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Abstract: The aim of this study is to evaluate the EFL curriculum of public secondary schools of Afghanistan employing CIPP evaluation model. The model has four dimensions including context, input, process and product. Utilizing an adopted questionnaire, 38 schools were selected through cluster sampling where 73 EFL teachers were involved as the participants of the study. The total items of the instrument pertaining to respondent opinions were 46: context 10; input 6; process 8 and product 22 (Hakan & Seval, 2011). Data were transferred and analyzed through SPSS version 24 to find out descriptive statistics (frequency, mean and standard deviation) of the participants’ responses. The main findings of the study show that most of the teachers are agree to some extent (between partly agree and agree) with the four components of the in-use curriculum. Thus, it is recommended to reform and improve the curriculum.
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1.0 Introduction

Evaluation, being universally accepted, is one of the basic components of curriculum and an integral part of teaching and learning (Agrawal, 2004). Typically, there are two types of evaluation–formative and summative–which have been accompanied curriculum development (Scriven, 1967) for a long time. Formative evaluation take place during the development of curriculum (Tamir, 1988) when information is keyed proactively to the improvement
(Stufflebeam, 2003). Conversely, summative evaluation is performed after the completion of the development providing information to the users how to utilized the materials most effectively (Tamir, 1988). In order to know whether an implemented novice curriculum is effective or not, evaluation or quality control is pivotal (Lewy, 1977). The loss of the effectiveness of the curriculum is termed deterioration which may be total, differential or unintended (p.155). For instance, English as a Foreign Language (EFL) curriculum of Afghanistan was entirely replaced with the current curriculum because of total deterioration in 2001. Thus, to improve the quality of education, evaluation is widely acknowledged as a powerful means for achievement.

Other than that, as interest in English as an International Language (EIL) is substantially increasing in line with the current rapid development in technology, EFL students are required to communicate in English (Asadi, Kiany, Akbari, & Samar, 2016). In Afghanistan, English is considered as a foreign language being taught along with national languages at school level where EFL curriculum make an important contribution to students’ learning. It is probably best to see textbooks as a means of achieving aims and objectives that have already been set in terms of learners’ needs (Litz, 2005) as part of the curriculum. Curricula need constant and regular evaluation to keep up to date and to comply with the developments and changes in current condition and time since curriculum facilitates individuals’ access to education (Batdi, 2017) where a nation of a country survives on it.

Hence, in order to satisfy the demands of the students, society and stakeholders, changes in curriculum in general and in English programs in specific have been witnessed, but still it is unexplored and unknown if the in-use curriculum fulfills the needs of the students as well as other stakeholders. Darassalam (2010) asserts that there are many models for evaluation such as goal-free evaluation model; Tyler’s objective-centered model; Hammond model; management-oriented evaluation model; and CIPP model. Among them, Sufflebeam CIPP model is the most adopted one for evaluating curricula, programs and institutions acknowledged for its comprehensibility, reliability and efficacy (Al-Shanawani, 2019). Therefore, by employing CIPP model, this study aims to investigate the effectiveness of the EFL curriculum at secondary school level in Afghanistan. The study attempts to answer the following research questions:
**Research Questions**

1. What are the Afghan EFL teachers’ perspectives regarding the context dimension of the curriculum?
2. What are the Afghan EFL teachers’ perspectives regarding the input dimension of the curriculum?
3. What are the Afghan EFL teachers’ perspectives regarding the process dimension of the curriculum?
4. What are the Afghan EFL teachers’ perspectives regarding the product dimension of the curriculum?

**2.0 Literature Review**

**2.1 Curriculum and Program Evaluation**

The evaluation of educational programs or curriculum is a relatively emerging profession which came into use in 1960s (Ball, 2011). To Ulum (2016), program evaluation refers to the implementation of arranged and planned procedures seeking information about the applications and outcomes of the program. The purpose of such evaluation is to make the decision makers aware of the essential information about current or proposed educational programs. The decisions include either to develop or design a program (needs assessment), how best to develop a program (formative evaluation) or to modify or continue the current program (summative evaluation) (Ball, 2011). In education field, evaluation has been continuously employed to assess educational programs since the last five decades, however, its implementation in English Language Teaching (ELT) is comparably a current topic of discussion among researchers (Ulum, 2016). Moreover, evaluation of educational programs in various contexts is beneficial examining a program’s success, merit, worth, validity and students’ needs.

