



## Evaluation of Preschool Curriculum by Stufflebeam's Context, Input, Process and Product (CIPP) Evaluation Model

Mecit Aslan <sup>1</sup>, Nur Uygun <sup>2</sup>

### Abstract

The aim of the present research was to evaluate preschool curriculum by Stufflebeam's Context, Input, Process and Product (CIPP) Evaluation Model. Mixed method and explanatory design was used in the study. The quantitative dimension of study was conducted with 124 preschool education teachers in 2016-2017 academic year in Van/Turkey. On the other hand, interviews were conducted with 15 preschool teachers so as to explain the quantitative data in more detail, and observations were carried out in a typical preschool class. Preschool Curriculum Evaluation Scale, a semi-structured interview form and an observation form were used as data collection tools. As a result of the study, the dimension in which teachers expressed the most negative opinion was determined as context. Teachers at this dimension stated that the physical infrastructure of preschool education institutions was not appropriate and that regional conditions were not sufficiently taken into account during the development of the curriculum. Regarding the input dimension, it was stated that the family factor and the individual differences of the children were not considered sufficiently in the curriculum. Regarding the process dimension, it has emerged that studies the least done were the implementation of qualified home practices, assessment studies and the addition or removal of learning centers as needed. In the product dimension, the curriculum was usually effective only when it was not effective enough to solve family-related problems.

### Keywords

Preschool education  
Preschool curriculum  
Curriculum development  
Curriculum evaluation  
CIPP evaluation model

### Article Info

Received: 01.23.2018  
Accepted: 08.28.2019  
Online Published: 10.30.2019

DOI: 10.15390/EB.2019.7717

<sup>1</sup> Van Yüzüncü Yıl University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Turkey, [maslan4773@gmail.com](mailto:maslan4773@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup> Van Yüzüncü Yıl University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Turkey, [nuruygun.13@gmail.com](mailto:nuruygun.13@gmail.com)

## Introduction

Human beings, born with the instinct to learn, endeavor to continue their lives, to recognize and to make sense of the foreign world surrounding them. They sought many ways to satisfy their vital needs and to find solutions for the challenges they face. They also tried to convey their experiences to future generations. The concept of education has accompanied this endeavor. While Tyler (1949) explains education as the process of changing individual's behaviors, Ertürk (2013) addresses it as the process of intentionally and deliberately changing individual's behaviors through their own experiences. Education has been very crucial for the societies since the existence of humanity; furthermore, practicing education in a systematic, programmed and intentional way dates back to the history of humanity. The concept of intentional, programmed and systematic education characterizes contemporary education concept. That is why curricula play a crucial role in the education systems. Demirel (2015) defines the curriculum as the education experience mechanism operating on the inside and outside of the school. Curricula function as a means to develop individuals' behaviors in social, political and economic order (Özdemir, 2009).

It is significant to lay out curricula as soon as possible to render the education experience – starting with the birth of the individual- eligible. It is accepted that early years of the life have an outstanding importance in the development of the infant's physical and other characteristics, especially in the personality development. Under normal circumstances, infants and children are rather active; they want to discover the environment and learn it through imitation. No matter how much they are curious and eager to learn, they should be motivated and supported in order to live easefully as self-confident individuals. In that sense, they should be supported to receive an appropriate education (Kitta & Kapinga, 2015). Diken (2014) highlights that as the infancy is the period when children are most exposed to external influences; it is one of the vital periods most needed for the protection. Moreover, development and growth are the fastest in this crucial period. Significant changes occur in physical, cognitive and socio-emotional features of children during their preschool period, which is when they become physically stronger and much faster. Thanks to their rough and fine motor skills growing, preschool children are capable of performing such skills as running, throwing something, maintaining balance, eating with spoons, making representative drawings, and doing button-ups. Children in this period cognitively think over problem before taking an action towards it, make plans and carry out reasoning processes. These children begin to realize that beliefs and desires have an impact upon behaviour. However, they form opinions by reasoning in a symbolic, perception-based, unidimensional, and from specific to specific way. As for their socio-emotional feature, these children can be said to be self-confident and sociable freedom-lovers. Also, they are quite willing to communicate with both peers and adults alike. Nevertheless, they may exhibit some aggressive behaviour during this time (Berk, 2013; Trawick Smith, 2013). The idea that education should commence in the earlier periods which are vital for the personality development of individuals has been effective in the appearance of the preschool education.

Preschool education constitutes a significant part of basic education, hence marking the take-off point of a whole education system. Added to that, preschool education is an essential phase of education, where the foundations of both school education and life-long education are laid (He, 2015), so it is believed to affect the child's whole life (Duffy, 2006). Preschool education takes on the task of motivating and promoting the children's curious and eager characteristics to discover and learn their environment. In addition, it aims to support children's personality, sense of self, creativity, communication skills, social and emotional stability through affecting their all developmental areas (Kuru Turaşlı, 2018; Senemoğlu, 1994). As would be expected, preschool education also aims to prepare children for primary schools as affectively as possible. Parenthetically, it is crucial that children should also achieve such qualities as cognitive, emotional, social and language growth before they can embark on their primary school life (Commodari, 2013; Kuru Turaşlı, 2018). Preschool education's environment offers abundant stimulants. Thanks to these well-supplied stimulants, individuals have the opportunity to compare, to relate new conditions and information with previous ones and to form new information.

In other words, these stimulants present opportunities for the cognitive development of the individual. Besides, preschool education plays an important role in the children's academic, social, linguistic, psychomotor developments and self-care skills, especially disadvantaged children (Conyers, Reynolds, & Ou, 2003; İş, 2017; MONE, 2013; Taner & Başal, 2005; Türkkaş Anasız, Ekinci, & Anasız, 2018). Taking all these effects into consideration, it could be asserted that preschool education has a vital role in the development of the individual as a whole.

Analyses of the positive outcomes of the studies relating to preschool education (Erkan, 2011; Erkan & Kırca, 2010; Taner & Başal, 2005; Türkkaş Anasız et al., 2018), as well as investigations into modern education systems, have revealed that educations should start in early life if we are to raise qualified individuals (İş, 2017). According to the data released in 2014, as far as OECD countries are concerned, 71% of children aged 3 years, 86% of children aged 4 years, and 95% of children aged 5 enrol in a school. As for the countries in the European Union, the percentage of children aged 3 to 5 years enrolling in a school is 71%, 89% and 95%, respectively, whereas it is 8%, 3% and 71%, respectively in Turkey (OECD, 2016). However, the data released in 2016 show that while the percentage of the schooling of children aged 3-5 years old is 86% for OECD countries, it comes down to only 37% in Turkey. On the other hand, schooling at an early age accounts for 95% in France, The United Kingdom, Belgium, Israel, Denmark, Iceland, Spain, Sweden, Norway, Italy, Germany and The Netherlands (OECD, 2018). Although Turkey has made remarkable progress, participation of young children in early childhood education has failed to achieve a desirable level. Furthermore, the distribution of early childhood education has not exhibited an even distribution across Turkey (World Bank, 2011).

In order for the positive outcomes of preschool education to occur, it is imperative that learning environments should be made optimized, materials be accessible and a quality curriculum be developed (Ishimine & Tayler, 2014). The experiences to be gained through a qualified preschool curriculum – applied in the preschool period which is the basis of life- initially enable children to identify all their characteristics and accept themselves. Moreover, it would ensure that children lead a harmonic life in the society they live and they gain not only multi-faceted thinking and problem-solving skills; but also aesthetics and creativity skills (Senemoğlu, 1994). By this way, it would be possible to minimize the difference stemming from the socio-economic and cultural inequalities (Yazar, 2013). Through preschool education, children could make better investments for their future by making the best use of their environment. Surely, a qualified curriculum is needed for children to receive an efficient and proficient preschool education.

### *Preschool Curriculum*

In recent years, the fact that awareness toward preschool education has increased in Turkey reinforced the need to develop a qualified preschool curriculum. Inspecting the history of the latest curriculum formulated in 2013, it could be seen that there have been various studies and that many curricula have been formulated. Some of these studies and curricula are listed below (Düzgün, 2014; Gelişli & Yazıcı, 2012; Köksal, Balaban Dağal, & Duman, 2016; MONE, 2006, 2013):

- “Regulation Kindergartens and Nursery Classes” –which was issued in 1952- is among the initiatory important developments.
- National Education Council prepared a preschool curriculum in 1989 and this curriculum had the purposes and the content chapters. This curriculum was carried out as three different curricula in 1994: (i) Kindergarten Curriculum (0-3 Ages), (ii) Preschool Curriculum (3-5) and (iii) Nursery Class (5-6).
- In 2002, it was determined that the Kindergarten Curriculum developed earlier would be kept same and Preschool and Nursery Class Curricula would be combined and organized under the name of “Preschool Curriculum for the Children 36-72 Months”. This curriculum has abandoned teaching the subjects; rather, it focused on the objectives and behaviors to be developed.

