United International Journal for Research & Technology

Volume 05, Issue 09, 2024 | Open Access | ISSN: 2582-6832

Evaluation of Human Resource Development Programs in Elementary Schools (Marand City Case Study)

Dr. Fereshteh Karimivand

Cukurova University

***Abstract*—** The present study was conducted to evaluate human resource development programs between elementary school educators in Marand City. This study is a survey in terms of data collection method, and it is practical. The statistical population includes all elementary school educators of Marand city in the academic year of 2019, numbering 1140 people, which was chosen by simple random sampling method and by means of Morgan's table, a sample of 275 people. The validity of the questionnaire was approved by experts, and its reliability was obtained using Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.88 for the index of the existing situation of the development program and 0.90 for the index of the need for the development program. Analyzing the data of the questionnaires using SPSS software and paired t-test, independent t-test and one-way ANOVA presented that there exists a significant difference between the indicators of the current situation of development (teacher's participation level, needs assessment and educational planning, implementation and evaluation), and the need for development program, and the current situation is significantly less. Similarly, there exists a meaningful difference between the opinions of the people about the indicators of the existing situation and the need for development program in terms of age. In terms of educational level, apart from the current situation of implementation and evaluation, there is a significant difference between the two situations. And after all, there is no meaningful difference between situations in terms of gender.

***Keywords*—** Educational Planning, Evaluation, Human Resources Development, Improvement, Teachers.

INTRODUCTION

Today, human resources are the driving force of the organizations and play an imperative part in determining the destiny of a country's economic and social development. Training and development of human resources allow them to adapt to the performance requirements of their jobs and increase their efficiency in response to organizational and environmental changes (Mahapatro, 2021). In order to adapt to operational goals and institutional development, organizations continuously improve four variables of human resources: the use of new technologies, rules and regulations, equipment, and the cultural atmosphere of the organization (Baruch, 2003).

Cooper (2004) explains that: "Human resource improvement is related to preparation for learning and development of educational opportunities to improve individual and group performance and organizational development". According to Lee (1996), development is a natural process of professional growth in which employees gradually gain self-confidence, reach new perspectives, increase in knowledge, and discover and perform new methods. Lee believes that the development of employees depends on three components: 1) the knowledge, experience, and personality of the employee, 2) the context of the work environment, and 3) professional contacts and discussions outside the work environment. He and co-workers (2017), see employees as the result of three fundamental factors: The first factor is the individual factor, which is the result of continuous personal learning. The second factor is the institutional factor that reflects the interactions in the work environment between employees and the subject of work, and the third factor is the management factor responsible for planning and implementing development programs.

Teachers, undoubtedly, are the pillar of educational structure, and their quantitative and qualitative decrease directly affects the goals and performance of education (Appova and Arbaugh, 2018). For this reason, teachers need to be provided with the opportunity to benefit from new training skills, so that they can better fulfill their professional, specialized, and educational duties (Kraut et al., 2016). Development is essentially a flexible approach to learning using different methods, resulting in teachers moving towards improving their skills, beliefs, and abilities (Richter et al., 2014). Undoubtedly, the more capable teachers are in their profession, the more successful they will be in their teaching and the more opportunities they will provide for students to learn. Professional development of teachers is "processes and activities planned to increase the skills, knowledge, and specialized approaches of teachers so that they can progress the learning of students (Guskey,

1986)." Engstrom and co-workers (2012) also define teacher development as "any organized program, formal or informal, that attempts to help teachers improve the quality of teaching". They consider teacher development as the continuous learning of teachers as professionals.

The implementation of the teacher development system has lots of achievements, which can be expressed in three dimensions: individual, organizational, and social (Dinham and Scott, 1998). Among its individual benefits are increasing the teacher's morale and self-confidence, providing professional development, increasing efficiency, increasing the feeling of job security in terms of strengthening abilities, desirably performing tasks, strong and stable job satisfaction, increasing salaries and benefits (Mestry and co-workers, 2009); The organizational dimension includes more productivity, less absenteeism, achieving goals, less displacement and transfer, strengthening the sense of belonging and organizational commitment (Olsson and Roxa, 2013); In the social dimension, defending the dignity and credibility of the organization, helping to prevent the occurrence of social anomalies, helping the durability and strength of the family center, and so on (Mujis and Harris, 2003).

