skills. Additionally, among the motivational beliefs of the students, control beliefs, task value, and intrinsic goal orientation were perceived to be crucial for the students. Finally, the perceptions of the students and instructors reported some strengths and weaknesses that need to be addressed in the program.

Keywords: CIPP model, English language teaching and learning, motivated strategies for learning questionnaire, motivational beliefs, perceptions, program evaluation.

Introduction

In today's world, English is known as a contact language among people who do not speak the same first language (Firth, 1996; Jenkins, 2002; Seidlhofer, 2005). In other words, English is regarded as a Lingua Franca (ELF) since it is a common language among the speakers who do not share the same language or culture (House, 1999; Jenkins, 2009; Seidlhofer, 2005).

This growing interest in the English language gives rise to a greater interest in English language teaching and learning in all educational settings (Crystal, 2012; Nunan, 2003). Considering the importance and necessity of English language education, it is significantly crucial to examine the perceptions of students and instructors to obtain systematic information to decide to achieve specific goals and aims (Nunan 2003). From this point forward, many studies in the field of program evaluation have been conducted to assess the quality and evaluate the effectiveness of a program (Brown, 1989; Dollar et al., 2014; Lynch, 1990; Nunan, 1991; Peacock, 2009; Scriven, 1991; Tyler, 2013).

Brown (1989) emphasizes the importance of evaluation stating that without evaluation, other elements become meaningless. The importance and the necessity of program evaluation are a must in formal and distance/virtual mode education. Likewise, Nunan (1991) mentions the importance of program evaluation as it is not only a process of gathering information but also a process of decision-making. Lynch (1990) pointed out the need to assess the quality of the program to provide useful information to all the stakeholders. Peacock (2009) focused on the necessity of systematic program evaluation to obtain feedback for program improvement and increase its accountability. Finally, Tyler (2013) mentioned that evaluation is crucial in determining whether a program is effective.

As previous studies highlighted the necessity of evaluation, the present study adopted Stufflebeam's (1971) Context, Input, Process, and Product (CIPP) Model as a systematic approach to evaluating a language program. According to Robinson (2004), this model was developed to connect evaluation with program decision-making. This evaluation model focuses on the role of the evaluation in providing information to improve the quality of decisions made by stakeholders (Fitzpatrick et al., 2011).

According to Fitzpatrick et al. (2011), context evaluation plays an important role in planning decisions that try to determine the needs and problems of students. On the other hand, input evaluation is about selecting appropriate educational strategies to solve problems and achieve the desired outcome. Also, process evaluation provides feedback related to the implementation of the program. It has two main functions: first, to provide information to the external stakeholder who would like to learn more about the program, and second, to help program evaluators to interpret the program outcomes (Gredler, 1996). Lastly, product evaluation assesses the programs' quality and questions whether a program should be continued, repeated, or extended

Motivation is another crucial concept of program evaluation which is a broad and complicated term, and it is not possible to explain all the aspects of motivation in one theory (Dörnyei, 1998). More specifically, motivational components include not only the students' perceptions related to the classroom environment but also their self-related beliefs, personal goals, value beliefs, interest, and self-efficacy. Many researchers have examined the relationship between motivation and language learning (Brown, 1989; Dörnyei & Csizer, 2012; Garcia & Pintrich, 1994) which makes it an indispensable part of education and has a positive role in learning (Brown, 1989; Dörnyei & Csizer, 2012). Therefore, it is important to identify students' needs and purposes to learn English and create proper motivational strategies for its learning. Garcia and Pintrich (1994) emphasized the importance of the assessment of both motivational and cognitive components of academic performance in the classroom. It is crucial to identify students' needs and identify their motivational strategies; hence, this study also tries to find out the motivational beliefs of the students for learning and examine the possible relationship among their beliefs. Specifically, the following research questions were addressed:

Research Questions

1. What are the perceptions of the students about the A1 (elementary level) English preparatory program at a Turkish state university with respect to the CIPP model?
2. What are the perceptions of the English instructors about the current program with respect to the CIPP model?
3. What are the motivational beliefs of the students for learning English in the

current program?

a) Is there any significant relationship among the motivational beliefs used by the students?

4. What are the perceptions of students and instructors about the program?

Literature Review

Program Evaluation

Program evaluation in education is a process of collecting, analyzing, and interpreting information about teaching and learning to determine the value and worth of the program (Lync, 1990; Ornstein & Hunkins, 1988).