- The primary curricula were reformulated in 2005 and in 2006; a developmental, holistic and spiral approach was attained. Moreover, in the same year, a "Preschool Curriculum" and a guidebook were prepared for teachers. This curriculum has foreseen that the evaluation should comprise the child, teacher, and the curriculum.

- In 2012, "Project on Strengthening the Preschool Curriculum" and some studies were carried out in order to develop the preschool curriculum. There have been some changes and innovations in the curriculum intended for three different age groups (36-48 months, 48-60 months, and 60-72 months). In the new curriculum, the acquisitions have been changed to *acquisition indicators*. Furthermore, an "Activity Book" containing sample activities and "Family Support Program Integrated with the Preschool Curriculum" was prepared. This curriculum has been started to be implemented since 2013-2014 school year. During the formulation of this curriculum – which is still being used- it has been prioritized that the curriculum would be child-centered, flexible, and game-based; furthermore, it would give importance to learning centers, include multi-dimensional evaluation, give importance to guidance work and would develop children holistically and prepare them for the primary school.

Though it has been accepted that such curriculum -prepared in such a way to cover certain stages- will be of much better quality than an arbitrarily prepared curriculum, it does not necessarily guarantee that the curriculum based on scientific principles will be fully implemented and will never need to be reassessed (Ertürk, 2013). On the contrary, curricula should be regularly evaluated. As Uşun (2012) points out, different definitions and explanations can be made about the evaluation of the curriculum, depending on the philosophy, expectations, and approaches to be adopted. While Demirel (2015) defines the curriculum evaluation as "the decision-making process about the efficiency of the curriculum"; Tyler (1949) recognizes it as the most important application of the curriculum development process. When it comes to Ertürk (2013), he asserted that the curriculum evaluation is the complementary step of the development process and that targets' level of achievement is determined by this step. No matter how it is defined, it is a well-known fact that evaluation is one of the most important processes of the curriculum development process. Therefore, like all curricula, preschool curriculum -developed for a critical period of human life- needs to be constantly evaluated and developed.

Some studies aimed at evaluating preschool education and pre-school curriculum (Dilek, 2013; Dilek & Duman, 2014; Düzgün, 2014; Gelişli & Yazıcı, 2012; Göle & Temel, 2015; İş, 2017; Sapsağlam, 2013; Özsirkıntı, Akay, & Bolat, 2014; Yazar, 2013) have been carried out in Turkey. Our observation is such that studies have primarily focused on the evaluation of the curriculum implemented in 2006 while there is a limited number of those having evaluated the curriculum implemented in 2013. In a study into the 2013 curriculum by İş (2017), it was concluded that although it was applicable and resulted in learning outcomes, parental involvement was not satisfactory. A study by Göle and Temel (2015), which investigated the qualities of preschool education curricula, found the curriculum theoretically favourable. Likewise, a study by Düzgün (2014), which evaluated the opinions of the teachers about the application of the changes made to the curriculum in 2012, found these changes to be applicable. Özsirkıntı et al. (2014) investigated the opinions of the teachers involved in the pilot scheme on the changes made to the curriculum in 2012 and determined that although teachers found it child-centred and flexible enough, they had problems in establishing learning centres. While these studies provided us with significant opinions about the curriculum, considering the fact that curriculum development is a dynamic process (Demirel, 2015) and that the studies evaluating the 2013 preschool curriculum are limited, it is important to do more evaluation studies to provide this dynamism. The fact that evaluation studies have been carried out with different methodologies in different regions may give a clue on how to reach a judgment on the curriculum. In addition, it is important to use the evaluative models not used in most of the evaluation studies (Aslan & Sağlam, 2017; Gökmenoğlu, 2015; Kurt & Erdoğan, 2015) for providing both a theoretical and a systematic basis of the studies (Kürüm Yapıcıoğlu, Atik Kara, & Sever, 2016). Briefly, it is a necessity for educators and researchers to evaluate preschool curriculum in line with comprehensive and systematic evaluation models.

### *Aim of the Research*

This research aims to evaluate preschool curriculum in a comprehensive and systematic way in the context of Stufflebeam's context-input-process-product evaluation model. In line with this general objective, the following questions were sought:

1. What are teacher views and researcher observations regarding the context, input, process and product dimensions of the preschool curriculum?
2. Do teachers' opinions about preschool curriculum show significant difference according to the place of duty?
3. Is there a meaningful relationship between the context, input, process and product dimensions of the preschool curriculum?
4. Do context, input and process dimensions significantly predict the product?

## **Method**

### *Research Design*

The mixed research method was used in this research. Mixed method is the analysis and the presentation of the data obtained by using the qualitative and quantitative research techniques and methods blended and used in a single study. In this study, explanatory pattern was used among mixed method designs. The explanatory pattern aiming to investigate the findings obtained by quantitative research in depth with qualitative research techniques begins with quantitative research and continues with qualitative research (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007).

In the study, Context-Input-Process-Product Evaluation Model [CIPP] proposed by Stufflebeam was used as the curriculum evaluation model. Current situation analysis is performed in assessing the context (Stufflebeam, Madaus, & Kellaghan, 2002) and the environment in which the program is applied is depicted (Ornstein & Hunkins, 2004). When it comes to input evaluation; envisaged activity plans, stakeholders and materials are assessed (Yüksel & Sağlam, 2012). In the process evaluation, the problems encountered in the process are identified through inspecting how the curriculum is implemented and how the process progresses. When the curriculum is implemented, the consistency of planned and actual events is also checked (Demirel, 2015; Stufflebeam et al., 2002). Lastly, in the product evaluation, the curriculum's general and special outputs, expected and unexpected outputs are evaluated altogether (Ornstein & Hunkins, 2004).

### *Study Group*

The study group of this research is comprised of preschool teachers working in kindergartens of primary schools and in preschool education institutions affiliated to the Ministry of National Education (MONE) in Van province center, districts and villages in the 2016-2017 academic year. The quantitative dimension of the study was conducted with 124 preschool teachers selected by random sampling method. In this sampling method, there is neutrality and each unit has equal chance of entering the sample (Balci, 2010). The distribution of teachers regarding demographic variables is demonstrated in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Distribution of Teachers in Terms of Demographic Features

Demographic variable	Category	n	%
Gender	Female	105	84.7
	Male	19	15.3
Seniority	1-3	52	41.9
	4-9	50	40.4
	10 or more	22	17.7
Place of Duty	Province	83	66.9
	District	22	17.8
	Village	19	15.3
In-service training	Yes	69	55.6
	No	55	44.4

According to the data represented in Table 1, 105 of the prospective teachers in the study group were female, 19 were male; there are 52 teachers whose years of seniority range between 1 to 3 years, 50 others whose years of seniority range between 4 to 9 years and also 22 others with 10 or more years of seniority. While 83 of the teachers in the sample work in the province, 22 others work in the district and 19 others work in the village. While 69 of these teachers have participated in in-service training activities, 55 of them have not done so.

In addition to study group mentioned above, observations were carried out in a preschool class. Observational data were collected from 1 preschool teacher and 27 children in this class selected in accordance with the typical case sample. The observed teacher is a female instructor working in the provincial center with an 8-year vocational seniority. There are 13 girls and 14 boys in the observed classroom. Moreover, interviews were conducted with 15 preschool teachers so as to explain the quantitative data in more detail. Among the interviewed teachers; while 2 of them have 1-year working experience, 3 of them have 2, 5 of them have 3, 2 others have 4 and 1 of them has 5-year working experience. And, while 4 of them work in the province, 4 others work in the district and 7 others work in the village.

#### *Data Collection Tools*

In this research, "Pre-school Curriculum Evaluation Scale", "Observation Form" and "Semi-structured Interview Form" were used as data collection tools. Detailed explanations about these tools are included hereinafter.

