Randwick International of Education and Linguistics Science (RIELS) Journal
Vol. 4, No. 1, March 2023 | Page 103-113 |
https://www.randwickresearch.com/index.php/rielsj

Afghanistan EFL Lecturers and Students' Attitudes towards Paktia-University Languages and Literature Faculty English Department Curriculum by Using CIPP Model

DOI: *https://doi.org/10.47175/rielsj.v4i1.613*

| Wahidullah Alokozay[1] | Sultan Zahid[2] | Noor Agha Noori[3] |

[1] Paktia University, Faculty of languages and literature, English Language and Literature Department, Paktia-Afghanistan.

[2] Paktia University, Faculty of languages and literature, Pashto Language and Literature Department, Paktia-Afghanistan

[3] Paktia University, Faculty of languages and literature, Journalism Department, Paktia-Afghanistan.

[1]wahidullahalokozay123@gmail.com
[2]sultanzahid1366@gmail.com,
[3]nooragha057@gmail.com

ABSTRACT
The goal of this study is to evaluate the English department curriculum at Afghanistan Paktia University from the perspectives of EFL lecturers and students in accordance with the CIPP Model which has four dimensions; Context, input, process, and product. The research used a quantitative approach to collect data from 88 lectures and students which analyzed using SPSS version 24. The replies of the participants were ascertained using descriptive statistics (frequency, mean, and standard deviation) and inferential statistics (t-test). The outcome proved that the English Department curriculum at Paktia University's Languages and Literature Faculty received favorable evaluations from both the lecturer and the students. Study restrictions made it clear that a mixed-method study may be conducted to produce more credible results.

KEYWORDS
lecturers and students perception; usages of curriculum CIPP model; evaluation of LLF/English Department Curriculum

INTRODUCTION

Being widely accepted, evaluation is a fundamental part of the curriculum and of both teaching and learning (Agrawal, 2004). For a very long time, curriculum creation has been accompanied by two types of evaluation: formative and summative (Scriven, 1967). When information is actively keyed to the improvement of the curriculum, formative evaluation occurs (Tamir, 1988). On the other hand, summative evaluation is carried out after the development is finished and informs users on how to use the contents supreme efficiently (Tamir, 1988). Evaluation or quality control is crucial to determine whether a deployed curriculum is successful or not (Lewy, 1977). The loss of the curriculum's efficiency, which may be partial, different, or unexpected, is referred to as "deterioration" (p.155). For instance, due to serious deterioration, Afghanistan's English as a Foreign Language (EFL) curriculum was entirely replaced with the current curriculum in 2001. As a result, evaluation is widely recognized as a potent tool for success in raising educational quality. Numerous models and designs have been used for evaluating programs, projects, or the operations of institutions, but the CIPP model is mostly employed in curriculum evaluation (Aziz, Mahmood & Rehman, 2018). evaluation as the process of outlining, acquiring, supplying, and using descriptive data on the value and merit of specific objects' aims, forms, achievements, and impacts to route the development compromises, provide documentation on liability, update decisions, and create an understanding of the practice enclosed as Ulum (2016) cites Stufflebeam (2003) in support of this definition. The approach can be used for both formative and summative evaluations, according to