Recent studies revealed that the language programs require modifications and improvements in terms of materials, targets, physical conditions, and assessment tools (Aziz et al., 2018; Güllü, 2007; Pamukoğlu, 2019; Tunç, 2010). Güllü (2007) carried out a study to evaluate the English program at a state university from students' points of view. The results showed that students had some difficulties related to course content and their level of English, unattractive course materials, lack of motivation, and physical equipment. Tunç (2010) aimed to evaluate the effectiveness of the preparatory school program in a state university. The results indicated that to make these programs more effective, some improvements regarding physical conditions, content, materials, and assessment tools were needed. Aziz et al., (2018) reported some recommendations for the stakeholders to improve the quality of education such as audiovisuals aids, extracurricular activities, educational trips, and regular assessments. Finally, Pamukoğlu (2019) emphasized that targets, materials, and physical conditions should be modified and improved in the existing programs.

Other studies suggested possible ways for program renewal (Coşkun 2013; Gereade, 2005; Öner & Mede, 2015; Özdoruk, 2016; Mede 2012). Gereade (2005) evaluated the effects of the curricula based on students' perceptions at a state university and made suggestions for the renewal of the curriculum. In another study, Mede (2012) redesigned and evaluated the language preparatory program at a Turkish university. According to the results, it was decided to redesign the program of the ELT department. Coşkun's (2013) study revealed that modular

system had certain drawbacks and it should have been replaced by a more manageable system. Besides, Öner and Mede (2015) investigated the perceptions of students, instructors, level coordinators, and program administrators related to the A1 level (beginner) program. The results showed that more emphasis should be given to speaking skills. Finally, Özdoruk (2016) evaluated the English preparatory curriculum at a university from the stakeholders' point of view and emphasized the need of improving listening and speaking skills.

Based on these overviews, it is obvious that evaluation can be used to enhance the quality and the implementation of various programs. To put it simply, evaluation plays an important role in assessing whether the plans achieved their stated goals and objectives.

Motivation in Language Education

Motivation is of the most curial factors in improving the quality of English language learning and teaching as it affects both the success and failure of a program. In this sense, Csizer (2012) emphasizes the necessity of motivation in L2 by saying that to learn a second language, there should be many conditions like a good teacher, language learning aptitude, strategies but without motivation, it is impossible.

Many studies unraveled the direct relationship between motivation and success in language learning. Engin (2009), for example, examined the relationship between success in second language learning and motivation types and found a strong relationship between the variables. Vibulphol (2016) investigated the learners' motivation and learning of English and the ways that the teachers support students' motivation and learning. The findings emphasized the importance of having a high level of motivation and internal interest in learning. In similar studies, a strong relationship was found between motivation and academic success in L2 learning (Amrai et al., 2011; Savoji, 2013).

Based on these overviews, there is a direct relationship between motivation and success. Therefore, while designing a language program, the factors that affect students' motivation should also be taken into consideration. The present study aims to evaluate the A1 level English preparatory program from the perceptions of students and instructors based on Stufflebeam's (1971) CIPP model.

Methodology

The present study adopted a mixed-method as a research design. The most common and well-known approach to mixing methods is through the triangulation of data (Creswell et al., 2003). Triangulation focuses on “obtaining different but complementary data on the same topic” (Morse, 1991, p. 122). In this study, the quantitative part of the study is composed of 2 different questionnaires. As for qualitative data, semi-structured individual interviews with 5 instructors and 10 students were conducted.

Setting and Participants

The present study was conducted at the School of Foreign Languages, Turkish state university. Purposeful sampling was used to select the target group of participants. Specifically, a total of 54 A1 (elementary level) students whose mother tongue was Turkish took part in this study. 64.8% were male ($n=35$) and 35,2 % were female ($n=19$). Their age ranged between 17 and 34 years old.

Apart from the students, 33 A1 level English instructors whose age range was between 29 to 64 voluntarily participated in the study. 15.2 % were male ($n= 5$) and 84,8 % were female ($n= 28$). All the participants had the experience of teaching for more than 2 years.

Instruments

To meet the objectives of this study, the questionnaire adapted from Stufflebeam’s (1971) CIPP model was used to gather data from the students and instructors to evaluate the current program in terms of context, input, process, and product. The items were based on a 5-point Likert ranging from ‘5 strongly agree’ to ‘1 strongly disagree’. Also, the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ) translated to Turkish by Karadeniz et al. (2008) as MSLQ-TR was used to measure the motivational beliefs of the students. There were 25 items related to motivational beliefs which were composed of 3 main areas; value (intrinsic and extrinsic goal orientation, task value); expectancy (control beliefs about learning and self-efficacy); affect (test anxiety) based on a 7 point-Likert scale (‘1’ means not true at all, ‘7’ means very true).

Finally, to complement the quantitative data, qualitative data were gathered

from semi-structured interviews. with 10 students and 5 instructors to gain in-depth information about the current program. Before the data collection procedure, online consent forms were sent to the two groups of participants who volunteered to take part in the study. These participants were given pseudonyms regarding their number. Such as Student 1, Student 2, student 3, etc.

