

Opinions of Stakeholders about Evaluation of Middle-School Turkish and English Curriculum Dimensions

İsmail Gelen^{1,*} & Esra Aliş²

¹Department of Educational Science, Educational Curriculum and Training Subdepartment, Ondokuz Mayıs University, Samsun, Turkey

²Teacher (MED), Kanberli- İlyaslı Elementary School, Bafra, Samsun, Turkey

*Correspondence: Department of Educational Science, Educational Curriculum and Training Subdepartment, Ondokuz Mayıs University, Samsun, Turkey. Tel: 90-362-312-1919. E-mail: ismailgelen@omu.edu.tr

Received: September 20, 2019

Accepted: October 17, 2019

Online Published: October 29, 2019

doi:10.5430/jct.v8n4p13

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5430/jct.v8n4p13>

Abstract

The purpose of the research is to describe the problems in the program evaluation field according to curriculum's four different dimensions, to search if the problems differ significantly according to students' class level and teachers', administrators'/inspectors' seniority. The research used one of the quantitative research methods, the field survey model, which is descriptive research. The population of the research is Samsun city, and the target population of the research is middle-school students, teachers of Turkish and English branches, inspectors and administrators working at secondary schools in Samsun city's districts Atakum, Bafra, Canik and İlkadım. The research sample consists of middle-school students, teachers of Turkish and English branches, inspectors and administrators working at middle-schools in these districts, chosen with stratified sampling, a random sampling method. In the research, "Survey of Defining Problems about Curriculum Dimensions" is completed by the students, teachers and inspectors/administrators. When the participants' problems about the curriculum dimensions are examined, it is revealed that the most common problems they face is the lack of adequacy of functionality, flexibility, practicality, scientificness and actuality of the dimensions of curriculum. It is concluded that students' issues with program evaluation differ according to their class levels whereas the inspectors'/administrators' problems with program evaluation do not differ significantly according to their seniority.

Keywords: curriculum, program evaluation, curriculum dimensions

1. Introduction

Training programs are developed for purposes such as establishing a quality education system at national or international level, raising qualified manpower for the development and improvement of the country, and supporting the protection and development of social and cultural values. The implementation of the basic policies of national education happens through education programs. Accordingly, the programs serve as bridges in the spread and realization of the national education policy based on the unity and integrity of the Turkish Nation to the farthest corner of the country. Education programs also function as a tool to develop human behaviors in a way that enables them to be effective in social, political and economic order (Özdemir, 2009, p.127).

Training programs should be developed in a systematic, coordinated and scientific manner in order to fulfill these functions fully. While program development activities continue from the design of the program to its wide dissemination after being tested and corrected, a program development process in general includes the following stages (Turgut, 1983, Richards, 2001, Kiely, 2006, Oral & Yazar, 2017):

1. Preparation of the draft program and auxiliary materials,
2. Testing or try on the draft in real cases,
3. Evaluation of trial data from stakeholders and
4. Correction and dissemination of the draft according to the evaluation results.

Accordingly, education programs should be evaluated in an effective and continuous manner as well as

systematically, coordinated and scientifically developed. One of the most important process steps is the evaluation of the program. Because an educational program has the features such as functionality, flexibility, scientificity and applicability as a result of an effective program evaluation process. Effective program evaluation is possible through systematic, scientific and comprehensive evaluation studies.

It is the process of collecting data about the effectiveness of educational programs with program evaluation, observation and various measurement tools in education, comparing and interpreting the obtained data with the criteria which are the indicators of the effectiveness of the program (Erden, 1998). Chelimsky (1989, Yazçayır, 2016) describes program evaluation as the application of systematic research methods to determine the design, realization level and effectiveness of the program.

The effectiveness and usefulness of the training program is directly related to the validity and reliability of the program evaluation study. The fact that the program evaluation study provides valid and reliable information is directly proportional to the quality and quantity of the opinions of the stakeholders involved in the study. When the program evaluation studies are examined, most common problems are that the studies are far from systematic, that they do not give sufficient room for stakeholder views, and that they are not scientific-comprehensive and dynamic. This situation shows that program evaluation, which has a very important and indispensable place in program developing, is one of the areas ignored in Turkey (Yuksel, 2010; Abuammar, 2018).

In 2017-2018 academic year in Turkey, Ministry of National Education conducted a pilot study (53 courses of preschool, elementary school, middle school levels having been developed in draft program) and in the years 2018-2019, the programs started to be implemented in schools (MEB, 2017), however, unfortunately, the pilot programs are again not evaluated adequately. While developing these programs, first of all, the basic skills and competencies necessary for the students to be successful in higher education, work and daily life, literature review, research conducted by different institutions, education programs of the countries who were highly in successful International Student Assessment Program (PISA) and International Mathematics and Science Trends Research (TIMSS) were examined. The information obtained was evaluated in accordance to Turkey's high goals, and interests in accordance with the programs evaluated and were put forward as evidence-based targets. The following eight criteria have guided the process of setting these objectives and developing programs (MEB, 2017):

1. The requirements of being successful in university and professional life and being coherent
2. Clarity and legibility
3. Equality between regions
4. Practical orientation
5. Consistency with the country's current education standards
6. Consistency with international education standards
7. Suitability for classroom use and realism
8. Being evidence and research-based

Monitoring and evaluation of the existing programs implemented for the first time in the 2017-2018 academic year are carried out by using quantitative and qualitative research methods, and the studies are carried out jointly by the Directorate of Education and Training, General Directorate of Primary Education and General Directorate of Secondary Education (MEB, 2017).

With the "2023 Education Vision Document" published by the Ministry of National Education in October 2018, it was announced that radical changes in education will be made. It is stated in the vision document that the curriculum will be structured as flexible and modular structures and that teachers can arrange the curriculum according to students' readiness, differences, abilities, interests and needs and environmental conditions. In this context, it is planned to organize flexible elective course hours, to establish design-skill workshops to explore students' abilities, to create special curricula for disadvantaged groups, to evaluate and improve the curricula in many respects. Although there is no mention of program evaluation, any infrastructure work, planning or software related to the implementation in the 2023 Education Vision Document, it states that, a continuous change, improvement and development process will take place in the programs (MEB, 2018). As the first indicator of this evaluation Ministry of National Education conducted Turkish-Mathematics-Science Student Success Monitoring Research for the first time based on this vision document (MEB, 2019).

The problem of the research is related to "secondary school Turkish and English curriculum". In this context, it is

aimed to reveal the problems related to the dimensions of the curriculum by evaluating each dimension of secondary school Turkish and English curriculum separately. This research is considered important in terms of describing the problems according to the opinions of the stakeholders by examining the secondary school Turkish and English programs over the dimensions of acquisition, content, learning-teaching process and assessment-evaluation process of the program.

2. Method

2.1 Research Model

The research is a descriptive research to determine the current situation of the problems related to the evaluation of the dimensions of the curriculum in basic education. The objectives of the study are the problems of the secondary school Turkish and English curriculum according to the dimensions of acquisition, content, learning-teaching process and assessment-evaluation process (functionality, framework, flexibility, compatibility with social values and general aims of National Education, applicability) and to include general elements (scientific, timeliness).

a-According to the grade level of students

b- according to seniority of teachers

c- according to seniority of inspectors / administrators

test whether there is a significant difference in terms of the characteristics of the program.

In this research, survey model was deemed appropriate since opinions of various stakeholders were taken in order to achieve sub-objectives. In order to determine the deficiencies and deficiencies in a program, the subject area and program development experts, teachers, parents, administrators and so on. The studies in which the opinions are taken are in the survey model which is one of the descriptive research types (Erden, 1998). According to one of the program evaluation models Participant- Oriented Evaluation Approaches stakeholders' opinions about program evaluation are very important (Madau, Stufflebeam, & Kellaghan, 2002). So in this research, students', teachers' and supervisors' / administrators' opinions were determined by collecting the current situation of problems related to Turkish and English teaching programs in the survey (field survey) model (Büyüköztürk, Kılıç Çakmak, Erkan Akgün, Karadeniz, & Demirel, 2008; Mertkan, 2015) used.