#### *Pre-school Curriculum Evaluation Scale*

In this study, "Pre-school Curriculum Evaluation Scale" -developed by Aslan, Soyalp, Karahan, and Altuntaş (2016)- was used to determine the quality of preschool curriculum. 5 point Likert scale is comprised of 50 items and 4 dimensions (context, input, process, and output). In the scale development study; when the reliability coefficient- which is determined as .925 for the whole scale- is examined in terms of sub-dimensions, it was measured as .706 for the context dimension, .796 for the input dimension, .930 for the process dimension, and .930 for the product dimension. In the study, the reliability coefficient was determined to be .908 for the sum of the scale, .680 for the context dimension, .771 for the input dimension, .901 for the process dimension, and .887 for the product dimension.

#### *Observation Form*

An observation form developed by the researchers was used to determine how the teaching-learning process was conducted in the classroom and a total of 25-hour observations were carried throughout 5 weeks, the observations were executed only 1 day of these weeks. A literature review was made during the formation of observation form and two experts in the field of preschool education, two

experts in the field of curriculum and instruction and two linguists were consulted. While the observation was conducted in line with Stufflebeam's context-input-process-product model, there has been a special focus on the data about the process dimension of the model. During the observations, an attention has been paid to the physical condition of the class (learning centers, materials), daily plan (starting the day, game, nutrition, activity, and day evaluation time), teacher-child and child-child communication. The observations focused on whether the daily plan was carried out as planned, what activities were performed and what were not at the activity time, and how the activities were conducted. During the observations, the researcher sat in a place where he could see the whole class and acted as a non-participant observer. In this type of observation, observations take place without any intervention in the environment (Creswell, 2009).

#### *Semi-structured Interview Form*

Third data collection tool used in the study is semi-structured interview form developed by the researchers. The relevant literature has been reviewed for the development of the semi-structured interview form and the results obtained from the scale and observation notes were taken into account. As a result, a 22-question pool was created. Firstly, some questions in this pool were selected based on Stufflebeam's context-input-process-product (CIPP) model and a draft form was constituted. Two experts in the field of preschool education, two experts in the field of curriculum and instruction and two linguists were consulted on the draft interview form and a semi-structured interviewed form – including 11 questions- was composed. This draft form was read aloud by two preschool teachers and it was confirmed to be clear and understandable by the teachers. The interview form was finalized at the end of this stage. Some of the questions appearing in the abovementioned form are as follows:

- *What do you think about the quality of physical conditions in preschool educational institutions? (Context)*
- *What do you think about the preschool teachers? At what level do you think they possess necessary qualities? (Input)*
- *What are the problems you typically encounter in the course of daily education? (Starting the day, games, nutrition, activities, evaluation of the day etc.) What do you think the causes of these problems are? (Process)*
- *What kind of changes did you observe in the growth and thinking skills of the children at the end of the year as far as their preschool education curriculum is concerned? What were the positive and negative outcomes that you observed with regard to the curriculum? (Product)*

Interviews were conducted at places and times deemed appropriate by the teachers. In order to prevent data loss, a voice recorder was used in the interviews with the permission of the participants. As a result of the analysis of the data obtained from the interviews, the participant confirmation regarding the accuracy of the results was performed.

#### *Data Analysis*

SPSS package program was used in the analysis of the quantitative data obtained from the research. In determining whether the data given prior to the analysis process showed a normal distribution or not, skewness and kurtosis values were examined. As a result, it was concluded that these values were normal inasmuch as they varied between -0.612 and 0.209 (Huck, 2000). Another observation was that the data met the assumption of homogeneity based upon the Levene Test ( $p > .05$ ), which is why parametric tests were preferred. The mean and standard deviation values were examined to determine the opinions of the pre-school teachers about the dimensions of Pre-school Curriculum Evaluation Scale. The ANOVA test was operated to determine whether the opinions of preschool teachers differed significantly regarding the place of duty variable. In the event that there is a significant

difference as a result of this test, the Tukey Test was used to determine from which groups this difference derives. While Pearson correlation analysis was performed to determine the relationship between scale dimensions; stepwise regression analysis was performed to determine how the context-input and process envisage the product. The significance level was accepted as  $p < .05$  for all analyzes in the study.

Qualitative data were analyzed with the descriptive analysis technique. In this technique, data is described and interpreted in line with predetermined themes (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2011). The data obtained from the observation and interviews were analyzed and evaluated in accordance with Stufflebeam's context-input-process-product dimensions. It was presented with direct quotations from the observation and interviews. While findings from the observations were demonstrated -with the observation number- as O1, O2, O3, etc.; findings of the interviews were marked as T1, T2, etc. The reliability of qualitative data was tested by the reliability formula proposed by Miles and Huberman (1994). The data were coded and compared separately by two researchers. It has been striven to reach a consensus on controversial issues. An expert researcher on the Curriculum and Instruction was consulted for the uncompromising codes. All in all, the accordance between the two researchers was set as .94 and the fact that this is higher than .70 indicates the reliability of qualitative data.

## Results

This section contains the opinions of preschool teachers regarding the quality of preschool curriculum. Results were regulated in line with the study's subaims and they were organized in a way to demonstrate teachers' remarks on the sub-dimensions of the preschool curriculum evaluation scale and how these remarks change depending on the place of duty and to reveal the relationship between the dimensions. Results obtained from the analyses were presented as tables.

### *Findings on Context, Input, Process and Product Aspects of Preschool Education*

**Table 2.** Opinions of Teachers About Context, Input, Process, Product Dimensions of Preschool Curriculum

Dimensions	n	Mean	Sd	Skewness	Kurtosis
Context	124	3.03	0.53	-.031	-.531
Input	124	3.72	0.55	-.047	-.052
Process	124	4.09	0.48	-.347	-.266
Product	124	4.03	0.59	-.612	.209
Total	124	3.79	0.39	-.095	-.177

As demonstrated in Table 2, while the mean of teachers' remarks on the *context* dimension of the preschool curriculum is measured as 3.01, the mean of *input* dimension is 3.69, that of *process* dimension is 4.07 and finally, that of *product* dimension is 3.99. The mean of teachers' remarks on the whole scale was measured as 3.77.

The dimension on which teachers had most negative opinions was determined as *context*. The quantitative findings show that there is not enough material for the organization of learning centers, the physical environment of preschool institutions are not suitable and the regional conditions are not taken into account in the curriculum. Teachers' judgments were consulted in these regards. During the interviews, some teachers argued that regional characteristics were considered due to the feasibility of the curriculum and also highlighted that teacher could adopt and apply the curriculum in line with their circumstances. On the other hand, some others pointed out that these regional conditions were ignored. These teachers notably remarked that district areas and villages were neglected.



*"As preschool curriculum is flexible, the teacher could adapt it to regional circumstances. I think s/he could organize it through daily plans. As the plan is flexible, regional circumstances were considered." (T7-District)*

*"I do not believe that all regional circumstances were considered while the preschool curriculum was being prepared. I think those who do not work in the villages have no idea about the villages' circumstances. Such circumstances should be taken into account during the preparation process of the curriculum." (T14-Village)*

*"I believe that regional circumstances have been taken into account. Villages' circumstances are not definitely the same with which of the urban'. Yet, the same curriculum is applied in both areas. Feedbacks gained from the village schools could be indicated in the curriculum." (T13-Village)*

All the teachers interviewed about the physical environment of preschool institutions, which is another subject of teachers' opinions, expressed negative opinions. Teachers have pointed out that while some schools in the urban have relatively better physical conditions, those in rural areas are worse in that sense. They have also emphasized that physical conditions of the preschool institutions do not generally match those specified in the curriculum. Moreover, they have indicated that classrooms are small and that there are problems regarding the heating, water supply, and hygiene. It has been observed that the school/ classroom observed in the province generally had a suitable physical environment but that the learning centers were lacking.