Curriculum evaluation is the process of collecting information to make judgements about the effectiveness and worth of a specific educational program (Hussain et al., 2011). Also, evaluation in education is considered as a process of judging the implemented curriculum’s competence (Kartas and Fer, 2009). However, Lewy (1977) states that curriculum evaluation, quality control stage, should be done for the improvement of the curriculum rather than as a means
of making judgements. The methods involved in evaluating a curriculum are questionnaire, interview, observation, experiments, discussion, opinions of stakeholders, official records and practical performance (Hussain et al., 2011; Lewy, 1977). The purpose of curriculum evaluation is to determine the effectiveness, quality, importance and value of the attained objectives based on defined criteria. Before implementing the curriculum, evaluation seeks to examine the strengths and weaknesses of proposed curriculum, and after implementation, the effectiveness of the observed outcomes is determined (Kartas and Fer, 2009). Curriculum evaluation is not an easy and simple process to conduct, for it is a continuous and sophisticated process involving several stages of obtaining, selecting, analyzing and transferring the data, and the most crucial stage is to make decisions on the quality of curriculum.

2.2 Stufflebeam's CIPP Model of Evaluation

According to Aziz, Mahmood and Rehman (2018), many models and designs have been utilized for evaluating programs, projects or working of institutes where CIPP model is mostly applied in curriculum evaluation. Ulum (2016) whilst citing Stufflebeam (2003) defines evaluation guiding the CIPP model as the process of outlining, acquiring, supplying and using descriptive data on the value and merit of certain objects’ aims, forms, achievement and impacts to route the development compromises, providing documentation on liability, updating decisions and creating an understanding of the experience covered. According to Stufflebeam (2003), the model also represents formative and summative evaluation, thus, it can be employed for both types of evaluations as well. Understanding the four components of the Stufflebeam Model in evaluating a program is relatively important. In the late 1960s, CIPP model was developed to help strengthen and accomplish accountability for U.S. school programs, particularly those aimed at improving teaching and learning in urban, inner city school districts (Stufflebeam, 2003). Then, the Model was further developed and applied in evaluating many different areas in education not only in the United States but also world-wide. Having a wide-range of applicability, it is utilized internally by schools, school districts, universities, business, government agencies, charitable foundations and other organization; teachers, educational administrators, external evaluators and others to improve their services (P.31).

Proposing context, input, process and product for evaluation, the model assesses the needs; plans or strategies, responsiveness of the program; extent of the outcomes; and impact of both the
intended and unintended outcomes simultaneously (Thurab-Nkhosi, 2019). The model aims to provide concrete information that will regularly assist evaluators in evaluating and improving services and to make practical and adequate use of sources, duration and technology to adequately and reasonably fulfill the desired requirements of relevant beneficiaries (Ullum, 2016). Mainly it focuses on to improve not to prove (Stufflebeam, 2003). Delineating each component of the model, the following part entails the context, input, process and product.

2.2.1 Context

The purpose of context evaluation is to define the environment, identify the necessary and absolute conditions associated with the environment, focus on the unattainable or overlooked needs, and define the rationale behind the requirements which are not obtained (Darama, Karaduman, Kahraman, & Gündoğdu, 2018). To put differently, it evaluates the needs, assets and resources employing both qualitative and quantitative analysis by means of data collection, document review and stakeholders’ interviews (To, 2017). It rates the context to see whether it is aligned with goals or not. Also, (Stufflebeam, 2000; Hasan, Yasin and Yunus, 2015) maintained that rating context refers to the needs, challenges and opportunities as a basis for identifying goals and priorities when deciding on the importance of a product. The methods used in contextual evaluation include system analysis, analysis of secondary data, document analysis, surveys, interviews, diagnostic tests, and the Delphi technique (Dalkey and Helmer, as cited in Ullum, 2016).

2.2.2 Input

The input evaluation aims to assess the resources and capabilities, the plans and approaches to accomplish the aims of the program which may include budgets, scheduling implantation development procedures, human and material assets and cost-benefit analysis (To, 2017). Projecting and analyzing alternative procedural designs, the input evaluation serves structuring decisions (Tokmak, Baturay, and Fadde, 2013) which includes a variety of approaches and program planning essential for program implementation (Hasan, Yasin, & Yunus, 2015). In other way, it reflects on assessing various implementation approaches for a program with the goal of finding an appropriate method that effectively addresses the needs determined through context assessment (Frye & Hemmer, 2012). Also, it “assesses competing strategies and the work plans and budgets of the selected approach” (Stufflebeam, 2007, P.5). Apart from this, the steps in the
input assessment include evaluation of potential volunteers, materials resources, schedules, and budgets (Zhang et al., 2011).

