Id: 1706025

Participatory Educational Research (PER)
Vol.13(2), pp. 63-84, March 2025
Available online at http://www.perjournal.com
ISSN: 2148-6123
http://dx.doi.org/10.17275/per.26.19.13.2

Turkish Language Teachers' Curriculum Literacy Levels: A Mixed Method Study

ORHAN ÖZEN*
Directorate of National Education, Erzurum, Türkiye
ORCID: 0000-0002-3534-3084

OSMAN MERT
Turkish Language Institute, Ankara, Türkiye
ORCID: 0000-0001-6159-1906

Article history

Received:
25.05.2025

Received in revised form:
18.09.2025

Accepted:
07.01.2026

Key words:
language teaching, curriculum literacy, language curriculum.

Continuously updated curriculum programs due to technological advancements, changing classroom practices, and new approaches increase the importance of curriculum literacy. The purpose of this study is to determine Turkish teachers' perceptions of the Turkish Curriculum and to determine their curriculum literacy levels. The participants of the study, which was designed as a mixed method, consisted of teachers of Turkish language course working in secondary schools. Curriculum literacy scale, classroom observations, interviews and document analysis were used in the study. According to the results of the scale, teachers see themselves as highly curriculum literate. According to the results of the observations, it was determined that the teachers' achievement and annual plan alignment was low. While textbooks were mostly preferred as content, problems were detected in the execution of the learning-teaching process in line with the objectives of the programme. Measurement and evaluation practices are mostly result-oriented and process-oriented practices are less common. According to the interview results, time, school facilities and exam concerns negatively affect the implementation of the programme. When the research results were evaluated in general, although the teachers evaluated themselves as curriculum literate in the scales and interviews, deficiencies in their compliance with the curriculum were observed in the observation and document review. It is recommended that the curriculum be monitored more effectively during its implementation.

Introduction

One of the most important guides in teaching a course is the curriculum. Curriculum is a set of planned activities prepared in an educational institution to achieve the general goals of national education and the objectives of the institution (Varış, 1988). Demirel (2020) defines the curriculum as an arrangement of experiences covering all the activities that should be given to students at school or outside. In general terms, in addition to the general objectives of the education system, there are also separate objectives for each course in the curriculum. In general, the student model to be raised, the educational situation variables to be used in the

* Correspondency: orhanozen25@gmail.com

process and measurement and evaluation practices constitute the main outline of the curriculum. Specific aims and objectives of the courses and course-specific learning-teaching processes and assessment and evaluation practices are included. The curriculum should be able to predict the skills that should be given to students in the course areas determined by creating near and far goals and should be able to provide teachers with all the steps in this process (Güzel & Karadağ, 2013).

The harmony between the teacher, student, and curriculum directly affects course instruction. If the curriculum is effectively implemented in line with the goals and expectations of the experts who prepared it, this can be considered an indicator of strong commitment to the curriculum (Yurt, 2024). The extent to which teachers understand, interpret, and reflect the components of the curriculum—the objectives, content, teaching-learning processes, and assessment-evaluation—into the classroom environment reveals a strong relationship between teachers' curriculum literacy and their commitment to the curriculum (Aynas, 2023). This relationship is strengthened by teachers' accurate understanding of the curriculum, their internalization, their appreciation of it, and their high commitment to its implementation (Yılmaz & Kahramanoğlu, 2021).

Turkish Language Teaching Programme has been tried to be improved since it was put into effect. Technological developments, innovations and competencies required by the age, changing classroom practices, new approaches and educational philosophies can be listed as the main reasons for this development. In parallel with this rapid development, Turkish Language Teaching Programme has been frequently renewed in recent years. Therefore, the teacher, who is the most important implementer of the programme, is expected to follow these developments and apply the renewed programmes in his/her lessons. At this point, the teacher's curriculum literacy skill comes into play. In this skill area, the teacher is expected to carry out educational activities effectively in line with the objectives and achievements specified in the programme. Çetinkaya and Tabak (2019) consider it as a teacher competency for teachers, who are in the position of guide and practitioner in the implementation of educational activities, to understand, design and implement curricula correctly. Aslan and Gürlen (2019) emphasise that there is a difference between the prepared curriculum and the teacher's perception and implementation of the curriculum and the importance of curriculum literacy in minimising this difference. Curriculum can be expressed as teachers' perceptions and attitudes towards curricula. In this context, teachers with high curriculum literacy competence will also have high perceptions and attitudes towards the curriculum (Demeuse & Christine. 2016).

When the literature is examined, it is seen that three basic terms are used: curriculum literacy, education curriculum literacy and programme literacy. There are definitions of curriculum literacy made by different researchers. Bolat (2017) defined it as knowing the elements of the curriculum, while Aslan (2018) defined it by adding planning and implementation to knowing. Akyıldız (2020) defines curriculum literacy as a competence area for understanding all the processes involved in understanding, implementing and evaluating a prepared curriculum. Keskin and Korkmaz (2020) defined literacy as being aware of the programme, interpreting the programme, applying it according to the conditions, and transferring it. Similarly, Aslan and Gürlen (2019) define it as being aware of the curriculum and its content, understanding the curriculum correctly, making plans in line with the curriculum and implementing the curriculum in line with the set goals.

When the contents of the studies on curriculum literacy in the literature are examined, it is

seen that the majority of the studies are about curriculum literacy levels. Aslan and Gürlen (2019), Gündoğan (2019), Erdamar (2020), Altuncu (2021), Atlı et al. (2021 Yılmaz and Kahramanoğlu (2021), Sarıca (2021), Dağ (2021), Güler (20219 Demir and Toraman (2021), Ustabulut (2021), Güleş (2022), Nasırcı (2022), Öner (2023) investigated the curriculum literacy levels of teachers working at different levels. Gömleksiz and Erdem (2019), Demir, Yücesoy and Yurttaş (2020) and Gülpek (2020) investigated the curriculum literacy levels of prospective teachers. Yıldırım and Dursun (2019), Başar and Berilgen (2021) investigated the curriculum literacy levels of school administrators.

The results of the research show that the curriculum literacy levels of pre-service teachers, teachers and administrators are high. Participants consider themselves sufficient in the dimensions of understanding, implementing and evaluating the curriculum. When the results of the demographic characteristics of the researches are analysed, it is understood that variables such as age, gender, length of service, type of school, etc. do not create a significant difference in the research results. It was stated that teachers and pre-service teachers who took curriculum-related courses such as curriculum development in undergraduate education perceived their curriculum literacy higher. In addition, it was stated that the literacy of the teachers who participated in curriculum-related training and those who received in-service training differed significantly. Again, it is understood that demographic characteristics such as the higher education institution graduated from and whether or not they received pedagogical formation education showed significant differences in the literacy levels of teachers (Aslan and Gürlen, 2019; Yılmaz and Kahramanoğlu, 2021; Sarıca, 2021; Güleş, 2022; Nasırcı, 2022; Öner, 2023).

