AJ ACADEMIC JOURNALS
expand your knowledge

International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies

Full Length Research Paper

Examination of the competencies of the pre-service teachers studying at the education faculties about the educational program literacy

Okan Sarıgöz and Yavuz Bolat*

Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Faculty of Education, Hatay Mustafa Kemal University, Hatay, Turkey.

Teaching programs are the basic elements and guides of the education-teaching processes. The correct understanding of the content of the teaching programs reveals the concept of the educational program literacy. The aim of this research is to study to identify the competencies of the educational program literacy of the pre-service teachers studying in the education faculties by arithmetic mean of the answers given to the scale items by department type, class level demographic variables and gender. In accordance with this purpose; a Teaching Program Literacy scale consisting of 29 items, developed by Bolat (2017) was used in the reading and writing dimensions about education programs and teaching literacy in order to collect data. In addition to the descriptive statistics of the collected data with the Education Program Literacy Scale, analyzes such as t-test, Tukey and Anova were also conducted. In the study, the general scanning model, which is one of the descriptive scanning methods, was used. The universe of the research is composed of all the pre-service teachers who are studying in different programs of Mustafa Kemal University Faculty of Education, the sample of the research constitutes a total of 785 pre-service teachers studying in Turkish Teaching, English Language Teaching, Science Education and Classroom Teaching programs of Mustafa Kemal University Faculty of Education. As a result of the research, the curriculum of the pre-service teachers has been differentiated in favor of female pre-service teachers in terms of literacy of writing by gender. However, gender change, from the general angle of the scale, did not cause any statistical differentiation. It has also been found that the opinions of pre-service teachers are close to each other on program literacy, depending on the program they are studying. It has been determined that there are statistically significant differences in favor of pre-service teachersstudying at the upper class among the class levels in which the pre-service teachers have studied. In addition, the results of the study showed that the pre-service teachers felt themselves sufficient in terms of understanding, interpreting and evaluation in terms of program literacy and felt themselves inadequate in terms of goals.

Key words: Teaching program, teaching program literacy, teacher training.

INTRODUCTION

Education is undoubtedly one of the most important factors that keep communities alive and transfer their knowledge and skills to new generations. Education, which has a social prescription, emerges in different ways

*Corresponding author. E-mail: yavuzbolat06@gmail.com.

depending on the needs of the society in which it lives (Karatekin et al., 2017). Despite these differences, the unchanging basic structure of educational activities is that education is planned and programmed in every category (Tonbul, 2017).

Educational programs are developed and implemented with the aim of guiding learners in order to acquire the

necessary knowledge, values and skills, and to develop their learning in a holistic way, with preliminary to the teachingprocess (Yakar, 2016). Increasing the number of qualifications in education is possible through the development of qualified teaching programs that can respond to the needs (Atik and Aykaç, 2017). Teaching program development is a scientific field that delves deeply into all the parameters in the process of structuring the individual's behavioral change as a point of departure as a science (Örten and Erginer, 2016). The fact that educators have knowledge about this science field can be expressed as education program literacy competencies.

The attainment of the behaviors desired by the students is possible with the fact that the teaching program is practical and workable in real situations (Karaman and Bakaç, 2018). In this context, the educational program must be defined correctly and the language of the program must be mastered in terms of the educator. The Wiles and Bondi (2014) program is defined as all the experiences that children have gained in the guidance of their teachers. Considering the humanist approach, the teaching program is a set of pre-prepared educational obstacles and some experiences of the child in school (Eisner, 2002). In other words, the teaching program is an officially approved technical documentation that reflects the broad social agreement and policy statement that is used to transfer the most valuable things in the community to the children of the new generation (Stabback, 2016; Bolat, 2017). These technical documents become the most important guide to the education and teaching processes since they are officially recognized. In another sense, it is a guidance from the starting point of the educational process to show what competence the individual will have in terms of cognitive, emotional and psychomotor. To be able to understand this guidance correctly, to interpret and design the process, to be able to create learning environments suitable for the needs of the students and to evaluate the process in the most accurate way make the education program literacy compulsory. For this reason, it is necessary for the teacher and pre-service teachers to have a literacy program in order to define education and to understand the current developmental process of education. Therefore; teachers and pre-service teachers should have a literacy program in order to define education, understand the existing developmental process of education, gain educators educational literacy in their applications, be aware of the learner.

