

The Relationship between Secondary School Teachers' Curriculum Fidelity and National High Stake Tests

By Tuncay Arduç^{}, Sedef Süer[±] & İsmail Kinay[°]*

In this study, it was aimed to examine the relationship between secondary school teachers' curriculum fidelity and their views on central exams. The study was designed with relational survey model. The population of the study consists of Turkish language, mathematics, science, English language and social studies teachers working in secondary schools affiliated to Diyarbakır Provincial Directorate of National Education during the 2021-2022 academic year. The sample of the study consists of 517 secondary school teachers randomly selected from these field of studies. "Curriculum Fidelity Scale", "Scale of Views on Central Examination" and "Open-ended Questionnaire Form" were used as data collection tools. The data of the study were collected online between 28.06.2021 - 14.03.2022. As a result of the study, it was determined that there was no significant relationship between secondary school teachers' curriculum fidelity and their views towards central exams. However, no significant relationship was found between the curriculum fidelity of secondary school teachers working in Supporting and Training Courses and their negative views towards central exams. On the other hand, a positive and significant relationship was found between the curriculum fidelity of secondary school teachers working in the Supporting and Training Courses and their views towards the central exams.

Keywords: Curriculum, Curriculum fidelity, high-stakes tests, secondary school teachers,

Introduction

The experiences in the teaching and learning process are too important to be left to do random activities. Therefore, following a program is necessary for the realization of educational goals and experiences. Curriculum refers to all teaching activities, such as academic material and courses taught in a school or any educational institution, to educate individuals in line with the goals and needs of the age (Bas & Sentürk, 2019; Zaman & Khawaja, 2022). Curricula stands at the center of education systems and function as maps that can help determine the objectives, contents, the way and criteria for the realization of the educational goals in the educational process (Çetinkaya & Tabak, 2019). While well-organized curricula enable students to acquire lifelong learning and thinking skills and daily

^{*}Assistant Professor, Dicle University, Ziya Gökalp Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Türkiye.

[±]Associate Professor, Dicle University, Ziya Gökalp Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Türkiye.

[°]Associate Professor, Dicle University, Ziya Gökalp Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Türkiye.

life skills, they guide educational activities, teachers, students and parents by consciously using the opportunities (Bay et al., 2017). Curricula are evaluated and revised at regular intervals in parallel with the changes in current life. However, no matter how much the curricula are well improved and developed; they need to be implemented completely and in fidelity with support of all stakeholders (LaChausse et al., 2014; Özcelik, 2014). This makes it necessary for the curricula to be implemented in line with its original design, which brings the concept of fidelity to the agenda.

Fidelity refers to the intended implementation of a plan (Gresham, 1989), and fidelity studies have their origins in E. M. Rogers' Diffusion of Innovations Theory (Dusenbury et al., 2003). The first studies of fidelity were initiated in the 1970s-80s to determine the effectiveness of the curricula developed to prevent substance use in the health sector, and from there it spread to the education and service sectors (Vartuli & Rohs, 2009). On the other hand, curriculum fidelity in the field of education is defined as the faithful implementation of the curriculum to its original design by the teachers/ stakeholders who implement it (Bumen, Cakar & Yildiz, 2014; Aslan & Erden, 2020). Curriculum fidelity, in other words, refers to how much of the designed curriculum has been implemented qualitatively and quantitatively (Haataja et al., 2014).

Curriculum fidelity is at the center of curriculum studies for determining the impact of the curricula on education and learning outcomes (McNeill et al., 2018), for the development of the curriculum or for identifying the setbacks or problems that arise regarding curricula in practice (Bumen et al., 2014). It also emerges as an intermediate variable that should be considered in evaluating teacher performance and providing support for professional development (Pence et al., 2008). However, the relevant literature revealed that teachers have to make curricular adaptations in the teaching and learning process and unable demonstrate complete fidelity to original design of curricula in Turkey, where the curricula are designed centrally and implemented throughout the country (Bas & Sentürk, 2019; Moon & Park, 2016; Stains & Vickrey, 2017; Tas, 2022). The literature also emphasizes that several variables, such as regional, institutional and external factors, curriculum revisions, teacher qualification and training, and student needs affect curriculum fidelity (Burakgazi, 2019; Dusenbury et al., 2003; Kimpston, 1985; Superfine, Marshall & Kelso, 2015); Ringwalt et al., 2003; Tas, 2022). Another highlighted variable is the national high-stake tests, which are conducted to select and place students at upper institutions after certain school stages in Turkey (Bay et al., 2017; Bümen et al., 2014).

National high-stake tests have been used for centuries to eliminate bias in different nations, to help access to public service, to identify and select people to become an official member of a community and to measure whether students have acquired certain skills (Madaus et al., 2010). Today, high-stake tests are based on the understanding of program interventions as a requirement of evidence-based practices and the quantitative measurement of the instructional results (Misset & Foster, 2015). Based on the principle of "standards and accountability" in learning, high-stake tests can be preferred worldwide to determine the quality of the teaching process, student success, the effectiveness of the curriculum, or to select

students (Kahraman, 2014; Sloane & Kelly, 2003). In this context, national high-stake tests are also frequently used in our country to determine student success and to place students in a higher institution in line with academic success (Ertem, 2021). Although the applied national high-stake tests seem to be the most unprejudiced method for student selection and placement, they may especially affect the teaching and learning process in the long run (Dong, 2020). For example, Brimijoin (2005) stated that the use of high-stake tests as an assessment approach by the state for student selection, placing or graduation from a certain school level, may prevent teachers from the followed pedagogy and lead them to implement practices that ignores the learners needs. Büyüköztürk (2016) emphasizes that high-stake tests are the determinants of teaching, learning, assessment and measurement practices in classrooms in Turkey, therefore, both the teaching process and assessment and measurement practices in schools are organized to assure the success in national high-stake tests. Demir and Keleş (2021), on the other hand, state that national high-stakes tests lead teachers to use more traditional teaching methods and multiple-choice test-solving techniques. As it is known, curricula comprise four main elements: objectives, content, learning-teaching and measurement and assessment process (Hunkins, & Ornstein, 1988). There is a dynamic relationship between these four elements of the curriculum, and practices and interventions in any element can affect others (Reyhanlıoğlu & Tiryaki, 2021). Based on these, the national high-stake tests conducted in the evaluation part of the curricula may affect the implementation of the other three elements. As a matter of fact, the relevant literature pointed out that teachers generally go beyond the teaching suggested by the curriculum and carry out their practices to assure academic success on national high-stake tests (Dawson, 2012; Demir & Keleş, 2021; Supovitz, 2009). Therefore, the national high-stake test conducted in Turkey impairs teachers' curriculum fidelity (Bay et al. ., 2017; Bumen et al., 2014). Based on these results, the relationship between teachers' curriculum fidelity and their views towards national high-stake tests was to be worth investigating in this study. This study aims to examine the relationship between secondary school teachers' curriculum fidelity and their views on national high-stake tests. For this purpose, the following research questions were searched: What is the level of secondary school teachers' views on curriculum fidelity and national high-stake tests?

2. Is there a significant difference between secondary school teachers' views on curriculum fidelity and national high-stake tests in terms of following variables:

- a) Education status,
- b) Field of study,
- c) School types,
- d) Teaching in Support and Training Courses (STC)?

3. What is the relationship between secondary school teachers' views on curriculum fidelity and national high-stake tests?

Method

Research design, population and sample of the study, data collection instruments, data collection procedure and data analysis procedures of the research is presented in this section.

Research Model

This study was based on correlational survey method as it aimed to search the relationship between secondary school teachers' views on curriculum fidelity and national high-stake tests.

Population and Sample

The population of the study comprised 6866 Turkish Language, Mathematics, Science, English Language and Social Studies teachers working in secondary schools in Province of Diyarbakır in the 2021-2022 academic year. The sample of the study comprised 517 secondary school teachers randomly selected from the population in line with the study field. For a population of 6866, the sample size was found as much as 364 with 95% confidence level and 5% margin of error calculations (<https://www.research-advisors.com/tools/SampleSize.htm>). The sample of this study may represent the population. The descriptive characteristic of the sample was presented in Table 1.