(Stufflebeam, 2003) who also claims that it does so. The CIPP model has four-dimension input, context, process component and product component. The purpose of a context evaluation, according to Darama, Karaduman, Kahraman, and Gündodu (2018), is to define the atmosphere, determine the essential and utter circumstances connected to the environment, focus upon this unmet as well as disregarded requirements, and provide an explanation for the criteria that are not met. The input evaluation aims to evaluate the program's capabilities and resources, as well as the strategies and plans used to achieve the program's objectives. Expenditures, scheduling, implant development procedures, personnel and material resources, and cost benefit analyses may be part of these strategies and plans (To, 2017). The CIPP model views the levels of quality as a continuous assessment and documentation of the carried out plans and actions that guide activities and explain outcomes (Stufflebeam, 2000). Product evaluation concentrates on the identification and analysis of the planned, unplanned, good, unfavorable, brief, and lengthy effects of the program in order to keep the process going and review the program's performance (Stufflebeam, 2012; 2000; Stufflebeam and Coryn, 2014). The study used a quantitative design by applying the CIPP model questionnaire to collect data from 88 EFL lecturers and learners which was analyzed by SPSS version 24. The result of the study portrayed that Afghanistan EFL Lecturers and students' perception was positive about Paktia University languages and literature faculty English Department. In addition, the result showcased that according to product evaluation the curriculum was very strong with the mean 3.78 which can fulfill students and teachers needs in English but on the other hand, the context evaluation pointed out the weak zone of the curriculum with 3.29 means which needs amendments. The study recommended for mixed-method study to find out more reliable result.

RESEARCH METHODS

Data Analysis and Reports

The CIPP Model overall mean

The CIPP model overall mean The CIPP model aims is related to the evaluation process and to look into the components and all the strategies of evaluation. Furthermore, this model seeks to answer several questions such as; Is evaluation process working properly? What would be the problematic aspects, and how might they be resolved? Exist more effective ways to gather data (Gilchrist & Roberts, 1974)? The following Table indicates the overall mean of the students' and teachers' perception of the CIPP model components.

CIPP Model

Table 1. CIPP Model

CIPP Model	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Product Evaluation	88	3.78	.76
Process Evaluation	88	3.57	.72
Input Evaluation	88	3.45	.70
Context Evaluation	88	3.29	.83

The data in the Table 1 describes the respondents' perceptions of the CIPP model components. All four of the CIPP model's components were almost perceived by participants at the same level. The component product evaluation was ranked with a mean of 3.78 and 0.76 standard deviation, followed by the process evaluation with a mean 3.57 and .72 standard deviation. Besides, the subjects marked the input evaluation with a mean of 3.45

and 0.70 standard deviation. The context evaluation was marked with a mean 3.29 and 0.83 standard deviation.

Product Evaluation

The product evaluation is designed to recycle the process used for generating the product. The following Table indicate the perception of students and teacher of Paktia university regarding the product evaluation.

Table 2. Product Evaluation from Lectures and Student's Perspective

Statements	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
During the curriculum, the time spent on solving the students' problems about English is enough.	88	3.39	1.23
The curriculum meets the students' individual needs.	88	3.52	1.29
The curriculum meets the students' characteristics needs.	88	3.75	1.09
The curriculum meets the students' existing needs related with English.	88	3.88	1.05
The curriculum forms a basis for the students' future needs related with English.	88	3.80	.93
The curriculum contributes to the students' work related with their fields.	88	3.80	.93
The curriculum motivates the students to learn English.	88	3.63	1.07
The projects assigned according to the curriculum affect the students' language skills positively.	88	3.82	1.01
The curriculum increases the students' vocabulary knowledge in English.	88	3.53	1.04
The curriculum helps the students to acquire the habit of studying English.	88	3.85	.65
The curriculum helps the students to acquire the habit of studying in groups.	88	3.92	1.09
The curriculum gives the students the opportunity to use their knowledge.	88	3.65	.80
The students' improvement of English reading skills is satisfactory.	88	3.80	.85
The students' improvement of English writing skills is satisfactory.	88	3.90	1.00
The students' improvement of English listening skills is satisfactory.	88	3.76	1.33
The students' improvement of English speaking skills is satisfactory.	88	3.67	1.03
The students' improvement of English grammar is satisfactory.	88	3.97	.81
The knowledge of English the students acquire at the end of the curriculum is satisfactory.	88	4.03	.85
The English skills the students acquire at the end of the curriculum are satisfactory.	88	3.73	.95
The curriculum complies with the students' courses in their fields of study.	88	4.10	1.15
The curriculum helps the students to acquire the knowledge of English they need for their fields of study.	88	3.81	1.01
The curriculum helps the students to acquire the knowledge of English they need for various business areas.	88	3.78	1.19

