eefdergi

Cilt 21 Sayı 1 Erzincan Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi
e-ISSN 2148-7510
http://eefdergi.erzincan.edu.tr | eefdergi@erzincan.edu.tr
Doi numarası: 10.17556/erziefd.443298

Content Analysis of PhD Dissertations on Curriculum Evaluation (1996-2017)

Alper YETKİNER[*], Tuba ACAR ERDOL[**], Şahika ÜNLÜ[***]

Received date: 12.07.2018 **Accepted date: 13.03.2019**

Abstract

The aim of this research is to analyze the curriculum evaluation PhD dissertations in Turkey according to different variables and present the current situation. The Research is important in terms of helping to identify tendencies in this area and to monitor progress through setting out the current situation in the area of curriculum evaluation. In this research, PhD dissertations on curriculum evaluation which were written in Curriculum and Instruction Departments in universities in Turkey were examined by document analysis. Curriculum evaluation PhD dissertations made in Curriculum and Instruction Departments in universities in Turkey during 1996-2017 were included in this research. In the analysis of the dissertations included in this research, content analysis was applied. It was seen that the analyzed PhD dissertations are accepted between 1996-2017. It is also clear that the curriculum evaluation PhD dissertations have been made more since 1998 when undergraduate programs in CI were closed. The fact that subjects of many of the curriculum evaluation PhD dissertations include the formal education subjects, has led to the classification of the subjects as the evaluation of the formal education curricula and the evaluation of the non-formal education curricula. It was seen that approximately all of PhD dissertations were listed under the heading of evaluation of the formal education curricula. It was seen that the dissertations were made mostly in Ankara. As a result of that some of the dissertations include places as far as possible in Turkey, the number of provinces where theses have been increased. The majority of participants of the dissertations consisted of individuals from higher education institutions, which provided a high proportion of participants with a university level of education.

Keywords: Curriculum and instruction, curriculum evaluation, PhD dissertations.

[*] Kilis 7 Aralık University, Muallif Rıfat Education Faculty, Kilis, Turkey, alperyetkiner@gmail.com
[**] Ordu University, Faculty of Education, Ordu, Turkey, redmonday24@hotmail.com
[***] MEB, Turkey, sahikau@gmail.com

Program Değerlendirme Doktora Tezlerine Ait İçerik Çözümlemesi (1996-2017)

Alper YETKİNER[*], Tuba ACAR ERDOL[**], Şahika ÜNLÜ[***]

Geliş tarihi: 12.07.2018 **Kabul tarihi: 13.03.2019**

Öz

Bu araştırmanın amacı, Türkiye'de yapılan program değerlendirme doktora tezlerinin farklı değişkenlere göre analiz edilmesi ve mevcut durumu ortaya koymaktır. Araştırma, program değerlendirme konu alanındaki mevcut durumu ortaya koyarak, bu alandaki eğilimlerin belirlenmesinde ve ilerlemenin izlenmesinde yardımcı olması açısından önemlidir. Ayrıca araştırma, yapılacak diğer program değerlendirme çalışmalarına yol göstermesi açısından da önem taşımaktadır. Bu araştırmada Türkiye'deki üniversitelerde EPÖ Anabilim/Bilim Dalı'nda yapılan program değerlendirme doktora tezleri doküman analizi ile incelenmiştir. Bu araştırmaya, Türkiye'deki üniversitelerde EPÖ Anabilim/Bilim Dalı'nda 1996-2017 yılları arasında program değerlendirme alanında yapılan doktora tezleri dâhil edilmiştir. Analiz kapsamına alınan tezlerin çözümlenmesinde, içerik analizi yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Analiz edilen doktora tezlerinin 1996-2017 arasında kabul edildiği görülmüştür. EPÖ'nün lisans programlarının kapatıldığı yıl olan 1998'den sonra program değerlendirme doktora tezlerinin daha fazla yapıldığı da açıktır. Program değerlendirme doktora tezlerinin birçoğunun konusunun örgün eğitim programlarının etkililiğine giriyor olması konuların örgün eğitim programlarının değerlendirilmesi ve yaygın eğitim programlarının değerlendirilmesi diye sınıflama yapılmasına itmiştir. Tezlerin neredeyse bütününe yakınının örgün eğitim programlarının değerlendirilmesi başlığı altına girdiği görülmektedir. Alanındaki program değerlendirme doktora tezlerinin büyük bir bölümünün Ankara'da yapıldığı görülmektedir. Bazı tezlerin Türkiye'de ulaşılabildiği kadar uzak yerleri de içeriyor olması tezlerin yapıldığı il sayısını arttırmıştır. Tezlerin katılımcılarının çoğunlukla yükseköğretim kurumlarındaki bireylerden oluşması öğrenim düzeyi üniversite olan katılımcıların oranının yüksek olmasını sağlamıştır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Eğitim programları ve öğretim, program değerlendirme, doktora tezleri.

[*] Kilis 7 Aralık Üniversitesi, Muallim Rıfat Eğitim Fakültesi, Kilis, Türkiye, alperyetkiner@gmail.com
[**] Ordu Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Ordu, Türkiye, redmonday24@hotmail.com
[***] MEB, Türkiye, sahikau@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Education is one the most powerful tool used in order to form society. Social change and development take place as a result of education. Paradigms which determine the aspects of this change and development are effective to specify the educational philosophy. When it is individualized, the most important output of the education is raising well-behaved individuals and fulfilling the important function of individual, such as discovering their talents and building their capacity. In other words, societies use education as a tool in order to raise individuals in accordance with their targets. Thus, they socialize individuals who can be effective in social, economic and political level. This change and development is mediated by curricula. In order to fulfill the expectations, curricula should be developed by scientific, collusive and systematic understanding. Even though there are different philosophers and different definitions of pedagogue for the concept of curriculum in the literature, in general curricula can be defined as the determinant of the human characteristics who are intended to be raised or as a road map presented for realizing educational purposes (Saylor, Alexander and Lewis, 1981; Oliva and Gordon, 2012). When we look at the detailed definition of curriculum it is stated that in the common definition as a "mechanism of learning experiences provided by planned activities at school and out of school" (Demirel, 2012: 4).