2.2 Population and Sampling

The study population was all Turkey. Atakum, Bafra, Canik and İlkadım districts of Samsun were determined as the study population. In the research, stratified sampling, one of the random sampling methods, was used. Random sampling is a sampling method that is used in quantitative studies and is the method of withdrawing a small group that includes all the characteristics of the universe assuming that the characteristics are distributed normally in the universe (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2011). In the stratified sampling method, it is aimed to represent the characteristics of the study population in the sample without rates of the defined proportions. In this method, the study universe is divided into subgroups by the researcher and sub-clusters are selected from each subgroup according to their amount in the universe (Çepni, 2007). In this context, the sample of the study consists of secondary school students selected by stratified sampling from random sampling methods from Atakum, Bafra, Canik and İlkadım districts of Samsun province, teachers from secondary school Turkish and English branches, supervisors and administrators working in secondary schools.

2.3 Data Collection Tools

In accordance with the purpose and sub-objectives of the research, a quantitative data collection tool consisting of three parallel questionnaires was developed by the researchers themselves for this research. These are the Questionnaires for Determining Problems Related to the Dimensions of the Program prepared in three different ways for students, teachers and supervisors / administrators. In developing data collection tools, first of all, the features that a program should have were determined. These features are: *functionality, Framingwork, flexibility, being compatible with social values and the general aims of National Education, applicability, including invariant and general elements, scientificity, timeliness* (İşman and Eskicumalı, 2006; Aykaç and Aydin, 2006; Hesapçıoğlu, 1994). In order to evaluate the dimensions of acquisition, content, learning-teaching process and measurement-evaluation process of each of the secondary school Turkish and English curriculum according to the above- mentioned eight features, a pool of items/ questions corresponding to these features was created and presented to expert opinion and data collection tools were developed in line with these opinions. The items in the three questionnaires prepared for students, teachers and supervisors / administrators are parallel to each other and each item evaluates a specific

feature of the program according to the four different dimensions of the program.

The Questionnaire for Determining Problems Related to the Dimensions of the Program prepared as a data collection tool is a 5-point Likert type and the response options are percentage-based Likert model. In the questionnaire developed for the students, there are 8 items for each of the dimensions of acquisition, content, learning-teaching and measurement-evaluation process of the Turkish and English curriculum, 32 items for each of the courses and a total of 64 items. In the questionnaire, the students are asked to know the level of class which is one of the independent variables of the research. The validity and reliability coefficients of the data collection tool for the students were calculated and the results in Table 1 were obtained.

Table 1. Reliability and Validity Coefficients of the Data Collection Tool for Students According to Lessons and Dimensions

| Analysis | | Lessons | | Dimensions | | |
|-------------|--------------------|---------|---------|--------------|---------|----------------------------|
| | | Turkish | English | Acquisitions | Content | Learning -teaching process |
| Reliability | Cronbach Alpha | .86 | .87 | .92 | .93 | .91 |
| Validity | Described variance | .50 | .51 | .67 | .68 | .72 |

The Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient was found to be greater than 0.80 for each dimension of the questionnaire administered to 437 individuals. According to this, it can be stated that the data collection tool developed for the students is high in reliability and consistent in terms of the dimensions of the courses and the program. When the outputs were examined, no item was excluded from the analysis because the communality value of the variables was ≥ 0.45 , so no item with a low common variance below 0.45 was found. As a result of the validity and reliability analyzes, it can be said that the data collection tool for the students used in the research is valid and reliable according to the dimensions of the program.

In the questionnaire developed for teachers, there are 8 items from each of the program's acquisition, content, learning-teaching and measurement-evaluation processes, and a total of 32 items. In the survey, teachers are asked for seniority information which is one of the independent variables of the research. The validity and reliability coefficients of the data collection tool for teachers were calculated and the results in Table 2 were obtained.

Table 2. Reliability and Validity Coefficients of the Data Collection Tool for Teachers

| Dimensions Analysis | | Acquisitions | Content | Learning-Teaching process | Measuring-Evaluation Process | All Test |
|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------|---------------------------|------------------------------|----------|
| Reliability | Cronbach Alpha | .72 | .57 | .70 | .79 | .90 |
| Validity | Explained Variance | .52 | .59 | .50 | .47 | .62 |

The Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient was found to be greater than 0.80 for the whole questionnaire. Accordingly, the data collection tool developed for teachers is reliable according to the dimensions of the program and it can be stated that the questionnaire is consistent within itself. When the outputs were examined, since the communality value of the variables was ≥ 0.50 , that is, no item with a low common variance below 0.50 was found and no item was excluded from the analysis. As a result of the factor analysis, since the variance value explained for the dimensions other than the measurement-evaluation process in the data collection tool was ≥ 0.50 , it was seen that the questionnaire had validity to measure the desired properties. As a result of the validity and reliability analyzes, it can be said that the data collection tool for teachers used in the research is valid and reliable according to the dimensions of the program.

The questionnaire developed for inspectors / administrators includes 8 items for each of the dimensions of acquisition, content, learning-teaching and assessment-evaluation process of the secondary school Turkish and English curriculum, and 64 items for each of the courses. In the survey, the participants are asked for seniority information which is one of the independent variables of the research. In the study conducted with the inspectors / administrators, descriptive statistics were used for the data obtained from the data collection tool developed for the inspectors / administrators because the sample was not large enough ($N = 31$). Two ways are adopted for the validity of this data collection tool. First, the survey was presented to expert opinion. Necessary changes were made in line

with the opinions of two academic staff in the Department of Education Programs and Instruction and the validity of the questionnaire was ensured. After the corrections, the inter-rater agreement was recalculated and $r = .90$. Secondly, the opinions of the participants about the data collection tool were taken. The purpose of the questionnaire was compared with the opinions of the participants about the data collection tool and the internal consistency of the questionnaire was ensured.

2.4 Data Collection and Analysis

Data collection tools, with the permission of Ondokuz Mayıs University Ethics Committee and Samsun Provincial MEM in the 2015-2016 academic year were applied to, 437 students, 78 Turkish teachers, 57 English teachers in total 135 teachers and 31 inspectors / administrators in Atakum, Canik, Ilkadim and Bafra districts in Samsun. The questionnaires were applied by the researchers themselves, and the necessary explanations were made to the participants before the application, so that all questions were answered completely. Since the data set obtained in the study showed normal distribution, parametric analyzes were used in addition to descriptive statistical analyzes. In the study, the level of the program evaluation problems of the participants was determined based on the limits and groupings in Table 3:

Table 3. Limits and Groupings on Options in Data Collection Instruments (Yüksel, 2010)

| Options | Limits | Levels | Limits |
|-----------------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|
| I totally agree | 4.30 - 5.00 | I agree | 3.50 - 5.00 |
| I agree | 3.50 - 4.29 | | |
| Undecided | 2.70 - 3.49 | Undecided | 2.70 - 3.49 |
| I do not agree | 1.90 - 2.69 | | |
| I do not agree at all | 1.0 - 1.89 | I do not agree | 1.00 - 2.69 |

According to Table 3, the arithmetic mean of any item in the data collection means;

- Participants agree with the opinion stated in the article if they are equal to or equal to 3.50 - 5.00,
- If the participants are between 2.70 and 3.49 or equal to these values, the participants are undecided or partially agree with the opinion stated in the article,
- If they are equal to or equal to 1.00 - 2.69, the participants do not agree with the opinion stated in the article.

3. Results

In this section, the findings obtained from the statistical analysis of the data collected from teachers, students, administrators and inspectors in order to determine the problems related to the dimensions of the program are included.