For the product evaluation, the respondents believe that the curriculum complies with the students' courses in their fields of study with a high mean of 4.10 and 1.15 standard deviation while they think that the curriculum meets the students' individual needs with a low mean of 3.52 and 1.29 standard deviation. The respondents think that the knowledge of English the students acquire at the end of the curriculum is satisfactory with a high mean of 4.03 and

0.85 standard deviation. Besides, the participants ranked the statement "The students' improvement of English grammar is satisfactory" with a mean 3.97 and 0.81 standard deviation. For the statement "The curriculum meets the students' existing needs related with English" with a mean of 3.88 and 1.05 standard deviation.

Process Evaluation

The process evaluation addresses the application of decisions that manage and control the entire program and determines the congruency between the planned and actual activities. Besides it is to detect and predict in the design, to provide information for decisions and to maintain a record of the procedures as they occur. The Table below indicates the respondents' perception of process evaluation.

Table 3. Process Evaluation From Lecturers and Students'Perspective

Statements	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
The classwork of the curriculum has positive effects on the students' language skills.	88	3.82	1.08
Sufficient exercises are done about each new topic in the curriculum.	88	3.85	.75
When necessary, revision is included in the curriculum.	88	3.52	1.16
The consolidating homework is given to the students about the newly learned topics.	88	3.67	.97
The curriculum enables the students to participate in the course actively.	88	3.65	.81
The number of the formative tests applied during the curriculum is enough.	88	2.97	1.27
The program has activities suitable for pair and group work.	88	3.60	.98
The curriculum has activities in which all language skills can be applied.	88	3.76	.97

The responded belief that sufficient exercises are done about each new topic in the curriculum with a mean of high 3.85 and 0.75 standard deviation. Followed by the statement "The classwork of the curriculum has positive effects on the students' language skills." with a mean of 3.82 and 1.08 while the participants think that he number of the formative tests applied during the curriculum is enough with a low mean of 2.97 and 1.27 standard deviation.

Input Evaluation

Input evaluation provides information regarding resource use. It focuses on feasibility. Evaluators assess the school's ability to carry out evaluation. The Table below indicates the subjects' perception of input evaluation.

Table 4. Input Evaluation from Lecturers and Learners' Perspective

Statements	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
The classwork of the curriculum attracts the students' attention.	88	3.65	.80
The audio-visual materials of the curriculum help the students learn easily	88	3.52	.93
The content of the course book is comprehensible.	88	3.51	1.12
The classwork of the curriculum helps the students learn easily.	88	3.45	.90
The audio-visual materials of the curriculum attract the students' attention.	88	3.36	1.04
The audio-visual materials of the curriculum have positive effects on the students' language skills.	88	2.94	1.10

For the input evaluation the respondents' level the statement "The classwork of the curriculum attracts the students' attention" with a high mean 3.65 and 0.80 standard deviation followed by the statement "The audio-visual materials of the curriculum help the students learn easily" with a mean of 3.52 and 0.93 standard deviation, while the statement "The audio-visual materials of the curriculum have positive effects on the students' language skills" with a low mean of 2.94 and 1.10 standard deviation.

Context Evaluation

In context evaluation the evaluators the environment of the program's environment. The following Table describes the participants' perception of context evaluation.

Table 5. Context Evaluation from Lecturers and Learners' Perspective

Statements	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
The total duration of the curriculum is adequate.	88	3.73	1.02
The objectives of the curriculum are appropriate for the students' preliminary knowledge of English.	88	3.61	1.24
The coursebook of the curriculum is appropriate for the students' level.	88	3.32	1.22
The objectives of the curriculum meet the needs of the students regarding English.	88	3.27	1.26
The curriculum is appropriate for the improvement of the students' language skills.	88	3.25	1.01
The level of the difficulty of the topics in the curriculum complies with their duration.	88	3.18	1.17
The coursebook attracts the students' attention.	88	3.18	1.20
The curriculum has measurable objectives.	88	3.09	1.03
The reading, writing, listening and speaking skills are balanced well in the curriculum.	88	3.01	1.11