Education is an expected enculturation study that is progressing with programmatic steps and including targeted applications. In culturing studies, purpose of education is to be a part of knowledge and skill, to promote personal and professional development as human values (Özen and Hendekçi, 2016). The most important element regulating these studies is undoubtedly the education programs. In addition, education and teaching programs are the most important elements that determine and direct the quality of education (Baş and Sarıgöz, 2018). These elements make clear the guidance of the teaching leaders and the expected behaviors of the beneficiaries of the teaching. In addition to all these benefits, a teaching program defines the political, economic, ideological etc. expectations of the societies and the characteristics of the individuals identified by taking into account the needs of the individuals and learning and teaching experiences that will enable them to gain these expected characteristics (Senemoğlu, 2018; Varış, 1996; Ertürk, 1998; Demirel, 1999; Ornstein and Hunkins, 2017). The teaching program guides how to do what is the most important aspect of the education system, wich is the practice dimension (Batdı, 2016). Thus, the teaching programs guide the whole of the teaching activities. The Meyers and Nulty (2009) focuses on five different elements that a teaching program should have. These are; 1) The teaching program should be about real world needs and related to real world situations; 2) the subjects taught must be constructive, sequential and interconnected; 3) should provide high-grade cognitive skills to students in turn; 4) all topics and outputs must be related to each other and 5) should motivate and inspire students.

The fact that the above teaching program features specified by Meyers and Nulty (2009) take place in a program indicates that the program designers and the educators who will be using this teaching program should have sufficient command of the area, that is, should be a good education program literacy.

Individual differences with directly affecting the learning process, both leads the learning process and causes the individual to be affected differently from the learning process. The differences in the individuals involved in the learning process are determined by a number of factors such as their cultural back-ground, socio-economic status, gender, disability status. Besides the views that the learning style will not change, there are also preferred tendencies in the way information is processed differently. While some individuals are learning, problem solving, thinking or just responding to an educational situation, some individuals react to possible learning styles that they like, dislike, prefer (Veznedaroğlu and Özgür, 2005). In the minimizing of the differences in learning, a well-designed or well-developed teaching program is always needed. The presence of proficienteducators who will recognize this process and

contribute to the development of teaching programs and their success will affect the education of the country positively. Of course, the competencies of these proficients should be at the highest level in all aspects of the teaching program literacy competencies.

When educational programs are considered in a systematic structure, it is mentioned that a teaching program has four dimensions. These are objectives, content (scope), learning-teaching processes (educational situations), and measurement and evaluation (Özçelik, 2010; Baş, 2013; Çelik, 2006; Ertürk, 1998; Gültekin, 2003; Demirel and Kaya, 2012; Taba, 1962; Wiles and Bondi, 2014; Ornstein and Hunkins, 2017). Since there is a close relationship between these items of educational programs, any disruption or change that occurs in any of these items affects the entire program (Demirel, 2017). The fact that a pre-service teacher's having basic knowledge of these dimensions, being able to recognize the importance of dimensions in education program, designing and evaluatingteaching processes form basic skills of educational program literacy. There are many definitions in the literature on the concept of literacy and the concept of literacy forms the basis of literacy activities (Güneş, 1997). In the concept of educational program literacy, there is a need for high-level skills that require analyzing and understanding concepts apart fromthe basic reading and writing skills.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Purpose of the research

To try to identify the competencies of the education program literacy of the pre-service teachers studying at the education faculties by arithmetic mean of the answers which have been given

$$OR = \frac{HV - LV}{NO} = \frac{5-1}{5} = 0.8$$

to the scale items by department type, class level demographic variables and gender, is the aim of this research. Based on the obtained data, some suggestions about the effect of educational program literacy on academic achievement in the research will be tried to be brought.

Problem of research

At what level are the opinions of the pre-service teachers who are studying at the faculty of education about the literacy of the curricula? Do the literacy levels of pre-service teachers differ considering department type, class level demographic variables and gender?

