Near East University Online Journal of Education (NEUJE)
Received: May 08, 2018 Revised: July 20, 2018 Accepted: August 02, 2018

AN INVESTIGATION INTO CONTENT EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS BETWEEN 2013 – 2018

Felix Danjuma Tappi[1], Cigdem Hursen[2,*]
[1] Division of Curriculum and Instruction, Ataturk Education Faculty, Near East University, North Cyprus, Via Mersin 10, Turkey, felixtappidanjuma@gmail.com
[2] Division of Curriculum and Instruction, Ataturk Education Faculty, Near East University, North Cyprus, Via Mersin 10, Turkey, cigdem.hursen@neu.edu.tr
Correspondence: cigdem.hursen@neu.edu.tr; Tel.: +90(392) 223 64 64

Abstract

This research was conducted following specific content evaluation of programs between the period of 2015 – 2018 with limitations, a content analysis related studies on evaluation of programs to specify the direction of the research using qualitative study to analyze search results for four years. The Science Direct Data Base was searched to collect the data and journals were scanned to reach 72 studies. The aim of this research is to improve evaluation program effectiveness and to encourage researchers to study in this field. This study focused on program evaluation and answers were sought for distribution of studies by year of publication, subject area, country, method, and sample. The findings revealed that studies on program evaluation were mostly carried out in 2015 and 2018. The findings revealed that qualitative research was used more than quantitative and the mixed method. The result also revealed that most of the studies analyzed were in the area of teacher education and educational research. The analysis was done by the two researchers and for any disagreement, researchers studied on the issue and reached complete agreement. The data obtained from the studies were analyzed through descriptive statistic after calculating their frequency and percentage values.

Keywords: content analysis, evaluating programs, investigating, qualitative

1. Introduction

In our world today, new technologies are fast emerging, new industries are also booming, new cultures are being adopted, new political powers are also surfacing, therefore the need to raise quality individuals who can respond to the expectations of this changing world at enormous speed in this era of flexibility and change, there should be effective research questions on the new trends, determination which can only be possible through functional education systems being the backbone of development and educational programs serves as the essential elements of the whole system (Cai & Cirillo, 2014; Sahafque & Mohammed, 2013). Educational programs are not only considered to be effective as a factor in a competitive and economic development (Clemente, Ramirez & Dominguez, 2000) with significant role in the transfer of cultural values, and beliefs to the new generations. The quality of our teachers and students today are measured by the quality control standards being worked upon at the stage of curriculum planning. Efforts must be made in order to prepare students who can survive and further develop themselves towards responding to this challenges on the 21st century Dolls (1992).

Educational programs include the following: targets, content, educational activities and assessment selection criteria focus on the questions regarding what; when; how students or learners will learn (Cai & Cirillo, 2014). The emphasis on educational programs is for

researchers to throw light by giving the explanation that is expected to meet the students learning outcomes that are functional, applicable, flexible, scientific and subject to alteration (Skinner, 2014; Erden, 1998; Vans, 1996). The art of teaching and learning is the interaction or communication that occurs between both human and material resources in a classroom setting (Brain, 2014), while Evening (2001) suggested that the art of teaching as a profession should encompass both instructions in the procedures, being a process to guiding students or learners to the information the deserved and challenging them to engage in the thinking about concepts they construct in their inner minds to be creative in return. Cai and Cirillo (2014) expressed worries and draws the attention to the fact that the biggest problem most students are facing today in the learning processes is their attitude of trying to memorize information given than careful studying to comprehend and to be able to apply the knowledge learnt into real situations. Taylor (2013) in his submission mentioned on the dynamic interaction between teachers and the educational programs and went further to emphasized that teachers' effective applications of the programs facilitates learning in no small measure.

Curriculum includes total courses that students offer and the related process and arrangement. Curriculum evaluation process, the participative decision making is key in the new nominal domain of leadership (Ratsoy & Bing, 1999). Facing employment pressure from the growing population. Complex information can make evaluation procedure difficult. In this light, this research aimed at investigating the studies carried out in program evaluation in the scope of four years and guide the researchers in the future studies and new trends in program evaluation was considered for specification. There is the need to review the tendencies of other researchers.

