PROGRAM EVALUATION IN OPEN AND DISTANCE LEARNING: THE CASE OF OPEN EDUCATION SYSTEM CALL CENTER SERVICES ASSOCIATE DEGREE PROGRAM

Yagmur TUC
ORCID: 0000-0001-7061-6554
Open Education Faculty
Anadolu University
Eskisehir, TURKIYE

Dr. Nejdet KARADAG
ORCID: 0000-0002-9826-1297
Open Education Faculty
Anadolu University
Eskisehir, TURKIYE

ABSTRACT

In this study, it is aimed to evaluate Anadolu University Open Education Faculty Call Center Services Associate Degree Program, which is carried out through open and distance education, according to learner views within the framework of Stufflebeam's Context, Input, Process, Product (CIPP) Evaluation Model and to make suggestions for the development of the program. In the study in which Exploratory Sequential design, one of the mixed method research designs, was used; "Anadolu University Call Center Services Associate Degree Program Evaluation Questionnaire" was prepared to collect quantitative data. The questionnaire was applied online to learners who graduated from Anadolu University Open Education Faculty Call Center Services Associate Degree Program. Semi-structured interview questions were used to collect qualitative data. In the interpretation of quantitative data, percentage and frequency tables, mean and standard deviation values were used to compare and interpret the average score that can be obtained in the four dimensions (Context, Input, Process and Product) in the measurement tool and the average scores of the participants in these dimensions. In addition, the mean score values obtained in the sub-dimensions were analyzed and interpreted in terms of gender, age, marital status and employment status variables. Descriptive analysis method was used to analyze the qualitative data. The results revealed that the program objectives were determined in accordance with the expectations of the learners, learning resources were designed in accordance with the objectives, learning activities were carried out in accordance with the expectations of the participants and learning outcomes were achieved in the program.

Keywords: CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product) Evaluation Model, exploratory sequential design, open and distance learning, program evaluation.

INTRODUCTION

Education, on the one hand, reveals the stimulating and invigorating power existing in human beings and makes it functional, and on the other hand, it enables people to create ideals and to discover methods that can be adapted to various value judgments and life styles by developing alternatives on the way to their ideals (Bilhan, 1991). In all educational activities, whether formal or non-formal, it is aimed to achieve the objectives determined in line with a program prepared and planned in advance (Howard, 2007). Undoubtedly, achieving these goals is possible through qualified education practices. Quality of education has become an important strategy of higher education today (Davlatmirzayevich, 2022).

Educational programs should be designed from a multidimensional perspective; not only subject-based, but also the needs of society and the individual, and the applicability of the program should be taken into consideration (Yager, 2001). Although an education program is prepared according to scientific principles, whether it has the desired quality can be decided after the program is implemented and the outcomes are evaluated. This situation reveals the necessity of evaluating the implemented curricula. Evaluation is necessary for the planning and continuous development of programs at any level (Bilen, 1999). According to Gungor and Yilmaz (2002), the main purpose of curriculum evaluation is to determine whether the learning activities serve the purpose, whether they have negative aspects, deficiencies and unexpected results and to redesign the curriculum by evaluating them. This process is as valid for open and distance education as it is for formal education.

In order to open a new program in open and distance education, many components need to be systematically designed and put into practice. Bilgic, Dogan, and Seferoglu (2021) stated these components as "legislation, program structure, instructional design, assessment and evaluation, communication and interaction, support dimension, technical dimension, and program evaluation". According to Donmez (2018), the educational process in open and distance learning systems consists of material design and development, production and distribution, operations management, learner support system and networked learning subsystems, and evaluation. In a successful distance education process, instructional design can only be realized through the successful implementation of various stages of design, development, implementation and evaluation. However, educational programs that are thought to be successfully implemented also need evaluation. Because new needs arising from changing conditions can be determined through evaluation. Therefore, educational programs should be evaluated and developed at regular intervals and program outcomes should be continuously improved (Evans, 2003).

Evaluation in open and distance learning is carried out to guide decision makers, program coordinators and other practitioners in line with an overall goal of improving service delivery and learner satisfaction (Miriam&Offat, 2015). For this reason, it is very important in terms of the quality of education that the programs in open and distance education systems are evaluated regularly in all dimensions and their deficiencies, if any, are eliminated. In addition, the responsibilities of institutions to provide information to both learners and the public about their investments, learning methods, assessment methods and educational activities have increased (Garrett, 2016). In line with these developments, the Higher Education Quality Assurance System and the Higher Education Quality Board were put into practice in Turkiye with the additional article 35 of the Higher Education Law No. 2547 (Additional: 18/6/2017-7033/18 art.) (Council of Higher Education, 2018). Program evaluation studies are important to guarantee the quality of the education provided and to ensure accreditation.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

In this study, it was aimed to evaluate Anadolu University Open Education Faculty Call Center Services Associate Degree Program based on learner opinions within the scope of Stufflebeam's "Context, Input, Process, Product (CIPP)" model and to determine suggestions for improving the program. In this context, answers to the following questions were sought:

- "Are the objectives of the program determined in accordance with the needs of the learners? (Context)"
- "Are the learning resources in the program designed in accordance with the objectives? (Input)"
- "Are the learning activities in the program carried out in accordance with the expectations of the learners? (Process)"
- "Are the learning outcomes achieved in the program? (Product)"
- "Do learners' views on the program differ according to gender, age, marital status and employment status?"
- "What can be done to improve the program?"

LITERATURE

Program Evaluation

One of the important components of the education process is well-designed education programs. The basic features expected to be present in an education program are determined as "functionality, flexibility, compatibility with the general views and expectations of the state and society and applicability, scientificity, fitness for purpose and economy" (Isman & Eskicumali, 2006; Karacaoglu, 2011; Aydiner, 2016). These functions are briefly as follows:

- *Functionality:* Content and applications are in line with social life, usable and appropriate to current conditions,
- *Flexibility:* Organizing the subjects and activities by taking into account the socio-economic characteristics of the target group and the learners' interests, needs and social environment,
- *Compatibility with the Trends and Expectations of the State and Society:* Reflecting the ideals and philosophy of the society in which it exists,
- *Applicability:* Combining functionality and flexibility,
- *Scientificity:* Taking into account scientific developments, new learning-teaching methods and techniques,
- *Purposefulness:* Being based on the cultural values of the society and realizing the determined educational objectives,
- *Economic relevance:* Being economical in terms of objectives, content, learning-teaching methods and assessment techniques.

It is widely accepted that an educational program consists of objectives, content, learning-teaching process and evaluation elements. (Demirel, 2012). The functionality of an education program designed in line with these elements depends on the evaluation of this program according to appropriate methods and the use of the results obtained as data for development studies (Ozdemir, 2009; Guven & Ileri, 2006). Because there is a need to evaluate the program in order to identify various problems that may occur during the implementation phase and to eliminate these problems. Bloom, Madaus & Hastings (1971) state that it is not possible to make a decision about the teaching situation without evaluation and define the purpose of evaluation as collecting and judging the evidence that reveals to what extent the determined goals have been realized and the degree of realization. The success of an educational program depends on the evaluation of that program with appropriate methods and the use of the results to improve the program as well as a good design and implementation method. For this reason, "evaluation" is very important in determining the faulty aspects of all educational programs, if any, and in revising these aspects. In addition, the digital age we are in has revealed the need for different and new education programs and necessitated some changes in existing programs. New educational technologies and the ease of access to these technologies have increased the interest in open and distance education and eliminated geographical boundaries. This situation has both increased the number of learners and created a heterogeneous learner population. Program evaluation has an important function in determining whether the programs applied to the masses with different characteristics meet the educational needs of the masses and whether the desired level of learning is achieved.

