Religious Education Journal
Volume 1, Issue 2, 2025, 69-86

e-ISSN: 3108-4613
Research Article

An examination of teachers' views on the assessment and evaluation tools in the Century of Türkiye Education Model Secondary Religious Culture and Ethics Knowledge Teaching Program

Teceli Karasu, Fatma Bildirici* & Aslan Ali Demirkol

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Muş Alparslan University, Faculty of Theology, Muş/Türkiye t.karasu@alparslan.edu.tr, https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4218-2802, https://ror.org/009axq942

Teacher, Ministry of National Education, Muş/Türkiye fatma_bildiricii@hotmail.com, https://orcid.org/0009-0003-3179-6718, https://ror.org/00jga9g46

Teacher, Ministry of National Education, Muş/Türkiye, aademirkol@hotmail.com, https://orcid.org/0009-0004-1080-5002, https://ror.org/00jga9g46

* Corresponding Author

Abstract: This study aimed to examine teachers' views on the assessment and evaluation tools in the Century of Türkiye Education Model (CTEM) Secondary Religious Culture and Ethics Knowledge (RCEK) Teaching Program. The research was conducted using a case study design. The research study group consists of 13 RCEK teachers working in secondary education institutions in Muş province during the 2024-2025 academic year. The study group was selected using criterion sampling, a purposive sampling method. In selecting the participants, the following criteria were taken into account: their prior review of the CTEM Secondary RCEK Teaching Program, their participation in the in-service training seminars provided to teachers at the beginning of the academic year regarding the CTEM RCEK Teaching Program, and their current instruction of the 9th-grade RCEK course in secondary education. A semi-structured interview form consisting of 4 demographic questions and 5 open-ended questions was used as a data collection tool. The study data were transferred to the MAXQDA 2020 program and analyzed using descriptive methods. Based on the data obtained in the study, it was concluded that teachers generally saw the assessment and evaluation practices stipulated in the teaching program positively, found themselves partially competent in using assessment and evaluation tools, preferred traditional assessment and evaluation tools more, and had difficulties in the implementation of assessment and evaluation tools due to students, teachers, teaching environment, teaching program and textbooks. Also, this implementation makes significant contributions to both students and teachers in the educational process.

Article History
Received: 16 September 2025
Accepted: 05 December 2025
Published: 31 December 2025

Keywords
Religious Education, the Century of Türkiye Education Model, Teaching Programs, Religious Culture and Ethics Knowledge Course, Assessment and Evaluation Tools.

Introduction

Assessment and evaluation are among the most important elements of the educational process. It plays a critical role in evaluating the program, monitoring student development, understanding the effectiveness of the learning and teaching process, improving the teaching process, and encouraging teachers

Cite As (APA7): Karasu, T., Bildirici, F. & Demirkol, A. A. (2025). An examination of teachers' views on the assessment and evaluation tools in the Century of Türkiye Education Model Secondary Religious Culture and Ethics Knowledge Teaching Program. *Religious Education Journal, 1*(2), 69-86.

to reflect on their own practice (Çüm, 2021, pp. 4–5; Yiğit, 2024, pp. 9–15). On the other hand, differences may be observed in assessment and evaluation tools depending on the educational approach paradigm. Moreover, an approach that ignores the requirements of our era and focuses solely on results or products cannot achieve the desired efficiency. Therefore, it is necessary to use contemporary assessment tools that evaluate the processes that contribute to the development of students' various qualities (Bahar et al., 2025, p. 49; Bilmez, 2024, pp. 33–38). Indeed, the Century of Türkiye Education Model (CTEM) recommends the use of process-centered contemporary assessment tools alongside traditional outcome-centered assessment tools and adopts an approach that encourages deepening the learning process in instructional design and implementation. The approach, which is based on the teacher's systematic observation of the student's development of any skill in the process, supports the teacher in providing effective feedback (Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, 2024b, pp. 59–61).

Assessment and evaluation are integral parts of Religious Culture and Ethics Knowledge (RCEK) teaching. In the CTEM Secondary RCEK Teaching Program (also known as the Curriculum), when assessment and evaluation practices are implemented, it is observed that importance is placed on ensuring these practices align with all elements of the program and on diversifying assessment and evaluation tools. Students must be actively engaged in the educational process. To this end, teachers should use a variety of assessment methods, including short-answer, open-ended, matching, true-false, multiple-choice, observation forms, rating scales, checklists, rubrics, structured grids, worksheets, comparison tables, T-charts, exit tickets, performance tasks, projects, written and oral exams, as well as self, peer, and group assessment forms (Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, 2024a, p. 9).

