



2023, 19(2), 258-273

Comparative Analysis of Problem-Based Learning and Traditional Instruction Methods in Postgraduate Studies: A Synthesis of Effects on Learning Outcomes

Ebubekir Usanmaz¹, Ahmet Basal²

 ¹ Department of Educational Sciences, School of Education, Yıldız Technical University, İstanbul, Türkiye, <u>eusanmaz2016@gmail.com</u>
² Department of Educational Sciences, School of Education, Yıldız Technical University, İstanbul, Türkiye, <u>ahmetbasal@gmail.com</u>

Corresponding Author: Ahmet Basal

Article Type: Research Article

Acknowledgement: This research is based on the doctoral dissertation of the first author, conducted under the guidance and supervision of the second author.

To Cite This Article: Usanmaz, E., & Basal, A. (2023). Comparative analysis of problem-based learning and traditional instruction methods in postgraduate studies: A synthesis of effects on learning outcomes. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama, 19*(2), 258-273. <u>https://doi.org/10.17244/eku.1310944</u>

Ethical Note: This study did not require ethical approval as it does not involve human participants.

Probleme Dayalı Öğrenme ve Geleneksel Öğretim Yöntemlerinin Lisansüstü Çalışmalarda Karşılaştırmalı Çözümlemesi: Öğrenme Çıktıları Üzerine Etkilerinin Sentezi

Ebubekir Usanmaz¹, Ahmet Basal²

 ¹ Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü, Eğitim Fakültesi, Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi, İstanbul, Türkiye, <u>eusanmaz2016@gmail.com</u>
² Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü, Eğitim Fakültesi, Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi, İstanbul, Türkiye, <u>ahmetbasal@gmail.com</u>

Sorumlu Yazar: Ahmet Basal

Makale Türü: Araştırma Makalesi

Bilgilendirme: Bu araştırma, ilk yazarın doktora tezi üzerine kurulmuş olup, ikinci yazarın rehberliği ve denetimi altında gerçekleştirilmiştir.

Kaynak Gösterimi: Usanmaz, E., & Basal, A. (2023). Probleme dayalı öğrenme ve geleneksel öğretim yöntemlerinin lisansüstü çalışmalarda karşılaştırmalı çözümlemesi: Öğrenme çıktıları üzerine etkilerinin sentezi. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama, 19*(2), 258-273. <u>https://doi.org/10.17244/eku.1310944</u>

Etik Not: Bu çalışma, insan katılımcıları içermediği için etik onay gerektirmemektedir.



2023, 19(2), 258-273



Comparative Analysis of Problem-Based Learning and Traditional Instruction Methods in Postgraduate Studies: A Synthesis of Effects on Learning Outcomes

Ebubekir Usanmaz¹, Ahmet Basal²

 ¹ Department of Educational Sciences, School of Education, Yıldız Technical University, İstanbul, Türkiye, eusanmaz2016@gmail.com, ORCID: <u>0009-0001-6625-6629</u>
² Department of Educational Sciences, School of Education, Yıldız Technical University, İstanbul, Türkiye, ahmetbasal@gmail.com, ORCID: <u>0000-0003-4295-4577</u>

Abstract

This research aimed to evaluate and synthesize the effectiveness of problem-based learning (PBL) compared to traditional instruction (TI) in various learning outcomes. The study, using a sequential explanatory mixed research approach, reviewed 74 postgraduate dissertations from Türkiye, spanning from 2009 to 2021, that matched specific inclusion criteria. Qualitative data analysis revealed that the majority of these dissertations were master's level and completed in 2010. These studies frequently implemented experimental interventions in middle school science classes, typically over five weeks with groups of 21-30 students. The quantitative analysis showed that PBL had a significant overall impact, with a General Effect Size (GES) of 0.734 across all variables. This effect was divided into specific clusters: knowledge (GES of 0.992), skills (GES of 0.696), and emotions (GES of 0.406). Further, PBL particularly affected academic achievement (GES of 0.842), scientific process skills (GES of 0.351), and course attitude (GES of 0.402), which were the most commonly assessed variables in the respective dimensions of knowledge, skills, and emotions. Additionally, PBL showed a substantial impact (GES of 0.799) on variables covering 21st-century competency framework skills. In summary, the study found that PBL is significantly more effective than traditional instructional methods across various learning outcomes, particularly in enhancing knowledge, skills, and emotional aspects of learning. This study suggests that integrating PBL activities can significantly enhance the attainment of curriculum objectives.

Article Info

Keywords: Problem-based learning, traditional instruction, meta-evaluation, learning outcomes

Article History: Received: 7 June 2023 Revised: 30 November 2023 Accepted: 1 December 2023

Article Type: Research Article

Probleme Dayalı Öğrenme ve Geleneksel Öğretim Yöntemlerinin Lisansüstü Çalışmalarda Karşılaştırmalı Çözümlemesi: Öğrenme Çıktıları Üzerine Etkilerinin Sentezi

Öz Bu araştırma, problem dayalı öğrenmenin (PDÖ) geleneksel öğretim yöntemleriyle (GÖ) karşılaştırarak çeşitli öğrenme çıktıları üzerindeki etkilerini değerlendirmeyi ve sentezlemeyi amaçlamıştır. Sıralı açıklayıcı karma araştırma yaklaşımı kullanılan araştırmada, 2009'dan 2021'e kadar Türkiye'den belirli dahil etme kriterlerini karşılayan 74 lisansüstü tezi incelemiştir. Nitel veri analizi, önemli sayıda lisansüstü çalışmanın özellikle 2010 yılında tamamlandığını ve büyük oranda yüksek lisans tezlerinden oluştuğunu ortaya koymuştur. Bu çalışmalar genellikle deneysel müdahaleler olarak ortaokul fen derslerinde, beş hafta süreyle ve 21-30 öğrencilik gruplarla, yürütülmüştür. Nicel analiz, PDÖ'nün tüm değişkenler üzerinde anlamlı bir genel etkiye sahip olduğunu, Genel Etki Büyüklüğü'nün (GES) 0.734 olduğunu göstermiştir. Bu etki, belirli kümeler olarak ayrılmıştır: bilgi (GES 0.992), beceriler (GES 0.696) ve duygular (GES 0.406). Ayrıca, PBL özellikle akademik başarıyı (GES 0.842), bilimsel süreç becerilerini (GES 0.351) ve ders tutumunu (GES 0.402) etkilemiştir ki, bunlar sırasıyla bilgi, beceriler ve duygular boyutlarında en sık değerlendirilen değiskenlerdir. Ek olarak, PBL, 21. yüzyıl yetkinlik çerçeve becerilerini kapsayan değişkenlerde önemli bir etki göstermiştir (GES 0.799). Sonuç olarak, çalışma, PDÖ'nün çeşitli öğrenme kazanımları, özellikle de öğrenmenin bilgi, beceri ve duygusal yönlerini geliştirmede, açısından geleneksel öğretim yöntemlerinden anlamlı olarak daha etkili olduğunu ortaya çıkarmıştır. Araştırmada, PDÖ etkinliklerinin, müfredata entegre edilmesinin, müfredattaki hedeflere ulaşmayı önemli ölçüde artıracağı ileri sürülmektedir.

Makale Bilgisi

Anahtar Kelimeler: Probleme dayalı öğrenme, geleneksel öğretim, meta değerlendirme, öğrenme çıktıları

Makale Geçmişi: Geliş: 7 Haziran 2023 Düzeltme: 30 Kasım 2023 Kabul: 1 Aralık 2023

Makale Türü: Araştırma Makalesi

Introduction

Individuals acquire the knowledge, skills, and attitudes essential for life through teaching methodologies grounded in solid theoretical foundations and empirical research findings (Eggen & Kauchak, 2016). Learning and teaching processes, as posited by behavioral, cognitive, and information processing theories, involve changes in behavior, the renewal of meaning schemas, and the consolidation of information into long-term memory (Schunk, 2012). The shift from behavioral theories to constructivist theories sparks a critical reevaluation of traditional instructional (TI) methods, encouraging the development of constructivist teaching methodologies focused on supporting the ability to generate and utilize knowledge (Ormrod, 2016). These constructivist teaching methodologies provide more engaging, learner-focused educational encounters. In these settings, students proactively build their own comprehension and awareness of the world by engaging with and reflecting on their experiences. This paradigm shift emphasizes the importance of a learner's engagement in constructing knowledge, as opposed to passively receiving it. Consequently, it necessitates the design of learning environments that are dynamic, interactive, and rich in resources, thereby enabling learners to question, explore, and challenge their understanding. As a result, this supports more profound and durable learning, equipping individuals with the vital skills and competencies necessary for lifelong learning and adaptability in an everchanging world.

According to the constructivist learning theory, when a person cannot explain new information within the framework of his prior knowledge and experiences, they reorganize mental meaning schemas at the end of cognitive inquiry processes (Pelech & Pieper, 2010). In line with constructivist teaching methods (Borich, 2017) that provide opportunities for learners to evaluate and develop their prior knowledge and experiences, schools should create free-thinking environments for students and teachers should assume a guiding role (Woolfolk, 2016). Problem-based learning (PBL) is a method based on constructivist learning principles, working with real-life problems, in which students take responsibility, and adopt collaborative working and reflective thinking processes (McConnell et al., 2016). PBL aims to provide students with the competency to solve problems they may encounter in society and work life, take advantage of opportunities, protect themselves from threats, and adapt to changing conditions (Moust et al., 2019).

In the PBL process, teachers present problems in line with real life within scenarios and enable students to reach a solution by applying the steps of the scientific method (Amador et al., 2006). Students taking responsibility, integrating knowledge and experience from different disciplines, and collaborating with their peers contribute to their acquisition of lifelong learning understanding (Bidokht & Assareh, 2011; Eggen & Kauchak, 2012; Uden & Beaumont, 2006). The philosophical foundations of the PBL method are based on John Dewey's principles of "Experience and Nature" (1925) and "Experience and Education" (1938), advocating the transformation of schools into real-life environments and the ability of students to reach the targeted level of knowledge and skills in interactive environments (Duch et al., 2001; Savin-Baden & Howell-Major, 2004). Its theoretical foundations are based on Jean Piaget's "cognitive constructivism" due to questioning and reconstructing past experiences, Jerome Bruner's "discovery learning" due to directing students to discover information beyond memorization, and Albert Bandura's "social constructivism" principles due to collaborative endeavors (Duch et al., 2001; Savin-Baden & Howell-Major, 2004).

Gorghiu et al. (2015) identified 10 principles for PBL and emphasized that the desired learning objectives will be reached with the application of these principles: In the PBL process, while student-centered learning ensures active participation of students in the process, learning in stimulating environments enables their access to resources. Purposeful learning results in usable gains by working on real-life problems and active experiential learning directs students to research to improve their competencies. Rational learning focuses on developing higher-order thinking skills while learning based on previous experiences considers the prior knowledge and experiences of students. Collaborative learning supports peer instruction and social skill development. Effective learning encourages students to make voluntary efforts to achieve lasting gains. Authentic learning motivates students and facilitates the transfer of gains by working on real-life problems. Holistic (interdisciplinary) learning values the use of knowledge and skills from different areas in solving problems. Kim (2019) visualized the PBL process as a 9-step cyclical flowchart that begins with the presentation of the problem and extends to the presentation of the results, focusing on the improvement of the solution (Figure 1).



Figure 1. The PBL process (Kim, 2019)

According to the findings of meta-analysis research (Alacapınar & Ok, 2020; N. Ayaz, 2015; Batdı, 2014; Dağyar, 2014; Jensen, 2015; Leary, 2012; Özgül, 2021), the PBL method has a high level of overall effect size (OES) on knowledge and skill development and a moderate level of overall effect size on attitude development compared to the TI method. However, due to the PBL method requiring more resources, it is important to consider the cost-benefit situation. It is suggested that resource-intensive methods like PBL should be used in dealing with subjects that are difficult to learn or have an interdisciplinary character within the framework of teachers' professional experiences.

Since 2005, with the preparation of curricula in Türkiye according to the constructivist education understanding, scientific research and teaching activities for student-centered teaching methods have become increasingly widespread. For example, between 2005-2022, 128 graduate studies on the 5E learning cycle model, 158 on problem-based learning, 153 on project-based learning, and 237 on argumentation-based learning were conducted (YÖK UTM, 2022). This research aims to analyze the contents of graduate studies comparing the effects of the PBL method on various learning products with the TI method carried out in Türkiye between 2009-2021, and to integrate their findings. This study is expected to contribute to (1) prioritizing PBL activities in updating curricula, (2) planning, implementation, and evaluation of action research that teachers will carry out in their schools, and (3) research comparing the effects of different teaching methods.

In the research undertaken, comprehensive research questions were developed concerning both qualitative and quantitative aspects in accordance with the guidelines provided by Fraenkel et al. (2012, p. 563). The objective was to explore and answer the following:

Research Question 1. What are the descriptive characteristics of graduate studies comparing the effects of PBL and TI methods conducted in Türkiye between 2009-2021?

- 1.1. How are the graduate studies distributed according to years, types, and research methods?
- 1.2. How are experimental intervention processes distributed according to learning levels, courses processed, implementation duration, number of students, dependent variable clusters of knowledge, skills, and feelings, and dependent variables in the clusters of knowledge, skills, and feelings?