Program evaluation should focus on the extent to which learners achieve learning outcomes, the extent to which they are satisfied with the quality of instruction, the extent to which they are able to make use of learning materials, and the unexpected situations that arise at the end of the program (Inglis, 2003).

Program evaluation is done to ensure that the training program is updated, improved or maintained. In this way, the continuity of the program is ensured. In addition, program evaluation provides information on what can be done to improve the program, as well as providing insight into the efficiency and effectiveness of the current program as a result of its implementation (Klenowski, 2010). Criteria are determined before the evaluation. The data obtained through the program evaluation conducted in line with the determined criteria are analyzed and the results obtained by interpreting the findings are shared with decision makers. These results provide decision-makers with information not only about the success of the program but also about the success of the participants and even the implementers of the program (Ornstein & Hunkins, 2009). Based on these definitions, it can be said that the evaluation process of a program is very important and necessary for the success of the program.

Program Evaluation Approaches and Stufflebeam's Context, Input, Process and Product (CIPP) Evaluation Model

When the literature is examined, it is seen that curriculum evaluation approaches are generally classified in different ways as "curriculum evaluation philosophies, ideologies, designs, and types of curriculum evaluation". Program evaluation approaches are classified into four categories as "objectivist, subjectivist, pluralist and utilitarian" in terms of their philosophies; into five categories as "separatist, factualist, managerial, relativist and utilitarian" in terms of their ideologies; into six categories as "goal-based, management-oriented, beneficiary-oriented, expert-oriented, deliberative, and participant-oriented" in terms of their design; and finally into three categories as "according to the role of the evaluator, according to the type of evaluation, and according to the system dimensions" in terms of their types (Aygoren & Er, 2018).

There are many program evaluation models developed based on the approaches mentioned above. Bates' "Access, Cost, Instructional Function, Interaction, Organizational Issues, Innovation and Speed (ACTIONS)" model; "Accountability, Effectiveness, Impact, Institutional Context, Unanticipated Outcomes (AEIOU)" model developed by Fortune, Keith, Sweeney and Sorensen; Kirkpatrick's Four Level Model, the Logic Model, also called the Theory of Change; and Stufflebeam's Context, Input, Process and Product (CIPP) model are among the prominent evaluation models in the literature.

In this study, Stufflebeam's "Context, Input, Process and Product (CIPP)" model, which is one of the evaluation models considered according to system dimensions in terms of its types, was used. In this model, the main purpose of evaluation is not to prove but to improve (Stufflebeam, 2003). Stufflebeam defined evaluation as a process that needs to be repeated continuously and thus contributed to decision management-centered evaluation. The continuous collection of information about different dimensions of the program helps practitioners to make the right decisions about the functioning of the program. Stufflebeam's model has four basic dimensions: context evaluation, input evaluation, process evaluation and product evaluation (Demirel, 2012).

Context Evaluation: In context evaluation, which is also referred to as needs assessment, where program components and program objectives are analyzed, opportunities, problems and needs in the defined environment are evaluated. In this dimension, the strengths and weaknesses of the program are determined by focusing on the consistency of the objectives with the needs and the extent to which these objectives meet the needs (Stufflebeam, 2003). The main purpose of contextual evaluation is to define the program framework, to identify expected and existing situations, and to investigate the reasons for this situation by focusing on opportunities and unmet needs, if any (Ornstein & Hunkins, 2009).

Input Evaluation: This is the dimension in which the resources required for the objectives and the knowledge of how to use these resources are tested. In the input dimension, answers are sought to questions related to various elements of the program such as "Are the objectives determined in accordance with the current situation?", "Are the objectives consistent with the objectives of the program?", "Are the teaching strategies appropriate to the objectives?", "Is the scope consistent with the general objectives and specific objectives?". According to these answers, it is aimed to determine the changes needed in the program. In this dimension, it is also evaluated what resources (tools, materials or personnel) are necessary to realize the objectives of the program and whether the strategies and methods to be used in implementation are applicable (Stufflebeam, 2003).

Process Evaluation: Decision-makers are given feedback by checking the extent to which the teaching practices planned in the program are carried out in a planned and effective manner. In addition, information is also provided about decisions that are faulty or need to be changed, if any. In this dimension, it is also aimed to gradually evaluate the extent to which participants or practitioners fulfill their roles (Kayhan & Gurol, 2019). In summary, the process of reporting how the participants evaluate the quality of the process and how the planned program is actually implemented, identifying unexpected problems in implementation and taking measures to address them are carried out (Stufflebeam, 2003).

Product Evaluation: This is the dimension in which data are collected about the learning outcomes in the program and the determined and achieved learning outcomes are compared. In this dimension, unexpected results are also identified and it is determined whether the program should be continued in its current form or information is collected to improve the program (Usun, 2016).

Call Center Services and Anadolu University Open Education System Call Center Services Associate Degree Program

Call centers are centers that enable institutions and businesses to interact with their stakeholders (customers, suppliers, dealers, etc.) through other communication tools such as telephone, web, fax, e-mail. Call center services include processes such as meeting customer calls by a center (Kohen, 2002), initiating the necessary transactions in line with the needs of the customer, directing the call to different units when necessary, and making external calls (Celik & Uzmez, 2014). Call services is a sector that allows individuals or groups who want to communicate with many businesses serving in various fields to use different communication tools and where many experts work together (Dean, 2002; Mentese & Es, 2017). In addition, call center services have interactive voice response technology and can serve customers around the clock (Kocabas, 2017). The Call Center Services Association (CCSA), on the other hand, defines the call center as "a communication management system in which people, technology, business processes and strategy are carried out in coordination with the people and/or institutions that the institutions are in contact with and through various communication channels" (CCSA, 2022).

The history of the call center sector, which is known to have existed institutionally in Turkiye since the 1990s, is examined in four stages (Kohen, 2020):

1. *Pre-1996 "The period of taking the broken product to the store":*

    This is the period when both consumers and businesses had low levels of awareness about call center services. In this period, problems related to the product or service purchased were tried to be solved through face-to-face communication. In this period, companies such as DHL, Cine5, Citibank and Arcelik were among the companies that could use call center services to a limited extent.

2. *1996-2001 "Uprising and learning period":*

    During this period, awareness of call centers increased and sectoral development began, led by GSM companies and banks. In particular, the focus on customer relationship management, customer continuity, segmentation and analysis of customer data etc. increased. Foreign call centers operating in Turkiye such as La Mer (Vodatech), Global Bilgi, CMC and Metis (Teleperformance) were established in this period.

3. *2002-2008 "Ownership period":*

    This is the period in which businesses grasped the importance of call centers, internalized their role in customer satisfaction and made various investments. Although the technologies required for call center services were not available in Turkiye in this period, it was understood that Turkiye had the infrastructure to answer calls from abroad and investments were made in this direction.