According to the results of the research, the importance of teachers who are described as curriculum literate in implementing the curriculum more effectively and increasing success in education was emphasised. When the suggestions of the researchers were examined, it was emphasised that curriculum-based courses should be diversified or their hours should be increased especially in undergraduate education. It was stated that active teachers should be given trainings on curriculum development, curriculum literacy, in-service trainings should be organised, seminars and introductory meetings on updated or renewed programmes should be increased. It was emphasised that the term curriculum literacy should be emphasised more and this type of literacy should be made a teacher competency.

Studies on the implementation of the Turkish language curriculum are insufficient in the literature. There are no studies specifically focused on Turkish language instruction. Existing studies are general and superficial, encompassing all subjects. This study examines the implementation of the curriculum from different perspectives. By using a combination of scales, observation, interviews, and document analysis, the study provided an opportunity to assess teachers' curriculum literacy from different perspectives.

Purpose of the Study

The aim of this study is to determine the perceptions of Turkish teachers about the Turkish Curriculum, to determine the level of curriculum literacy skills and to examine the 'Education Curriculum' in general and the 'Turkish Curriculum' in particular in all aspects.
The subject of the research is the curriculum literacy levels of Turkish teachers. 'What is the curriculum literacy level of Turkish language teachers?' is the problem statement of the research. In the context of this problem, answers to the following questions are sought:

(1) At what level are Turkish teachers' perceptions of curriculum literacy?
(2) What are Turkish teachers' views on curriculum literacy?
(3) How are Turkish teachers' practices towards the dimensions of the curriculum?

- How are their practices towards the target dimension of the curriculum?
- How are their practices towards the content dimension of the curriculum?
- How are their practices towards the learning-teaching process dimension of the programme?
- How are their practices towards the measurement and evaluation dimension of the programme?

Methodology

Research methodology

This study, which was prepared to investigate the curriculum literacy levels of Turkish teachers, was designed as a mixed method. Mixed research method allows both quantitative and qualitative data to be collected and analysed. The design of the study is convergent parallel design which is one of the mixed research methods. In the convergent parallel design, data are collected independently from each other. In the analysis phase, the data are evaluated separately. In the interpretation section, the data are tried to be combined through the determined dimensions. This design can be chosen if the researcher has limited time to collect data and needs access to both types of data simultaneously. It will also be advantageous when both quantitative and qualitative data are equally necessary for understanding the research problem. Here, the researcher is expected to be proficient in both types of research (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2014).

In order to determine the curriculum literacy levels of Turkish teachers, literacy scale, classroom observations, document analysis and interview forms were applied.

Population and sample and participants

'Probability Sampling' method was used to determine the sample of the quantitative part of the research. It aims to determine as many samples as possible from a group or certain subgroups in a group, which is mostly used in quantitative research (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). In this study, stratified sampling method was used. In this sampling method, the aim is to conduct studies on the universe based on the sub-strata representing the universe. In this study, strata were formed from the districts of Erzurum province to reflect the universe and sampling was provided for the research. Turkish teachers working in 20 districts of Erzurum province constitute the universe. The number of Turkish teachers working in this universe is 572. 164 teachers participated in the study.

The maximum diversity method was used to determine the study group of the qualitative part of the research. The main purpose of this method is to provide diversity (school type, age, tenure, etc.) to reflect the study population as much as possible (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2016). Accordingly, it was aimed to form a relatively small group in order to reflect the diversity of individuals who are the parties of the research problem in the best way. Voluntary participants who could reflect the universe to the maximum extent were selected among the teachers participating in the quantitative research. The participants of the observation method and the semi-structured interview form were determined by this method. The observation study was conducted with 5 volunteer teachers. Due to the long period of observation, the number of

teachers observed was limited to 5 participants to represent the universe. Because qualitative research involves lengthy interviews and observations, it is natural for participants to be limited in number (Çevikbaş & Argün, 2016). The number of participants in qualitative research is determined by considering the adequacy of the data obtained (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). A semi-structured interview form was conducted with 15 teachers selected from among those who participated in both the observation and the scale. The other data source of the research is the documents used by the teachers in their lessons. The Turkish curriculum, the lesson plans of the observed classes, the sections of the Turkish textbooks used during the observation and other materials, books or written documents used by the teachers in the lessons constitute the documents of the research.

Data collection techniques/instruments

Two data collection tools were used to collect data for the quantitative part of the study. Data were obtained with the 'Curriculum Literacy Scale (CLS)' developed by Akyıldız (2020) in order to determine the level of Turkish teachers about the curriculum. Permission was requested from the author for the use of the scale and the scale was used in line with the necessary permissions. Among the scales determined in the literature related to the research topic, it was decided to use this scale in line with the opinions of two lecturers who are experts in the field of Programme Development, one lecturer who is an expert in the field of Turkish Education and one lecturer who is a scale development expert.

Observation, document analysis and interview techniques were used to collect qualitative data. The aim of observation is to observe the situation or behaviour to be observed in its own environment and holistically. This method is a method used when the researcher wants to collect detailed, time-spanning and comprehensive information about the behaviour in a certain environment (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2016). In this study, the researcher naturally took part in the observation area and did not participate in any way. In order to control the environment, the 'Turkish Lesson Semi-Structured Observation Form (TLSOF)' developed by the researcher was used. Thanks to the TLSOF, the data of the observed environment were collected and coded in themes, sections or dimensions. The other data collection tool used in the study was interview. In this research, semi-structured interview form, one of the interview types, was used. Semi-structured interview form is a qualitative data collection tool. In this type of interview, an interview plan is prepared by the researcher in general terms. However, it is possible to add questions later according to the course of the interview and in order to examine the subject in more detail (Karataş, 2017). In the study, the 'Turkish Teachers' Semi-Structured Interview Form (TTSIF)' developed by the researcher was used. In the preparation of the interview form, expert opinion was sought from both Turkish education and educational sciences. Finally, the documents collected within the scope of the research were analysed. In document analysis, it is aimed to examine and analyse the documents of the course in detail. The aim of document analysis is to examine written sources containing information about the situation under investigation (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2016). The advantage of this method is that it provides access to data that cannot be obtained by observation or interview methods (Merriam, 2013). The Turkish lesson plans of the observed grade level, the documents related to the programme, and the relevant sections of the textbooks constitute the documents of the study. Themes and dimensions were again utilised in the collection of these documents. Thus, it was aimed to obtain appropriate data from the documents.

Analysing the Data

SPSS 22 programme was used to analyse the quantitative data of the research. Arithmetic mean and standard deviation calculations were used to describe the quantitative data of the research. The quantitative data were analysed by tabulating the obtained data. Tests related to the validity and reliability of the data were used through the SPSS programme and the results were evaluated in line with the opinions of statistical experts. The scale consists of 4 dimensions: objective, content, educational context, and evaluation, totalling 36 items. The highest average score was 4.35 points for item 5, "I can distinguish between general and specific objectives." The lowest average score was 3.85 points for item 12, "I can create tables showing the relationship between objectives and content."