*"I do not find physical conditions sufficient. Especially, I think, open-air areas are insufficient. Moreover, classrooms are not big enough for crowded class size." (T7-District)*

*"I think that physical conditions and preschool curriculum do not coincide. In simple terms, there is a huge difference between the central allocation of the program and my classroom because my classroom is very small." (T8-District)*

*"Physical conditions in villages are not bad, they are really very bad. Weather conditions are rather harsh because of the climate; thus, heating is a problem. Furthermore, there are crucial infrastructural problems. For instance, we have tap water only one or two hours a day. Cleaning and hygiene are great problems." (T12-Village)*

*"Surely it depends on the school. Those in the urban could have better physical conditions. However, physical conditions are really poor here. There are not sinks which children could use in the classroom. We use the stove as the heater in the classroom. Physical conditions could be ameliorated if these problems are solved." (T14-Village)*

*"It is in a building serving as a primary school, secondary school and imam hatip secondary school in the city center. Preschool classrooms are situated in another area of the school and their entrances are different than those of the school. In that field, there is a kitchen to be used by preschool teachers and a store including preschool education materials. Sinks were appropriately designed for children. The hallway is covered with carpets and walls are painted with flowers, butterflies and bird figures. There are park and sports buildings in the schoolyard. Moreover, there are also information technologies class, science laboratory, canteen and library." (O1)*

*"One wall of the classroom is covered with wardrobes suitable for children's length and there are toys above these cupboards. There are not special wardrobes belonging to children." (O2)*

*"There are not learning centers -demonstrated in the curriculum- in this classroom. There is only leisure center; yet, its name and its borders have not been stated." (O4)*

In the quantitative aspect of the study, as mentioned above, there was a negative result about the availability of the materials dealt with the scope of the current situation analysis. While most of the teachers stated that the materials in the classrooms were insufficient and this situation had reverse effects on the process, some teachers asserted that materials in the classrooms depend on the school and the teacher could create new materials on his/her own. Teachers having inadequate materials pointed out that the ministry should help them in that sense. It was observed that there were many materials to be used; yet, there were still some deficiencies in the observed classroom. Furthermore, some materials –such as storybooks- were not eligible enough and some usable materials were kept in the store. Some observational notes and teachers' opinions in this regard are mentioned below.

*“Sufficient materials depend on the location of the school. Especially kindergartens in the urban have sufficient materials. Yet, unfortunately, there are only a few such schools. If they have insufficient materials, teachers could make puppets, toys or musical instruments by themselves.” (T7-District)*

*“The fact that my classroom is small, and that I have no materials is an obstacle for me to organize learning centers. Teachers could enrich these centers with materials they have created on their own and the materials provided by the ministry.” (T15-Village)*

*“I do not have enough material to organize the learning center. Materials that I have made myself wear off so fast. The ministry should make up this shortage.” (T14-Village)*

*“The classrooms without learning centers also have insufficient material. There are bowling pairs, toy blocks, balls and dolls as toys and children could easily access these toys. When it comes to science center's necessary equipment, there is human body model, bascule, globe and season chart and these materials are above the cupboard, an unreachable place for children. Materials to be used in art activity are kept in the store.” (O1)*

*“Many books used in the story activity have been worn off and illustrations of some books are so small. There are only four puppets to be used in the story activity.” (O3)*

As quantitative data proposes, while teachers had generally positive remarks on the *input* dimension, the most negative opinions were related to the consideration of the family factor and children's individual differences in the preschool curriculum. In the interviews carried out with teachers, the level of availability of the children –important elements of *input* dimension- and the adequacy of the teachers was dealt. Whereas most teachers –especially those working in villages- indicated that children did not have the features required by the curriculum, some others argued that children had sufficient availability. Teachers working in villages pointed out that children's availability, mainly the language issue, was not adequate. Two other teachers, emphasizing the individual differences, stated that this situation depends on the child. It has been argued that individual differences should be taken into account in the curriculum. When it comes to the adequacy of teachers, though there are some negative examples, it has been asserted that generally well educated qualified teachers are in charge. Some teachers' answers are given below.

*“This depends on the family of the child, socio-cultural situation, financial situation and the place s/he lives. Though there are not remarkable differences in physical factors, there might be great differences in self-care, social and linguistic development. While these conditions are satisfactory in some places, the situation is worse, under the level of development.” (T7-District)*

*“I do not think that children in the villages have the features required by the curriculum. Especially in the linguistic and self-care abilities. Most of the preschool children do not know Turkish. Their motor development is not at the expected level either. All these greatly affect other zones of development. We could practice the program only after making the availability of the child eligible for its necessities.” (T14-Village)*

*"The program needs to be prepared with greater attention to individual differences in children."  
(T6-District)*

*"I think that teachers generally care about their job. They get experienced and improve themselves in time." (T2-Province)*

*"I believe that preschool teachers should be more involved in self-development and innovation than other teachers. Yet, in that sense, there are incompetent teachers." (T5-District)*

*"I think that teachers from the faculty of education have undergone competent training. A preschool teacher from these faculties could be really successful with the necessary effort and care." (T10-Village)*

Teachers generally expressed positive opinions about the *process* dimension. However, in the quantitative findings, it was determined that qualified homework and evaluation studies were not done adequately and learning centers were not organized regarding the needs. In order to determine how the preschool curriculum has been implemented, it has been tried to determine the general course of the daily plan through observation in a typical preschool class selected in the province center. It has been observed and approved that the teacher uses the daily plan. Daily plan respectively includes starting the day time, game-time, nutrition time, activity time and day evaluation time. It was observed that the education process started with game time. Class sisters or interns generally take care of children in game time. In the game time, children play with the toys in the classroom, paint coloring books and play with potty putty one a week. The teacher usually comes to class for half an hour and meantime, goes to the children playing in the classroom and provides insights about their games. S/he helps children having difficulty in participating in the activities to take part in playgroups. Following this, it has been observed that teacher sometimes takes some notes from the daily plan book or s/he prepares some activities for that day's art activity. Some observations made in game time are indicated below.

*"(12:30) There are 11 children in the classroom. The intern takes care of children. The intern said that 'Those who would like to do painting could take coloring books.' 6 children do painting, 5 others play with toy blocks. There are 22 children after 20 minutes. The teacher came to the classroom 15 minutes later. S/he told the children 'How are you? What are you doing? You painted so well honey. Yes, your painting is greatsweety.' and goes out. S/he comes 10 minutes later." (O1)*

*"There are 18 children in the classroom. Class sister said 'Whoever wants to play with toys could do so. You can play with potty putty today, I will prepare and bring it.' and then went out. There are 25 children 15 minutes later. The class sister brings the potty putty and distributes to the class. The teacher came in 25 minutes later. The teacher observed the games and told the intern ton to bring cardboard from the store. They are preparing that day's art activity with the intern." (O3)*

*"There are 13 children in the classroom. The intern says 'Whoever wants to play with toys could do so. Those who would like to do painting should take markers and sit down. I will bring the papers.' There are 22 children 15 minutes later. Teacher comes in 10 minutes later and sits downs after checking on the games. S/he checks daily plan samples and takes down notes from the book... S/he goes out after taking a storybook from the bookcase. Then the intern went out. The class sister came in 5 minutes later. The teacher came in 10 minutes later and sits to write song lyrics." (O4)*

Children collect toys and cue to wash their hands in game time. As children share shares sinks with the other two classes, they are waiting other classes' cleaning time to end. Meanwhile, the teacher makes a brief "starting the day" activity. Children sometimes stand or sit on the carpet while teacher applies the starting the day activity. Concurrently, in the starting the day period, the teacher takes attendance, provides information about the weather and asks questions about the national holidays coinciding with that week. Some observational notes from starting the day activity are noted below.

*“Children cued after collecting toys. Teacher takes boys’ and then girls’ attendance. She asked such questions: ‘There are not 4 of the girls and 3 of the boys. Thus, how many children absent? What day it is today? What day of the week? How is the weather? Which season are we in?’ and waited for children to answer. Class presidents, there are 2 presidents each day, distribute the soap and paper towel respectively; then children go to wash their hands.” (O2)*

*“After picking up the toys, children were grouped as boys and girls. The teacher counts children individually. Then s/he asks these questions: ‘There are 12 girls and 10 girls. Which group has more members? Which group has fewer members? What day is it today? Which day of the week? How is the weather?’ Afterwards, the teacher explains the instructions for washing hands and children go to wash hands in turn.” (O4)*

*“Children sit on the carpet after picking up the toys. After teacher asks the questions ‘What will we celebrate tomorrow? Well, who attributed this gift to you? In what other country is it celebrated? How is it celebrated?’, children cue. After class presidents hand the liquid soap over, they go to wash their hands.” (O1)*

As there is no common dining hall, the nutrition time is applied in the classroom. Generally, it is done 2 hours after the start and lasts about 40 minutes. In the nutrition time, children first wash their hands and then say the blessing. Meanwhile, it has been observed that teacher is not in the classroom, the intern take care of the children. After finishing eating, children wash their hands and sit on cushions. In the meantime, the class sister cleans the classroom and children’s attention gets distorted. Some observational notes about the nutrition time are listed below.

