International Journal of Management, Accounting, Governance and Education
2024, Volume 4, Issue 1

Research on the Quality Assessment System of Chinese University Student Association Construction Based on CIPP Model

Ren Chao[a1]
Zaida Binti Mustafa[a2]
Li Bo[a3]

[a] Universiti Tun Abdul Razak (UNIRAZAK)

[1] ren.chao@ur.unirazak.edu.my
[2] zaida@unirazak.edu.my
[3] li.bo@ur.unirazak.edu.my

Abstract

This study aims to construct a quality assessment system for the construction of student associations in Chinese universities based on the CIPP model (Context, Input, Process, Product). Through systematic literature review and theoretical analysis, combined with expert consultation and analytic hierarchy process (AHP), this paper successfully establishes an evaluation index system covering four dimensions and three levels, with four first-level indicators, 12 second-level indicators, and 36 third-level indicators. This evaluation indicator system takes into account the context in which the association is located, the input resources, the process of activities and the final output results. In addition, the scientific and authoritative nature of the selection of the indicators was ensured through the Delphi method, and the distribution of the weights of the indicators was further confirmed through the analytic hierarchy process, ensuring the objectivity and adaptability of the evaluation system.

Keywords: student association; CIPP model; evaluation index system; Delphi method; analytic hierarchy process

---

1. Introduction

As an important part of the higher education system, China's student associations have experienced rapid development and change in recent years (Huang et al., 2021). With the massification of higher education, student societies not only provide a platform for students to show themselves and develop their interests, but also become an important place to cultivate students' organisational, creative and practical abilities (Cai & Wang, 2023). However, with the increase in the number and activities of the societies, the problems of their management and quality have become more and more prominent, and how to scientifically and systematically evaluate and guide the construction of the societies has become an urgent task in the management of higher education (Wang et al., 2022).

This study aims to construct a quality assessment system suitable for Chinese university student

societies based on the CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product) model. Through this system, the construction and operation of clubs can be systematically evaluated to promote the healthy and orderly development of clubs. The core questions of the study include: how to define and quantify the quality indicators of club construction? How to systematically construct the evaluation index system according to the framework of CIPP model? and how to assign weights to the indicators?

The relevant theories and researches in this study mainly focus on the application of the CIPP model, the method of constructing the evaluation system, and the use of the Delphi method and the analytic hierarchy process. The CIPP model, as a mature evaluation framework, has been widely used in the evaluation of programmes in education and other fields (Kasmaini et al., 2023). The Delphi method is mainly used in the construction of the evaluation system to reach consensus through the opinions of experts, while the analytic hierarchy process is used to assign weights to evaluation indicators to ensure the systematic and scientific nature of the evaluation (Rebia et al., 2023). Through the comprehensive application of these theories and methods, this study will construct an evaluation system for student associations that meets the reality of Chinese colleges and universities.

2. Theoretical framework and methodology

2.1 Introduction to the CIPP model

The CIPP model is an integrated assessment framework, proposed by Stufflebeam, for project evaluation and decision support. The model name CIPP stands for four components: Context, Input, Process and Product. In this study (Wilson, 2023), the CIPP model was used to construct and evaluate a quality assessment system for student associations in Chinese universities.

- Context: assessing the environment and needs of the association and analysing the current situation and development context of association building.

- Input: relates to the resources and strategies invested in building the association, such as management regulations, financial support and training.

- Process: focuses on the process of implementing the activities of the association, including the way in which the activities are organised and the interaction in the process.

- Product: Evaluates the final outcomes of club activities, including the contribution of the club to the empowerment of students and its social impact.

2.2 Research methodology

2.2.1 Thematic analysis

In this study, thematic analysis was used to conduct a systematic literature analysis of existing regulations governing university student associations. By accurately coding and categorising the information in the literature, we identify key themes and patterns, which helps to initially construct the association evaluation index system (Thelwall, 2021). The method provides theoretical support

for the design of the evaluation system by interpreting the content of the literature at the macro and micro levels (Samanes et al., 2023).