Research Question 2. According to the findings of graduate studies conducted in Türkiye between 2009-2021, what are the general effect size (GES) values of the PBL method on dependent variable clusters of knowledge, skills, and feelings, the most frequently questioned dependent variables under the clusters of knowledge, skills, and feelings, and dependent variable clusters consisting of skills in the 21st-century competence frameworks?

Research Question 3. What are the integrated effect size (IES) values of the PBL method on academic achievement and attitude towards the course within the framework of the findings of meta-analysis research conducted in Türkiye?

Method

Research Design

In the conducted research, an exploratory sequential mixed research method, which includes descriptive scanning in the qualitative dimension and meta-evaluation techniques in the quantitative dimension, was used to reach descriptive and explanatory results related to the problem situation. This method involves collecting and analyzing qualitative data in the first stage to access detailed information about events, phenomena, situations, and trends, and collecting and analyzing quantitative data in the second stage to explain the relationships between variables (Trochim et al., 2016). Using only qualitative or only quantitative research methods leads to approaching the problem situation only subjectively or only objectively, resulting in the loss of detailed or holistic perspectives, and weakening conformity with reality (Cohen et al., 2018). In this study, the research method was applied, with an emphasis on comparing PBL with TI on various learning outcomes. The initial phase involved qualitative analysis, drawing from 74 postgraduate dissertations conducted in Türkiye between 2009 and 2021. This approach allowed for an in-depth exploration of methodologies in question. Subsequently, the study proceeded to the quantitative phase, where the relationships between variables were systematically examined.

Data Set

The research focused on graduate studies related to PBL conducted in Türkiye between 2009 and 2021. From the pool of 147 studies identified (YÖK UTM, 2022), 74 were found to contain descriptive and explanatory data pertinent to the research's problem statement. The final sample comprised 24 Ph.D. and 50 master's studies (See Appendix A), selected based on specific inclusion and exclusion criteria.

Inclusion Criteria:

Timeframe and Location: Studies conducted in Türkiye between 2009-2021.

Methodology: Utilization of a control group pretest-posttest quasi-experimental research method was mandatory. Teaching Methods in Study: Both the control and experimental groups had to organize activities based on either TI or PBL methods.

Detailed Reporting: Comprehensive reports on the experimental process and comparison findings were required. Data Analysis: Use of parametric tests in data analysis was necessary to ensure statistical robustness.

Exclusion Criteria:

Non-Compliance with Methodology: Studies lacking a control group pretest-posttest quasi-experimental research method were excluded.

Inconsistent Control Group Methods: Studies where the control group used teaching methods other than TI were not considered.

Data Analysis Method: Studies employing non-parametric tests were excluded, as parametric tests offer more reliable statistical analysis.

The counting method was employed to create the sample set, deemed appropriate due to the limited number of relevant studies and the feasibility of accessing all of them (Gliner et al., 2017). This approach ensures a comprehensive and methodologically consistent sample, enhancing the research's reliability and validity.

Data Analysis

Qualitative data analysis

Descriptive scanning involves assessing the levels of certain characteristics within the elements of the research population through a selected sample set, without any intervention in their natural structures and functioning (Krippendorff, 2019; Mayring, 2022). In this study, the distribution of graduate studies included in the sample set was examined based on the following criteria: the years in which they were conducted, their types, and the research methods employed. Furthermore, the distribution of these studies was also analyzed in terms of the experimental intervention processes they utilized. These descriptive analyses provide a comprehensive overview of the characteristics and trends present within the selected graduate studies, offering valuable insights into the research.

Quantitative data analysis

Meta-analysis refers to the integration of different study findings that contain the same dependent and independent variable sets and determining the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable independently of the sample size (Martin & Bridgmon, 2012). In meta-analysis research, firstly, Cohen's d effect size values are calculated for each comparison where the effects of different levels of the independent variable on the dependent variable on the dependent

variable are questioned. Then, the weighted average of Cohen's d effect size values is taken over the sample size, and the GES value and level, which indicates the form of differentiation occurring in the dependent variable free from effects arising from chance, are found (Patten & Newhart, 2018).

$$sd_{spoiled} = \sqrt{\frac{(n_{experimental} - 1)sd_{experimental}^{2} + (n_{control} - 1)sd_{control}^{2}}{n_{experimental} + n_{control} - 2}}$$

 $cohen's \ d = \frac{m_{experimental} - m_{control}}{sd_{spoiled}}$

$$GES = \frac{\sum_{i} n_{i} d_{i}}{\sum_{i} n_{i}}$$

Here; the experiment and control indices represent the experiment and control groups; n, m, and sd symbols respectively represent the number of students/elements/studies, arithmetic mean, and standard deviation values.

In interpreting the GES value, the criteria indicated by Cooper et al. (2019); Gough et al. (2017), and Murphy et al. (2014) are commonly used; Cohen's d < 0.200 is negative, $-0.200 \le$ Cohen's d < 0.200 is insignificant, $0.200 \le$ Cohen's d < 0.500 is weak, $0.500 \le$ Cohen's d < 0.800 is moderate, $0.800 \le$ Cohen's d < 1.200 is high, $1.200 \le$ Cohen's d < 2.000 is very high, and $2,000 \le$ Cohen's d is considered colossal.

Meta-integration refers to the blending of different meta-analysis study findings that contain the same dependent and independent variable sets and the highly comprehensive determination of the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable (Martin & Bridgmon, 2012). The weighted average of the GES values calculated in meta-analysis studies participating in meta-integration research over the sample size gives the IES (integrated effect size) value (Patten & Newhart, 2018).

 $\text{IES} = \frac{\sum_{i} n_{i}.GES_{i}}{\sum_{i} n_{i}}$

The following operations were performed in the process of analyzing the quantitative data collected in the study:

- 1. For each of the 176 comparisons questioning whether the PBL method creates a significant difference compared to the TI method in the studies selected for the research sample, Cohen's d effect size values have been calculated.
- 2. To facilitate the interpretation of the results, dependent variables in the studies selected for the sample, which examined the differentiation situations in the experimental intervention process, were collected under the clusters of knowledge, skills, emotions, and GES values regarding the PBL method compared to the TBL method for each dependent variable cluster have been calculated.
- 3. In the studies selected for the research sample, GES values of the PBL method compared to the TI method have been calculated for academic success, scientific process skills, and attitude towards the course, which are the dependent variables most questioned in the knowledge, skill, and emotion clusters.
- 4. A GES value has been calculated for the PBL method compared to the TI method on a dependent variable set consisting of skills found in the 21st-century proficiency frameworks.
- 5. The findings of the 5 meta-analysis studies on PBL in the literature and the findings of the conducted research have been blended, and integrated effect size (IES) values of the PBL method compared to the TBL method on the dependent variables of academic achievement and attitude towards the course have been calculated.

Results

Qualitative Research Findings

It was observed that 147 graduate studies on PBL conducted in Türkiye between 2009 and 2021 consisted of 49 (33.33%) doctoral theses and 98 (66.67%) master's theses; 24 (48.97%) and 50 (51.02%) of the doctoral and master's studies, respectively, met the conditions for selection into the sample of the conducted research; and the distribution of selected, eliminated, and the total number of graduate studies did not show regular distribution according to years and types (Table 1). Studies using only qualitative research methods and studies using single-group quantitative research methods were excluded from the sample because they did not provide the data needed to clarify the problem statement of the conducted research.

Vaan

rear	r	FIID		MA		70
						(100.n/147)
	Included	Excluded	Included	Excluded		
2009	1	1	3	5	10	6.80
2010	4	0	8	2	14	9.52
2011	4	0	6	2	12	8.16
2012	3	7	1	5	16	10.88
2013	1	3	4	1	9	6.12
2014	1	2	4	4	11	7.48
2015	0	2	4	5	11	7.48
2016	1	2	0	4	7	4.76
2017	4	2	0	1	7	4.76
2018	0	2	4	5	11	7.48
2019	1	1	9	4	15	10.20
2020	2	1	4	5	12	8.16
2021	2	2	3	5	12	8.16
Total	24	25	50	48	147	100.00

Table 1. Selection of Postgraduate PBL Studies in Türkiye (2009-2021): Yearly Distribution in the Research Sample

ъла

Tatal

DLD

It was found that between 2009 and 2021 in Türkiye, the most graduate studies on PBL were conducted in 2012 (f=16/147, 10.88%) and 2019 (f=15/147, 10.20%), and the least in 2016 (f=7/147, 4.76%) and 2017 (f=7/147, 4.76%). The most selected studies for the research sample were conducted in 2010 (f=12/74, 16.22%), 2011 (f=10/74, 13.51%), and 2019 (f=10/74, 13.51%), representing 43.24% (32/74) of the sample. The studies most excluded from the sample were conducted in 2012 (f=12/73, 16.44%), and the least in 2010 and 2011 (f=2/72, 2.74%).

In the same period, the most doctoral studies on PBL were conducted in 2012 (f=10/49, 20.41%), and the least in 2009, 2015, 2018, and 2019 (f=2/49, 4.08%). The most selected doctoral studies for the research sample were conducted in 2010, 2011, and 2017 (f=4/24, 16.67%), representing 50.00% (12/24) of the sample. The doctoral studies most excluded from the sample were conducted in 2012 (f=7/25, 28.00%), and none were conducted in 2010 and 2011 (f=0/25, 0.00%).

Most master's studies on PBL were conducted in 2019 (f=13/98, 13.27%) and the least in 2017 (f=1/98, 1.02%). The most selected master's studies for the research sample were conducted in 2019 (f=9/50, 18.00%), 2010 (f=8/50, 16.00%), and 2011 (f=6/50, 12.00%), representing 46.00% (23/50) of the sample. The master's studies most excluded from the sample were conducted in 2012, 2015, 2018, 2019, and 2021 (f=5/48, 10.42%) and the least in 2013 and 2017 (f=1/48, 2.08%).

Between 2009 and 2021 in Türkiye, of the doctoral and master's studies on PBL selected for the research sample, 17 (70.83%) and 27 (54.00%) were designed according to the mixed research method and 7 (29.17%) and 23 (46.00%) were designed according to the quantitative research method. The research methods used in graduate studies did not show a regular distribution according to years and types. There was a tendency to use the mixed research method in both doctoral and master's studies. It was concluded that the mixed research method was used more in doctoral studies than in master's studies (Table 2).

 Year		PhD		MA	Mi	xed	Quantitative	
	Mixed	Quantitative	Mixed	Quantitative	Total	%	Total	%
2009	1	0	2	1	3	4.05	1	1.35
2010	2	2	4	4	6	8.11	6	8.11
2011	1	3	1	5	2	2.70	8	10.81
2012	3	0	1	0	4	5.41	0	0.00
2013	1	0	3	1	4	5.41	1	1.35
2014	0	1	2	2	2	2.70	3	4.05
2015	0	0	2	2	2	2.70	2	2.70
2016	1	0	0	0	1	1.35	0	0.00
2017	4	0	0	0	4	5.41	0	0.00
2018	0	0	2	2	2	2.70	2	2.70
2019	1	0	8	2	9	12.16	2	2.70
2020	1	1	1	3	2	2.70	4	5.40
2021	2	0	1	2	3	4.05	2	2.70
Total	17	7	27	23	44	59.46	30	40.54

Table 2. Overview of Postgraduate PBL Studies in Türkiye (2009-2021): Yearly Distribution, Types, and Research Methods

It was observed that between 2009 and 2021 in Türkiye, the distribution of graduate studies on PBL selected for the research sample was as follows according to the research method: in doctoral theses, it was mixed (f=17/24, 70.83%) and quantitative (f=7/24, 29.17%), and in master's theses, it was mixed (f=27/50, 54.00%) and quantitative (f=23/50, 46.00%).

In graduate studies on PBL conducted between 2009 and 2021 in Türkiye and selected for the research sample, it was found that experimental interventions were carried out mostly at the middle school level (f=43/74, 58.11%) and least at the associate degree level (f=1/74, 1.35%). They were mostly implemented in science (f=21/74, 28.38%) and math classes (f=20/74, 27.03%), and these two subjects represented 55.41% (41/74) of the total. They were conducted for 5 weeks the most (f=16/74, 21.62%) and there was a concentration in the 3, 4, 5, and 6-week durations (f=46/74, 62.16%). They were carried out in classes composed of 21-30 students the most (f=40/74, 54.05%) and in classes composed of 1-10 students the least (f=1/74, 1.35%) (Table 3).