The context evaluation is ranked to be the fifth component of the CIPP model in this study. The respondents believe that the total duration of the curriculum is adequate with a high mean of 3.73 and 1.02 standard deviation. Followed by the statement "The objectives of the curriculum are appropriate for the students' preliminary knowledge of English" with a mean of 3.61 and 1.24 standard deviation while the respondents levelled the statement "The reading, writing, listening and speaking skills are balanced well in the curriculum with a mean of 3.01 and 1.11 standard deviation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Lecturers' and students' attitudes toward the English language department curriculum in the public universities of Afghanistan by using CIPP Model

H_0: There is no significant different among instructor' and students' perception of the English language department curriculum (CIPP Model) in the public universities of Afghanistan.

H_1: There is significant different among instructor' and students' perception of the English language department curriculum (CIPP Model) in the public universities of Afghanistan.

Statistics					Independent t-test		
CIPP Model	Major	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)

	Student	71	3.57	0.65	1.347	86	.182
	Teachers	17	3.33	.61			

A t-test has been conducted to find out the difference between the teachers' and students' perception of curriculum evaluation CIPP Model. From the t test results, it can be concluded that there is no statistically significant difference in perception between the two categories (teachers and students) of Paktia University. The mean difference seen between both categories is not a statistically significant difference. The t test fails to reject the null hypothesis.
t (86) = 1.347, p<0.05, p=0.182, the t test results show "that there was not a significant difference in the teacher's perception (M=3.33, SD= 0.61) and the students' perception (M=3.57, SD=0.65) conditions; t (86) = 1.34, p=0.182."

Lecturers' and students' attitudes toward Context of the English language department curriculum in the public universities of Afghanistan

H_0: There is no significant different between Lecturers' and students' attitudes toward Context of the English language department curriculum in the public universities of Afghanistan
H_1: There is significant different between Lecturers' and students' attitudes toward Context of the English language department curriculum in the public universities of Afghanistan

Statistics					Independent t-test		
Context Evaluation	Major	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Student	71	3.35	.85	1.464	86	.147
	Teachers	17	3.03	.68			

A t-test has been done to find out the difference between the teachers' and students' perception of context evaluation. The t test results show, that there is no statistically significant difference in perception of context evaluation between the two categories (teachers and students) of Paktia University. The mean difference seen between both categories is not significantly different. Thus, the t test fails to reject the null hypothesis.
t (86) = 1.464, p<0.05, p=0.147, the t test results show "that there was not a significant difference in the teacher's perception (M=3.03, SD= 0.68) and the students' perception (M=3.35, SD=0.85) conditions; t (86) = 1.46, p=0.147."

The lecturers' and students' attitudes toward Input Components of the English language department curriculum in the public universities of Afghanistan

H_0: There is no statistically significant differences between students' and teachers' attitude toward Input Components of the English language department curriculum in the public universities of Afghanistan.
H_1: There is no statistically significant differences between students' and teachers' attitude toward Input Components of the English language department curriculum in the public universities of Afghanistan.

Statistics					Independent t-test		
Input Evaluation	Major	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)

	Student	71	3.49	.71	1.091	86	.278
	Teachers	17	3.28	.65			

A t-test has been carried to find the difference between the teachers' and students' perception of input evaluation of curriculum. The results of t test show, that there is no statistically significant difference in perception of curriculum input evaluation between the two categories (teachers and students) of Paktia University. The mean difference between both categories is not statistically different. The t test fails to reject the null hypothesis.
t (86) = 1.091, p<0.05, p=0.278, the t test results show "that there was not a significant difference in the teacher's perception (M=3.28, SD= 0. 65) and the students' perception (M=3.49, SD=0.71) conditions; t (86) = 1.0, p=0.278."