Teachers are one of the most important pillars in achieving the objectives of teaching programs. Teachers must understand the philosophy and requirements of the program (Karasu, 2018, pp. 249–255). The CTEM, described as a major paradigm shift in the country's history, has brought about significant transformations in many respects. One of these transformations is evident in the assessment and evaluation tools. Since assessment and evaluation tools vary according to the target and the nature of the subject, achieving the desired success from the CTEM is possible by understanding the philosophy underlying the model (Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, 2024b, pp. 4–10, 2024a, pp. 4–5). However, teachers continue to perform their duties based on certain habits. The Ministry is employing various methods, including presentations, projects, in-service training, television programs, and conferences, to transform teachers in line with the new model. However, it is important to receive feedback on how all these services are reflected in the implementation of the model in question. In this sense, it is necessary to explore whether teachers have achieved transformation in terms of assessment and evaluation, as well as other dimensions of the program, in line with the model's paradigm.

A review of the relevant literature reveals studies conducted in different teaching fields, with particular emphasis on RCEK teachers' views on the teaching program (Ceylan, 2025; Karataş & Tabak, 2010), their preferred assessment tools (Gündoğdu, 2013), their opinions on constructivist assessment and evaluation methods (Işıkdoğan, 2014), their level of proficiency in using assessment and evaluation techniques (Çakmak, 2011; Yıldız & Genç, 2016; Karbeyaz, 2018; Cingöz & Akyürek, 2021), their general perceptions of assessment and evaluation competence (E. Şimşek, 2018), and their attitudes towards assessment and evaluation (V. Şimşek, 2022). There are also studies comparing teaching programs (Köseoğlu, 2025) and the theoretical structure of the CTEM RCEK course teaching program (Kaya & Köseoğlu, 2024; Turan & Nazıroğlu, 2024; Üzümcü & Abanoz, 2024; Yaşar, 2024). However, no research has been found that explores teachers' views on the assessment and evaluation tools envisaged in the CTEM Secondary Education RCEK Course Teaching Program.

This study aims to explore RCEK teachers' perspectives on the assessment and evaluation tools included in the CTEM Secondary Education RCEK Course Teaching Program. To this end, the following questions were addressed:

1. How do teachers assess the assessment and evaluation practices outlined in the teaching program?

2. What is the status of teachers' self-perceived competence in using the assessment and evaluation tools specified in the teaching program?

3. How often do teachers use the assessment and evaluation tools specified in the teaching program? Which assessment and evaluation tools do they prefer?

4. What difficulties do teachers encounter when implementing the assessment and evaluation tools specified in the teaching program?

5. What are the benefits of implementing the assessment and evaluation tools specified in the teaching program, according to teachers?

1. Research Method

This section includes information about the research model, study group, data collection tool, data collection process, and data analysis.

1.1. Research Model

The research was conducted using a case study design, one of the qualitative research methods. A case study is a research design in which the researcher conducts an in-depth analysis of a situation, action, event, program, process, or one or more individuals (Creswell, 2017, p. 14). It is a research approach in which the researcher collects detailed information through observation, interviews, documents, or audiovisual materials based on the questions “why,” “how,” and “for what purpose” regarding a defined situation, and then describes the problem (Yeşilbaş Özenç, 2022, pp. 58–59; Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2008, p. 276). In this study, a case study design was chosen because the aim was to examine teachers’ views on the assessment and evaluation tools in the CTEM Secondary Education RCEK Course Teaching Program in detail and depth.