Table 3. Postgraduate Research or	ı PBL in Türkiye ((2009-2021): D	Distribution	by Types of E	xperimental Intervent	tions
	Experimental In	tervention M	ode (f)	(%)		

Experimental intervention would	(I)	(70)
Level		
Primary school	4	5.41
Middle school	43	58.11
High school	8	10.81
Associate's degree	1	1.35
Bachelor's degree	18	24.32
Subject		
Science	21	28.38
Mathematics	20	27.03
Other	15	44.59
Duration (Weeks)		
1-2	4	5.40
3-4	18	24.32
5	16	21.62
6-7	14	18.92
8 weeks and above	22	29.73
Class Size		
1-20	7	9.46
21-30	40	54.05
31-40 arası	18	24.32
41-50 arası	6	8.11
51 ve üzeri	3	4.05

In graduate studies on PBL conducted between 2009 and 2021 in Türkiye and selected for the research sample, it was found that the significant differences created by the PBL method compared to the TL method were mostly investigated in the knowledge dimension (f=83/176, 47.16%). In terms of independent variables, they were investigated the most in the academic achievement in the knowledge dimension (f=59/83, 71.08%), scientific process skills in the skills dimension (f=14/46, 30.43%), and attitudes toward the course in the affective dimension (f=30/47, 63.83%). Among the 21st-century competencies, problem-solving skills were the most investigated (f=9/46, 19.57%).

Table 4. Postgraduate Studies on PBL in Türkiye (2009-2021): Comparing PBL and TI Methods by Dependent Variables

Experimental Intervention Approach	(f)	(%)
Set of Dependent Variables		
knowledge	83	47.16
skills	46	26.14
emotions	47	26.70
total	176	100.00
Knowledge Dimension		
academic achievement	59	71.08
retention of knowledge	17	20.48
conceptual understanding	7	8.43
total	83	100.00
Skill Dimension		
scientific process skills	14	30.43
problem-solving skills	9	19.57
critical thinking skills	6	13.04
creative thinking skills	6	13.04
other types of skills	11	23.91
total	46	100.00
Emotion Dimension		
attitude towards the lesson	30	63.83
motivation toward the lesson	6	12.77
other affective characteristics	11	23.40
total	47	100.00

Quantitative Research Findings

In graduate studies on PBL conducted in Türkiye between 2009 and 2021 and selected for the sample of this research, it was found that among the comparisons of 7 groups investigating the significant differences created by the PBL method compared to the TI method, the effect size was mostly high (f=40/176, 22.73%) and least negatively (f=12, 6.82%) (Table 5). In the selected sample of graduate research on Problem-Based Learning (PBL) conducted in Türkiye from 2009 to 2021, comparisons across 7 groups investigating the significant differences yielded by the PBL method in contrast to the Traditional Instruction (TI) method revealed that the effect size was predominantly high (f=40/176, 22.73%) and least frequently negative (f=12, 6.82%), as detailed in Table 5.

Table 5. Comparison of 7 groups: Effect Levels in PBL vs. TI Methods

Effect Size (Cohen's d)	Effect Level	f	%
Cohen's d < - 0,200	In a negative direction	12	6.82
$-0,200 \le$ Cohen's d $< 0,200$	Insignificant	30	17.05
0,200 ≤ Cohen's d < 0,500	Weak	19	10.80
0,500 ≤ Cohen's d < 0,800	Moderate	34	19.32
0,800 ≤ Cohen's d < 1,200	High	40	22.73
1,200 ≤ Cohen's d < 2,000	Very high	23	13.07
$2,000 \le$ Cohen's d	Huge	18	10.23

The integration of findings from graduate studies conducted in Türkiye between 2009 and 2021, selected for this research sample, reveals that the PBL method, compared to the TI method, demonstrates significant effects. The PBL method shows a high level of effect (0.992) in the knowledge dimension, a medium level of effect (0.696) in the skills dimension, a weak level of effect (0.406) in the emotional dimension, and a medium level of effect (0.734) in total.

Among the most studied dependent variables, the PBL method has a high level of effect on academic success (0.842), a weak level of effect on scientific process skills (0.351), and a weak level of effect on attitude towards the course in the emotional dimension (0.402). Additionally, the PBL method demonstrates a high level of effect size (0.799) on the set of skills aligned with the 21st-century competency frameworks. These findings indicate the effectiveness of the PBL method in enhancing knowledge, skills, and attitudes in educational settings. The meta-analysis studies on Problem-Based Learning (PBL) in literature, including works by Alacapınar and Ok (2020), Ayaz (2015), Dağyar (2014), Batdi (2014), and Özgül (2021), along with the meta-synthesis of these findings (Cooper et al., 2019; Gough et al., 2017; Murphy et al., 2014), indicate that the PBL method significantly impacts academic success with a high effect size of 0.857. Additionally, it shows a moderate effect size of 0.601 on attitudes towards courses when compared to the Traditional Instruction (TI) method, as detailed in Table 6.

	Effect size fou	ind in the	The number	of studies	Weighted effect size (WES)	
	research		exam	ined	$(WES = OES \times SS)$	
	Overall effe	Overall effect size		size (SS)		
Research	Academic	Attitude	Academic	Attitude	Academic	Attitude
	achievement	toward	achievement	toward the	achievement	toward the
		the		lesson		lesson
		lesson				
Alacapınar & Ok (2020)	0.821	0.914	32	24	0.077	0.207
Ayaz (2015)	1.162	0.769	30	22	0.102	0.160
Batd1 (2014)	1.302	-	26	-	0.099	-
Dağyar (2014)	0.620	-	118	-	0.214	-
Özgül (2021)	0.979	0.426	77	30	0.220	0.121
Studies						
Conducted(2023)	0.842	0.402	59	30	0.145	0.114
Total			342	106	0.857	0.601

Table 6. Meta-Analysis of PBL vs. TI Methods: Effect Size and Significance

Discussion

The research focused on synthesizing and examining the outcomes of postgraduate research that assessed the impact of PBL and TI methods on different learning outcomes, specifically emphasizing studies that utilized parametric statistical tests for data analysis. This analysis covered research conducted in Türkiye from 2009 to 2021. To streamline the interpretation of the experimental results, the dependent variables examined during the intervention phase of these studies were systematically categorized into specific groups. These groups included various aspects of learning, such as knowledge, skills, and emotional dimensions, thereby providing a structured framework for facilitating the interpretation of the results.

A total of 147 graduate studies on the PBL method conducted in Türkiye between 2009 and 2021 were reached, of which 74 (50.34%) were determined to contribute to the clarification of the problem sentence were selected, and the remaining 73 (49.66%) were eliminated from the sample. Due to the acceleration of developments in scientific research methods since the late 20th century, the patterns used in scientific research are diversifying as much as possible and the usage rate of the pretest-posttest experimental research method with a control group is gradually decreasing. Moreover, due to the diversification of the characteristics expected from individuals in the increasingly complex life conditions of the 21st century, the dependent variables questioned in education research are increasing and diversifying over time. The increase in methodological and purposeful diversity in scientific research reduces the rate of being selected into the sample in meta-analysis studies based on the quantitative research tradition and increases the elimination rate. Similar to the findings of the research conducted, in meta-analysis studies conducted by Alacapınar and Ok (2020), Batdı (2014), Dağyar (2014), and Özgül (2021) aimed at determining the ES value and level of the PBL method on academic achievement, it was stated that only 25/44 (56.82%), 118/180 (65.56%), 118/252 (46.83%), and 77/239 (32.22%) of the reached research were selected into the sample, respectively.

Between 2009 and 2021 in Türkiye, graduate studies on the PBL method included 49 doctoral dissertations (33.33%) and 98 master's theses (66.67%). Of these, 24 doctoral dissertations (48.97%) and 50 master's theses (51.02%) were chosen for a sample in a specific study. The fewer doctoral dissertations, compared to master's theses, can be attributed to the more extended, demanding nature of doctoral studies, which require more resources and have fewer enrolled students. In similar content analysis studies on PBL, the proportion of doctoral dissertations in the samples were as follows: Ayaz and Ayaz (2015) - 26.56%, Biber et al. (2014) - 29.69%, Erdoğan (2017) - 37.62%, Mutlu and Aydoğmuş (2019) - 32.50%, Temel et al. (2015) - 22.41%, Tosun and Yaşar (2015) - 30.00%, and Yıldırım and Say (2020) -

17.86%. These studies similarly reflect a trend of a lower number of doctoral dissertations compared to master's theses. This consistent pattern across various studies indicates a broader academic trend, suggesting that while PBL is a popular subject for graduate research, the complexities and demands of doctoral-level study result in a naturally lower output of dissertations in this area compared to master's theses.

In the doctoral dissertations on PBL conducted in Türkiye between 2009 and 2021, 17 out of 24 (70.83%) used mixed research methods, while 7 out of 24 (29.17%) used quantitative methods. In contrast, among the master's theses, 27 out of 50 (54.00%) employed mixed methods, and 23 out of 50 (46.00%) used quantitative methods. The mixed research approach is beneficial as it combines multiple evidence sources, integrates objective and subjective perspectives, and compensates for the main method's limitations (Christensen et al., 2015). However, due to its complexity, requiring expertise in both quantitative and qualitative methods, and the significant investment of time, effort, and resources, it is more commonly utilized in doctoral dissertations. It has been noted that postgraduate studies on the PBL method in Türkiye are unevenly distributed over the years in terms of types and research methods. This irregularity is partly due to the lack of a cohesive education research policy in Türkiye. This absence leads to fragmented scientific studies, making it challenging to draw comprehensive conclusions on the subjects researched. It also causes inconsistencies in sample sets for meta-analysis research and diminishes the relevance of longitudinal studies to real-world situations.

In Türkiye, from 2009 to 2021, it was observed that in selected postgraduate studies, experimental interventions were primarily focused on middle school students, with 43 out of 74 interventions (f=43/74, 58.11%) taking place at this level. These interventions were mainly in science (f=21/74, 28.38%) and math (f=20/74, 27.03%) classes, typically spanning a period of 5 weeks (f=16/74, 21.62%), and conducted in classes of 21-30 students (f=40/74, 54.05%). This pattern could be influenced by several factors: adherence to the Ministry of National Education's (MEB) guidelines in Türkiye, which stipulate non-disruption of educational processes, the low average academic performance in science and math in the High School Entrance Exam (LGS), the typical duration of middle school science and math units being 4-5 weeks, and the common class size range. In terms of the effectiveness of the PBL method was found to create a significant difference in 47.16% of cases in knowledge (f=83/176), 26.14% in skill (f=46/176), and 26.70% in emotion (f=47/176). The focus was mainly on academic achievement (f=59/176, 33.52%), scientific process skills (f=14/176, 7.95%), and attitude towards the course (f=30/176, 17.05%). The emphasis on knowledge-related variables is largely due to the assessment and evaluation methods used in Türkiye, which primarily assess cognitive aspects, thereby directing researchers to predominantly investigate variables in the knowledge cluster.

John Dewey, in 1938, highlighted the critical importance of both in-depth content mastery and skill development in educational settings, advocating for their integration in both research and practice. This approach emphasizes personal growth and self-realization. However, an analysis of postgraduate studies in this field reveals a skewed emphasis: a majority of these studies concentrated on the impact of the PBL method on content knowledge (47.16% of studies), while relatively fewer explored its influence on skill development (26.14%). Echoing Dewey's comprehensive approach, Slavin (2018) pointed out the crucial role of affective elements in the learning process, noting how students' perceptions of their learning environment can significantly affect educational outcomes. Similarly, Woolfolk (2016) argued for the necessity of a robust affective component in learning environments to facilitate cognitive development and ensure effective knowledge retention and application. Yet, the analyzed studies insufficiently addressed the impact of PBL on emotional development (26.70% of studies). The current research also reveals a gap in aligning with the 21stcentury competencies, which emphasize skills vital for navigating complex life challenges and solving unpredictable problems. These competencies have become a focal point in global education systems and research. Nonetheless, the studies reviewed in this sample set show a lack of thorough exploration of the PBL method's effectiveness in developing skills outlined in these competency frameworks (15.34% of studies), particularly overlooking the areas of communication and collaboration skills entirely. This overview suggests a need for a more balanced research approach, one that equally values knowledge acquisition, skill development, and emotional growth in line with a holistic educational vision.

The comparative analysis of the PBL and TI methods reveals that PBL exhibits varying GES values across different educational dimensions. Specifically, the PBL method shows GES values of (a) 0.992, 0.696, 0.406, and 0.734 for knowledge, skills, emotions, and overall clusters respectively, (b) 0.842, 0.351, and 0.402 for the frequently researched variables of academic achievement, scientific process skills, and attitude towards the course in the knowledge, skill, and emotion dimensions respectively, and (c) 0.799 for the skill cluster included in the 21st-century competency frameworks. The learner-centric approach of the PBL method facilitates the achievement of high to medium effect sizes in the knowledge and skills dimensions within a relatively short period. However, the development of affective features, such as attitudes and emotions, appears to require longer educational interventions than those implemented in the selected studies, resulting in a weaker effect size in this area. Additionally, students' feedback on the experimental intervention processes in the studies predominantly praised the activities rather than the courses

themselves, indicating that while PBL can effectively engage students, more efforts are needed to create a positive attitude towards the courses themselves. This observation highlights the necessity for a more holistic approach in educational interventions, aiming not only for knowledge and skill acquisition but also for the cultivation of positive emotional and attitudinal responses toward learning.