Table 1. The Descriptive Characteristics of the sample

Characteristics	Categories	N	%
Gender	Female	226	43.7
	Male	291	56.3
Educational Level	Bachelor's	425	82.2
	Postgraduate	92	17.8
Field of Study	Turkish Language	124	24.0
	Mathematics	125	24.2
	Science	93	18.0
	English Language	85	16.4
	Social Science	90	17.4
School Types	Private	39	7.5
	State	478	92.5
Teaching in STC	Yes	450	87.0
	No	67	13.0
Total		517	100

Data Collection Tools

“Curriculum Fidelity Scale”, “General View about High-Stakes Testing Scale” and “Open Ended Questionnaire Form” were used as data collection tools.

Curriculum Fidelity Scale (CFS)

CFS was developed by Yasaroglu and Manav (2015) as a single dimensional 5-point Likert type scale. CFS comprised 16 positive and 4 negative, totally 20 items. Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient value of the scale was calculated as .896 (Yasaroglu and Manav, 2015). In this study, Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient was found as .785.

General View about High-Stakes Testing Scale

General View about High-Stakes Testing Scale was developed by Genç (2005) and was adopted in Turkish Language and Culture by Buldur and Acar (2018). The scale was 5 point Likert type, comprised 12 items and two dimensions. The first dimension is positive views about high-stake tests consisting five items and the second one is about negative views about high-stake tests consisting 7 items. Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient value of the scale was calculated as .79 for the dimensions of positive views about high-stake tests and .75 for dimension of the negative views about high-stake tests in the adaptation study (Buldur & Acar, 2018). In this study, Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient value of the dimensions was calculated as .892 and .708 respectively.

Open-Ended Questionnaire Form

The questionnaire, comprised two open-ended questions, was developed by the researchers for this study. First, the researchers prepared two open-ended questions to reveal the secondary school teachers' opinions on the relationship between the curriculum fidelity and national high-stake tests. Afterwards, the questions were sent to three experts in curriculum and instruction and revised in line with expert opinions. The final form of the open-ended questions were:

1. How do national high-stake test contribute to the curriculum implementation process?
2. How do national high-stake test detriment to the curriculum implementation process?

Data Collection Process

The data collection process started after the ethical approvals of Social and Human Sciences Ethics' Committee and Diyarbakır Provincial Directorate of National Education to implement the research instruments. Research items in the data collection tools were processed into "Google Forms" and a link was obtained. The scale items and demographic variables were kept obligatory while the open-ended questionnaire was offered as optional. The online data collection process lasted from 28th June 2021 to 14th March 2022.

Ethical Committee Approval (2. Level Title Style)

Ethical committee approval is obtained from Dicle University Social and Human Sciences Ethics' Committee on 18.05.2021 No: 71445

Data Analysis

The quantitative and qualitative data within the scope of this study were analyzed separately. Quantitative data were analyzed with Jamovi package program. The statistics regarding demographic variables were presented with percentages and frequencies. The mean and standard deviation values were calculated to determine the secondary school teachers' views regarding curriculum fidelity and national high stake tests. The means scores of teachers' views were interpreted based on the following score ranges and levels presented on Table 2.

Table 2. Score Ranges and Levels Used to Interpret Mean Values

Score ranges	Levels
1.00 – 1.80	I strongly disagree
1.81 – 2.60	I disagree
2.61 – 3.40	I partly agree
3.41 – 4.20	I agree
4.21 – 5.00	I strongly agree

Normality assumptions of data were tested to determine the type of statistics to be used. First, Kurtosis and Skewness coefficients were examined to test the normality assumption. The Kurtosis and Skewness coefficients were found 6.52 and -1.77 for the curriculum fidelity, 0.472 and -0.700 for negative views dimension of national high stake, and -0.435 and -.268 for the positive views dimension. Based on these findings, the data set showed normality for both positive and negative views dimensions of national high-stake, but those for the curriculum fidelity did not assure the assumption of normality. However, as a basis of many analysis methods, the Central Limit Theorem (CLT) claims that the means of randomly selected samples from any distribution must have a normal distribution. CLT also recommends ignoring data distribution when we have a sample comprising hundreds of observations (Altman & Bland, 1995: 298). This assures that the mean of sample taken from a population will inevitably be a normally distributed if it has a sample over a certain volume (usually 30 or more) regardless of the distribution of the random variable in the population (Korum, 1985: 135). Although Parametric tests require samples that have a normal distribution, large sample sizes (30 or more variables) do not cause any major problems with the violation of this assumption (Pallant, 2017:227). If the group size is greater than 40 when comparing the means for each group, CLT suggests the use of parametric tests even if the data does show a normal distribution (Elliott & Woodward, 2007: 26). Based on these assumptions, the sample size of the study would not pose a threat to the assumption of normality and allow for the use of parametric tests for curriculum fidelity scores. Then, Levene's test was used to test the homogeneity

independent variables, and the results for each independent variable considered in the study were presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Results of Levene Tests

Dependent variable Independent variable	Curriculum Fidelity		Positive views		Negative views	
	F	p	F	p	F	p
Education Status	.0575	.810	.0852	.770	.0012	.972
Field of Study	.638	.635	.624	.646	2.744	.028*
School Types	1.156	.283	11.194	.001*	.144	.705
Teaching in STC	.1603	.689	.027	.869	.0665	.797

*p<.05

Independent Samples t-test and ANOVA tests were used to test whether secondary school teachers' views on curriculum fidelity and national high-stake tests differ in line with the independent variables discussed in the study. When Independent Samples t-Test is used and homogeneity assumption is assured, Student's t-Test results are reported, if not Welch's t-Test results are reported. When One-Way ANOVA test is used and the homogeneity assumption is assured, the Fisher's Test results are reported. If not, the Welch's Test results are reported. Pearson Correlation coefficient was used to determine the relationship between secondary school teachers' curriculum fidelity and their views on national high-stake. Then, the sample were separated into two variables in line with teachers' taking part in STC or not, and the Pearson Correlation coefficient was calculated again to determine the relationship. Büyüköztürk (2011:32) stated that a correlation coefficient between .70-1.00 can be interpreted as a high correlation, between .30-.70 as a medium and between .00-.30 as a low level correlation. The comparisons were based on the .05 level of significance. The effect size (Cohen's d) was calculated to determine the size of the significant difference. Cohen's effect size (Cohen d) results from 0.20 to 0.49 showed a small effect, if it is from 0.50 to 0.79 means a medium effect, and if it is equal to or over 0.80 indicated a large effect (Tan, 2016: 278).

In the study, the qualitative data obtained via open-ended questionnaire form were analyzed with descriptive statistics. The secondary school teachers' responses to the open-ended questions were divided into categories and their frequencies were calculated.

Results

The findings of the study are presented according to the problems of the research. The mean and standard deviation values of secondary school teachers' curriculum fidelity and their negative and positive views on national high-stake tests are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Mean and Standard Deviation Values of Secondary School Teachers' Curriculum Fidelity, Negative and Positive Views on National High-Stake Tests

Variable	N	\bar{X}	ss
Curriculum Fidelity	517	4.54	.468
Negative Opinion	517	3.80	.795
Positive Opinion	517	3.33	.969

When Table 4 is examined, it is seen that secondary school teachers' curriculum fidelity(4.54) is at the level of strongly agree, their negative views on national high-stake tests (3.80) is at the level of agree, and their positive views on national high-stake tests (3.33) is at the level of partially agree. Table 5 presents the findings on whether there is a significant difference between secondary school teachers' curriculum fidelity, their negative and positive views on national high-stake tests according to their education level.