2. Aim of the Study

This study aims to carry out a content analysis of evaluation of programs and determined the trends in this field and in line with this general aim answers to the following questions were sought in the study.

1. To which years were the studies carried out in program evaluation scanned and published?
2. What is the distribution of studies in based on subject area?
3. What is the distribution of studies based on countries?
4. What is the data collection techniques used in the studies?
5. What is the method used in used in the studies?
6. What is the Distribution of Sample used in the studies?

3. Method

In this section, research model, data collection tool and data analysis are explained in detail.

3.1. Research Model

A qualitative content analysis method was used in the search to analyze papers in this study. The data were analyzed with content analysis to reach the concepts and relations that assist to explain the 72 data collected from the Science Direct Data Base search. The basic procedure in content analysis is to gather similar data that explain certain concepts and explain them in such a way that readers will understand. Content analysis has been so effective and has been used to examine the evolution of other disciplines.

3.2. Sample

The sample for this study was composed of 72 studies published in the Science Direct Journals on curriculum evaluation of programs with limitations for the selection of the studies.

3.3. Data Collection Tool

In this study, a program evaluation classification in line with the aim of the study was used as tool to collect the data. This form composed of six sections which include: the year of publication of studies, the subjects, the countries of research, data collection techniques, the method used, and the Sample used in the studies. Data for the study were collected from the journals scanned in the Data Base of Science Direct. Through scanning electronic data base which revealed a total of 72 Journals reached were the ones published in the year 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018. At the same time also, the data collection process, the keywords" curriculum evaluation and teacher education" were used. The articles obtained from the journals published in data base, were analyzed through the criteria formed into sub-targets of this research.

- Publication year
- Publication by Subject area
- Countries of research
- Data collection techniques
- Data collection method
- Sample used within the scope

3.4. Data Analysis

The content analysis was carried out by an instructor and a Ph.D. Student. The writers worked together so that the articles were classified reliably. The data obtained from the articles were carefully analyzed in line accordance with the research questions through descriptive statistics. The articles' metadata were analyzed based on the criteria involving year of publication, subjects, sample, countries of authors, method, and type of study. The data were put into tables of frequency and percentage values.

4. Results

In this section, the results of the findings are presented and discussed in line with the aim and framework of the study.

4.1. Distribution of Studies in Terms of Year

As it can be seen Table 1, the number of articles dealing with program evaluation in Journals obtained from Science Direct Data Base revealed that most of the studies were done in 2015 with frequency of 18(25) and 2018 with frequency of 22(30.56%). The increase of articles in 2018 shows how interested researchers are on the field with 22(30.56%) journal publications.

Table 1. Results by Year

Year	Document	%
2018	22	30.56
2017	16	22.22
2016	16	22.22
2015	18	25
Grand total	72	100

4.2. Distribution of Subject Area within the Scope of This Research

Table 2. Shows the Distribution of the Subject Area within the Scope of This Research

Study Topics	**f**	**%**
Teacher Education	23	31.94
Educational Research	14	19.44
Social and Behavioral Sciences	7	9.72
Curriculum Studies	6	8.33
Psychology	6	8.33
Technology	4	5.56
Special Education	4	5.56
Physical Education	3	4.17
Guidance & Counselling	2	2.78
Mathematical thinking	2	2.78
Mathematics	1	1.39
Grand Total	72	100 (rounded)

As it can be noted in Table 2, program evaluation studies the various Subjects, mostly in Teacher Education with frequency of 23(31.94%) and Educational Research with frequency of 14(19.44%). The least study was in field of Mathematics with a frequency of 1(1.39%) study.