Research model

In this study, the general survey model, that is one of the descriptive scanning methods, was used. The general survey model is a screening of the whole universe or a set of samples or samples taken from it to arrive at a judgment about the universe in an environment composed of a large number of elements (Karasar, 2010: 79).

This research was applied to identify the qualifications of the pre-service teachers studying at education faculties on education program literacy by considering department type, class level demographic variables and gender. To this end, the Education Program Literacy Scale developed by Bolat (2017) on educational programs and teaching literacy was used in this research with the permission of the researcher. The scale developed by Bolat (2017), consists of 29 subdimensions, 15 matter of which are reading subdimensions and 14 matter of which are writing subdimensions. The scale is also a type of 5 likert scale.

The validity and reliability coefficients of the Education Program Literacy Scale to be used in the study were recalculated and the Cronbach Alpha internal reliability coefficient of the scale consisting of 29 items was identified as 0.87. The responses of the survey participants to the questionnaire considering the demographic variables were calculated using the SPSS 20 statistical package program, the F test, the t-test, and the ANOVA test, which is a one-way analysis of variance. The scale used in the research consists of 29 items in the form of five likert types: (1) Strongly disagree (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree (5) Strongly agree. The general assessment of the scale used in the research is as follows (Dönger et al. (2016, 2017):

OR= Option Range; HV= Highest Value; LV=Lowest Value; NO= Number of Options; 1.00 - 1.80= Strongly disagree; 1.81 - 2.60= Disagree; 2.61 - 3.40= Undecided; 3.41 - 4.20= Agree; 4.21 - 5.00= Strongly agree

Universe and sample

The universe of this research is composed of all the pre-service teachersstudying in different programs of Mustafa Kemal University Faculty of Education, the sample of the research constitutes a total of 785 pre-service teachers studying in Turkish Teaching, English Language Teaching, Science Education and Classroom Teaching departments of Mustafa Kemal University Faculty of Education.

FINDINGS

In this section, the literacy levels of the curriculum of the pre-service teachers depending on the department type, class level demographic variables and gender and also the responses of the pre-service teachers to the scales were identified, tabled and interpreted.

From the analysis of the data in Table 1, depending on the answers of the pre-service teachers participating in the research to the Instructional Programs Literacy Scale, it was found that there is a meaningful difference in opinion between female and female pre-service teachers depending on the statistical aspect of writing scale. However, it was found that pre-service teachers ' views on program literacy are close to or equal to each other in terms of reading and general of the scale.

From the analysis of the data in Table 2, it was identified that there is no statistically significant difference between reading, writing and the general of the scale among the pre-service teachers studying at different types of programs as a result of the Anova Test conducted with the answers of the pre-service teachers

Table 1. The results of the t-test analysis considering the gender variable of the answers of the pre-service teachers to the educational program literacy scale.

Parameter	Gender	N	$\overline{X}$	Ss	Sd	-t	p
Reading	Female	490	61.69	5.43	783	0.610	0.542
	Male	295	61.93	5.56			
	Total	785					p>0.05
Writing	Female	490	57.45	5.20	783	2.036	0.042
	Male	295	56.70	4.70			
	Total	785					p<0.05
General	Female	490	119.14	9.09	783	0.775	0.439
	Male	295	118.63	8.49			
	Total	785					p>0.05

Table 2. Analysis results of Anova test considering *department type* variable of answers of pre-service teachers given to education program literacy scale.

Parameter	Program Type	N	$\overline{X}$	Ss	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	Sd	Avg. of Squares	F	p (Anova)
Reading	TT	100	62.00	6.67	B/w Groups	98.86	3	32.95	1.099	0.349
	ELT	228	61.22	5.20	Inter Groups	23420.57	781	29.99		
	SE	116	62.01	5.68	Total	23519.43	784			
	CT	341	62.01	5.34						
	Total	785	61.78	5.48						p>0.05
Writing	TT	100	57.07	5.50	B/w Groups	160.14	3	53.38	2.122	0.096
	ELT	228	57.66	4.69	Inter Groups	19641.67	781	25.15		
	SE	116	56.22	4.74	Total	19801.81	784			
	CT	341	57.19	5.16						
	Total	785	57.17	5.03						p>0.05
General	TT	100	119.07	10.11	B/w Groups	82.27	3	27.42	0.348	0.791
	ELT	228	118.89	8.17	Inter Groups	61541.49	781	78.80		
	SE	116	118.23	8.88	Total	61623.75	784			
	CT	341	119.19	9.95						
	Total	785	118.95	8.87						p>0.05

given to the Instructional Programs Literacy Scale. Therefore, it was found that pre-service teachers' opinions about program literacy are close to or equal to each other depending on the department type.

