



Investigation of the Relationship Between the Secondary School Teachers' Instructional Planning Proficiency and Curriculum Literacy Levels

Duygu Yıldız ¹

İsmail Kinay ²

Abstract

It is important that teachers know the curriculum and how to execute it for the curricula to have effective results. Therefore, teachers' curriculum literacy status and planning competency are required to be evaluated. This research aims to investigate the relationship between the secondary school teachers' perception of proficiency in instructional planning and curriculum literacy levels. Relational screening model was used in the research. "The Scale for Perception of Proficiency in Instructional Planning" by Gülbahar (2016) and "The Scale for Curriculum Literacy Level" by Kahramanoğlu (2019) were used in the research. The population consists of 5448 secondary school teachers working in central districts of Diyarbakır. The sample corresponds to 675 secondary school teachers determined by simple random sampling. The scales were applied face to face. Descriptive statistics, independent samples t-test, one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and Spearman's rank correlation coefficient were made use of in data analysis. The findings show that there is no significant difference in secondary school teachers' perceptions of instructional planning depending on faculty of graduation, school type, weekly hour of lessons, getting in-service training. While school type, weekly hour of lessons, getting in-service training are the variables leading to significant difference in curriculum literacy levels, the faculty of graduation variable does not have an effect on secondary school teachers' curriculum literacy levels. It was also found that there is a positive relationship between the secondary school teachers' perception of instructional planning proficiency and curriculum literacy on moderate level. It is suggested that teachers' knowledge and attitude about the application of the curriculum be evaluated. Accordingly, teachers can be provided with in- service training.

Key words: Competency, Curriculum, Curriculum Literacy, Instructional Planning, Lesson Plan

Yıldız, D., & Kinay, İ. (2025). Investigation of the Relationship Between the Secondary School Teachers' Instructional Planning Proficiency and Curriculum Literacy Levels. *Journal of the Human and Social Science Researches*, 14(2), 825-851. <https://doi.org/10.15869/itobiad.1528310>

Date of Submission	05.08.2024
Date of Acceptance	10.06.2025
Date of Publication	30.06.2025
*This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC license.	

¹ Ph.D. Student, Dicle University, Institute of Education Science, Diyarbakır, Türkiye, duyguyladz61@gmail.com, ORCID:0000-0002-3363-4312

² Assoc. Prof. Dr., Dicle University, Ziya Gökalp Faculty of Education, Education Science, Diyarbakır, Türkiye, ismailkinay84@gmail.com, ORCID:0000-0001-8963-8411



2025, 14 (2), 825-851 | Araştırma Makalesi

Ortaokul Öğretmenlerinin Öğretimi Planlama Yeterlik Algıları ve Program Okuryazarlık Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi

Duygu Yıldız ¹

İsmail Kinay ²

Öz

Öğretmenlerin öğretim programını tanımaları ve onu nasıl işe koşacaklarını bilmesi programların etkili sonuç verebilmesi için önemli bir etkidir. Bu yüzden öğretmenlerin program okuryazarlık durumunun ve öğretimi planlama yetkinliklerinin değerlendirilmesi gerekir. Bu araştırma ortaokul öğretmenlerinin öğretimi planlama yeterlik algıları ile program okuryazarlık düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Araştırmada ilişkisel tarama modeli kullanılmıştır. Bu araştırmada Gülbahar (2016)'ın "Öğretimi Planlama Yeterlik Algısı Ölçeği" ve Kahramanoğlu (2019)'nun "Öğretim Programı Okuryazarlığı Ölçeği" kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın evreni Diyarbakır merkez ilçelerindeki ortaokullarda görev yapan 5448 ortaokul öğretmeninden oluşmaktadır. Araştırmanın örnekleme basit seçkisiz örnekleme yoluyla belirlenen 675 ortaokul öğretmenine tekabül etmektedir. Ölçekler öğretmenlere yüz yüze uygulanmıştır. Veri analizinde betimsel istatistiklerin yanında bağımsız örneklem t-testi, tek yönlü varyans analizi (ANOVA) ve Spearman sıra korelasyon katsayısından faydalanılmıştır. Bulgular ortaokul öğretmenlerinin öğretimi planlama yeterlik algılarında fakülte, okul türü, haftalık ders saati, hizmet içi eğitim değişkenlerine göre farklılık olmadığını göstermektedir. Okul türü, haftalık ders saati, hizmet içi eğitim program okuryazarlık düzeyinde anlamlı farklılığa yol açan değişkenler iken mezun olunan fakülte değişkeninin ortaokul öğretmenlerinin program okuryazarlık düzeylerine etkisi yoktur. Ayrıca ortaokul öğretmenlerinin öğretimi planlama yeterlik algıları ile program okuryazarlık düzeylerinde orta düzeyde bir ilişki olduğu bulunmuştur. Öğretmenlerin kendi branşlarının öğretim programlarına yönelik bilgi ve tutumlarının değerlendirilmesi önerilmektedir. Buna göre öğretmenlere hizmet içi eğitim sağlanabilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Ders Planı, Öğretimi Planlama, Program, Program Okuryazarlığı, Yeterlik

Yıldız, D., & Kinay, İ. (2025). Ortaokul Öğretmenlerinin Öğretimi Planlama Yeterlik Algıları ve Program Okuryazarlık Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. İnsan Ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi, 14(2), 825-851. <https://doi.org/10.15869/itobiad.1528310>

Geliş Tarihi	05.08.2024
Kabul Tarihi	10.06.2025
Yayın Tarihi	30.06.2025
*Bu CC BY-NC lisansı altında açık erişimli bir makaledir.	

¹ Doktora Öğrencisi, Dicle Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Diyarbakır, Türkiye, uyguyladz61@gmail.com, ORCID:0000-0002-3363-4312

² Doç. Dr., Dicle Üniversitesi, Ziya Gökalp Eğitim Fakültesi, Diyarbakır, Türkiye, ismailkinay84@gmail.com, ORCID:0000-0001-8963-8411

Introduction

Education can be defined as “change and improvement in individuals’ behaviors” (Dirik, 2015: 2). All the stakeholders in educational contexts need to be evaluated for this change and improvement to come true. Teachers, learners, and curricula can be initially counted as the most important ones. The interaction among these three elements at the same time and setting indicates the educational process executed in schools. In this research, the intended concept is formal education carried out in a planned and organized way within the frame of predetermined objectives (Köse, 2020: 40). Education in this context requires a preparation step before the actual implementation.

Competence is generally related to high level of professional performance and there is a direct connection between the teachers’ professional competency and students’ performance in the field of education (Kulshrestha & Pandey, 2013: 29). Therefore, there are certain professional competencies teachers need to have in order to achieve the desired quality in education (Akkuzu, 2011: 2612). Teachers are one of the most important elements in determining the quality of education. Besides, Document of Teacher Strategy by MoNE (2017: 11) mentions the significance of highly qualified and well-trained teachers in order to have a successful education system. It can be thought that there is a highly effective link between teachers’ qualifications and the quality of education. For this reason, teachers’ competency is an important topic to be addressed.

Professional competency is described as continuous and reasonable use of communication, knowledge, technical skills, emotions, values and reflection of it to daily life for the benefit of individuals and society (Epstein & Hundert, 2016: 226). There is a need for a comprehensive and combining instructional competency concept considering all various aspects such as teacher features, knowledge, behavior, thinking, making decisions appropriately for situations, and concluding instructional activities (Roelofs & Sanders, 2007: 127). As an answer to this need, the concept of teacher competency is described as the required knowledge, skills and attitude of teachers in order to realize the teaching profession in an efficient and fruitful manner. General competencies for teaching are discussed under three categories: 1) professional knowledge, 2) professional skills, and 3) attitude and values. The sub-categories are as follows: 1) Professional knowledge: content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, knowledge of law and regulations; 2) Professional skills: planning education and instruction, designing instructional environment, management of learning and teaching process, assessment and evaluation; 3) Attitude and values: national, moral and universal values, approach towards students, communication and cooperation, personal and professional development (MoNE, 2017: 8).

Apart from the competencies addressed in the “General Competencies for Teaching Profession” document, it can be observed that instructional planning is mentioned along with other abilities in different definitions of the concept of “teacher.” To exemplify, teachers are described as people who realize education and instruction within the framework of a program in a planned manner by Köse (2020: 34). In addition, teachers are called “preparer of situations” (Ertürk, 2017: 110) in that they are the organizers of learning experiences. This indicates a point of view related to planning ability. Teachers decide on which parts of the curriculum in force to be implemented and emphasized, so they have a central position in this respect (Ornstein & Hunkins, 2016: 334). They have to

take on the initial role in planning, implementation, and evaluation steps of curriculum at a local level. Planning the activities effectively depends on the fact that objectives, learning experiences to reach those objectives, and assessments to evaluate the level of achievement are qualified (Erginer, 2004: 5).