Data Analysis

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) 22.0 version was used to analyze the two questionnaires. Specifically, the mean score, frequencies, and the percentages of each item in the questionnaire were calculated separately using descriptive statistics, and an independent sample t-test was used to examine if any differences existed between the concepts of CIPP. Finally, the correlation was calculated through an inferential statistic.

For the validity and reliability of the present study, the Cronbach Alpha scores were calculated for both of the adopted questionnaires. The results indicated acceptable internal consistency. This made the questionnaire reliable (Table 1).

Table 1

Reliability Statistics of the CIPP Scale

| | Cronbach's Alpha | Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items | N of Items |
|---------|------------------|--|------------|
| Context | .836 | .844 | 10 |
| Input | .850 | .859 | 6 |
| Process | .840 | .842 | 8 |
| Product | .944 | .946 | 21 |

Also, the subscales of MSLQ-TR were tested for their reliability using Cronbach's Alpha test. According to the results, Cronbach's alpha score for Value ($\alpha=0.808$), Expectancy ($\alpha=.842$), and Affective ($\alpha=.738$), coefficients are quite strong to measure for the MSLQ questionnaire (See Table 2 below).

Table 2

Reliability Statistics of the MSLQ-TR Scale

| | Cronbach's Alpha | CA Based on SI | N |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|----------|
| Value | .796 | .819 | 11 |
| Intrinsic Goal Orientation | .742 | .741 | 4 |
| Extrinsic Goal Orientation | .760 | .764 | 2 |
| Task Value Beliefs | .748 | .754 | 5 |
| Expectancy | .768 | .784 | 7 |
| Students' Perceptions of Self-efficacy | .705 | .730 | 4 |
| Control Beliefs for Learning | .715 | .730 | 3 |
| Affective | .738 | .739 | 5 |
| Test Anxiety | .738 | .739 | 5 |

Finally, for the semi-structured interviews, 6 open-ended questions were asked to participating students and instructors. The gathered data were analyzed using content analysis (Creswell et al., 2003). First, the gathered data was clustered into themes about the context, input, process, and product evaluation subgroups, and the repeated words and key points were analyzed accordingly.

Findings

The following part of this study reports the findings for each research question.

Perceptions of the Students about the A1 Level English Preparatory Program

To find out the perceptions of students related to the current program data were first collected from the questionnaires and the findings related to each item were presented separately based on Stufflebeam's (1971) CIPP model. The following sections report the obtained findings.

Context Evaluation

The results of the context evaluation were reported in the following table:

Table 3*Students' Perceptions about Context Evaluation*

| Items | M | SD | Var. |
|---|------|------|-------|
| 1.The program is appropriate for my language skills. | 4.03 | .720 | .518 |
| 9. The context of the coursebook is consistent with program objectives. | 3.68 | .836 | .700 |
| 8. Course book is able to grab my attention. | 3.27 | 1.09 | 1.203 |
| 2. Four language skills are well balanced in the program. | 3.15 | .946 | .895 |

As shown in Table 3 above, the highest and lowest scores given by the students were examined. For context evaluation, the students gave the highest score to the item 'the program is appropriate for my language skills' (M: 4.03; SD: .720). On the other hand, the item which was about 'four language skills are well balanced in the program' had the lowest score (M: 3.15; SD: .946). Finally, the items about the context of the coursebook and its consistency with the program objectives as well as the coursebook and its attention-grabbing feature were ranged moderately by the students.

Input Evaluation

The data analysis of the highest and lowest scores related to input evaluation was presented in Table 4 below:

Table 4*Students' Perceptions about Input Evaluation*

| Items | M | SD | Var. |
|--|------|------|------|
| 14. Extra handed-out materials ease my learning. | 4.49 | .612 | .375 |
| 16. Extra handed-out materials have positive effect on my language skills. | 4.41 | .605 | .367 |
| 12. Visual and audial materials used in the program are able to grab my attention. | 3.80 | .916 | .841 |

The Table 4 results report that the students supported extra handed-out materials ease their learning (M: 4.49; SD: .612) extra handed-out materials have a positive effect on their language skills (M: 4.41; SD: .605).

However, they moderately agreed 'visual and audial materials used in the program can grab their attention' (M: 3.80; SD: .916).

Process Evaluation

The findings that conceptually corresponded to process evaluation were presented separately as following:

Table 5

Students' Perceptions about Process Evaluation

| Items | M | SD | Var. |
|---|------|-------|-------|
| 22. In the program, there are activities to be performed as pairs or group work. | 4.25 | .688 | .474 |
| 18. Throughout the program, if it's needed, subject repetitions are done. | 4.11 | .682 | .466 |
| 19. In the program, homework is given as intensifiers for already learned subjects. | 4.11 | .738 | .546 |
| 23. In the program, there are activities to make me use all my language abilities. | 3.37 | 1.076 | 1.158 |

Looking at Table 5, the students agreed:

“in the program, there are activities to be performed as pairs or group work.” (M:4.25; SD: .688)

“throughout the program, if it's needed, subject repetitions are done.” (M:4.11; SD: .682) *“homework was given as intensifiers for already learned subjects.”* (M: 4.11; SD: 738).