From the analysis of the data in Table 3, we can see that in the general sense of reading, writing and scale it was found that there are some statistically significant differences in the result of the Anova test between pre-service teachersstudying at different grades.

In the Tukey test results obtained to learn the source of this difference, it was found that there is a statistically significant difference in opinion between the pre-service teachers studying at the 4th grade and the pre-service teachers who study at the 1st grade in the dimension of reading scale in favor of the pre-service teachers who study at the 4th grade. It can be said that the reason for this difference is due to the fact that the pre-service teachers who study at the 4th grade are from the different education courses they have taken until the 4th grade level, or from the courses they have taken for the proficiency exam they are going to enter for teaching. In other words, it can be said that pre-service teachers studying at the 4th grade have more knowledge about program literacy than pre-service teachers studying at the

Table 3. Tukey test analysis results considering class level variable of answers ofpre-service teachers given to educational program literacy scale.

Parameter	Program Type	N	$\overline{X}$	Ss	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	Sd	Avg. Of Squares	F	P (Tukey)
Reading	Grade	209	60.67	5.26	B/w Groups	533.89	3	177.96	6.047	.00
	Grade	212	61.82	5.69	Inter Groups	22985.54	781	29.43		
	Grade	192	61.81	5.23	Total	23519.43	784			
	Grade	172	63.05	5.51					4-1	
	Total	785	61.78	5.48						p<0.05
Writing	Grade	209	56.26	4.75	B/w Groups	392.03	3	130.68	5.258	.001
	Grade	212	57.38	4.92	Inter Groups	19409.77	781	24.85		
	Grade	192	56.96	5.30	Total	19801.80	784			
	Grade	172	58.25	4.98					4-1	
	Total	785	57.17	5.03						p<0.05
General	Grade	209	116.93	8.46	B/w Groups	1820.43	3	606.81	7.925	.000
	Grade	212	119.19	8.90	Inter Groups	59803.33	781	76.57		
	Grade	192	118.77	8.85	Total	61623.76	784			
	Grade	172	121.30	8.80					4-3; 4-1; 2-1	
	Total	785	118.95	8.87						p<0.05

1st grade.

It was found that there was a statistically significant difference in opinion about the writing dimension in favor of pre-service teachers in the 4th grade between the pre-service teachers whostudy in the 4th grade and the pre-service pre-service teachers who study at the 1st grade. It can be said that the reason for this difference comes from the information and education they have taken from the different teaching courses they have taken to the 4th grade level as well as from the courses they have taken for the qualification examination to be a teacher.

In terms of the general of the scale, it was found that there is a statistically significant difference between 4th, 3rd and 5th grades in opinion in favor of pre-service teachers who are studying at the 4th grade. It can be said that the reason for this difference is due to the knowledge obtained from the courses that the pre-service teachers studying at the 4th grade have gone from the knowledge level to the qualification examination they will have.

Table 4 shows the arithmetic mean and skill levels of the answers of the pre-service teachers in the Faculty of Education to *the Educational Program Literacy Scale.*

As the arithmetic mean of the answers of the pre-service teachers given to the items in the 1st sub-dimension of the scale; the reading sub-dimension is examined; it was found that the 8th matter 'I can understand what the target behavior needs.' ($\overline{X}$ = 4.53), the 9th matter 'I can evaluate the effectiveness of learning-teaching processes.' ($\overline{X}$ = 4.47) and the 10th matter 'I can interpret the results of the assessment and evaluation process.' ($\overline{X}$ = 4.42) have the highest arithmetic mean in the sub-dimension. From the interviews with pre-service teachers and the arithmetic average of the answers given to the items of the reading subscale, it was found that the pre-service teachers found themselves to be most successful in understanding, interpreting and evaluating them.