Teacher is the element planning the instruction and evaluating it on the track of the curriculum whereas students are the reason why planned instruction is done (Gürkan, 2019: 643). Therefore, on what level teachers are curriculum literate and how proficient they are in instructional planning are important issues to be discussed. There exist studies determining teachers' curriculum literacy levels and examining their perceptions and self-efficacy beliefs (Aslan & Gürten, 2019; Saral, 2019; Kahraman, 2020; Keskin, 2020; Altuncu, 2021; Dağ, 2021; Demir & Toraman, 2021; Erdamar & Akpınar, 2021; Güler, 2021; Sarıca, 2021; Tutuş, 2021; Yılmaz, 2021; Aydın Sesli, 2023; Berberoğlu, 2023; Güleç, 2023; Öner, 2023; Taşdemircan, 2023; Türeyen, 2023; Durak, 2024; Duman, 2024; Turan Özpolat, 2024). Curriculum literacy has also been addressed related to other professional competencies in the literature (Demir, 2022; Berberoğlu, 2023; Dikmen, 2023; Göl, 2023; Güngör, 2023; Karaağaç, 2023; Kuloğlu, 2023; Öztürk, 2023; Sevim, 2023; Tanaş, 2023; Kılıçlı, 2024). In addition, there are some studies aimed at designing in-service training or professional development programs for teachers to improve their curriculum literacy and along with teaching competencies (Bilgin, 2023; Erdem, 2023; Baysal, 2024). On the other hand, instructional planning stands out as a sub-skill addressed in teachers and teacher candidates' self-efficacy, professional competency and autonomy studies (Coşkun, Gelen & Öztürk, 2009; Şan, 2013; Üstün & Tekin, 2016; Gülbahar, 2016; Gülbahar, 2017; Tokgöz Can, 2019; Pehlivan & Özdemir, 2020; Zöğ, 2022; Taşdemircan, 2023; Ulukulu, 2023; Kurtoğlu Yalçın, 2024). Additionally, there are studies in which planning is addressed along with other skills or competencies (Aydın, 2013; Hurioğlu, 2016; Yıldız, 2020). It is observed that relational studies have not been carried out in sufficient number. There is a study in which instructional planning has been determined as one of the predictive variables of curriculum literacy (Erkmen Bolat, 2024). Another study was carried out on teachers' awareness levels of curriculum literacy and instructional planning (Aygün, 2023). Researching the effectiveness of these two variables on each other can be seen significant in that this can point out which teacher qualifications are required to gain. Thus, which competency is prerequisite for the other can be detected and both individuals and institutions in charge can initially work on the acquisition and improvement of that skill. For this reason, the relationship between secondary school teachers' perception of proficiency in instructional planning and curriculum literacy was examined in this research.

The aim of this research is to investigate the relationship between secondary school teachers' perception of proficiency in instructional planning and curriculum literacy levels. In line with this aim, the following questions are intended to be answered:

1. What is the level of secondary school teachers' proficiency in instructional planning and curriculum literacy?
2. Is there a significant difference in secondary school teachers' perceptions of proficiency in instructional planning or curriculum literacy levels by
 - a. Graduation Faculty

- b. School type (private/governmental)
 - c. Weekly hour of lessons
 - d. Getting in – service training about the implementation of the curriculum?
3. What kind of relationship is there between the secondary school teachers' perception of proficiency in instructional planning and curriculum literacy?

The quality of the interaction between curriculum, teacher and learner is directly in line with whether education gives effective results. Teachers have a basic role in this cycle in that they are the implementor of the curriculum and have direct contact with learners. As teachers' strong self-efficacy beliefs are related to high level of student achievement and desired features for teachers, it would be appropriate to design experiences of learning to teach in a way to increase teachers' self-efficacy (Mulholland & Wallace, 2001: 243; Oh, 2011: 235). Teacher proficiency is stated to be effective on student attitude and emotional development; therefore, researching the efficacy beliefs among teachers draws attention (Oh, 2011: 235). As Gelmez Burakgazi (2019: 236) explains what is between the curriculum and the output is an unknown black box. This black box can correspond to the implementation. At this point, teachers do not apply content knowledge but build his/her own individual knowledge of implementation (Ben-Peretz, 2011: 5). It can be expected that the more competent teachers are in the curriculum, the better results they can get in planning. In this case, research on whether possessing these two competencies is a property which fosters each other may be beneficial for teacher training and development. By presenting this relationship, this research is expected to contribute to literature, the implementors of the curriculum; namely, teachers and authorities who support and organize decisions on teachers' professional skills and development.

Methodology

Research Design

The aim of the research is to investigate the relationship between secondary school teachers' perception of proficiency in instructional planning and curriculum literacy levels. Therefore, relational survey model was preferred in the research. The purpose in relational studies is to determine the existence or the degree of two or more variables' change together (Karasar, 2020: 114).

Population and Sample

The population of the study consists of 5448 secondary school teachers working in Diyarbakır central districts in 2021-2022 spring semester. The sample comprises 675 secondary school teachers determined by simple random sampling method. The required sample size for 5448 population was determined as 365 participants with % 95 level of accuracy and % 5 margin of error (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970: 608). Demographic variables were issued and descriptive statistics in relation to the teachers participated in the research are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. *Descriptive Statistics in Relation to The Participant Teachers*

Variables		f	%
Gender	Female	329	48.7
	Male	346	51.3
Age	34 and below	238	35.3
	35-40	220	32.6
	41 and over	217	32.1
Faculty of graduation	Education	559	82.8
	Others	116	17.2
School type	State	598	88.6
	Private	77	11.4
Weekly hour of lessons	15 hours below	29	4.3
	15-20 hours	166	24.6
	21-25 hours	274	40.6
	25 hours and over	206	30.5
In-service training	Yes	412	61.0
	No	263	39.0

Data Collection Instruments

Curriculum literacy scale (CLS)

The Curriculum Literacy Scale was developed by Kahramanoğlu (2019). This 5-point likert type scale consists of 23 items and 3 factors. The factors are 1) the foundations of curriculum, 2) the elements of the curriculum and 3) structural qualities of the curriculum. The first factor includes items from 1 to 7, the second factor from 8 to 15 and the third factor from 16 to 23. There is no reverse item in the scale. In the final form of the scale, Cronbach Alpha coefficient was calculated as 0.92 (Kahramanoğlu, 2019: 833).

Analysis was made based on the total points from the scale in this research. Stratified Cronbach Alpha coefficient was calculated for the accuracy of the scale and stated as 0.97. This calculation indicates that the accuracy of the results obtained from this scale is high (Salvucci, Walter, Convery, Fink & Saba, 1997: 115).

The scale for perception of proficiency instruction planning (SPPIP)

The Scale for Perception of Proficiency in Instruction Planning (SPPIP) was developed by Gülbahar (2016). This 5-point likert type scale with 1 factor consists of 24 items. There is no reverse item in the scale. The internal consistency Cronbach Alpha coefficient of the scale was calculated as 0.97 (Gülbahar, 2016: 699). In this research, Cronbach Alpha coefficient was calculated as 0.964. This calculation indicates that the results obtained from this scale is high (Salvucci et al., 1997: 15).

Data Collection Process

First of all, permission was gotten from the developers of the scales to be used in the research. The necessary ethical approval was obtained from Social and Human Sciences Ethics Committee of Dicle University on 24. 03. 2022. The approval for the

implementation of the scales from Diyarbakır Provincial Directorate of National Education was obtained through the Rectorate of Dicle University on 05. 04. 2022. The data were gathered by handing out the scales to the teachers face-to-face between 8th of April and 10th of June.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics (minimum, maximum, mean, and standard deviation values) in relation to the participants' perception of proficiency in instructional planning and curriculum literacy levels were evaluated. Afterwards, the differences among the mean values of the groups were statistically tested. On the condition that there were two independent samples, t-test was applied whereas one way ANOVA was intended to be used when there happened to be more than two variables.

For the independent samples t- test and ANOVA to be used, normal distribution and homogeneity of the variables should be addressed (Gravetter, Walnau, 2013: 337, 421). When the sample size is small, Shapiro-Wilk or Kolmogrov-Smirnov tests are used. However, it is stated that distributional statistics deliver better results when the sample size is moderate and graphical evaluations when it is big (Çelikten Demirel & Gündüz, 2022). In this respect, kurtosis and skewness coefficients were evaluated, and normal distribution was seen in the points of curriculum literacy scale while the points of perception of proficiency in instructional planning scale were away from normal distribution on mild and moderate level. Skewness and kurtosis values in relation to planning competency and curriculum literacy variables are presented in table 2 and 3.

Table 2. *Skewness and Kurtosis Values in Relation to Planning Competency*

Variables		Skewness	Std. Error	Kurtosis	Std. Error
Faculty of graduation	Education	-1.409	.103	2.983	.206
	Others	-1.195	.225	3.617	.446
School type	State	-1.244	.100	3.118	.200
	Private	-1.819	.274	3.376	.541
Weekly hour of lessons	15 hours below	-1.853	.434	3.969	.845
	15-20 hours	-.879	.188	3.211	.375
	21-25 hours	-1.240	.147	2.614	.293
	25 hours and over	-1.788	.169	3.962	.337
In-service training	Yes	-1.660	.120	3.860	.240
	No	-.836	.150	2.402	.299

Table 3. *Skewness and Kurtosis Values in Relation to Curriculum Literacy Variable*

Variables		Skewness	Std. Error	Kurtosis	Std. Error
Faculty of graduation	Education	.214	.103	-.218	.206
	Others	.450	.225	.450	.225
School type	State	.279	.100	-.224	.200
	Private	.123	.274	-1.064	.541
Weekly hour of lessons	15 hours below	.162	.434	.353	.845
	15-20 hours	.249	.188	.312	.375
	21-25 hours	.320	.147	-.162	.293
	25 hours and over	.182	.169	-1.113	.337
In-service training	Yes	.184	.120	-.318	.240
	No	.408	.150	-.221	.299

However, the fact that there is a difference in kurtosis or skewness coefficients of the related variable does not indicate that the variable deviates from normality. Thus, it does not have much effect on the results of the analysis (Tabahnick & Fidell, 2013: 86). It is addressed that this effect starts to disappear especially on the condition that the sample size is bigger than 100 (Waternaux, 1976). Apart from that, Kirk (2008: 411) states that t-test and ANOVA tests can be considered as quite powerful techniques even when there is deviation from normality. Therefore, it has been concluded that using ANOVA and t-test in this research does not pose an important threat in terms of normality distribution.