3.1 The Results and Discussion of the Dimension of Secondary Turkish Education in terms of the Features that the Program Needs to Have

Descriptive statistical analysis of the problems of students, teachers, inspectors / administrators about the dimensions of the program of Turkish course is given in Table 4:

When the items related to the functionality of the program are examined in Table 4, it can be stated that the gains in the Turkish curriculum are functional and useful, the content is not functional enough and the content should be reviewed and selected from the topics that will work in daily life. Teachers' ambivalence about the functionality of the program's learning-teaching and assessment-evaluation processes shows that activities of these dimensions do not serve the purpose of the program sufficiently. When the items 2 in Table 4 are examined, it is stated that the Turkish program is generally a framework program. According to this view, it can be said that there is no synchronization problem in the implementation of the Turkish program throughout the country. In terms of flexibility; only students think that all dimensions of the program are flexible and can adapt to changing conditions; teachers and inspectors / administrators are undecided about the flexibility of the Turkish curriculum. It can be said that the Turkish program is generally in line with the social values and the general aims of the National Education. Among the groups that participated in the study, only the students thought that the Turkish curriculum, acquisition, content and assessment process were feasible and they were undecided about the applicability of the learning-teaching process. Teachers and inspectors/administrators stated that the gains, learning-teaching and assessment activities are not applicable and they are undecided about the applicability of the content. In terms of ***being unchangeable and general***; according to the opinions of the participants, it can be said that all dimensions of the Turkish program contain unchanging and general

elements such as national holidays and important days. In terms of science; The students and supervisors / administrators have similar opinions and think that the gains, content and assessment process are determined by scientific studies. While the students are undecided about the scientificness of their learning-teaching situations, the inspectors / administrators think that the activities in the learning-teaching process are not determined by scientific studies. Teachers, on the other hand, are undecided about the scientificness of all aspects of the Turkish curriculum. Accordingly, it can be said that the learning-teaching activities of the Turkish program are far from scientific. In terms of topicality; all the groups that participated in the study think that the learning and teaching process of the program is dynamic and renewable. While students think that content and assessment process are dynamic, they are undecided about the dynamics of the gains. Inspectors/administrators think that the achievements and measurement-evaluation activities are updateable, but they are undecided about the actuality of the content. Teachers state that they are undecided about the dynamics of all dimensions except the learning-teaching process.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistical Results of Students, Teachers, Inspectors / Administrators on the Problems Related to the Dimensions of the Turkish Course Program

| Dimensions of the Program | Article No | Feature that Program measures | Student N = 437 | | | Teacher N = 78 | | | Supervisor N= 31 | | |
|---|------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|------|------|----------------|------|------|------------------|------|------|
| | | | | ss | | ss | | ss | | ss | |
| Acquisitions | 1 | Functionality | 4:29 | .95 | 3.87 | 3.5 | .98 | 3:45 | 3.87 | .89 | |
| | 2 | Framing | 3.97 | 1:16 | | 3.71 | 1:09 | | 3:42 | 1.26 | 3:59 |
| | 3 | Flexibility | 4:06 | 1:05 | | 3.23 | 1:01 | | 3:13 | 1:18 | |
| | 4 | Compliance with general objectives | 4:14 | 1:08 | | 3.78 | .73 | | 3.90 | .91 | |
| | 5 | Applicability | 4.12 | 1:01 | | 3.49 | .96 | | 3:52 | 1:18 | |
| | 6 | Invariance and generality | 4:02 | 1.14 | | 3.68 | .81 | | 3.90 | .94 | |
| | 7 | Scientific | 3.71 | 1:29 | | 3.00 | 1:06 | | 3:45 | 1:06 | |
| | 8 | Actuality | 2.67 | 1:38 | | 3:18 | 1:13 | | 3:48 | .96 | |
| Content | 1 | Functionality | 2.93 | 1:51 | 3.89 | 2.9 | 1:11 | 3:43 | 3:36 | 1:08 | |
| | 2 | Framing | 3.91 | 1:24 | | 3:59 | .90 | | 3:58 | 1:15 | 3:50 |
| | 3 | Flexibility | 3.90 | 1:27 | | 3:36 | 1:02 | | 3:07 | 1:18 | |
| | 4 | Compliance with general objectives | 4:07 | 1.14 | | 3.71 | .79 | | 3.65 | 1:05 | |
| | 5 | Applicability | 4:44 | .86 | | 3:41 | .93 | | 3:39 | 1:05 | |
| | 6 | Invariance and generality | 4:04 | 1.14 | | 3.65 | .85 | | 3.84 | .93 | |
| | 7 | Scientific | 4:04 | 1:18 | | 3:35 | .98 | | 3.81 | .83 | |
| | 8 | Actuality | 3.90 | 1:19 | | 3:41 | .96 | | 3:36 | 1.14 | |
| Learning- Teaching Process | 1 | Functionality | 4:10 | 1.14 | 3.76 | 3:32 | 1:04 | | 3.71 | 1:01 | 3.67 |
| | 2 | Framing | 3.91 | 1.22 | | 3:47 | .91 | 3:50 | 3:58 | .96 | |
| | 3 | Flexibility | 4:02 | 1:15 | | 3:40 | 1:02 | | 3:39 | 1:12 | |
| | 4 | Compliance with general objectives | 4:09 | 1:13 | | 3.78 | .77 | | 3.87 | .89 | |
| | 5 | Applicability | 3:30 | 1:47 | | 3:55 | .95 | | 3:45 | 1:12 | |
| | 6 | Invariance and generality | 3.91 | 1.22 | | 3:59 | .90 | | 3.90 | .91 | |
| | 7 | Scientific | 3:18 | 1:51 | | 3:35 | 1:09 | | 3:55 | 1.26 | |
| | 8 | Actuality | 3:53 | 1:39 | | 3:51 | .94 | | 3.90 | .83 | |
| Measurement and Evaluation Process | 1 | Functionality | 4:29 | 1:03 | 3.85 | 3:22 | 1:04 | 3:34 | 3:58 | 1:03 | 3:54 |
| | 2 | Framing | 3:58 | 1:29 | | 3:40 | .93 | | 3.77 | 1:02 | |
| | 3 | Flexibility | 3.82 | 1:17 | | 3:18 | 1:04 | | 3:29 | 1:19 | |
| | 4 | Compliance with general objectives | 3.88 | 1.23 | | 3:53 | .94 | | 3:52 | 1:06 | |
| | 5 | Applicability | 4:06 | 1:12 | | 3:55 | .93 | | 3:16 | 1:24 | |
| | 6 | Invariance and generality | 3.65 | 1:34 | | 3:37 | 1:07 | | 3.90 | .79 | |
| | 7 | Scientific | 3.78 | 1:32 | | 3:21 | 1:04 | | 3:45 | 1:12 | |
| | 8 | Actuality | 3.78 | 1:25 | | .330 | 1:02 | | 3.61 | 1:09 | |

When the findings are evaluated together, it can be stated that the gains in the Turkish curriculum are functional and useful, and that the content is not *functional* enough and the subjects in the content should be reviewed and selected from the topics that will work in daily life. The fact that teachers are undecided about the functionality of the program's learning-teaching and assessment-evaluation processes shows that the activities in these dimensions do not serve the purpose of the program sufficiently and that the activities should be made useful. Similarly, it was found that the end-of-theme evaluation activities in Turkish textbooks were mostly at the level of knowledge level of the cognitive domain (Göçer, 2008) and a low level relationship in context, input and process dimensions of the 2015 and 2018 Turkish Curriculum (Bağcioğlu, 2019). This has a negative impact on the validity and functionality of the measurement tools. In addition, in the same research, the deficiencies in the reinforcing activities of the assessment activities in the student textbook were identified. In parallel with the results of the research, Karadüz (2009) states that in his research, there is no constructivist evaluation in Turkish course, and more product evaluation is performed in the central system examinations than in the process. In the study, it is stated that the Turkish program usually has framework qualifications. According to this view, it can be said that there is no synchronization problem in the implementation of the Turkish program throughout the country.