2.2.3 Process Component

Based on CIPP model, process component is considered as an ongoing assessment and documentation of the implemented plans and actions that guide activities and explain the outcomes (Stufflebeam, 2000). In education field, the focus of process evaluation is on the implementation of teaching and learning processes and programs (Aziz, Mahmood and Rahman, 2018) where the goal is to provide feedback to individuals for taking responsibility of the curriculum activities (Warju, 2016). Moreover, changes in the plans and the omissions or execution of certain procedures are considered (Stufflebeam, 2000). Feedback is provided during the implementation stage of the program by evaluators and then reports on the extent of implemented program as planned or intended are also provided (Stufflebeam and Coryn, 2014). In addition, this process helps in identifying implementation problems and making corrections in the plan when needed. He further mentions another objective of process evaluation as to periodically assess the extent of acceptance and execution of participants’ roles. According to Tan, Lee and Hall (2010), at the process stage of evaluation, a structured design is put on trial and evidence is collected in order to determine the success or effectiveness of objectives and process. The techniques involved in process evaluation consist of interview with participants, questionnaires, rating scales, on-site observations, case studies, focus groups, records analysis, photographic records and self-reflect sessions with involved participants (Zhang et al., 2011).

2.2.4 Product Component

Product evaluation is concerned with the assessment and identification of intended, unintended, positive, negative, short-term and long-term outcomes of the program which helps in keeping the process on track and determining the effectiveness (Stufflebeam, 2012; 2000; Stufflebeam and Coryn, 2014). According to Warju (2016), Stufflebeam suggested four aspects of evaluation by implementing product evaluation as impact, effectiveness, sustainability and transportability. The main focus of evaluator is to assess whether current program’s objectives meet the needs of the learners, record and assess learners’ level of success in meeting the intended needs, and to make decisions whether to maintain, reject (stop) or to make changes (improvements)
to the program (Stufflebeam, 2012). In addition, stakeholders’ judgements are gathered and analyzed in product evaluation stage by comparing the efforts’ outcomes with those of other similar programs. By doing product evaluation, evaluators should interpret the causes of poor outcomes by viewing from different vantage points such as in the aggregate, for sub-groups and for individuals (Stufflebeam, 2000). Several instruments as test sheets, observation sheets and interview sheets are used to observe the change in learners’ behavior after implementing a learning program (Warju, 2016). The whole focus of product evaluation stage is not only on learners’ achievement scores but also on the attainment of skills, attitudes, knowledge and abilities which learners are going to apply in real life situations to benefit society (Aziz, Mahmood and Rahman, 2018).

3.0 Method

The aim of this quantitative study was to analyze Afghan EFL secondary school curriculum based on teachers’ perspectives. To understand the four components of the current in use curriculum, a descriptive model was employed which Karasar (1999) considers important for grasping the gist picture of an existing situation (as cited by Hakan, & Seval, 2011).

3.1 Participants

Indicating the quality of the research findings, it is of importance for the researchers to define and determine the sampling procedures (Collins, Onwuegbuzie & Jiao, 2006). In this study, cluster sampling was used which represents variety in the population selected randomly (Newby, 2014). By cluster sampling, a researcher can select specific number of schools (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2000), so 38 secondary schools were chosen from Kabul province. Then, within each school, EFL teachers were involved in the study as participants.

3.2 Instrument

A questionnaire adopted from (Hakan and Seval, 2011) was administered to the respondents via online google form where they were asked to read and rate each item carefully. A total of 73 teachers answered the distributed questionnaire. The instrument was already validated and reliability was checked by the developer in the frame of the Stufflebeam’s CIPP evaluation model principles (p.594). The scale of the questionnaire was based on a five-point Likert scale ranges from Strongly disagree, disagree, partly agree, agree to Strongly agree covering all four
components of the CIPP model. The total items of the instrument pertaining to respondents’ opinions are 46 (context 10; input 6; process 8 and product 22)

3.3 Data Analysis:

The data collected via the questionnaire were analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS v. 24) a computer program which performs most of the statistical calculation (Evans, 1996). As the instrument was designed on a five-point scale, the number values ranging from 1 to 5 was determined for each item in order to be able to perform the analysis. After collecting the data, descriptive statistics methods (frequency, mean and standard deviation) were employed for the analysis. First, the frequency and standard deviation were calculated, then means of the teachers’ views were analyzed.