Homogeneity of variances is another hypothesis to be issued for the use of t-test and analysis of variances. To test it, Levene test was used, and the results are presented in table 4.

Table 4: *Results of Levene Test*

	Competency		Literacy	
	F statistic	p-value	F statistic	p-value
Faculty	.479	.489	2.597	.108
School Type	2.180	.140	.570	.451
Lesson Load	0.110	0.954	2.579	0.053
In-service Training	0.071	0.790	0.628	0.428

*p<.05

Effect size values are presented by calculating the eta squared (η^2) and partial eta squared (partial η^2) values for the significant differences observed in the research. While interpreting the effect size values, 0,01, 0,06 and 0,14 are respectively expressed as minor, medium, and large effect (Cohen, 1988: 286). In addition, Scheffe test, one of the multiple comparison tests, was used when there was seen significant differences in the results of ANOVA test in order to determine the source of the variance. Thus, among which groups there is a difference, and which group is in favor have been interpreted.

In this research, the relationship between the points obtained from the perception of proficiency in instructional planning and curriculum literacy scale has been investigated. With this aim, Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient was used. While interpreting the coefficient value, 0.00 – 0.30, 0.31-0.70 and 0.71-1.00 were respectively considered as low, moderate, and high level of relationship (Büyüköztürk, 2013: 32).

Findings

Findings in Relation to the Secondary School Teachers' Perception of Proficiency in Instructional Planning and Curriculum Literacy Level

Table 5. *Secondary Teachers' Level of Proficiency in Instructional Planning and Curriculum Literacy*

	N	Min	Mak	\bar{X}	ss	Rating/ level
Instructional Planning	675	1.00	5.00	3.95	0.72	Efficient
Curriculum Literacy	675	1.04	5.00	3.59	0.66	Quite efficient

When table 5 is examined, it is seen that the minimum score regarding secondary school teachers' perception of proficiency is 1.00 and maximum score is 5.00. Mean score regarding the related points is 3.95 and standard deviation is 0.72. It is seen that mean score obtained from the scale corresponds to "efficient" level.

When the points regarding secondary school teachers' curriculum literacy scores are examined, it is seen that the minimum score is 1.04 and the maximum score is 5.00. Mean score regarding the curriculum literacy is 3.59 and standard deviation is 0.66. It is seen that mean score obtained from the scale corresponds to "quite efficient" level.

Findings in Relation to the Secondary School Teachers' Perception of Proficiency in Instructional Planning and Curriculum Literacy Level by Various Variables

Findings in relation to faculty of graduation

Table 6. *Secondary School Teachers' Perception of Proficiency in Instructional Planning by Faculty of Graduation*

Source of Variance	N	\bar{X}	ss	t	sd	p
Education	559	3.94	.71	-.697	673	.486
Other	116	3.99	.80			

*p<.05

When table 6 is examined, it is observed that mean score of the teachers graduated from other faculties (\bar{X} = 3.94, SS = 0.71) regarding the perception of proficiency in instructional planning is higher than the ones graduated from educational faculties (\bar{X} = 3.99, SS = 0.80). In order to test whether the difference is significant, independent samples t-test was conducted. According to the results of the analysis, it has been concluded that the difference between the mean scores of the teachers graduated from other faculties and the ones graduated from educational faculties is not significant, $t(673) = -0.697$, $p > .05$.

Table 7. *Secondary School Teachers’ Curriculum Literacy Levels by Faculty of Education*

Source of Variance	N	\bar{X}	ss	t	sd	p
Education	559	3.57	.65	-1.542	673	.124
Other	116	3.67	.69			

*p<.05

When table 7 is examined, it is observed that mean score of the teachers’ graduated from other faculties (\bar{X} = 3.57, SS = 0.65) regarding curriculum literacy level is higher than the ones graduated from educational faculties (\bar{X} = 3.67, SS = 0.69). In order to test whether the difference is significant, independent samples t-test was conducted. According to the results of the analysis, the difference between the mean scores of the teachers graduated from other faculties and the ones graduated from educational faculties is not significant, t(673) = -1.542, p> .05.

Findings in relation to school type

Table 8. *Secondary School Teachers’ Perception of Proficiency in Instructional Planning by School Type*

Source of Variance	N	\bar{X}	ss	t	sd	p
State	598	3.94	.70	-1.064	673	.288
Private	77	4.03	.89			

*p<.05

When table 8 is examined, it is observed that mean score of the state- school teachers’ perception of proficiency in instructional planning (\bar{X} = 3.94, SS = 0.70) is lower than the mean scores (\bar{X} = 4.03, SS = 0.89) of the teachers working at private schools. In order to determine whether this difference is significant, independent samples t-test was conducted. According to the results of the analysis, it has been concluded that the difference between the mean scores of the teachers working at state schools and private schools is not statistically significant, t(673) = -1.064, p > .05.

Table 9. *Secondary School Teachers’ Curriculum Literacy Levels by School Type*

Source of Variance	N	\bar{X}	ss	t	sd	p	η^2
State	598	3.56	.65	-3.050	673	.002**	0,014
Private	77	3.80	.67				

*p<.05; **p<.01

When table 9 is examined, it is observed that mean score of the state- school teachers’ curriculum literacy (\bar{X} = 3.56, SS = 0.65) is lower than the ones working at private school (\bar{X} = 3.80, SS = 0.67). In order to determine whether the difference is significant,

independent samples t- test was used. According to the results, it has been concluded that the difference between the mean scores of the teachers working at state schools and private schools is statistically significant and the effect size is minor, $t(673) = -3.050$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = 0.014$. That is to say, it can be stated that curriculum literacy level of the teachers at private schools is higher than curriculum literacy level of the teachers at state schools.

Findings in relation to weekly hours of lessons

Table 10. *Secondary School Teachers' Perception of Proficiency in Instructional Planning by Weekly Hours of Lesson*

Weekly Hours of Lesson	N	\bar{X}	ss	Minimum	Maximum
Fewer than 15	29	3.86	.85	1.21	5.00
15-20	166	3.96	.72	1.00	5.00
21-25	274	3.91	.69	1.00	5.00
Over 25	206	4.02	.76	1.13	5.00

When table 10 is examined, it is seen that secondary school teachers' perception of proficiency in instructional planning differs based on weekly hours of lesson on descriptive level. In order to test whether the difference is statistically significant, one-way analysis of variances (ANOVA) test was used and the results are presented in table 9.

Table 11. *Secondary School Teachers' Perception of Proficiency in Instructional Planning by Weekly Hours of Lesson*

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	sd	Mean of Squares	F	p
Between Groups	1.792	3	.597	1.138	.333
Within groups	352.102	671	.525		
Total	353.894	674			

* $p < .05$

ANOVA results in table 11 show that the difference among the scores of perception of proficiency in instructional planning in terms of weekly hours of lesson is not statistically significant $F(3, 671) = 1.138$, $p > .05$. That is to say, the score of perception of proficiency in instructional do not change depending on weekly hours of lesson.

Table 12. *Secondary School Teachers' Curriculum Literacy Levels by Weekly Hours of Lesson*

Weekly Hours of Lesson	N	\bar{X}	ss	Minimum	Maximum
Fewer than 15	29	3.51	.63	2.00	4.78
15-20	166	3.53	.69	1.04	5.00
21-25	274	3.53	.62	2.00	5.00
Over 25	206	3.72	.68	2.39	5.00
Total	675	3.59	.66	1.04	5.00

When table 12 is examined, it is seen that mean scores of curriculum literacy level of teachers differ based on weekly hours of lessons on descriptive level. In order to test whether the difference is statistically significant one-way analysis of variances (ANOVA) test was used and the results are presented in table 11.

Table 13. *Secondary School Teachers’ Curriculum Literacy Levels by Weekly Hours of Lesson*

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	sd	Mean of Squares	F	p	η_p^2	Multiple Comparison
Between groups	5.010	3	1.670	3.887	.009**	0,017	(Over 25 > 21-25)
Within groups	288.273	671	.430				
Total	293.283	674					

*p<.05; **p<.01

ANOVA results in table 13 show that there is a statistically significant difference among the curriculum literacy scores in terms of weekly hours of lesson, $F(3, 671) = 3.887, p < .01$. That is to say, teachers’ curriculum literacy scores significantly differ based on weekly hours of lessons. According to the multiple comparison test results conducted in order to find out which groups the difference in occurs, the curriculum literacy level of the teachers responsible for more than 25 hours ($\bar{X} = 3.72$) is significantly higher than the teachers responsible for 21-25 hours of lesson ($\bar{X} = 3.53$).