2.2.2 Delphi method

The Delphi method is a technique for reaching consensus through repeated expert consultation (Andreev & Zavyalov, 2023). In this study, the method is used to validate and determine the evaluation indicator system. Through multiple rounds of questionnaire surveys, opinions from experts in the field were collected to gradually refine and adjust the evaluation indicators to ensure the comprehensiveness and scientificity of the evaluation system (Marcos et al., 2023).

2.2.3 Analytic Hierarchy process

The analytic hierarchy process (AHP) is a commonly used decision support tool for assigning weights to evaluation indicators (El Ghazali et al., 2023). In this study, the complex evaluation problem is decomposed into easily comparable parts by constructing a hierarchical model, and then the relative importance of each indicator is calculated through a pairwise comparison matrix (Du, 2023). The application of this method ensures the objectivity and rationality of the evaluation indicator system (Liu et al., 2023).

Through the comprehensive application of these methods, this study will establish a scientific and practical quality assessment system for university student association construction based on the CIPP model, which will provide a basis and direction for the continuous improvement of university associations.

3. Construction of the evaluation index system

3.1 Data collection

The data source of this study is mainly based on the literature analysis of existing regulations related to the management of university student associations in China, and specific documents include the Measures for the Management of Construction of Student Associations in Colleges and Universities issued by the Ministry of Education and the Central Committee of the Communist Youth League of China in 2020, and the Tips for the Standardised Management of Student Associations issued by the Hubei Provincial Education Institution in 2022. In addition, this study incorporates several research documents related to the construction of student associations in colleges and universities to enhance the theoretical foundation and practical applicability of the evaluation index system. The data collection process was carried out through a systematic literature review and content analysis method, aiming to distil the key factors affecting the quality of student association construction from the existing literature. The type of data used is qualitative and the information is extracted mainly through textual analysis.

3.2 Constructing an evaluation indicator system

the existing literature. The type of data used is qualitative and the information is extracted mainly through textual analysis.

Table 1: A quality assessment system for the construction of student organisations in the initial structure

Level 1	Secondary indicators	Tertiary indicators
Context	Policy and Regulation	Regulatory Adaptability
		Policy Update Frequency
		Policy Clarity
	Resource Environment	Funding Availability
		Facility Completeness
		Resource Appropriateness
	Cultural Atmosphere	Openness
		Supportiveness
		Diversity
Input	Financial Support	Budget Transparency
		Funding Adequacy
		Financial Management Efficiency
	Human Resources	Teacher Involvement
		Managerial Competence
		Human Resource Appropriateness
	System Development	System Completeness
		Enforcement Strength
		Response Flexibility
Process	Activity Organization	Planning Quality of Activities
		Execution Efficiency
		Activity Accessibility

	Member Interaction	Participation Rate
		Interaction Quality
		Communication Effectiveness
	Innovation Implementation	Number of Innovative Projects
		Effectiveness of Innovation
		Continuous Improvement
Product	Skill Enhancement	Skill Diversity
		Skill Mastery
		Skill Practicability
	Organizational Impact	Internal Influence
		External Influence
		Brand Image of the Organization
	Sustainable Development	Development Potential
		Self-Renewal Ability
		Sustainable Financial Security

4. Revision and improvement of the evaluation indicator system

In the revision and improvement of the assessment indicators, the study conducted two rounds of questionnaires in accordance with the requirements of the Delphi method. In terms of questionnaire design, the study used a five-point Likert scale to measure the attitudes of experts, and the questionnaire used 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 points to indicate five kinds of attitudes, such as "very unsuitable", "quite suitable", "generally suitable", "quite unsuitable", "very suitable" and so on. The questionnaire used 1, 3, 4 and 5 points to indicate five types of attitudes: "very unsuitable", "quite suitable", "average", "quite unsuitable" and "very suitable". Since this is the first round of indicator selection, based on the principle of conservatism, the study regards the average score of each indicator (between "average" and "more suitable") as the threshold for experts to reach a consensus on the selection of an indicator, i.e., indicators with an average score of more than 3.5 will be retained, while the rest of the indicators will be considered as "more suitable" and "less suitable". be retained, while the remaining indicators would be eliminated.