Data from the Ministry of National Education (MEB, 2022) and the Measurement, Selection and Placement Center (ÖSYM, 2022) indicate underwhelming performance averages in the High School Entrance Exam (LGS) for Science and Math, as well as the Transition to Higher Education Exam (YGS) in Physics and Math. This trend suggests that middle and high school students in Türkiye may be struggling to develop a robust understanding and application skills in these subjects, pointing to a potential need for substantial reforms in the educational system. Despite efforts since 2005 to align curricula with constructivist learning principles, several challenges persist. These include a predominant focus on cognitive aspects in assessment and evaluation systems, a disconnect between curricula and reallife applications, inadequate school resources like labs and libraries, limited support from school administrations, insufficient parental involvement, gaps in pre-service and in-service teacher training, and a tendency among teachers to adhere to familiar teaching methods (as highlighted in studies by Akıncı et al., 2015; İpek et al., 2021; Saraç & Yıldırım, 2019). Consequently, TI based on behavioral learning principles continue to be widely employed. However, there is an opportunity for more effective teaching approaches. Teachers, drawing from their professional experience, might choose TI for topics where direct narration and a question-answer approach are deemed most effective. Conversely, they might opt for the PBL method for subjects where students face learning challenges and which require more resources. Such strategic use of teaching methodologies could potentially enhance educational outcomes.

Conclusion

The analysis of graduate studies in Türkiye from 2009 to 2021 offers significant insights into the effectiveness of PBL and TI methods in education. While PBL shows promise in enhancing academic achievement, critical thinking, problemsolving, and creative abilities, it is clear that the method's impact varies across different learning dimensions including knowledge, skills, and emotions. The studies indicate a stronger effect of PBL on knowledge and skills, yet its influence on emotional aspects requires more prolonged interventions for substantial impact. This disparity highlights the need for a more integrated approach in teaching methodologies, balancing cognitive, affective, and skill-based learning to align with the holistic vision of education. PBL activities establish a strong foundation for enhancing academic achievement by immersing students in real-world problems, encouraging responsibility and critical thinking, and making abstract concepts accessible and applicable across various contexts. PBL's active engagement in learning promotes motivation and self-regulation, helping students overcome fear of errors, share openly, and appreciate diverse perspectives. This approach effectively removes affective barriers to learning and contribute to the development of critical skills such as creative thinking within scientific limits, problem-solving through practical solutions, collaboration in teamwork, and communication through knowledge sharing. Importantly, PBL aligns with 21st-century competencies by supporting an integrated framework of knowledge, skills, and emotions. However, the implementation and effectiveness of PBL depend on the professional competencies of teachers and the resources available to them. Highquality pre-service and in-service training, sufficient resource allocation, and support from school administrations are pivotal for the widespread adoption of PBL and the realization of curriculum goals. The persistence of TI methods in Türkiye, despite a shift towards constructivist principles, reveals systemic challenges including resource constraints, limited teacher training, and an emphasis on cognitive assessments. Addressing these issues through strategic interventions such as comprehensive teacher development and curriculum reform is essential for a balanced and effective education system. To address the complex demands of today's rapidly changing world, it is essential to develop educational practices. A balanced approach that integrates PBL with TI can create a more dynamic and effective learning environment. This integrative approach ensures that students master content but also develop crucial skills for the 21st century, such as adaptability, collaboration, and innovation. Focusing on holistic student development, the education system can prepare learners more effectively for the diverse challenges and opportunities they will face in the future. As a result, this integrative and comprehensive educational approach is key to supporting individuals who are not only knowledgeable but also capable of thriving in a rapidly changing global environment.

Contributions of the Researchers

All authors contributed to the manuscript equally.

Financial Support and Acknowledgment

The authors declared that this research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Conflict of Interest

The authors have disclosed no conflict of interest.

References

- Akıncı, B., Uzun, N., & Kışoğlu, M. (2015). Fen bilimleri öğretmenlerinin meslekte karşılaştıkları problemler ve fen öğretiminde yaşadıkları zorluklar. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 12(1), 1189-1215. https://doi.org/10.14687/ijhs.v12i1.3188
- Alacapınar, F. G., & Ok, M. (2020). Meta-Analysis covering studies on problem-based learning. Research on Education and Psychology (REP), 4(Special Issue), 53-73.
- Amador, J. A., Miles, L., & Peters, C. B. (2006). The practice of problem based learning: a guide to implementing PBL in the college classroom. Anker.
- Ayaz, N. (2015). Probleme dayalı öğrenme yaklaşımının öğrencilerin fen bilimleri dersindeki akademik başarılarına ve tutumlarına etkisi: bir meta-analiz çalışması. [Yayınlanmamış yüksek tezi]. Fırat Üniversitesi.
- Ayaz, M. F., & Ayaz, N. (2015). Probleme dayalı öğrenme yaklaşımı ile ilgili Türkiye'de yapılmış tezlerin incelenmesi. International Journal of Social Science, 38, 407-427. https://doi.org/10.12780/uusbd.63667
- Batdı, V. (2014). Probleme dayalı öğrenme yaklaşımı ile geleneksel öğretimin karşılaştırılması: bir meta-analiz çalışması. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *13*(51), 346-364.
- Biber, M., Ersoy, E., & Köse Biber, S. (2014). A content analysis on problem based learning approach. *Hasan Ali Yücel Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 11(22), 113-133.
- Bidokht, M. H., & Assareh, A. (2011). Life-long learners through problem-based and self directed learning. *Procedia Computer Science*, *3*, 1446-1453. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2011.01.028
- Borich, G. D. (2017). Effectice teaching methods: research based practice. Pearson.
- Christensen, L. B., Johnson, R. B., & Turner, L. A. (2015). Research methods, design, and analysis. Pearson.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). Research methods in education. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315456539
- Cooper, H., Hedges, L. V., & Valentine, J. C. (2019). The handbook of research synthesis and meta-analysis. Russell Sage Foundation. <u>https://doi.org/10.7758/9781610448864</u>
- Dağyar, M. (2014). Probleme dayalı öğrenmenin akademik başarıya etkisi: bir meta-analiz çalışması. [Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi]. Hacettepe Üniversitesi.
- Dewey, J. (1925). Experience and Nature. MacMillan.
- Dewey, J. (1938). Experience and Education. MacMillan.
- Duch, B. J., Groh, S. E., & Allen, D. E. (2001). The power of problem-based learning: a practical "how to" for teaching undergraduate courses in any discipline. Stylus.
- Eggen, P., & Kauchak, D. (2012). Strategies and models for teachers: teaching content and thinking skills. Pearson.
- Eggen, P. D., & Kauchak, D. P. (2016). Educational psychology: windows on classrooms. Pearson.
- Erdoğan, T. (2017). What does research tell us about trends in dissertations on PBL? Universal Journal of Educational Research, 5(6), 972-988. <u>https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2017.050610</u>
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). How to design and evaluate research in education. McGraw Hill.
- Gliner, J. A., Morgan, G. A., & Leech, N. L. (2017). Research methods in applied settings: an integrated approach to design and analysis. Routledge. <u>https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315723082</u>

- Gorghiu, G., Drăghicescu, L. M., Cristea, S., Petrescu, A., & Gorghiu, L. M. (2015). Problem-based learning-an efficient learning strategy in the science lessons context. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 191, 1865-1870. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.570
- Gough, D., Oliver, S., & Thomas, J. (2017). An introduction to systematic reviews. Sage.
- İpek, Z., Atik, A. D., & Erkoç, F. (2021). Ortaöğretim Biyoloji öğretmenlerinin Biyoloji öğretiminde karşılaştıkları güçlükler. *Turkish Journal of Educational Studies*, 8 (2), 241-290.
- Jensen, K. J. (2015). A meta-analysis of the effects of problem- and project-based learning on academic achievement in grades 6-12 Populations. [Unpublished Doctoral Dissartation]. Seattle Pacific University.
- Kim, G. (2019). A learning model for software coding education. *Journal of Problem Based Learning*, 6(2), 67-75. https://doi.org/10.24313/jpbl.2019.00164
- Krippendorff, K. (2019). Content analysis: an introduction to its methodology. Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781071878781
- Leary, H. M. (2012). *Self-directed learning in problem-based learning versus traditional lecture-based learning: a meta-analysis.* [Unpublished Doctoral Thesis]. Utah State University.
- Martin, W. E., & Bridgmon, K. D. (2012). Quantitative and statistical research methods: from hypothesis to results. Jossey-Bass.
- Mayring, P. (2022). Qualitative content analysis: a step-by-step guide. Sage. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-818630-5.11031-0
- McConnell, J. J., Parker, J., & Eberhardt, J. (2016). Problem based learning in the life science classroom. NSTA.
- MEB (2022). Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı. www.meb.gov.tr
- Moust, J. H. C., Bouhuijs, P. A. J., & Schmidt, H. G. (2019). *Introduction to problem based learning: a guide for students*. Pearson. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003021810
- Murphy, K. R., Myors, B., & Wolach, A. (2014). *Statistical power analysis: a simple and general model for traditional modern hypothesis tests*. Routledge. <u>https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315773155</u>
- Mutlu, A., & Aydoğmuş, M. (2019). Problem based learning studies: a content analysis. *Turkish Studies Educational Sciences*, 14(4), 1615-1630. <u>https://doi.org/10.29228/TurkishStudies.23012</u>
- Ormrod, J. E. (2016). Human learning. Pearson.
- ÖSYM (2022). Ölçme, Seçme ve Yerleştirme Merkezi. www.osym.gov.tr
- Özgül, B. (2021). Probleme dayalı öğrenme yaklaşımının etkililiği: bir meta-analiz çalışması. [Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Tezi]. Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi.
- Patten, M. L., & Newhart, M. (2018). Understanding research methods: an overview of the essentials. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315213033
- Pelech, J., & Pieper, G. (2010). The comprehensive handbook of constructivist teaching: from theory to practice. Information Age.
- Saraç, E., & Yıldırım, M. S. (2019). 2018 Fen bilimleri dersi öğretim programına yönelik öğretmen görüşleri. Academy Journal of Educational Sciences, 3(2), 138-151. <u>https://doi.org/10.31805/acjes.641002</u>
- Savin-Baden, M., & Howell-Major, C. (2004). Foundations of problem-based learning. McGraw-Hill.
- Schunk, D. H. (2012). Learning theories: an educational perspective. Pearson.
- Slavin, R. E. (2018). Educational psychology: theory and practice. Pearson.
- Temel, S., Şen, Ş., & Yılmaz, A. (2015). Fen eğitiminde probleme dayalı öğrenme ile ilgili yapılan çalışmalara ilişkin bir içerik analizi: Türkiye örneği. Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi, 23(2), 565-580.

- Tosun, C., & Yaşar, M. D. (2015). Türkiye'de Fen eğitiminde probleme dayalı öğrenme araştırmalarının betimsel içerik analizi. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 23(1), 293-310.
- Trochim, W. M., Donnelly, J. P., & Arora, K. (2016). Research methods: the essential knowledge base. Cengage.
- Uden, L., & Beaumont, C. (2006). Technology and problem based learning. Idea. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-59140-744-7
- Woolfolk, A. (2016). Educational psychology. Pearson.
- Yıldırım, F. S., & Say, S. (2020). Probleme dayalı öğrenme yaklaşımına ilişkin Fen eğitimi alanında yapılan bilimsel çalışmaların incelenmesi. Uluslararası Sosyal Bilgilerde Yeni Yaklaşımlar Dergisi, 4(1), 151-164. <u>https://doi.org/10.38015/sbyy.750758</u>
- YÖK UTM (2022). Yüksek Öğretim Kurulu Ulusal Tez Merkezi. www.tez.yok.gov.tr