Among the groups that participated in the study, only the students thought that all dimensions of the program were *flexible* and that they could *adapt* to changing conditions; teachers and inspectors / administrators are undecided about the flexibility of the Turkish curriculum. Similar to this result, Yaman (2009) states that the activities in the Turkish program should be flexible enough to be applied especially in crowded classes. The result of the research conducted by Yiğit and Kırımlı (2014) is the opposite of this view and the Turkish teachers who participated in the research stated that they gave study subjects in accordance with their interests, needs and desires in their performance assignments.

In terms of *applicability*, Turkish curriculum has serious problems. Among the groups that participated in the study, only the students thought that the Turkish curriculum, acquisition, content and assessment process were **feasible and** they were undecided about the *applicability* of the learning-teaching process. Teachers and inspectors / administrators stated that the gains, learning-teaching and assessment activities are not applicable and they are undecided about the applicability of the content. Durukan (2015) states that the gains of Turkish lessons should be rearranged in terms of clarity, applicability and measurability by taking the opinions of teachers and academicians. In addition, Özbay (2008) found that there were inconsistencies in the application and understanding of Turkish gains in his research. Similarly, in a study conducted by Duman (2004), teachers and administrators did not find the objectives of reading, listening, speaking and writing in Turkish curriculum sufficiently feasible. In a study by Yaman (2009), Turkish teachers state that the learning-teaching process activities in the program are not suitable for crowded classes. In the same research, it is stated that the crowded classes decrease the efficiency and prevent the Turkish lesson from reaching its aim. Considering that the Turkish curriculum is prepared with a constructivist approach, classroom management is difficult and challenging to apply in crowded classrooms, the physical conditions and technical infrastructure of schools are not suitable for the program, the implementation of alternative measurement and evaluation methods is long and teachers do not have enough information about this program may be among the reasons for the negative opinions about its applicability. Yiğit and Kırımlı's (2014) study supports this view, and Turkish teachers participating in the research have experienced alternative assessment-evaluation because of the insufficient physical condition of the classes, the excess of class size, the lack of weekly teaching hours, the complexity of the scales and the difficulty in classroom management during the implementation of these methods. In another study, Turkish teachers think that using measurement-assessment tools such as peer assessment, observation form and self-assessment, which provides process assessment, especially in crowded classrooms, takes a long time and increases the burden (Karadüz, 2009). Karaca stated in his doctoral dissertation in 2018 that there are important factors that hinder the effective implementation of the program and that the previous problems of the 2017 English curriculum are the continuation of the program, and that the same problems continue to exist. Karaca (2008) also found that there is a mismatch between the planned and the actual in terms of the learning-teaching process and evaluation elements of the program.

When the findings are evaluated, it can be said that especially the learning and teaching activities of the Turkish program are far from *scientific* and that the improvement studies on this subject are insufficient. The same situation continues in the new (2018) program (Avci, 2018).

In terms of *actuality and dynamics*; While the students think that the content and assessment process of the secondary school Turkish program is dynamic, it is undecided about the dynamics of the gains. Inspectors / administrators think that the achievements and measurement-evaluation activities are updateable, but they are undecided about the actuality of the content. Teachers state that they are undecided about the dynamics of all

dimensions except the learning-teaching process. Benzer and Eldem (2013) stated that teachers generally use classical assessment tools in Turkish lesson and they do not apply alternative assessment-evaluation activities such as self-assessment and peer assessment. This opinion supports the opinion of the teachers participating in the research.

In the research, it is seen that the problems related to program evaluation related to Turkish curriculum sub-dimensions do not differ according to seniority of teachers and supervisors / administrators. There is a significant difference between students' problems related to program evaluation related to Turkish curriculum sub-dimensions and grade levels. According to this, there is a significant difference between 5th grade students and 6th, 7th and 8th grade students in all dimensions except the learning-teaching process dimension of the program in favor of 5th grade students. In addition, there is a significant difference between the 6th and 8th grade students in favor of 6th grade students in terms of acquisition and measurement-evaluation process, and the 7th and 8th grade students in favor of 7th grade students in content dimension. In terms of learning-teaching process, there is a significant difference between 5th grade and 6th and 8th grade students in favor of 5th grade students. Accordingly, as the students' class levels and ages increase, their positive opinions about Turkish curriculum are replaced by negative opinions. In this case, it can be said that the number and type of problems related to the dimensions of the program increases as the students' grade levels and ages increase as a result of the development of critical thinking skills or the increase of exam anxiety.

3.2 The Results and Discussion of the Dimension of Secondary English Education in terms of the Features that the Program Needs to Have

The descriptive statistical analysis of the problems of the students, teachers, supervisors/managers related to the dimension of English lessons are provided in Table 5;

According to Table 5, while students and inspectors/administrators think that the learning-teaching and measurement-evaluation processes of the English program are functional, teachers are undecided about it. Regarding the dimension of the learning outcome, the students and teachers think that the gains are functional, while the inspectors / administrators are undecided. For the content dimension, students and supervisors/administrators are undecided while teachers think that the content is useful and functional. According to Table 5, the participants of the study indicated that all dimensions of the English lessons' syllabuses have a framework program feature. In terms of flexibility; while students think that the English program has flexibility, teachers and supervisors are undecided about the flexibility of the program. According to Table 5, it can be said that the outline of the English program is the same throughout the country and it is compatible with the social values and the general aims of the National Education. While students think that the learning outcome, content, and assessment process dimensions of the English program are feasible, teachers and inspectors/administrators are undecided about the applicability of these dimensions. In addition, students, teachers and inspectors/administrators are undecided about the applicability of the dimension of learning-teaching process of the program. According to Table 5, it is seen that the English curriculum is insufficient in terms of having general elements and stability. In terms of scientific; the students are only undecided about the scientific of the learning-teaching process of the program, while they think the other dimensions are scientific. Teachers think that only the content dimension is scientific, but they are uncertain about the scientific of the other dimensions. Inspectors/administrators think that content and assessment activities are scientific and learning-teaching process is not scientific while they are undecided about the scientific of the learning outcomes. In terms of actuality and dynamism, it can be said that the learning-teaching process of the English program is updated and dynamic, but the learning outcomes are not up-to-date. While students and supervisors / administrators think that content and assessment activities are consistent with current knowledge, teachers are undecided about it.

Table 5. Descriptive Statistical Results of Students, Teachers, Inspectors / Administrators on the Problems Related to the Dimensions of the English Course Program