4.1 Composition of the Expert Team

In this study, 10 experts were invited to participate in the Delphi expert consultation (**Table 2**). The selection of experts included three basic conditions: first, they had a senior title of associate professor or above; second, they were experts and scholars working in Chinese universities; and third, they were faculty members with experience in advising student associations. All experts were required to

volunteer to participate in the study and could guarantee to complete at least two rounds of counselling.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of Expert Information

No.	Gender	Age	Years of work experience	Educational background	Professional title
1	Female	51-60	≥20	PhD	Professor
2	Female	41-50	16-20	Master's degree	Professor
3	Female	41-50	16-20	Master's degree	Associate Professor
4	Male	41-50	16-20	Master's degree	Associate Professor
5	Female	41-50	16-20	Master's degree	Associate Professor
6	Female	41-50	16-20	PhD	Associate Professor
7	Male	41-50	16-20	Master's degree	Associate Professor
8	Male	41-50	16-20	Master's degree	Associate Professor
9	Female	31-40	11-15	PhD	Associate Professor
10	Male	31-40	11-15	Master's degree	Associate Professor

3.

4.2 Coefficient of the degree of authority of the expert

The degree of expert authority is related to the predictive accuracy of the study and the reliability of the results (Lannoy & Procaccia, 2014). The basis on which an expert makes a judgement on a problem (Ca) and the expert's familiarity with the problem (Cs) affect the expert's degree of authority (Cr). The coefficient of the expert's degree of authority is generally expressed by the formula Cr = (Ca + Cs)/2(Du et al., 2018). In this study, Ca is divided into 3 levels of large, medium and small (Table 3), and Cs is divided into 5 levels of very familiar, familiar, average, unfamiliar and very unfamiliar (Table 4), and the experts obtain the information of Ca and Cs through self-assessment.

Table 3: Basis for expert judgement and level of impact

Basis of judgement	Degree of influence on expert judgement Ca		
	oldest	middle	few
theoretical analysis	0.30	0.20	0.10
practical experience	0.50	0.40	0.30
Current status of research at home and abroad	0.15	0.10	0.05
personal judgment	0.05	0.05	0.05

Table 4: Quantitative table of familiarity with expert advice

familiarity	**Coefficient Cs**
familiarity	0.90
more familiar	0.70
usual	0.50
not familiar	0.30
Very unfamiliar.	0.10

In both the first and second rounds of expert consultation, 10 questionnaires were distributed and 10 were returned, with a positive coefficient of 100%. 4 experts had a degree of authority coefficient of ≥0.9, 3 experts had a degree of authority coefficient of 0.8-0.9, 3 had a degree of authority coefficient of 0.7-0.8, and the mean value of the coefficient of the degree of authority of the 10 experts was 0.863 (**Table 5**). It is generally accepted that an expert authority degree coefficient ≥ 0.7 is acceptable in Delphi method studies (Zhang et al., 2022). It can be seen that the expert team in this study has a certain degree of credibility and meets the requirements of Delphi method research.

Table 5: Expertise Authority Level

No.	Cs	Ca	Cr	Mean
1	0.9	1.0	0.95	0.863
2	0.9	0.95	0.925	
3	0.7	1.0	0.85	
4	0.7	0.85	0.775	
5	0.9	0.95	0.925	
6	0.9	0.95	0.925	
7	0.7	1.0	0.85	
8	0.7	0.85	0.775	
9	0.7	0.85	0.775	
10	0.9	0.85	0.875	

4.3 Degree of Expert Activism

The coefficient of expert motivation is expressed according to the recovery rate of the questionnaire, and in general, a recovery rate of more than 70 per cent indicates that the expert is highly motivated. In this study, 10 questionnaires were distributed in the first round and 10 valid questionnaires were recovered; 10 questionnaires were distributed in the second round and 10 valid questionnaires were recovered; the recovery rate of the questionnaires was 100 per cent in both cases.