As the arithmetic mean of the answers given to the items in the 1st sub-dimension of the scale; the reading sub-dimension was examined; it was found that the 7th matter 'I can determine the limits of the targets.' ($\overline{X}$ =3.85), the 11th matter 'I can choose the appropriate evaluation method.' ($\overline{X}$ =3.90) and the 4th matter 'I can determine the consistency of goals with each other.' ($\overline{X}$ =3.90) have the lowest arithmetic mean in the reading sub-dimension. It was found from the interviews made with the pre-service teachers and the arithmetic average of the answers given to the scale items that the pre-service teachers felt themselves inadequate in the target dimension at the most in the educational program literacy. When the arithmetic mean of the answers given to the items in the 2nd sub-dimension of the scale; the writing sub-dimension, is examined; it has been identified that the 16th matter 'I can design educational materials suitable for learning-teaching processes.' ($\overline{X}$ =4.46), the 17th matter 'I can prepare a measurement tool suitable for the target.' ($\overline{X}$ =4.29) and the 29th matter 'I can enrich

Table 4. The arithmetic mean and skill levels of answers ofpre-service teachers given to the program literacy scale.

Educatıon program lıterature scale	$\overline{X}$	Skill Level
Readıng		
8. I can understand what the target behavior needs.	4.53	Agree
9. I can evaluate the effectiveness of learning-teaching processes.	4.47	Agree
10. I can interpret the results of the assessment and evaluation process.	4.42	Agree
5. I can determine the level of relationship between content and goals.	4.34	Agree
1. I can distinguish which target dimension the given target behavior relates to.	4.09	Strongly agree
12. I can determine the appropriate teaching technique to the target.	4.09	Strongly agree
13. I can choose educational materials suitable for learning-teaching processes.	4.06	Strongly agree
3. I can choose content that is appropriate for the target.	4.06	Strongly agree
14. I can determine the suitability of the content of the target behavior for the duration of the realization.	4.04	Strongly agree
2. I can check the suitability of the content to student level.	4.03	Strongly agree
15. I can determine the appropriate teaching method to the target.	4.03	Strongly agree
6. I can understand the assesment tools.	4.01	Strongly agree
4. I can determine the consistency of goals with each other.	3.90	Strongly agree
11. I can choose the appropriate evaluation method.	3.90	Strongly agree
7. I can determine the limits of the targets.	3.85	Strongly agree
Wrıtıng		
16. I can design educational materials suitable for learning-teaching processes.	4.46	Agree
17. I can prepare a measurement tool suitable for the target.	4.29	Agree
29. I can enrich the content according to the target.	4.24	Agree
25. I can write targeted content.	4.16	Strongly agree
22. I can analyze an assesment tool by taking into account the objectives.	4.12	Strongly agree
18. I can design educational activities appropriate to teaching-learning processes.	4.09	Strongly agree
27. I can design the context according to the target of the subject field.	4.08	Strongly agree
23. I can write the question according to the target.	4.05	Strongly agree
26. I can design the learning-teaching processes according to the teaching method I choose.	4.05	Strongly agree
28. I can write appropriate parallel targets for the course / subject area.	4.04	Strongly agree
24. I can design the learning-teaching processes in accordance with the chosen teaching technique.	4.02	Strongly agree
21. I can write the appropriate target for the student level.	3.90	Strongly agree
19. I can write the evaluation criterion appropriate to the target.	3.86	Strongly agree
20. I can write goals based on expected student behavior.	3.81	Strongly agree

The General Arithmetic Mean of the Scale: 4.10 (Strongly agree).

the content considering the target.' ($\overline{X}$ =4.24) have the highest arithmetic mean in writing the sub-dimension. It has been determined from the interviews made with the pre-service teachers and the arithmetic average of the answers given to the scale items that the pre-service teachers find themselves successful in the subjects of preparing the materials, preparing the questions and enriching the samples in the writing sub-dimension of the educational program literacy scale.