Findings in relation to in-service training

Table 14. *Secondary School Teachers’ Perception of Proficiency in Instructional Planning by Getting In-service Training*

Source of Variance	N	\bar{X}	ss	t	sd	p
Yes	412	3.99	.74	1.735	673	.083
No	263	3.89	.70			

*p<.05

When table 14 is examined, it is observed that mean scores regarding the perception of proficiency in instructional planning of secondary school teachers who got in-service training ($\bar{X} = 3.99, SS = 0.74$) is higher than the mean scores of the ones who did not get in-service training ($\bar{X} = 3.89, SS = 0.70$). Independent samples t-test was used in order to determine whether the difference is significant. According to the analysis results, it has been concluded that the difference between the mean scores regarding the perception of proficiency in instructional planning of the teachers who got in-service training and the ones who did not get in-service training is not statistically significant, $t(673) = 1.735, p > .05$.

Table 15. *Secondary School Teachers' Curriculum Literacy Level by Getting In-service Training*

Source of Variance	N	\bar{X}	ss	t	sd	p	η^2
Yes	412	3.68	.66	4.488	673	.000**	0,029
No	263	3.45	.64				

*p<.05; **p<.01

When table 15 is examined, it is observed that mean scores regarding curriculum literacy level of the teachers who got in-service training (\bar{X} = 3.68, SS = 0.66) is higher than the mean scores regarding curriculum literacy level of the teachers who did not have in-service training (\bar{X} = 3.45, SS = 0.64). Independent samples t-test was used in order to test whether the difference is significant with minor effect size, $t(673) = 4.488$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = 0,029$. The difference between the mean scores indicates that the curriculum literacy level of the teachers who got in-service training is significantly higher than the curriculum literacy level of the teachers who did not get in-service training with minor effect size.

Findings in Relation to the Relationship Between Secondary School Teachers' Perception of Proficiency in Instructional Planning and Curriculum Literacy Levels

Table 16. *The Relationship Between Perception of Proficiency in Instructional Planning and Curriculum Literacy*

	SPPIP	CLS
SPPIP	1	0.504**
CLS	0.504**	1

*p<.05; **p<.01

When table 16 is examined, it is seen that the relationship between the scores obtained from the scale of perception of proficiency in instructional planning and the scores obtained from the curriculum literacy scale is 0,504 and this value is statistically significant ($p<.01$). It can be interpreted as moderate relationship since this correlation coefficient value is between 0,30-0,70 (Büyüköztürk, 2013: 32). In general, it is concluded that there is a moderate, positive and significant relationship between perception of proficiency in instructional planning and curriculum literacy.

Discussion

The findings of the first research question show that secondary school teachers' perception of proficiency in instructional planning corresponds to "efficient" level. In this case, it can be interpreted that teachers perceive themselves to be successful in instructional planning process. It can be deduced that teachers mostly perceive themselves to be efficient in instructional planning in the studies in which teachers and teacher candidates evaluate themselves in terms of instructional planning (Şan, 2013; Özmen, 2016: 16; Yıldız, 2020: 437). It can be understood that teachers and teacher candidates perceive themselves to be highly efficient in some studies (Coşkun, Özer &

Tiryaki, 2010: 123; Yavuz, Konokman & Yanpar Yelken, 2013: 175; Gülbahar, 2017: 322; Tokgöz Can, 2019: 55; Mallillin & Mallillin, 2019: 16; Zöğ, 2022: 91; Tanaş, 2023: 54; Girgin, 2023; Türeyen, 2023: 63; Ulukulu, 2023: 77; Kurtoğlu Yalçın, 2024: 68). Bingöl Meşe (2010: 138) presented that Information and Communication Technology teachers (ICT) often exhibit the performances which instructional planning and implementation competency requires. Karaca (2019) showed that teacher candidates perceive themselves to be completely ready in instructional planning and creating a teaching environment. The findings of this research show that teachers perceive themselves to be efficient in instructional planning is supported by the results of other studies in literature. However, there exist studies with different results. Teachers were evaluated by school administrators and considered “not much competent” in terms of instructional plans in the research by Akpınar and Özer (2008: 141). Coşkun, Gelen and Öztürk (2009: 151) concluded that teacher candidates are not sufficient enough in instructional planning. On the other hand, the fact that teachers had self-evaluation may have led the perception of proficiency level to be quite positive in this research. In overseas research, it is observed that the results are not at high levels unlike the ones in our country. Copriady (2014) states that teachers perform instructional planning at average level whereas Maba and Mantra (2018) express primary school teachers lack competency of implementing the curriculum. Besides, teachers expressed their frequency of designing instruction is “sometimes” and this is not a habit in Almerich, Orellana, Suarez-Rodríguez, and Diaz-Garcia (2016: 118)’s study. Another study has concluded that teacher candidates were aware of the importance of instructional planning, but they faced some problems while they were preparing plans (Alanazi, 2019). The fact that teachers affiliate one of the models developed with successful teaching, but they still do not use it stands out in the findings of Brown and Wendel (2019: 68)’s study. In this case, it can be commented that teachers do not perform planning effectively enough although they do not ignore the importance of the role of planning competency. These findings in overseas studies differ from the ones in this research. This situation may root in the reflection of differences in teacher training and educational systems implemented in different countries.

The findings of the first research question show that secondary school teachers’ curriculum literacy is at “quite efficient” level. In this case, it can be said that secondary school teachers perceive themselves to be curriculum literate at a high level. There exist several studies in line with this finding in the literature (Aslan, 2018: 55; Aslan & Gürlen, 2019: 177; Erdamar, 2020: 90; Keskin, 2020: 103; Kahraman, 2020: 48; Altuncu, 2021: 63; Atlı, Kara & Mirzeoğlu, 2021: 286; Dağ, 2021: 64; Demir & Toraman, 2021: 1522; Güler, 2021: 42, 43; Güneş Şinego & Çakmak, 2021: 244; Tutuş, 2021: 65; Yılmaz, 2021: 55; Demir, 2022: 54; Berberoğlu, 2023: 56; Sarıca, 2021: 139; Aydın Sesli, 2023: 69; Aygün, 2023: 49; Göl, 2023: 52; Güngör, 2023: 53, 54; Karaağaç, 2023: 94; Kuloğlu, 2023: 154; Taşdemircan, 2023: 88; Kılıçlı, 2024: 60; Kurtoğlu Yalçın, 2024: 67). A qualitative study by Gündoğan (2019) supports this research’s finding by expressing that 66,4 % of teachers’ knowledge regarding curriculum literacy is on a sufficient level. Gülpek (2020: 52) states that both physical education teachers’ and the prospective teachers’ curriculum literacy levels are high. In addition, Başar and Berilgen (2021: 352) indicated that school administrators’ curriculum literacy is on above average level. On the one hand, a study conducted by Aslan (2019) states that school administrators’ curriculum literacy is on a moderate level. There are studies in which teachers and teacher candidates are also concluded to be curriculum literate on moderate level (Kahramanoğlu, 2019: 836, 837; Saral, 2019: 58;

Yıldız, 2020: 5185; Kızılaslan Tunçer & Şahin, 2019: 253; Erdamar & Akpınar, 2021: 1868). It is revealed that teachers consider themselves efficient at least on a moderate level in each of the studies mentioned. Considering moderate level and above as positive results, the finding of this research that secondary school teachers are curriculum literate at above average level is supported by other studies in literature. Teachers' self-evaluation in the research may have affected the results in a positive direction in that there is a modest relationship between individuals' views about themselves and their real performances and they may have too optimistic predictions (Dunning, Heath, Suls, 2004: 69). However, it must be noticed that there is a research result that teachers perceive themselves "inefficient" regarding curriculum literacy in Durak's (2024: 46) study.

The findings regarding the faculty of graduation variable show that secondary school teachers' perception of proficiency in instructional planning does not differ significantly based on having graduated from educational faculty or other faculties. Two studies addressing the faculty of graduation variable in relation to instructional planning were found in the literature. In one of them, planning the instruction and implementation was examined as a sub-dimension of special field competencies of ICT teachers by Bingöl Meşe (2010: 136). It was determined that faculty of graduation variable does not cause a significant difference in instructional planning and implementation dimension, and it supports this research finding regarding the faculty of graduation variable. However, the other study, in which mathematics teacher candidates' self-perception of instructional planning and organizing competency was examined by Şan (2013), does not comply with this research. In Şan (2013: 527)'s study, it has been concluded that teacher candidates in educational faculties have higher self-efficacy in the performance of using instructional tools, materials and making use of teaching and learning theories than the teacher candidates in science faculties.