4.4 Degree of harmonisation of expert advice

The degree of coordination of expert opinion is whether the experts' judgement on the indicators is consistent, which is expressed by the coefficient of variation (CV, standard deviation/mean of each indicator) and Kindle's (Kindle) coordination coefficient (W) (Gallagher & Vajargah, 2000). The smaller the coefficient of variation CV is, the more convergent the expert's opinion on a particular item is, and CV < 0.25 is an acceptable range (Xie, 2009). The value of W ranges from 0 to 1, and when W fluctuates from 0.4 to 0.5, the coordination is better, and the counselling can be discontinued. The closer the W value of Kendall's coordination coefficient is to 1, the better the coordination of the expert (Cichomski & Osękowski, 2021).

In this study, the first round of expert consultation involved 10 participants, and the Kendall's coordination coefficient W was 0.401, with a p-value of 0.000. The second round of expert

consultation showed that the Kendall's coordination coefficient W was 0.436, ranging from 0.4 to 0.5, and the results were available with a p-value of 0.000 (**Table 6**). The expert opinions basically converged.

Table 6: Expert Consultation Test Statistics

first round (of match, or election)		second round (of match, or election)	
N	10	N	10
KendallWa	0.401	KendallWa	0.436
P	0.000	P	0.000

4.5 Results of the first round of expert consultation

Through literature research, the first round of consultation questionnaire was directed to the evaluation indicators of "Quality Assessment System of Chinese University Student Organisations". The first-order indicators include four first-order indicators, namely, "context evaluation", "input evaluation", "process evaluation", "product evaluation", 12 second-order indicators and 36 third-order indicators. Product Evaluation", as well as 12 secondary indicators and 36 tertiary indicators, with a specific interpretation of the connotation of each indicator. Experts were asked to evaluate each indicator on a 5-level scale, and to explain the indicators that needed to be adjusted and modified. The results of the first round of expert consultation show that the Kendall coefficient W is 0.401, the mean value of two indicators is less than 3.5, and the coefficient of variation CV (standard deviation/mean value) is greater than 0.25, which does not meet the requirement that the coefficient of variation must be less than 0.25. Therefore, based on the results of the current round of expert consultation and the feedback from experts, the system of non-conformity indicators is modified by changing "Teacher Involvement" to "Managerial Competence" in the level 3 indicators. "Managerial Competence" was changed to "Competence of Club Management Team", and then the second round of expert consultation was conducted.

4.6 Results of the second round of expert consultation

Second round of expert consultation (N=10). The first-level indicators include four indicators, namely, "context evaluation", "input evaluation", "process evaluation" and "product evaluation", as well as 12 second-level indicators and 36 third-level indicators. product evaluation", as well as 12 secondary indicators and 36 tertiary indicators, with a specific interpretation of the content of each indicator. The experts evaluated each indicator on a 5-level scale and explained the indicators that needed to be adjusted and modified. The results of the second round of expert consultation show that the Kendall coefficient W is 0.436, the mean value of all evaluation indicators is greater than 3.5, and the coefficient of variation CV (standard deviation/mean value) is less than 0.25, which is in line with the requirements. Therefore, it can be judged that the modified evaluation index system is better than the evaluation index system before the modification, and this study can determine the evaluation

index system through the second round of expert consultation.

5. Determination of indicator weights

5.1 Modelling the hierarchy

This study takes the "Quality Assessment System of Chinese University Student Organisations" as the decision-making goal, and constructs a hierarchical model (**Table 7**) with 4 first-level indicators, 12 second-level indicators as the middle-level elements, and 36 third-level indicators as the bottom-level elements. At the same time, this study coded each evaluation indicator as A1-A4 for primary indicators, B1-B12 for secondary indicators, and C1-C36 for tertiary indicators for data analysis.