Due to the fact that educational activities have a specific purpose, it has become a necessity to organize the activities that are arranged in institutions in a planned manner (Bellon and Handler, 1982; Bilen, 1999; Ertürk, 1998; Senemoğlu, 2007). Success of the curriculum is depends on the planned education in a qualitative manner (Senemoğlu, 2007). Education given in any institution is carried out within a prepared curricula. Therefore, "institutions implements the curricula in a form of written documents" (Yüksel, 2002: 31). The curriculum includes subjects, courses, instructional materials, intramural or extramural learning.

The curriculum consists of aims , content, teaching- learning process and evaluation. There is a constant and dynamic relationship between these dimensions. Curriculum development is considered as a designing of learning experiences for learners through the coordinated activities scheme (Wiles and Bondi, 2010) and a collective process intended for effective change and improvement of the curriculum (Marsh and Willis, 2007). So there is a need to constantly monitor and update the curricula. This relationship provided the basis for the development of the curriculum development concept. According to Tuncel (2012: 62), curriculum development is, "a process which is influenced by different disciplines supported by scientific researches". In this process, disciplines such as history, philosophy, psychology, sociology, politics and economics can be effective. Akpınar (2009: 153) refers to curriculum development as "an activities that are continuously developing with research and become more effective".

Curriculum development which is based on a continuous research process a necessity. It is important to develop the curriculum according to the purposes along with the requirements. Therefore, other curriculum dimensions such as content, learning and teaching processes and evaluation should be developed in accordance with each other. The importance of curriculum development is, of course, inarguable. However, since this study is limited to "evaluation of the curriculum", other items constituting the curriculum will not be detailed.

When the literature is examined, it is seen that there is different definitions on the concept of curriculum evaluation. Ornstein and Hunkins (1988) stated that the process of curriculum development and evaluation is intertwined and that it depends on the evaluation of the success of the program. According to Varış (1994), the results obtained during the curriculum evaluation phase are important for further improvement of the curriculum. According to Tyler (1969), the main function of the curriculum development progress is the evaluation phase. The feedback on the extent to which the objectives of the curriculum have been achieved at the end of the evaluation phase (Marsh and Willis, 2007) have resulted in a reorganization and development of

all aspects of the curriculum. The curriculum evaluation process provides information for planning, implementation and evaluation stages (Fitzpatrick, Sanders and Worthen, 2004) and for experts who develop the curriculum by providing data (Klenowski, 2010). Scriven (1967) has stated that even though the curriculum evaluation serves many purposes, the basic function is to reveal the qualities and the adequacy of the curriculum. Different researchers–emphasized different aims for curriculum evaluation as "a process of making decisions about features such as accuracy, realism, conformity, productivity, success and executability" (Uşun, 2012:10). Gözütok (2005) emphasizes on the importance of the concept of curriculum evaluation and expresses the necessity of evaluating curricula according to the appropriate evaluation models before, during and after the implementation of a curriculum. Yüksel and Sağlam (2012: 25) stated that the evaluation of the curriculum is "not only a process performed at the end of the program, but also a process in which data is collected and judged".

It is also an important matter of which subjects and what models the curriculum evaluation used to indicates and express the observations, the achievements and the situation of the existing ones. The existence of different curriculum evaluation models in the literature can create a different point of view for curriculum evaluation. However, a single curriculum evaluation model for all developed curricula is not a correct approach in order to obtain valid and reliable results. Researchers can utilize either existing curriculum evaluation models or create a new curriculum evaluation model based on the conditions and circumstances of their work (Erden, 1998). Therefore, the differences in the subject areas to be assessed provided the diversity of curriculum evaluation studies. The aim of this research is to analyze the curriculum evaluation PhD dissertations in Turkey according to different variables and present the current situation. Research is important in terms of helping to identify tendencies in this area and to monitor progress through setting out the current situation in the area of curriculum evaluation.

2. Method

Document analysis method was used in this study. Document analysis is a systematic process that includes a detailed examination and evaluation of both printed and electronic materials. Document analysis, like other methods in qualitative research, requires the examination and interpretation of data in order to judge, to gain understanding and to develop knowledge (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Documents of this study consist of PhD dissertations made in the field of Curriculum and Instruction Programs in Turkey.

Research Sample

The concept of 'program evaluation' was written in the detailed screening section at the Council of Higher Education Thesis Center and 55 dissertations PhD were found. Since five of these dissertations were closed to open access, 50 dissertations were included in the study. The documents included in this research consist of the PhD dissertations that were made in the years 1996-2017 because of the fact that the first PhD dissertations in the field of program evaluation was conducted in 1996 and the research was done in 2017.The list of the dissertation is given in Annex 1. The number of the PhD dissertations made in Curriculum and Instruction Departments used in the scope of this research is given in Table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of PhD Dissertations Determined and Analyzed in the Field of Curriculum Evaluation in Curriculum and Instruction According to Universities

Universities	Number of dissertations	Number of reached dissertations
Ortadoğu Teknik	9	9
Hacettepe	8	6
Ankara	7	7
Anadolu	4	4
Abant İzzet Baysal	4	4
Fırat	3	3
Gazi	3	3
Atatürk	2	2
Gaziantep	2	2
Selçuk	2	2
Adnan Menderes	2	2
Çukurova	2	1
Balıkesir	2	1
Marmara	1	1
İnönü	1	1
Ege	1	1
Çanakkale 18 Mart	1	1
Yeditepe	1	0
Total	55	50

As can be seen in Table 1, in 18 universities, 55 curriculum evaluation PhD dissertations about Curriculum and Instruction were identified, however, 50 of these dissertations could be reached.

Content Analysis

Content analysis method was used to analyze the data of the study. Content analysis is a data analysis method based on making a valid and reproducible deduction from the data for the purpose of disclosing information, representing new opinions and facts (Krippendorff, 1980). The themes to be encoded are predetermined by using content analysis. These themes are: 'the gender of the researcher', 'the university where the dissertation was conducted', 'the institute where the dissertation was held', 'the year of the dissertation' 'research subject', 'research design', 'research method', 'sample type', 'data collection tool', 'cities in which dissertations are written', 'education level of the participants', 'course which was evaluated', 'duration', 'the number of participants in the (experimental design) experimental and control group', 'school type'. The number of the repeated responses determined in each PhD dissertations are indicated as a frequency and a percentage.

3. Findings

Gender of Researchers

Distribution of gender of the researchers of PhD dissertations are given in Table 2.