While calculating the mean, point intervals for the measuring scale were identified as: (1-1.79 “Strongly Disagree”), (1.80-2.59 “Disagree”), (2.60-3.39 “Partly Agree”), (3.40-4.19 “Agree”) and (4.20-5 “Strongly Agree”). The intervals were calculated by the formula of 5-1= 4 and 4/5 =0.80 (Karataş and Fer, 2009). The related statistics obtained from the collected data are presented in tables.

4.0 Results and Discussion

Results of the study related to the research questions are described in the following sections based on the data obtained from the participants through questionnaire. The data are grouped under the categories from the questionnaire. Table 1,2,3 and 4 show teachers’ perceptions on the Context, Input, Process and Product components of the English Curriculum respectively.

The first section of the questionnaire is consisting of 10 items on the context of the curriculum aiming to find out teachers’ perspectives on the EFL curriculum currently taught at Secondary schools in Afghanistan. Table 1 clarifies the results of the teachers’ perspectives related to the Context of the curriculum.
Among the above ten items in the first part of the questionnaire regarding the context of the curriculum, the 2\textsuperscript{nd} item \textit{(The objectives of the curriculum meet the needs of the students regarding English.)}
regarding English) with the mean ($\bar{x}$) 3.3973 is the most agreed and the 4th item (The reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills are balanced well in the curriculum) with the mean ($\bar{x}$) 2.5068 is the least agreed item by the EFL teachers. The mean (3.3973) of the 2nd item in the questionnaire represents that the participants are in favor (agree) of curriculum objectives to meet needs of the students, and the mean ($\bar{x}$) 2.5068 of the 4th item comes in the category of the disagreement which means that EFL teachers are against (not agreed) the balance of the language skills in the curriculum. This disagreement indicates that the language skills are not well distributed which results in producing incompetent users of the language.

For the item five (The level of the difficulty of the topics in the curriculum complies with their duration) and eight (The Coursebook attracts the students’ attention) in the questionnaire with the mean ($\bar{x}$) score 3.2603 represents that the participants are partly agreed with the level of the difficulty of the topics, and fails to attract students’ attention.

The other six items of the questionnaire namely (Item 10 “The content of the Coursebook is comprehensible, mean score 3.2192 ”, Item 1 “The curriculum is appropriate for the improvement of the students’ language skills, mean score 3.1918 ”, Item 6 “The Coursebook of the curriculum is appropriate for the students’ level, mean score 3.1644 ”, Item7 “The total duration of the curriculum is adequate, mean score 3.1507 ” Item 9 “The content of the Coursebook is consistent with the objectives of the curriculum, mean score 2.9589 ” and Item3 “The objectives of the curriculum are appropriate for the students’ preliminary knowledge of English, Mean Score 2.6575”) regarding the context of the curriculum also comes in the partly agreed category of the given interval with the highest mean ($\bar{x}$) score 3.2192 of item 10 and the lowest mean ($\bar{x}$) score 2.6575 of item 3. It can be inferred from the perspectives of the EFL teachers that they are not completely agreed with the comprehensibility, appropriateness for language skills improvement, students’ level, duration, and students’ preliminary knowledge parts of the curriculum.

The overall mean ($\bar{x}$) score of the context of the program 3.07672. So, it is clearly seen that in total the participants are partly agree about the context of the program.

Teachers’ Perspectives on the input of the Curriculum (English For Afghanistan)
The second section of the questionnaire is consisting of 6 items about the input of the curriculum. The aim of this part is to find out EFL teachers’ perspectives about the English language curriculum currently taught at schools in Afghanistan. Table 2 clarifies the results of the teachers’ perspectives relating to the input of the curriculum.

From these 6 items of input category, second item (*The classwork of the curriculum attracts the students’ attention*) with the mean (\( \bar{x} \)) score of 3.5342 is the most agreed item by the teachers, while the 4\(^{th} \) item (*The audio-visual materials of the curriculum have positive effects on the students’ language skills*) with the mean (\( \bar{x} \)) score of 2.6438 is the least agreed item in this part of
the questionnaire. The mean score of 2 items represent that EFL teachers are agree with the
classwork of the curriculum, and the attractiveness of classwork can also be inferred. However,
the mean score of the 4th item represents that EFL teachers are partly agreed with the positive effect
of audio-visual materials of the curriculum on students’ language skills.