| Dimensions of the Program | Article No | Feature that program measures | Students N=437 | | | Teacher N=57 | | | Supervisors - Managers N=31 | | |
|------------------------------------|------------|------------------------------------|----------------|------|------------------|--------------|------|------------------|-----------------------------|------|------------------|
| | | | X | ss | X _{ort} | X | Ss | X _{ort} | X | ss | X _{ort} |
| Acquisitions | 1 | Functionality | 4.07 | 1.14 | 3.67 | 3.63 | 1.05 | | 3.42 | 1.23 | 3.46 |
| | 2 | Framing | 4.03 | 1.12 | | 3.79 | 1.11 | 3.51 | 3.74 | 1.13 | |
| | 3 | Flexibility | 3.82 | 1.19 | | 3.40 | 1.16 | | 3.16 | 1.24 | |
| | 4 | Compliance with general objectives | 3.79 | 1.24 | | 3.90 | .90 | | 3.74 | 1.10 | |
| | 5 | Applicability | 3.77 | 1.26 | | 3.16 | 1.19 | | 3.39 | 1.17 | |
| | 6 | Invariance and generality | 3.33 | 1.39 | | 3.77 | .95 | | 3.55 | 1.31 | |
| | 7 | Scientific | 3.62 | 1.32 | | 3.28 | 1.05 | | 3.29 | 1.16 | |
| | 8 | Actuality | 2.91 | 1.39 | | 3.17 | 1.14 | | 3.39 | 1.09 | |
| Content | 1 | Functionality | 2.97 | 1.46 | 3.65 | 2.58 | 1.00 | | 2.65 | 1.20 | 3.30 |
| | 2 | Framing | 3.91 | 1.20 | | 3.79 | 1.08 | 3.41 | 3.68 | 1.11 | |
| | 3 | Flexibility | 3.67 | 1.34 | | 3.19 | 1.20 | | 2.84 | 1.32 | |
| | 4 | Compliance with general objectives | 3.75 | 1.25 | | 3.72 | .92 | | 3.45 | 1.12 | |
| | 5 | Applicability | 4.16 | 1.12 | | 3.19 | 1.13 | | 3.32 | .98 | |
| | 6 | Invariance and generality | 3.28 | 1.38 | | 3.88 | .66 | | 3.45 | 1.09 | |
| | 7 | Scientific | 3.73 | 1.26 | | 3.49 | 1.02 | | 3.52 | 1.00 | |
| | 8 | Actuality | 3.76 | 1.27 | | 3.40 | 1.13 | | 3.52 | 1.03 | |
| Learning-Teaching Process | 1 | Functionality | 3.83 | 1.30 | | 3.32 | 1.04 | | 3.55 | 1.18 | |
| | 2 | Framing | 3.84 | 1.26 | | 3.72 | .94 | | 3.74 | .89 | |
| | 3 | Flexibility | 3.90 | 1.21 | | 3.40 | 1.01 | | 3.16 | 1.21 | |
| | 4 | Compliance with general objectives | 3.68 | 1.33 | | 3.74 | .81 | | 3.68 | 1.08 | |
| | 5 | Applicability | 3.40 | 1.46 | | 3.19 | 1.01 | | 3.32 | 1.08 | |
| | 6 | Invariance and generality | 3.26 | 1.39 | | 3.67 | .87 | | 3.81 | .95 | |
| | 7 | Scientific | 3.22 | 1.49 | | 3.32 | 1.02 | | 3.45 | 1.29 | |
| | 8 | Actuality | 3.51 | 1.41 | | 3.51 | .83 | | 3.81 | 1.01 | |
| Measurement and Evaluation Process | 1 | Functionality | 4.10 | 1.19 | | 3.30 | 1.00 | | 3.71 | 1.04 | 3.55 |
| | 2 | Framing | 3.50 | 1.31 | | 3.61 | .86 | | 3.71 | 1.16 | |
| | 3 | Flexibility | 3.60 | 1.26 | | 3.37 | .99 | | 3.19 | 1.17 | |
| | 4 | Compliance with general objectives | 3.63 | 1.30 | | 3.67 | .93 | | 3.58 | .92 | |
| | 5 | Applicability | 3.90 | 1.23 | | 3.21 | 1.07 | | 3.19 | 1.33 | |
| | 6 | Invariance and generality | 3.03 | 1.40 | | 3.56 | 1.02 | | 3.84 | .97 | |
| | 7 | Scientific | 3.66 | 1.37 | | 3.39 | 1.01 | | 3.48 | 1.06 | |
| | 8 | Actuality | 3.64 | 1.34 | | 3.44 | .95 | | 3.71 | .94 | |

While students and supervisors / administrators think that the learning-teaching and assessment-evaluation processes of the English curriculum are functional, teachers are undecided. Regarding the dimension of the learning outcome, the students and teachers think that the outcomes are functional, while the inspectors / administrators are undecided. For the content dimension, students and supervisors/administrators are undecided while teachers think that the content is useful and functional. The results of the research are similar to the results of some researches in this field. In the researches in which the dimensions of the English syllabus were evaluated, the teachers stated that the

objectives were aimed at gaining reading, writing, speaking and listening skills (Erbilen-Sak, 2008; Cihan and Gürlen, 2013). However, some studies show that teachers have negative views about the functionality of the objectives (Küçük, 2008; Topkaya and Küçük, 2010). This result is similar to the opinions of the inspectors / administrators participating in the research. In the study conducted by Er (2006), teachers and inspectors stated that the objectives in the 4th grade English curriculum could not meet the needs of students in daily life. In line with this view, İnam-Çelik (2009) stated that although the 4th grade students were willing, they could not use English actively in daily life. This situation negatively affects the functionality of the program outcomes. Küçük (2008) stated that students had difficulty in some units of English course and this situation negatively affected students' self-efficacy awareness. In the same research, it was stated that the reading pieces in the content were functional so that they could be used in real life. In parallel with this view, in the research Er (2006) conducted, while inspectors thought that the content of the 4th and 5th grade program did not encourage students to speak English in daily life, the teachers thought that the content was intended for daily life. Kozikoğlu's (2014) study with 7th grade students yielded similar results. In this study, it is stated that the educational experiences in the English course do not fully conform to the constructivist approach on which the program is based and that the teachers operate the lesson with traditional methods. In addition, it was stated that grammar activities were generally included in the lessons and listening, writing and speaking activities which had more place in daily life were not given enough space. İnam-Çelik (2009) stated that the number of speaking, writing, reading and listening activities in the program should be increased as a result of his research. Similarly, Tanis (2007) stated that the activities in foreign language teaching are teacher-centered, not intended for daily life, and therefore the desired success cannot be achieved. In foreign language teaching, the fact that learning-teaching activities are intended to improve interpersonal interaction and to be more listening and speaking is directly related to the effectiveness of the program. In fact, Davies and Pearse (2000) stated that the success of foreign language teaching was only achieved by the fact that learners could really use the language in the classroom and outside the classroom. Similarly, in the study conducted by Cihan and Gürlen (2013), English teachers stated that assessment and evaluation activities mostly measure their reading and writing skills and are inadequate in measuring their speaking and listening skills. This shows that measurement and evaluation activities are not functional enough to test the effectiveness of the gains in the program. Contrary to this view, İnam-Çelik (2009) stated that the measurement and evaluation techniques proposed in the 4th grade English program are suitable for measuring the gains. In the same research, it was stated that not only the product but also the process was evaluated by using both classical methods and alternative measurement-evaluation methods such as portfolio, and thus the students' development in the process was evaluated better.

In terms of flexibility; While students think that the English curriculum is flexible, teachers and supervisors are undecided about the flexibility of the curriculum. Similarly, in various studies conducted with English teachers, teachers stated that the objectives were generally appropriate to the level, interests and needs of the students, but the goals for writing and speaking were heavier for the students (Cihan & Gürlen, 2013; Büyükduman, 2005). Similar results have been obtained regarding the flexibility of the gains in different studies and it has been stated that the 4th and 5th grade gains are not appropriate for the cognitive and affective development levels of the students (Baturay and Karaca, 2008). In the study of İnam-Çelik (2009), teachers think that the 4th grade English curriculum is appropriate for students' cognitive, affective and psychomotor development levels. Similar to this result, in Er's (2006) research, teachers and inspectors stated that the content was not fun for the students. Contrary to this result, some studies have reported that the content is appropriate to the students' age levels, interests and needs (Cihan & Gürlen, 2013; Erbilen-Sak, 2008). Erdoğan (2005) states that speaking and writing activities cannot prepare students for real life, and that some activities take a long time and that the materials used in the learning-teaching process are not suitable for the financial situation of some students. This shows that the learning-teaching process is not flexible enough. In the study conducted by Cihan and Gürlen (2013), the teachers stated that the activities in the learning-teaching process could attract the attention of the students and enable them to participate effectively. Similar to the result of this research, in the research conducted by Er (2006), 4. teachers and inspectors state that the teaching methods and techniques in the classroom English program are appropriate, entertaining and endearing to the class level of the students.

The outline of the secondary school English curriculum can be said to be the same throughout the country, is consistent with social values and the overall objectives of National Education. Similarly, in the study conducted by İnam-Çelik (2009), teachers state that their 4th grade English acquisitions are consistent with general purposes.