1.2. Study Group

The study group consists of 13 RCEK teachers working in secondary education institutions in Muş province during the 2024-2025 academic year. The study group was selected using criterion sampling, a purposive sampling method. Purposive sampling is a method in which the researcher selects a sample based on specific characteristics that they believe are appropriate for the research problem, based on their own personal observations (Aksoy et al., 2018, p. 154; A. Şimşek, 2018, p. 121). Criterion sampling is the examination of all cases that meet a set of criteria determined in advance. (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2008, p. 112). In this regard, it has been decided that teachers in the working group should review the CTEM Secondary Education RCEK Course Teaching Program, participate in the training seminars provided to teachers at the beginning of the year regarding the CTEM RCEK, and teach the RCEK course in the 9th grade of secondary education. This is because the CTEM teaching programs have been implemented starting from the 2024-2025 academic year for 1st-grade elementary school, 5th-grade middle school, and 9th-grade secondary school levels. Since the study aimed to examine teachers’ opinions regarding the assessment and evaluation tools in the CTEM Secondary Education RCEK Course Teaching Program, the study group consisted of teachers teaching the 9th-grade RCEK course. When the number of interviewees reached 13, it was observed that teachers' responses became repetitive, and no new data were generated. Therefore, the interviews were terminated. The demographic characteristics of the study group are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. *Demographic Characteristics of the Study Group*

Participant Code	Gender	Age	Seniority	School Type
K1	Female	29	4	Science High School
K2	Female	34	10	Anatolian High School
K3	Female	36	11	Vocational and Technical Anatolian High School
K4	Male	30	4	Anatolian High School
K5	Female	38	15	Anatolian High School
K6	Male	31	8	Vocational and Technical Anatolian High School
K7	Male	31	8	Vocational and Technical Anatolian High School
K8	Female	36	11	Vocational and Technical Anatolian High School
K9	Male	35	11	Anatolian High School
K10	Female	30	4	Multi-Program Anatolian High School
K11	Male	29	4	Anatolian High School
K12	Female	30	5	Anatolian High School
K13	Female	34	10	High School of Visual Arts

Table 1 shows that 8 of the teachers in the study group are female and 5 are male. The teachers' ages range from 29 to 38, and their professional seniority ranges from 4 to 15 years. Six of the teachers work at Anatolian High Schools, 4 at Vocational and Technical Anatolian High Schools, 1 at a Science High School, 1 at a Multi-Program Anatolian High School, and 1 at a High School of Visual Arts. In accordance with the ethics of the study, the participants' personal information was kept confidential, and they were coded K1, K2, K3, etc., in the order in which they were interviewed.

1.3. Data Collection Tool and Data Collection Process

In the study, a semi-structured interview form was used as a data collection tool. A semi-structured interview is a type of interview in which participants are asked predetermined questions directly about the topic to be examined (Balaban Salı, 2012, p. 145; Çapcıoğlu & Kalkan Açıkgöz, 2018, p. 210). After conducting a literature review, the researchers prepared the interview form by consulting two experts in religious education and one expert in scientific research to ensure the scope and structural validity of the questions. At the beginning of the research process, ethical commission approval dated 03.06.2025 and numbered 197094 was obtained from the Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Board of Muş Alparslan University. In addition, a research application permit dated 25.04.2025 and numbered MEB.TT.2025.023883 was obtained through the Ministry of National Education Research Application Permits Application System. After the permits were obtained, two RCEK teachers were interviewed for the pilot study. As a result of the interview, it was decided that the questions were sufficiently clear and understandable. Thus, within the scope of the study, in addition to the information text, four demographic questions and five open-ended questions were asked of the participants. The teachers who participated in the pilot study were excluded from the study group, and data collection began.

The interviews were conducted in June 2025. The interviews were completed in an environment where participants felt comfortable, with individual, face-to-face audio recordings. Participant consent was obtained before audio recording. The audio recordings were then transcribed and presented to the participants for verification. Data analysis proceeded after the participants verified the transcriptions. However, some participants (K1, K2, and K9) who did not wish to be audio recorded wrote their views by hand on the interview form.

1.4. Data Analysis

Descriptive analysis was used to analyze the data in the study. In descriptive analysis, data is interpreted according to predetermined dimensions or categories. In this analysis method, a framework is

created for analysis. In other words, the themes or concepts under which the data will be organized are determined at the outset. Then, the data are read, organized, and processed according to this prepared thematic framework (Akbulut, 2012, p. 186). In this regard, a data analysis framework was first established based on the research questions, and each interview question was treated as a theme. The data was then read and organized according to these thematic frameworks. Separate files were created for each question in the interview form in the computer environment, and all participants' views were coded and organized as K1, K2, K3…….K13, keeping their personal information confidential. The teachers' answers to the interview questions were examined separately by each researcher. To ensure the reliability of the research, inter-coder consistency was examined. The formula developed by Miles and Huberman was used for this analysis. It is generally accepted that reliability calculations above 70% are considered reliable for a study. According to the formula, the reliability of this study was calculated as 75%. This result indicates that the study's data are reliable.