The other four items of this category related to the input of the curriculum namely item 5
(The audio-visual materials of the curriculum attract the students’ attention, mean score of
3.2329), item 6 (The audio-visual materials of the curriculum help the students learn easily, mean
score 3.2055), item 1 (The classwork of the curriculum helps the students learn easily, mean score
2.8082) and item 3 (The classwork of the curriculum has positive effects on the students’ language
skills, mean score 2.7808) come in partly agreed category of the point interval described earlier in
the data analysis. The highest mean score among these four items is 3.2329 and the lowest mean
score is 2.7808 which represents that the teachers are partly agreed with the (1) attraction of the
students attention through audio-visual materials of the curriculum, (2) audio-visual materials help
students learn easily, (3) helpful classwork of the curriculum which enable  students learn easily
and (4) positive effect of classwork on  students language skills.

The mean (\(\bar{x}\)) score of the teachers’ perspectives on the input of the curriculum is 3.034233.
Therefore, it is clearly seen that the participants are partly agree on the input component of the
program.

Teachers’ Perspectives on the Process of the Curriculum (English For Afghanistan)

The third section of the questionnaire is consisting of 8 items regarding the Process of the
curriculum aiming to find out teachers’ perspectives on the process component of currently in use
EFL curriculum at secondary schools in Afghanistan. Table 3 clarifies results of the teachers’
perspectives relating to the process of the curriculum.
Table 3: Perspectives on the Process of the Curriculum (English For Afghanistan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The curriculum enables the students to participate in the course actively.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.6027</td>
<td>1.16356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sufficient exercises are done about each new topic in the curriculum.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.4932</td>
<td>.95921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. When necessary, revision is included in the curriculum.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2.7260</td>
<td>1.23895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The consolidating homework is given to the students about the newly learned topics.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2.9726</td>
<td>1.18992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The number of formative tests applied during the curriculum is enough.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.2055</td>
<td>.95683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The program has activities suitable for pair and group work.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.4384</td>
<td>.91266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The curriculum has activities in which all language skills can be applied.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.0548</td>
<td>1.32172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. During the curriculum, the time spent on solving the students’ problems about English is enough.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.3014</td>
<td>.98157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the above eight items in the process part of the questionnaire about the curriculum, the 1st item (The curriculum enables the students to participate in the course actively) with the mean (\(\bar{x}\)) of 3.6027 is the most agreed and the 3rd item (When necessary, revision is included in the curriculum) with the mean (\(\bar{x}\)) of 2.7260 is the least agreed item by the EFL teachers. The mean (3.6027) of 1st item in the questionnaire represents that the participants are agreed about the item and the curriculum allows the students to participate in the class actively, and the mean (\(\bar{x}\))
2.7260 of the 3rd item comes in partly agreed category indicating the necessary revision of the curriculum.

The second (Sufficient exercises are done about each new topic in the curriculum) and sixth (The program has activities suitable for pair and group work) items of this category with the mean score of 3.4932 and 3.4384 respectively show that the teachers are agree with the sufficiency of exercises and suitability of pair and group work activities.

The remaining four (8th During the curriculum, the time spent on solving the students’ problems about English is enough, 5th The number of formative tests applied during the curriculum is enough, 7th The curriculum has activities in which all language skills can be applied and 4th The consolidating homework is given to the students about the newly learned topics) items of this part respectively at mean scores 3.3014, 3.2055, 3.0548 and 2.9726 come in the partly agreed category of the point interval. Meaning that the teachers are partly agreed with the time spent on solving students’ problems, number of formative tests, activities about the four skills of language and home work that strengthen the students’ knowledge.

Related to the total perspectives on the process of the curriculum, the mean (X) score is 2.81165. So, it is clearly seen that the participants partly agree about the process of the program in total.

**Teachers’ Perspectives on the Product of the Curriculum (English For Afghanistan)**

The last section of the questionnaire is consisting of 22 items regarding the product component of the curriculum to find out teachers’ perspectives about result (both planned and unplanned), and accomplishment of the English language curriculum currently taught at schools in Afghanistan. Table 4 clarifies the results of the teachers’ perspectives relating to the Product of the curriculum.
Table 4: **Perspectives on the Product of the English For Afghanistan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The curriculum meets the students’ individual needs.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>1.26930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The curriculum meets the students’ individual interests.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.3014</td>
<td>1.07606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The curriculum meets the students’ characteristics needs.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2.9452</td>
<td>1.26810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The curriculum meets the students’ existing needs related with English.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2.7260</td>
<td>1.14577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The curriculum forms a basis for the students’ future needs related with English.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.8082</td>
<td>.81065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The curriculum contributes to the students’ work related with their fields.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.4795</td>
<td>.76575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The curriculum motivates the students to learn English.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.6027</td>
<td>1.17544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The projects assigned according to the curriculum affect the students’ language skills positively.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.1918</td>
<td>1.06272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The curriculum increases the students’ vocabulary knowledge in English.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.3973</td>
<td>1.01022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The curriculum helps the students to acquire the habit of studying English.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2.6575</td>
<td>1.30404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The curriculum helps the students to acquire the habit of studying in groups.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.3014</td>
<td>.95285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The curriculum gives the students the opportunity to use their knowledge.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.1644</td>
<td>1.23619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The students’ improvement of English reading skills is satisfactory.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.2603</td>
<td>1.04120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item five (*The curriculum forms a basis for the students’ future needs related with English*)