4.3. Distribution of the Studies Investigated in Terms of Countries

Table 3a. Distribution of Studies by Countries

Country	**F**	**%**
United States	19	26.39
The Netherlands	9	12.5
Norway	6	8.3
Australia	5	6.9
Belgium	5	6.9
Canada	4	5.55
Germany	3	4.17
New Zealand	3	4.17
United Kingdom	3	4.17
Cyprus	2	2.8
Finland	2	2.8
France	2	2.8
Taiwan	2	2.8
Chile	1	1.38
Denmark	1	1.38
Egypt	1	1.38
Hungry	1	1.38
Hong Kong	1	1.38
Poland	1	1.38
Israel	1	1.38
Grand Total	72	100 (rounded)

Table 3b. Distribution in Terms of Countries

Countries	2015	2016	2017	2018	f
United States	4	2	5	8	19
The Netherlands	3	4	2		9
Norway		1	1	4	6
Australia	1		3	1	5
Belgium	2		3		5
Canada	2	1		4	4
Germany	1	1		1	3
New Zealand		1		2	3
United Kingdom	1	2			3
Cyprus	1			1	2
Finland	1	1			2
France	1	1			2
Taiwan	1	1			2
Chile				1	1
Denmark	1				1
Egypt				1	1
Hungry			1		1
Hong Kong			1		1
Poland			1		1
Israel					1

Table 3ab on the distribution of articles in terms of countries revealed that most of the studies in program evaluation were done in the United States with frequency of 19 (26.39%) in 2017 and 2018, the Netherlands with frequency of 9 (12.5%) in 2016 but a decreased in 2017, and Norway with frequency of 6 (8.3%) with most of the studies done in 2018. There is a steady increase in the interest of researchers on the field of study. It is assumed that the reason for less number of publications compared in the Netherlands in 2017 is that we are still in 2017. When program evaluation is considered, it is interestingly noted that Chile, Denmark, Egypt, Hungry, Hong Kong, Poland, and Israel were the countries where least number of studies have been done with 1 article each within the scope of the research.

4.4. Distribution of Data Collection Techniques in the Scope of This Research

The distribution of data collection techniques as shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Data Collection Techniques

Data Collection Techniques	F	%
Interviews	30	41.67
Literature Scanning	23	31.9
Analysis of Documents	12	16.67
Questionnaires	**7**	9.7
Grand total	72	100 (rounded)

Table 4 revealed that 30 (41.667%) of the program evaluation were done through interview technique, 23 (31.9%) were done through literature scanning, 12 (16.67%) were done through analysis of document, and 7 (9.7%). This finding revealed that the most used data collection technique was through interview.

4.5. Distribution of Data Collection Method from the Studies in the Scope of This Research

The distribution of data collection method used in the program evaluation in the scope of the research is given in Table 5

Table 5. Distribution of Data Collection Method

Data Collection Method	f	%
Qualitative Method	47	65.28
Quantitative Method	11	15.28
Mixed Method	14	19.44
Grand total	72	100 (rounded)

Table 5 revealed that greater part of the studies in the scope of the research (n=47) were fulfilled through a qualitative method. 11 of the studies, however were done through quantitative method, while 14 of the studies was through the use of mixed method of qualitative and quantitative were preferred.

5. Distribution of Sample in the studies

The sample used in the studies (n=72) was composed of the following participants: student teachers on practice, prospective teachers, pre-service teachers, lower-level teachers, in-service teachers, full-teachers, female teachers, educators, program teachers, lecturers, and undefined, students and student groups. The array of the sample data collected from the studies are as follows:

Teachers Category: 190 pre-service teachers, 102 full-teachers, 297 full-teachers, 180 full-teachers, 202 full-teachers, 106 full-teachers,1866 full-teachers, 6428 educators, 15 full-teachers, 102 in-service teachers, 43 full-teachers, 70 full-teachers, 37 full-teachers,254 full-teachers, 9 full-teachers, 8 full-teachers, 74 full-teachers, 1008 full-teachers, 40 lecturers,14 lecturers, 495 full-teachers, 179 full-teachers79 pre-service teachers, 88 full-teachers, 13 full-teachers, 12 prospective-teachers,30 full-teachers, 163 pre-service teachers, 83 in-service teachers, 45 full-teachers, 499 full-teachers, 322 student-teachers on practice, 22 full-teachers, 18 lower-level teachers, 2 program teachers, 248 full-teachers, 300 in-service teachers, 2 full-teachers, 359 in-service teachers, 30 female-teachers, 97% teachers, 72% teachers, 8% teachers, 9% teachers, 87% teachers, 57% teachers, 80% teachers, 77.4% teachers, 3% teachers, 62%,, 10% teachers, 75% teachers, 30% teachers.