In contrast, they disagreed:

“in the program there are activities to make them use all their language abilities.”(M: 3.37; SD: 1.076).

Product Evaluation

The results of the highest and lowest scores regarding product evaluation were illustrated in Table 6.

Table 6*Students' Perceptions about Product Evaluation*

| Items | M | SD | Var. |
|--|------|-------|-------|
| 33. The program developed my vocabulary knowledge. | 4.45 | .756 | .573 |
| 32. The assignments given in the program had positive effects on my language skills. | 4.11 | .652 | .426 |
| 39. At the end of the program, the improvement in English listening skills was satisfactory. | 3.41 | 1.080 | 1.167 |
| 40. At the end of the program, the improvement in English speaking skills was satisfactory. | 3.07 | 1.230 | 1.514 |

For product evaluation, the students strongly agreed:

the program developed my vocabulary knowledge (M: 4.45; SD: .756)

the assignments given in the program had positive effects on my language skills (M: 4.11; SD: .652).

Contrarily, they were moderately agreed:

at the end of the program, the improvement in English listening skill (M: 3.41; SD: 1.080) *speaking skill was satisfactory* (M: 3.07; SD: 1.230)

which mean that the program for listening and speaking skills need some improvement.

Perceptions of the Instructors about the A1 Level English Preparatory Program

The second research question of the study attempted to find out the instructors' perceptions about the effectiveness of the A1 program to CIPP.

Context Evaluation

The results of the highest and lowest scores of the items corresponding to context evaluation were presented below.

Table 7*Instructors' Perceptions about Context Evaluation*

| Items | M | SD | Var. |
|---|------|------|------|
| 7. Books used in program are appropriate for students' level. | 4.09 | .630 | .398 |
| 6. The program's overall time is enough. | 3.39 | .998 | .996 |
| 8. Course books grab students' attention. | 3.30 | .918 | .843 |

According to Table 7, the instructors supported the item

“Books used in the program are appropriate for students’ level.”

(M: 4.09; SD: .630)

On the other hand, the instructors moderately agreed

“Course books can grab students’ attention.” (M: 3.39, SD: .998)

“The program’s overall time is enough.” (M: 3.30; SD: .918)

Input Evaluation

As for input evaluation, the results of the highest and lowest scores were presented in Table 8

Table 8

Instructors’ Perceptions about Input Evaluation

| Items | M | SD | Var. |
|---|----------|-----------|-------------|
| 14. Extra handed-out materials eased students’ learning. | 4.36 | .603 | .364 |
| 13. Visual and audial materials used in the program had positive effects on students’ language skills | 4.21 | .484 | .235 |
| 12. Visual and audial material used in the program were able to grab students’ attention | 3.63 | .699 | .489 |
| 15. Extra handed-out materials were able to grab students’ attention. | 3.54 | .794 | .631 |

As reported in Table 8, the instructors agreed:

“Extra handed-out materials eased students’ learning.” (M: 4.36, SD: .603)

“Visual and audial materials used in the program had positive effects on students’ language skills.” (M: 4.21; SD: .484)

However, they were slightly agreed:

“Visual and audial material used in the program was able to grab students’ attention.” (M: 3.63, SD: .699)

“Extra handed-out materials were able to grab students’ attention.” (M: 3.54; SD: .794).

Process Evaluation

The results of the highest and lowest scores related to process evaluation were as follows:

Table 9

Instructors' Perceptions about Process Evaluation

| Items | M | SD | Var. |
|---|------|------|------|
| 21. The number of exams was sufficient in the program | 4.30 | .529 | .280 |
| 22. In the program, there were activities to be performed as pairs or group work. | 4.21 | .696 | .485 |
| 20. the program lets students attend the lessons actively. | 3.39 | .747 | .559 |

In Table 9, the instructors agreed:

"The number of exams was sufficient in the program and the program."

(M: 4.30; SD: .529)

"There were activities to be performed as pairs or group work."

(M: 4.21; SD: .696)

However, they did not support the item:

"The program let students attend the lesson actively." (M: 3.39; SD: .747).

Product Evaluation

Finally, the product evaluation results were presented in Table 10.