The lecturers' and students' attitudes toward Process of the English language department curriculum in the public universities of Afghanistan?

H_0: There is no statistically significant differences between students' and teachers' attitude toward Process of the English language department curriculum in the public universities of Afghanistan.
H_1: There is statistically significant differences between students' and teachers' attitude toward Process of the English language department curriculum in the public universities of Afghanistan.

Statistics					Independent t-test		
Process Evaluation	Major	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Student	71	3.62	.72	1.141	86	.257
	Teachers	17	3.39	.74			

The researchers conducted a t test to find the difference between the teachers' and students' perception of curriculum process evaluation. The results of t test show, that there is no statistically significant difference in perception of curriculum input evaluation between the two categories (teachers and students) of Paktia University. The mean difference between both categories is not statistically different. The t test fails to reject the null hypothesis.
t (86) = 1.141, p<0.05, p=0.257, the t test results show "that there was not a significant difference in the teacher's perception (M=3.39, SD= 0.74) and the students' perception (M=3.62, SD=0.72) conditions; t (86) = 1.14, p=0.257."

The lecturers' and students' attitudes toward Product of the English language department curriculum in the public universities of Afghanistan

H_0: There is no statistically significant differences between students' and teachers' attitude toward Product of the English language department curriculum in the public universities of Afghanistan.
H_1: There is statistically significant differences between students' and teachers' attitude toward Product of the English language department curriculum in the public universities of Afghanistan.

Statistics					Independent t-test		
Product Evaluation	Major	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Student	71	3.82	.74	.870	86	.386
	Teachers	17	3.64	.82			

A t test was carried to find the difference between the teachers' and students' perception of curriculum process evaluation. The results of t test show, that there is no statistically significant difference in perception of curriculum input evaluation between the two categories (teachers and students) of Paktia University. The mean difference between both categories is not statistically different. The t test fails to reject the null hypothesis.
t (86) = 0.870, $p<0.05$, $p=0.386$, the t test results show "that there was not a significant difference in the teacher's perception (M=3.64, SD= 0.82) and the students' perception (M=3.82, SD=0.74) conditions; t (86) =0.870, p=0.386."

Discussion

The purpose of this research is to examine the English department curriculum at Paktia University from the viewpoints of both teachers and students. The study used a quantitative design with descriptive and inferential statistics. The results portray that overall mean for CIPP models components; product evaluation, process evaluation, input evaluation, and context evaluation is more than three and there is no noteworthy dissimilarity among instructors' and learners' view towards Paktia university English department curriculum regarding product evaluation, process evaluation, input evaluation and context evaluation (CIPP Model) which clearly indicates that Paktia university English department curriculum fulfil the dire need of CIPP model.

The result shows that teachers and students evaluated the Paktia University English department curriculum positively because the outcome of the curriculum was effective and can fulfill students' needs in learning. In addition, the curriculum of the English department was effective, sustainable, and transportable in production; thus, there was no substantial alteration between instructors' and learners' observations regarding product evaluation. In keeping with the evaluation of the program's favorable, unfavorable, lengthy, and brief effects, which helps us determine the process's efficacy (Stufflebeam, 2012; Stufflebeam and Coryn, 2014). In relation to, Warju (2016) portrayed four features, namely effectiveness, sustainability, impact, and transportability, which could help us in production evaluation. The key focus in evaluation is to find out whether the program objective meets learners' needs or not and boots teachers and learners to decide whether to remain stable or changes program (Stufflebeam, 2012). Furthermore, teachers and learners depicted that the Paktia university English department curriculum could support students to gain skills, knowledge, abilities, and attitudes, which they can practically use in their real life. In relation to, the production process is not only focusing on gained scores of students but also on attitudes, skills, knowledge, and abilities, which is used by learners in real life (Aziz, Mahmood and Rahman, 2018). Similarly, the finding of this research is equal to Al-Thuwaini (1986), which also marked attitudes, skills, knowledge, and abilities essential for the product evaluation (Apadier, M. M. M, 2020)..