Table 2. Distribution of PhD Dissertations in the Field of Curriculum Evaluation in Curriculum and Instruction CI according to Gender of the Researchers

Gender of Researchers	N	%
Male	29	58
Female	21	42
Total	50	100

Total of 50 PhD dissertations included in the analysis were conducted by 29 (58%) male researchers and by 21 (42%) female researchers.

Universities of Examined PhD Dissertations

Distribution of PhD dissertations in the field of curriculum evaluation in CI according to universities is given in Table 3.

Table 3. Distribution of PhD Dissertations in the Field of Curriculum Evaluation in CI According to Universities

Universities	N	%
Ortadoğu Teknik	9	18
Ankara	7	14
Hacettepe	6	12
Anadolu	4	8
Abant İzzet Baysal	4	8
Fırat	3	6
Gazi	3	6
Atatürk	2	4
Selçuk	2	4
Gaziantep	2	4
Adnan Menderes	2	4
Çukurova	1	2
Marmara	1	2
İnönü	1	2
Balıkesir	1	2
Ege	1	2
Çanakkale 18 Mart	1	2
Total	50	100

It is detected that most of the curriculum evaluation PhD dissertations were conducted in Middle East Technical University (18%), followed by Ankara (14%), Hacettepe (12%), Anadolu and Abant İzzet Baysal (8%) and at least in Çukurova, Marmara, İnönü, Balıkesir, Ege and Çanakkale 18 Mart (2%) universities.

Institutes that Dissertations Presented

Distribution of PhD dissertations in the field of curriculum evaluation in CI according to institutes is given in Table 4.

Table 4. Distribution of PhD Dissertations in the Field of Curriculum Evaluation in CI According to Institutes

Institutes	N	%
Educational Sciences	24	48
Social Sciences	26	52
Total	50	100

When Table 4 is examined, it is noticed that 24 of PhD dissertations (48%) were made in Institute of Educational Sciences and 26 of them (56%) were made in Institute of Social Sciences.

Admission Year of PhD Dissertations

Distribution of PhD dissertations in the field of curriculum evaluation in CI according to year of admission is given in Table 5.

Table 5. Distribution of PhD Dissertations in the Field of Curriculum Evaluation in CI According to Year of Admission

The years of admission	N	%
1996-1998	5	10
1999-2017	45	90
Total	50	100

When Table 5 is examined, it is observed that the classification of PhD dissertations according to the years of admission is based on the data intervals regarded as critical for the CI in Turkey. The first group was selected as 1996-1998 since the acceptance date of the first PhD dissertations analyzed in the field of curriculum evaluation was 1996, the closure of the undergraduate programs of CI and the beginning of continuation postgraduate programs were 1998. The second group was selected as 1999-2017 due to the fact that the analyzed PhD dissertations as from 1999 was accepted in 2017. Out of 50 analyzed PhD dissertations, 5 of them (10%) was accepted between 1996-1998, 45 of them (90%) was accepted between 1999-2017.

Research Subjects

Distribution of PhD dissertations in the field of curriculum evaluation in CI according to research subjects is given in Table 6.

Table 6. Distribution of PhD Dissertations in the Field of Curriculum Evaluation in CI According to Research Subjects

Research Subjects	N	%
The evaluation of formal education curricula	46	88.5
Evaluation of pre-school curricula	2	3.8
Evaluation of primary school curricula	17	32.7
Evaluation of secondary school curricula	8	15.4
Evaluation of higher education curricula	19	36.5
The evaluation of non-formal education curricula	6	11.5
Total	52	100

*One of the dissertation includes the evaluation of teaching methods according to primary, secondary and higher education. That is why the total number of dissertations analyzed is not same with the total number.

When Table 6 is examined, most of PhD dissertations were conducted on evaluation of formal education curricula. Six PhD dissertations were written on the evaluation of non-formal education curricula. The most studied area in the field of evaluation of the formal education is evaluation of higher education programs with 36.5%. In one PhD dissertation, the curriculum evaluation of the English course was conducted at primary, secondary and higher education levels.

Research Subjects According to Years

Distribution of the subjects of PhD dissertations according to years is given in Table 7.

Table 7. Distribution of the Subjects of PhD Dissertations in the Field of Curriculum Evaluation in CI According to Years

	1996-1998		1999-2017		Total	
Research Subjects	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
The evaluation of formal education curricula	4	7.7	42	80.8	46	88.5
Evaluation of pre-school curricula	-	-	2	3.8	2	3.8
Evaluation of primary school curricula	-	-	17	32.7	17	32.7
Evaluation of secondary school curricula	1	1.9	7	13.5	8	15.4
Evaluation of higher education curricula	3	5.8	16	30.8	19	36.5
The evaluation of non-formal education curricula	1	1.9	5	9.6	6	11.5
Total	5	9.6	47	90.4	52	100

*One of the dissertations includes the evaluation of one course which was taught more than one level.

80% of PhD dissertations conducted between 1996 and 1998 related to the evaluation of formal education curricula. Secondary education and higher education levels were preferred in the evaluation of the formal education curricula. In this period, only one PhD dissertation was reached in the field of non-formal education. Between the years 1999-2017; curriculum evaluation PhD dissertation was carried out for each level of formal education and for non-formal education. 80.8% of dissertations written in this period are in the field of formal education and 9.6% are in

the non-formal education field. All PhD dissertations analyzed regarding preschool and primary education curricula were conducted during this period.

Universities According to Years and Their Research Subjects

Distribution of the subjects of PhD dissertations in the field of curriculum evaluation according to universities and years is given in Table 8.