Table 5. Independent Samples t-Test Results Regarding Secondary School Teachers' Curriculum Fidelity, Negative and Positive Views on National High-Stake Tests regarding Educational Background

Dependent variable	Education status	N	\bar{X}	ss	Df	t	p	Effect size
Curriculum Fidelity	Bachelor's	425	4.55	.474	515	.508	.612	
	Postgraduate	92	4.52	.442				
Negative Opinion	Bachelor's	425	3.81	.796	515	.649	.516	
	Postgraduate	92	3.75	.794				
Positive Opinion	Bachelor's	425	3.32	.963	515	.387	.699	
	Postgraduate	92	3.37	1.00				

* p < .05

When Table 5 is examined, it is seen that there is no significant difference between secondary school teachers' curriculum fidelity and their negative and positive views on national high-stake tests according to their educational level. Although no significant differences were found according to education level, it is seen that the negative views of teachers with bachelor's degree on curriculum fidelity and national high-stakes tests are higher. On the other hand, it was determined that teachers with postgraduate education had higher positive views towards national high-stake tests. The findings regarding whether there is a significant difference between secondary school teachers' fidelity to the curriculum, negative and positive views towards national high-stake tests according to their branches are presented in Table 6, Table 7 and Table 8, respectively.

Table 6. ANOVA (Fisher's) Results of Secondary School Teachers' Curriculum Fidelity regarding Teachers' Field of Study

Dependent variable	Field of Study	N	\bar{X}	ss	F	p	Tukey	Effect size
Curriculum Fidelity	Turkish Language	124	4.62	.430	1.3728	.242	-	-
	Maths	125	4.52	.427				
	Science	93	4.55	.427				
	English Language	85	4.47	.546				
	Social Studies	90	4.51	.526				

*p < .05

When Table 6 is examined, it is seen that there is no significant difference between secondary school teachers' curriculum fidelity regarding teachers' field of study variable. Although no significant difference was found, it is seen that Turkish language teachers have the highest average and English language teachers have the lowest average in terms of curriculum fidelity.

Table 7. ANOVA (Fisher's) Results of Secondary School Teachers' Negative Views on National High-Stake Tests regarding Teachers' Field of Study Variable

Dependent variable	Field of Study	N	\bar{X}	ss	F	p	Tukey	Effect size
Negative Opinion	Turkish Language	124	3.79	.851	.0785	.989	-	-
	Maths	125	3.80	.850				
	Science	93	3.76	.801				
	English Language	85	3.81	.742				
	Social Studies	90	3.82	.689				

*p < .05

When Table 7 is examined, it is seen that there is no significant difference between the negative opinions of secondary school teachers about national high-stake tests regarding teachers' study field. Although no significant difference was found, it is seen that social sciences teachers have the highest average and science teachers have the lowest average in terms of negative views towards central exams.

Table 8. ANOVA (Welch's) Results Regarding Secondary School Teachers' Positive Views on National High-Stake Tests regarding Teachers' Field of Study Variable

Dependent variable	Field of Study	N	\bar{X}	ss	F	p	Tukey	Effect size
Positive Opinion	Turkish	124	3.25	1.092	1.6137	.171	-	-
	Maths	125	3.33	.991				
	Science	93	3.30	.940				
	English	85	3.26	.793				
	Social Studies	90	3.55	.924				

*p < .05

When Table 8 is examined, it is seen that there is no significant difference between the positive views of secondary school teachers on national high-stake tests regarding teachers' study field. Although no significant difference was found, it is seen that social studies teachers have the highest average and Turkish language teachers have the lowest average in terms of positive views towards national high-stake tests. The findings on whether there is a significant difference between secondary school teachers' curriculum fidelity, negative and positive views on national high-stake tests regarding the teachers' school type are presented in Table 9.

Table 9. Independent Samples t-Test (Student's t-Test for Curriculum Fidelity and Positive Views and Welch's t-Test for Negative Views) Results Regarding Secondary School Teachers' Fidelity, Negative and Positive Views on National High-Stake Tests regarding the Teachers' School Type

Dependent variable	School type	N	\bar{X}	ss	Df	t	p	Effect size
Curriculum Fidelity	Private	39	4.69	.398	515	2.0615	.040*	.343
	State	478	4.53	.471				
Negative Views	Private	39	3.79	1.128	40.9	.0233	.982	
	State	478	3.80	.763				
Positive Views	Private	39	3.67	1.016	515	2.3088	.021*	.384
	State	478	3.30	.961				

*p < .05

When Table 9 is examined, a significant difference was found between secondary school teachers' curriculum fidelity and their positive views on national high-stake tests regarding teachers' school type. These significant differences were found in favor of teachers working in private schools. When the effect size value was analyzed, the significant differences were at a small level. On the other hand, no significant difference was found between secondary school teachers' negative views on national high-stake tests regarding teachers' school type. Although no significant difference was found between the negative views of secondary school teachers on national high-stake tests regarding teachers' school type, it is seen that the views of teachers working in public schools towards national high-stake tests are higher. Table 10 presents the findings on whether there is a significant difference between secondary school teachers' curriculum fidelity and their negative and

positive views on national high-stake tests regarding teachers' taking part in Supporting and Training Courses (STC)

Table 10. Independent Samples t-Test (Student's t) Results of Teachers' Curriculum Fidelity, Negative and Positive Views on National High-Stake Tests Regarding the Variable of Taking Part in Secondary School Supporting and Training Courses (STC)

Dependent variable	Taking part in STC	N	\bar{X}	ss	Df	t	p	Effect size
Curriculum Fidelity	Yes	450	4.56	.453	515	1.981	.048*	.259
	No	67	4.44	.550				
Negative Views	Yes	450	3.81	.796	515	.514	.608	
	No	67	3.75	.793				
Positive Views	Yes	450	3.31	.975	515	1.115	.265	
	No	67	3.45	.924				

*p < .05

When Table 10 is examined, a significant difference was found between the secondary school teachers' curriculum fidelity according to the variable of taking part in the STCs. This difference was found in favor of the teachers who took part in the STCs. When the effect size value is analyzed, it is seen that the significant difference is at a small level. On the other hand, no significant difference was found between negative and positive views on national high-stake tests. Although no significant difference was found between the positive and negative views of secondary school teachers on national high-stake tests, it is seen that the mean scores of the teachers who took part in STCs were higher in terms of negative views and the mean scores of the teachers who did not take part in STCs were higher in terms of positive views. Findings on the relationship between secondary school teachers' curriculum fidelity and their views on national high-stake tests were presented in the table below.

Table 11. Findings Related to the Relationship between Secondary School Teachers' Curriculum Fidelity and Their Views on National High-Stake Tests

		Negative views	Positive views
Curriculum Fidelity (For all teachers)	r	-.033	.085
	p	.455	.053
Curriculum Fidelity (Taking part in STCs)	r	-.080	.100
	p	.088	.033*
Curriculum Fidelity (Not taking part in STCs)	r	.220	.030
	p	.073	.807

*p < .05


Table 11 shows that there is no significant relationship between secondary school teachers' curriculum fidelity and their views towards national high-stake tests. On the other hand, no significant relationship was found between curriculum fidelity of secondary school teachers' taking part in STCs and their negative views

on national high-stake tests. However, there is a significant relationship between secondary school teachers' who take part in STCs curriculum fidelity and positive views on national high-stake tests. However, the correlation coefficient indicates a low relationship between these two variables. In addition, no significant relationship was found between the curriculum fidelity of secondary school teachers who did not take part in STCs and their views on national high-stake tests.

What are the positive effects of national high-stake tests on curriculum fidelity of secondary school teachers?

It was determined that 218 teachers gave valid answers to the question about the positive effects of national high-stake tests on teachers' curriculum implementation process and 31 of the teachers who answered the question stated that national high-stake tests did not have a positive effect. The rest of the responses were grouped under three themes: teacher, student and curriculum.