A look at the benefits of employee training shows that the organization without designing and implementing a detailed system for the development and improvement of human resources loses valuable opportunities to keep pace with changes, meet specialized needs, organizational effectiveness, improve job performance, and the possibility of success in competitive conditions (Schuler and Jakson, 1987). In recent years, improving teachers has become one of the most important challenges for education. The failure to provide the skills and knowledge needed by the educators via the formal education systems, and the gap between academic learning and the classroom, reveals the necessity of addressing the professional development of teachers during their teaching period.

HYPOTHESES

1- There is a difference between the indicators of the current situation and the need for development.
2- There is a difference between the opinions of the sample under study, about the indicators of the existing situation and the need for development program in terms of gender.
3- There is a difference between the opinions of the sample under study, about the indicators of the existing situation and the need for development program in terms of the level of education.
4- There is a difference between the opinions of the sample under study, about the indicators of the existing situation and the need for development program in terms of age.
5- There is a difference between the opinions of the sample under study, about the indicators of the existing situation and the need for development program in terms of service history.

METHODOLOGY

This research is practical and it is a survey in terms of data collection technique. The statistical population includes all elementary school teachers of Marand city in the academic year of 2019, numbering 1140 people, which was selected by simple random sampling method and by means of Morgan's table, a sample of 275 people. To collect data and measure the development of human resources, the criteria provided by Rao and Abraham (1990) were used. The validity of the questionnaire was approved by experts, and its reliability was obtained using Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.88 for the index of the existing status of the development program and 0.90 for the index of the need for development program. To analyze the data collected the SPSS software and paired t-tests, independent t-tests and one-way ANOVA were used.

FINDINGS

Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to check the normality of the distribution of variable scores. The test outcomes are shown in Table 1.

Table I: *The results of Kolmogorov-Smirnov test*

Variable	N	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z statistic	Sig Level
The current situation of development	275	1.293	0.082
The current situation of teachers' participation in development programs	275	1.302	0.078
Current situation of needs assessment and educational planning	275	1.315	0.073
Current situation of implementation and evaluation	275	1.326	0.070
The need for development	275	1.277	0.100

The importance of teachers' participation in development programs	275	1.294	0.081
The importance of needs assessment and educational planning	275	.334	0.062
The importance of implementation and evaluation	275	1.284	0.092

According to the results of table (1) in terms of significant levels, it is concluded that all variables have a normal distribution ($p>0.05$).

Hypothesis 1: There is a difference between the indicators of the current state of development and the need for development. Paired t-test was used to test this hypothesis. The outcomes are given in Table 2.

Table II: *the results of the paired t-test to compare the current situation and the need for development indicators*

Variable		N	Average	Standard Deviation	t Value	Degrees of Freedom	Sig. Level
Development	The present situation	275	1.74	0.38	-67.69	284	0.001
	The Need	275	4.33	0.35			
Teachers' participation in development programs	The present situation	275	1.75	0.49	-54.89	284	0.001
	The Need	275	4.37	0.44			
Needs assessment and educational planning	The present situation	275	1.74	0.44	-61.76	284	0.001
	The Need	275	4.32	0.39			
Implementation and evaluation	The present situation	275	1.72	0.40	-67.91	284	0.001
	The Need	275	4.32	0.39			

According to the consequences, it can be understood that development, indicators of teachers' participation in development programs, needs assessment and educational planning, and implementation and evaluation of the existing situation are significantly less than the level of importance ($p<0.05$).

Hypothesis 2: There is a difference between the opinions of the studied people regarding the indicators of the existing situation and the need for development program in terms of gender. Independent t-test was used to test this hypothesis. The test outcomes are given in Table 3.