Table 8. Distribution of the Subjects of PhD Dissertations in the Field of Curriculum Evaluation in CI According to Universities and Years

Years	*Subjects*	*The evaluation of formal education curricula*	*Preschool*	*Primary*	*Secondary*	*Higher*	*Evaluation of non-formal education curricula*	*Total*
	Universities	**N**	**N**	**N**	**N**	**N**	**N**	**N**
1996-1998	Ankara	1	-	-	1	-	-	1
	İnönü	1	-	-	-	1	-	1
	Ortadoğu Teknik	1	-	-	-	1	1	2
	Fırat	1	-	-	-	1	-	1
	Total	4	0	0	1	3	1	5
1999-2017	Ortadoğu Teknik	6*	1	1	2	4	1	7
	Hacettepe	5	-	2	1	2	1	6
	Ankara	5	1	2	-	2	1	6
	Abant İzzet Baysal	5	-	4	-	1	-	5
	Anadolu	3	-	-	1	2	-	3
	Gazi	3	-	1	1	1	-	3
	Adnan Menderes	2	-	1	-	1	-	2
	Fırat	2	-	1	-	1	-	2
	Gaziantep	1	-	-	-	1	1	2
	Atatürk	2	-	1	-	1	-	2
	Selçuk	2	-	1	1	-	-	2
	Çukurova	1	-	1	-	-	-	1
	Marmara	1	-	1	-	-	-	1
	Ege	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	Balıkesir	1	-	-	1	-	-	1
	Çanakkale 18 Mart	1	-	1	-	-	-	1
	Total	40	2	17	7	16	5	45

* In one PhD Dissertation one course at different education stages was evaluated.

When PhD dissertations in the field of curriculum evaluation according to universities are examined, it is observed that the evaluation of the secondary education curricula were being studied between 1996-1998 and the evaluation of preschool, primary and higher education curricula in the formal education were being studied between 1999-2017 in Ankara University. A PhD dissertation was also conducted in the field of assessment of non-formal education curriculum. The curriculum evaluation PhD dissertation which were carried out at the Ankara University varies according to levels.

The evaluation of higher education curricula were being studied between 1996-1998 at İnönü University, however, no other PhD dissertations written in the field of curriculum evaluation was found between 1999-2017 at İnönü University.

While between 1999-2017 dissertations on the field of curriculum evaluation were diversified, between 1996-1998, the evaluation of higher education curricula and evaluation of non-formal education curricula were being conducted at Middle East Technical University. Studies on the evaluation of preschool, primary education, secondary education and higher education curricula and non-formal education curricula were being carried out.

While between 1996-1998, studies on the evaluation of higher education curricula were carried out at Fırat University, studies about the evaluation of primary and secondary education curriculum were carried out between 1999-2017.

Between 1999-2017, PhD dissertations in the field of the evaluation of secondary education and higher education curricula at Anadolu University; the evaluation of primary, secondary, higher education and non-formal education curricula at Hacettepe University; the evaluation of primary and higher education curricula at Adnan Menderes University; the evaluation of primary education curricula at Çukurova University; the evaluation of primary and higher education curricula at Gazi University; the evaluation of primary education and higher education curricula at Abant İzzet Baysal University; the evaluation of primary and secondary education curricula at Selçuk University; the evaluation of primary education curricula at Marmara University and the evaluation of primary education and higher education curricula at Atatürk University were carried out.

The university with the greatest number of PhD dissertations in the field of curriculum evaluation is the Middle East Technical University. The most studied areas in the field of formal education are primary and higher education. A small number of studies have been conducted on the evaluation of secondary education curricula. There are scarcely any studies on the evaluation of preschool curricula.

Research Design

Distribution of PhD dissertations in the field of curriculum evaluation in CI is given in Table 9.

Table 9. Distribution of PhD Dissertations in the Field of Curriculum Evaluation in CI According to the Research Designs

Research Designs	N	%
Descriptive research	38	76
Descriptive and experimental research	6	12
Experimental research	5	10
Model development	1	2
Total	50	100

38 of (76%) PhD dissertations in the field of curriculum evaluation in CI were conducted on descriptive research, 6 of them (12%) were conducted on descriptive and experimental research, 5 of them (10%) were conducted on experimental research and 1 of them (2%) was conducted on model development research design. In those studies, it is observed that descriptive research is often used.

Research Design According to Years

Distribution of the research design used in PhD dissertations in the field of curriculum evaluation according to years is given in Table 10.

Table 10. Distribution of PhD Dissertations in the Field of Curriculum Evaluation in CI According to Years of the Research Designs

	1996-1998		1999-2017		Total	
Research Designs	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
Model Development	1	2	-	-	1	2
Descriptive research	3	6	35	70	38	76
Experimental research	1	2	4	8	5	10
Descriptive and experimental research	-	-	6	12	6	12
Total	5	10	45	90	50	100

Descriptive design (6%) was preferred in the PhD dissertations carried out in the curriculum evaluation field between 1996-1998. In addition to that, model development (2%) and experimental research designs (2%) were used. Between 1999-2017, the most commonly used pattern was descriptive with a ratio of 70%. Descriptive-experimental research (12%) and experimental research (8%) were also used in this period.

Research Designs According to Universities

Distribution of the research designs used in PhD dissertations in the field of curriculum evaluation in CTL according to universities is given in Table 11.

Table 11. Distribution of the Research Designs of PhD Dissertations in the Field of Curriculum Evaluation in CTL According to Universities

Research Designs / *Universities*	*Model Development* n	*Descriptive research* n	*Experimental research* n	*Descriptive and experimental research* n	*Total* n
Abant İzzet Baysal		4	-	-	4
Adnan Menderes	-	2	-	-	2
Anadolu		3	-	1	4
Ankara		4	-	3	7
Atatürk	-	2	-	-	2
Balıkesir	-	1	-	-	1
Çanakkale 18 Mart	-	-	1	-	1
Çukurova	-	-	-	1	1
Ege	-	1	-	-	1
Fırat	1	2	-	-	3
Gazi	-	3	-	-	3
Gaziantep	-	1	1	-	2
Hacettepe	-	4	2	-	6
İnönü			1	-	1
Marmara	-	1	-	-	1
Ortadoğu Teknik	-	9	-	-	9
Selçuk		1	-	1	2
Total	1	38	5	6	50

When research designs were examined according to universities in curriculum evaluation PhD dissertations; only descriptive design was preferred at Abant İzzet Baysal, Adnan Menderes, Atatürk, Balıkesir, Ege, Gazi, Marmara and Middle East Technical universities. In Anadolu, Ankara, Gaziantep, Hacettepe and Selçuk universities, both descriptive and experimental design were used. At Çanakkale 18 Mart and İnönü universities, only experimental designs were performed. It is also seen that model development research design was preferred only at Fırat University.

Research Methods

Distribution of PhD dissertations in the field of curriculum evaluation in CI according to the research method is given in Table 12.