4. *2009-2014 "Growth and expansion period":*

    This period, during which the number of outsourced and in-sourced call centers increased and the expansion from big cities to Anatolia began, is considered to be a period of growth and expansion for call centers in Turkiye. The introduction of call center services, especially in the public sector, had a positive impact on the development in this area.

Anadolu University Open Education System has been renewing itself according to technological developments and social needs since the day it was founded and includes various programs. In the Open Education System, there are 52 programs at 9 undergraduate and 43 associate degree levels within the Open Education Faculty, 8 undergraduate programs at the Faculty of Economics and 5 undergraduate programs at the Faculty of Business Administration.

The Call Center Services Associate Degree Program in Anadolu University Open Education System was opened in 2009 and has 1232 active learners today. To date, 1193 learners have graduated from the program. The aim of the program is to train human resources who know the basic principles, processes and management of the call center sector, communicate effectively and create customer loyalty. In parallel with the development of the call center sector in our country, the need for qualified personnel is also increasing. For this reason, it is aimed to provide the opportunity to be employed in the sector through distance education for those who are interested in the sector and who want to specialize professionally by receiving education in this field.

METHOD

In the study, sequential exploratory design, one of the mixed method research designs, was used. The aim of mixed methods research is to use two different designs in a way to complement each other in the research. In this way, the strengths and weaknesses inherent in quantitative and qualitative methods are integrated to reach more reliable results (Creswell, 2021). In this design, quantitative data on the researched topic are first collected and analyzed. Then, qualitative data are used to clarify and/or expand the data obtained. After the qualitative data are analyzed, the findings are interpreted together (Creswell, 2021; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). In this study, quantitative data were collected first and then qualitative data were collected. The quantitative data were analyzed statistically and qualitative data were analyzed descriptively. The findings obtained with qualitative data were utilized to explain the quantitative data results.

The Study Group

The study group of this research consisted of graduates of Anadolu University Open Education Faculty Call Center Services Associate Degree Program. A link to the quantitative measurement tool was sent to 1,193 graduates of the program since its inauguration and 104 graduates responded to the measurement tool. The distribution of the respondents is given in Table 1.

Table1. Distribution of Quantitative Measurement Tool Participants

		F	%
Gender	Female	55	52,9
	Male	49	47,1
Age	22-25	15	14,4
	26-29	15	14,4
	30-33	20	19,2
	34 and older	54	51,9
Marital Status	Single	33	31,7
	Married	71	68,3
Employment Status	Employed	64	61,5
	Unemployed	40	38,5

Graduates were asked to provide an e-mail address if they wished to participate in the semi-structured interview. Interviews with 6 graduates who volunteered for semi-structured interviews were conducted via Zoom application. The information of the graduates who participated in the interviews is given in Table 2.

Table 2. Graduates who participated in the semi-structured interview

Participant	Position/Industry
P1	Team Leader/Private Sector
P2	Operations Manager/Private Sector
P3	Unit Manager/Public
P4	Unit Manager/Private Sector
P5	Customer Representative/Public
P6	Team Leader/Private Sector

All of the participants whose information is given in Table 2 work in public institutions or private sector companies providing call center services.

Data Collection Tools and Process

Quantitative and qualitative data collection tools were utilized in the study. "Anadolu University Call Center Services Associate Degree Program Evaluation Questionnaire" was prepared to collect quantitative data. The questionnaire was collected in four dimensions by associating it with Stufflebeam's "Context, Input, Process and Product" model within the framework of program outcomes and field competencies and finalized by taking the opinions of three experts. In the measurement tool, there were 10 items in the context sub-dimension, 8 items in the input sub-dimension, 12 items in the process sub-dimension and 10 items in the product sub-dimension, totaling 40 items.

Quantitative data were collected between February 1-28, 2022. The survey link created through Google Form was sent to the e-mail addresses of the graduates of the program. The graduates were asked to answer the items prepared on a 5-point Likert scale between 1 and 5 as "1 - Strongly disagree", "2 - Disagree", "3 - Neutral", "4 - Agree", "5 - Strongly agree". Two reminder SMS messages were sent to the graduates to answer the measurement tool and 104 graduates participated in the study.

Semi-structured interviews were used as a qualitative data collection tool. The graduates were contacted via e-mail and interviews were conducted through online meetings. Six graduates working in the call center sector in the positions of operations manager, team leader, unit manager and customer representative participated in the interviews. In these interviews, the graduates were asked "Was the program sufficient to meet your expectations and needs? Explain." and "What can be done to improve and develop the program? What are your suggestions?" questions were asked. The interviews were conducted on May 23-30, 2022 by appointment through the Zoom application and were recorded for later analysis with the consent of the participants. Interview sessions lasted between 35 and 80 minutes.

Data Analysis

In the study, quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS 20.0 program. Skewness and kurtosis values were examined to determine whether the data were normally distributed or not, and skewness and kurtosis values were found to be -1.199 and 1.159, respectively. When skewness and kurtosis values are between -1.5 and +1.5 or -2.00 and +2.00, the distribution is considered normal (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2019). In the interpretation of the data, percentage and frequency tables, mean and standard deviation values were used to compare and interpret the average score that can be obtained from the "Context, Input, Process and Product" dimensions in the measurement tool and the average scores of the participants in these dimensions. The mean score values obtained from the sub-dimensions were examined in terms of gender, age, marital status and employment status variables; one-sample t-test was used to test the score differences according to gender, marital status and employment status variables, and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used for the age variable. Qualitative data were analyzed using descriptive analysis. The 15 themes that emerged at the end of the interviews were grouped under 4 categories based on the findings obtained from the quantitative data and the literature. Interview findings were interpreted within the framework of these categories and themes.

Validity and Reliability of Data Collection Tools

Confirmatory factor analysis was used to determine the validity of the quantitative data collection tool developed by taking expert opinions. In the process of developing the quantitative measurement tool, it was aimed to measure the items in 4 sub-dimensions as "Context, Input, Process and Product". Two different factor structures were tested to determine whether the items in the measurement tool work in line with the related purposes. The first of these structures is that the factors are 4 separate sub-dimensions, while the other is a second-order structure that accepts that the factors are united in a single factor of the general perception of the Call Center Services Associate Degree Program. The fit statistics obtained from confirmatory factor analyses are given in Table 3.

Table 3. Fit Statistics Table for Confirmatory Factor Analyses

Model	RMSEA	CFI	TLI	SRMR
Segregated 4-factor structure	0,082	0,946	0,942	0,091
Quadratic structure	0,096	0,926	0,921	0,091

The results given in Table 3 show that the 4 independent factor structure measures the data obtained in this study at an acceptable level. Although it is possible to collect 4 factors under one factor of the measurement tool, it should be taken into consideration that the fit is within the acceptable validity limit. Considering the fit statistics, it was evaluated that it was more appropriate to use 4 independent factor structure in this study. The findings regarding the reliability of the measurement tool are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Findings Regarding the Reliability of the Measurement Tool

Dimension	Alfa
Context	0,899
Input	0,952
Process	0,921
Product	0,910
General	**0,964**

When the results in Table 4 are examined, it is seen that the reliability coefficients of the sub-dimensions and the measurement tool are between 0.899 and 0.952. When this coefficient approaches 1, it is accepted that the internal consistency of the items in the measurement tool is high (Yang & Green, 2011). The results in Table 4 revealed that the data collection tool was reliable.