Table III: *The results of the independent t-test to compare the current situation and the need for development indicators for male and female teachers*

Variable	Gender	N	Average	Standard Deviation	T Value	Degrees of Freedom	Sig Level
The current state of development	Female	146	1.74	0.39	-0.02	283	0.981
	Male	129	1.74	0.37			
The current situation of teachers' participation in development programs	Female	146	1.73	0.49	-0.66	283	0.513
	Male	129	1.77	0.49			
Current status of needs assessment and educational planning	Female	146	1.73	0.46	-0.20	283	0.838
	Male	129	1.74	0.43			
Current status of implementation and evaluation	Female	146	1.74	0.43	0.83	283	0.407
	Male	129	1.70	0.36			
The need for development	Female	146	4.33	0.37	-0.15	283	0.883
	Male	129	4.34	0.32			

The importance of teachers' participation in development programs	Female	146	4.37	0.48	-0.08	283	0.937
	Male	129	4.37	0.40			
The importance of needs assessment and educational planning	Female	146	4.30	0.42	-0.62	283	0.534
	Male	129	4.33	0.36			
The importance of implementation and evaluation	Female	146	4.33	0.41	0.17	283	0.866
	Male	129	4.32	0.37			

According to the outcomes, it can be understood that the indicators of teachers' participation, needs assessment, educational planning, and implementation and evaluation, both in the current situation and in the level of importance, do not have a significant difference in terms of gender.

Hypothesis 3: There is a difference between the opinions of the people under study about the indicators of the existing situation and the need for development program in terms of the level of education. One-way ANOVA was used to test this hypothesis. The results are presented in Table (4).

Table IV: *The results of the one-way analysis of variance test to compare the current situation and the importance of teachers' development indicators based on the level of education.*

Dependent Variable	Level of Education	N	Average	Standard Deviation	The result of Duncan's test	F value	Sig level
The current state of development	Associate Degree	11	1.97	0.53	A	3.628	0.013
	Bachelor's degree	137	1.77	0.41	B		
	Master's degree	107	1.66	0.32	B		
	Doctorate	20	1.75	0.28	B		
The current situation of teachers' participation in development programs	Associate Degree	11	2.01	0.56	A	4.145	0.007
	Bachelor's degree	137	1.79	0.50	AB		
	Master's degree	107	1.64	0.45	AB		
	Doctorate	20	1.89	0.53	B		
Current status of needs assessment and educational planning	Associate Degree	11	2.00	0.57	A	2.646	0.049
	Bachelor's degree	137	1.77	0.49	B		
	Master's degree	107	1.68	0.38	B		
	Doctorate	20	1.64	0.29	B		
Current status of implementation and evaluation	Associate Degree	11	1.88	0.57	-	1.958	0.121
	Bachelor's degree	137	1.76	0.43	-		
	Master's degree	107	1.76	0.33	-		
	Doctorate	20	1.73	0.36	-		
The need for development	Associate Degree	11	4.09	0.53	B		

	Bachelor's degree	137	4.30	0.37	A	5.198	0.002
	Master's degree	107	4.42	0.28	A		
	Doctorate	20	4.31	0.21	A		
The importance of teachers' participation in development programs	Associate Degree	11	4.10	0.55	B	5.551	0.001
	Bachelor's degree	137	4.31	0.48	AB		
	Master's degree	107	4.49	0.35	AB		
	Doctorate	20	4.32	0.38	A		
The importance of needs assessment and educational planning	Associate Degree	11	4.05	0.58	B	3.664	0.013
	Bachelor's degree	137	4.28	0.42	A		
	Master's degree	107	4.38	0.33	A		
	Doctorate	20	4.36	0.29	A		
The importance of implementation and evaluation	Associate Degree	11	4.16	0.49	B	2.748	0.043
	Bachelor's degree	137	4.29	0.42	AB		
	Master's degree	107	4.40	0.34	A		
	Doctorate	20	4.24	0.32	AB		

* Common letters indicate non-significance and non-common letters indicate significance at the 5% level.

It can be seen that the current situation of development, the current situation of teachers' participation in the programs, the current status of needs assessment and educational planning, the need for development, the importance of teachers' participation in development programs, the importance of needs assessment and educational planning, the importance of implementation and evaluation in terms of education level are significantly different. ($p<0.05$).

However, the current situation of implementation and evaluation is not significantly different in terms of education level. ($p>0.05$)

Hypothesis 4: There is a difference between the opinions of the people under study about the indicators of the existing situation and the need for development program in terms of age. One-way ANOVA was used to test this hypothesis. The results are presented in Table (5).