Table 12. Distribution of PhD Dissertations in the Field of Curriculum Evaluation in CI According to Research Method

Research Method	N	%
Qualitative method	5	10
Quantitative method	9	18
Mixed method	36	72
Total	50	100

5 (10%) of the curriculum evaluation PhD dissertations in CTL were conducted by the qualitative method. 9 of them (18%) were conducted by the quantitative method and 36 of them (72%) were conducted by the mixed method. This situation demonstrates that the mixed method is the most preferred method in Curriculum and Instruction Department.

Research Methods in Examined Dissertations

Distribution of the research methods of the analyzed PhD dissertations according to universities is given in Table 13.

Table 13. Distribution of the Research Methodologies in Examined PhD Dissertations

Research Methods	Qualitative	Quantitative	Mixed	Total
	N	N	N	N
Orta Doğu Teknik	1	-	8	9
Ankara	-	2	5	7
Hacettepe	-	1	5	6
Abant İzzet Baysal	-	-	4	4
Anadolu	1	1	2	4
Fırat	-	2	1	3
Gazi	1	-	2	3
Adnan Menderes	1	-	1	2
Atatürk	1	1	-	2
Gaziantep			2	2
Selçuk	-	-	2	2
Balıkesir			1	1
Çanakkale 18 Mart			1	1
Çukurova	-	-	1	1
Ege			1	1
İnönü	-	1	-	1
Marmara		1	-	1
Total	5	9	36	50

The methods used in PhD dissertations carried out at seventeen universities (Middle East Technical University Ankara, Hacettepe, Abant İzzet Baysal, Anadolu, Fırat, Gazi, Adnan Menderes, Atatürk, Gaziantep, Selçuk, Balikesir, Çanakkale 18 Mart, Çukurova, Ege, İnönü, Marmara universities) between 1996-2017, were qualitative (5), quantitative (9) and mixed (36) methods.

Sample of the Examined Dissertations

Distribution of PhD dissertations in the field of curriculum evaluation in CTL according to the sample type is given in Table 14.

Table 14. Distribution of PhD Dissertations According to the Sample

The Sample	N	%
Academicians	17	16.0
Primary school teachers	11	10.4
Secondary school teachers	10	9.4
Teacher candidates	9	8.5
Undergraduate students	8	7.5
Elementary school teachers	7	6.6
Secondary school students	7	6.6
Primary school students	5	4.7
Other	5	4.7
School administrators	4	3.8
Graduates	3	2.8
Lecturers	3	2.8
Parents	2	1.9
Inspectors	2	1.9
Specialists	2	1.9
Preschool teachers	2	1.9
Post graduate students	1	0.9
Associate degree students	1	0.9
Total	106	100

It is observed that there were different sample groups in the field of curriculum evaluation in Curriculum and Instruction. While there were academicians (16%) in the first place, they were followed by primary school teachers, secondary school teachers, teacher candidates and undergraduate students. The groups which are slightly included in the sample type were parents, inspectors, specialists, preschool teachers, post graduate students and associate degree students. On some of the studies, there were more than one sample groups which is why the number of the sample types exceeded the number of theses.

Data Collection Tools

Distribution of PhD dissertations in the field of curriculum evaluation in CI according to the data collection tool is given in Table 15.

Table 15. Data Collection Tools in Examined PhD Dissertations

Data collection tools	N	%
Survey	34	31.2
Interviews	33	30.3
Scale (attitude etc)	15	13.8
Tests (success test etc.)	12	11.0
Observations	11	10.1
Document analyzes	4	3.7
Total	109	100

* Due to the fact that some of the dissertation used more than one data collection tool and were coded more than once for this reason, the number of f is not equal to the number of analyzed theses.

It is observed that the most used data collection tool in PhD dissertations according to Table 15 is the survey with a ratio of 31.2% (34). After that, 33 (30.3%) interviews, 15 (13.8%) scales, 12 (11%) tests, 11 (10.1%) observations and 4 (3.7%) document analyzes are used.

Province Where Theses are Written

Distribution of PhD dissertations in CI according to provinces is given in Table 16.

Table 16. Distribution of PhD Dissertations According to Provinces Where PhD Theses are Conducted

Provinces	N
Ankara	20
Eskişehir	6
Konya	6
İzmir	5
Adana	4
Elazığ	3
Gaziantep	2
İstanbul	2
Kayseri	2
Other (Bartın, Balıkesir, Bolu, Zonguldak, Antalya, Isparta, Malatya, Mersin, Muş, Bursa, Kocaeli, Tekirdağ, Aydın, Trabzon, Hatay, Van, Diyarbakır vb.)	105

When Table 16 is observed, it is seen that most of the curriculum evaluation PhD dissertations in CI (20) were conducted in Ankara. Following provinces are Eskişehir, Konya (6), İzmir (5), Adana (4), Elazığ (3), Gaziantep, İstanbul, Kayseri (2) and other cities (105) which are listed under the other provinces category.

Education Level of the Participants in the PhD Dissertations

Distribution of PhD dissertations in CI according to educational level of the participant is given in Table 17.

Table 17. Distribution of PhD Dissertations in the Field of Curriculum Evaluation in CI According to Educational Level of the Participants

Education level	*N*	*%*
Primary and elementary school graduates	8496	25.5
University graduates	8433	25.3
Secondary school graduates	6890	20.7
Postgraduate	6713	20.2
Other	2736	8.2
Total	33268	100

When the education levels of the participants were examined it is seen that primary and elementary graduates were in the first place with 8496 people (25.5%). It is observed that university graduates were in second place with 8433 people (25.3%). Then, they were followed by 6890 secondary (20.7%) and 6713 postgraduate students (20.2%).

Courses/Subjects of PhD Dissertations

Distribution of PhD dissertations in CI according to courses/subjects is given in Table 18.

Table 18. Distribution of PhD Dissertations According to Courses/Subjects

Courses/Subjects	**N**	**%**
Other (Web 2. İntel, Medical Ethics, Values Education, Police Vocational Law, Police Ethics, Action Research)	20	38.5
Teacher Training Courses	11	21.2
Foreign Language Courses	6	11.5
Science and Technology-Science-Scientific Thinking SST Courses	4	7.7
Math Courses	3	5.8
Biology Courses	2	3.8
Social studies Courses	2	3.8
Physical education Courses	1	1.9
Life science Courses	1	1.9
Pres-school	1	1.9
Chemistry Courses	1	1.9
Total	52	100

* In some dissertations, studies are conducted on more than one course. Because of that reason the number N is not equal to the number of theses analyzed.