Table 10

Instructors' Perceptions about Product Evaluation

| Items | M | SD | Var. |
|--|------|------|------|
| 33. The program developed students' vocabulary. | 4.42 | .501 | .252 |
| 29 The program became a basis for students' future needs of English. | 4.12 | .545 | .297 |
| 27. The program satisfied students' individual qualification. | 3.12 | .739 | .547 |
| 40. At the end of the program, students' improvement on speaking skill was satisfactory. | 2.69 | .918 | .843 |

Considering product evaluation, the instructors supported:

“The program developed students’ vocabulary.” (M: 4.42; SD: .501)
“The program became a basis for students’ future needs of English.”
 (M: 4.12; SD: .545).

However, lower ranks were given

“The program satisfied students’ qualification.” (M: 3.12; SD: .739)
“At the end of the program, students’ improvement in speaking skill was satisfactory.” (M: 2.60; SD: .918).

Motivational Beliefs of the Students for Learning English

Considering the third research question on the motivational beliefs of students for learning, the descriptive statistics were calculated and reported in Table 11.

Table 11

Descriptive Statistics of the Motivational Beliefs for Learning

| Items | M | SD | Var. |
|---|----------|-----------|-------------|
| 2. If I study in appropriate ways, then I will be able to learn the material in the courses of this program. | 6.00 | 1.258 | 1.585 |
| 9. I need to learn the course materials in the courses. | 5.88 | 1.283 | 1.648 |
| 14. If I try hard enough, then I will understand the course materials. | 5.66 | 1.387 | 1.925 |
| 8. It is my fault if I do not learn the material in the courses. | 4.03 | 1.589 | 2.527 |
| 16. I’m confident that I can do an excellent job on the assignments and tests in the program. | 3.87 | 1.467 | 2.153 |
| 10. The most important thing for me right now is improving my overall grade point average so my main concern in this program is getting a good grade. | 3.64 | 1.760 | 3.100 |
| 3. When I take a test, I think about how poorly I am doing compared with other students. | 3.33 | 1.791 | 3.208 |

As displayed in the table above, the high motivated strategy level between 6.00 – 5.11; moderate level between 5.07 – 4.03; low-level motivated strategy can be defined as a score between 3.87 – 3.33. First of all, the students strongly agreed with the item:

“If I study in appropriate ways, then I will be able to learn the material in the courses of this program.”

This means that the students trusted their own beliefs and they were very aware of the importance of studying hard to be able to learn all the topics easily. Moreover, the students also perceived the item:

*“It is important for me to learn the course materials in the courses.”
Finally, the items related to the students’ responsibility to understand the course materials were highly ranked as well.*

On the contrary, lower scores were given to the items:

“I’m confident that I can do an excellent job on the assignments and tests in the program, the most important thing for me right now is improving my overall grade point average so my main concern in this program is getting a good grade and when I take a test, I think about how poorly I am doing compared with other students’ scores.”

Relationship between the Motivational Beliefs in the Program

The last research question examined the possible relationship between motivational beliefs namely, task value and control beliefs. The results of Pearson’s Correlation Coefficient were reported below (see Table 12).

Table 12

Pearson’s correlation coefficient results for task value and control beliefs

| | N | Correlation | Sig. |
|--|----------|--------------------|-------------|
| 2. If I study in appropriate ways, then I will be able to learn the material in the courses of this program. | 54 | .747 | .000 |
| 9. I need to learn the course materials in the course. | | | |

*p<.05

The obtained results reported a strong significant correlation between the second item of control beliefs for learning and the ninth item of task value beliefs. The items below indicated a correlation Sig.=.000 showing the significance of correlation coefficients.

“If I study in appropriate ways, then I will be able to learn the material in the courses of this program.”

“I need to learn the course materials in the course were 747.”

Therefore, it could be concluded that students gave importance to lesson topics, besides that they were able to learn all subjects when they studied hard which also resulted in strong positive correlation.

Furthermore, the analysis showed a significant correlation between the items related to the self-efficacy subscale. The 16th and 25th items were:

“I’m confident I can do an excellent job on the assignments and tests in this program and considering the difficulty of the courses, the teachers, and my skills, I think I will do well in the classes.”

The correlation coefficients of these items were .611, which indicated a correlation between self-efficacy items Sig.=.000 and showed the significance of correlation coefficients as well (see Table 13).

Table 13

Pearson’s Correlation Coefficient Results for Self-Efficacy Sub-Scale

| | N | Correlation | Sig. |
|---|----|-------------|------|
| 16. I’m confident I can do an excellent job on the assignments and tests in this program. | 54 | .611 | .000 |
| 25. Considering the difficulty of the courses, the teachers and my skills, I think I will do well in the classes. | | | |

*p<.05

Qualitative Interviews: Perceptions of the Students About the Program

Sufficiency of the Program. One of the themes that emerged from the student interviews was related to the sufficiency of the program. The students found the program satisfying in terms of their needs, extra handed-out materials, exams, quizzes, and also, reading and writing skills. The following excerpts support these findings:

“Thanks to the language program, I developed my writing and reading skills.”