It can also be said that secondary school teachers' curriculum literacy does not differ significantly according to faculty of graduation. There exist supporting studies indicating that faculty of graduation does not create a significant difference in teachers' curriculum literacy levels (Aslan, 2018: 77; Keskin, 2020: 111; Altuncu, 2021: 67; Başar & Berilgen, 2021: 355; Demir & Toraman, 2021: 1525; Tutuş, 2021: 73; Yılmaz, 2021: 60; Ayaz, 2023: 86; Aygün, 2023: 59) in the literature. Similarly, Yar Yıldırım (2018: 96, 97) expressed that faculty of graduation does not have an effect on school administrators' curriculum literacy levels. As opposed to these results, there are also studies ascertaining that faculty of graduation creates a significant difference in favor of graduates of educational faculties (Aslan & Gürten, 2019: 180; Kahraman, 2020: 53; Demir, 2022: 48; Erkmen Bolat, 2024: 90). On the other hand, Erdem and Eğinir (2018: 131) stated that teacher candidates in teaching programs had higher mean score in only writing dimension of curriculum literacy.

The findings regarding the school type variable show that secondary school teachers' perception of planning proficiency does not differ significantly according to working at a state or private school. There are few studies addressing the effect of school type on the competency of instructional planning in the literature. In Tokgöz Can (2019: 59)'s study, in which teachers' perception of autonomy in instructional planning and implementation was issued, it was concluded that there is no significant difference in instructional planning and implementation autonomy based on school type. Aforesaid study complies with this research's finding. These results indicate that there does not occur any difference

in the competency of instructional planning based on working at a state or private school.

It has also been realized that secondary school teachers' curriculum literacy levels differ significantly in favor of teachers working at private schools. In other words, it can be stated that curriculum literacy levels of teachers working at private schools are higher than the ones working at state schools. There have not been any studies encountered supporting this result of the research. This difference across the school type may raise the question of whether there is a difference in the training or professional development of the teachers at private or state school. After all, there are studies addressing the situation of working at a private or state school in which this variable does not have a significant effect on teachers' curriculum literacy (Atlı, Kara & Mirzeoğlu, 2021: 290; Erkmen Bolat, 2024: 90). This research, on the other hand, presents variety with the finding that school type has a significant effect on teachers' curriculum literacy.

The findings regarding the school type variable show that there is no significant difference in perception of proficiency in instructional planning whereas there is a significant difference in curriculum literacy levels in favor of teachers working at private schools. Tokgöz Can (2019: 86) states that this situation may arise the comment that private schools have such environment in which new concepts, theories and approaches are closely followed. This may be considered as a possible cause of the difference in curriculum literacy levels. On the one hand, there is no difference in the perception of planning proficiency of the same participant teachers. This may indicate that the experience of the teachers at state schools is not different from the ones at private schools. In the end, teachers in both types of schools perceive themselves to be efficient in the implementation dimension at the same level.

The findings regarding weekly hour of lesson variable show that secondary school teachers' perception of proficiency in instructional planning does not significantly differ. Only one study has been encountered in the literature addressing the lesson load. It puts forward that weekly hours of lessons cause significant difference in instructional planning proficiency and differs from this research. In the study by Tokgöz Can (2019: 85), it was determined that there occurs a significant difference in teachers' perceptions of autonomy in instructional planning. It was stated that teachers with 31-35 and 26-30 hours of lesson load had higher perception of autonomy in instructional planning than the ones with 16-20 hours of lesson. This result shows that teachers with more hours of lessons have higher perception of autonomy in instructional planning. However, there is a need for further research regarding the weekly hours of lessons as it is a limitedly addressed variable in studies.

It is also realized that secondary school teachers' curriculum literacy levels significantly differ according to weekly hours of lesson. This difference is seen between the teachers responsible for more than 25 hours of lessons and the ones with 21-25 hours. The difference is in favor of teachers with over 25 hours of lessons. Therefore, it is possible to say that curriculum literacy level of teachers with more than 25 hours of lessons is higher than the ones with 21-25 hours of lessons. This may result from the need for teachers to make use of the curriculum, reflect all elements of it into the classroom by considering the students, and make an evaluation in this frame more often as the hours of lessons increase. In this situation, it may be thought that the increase in teachers' experience reflects curriculum literacy in the end. There have not been any studies about the effect

of lesson load on teachers' curriculum literacy in literature. This research contributes to the literature by showing that there is a difference in curriculum literacy levels between the secondary school teachers with more than 25 hours of lesson and the ones with 21-25 hours in favor of the ones with more than 25 hours of lesson load.

The findings regarding in-service training variable show that secondary school teachers' perception of instructional planning proficiency does not significantly differ. Based on this, it is possible to say that both the teachers who got in-service training and the ones who did not perceive themselves to be efficient at the same level. Likewise, it has been expressed in a few studies (Erman, 2016: 94; Örer, 2020: 48; Kurtoğlu Yalçın, 2024: 14) that getting in-service training does not create a significant difference in teachers' making use of the curriculum on preparation, implementation and planning education and instruction dimensions. As instructional planning is a competency which improves by getting hands on experience, it may be thought that in-service training is not effective at this point. In a study (Kurtuluş & Çavdar, 2011: 14) which has a finding to support this idea, participant teachers expressed that their competencies required to realize the activities in the curriculum had improved through the experience they gained in time and in-service training had no contribution to themselves. There have not been any studies in the literature in-service training is issued regarding instructional planning. This research makes a contribution to the literature by presenting a different variable on this subject.

It is also determined that secondary school teachers' curriculum literacy level differs in favor of the ones who got in-service training. That is to say, the curriculum literacy level of the teachers who got in-service training about the implementation of curriculum is higher than the ones who did not. This is an expected result in terms of the functionality of in-service trainings thinking that getting education about the implementation of the updated curriculum and being knowledgeable about the content positively affects curriculum literacy. There are studies in the literature (Aslan, 2019: 93; Erdamar, 2020: 103; Keskin, 2020: 113; Sarıca, 2021: 142; Atlı, Kara & Mirzeoğlu, 2021: 291; Duman, 2024: 60) supporting this research by putting forth that curriculum literacy level of teachers differ in favor of the ones who got in-service training.

The findings of the third research question show that there is a positive and moderate relationship between secondary school teachers' perception of proficiency in instructional planning and curriculum literacy levels. It is understood that as teachers' curriculum literacy level increases, their perception of proficiency in instructional planning also increases. This finding can be supported by another study about the relationship between curriculum literacy and competency in lesson planning. The participants of the study by Süral and Dedebali (2021) consist of candidate teachers in Pamukkale and Akdeniz University. In the results of the study, it was determined that there is a positive relationship on a high level between candidate teachers' curriculum literacy level and competency in lesson planning. Both studies are alike in finding out positive relationship between curriculum literacy and instructional planning. Besides, intern and novice teachers expressed that the ones with less experience and knowledge in content were more involved in planning in a study by Ball, Knobloch and Hoop (2007: 60). It can be deduced that there is a relationship between content knowledge and planning. This can be interpreted as a supporting study result. Another study by Yurtseven (2021: 8) examined the predictive power of teacher candidates' perception towards instructional planning on their planning performance. It was concluded that

there is a positive, significant relationship between the perception towards instructional planning and proficiency in instructional planning competency. This shows that perception towards instructional planning predicts instructional planning competency. Besides, instructional planning was detected to be the most important predictive variable of curriculum literacy in Erkmen Bolat's (2024) study. As for the findings of our research, it can be said that secondary school teachers' instructional planning proficiency increases or decreases based on their curriculum literacy levels. As Süral and Dedeali (2021: 28) express, the teachers who properly read a well-designed curriculum can use it effectively in practice. Therefore, high curriculum literacy level of teachers show that they will use their own educational programs more effectively (Süral and Dedeali, 2018: 313).

Conclusion

As a result of the research, the following conclusions can be drawn:

Secondary school teachers evaluate themselves to be curriculum literate and proficient in instructional planning on above average level.

Faculty of graduation, school type, weekly hour of lesson and in-service training variables do not have a significant effect on secondary school teachers' perception of proficiency in instructional planning.

Faculty of graduation has no significant effect on secondary school teachers' curriculum literacy levels.

Secondary school teachers at private schools have higher curriculum literacy levels than the ones at state schools.

Considering the finding that secondary school teachers' curriculum literacy level is higher in favor of the ones with more than 25 hours of lessons and the ones who got in-service training, it is possible to deduce that increase in the weekly hour of lesson and getting in-service training favorably contributes to curriculum literacy.

Finally, there is a positive and moderate relationship between secondary school teachers' perception of proficiency in instructional planning and curriculum literacy level. It can be interpreted that as curriculum literacy level of secondary school teachers increases, so does their perception of proficiency in instruction planning.

Suggestions

This research was conducted with the participation of secondary school teachers. Another research can be done with teachers working at other grade levels or including more than one grade level in a study. Deeper data can be collected by using data collection techniques such as observation and interview for further qualitative studies. Teachers or teacher candidates' instructional proficiency and curriculum literacy can be evaluated by school administrator or a specialist in educational sciences in various research contexts. The effect of the courses taken in educational faculties on teacher candidates' development of instructional planning competency and curriculum literacy can be examined. Finally, instructional planning proficiency and curriculum literacy can be issued regarding their relationship with other professional competencies.