The analysis of the scale results started with the analysis of the data related to personal information and participation status. The data in this section were tabulated using frequency and percentage calculations. Then the scale items were analysed. Scale scores, averages and standard deviations of the scores were calculated and presented in tables. Normality tests were performed to determine whether there was a significant difference between the variables of the study and the scale scores. Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test was applied to analyse the research dimensions and scale items in terms of all variables. Table 1 shows the results of the normality test.

Table 1. Results of Normality Analysis of Curriculum Literacy Scale

Dimensions	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
	statistics	sd	p	statistics	sd	p
Goal	.112	164	.000	.958	164	.000
Content	.123	164	.000	.952	164	.000
Process	.124	164	.000	.951	164	.000
Evaluation	.168	164	.000	.924	164	.000

Descriptive analysis method was used in the analysis of observation and semi-structured interview data, which are among the qualitative data collection techniques of the research. According to this technique, themes and dimensions are used in summarising and interpreting the collected data. In addition to this, direct transfer is frequently used in transferring the data obtained in observation or interview. This transfer is an ideal method to present a more reliable picture of the results. At the end of the research, the data described are explained, interpreted, analysed in the context of cause and effect and conclusions are drawn.

In the analysis of qualitative data, observation results were analysed first. After analysing the observation forms of the teachers in detail, they were transferred to the classification tables prepared in advance. The observations were categorised according to the four basic dimensions in the scale. The observed behaviours of each teacher regarding the goal, content, process and evaluation dimensions were examined separately. The outcomes used in the lessons were transferred to the tables with their codes. In the tables, the themes, texts, outcomes and methods, techniques, tools and materials of each observed lesson of the teacher were shown separately. Again, the observation form of each teacher was transferred to a table showing whether the behaviours expected to be observed in all dimensions were identified. Then, detailed information about the observations was analysed by giving the acquisition codes and titles.

Validity and Reliability

The scale used in the study is a frequently used scale in the literature. Tests (Bartlett, KMO) were conducted to determine the scale's suitability for factor analysis and yielded positive results. Cronbach's alpha results were also determined to be high.

Table 2. Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
,973	,974	36

The observation form was developed based on field studies and expert opinions. Interview questions were reviewed by experts in the field of education programs as well as Turkish language experts.

Results

Findings related to Turkish language teachers' programme literacy levels

Statistical findings related to the general and sub-dimensions of the programme literacy scale are given in Table 3.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of Data Obtained with the Curriculum Literacy Scale

Sub dimensions	N	Minimum	Maximum	$\bar{X}$	SS
Goal	164	2,67	5,00	4,20	.50
Content	164	2,56	5,00	4,13	.55
Process	164	2,67	5,00	4,11	.54
Evaluation	164	2,89	5,00	4,19	.56
General	164	2,97	5,00	4,15	.48

When the table is analysed, it is seen that the highest mean score is in the dimension of goal with 4,20 and the lowest mean score is in the dimension of educational status with 4,11. It is understood that the mean score of the scale in general is 4,15. According to the results of the scale, it is understood that teachers' curriculum literacy levels are generally high, and teachers see themselves more positively in the goal dimension compared to other dimensions.

Findings related to participation in curriculum activities

Findings related to taking curriculum development course in university education

Mann Whitney U test results and descriptive statistics of the curriculum literacy scale related to the variable of taking curriculum development course in university education are shown in Table 4. It is seen that the mean scores of those who took curriculum development course in university education are higher in the dimension of goal, while the mean scores of those who did not take curriculum development course in university education are higher in other dimensions. However, it is seen that this situation does not create a significant difference for all dimensions. (U=2323,00, 2379,00, 2334,00, 2283,50, p>.05)

Table 4. Statistical Data and Mann Whitney U Test Results of the Curriculum Literacy Scale on the Status of Taking Curriculum Development Courses in University Education

Dimensions	Answer	N	X	Ss	U Test			
					S. av.	S. tot.	U	p
Goal	Yes	125	4,20	,50	83,42	10427,00	2323,00	,65
	No	39			79,56	3103,00		
Content	Yes	125	4,13	,55	82,03	10254,00	2379,00	,82
	No	39			84,00	3276,00		
Process	Yes	125	4,11	,54	81,67	10209,00	2334,00	,68
	No	39			85,15	3321,00		
Evaluation	Yes	125	4,19	,56	81,27	10158,50	2283,50	,54
	No	39			86,45	3371,50		

Findings related to taking curriculum development course in the process of teaching

Descriptive statistics and Mann Whitney U test results of the curriculum literacy scale for the variable of taking curriculum development course during the teaching process are shown in Table 5. It is seen that the mean scores in all dimensions are higher in favour of those who took curriculum development courses during the teaching process. Accordingly, there is a significant difference in favour of those who took curriculum development courses in the process of teaching in the dimensions of objectives, content and process. (U=1590,50, 1228,50, 1715,00 p<.05) In the evaluation dimension, it is understood that the mean scores of those who did not take curriculum development course during the teaching process are higher, but this situation is not statistically significant (U=1877,00, p>.05).

Table 5. Statistical Data and Mann Whitney U Test Results of the Curriculum Literacy Scale on the Status of Taking Curriculum Development Courses During the Teaching Process

Dimensions	Answer	N	X	Ss	U Test			
					S. av.	S. tot.	U	p
Goal	Yes	35	4,20	,50	101,56	3554,50	1590,50	,00
	No	129			77,33	9975,50		
Content	Yes	35	4,13	,55	103,33	3616,50	1228,50	,00
	No	129			76,85	9913,50		
Process	Yes	35	4,11	,54	98,00	3430,00	1715,00	,02
	No	129			78,29	10100,00		
Evaluation	Yes	35	4,19	,56	93,37	3268,00	1877,00	,12
	No	129			79,55	10262,00		

Findings related to receiving in-service training related to curricula

The statistical data and Mann Whitney U Test results of the Curriculum Literacy Scale related to in-service training on curricula are shown in Table 6. It is seen that the mean scores of those who received in-service training on curricula in all dimensions are high. This situation was significant in favour of those who received in-service training in the evaluation

dimension (U=2507,50 p<.0.5). It is understood that there is no statistically significant difference in other dimensions (U=2646,00, 2714,50, 2546,00, 2507,50, p>.05).

Table 6. Statistical Data and Mann Whitney U Test Results on the Status of Receiving In-Service Training on Curriculums for the Curriculum Literacy Scale

					U Test			
Dimensions	Answer	N	X	Ss	S. av.	S. tot.	U	p
Goal	Yes	58	4,20	,50	89,88	5213,00	2646,00	,138
	No	106			78,46	8317,00		
Content	Yes	58	4,13	,55	88,70	5144,50	2714,50	,214
	No	106			79,11	8385,50		
Process	Yes	58	4,11	,54	91,60	5313,00	2546,00	,068
	No	106			77,52	8217,00		
Evaluation	Yes	58	4,19	,56	92,27	5351,50	2507,50	,049
	No	106			77,16	8178,50		

Findings related to receiving ın-service training related to programme literacy

Statistical data and Mann Whitney U Test results regarding the status of receiving in-service training on curriculum literacy are shown in Table 7. It is seen that the mean scores of those who received in-service training on curriculum literacy are higher in all dimensions. However, this situation is not statistically significant in any dimension (U= 1637,50, 1573,00, 1565,00, 1824,00, p>.05).