While students think that the dimensions of learning outcome, content, and assessment process of the secondary school English curriculum are applicable, teachers and supervisors/administrators are undecided about the applicability of these dimensions. In addition, students, teachers and inspectors / administrators are undecided about

the applicability of the learning-teaching process dimension of the program. Accordingly, it is difficult to say that the dimensions of the English curriculum, especially the learning-teaching process, are successful in terms of applicability. In the study conducted by Er (2006), teachers and inspectors stated that the objectives in the 4th and 5th grade English curriculum were understood in a comprehensible language and that the general objectives were achievable by the students, but similar to the results of the research, some specific learning outcomes could not be achieved. Similarly, in the study conducted by İnam-Çelik (2009), the teachers stated that the 4th grade English acquisitions were expressed in a clear and understandable language. While this situation positively affects the applicability of the outcomes, the fact that the outcomes are costly to perform, and some specific objectives cannot be achieved adversely affect the applicability of the learning outcomes. In the researches, it is stated that the weekly course hours are not suitable for the content (İnam-Çelik, 2009; Şimşek, 2007; Topkaya and Küçük, 2010). It can be said that this problem negatively affects the applicability of the content of the English course. In contrast to this result, in a study, teachers and inspectors stated that the content in the 4th and 5th grade English curriculum was ordered from simple to complex and concrete to abstract (Er, 2006). In the study conducted by İnam-Çelik (2009), teachers stated that repeating the subjects in a few units enables students to understand the content more easily. These situations have a positive effect on the applicability of the program by providing convenience to learners and teachers. Similar to the findings of the study, Kozikoğlu (2014) stated that the physical conditions of the classes were not suitable for interaction activities such as speaking, listening and writing. Similarly, in the research conducted by Kaya and Ok (2016), teachers stated that the tools and equipment were not used sufficiently during the activities. In the study conducted by Er (2006), teachers and inspectors stated that the activities could not be done due to the insufficiency of the weekly lecture hours and tools and that some of the tools could not be reached by the teachers. It can be said that this situation is related to the physical facilities of the schools and the socio-economic status of the students. Büyükduman (2005) recommends MoNE to prepare books containing songs, games, different types of questions and exercises that encourage English learning, and also send tools to schools such as tapes and cassettes for listening activities. Similarly, İnam-Çelik (2009) stated that the methods and techniques in the program guide teachers sufficiently but that teachers find it difficult to find the tools they will use during the course and it will be useful to send these tools to schools by the Ministry of National Education. In addition, it is stated in the same study that teachers sometimes have difficulty in performing activities due to the crowds of some classes. Similarly, in the study conducted by Cihan and Gürlen (2013), it was stated that teachers have negative opinions about the applicability of assessment and evaluation activities. In the study, it is stated that teachers do not have enough information about measurement-evaluation methods and techniques, they do not know what, where, how to use and there are not enough examples about test situations in the program. Er (2006) supports the results and the teachers who participated in the research and evaluated the 4th grade English curriculum think that the examples given about the assessment are insufficient and that they and other shareholders are not given enough information about the test cases. Inspectors who participated in the same research have the opposite opinions. İnam-Celik (2009), on the other hand, stated that it would be helpful for teachers to include project homework examples in teacher guidebooks. In the same study, it was stated that teachers may have difficulty in evaluating their reading, writing, listening and speaking skills together and it would be beneficial to organize in-service training activities for teachers.

In terms of having unchangeable and general elements; while inspectors / administrators consider that the content, learning-teaching process and measurement-assessment process dimensions of the Science curriculum are unchanging and include general elements such as National holidays, students and teachers are undecided about this issue. Regarding the acquisition dimension, teachers and supervisors / administrators are undecided about this, while students think that the acquisition dimension of the program includes unchanging and general elements such as National Holidays. When the findings are evaluated, it is seen that the English course syllabus does not include unchangeable and general elements sufficiently.

In terms of scientific; the students are only undecided about the scientific of the learning-teaching process of the program, while other dimensions are scientific. While teachers think that only the content dimension is scientific, they are undecided about the scientific of the other dimensions. Inspectors / administrators think that content and assessment activities are scientific and learning-teaching process is not scientific while they are undecided about the scientific of the gains.

In terms of actuality and dynamism, the learning-teaching process of the English curriculum can be updated and dynamic, but it can be said that the gains are not sufficiently up-to-date. While students and supervisors / administrators think that content and assessment activities are consistent with current knowledge, teachers are undecided. Similarly, in Er's (2006) study, teachers stated that the content in the 4th grade program consisted of unnecessary and detailed information. İnam-Celik (2009) and Kirkgoz, Celik, Arikán (2016) likewise believe that

new subjects should be added to the 4th grade English program and some subjects should be removed. In this case, it can be said that the content in the 4th grade program is not compatible with the aims and current knowledge and it is necessary to update the content of the program and as a result it will positively affect the currentity and dynamics of the measurement and evaluation process of the program. According to Karabacak (2018), it is determined that there are some points that there is no harmony in terms of the teaching-learning process and evaluation elements of the program. In addition, Efeoglu, Ilerten, Basal (2018) state that the updated 2018 ELT teachers adapt to the changes in the program and are more acceptable than the previous program.

In the study, it was found that the problems related to program evaluation related to the secondary school English curriculum sub-dimensions did not differ according to seniority of teachers and supervisors / administrators. There is a significant difference between students' problems related to program evaluation related to sub-dimensions of secondary school English program and their grade levels. Accordingly, in all dimensions of the program, there is a significant difference between 5th grade and 6th, 7th and 8th grade students in favor of 5th grade students. Accordingly, as the students' class levels and ages increase, their positive opinions about the English curriculum are replaced by negative opinions. In this case, it can be said that the number and type of problems related to the dimensions of the program increases as the students' grade levels and ages increase as a result of the development of critical thinking skills or the increase of exam anxiety.

3.3 Analysis of the Differences Between the Students' Grade Levels and the Problems Related to the Dimension of the Program According to the Courses

Findings related to the dimensions of the curriculum of the students show a significant difference according to their grade levels in both courses ($p \leq .05$). Class horizons with significant differences between courses and dimensions were determined by Post Hoc test and the results are explained in detail in Table 6.

Table 6. Differences Analysis Results Between Classroom Problems of Students and Problems of Program Dimensions by Courses

| Dimensions | Grades | Lessons | | | Turkish | | | English | | |
|--------------------------------|--------|---------|---|---|---------|---|---|---------|---|---|
| | | 6 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Acquisitions | 5 | | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| | 6 | | | | * | | | | | |
| | 7 | | | | | | | | | |
| Content | 5 | | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| | 6 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 7 | | | | | | | * | | |
| Learning-Teaching Process | 5 | | | | * | | * | * | * | * |
| | 6 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 7 | | | | | | | | | |
| Measurement-Evaluation Process | 5 | | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| | 6 | | | | | | | * | | |
| | 7 | | | | | | | | | |

* $p \leq .05$

According to Table 6, there is a significant difference between the 5th and 6th grades in favor of the 5th grade in the items related to the gains of the Turkish course ($p = .000$). There is a significant difference between 5th grade and 7th grade in favor of 5th grade ($p = .000$). There is a significant difference between 5th grade and 8th grade in favor of 5th grade ($p = .000$). There is a significant difference between 6th grade and 8th grade in favor of 6th grade ($p = .047$). There is a significant difference between 5th grade and 7th grade in favor of 5th grade ($p = .000$). There is a significant difference between 5th grade and 8th grade in favor of 5th grade ($p = .000$).