Also, almost all the students agreed that the extra-handed materials and presentations were sufficient and appropriate for their level. One of them stated:

“Presentations and materials ease learning and they are appropriate for our level.”

As for exams and quizzes, the students found the exams necessary, useful and sufficient as can be seen from one of the quotes below:

“Exams and quizzes are suitable for our level, but the number of the quizzes should be more to motivate students to study.”

Insufficiency of Speaking and Listening Skills. The second theme was related to the insufficiency of speaking and listening skills in the program. The students indicated that they found the program insufficient with respect to improving their speaking and listening skills as shown in the following statement:

“I think our program focuses on writing, grammar and vocabulary; listening and speaking is not sufficient.”

Qualitative Interviews: Perceptions of the Instructors About the Program

Apart from the perceptions of students, the instructors were asked to share their viewpoint about the current program as well. Based on the gathered themes, although the instructors were positive about the aims, objectives, and audiovisuals, there are some points that need to be reconsidered. This section presents the findings under the gathered themes.

Duration of A1 Level Program. The most common response given by the instructors was related to the duration of the program. They stated that they did not have enough time to complete the content. The reason they provided was related to the differences among the proficiency level of the students as shown in the excerpt below:

“Having two terms to teach lots of things is not enough in A1 level program. We need at least two years to achieve our aims.”

Distribution of the Four Language Skills. As for the exams and quizzes of the program, the instructors indicated that although the exams were appropriate in terms of number and content, the percentages of the four language skills were not well balanced. For example, the percentage for the speaking skill was the least one given in the exam which prevented students to improve their speaking as displayed below:

“I think the exams and quizzes are enough and sufficient for the students, but we can't claim that we give importance to speaking.”

Lack of Motivation. The last theme that emerged from the instructor interviews was related to motivation. Specifically, the instructors had difficulty motivating students during the lesson as illustrated in these excerpts:

“The most difficult situation for me is to motivate students during the lesson.”

Discussion

One of the main aims of the study was to investigate the perceptions of students and instructors about the A1 level English preparatory program for CIPP. Considering the context, most of the students agreed that the program objectives met their needs. The findings of Özdoruk's (2016) study which aimed to evaluate the effectiveness of the English preparatory curriculum by applying Stufflebeam's (2003) CIPP evaluation model reported parallel results with the present study. Both the students and instructors had a positive view related to the appropriateness of the aims and the content of the program. Accordingly, it was found that well-stated objectives contributed to its achievement. Moreover, the four language skills (except speaking), materials, exams, and pacing were well balanced in the program which were in line with previous studies (Byram, 2011; Mukundan et al.; 2011; Nunan, 1991; Özdoruk, 2016; Pamukoğlu, 2019; Tomlinson & Masuhara, 2013; Tunç, 2010; Mede, 2012; Viral 2012; Willis 1981).

Another aim of this study was to find out the motivational beliefs of students for learning English and examine the relationship among them. According to the

descriptive analysis, the strongest motivational strategy was the control beliefs for learning and task value beliefs. The control beliefs were related to students' beliefs that they could control their performance. In other words, they were more likely to do what was needed to achieve the desired goal (Pintrich, 1991). On the contrary, if the students believe that they cannot learn a new language successfully, their beliefs can be an obstacle for them (Lennartsson, 2008).

In addition, task value beliefs refer to students' perceptions of the course material in terms of interest, usefulness, and importance (Pintrich, 1991). According to the study, if the task is important, useful, or interesting for the students, then they will be more likely to study effectively. These findings were following Savoji's (2013) and Soyoglu's (2015) studies illustrating that both control beliefs for learning and task value beliefs were important for the virtual group.

An important motivational belief for students was related to intrinsic goal orientation which refers to students' perceptions of the reasons why they are engaging in a task. Even if students do not get any reward or grade, they are intrinsically motivated for learning (Soyoglu, 2015). Finally, self-efficacy which focuses not only on judgments about one's ability to accomplish a task but also one's confidence in performing a task (Pintrich, 1991) was perceived as a moderate motivational belief by the students in the present study.

On the contrary, the extrinsic goal orientation and test anxiety were the less adaptive motivational beliefs for the students. The reason behind this might be that while intrinsic goal orientation is related to a student's curiosity and interest, extrinsic goal orientation focuses on external factors such as grades, rewards, luck, and competition coming from outside (Pintrich, 1991).

Also, the study showed a strong positive correlation between control beliefs for learning and task value components of the motivational beliefs. In other words, if the students believed in their efforts to study make a difference in their learning, then they will be more likely to study effectively. Besides, the results also indicated that students gave importance to the course material in terms of interest, importance, and utility; thus, if a topic is interesting for students, they will be more interested in learning it. In this sense, Soyoglu's (2015) study showed similarity that controls beliefs for learning, task value beliefs, self-efficacy, intrinsic goal orientation was

positively correlated with each other. As stated by Duncan and McKeachie (2005), control beliefs for learning, task value, self-efficacy, intrinsic and extrinsic goal orientation were all positively correlated with one another.