Figure 1. Positive Effects of National High-Stake Tests on Teachers' Curriculum Fidelity




As stated in Figure 1, secondary school teachers thought that National high-stake tests contribute to curriculum fidelity of teachers for three reasons: teacher, student and curriculum components. The first of these reasons is the component of students, and secondary school teachers think that national high-stake tests enhance students' readiness, success, planned study habits, reinforcement and feedback, and equality of opportunity, which in turn contribute curriculum fidelity of teachers. According to secondary school teachers, the second reason is the component of teacher. The teachers stated that national high-stake tests contribute to teachers' curriculum fidelity on the grounds that they give feedback to teachers in terms of both their own and student performance, encourage teachers to cooperate and

work regularly, guide them in choosing methods and techniques, and require their professional development. Finally, the secondary school teachers pointed the curriculum components as a last reason, and stated that national high-stake tests urged teachers to have cooperation and coordination in curricular implementations, providing feedback for the realization of goals, providing guidance, equal opportunities and increasing the function of the school as the implementer of the curriculum. This in the end, led to the curriculum fidelity of teachers in schools. Based on all these views, national high-stake tests may have a positive effect on curriculum fidelity of secondary school teachers on the basis of students, teachers and curriculum components.

What are the Negative Effects of National High-stake Tests on Curriculum Fidelity of Secondary School Teachers?

It was determined that 196 teachers gave valid answers to the question about the negative effects of central exams on the process of teachers' implementation of the curriculum, and 10 of the teachers who answered the question stated that there was no negative effect. The rest of the responses were grouped under four themes: education, student, teacher and curriculum.

Figure 2. Negative Effects of National High-Stake Tests on Teachers' Curriculum Fidelity



As shown in Figure 2, secondary school teachers think that National High-Stakes Tests have negative effects on curriculum fidelity under four themes: student, curriculum, education and teacher components. Under the student theme, it was stated that high-stakes tests cause stress and anxiety in students, individual

differences of learners are ignored and socialisation of students is negatively affected. Under the theme of curriculum, it was stated that standard tests narrow the curriculum, make the curriculum irrelevant, curriculum and test outcomes do not match, curriculum outcomes have become exam-oriented, and cognitive-affective and motor skills are neglected. Regarding the characteristic of education, the participants stated that high-stakes tests create inequality of opportunity in education and increases rote learning. Under the theme of teacher, it is stated that central exams create anxiety on teachers to finish the curriculum on time and this is a negative situation for teachers. Based on all these views, it can be said that national high stake tests have negative effects on the curriculum fidelity in terms of students, curriculum, teachers and education components.

Conclusion, Discussion and Recommendations

In this study, which examined the relationship between secondary school teachers' curriculum fidelity and their views on national high-stake tests, it was concluded that secondary school teachers' implement the curriculum with high fidelity. This result is in line with the results of the studies examining teachers' curriculum fidelity in the literature. Aslan and Erden (2020) in the study examining secondary school teachers' curriculum fidelity concluded that the teachers' curriculum fidelity level was high. Studies examining primary and secondary school teachers' curriculum fidelity (Burul, 2018; Kabaş & Yıldız, 2020; Karakuyu & Oğuz, 2021; Süer & Kinay, 2022) reported that primary and secondary school teachers have a high level of curriculum fidelity. Besides, other studies have found that high school teachers generally adhere to the curriculum at a high level (Aşçı & Yıldırım, 2020; Zög, 2022). Overall, the level of fidelity to the curriculum showed a high level of fidelity for teachers working at kindergarten, primary, secondary and high schools (Boncuk, 2021; Sakallıoğlu & Özüdoğru, 2022; Yılmaz & Kahramanoğlu, 2021). Majority of studies indicate that teachers have a high level of curriculum fidelity, then it can be considered that teachers generally adhere to the curriculum to a significant degree. High level of curriculum fidelity means that the curriculum is implemented as intended by the curriculum designers. (Vartuli & Rohs, 2009). While there may be variations in curriculum fidelity levels among teachers, it is important for them to strive towards adhering to the curriculum as closely as possible in order to provide students with the best possible education and opportunities for future success. Otherwise, students' experiences of the curriculum and ultimately their learning opportunities will be affected. (Superfine et al., 2015). In this respect, McNeill et al. (2018) state that it is important to include justifications for the objectives of the curriculum, especially in education programs. According to Bümen et al. (2014), there are several factors that can influence teachers' fidelity to the curriculum. These factors include teacher characteristics, teacher training, regional and socio-economic characteristics, a centralized education system, and diagnostic tests for the future. This suggests that if teachers are seen as solely obligated to implement a prepared curriculum without any room for adaptation, it can lead to a teacher profile that is unable to adapt the curriculum based on the

unique conditions of their students and classroom. This may ultimately result in the implementation of a curriculum that is different from the designed one. According to Döş et al. (2017), there are multiple factors that can affect teachers' fidelity to the curriculum. These factors include school-environment, education system, teacher, curriculum, subject, method-application, student, resource-material and social factors. Dikbayır and Bümen (2016) state that student, curriculum, teacher and institutional characteristics and the centralised education system are determinative in teachers' curriculum fidelity. Hill & Erickson (2019) argues that medium or high level of fidelity is sufficient to achieve the desired results in the curriculum. Examining and determining the curriculum fidelity is important in explaining why curriculum initiatives are successful or not. If the desired results in teaching cannot be achieved despite teachers' high level of curriculum fidelity, the curriculum may need to be redesigned. (Dusenbury et al., 2003). According to Cutbush et al. (2017), although educators may define curriculum fidelity as strictly following the developed program without making any additions or subtractions, they do make some adaptations to the program. It is suggested that curriculum developers should support practitioners by explaining the curriculum theory in terms that practitioners can understand, clearly articulating expectations for adaptations or changes to the curriculum, and noting lessons learned from previous implementation. In general, it is important for teachers to have a high level of curriculum fidelity in order to effectively implement the intended curriculum and achieve desired learning outcomes. However, it is also important to recognize that teaching and learning take place within a complex and dynamic context that can influence how the curriculum is implemented. Teachers' commitment to the curriculum may be high, but this may also be an indicator that teachers do not evaluate the curriculum critically and make the necessary adaptations. For this reason, in studies on fidelity, determining in which situations teachers adhere to the program and in which situations they deviate from the program through detailed examinations will enable better evaluations.

It was concluded that there is no significant difference in teachers' curriculum fidelity according to gender, education level, or field of study variable, this means that these factors do not seem to have a significant impact on teachers' implementation of the curriculum. When the research in the related literature examined (Aşçı & Yıldırım, 2020; Aslan & Erden, 2020; Baş & Şentürk, 2019; Burul, 2018; Karakuyu & Oğuz, 2021; Sakallıoğlu & Özüdoğru, 2022), they reported that teachers' curriculum fidelity did not differ significantly according to gender variable. However, Süer and Kinay (2022) state that female teachers' curriculum fidelity is higher than male teachers. In terms of education level variables (Aslan & Erden, 2020; Baş & Şentürk, 2019; Karakuyu & Oğuz, 2021; Sakallıoğlu & Özüdoğru, 2022), the studies argue that curriculum fidelity did not create a significant difference. Boncuk (2021) reported that teachers with postgraduate education have higher curriculum fidelity. Bümen et al. (2014) state that teacher training is an important part of the successful implementation of the new curriculum. This can include training on the content and structure of the curriculum, as well as on effective teaching strategies and assessment methods that align with the new curriculum, which can be achieved via qualified pre-service education. In order to

train expert teachers who can adapt the curriculum according to environmental conditions, teachers' professional knowledge and skills as well as their professional self-efficacy beliefs should be strengthened so that they can adapt the curriculum more effectively. In this respect, teacher education should include experiences that teach how much and how to implement the curriculum as well as how to adapt the curriculum according to environmental conditions.