Table 7. Statistical Data and Mann Whitney U Test Results on the Status of Receiving In-Service Training on Program Literacy for the Program Literacy Scale

					U Test			
Dimensions	Answer	N	X	Ss	S. av.	S. tot.	U	p
Goal	Yes	27	4,20	,50	90,35	2439,50	1637,50	,343
	No	137			80,95	11090,50		
Content	Yes	27	4,13	,55	92,74	2504,00	1573,00	,218
	No	137			80,48	11026,00		
Process	Yes	27	4,11	,54	93,04	2512,00	1565,00	,205
	No	137			80,42	11018,00		
Evaluation	Yes	27	4,19	,56	83,44	2253,00	1824,00	,909
	No	137			82,31	11277,00		

Findings related to participation in activities or seminars on curricula

The statistical data and Mann Whitney U Test results of the participation in activities or seminars on Turkish curriculum and introduction of curricula are shown in Table 8. It is seen that the mean scores of those who participated in the activities or seminars on introducing Turkish curriculum and teaching programmes are higher in all dimensions. This situation shows a significant difference in the process dimension in favour of those who

participated in the activities or seminars on introducing Turkish curriculum and instructional programmes (U=2537,00, p<.05). There is no statistically significant difference in the goal, content and evaluation dimensions (U= 2801,00, 2705,50, 2940,50, p>.05).

Table 8. Statistical Data and Mann Whitney U Test Results on Participation in Turkish Curriculum and Curriculum Introduction Activities or Seminars of Program Literacy Scale

					U Test			
Dimensions	Answer	N	X	Ss	S. av.	S. tot.	U	p
Goal	Yes	64	4,20	,50	88,73	5679,00	2801,00	,175
	No	100			78,51	78,51,00		
Content	Yes	64	4,13	,55	90,23	5774,50	2705,50	,094
	No	100			77,56	7755,50		
Process	Yes	64	4,11	,54	92,86	5943,00	2537,00	,025
	No	100			75,87	7587,00		
Evaluation	Yes	64	4,19	,56	86,55	5539,50	2940,50	,377
	No	100			79,91	7950,50		

Findings related to participation in curriculum development studies of Turkish curriculum and instructional programmes

The statistical data and Mann Whitney U Test results of the Turkish curriculum and teaching programmes regarding the participation in curriculum development studies are shown in Table 9. It is seen that the mean scores of those who participated in the curriculum development studies of Turkish curriculum and instructional programmes are higher in all dimensions. This situation shows a significant difference in the process dimension in favour of those who participated in the curriculum development studies of Turkish curriculum and instructional programmes (U = 1265,00, p < .05). There is no statistically significant difference in the goal, content and evaluation dimensions.

Table 9. Statistical Data and Mann Whitney U Test Results on the Participation of the Curriculum Literacy Scale in the Turkish Curriculum and Curriculum Development Studies

					U Test			
Dimensions	Answer	N	X	Ss	S. av.	S. tot.	U	p
Goal	Yes	24	4,20	,50	86,02	2064,50	1595,50	,692
	No	140			81,90	11465,50		
Content	Yes	24	4,13	,55	87,00	2088,00	1572,00	,614
	No	140			81,73	11442,00		
Process	Yes	24	4,11	,54	100,17	2404,00	1256,00	,048
	No	140			79,47	11126,00		
Evaluation	Yes	24	4,19	,56	88,21	2117,00	1543,00	,520
	No	140			81,52	11413,00		

Findings related to Turkish language teachers' practices regarding the dimensions of the curriculum

Firstly, the behaviours of the observed teachers related to the objective dimension were observed. It was tried to determine the harmony between the outcome written by the teachers in the notebook and the annual plan and the outcome taught in the lesson. It was observed that teachers generally tried to write the statement in the programme while writing the objectives in the notebook. It was determined that only two of the teachers always kept an annual plan in the lesson. It was stated that the annual plans were mostly obtained from the plans prepared in the general network environment. It is seen that the learning outcome written by the teachers in the notebook and the learning outcome given in the lesson generally do not coincide. Again, it is understood that the learning outcome written by the teachers in the notebook and the annual plan are mostly incompatible. It is understood that the lessons progressed in line with the annual plan in some grade levels, while in others, the lessons were out of the plan. It is understood that the lessons progress outside the plan due to reasons such as official holidays, snow holidays, local holidays and ceremonies that are not included in the plan. It is understood that some official holidays were not shown in the plans at the beginning of the year or were not updated in line with the holidays that emerged later. Secondly, practices related to the content dimension were observed during the observations. It was tried to observe whether the teachers selected appropriate content for the learning outcomes and the interests and needs of the students. It is understood that teachers utilised games especially to reinforce the grammar acquisitions. It was determined that they tried to enrich the lesson with content in line with the objectives. It is understood that teachers mostly follow the lesson from the textbook and do not tend towards different contents. It was determined that some teachers followed the textbook on the smart board. It was observed that this situation attracted more student interest. It is understood that worksheets are used in the 8th grade, which is called the exam preparation class. It was determined that the worksheets prepared at this grade level were tests consisting entirely of multiple-choice questions and did not address the learning outcomes and students in terms of content. Thirdly, practices related to the educational situation dimension were observed during the observations. It was examined whether the teachers determined learning-teaching processes appropriate to the learning outcome in their lessons and whether they used methods and techniques appropriate to the learning outcome. It was determined that teachers generally had a high level of classroom dominance. It can be said that classroom environments offer a democratic participation and learning environment and students express themselves easily. However, in some observations, it was observed that teachers showed authoritarian attitudes and preferred traditional methods. It was observed that participation and interaction in these classes were quite low. It was observed that teachers generally used methods and techniques such as question-answer, silent reading aloud, reading by guessing, intuition, demonstration, role-playing, drama, brainstorming, and used methods and techniques suitable for the purpose of teaching Turkish. It was observed that the teachers made sample applications before skills such as speaking and reading, and paid attention to give immediate feedback to the students' work. The lessons in which grammar subjects were taught were more teacher centred. It is understood that teachers mostly preferred the lecture method in these lessons. This situation caused the lesson to be more monotonous and not all of the students followed the lesson effectively. In order to overcome this situation, some teachers used gamification and game papers to make the lesson more enjoyable. The fourth dimension of the observations was measurement and evaluation. The measurement and evaluation activities of the teachers for the observed grade levels were observed. The observations revealed that the teachers partially preferred the assessment and evaluation practices emphasised in Turkish Course Curriculum. It was determined that teachers generally

prefer result-oriented assessment and evaluation tools. It is understood that teachers who prefer process-oriented assessment tools sometimes use traditional practices and sometimes use innovative and alternative practices. Product files, follow-up charts and tests, performance tasks and assignments were preferred among innovative assessment tools for process assessment. In 8th grades, tests consisting of multiple-choice questions were preferred due to central exam anxiety. It is understood that question types such as fill-in-the-blank and true-false questions, which are among the question types described in TCC, are rarely used. It was determined that the exams, which were thought to be prepared in accordance with the purpose, consisted of a variety of items such as open-ended, matching, true-false, fill-in-the-blank, and fill-in-the-blank questions that were useful for measuring students' high-level cognitive skills. It was determined that teachers used theme evaluation and outcome evaluation questions, albeit partially.