Table V: *The results of the one-way analysis of variance test to compare the current situation and the need for development indicators based on the age of teachers.*

Dependent Variable	Age	N	Average	Standard Deviation	The Result of Duncan's Test	F Value	Sig Level
The current state of development	25 years and under	14	2.28	0.60	A	7.268	0.001
	26-30	38	1.69	0.37	B		
	31-35	52	1.68	0.22	B		
	36-40	73	1.78	0.38	B		
	41-45	36	1.65	0.42	B		
	46-50	55	1.67	0.28	B		

	More than 50 years	7	1.77	0.25	B		
The current situation of teachers' participation in development programs	25 years and under	14	2.33	0.68	A	4.538	0.001
	26-30	38	1.72	0.45	B		
	31-35	52	1.70	0.44	B		
	36-40	73	1.75	0.49	B		
	41-45	36	1.63	0.50	B		
	46-50	55	1.72	0.43	B		
	More than 50 years	7	1.79	0.27	B		
Current status of needs assessment and educational planning	25 years and under	14	2.30	0.72	A	6.108	0.001
	26-30	38	1.68	0.42	B		
	31-35	52	1.64	0.28	B		
	36-40	73	1.81	0.47	B		
	41-45	36	1.67	0.42	B		
	46-50	55	1.66	0.37	B		
	More than 50 years	7	1.77	0.29	B		
Current status of implementation and evaluation	25 years and under	14	2.20	0.54	A	5.513	0.001
	26-30	38	1.68	0.39	B		
	31-35	52	1.71	0.28	B		
	36-40	73	1.77	0.41	B		
	41-45	36	1.61	0.45	B		
	46-50	55	1.65	0.32	B		
	More than 50 years	7	1.75	0.31	B		
The need for development	25 years and under	14	3.95	0.61	B	4.187	0.001
	26-30	38	4.40	0.27	A		
	31-35	52	4.36	0.24	A		
	36-40	73	4.31	0.36	A		
	41-45	36	4.36	0.43	A		
	46-50	55	4.39	0.24	A		
	More than 50 years	7	4.31	0.28	A		
The importance of teachers' participation in development programs	25 years and under	14	3.96	0.61	B	3.148	0.005
	26-30	38	4.41	0.40	A		
	31-35	52	4.43	0.35	A		
	36-40	73	4.34	0.46	A		

	41-45	36	4.49	0.46	A		
	46-50	55	4.37	0.41	A		
	More than 50 years	7	4.29	0.42	A		
The importance of needs assessment and educational planning	25 years and under	14	3.87	0.67	B	4.315	0.001
	26-30	38	4.39	0.32	A		
	31-35	52	4.34	0.27	A		
	36-40	73	4.31	0.39	A		
	41-45	36	4.32	0.48	A		
	46-50	55	4.38	0.31	A		
	More than 50 years	7	4.31	0.26	A		
The importance of implementation and evaluation	25 years and under	14	4.02	0.65	B	2.443	0.026
	26-30	38	4.39	0.33	A		
	31-35	52	4.31	0.36	A		
	36-40	73	4.30	0.40	A		
	41-45	36	4.31	0.47	A		
	46-50	55	4.41	0.27	A		
	More than 50 years	7	4.33	0.23	A		

* Common letters indicate non-significance and non-common letters indicate significance at the 5% level.

It can be seen that the current situation of development, the current situation of teachers' participation in the programs, the current status of needs assessment and educational planning, the need for development, the importance of teachers' participation in development programs, the importance of needs assessment and educational planning, the importance of implementation and evaluation in terms of age are significantly different. ($p<0.05$)

Hypothesis 5: There is a difference between the opinions of the people under study about the indicators of the existing situation and the need for development program in terms of service history. One-way ANOVA was used to test this hypothesis. The results are presented in Table (6).