Gokkan Scam 2000 ODTC PinD Mixed Penary sections 5 sections 3 and Alper Alungekie, 2010 Kattik PinD Ounstituitive bachelor's degree celonitions 6 seckis 3 and Calide nablas 2010 Antarn PinD Mixed bachelor's degree chemistry 5 seckis 3 as Calide nablas 2010 Delya PinD Quantifative secondary secines 9 wecks 23 Canan Diale Fran 2011 Antifative PinD Quantifative secondary secines 9 wecks 36 Canan Diale Fran 2011 Antifative PinD Quantifative secondary visual antif<9 9 wecks 36 Canan Diale Frant 2012 Dalidit PinD Mixed bachelor's degree chemistry 9 wecks 36 Evan Fordy 2012 Dalidit PinD Mixed bachelor's degree physics 1 wecks 36 Evan Fordy	Researcher	Year	University	Туре	Design	Level	Lesson	Duration	Participant
Alper Alunycký 2010 Gaz PhD Quantituré beschér's degres eclocation 0 wecks 20 Camal Tosan 2010 Aakara PhD Mixed backará degres English 9 wecks 22 Özlem Sahbaz 2010 D. Tylit PhD Quantitative secondary science 9 wecks 22 Canan Dilek Fren 2011 Marmara PhD Quantitative science 9 wecks 28 Canan Dilek Fren 2011 Marmara PhD Quantitative science 9 wecks 38 Elvan Ince Aka 2012 Gaz PhD Mixed bachelor's degres cleanisty 9 wecks 30 Franz Celk 2013 D. Tylit PhD Mixed bachelor's degres cleanisty 9 wecks 21 Gelde Todgar 2013 D. Eylit PhD Mixed bachelor's degres cleanisty 9 wecks 21 Gelde Todgaronghaz 2014 D.Fylit PhD Mix	Gökhan Serin	2009	ODTÜ	PhD	Mixed	Primary	science	5 weeks	34
Cenal Tosan2010AutorkPhDMixedbachelor's degreeChemistry 3 weeks36Gölden Alarn2010D. TylioPhDOhanriahivesecondaryscience9 weeks33Reya Rayak2011MarmanPhDQuantitativesecondaryscience9 weeks34Raya Rayak2011MarmanPhDQuantitativesecondaryvisual arts9 weeks34Rain Toger2011GariPhDQuantitativesecondaryvisual arts9 weeks38Chan Evak Okces2012GariPhDMixedbachelor's degreechemistry9 weeks34Evau Inex Ala2012GariPhDMixedbachelor's degreechemistry9 weeks36Forar Colka2012D. FyliolPhDMixedbachelor's degreeeducation15 weeks36Forar Colka2013D. FyliolPhDMixedbachelor's degreephysics12 weeks36Forar Colka2013D. FyliolPhDMixedbachelor's degreephysics17 weeks21Ashban Karul Taogbu2014D. FyliolPhDMixedbachelor's degreephysics17 weeks24Ashban Karul Taogbu2017GariPhDMixedsecondaryratitation6 weeks25Gölscha Eyseyur Tak2017GariPhDMixedsecondaryratitation6 weeks24Meed Colma <td>Alper Altunçekiç</td> <td>2010</td> <td>Gazi</td> <td>PhD</td> <td>Quantitative</td> <td>bachelor's degree</td> <td>education</td> <td>6 weeks</td> <td>30</td>	Alper Altunçekiç	2010	Gazi	PhD	Quantitative	bachelor's degree	education	6 weeks	30
Gilden Akan2010AkkarPhDMixedbachelor's degreeEnglish9 weeks22Oxlem Şahbaz2010D. EylilPhDQuantiativesecondaryscience9 weeks35Exya Bayrak2011MarmanPhDQuantiativesecondaryscience5 weeks28Canan Diplet Fren2011GaraPhDQuantiativebachelor's degreephysics11 weeks24Kari Üger2011GaraPhDMixedbachelor's degreechemistry9 weeks38Thvan Ibea Aka2012GaraPhDMixedbachelor's degreechemistry9 weeks30Tolga Erdögar2012D. EylillPhDMixedbachelor's degreechemistry9 weeks30Tolga Erdögar2013D. EylillPhDMixedbachelor's degreechemistry9 weeks12Ashbaa Karul Taoglu2014D. EylillPhDMixedbachelor's degreephysics12 weeks24Edit Orayin Oratin2013D. EylillPhDMixedbachelor's degreephysics12 weeks24Edit Orayin Oratin2017AattarkPhDMixedbachelor's degreephysics12 weeks24Edit Orayin Oratin2017AattarkPhDMixedbachelor's degreeveetas25Gilded Eycyurt Tuk2017GariPhDMixedbachelor's degreeveetas25Gilded Eycyurt Tuk	Cemal Tosun	2010	Atatürk	PhD	Mixed	bachelor's degree	chemistry	5 weeks	36
Orden solutor2010D. EylilPhDQuantitativescience9 weeks33Beyan Baymak2011MarmaraPhDQuantitativesecondaryscience5 weeks28Canna Dick Free2011MarmaraPhDQuantitativesecondaryvisual atts9 weeks34Kam Cilger2011GuazPhDQuantitativebachelor's degreechemistry9 weeks36Omer Faruk Özkesea2012GuazPhDMixedbachelor's degreechemistry9 weeks36Faran Faruk2012D. FyluPhDMixedbachelor's degreechemistry9 weeks36Faran Ceak2012D. FyluPhDMixedbachelor's degreechemistry8 weeks36Faran Ceak2014D. FyluPhDMixedbachelor's degreephysics7 weeks21Ashfara Karll Tasoffa2016D. FyluPhDMixedbachelor's degreephysics7 weeks24Heill Orayin Ockarn2016Gaz2PhDMixedbachelor's degreephysics7 weeks24Heill Orayin Ockarn2017GaziPhDMixedbachelor's degreephysics7 weeks24Veeta Cetin2017GaziPhDMixedbachelor's degreehohiogyn7 weeks24Vieel Cetin2017GaziPhDMixedbachelor's degreehohiogyn7 weeks24Steince2017	Gülden Akın	2010	Ankara	PhD	Mixed	bachelor's degree	English	9 weeks	22
Insyrable 2011 Marmara PhD Quantitative secondary siscence 5 weeks 28 Canna Dilek Eren 2011 Garia PhD Quantitative secondary visal atts 9 weeks 36 Gara PhD Quantitative secondary visal atts 9 weeks 38 Elvan Ince Aka 2012 Garia PhD Mixed bachelor's degree chemistry 9 weeks 38 Fson Frssop 2012 D.FyHU PhD Mixed bachelor's degree eduction 15 weeks 36 Pinar Collak 2013 D. FyHU PhD Mixed bachelor's degree eduction 12 weeks 21 Asthan Kartal Tasoju 2016 Garia PhD Mixed bachelor's degree viscational 8 weeks 115 Elif Galia 2017 Atutirk PhD Mixed bachelor's degree viscational 8 weeks 124 Galada Fyseymer Mk 2017 Garia PhD	Özlem Şahbaz	2010	D. Eylül	PhD	Quantitative	secondary	science	9 weeks	35
Canan Dijkk From 2011 Marmara PhD Quantitative hadebols's dagese physics 11 wacks 24 Kani Diger 2011 Gazi PhD Quantitative secondary visual arts 9 weeks 36 Omer Fauk Ökkers 2011 Aulitik PhD Mixed bachelor's dagree chemistry 9 weeks 38 Eine Encoy 2012 D. Eylül PhD Mixed bachelor's dagree chemistry 9 weeks 30 Tolga Enclogan 2012 D. Eylül PhD Mixed bachelor's dagree chemistry 7 weeks 21 Ashan Kartal Tasophu 2014 D. Fylül PhD Mixed associat degree physics 12 weeks 15 Elif Crajun Okara 2016 Gazi PhD Mixed associat degree chemistry 8 weeks 15 Elif Crajun Okara 2017 Autitrik PhD Mixed associat degree chemistry 8 weeks 15 Vaccl (crin	Beyza Bayrak	2011	Marmara	PhD	Quantitative	secondary	science	5 weeks	28
Kam Üger2011GaziPhDQuantitativesecondaryvisual arts9 weeks36Omer Faruk Özkssen2011AttatirkPhDMixedbachclor's degreechemistry9 weeks38Flvan Ince Aka2012GraiPhDMixedbachclor's degreechemistry9 weeks41Egne Ersoy2012D. EylulPhDMixedbachclor's degreechearation15 weeks36Tolga Erdogian2012M. EylulPhDMixedbachclor's degreephysics12 weeks21Ashban Kartal Taşoğlu2014D. EylulPhDMixedbachclor's degreephysics7 weeks24Retti Oraydın Orkara2016GaziPhDMixedbachclor's degreevocational8 weeks15Fiff Cilk2017AttrikPhDMixedbachclor's degreechemistry8 weeks24Veacl Cion2017CaziPhDMixedbachclor's degreechemistry8 weeks24Seda Akti Aslan2019IabiaPhDMixedbachclor's degreechemistry8 weeks24Seda Akti Aslan2019IabiaPhDMixedsecondarycompater science8 weeks37Faruk Anci2020AttrikPhDMixedsecondaryscience5 weeks31Uhan Kort2020AttrikPhDMixedsecondaryscience5 weeks321Faruk Anci <td< td=""><td>Canan Dilek Eren</td><td>2011</td><td>Marmara</td><td>PhD</td><td>Quantitative</td><td>bachelor's degree</td><td>physics</td><td>11 weeks</td><td>24</td></td<>	Canan Dilek Eren	2011	Marmara	PhD	Quantitative	bachelor's degree	physics	11 weeks	24
Ömer Fank Ödkesen2011AtatrikPhDMixedbachelor's degreechemistry5 vecks38Elvan Ince Aka2012GaziPhDMixedbachelor's degreechemistry9 vecks41Lene Insoy2012HacettepePhDMixedbachelor's degreeeducation15 wecks36Tolga Erdoğan2012HacettepePhDMixedbachelor's degreeeducation15 wecks26Ashhm Kutti Targoği2014D. EyfülPhDMixedbachelor's degreephysics7 vecks214Betili Özaydın Özkan2016GaziPhDMixedassociate degreevocational8 vecks27Gilkeda Fyceyur Tutk2017AtatrikPhDMixedbachelor's degreevocational8 vecks24Betil Özaydın Özkan2017AtatrikPhDMixedbachelor's degreecomputer science8 vecks24Seid Ath Aslan2017AtatrikPhDMixedbachelor's degreecomputer science8 vecks24Seid Ath Aslan2017AtatrikPhDMixedbachelor's degreecomputer science8 vecks24Seid Ath Aslan2019InéniaPhDMixedsecondarycoscince7 vecks37Seid Ath Aslan2019AtatrikPhDMixedsecondaryscience5 vecks31Farak Arcis2021AtatrikPhDMixedsecondaryscience10	Kani Ülger	2011	Gazi	PhD	Quantitative	secondary	visual arts	9 weeks	36
Elvan Ince Aka2012GuziPPDMixedbachelor's degreechemistry9 weeks41Esen Erway2012D. EylilPhDMixedbachelor's degreechemistry6 weeks30Tolga Erdoğan2013D. EylilPhDMixedbachelor's degreechemistry15 weeks21Ashhan Karla Tsaoğlu2014D. EylilPhDQuunitativebachelor's degreephysics7 weeks24Hettil Özaydın Özkara2016GaziPhDMixedssociate degreevocational8 weeks15Elf'Celik2017AtatirkPhDMixedbachelor's degreechemistry8 weeks44Merçen Kora2017GaziPhDMixedbachelor's degreechemistry8 weeks24Seda Akti Aslan2019IaönäPhDMixedbachelor's degreesecondary8 weeks25Uluhan Kurt2020O. MayaPhDMixedsecondarycomputer science8 weeks25Uluhan Kurt2020AtatirkPhDMixedsecondaryscience9 weeks21Häseyin Bayram2021AtatirkPhDMixedsecondaryscience9 weeks23Häseyin Bayram2020AtatirkPhDMixedsecondaryscience9 weeks24Asfer Karudag2010D. EylilMAMixedsecondaryscience9 weeks24Tilin Özsar2009 <td>Ömer Faruk Özkesen</td> <td>2011</td> <td>Atatürk</td> <td>PhD</td> <td>Mixed</td> <td>bachelor's degree</td> <td>chemistry</td> <td>5 weeks</td> <td>38</td>	Ömer Faruk Özkesen	2011	Atatürk	PhD	Mixed	bachelor's degree	chemistry	5 weeks	38
Issn Ensoy2012D. EylilPhDMixedbachelor's degreestatistics6 vecks30Tolga Ecdoğan2012HacettepePhDMixedbachelor's degreeeducation15 wecks36Pmar Çelik2013D. EylilPhDMixedbachelor's degreephysics12 wecks21Ashhan Kartal Taşoğlu2014D. EylilPhDMixedbachelor's degreephysics7 wecks24Hettil Graydin Özkara2016GaziPhDMixedbachelor's degreevocational8 wecks15Elif Çelik2017GaziPhDMixedbachelor's degreechemistry8 wecks24Meryen Kona2017GaziPhDMixedbigh schoolmaths6 wecks25Vacel Cetin2017GaziPhDMixedbigh schoolmaths4 wecks24Scak Akti Adata2019IoñonPhDMixedsecondaryscience5 wecks35Nuay Topal Germi2020O. MayisPhDMixedsecondaryscience5 wecks31Hussyin Bayram2021AtafatkPhDMixedsecondaryscience5 wecks23Hussyin Bayram2021AtafatkPhDMixedsecondaryscience5 wecks24Ashhan Kartal Taşoğlu2009D. EylilMAMixedsecondaryscience5 wecks24Ashhan Kartal Taşoğlu2009D. Eyl	Elvan İnce Aka	2012	Gazi	PhD	Mixed	bachelor's degree	chemistry	9 weeks	41
Tolga Erdogan2012HacettepePhDMixedbachelor's degreeeducation15 weeks36Pnar Çelik2013D. EylulPhDMixedbachelor's degreephysics12 weeks21Aslhan Kartal Tasoğlu014D. EylulPhDQuantitativebachelor's degreevocational8 weeks24Bettl Özgdin Özkara2016GaziPhDMixedsscondarymaths6 weeks27Gilscala Eyceyur Tark2017AtatirkPhDMixedsscondarymaths6 weeks59Yüsel Çetin2017GaziPhDMixedhachelor's degreechemistry8 weeks59Yüsel Çetin2017GaziPhDMixedhagh schoolmaths4 weeks24Seda Kat Aslan2019InöniPhDMixedsecondaryscience8 weeks35Naray Topal Germi2020O. MaysPhDMixedsecondaryscience9 weeks31Häkeyin Rayram2021AtatirkPhDMixedsecondaryscience9 weeks23Pant Akara2020O. MaysPhDMixedsecondaryscience9 weeks24Stank Aralin2021AtatirkPhDMixedsecondaryscience9 weeks23Pant Akaro2021AtatirkPhDMixedscondaryscience10 weeks24Jahhan Karti Tasoğlu2009EgeMAMix	Esen Ersoy	2012	D. Eylül	PhD	Mixed	bachelor's degree	statistics	6 weeks	30
Pnar Çelik2013D. EylülPhDMixedbachelor's degreephysics12 weeks21Aslhan Kartal Tsegliu2016GaziPhDQuantitativebachelor's degreephysics7 weeks24Betül Özaydın Özkarı2016GaziPhDMixedassociate degreevocational8 weeks15Gülscla Fyceyurt Türk2017GaziPhDMixedbachelor's degreechemistry8 weeks44Meryen Konu2017GaziPhDMixedbigh schoolbiology7 weeks59Yücel Çetin2017GaziPhDMixedbigh schoolmaths4 weeks24Seda Akt Aslan2019Inôn0PhDMixedsecondarycomputer science8 weeks35Naray Topal Germi2020O. MayisPhDMixedsecondaryscience9 weeks31Ilfasyin Bayram2021AtatirkPhDMixedsecondaryscience9 weeks31Ilfasyin Bayram2021AtatirkPhDMixedsecondaryscience10 weeks21Ashhan Kartal Taşağlu2009D. EylülMAMixedsecondarymaths6 weeks23Pinar Akın2009D. EylülMAMixedsecondarymaths6 weeks24Ayfer Karadas2010D. FylülMAMixedsecondaryscience10 weeks24Ayfer Karadas2010D. Eylül <td< td=""><td>Tolga Erdoğan</td><td>2012</td><td>Hacettepe</td><td>PhD</td><td>Mixed</td><td>bachelor's degree</td><td>education</td><td>15 weeks</td><td>36</td></td<>	Tolga Erdoğan	2012	Hacettepe	PhD	Mixed	bachelor's degree	education	15 weeks	36
Ashhan Kartal Taşoğlu2014D. EylülPhDQuantitativebachelor's degreeplaysics7 weeks24Betül Colik2017AnatluckPhDMixedassociate degreevocational8 weeks15Elif Colik2017AnatluckPhDMixedsecondarymaths6 weeks27Gilskeli Eyeyurt Tark2017AnatluckPhDMixedbachelor's degreechemistry8 weeks44Meryem Kouu2017AnatluckPhDMixedhigh schoolbiology7 weeks59Yücel Cyctin2017GaziPhDMixedhigh schoolmuths4 weeks24Seda Akt Aslan2019IndinPhDMixedsecondaryscience5 weeks35Uluhan Kurt2020O. MayisPhDMixedsecondaryscience5 weeks37Faruk Arrei2021AtatluckPhDMixedsecondaryscience5 weeks21Ashhan Kartal Taşoğlu2009D. EylülMAMixedbachelor's degreeplysics3 weeks23Pmar Akın2009D. EylülMAMixedsecondaryscience10 weeks24Ayfer Kanada2010D. EylülMAMixedsecondaryscience3 weeks23Pmar Akın2009EgeMAQuantitativesecondaryscience3 weeks24Ayfer Kanada2010D. EylülMAMixe	Pınar Çelik	2013	D. Eylül	PhD	Mixed	bachelor's degree	physics	12 weeks	21