Findings related to Turkish teachers' views on curriculum literacy

In Table 10, the expressions used by the teachers in defining curriculum literacy are listed as themes and codes from the most repeated to the least repeated. According to this, teachers used the expression of understanding (f=9) the most in the definition of curriculum literacy. T1 and T3 used the following expressions while defining curriculum literacy as reading comprehension and critical reading: '*Reading the curriculum critically* (T1). *I understand it as reading the published teaching programmes and examining the changes in these programmes* (T3).'

Table 10. Teachers' Views on Curriculum Literacy

Theme	Sub Theme	Codes	f
Recognizing Program Literacy	Understand	Reading comprehension, critical reading. Analyzing and understanding the conveyed thought. Correct understanding, understanding what is said. Comprehension in every aspect.	T1, T3. T2, T13 T4, T5,T10, T13 T9
	Implement	Implement. Implement as planned. Implement effectively. Implement correctly.	T4, T10, T13 T6 T8 T9
	Gain-Goal	Realization of gains. Realization of goals. Being aware of gains.	T6, T8 T9, T14 T11
	Awareness	To be awareness about the program. To be awareness about the changes.	T7, T12 T3, T14
	Measurement and evaluation	Making an evaluation. Measurement and evaluation	T13 T14, T15

In Table 11, the findings related to the training received by the teachers about the curriculum are shown as themes and codes. When the table is examined, it is understood that 10 of the 15 teachers who participated in the interview did not take any courses related to the curriculum at undergraduate or postgraduate level. The answers given by the teachers who did not take any courses are as follows: '(T5) *Basic language skills and Turkish education system course*, (T10) *Undergraduate education*.

Table 11. Findings Regarding the Training Received by Teachers Regarding the Curriculum

Theme	Sub Theme	Codes	f
Trainings received regarding the Curriculum	I took lesson.	Program development course.	T1, T9, T11, T15
		Teaching Turkish to Foreigners	T12
	I didn't took lesson.		T2, T3, T4, T5, T6, T7, T8, T10, T13, T14

In Table 12, the findings regarding the frequency and reasons of teachers' looking at the curriculum before or during the lesson are presented as themes, sub-themes and codes. According to this, it is understood that only two of the teachers do not need to look at the teaching programme. The answers of these teachers are as follows: '(T4) I do not need, (T15) I do not look.

Table 12. Findings Regarding the Turkish Curriculum

Theme	Sub Theme	Codes	f
Finding the Turkish language curriculum sufficient	Sufficient	I find it sufficient.	T7, T8, T15
		It provides support for planning.	T3
		I receive contributions.	T9, T13
		It should be improved.	T9
		Users do not care.	T11
	Not Sufficient	Gains-grade level are not compatible, some are intensive.	T2
		Repetition of the same gains.	T6
		No subject integrity.	T12
		Not sufficient.	T5
		Should be improved.	T14
	Partially	Relatively	T1

Table 13 shows the responses of the teachers regarding the situations they see as deficiencies in the Turkish curriculum, the sections they want to change and their reasons. The information obtained from the answers was conveyed through themes, sub-themes and codes. Accordingly, it was observed that eleven teachers had requests for changes in the learning outcomes. Six of the teachers stated that the acquisitions should be renewed, while four teachers stated that the grammar acquisitions should be updated. 3 teachers stated that they could not complete the programme due to lack of time.

Table 13. Findings Regarding the Deficiencies Identified in the Turkish Curriculum

Theme	Sub Theme	Codes	f
Deficiencies Identified in the Curriculum	Gain	Gains should be renewed	T2, T6, T8, T9, T11, T13
		Grammar gains should be updated	T5, T10, T13, T14
	Time	Lack of time	T7, T12, T14

In Table 14, the opinions of the teachers about the sections they did not use in the Turkish curriculum are given in the form of themes and sub-themes. According to this, most of the teachers (f=7) stated that there were no sections they did not use, 2 teachers stated that they mostly did not use the writing section, and 1 teacher stated that they sometimes did not use the sections related to the text.

Table 14. Findings Regarding Opinions on Unused Sections of the Turkish Curriculum

Theme	Sub theme	f
Unused Parts of the Curriculum	There is no section I haven't used	T1, T3, T4, T5, T10, T11, T12, T15
	Writing section	T2, T14
	I have no idea	T6, T7, T8
	Text related sections	T9

Table 15 presents the findings related to the problems experienced by teachers while implementing the programme. The answers obtained are presented through themes, sub-themes and codes. Accordingly, it is seen that student level (f=9) comes first among the problems experienced by teachers. Secondly, central exam anxiety (f=5) comes second. Insufficient time (f=3) and physical environment (f=3) are seen as other deficiencies mentioned by teachers.

Table. 15. Findings Regarding the Problems Experienced in the Implementation of the Curriculum

Theme	Sub Theme	Codes	f
Problems encountered in the implementation of the program	Student level	Student level	T1, T4, T7, T15
		Level difference	T2, T9
		Level low	T13, T14
		Student age	T5
	Central exam anxiety		T1, T3, T9, T11, T13
	Lack of time		T2, T9, T13
	Physical environment	Lack of materials	T5
		Class size	T11
		Internet speed and interruption	T12

Discussion and conclusion

The findings were evaluated based on both quantitative and qualitative data. The results obtained within the scope of the study were discussed under the headings "scale dimensions," "demographic characteristics," "participation in curriculum activities," and "teacher observations and opinions."

Results Regarding Scale Dimensions

The curriculum literacy scale was examined in four dimensions: goal, content, process (learning-teaching situation), and evaluation. According to the scale results, teachers received the highest scores in the goal dimension and the lowest in the process dimension. High scores in the goal dimension indicate that teachers are competent in recognizing the goals and outcomes of the curriculum. Low scores in the process dimension indicate that teachers have

difficulty implementing the teaching methods and techniques prescribed by the program in the classroom.
Similar results were obtained by Demir, Yücesoy, and Serttaş (2020); in their study using the same scale, they noted that the highest score belonged to the goal dimension. Conversely, Güleş (2022) found the highest score in the learning-teaching situation dimension. This suggests that differences in teachers' classroom practice skills are related to the type of school they work in, the student level, and the conditions under which the curriculum is implemented.

Results Regarding Demographic Characteristics

Regarding the gender variable, female teachers were found to have higher scores in the goal, content, and process dimensions, while male teachers were found to have higher scores in the evaluation dimension. However, the differences were not statistically significant. This result is also supported by studies conducted by Aslan and Gürlen (2019), Gülpek (2020), and (2020). Only Gömleksiz and Erdem (2019) found a significant difference in favor of female preservice teachers.

