Efficiency of Social Studies Integrated Character Education Program

Abstract

The aim of this study was to define the level of quality and types of analytical errors for measurement instruments used [i.e., interview forms, achievement tests and scales] in doctoral dissertations produced in educational sciences in Turkey. The study was designed to determine the levels of factors concerning quality in research methods and the case study model was used. Theoretical universe for the study was 324 doctoral dissertations in educational sciences in Turkey from 2003 to 2007. Sampling group was consisted of 211 doctoral dissertations accessed through online in the National Thesis Center. In order to collect the data, an evaluation form was developed by the researcher and the data analysis method was epistemological document analysis. In the analysis process, frequencies, descriptive statistics, and typology analysis techniques were used. The findings indicate that the properties of measurement tools used in dissertations in educational sciences were absent and that the most common analytical mistake was the absence of validity.
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The number of educational research concerning the educational system has gained an important role in the decade. While some of the published studies have created a basis for educational reforms, another portion has tested the results of previous research and the reliability via literature review (Balcı & Apaydın, 2009; Odom et al., 2005; Onwuegbuzie & Daniel, 2003). In parallel to this growth in quantity, inquiry process of educational research, the results reached through the conduct of research and the availability of high quality works are quite important. When these studies were examined, some authors’ findings included misconceptions, contrary to the reality, opposite findings were expressed. This study provides an important and necessary synthesis of studies (Dunkin, 1996).

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine the quality of research, measurement instruments and the types of analytical errors in doctoral dissertations in educational sciences produced in the Turkish universities.

Method

Research Design

While conducting the research, which aimed to determine the measurement instruments used and the analytical errors in the doctoral dissertations in educational sciences between the years of 2003 and 2007, the
case study design had been used in addition to the other qualitative research designs (Creswell, 1998; Merriam, 1998).

Universe and Sampling

The theoretical universe of this research was the doctoral dissertations produced in Turkey in education sciences. Yet, the theoretical universe to study, which was identified by taking into consideration the improvements in methodology and whether they were up to date, included 324 doctoral dissertations education sciences between the years of 2003 and 2007 (Yüksek Öğretim Kurulu [YÖK], 2008).

Data Analysis

Quantitative dimension. SPSS package was used to analyze the data. The comparisons according to the variables of gender, branch and position were made and chi-square test was conducted.

Qualitative method. Content analysis method was used to analyze the qualitative data. In the analysis of the qualitative data, other questions were encoded and their frequency analyses were conducted. The questions were evaluated and interpreted together with their frequency. The obtained findings were significantly classified. The frequency of the opinions that were classified was determined and the conclusions were interpreted via this obtained data (Silverman, 2006).

Results

The measurement instruments used in doctoral theses in educational sciences and their percentages were as follows: (1) scale \( (n = 163, \%63.1) \) and (2) interview form \( (n = 54, \%20.9) \), (3) achievement test \( (n = 32, \%12.4) \) and (4) observation form \( (n = 9, \%12.4) \).

The general quality levels of measurement instruments vary from 0.68 to 5.57 based on the item. The total average point of measuring instruments was calculated as 2.18 \[ SD = 1.46, Median = 1.86 \]. The quality levels of interview forms vary from 2.51 to 5.34 based on the item. The total average point of interview forms was calculated as 3.85 \[ SD = 2.08, Median = 3.67 \]. The quality levels of achievement tests vary from 1.19 to 4.97 based on the item. The total average point of achievement tests was calculated as 2.39 \[ SD = 1.28, Median = 2.20 \].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>58.55</td>
<td>2.161</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>1.961</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The present quantitative study results were also supported by qualitative data. Two examples of expressions made by PPETs after intervention are following:

...If I consider my status before participating in this study, I think I am better at measurement and evaluation in physical education and general education. I can apply alternative assessments tools better henceforward…

...We are more knowledgeable now. In the future, we are going to be able to better…

**Discussion**

The level of measurement instruments used in doctoral theses in educational sciences by means of general properties were normally insufficient while the info was not provided regarding the properties of the measurement instruments in the qualitative studies which was considered as an error (Punch, 2005; Neuman, 2007). These finding were similar to the research findings of Onwuegbuzie (2002), Stevenson (2000), and West, Carmody, and Stallings (1983).

The quality level of *interview forms* used as measurement instrument in doctoral theses was insufficient. The most important error in this dimension was the lack of pilot studies or lack of explanations of pilot test results in the theses where pilot study has been conducted (Mason, 1996; Patton, 2002).

The quality level of *achievement tests* used as other measurement instruments in doctoral theses was insufficient. This result of the research was in correspondence with some of the earlier research findings (see: Hall, 1986; Kırcaali-İftar, 1999; Onwuegbuzie, 2002).
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