Değerlendirme	İki Dış Hakem / Çift Taraflı Körleme
Etik Beyan	<p>* Bu çalışma ikinci yazar danışmanlığında birinci yazarın 16.05.2023 tarihinde sunduğu “Ortaokul Öğretmenlerinin Öğretimi Planlama Yeterlik Algıları ile Program Okuryazarlık Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi” başlıklı yüksek lisans tezi esas alınarak hazırlanmıştır.</p> <p>Bu çalışmanın hazırlanma sürecinde bilimsel ve etik ilkelere uyulduğu ve yararlanılan tüm çalışmaların kaynakçada belirtildiği beyan olunur.</p> <p>*(Dicle Üniversitesi Rektörlüğü, Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Yayın Etiği Kurulu Başkanlığının 24.03.2023 Tarih, 255919 Nolu kararı ile Etik Kurul Kararı alınmıştır.)</p>
Benzerlik Taraması	Yapıldı – İthenticate
Etik Bildirim	itobiad@itobiad.com
Çıkar Çatışması	Çıkar çatışması beyan edilmemiştir.
Finansman	Bu araştırmayı desteklemek için dış fon kullanılmamıştır.
Yazar Katkıları	<p>Çalışmanın Tasarlanması: 1. Yazar (%70), 2. Yazar (%30)</p> <p>Veri Toplanması: 1. Yazar (%70), 2. Yazar (%30)</p> <p>Veri Analizi: 1. Yazar (%70), 2. Yazar (%30)</p> <p>Makalenin Yazımı: 1. Yazar (%70), 2. Yazar (%30)</p> <p>Makale Gönderimi ve Revizyonu: 1. Yazar (%70), 2. Yazar (%30)</p>
Peer-Review	Double anonymized - Two External
Ethical Statement	<p>* This article is extracted from my master thesis entitled “Investigation of the Relationship Between the Secondary School Teachers’ Instructional Planning Proficiency and Curriculum Literacy Levels”, supervised by the second writer. (Master’s Thesis, Dicle University, Diyarbakır/Turkey, 2023).</p> <p>It is declared that scientific and ethical principles have been followed while carrying out and writing this study and that all the sources used have been properly cited.</p> <p>* (Dicle University Rectorate, Social and Human Sciences Ethics Committee Decision was taken with the decision dated 24.03.2023, numbered 255919 of the Presidency of the Publication Ethics Committee.)</p>
Plagiarism Checks	Yes - İthenticate
Conflicts of Interest	The author(s) has no conflict of interest to declare.
Complaints	itobiad@itobiad.com
Grant Support	The author(s) acknowledge that they received no external funding in support of this research.
Author Contributions	<p>Design of Study: 1. Author (%70), 2. Author (%30)</p> <p>Data Acquisition: 1. Author (%70), 2. Author (%30)</p> <p>Data Analysis: 1. Author (%70), 2. Author (%30)</p> <p>Writing up: 1. Author (%70), 2. Author (%30)</p> <p>Submission and Revision: 1. Author (%70), 2. Author (%30)</p>

References / Kaynakça

- Akkuzu, N. (2011). Determination of Relationships Between Professional Competences of Pre-Service Teachers and Factors Effecting Professional Competences: An Example of Structural Equation Model. *E-Journal of New World Sciences Academy*, 6 (4), 2611- 2629.
- Akpınar, B. & Özer, B. (2008). Evaluation of the Teaching Plans Prepared in the General Secondary Education According to the Opinions of Directors and Teachers. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 5 (10), 121-145. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/mkusbed/issue/19559/208515>.
- Alanazi, M. H. (2019). A Study of the Pre-Service Trainee Teachers Problems in Designing Lesson Plans. *Arab World English Journal*, 10 (1) 166- 182. DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol10no1.15>
- Almerich, G., Orellana, N., Suarez-Rodriguez, J. & Diaz-Garcia, I. (2016). Teachers' Information and Communication Technology Competences: A structural approach. *Journal of Computer and Education*, 100, 110- 125. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2016.05.002>
- Altuncu, N. (2021). Examining The Curriculum Literacy Level of High School Teachers (Sample of Kayseri). Master's Thesis, Erciyes University, Kayseri.
- Aslan, S. (2018). The Curriculum Literacy Level of Secondary School Teachers. Master's Thesis, Hacettepe University, Ankara.
- Aslan, O. (2019). The Analysis of Primary and Secondary School Administrators' Perception of Curriculum Literacy According to Various Variables. Master's Thesis, Harran University, Şanlıurfa.
- Aslan, S., & Gürlen, E. (2019) Ortaokul Öğretmenlerinin Program Okuryazarlık Düzeyleri. *Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 20(1), 171-186.
- Atlı, K., Kara, Ö. & Mirzeoğlu, A. D. (2021). Investigating Physical Education Teachers Perceptions About Their Curriculum Literacy Levels. *Gazi Journal of Physical Education and Sports Sciences*, 26 (2), 281-299. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/gbesbd/issue/61222/837824>
- Ayaz, S. (2023). The Correlation Between the Curriculum Literacy of Mathematics Teachers and The Patterns of Adaptation of The Curriculum. Master's Thesis, Dumlupınar University, Kütahya.
- Aydın, İ. S. (2013). The Effect of Microteaching Technique on Teacher Candidates' Perceptions of Efficacy in Lesson. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences*, 12 (43), 67-81. <https://Dergipark.Org.Tr/Tr/Pub/Esosder/Issue/6157/82749>
- Aydın Sesli, M. (2023). Öğretmenlerin Program Okuryazarlığı Yeterliliğinin Okul İklimine Etkisinde Program Liderliği Algısının Aracı Etkisi. [The Mediating Effect of The Perception Of Curriculum Leadership On The Effect Of Teachers' Curriculum Literacy Proficiency On School Climate]. Master's Thesis, Mimar Sinan Güzel Sanatlar University, İstanbul.
- Aygün, Ç. (2023). Ortaokul Öğretmenlerinin Öğretim Programı ve Öğretimi Planlamaya Yönelik Farkındalıklarının Değerlendirilmesi. [Evaluation of Secondary School Teachers' Awareness of Curriculum and Instructional Planning]. Master Thesis, Fırat University,

Elâzığ.

Ball, A. L., Knobloch, N. A. & Hoop, S. (2007). The Instructional Planning Experiences of Beginning Teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 48(2):56-65.

Başar, T. & Berilgen, S. (2021). Determination of Curriculum Literacy Levels of School Administrators. *Kastamonu Education Journal*, 29 (2), 348-361.

Baysal, O. (2024). Öğretmenler İçin Program Okuryazarlığı Mesleki Gelişim Programının Geliştirilmesi. [Developing Curriculum Literacy Professional Development Program for Teachers]. Master's Thesis, Ege University, İzmir.

Ben-Peretz, M. (2011). Teacher knowledge: What is it? How do we uncover it? What are its implications for schooling? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27 (2011), 3-9. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2010.07.015

Berberoğlu, A. (2023). Etken Öğretmenlik ile Öğretim Programı Okuryazarlığı Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. [The Investigation of The Relationship Between Teacher Agency and Curriculum Literacy]. Master's Thesis, Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University, Bolu.

Bilgin, H. (2023). Program Okuryazarlığına Yönelik Bir Program Tasarısı ile Öğretmenlerin Öğretmenlik Mesleği Genel Yeterliklerinin Geliştirilmesi. [Developing Teachers' General Competencies of Teaching Profession Through A Curriculum Proposal Regarding Curriculum Literacy]. PhD Dissertation, Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, Muğla.

Bingöl Meşe, E. T. (2010). The Self-Assessment of ICT Teachers on The Professional Standards of Their Branch: Case Of İzmir. Master's Thesis, Ege University, İzmir.

Brown, D. & Wendel, R. (1993). An Examination of First-Year Teachers' Beliefs about Lesson Planning. *Journal of Action in Teacher Education*, 15 (2), 63-71. DOI: 10.1080/01626620.1993.10734411.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2013). *Sosyal Bilimler İçin Veri Analizi El Kitabı*. Ankara: Pegem.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for The Behavioral Sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Copriady, J. (2014). Teachers Competency in the Teaching and Learning of Chemistry Practical. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5 (8), 312-318. DOI: 10.5901/mjss.2014.v5n8p312.

Coşkun, E., Gelen, İ. & Öztürk, E. (2009). The Proficiency Perceptions of Pre-Service Turkish Language Teachers About Educational Planning, Application and Evaluation. *Mustafa Kemal University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 6 (12), 140-163. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/mkusbed/issue/19557/208437>

Coşkun, E., Özer, B. & Tiryaki, E. N. (2010). An Evaluation of Competency Perceptions of Prospective Turkish Teachers. *Dokuz Eylül University Journal of Buca Education Faculty*, 6 (12), 140-163.

Çelikten Demirel, S., & Gündüz, T. (2022, Mart). Küçük ve Büyük Örneklem Koşullarında Farklı Yöntemlere Dayalı Olarak Normallik Varsayımının İncelenmesi. 12. Uluslararası

Sosyal, Beşerî ve Eğitim Bilimleri Kongresi'nde sunulmuş tam metin sözlü bildiri, İstanbul.

Dağ, Ş. (2021). Investigation of the Curriculum Literacy and Teaching Motivations of Teachers. Master's Thesis, Sabahattin Zaim University, İstanbul.

Demir, M. (2022). The Relationship between Curriculum Literacy Levels and Cognitive Flexibility Levels of Secondary School Teachers. Master's Thesis, Fırat University, Elâzığ.