Regarding the age variable, although the mean scores of teachers aged 21–30 were higher than those of other groups, the difference was not significant. This finding is consistent with studies conducted by Altuncu (2021) and Dağ (2021).

Regarding years of service, teachers with 16–20 years of service were found to have higher scores in the goal, content, and evaluation dimensions, but the differences were not significant. In the literature, Keskin (2020), Altuncu (2021), and Yılmaz & Kahramanoğlu (2021) similarly found no significant difference based on years of service.

In terms of the faculty of graduation variable, teachers who received pedagogical formation training were found to score significantly higher in the goal, content, and process dimensions. This finding is also partially supported by the studies of Güleş (2022) and Aslan & Gürlen (2019). However, some studies (e.g., Nasırcı, 2022; Demir, 2023) have produced different results.

In terms of the education level variable, it was determined that the mean scores of master's degree graduates were higher than those of bachelor's degree graduates, but a significant difference was found only in the process dimension. Similarly, Erdamar (2020) stated that graduate education increased the overall mean score.
No significant difference was found in terms of school type. Middle school teachers scored higher in the goal dimension, while imam hatip middle school teachers scored higher in the process and evaluation dimensions. This finding is supported by Dağ (2021), Güler (2021), and Yılmaz & Kahramanoğlu (2021).

Results Regarding Participation in Curriculum Activities

Although the average score of those who took the course in the objective dimension was higher compared to taking a curriculum development course in university education, the difference was not significant. Kuyubaşıoğlu (2019) and Keskin (2020) similarly stated that while this undergraduate course raised awareness, it did not create a significant difference at the behavioral level. In the variable of taking a curriculum development course during the teaching process, significant differences were found in the objective, content, and process dimensions. This result suggests that the contribution of curriculum development training

received in professional life to practice is higher than that of undergraduate courses. In terms of participation in in-service training, teachers who participated in in-service training on curriculum scored higher in all dimensions. The difference was significant only in the evaluation dimension. This is consistent with the findings of Keskin (2020) and Nasırcı (2022). Erdamar (2020) and Karacaoğlu (2008) also emphasized that in-service training improves teacher competencies, while Şişman (2015) emphasized its necessity for the continuity of teacher training. Teachers who received in-service training on the Turkish curriculum were found to have higher scores in all dimensions, but the differences were not significant. This suggests that the content of existing in-service training makes a limited contribution to teachers' practical skills. Teachers who received in-service training on curriculum literacy also had higher mean scores, but the differences were not significant. Güleş (2022), Erdamar (2020), and Karacaoğlu (2008) emphasized the positive effects of in-service training on teacher awareness. A significant difference was found in the process dimension based on participation in Turkish curriculum promotion events or seminars. This suggests that awareness of the program's implementation process increased through seminars and demonstrations. A significant difference was found in the process dimension based on participation in program development activities. Nasırcı (2022) and Dündar et al. (2023) stated that teachers who participated in the curriculum development process better understood the program and strengthened their implementation skills.

Findings Regarding Teacher Practices

Observations indicate that teachers exhibited different practices in the goal, content, process, and evaluation dimensions. In the goal dimension, it was determined that teachers generally wrote down the outcomes in notebooks, but they were not fully aligned with the annual plan. Yıldırım and Yıldırım (2020) emphasized that planning is a prerequisite for teaching. However, teachers prefer ready-made plans, which weakens the alignment of learning outcomes (Kara et al., 2017). In terms of content, it has been observed that teachers mostly use the textbook and focus on different content to a limited extent. Test-heavy materials are preferred, especially due to exam anxiety. Arslan and Engin (2019) stated that this situation is related to textbook deficiencies. In terms of process, it has been observed that teachers generally prefer traditional methods, but they also use techniques such as drama, brainstorming, and question-answer. Arıcı (2006) and Güven (2011) similarly state that these methods are frequently preferred in teaching Turkish. In terms of evaluation, it has been observed that teachers mostly prefer outcome-oriented assessment tools and make limited use of process assessment tools. Bıçak and Alver (2018), Benzer and Eldem (2013) stated that teachers still maintain the traditional assessment approach. However, some teachers were observed to use open-ended questions, portfolios, and performance tasks (Menteşe, 2014).

Findings Regarding Teachers' Views

In the interviews, teachers most frequently defined the concept of "curriculum literacy" with the terms "understanding" and "application." This is consistent with definitions in the literature (Akyıldız, 2020; Erdem & Eğmir, 2018; Nasırcı, 2022). The majority of teachers stated that they had not taken any courses or seminars on the curriculum during their undergraduate or in-service training. Similarly, Kırmızı & Akkaya (2009) and Durukan & Alver (2008) stated that teachers found the curriculum training they received inadequate. Most teachers stated that they followed changes in the curriculum, but they stated that the innovations were not sufficiently reflected in practice (Kavan & Suna, 2019). The intensity of learning outcomes, insufficient time, and the unbalanced distribution of grammar topics are the main points criticized by teachers (Dur, 2014; Bıçak & Alver, 2018). Among the

challenges teachers face during the program implementation process, student levels, time constraints, physical conditions, and the pressure of centralized exams are prominent. Similar results in the literature (Dur, 2014; Binay Kaya, 2021) indicate that problems encountered at the implementation level of curriculum stem from systemic and environmental factors.
According to the research findings, teachers' curriculum literacy levels are generally moderate to high. However, relatively low levels were observed in the process and evaluation dimensions. This may be due to the fact that teachers' theoretical knowledge is not fully reflected in practice. In particular, in-service training often remains at a formal level, leading teachers to underutilize innovative methods and assessment tools in classroom practice. Similarly, the fact that "program development" courses in teacher preparation programs are mostly taught at a theoretical level limits teacher candidates' ability to translate program philosophy into practice (Keskin, 2020; Kuyubaşıoğlu, 2019).

Furthermore, teachers' level of program implementation varies depending on school type, student profile, and the centralized exam system. Exam pressure, in particular, leads teachers to focus on measurable outcomes, reducing the use of process-based assessment tools (Benzer & Eldem, 2013; Bıçak & Alver, 2018). Therefore, low scores in the process dimension suggest that teachers' pedagogical preferences are influenced by systemic factors.

The lack of a difference based on years of service suggests that teachers' professional experience does not solely determine program literacy. This suggests that as teachers progress through their years of service, they become ingrained in professional routines and embrace innovation. This can be explained by the development of resistance to internal practices (Altuncu, 2021; Yılmaz & Kahramanoğlu, 2021).

This study expands the theoretical framework in the literature by examining the concept of curriculum literacy in the context of Turkish language teaching. The findings support the notion that curriculum literacy is a multidimensional construct encompassing not only "curriculum understanding" but also "implementation and evaluation." Thus, the study contributed to a clearer separation of the cognitive, affective, and action dimensions of curriculum literacy.

In this respect, the research helps explain the relationship between teachers' curriculum knowledge and their practical competencies; it provides a theoretical basis for the "curriculum awareness-practice consistency" model. Furthermore, the research strengthens the conceptual integrity of the literature by establishing a framework linking curriculum literacy to teacher professional development (Erdem & Eğmir, 2018; Akyıldız, 2020).