Betall Orzydm Özkara 2016 Giazi PhD Mixed associate degree vocational 8 wecks 15 Eifr Çelik 2017 Atatürk PhD Mixed bacchol's degree chemistry 8 wecks 27 Gälseda Eyceyurt Turk 2017 Gazi PhD Mixed bachelor's degree chemistry 8 wecks 59 Yacel Çetin 2017 Gazi PhD Mixed high school maths 4 wecks 24 Seda Akti Aslan 2019 Ioñoù PhD Mixed secondary computer science 8 wecks 35 Nuray Topal Germi 2020 O. Mayıs PhD Quantituive secondary social science 9 wecks 37 Fank Anci 2021 Atatürk PhD Mixed secondary social science 10 wecks 21 Alahan Karat Tagoğlu 2009 D. Eylül MA Mixed secondary maths 6 wecks 24 Talin Özsar 2009 E	Aslıhan Kartal Taşoğlu	2014	D. Eylül	PhD	Quantitative	bachelor's degree	physics	7 weeks	24
Elif Çelik2017AtatürkPhDMixedsecondarymaths6 weeks27Gülsda Eyceyurt Türk2017GaziPhDMixedbachelor's degreechemistry8 weeks44Meryem Konu2017AtatürkPhDMixedhigh schoolbiology7 weeks59Yücel Çein2017GaziPhDMixedhigh schoolmaths4 weeks24Seda Aktı Aslan2019InönüPhDMixedsecondarycomputer science8 weeks35Nuray Topal Germi2020O. MayısPhDMixedsecondaryscience9 weeks37Faruk Arıcı2021AtatürkPhDMixedsecondaryscience9 weeks31Hüseyin Bayarn2021AtatürkPhDMixedsecondarysocial science10 weeks21Ashhan Karıta Taşoğlu2009D. EylölMAMixedbachelor's degreephysics3 weeks23Pmar Akın2009EgeMAMixedbachelor's degreephysics3 weeks24Ayfer Karnaday2010O. EylölMAMixedbachelor's degreebiochemistry3 weeks24Ayfer Karnaday2010GaziMAQuantitativesccondaryscience5 weeks35Mayara2010GaziMAQuantitativesccondaryscience5 weeks35Mardar Karnal2010GaziMAQuantit	Betül Özaydın Özkara	2016	Gazi	PhD	Mixed	associate degree	vocational	8 weeks	15
Gülseda Eyceyurt Türk 2017 Gazi PhD Mixed bachelor's degree chemistry 8 weeks 44 Meryem Konu 2017 Gazi PhD Mixed high school biology 7 weeks 59 Yücel Çetin 2017 Gazi PhD Mixed high school maths 4 weeks 24 Soda Akti Aslan 2019 Inôni PhD Mixed secondary computer science 8 weeks 35 Nuray Topal Germi 2020 O. Mayis PhD Mixed secondary science 5 weeks 37 Faruk Arnet 2020 Atutirk PhD Mixed secondary science 5 weeks 31 Hüseyin Bayram 2021 Atutirk PhD Mixed secondary social science 10 weeks 21 Ashtan Kartal Taşoğlu 2009 D. Eylül MA Mixed bachelor's degree physise 3 weeks 24 Ayfer Karadas 2009 Ege MA Quantitutive primary maths 10 weeks 24 Ayfer Karadas 2010 Gazi MA Quantitutive secondary science 5 weeks 25 Elf	Elif Çelik	2017	Atatürk	PhD	Mixed	secondary	maths	6 weeks	27
Meryem Konu2017AtatürkPhDMixedhigh schoolbiology7 wecks59Yücel Çetin2017GaziPhDMixedhigh schoolmaths4 wecks24Seda Akt Aslan2019IoñuPhDMixedsecondarycomputer science8 wecks35Nuray Topal Germi2020O. MayisPhDQuantitutivesecondaryscience9 wecks37Faruk Arien2021AtatürkPhDQuantitutivesecondaryscience9 wecks31Hüseyin Bayram2021AtatürkPhDMixedsecondarysocial science10 wecks21Ashhan Kartal Taşoğlu2009D. EylülMAMixedsecondarymaths10 wecks24Ayfer Karadaş2010D. EylülMAMixedsecondarymaths10 wecks24Ayfer Karadaş2010D. EylülMAMixedbachelor's degreebiochenistry3 weeks24Ayfer Karadaş2010D. EylülMAMixedbachelor's degreebiochenistry3 weeks24Ayfer Karadaş2010GaziMAQuantitutivesecondaryscience5 weeks35Elif Çelik2010GaziMAQuantitutivesecondaryscience5 weeks35Mesut Kuşemir2010GaziMAQuantitutivesecondaryscience8 weeks39Neset Vygun2010GaziMA	Gülseda Eyceyurt Türk	2017	Gazi	PhD	Mixed	bachelor's degree	chemistry	8 weeks	44
Yūcel Çetin2017GaziPhDMixedhigh schoolmaths4 weeks24Seda Aktı Aslan2019InönüPhDMixedsecondarycomputer science8 weeks35Nuray Topal Germi2020O. MayisPhDMixedsecondaryscience5 weeks25Uluhan Kurt2020AtatürkPhDQuanitativesecondaryscience9 weeks37Faruk Arci2021AtatürkPhDMixedsecondaryscience9 weeks31Hüseyin Bayram2021AnadoluPhDMixedsecondarysocial science10 weeks21Aslinn Kartal Taşoğlu2009EgeMAMixedbachelor's degreephysics3 weeks23Pmar Akin2009EgeMAMixedbachelor's degreebiochemistry3 weeks24Ayfer Karadaş2010D. EylülMAMixedbachelor's degreebiochemistry3 weeks24Ayfer Karadaş2010GaziMAQuanititivesecondaryscience5 weeks21Elif Çelik2010GaziMAQuanititivesecondaryscience3 weeks24Ayfer Karadaş2010GaziMAQuanititivesecondaryscience5 weeks35Mesu Kuşdemir2010GaziMAQuanititivesecondaryscience5 weeks35Mesu Kuşdemir2010GaziMAQuanitit	Meryem Konu	2017	Atatürk	PhD	Mixed	high school	biology	7 weeks	59
Seda Aku Aslan2019InönüPhDMixedsecondarycomputer science8 wecks35Nuray Topal Germi2020O. MayisPhDMixedsecondaryscience5 wecks25Uluhan Kurt2020AtatürkPhDQuanitiativesecondaryscience9 wecks37Faruk Arner2021AtatürkPhDMixedsecondaryscience10 wecks21Ashhan Kartal Taşoğlu2009D. EylülMAMixedsecondarymaths10 wecks22Pinar Akın2009D. EylülMAMixedsecondarymaths6 wecks24Tülin Özsarı2009EgeMAQuanitiativeprimarymaths10 wecks24Ayfer Karudaş2010D. EylülMAMixedbachelor's degreebiochemistry3 weeks27Elif Çelik2010GaziMAQuanitiativesecondaryscience3 weeks27Elif Çelik2010GaziMAQuanitiativesecondaryscience5 wecks35Mesut Kuşdemir2010GaziMAQuanitiativesecondaryscience8 weeks35Mesut Kuşdemir2010GaziMAQuanitiativesecondarymaths6 weeks30Cimit Çimen2010GaziMAQuanitiativesecondarymaths6 weeks30Masut Kuşdemir2010GaziMAQuanitiativesec	Yücel Çetin	2017	Gazi	PhD	Mixed	high school	maths	4 weeks	24
Nuray Topal Germi2020O. MayısPhDMixedsecondaryscience5 wecks25Uluhan Kurt2020AtatürkPhDQuantilativesecondaryscience9 weeks37Faruk Artei2021AtatürkPhDMixedsecondarysociance9 weeks31Hüseyin Bayram2021AtatürkPhDMixedsecondarysocial science10 weeks21Aslıhan Kartal Taşoğlu2009D. EylülMAMixedbachelor's degreephysics3 weeks23Phar Akın2009EgeMAMixedbachelor's degreephysics3 weeks24Ayfer Karadaş2010D. EylülMAMixedbachelor's degreebiochemistry3 weeks24Ayfer Karadaş2010D. EylülMAQuantilativesecondaryscience3 weeks27Elif Çelik2010GaziMAQuantilativesecondaryscience5 weeks21Kasut Kuşdemir2010GaziMAQuantilativesecondaryscience5 weeks35Mesut Kuşdemir2010MarmaraMAQuantilativesecondaryscience8 weeks39Neşe Uygun2010MarmaraMAQuantilativesecondaryscience3 weeks24Adem Ayvaci2010MarmaraMAQuantilativesecondaryscience8 weeks39Neşe Uygun2010Marmara <td< td=""><td>Seda Aktı Aslan</td><td>2019</td><td>İnönü</td><td>PhD</td><td>Mixed</td><td>secondary</td><td>computer science</td><td>8 weeks</td><td>35</td></td<>	Seda Aktı Aslan	2019	İnönü	PhD	Mixed	secondary	computer science	8 weeks	35
Uluhan Kurt2020AtatürkPhDQuantitativesecondaryscience9 weeks37Faruk Arıcı2021AtatürkPhDMixedsecondaryscience5 weeks31Hüseyin Bayram2021AnadoluPhDMixedsecondarysocial science10 weeks21Aslhan Kartal Taşoğlu2009D. EylülMAMixedbachelor's degreephysics3 weeks23Pınar Akın2009EgeMAMixedsecondarymaths6 weeks24Tülin Özsarı2009EgeMAQuantitativeprimarymaths10 weeks24Ayfer Karadaş2010D. EylülMAMixedbachelor's degreebiochemistry3 weeks24Ayfer Karadaş2010GaziMAQuantitativesecondaryscience3 weeks27Elif Çelik2010GaziMAQuantitativesecondaryscience5 weeks35Mesur Kuşdemir2010GaziMAMixedbachelor's degreeeducation8 weeks35Mesur Kuşdemir2010MarmaraMAQuantitativesecondaryscience8 weeks39Neşe Uygun2010GaziMAQuantitativesecondarymaths6 weeks30Ömit Çimen2010MarmaraMAQuantitativesecondarymaths3 weeks42Adem Ayvaci2010GaziMAQuantitative	Nuray Topal Germi	2020	O. Mayıs	PhD	Mixed	secondary	science	5 weeks	25
Faruk Arter2021AtatürkPhDMixedsecondaryscience5 weeks31Hüseyin Bayram2021AnadoluPhDMixedsecondarysocial science10 weeks21Aslhan Kartal Taşoğlu2009D. EylülMAMixedbachelor's degreephysics3 weeks23Pmar Akın2009EgeMAMixedsecondarymaths6 weeks24Tülin Özsarı2009EgeMAQuantitativeprimarymaths10 weeks24Ayfer Karadaş2010D. EylülMAMixedbachelor's degreebiochemistry3 weeks24Ayşegül Bayram2010SelçukMAQuantitativesecondaryscience3 weeks21Esra Benli2010GaziMAMixedbachelor's degreeeducation8 weeks35Mesut Kuşdemir2010GaziMAMixedhigh schoolchemistry9 weeks26Nazan Yıldız2010MarmaraMAQuantitativesecondaryscience8 weeks39Neşe Uygun2010GaziMAMixedsecondarycomputer sciences3 weeks29Adem Ayvaci2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarycomputer sciences3 weeks42Nireg Cigül Aryaç Çaği Kaypenz2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths4 weeks32Gülaur Cigue2011Kasta	Uluhan Kurt	2020	Atatürk	PhD	Quantitative	secondary	science	9 weeks	37
Hüseyin Bayram2021AnadoluPhDMixedsecondarysocial science10 weeks21Aslhan Kartal Taşoğlu2009D. EylülMAMixedbachelor's degreephysics3 weeks23Pmar Akın2009EgeMAMixedsecondarymaths6 wecks24Tülin Özsarı2009EgeMAQuantitativeprimarymaths10 weeks24Ayfer Karadaş2010D. EylülMAMixedbachelor's degreebiochemistry3 weeks24Aysegül Bayram2010SelçukMAQuantitativesecondaryscience3 weeks27Elif Çelik2010GaziMAQuantitativesecondaryscience5 weeks21Esra Benli2010GaziMAMixedbachelor's degreeeducation8 weeks35Mesut Kuşdemir2010GaziMAQuantitativesecondaryscience8 weeks39Neşe Uygun2010GaziMAQuantitativesecondarycomputer sciences3 weeks29Adem Ayvacı2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths3 weeks42Alime Şahin2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarycomputer sciences3 weeks42Alime Şahin2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths3 weeks42Alime Şahin2011Kastamonu	Faruk Arıcı	2021	Atatürk	PhD	Mixed	secondary	science	5 weeks	31
Ashthan Kartal Taşoğlu2009D. EylülMAMixedbachelor's degreephysics3 weeks23Pınar Akın2009EgeMAMixedsecondarymaths6 weeks24Tülin Özsarı2009EgeMAQuantitativeprimarymaths10 weeks24Ayfer Karadaş2010D. EylülMAMixedbachelor's degreebiochemistry3 weeks24Ayfer Karadaş2010D. EylülMAQuantitativesecondaryscience3 weeks27Elif Çelik2010GaziMAQuantitativesecondaryscience5 weeks21Esra Benli2010GaziMAMixedbachelor's degreeeducation8 weeks35Mesut Kuşdemir2010M. KemalMAMixedhigh schoolchemistry9 weeks26Nazan Yıldız2010MarmaraMAQuantitativesecondaryscience8 weeks30Dinit Çimen2010GaziMAMixedsecondarycomputer sciences3 weeks42Adem Ayvacı2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarycomputer sciences3 weeks42Alime Şahin2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths3 weeks42Alime Şahin2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths3 weeks42Alime Şahin2011KastamonuMA	Hüseyin Bayram	2021	Anadolu	PhD	Mixed	secondary	social science	10 weeks	21
Pinar Akın2009EgeMAMixedsecondarymaths6 weeks24Tülin Özsarı2009EgeMAQuantitativeprimarymaths10 weeks24Ayfer Karadaş2010D. EylülMAMixedbachelor's degreebiochemistry3 weeks24Ayfer Karadaş2010SelçukMAQuantitativesecondaryscience3 weeks24Ayşegül Bayram2010GaziMAQuantitativesecondaryscience3 weeks27Elf Çelik2010GaziMAQuantitativesecondaryscience5 weeks35Mesut Kuşdemir2010GaziMAMixedbachelor's degreeeducation8 weeks35Mesut Kuşdemir2010MarmaraMAQuantitativesecondaryscience8 weeks39Neşe Uygun2010GaziMAQuantitativesecondarymaths6 weeks30Ömit Çimen2010GaziMAQuantitativesecondarymaths4 weeks24Adem Ayvacı2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths3 weeks41Ayşe Çağıl Kayıpmaz2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths3 weeks42Alime Şahin2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths4 weeks32Gülnur Özdil2011KastamonuMAQuantitative	Aslıhan Kartal Taşoğlu	2009	D. Eylül	MA	Mixed	bachelor's degree	physics	3 weeks	23
Tülin Özsarı2009EgeMAQuantitativeprimarymaths10 weeks24Ayfer Karadaş2010D. EylülMAMixedbachelor's degreebiochemistry3 weeks24Ayşeğil Bayram2010SelçukMAQuantitativesecondaryscience3 weeks27Elif Çelik2010GaziMAQuantitativesecondaryscience5 weeks21Esra Benli2010GaziMAMixedbachelor's degreeeducation8 weeks35Mesut Kuşdemir2010M. KemalMAMixedhigh schoolchemistry9 weeks26Nazan Yıldız2010MarmaraMAQuantitativesecondaryscience8 weeks39Neşe Uygun2010GaziMAQuantitativesecondarycomputer sciences3 weeks29Adem Ayvacı2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths3 weeks42Alime Şahin2011AtatürkMAQuantitativesecondarymaths3 weeks32Gülnur Özdil2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths4 weeks32Gülnur Özdil2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths4 weeks24Adem Ayvacı2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths4 weeks32Gülnur Özdil2011KastamonuMA	Pınar Akın	2009	Ege	MA	Mixed	secondary	maths	6 weeks	24
Ayfer Karadaş2010D. EylülMAMixedbachelor's degreebiochemistry3 weeks24Ayşegül Bayram2010SelçukMAQuantitativesecondaryscience3 weeks27Elif Çelik2010GaziMAQuantitativesecondaryscience5 weeks21Esra Benli2010GaziMAMixedbachelor's degreeeducation8 weeks35Mesut Kuşdemir2010M. KemalMAMixedhigh schoolchemistry9 weeks26Nazan Yıldız2010MarmaraMAQuantitativesecondaryscience8 weeks39Neşe Uygun2010GaziMAQuantitativesecondarymaths6 weeks30Ömit Çimen2010YıldızMAMixedsecondarycomputer sciences3 weeks42Adem Ayvacı2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths3 weeks42Alime Şahin2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths4 weeks32Gülnur Özdil2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths4 weeks24Alime Şahin2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths4 weeks32Gülnur Özdil2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths4 weeks33Gülnur Özdil2011KastamonuMA <td< td=""><td>Tülin Özsarı</td><td>2009</td><td>Ege</td><td>MA</td><td>Quantitative</td><td>primary</td><td>maths</td><td>10 weeks</td><td>24</td></td<>	Tülin Özsarı	2009	Ege	MA	Quantitative	primary	maths	10 weeks	24