As the arithmetic mean of the answers given to the items in the 2nd sub-dimension of the scale; the writing sub-dimension, is examined; it was identified that the 20th matter 'I can write goals based on expected student behavior.' ($\overline{X}$ =3.81), the 19th matter 'I can write the

evaluation criterion appropriate to the target.' ($\overline{X}$ =3.86) and the 21st matter 'I can write the appropriate target for the student level.' ($\overline{X}$ =3.90) have the lowest arithmetic mean in the writing sub-dimension. It has been determined from the interviews made with the pre-service teachers and the arithmetic mean of the answers given to the scale items that the pre-service teachers felt themselves inadequate in the target dimension in the writing dimension of the educational program literacy.

RESULTS

A total of 785 pre-service teachers studying at Mustafa

Kemal University Faculty of Education's different programs studying in Turkish Language Teaching, Science Teaching English Language Teaching, and Classroom Teaching programs participated in this research. When the answers of the pre-service teachers to the Education Program Literacy Scale are examined, it is concluded that the pre-service teachers' education program is different in favor of female in terms of writing. However, the reading sub-dimension and the general of the scale have also reached the result that the gender variable was not statistically different. It was identified that there was no statistically significant difference in reading, writing and scale among the pre-sevice teachers participating in the research and those are studying in different types of programs. Depending on the type of program that the pre-sevice teachers have studied, it was concluded that the opinions about the program literacy in the research are close or equal to each other.

It was found that there are some statistically significant differences between the levels of the grade where the pre-service teachers have been studying at. It has been found that this variation is in favor of higher classes. In interviews with pre-service teachers, pre-service teachers who study at the higher classes have more information about the curriculum and items, which is the result of the fact that they are the result of teaching courses taught at universities. Thus, it has been found that; as pre-service teachers get more and more instructional courses as the grade level rises, both the level of knowledge about the curriculum, the items and the literacy and the awareness of the class have increased.

It was found from the interviews made with the pre-service teachers and the arithmetic average of the answers which have been given to the scale items that the pre-service teachers find themselves successful in the areas of reading comprehension, interpretation and evaluation in the reading sub-dimension of the educational program literacy scale. It was found from the interviews made with the pre-service teachers and the arithmetic average of the answers given to the scale items that the pre-service teachers felt themselves inadequate in the target dimension at the most in the educational program literacy. The results of interviews with pre-service teachers and arithmetic averages of responses to scale items, and the result that pre-service teachers felt themselves inadequate at the most target dimension in the writing dimension of educational programs literacy.

In this study, the reading sub-dimension's overall arithmetic mean is calculated as 4.12 (strongly agree), the overall arithmetic mean of the writing sub-dimension as 4.08 (strongly agree), and the scale's the overall arithmetic mean as 4.10 (strongly agree). However, it have been expected that the general arithmetic average of the scale as well as the sub-dimensions of the scale would be 4.21-5.00 (I fully agree). In interviews with pre-service teachers to learn the reason for this situation, it

has been found that the pre-service teachers do not feel that they are adequately concerned with the items of the curriculum, especially about the items of the goals.

Suggestions

In this study, it was found that the education program was different in favor of female in terms of literacy competence. Therefore, male pre-service teachers consider program literacy less than female pre-service teachers. Therefore, in order for male pre-service teachers to take account of program literacy, studies should be conducted to attract more attention to male candidates.

The teaching program forms the basis of the target dimension items in terms of literacy competence. In this study, it have been determined that the pre-service teachers do not feel enough in the target dimension. Therefore, in the courses such as teaching principles and methods in education faculty language programs, special teaching methods, program development, program evaluation, the target dimensions of the program should be reprocessed and the dimensions of goals for better understanding and conception of pre-service teachers should be explained both practically and applied.

The teaching program should be carried out by at least graduate or doctoral specialists specialized in the field of education-based courses in order to be able to develop literacy competence in pre-service teachers.

The resources of curriculum development courses taught at universities are usually above the level of pre-service teachers. Therefore; appropriate resources should be created for the levels of teacher candidates so that the curriculum, items or literacy of the teacher candidates can be increased to the desired level.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The authors have not declared any conflict of interests.

REFERENCES

Atik S, Aykaç N (2017). 2009 ve 2015 Türkçe öğretim programlarının eğitim programı ögeleri açısından değerlendirilmesi. Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi 18(3):586-607.