The results of the study offer important implications for the restructuring of teacher preparation and in-service training programs. The findings demonstrate the need to enhance teachers' practical skills; in this context, they suggest that curriculum literacy should be supported with practice-based modules rather than theoretical ones. In particular, teachers' participation in curriculum development activities has been observed to significantly increase their awareness levels (Dündar et al., 2023; Nasırcı, 2022). Furthermore, the study demonstrates that school-based professional learning communities (e.g., curriculum development teams, seminar groups) directly contribute to curriculum literacy. This suggests that teachers' interaction with the curriculum positively impacts the development of their professional identity (Şişman, 2015; Güleş, 2022).

Unlike previous studies, this study was conducted specifically with Turkish teachers and

adopted a mixed approach, integrating quantitative and qualitative data. In this respect, it offers a unique framework that jointly evaluates both statistical trends and teachers' perceptual and experiential dimensions of curriculum literacy. Furthermore, it is one of the first in the field to holistically analyze variables such as university education, in-service training, and participation in program development activities that influence teachers' engagement with the program. This clarifies the literature on which types of educational interventions are most effective in increasing teachers' program awareness.

Integration Quantitative and Qualitative Data

In the research, quantitative and qualitative data were integrated in two stages. These comparisons, conducted both at a general level and across dimensions, revealed that teachers perceived themselves to be sufficiently literate, a finding supported by interview data. However, observation and document analysis data were not consistent. While demographic variables did not produce significant differences, teachers who took curriculum development courses and participated in seminars and in-service training had more positive views on program familiarity and implementation. Dimensional evaluations revealed that the goal dimension received the highest scores, but there were also learning-time mismatches and planning deficiencies. In the content dimension, teachers received low scores, did not fully adhere to the textbook, and external factors influenced their content selection. In the process dimension, teachers were observed to be inadequate in their use of methods, techniques, and materials, preferring traditional methods. In the measurement and evaluation dimension, although teachers perceived themselves as competent, they found they rarely used process-oriented assessments in practice and, out of anxiety about centralized exams, preferred outcome-oriented assessment tools.

Conclusions and Recommendations

This study expands the theoretical framework in the literature by examining the concept of curriculum literacy in the context of Turkish language teaching. The research evaluated data obtained from scales, observations, interviews, and document analysis. According to the scale results, teachers perceive themselves as quite competent regarding the curriculum. Observation results indicated that teachers' success and annual plan adherence were low. While textbooks were mostly preferred in terms of content, problems were identified in conducting the learning-teaching process in accordance with the program's objectives. Measurement and evaluation practices were mostly outcome-oriented, while process-oriented practices were less common. Interview results showed that time, school resources, and exam anxiety negatively impacted program implementation. Overall, while teachers assessed themselves as competent in the curriculum through scales and interviews, deficiencies in their adherence to the curriculum were observed through observation and document analysis. More effective monitoring during curriculum implementation is recommended.

Declarations
Acknowledgments: *This research is derived from a doctoral dissertation.*
Funding: *No funding source is reported for this study.*
Ethics Statements: *Author/s declare presence of Ethics Statements that needed for ethical conduct of research using human subjects.*
Conflict of Interest: *No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s)*
Data availability: *The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.*

References

Akyıldız, S. (2020). Conceptual analysis of the concept of curriculum literacy: A scale development study. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences, 19*(73), 315-332.

Altuncu, N. (2021). *Examining the curriculum literacy levels of high school teachers* (Thesis No. 694356) [Master's thesis, Erciyes University-Kayseri]. National Thesis Center of the Council of Higher Education.

An, F. (2020). *Examining the status of English teachers in ensuring curriculum compliance* (Thesis No. 616652) [Master's thesis, Gaziantep University-Gaziantep]. National Thesis Center of the Council of Higher Education.

Arıcı, A. F. (2006). Strategies-methods and techniques used in teaching Turkish. *Atatürk University Journal of Social Sciences Institute, 7*(1), 299-308.

Arslan, A., & Engin, A. O. (2019). Evaluation of 5th grade Turkish course curriculum according to teachers' opinions. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Educational Research, 3*(5), 19-39.

Aslan, S. (2018). *Curriculum literacy levels of secondary school teachers* (Thesis No. 516831) [Master's thesis, Hacettepe University-Ankara]. National Thesis Center of the Council of Higher Education.

Aslan, S. & Gürlen, E. (2019). Curriculum literacy levels of secondary school teachers. *Ahi Evran University Journal of Kırşehir Faculty of Education, 20*(1), 171-186.

Atlı, K., Kara, Ö. & Mirzeoğlu, A. D. (2021). Examining the perceptions of physical education teachers regarding curriculum literacy levels according to some variables. *Gazi Journal of Physical Education and Sports Sciences, 26*(2), 281-299.

Aynas, N. (2023). Examining the relationship between curriculum literacy levels and curriculum commitment of classroom teachers. *Dokuz Eylül University Buca Faculty of Education Journal (57)*, 1426-1445.

Başar, T., & Berilgen, S. (2021). Determination of curriculum literacy levels of school administrators. *Kastamonu Education Journal, 29*(2), 348-361.

Bateman, D., Taylor, S., Janik, E., & Logan, A. (2007). Curriculum coherence and student success. *Pédagogie Collégiale, 22*(5), 8-18.

Benzer, A., & Eldem, E. (2013). Knowledge levels of Turkish and literature teachers about measurement and evaluation tools. *Kastamonu Education Journal, 21*(2), 649-664.

Bıçak, N., & Alver, M. (2018). Teachers' views on the 2018 Turkish course curriculum. *International Turkish Literature Culture Education Journal, 7*(4), 2480-2501.

Binay Kaya, E. (2021). *An evaluation of the compatibility of the 2019 Turkish language course curriculum (Iğdır province example)* (Thesis No. 681242) [Master's thesis, On Dokuz Mayıs University-Samsun]. National Thesis Center of the Council of Higher Education.

Bolat, Y. (2017). The concept of curriculum literacy and curriculum literacy scale. *Electronic Turkish Studies, 12*(18), 121-138.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2014). *Mixed methods research: Design and implementation* (2nd ed.). (Y. Dede & S. B. Demir, Trans. Ed.). Memoir. (The original study was published in 2011)

Çetinkaya, S., & Tabak, S. (2019). Curriculum literacy competencies of prospective teachers. *Ondokuz Mayis University Journal of Education Faculty, 38*(1), 296-309.

Çevikbaş, M., & Argün, Z. (2016). The role of mathematics teachers' feedback on wrong answers on students' self-esteem. *Gazi Education Faculty Journal, 36*(3).

Dağ, Ş. (2021). *Investigation of teachers' curriculum literacy and teaching motivation* (Thesis No. 701331) [Master's thesis, Sabahattin Zaim University-İstanbul]. National Thesis Center of the Council of Higher Education.

Demeuse, M. & Christine, S. (2016). *Curriculum development in education from political decisions to implementation* (Y. Budak, Trans.). Pegem Academy.