According to Table 6, since there is $p \leq .05$, there is a significant difference between 5th and 6th grades in favor of 5th grade in the items related to Turkish content ($p = .001$). There is a significant difference between 5th grade and 7th grade in favor of 5th grade ($p = .015$). There is a significant difference between 5th grade and 8th grade in favor of 5th grade ($p = .000$). There is a significant difference between 7th grade and 8th grade in favor of 7th grade ($p = .033$). Because $p \leq .05$, according to Table 6, in the articles related to the content of the English course there is a significant difference between the 5th grade and the 6th grade in favor of the 5th grade ($p = .000$). There is a

significant difference between 5th grade and 7th grade in favor of 5th grade ($p = .000$). There is a significant difference between 5th grade and 8th grade in favor of 5th grade ($p = .000$).

According to Table 6, there is a significant difference between the 5th grade and the 6th grade in favor of the 5th grade in the related items of the Turkish-language learning-teaching process ($p = .004$). There is a significant difference between 5th grade and 8th grade in favor of 5th grade ($p = .001$). According to Table 6, there is a significant difference between the 5th grade and the 6th grade in favor of the 5th grade in the items related to the learning-teaching process of English lesson since it is $p \leq .05$ ($p = .004$). There is a significant difference between 5th grade and 7th grade in favor of 5th grade ($p = .005$). There is a significant difference between 5th grade and 8th grade in favor of 5th grade ($p = .000$).

According to Table 6, there is a significant difference between the 5th grade and the 6th grade in favor of the 5th grade in the items related to measurement and evaluation of the Turkish course since it is $p \leq .05$ ($p = .037$). There is a significant difference between 5th grade and 7th grade in favor of 5th grade ($p = .002$). There is a significant difference between 5th grade and 8th grade in favor of 5th grade ($p = .000$). There is a significant difference between 6th grade and 8th grade in favor of 6th grade ($p = .021$). Since $p \leq .05$ according to Table 6, in the items related to measurement and evaluation of English course, there is a significant difference between the 5th grade and the 6th grade in favor of the 5th grade in the items related to the assessment and evaluation of the English course ($p = .000$). There is a significant difference between 5th grade and 7th grade in favor of 5th grade ($p = .001$). There is a significant difference between 5th grade and 8th grade in favor of 5th grade ($p = .000$).

In the study, there is no significant difference ($p > .05$) in terms of acquisition, content, learning-teaching process and measurement-evaluation process dimensions of teachers and supervisors / administrators in Turkish and English curriculum.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

4.1 Results

4.1.1 Results of Turkish Curriculum

1. It can be said that the Turkish curriculum is generally a framework program and is valid all over the country, it is compatible with the social values and the general aims of the National Education, and it can be said that it contains unchanging and general elements like the National Holidays, the important days.
2. It can be stated that the gains in the Turkish curriculum are functional and useful, the content is not functional enough and the subjects in the content should be reviewed and selected from the topics that will work in daily life. The fact that teachers are undecided about the functionality of the program's learning-teaching and assessment-evaluation processes shows that the activities in these dimensions do not serve the purpose of the program sufficiently and that the activities should be made useful.
3. According to the opinions of teachers and supervisors / administrators, it can be said that Turkish curriculum has a problem of flexibility, it is not applicable and it is far from scientific.
4. According to students, teachers and supervisors/administrators, it is seen that the dimensions of acquisition, content and assessment process of the Turkish curriculum are not sufficiently up-to-date.
5. In the study, it is seen that the problems related to program evaluation related to Turkish curriculum sub-dimensions do not differ according to seniority of teachers and supervisors / administrators.
6. There is a significant difference between students' problems related to program evaluation and grade levels related to Turkish curriculum sub-dimensions. According to this, there is a significant difference between 5th grade students and 6th, 7th and 8th grade students in all dimensions except the learning-teaching process dimension of the program in favor of 5th grade students. In addition, there is a significant difference between the 6th and 8th grade students in favor of 6th grade students in terms of acquisition and measurement-evaluation process, and the 7th and 8th grade students in favor of 7th grade students in content dimension. In terms of learning-teaching process, there is a significant difference between 5th grade and 6th and 8th grade students in favor of 5th grade students. Accordingly, as students' grade levels and ages increase, their positive opinions about Turkish curriculum are replaced with negative opinions.

4.1.2 Results of English Curriculum

1. According to the students' views, it can be said that in the studies conducted to evaluate the English syllabus, it is

not given enough importance to the feature of invariant and general elements which are among the features that a program should have.

2. According to teachers and supervisors / administrators, it can be said that the English syllabus cannot adequately adapt to the conditions of the environment in which it is applied, cannot be shaped according to the characteristics, interests and needs of the students, and especially the gains and activities aimed at speaking and writing are not suitable for the age of the students.

3. It is seen that the dimensions of the English curriculum, especially the learning-teaching process, failed in terms of applicability.

4. It can be said that the acquisition dimension of the English syllabus is functional, it serves the purpose of the program, but the other dimensions are not found to be particularly useful by the teachers.

5. According to the opinions of all the groups participating in the research, it can be stated that the content of the English curriculum is scientific but the other dimensions are not scientific.

6. It can be said that the learning-teaching process of the English syllabus are updated and dynamic, but the gains are not sufficiently up-to-date.

7. It is seen that the problems related to program evaluation related to the sub-dimensions of the English curriculum do not differ according to seniority of teachers and supervisors / administrators.

8. There is a significant difference between students' problems related to program evaluation and grade levels regarding the sub-dimensions of the English curriculum. Accordingly, in all dimensions of the program, there is a significant difference between 5th grade and 6th, 7th and 8th grade students in favor of 5th grade students.

4.2 Suggestions

1. Within the scope of program development and evaluation studies, in-service trainings can be provided to teachers or the number of existing trainings can be increased. Thus, by preparing teachers who are the implementers of the programs, a positive contribution can be made to the applicability of the program.

2. The number and type of data collection tools used in program evaluation studies can be increased. Thus, the data obtained can be enriched in terms of quality and quantity.

3. Instead of evaluating only one or several aspects of the program, the number of studies evaluating all aspects of the program can be increased

4. In the program evaluation studies, not only the opinions of a certain segment, but also the opinions of the shareholders from different segments can be included. Thus, by increasing the diversity of data, more realistic information can be reached and the impact of program evaluation studies on the program can be increased.

5. Emphasis can be placed on the establishment of specific standards for program evaluation or the use of existing standards in program evaluation studies by adapting them to the Turkish Education System. Thus, more functional and systematic evaluation studies can be done.

References

- Abuammar, R. (2018). Yabancılara Türkçe eğitiminde program sorunun ders kitaplarına yansımazı [The reflection of the problem of program on teaching Turkish as a foreign language]. *Unpublished master thesis*. Sakarya Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Sakarya.
- Avcı, İ. N. (2018). Türkçe öğretim programı bağlamında 5.sınıf Türkçe dersi öğretimine ilişkin öğretmen ve öğrenci görüşlerinin incelenmesi [An investigation of teachers' and students' opinions regarding fifth grade Turkish language course in terms of Turkish language teaching program]. *Unpublished master thesis*. Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Antalya.
- Aykaç, N., & Aydin, H. (2006). *Öğrenme-öğretimde sürecinde planlama ve uygulama* [Planning and application in learning-teaching process]. İstanbul: Naturel Yayıncılık.
- Baturay, M. H., & Karaca, F. (2008). *Perceptions of the school staff for the curriculum change at a K12 school setting*. 8th International Educational Technology Conference, Eskişehir.
- Benzer, A., & Eldem, E. (2013). Türkçe ve edebiyat öğretmenlerinin ölçme ve değerlendirme araçları hakkında bilgi düzeyleri [Level of the information about Turkish and literature teachers' measurement and assessment materials]. *Kastamonu Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 21(2), 649-664.