This study has concluded that there is no significant difference in secondary school teachers' curriculum fidelity according to their field of study variable, this means that teachers from different fields of study are equally likely to implement the curriculum as intended. This finding suggests that teachers' academic background or field of study may not be a major factor in shaping their implementation of the curriculum. Parallel to this finding in the literature Zöğ, (2022) in a study conducted with high school teachers reported that the field of teaching did not make a significant difference in teachers' curriculum fidelity. Aşçı and Yıldırım (2020) states that there is no significant difference in the secondary school teachers curriculum fidelity in terms of field of study variable. Sakallıoğlu and Özüdoğru (2022) as a result of the research conducted with teachers working at different school stages stated that teachers' curriculum fidelity differs significantly according to the teachers' field of study variable. Accordingly, pre-school and primary teachers have higher curriculum fidelity level than the teachers of other study fields. Similarly, Aslan and Erden (2020) reported that there are significant differences in teachers' curriculum fidelity in terms of teachers' field of study variable. Accordingly, science teachers' curriculum fidelity is higher than primary mathematics, religious culture and ethics, and technology design/ information technologies teachers. Fine arts/sports teachers' curriculum fidelity is higher than primary mathematics and technology design/information technologies teachers. When the findings of this study and the literature findings are evaluated together, it is important to continue research that differentiates between teachers from different field of studies in order to gain a more comprehensive understanding of this factor on curriculum fidelity.

When the teachers' curriculum fidelity in terms of the school type variable was examined, no significant difference was found between teachers working in private and public secondary schools. This means that teachers working in both private and public secondary schools are equally likely to implement the curriculum as intended. Aşçı and Yıldırım (2020) also reported that there is no significant difference in the fidelity of teachers working in secondary schools towards curriculum according to the type of school they work in. Öztürk-Akar (2005) found differences in the implementation of the high school biology curriculum according to school type in their study. Bümen et al. (2014) pointed out that student achievement in Turkey differs according to geographical region and socio-economic structure, and this situation contains important data on student success or failure, which affects the curriculum fidelity. In this regard, it is reported that there is a need for detailed guidelines for the adaptation of the curriculum in advantageous or disadvantaged groups arising from regional and socio-economic differences. In Turkey, private and public schools must comply with the curriculum of the Ministry of National Education. Therefore, in this study, no significant difference was found in the commitment of private and public-school

teachers to the program. Since private schools, like public schools, have to prepare students for central exams, it is expected that there would be no difference in teachers' commitment.

When the teachers' opinions about the national high-stake tests were examined, it was concluded that the negative opinions of the secondary school teachers participating in the study about the national high-stake tests were at the level of agree, while their positive opinions were at the level of partially agree. At this point, it can be said that teachers' negative opinions about national high-stake tests are higher than their positive opinions. A significant difference was found between secondary school teachers' curriculum fidelity and their positive views on national high-stake tests according to school type. These significant differences were found to be in favor of teachers working in private schools. Ünsal and Çetin (2019) reports that private school teachers adhere to the curriculum; however, in competitive private schools that want their students to be more successful, additional resources are required, thus private school teachers are concerned about students' academic success and test results. They also state that teachers use mock exams as a measurement tool in private schools and the use of mock exams as a measurement tool in private schools could be seen as an indication of the importance placed on preparing students for national high-stakes tests. According to the findings obtained from the open-ended questionnaire, the positive effects of national high-stake tests on curriculum fidelity were grouped under the themes of student, teacher and curriculum. In terms of students; readiness, planned work, feedback, reinforcement, test technique, equal opportunity and success come to the fore. Gündoğdu et al. (2010) and Karakaya et al. (2020) suggest that national high-stakes tests can have a positive impact on student achievement. These tests can provide a clear goal for students to work towards, and may motivate them to study more effectively and consistently. Additionally, the tests can provide valuable feedback for students, teachers, and schools. However, it is important to note that the benefits of national high-stakes tests are a matter of debate, and there are also arguments against their use. Critics argue that these tests can place too much emphasis on test-taking strategies and they enable students to work in a planned way (Acar & Buldur, 2021; Gündoğdu et al., 2010; Hündür & Diken, 2018; Şad & Şahiner, 2016). From the teacher's point of view, feedback on teacher and student performance, coordination and regular work, method and technique selection and professional development have been pointed out as the positive effects. The role of national high-stake tests in providing feedback on teachers' performance has also been reported by different research (Acar & Buldur, 2021; Buyruk, 2014; A. Çetin & Ünsal, 2019; Taşkın & Aksoy, 2018). It is also known that teachers' planned and regular work and coordination are ensured through centralized examinations. (İnceoğlu, 2015; Kırkağaç & Bayrak, 2019). Another remarkable finding related to the theme of teachers' curriculum fidelity of national high-stake tests is related to the professional development of teachers. Various studies reported that national high-stake tests contribute to teachers' professional development as an incentive for teachers to renew themselves in terms of curriculum adherence (Acar & Buldur, 2021; A. Çetin & Ünsal, 2019; Çetin, 2019; Hündür & Diken, 2018; Kırkağaç & Bayrak, 2019; Kızırcan & Nacaroglu, 2019). Ensuring curriculum

fidelity, coordination in the implementation of the curriculum, feedback on achievements, giving direction to the curriculum, equality of opportunity and making the school functional are some of the positive effects of national high-stake tests on curriculum fidelity. Kızıkan and Nacaroglu (2019) state that teachers think that LGS (High School Entrance Exam) exams are reflective of the science curriculum, compatible with the curriculum, consistent with the learning outcomes, reflect the curriculum and ensure that the curriculum is implemented simultaneously all over the country. Similarly, it is stated that coordination in curricula can be ensured through national high-stake tests. Including questions from the content of programs in the national high-stake tests can strengthen the relationship between students, teachers, and the school, as it encourages students to take the curriculum more seriously and motivates them to learn the required content (Hündür & Diken, 2018; Kızıkan & Nacaroglu, 2019).

The results of open-ended questionnaire suggested that the negative effects of national high-stake tests on curriculum fidelity were perceived to be related to such factors as students, education, curriculum, and teachers. In terms of students, it was concluded that national high-stake tests cause stress and anxiety on students, individual differences are not taken into account, high-level cognitive skills, affective and kinesthetic skills are lacking, and socialization is negatively affected. Özdaş (2019) report that national high-stake tests negatively affect students' psychology, decrease their motivation and their interest in the course and determinate student socialization. This finding is consistent with the findings of other studies in the literature (Acar & Buldur, 2021; Kahraman, 2014; Kalsen & Yiğit Öztekin, 2021; Önder, 2016; Öner & Bahadırtas, 2022). The findings of the study also coincide with the studies above. The negative effect of national high-stake tests on the development of students' higher-order cognitive skills has been reported by various research (Gökdeniz & Demirci, 2020; Kaya & Göktürk, 2019; Ömür & Bavlı, 2020; Polat & Bilen, 2022). The finding of this study in that sense overlapping with the previous studies' findings. At this point, the ability of national high-stake tests to measure high-level cognitive skills should be carefully considered. In addition, Önder, (2016) and Özdaş (2019) emphasize that students cannot socialize due to national high-stake tests and the development of their social skills is negatively affected. Another negative effect of national high-stake tests in terms of curriculum fidelity was grouped under the theme of education. According to this, national high-stake tests create inequality of opportunity in education and accustom students to rote learning. The finding that national high-stake tests cause inequality of opportunity in education is supported with the various study results (Hündür & Diken, 2018; Kalsen & Yiğit Öztekin, 2021). In addition, the result that national high-stake tests urge students to rote learning is pointed out by other research results (Acar & Buldur, 2021). The theme of the curriculum in the study suggests that the national high-stake tests have negative effects on the curriculum fidelity of teachers. The study found that the activities in the curriculum could not be carried out due to the national high-stake tests. The methods were narrowed, the objectives in the curriculum and the exam were incompatible, and the objectives in the curriculum became exam-oriented, which narrowed down the curriculum and made it less meaningful. These findings are

consistent with previous studies that have shown how national high-stake tests can limit the curriculum and negatively impact teaching practices. The findings of the current study regarding the incompatibility between the national high-stake tests and the curriculum and the teaching becoming exam-oriented are in line with the findings of previous studies in the literature (Acar & Buldur, 2021; A. Çetin & Ünsal, 2019; Erden, 2020; Hündür & Diken, 2018; Kablan & Bozkuş, 2021; Ömür & Bavlı, 2020; Öner & Bahadırtaş, 2022; Ormancı et al., 2018; Sezer, 2018). These results indicate that central exams ensure that teachers adhere to the curriculum and create coordination among teachers. However, due to central exams, activities related to the socio-cultural development of students can sometimes be sacrificed in the programs. Care should be taken to ensure that the achievements that current standard tests aim to measure are consistent with the human profile and skills that the applied curriculum aims to train. Content that is not asked in the exam is removed from the program, creating the impression that it is unimportant. This situation can be generalized by students and parents to courses which questions are not asked in the exams. In this case, learning can be reduced to taking tests. By overlooking the social and cultural contexts of learning, students may fail to learn socialization, empathy, and social responsibilities.