Demir, E. & Toraman, Ç. (2021). Teachers' Levels of Curriculum Literacy. *Trakya Journal of Education*, 11(3), 1516-1528.

Dikmen, Ş. (2023). Öğretmenlerin Öğretim Programı Okuryazarlığı, Program Özerkliği, Pedagojik Bilgi ve Beceri Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. [Examining The Curriculum Literacy Levels, Curriculum Autonomy Levels and Pedagogical Knowledge And Skill Levels Of Teachers]. Master's Thesis, Aydın Adnan Menderes University, Aydın.

Dirik, M. Z. (2015). *Öğretim İlke ve Yöntemleri*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Duman, M. (2024). Sosyal Bilgiler Öğretmenlerinin Öğretim Programı Okuryazarlığı Algısının İncelenmesi. [Examination of Social Studies Teachers' Perception of Curriculum Literacy]. Master's Thesis, Cumhuriyet University, Sivas.

Dunning, D., Heath, C. & Suls, M. (2004). Flawed Self-assessment: Implications for Health, Education and Workplace. *Psychol Sci Public Interest*, 5(3), 69-106. DOI: 10.1111/j.1529-1006.2004.00018.x

Durak, M. (2024). Öğretim Programı Okuryazarlığı ve Öğretmen Motivasyon İlişkisinin İncelenmesi. [Examining The Relationship Between Curriculum Literacy And Teacher Motivation]. Master's Thesis, Artuklu University, Mardin.

Epstein, R. M. & Hundert, E. M. (2016). Defining and Assessing Professional Competence. *Journal of American Medical Association*, 287 (2), 226-235. [PDF] Defining and Assessing Professional Competence (researchgate.net)

Erdamar, F. S. (2020). The Analysis of Primary School Teachers' Curriculum Literacy Perceptions and Primary School Administrators' Perceptions of Teachers' Curriculum Literacy Skills in the Context of Progressive Philosophy. Doctoral Thesis, Fırat University, Elâzığ.

Erdamar, F. T. & Akpınar, B. (2021). The Analysis of Primary School Teachers' Curriculum Literacy Skills from the Administrators' Perspective. *Journal of History School*, 52, 1861-1884.

Erdem, C. & Eğinir, E. (2018). Prospective Teachers' levels of Curriculum Literacy. *Afyon Kocatepe University Journal of Social Sciences*, 20 (2), 123-138. DOI: 10.32709/akusosbil.428727

Erdem, S. (2023). Öğretmenlere Yönelik Program Okuryazarlığı Hizmet İçi Eğitim Programının Geliştirilmesi: Tasarım, Uygulama ve Değerlendirme. [Developing Curriculum Literacy In-Service Training Curriculum for Teachers: Design, Implementation and Evaluation]

- Erginer, E. (2004). *Öğretimi Planlama Uygulama ve Değerlendirme*. Ankara: Öğreti Yayınları.
- Erkmen Bolat, T. (2024). Sınıf Öğretmenlerinin Öğretim Programı Okuryazarlık Algılarını Yordayan Değişkenlerin İncelenmesi. [An Investigation of the Variables Predicting Primary School Teachers' Curriculum Literacy Perceptions]. Master's Thesis, Cumhuriyet University, Sivas.
- Erman, M. (2016). The Examination of Teachers' Awareness About the Curricula and the Status of Their Benefit from the Curricula. Master's Thesis, Kırıkkale University, Kırıkkale.
- Ertürk, S. (2017). *Eğitimde Program Geliştirme*. Ankara: Eva Edge Akademi Yayınları.
- Gelmez Burakgazi, S. (2019). Curriculum Fidelity: Opening the Black Box. *Başkent University Journal of Education*, 6 (2), 236- 249. <https://search.trdizin.gov.tr/tr/yayin/detay/355035/>
- Girgin, A. (2023). Investigating The Relationship Between English Teachers' Curriculum Literacy and Classroom Administration Competencies. Master's Thesis, Celal Bayar University, Manisa.
- Göl, H. (2023). Özel Eğitim Öğretmenlerinin Program Okuryazarlık, Öz Yeterlik İnanç ve Programa Bağlılık Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. [Examination Of The Relationship Between Special Education Teachers' Levels Of Curriculum Literacy, Self-Efficacy Belief and Commitment to the Curriculum.] Master's Thesis, Artuklu University, Mardin.
- Gravetter, F. J. & Wallnau, L. B. (2013). *Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences*, (10. Basım.) New York, Centage.
- Gülbahar, B. (2016). Developing The Scale for Perception of Proficiency in Instruction Planning: Validity and Reliability Study. *Ahi Evran University Journal of Kırşehir Education Faculty*, 17 (3), 699-715.
- Gülbahar, B. (2017). Investigation Into Turkish Primary School Teachers' Perception of Proficiency Towards Instruction Planning in Relation to Various Variables. *The Journal of Academic Social Science*, 5 (43), 315-328. <https://asosjournal.com/DergiTamDetay.aspx?ID=12185>
- Güleç, H. (2023). An Investigation of Primary School Teachers' Curriculum Literacy Levels. Master's Thesis, Kastamonu University, Kastamonu.
- Güler, Ş. Y. (2021). The Relationship Between Preschool Teachers' Curriculum Literacy, Self-Efficiency Beliefs and Classroom Management Skills. Master's Thesis, Sütçü İmam University, Kahramanmaraş.
- Gülpek, U. (2020). Investigation Of the Physical Education and Sports Teachers and Prospective Teachers Curriculum Literacy and Physical Education Efficacy Levels. Master's Thesis, Uludağ University, Bursa.
- Gündoğan, G. (2019). A Qualitative Evaluation on Teachers' Curriculum Literacy. Master's Thesis, Sütçü İmam University, Kahramanmaraş.
- Güneş Şinego, S. & Çakmak, M. (2021). Examination Of Education Program Literacy

Levels of Teachers. *Journal of Kesit Academy*, 7 (27), 233-256.

Güngör, H. (2023). Öğretmenlerin Program Okuryazarlığı Yeterliklerinin Yordayıcısı Olarak Yansıtıcı Düşünme ile Öğretim Yöntemlerini Kullanma Becerileri. [Reflective Thinking and Teaching Methods Skills as Predictors of Teacher's Curriculum Literacy Competencies]. Master's Thesis, Akdeniz University, Antalya.

Gürkan, B. (2019). Primary School Teacher Candidates' Cognitive Structures in Relation to Curriculum, Instruction, Instruction Planning and Evaluating Instruction. *Kastamonu Education Journal*, 27 (2), 633- 645.

Hurioğlu, L. (2016). The Effect of Feedback on Pre-Service Teachers' Teaching Practice and Lesson Plan Preparing Skills Along with Self-Efficacy Levels During the Process of Teaching Experience. Doctoral Thesis, Çukurova University, Adana.

Kahraman, A. (2020). Özel Okul Öğretmenlerinin Eğitim Programı Okuryazarlığı, Epistemolojik İnançları ve Bireysel Yenilikçilik Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi. [Examination of Private School Teachers' Levels of Educational Program Literacy, Epistemological Beliefs, and Individual Innovativeness]. Master's Thesis, Marmara University, İstanbul.

Kahramanoğlu, R. (2019). A Study on Teachers' Curriculum Literacy Levels. *The Journal of International Social Research*, 12 (65), 827-840.

Karaağaç, M. (2023). Öğretmenlerin Eleştirel Düşünme ve Problem Çözme Becerileri ile Program Okuryazarlığı Arasındaki İlişki. [The Relationship Between Teachers' Critical Thinking and Problem-Solving Skills with Curriculum Literacy]. Master's Thesis, Hacettepe University, Ankara.

Karaca, N. (2019). A Study on Preservice Teachers' Perceived Preparedness Levels Regarding Instructional Planning and Creating Learning Environments. Master's Thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara.

Karasar, N. (2020). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Keskin, A. (2020). Determining The Perceptions of Teachers' Instructional Program Literacy Levels. Doctoral Thesis, Hacettepe University, Ankara.

Kılıçlı, H. (2024). Türkçe Öğretmen Adaylarının 21. Yüzyıl Becerileri, Program Okuryazarlığı ve Öz Yeterlik Algıları Arasındaki İlişki. [The Relationship Between 21st Century Skills, Program Literacy and Self-Efficacy Perceptions of Turkish Teacher Candidates]. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University, Karaman.

Kızılaslan Tunçer, B. & Şahin, Ç. (2019). Examining the Knowledge Level of Pre-Service Teachers' About Curriculum. *Erzincan University Journal of Education Faculty*, 21 (2), 247-260.

Köse, E. (2020). *Eğitimin Temeli Temel Kavramlar*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Krejcie, R. & Morgan, D. (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. *Journal of Educational and Psychology Measurement*, 30 (3), 607-610. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00131644700300008>

Kulshrestha, A.K. & Pandey, K. (2013). Teachers Training and Professional Competencies. *Journal of Voice of Research*, 1 (4), 29-33.

Kuloğlu, M. E. (2023). Program Özerkliği, Öğretmen Özerkliği, Öğretim Programı Okuryazarlığı, Öğretim Programına Bağlılık ve TPAB Arasındaki İlişkiler. [The Relationships Among The Curriculum Autonomy, Teacher Autonomy, Curriculum Literacy, Curriculum Fidelity, And Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge]. PhD Thesis, Abant İzzet Baysal University, Bolu.