Demir, E. & Toraman, Ç. (2021). Curriculum literacy levels of teachers. *Trakya Education Journal, 11*(3), 1516-1528.

Demir, B., Yücesoy, Y. & Serttaş, Z. (2020). Curriculum literacy levels of prospective teachers: The TRNC example. *International Journal of Social Sciences in Turkish Cultural Geography, 5*(1), 28-37.

Demirel, Ö. (2020). *The art of teaching*. Pegem Academy.

Dur, Y. (2014). *Opinions of second-level primary school teachers, students, and parents on the Turkish curriculum and its implementation, and the problems they encountered during the implementation of the curriculum* (Thesis No. 377633) [Master's thesis, Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University-Muğla]. National Thesis Center of the Council of Higher Education.

Durukan, E., & Alver, M. (2008). Evaluation of the sound-based sentence method according to teachers' opinions. *Journal of International Social Research, 1*(5), 274-289.

Dündar, E., Sözcü, U., & Türker, A. (2023). Examining the curriculum literacy levels of geography teachers. *Gazi University Gazi Faculty of Education Journal, 43*(2), 1245-1281.

Erdamar, F. S. (2020). *Analysis of classroom teachers' perceptions of curriculum literacy and primary school administrators' perceptions of teachers' curriculum literacy skills in the context of progressive philosophy* (Thesis No. 621287) [Doctoral dissertation, Fırat University-Elazığ]. National Thesis Center of the Council of Higher Education.

Gömleksiz, M. N. & Erdem, Ş. (2019). Views of teacher candidates registered in the faculty of education and PFE program on curriculum literacy. *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies, 9*(73), 509-529

Güler, Ş. Y. (2021). *The relationship between preschool teachers' program literacy, self-efficacy beliefs and classroom management skills* (Thesis No. 681722) [Master's thesis, Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University-Kahramanmaraş]. National Thesis Center of the Council of Higher Education.

Güleş, E. (2022). *Investigation of primary and secondary school teachers' program literacy and commitment to the curriculum* (Thesis No. 715738) [Master's thesis, Hacı Bektaş Veli University-Nevşehir]. National Thesis Center of the Council of Higher Education.

Gülpek, U. (2020). *Investigation of program literacy and physical education teaching competence levels of physical education and sports teachers and teacher candidates* (Thesis No. 627563) [Master's thesis, Uludağ University-Bursa]. National Thesis Center of the Council of Higher Education.

Gündoğan, G. (2019). *A qualitative assessment of teachers' curriculum literacy* (Thesis No. 579025) [Master's thesis, Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University-Kahramanmaraş]. National Thesis Center of the Council of Higher Education.

Güven, A. Z. (2011). Teachers' opinions on the Turkish language course curriculum for the second stage of primary education. *Dokuz Eylül University Buca Faculty of Education Journal* (29), 121-133.

Güzel, A., & Karadağ, Ö. (2013). A critical look at the "Turkish Course Curriculum (6, 7, 8. Grades)" in terms of narration skills. *Journal of Mother Tongue Education, 1*(1), 45-52.

Kara, K., Karakoç, Yıldırım, İ., & Bay, E. (2017). An examination of "program compatibility" in the context of theory and practice in eighth grade mathematics teaching. *Harran Maarif Journal, 2*(1), 26-40.

Karacaoğlu, Ö. C. (2008). Teachers' perception of competence. *Van Yüzüncü Yıl University Faculty of Education Journal, 5*(1), 70-97.

Karataş, Z. (2017). Paradigm shift in social science research: The rise of the qualitative approach. *Turkish Journal of Social Service Research, 1*(1), 68-86.

Kavan, N., & Suna, Z. Y. (2023). Examining the awareness levels of Turkish teachers regarding the 2019 Turkish course curriculum. *Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University Journal of Social Sciences, 20*(3), 781-797.

Keskin, A. (2020). *Determining teachers' perceptions of curriculum literacy levels* (Thesis No. 618850) [Doctoral dissertation, Hacettepe University-Ankara]. National Thesis Center of the Council of Higher Education.

Keskin, A., & Korkmaz, H. (2020). Development of teachers' curriculum literacy perception scale. *Turkish Journal of Educational Sciences, 19*(2), 857-884.

Kırmızı, F. S., & Akkaya, N. (2009). Teachers' opinions on the problems encountered in the Turkish curriculum. *Pamukkale University Journal of Education, 25*(25), 42-54.

Kuyubaşıoğlu, R. M. (2019). *Examining teachers' curriculum literacy competencies* (Thesis No. 608523) [Doctoral dissertation, Mersin University-Mersin]. National Thesis Center of the Council of Higher Education.

Lincoln, Y. S. ve Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Merriam, S. B. (2013). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (S. Turan, Trans. Ed.) Nobel. (The original study was published in 2009)

Menteşe, H. (2014). *Examining the secondary school Turkish course curriculum according to teachers' opinions (A sample of Aydın province)* (Thesis No. 375789) [Master's thesis, Adnan Menderes University-Aydın]. National Thesis Center of the Council of Higher Education.

Nasırcı, H. (2022). *Examining the curriculum literacy competencies of classroom teachers* (Thesis No. 714076) [Master's thesis, Çukurova University-Adana]. National Thesis Center of the Council of Higher Education.

Öner, F. (2023). *Curriculum literacy skills of primary school English teachers: an examination in the context of formal and functional curriculum* (Thesis No. 781266) [Master's thesis, Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University-İstanbul]. National Thesis Center of the Council of Higher Education.

Sarıca, R. (2021). A study on the curriculum literacy of teachers. *Ahi Evran University Kırşehir Faculty of Education Journal, 22*(1), 132-170.

Şişman, M. (2015). *Introduction to educational sciences.* Pegem Academy.

Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (2003). *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research.* Sage.

Ustabulut, M. Y. (2021). Curriculum literacy levels of instructors teaching Turkish as a foreign language. *Fırat University Journal of Social Sciences, 31*(3), 1235-1243.

Varış, F. (1988). *Curriculum development in education: theory and techniques.* Ankara: Ankara University Faculty of Educational Sciences Publications.

Yar Yıldırım, V., 2018. *Development and evaluation of an in-service training program for curriculum literacy of school administrators* (Thesis No. 493983) [Doctoral dissertation, Gaziosmanpaşa University-Tokat]. National Thesis Center of the Council of Higher Education.

Yıldırım, V. Y., & Dursun, F. (2019). Development of a scale for curriculum literacy levels of school administrators. *Kırşehir Faculty of Education Journal, 20*(2), 705-750.

Yıldırım, A., & Simsek, H. (2016). *Qualitative research methods in social sciences* (10th ed.). Seçkin.

Yılmaz, G., & Kahramanoğlu, R. (2021). Investigation of the relationship between teachers' curriculum literacy levels, curriculum orientations, and curriculum commitment levels. *Journal of Interdisciplinary*

Yurt, E. (2024). Examining the relationship between teachers' critical thinking dispositions and their commitment to the curriculum. *Abant İzzet Baysal University Journal of Education, 24*(1), 152-169.