Table VI: *The results of the one-way analysis of variance test to compare the current situation and the need for development indicators based on teachers' service history.*

Dependent Variable	Work Experience	N	Average	Standard Deviation	The result of Duncan's test	F value	Sig Level
The current state of development	less than 10 years	23	2.18	0.60	A	6.440	0.001
	10-15 years	56	1.75	0.39	B		
	6-20 years	43	1.73	0.32	B		
	21-25 years	58	1.67	0.32	B		
	26-30 years	54	1.68	0.30	B		
	31-35 years	36	1.66	0.32	B		

	35 years and above	5	1.72	0.25	B		
The current situation of teachers' participation in development programs	less than 10 years	23	2.22	0.69	A	4.735	0.001
	10-15 years	56	1.81	0.49	B		
	16-20 years	43	1.69	0.45	B		
	21-25 years	58	1.63	0.38	B		
	26-30 years	54	1.72	0.48	B		
	31-35 years	36	1.70	0.45	B		
	35 years and above	5	1.67	0.36	B		
Current status of needs assessment and educational planning	less than 10 years	23	2.16	0.71	A	4.172	0.001
	10-15 years	56	1.71	0.46	B		
	16-20 years	43	1.74	0.38	B		
	21-25 years	58	1.68	0.37	B		
	26-30 years	54	1.71	0.40	B		
	31-35 years	36	1.64	0.35	B		
	35 years and above	5	1.75	0.25	B		
Current status of implementation and evaluation	less than 10 years	23	2.15	0.54	A	5.916	0.001
	10-15 years	56	1.74	0.39	B		
	16-20 years	43	1.76	0.41	B		
	21-25 years	58	1.66	0.38	B		
	26-30 years	54	1.61	0.29	B		
	31-35 years	36	1.65	0.34	B		
	35 years and above	5	1.75	0.22	B		
The need for development	less than 10 years	23	4.06	0.56	B	3.027	0.007
	10-15 years	56	4.33	0.32	A		
	16-20 years	43	4.32	0.34	A		
	21-25 years	58	4.39	0.34	A		
	26-30 years	54	4.36	0.28	A		
	31-35 years	36	4.38	0.27	A		
	35 years and above	5	4.51	0.09	A		
The importance of teachers' participation in development programs	less than 10 years	23	4.07	0.59	B	2.390	0.029
	10-15 years	56	4.36	0.46	AB		
	16-20 years	43	4.34	0.43	AB		
	21-25 years	58	4.47	0.40	A		
	26-30 years	54	4.38	0.37	AB		
	31-35 years	36	4.42	0.46	AB		
	35 years and above	5	4.52	0.30	A		
The importance of needs assessment and educational planning	less than 10 years	23	4.00	0.64	B		
	10-15 years	56	4.32	0.36	A		

	16-20 years	43	4.32	0.36	A	2.942	0.008
	21-25 years	58	4.37	0.39	A		
	26-30 years	54	4.33	0.33	A		
	31-35 years	36	4.38	0.34	A		
	35 years and above	5	4.50	0.13	A		
The importance of implementation and evaluation	less than 10 years	23	4.11	0.62	-	1.639	0.136
	10-15 years	56	4.32	0.39	-		
	16-20 years	43	4.30	0.38	-		
	21-25 years	58	4.33	0.40	-		
	26-30 years	54	4.39	0.31	-		
	31-35 years	36	4.36	0.30	-		
	35 years and above	5	4.50	0.13	-		

* Common letters indicate non-significance and non-common letters indicate significance at the 5% level.

It can be seen that the current situation of development, the current situation of teachers' participation in the programs, the current status of needs assessment and educational planning, the need for development, the importance of teachers' participation in development programs, the importance of needs assessment and educational planning, the importance of implementation and evaluation in terms of service history. are significantly different. ($p<0.05$) However, the current situation of implementation and evaluation is not significantly different in terms of service history. ($p>0.05$)

CONCLUSION

Teachers should equip their professional development with maximum competence and necessary skills in their development courses, being aware of the heavy responsibility they undertake (Sparks, 2002). In this context, teachers need to be equipped with contemporary knowledge in order to acquire professional skills and raise literate and effective citizens in the society (Darling-Hammond and Bransford, 2007). The outcomes of the research showed that there is no significant difference in overall development and teachers' participation indicators in development programs, needs assessment, and educational planning, and implementation and evaluation, both in the current situation and in the level of importance in terms of gender; Therefore, it can be said that the gender of the teachers is not an obstacle for teachers' participation in the development program, and male and female teachers have almost the same opinion about the implementation of development programs. Today, due to the high importance of teachers' efficiency, educational systems pay more attention to the skills and abilities of people in education, and the selection of such people is considered one of the biggest challenges for education. Also, the results show that there is a significant difference between the opinions of the people studied regarding the indicators of the current situation and the need for development program in terms of age and service history, and there is a significant difference in terms of the level of education, apart from the current situation of implementation and evaluation. This shows that the age, service history, and education of teachers have a significant effect on their opinions about development programs, and perhaps the factors that cause differences in the above three cases can be introduced, the experience, the level of knowledge of teachers, etc.