Kurtoğlu Yalçın, C. (2024). Öğretmenlerin Program ve Teknoloji Okuryazarlıkları ile Mesleki Yeterlik Algılarının Aralarındaki İlişkiye ve Bazı Değişkenlere Göre İncelenmesi. [Investigation of Teachers' Program and Technology Literacy and Professional Competence Perceptions According to the Relationship Between Them and Some Variables]. PhD Thesis, Fırat University, Elazığ.

Kurtuluş, N. & Çavdar, O. (2011). Teachers' and Students' Views Toward the Activities of the Primary Science and Technology Curriculum. *Necatibey Faculty of Education Electronic Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, 5 (1), 1- 23. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/balikesirnef/issue/3372/46533>

Maba, W. & Mantra, I. B. N. (2018). The Primary School Teachers' Competence in Implementing the 2013 Curriculum. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 42, 1-6. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20184200035>.

Mallillin, L. L. D. & Mallillin, J. B. (2019). Competency Skills and Performance Level of Faculties in The Higher Education Institution (HEI). *European Journal of Educational Studies*, 6 (9), 1- 19. <https://zenodo.org/record/3566454#.ZA-fY5HP25c>

MEB Öğretmen Yetiştirme ve Eğitimi Genel Müdürlüğü (2017). Öğretmenlik Mesleği Genel Yeterlikleri. Ankara: Millî Eğitim Basımevi. 15 Mayıs 2022 tarihinde https://oygm.meb.gov.tr/dosyalar/StPrg/Ogretmenlik_Meslegi_Genel_Yeterlikleri.pdf

MEB Öğretmen Yetiştirme ve Eğitimi Genel Müdürlüğü (2017). Öğretmen Strateji Belgesi. Ankara: Millî Eğitim Basımevi.

Mulholland, J. & Wallace, J. (2001). Teacher Induction and Elementary Science Teaching: Enhancing Self-Efficacy. *Journal of Teaching and Teacher Education*, (17) 243-261.

Oh, S. (2011). Preservice Teachers' Sense of Efficacy and Its Sources. *Journal of Scientific Research*, 2 (3), 235-240. DOI:10.4236/psych.2011.23037

Ornstein, A. C. & Hunkins, F. P. "Curriculum Development". trans. Aysun Doğutaş. *Curriculum Foundations, Principles, and Issues*. Ed. Asım Arı. (s. 287-341). Konya: Eğitim Kitabevi, 2. Basım, 2016.

Öner, F. (2023). Curriculum Literacy Skills of Primary School English Teachers: A Review in The Context of Official and Functional Curriculum. Master's Thesis, Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University, İstanbul.

Örer, M. M. (2020). Investigation of Awareness on the Curriculum Implemented by the Physical Education Teachers and the Situation Teachers' Benefit from the Curriculum: The Çankaya Example. Master's Thesis, Yıldırım Beyazıt University, Ankara.

Özmen, F. (2016). Aday Öğretmenlerin Öz Yeterlilikleri ve Öğretmenlik Mesleki Kaygıları Arasındaki İlişki. Tezsiz Yüksek Lisans Projesi, Pamukkale Üniversitesi, Denizli.

Öztürk, N. (2023). Öğretmenlerin Program Okuryazarlığı Yeterliklerinin Yordayıcısı Olarak Yaratıcı Düşünme ile 21. Yüzyıl Öğreten Becerileri. [Creative Thinking And 21st Century Teaching Skills As Predictors Of Teachers' Curriculum Literacy Competencies]. Master's Thesis, Akdeniz University, Antalya.

Pehlivan, R. & Özdemir, S. (2020). Kuzey Kıbrıs'ta Devlette Görevli Okul Öncesi Öğretmenlerinin Oyun Öğretiminde Planlama ve Uygulama Öz Yeterliklerinin İncelenmesi. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/347999667>

Roelofs, E. & Sanders, P. (2007). Towards A Framework for Assessing Teacher Competence. *European Journal of Vocational Training*, 40 (1), 123-139.

Salvucci S., Walter E., Conley V., Fink S. & Saba M. (1997). *Measurement Error Studies at the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES)*. Washington D. C.: U. S. Department of Education.

Saral, N. Ç. (2019). Exploring Curriculum Literacy Level of English Language Teachers in Turkey. Master's Thesis, Gazi University, Ankara.

Sarıca, R. (2021). A Study on Teachers' Curriculum Literacy. *Journal of Kırşehir Education Faculty*, 22 (1), 132-170. DOI: 10.29299/kefad.776214.

Sevim, F. (2023). Beden Eğitimi Öğretmenlerinin Mesleki İnançları ile Program Okuryazarlığı Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi (Osmaniye İli Örneği). [Investigating The Relationship Between Professional Beliefs And Program Literacy Among Physical Education Teachers: A Case Study In Osmaniye Province, Turkey]. Master's Thesis, Mersin University, Mersin.

Süral, S. & Dedebeali, N. C. (2018). A Study of Curriculum Literacy and Information Literacy Levels of Teacher Candidates in Department of Social Sciences Education. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 7(2), 303-317. Doi: 10.12973/eujer.7.2.303

Süral, S. & Dedebeali, N. C. (2021). The Predictive Power of The Curriculum Literacy Levels of Pre-Service Teachers Upon Their Competencies in Lesson Planning. *Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 9 (2), 27-40.

Şan, İ. (2013). The Level of Self-Efficacy of Prospective Mathematics Teachers About Competencies for Planning and Organizing Instruction. *Journal of Turkish Studies*, 8 (3), 517-537.

https://turkishstudies.net/turkishstudies?mod=makale_tr_ozet&makale_id=16196

Tabachnick, B.G. and Fidell, L.S. (2013). Using Multivariate Statistics. 6h Edition, Person Education, Boston.

Tanaş, R. (2023). Relationships Between Teachers' Levels of Curriculum Literacy, Curriculum Commitment, Learning-Teaching Process Competencies, and Achievement Goals. Doctoral Thesis, Fırat University, Elazığ.

Taşdemircan, A. (2023). An Analysis of Perceived Autonomy of Teachers and Their Curriculum Literacy Levels. Master's Thesis, Sivas Cumhuriyet University, Sivas.

Tokgöz Can, M. (2019). A Study on Autonomy Perceptions and Expectations of Teachers in Planning and Implementing of Teaching. Master's Thesis, Ege Üniversitesi, İzmir.

- Turan Özpolat, E. (2024). İlköğretim Öğretmenlerinin Eğitim Programı Okuryazarlığına Yönelik Görüşleri. [Primary School Teachers' Views on Curriculum Literacy]. *International Journal of Language Academy*, 12 (4), 342-366.
- Tutuş, F. (2021). English Teachers' Curriculum Literacy Levels and Views on English Language Teaching. Master's Thesis, Fırat University, Elâzığ.
- Türeyen, H. (2023). Investigation Of Curriculum Literacy Levels of School Administrators and Teachers. Master's Thesis, Yozgat Bozok University, Yozgat.
- Ulukulu, G. (2023). Psikolojik İhtiyaçlara Duyarlı Öğretim Stili ile Mesleki Doyum, Özerklik ve Öz Yeterlik Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. Master's Thesis, Ege University, İzmir.
- Üstün, A. & Tekin, S. (2016). A Comparison of The Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Teacher Candidates in Terms of Different Variables at Amasya University Faculty of Education. *Abant İzzet Baysal University Journal of Education Faculty*, 9 (1), 35-47.
- Waternaux, C. M. (1976). Asymptotic Distribution of The Sample Roots for A Nonnormal Population. *Biometrika*, 63(3), 639-645.
- Yar Yıldırım, V. (2018). Developing and Evaluating In-Service Training Curriculum for School Administrators' Curriculum Literacy. Doctoral Thesis, Gaziosmanpaşa University, Tokat.
- Yavuz Konokman, G. & Yanpar Yelken, T. (2013). Prospective Teachers' Opinions on Their Competencies in Learning Teaching Process. *Mersin University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 9 (1), 175-188. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/mersinefd/issue/17382/181582>
- Yıldız, S. (2020). Educational Planning Proficiency Perceptions and Time Management Skills of Classroom Teachers. *TURAN-SAM International, Scientific Peer-reviewed and Refereed Journal*, 12 (46), 365-442. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15189/1308-8041>
- Yılmaz, G. (2021). Examining The Relationship Between Curriculum Literacy Levels, Curriculum Orientations and Curriculum Fidelity Levels of Teachers. Master's Thesis, Gaziantep University, Gaziantep.
- Yurtseven, N. (2021). On the Path to Becoming a Teacher: Student Teachers' Competency in Instructional Planning. *The Teacher Educator*, 1-17. DOI: 10.1080/08878730
- Zöğ, H. (2022). Öğretmenlerin Öğretim Programına Bağlılıkları, Eğitim Felsefelerine Yönelik Eğilimleri ve Öğretme Öğrenme Süreci Yeterlilik Algıları Arasındaki İlişki. [The Relationship Between Teachers' Commitment To The Curriculum, Their Tendencies Towards The Philosophy Of Education And Their Perceptions Of Competencies In The Teaching-Learning Process]. PhD Dissertation, Balıkesir University, Balıkesir.