Baş G (2013). Öğretmenlerin eğitim programı tasarım yaklaşımı tercih ölçeği: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi 13(2):965-992.

Baş M, Sarıgöz O (2018). Determining the readiness levels of pre-service teachers towards mobile learning in classroom management. Educational Research and Reviews 13(10):382-390.

Batdı V (2016). Multi-analysis of english curriculum through Blooom's evaluation model based on program items. Journal of Research in Education and Teaching 5(20):178-191.

Bolat Y (2017). Eğitim programı okuryazarlığı kavramı ve eğitim programı okuryazarlığı ölçeği. Turkish Studies International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic 2(18):121-138.

Çelik F (2006). Türk eğitim sisteminde hedefler ve hedef belirlemede yeni yönelimler. Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Burdur Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi 11(7):1-15.

Demirel Ö (1999). Eğitimde program geliştirme. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.

Demirel Ö (2017). Kuramdan Uygulamaya Eğitimde Program Geliştirme. (10. Baskı). Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık.

Demirel Ö, Kaya Z (2012). Eğitim ile ilgili temel kavramlar. Ö. Demirel, & Z. Kaya (Ed.), Eğitim Bilimine Giriş. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.

Dönger A, Özkartal Z, Sarıgöz O (2016). An Investigation Into Variables That Affect Self Effıcacy Beliefs of People Working in Educational Institutions. International Refereed Academic Social Sciences Journal 24:1-17.

Dönger A, Özkartal Z, Sarıgöz O (2017). An Examination of Anxiety Levels of the Students Towards Scientific Research. International Refereed Journal of Humanities and Academic Science 21:22-36.

Eisner EW (2002). The educational imagination: On the design and evaluation of school programs. (3rd ed.), Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Ertürk S (1998). Eğitimde program geliştirme. Ankara: Yelkentepe.

Gültekin M (2003). Öğretimde planlama ve değerlendirme. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Karaman P, Bakaç E (2018). Invastigating the teachers' curriculum Orıentations in terms of various variables. Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi 18(1):304-320.

Karasar N (2010). Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi kavramlar-ilkeler-teknikler. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Karatekin K, Çapkın Ö, Üstün S (2017). Sosyal bilgiler öğretiminde hafıza mekânlarının önemi: Kastamonu örneği. International Journal of Eurasia Social Sciences, (Özel Sayı), 8(28):498-522.

Meyers NM, Nulty DD (2009). How to use (five) curriculum design principles to align authentic learning environments, assessment, students' approaches to thinking and learning outcomes. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 34(5):565-577.

Ornstein AC, Hunkins FP (2017). Curriculum--foundations, principles, and issues global edition. Pearson Education Limited.

Örten D, Erginer E (2016). Türkiye'de eğitimde program geliştirme alanındaki öncü akademisyenlerin eğitimde program geliştirmeye ilişkin metaforik algıları. OPUS–Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi 6(11):387-414.

Özçelik DA (2010). Eğitim programları ve öğretim. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.

Özen F, Hendekçi EA (2016). Türkiye'de eğitim denetimi alanında 2005-2015 yılları arasında yayımlanan makale ve tezlerin betimsel analizi. OPUS Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi 6(11):619-650.

Senemoğlu N (2018). Gelişim öğrenme ve öğretim. (25. Basım), Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Stabback P (2016). What makes a quality curriculum? Current and critical issues in curriculum and learning. UNESCO International Bureau of Education.

Taba H (1962). Curriculum development: theory and practice. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Tonbul Y (2017). Role of institutes of social sciences in enhancing the quality of postgraduate education. Journal of Higher Education and Science 7(1):150-162.

Varış F (1996). Eğitimde program geliştirme. Ankara: Alkım Yayınları.

Veznedaroğlu RL, Özgür AO (2005). Öğrenme stilleri: Tanımlamalar, modeller ve işlevleri. İlköğretim-Online 4(2):1-16.

Wiles JW, Bondi JC (2014). Curriculum development: A guide to practice. (9th ed.), Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Yakar A (2016). Model proposals of curriculum and ınstructional design on future education: vital curriculum and vital instructional design. MSKU Journal of Education 3(2):1-15.