This study also suggests that there was a relationship between teachers' attitudes towards national high-stake tests and their curriculum fidelity. Specifically, the study found that there was a significant relationship between the curriculum fidelity of secondary school teachers working in Supporting and Training Courses and their positive views towards national high-stake tests. Although the relationship was found to be weak, it suggests that teachers who have positive attitudes towards high-stakes tests might be more committed to implementing the curriculum as intended. In line with this finding, the related studies have shown that teachers generally have positive views about the national high-stake tests in Turkey and believe that these tests can increase students' interest, motivation, and success in academic courses (Bakırcı & Kırıcı, 2018; Buldur & Acar, 2019; Eroğlu & Özbek, 2017; Karakaya et al., 2019). From this point of view, a common perspective among teachers in Turkey regarding the purpose of national high-stake tests may be that teachers believe that student achievement is an important outcome of the curriculum, and they see national high-stake tests as a way to measure this achievement. Westbury (2000) argues that the main indicator of providing effective teaching is student achievement and teachers should implement curricula for this purpose. In our country, the output of centrally prepared programs is measured through national high-stake tests and teachers are expected to increase student achievement by implementing the curriculum as it was designed (Bumen, 2019). Considering that the content of the LGS (High School Entrance Exam) exam are likely to value and implement the secondary education program qualitatively and quantitatively more as it is designed to assess students' success and abilities in the transition from secondary school to higher education. (Azili & Tutkun, 2021). Therefore, it is important for teachers to ensure that students have a strong foundation in the secondary education program to perform well in the LGS (High School Entrance Exam) exam, which may have led teachers taking part in

Supporting and Training Courses to both express positive views towards the national high-stake tests and to show more fidelity to curriculum.

In line with the results obtained from the research, this study, which deals with the relationship between teachers' curriculum fidelity and their views on national high-stake tests and the variables affecting this relationship, provides important data to the literature on quantitative approach. However, this study also has some limitations. First of all, since the data of this study is based on teachers' statements, it can be considered to reflect a subjective point of view. In addition, since this study contains quantitative data, it can be suggested that studies on similar subjects should be continued with classroom observations, document analysis, interviews and experimental models. As, this study was conducted in the context of Turkey, it may be necessary to conduct comparative studies between countries in terms of generalizability.

References

- Acar, M., & Buldur, S. (2021). High Stakes Tests through the Eyes of Science Teachers: Positive and Negative Impacts. *Anadolu Journal of Educational Sciences International*, 11(1), 390–414. <https://doi.org/10.18039/ajesi.758369>
- Altman, D. G., & Bland, J. M. (1995). *Statistics notes: the normal distribution*, BMJ 310, 298.
- Aslan, M., & Erden, R. Z. (2020). Investigation of Secondary School Teachers' Curriculum Fidelity. *YYU Journal of Education Faculty*, 17(1), 175–199. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/yyuefd/issue/51176/691525>
- Aşçı, M., & Yıldırım, R. (2020). The Relationship Between The Teacher Agency And The Teachers' Commitment To The Curriculum: Yunus Emre District Sample. *International Journal of Society Researches*, 16, 6126–6149. <https://doi.org/10.26466/opus.806477>
- Azili, E., & Tutkun, Ö. F. (2021). Advantages and Limitations of the Secondary Education Center Exam (SECE) According to the Opinions of Middle School Teachers. *Journal of Social Research and Behavioral Sciences*, 7(13), 123-146.
- Bakırcı, H., & Kırıcı, M. G. (2018). Science Teachers' Views on the Removal of the Transition from Primary to Secondary Education Exam. *YYU Journal of Education Faculty*, 15 (1), 383-416. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/yyuefd/issue/40566/493331>
- Baş, G., & Şentürk, C. (2019). Teaching-learning conceptions and curriculum fidelity: A relational research. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, 11(2), 163–180. <http://ijci.wcci-international.org/index.php/IJCI/article/view/273/111>
- Bay, E., Kahramanoğlu, R., Döş, B., & Özpolat, E.T. (2017). Analysis of Factors Affecting Curriculum Fidelity. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Journal of Education Faculty*, 43, 110-137. <https://doi.org/10.21764/efd.02208>
- Boncuk, A. (2021). Examination of the Relationship between Teachers ' Program Literacy and Their Commitment to the Curriculum. *Anatolian Turk Education Journal*, 3(1), 88–108. <https://www.anadoluturkegitim.com/index.php/ated/article/view/33>
- Brimijoin, K. (2005). Differentiation and high-stakes testing: An oxymoron? *Theory Into Practice*, 44(3), 254–261. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4403_10
- Buldur, S., & Acar, M. (2019). Middle School Teachers' Views about High-Stakes Tests. *Kastamonu Education Journal*, 27 (1), 319-330. <https://doi.org/10.24106/kefdergi.2546>
- Bümen, N. T., Cakar, E., & Yıldız, D. G. (2014). Curriculum Fidelity and Factors Affecting Fidelity in the Turkish Context. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 14(1), 219-228. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1038715>

- Burakgazi, S. G. (2019). Curriculum Fidelity: Opening the Black Box. *Başkent University Journal of Education*, 6(2), 236-249. <http://buje.baskent.edu.tr/index.php/buje/article/view/189/141>
- Burul, C. (2018). *Investigation of the relationships between curriculum design approach preferences of teachers and their curriculum fidelity*. [MA. Dissertation, Department of Educational Sciences, Balıkesir University]. <https://dspace.balikesir.edu.tr/xmlui/handle/20.500.12462/3384>
- Buyruk, H. (2014). Standardized Examinations as a Teacher Performance Indicator and Performance Evaluation in Education. *Trakya University Journal of Education*, 4(2), 28–42. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/trkefd/issue/21480/230201>
- Bümen, N. T. (2019). Curriculum in the Claws of Autonomy against Centralism in Turkey: Issues and Suggestions. *Kastamonu Education Journal*, 27(1), 175-185.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2011). *Data analysis handbook for social sciences*. Ankara: Pegem Academy.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2016). Sınavlar üzerine düşünceler. *Kalem International Journal of Education and Human Sciences*, 6(2), 345-356. <http://kalemacademy.org>
- Cooper, S., & Null, J. W. (2011). 'New' ideas in old contexts: Warren Colburn and mathematics curriculum and teaching. *American Educational History Journal*, 38(1/2), 145.
- Cutbush, S., Gibbs, D., Krieger, K., Clinton-Sherrod, M., & Miller, S. (2017). Implementers' Perspectives on Fidelity of Implementation: "Teach Every Single Part" or "Be Right With the Curriculum"? *Health Promotion Practice*, 18(2), 275–282. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524839916672815>
- Çetin, A., & Ünsal, S. (2019). Social, Psychological Effects of Central Examinations on Teachers and Their Reflections on Teachers' Curriculum Implementations. *H. U. Journal of Education*, 34(2), 304–323. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/hunefd/issue/44845/557218>
- Çetin, B. Ş. (2019). *Investigation of mathematics teachers' views on the 2018 LGS system*. [MA. Dissertation, Department of Educational Sciences, Sakarya University]. <https://acikerisim.sakarya.edu.tr/handle/20.500.12619/74371>
- Çetinkaya, S., & Tabak, S. (2019). Curriculum Literacy Efficiency of Preservice Teachers. *Ondokuz Mayıs University Journal of Education Faculty*, 38(1), 296-309. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/omuefd/issue/46119/535482>
- Dawson, H.S. (2012). *Teachers' motivation and beliefs in a high-stakes testing context*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. The Ohio State University. http://rave.ohiolink.edu/etdc/view?acc_num=osu1338399669
- Demir, C. G., & Keles, Ö. K. (2021). The Impact of High-Stakes Testing on the Teaching and Learning Processes of Mathematics. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, 5(2), 119-137. <http://dx.doi.org/10.33902/JPR.2021269677>
- Dikbayır, A., & Bümen, N. T. (2016). An Investigation of Ninth Grade Mathematics Curriculum Fidelity. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instructional Studies (IJOICIS)*, 6(11), 17–38. <https://app.trdizin.gov.tr/publication/paper/detail/TWpBNE1UWXINZz09>
- Dong, M. (2020). Structural relationship between learners' perceptions of a test, learning practices, and learning outcomes: A study on the washback mechanism of a high-stakes test. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 64, 100824. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2019.100824>
- Dusenbury, L., Brannigan, R., Falco, M., & Hansen, W. B. (2003). A review of research on fidelity of implementation: Implications for drug abuse prevention in school settings. *Health Education Research*, 18(2), 237-256. <https://doi.org/10.1093/her/18.2.237>