*“When children wash their hands, the class sister puts each child’s lunch bag on their chairs. Children sit the chairs where their bags have been put and take their meals out. Two class presidents say the blessing and others repeat. Those having finished eating pick the bag up and go to wash their hands. The intern says ‘Whoever has washed their hands should sit on cushions, I will read a story.’ Children sit and wait the activity to start. While the intern is reading the story, the class sister cleans the classroom and opens the windows. Some children do not follow the story; they watch the class sister cleaning. The intern warns as ‘Listen to the story, listen what it says.’ Children listen to the story, 3 of them keep watching the class sister.” (O3)*

*“Those who have washed their hands sit on the chairs on which their bags have been put. They start eating after class presidents say the blessing. Teacher comes in 20 minutes later, tells the intern ‘Call me when they finish eating.’ and goes out. Children having finished eating go to wash their hands and sit on cushions. The class sister starts to clean the classroom. After all children sit down, the intern has children play games and sing. Teacher comes in after the class is cleaned and starts the activity.” (O4)*

On each observation day, these activities were done: Turkish, preparation for reading and writing and math activities. The observations were carried out one day of a week and they lasted for five weeks. In the meantime; two times drama, two times artistic activity, three times play / movement activity and one time science activity were applied. Turkish activity is always done after nutrition time. Before the story; finger games are played, songs are sung and riddles are asked. Puppet and puppet scene was only used once on the observation days. On other days, children follow the story through its visual. The teacher sometimes has children perform breathing and physical exercises after the story activity. Drama activity is carried out without paying attention to the application stages of the drama activity. Teacher could make all children participate in the drama activity. Although s/he tries to give opportunity to all children, some kids just watched the activity. In the game activity, teacher could make changes in accordance with the levels of children. Math and preparation for reading and writing activities are generally carried out at the end of the day and the worksheets on the exercise books-bought by all class- are studied.

Inspecting the teachers' opinions on the activities applied in the process, it could be noticed that activities change from teacher to teacher. While some do all activities, some others do not apply all activities. Teachers working in villages asserted that they did more Turkish, preparation for reading-writing, arts, games and math-based activities in order to develop children's linguistic skills. Four of them stated that they did not do drama activities in that they taught themselves to be incompetent in that sense. Some observational and interview notes on the activities are mentioned below.

*"Teacher asked the children 'Dream a cat and an elephant. Which one is heavier?' After children replied as 'Elephant', the teacher called children. S/he gave a heavy and a slight object to each. Then, asked 'Which one is heavy?. Students replied. Then, the teacher put a transparent container on the table. Showing the stone and paper in his-her hand, s/he asked the children 'Which one is heavy? What happens if I throw them in water?' and did the experiment. Following the experiment, s/he asked the reasons and discussed with children."* (Science activity-O5)

*"Teacher narrated the game after telling children 'We will play an egg-and-spoon race. We need to separate into two groups and to find group names. When the game was started, children were unable to carry the egg on the spoon. The teacher intervened "This does not work, what can we do? What if you use your hands instead of your mouth?' and they all decided to play in this way."* (Game- O2)

*"Teacher told the children 'Let's dream. We are in a huge garden. There is a very interesting tree. What makes this tree interesting?' All students expressed their opinions. The teacher asked such additional questions to the children having difficulty: 'How are its leaves, fruits? How is its color, its length?' When it comes to the children who did not want to talk, the teacher asserted that 'If you wish, you can talk after all your friends are done.'" (Drama- O3)*

*"I use Turkish, language, arts, games and musical activities too much in order for children's linguistic and motor developments to accelerate. As I did language-based activities in the first semester, I focus on science activities in the second semester."* (T14-Village)

*"I always use Turkish, language, arts and games activities; yet, I find myself incompetent at drama and music."* (T5-District)

*"I apply all of them. There is not any that I apply more. The one which I apply less is drama because I find myself incompetent."* (T11-Village)

*"I apply all of them adequately and commensurately."* (T10-Village)

On the observation days, the day evaluation time was carried out only once. On other days, as children's services come and they go home, there is no time left for the evaluation. Inspecting teachers' opinions regarding the difficulties they face in the daily plan, teachers working in the province and in the districts most often have problems with the day evaluation. On the other hand, those working in villages face challenges in the nutrition time because of the inadequacy of physical conditions and families' situations. Some remarks and observational notes are given below.

*"Children having worn their coats sit on the carpet. The teacher told them 'Let's listen quietly and evaluate the day. Did you like the activities? Why did you like? Was it difficult? How did you feel while dreaming in the drama activity? What can we do tomorrow?' and listened to all children. Some children went out as their mothers came. Most of the children left the classroom after around 5 minutes. Five children waited for their bothers and sisters."* (O3)

*"I have difficulty in the day evaluation because children's attention has been completely distracted. As it is almost ending time, the evaluation part is always intervened."* (T5-District)

*"I have always problems in the starting the day and the day evaluation parts because parents do not bring/take children on time." (T6-District)*

*"I have too much trouble in the breakfast/cleaning time because there is not a separate dining hall. It is a big problem to clean the classroom after breakfast. As we do not have any other worker, I have all the responsibility." (T13-Village)*

*"I have problems with the cleaning because families are not conscious in this regard." (T9-Village)*

When it comes to *product* dimension, it has been approved that the preschool curriculum is generally effective and it is only inefficient in solving the problems stemming from the family. During the interviews, all teachers asserted that generally there were improvements in all developmental areas of children. One teacher stated that in addition to the improvements, there are also behavioral problems with some children. Another one argued that while there were positive changes in some children, there is no change in already adequate children. Teachers' some answers follow as:

*"There are big changes even at the end of the first semester." (T14-Village)*

*"Children who keep on going to school make better progress at the end of the academic year. Especially, their receptive language improves." (T13-Village)*

*"The curriculum earns some many things to the children who do know nothing. However, there is not a remarkable change for already competent children." (T2-Province)*

*"I mostly observe the positive behavioral change. Yet, children, who are initially very quiet, get hectic at the end of the year and I might have problems with calming them down." (T8-District)*

Approximately half of the teachers reported that the curriculum was effective as to whether the curriculum was effective in solving family-related problems. Some teachers asserted that the curriculum was not effective in that sense because families were not conscious enough and did not sufficiently participate in the process. These teachers argued that families should be trained with seminars or workshops –regarding family participation- in order for effective solutions. Some teachers pointed out that while the curriculum was effective for some problems, it did not work in other cases either. Some answers of teachers follow as:

*"I find the curriculum ineffective. Awareness could be raised in the families with the training to be organized at the beginning of the year; by this way, it may be possible to find solutions for various problems encountered afterward." (T6-District)*

*"It is effective in some problems even for a short term; however, many problems persist because of the weak communication with the family. In order to overcome these problems, regular training programs should be organized to notify families." (T14-Village)*

*"In some cases, yes. Yet problems could be overcome through cooperation with the family." (T9-Village)*

*"I do not find it effective in rural areas because families are very ignorant, they do not even come to the school." (T12-Village)*

#### ***Findings Regarding As To Whether Teachers' Remarks on the Quality of Preschool Education Differ With Regard To Place of Duty (Or Not)***

The ANOVA test was carried out to analyze as to whether there was a significant difference in the sub-problem of the research between the total of the scale and the scores they received from the subscales. Analyze results are demonstrated in Table 3.

**Table 3.** ANOVA Test Results for Pre-School Curriculum Evaluation Scale in Terms of Place of Duty

Dimensions	Place of Duty	n	Mean	sd		Sum of S.	df	Mean S.	F	p	Significant Difference
Context	Province	83	3.12	.51	Between G.	4.472	2	2.236			
	District	22	3.09	.52	Within G.	30.608	121	.253	8.840	.000	1-3, 2-3
	Village	19	2.58	.42	Total	35.080	123				
Input	Province	83	3.70	.55	Between G.	.409	2	.205			
	District	22	3.84	.60	Within G.	36.544	121	.302	.678	.510	
	Village	19	3.67	.46	Total	36.954	123				
Process	Province	83	4.16	.46	Between G.	2.645	2	1.322			
	District	22	4.10	.45	Within G.	26.213	121	.217	6.105	.003	1-3, 2-3
	Village	19	3.75	.50	Total	28.858	123				
Product	Province	83	3.95	.61	Between G.	1.599	2	.800			
	District	22	4.25	.55	Within G.	41.153	121	.340	2.351	.100	
	Village	19	4.08	.51	Total	42.752	123				
Total	Province	83	3.82	.39	Between G.	1.185	2	.592			
	District	22	3.88	.34	Within G.	17.056	121	.141	4.202	.017	1-3, 2-3
	Village	19	3.57	.35	Total	18.241	123				

As shown in Table 3, it was identified that teachers' opinions regarding the *context* and *process* dimensions and total scale show a statistically significant difference in line with the place of duty variable [ $p < .05$ ]. Tukey Test was operated to determine from which groups this significant difference stemmed. As a result, in the *context* and *process* dimension along with *total* points, opinions of teachers working in the village are disadvantageously and significantly differ from those of working in the province and the districts [ $p < .05$ ].