Finally, the obtained results showed the correlation between the items related to self-efficacy. To put it simply, although the program was difficult, students perceived it possible to pass the courses successfully which supports the relationship between self-efficacy and motivation (Bandura, 1993; Chowdhury & Shahabuddin, 2007).

Conclusion and Recommendations

The present study aimed to reveal the perceptions of students and instructors about the effectiveness of the A1 level English preparatory program with respect to CIPP and to report the students' motivational beliefs for learning and examine the possible relationship between the motivational beliefs. Based on the obtained findings, the study offers some recommendations for future research. Primarily, the current study could be replicated by using a larger sample. Besides, in terms of the evaluation of the motivational beliefs, only students' perceptions were identified. It would be meaningful to explore teachers' beliefs for teaching as well. Also, using the same evaluation model can generate different results in different programs. That's why it would be useful to replicate the evaluation studies in different contexts.

Overall, the present study contributes to the existing literature by attempting to raise awareness not only on the effectiveness of program evaluation but also the importance of students' motivational beliefs. The findings of this study, therefore, shed light to further studies on program evaluation.

References

- Amrai, K., Motlagh, S. E., Zalani, H. A., & Parhon, H. (2011). The relationship between academic motivation and academic achievement students. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 399-402.
- 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.
- Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, 28(2), 117-148.

- Bayram, İ. (2011). *The evaluation of the English preparatory curriculum at TOBB University of economics and technology department of foreign languages from teachers' and students' point of view* (Master's thesis). Ankara University.
- Brown, J. D. (1989). Language program evaluation: A synthesis of existing possibilities. *The Second Language Curriculum*, 222-241.
- Chowdhury, M. S., & Shahabuddin, A. M. (2007). Self-Efficacy, motivation and their relationship to academic performance of Bangladesh college students. *College Quarterly*, 10(1), 1-9.
- Coşkun, A. (2013). An investigation of the effectiveness of the modular general English language teaching preparatory program at a Turkish university. *South African Journal of Education*, 33(3), 1-18.
- Creswell, J. W., Plano Clark, V. L., Gutmann, M. L., & Hanson, W. E. (2003). An expanded typology for classifying mixed methods research into designs. *A. Tashakkori y C. Teddlie, Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research*, 209-240.
- Crystal, D. (2012). *English as a global language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Csizer, K. (2012). An overview of L2 motivation research in Hungary. *New Perspectives on Individual Differences in Language Learning and Teaching*, 233-246.
- Dollar, Y. K., Tolu, A. T., & Doyran, F. (2014). Evaluating a graduate program of English language teacher education. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, 5(2), 1-10.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Motivation in second and foreign language learning. *Language Teaching*, 31(3), 117-135.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Csizér, K. (2012). How to design and analyze surveys in second language acquisition research. *Research Methods in Second Language Acquisition: A practical guide*, 1, 74-94.
- Duncan, T. G., & McKeachie, W. J. (2005). The making of the motivated strategies for learning questionnaire. *Educational Psychologist*, 40(2), 117-128.
- Engin, A. O. (2009). Second language learning success and motivation. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 37(8), 1035-1041.
- Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26(2), 237-259.
- Fitzpatrick, J., Sanders, J., & Worthen, B. (2011). Program-Oriented evaluation approaches. *Program Evaluation: Alternative Approaches and Practical Guidelines*. 4th ed. Pearson Education, 153-71.
- Flowerdew, J., & Peacock, M. (2001). *Research perspectives on English for academic purposes*, Cambridge University Press.