Teachers and learners perceived Paktia university English department curriculum favorably regarding process components because it focuses on the activities, exercises, and tests, which helps students to work in groups and pairs to achieve their goals. Aziz, Mahmood, and Rahman (2018) illuminated that process evaluation emphasis putting the teaching and learning process into practice where the learners are given feedback to take responsibility for the curriculum activities. Furthermore, the plans and actions of curriculum guide Paktia English department teachers and learners to specific activities, which clearly describes the outcomes of the program. Regarding the CIPP model, the process component is the ongoing assessment of plans and action, which represents the outcomes of the program (Stufflebeam, 2000). The finding of this research is same with the finding of Mersinligil's

(2002), which also indicated that there was no significant difference between teachers and students' perceptions regarding process components.

The results also illustrated that there was no significant differences among teachers and students' perceptions regarding input evaluation because they believed that different approaches are implemented in this program, which showed an effective method for learners to gain their goals. In line with, Frye & Hemmer (2012) illustrated that input evaluation focus on the implementing of various approaches to find an effective method which assists us in achieving our context achieving objectives. The finding of this study is across with the finding of Nam (2005) because the participants of this study revealed that audio-visual material of the curriculums assists learners to learn easily; however, the respondents of Nam (2005) study believed that audio-visual materials do not support students to learn easily.

The respondents of this study do not show negative perceptions towards the Paktia university English department regarding context evaluation because it is aligned with the learners' goals. In addition, the curriculum overcomes the challenges, which precludes afghan learners from achieving their goals and provides chances to identify their goals. In defense, it is held that when determining the significance of a product, the rating context relates to the needs, difficulties, and opportunities as a foundation for setting goals and priorities (Stufflebeam, 2000; Hasan, Yasin, and Yunus, 2015). The finding of this study is similar to Yılmaz (2005) because the respondent of both studies believed that the objectives of the curriculum are appropriate for the students' preliminary knowledge of English.

CONCLUSION

This research seeks to assess the Paktia university English department curriculum from teachers' and students' perspectives. The study used a quantitative design with descriptive and inferential statistics. The results portray that overall mean for CIPP models components; product evaluation, process evaluation, input evaluation, and context evaluation is more than three and there is no significant difference among instructors' and students' perception towards Paktia university English department curriculum regarding product evaluation, process evaluation, input evaluation and context evaluation (CIPP Model) which clearly indicates that Paktia university English department curriculum fulfil the dire need of CIPP model.

The result shows that teachers and students evaluated the Paktia University English department curriculum positively because the outcome of the curriculum was effective and can fulfill students' needs in learning. In addition, the curriculum of the English department was effective, sustainable, and transportable in production; thus, there was no significant difference between teachers' and learners' perceptions regarding product evaluation. In addition, teachers and learners perceived Paktia university English department curriculum favorably regarding process components because it focuses on the activities, exercises, and tests, which helps students to work in groups and pairs to achieve their goals. The results also illustrated that there were no significant differences among teachers and students' perceptions regarding input evaluation because they believed that different approaches are implemented in this program, which showed an effective method for learners to gain their goals.

In summary, the respondents of this study do not show negative perceptions towards the Paktia university English department regarding context evaluation because it is aligned with the learners' goals. In addition, the curriculum overcomes the challenges, which precludes afghan learners from achieving their goals and provides chances to identify their goals.

REFERENCES

Agrawal, M. (2004). Curricular reform in schools: the importance of evaluation. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 36*(3), 361-379.

Al-Thuwaini, S. I. (1986). Attitudes of supervisors and teachers toward the social studies curriculum in Saudi Arabian elementary schools. Dissertation Abstracts International, 47 (08) 2989.

Apadier, M. M. M. (2020). Perspectives on the Strategies for Teaching and Learning English as a Second Language at the University of Juba, South Sudan. *Randwick International of Education and Linguistics Science Journal*, *1*(2), 217-225. https://doi.org/10.47175/rielsj.v1i2.88

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.