#### *Findings on the Relationship between the Context- Input- Process-Product Aspects of the Preschool Education*

Table 4 shows the results of Pearson correlation analysis performed to determine the relationships between context, input, process and product dimensions.

**Table 4.** Pearson Correlation Analysis Results About The Relationship Between Dimensions

Dimensions	Input	Process	Product	Total
Context	.321**	.426**	.308**	.677**
Input	-	.246**	.278**	.582**
Process		-	.501**	.845**
Product			-	.723**

\*\*  $p < .01$

As Table 4 suggests, there is a significant positive correlation between scale dimensions [ $p < .01$ ]. It is demonstrated that there is a moderate ( $r = .321$ ) relationship between the context and input dimensions, a moderate ( $r = .426$ ) relationship between context and process dimensions and another moderate ( $r = .308$ ) relationship between the context and product dimensions. It is also notified that there is a low level of association between the input and process ( $r = .246$ ) and product ( $r = .278$ ) dimensions. Lastly, a moderate relationship has emerged between process and product dimensions ( $r = .501$ ).

**Findings Regarding As To Whether Context, Input and Process Dimensions Predict Product (Or Not)**

Table 5 presents the results of stepwise regression analysis about the product's estimation.

**Table 5.** Stepwise Regression Analysis Results About The Product's Estimation

Model	Variables	B	SE	$\beta$	t	p
1	(Constant)	1.531	.393		3.898	.000
	Process	.610	.095	.501	6.397	.000
	R=.501	R <sup>2</sup> =.251	$\Delta$ R <sup>2</sup> =.245	F <sub>(1,122)</sub> =40.923**		
2	(Constant)	1.073	.446		2.403	.018
	Process	.561	.097	.461	5.776	.000
	Input	.177	.086	.165	2.067	.041
	R=.526	R <sup>2</sup> =.277	$\Delta$ R <sup>2</sup> =.265	F <sub>(2,121)</sub> =23.146*		

\*\* p<.01, \* p<.05

As seen in the table, input ( $\beta = .165$ ) and process ( $\beta = .461$ ) are significant predictors of the resulting product ( $F_{(2,121)}=23.146$ ,  $p<.05$ ). The regression analysis carried out to predict the resulting product was operated in two stages. The process dimension –which has the 24.5% power to predict the product- was included in the 1st step of the regression analysis. The input dimension with 2% power to predict the product was incorporated into the 2nd step of the analysis. Therefore, the ratio of two dimensions (process and input) was estimated to be 26.5% in total. Although there is a moderately and positively significant relationship between the context and product dimensions (as in Table 4), it has been determined that this dimension does not contribute independently to the model; in other words, the context dimension is not a significant predictor of the product independently.

### Discussion, Conclusion and Suggestions

This research intends to evaluate the preschool curriculum in accordance with the opinions of preschool teachers and CIPP evaluation model. Inspecting teachers' opinions on the context dimension, it is noticed that the dimension about which teachers expressed most negative views is the context dimension and that the average level of opinions on this dimension is moderate. It is also demonstrated that there are important problems regarding the context dimension on which current situation analysis has been operated. Preschool teachers have indicated that especially the physical infrastructure of preschool institutions is not proper and that regional conditions were not sufficiently taken into account during the curriculum development process. It has been observed that there are learning centers in the classroom. The studies carried out by Baki and Hacısalıhoğlu Karadeniz (2013) and İş (2017) also indicate that there are infrastructural inefficiencies in preschool institutions. Kubanç (2014) has examined the physical conditions of preschool institutions and concluded that there is not a standard base to design preschool institutions and there are inefficient to satisfy the need. As Düzgün's (2014) study suggests, preschool curriculum should be developed in line with regional conditions and this conclusion is consistent with another result of the study indicating that regional conditions have been ignored in the preschool curriculum.

It is indicated that teachers' opinions on the input dimension of the preschool curriculum are above the middle average. It has been emphasized that teachers find the curriculum strategy (Yüksel & Sağlam, 2012), to be evaluated at the input dimension, qualified. The curriculum schedule with such features as being child-centred, flexible, game-based, eclectic, and spiral (MONE, 2013) was found quality enough by the participants. In other words, it has been concluded that bot only activities and daily plans envisaged to be implemented are sufficient; but also, that the acquisitions are appropriate and the availability level of children is sufficient enough to implement the curriculum. In the study conducted by Özsırkıntı et al. (2014), it was found out that the achievements and planned studies in the pre-school curriculum seemed appropriate in accordance with the result of this study. A study was conducted by Dilek (2013) in order to evaluate the 2006 preschool curriculum and this study has shown



that more than half of the teachers find the goals, acquisitions, and activities "partially satisfactory." Evaluating all results together, it could be argued that there are some improvements in the acquisitions and activities of 2013 program compared to previous ones. On the other hand, it can be asserted that the role of the families in the curriculum and children's individual differences are not considered sufficiently. On the other hand, although it was included in the curriculum, it was stated by the participants that the role of parents and the individual differences of children were not taken into consideration sufficiently in the curriculum. Explanations about family participation in the curriculum were found "partially satisfactory" in the study conducted by Dilek (2013). However, parent participation contributes to teachers, children, families, and institutions; in addition, it plays a key role in realizations of effective and lasting learning (Brotman et al., 2011; Ekinçi Vural, 2006; Fan & Chen, 2001; Gürşimşek, 2003; McWayne, Downer, Campos, & Harris, 2013). Therefore, it can be argued that this issue and the related explanations should be more covered in the curriculum.

Examining the quantitative data, it has been determined that teacher have positive opinions on the process dimension. The most effective activities applied by teachers regarding the process dimension are including effective learning activities, effectively using the game time, adopting activities in line with children's level and including child-based activities. Considering the fact that these studies put the child in the centre, the feature of child-centeredness is being largely implemented. Though it cannot be deemed as insufficient, the least-implemented activities in the process are qualified home practices, evaluation studies and the addition or removal of learning centers on demand. Studies carried out by Işık (2015) and Özsirkıntı et al. (2014) demonstrate that teachers have difficulty in establishing learning centers in that physical conditions of the class are not suitable and the number of children is high. However, the research executed by Özyürek and Kılınc (2015) has concluded that most of the teachers find the learning centers adequate and some others do not have enough opportunities to establish learning centers. Families are the first and the most effective teachers of children. Parental involvement in the children's education is both a fundamental right and a necessity (Ljubetic, Ercegovic, & Koludrovic, 2016). Because children begin their preschool education school with their parents, not with curriculum vitae. Therefore, teachers should consult parents to determine the interests, needs, abilities, and cultural experience of children (Bredenkamp, 2014). The finding that home practices, which are one of the most negative points in the process dimension, have been made less is accompanied by a low level of family participation in the process. In this regard, research conducted by Erkan et al. (2015) has shown that families do not consistently participate in the preschool education process. In the study practiced by Ntumi (2016), teachers have pointed out that families do not participate in their children's education process and that they are not even aware of this, they see it as a waste of time and they also regard preschool institutions as playgrounds rather than learning centers. However, we are faced with the fact that family participation has positive effects on the development of children and we have encountered various studies (Ekinçi Vural, 2006; Gürşimşek, 2003; Hindman & Morrison, 2012; Jeynes, 2015; Son & Morrison, 2010) to reveal this fact. Therefore, it is essential that contacting families through home visits, letters, telephone/internet-supported interviews and encouraging families to participate in meetings, educational activities, decision-making and program development processes (Morrison, 2003).