- Elliott, A. C., & Woodward, W. A. (2007). Statistical analysis quick reference guidebook with SPSS examples. (1. ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- Erden, B. (2020). Teachers' Views Related to Skill-Based Questions in Turkish, Mathematics and Science Lessons. *Academia AJER-International E-Journal*, 5(2), 270–292. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/egitim/issue/54643/742630>
- Ertem, H. Y. (2021). Examination of System of Transition to Upper-Secondary Schools from Lower-Secondary Schools in Terms of Student, Class, and School Level Variables. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century*, 79(2), 194-206. <https://doi.org/10.33225/pec/21.79.194>
- Genç, E. (2005). Development and validation of an instrument to evaluate science teachers' assessment beliefs and practice. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The Florida State University.
- Gökdeniz, M., & Demirci, C. (2020). Alignment of TEOG English Questions to the English Language Teaching Curriculum and Classification According To the Renewed Bloom Taxonomy. *Education Sciences*, 15(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.12739/NW.SA.2020.15.1.1C0695>
- Gresham, F. M. (1989). Assessment of treatment integrity in school consultation and prereferral intervention. *School Psychology Review*, 18(1), 37–50. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02796015.1989.1208539>
- Gündoğdu, K., Kızıldaş, E., & Çimen, N. (2010). Opinions of Students and Teachers in Relation to High School Entrance Exam-SBS (Case of Erzurum). *Elementary Education Online*, 9(1), 316–330. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/ilkonline/issue/8596/106971>
- Haataja, A., Voeten, M., Boulton, A. J., Ahtola, A., Poskiparta, E., & Salmivalli, C. (2014). The KiVa antibullying curriculum and outcome: Does fidelity matter? *Journal of school psychology*, 52(5), 479–493. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2014.07.001>
- Hill, H. C., & Erickson, A. (2019). Using Implementation Fidelity to Aid in Interpreting Program Impacts: A Brief Review. *Educational Researcher*, 48(9), 590–598. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X19891436>
- Hunkins, F. P., & Ornstein, A. C. (1988). A Challenge for Principals designing the curriculum. *NASSP Bulletin*, 72(509), 50–59. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019263658807250908>
- Hündür, T., & Diken, E. H. (2018). Fen bilimleri öğretmenlerinin mevcut sınav sistemine (TEOG) yönelik görüşlerinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Caucasian Journal of Science*, 5(1), 13–29. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/cjo/issue/38939/423276>
- İnceoğlu, S. (2015). *The assessment of the TEOG common math exam by secondary school math teachers and 8. Grade*. [MA. Dissertation, Kırıkkale University Institute of Social Sciences]. <http://acikerisim.kku.edu.tr/xmlui/handle/20.500.12587/15551>
- Kabaş, İ., & Yıldız, S. (2020). Primary School Teachers' Perceptions of Self-Efficacy on First Literacy Teaching and Their Commitment to the Turkish Lesson First Literacy Teaching Curriculum. *Researcher*, 8(1), 105–134. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/researcher/issue/66638/1042721>
- Kablan, Z., & Bozkuş, F. (2021). L Mathematics Teachers' and Students' Opinions on Mathematics Problems of the High Schools Entrance Exam. *Mersin University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 17(1), 211–231. <https://doi.org/10.17860/mersinefd.800738>
- Kahraman, İ. (2014). The Effect of Common Implementation That Related To Teachers' Opinion. *Munzur Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2(4), 53–73. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/tusbd/issue/42133/506878>

- Kalsen, C., & Yiğit Öztekin, H. (2021). Teachers' and Parents' Views on the Transition to High School Education Policy's Referral of Students to Private Schools. *Trakya Journal of Education*, 11(2), 853–869. <https://doi.org/10.24315/tred.735552>
- Karakaya, F., Arık S., Çimen, O., & Yılmaz, M. (2019). Examination of Middle School Teachers' Views about High-Stakes Tests in Turkey. *Amasya Education Journal*, 8(2), 352-372.
- Karakaya, F., Bulut, A. E., & Yılmaz, M. (2020). Opinion of The Science High School Teachers About TEOG and LGS Systems, *Ihlara Journal of Educational Research*, 5(1), 116–126. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/1183566>
- Karakuyu, A., & Oğuz, A. (2021). Primary and Secondary School Teachers' Curriculum Fidelity. *Inonu University Journal of the Graduate School of Education*, 8(16), 85–103. <https://doi.org/10.29129/inujse.915003>
- Kaya, B., & Göktürk, Ş. (2019). Student assessment with high-stakes tests and its reflection on teachers' motivation to implement centralized educational objectives and the curriculum. *MSKU Journal of Education*, 6(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.21666/muefd.518919>
- Kırkağaç, Ş., & Bayrak, C. (2019). The Effects of Performance Evaluation System on Teachers During TEOG Exam Period: Kütahya Case. *Anadolu Journal of Educational Sciences International*, 9(2), 761–786. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/ajesi/issue/45725/578179>
- Kızıkan, O., & Nacaroglu, O. (2019). Science Teachers' Opinions about Central Exams (LGS). *Neşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University Journal of ISS*, 9(2), 701–719. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/nevsosbilen/issue/51363/594949>
- Kimpston, R. D. (1985). Curriculum fidelity and the implementation tasks employed by teachers: a research study. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 17(2), 185-195. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0022027850170207>
- Korum, U. (1985). Matematiksel İstatistiğe Giriş (Introduction to Mathematical Statistics), Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları (Ankara University Political Sciences Faculty Publications.)
- LaChausse, R. G., Clark, K. R., & Chapple, S. (2014). Beyond teacher training: The critical role of professional development in maintaining curriculum fidelity. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 54(3), S53-S58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2013.12.029>
- Madaus, G., & Russell, M. (2010). Paradoxes of high-stakes testing. *Journal of Education*, 190(1-2), 21-30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022057410190001-205>
- McNeill, K. L., Marco-Bujosa, L. M., González-Howard, M., & Loper, S. (2018). Teachers' enactments of curriculum: Fidelity to procedure versus fidelity to goal for scientific argumentation. *International Journal of Science Education*, 40(12), 1455-1475. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2018.1482508>
- Missett, T. C., & Foster, L. H. (2015). Searching for evidence-based practice: A survey of empirical studies on curricular interventions measuring and reporting fidelity of implementation published during 2004-2013. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 26(2), 96-111. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1932202X15577206>
- Moon, T. R., & Park, S. (2016). Fidelity of Intervention of English/Language Arts Elementary Curriculum for Gifted Students: An Exploratory Investigation in Different Service Delivery Models. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 39(1), 62–79. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0162353215624161>
- Ormancı, Ü., Çepni, S., & Ülger, B. B. (2018). Science Teachers' Views About The Transition From Primary Education To Secondary Education. *Academy Journal of Educational Sciences*, 2(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.31805/acjes.422031>