In order to ensure the validity of the qualitative data collection tool, the prepared questions were presented to two experts and the questions were finalized in line with the suggestions. The interviews were recorded and kept for reuse if needed. For reliability, support was obtained from two measurement and evaluation experts to ensure coding reliability (intercoder reliability) in the analysis of the interviews. The similarities and differences between the researcher and the three coders were expressed numerically and coding reliability was calculated. For coding reliability, Miles and Huberman's (1994) formula "Reliability = agreement/agreement + disagreement" was used. According to this formula, the coding reliability was found to be 86.6%. It is accepted that a reliability coefficient above 70% is sufficient.

FINDINGS

Under this heading, findings related to context, input, process and product dimensions are presented.

Findings on Context Dimension

Within the scope of the question "Are the objectives of the program determined in accordance with the needs of the learners?", 10 items were included in the context sub-dimension. The lowest score that can be obtained from this dimension is 10 and the highest score is 50. Since the value in the middle of these scores is 30, an individual who thinks that the objectives of the program are determined in accordance with the needs of the learners is expected to get an average of 30 points from this dimension. The mean score of the participants on the context dimension ($\bar{X}$=38,058) is higher than the expected mean score for this dimension ($\bar{X}$=30). A one-sample t-Test was conducted to test whether the observed mean being higher than 30 was statistically significant and the results are given in Table 5.

Table 5. t-Test Table for Context Dimension Score

Sub Dimension	N	Average	SS	T	df	p*	Mean Difference
Context	104	38,058	,77407	50,139	103	,000	8,058

*p<0,05

According to Table 5, the participants' mean score (38,058) for the items in the context dimension was statistically significantly higher than the expected score (t=50,139; p<0,05). Accordingly, it can be said that the objectives of the program were determined in accordance with the needs of the participants. The t-Test results comparing the scores obtained in the context dimension according to gender are given in Table 6.

Table 6. t-Test Table Comparing the Scores Obtained in the Context Dimension According to Gender

Group	N	Average	SS	T	Df	p
Female	55	3,7400	,74227	-,917	102	,361
Male	49	3,8796	,80957			

p>0,05

According to Table 6, there was no statistically significant difference between the context dimension mean scores of women and men. Accordingly, women and men have the same opinion about determining the program objectives in accordance with the needs of the participants. The t-Test results comparing the scores obtained in the context dimension according to marital status are given in Table 7.

Table 7. t-Test Table Comparing the Scores Obtained in the Context Dimension According to Marital Status

Group	N	Average	SS	T	Df	p
Single	33	3,7667	,92523	-,350	102	,727
Married	71	3,8239	,69948			

p>0,05

According to Table 7, there was no statistically significant difference between the scores of married and single participants in the context dimension. Accordingly, single and married participants have the same opinion about determining the program objectives in accordance with the needs of the participants. The t-Test results comparing the scores obtained in the context dimension according to employment status are given in Table 8.

Table 8. t-Test Table Comparing the Scores Obtained in the Context Dimension According to Employment Status

Group	N	Average	SS	T	Df	p
Employed	64	3,7672	,81105	-,641	102	,523
Unemployed	40	3,8675	,71661			

p>0,05

According to Table 8, there was no statistically significant difference between the context dimension scores of the employed and unemployed participants. Accordingly, employed and unemployed participants have the same opinion about the determination of program objectives in accordance with the needs of the participants. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to test whether the mean scores of the participants on the context dimension showed a significant difference depending on age and the results are given in Table 9.

Table 9. Analysis of Variance Table for the Distribution of the Scores Obtained in the Context Dimension According to Age

Age	N	Average	SS	Coefficient of Variance	KT	sd	KO	F	p
22-25	15	3,7000	,94944	Between Groups	,901	3	,300	,494	,687
26-29	15	3,9800	,53479	Within Group	60,815	100			
30-33	**20**	**3,8900**	**,72104**	**Total**	**61,717**	**103**			
34 and older	54	3,7556	,80462						
Total	**104**	**3,8058**	**,77407**						

p>0,05

According to Table 9, as a result of the analysis of variance, no statistically significant difference was observed in the mean context dimension scores of the participants according to age. Accordingly, it can be said that participants of different ages have the same opinion about determining the objectives of the program in accordance with their needs (F=0,494, p>0,05).

Findings on Input Dimension

Within the scope of the second question of the study, "Are learning resources designed in accordance with the objectives?", 8 items were included in the input sub-dimension. The lowest score that can be obtained from this dimension is 8 and the highest score is 40. Since the value in the middle of these scores is 24, an individual who thinks that learning resources are designed in accordance with the objectives is expected to get an average of 24 points from this dimension. In order to test whether the observed mean of the research group being greater than 24 ($\bar{X}$=37,73) is statistically significant, one sample t-Test was performed and the results are given in Table 10.

Table 10. t-Test Table for Input Dimension Scores

Sub Dimension	N	Average	SS	T	df	p*	Mean Difference
Input	104	37,73	,95729	38,656	103	,000	36,28

*p<0,05

According to Table 10, the mean score of the participants for the items in the input dimension (37.73) was statistically significantly higher than the expected score (t=38.656; p<0.05). Accordingly, it can be said that learning resources in the program are designed in accordance with the objectives. The t-Test results comparing the scores obtained in the input dimension according to gender are given in Table 11.

Table 11. t-Test Table Comparing the Scores Obtained in the Input Dimension According to Gender

Group	N	Average	SS	T	Df	p
Female	55	3,7114	,92605	,933	102	,353
Male	49	3,5357	,99248			

p>0,05

According to Table 11, there is no statistically significant difference between the scores of male and female participants on the design of learning resources in accordance with the objectives in the program. The t-Test results comparing the scores obtained in the input dimension according to marital status are given in Table 12.

Table 12. t-Test Table Comparing the Scores Obtained in the Input Dimension According to Marital Status

Group	N	Average	SS	T	Df	p
Single	33	3,6250	1,00972	-,025	102	,980
Married	71	3,6303	,93933			

p>0,05

According to Table 12, there was no statistically significant difference between the views of married and single students on the design of learning resources in accordance with the objectives in the input dimension. The t-Test results comparing the scores obtained in the input dimension according to whether they were employed or not are given in Table 13.

Table 13. t-Test Table Comparing the Scores Obtained in the Input Dimension According to Employment Status

Group	N	Average	SS	t	Df	p
Employed	64	3,5059	,94108	-1,660	102	,101
Unemployed	40	3,8250	,96194			

p>0,05

According to Table 13, there was no statistically significant difference between the opinions of those who were employed and those who stated that they were not employed regarding the design of learning resources in accordance with the objectives. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was performed to test whether the mean scores of the participants regarding the input dimension showed a significant difference according to age and the results are given in Table 14.