Students Category: 30 students, 20000 students, 5724 students, 1336 students, 133 students, 20 students, 11844 students, 2589 students, 154 students, 204 students, 5000 students, 8500 students, 93 teams of students, 10 student groups, 106 students,70000 students, 299 students, 60 kindergartens.

Schools & others: 150 schools, 20 departments, 6 schools, 2 schools, 27 skills

Table 6a. Distribution of Sample Types

Sample	F	%
Full-Teachers	24	32
Students	17	22.67
Undefined	13	17
In-Service Teachers	4	5.33
Pre-Service Teachers	3	4
Schools	3	4
Lecturers	2	2.7
Departments	1	1.33
Educators	1	1.33
Lower-level Teachers	1	1.33
Female Teachers	1	1.33
Program Teachers	1	1.33
Prospective Teachers	1	1.33
Skills	1	1.33
Teaching-Practice Teachers	1	1.33
Kindergartens	1	1.33
Grand total	75	100 (rounded)

Table 6b. Distribution of Sample Collected

Class Interval	F	%
1 - 99	32	42.66
100 - 199	9	12
200 - 299	5	6.66
300 - 399	3	4
400 - 499	2	2.66
Over 500	11	14.66
Undefined	13	17.33
Grand total	75	100 (rounded)

Table 6a were the sample of the participants that were used in the studies within the scope. As analyzed, the sample on full-teachers has the highest frequency of 24 (32%) and the students with a frequency of 17 (22.67%). Others are the in-service teachers with a frequency of 4 (5.33%), pre-service teachers with a frequency of 3 (4%), lecturers with a frequency of 2 (2.7%), while others have 1 (1.33%) frequency each as shown in the table.

It is noted in table 6b that the sample with class interval of 1-99 was at a frequency of 32 (42.66%). Samples at interval of 100-199 was at a frequency of 9 (12%). Samples with class interval of 200-299 was at a frequency of 5 (6.66%). Samples with class interval of 300-399 was at a frequency of 3 (4%). Samples with class interval of 400-499 was at a frequency of 2 (2.66%). Samples with class interval of over 500 was at a frequency of 11 (14.66%). Samples that were undefined was at a frequency of 13 (17.33%). The frequency grand total was 75 with a percentage of 100 % rounded.

6. Discussion and Conclusion

In this study, it is aimed to specify the trends regarding the studies carried out in program evaluation in which a content analysis was done, investigating articles published on the content evaluation of programs between the years 2013-2018 in Science Direct Data Base journals, were analyzed. The research was conducted through literature review of published articles. To provide a comprehensive review of all the studies (n=30,412), the researchers used a careful selection criterion with limitations to finally reached (n=72) studies used in this study. Based on the distribution of the investigated articles related to the research as considered, it can be noted that the studies were mostly done in 2015 and 2018. The findings also showed that more researchers are interested in the field under study.

When the distribution of the investigated subjects was considered, it was noticed that most of the studies on program evaluation were mostly done in teacher education and educational research. Teacher education has the highest number of articles (n=23), while Mathematics was the least (n=1). The result shows that very limited number of studies were done in physical education, Guidance and Counselling and mathematics. It was suggested that the studies in the field of Physical education, Guidance and Counselling and mathematics are taken more seriously.

The distribution in terms of countries revealed that United States has the highest number of publications (n=19). The Netherlands had (n=9) publications. Those countries with limited number of studies in the subject matter were done in Chile, Denmark, Egypt, Hungary, Hong Kong, Poland and Israel with (n=1) article each.

The most used data collection techniques in program evaluation was the interviews (n=30), literature scanning (n=23), analysis of documents (n=12), The questionnaire technique (n=2) was the least used. The highest method used was the qualitative with a frequency of 47 (65.28%), then the mixed method followed with a frequency of 14 (19.44%), and the least used was quantitative method with a frequency of 11 (15.28%) all within the scope of the study.