Ayşegül Bayram2010SelçukMAQuantitativesecondaryscience3 weeks27Elif Çelik2010GaziMAQuantitativesecondaryscience5 weeks21Esra Benli2010GaziMAMixedbachelor's degreeeducation8 weeks35Mesut Kuşdemir2010M. KemalMAMixedhigh schoolchemistry9 weeks26Nazan Yıldız2010MarmaraMAQuantitativesecondaryscience8 weeks39Neşe Uygun2010GaziMAQuantitativesecondarymaths6 weeks30Ömit Çimen2010GaziMAQuantitativesecondarycomputer sciences3 weeks29Adem Ayvacı2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths3 weeks42Alime Şahin2011AtatürkMAQuantitativesecondarymaths3 weeks32Gülnur Özdil2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths4 weeks24Mehtap Eski2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths4 weeks33Qüantiv Özdil2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths2 weeks33Gülnur Özdil2011KastamonuMAMixedprimarylife sciences6 weeks33Pinar Çetin2011D. EylülMAMixed<	Ayfer Karadaş	2010	D. Eylül	MA	Mixed	bachelor's degree	biochemistry	3 weeks	24
Elif Çelik2010GaziMAQuantitativesecondaryscience5 weeks21Esra Benli2010GaziMAMixedbachelor's degreeeducation8 weeks35Mesut Kuşdemir2010M. KemalMAMixedhigh schoolchemistry9 weeks26Nazan Yıldız2010MarmaraMAQuantitativesecondaryscience8 weeks39Neşe Uygun2010GaziMAQuantitativesecondarymaths6 weeks30Ümit Çimen2010YıldızMAMixedsecondarycomputer sciences3 weeks29Adem Ayvacı2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths3 weeks42Alime Şahin2011AtatürkMAQuantitativesecondaryTurkish4 weeks32Gülnur Özdil2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths3 weeks32Gülnur Özdil2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths4 weeks24Mehtap Eski2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths2 weeks33Ahmet Elbistanlı2012M. KemalMAMixedprimarylife sciences6 weeks33Ahmet Elbistanlı2012M. KemalMAMixedprimaryscial science5 weeks24Derya Şencan2013M. AkifMAMixed<	Ayşegül Bayram	2010	Selçuk	MA	Quantitative	secondary	science	3 weeks	27
Esra Benli2010GaziMAMixedbachelor's degreeeducation8 weeks35Mesut Kuşdemir2010M. KemalMAMixedhigh schoolchemistry9 weeks26Nazan Yıldız2010MarmaraMAQuantitativesecondaryscience8 weeks39Neşe Uygun2010GaziMAQuantitativesecondarymaths6 weeks30Ümit Çimen2010YıldızMAMixedsecondarycomputer sciences3 weeks29Adem Ayvacı2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths3 weeks42Alime Şahin2011KastamonuMAQuantitativebachelor's degreephysics8 weeks31Ayşe Çağıl Kayıpmaz2011KocatepeMAQuantitativesecondaryTurkish4 weeks32Gülnur Özdil2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths2 weeks20Pinar Çetin2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths2 weeks33Ahmet Elbistanlı2012M. KemalMAMixedprimarylife sciences6 weeks33Ahmet Elbistanlı2012M. KemalMAMixedprimaryscience5 weeks24Derya Şencan2013M. AkifMAMixedprimaryscience6 weeks33Erkan Özcan2013D. EylülMA <t< td=""><td>Elif Çelik</td><td>2010</td><td>Gazi</td><td>MA</td><td>Quantitative</td><td>secondary</td><td>science</td><td>5 weeks</td><td>21</td></t<>	Elif Çelik	2010	Gazi	MA	Quantitative	secondary	science	5 weeks	21
Mesut Kuşdemir2010M. KemalMAMixedhigh schoolchemistry9 weeks26Nazan Yıldız2010MarmaraMAQuantitativesecondaryscience8 weeks39Neşe Uygun2010GaziMAQuantitativesecondarymaths6 weeks30Ümit Çimen2010YıldızMAMixedsecondarycomputer sciences3 weeks29Adem Ayvacı2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths3 weeks42Alime Şahin2011AtatürkMAQuantitativesecondarymaths3 weeks41Ayşe Çağıl Kayıpmaz2011KocatepeMAQuantitativesecondaryTurkish4 weeks32Gülnur Özdil2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths2 weeks24Mehtap Eski2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths2 weeks20Pınar Çetin2011D. EylülMAMixedprimarylife sciences6 weeks33Ahmet Elbistanlı2012M. KemalMAMixedprimarysocial science5 weeks24Derya Şencan2013MarmaraMAQuantitativesecondaryscience6 weeks33Erkan Özcan2013D. EylülMAMixedprimaryscience6 weeks33Erkan Özcan2013D. EylülMAMixed<	Esra Benli	2010	Gazi	MA	Mixed	bachelor's degree	education	8 weeks	35
Nazan Yıldız2010MarmaraMAQuantitativesecondaryscience8 wecks39Neşe Uygun2010GaziMAQuantitativesecondarymaths6 wecks30Ümit Çimen2010YıldızMAMixedsecondarycomputer sciences3 wecks29Adem Ayvacı2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths3 wecks42Alime Şahin2011AtatürkMAQuantitativebachelor's degreephysics8 wecks41Ayşe Çağıl Kayıpmaz2011KocatepeMAQuantitativesecondaryTurkish4 wecks32Gülnur Özdil2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths4 wecks24Mehtap Eski2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths2 wecks20Pınar Çetin2011D. EylülMAMixedprimarylife sciences6 wecks33Ahmet Elbistanlı2012M. KemalMAMixedprimarysocial science5 wecks24Derya Şencan2013MarmaraMAQuantitativesecondaryscience6 wecks33Erkan Özcan2013D. EylülMAMixedprimaryscience6 wecks33Erkan Özcan2013UludağMAMixedsecondarysciences5 wecks20Coşkun Karaca2014AtatürkMAQua	Mesut Kuşdemir	2010	M. Kemal	MA	Mixed	high school	chemistry	9 weeks	26
Neşe Uygun2010GaziMAQuantitativesecondarymaths6 weeks30Ümit Çimen2010YıldızMAMixedsecondarycomputer sciences3 weeks29Adem Ayvacı2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths3 weeks42Alime Şahin2011AtatürkMAQuantitativebachelor's degreephysics8 weeks41Ayşe Çağıl Kayıpmaz2011KocatepeMAQuantitativesecondaryTurkish4 weeks32Gülnur Özdil2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths4 weeks24Mehtap Eski2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths2 weeks20Pinar Çetin2011D. EylülMAMixedprimarylife sciences6 weeks33Ahmet Elbistanlı2012M. KemalMAMixedprimaryscience5 weeks24Derya Şencan2013M. AkifMAMixedprimaryscience6 weeks33Erkan Özcan2013D. EylülMAMixedbachelor's degreebiology4 weeks47Niyazi Sezer2013UludağMAMixedsecondaryscience5 weeks20Coşkun Karaca2014AtatürkMAQuantitativesecondarysciences5 weeks20	Nazan Yıldız	2010	Marmara	MA	Quantitative	secondary	science	8 weeks	39
Ümit Çimen2010YıldızMAMixedsecondarycomputer sciences3 weeks29Adem Ayvacı2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths3 weeks42Alime Şahin2011AtatürkMAQuantitativebachelor's degreephysics8 weeks41Ayşe Çağıl Kayıpmaz2011KocatepeMAQuantitativesecondaryTurkish4 weeks32Gülnur Özdil2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths4 weeks24Mehtap Eski2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths2 weeks20Pınar Çetin2011D. EylülMAMixedprimarylife sciences6 weeks33Ahmet Elbistanlı2012M. KemalMAMixedprimarysocial science5 weeks24Derya Şencan2013M. AkifMAMixedprimarysocial science5 weeks33Erkan Özcan2013D. EylülMAMixedbachelor's degreebiology4 weeks47Niyazi Sezer2013UludağMAMixedsecondarymaths2 weeks20Coşkun Karaca2014AtatürkMAQuantitativesecondarysocial sciences5 weeks20	Neşe Uygun	2010	Gazi	MA	Quantitative	secondary	maths	6 weeks	30
Adem Ayvacı2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths3 weeks42Alime Şahin2011AtatürkMAQuantitativebachelor's degreephysics8 weeks41Ayşe Çağıl Kayıpmaz2011KocatepeMAQuantitativesecondaryTurkish4 weeks32Gülnur Özdil2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths4 weeks24Mehtap Eski2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths2 weeks20Pinar Çetin2011D. EylülMAMixedprimarylife sciences6 weeks33Ahmet Elbistanlı2012M. KemalMAMixedprimarysocial science5 weeks24Derya Şencan2013MarmaraMAQuantitativesecondaryscience6 weeks33Erkan Özcan2013D. EylülMAMixedbachelor's degreebiology4 weeks47Niyazi Sezer2013UludağMAMixedsecondarymaths2 weeks20Coşkun Karaca2014AtatürkMAQuantitativesecondarysocial sciences5 weeks20	Ümit Çimen	2010	Yıldız	MA	Mixed	secondary	computer sciences	3 weeks	29
Alime Şahin2011AtatürkMAQuantitativebachelor's degreephysics8 weeks41Ayşe Çağıl Kayıpmaz2011KocatepeMAQuantitativesecondaryTurkish4 weeks32Gülnur Özdil2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths4 weeks24Mehtap Eski2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths2 weeks20Pinar Çetin2011D. EylülMAMixedprimarylife sciences6 weeks33Ahmet Elbistanlı2012M. KemalMAMixedhigh schoolchemistry6 weeks30Ayşe Tuğba Tetik2013M. AkifMAMixedprimarysocial science5 weeks24Derya Şencan2013D. EylülMAMixedbachelor's degreebiology4 weeks47Niyazi Sezer2013UludağMAMixedsecondarymaths2 weeks20Coşkun Karaca2014AtatürkMAQuantitativesecondarysocial sciences5 weeks20	Adem Ayvacı	2011	Kastamonu	MA	Quantitative	secondary	maths	3 weeks	42
Ayşe Çağıl Kayıpmaz2011KocatepeMAQuantitativesecondaryTurkish4 weeks32Gülnur Özdil2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths4 weeks24Mehtap Eski2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths2 weeks20Pınar Çetin2011D. EylülMAMixedprimarylife sciences6 weeks33Ahmet Elbistanlı2012M. KemalMAMixedhigh schoolchemistry6 weeks30Ayşe Tuğba Tetik2013M. AkifMAMixedprimarysocial science5 weeks24Derya Şencan2013D. EylülMAMixedbachelor's degreebiology4 weeks47Niyazi Sezer2013UludağMAMixedsecondarymaths2 weeks20Coşkun Karaca2014AtatürkMAQuantitativesecondarysocial sciences5 weeks20	Alime Şahin	2011	Atatürk	MA	Quantitative	bachelor's degree	physics	8 weeks	41
Gülnur Özdil2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths4 weeks24Mehtap Eski2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths2 weeks20Pınar Çetin2011D. EylülMAMixedprimarylife sciences6 weeks33Ahmet Elbistanlı2012M. KemalMAMixedhigh schoolchemistry6 weeks30Ayşe Tuğba Tetik2013M. AkifMAMixedprimarysocial science5 weeks24Derya Şencan2013MarmaraMAQuantitativesecondaryscience6 weeks33Erkan Özcan2013D. EylülMAMixedbachelor's degreebiology4 weeks47Niyazi Sezer2013UludağMAMixedsecondarymaths2 weeks20Coşkun Karaca2014AtatürkMAQuantitativesecondarysocial sciences5 weeks29	Ayşe Çağıl Kayıpmaz	2011	Kocatepe	MA	Quantitative	secondary	Turkish	4 weeks	32
Mehtap Eski2011KastamonuMAQuantitativesecondarymaths2 weeks20Pinar Çetin2011D. EylülMAMixedprimarylife sciences6 weeks33Ahmet Elbistanlı2012M. KemalMAMixedhigh schoolchemistry6 weeks30Ayşe Tuğba Tetik2013M. AkifMAMixedprimarysocial science5 weeks24Derya Şencan2013MarmaraMAQuantitativesecondaryscience6 weeks33Erkan Özcan2013D. EylülMAMixedbachelor's degreebiology4 weeks47Niyazi Sezer2013UludağMAMixedsecondarymaths2 weeks20Coşkun Karaca2014AtatürkMAQuantitativesecondarysocial sciences5 weeks29	Gülnur Özdil	2011	Kastamonu	MA	Quantitative	secondary	maths	4 weeks	24
Pınar Çetin2011D. EylülMAMixedprimarylife sciences6 weeks33Ahmet Elbistanlı2012M. KemalMAMixedhigh schoolchemistry6 weeks30Ayşe Tuğba Tetik2013M. AkifMAMixedprimarysocial science5 weeks24Derya Şencan2013MarmaraMAQuantitativesecondaryscience6 weeks33Erkan Özcan2013D. EylülMAMixedbachelor's degreebiology4 weeks47Niyazi Sezer2013UludağMAMixedsecondarymaths2 weeks20Coşkun Karaca2014AtatürkMAQuantitativesecondarysocial sciences5 weeks29	Mehtap Eski	2011	Kastamonu	MA	Quantitative	secondary	maths	2 weeks	20
Ahmet Elbistanlı2012M. KemalMAMixedhigh schoolchemistry6 weeks30Ayşe Tuğba Tetik2013M. AkifMAMixedprimarysocial science5 weeks24Derya Şencan2013MarmaraMAQuantitativesecondaryscience6 weeks33Erkan Özcan2013D. EylülMAMixedbachelor's degreebiology4 weeks47Niyazi Sezer2013UludağMAMixedsecondarymaths2 weeks20Coşkun Karaca2014AtatürkMAQuantitativesecondarysocial sciences5 weeks29	Pınar Çetin	2011	D. Eylül	MA	Mixed	primary	life sciences	6 weeks	33
Ayşe Tuğba Tetik2013M. AkifMAMixedprimarysocial science5 weeks24Derya Şencan2013MarmaraMAQuantitativesecondaryscience6 weeks33Erkan Özcan2013D. EylülMAMixedbachelor's degreebiology4 weeks47Niyazi Sezer2013UludağMAMixedsecondarymaths2 weeks20Coşkun Karaca2014AtatürkMAQuantitativesecondarysocial sciences5 weeks29	Ahmet Elbistanlı	2012	M. Kemal	MA	Mixed	high school	chemistry	6 weeks	30
Derya Şencan2013MarmaraMAQuantitativesecondaryscience6 weeks33Erkan Özcan2013D. EylülMAMixedbachelor's degreebiology4 weeks47Niyazi Sezer2013UludağMAMixedsecondarymaths2 weeks20Coşkun Karaca2014AtatürkMAQuantitativesecondarysocial sciences5 weeks29	Ayşe Tuğba Tetik	2013	M. Akif	MA	Mixed	primary	social science	5 weeks	24
Erkan Özcan2013D. EylülMAMixedbachelor's degreebiology4 weeks47Niyazi Sezer2013UludağMAMixedsecondarymaths2 weeks20Coşkun Karaca2014AtatürkMAQuantitativesecondarysocial sciences5 weeks29	Derya Şencan	2013	Marmara	MA	Quantitative	secondary	science	6 weeks	33
Niyazi Sezer 2013 Uludağ MA Mixed secondary maths 2 weeks 20 Coşkun Karaca 2014 Atatürk MA Quantitative secondary social sciences 5 weeks 29	Erkan Özcan	2013	D. Eylül	MA	Mixed	bachelor's degree	biology	4 weeks	47
Coşkun Karaca 2014 Atatürk MA Quantitative secondary social sciences 5 weeks 29	Niyazi Sezer	2013	Uludağ	MA	Mixed	secondary	maths	2 weeks	20
	Coşkun Karaca	2014	Atatürk	MA	Quantitative	secondary	social sciences	5 weeks	29