Table 7: Quality Assessment System of Student Organisations in Chinese Universities

Level 1	Secondary indicators	Tertiary indicators
A1:Context	B1: Policy and Regulation	C1: Regulatory Adaptability
		C2: Policy Update Frequency
		C3: Policy Clarity
	B2: Resource Environment	C4: Funding Availability
		C5: Facility Completeness
		C6: Resource Appropriateness
	B3: Cultural Atmosphere	C7: Openness
		C8: Supportiveness
		C9: Diversity
A2:Input	B4: Financial Support	C10: Budget Transparency
		C11: Funding Adequacy
		C12: Financial Management Efficiency
	B5: Human Resources	C13: Instructor's competency
		C14: Competence of association
		C15: Human Resource Appropriateness
	B6: System Development	C16: System Completeness
		C17: Enforcement Strength

		C18: Response Flexibility
A3:Process	B7: Activity Organization	C19: Planning Quality of Activities
		C20: Execution Efficiency
		C21: Activity Accessibility
	B8: Member Interaction	C22: Participation Rate
		C23: Interaction Quality
		C24: Communication Effectiveness
	B9: Innovation Implementation	C25: Number of Innovative Projects
		C26: Effectiveness of Innovation
		C27: Continuous Improvement
A4:Product	B10: Skill Enhancement	C28: Skill Diversity
		C29: Skill Mastery
		C30: Skill Practicability
	B11: Organisational Impact	C31: Internal Influence
		C32: External Influence
		C33: Brand Image of the Organization
	B12: Sustainable Development	C34: Development Potential
		C35: Self-Renewal Ability
		C36: Sustainable Financial Security

5.2 Constructing judgement matrices

In this study, two-by-two comparisons were made between indicators at the same level to determine which indicator was more important and the level of importance. A judgement matrix was constructed by quantifying the qualitative level of importance through the 1-9 scale proposed by satty et al.

Consultation with 10 experts on the questionnaire on the importance of indicator data continued, based on the expert consultation form on the design of the indicator system. Cumulatively, 10 questionnaires on indicator data were recovered, with a recovery rate of 100 per cent. Based on the recovered expert consultation data were aggregated and calculated using the geometric mean method to obtain a comprehensive judgement matrix. An example is the first-level judgement matrix (**Table 8**).

Table 8: Judgement matrix for level 1 indicators

	A1: Context evaluation	A2: Input evaluation	A3: Process evaluation	A4: Product evaluation
A1: Context evaluation	1.000	0.127	0.225	0.417
A2: Input evaluation	8.000	1.000	1.775	3.250
A3: Process evaluation	4.500	0.563	1.000	1.833
A4: Product evaluation	2.500	0.310	0.550	1.000

5.3 Hierarchical Single Ordering and Consistency Tests

In order to calculate the weight of each indicator based on the judgement matrix, this study firstly finds the normalised eigenvector w corresponding to the maximum eigenvalue λmax of the judgement matrix by the sum-product method. The consistency indicator CI = (λmax-n)/(n-1) defined by the scholar Saaty is introduced, and RI is the stochastic consistency of the judgement matrix of order n. The consistency indicator is defined as the random consistency of the judgement matrix (Table 9). indicator (Table 9). Where n is the order of the judgement matrix and λmax is the maximum eigenvalue of the judgement matrix. Through stochastic simulation can be obtained consistency ratio CR = CI / RI, when the consistency ratio CR < 0.1, it can be concluded that the judgement matrix has consistency; if CR ≥ 0.1, the judgement matrix needs to be modified to a certain extent (Kolsrud, 2008), such as a first-order judgement matrix and consistency test (**Table 9**).