When the distributions of the courses were examined, it is seen that 38.5% of the other courses were in the first place, and 21.2% of the teaching profession courses were in the second place. Foreign language, science and technology, mathematics, biology courses followed these courses.

Application Periods of PhD Dissertations (Month)

Since the application periods of the curriculum evaluation PhD dissertations in CI is expressed as the period in most of PhD dissertations, the years are examined that PhD dissertations made and their education periods are taken into consideration. It is often seen that a period consists of 3 or 4 months. It was determined that the application period of the dissertations varied between 3 and 16 months and average duration is 8 months.

Number of Participants in PhD Dissertations with Experimental Design

Among PhD dissertations in the field of curriculum evaluation, only 5 of analyzed dissertations were carried out in an experimental research design. While the number of participants in the experimental group is 168, the number of participants in the control group is 117 in the dissertations.

School Type of PhD Dissertations

Distribution of PhD dissertations in CTL according to school types is given in Table 19.

Table 19. Distribution of PhD Dissertations in the Field of Curriculum Evaluation in CI According to School Types

School Types	N	%
Public school	44	88
Private school	4	8
Public and private	2	4
Total	50	100

According to the Table 19, 44 (88%) of the doctoral dissertations were conducted in public schools, 4 (8%) were conducted in private schools and 2 (4%) were conducted in both state and private schools.

4.Discussion and Suggestions

Significant results were obtained in this research which aim to analyze the curriculum evaluation PhD dissertations made in CI in the Education and Educational Sciences Faculties in Turkey between 1996-2017 according to different variables and present the current situation. It is seen that the genders of individuals who conducted curriculum evaluation PhD dissertations were close to each other. This shows that CI was not preferred by only one gender. Hazır Bıkmaz and others (2013) reaches the same conclusion that CI not preferred by a particular gender in their research.

It was seen that the curriculum evaluation PhD dissertations were carried out mostly in the Middle East Technical University within the period of 21 years. After that, there is a similar situation in Ankara and Hacettepe Universities. This ratio resulted from that postgraduate education being given in these three universities for a long time. When the institutes where PhD dissertations were carried out are examined, it is seen that the theses made at the social sciences institute are more than the others. This may have happened because the institutes in which the departments are affiliated in universities are different.

It was seen that the analyzed PhD dissertations are accepted between 1996-2017. It is also clear that the curriculum evaluation PhD dissertations have been made more since 1998 when undergraduate programs in CI were closed. The fact that subjects of many of the curriculum evaluation PhD dissertations include the formal education subjects, has led to the classification of the subjects as the evaluation of the formal education curricula and the evaluation of the non-formal education curricula. It was seen that approximately all of PhD dissertations were listed under the heading of evaluation of the formal education curricula. It was observed that the distributions of the subjects according to years have increased in both types of subjects since 1998. Closing of the undergraduate programs in CI in 1998 led researchers to do more research on this area. In research that was carried out by Kozikoğlu and Senemoğlu (2015), it was seen that out of 37 curriculum evaluation PhD dissertations, 16 of them carried out primary and secondary school curriculum evaluation, 11 of them made teacher education curriculum evaluation, 3 of them made non-formal education curriculum evaluation, 2 of them made high school curriculum evaluation. In total, 29 formal education curriculum evaluation studies were conducted.

It was observed that the most preferred research design in dissertations were descriptive research design. When we examine some researches (Saracaloğlu and Dursun, 2010; Tavşancıl and others, 2010) it was obvious that similar results were obtained and descriptive pattern was frequently used. While both descriptive and experimental design were preferred it has been noticed that experimental research and model development designs were used less than others. When research designs were examined according to the years, it has been determined that the descriptive research has increased significantly and there were no significant changes in other patterns. It was also seen that the model development design was used only at Fırat University and the descriptive research design was used at all other universities that were analyzed except İnönü and Çukurova Universities.

It was seen that the most preferred research method in the dissertations were the mixed method. Kozikoğlu and Senemoğlu (2015) emphasized that the preference of mixed method in the field of curriculum and education increased compared to previous years. This ratio was revealed by the preference of using both qualitative and quantitative methods together. It was observed that the mixed method especially used in the Middle East Technical University. The mixed method was preferred in the seven theses.

When sample types of the theses were examined, it was seen that the academicians took the top place. The sample type, which starts from the teacher candidates and shows a decrease, ends with a study which prefers the preschool teachers. When we examine the preferred data collection tools in the theses, it was seen that the survey was mostly used. Scale, test, and observation are close to each other when the interview was conducted at a similar rate to the survey. The least preferred data collection tool was document analysis.

It was seen that the dissertations were made mostly in Ankara. As a result of that some of the dissertations include places as far as possible in Turkey, the number of provinces where theses have been increased. The majority of participants of the dissertations consisted of individuals from higher education institutions, which provided a high proportion of participants with a university level of education. Having worked mostly with academicians also ensured that the level of post-graduate education is high. The studies made with secondary level were lower than the other studies which caused the proportion of participants with secondary education to be low compared to other studies. It is observed that the courses in which the dissertations were made different from each other and the other courses preferred most and teaching courses of were also preferred. Physical education, life science and social studies courses seem to take place in some studies.

It was seen that the average duration of application of PhD dissertation was eight month, number of the participants of experimental group was sixty four if the two studies were experimental, number of the participants of control group was fifty four, dissertation was mostly carried out in state schools and there was a serious difference between public schools and private schools. In both studies, both state and private schools were preferred.

References

Akpınar, B. (2009). *Eğitim ve Program.* Elazığ: Data Yayınları.

Bellon, J. J. & Handler, J. R. (1982). *Curriculum development and evaluation: A design for Improvement*. Kendall / Hunt Publishing Company.

Bilen, M. (1999). *Plandan uygulamaya öğretim* (5. Baskı). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Corbin, J. & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Demirel, Ö. (2012). *Kuramdan Uygulamaya Eğitimde Program Geliştirme*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.

Erden, M. (1998). *Eğitimde program değerlendirme*. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Ertürk, S. (1998). *Eğitimde program geliştirme*. Ankara: Meteksan A.Ş.

Fitzpatrick, J. L., Sanders, J. R. & Worthen, B. R. (2004). *Program evaluation: Alternatife approaches and practical guidelines.* Pearson.