Table 14. Analysis of Variance Table for the Distribution of the Scores Obtained in the Input Dimension According to Age

Age	N	Average	SS	Coefficient of Variance	KT	sd	KO	F	p
22-25	15	3,6417	1,04140	Between Groups	2,314	3	,771	,838	,476
26-29	15	3,9417	,54047	Within Group	92,075	100			
30-33	20	3,4250	1,18682	**Total**	**94,389**	**103**			
34 and older	54	3,6134	,93203						
Total	**104**	**3,6286**	**,95729**						

p>0,05

According to Table 14, as a result of the analysis of variance, no statistically significant difference was observed in the mean input dimension scores of the participants according to their age. Accordingly, the opinions of the participants from different ages on the design of learning resources in accordance with the objectives in the input dimension are similar (F=0,838, p>0,05).

Findings on Process Dimension

Within the scope of the third question of the study, "Were learning activities conducted in accordance with learner expectations?", 12 items were included in the process sub-dimension. The lowest score that can be obtained from this dimension is 12 and the highest score is 60. Since the value in the middle of these scores is 36, an individual who thinks that learning activities are carried out in accordance with learner expectations is expected to get an average of 36 points from this dimension. The average of the scores obtained from the process dimension ($\bar{X}$=38,12) is higher than the average score expected from the measurement tool in this dimension ($\bar{X}$=36). In order to test whether this score difference is statistically significant, one sample t-Test was conducted and the results are given in Table 15.

Table 15. t-Test Table for Process Dimension Scores

Sub Dimension	N	Average	SS	t	df	p*	Mean Difference
Process	104	38,13	,74802	51,988	103	,000	38,13

*p<0,05

According to Table 15, it was observed that the difference between the mean scores obtained from the process sub-dimension ($\bar{X}$=38.13) and the expected mean score ($\bar{X}$=36) was statistically significant (t=51.98; p<0.05). Accordingly, it can be said that learning activities in the program were carried out in accordance with the expectations of the participants. The t-Test results comparing the scores obtained in the process dimension according to gender are given in Table 16.

Table 16. t-Test Table Comparing the Scores Obtained in the Process Dimension According to Gender

Group	N	Average	SS	t	df	p
Female	55	3,8258	,72494	,179	102	,858
Male	49	3,7993	,78042			

p>0,05

According to Table 16, there is no statistically significant difference between the scores of women and men regarding the execution of learning activities in the program in accordance with their expectations (p>0.05). It can be said that women and men have the same opinion on this issue. The t-Test results comparing the scores obtained in the process dimension according to marital status are given in Table 17.

Table 17. t-Test Table Comparing the Scores Obtained in the Process Dimension According to Marital Status

Group	N	Average	SS	T	df	p
Single	33	3,8157	,87021	,022	102	,983
Married	71	3,8122	,69074			

p>0,05

According to Table 17, there was no statistically significant difference between the scores of married and single participants regarding the execution of learning activities in accordance with their expectations. The t-Test results comparing the scores obtained in the process dimension according to employment status are given in Table 18.

Table 18. t-Test Table Comparing the Scores Obtained in the Process Dimension According to Employment Status

Group	N	Average	SS	T	df	p
Employed	64	3,6992	,76544	-2,044	102	,044
Unmployed	40	3,9958	,68976			

*p<0,05

According to Table 18, there was a significant difference between those who were employed and those who were not employed in terms of the execution of the learning activities in the program in accordance with the expectations in favor of those who were not employed (p<0.05). The mean score of the process dimension of the participants who were not employed was significantly higher than the participants who were employed. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was performed to test whether the mean scores of the participants regarding the process dimension showed a significant difference depending on their age and the results are given in Table 19.

Table 19. Variance Analysis of the Distribution of the Scores Obtained in the Process Dimension According to Age

Age	N	Average	SS	Coefficient of Variance	KT	sd	KO	F	p
22-25	15	3,6556	,86423	Between Groups	,714	3	,569	,418	,740
26-29	15	3,8889	,53421	Within Group	56,918	100			
30-33	**20**	**3,7375**	**,85638**	**Total**	**57,632**	**103**			
34 and older	54	3,8642	,73371						
Total	**104**	**3,8133**	**,74802**						

p>0,05

According to Table 19, there is no statistically significant difference between age groups regarding the execution of learning activities in the program in accordance with the expectations of the participants. In other words, the opinions of the participants of different ages that the learning activities in the program are carried out in accordance with the expectations are similar (F=0,416, p>0,05).

Findings on Product Dimension

Within the scope of the fourth question of the study, "Have the learning outcomes been achieved in the program?", 10 items were included in the product sub-dimension. The lowest score that can be obtained from the product sub-dimension is 10 and the highest score is 50. Since the value in the middle of these scores is 30, an individual who thinks that learning outcomes are achieved in the program is expected to get an average of 30 points from this dimension. The average of the scores obtained from the product dimension ($\bar{X}$=41,11) is higher than the average score expected for this dimension ($\bar{X}$=30). The results of the one-sample t-Test conducted to test whether this difference is statistically significant are given in Table 20.

Table 20. t-Test Table for Product Dimension Scores

Sub Dimension	N	Average	SS	t	df	p*	Mean Difference
Product	104	41,11	,71678	58,484	103	,000	41,11

*p<0,05

According to Table 20, it was observed that the difference between the average score obtained from the product sub-dimension ($\bar{X}$=41,11) and the expected average score ($\bar{X}$=30) was statistically significant (t=58,48; p<0,05). Accordingly, it can be said that the expected learning outcomes were achieved in the program. The t-Test results comparing the scores obtained in the product dimension according to gender are given in Table 21.

Table 21. t-Test Table Comparing the Scores Obtained in the Product Dimension According to Gender

Group	N	Average	SS	T	df	*p
Female	55	3,9636	,73317			
Male	49	4,2755	,66725	-,271	102	,026

*p<0,05

According to Table 21, there was a significant difference between the groups in terms of achieving the learning outcomes in the program (p<0.05). Accordingly, it can be said that men have more positive opinions than women in terms of achieving learning outcomes in the program. The t-Test results comparing the scores obtained in the product dimension according to marital status are given in Table 22.

Table 24. t-Test Table Comparing the Scores Obtained in the Product Dimension According to Marital Status

Group	N	Average	SS	T	df	p
Single	33	4,1303	,91634			
Married	71	4,1014	,60980	,190	102	,849

p>0,05

According to Table 22, there was no statistically significant difference between the scores of married and single participants in terms of achieving the learning outcomes in the program. It can be said that both groups have the same opinion on this issue. The t-Test results comparing the scores obtained in the product dimension according to employment status are given in Table 23.

Table 23. t-Test Table Comparing the Scores Obtained in the Product Dimension According to Employment Status

Group	N	Average	SS	T	df	p
Employed	64	4,1266	,74796			
Unmployed	40	4,0850	,67237	,286	102	,775

p>0,05

According to Table 23, there was no statistically significant difference between the scores of those who were employed and those who were not employed in terms of achievement of learning outcomes in the program. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to test whether the participants' scores on the product dimension showed a significant difference depending on age and the results are given in Table 24.