- Ömür, Y. E., & Bavlı, B. (2020). High Stakes Testing and Transformation in the Occupational Identity of Teachers. *Journal of Economy Culture and Society, Supplement*, (1), 117–137. <https://doi.org/10.26650/JECS2019-0101>
- Önder, R. (2016). *Relationship between basis of stakeholders opinion about TEOG with teachers making test in 2014-2015* [MA. Dissertation, Akdeniz University, Department of Educational Sciences,]. <http://acikerisim.akdeniz.edu.tr/handle/123456789/2932>
- Öner, G., & Bahadırtaş, Ş. (2022). Transition process from TEOG to LGS: Experiences of Eighth-grade branch teachers. *Educational Academic Research*, 45, 11-23. <https://doi.org/10.54614/AUJKKEF.2022.825407>
- Özçelik, D.A. (2014). *Eğitim programları ve öğretim (Curriculum and Instruction)* (3rd Ed.). Pegem Akademi.
- Özdaş, F. (2019). The Evaluation of the Teacher and Student Views on the Central Placement Examination System. *Mukaddime*, 10(2), 688–707. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/mukaddime/article/509244>
- Öztürk-Akar, E. (2005). Differences Observed in High School Biology Curriculum Implementation at the School Level. *Journal of Educational Sciences & Practices*, 4(7), 51–67. http://www.ebuline.com/pdfs/7Sayi/7_4.pdf
- Pallant, J. (2017). SPSS Kullanma Klavuzu: SPSS ile Adım Adım Veri Analizi (SPSS Survival Manual) (Çev. S. Balcı ve B. Ahi). Ankara Anı Yayıncılık.
- Pence, K. L., Justice, L. M., & Wiggins, A. K. (2008). Preschool teachers' fidelity in implementing a comprehensive language-rich curriculum. *Language Speech and Hearing Services in Schools*, 39(3), 329-341. [https://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461\(2008/031\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461(2008/031))
- Polat, M., & Bilen, E. (2022). Evaluation of Cognitive Process Dimension of TEOG and LGS Central Exam Science Questions with Revised Bloom Taxonomy. *Journal of Turkish Chemical Society Section C: Chemistry Education (JOTCSC)*, 7(1), 45–72. <https://doi.org/10.37995/jotcsc.1041329>
- Reyhanlıoğlu, Ç. & Tiryaki, İ. (2021). An overview of the assessment and evaluation practices carried out in Turkey. *International Journal of Turkish Educational Sciences*, 9(16), 70-93. <https://doi.org/10.46778/goputeb.766689>
- Ringwalt, C. L., Ennett, S., Johnson, R., Rohrbach, L. A., Simons-Rudolph, A., Vincus, A., & Thorne, J. (2003). Factors associated with fidelity to substance use prevention curriculum guides in the nation's middle schools. *Health Education & Behavior*, 30(3), 375-391. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10901981030300030>
- Sakallıoğlu, G., & Özüdoğru, F. (2022). Analysis of the Curriculum Fidelity Levels of Teachers. *Adıyaman University Journal of Social Sciences*, (41), 70–107. <https://doi.org/10.14520/adyusbd.1112046>
- Sezer, A. (2018). *Analysis of science examination questions and central exam questions according to the revised BLOOM taxonomy, TIMMS and PISA (Kırıkkale province example)*. [MA. Dissertation, Kırıkkale University, Graduate school of Natural and Applied Sciences Department of Elementary]. <http://acikerisim.kku.edu.tr/xmlui/handle/20.500.12587/14323>
- Sloane, F. C., & Kelly, A. E. (2003). Issues in High-Stakes Testing Programs. *Theory Into Practice*, 42(1), 12–17. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4201_3
- Stains, M., & Vickrey, T. (2017). Fidelity of implementation: An overlooked yet critical construct to establish effectiveness of evidence-based instructional practices. *CBE—Life Sciences Education*, 16(1). <https://www.lifescied.org/doi/pdf/10.1187/cbe.16-03-0113>
- Superfine, A. C., Marshall, A. M., & Kelso, C. (2015). Fidelity of implementation: Bringing written curriculum materials into the equation. *The Curriculum Journal*, 26(1), 164–191. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585176.2014.990910>

- Superfine, A. C., Marshall, A. M., & Kelso, C. (2015). Fidelity of implementation: bringing written curriculum materials into the equation. *The Curriculum Journal*, 26(1), 164–191. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585176.2014.990910>
- Supovitz, J. (2009). Can high stakes testing leverage educational improvement? Prospects from the last decade of testing and accountability reform. *Journal of Educational Change*, 10(2-3), 211–227. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-009-9105-2>
- Süer, S., & Kinay, I. (2022). Investigation of Primary Teachers' Curriculum Fidelity. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instructional Studies*, 12(1), 191–214. <https://doi.org/10.31704/ijocis.2022.009>
- Şad, S. N., & Şahiner, Y. K. (2016). Students' Teachers' and Parents' Views about Transition from Basic Education to Secondary Education (BESE) System. *Elementary Education Online* 15 (1), 53–76. <https://doi.org/10.17051/ieo.2016.78720>
- Tan, Ş. (2016). SPSS ve Excel Uygulamalı Temel İstatistik: Ankara Pegem Akademi.
- Taş, M.A. (2022). An investigation of curriculum adaptation efforts of teachers working in disadvantaged secondary schools. *Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction*, 12(1), 10-24. <https://doi.org/10.47750/pegegog.12.01.02>
- Taşkın, G., & Aksoy, G. (2018). Students' and Teachers' Expectations from the Transition to Secondary Education System in the Light of TEOG System Views of Them. *International Journal of Active Learning*, 3(1), 19–43. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/ijal/issue/35833/367421>
- Ünsal, S., & Çetin, A. (2019). Differences Encountered by Classroom Teachers Who Worked at Private and State Schools in the Implementation of the Curriculum. *Kastamonu Education Journal*, 27(4), 1541–1551. <https://doi.org/10.24106/KEFDERGI.3131>
- Vartuli, S., & Rohs, J. (2009). Assurance of Outcome Evaluation: Curriculum Fidelity. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 23(4), 502–512. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02568540909594677>
- Yaşaroğlu, C., & Manav, F. (2015). Curriculum Fidelity Scale: The Study Of Validity & Reliability. *International Journal of Education Sciences*. 2(4), 247-258. doi: 10.16991/INESJOURNAL.60
- Yılmaz, G., & Kahramanoğlu, R. (2021). Examining The Relationship Between Curriculum Literacy Levels, Curriculum Orientations and Curriculum Fidelity Levels of Teachers. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Educational Research*, 5(10), 178–187. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/jier/issue/67379/1011656>
- Zaman, Z., & Khawaja, U. A. (2022). Deviation from recommended curriculum and efforts to bridge the gap between suggested and taught curricula. *Propel Journal of Academic Research*, 2(1), 26-36. <https://www.pjar.propelmas.com/index.php/pjar/article/view/28>
- Zöğ, H. (2022). *The relationship between teachers' commitment to the curriculum, their tendency towards educational philosophy and their perceptions of efficiency in the teaching-learning process* [PhD. Dissertation, Balıkesir University, Department of Educational Sciences]. <https://dspace.balikesir.edu.tr/xmlui/handle/20.500.12462/12669>