Gözütok, D. (2005). Program değerlendirme, In M. Gültekin (Ed.), *Öğretimde planlama ve değerlendirme* (pp.175-190). Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Hazır Bıkmaz F., Aksoy, E., Tatar, Ö. & Altınyüzük Atak, C. (2013). The Content Analysis of PhD. Theses Completed in the Field of Curriculum and Instruction (1974-2009). *Education and Science,* 38 (168), 288-303.

Klenowski, V. (2010). *Curriculum evaluation: Approaches and methodologies*. International Encyclopedia of Education. Retrieved from http://eprints.qut.edu.au/26163/1/ Klenowski_curriculum_evaluation.pdf

Kozikoğlu, İ. & Senemoğlu, N. (2015). Eğitim Programları ve öğretim alanında yapılan doktora tezlerinin içerik analizi (2009-2014). *Eğitim ve Bilim, 40*(182), 29-41.

Krippendorff K. (1980). *Content analysis: An Introduction to its methodology*. Sage Publications, Newbury Park.

Marsh, C. J & Willis, G. (2007). *Curricullum: Alternatife approaches, ongoing issues*. Colombus: Pearson: Prentice Hall.

Oliva, P. F. & Gordon, W. R. (2012). *Developing the curriculum*. Allyn & Bacon: Old Tappan.

Ornstein, A. C. & Hunkins F. P. (1988). *Curriculum-foundations, principles and issues.* United States: Allyn and Bacon.

Saracaloglu, A. S. & Dursun, F. (2010). Türkiye'de eğitim programları ve öğretim alanındaki lisansüstü tezlerin incelenmesi. *1. Ulusal Eğitim Programları ve Öğretim Kongresi Tam Metinler Kitabı.* Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Saylor, J. G., Alexander, W. M. & Lewis, A. J. (1981). *Curriculum planning for better teaching and learning*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Scriven, M. (1967). The methodology of evaluation. R. E. Stake (Ed.). *AERA Monograph Series on curriculum evaluation*, Chicago: Rand McNally.

Senemoğlu, N. (2007). *Gelişim öğrenme ve öğretim: Kuramdan uygulamaya*. Ankara: Gönül Yayıncılık.

Tavşancıl, E., Çokluk, Ö., Çıtak, G., Kezer, F., Yıldırım, Ö. Y., … & Özlem, D. T. (2010). *Eğitim bilimleri enstitülerinde tamamlanmış lisansüstü tezlerin incelenmesi (2000-2008).* Ankara Üniversitesi Bilimsel Araştırma Projesi Kesin Raporu.

Tuncel, İ. (2012). Program geliştirmenin kuramsal temelleri, H. Şeker (Ed.), *Eğitimde Program Geliştirme Kavramlar Yaklaşımlar.* Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Tyler, R. W. (1969). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction.* University of Chicago press.

Uşun, S. (2012). *Eğitimde program değerlendirme süreçler yaklaşımlar ve modeller.* Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Varış, F. (1994). *Eğitimde program geliştirme, teori ve teknikler.* Ankara: Alkım Yayıncılık.

Wiles, J. W., & Bondi, J. C. (2010). *Curriculum development: A guide to practice*. Prentice Hall.

Yüksel, İ.. & Sağlam, M. (2012). *Eğitimde program değerlendirme*. Ankara: Pegem Yayınları.

Yüksel, S. (2002). Örtük program. *Eğitim ve Bilim, 27*(126), 31-37.

Annex 1. List of Phd Dissertations Included in the Survey

Akpınar, B. (1998). *Meslek Yüksekokulu Makine Programı Malzeme Teknolojisi I Dersi Programının ön-son test sonuçları ve öğrenci görüşlerine göre değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). İnönü Üniversitesi, Malatya.

Arseven, İ. (2009). *Bağlam ve süreç boyutlarında bir hizmetiçi eğitim programının değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Aslan, M. (2015). *Eğitim fakültelerindeki öğretmenlik uygulaması dersinin değerlendirilmesi ve öğretim programının hazırlanması* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Anadolu Üniversitesi, Eskişehir.

Atik Kara, D. (2012). *Öğretmenlik meslek bilgisi derslerinin öğretmen adaylarına öğrenme ve öğretme sürecine ilişkin yeterlikleri kazandırması yönünden değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Anadolu Üniversitesi, Eskişehir.

Aydemir, H. (2011). *İlköğretim 7. Sınıf Sosyal Bilgiler Öğretim Programı etkinliklerinin uygulamadaki etkililiğinin değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Fırat Üniversitesi, Elazığ.

Aypek Aslan, A. (2010). *Mesleki eğitim fakültesi temel sanat derslerinin program, öğretim elemanı ve öğrenci faktörlerine göre değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Bal, A. P. (2009). *İlköğretim beşinci sınıf matematik öğretiminde uygulanan ölçme ve değerlendirme yaklaşımlarının öğretmen ve öğrenci görüşleri doğrultusunda değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Çukurova Üniversitesi, Adana.

Başar, T. (2016). *İlkokul 3. Sınıf Fen Bilimleri Dersi Öğretim Programı'nın değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Bayat, S. (2012). *Stake'in Uygunluk/Olasılık Modeline göre İlkokuma Yazma Programının değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi, Bolu.

Berk, Ş. (2012). *Mesleki ve Teknik Ortaöğretim Kurumlarında uygulanan modüler sistemin Provus'un Farklar Modeli ile değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Anadolu Üniversitesi, Eskişehir.

Çiçek, Ş. (1998). *Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi Öğretmenliği Programının değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). ODTÜ, Ankara.

Çubukçu, Z. (1997). *Anadolu Öğretmen Liseleri Eğitim Programının Değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Daloğlu, A. (1996). *Bilkent Üniversitesi'nde verilen İngilizce Öğretmenleri İçin Hizmetiçi Eğitim Programının değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). ODTÜ, Ankara.

Demirören, M. (2013). *Ankara Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi Lisans Programında Tıp Etiği Eğitiminin değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Demirtaş, Z. (2012). *İlköğretim Fen ve Teknoloji Dersi Öğretim Programının uygulanma sürecinin değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi, Bolu.

Dinçer, B. (2013). *7. Sınıf İngilizce Öğretim Programının Stufflebeam'in Bağlam-Girdi-Süreç-Ürüm (CIPP) Modeline göre değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi, Aydın.