- Garcia, T., & Pintrich, P. R. (1994). *Regulating motivation and cognition in the classroom: The role of self-schemas and self-regulatory strategies*. In D. H. Schunk & B. J. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Self-regulation of learning and performance: Issues and educational applications* (p. 127–153). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Gerede, D. (2005). *A curriculum evaluation through needs analysis: Perceptions of intensive English program graduates at Anadolu University* (Master's thesis, Anadolu Üniversitesi). Turkey.
- Gredler, M. E. (1996). *Program evaluation*. Pearson Education, Inc.
- Güllü, S. A. (2007). An evaluation of English program at Kozan Vocational School of Çukurova University: Students' point of view. *Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*. Çukurova Üniversitesi, Adana.
- House, J. (1999). Misunderstanding in intercultural communication: Interactions in English as a lingua franca and the myth of mutual intelligibility. In: Gnutzmann, C. (Ed.) *Teaching and learning English as a global language*, 73-93.
- Jenkins, J. (2002). A sociolinguistically based, empirically researched pronunciation syllabus for English as an international language. *Applied Linguistics*, 23(1), 83-103.
- Jenkins, J. (2009). English as a lingua franca: Interpretations and attitudes. *World Englishes*, 28(2), 200-207.
- Karadeniz, S., Buyukozturk, S., Akgun, O. E., Cakmak, E. K., & Demirel, F. (2008). The Turkish adaptation study of Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ) for 12-18-year-old children: Results of confirmatory factor analysis. *Online Submission*, 7(4).
- Lennartsson, F. (2008). *Students' motivation and attitudes towards learning a second language: British and Swedish students' points of view* (Dissertation). <http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:vxu:diva-2571>
- Lynch, B. K. (1990). A context-adaptive model for program evaluation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 24(1), 23-42.
- Mede, E. (2012). *Design and evaluation of a language preparatory program at an English medium university in an EFL setting: A case study* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Yeditepe University, İstanbul.
- Morse, J. M. (1991). Approaches to qualitative-quantitative methodological triangulation. *Nursing Research*, 40(2), 120-123.
- Mukundan, J., Hajimohammadi, R., & Nimehchisalem, V. (2011). Developing an English language textbook evaluation checklist. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research (CIER)*, 4(6), 21-28.

- Nunan, D. (1991). Methods in second language classroom-oriented research: A critical review. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 249-274.
- Nunan, D. (2003). The impact of English as a global language on educational policies and practices in the Asia-Pacific Region. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(4), 589-613.
- Öner, G., & Mede, E. (2015). Evaluation of A1 level program at an English preparatory school in a Turkish university: A case study. *ELT Research Journal*, 4(3), 204-226.
- Ornstein, A. C., & Hunkins, F. P. (1988). *Curriculum: Foundations, principles, and issues* (pp. 1-348). Prentice Hall.
- Özdoruk, P. (2016). *Evaluation of the English language preparatory school curriculum at Yıldırım Beyazıt University* (Master's thesis). Turkey.
- Pamukoğlu, M. (2019). *Evaluation of the English language preparatory programs with student and teacher perceptions through CIPP (context, input, process, product) model: Public and foundation university sampling* (Master's thesis) Sakarya Üniversitesi.
- Peacock, M. (2009). The evaluation of foreign-language-teacher education programmes. *Language Teaching Research*, 13(3), 259-278.
- Pintrich, P. R. (1991). *A manual for the use of the Motivated Strategies for Learning*
- Pintrich, P. R., Smith, D. A., Garcia, T., & McKeachie, W. J. (1993). Reliability and predictive validity of the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ). *Educational and psychological measurement*, 53(3), 801-813.
- Richards, J. C. (2005). *Communicative language teaching today*. SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Robbins, S. B., Lauver, K., Le, H., Davis, D., Langley, R., & Carlstrom, A. (2004). Do psychosocial and study skill factors predict college outcomes? A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 130(2), 261.
- Robinson, B., & Latchem, C. (Eds.). (2004). *Teacher Education Through Open and Distance Learning: World review of distance education and open learning*, (Vol. 3). Routledge.
- Savoji, A. P. (2013). Motivational strategies and academic achievement in traditional and virtual university students. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 84, 1015-1020.
- Scriven, M. (1991). *Evaluation thesaurus*. Sage.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2005). English as a lingua franca. *ELT Journal*, 59(4), 339-341.
- Soyoğul, E. C. (2015). *Students' motivational beliefs and learning strategies: an*

- investigation of the scholar development program* (Doctoral dissertation) Bilkent University.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. (1971). *The relevance of the CIPP evaluation model for educational accountability*. [Paper presentation]. Annual Meeting of the American Association of School Administrators. Atlantic City.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. (2003). The CIPP model for evaluation. In *International handbook of educational evaluation* (pp. 31-62). Springer.
- Stufflebeam, D. L., & Shinkfield, A. J. (1985). Stufflebeam's improvement-oriented evaluation. In *Systematic evaluation* (pp. 151-207). Springer.
- Tomlinson, B., & Masuhara, H. (2013). Adult coursebooks. *ELT journal*, 67(2), 233-249.
- Tunç, F. (2010). *Evaluation of an English language teaching program at a public university using CIPP model* (Master's thesis).
- Tyler, R. W. (2013). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. University of Chicago press.
- Vibulphol, J. (2016). Students' motivation and learning and teachers' motivational strategies in English classrooms in Thailand. *English Language Teaching*, 9(4), 64-75.
- Virlan, A. Y. (2014). A case study: Evaluation of an English-speaking skills course in a public university preparatory school program via CIPP model. [Unpublished master's thesis]. *University of Yeditepe*, Turkey.
- Willis, J. (1981). *Teaching English through English* (Vol. 8). Longman.