Table 9: Level 1 judgement matrix and consistency test

judgement matrix	Indicator weights				consistency test
	A1:Context evaluation	A2: Input evaluation	A3: Process evaluation	A4:Product evaluation	
Judgement matrix for level 1 indicators	0.0634	0.5000	0.2817	0.1549	λmax: 4.0210 CI:0.0070 RI:0.8900 CR: 0.0079

5.4 Hierarchical General Ranking Results

After calculation, it is determined that the CR value of all judgement matrices of each level in the indicator system is less than 0.1, which indicates that they have good consistency, and can be based on which the weights can be calculated, and then further calculated to obtain the comprehensive weights. That is, the weight value of the secondary indicators is calculated first, and then averaged together to get the weight of the first-level indicators, and the weight of the first-level indicators is multiplied by the weight of the second-level indicators to get the final integrated weight, which is the final weight of each second-level indicator in the evaluation system. The final indicator system with the weights of the indicators is obtained (**Table 10**).

Table 10: Weighting values for the overall objective of the evaluation indicator system

Level 1 indicators	weights	Secondary indicators	weights	Combined weights	Tertiary indicators	weights	Combined weights
A1	0.0634	B1	0.2274	0.0144	C1	0.4421	0.0064
					C2	0.2245	0.0032
					C3	0.3334	0.0048
		B2	0.4423	0.0280	C4	0.4084	0.0115
					C6	0.3333	0.0093
					C7	0.2583	0.0072
		B3	0.3303	0.0209	C8	0.1909	0.0040
					C9	0.4606	0.0096
					C10	0.3485	0.0073
A2	0.5000	B4	0.4479	0.2240	C11	0.3386	0.0758
					C13	0.4462	0.0999
					C14	0.2152	0.0482
		B5	0.3333	0.1667	C15	0.3662	0.0610
					C16	0.4331	0.0722
					C17	0.2007	0.0334
		B6	0.2188	0.1094	C18	0.4658	0.0510
					C19	0.3571	0.0391
					C20	0.1771	0.0194
A3	0.2817	B7	0.3598	0.1014	C21	0.4215	0.0427
					C22	0.1942	0.0197
					C23	0.3843	0.0390
		B8	0.1870	0.0527	C24	0.4316	0.0227
					C25	0.3681	0.0194
					C26	0.2003	0.0106
		B9	0.4532	0.1277	C27	0.3518	0.0449
					C28	0.3211	0.0410
					C29	0.3271	0.0418

					C25	0.4746	0.0316
		B10	0.4293	0.0665	C28	0.2592	0.0172
					C25	0.2662	0.0177
					C34	0.4425	0.0215
A4	0.1549	B11	0.3141	0.0487	C35	0.2152	0.0105
					C42	0.3423	0.0167
					C28	0.2319	0.0092
		B12	0.2566	0.0397	C28	0.2236	0.0089
					C28	0.5445	0.0216

6. Conclusions and findings

The quality assessment system of student club construction based on the CIPP model successfully constructed in this study provides a scientific and systematic tool for the assessment of student clubs in Chinese universities. The results of the study show that the evaluation system can effectively identify and assess the performance of student societies in different dimensions, and help the university management to formulate more precise development strategies and improvement measures.

The experts who participated in the questionnaire consultation of this study have rich experience in vocational education research and teaching, and all of them have researched and worked in the field of vocational education for more than 10 years, and all of them have experience in supervising the work of student associations. The valid questionnaire recovery rate for both rounds of consultation was 100%, indicating a high degree of enthusiasm on the part of the experts; the authority coefficient Cr = 0.863, indicating that the results of the expert consultation were reliable; and the coordination coefficient was 0.436, indicating that the experts' opinions converged and the results of the consultation were usable.

The quality assessment system of university student association construction in China compiled in this study contains 4 first-level indicators, 12 second-level indicators and 36 third-level indicators, and according to the analytic hierarchy process of assigning weights to these indicators, we can find that "Input evaluation" occupies the highest weight among the first-level indicators, with the weight value of 0.5, indicating that sufficient financial support, human resources and institutional construction are needed in the construction of university student associations. 0.5, indicating that the construction of university student associations needs to invest sufficient financial support, human resources and system construction. The second level indicator "Financial Support" has the highest weight, with a weight value of 0.2240, indicating that the transparency of funds, the adequacy of funds and the efficiency of funds management are very important for the development of student organisations. Among the three-level indicators, "Funding Adequacy" has the highest weight, with a weight value of 0.0999, indicating that adequate funding is a key factor in the quality of the construction of a student association.