- Büyükduman, F. İ. (2005). İlköğretim okulları İngilizce öğretmenlerinin birinci kademe İngilizce öğretim programına ilişkin görüşleri [Views of primary school English teachers about the primary stage English curriculum]. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 28, 55-64.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Erkan Akgün, Ö., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2008). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* [Scientific research methods]. Ankara: PegemA Yayıncılık.
- Çepni, S. (2007). *Araştırma ve proje çalışmalarına giriş (3.baskı)* [Introduction to research and project studies (3rd ed.)]. Trabzon: Celepler Matbaacılık.
- Chelimsky, E. (1989). *Program evaluation: Patterns and directions*. Washington D.C.: The American Society for Public Administration.
- Cihan, T., & Gürlen, E. (2013). İlköğretim 5. sınıf İngilizce dersi öğretim programına ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri [Teachers' opinions on the English language curriculum of the 5th grade of primary education]. *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 13(1), 131-146.
- Davies, P., & Pearse, E. (2000). *Success in English teaching: A complete introduction to teaching English at secondary school level and above*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Duman, B. (2004). İlköğretim Türkçe programının etkililiğinin değerlendirilmesi (Konya ve Muğla örneklerinin karşılaştırılması) [Evaluation of primary school Turkish programme's effectiveness (comparison of the Konya and Muğla samples)]. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2(1), 85-108.
- Durukan, E. (2015). Öğretmen görüşleri açısından Türkçe dersi öğretim programı kazanımları [Teachers' views about acquisitions in Turkish lesson curriculum]. *Karadeniz Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 5(8), 1-13.
- Efeoğlu, G., İlteren, F., & Basal, A. (2018). A utilization focused evaluation of the preparatory school of an ELT program. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 10(4), 149-163. <https://doi.org/10.15345/ijoes.2018.04.009>
- Er, K. O. (2006). İlköğretim 4. ve 5. sınıf İngilizce öğretim programlarının değerlendirilmesi [Evaluation of English curricula in 4th and 5th grade primary schools]. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 39(2), 1-25.
- Erbilen Sak, Ö. (2008). İlköğretim I. Kademe İngilizce Programının Öğretmen Görüşlerine Göre Değerlendirilmesi [Evaluation of the primary stage English program according to teachers' opinions]. *Unpublished master thesis*. Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Bolu.
- Erden, M. (1998). *Eğitimde program değerlendirme (3.baskı)* [Program evaluation in education (3rd ed.)]. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Erdoğan, V. (2005). An evaluation of the English curriculum implemented at the 4th and 5th grade primary state schools: The views of the teachers and the students. *Unpublished master thesis*. Mersin Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Mersin.
- Göçer, A. (2008). İlköğretim Türkçe ders kitaplarının ölçme ve değerlendirme açısından incelenmesi [Examination of elementary Turkish textbooks in terms of measurement and evaluation]. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 11(1), 197-210.
- Hesapçıoğlu, M. (1994). *Öğretim ilke ve yöntemleri; Eğitim programları ve öğretim* [Teaching principles and methods; Education programs and teaching]. İstanbul: Beta Basın Yayın Dağıtım.
- İnam Çelik, G. (2009). İlköğretim okulları 4. sınıf İngilizce dersi öğretim programının değerlendirilmesine ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri [Teacher opinions about 4th classes English programme in primary schools]. *Unpublished master thesis*. Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Aydın.
- İşman, A., & Eskicumalı, A. (2006). *Öğretimde planlama ve değerlendirme (5.baskı)* [Planning and evaluation in teaching (5th ed.)]. İstanbul: Sempati Yayıncılık.
- Karabacak, E. (2018). İlkokul resmi İngilizce müfredatı ile öğretilen müfredat arasındaki uyumu incelemek [Analyzing the alignment between the primary school official English curriculum and the taught curriculum]. *Unpublished master thesis*. Anadolu Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Eskişehir.
- Karaca, B. (2018). Türkiye'deki ilkokul ve ortaokul İngilizce müfredatının incelenmesi: Öğretmenler ve program tasarımcılarının algıları [A study of Turkey's primary and middle school English curricula: Teachers' and program designers' perceptions] *Unpublished doctoral thesis*. Atatürk Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü,

Erzurum.

- Karadüz, A. (2009). Türkçe öğretmenlerinin ölçme ve değerlendirme uygulamalarının “yapılardırmacı öğrenme” kavramı bağlamında eleştirisi [The critique of assessment practices of Turkish language teachers in the context of constructivist learning]. *Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, XXII (1), 189-210.
- Kaya, S., & Ok, A. (2016). The second grade English language curriculum: Theory-practice congruence. *Pegem Eğitim ve Öğretim Dergisi*, 6(4), 491-512. <https://doi.org/10.14527/pegegog.2016.024>
- Kiely, R (2006). Evaluation, innovation, and ownership in language programs. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90(4), Winter Issue, 597-601. https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1540-4781.2006.00466_X
- Kırkgöz, Y., Çelik, S., & Arıkan, A. (2016). Türkiye'deki yeni ilköğretim İngilizce programın teorik ve pratik temellerinin incelenmesi: Bir süreç analizi [Laying the theoretical and practical foundations for a new elementary English curriculum in Turkey: A procedural analysis]. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 24(3), 1199-1212.
- Kozikoğlu, İ. (2014). Ortaokul 7. sınıf İngilizce öğretim programının değerlendirilmesi [An evaluation of the secondary school 7th grade English curriculum]. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 14(1), 361-375. <https://doi.org/10.17240/aibuefd.2014.14.1-5000091517>
- Küçük, Ö. (2008). An evaluation of English language teaching program at key stage I and opinions of teachers regarding the program. *Unpublished master thesis*. Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Çanakkale.
- Madaus, G. F., Stufflebeam, D. L., & Kellaghan, T. (2002). *Evaluation Models: Viewpoints on Educational and Human Services Evaluation* (2nd ed.). USA: Kluwer Academic Publishers. <https://doi.org/10.1007/0-306-47559-6>
- MEB. (2017). *Taslak öğretim programları*. [Draft curricula]. Retrieved April 2, 2017, from <http://mufredat.meb.gov.tr/SSS.aspx.html>
- MEB. (2018). *2023 Eğitim vizyonu*. [2023 Education vision]. Retrieved July 29, 2019, from http://2023vizyonu.meb.gov.tr/doc/2023_EGITIM_VIZYONU.pdf.html
- MEB. (2019). *Türkçe-Matematik-Fen bilimleri öğrenci başarı izleme araştırması (TMF-ÖBA)-I:2019*. [Turkish-Mathematics-Science student success monitoring research (TMF-ÖBA)-I:2019]. Retrieved October 15, 2019, from http://www.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2019_09/23150323_TMF-OBAI-4-2019_Rapor9.pdf
- Mertkan Ş. (2015). *Karma araştırma tasarımları* [Mixed research design]. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Oral, B., & Yazar, T. (2017). *Eğitimde program geliştirme ve değerlendirme* [Curriculum development and evaluation in education]. Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık. <https://doi.org/10.14527/9786052410509>
- Özbay, M. (2008). *A critical look at the acquisitions of the new primary school Turkish curriculum (Grades 6, 7, 8)*. 1st World Turkish Symposium, Ankara.
- Özdemir, S. M. (2009). Eğitimde program değerlendirme ve Türkiye'de eğitim programlarını değerlendirme çalışmalarının incelenmesi [Curriculum evaluation in education and examination of the curriculum evaluation studies in Turkey]. *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 6(2), 126-149.
- Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. UK: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667220>
- Şimşek, H. (2007). *A teacher development program for young learners of English: An action research*. Unpublished master thesis. Çukurova Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Adana.
- Tanış, E. (2007). *Türkiye'de yabancı dil öğretimi*. [Foreign language teaching in Turkey]. Retrieved February 15, 2017, from http://www.ingilizceogretmeni.com/portal/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=115&Itemid=78.html
- Turgut, M. (1983). *Program değerlendirme: Cumhuriyet döneminde eğitim*. [Program evaluation: Education in republican era]. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.
- Yaman, H. (2009). İlköğretim Türkçe dersi programının kalabalık sınıflarda uygulanabilirliğine ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri [Teachers' views on the applicability of the Turkish course curriculum in crowded primary classrooms]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 9(1), 329-359.