Table 24. Variance Analysis of the Distribution of the Scores Obtained in the Product Dimension According to Age

Age	N	Average	SS	Coefficient of Variance	KT	sd	KO	F	p
22-25	15	4,1200	,51018	Between Groups	1,171	3	,517	,755	,522
26-29	15	4,1867	,52217	Within Group	51,747	100			
30-33	20	4,2900	,75247	Total	52,918	103			
34 and older	54	4,0204	,79536						
Total	**104**	**4,1106**	**,71678**						

p>0,05

According to Table 24, there was no statistically significant difference in the scores of the product dimension according to the participants' age. In other words, the opinions of the participants of different ages that the learning outcomes were achieved in the program were similar (F=0,755, p>0,05).

Findings on Semi-structured Interviews

In the study, the opinions and suggestions of 6 graduates working in the positions of operations manager, team leader, unit manager and customer representative in the call center sector were obtained through semi-structured interviews about whether the program applied has any deficiencies and what can be done to improve the program, if any. The opinions and suggestions of the participants were collected and interpreted in 15 themes under 4 categories determined by taking into consideration the literature and the findings obtained with the quantitative measurement tool. The findings are given in Table 25.

Table 25. Opinions of the Graduates Participating in the Interviews Regarding the Improvement of the Program

Category	Theme	Program Evaluation Dimension
Learning Resources	Course content	Context
	Up to dateness of courses	Input
	New courses needed	
Learning Activities	Examination	
	Internship	Process
	Technical trip	Product
	Practical lessons	
Recognition	Scope of work and professional competence	Context
	University-industry cooperation	Process
		Product
Expectations	Technology dimension	
	Theoretical dimension	Context
	Implementation aspect	Process
	Individual predisposition	Product
	Communication and foreign language proficiency	

According to Table 25, it was seen that the opinions and suggestions of the participants regarding the development of the program were concentrated in the context, process and product dimensions. These opinions and suggestions are explained below under category headings.

Learning Resources: Participants' views on learning resources were categorized under three themes: the content of the courses, the timeliness of the courses and the new courses needed. Participants mentioned the lack of content, especially in the technical dimension, regarding the content of the courses. They emphasized that the existing content is more theoretical and oriented towards academic progress. They stated that in the sector where the practical skills of the employees are more important, the courses should also have practical content. Some participants drew attention to the fact that vocational courses such as communication and presentation techniques, statistics, programming, sales techniques, office programs should be given with more practical content. As a justification, they pointed out that the structuring of vocational course contents in accordance with the sector plays an important role in the careers of sector employees. Some of the participants stated that the current course contents are not up-to-date enough due to the dynamic structure of the sector. They emphasized the necessity of updating the course contents in the program, especially in line with the developments in the technological field.

The most common theme in the learning resources category was the courses needed in the field. All of the interviewed participants pointed to the lack of courses covering the technical dimension of the program. They also said that it would be more beneficial to conduct some technical courses as applied online courses. They mentioned that some courses that will enable graduates to take managerial positions in the sector are not included in the program and stated that the addition of these courses will contribute to the graduates of the program in this process.

Learning Activities: Participants' views on learning activities were grouped under four themes: exams, internships, technical trips and application courses. Emphasizing the diversification of the program in terms of evaluation, the participants stated that the exam application was intended to finish the program, but the questions asked in some courses were very difficult. The participants found the e-campus system quite successful as a learning environment and stated that they mostly benefited from the exam questions in the system. However, they stated that candidates who start working in the sector are mostly evaluated on simulations, so it would be more effective to make such an evaluation in the program, at least in courses with technical content. They suggested asking questions based on scenarios in exams and diversifying the evaluation with applications such as homework and projects in some courses. They also said that the e-campus system has a structure in which these practices can be carried out. The opinions of the participants regarding the internship practice were that the internship is very necessary for the field but cannot be done due to the procedures and that this problem should be solved by the universities and the internship practice should be implemented. They stated that internship would be a very useful practice, especially in issues of critical importance for both the sector and the learners, such as minimizing the dropout rate, preventing loss of time and cost, and ensuring that candidates graduate from the program with a good command of the system by obtaining detailed information about the sector and job description.

Another issue that the participants drew attention to was the technical trip. They emphasized that the technical trip, which is nowadays practiced especially by quantitative departments, is important for the learners in the program to learn about the sector and experience the working environment.

One of the most emphasized issues by the participants was practical courses. Since the sector's field of activity involves mostly technical and technological skills, the lack of practical courses is overcome with in-service trainings after starting to work in the sector. Although some of the trainings are project-based, it is important for companies to complete the basic skills required by the sector during the training process provided in the program in terms of both cost and employing qualified personnel.

Recognition: The recognition category identified for the development of the program was examined under the themes of "Scope of work and professional competence, University-Sector cooperation". Participants are already working in the sector and one of their most common complaints is the public perception of the sector. Professionally, they complained that customer representative is still perceived as a job that consists only of answering incoming phone calls rather than a profession. They emphasized that the learners in the program and the public should be adequately informed about the profession that the candidates will have

when they graduate. They also stated that the sector is very dynamic and has a structure in which career steps are operated faster than in other sectors.

One of the issues emphasized by the participants working in the private sector was to ensure university-industry cooperation. Participants emphasized the importance of cooperation in determining the courses and contents of the program. Another issue is that the training provided is not sufficient in terms of practice, especially for customer representatives who answer calls. Organizations have to provide training to the personnel they hire beforehand. The training provided is comprehensive and covers general information as well as the project. If universities determine the scope and content of the training they provide together with the sector and provide the desired competencies in the candidate, candidates graduating from the program may have an advantage over other candidates. In addition, there were participants who stated that the role of the management staff working in the sector as instructors in some applied courses would prevent the deficit in the technical field. Stating that they expect an increase in interest in the sector, especially in the sector where the work-from-home model can be applied, the participants emphasized that better-equipped graduates will be advantageous in recruitment. They also stated that thanks to the university-industry cooperation, the rate of job dropout will decrease and more experienced personnel will work in the sector. In addition, this cooperation is also important in terms of the scope of work and professional competence discussed in the previous theme. Candidates enrolled in the program will learn where and what tasks they will perform when they graduate, what competencies they need to have, shape their expectations and draw a clearer path for themselves after graduation.

Expectations: In this category, the opinions and suggestions of the participants were grouped under the themes of "Technology dimension, Theoretical and practical dimensions, Individual predisposition, Communication and language proficiency". All participants pointed out that the technological dimension was particularly lacking in the program and stated that the program should be updated in line with technological developments. They also pointed out the importance of technical courses due to the prevalence of jobs requiring technical skills in the sector. Participants think that the program is theoretically sufficient in general, but some theoretical information should be added, especially for learners who prefer this department for a career. Participants stated that the sector includes practical work as well as theoretical knowledge, but there are no practical courses in the program. They stated that applied courses should be carried out in the program. They also frequently mentioned the internship issue and stated that internship would be a complementary application in the program.

The participants stated that those working in the call center services sector are performing a very difficult profession and emphasized the importance of not only having theoretical and practical competencies, but also being predisposed to this profession from an individual perspective. They also stated that personal competencies such as problem-solving skills, patience, empathy, and the ability to fulfill multiple tasks at the same time should be possessed.