With future research, this evaluation system is expected to be applied in a wider range of fields, providing solid support for quality assurance in higher education and personal development of students.

References:

Andreev, D. A., & Zavyalov, A. (2023). Using Delphi method in the development of a modern prostate cancer care quality indicators. Onkourologiâ.

Cai, R., & Wang, R. (2023). Investigation and research on the cultural construction of university students' associations. Advances in Education, Humanities and Social Science Research, 3(1).

Cichomski, S., & Osękowski, A. (2021). The maximal difference among expert's opinions. Electronic Journal of Probability, 26.

Du, P. (2023). Design of Task Evaluation Procedures Using Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) Method.

Du, Y.-W., Yang, N., & Zhou, W. (2018). A Reliability-Based Consensus Model for Multiattribute Group Decision-Making with Analytically Evidential Reasoning Approach. Mathematical Problems in Engineering, 2018.

El Ghazali, I., Mat Yusof, N. A., & Hamzah, N. (2023). Evaluation of physical and mechanical properties of intact sandstones through the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP). IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environment.

Gallagher, R., & Vajargah, B. F. (2000). Bayesian modelling of variability in expert to expert opinion using parallel Monte Carlo methods. Parallel and Distributed Processing Techniques and Applications.

Huang, W., Yao, P., Li, F., & Liao, X. (2021). Student governments in Chinese higher education: reflection on college students' and student cadres' political trust. Higher Education, 10734.

Kasmaini, K., Hamzah, S., & Winarto, H. (2023). CIPP Evaluation Model: Online In-service Teachers Training Program Conducted at English Language Education Study Program of Bengkulu University. English Franca, 7(1).

Kolsrud, D. O. (2008). Stochastic Ceteris Paribus Simulations. Computing in Economics and Finance.

Lannoy, A., & Procaccia, H. (2014). Expertise, safety, reliability, and decision making: practical industrial experience. Environment Systems and Decisions, 34(2), 250-262.

Liu, M., Zhu, X. R., Chen, Y., & Kong, Q. (2023). Evaluation and design of dining room chair based on analytic hierarchy process (AHP) and fuzzy AHP. Bioresources.

Marcos, E. B., Ordóñez-Carabaño, Á., Rodríguez-Ventosa Herrera, E., & Murcia Serrano, I. (2023). Identifying the Core Indicators of Migrant and Refugee Children's Integration Using the Delphi Method: A Multi-Input Strategy for Definition of Consensus. The International Journal of Qualitative Methods.

Rebia, P. S., Suharno, S., Tamrin, A. G., & Akhyar, M. (2023). Evaluation of Product-Based Education Training Class at Vocational High School using the CIPP Model. Journal of Curriculum and Teaching, 12(3).

Samanes, J., de la Parra, I., Berrueta, A., Rosado, L., Soto, A., Catalan, L., & Sanchis, P. (2023). Role of Student Associations in the Acquisition of Competences in University Engineering Programs.

Thelwall, M. (2021). Word Association Thematic Analysis: A Social Media Text Exploration Strategy.

Wang, L. (2022). International student education in China: An "Island" in Internationalization? International Journal of Chinese Education, 2212585X.

Wilson, M. (2023). Education Quality Evaluation Method Based on CIPP Theory. In Book on Educational Methods.

Xie, M. (2009). Analysis on Evaluation Reliability of A Single Expert During Process of Approach Evaluation. Journal of Chongqing Institute of Technology.

Zhang, L., Guo, X., Yang, S., Liu, S., Li, H.-t., Chen, G., Gao, H., Zhang, H. M., & Tong, L. (2022). Application of the Delphi Method in the Construction of an Evaluating and Grading Scale for Evidence of Disease Prevention and Treatment in Ancient Books of Traditional Chinese Medicine. Evidence-based Complementary and Alternative Medicine.