Appendix A. Graduate studies selected for the data set

Gülcan Uyar	2014	Çukurova	MA	Mixed	secondary	maths	8 weeks	39
Meltem Kuvaç	2014	İstanbul	MA	Quantitative	bachelor's degree	environmental education	10 weeks	24
Ozan Emre Demirel	2014	M. Kemal	MA	Mixed	high school	chemistry	5 weeks	20
Caner Dursun	2015	Pamukkale	MA	Quantitative	secondary	science	6 weeks	22
Makbule Keleş	2015	N. Erbakan	MA	Quantitative	secondary	science	3 weeks	21
Salih Çakır	2015	Gazi	MA	Mixed	secondary	maths	5 weeks	26
Vildan Kurt	2015	Marmara	MA	Mixed	secondary	maths	4 weeks	32
Ahmet Bayır	2018	Atatürk	MA	Mixed	high school	vocational	5 weeks	8
Atakan Çoban	2018	D. Eylül	MA	Quantitative	bachelor's degree	physics	1 week	30
Rukiye Aras	2018	B. Yıldırım	MA	Mixed	secondary	social science	6 weeks	25
Zeynep Güzel	2018	N. Erbakan	MA	Quantitative	secondary	science	4 weeks	22
Aytül Damla Tekin	2019	Marmara	MA	Mixed	secondary	science	4 weeks	23
Büşra Tuğçe Karabaş	2019	S. Koçman	MA	Mixed	secondary	science	4 weeks	20
Gözde Menten	2019	Çukurova	MA	Mixed	high school	maths	9 weeks	31
Hatice Büşra Erim	2019	N. Erbakan	MA	Mixed	secondary	religion	6 weeks	24
Mehmet Emin Seyran	2019	S. Demirel	MA	Quantitative	secondary	science	4 weeks	24
Serdal Günay	2019	Uşak	MA	Mixed	secondary	social sciences	4 weeks	23
Şeyma Yıldız	2019	Sakarya	MA	Mixed	secondary	science	5 weeks	30
Yavuz Macun	2019	Erciyes	MA	Mixed	secondary	maths	5 weeks	47
Zeher Dilek Öztürk	2019	Pamukkale	MA	Mixed	secondary	science	9 weeks	30
Aybüke Kara	2020	Fırat	MA	Quantitative	secondary	maths	3 weeks	30
Gökçe Boncukçu	2020	Mersin	MA	Quantitative	secondary	science	3 weeks	61
Gülgün Bakırlı	2020	S. Koçman	MA	Mixed	secondary	science	5 weeks	22
Tuğba Saygılı Yıldırım	2020	O. Mart	MA	Quantitative	secondary	computer science	5 weeks	104
Burcu Çimen	2021	Ordu	MA	Mixed	secondary	science	2 weeks	15
Büşra Nur Nerse	2021	Kocaeli	MA	Quantitative	secondary	science	8 weeks	30
Ersin Özkan	2021	Atatürk	MA	Quantitative	high school	chemistry	6 weeks	33