Ekşioğlu, S. (2013). *Mesleki ve Teknik Liselerde uygulanan modüler öğretim programının değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Engin, G. (2014). *Türkçe ve Beden Eğitimi Öğretim Programları ile Bütünleştirilmiş Değerler Eğitimi Programının etkililiği* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi, Çanakkale.

Er, K. O. (2006). *İlköğretim 4. ve 5. Sınıf İngilizce Öğretim Programlarının değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Erdem, E. H. (1999). *Özel bir okuldaki İngilizce Programlarının değerlendirilmesi konusunda bir çalışma* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). ODTÜ, Ankara.

Eret, E. (2013). *An assessment of Pre-Service Teacher Education in terms of preparing teacher candidates for teaching* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). ODTÜ, Ankara.

Güler, S. D. (2001). *4-5 ve 6 yaş Okulöncesi Eğitim Programlarının değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Güneş, Y. (2002). *Biyoloji Programının değerlendirilmesi üzerine bir araştırma* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Kaptı, S. B. (2014). *Vak'aya Dayalı Öğretim Programının etkililiği* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Kılıç, Ç. (2012). *Yetişkin eğitimi programlarının geliştirilmesi süreci açısından "Benim Ailem" kurs programının değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Kılınç, M. (2011). *İlköğretim Hayat Bilgisi Programı Karakter Eğitimi boyutunun öğrencilerin tipik performanslarına dayalı olarak değerlendirilmesi: Kırşehir örneği* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Atatürk Üniversitesi, Erzurum.

Kocabatmaz, H. (2011). *Teknoloji ve Tasarım Öğretim Programının değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Kösteroğlu, İ. (2012).*Sosyal Bilgiler Ders Programının öğelerinin değerlendirilmesi ve öğretmenlerin hizmet içi eğitim ihtiyaç analizi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi, Bolu.

Kumral, O. (2010). *Eğitsel Eleştiri Modeli ile Eğitim Fakültesi Sınıf Öğretmenliği Öğretim Programının değerlendirilmesi: Bir Durum Çalışması* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi, Aydın.

Kuzu, S. (2015). *Öğretim İlke ve Yöntemleri Ders Programının değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Gaziantep Üniversitesi, Gaziantep.

Kürüm, D. (2007). *Öğretim üyesi adayları için Öğretimsel Gelişim Programının değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Anadolu Üniversitesi, Eskişehir.

Mızıkacı, F. (2001). *Başkent Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Meslek Yüksek Okulu Turizm ve Otelcilik Programının toplam kalite yönetimi ilkelerine göre değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). ODTÜ, Ankara.

Öztekin, A. (2013). *Ortaöğretim 10. sınıf Kimya Dersi Öğretim Programının değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Balıkesir Üniversitesi, Balıkesir.

Öztürk, E. (2003). *Lise Biyoloji Öğretim Programının uygulama sürecinin belli faktörlere göre değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). ODTÜ, Ankara.

Payam, M. M. (2015). *Polis Meslek Yüksekokulları Polis Etiği Dersi Öğretim Programının değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Seçkin, H. (2010). *İlköğretim 4.sınıf İngilizce Dersi Öğretim Programının değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Semerci, Ç. (1998). *Mesleki ve Teknik Eğitim Fakültesi Programlarının değerlendirilmesi (program değerlendirme modeli ve ölçme araçlarının geliştirilmesi)* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Fırat Üniversitesi, Elazığ.

Sıcak, A. (2013). *İlköğretim 5. Sınıf Fen ve Teknoloji Öğretim Programının değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi, Bolu.

Sulak, S. A. (2007). *Dokuzuncu Sınıf Bilgi ve İletişim Teknolojisi Dersi Öğretim Programının değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Selçuk Üniversitesi, Konya.

Şahin, V. (2006). *Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu'nda yürütülen Hizmetiçi Eğitim İngilizce Öğretmenliği Sertifika Programının değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). ODTÜ, Ankara.

Taçman, M. (2009). *Sınıf Öğretmenliği Lisans Programlarının öğretim becerilerini kazandırma yönünden değerlendirilmesi: Kuzey Kıbrıs Türk Cumhuriyeti örneği* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Tazegül, A. (2011). *Muhasebe öğretim programının öğretim elemanı ve öğrenci görüşlerine göre değerlendirilmesi: Meslek yüksekokullarında bir uygulama.* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Atatürk Üniversitesi, Erzurum.

Tekmen, B. (2012). *Evaluation of Preschool Teacher Education Program in Turkey: Academicians' perspective* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). ODTÜ, Ankara.

Uslu, Ö. (2013). *Bilgi ve iletişim teknolojileriyle bütünleşmeyi amaçlayan bir mesleki gelişim programının değerlendirilmesi ve bir model önerisi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Ege Üniversitesi, İzmir.

Ülker, M. (2012). *Medya Okuryazarlığı Dersi Öğretmen Kılavuz Kitabının öğretim programı ile tutarlılığının değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Ünlü, C. E. (2000). *Program Değerlendirme ve Endüstri Ürünleri Tasarımı Eğitimini etkileyen faktörler: Eğitimcilerin, Profesyonellerin ve İşverenlerin Görüşleri* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). ODTÜ, Ankara.

Yazıcı, E. (2009). *İlköğretim Matematik Dersi 6. Sınıf Öğretim Programının değerlendirilmesi üzerine bir çalışma* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Selçuk Üniversitesi, Konya.

Yeşilyurt, E. (2010). *Öğretmenlik Uygulaması Öğretim Programının standart temelli ve ihtiyaca cevap verici modeller ışığında değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Fırat Üniversitesi, Elazığ.

Yiğit, C. (2016). *Öğretmenlerin mesleki gelişiminde eylem araştırmasının Kirkpatrick Program Değerlendirme Modeline göre incelenmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Gaziantep Üniversitesi, Gaziantep.

Zengin, M. (2010). *Yapılandırmacılık ve din eğitimi ilköğretim DKAB öğretim programlarının değerlendirilmesi ve öğretmen görüşleri açısından etkililiği* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

Review Article: Yetkiner, A., Acar, Erdol, T. & Ünlü, Ş. (2019). Content analysis of phd dissertations on curriculum evaluation (1996-2017). *Erzincan University Journal of Education Faculty, 21* (1), 247-269.