SUGGESTIONS

According to the results obtained from this research, the following practical suggestions are presented:

- Holding courses under the title of increasing the efficiency level of teachers and equipping them with modern knowledge can increase their efficiency level.
- Paying attention to the professional and personal needs of teachers can also be a factor in moving in the direction of development programs.
- Considering that the results of the research showed that the indicators of human resource development have a significant effect on the efficiency of teachers' routine, to maintain and sustain this effect, it is necessary to consider special training and programs.

- Paying attention to teachers' comments and criticisms about job opportunities, working hours, job benefits, and anything that causes them dissatisfaction.
- Designing teachers' performance evaluation mechanisms and creating promotion and reward opportunities according to their performance.

REFERENCES

[1] Appova, A., & Arbaugh, F. (2018). Teachers' motivation to learn: Implications for supporting professional growth. Professional development in education, 44(1), 5-21.

[2] Baruch, Y. (1996). Self-performance appraisal vs direct-manager appraisal: A case of ongruence.

[3] Journal of Managerial Psychology, 11(6), 50-65.

[4] Cooper, R. A. (2004). Public police and human resource development. In Seminar of (Vol. 19, pp.1-18).

[5] Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (Eds.). (2007). Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do. John Wiley & Sons.

[6] Dinham, S., & Scott, C. (1998). A three domain model of teacher and school executive career satisfaction. Journal of educational administration, 36(4), 362-378.

[7] Engström, S., Gustafsson, P., & Svenson, A. (2012). Education for sustainable development and the relation to learning for entrepreneurship in the national technology program in the Swedish upper secondary school–is it a "happy couple"? In IOSTE XV International Symposium, Science & Technology Education for Development, Citizenship and Social Justice, La Medina-Yasmine Hammamet, October 28, 2012–November 3, 2012.

[8] Guskey, T. R. (1986). Staff development and the process of teacher change. Educational researcher, 15(5), 5-12.

[9] He, Y., Lundgren, K., & Pynes, P. (2017). Impact of short-term study abroad program: Inservice teachers' development of intercultural competence and pedagogical beliefs. Teaching and teacher education, 66, 147-157.

[10] Kraut, R., Chandler, T., & Hertenstein, K. (2016). The interplay of teacher training, access to resources, years of experience and professional development in tertiary ESL reading teachers' perceived self-efficacy. Gist: Education and Learning Research Journal, (12), 132-151.

[11] Lee, J. (1996). Faculty Development: Opportunity and Satisfaction, National Education Associassion. Office of Higher Education.

[12] Mahapatro, B. (2021). Human resource management. New Age International (P) ltd.

[13] Mestry, R., Hendricks, I., & Bisschoff, T. (2009). Perceptions of teachers on the benefits of teacher development programmes in one province of South Africa. South African journal of education, 29(4).

[14] Muijs, D., & Harris, A. (2003). Teacher leadership—Improvement through empowerment? An overview of the literature. Educational management & administration, 31(4), 437-448.

[15] Olsson, T., & Roxå, T. (2013). Assessing and rewarding excellent academic teachers for the benefit of an organization. European Journal of Higher Education, 3(1), 40-61.

[16] Richter, D., Kunter, M., Klusmann, U., Lüdtke, O., & Baumert, J. (2014). Professional development across the teaching career: Teachers' uptake of formal and informal learning opportunities. In Teachers' professional development (pp. 97-121). Brill.

[17] Schuler, R. S., & Jackson, S. E. (1987). Linking competitive strategies with human resource management practices. Academy of Management Perspectives, 1(3), 207-219.

[18] Sparks, D. (2002). Designing powerful professional development for teachers and principals.