The research data were transferred to the MAXQDA 2020 software package, which is often preferred for analyzing qualitative data, and descriptive analysis was performed. The obtained data were presented in tables in the findings section of the study, including categories, codes, and subcodes within the themes, along with their frequencies. To ensure the internal validity of the research data, participants' views were included in the findings section in the form of direct quotations.

2. Findings

The study sought answers to five research questions. The findings obtained in this regard are presented under a heading related to each research question.

2.1. Opinions on How Assessment and Evaluation Practices Are Assessed

The responses provided by teachers to the first interview question of the study, "How do you evaluate the assessment and evaluation practices envisaged in the teaching program?", were analyzed, and the findings are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. *Teachers' Opinions on How They Evaluate Assessment and Evaluation Practices*

Theme	Category	Code	F
How assessment and evaluation practices are assessed	Positive	Process-oriented	8
		Contributes to the development of students' higher-order thinking skills	6
		Provides individualized feedback	5
		Being Student-centered	5
		Enables the identification of learning gaps	5
		Facilitates access to assessment tools by scanning QR codes in the book	4
		Inclusion of both traditional and contemporary assessment and evaluation tools	4
		Providing opportunities for students to participate in the assessment process	4
		Inclusion of assessment and evaluation tools for almost every learning outcome	3
		Providing the opportunity for multifaceted assessment	2
		Providing examples of assessment and evaluation applications	2
	Negative	Insufficient in-service training	4
		Lack of sample classroom videos for RCEK lessons	1

Table 2 shows teachers' opinions on how they evaluate assessment and evaluation practices, grouped under the categories of "positive" and "negative." The teachers participating in the study assessed their assessment and evaluation practices as: "process-oriented (K1, K4, K6, K7, K8, K9, K10, K11)", "contributing to the development of students' higher-order thinking skills (K3, K5, K6, K9, K12, K13)", "providing individualized feedback (K1, K2, K4, K6, K11)", "being student-centered (K1, K5, K8, K12, K13)", "enabling the identification of learning gaps (K1, K2, K6, K10, K12)", "Facilitating access to assessment tools by scanning QR codes in the book (K1, K2, K10, K12)", "Inclusion of both traditional and contemporary assessment and evaluation tools (K2, K4, K11, K12)", "Providing opportunities for student participation in the assessment process (K2, K11, K12, K13)", "Including assessment and evaluation tools for almost every learning outcome (K2, K7, K9)", "Providing the opportunity for multi-faceted evaluation (K4, K10)", and "Providing examples of assessment and evaluation applications (K9, K12)" were found to be positive. Below are some direct quotes from teachers' views regarding the positive evaluation of assessment and evaluation practices.

K8: "Previously, we measured students' knowledge solely through written exams and formed a general opinion. But now, with a process-oriented approach, many factors such as the student's effort in the learning process, their relationships with their peers, and their level of responsibility are also included in the assessment and evaluation process."

K12: "With assessment and evaluation practices, students no longer just learn information; they analyze, critique, and interpret it. Therefore, it is very encouraging that assessment and evaluation practices are aimed at developing students' higher-order thinking skills."

K2: "With the assessment and evaluation practices in the new model, students become individuals who research, question, express their opinions, and make decisions as part of the process. The 'teacher feedback' section in the evaluation forms at the end of the activities also provides students with personalized feedback."

K5: "The new program's assessment and evaluation practices are based on a student-centered approach that aims to enable students to become individuals who gather, analyze, relate, draw conclusions, determine content, develop designs, and effectively present their products."

K10: "I find the assessment and evaluation practices included in the teaching program to be highly successful in terms of being process-oriented, providing students with the opportunity for multi-faceted evaluation, and revealing students' learning deficiencies."

K1: "Providing easy access to assessment tools by scanning the QR codes in the book is a very appropriate practice."

K11: "In the previous teaching program, the number and variety of tools for assessment and evaluation of students' critical thinking and analysis skills were insufficient. It is perfect that the new teaching programs give ample space to alternative assessment and evaluation tools alongside traditional ones to develop these skills."