with the mean score of 3.8082 is the most agreed one among all 22 items in process part of the questionnaire. The mean score of the fifth item comes in the partly agreed category of the point interval. The item 14 (*The students’ improvement of English writing skills is satisfactory*) with the mean score of 2.4932 is the least agreed item in the product part of the questionnaire. The mean score of the item 14 represents that teachers disagree with this part of the curriculum which lacks to contribute in improving students’ writing skills.
The item 7 (The curriculum motivates the students to learn English), with the mean score 3.6027, item 18 (The knowledge of English the students acquire at the end of the curriculum is satisfactory) mean score 3.4932 and item 6 (The Coursebook of the curriculum is appropriate for the students’ level) with the mean score 3.4795 come in the agreed category of the point interval. The mean score of these items show that the teachers are agreed that the curriculum motivates the learners to learn English, the knowledge students acquire at the end of the curriculum is satisfactory and the coursebooks are appropriate for the students’ level.

Sixteen other items of the questionnaire (item 9 “The curriculum increases the students’ vocabulary knowledge in English” mean score 3.3973, item 21 “The curriculum helps the students to acquire the knowledge of English they need for their fields of study” mean score 3.3425, item 11 “The curriculum helps the students to acquire the habit of studying in groups” mean score 3.3014, item 13 “The students’ improvement of English reading skills is satisfactory” mean score 3.3014, item 17 “The students’ improvement of English grammar is satisfactory” mean score 3.2603, item 15 “The students’ improvement of English listening skills is satisfactory” mean score 3.2466, item 8 “The projects assigned according to the curriculum affect the students’ language skills positively” mean score 3.2192, item 22 “The curriculum helps the students to acquire the knowledge of English they need for various business areas” mean score 3.1781, item 12 “The curriculum gives the students the opportunity to use their knowledge” mean score 3.1644, item 1 “The curriculum meets the students’ individual needs” mean score 3.0000, item 16 “The students’ improvement of English-speaking skills is satisfactory” mean score 2.9726, item 3 “The curriculum meets the students’ characteristics needs” mean score 2.9452, item 19 “The English skills the students acquire at the end of the curriculum are satisfactory” mean score 2.8082, item 4 “The curriculum meets the students’ existing needs related with English” mean score 2.7260, item 20 “The curriculum complies with the students’ courses in their fields of study” mean score 2.7123 and item 10 “The curriculum helps the students to acquire the habit of studying English” mean score 2.6575) come in the partly agreed category of the point interval. Regarding the product of the curriculum, it can be inferred from teachers’ perspectives that the curriculum helps students to increase vocabulary knowledge and to acquire the knowledge of English language they need in their field of study but is not sufficient. In addition, teachers perceive that the techniques provided for the improvement of grammar and language skills are not sufficient and need improvisation.
Furthermore, the curriculum lacks to meet the individual needs of the students as is required such as working in groups and pairs.

The mean ($\bar{x}$) score of the total perspectives on the product of the curriculum is 3.15007. As a consequence, it is clearly seen that the participants partly agree on the overall program product.

**Conclusion**

Based on teachers’ responses to the evaluation of ELT curriculum (English for Afghanistan), it can be concluded that most of the teachers are in favor of the four components of the curriculum namely context, input, process and product. In addition, there is a consistency in the amount of support given to each component where teachers’ agreement to a certain degree (between partly agree and agree) is observed. However, a substantial difference is noted among some items of context, input, process and product components. The difference found in context component is due to the inappropriateness of objectives and the lack of required amount of four language learning skills (reading, writing, listening and speaking). Moreover, in input component, the items related to classwork and audio-visual materials were found inappropriate in attracting students’ attention and providing language acquisition. The remaining two components, process and product of the curriculum were considered beneficial enough to meet students’ existing needs and to provide them with a satisfactory language input.
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