As a result of the qualitative data analysis, it has been determined that daily plan is implemented in the process and starting the day part, supposed to be practiced at the beginning, is partially done after the game time because children come to class at different times. Furthermore, it has been determined that day evaluation time is rarely practiced in that there is no time left and parents come early to take the children. These conclusions indicate that there are problems applying starting the day and the day evaluation parts during the implementation of the preschool curriculum. Apart from this, it has been determined that game time, nutrition time, playing and activity time are practiced with the help of the class sister and the intern. Interviews carried out with teachers have revealed that whereas teachers working in the province and the districts have problems with the day evaluation time, which is consistent with the observations. In the curriculum of preschool education, a multi-dimensional evaluation should be made in such a way that not only children and teachers but also the

curriculum itself has been evaluated. In the daily plan, children are expected to evaluate the activities they do with teachers, the materials they use, as well as the events making them happy or unhappy (MONE, 2013). This being the case, the present study has revealed that some of the important aspects emphasized in the curriculum are dealt with poorly. The teachers working in villages encounter problems with cleaning/ nutrition time because of the current situations and families. These results justify the fact that the inadequacy of existing conditions, demonstrated in the context dimension, negatively affects the process as well. It has been notified that activities to be applied depend on the teacher, that especially Turkish, preparation for reading/writing and math activities are practiced more and those other activities are rarely or never practiced. It has been determined that some teachers do not apply drama activities because they find themselves incompetent. The preschool education curriculum was designed to be a balanced one, so it was emphasized that activities usually done should be enriched with variety (MONE, 2013). The present study concludes that this balance tends to be disturbed in favour of helping children acquire reading and writing skills, as well as for their Turkish and mathematics activities.

When it comes to product dimension, the curriculum has been found to help children adapt to the school environment and to greatly contribute to their motor development. It has been concluded that it is not efficient to solve problems related to the family. It could be argued that one reason for this negative result lies in the fact that family factor has not been considered in the program –as justified in the input dimension- and the fact that home practices, enabling families to be more included in the process, have not been applied enough. Studies carried out by İş (2017) and Yazar (2013) have proven that the program remarkably contributes to the cognitive, social, linguistic, psychomotor and self-care skills of children and that these acquisitions have reached to a significant extent. The research conducted by İş (2007) has proven that there are characteristics/skills not developed enough for each dimension. In terms of cognitive development, it has been detected that there are problems in senior cognitive skills such as "problem-solving, cause-effect relationship"; in "developing empathy and identifying different cultures" with regard to social development; in "grammar, vocabulary, phonetics and reading awareness with regard to linguistic development; in "small motor skills" with regard to psychomotor development and in "healthy and regular diet" with regard to self-care skills.

Teachers' opinions regarding the quality of the curriculum depend on their place of duty. It has been revealed that teachers working in villages are more pessimistic than those working in the province and the districts. Considering the fact that current conditions in villages are less adequate than those in the province and districts, it can be verified that this situation will affect the education process negatively. However, this result shows that one of the general purposes of the preschool education curriculum, that is, to create a common growth medium for the children raised in underprivileged families and environments with unfavourable conditions, is not sufficiently achieved. Düzgün's study (2014) proposed that teachers in schools with low socio-economic level have less opportunity than those in the prestigious schools to practice many required activities. In their study, Özpınar and Sarpkaya (2010) find out that teachers in villages do not have the materials they need and they face difficulty in having access to these materials. In a study, including primary school teachers, carried out by Mercan Uzun and Alat (2014), it has been determined that teachers working in villages find the cognitive availability of children low. Thus, it is necessary to make up material deficiencies and to improve the conditions of the schools in villages so that updated programs in the Turkish Education System could be effectively implemented (Karacaoğlu & Acar, 2010).

As a result of the analysis of the data obtained from 124 teachers working in Van, Turkey, who participated in the study, it has been determined that all dimensions have a positive significant relationship with each other. The highest correlation was found between process and product dimensions. Aslan et al. (2016) reached a similar result in their research. As a result of the stepwise regression analysis performed to predict the quality of the product, the process dimension alone has the power to determine about four quarters of the product. In the same analysis, it has been found out that whereas the input has 2% explanatory power on the product, the context does not have an independent

explanatory power on the product though it has a moderate relation with the product. These results can be interpreted as the expectation that the quality of the product may be expected to be high especially if a qualified process is gone through.

The significant results mentioned in this study were achieved within some limitations, the first of which is the period during which data were collected. The data of this study were collected during the second semester of 2016-2017. The second limitation could be that quantitative data were obtained from 124 preschool education teachers working in the same city. If the sample size were higher and the data were collected from different provinces, the study would be stronger. The third limitation is that, at the qualitative level, only observation and interviews were emphasized, thus a documentary-based analysis of the curriculum schedule was not made. Finally, although a comprehensive model is available for evaluating the preschool education curriculum, only one model (CIPP evaluation model) was used in this study.

The following suggestions are listed in line with the findings and limitations of the research:

- Physical conditions in preschool institutions should be ameliorated so that the curriculum could be effectively applied.
- The curriculum should be developed in deference to different regions/conditions and teachers should be trained as to how this curriculum should be practiced.
- The curriculum should be developed and practiced taking into account the importance of family involvement in the educational process
- Home practices to increase family involvement and assessment studies to demonstrate children's development should be included more.
- Evaluating the preschool curriculum in the light of the data obtained from different sample groups and different evaluation models would be useful in determining the effectiveness of the curriculum in different conditions.
- The primary source of data in this study is preschool teachers and children. In addition, the preschool curriculum could be evaluated from a different perspective by collecting data from stakeholders such as parents, school managers, etc.

## References

- Aslan, M., & Sağlam, M. (2017). Methodological investigation of the curriculum evaluation theses completed between the years 2006-2015 in Turkey. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 5(9), 1468-1478.
- Aslan, M., Soyalt, H., Karahan, O., & Altuntaş, M. (2016). Okul öncesi eğitim programı değerlendirme ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi. *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 8(1), 677-683.
- Baki, A., & Hacısalihoğlu Karadeniz, M. (2013). Okul öncesi eğitim programının matematik uygulama sürecinden yansımalar. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 21(2), 619-636.
- Balcı, A. (2010). *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma: Yöntem, teknik ve ilkeler*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Berk, L. E. (2013). *Bebekler ve çocuklar: Doğum öncesinden orta çocukluğa* (N. Işıkoğlu Erdoğan, Trans.). Ankara: Nobel.
- Bredenkamp, S. (2014). *Effective practices in early childhood education: Building a foundation*. NJ: Pearson.
- Brotman, L. M., Calzada, E., Huang, K. Y., Kingston, S., Dawson-McClure, S., Kamboukos, D., ... & Petkova, E. (2011). Promoting effective parenting practices and preventing child behavior problems in school among ethnically diverse families from underserved, urban communities. *Child Development*, 82(1), 258-276.
- Commodari, E. (2013). Preschool teacher attachment, school readiness and risk of learning difficulties. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 28(1), 123-133.
- Conyers, L. M., Reynolds, A. J., & Ou, S. R. (2003). The effect of early childhood intervention and subsequent special education services: Findings for the Chicago Child-Parent Centers. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 25, 75-95.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*. California: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Demirel, Ö. (2015). *Eğitimde program geliştirme: Kuramdan uygulamaya*. Pegem Akademi.
- Diken, İ. H. (2014). *Erken çocukluk eğitimi*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Dilek, H. (2013). *2006 okul öncesi eğitim programının değerlendirilmesi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Gazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.
- Dilek, H., & Duman, T. (2014). 2006 okul öncesi eğitim programının değerlendirilmesi. *Gazi Üniversitesi Endüstriyel Sanatlar Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 33, 143-158.
- Duffy, B. (2006). *Supporting creativity and imagination in the early years*. UK: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Düzgün, Ü. (2014). *Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin okul öncesi eğitim programı ve 2012 değişikliklerinin uygulanmasına ilişkin görüşleri (Kayseri ili örneği)* (Unpublished master's thesis). Erciyes University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Kayseri.
- Ekinci Vural, D. (2006). *Okul öncesi eğitim programındaki duyuşsal ve sosyal becerilere yönelik hedeflere uygun olarak hazırlanan aile katılımlı sosyal beceri eğitimi programının çocuklarda sosyal becerilerin gelişimine etkisi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Dokuz Eylül University, Graduate School of Social Sciences, İzmir.
- Erkan, S. (2011). Farklı sosyoekonomik düzeydeki ilköğretim birinci sınıf öğrencilerinin okula hazır bulunuşluklarının incelenmesi. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 40(40), 186-197.
- Erkan, S., & Kırca, A. (2010). Okul öncesi eğitimin ilköğretim birinci sınıf öğrencilerinin okula hazır bulunuşluklarına etkisinin incelenmesi. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 38(38), 94-106.