Participants have different views on communication and language competence, which are discussed lastly in the expectations category. Some participants emphasized that effective communication is very important in the sector. They drew attention to the correct use of voice and proper use of Turkish. In addition, the participants who stated that there is a need for foreign language, especially with the opening of the sector to the foreign market, stated that there is a need for personnel who know English and German at B1 level. They said that the necessity of foreign language is also very important for the programs used in the sector because the language of all programs is English.

CONCLUSION

When the findings obtained from quantitative data in the study were examined, it was seen that the program objectives were determined in accordance with the needs of the learners, teaching materials were designed in accordance with the objectives of the program, teaching activities overlapped with the expectations of the learners and the determined learning outcomes were achieved. The findings obtained from qualitative data suggest that the program needs to be updated, enriched and diversified, especially in terms of content and implementation. These results align with the results of Yucesan Kaya (2019)'s research, which was carried

out using the same evaluation model before in Open Education System. In that study, which evaluated the Turkish Language and Literature Undergraduate Program conducted through distance education, it was determined that the program outcomes were achieved in four dimensions (Context, Input, Process and Product) in Stufflebeam's (2003) model.

When the results of the research are evaluated in terms of the sector, it is seen that the call center services sector has a very important place in terms of both employment and sectoral value. However, as previously stated in the research conducted by Celik (2016), the sector has many problems such as education, recognition, trust, turnover rate, institutional supports, competition with foreign sectors, etc. Especially in the public sector, the perception that call center services are not a profession but just call answering causes the sector to be seen as a seasonal or transitional job. This increases the turnover rate in the sector. The problems experienced during the education process and the expectations of graduates exist not only for institutions providing distance education services but also in formal education. The general problem of the people who graduated and started to work in the sector is that the education given remains more theoretical despite the dynamic and practical structure of the sector. The fact that the sector does not seek call center services department graduates as a prerequisite for the personnel it hires, especially in the role of customer representative, negatively affects the interest in the program and public perception. When the reasons for this are investigated, the fact that the candidates graduating from the program do not have a good command of the application dimension of the program and that there is in-house training for this does not distinguish the graduates of the department from the others. In this respect, educational institutions have some duties.

It is especially important for educational institutions to organize the learning activities in the program by considering the above-mentioned issues. With internship and practice courses, the deficiencies in the graduates regarding the sector, in the application dimension, can be eliminated. As Oliva (2009) points out, education programs are expected to meet the needs of learners in both academic and professional life. In this study, when the reasons why the learners prefer the program are examined, the rate of marking the option "for promotion in the sector" reveals a different situation regarding the internship and the duration of the program. Internship would be unnecessary for those who work in the sector and prefer the program for promotion. Learners who enroll in the program for this purpose expect a more advanced education. In the interviews, it was seen that such a target group needs courses such as management organization, business law, advanced excel and programming knowledge. However, it is not possible to provide all these courses in the current duration of the program. For this reason, it may be useful to restructure the program at the undergraduate level, especially for learners with career plans in the sector.

However, it is important that the competence of the personnel trained for the sector is known by the sector as well as the restructuring of the program in the light of the findings obtained in the processes in which both learning activities and evaluation methods are determined. The most effective way to ensure this is to realize university-industry cooperation in all these processes (Bektas&Tayauova, 2014). Considering that one of the main tasks of educational institutions is to train individuals with adequate equipment in the fields that society needs, there is a need for university-industry cooperation in order to employ educated individuals in the relevant sectors and to benefit efficiently from this workforce. The call center services sector has favorable conditions for the employment of women and disabled people, especially in terms of working conditions and the remote working option, which has started to be applied more and more recently with the COVID-19 pandemic. It will be beneficial for both the learners and the sector to complete the deficiencies of the program, which serves such an important purpose, in order to provide the graduates with the necessary competencies.

As a result, it was seen that the program has sufficient theoretical content in many courses, while some courses need to be updated in line with the developments in the sector. In particular, there is a need to offer the program at the undergraduate level for managerial positions and to add new courses in line with the needs, to improve the technical dimension of the program, to include application courses, to enrich the content in line with the needs of the sector in terms of foreign language, to include scenario-based questions in exams for the evaluation of learners and to introduce internship practice. In addition to these, the sector's prioritizing the graduates of these programs both in the recruitment process and in the promotion process will significantly eliminate the problems experienced.

BIODATA and CONTACT ADDRESSES of AUTHORS

Yagmur TUC is working as a Vice-Manager in the Department of Assessment at Anadolu University Open Education Faculty. She received her bachelor's degree from Anadolu University, Faculty of Literature, Department of Turkish Language and Literature and her master's degree from the Department of Distance Education in 2022. Her research interests are instructional design, assessment, and programme evaluation in open and distance learning.

Yagmur TUC
Non-Formal Education, Open Education Faculty
Address: Anadolu University, 26470, Eskisehir, Turkiye
Phone: +90 222 3350580
E-mail: yagmurtuc@anadolu.edu.tr

Nejdet KARADAG, Ph.D., works as the manager of the Assessment Department at the Open Education Faculty of Anadolu University. He has a BA degree from the Department of French Language Teaching and MA degree from the Department of Distance Education. He received his Ph.D. in Distance Education from Anadolu University in 2014. His research interests are instructional design, assessment, programme evaluation, mega universities, and new learning technologies in open and distance learning.

Nejdet KARADAG
Non-Formal Education, Open Education Faculty
Address: Anadolu University, 26470, Eskisehir, Turkiye
Phone: +90 222 3350580
E-mail: nkaradag@anadolu.edu.tr

REFERENCES

Anadolu Bilgi Paketi. (2022). *Anadolu Universitesi Acikogretim Fakultesi Cagri Merkezi Hizmetleri Program Profili.* Retrieved December 08, 2022 from

https://abp.anadolu.edu.tr/tr/program/programProfili/1649/8

Aydiner, N. (2016). Egitim programi ve ogretim. A.S. Saracaloglu ve A. Kucukoglu (Editorler), *Ogretim ilke ve yontemleri icinde (21-55). Ankara:* Pegem A yayinlari.

Aygoren, F. & Er, K.O. (2018). Classifications of evaluating education programs. *Turkish Studies, 13* (11), 269-296. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.7827

Bektas, C. & Tayauova, G. (2014). A model suggestion for improving the efficiency of higher education: University–Industry cooperation. *Procedia -Social and Behavioral Sciences 116,* 2270-2274. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.558

Bilen, M. (1999). *Plandan uygulamaya ogretim*. Ankara: Ani Yayincilik.

Bilgic, G. H., Dogan, D. ve Seferoglu, S. S. (2021). Yuksekogretim kurumlarinda dijitallesme sureci: harmanlanmis ogrenme ile zenginlestirilen ortamlar. A. Isman, C. H. Aydin, O. Cicek, F. Silman ve M. Oztunc (Editorler), *Yuksekogretimde kalite ve akreditasyon calismalari* icinde. (122-142). Istanbul: Egitim Yayinevi.

Bilhan, S. (1991). *Egitim felsefesi*. Ankara: A.U. Egitim Bilimleri Yayinlari.