The investigation on the sample types in program evaluation revealed that the full-teachers were the highest participants with a frequency of 24 (32%). The next sample of participants were the students with a frequency of 17 (22.67%). Others include: undefined 13 (17%), in-service teachers 4 (5.33%), pre-service teachers 3 (4%), schools 3 (4%), lecturers 2 (2.7%), departments 1 (1.33%), educators 1 (1.33%), lower level teachers 1 (1.33), female teachers 1 (1.33%), program teachers 1 (1.33%), skills 1 (1.33%), teaching practice teachers 1 (1.33), kindergartens 1 (1.33%),

The investigated samples were put in to tables of class intervals, frequency and percentage. Samples with class interval of 1-99 were at a frequency of 32 (42.66%), Samples with class interval of 100-199 were at a frequency of 9 (12%). Samples with class interval of 200-299 were at a frequency of 5 (6.66%). Samples with class interval of 300-399 were at a frequency of 3 (4%). Samples with class interval of 400-499 were at a frequency of 2 (2.66%). Samples with class interval of 500 and above were at a frequency of 11 (14.66%). The samples that were undefined were at a frequency of 13 (17.33%). The research revealed that a total of 75 samples were used in the studies at 100% rounded value. According to research results, full teachers and students were mostly used as participants in the research on program evaluation.

References

Berrang-Ford J. D., & Ford J. Paterson. (2011). Are we adopting to climate change?. *Global Environment change, 21,* 25-33

Brain, M. (2014). *What is teaching?*. USA: Permalink Publishers

Burns, R. (2000). *Introduction to research methods*. (4th ed.). London: Sage

Cai, J., & Cirillo, M. (2014). What do we know about reasoning and proving? Opportunities and missing opportunities from curriculum analyses. *International Journal Research, 64*, 132-140

Caswell, H. L., & Campbell, D. (1935). *Curriculum Development*. New York: American Book Company

Cheng, C. (1997). Multi-models of quality in Education. *Quality Assurance in Education, 5*(1), 212-231

Clemente, M., Ramirez, E., & Dominguez, B. (2000). The selection of contents in school projects in Spain. *Curriculum Inquiry, 30*(3), 295-317

Coakes, S. J., & Steed, L. (2007). *SPPS Version 14.0 for windows: Analysis without anguish*. Milton: John Wiley & Sons

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research methods in education* (7th ed.). London: Routledge

Culbertson, H. M., & Sumerick, N. (1976, may 19). Cloaked attribution. What does it mean to Readers?. *ANPA News Research Bulletin*, 3

Eisner, E. W. (2002). Those who ignore the past…12 'easy' lessons for the next millennium. *Journal of curriculum studies, 32*(2) 343-357. Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/002202700182808

Evening, M. L. (2001). *Media education Ile-Ife*. University of Ife. Press Limited

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded Theory. Strategies for qualitative research.* Chicago: Aldine

Guba, E. S., & Lincoln,Y. S. (1994). *Competing paradigms in qualitative research,* 105-117. London Sage

Gudmundsdottir, S. (1990). Values in pedagogical content knowledge. *Journal of Teacher Education, 41(3), 44-52*. Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/002248719004100306

Jones, K. O., & Reid, J. M. V. (2007). Modifying teaching to address thinking styles. ACM International conference proceedings series, vol. 285, proceedings of the 2007 International Conference on computer systems and technologies. Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/1330598.1330682

Skinner, B. (1964). *Why we need teaching machine in educational technology*. New York: Julia Klaus Ethrow Publications

Stephen, G. (2014). Soft skills assessment: Theory development and the research agenda. *International Journal of lifelong Education, 33*(4), 455-471

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basic of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for Developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Leathwood, C., & Phillips, D. (2000). Developing Curriculum evaluation research in higher education process: Politics and practicalities. *Higher Education, 40,* 313-330

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage

Munby, H. (1990). Metaphorical expressions of teachers' practical curriculum knowledge *Journal of curriculum and supervision, 6*(1), 18-30

Ratsoy, E. W., & Bing, Z. (1999). Students participation in university governance. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 29*(1), 1-26

Biodata of the Corresponding Author

Cigdem Hursen works as an associate professor at Near East University. In October 2013, she was appointed to be the chairperson of the department of Measurement and Evaluation of Near East University, Institute of Educational Sciences. In 2018, she was appointed to be the chairperson of the department of Education Sciences of Near East University.