Darama, E., Karaduman, F., Kahraman, K., & Gündoğdu, K. (2018). Evaluation of 5th Grade English Curriculum According to Stufflebeam's Context, Input, Process, Product (CIPP) Model. *International Journal of Psycho-Educational Sciences,* 73-86.

Frye, A. W., & Hemmer, P. A. (2012). Program evaluation models and related theories: AMEE guide no. 67. Medical teacher, 34(5), e288-e299.

Hasan, A., Yasin, S. N. T. M., & Yunus, M. F. M. (2015). A Conceptual Framework for Mechatronics Curriculum Using Stufflebeam CIPP Evaluation Model. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences,* 195, 844-849.

Lewy, A. (1977). Handbook of curriculum evaluation. Paris: Unesco.

Mersinligil, G. (2002). İlköğretim dört ve beşinci sınıflarda uygulanan İngilizce dersi öğretim programının değerlendirilmesi (Adana İli Örneği). Doktora Tezi Çalışması, Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Elazığ.

Nam, J. M. (2005). Perceptions of Korean college students and teachers about communication- based English instruction: Evaluation of a college EFL curriculum in South Korea. A dissertation for the degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate School of the Ohio State University.

Scriven, M. (1967) The methodology of evaluation. In Tyler, R. W. (ed.) Perspectives of Curriculum Evaluation (Chicago: Rand McNally): 39-83

Stuffebeam, D.L. (2000). The CIPP model for evaluation. In Stufflebeam, D.L, Madaus, G. F., & Kellaghan, T. (Eds). Evaluation models: Viewpoints on educational and human services evaluation. (pp. 279-317). (2nd ed). Boston: Kluwer Academic

Stuffebeam, D.L. (2000). The CIPP model for evaluation. In Stufflebeam, D.L, Madaus, G. F., & Kellaghan, T. (Eds). Evaluation models: Viewpoints on educational and human services evaluation. (pp. 279-317). (2nd ed). Boston: Kluwer Academic

Stufflebeam, D. L. (2000). The CIPP model for evaluation. In Evaluation models (pp. 279-317). Springer, Dordrecht.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (2003). The CIPP model for evaluation. In International handbook of educational evaluation (pp. 31-62). Springer, Dordrecht. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-94-010-0309-4_4

Stufflebeam, D. L., & Coryn, C. L. (2014). Evaluation theory, models, and applications (Vol. 50). John Wiley & Sons.

Stufflebeam, D. L., & Coryn, C. L. (2014). Evaluation theory, models, and applications (Vol. 50). John Wiley & Sons.

Stufflebeam, D.L. (2012). The CIPP Evaluation Model: Status, Origin, Development, Use and Theory. In Alkin, M. C. (Ed.). (2012). Evaluation roots: A wider perspective of theorists' views and influences. (pp. 240-256). Sage Publications.

Tamir, P. (1988). The role of pre-planning curriculum evaluation in science education. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 20(3), 257-262

To, O. C. (2017). A Program Evaluation of an Apprenticeship Program using Stufflebeam's CIPP Model.

Tufflebeam, D.L. (2012). The CIPP Evaluation Model: Status, Origin, Development, Use and Theory. In Alkin, M. C. (Ed.). (2012). Evaluation roots: A wider perspective of theorists' views and influences. (pp. 240-256). Sage Publications

Ulum, Ö. G. (2016). Evaluation of English as a Foreign Language Program--Using CIPP (Context, Input, Process and Product) Model. Online Submission, 1(2), 114-137.

Warju, W. (2016). Educational program evaluation using CIPP model. *Innovation of Vocational Technology Education*, 12(1), 36-42.

Yılmaz, C. (2005). «İngilizce öğretmenliği bölümlerindeki öğrencilerin iletişimsel dil gereksinimleri ne ölçüde karşılanıyor?». Ondokuzmayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 19, 92-103.