Bloom, B. S., Madaus, G. F., & Hastings, J. T. (1971). *Handbook on formative and summative evaluation of student learning*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Call Center Services Association-CCSA (2022). *Turkiye cagri merkezi pazari verileri*. Retrieved Juin 20, 2022 from https://www.cagrimerkezleridernegi.org/raporlar

Council of Higher Education (2018). *Yuksekogretim kalite kurulu mevzuati*. Retrieved May 12, 2022 from

http://www.yok.gov.tr/web/kalitekurulu/ilgili-mevzuat

Creswell, J. W. (2021). *Karma yontem arastirmalarina giris*. (**Cev**: M. Sozbilir). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Creswell, J. W. & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Celik, N. (2016). Turkiye cagri merkezi sektoru sorunlarinin cozumune yonelik bir karar destek sistemi gelistirme. *Uluslararasi Sosyal Arastirmalar Dergisi*, *9*(42), 1445-1453.

Celik, N. ve Uzmez, U. (2014). Universite ogrencilerinin meslek secimini etkileyen faktorlerin degerlendirilmesi: Cagri merkezi hizmetleri ornegi. *Elektronik Mesleki Gelisim ve Arastirma Dergisi (EJOIR)*, *2*(1), 94-105.

Dart, J. (2004). *Six Normative Approaches to Evaluation*. Retrieved Juin 23, 2022 from

https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Six-Normative-Approaches-to-Evaluation-Dart

Davlatmirzayevich, A. A. (2022). Parameters and indicators of educational quality monitoring in higher educational institutions. *Web of Scientist: International Scientific Research Journal, 3*(3), 28-40. https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/C38BV

Dean, A. M. (2002). Service quality in call centres: Implications for customer loyalty. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal, 12*(6), 414-423.

Demirel, O. (2012). *Egitimde program gelistirme kuramdan uygulamaya.* Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Donmez, H.M. (2018). Acikogretim fakultesi halkla iliskiler ve tanitim on lisans programinin degerlendirilmesi ve gelistirilmesine yonelik oneriler. [Evaluation of the public relations and publicity two-year degree program of open education faculty and proposals for improvement]. (Doctoral dissertation). Anadolu University Graduate School of Social Sciences, Eskisehir, Turkiye. Available from the Council of Higher Education, National Dissertation Center, Dissertation ID: 626608.

Erden, M. (1998). *Egitimde program degerlendirme.* Ankara: Pegem Yayincilik.

Evans, T. (2003). Policy and planning in the developed countries: Coping with compulsive development cultures. S. Panda (Editor), in *Planning and management in distance education* (p. 31-39). Kogan Page.

Garrett, R. (2016). *The state of open universities in the Commonwealth: A perspective on performance, competition and innovation.* Burnaby: Commonwealth of Learning.

Gungor, C. ve Yilmaz, B. (2002). *"Egitimde Olcme ve Degerlendirme"*. Retrieved July 19, 2022 from

http://www.egitim.com/egitimciler/0753/0753.1/0753.Egitimdeolcmevedegerlendirme

Guven, B. ve Ileri, S. (2006). Program degerlendirme kavrami ve ilkogretimde program degerlendirme calismalarina kuramsal bir bakis. *Turkiye Sosyal Arastirmalar Dergisi*, *10*(1-2), 141-163.

Howard, J. (2007). Curriculum development. *Center for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning.*

Elon University. https://ocw.tudelft.nl/wp-content/uploads/Article-Judith-Howard-on-Curriculum-Design.pdf

Inglis, A. (2003). Planning and management of networked learning. S. Panda (Ed.), in *Planning and management in distance education.* 159-168. London: Kogan Page.

Isman, A. ve Eskicumali, A. (2006). Ogretimde planlama ve degerlendirme. Ankara: Sempati-Pegem A Yayincilik.

Karacaoglu, O. C. (2011). *Online egitimde program gelistirme*. Ankara: Ihtiyac Yayincilik.

Kayhan, E. ve Gurol, M. (2019). Turkce ogretim programi (2017)'nin Stufflebeam'in CIPP) modeline gore degerlendirilmesi. *Turk Egitim Dergisi, 4*(1), 48-67.

Klenowski, V. (2010). Curriculum evaluation: Approaches and methodologies. *International Encyclopedia of Education*. (335-341). Elsevier Ltd. DOI:10.1016/B978-0-08-044894-7.00069-5

Kocabas, I. (2017). Cagri merkezi musteri temsilcisinin imajinin musteri memnuniyeti uzerindeki rolu. *Gumushane Universitesi Iletisim Fakultesi Elektronik Dergisi*, 5(1), 118-147.

Kohen, A. (2020). Cagri merkezi gercekleri. Istanbul: Cinius Yayinlari.

Kohen, A. (2002). Cagri merkezleri: Yararlari ve bilesenleri. *Aktive Bankacilik ve Finans Dergisi.* 22, 1-7.

Miriam, C. & Offat, M. I. (2015). Programme evaluation in distance education: A function of quality assurance. *Greener Journal of Education and Training Studies, 3*(1), 1-8. http://doi.org/10.15580/GJETS.2015.1.012315016

Mentese, B. ve Muharrem, E. S. (2017). Turkiye'de cagri merkezlerinde calisma iliskileri: Yalova, Elazig ve Sanliurfa ornegi. *Yalova Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *8*(14): 23-50.

Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: an expanded Sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE.

Oliva, P. F. (2009). *Developing the curriculum*. New York, NY: Pearson Education, Inc.

Ornstein, A. C. & Hunkins, F. P. (2009). *Curriculum foundations, principles, and issues*. ABD: Pearson.

Ozdemir, S. M. (2009). Egitimde program degerlendirme ve Turkiye'de egitim programlarinin degerlendirme calismalarinin incelenmesi. *Yuzuncu Yil* Universitesi Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi, (6), 126-149.

Stufflebeam D. L. (2003). The CIPP model for evaluation: An update, a review of the model's development, a checklist to guide implementation. *2003 Annual Conference of the Oregon Program Evaluators Network.* Portland.

Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2019). *Using multivariate statistics*. Boston: Pearson.

Usun, S. (2016). *Egitimde program degerlendirme: Surecler, yaklasimlar ve modeller*. Ankara: Ani Yayincilik.

Yager, R. (2001). Problems of meaning in science curriculum, B. Kilbourn (Editor), in *For love of teaching*, (p. 612-614). Londan: Althouse Press.

Yang, Y. & Green, S.B. (2011). Coefficient alpha: a reliability coefficient for the 21st century? *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment.* 29(4), 377-392. https://doi.org/10.1177/0734282911406668

Yucesan Kaya, H. (2019). Anadolu Universitesi Acikogretim Fakultesi Turk Dili ve Edebiyati programinin baglam, girdi, surec ve urun modeli cercevesinde ogrenen goruslerine gore degerlendirilmesi. [Evaluation of the Turkish Language and Literature program of the Open Education Faculty at Anadolu University according to opinions of learners in the context, input, process and product model]. (Master's dissertation). Anadolu University Graduate School of Social Sciences, Ankara, Turkiye. Available from the Council of Higher Education, National Dissertation Center, Dissertation ID: 622876.

Yuksel, I. (2010). Turkiye icin program degerlendirme standartlari olusturma calismasi. [Development of Turkish program evaluation standards]. (Doctoral dissertation). Anadolu University Graduate School of Educational Sciences, Eskisehir, Turkiye. Available from the Council of Higher Education, National Dissertation Center, Dissertation ID: 262343