- Erkan, S., Tarman, İ., Ömrüuzun, I., Koşan, Y., Kuru, N., & Kaymak, S. (2015). Okul öncesi eğitimde ev ziyaretlerine ilişkin öğretmen ve ebeveyn görüşlerinin belirlenmesi. *Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 35(2), 307-332.
- Ertürk, S. (2013). *Eğitimde "program" geliştirme* (6<sup>th</sup> ed). Ankara: Edge Akademi.
- Fan, X., & Chen, M. (2001). Parental involvement and students' academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 13(1), 1-22.
- Gelişli, Y., & Yazıcı, E. (2012). Türkiye'de uygulanan okul öncesi eğitim programlarının tarihsel süreç içerisinde değerlendirilmesi. *Gazi Üniversitesi Endüstriyel Sanatlar Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 29, 85-93.
- Gökmenoğlu, T. (2015). Geniş açı: Modeller ve yaklaşımlar açısından Türkiye'de program değerlendirme çalışmaları. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instructional Studies*, 4(7), 55-70.
- Göle, M. O., & Temel, F. (2015). Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin nitelikli bir okul öncesi eğitim programında bulunması gereken özelliklere ilişkin görüşlerinin incelenmesi. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 11(3), 663-684.
- Gürşimşek, I. (2003). Okul öncesi eğitime aile katılımı ve psikososyal gelişim. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 3(1), 125-144.
- He, Y. (2015). Investigation on the development of preschool education informationization of ethnic region in Gansu, China. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 4(3), 161-167.
- Hindman, A. H., & Morrison, F. J. (2012). Differential contributions of three parenting dimensions to preschool literacy and social skills in a middle-income sample. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 58(2) 191-223.
- Huck, S. W. (2000). *Reading statistics and research*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Ishimine, K., & Tayler, C. (2014). Assessing quality in early childhood education and care. *European Journal of Education*, 49(2), 272-290.
- Işık, N. E. (2015). *Öğretmenlerin MEB 2013 okul öncesi eğitim programı hakkındaki görüşleri ve programı kullanma durumları* (Unpublished master's thesis). Gazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.
- İş, A. (2017). *Okul öncesi ve sınıf öğretmenlerinin 2013 okul öncesi eğitim programındaki kazanımların gerçekleşme düzeyine yönelik algıları* (Unpublished master's thesis). Fırat University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Elazığ.
- Jeynes, W. (2015). A meta-analysis: The relationship between father involvement and student academic achievement. *Urban Education*, 50(4), 387-423.
- Karacaoğlu, Ö. C., & Acar, E. (2010). Yenilenen programların uygulanmasında öğretmenlerin karşılaştığı sorunlar. *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 7(1), 45-58.
- Kitta, S., & Kapinga, O. S. (2015). Towards designing effective preschool education programmes in Tanzania: What can we learn from theories?. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(5), 180-185.
- Köksal, O., Balaban Dağal, A., & Duman, A. (2016). Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin okul öncesi eğitim programı hakkındaki görüşlerinin belirlenmesi. *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies*, 46, 376-394.
- Kubanç, Y. (2014). Okul öncesi eğitim kurumlarının fiziki durumunun incelenmesi. *Journal of International Social Research*, 7(31), 675-688.
- Kurt, A., & Erdoğan, M. (2015). Program değerlendirme araştırmalarının içerik analizi ve eğilimleri; 2004-2013 yılları arası. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 40(178), 199-224.
- Kuru Turaşlı, N. (2018). Okul öncesi eğitimin tanımı, kapsamı ve önemi. In G. Haktanır (Ed.), *Erken çocukluk eğitimine giriş* (pp. 9-30). Ankara: Anı.
- Kürüm Yapıcıoğlu, D., Atik Kara, D., & Sever, D. (2016). Trends and problems in curriculum evaluation studies in turkey: the perspective of domain experts. *Uluslararası Eğitim Programları ve Öğretim Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 6(12), 91-114.

- Ljubetic, M., Ercegovic, I. R., & Koludrovic, M. (2016). Quality partnership as a contextual prerequisite of successful learning of young and preschool-aged children. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 5(1), 78.
- McWayne, C., Downer, J. T., Campos, R., & Harris, R. D. (2013). Father involvement during early childhood and its association with children's early learning: A meta-analysis. *Early Education & Development*, 24(6), 898-922.
- Mercan Uzun, E., & Alat, K. (2014). İlkokul birinci sınıf öğretmenlerinin 4+ 4+ 4 eğitim sistemi ve bu sistem sonrasında ilkokula başlayan öğrencilerin hazır bulunuşlukları hakkındaki görüşleri. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 14(2), 15-44.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Sage.
- MONE. (2006). *36-72 aylık çocuklar için okul öncesi eğitim programı*. Ankara: Ya-Pa.
- MONE. (2013). *Okul öncesi eğitim programı*. Retrieved from <https://tegm.meb.gov.tr/dosya/okuloncesi/ooproram.pdf>
- Morrison, G. S. (2003). *Fundamentals of early childhood education*. New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.
- Ntumi, S. (2016). Challenges pre-school teachers face in the implementation of the early childhood curriculum in the cape coast metropolis. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(1), 54-62.
- OECD. (2016). *Education at a glance 2016: OECD indicators*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- OECD. (2018). *Education at a glance 2018: OECD indicators*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Ornstein, A. C., & Hunkins, F. P. (2004). *Curriculum: Foundations, principles and issues*. Boston: Pearson/Allyn and Bacon.
- Özdemir, S. M. (2009). Eğitimde program değerlendirme ve Türkiye'de eğitim programlarını değerlendirme çalışmalarının incelenmesi. *Yüzyüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 6(2), 126-149.
- Özpinar, M., & Sarpkaya, R. (2010). Köyde görev yapan sınıf öğretmenlerinin sorunları. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 27(27), 17-29.
- Özsırkıntı, D., Akay, C., & Yılmaz-Bolat, E. (2014). Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin okul öncesi eğitim programı hakkındaki görüşleri (Adana ili örneği). *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 15(1), 313-331.
- Özyürek, A., & Kılınc, N. (2015). Okul öncesi eğitim kurumlarındaki öğrenme merkezlerinin çocukların serbest oyun davranışları üzerine etkisi. *Karabük Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 5(2), 125-138.
- Sapsağlam, Ö. (2013). Değerlendirme boyutuyla okul öncesi eğitim programları (1952-2013). *Uluslararası Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 1(1), 63-73.
- Senemoğlu, N. (1994). Okulöncesi eğitim programı hangi yeterlikleri kazandırmalıdır?. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 10(10), 21-30.
- Son, S. H., & Morrison, F. J. (2010). The nature and impact of changes in home learning environment on development of language and academic skills in preschool children. *Developmental Psychology*, 46(5), 1103-1118.
- Stufflebeam, D. L., Madaus, G. F., & Kellaghan, T. (2002). *Evaluation models: Viewpoints on educational and human services evaluation*. Dordrechts: Springer.
- Taner, M., & Başal, H. A. (2005). Farklı sosyoekonomik düzeylerde okulöncesi eğitimi alan ve almayan ilköğretim birinci sınıf öğrencilerinin dil gelişimlerinin cinsiyete göre karşılaştırılması. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 18(2), 395-420.
- Trawick Smith, J. (2013). *Erken çocukluk döneminde gelişim: Çok kültürlü bir bakış açısı* (B. Akman, Trans.). Ankara: Nobel.

- Türkkaş Anasız, B., Ekinci, C. E., & Anasız, B. Y. (2018). Okul öncesi eğitime katılımın daha sonraki yıllardaki akademik başarıya etkisi: TEOG sınavları. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 19(2), 154-173.
- Tyler, R. W. (1949). *The basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Uşun, S. (2012). *Eğitimde program değerlendirme*. Ankara: Anı.
- World Bank. (2011). *Türkiye’de temel eğitimde kalite ve eşitliğin geliştirilmesi*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Yazar, A. (2013). *Okul öncesi eğitim programının ilkokula hazırlık açısından etkililiğinin incelenmesi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Atatürk University, Institute of Education Sciences, Erzurum.
- Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2011). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Seçkin.
- Yüksel, İ., & Sağlam, M. (2012). *Eğitimde program değerlendirme*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.