K9: "Textbooks contain a wide variety of assessment and evaluation practices, which motivates students to engage more actively in the course. I can say that there is an assessment and evaluation tool for almost every learning outcome. This prevents the course from becoming monotonous and encourages students to participate actively."

Some participants in the survey expressed a negative view of assessment and evaluation practices, citing codes such as "insufficient in-service training (K3, K6, K8, K10)" and "lack of sample classroom videos for RCEK lessons (K3)." Below are some direct quotes from teachers regarding their negative view of assessment and evaluation practices.

K3: "Frankly, I can't say I have a lot of knowledge. I'm trying to learn by experimenting and researching as I go along. At the beginning of the year, I attended three days of in-service training. Unfortunately, I didn't get anything out of it. I looked online to see if there were any sample lesson videos; there were for other subjects, but I couldn't find any for ours."

K8: "The in-service training we received at the beginning of the year was very ineffective. A program that took so many years of effort to prepare should not have been limited to three days of training. Furthermore, this training should have been delivered by experts in the field. Unfortunately, we teachers were included in the process too late."

2.2. Opinions on Competencies Related to the Use of Assessment and Evaluation Tools

The responses provided by teachers to the second interview question of the study, "How competent are you in your ability to use the assessment and evaluation tools specified in the teaching program?" were analyzed, and the findings are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. *Teachers' Opinions on How Competent They Consider Themselves in Using Assessment and Evaluation Tools*

Theme	Code	Subcode	F
Competencies in the Use of Assessment and Evaluation Tools	Somewhat competent (10)	The existence of assessment and evaluation tools that have not been used in class before	10
		Lack of technological competence	2
		Failure to receive in-service training on the use of assessment and evaluation tools	1
	Quite competent (3)	Being prepared for class	2
		Examination of the advantages and disadvantages of assessment and evaluation tools	2
		Receiving adequate training on assessment and evaluation tools	1
		Attending training seminars on assessment and evaluation tools	1

Table 3 shows that teachers' views on their competence in using assessment and evaluation tools were coded as "somewhat competent (K2, K3, K4, K6, K7, K8, K10, K11, K12, K13)" and "quite competent (K1, K5, K9)". Teachers participating in the study found themselves partially competent in using assessment and evaluation tools with the subcodes "The existence of assessment and evaluation tools that have not been used in class before (K2, K3, K4, K6, K7, K8, K10, K11, K12, K13)", "lack of technological competence (K3, K8)", and "Failure to receive in-service training on the use of assessment and evaluation tools (K6)". Below are some direct quotes from teachers regarding their views on finding themselves partially competent in using assessment and evaluation tools.

K11: "I can easily use traditional assessment and evaluation tools. However, I encounter difficulties when applying some alternative assessment and evaluation tools because I have not used them before. Therefore, I feel the need to improve myself."

K8: "I consider myself partially competent. This is because I do not have sufficient knowledge and skills in the field of technology. Much of the course content is in a digital environment, which tires me greatly."

K6: "I consider myself partially competent. I experienced assessment and evaluation tools for the first time in a classroom setting. I have not received any in-service training on using assessment and evaluation tools before."

Teachers participating in the study rated themselves as quite competent in using assessment and evaluation tools with the subcodes "going to class prepared (K1, K5)", "examining the advantages and disadvantages of assessment and evaluation tools (K1, K5)", "receiving good training on assessment and evaluation tools (K1)", and "attending training seminars on assessment and evaluation tools (K9)". Below are some direct quotes from teachers expressing their views on their high level of competence in using assessment and evaluation tools.

K1: "Since I am proficient in the assessment and evaluation course, I already know the assessment and evaluation tools very well. To avoid any problems during implementation, I always review the advantages and disadvantages of the assessment and evaluation tools before the course. I take care to prepare for the courses."

K9: "I find myself quite competent. My professional experience of over ten years has given me this vision. I can also say that I have developed myself considerably by following developments in this field and attending numerous seminars."

2.3. Opinions on the Frequency of Use of Assessment and Evaluation Tools and Preferred Assessment and Evaluation Tools

The responses provided by teachers to the third interview question of the study, "How often do you use the assessment and evaluation tools specified in the teaching program? Which assessment and evaluation tools do you prefer?" were analyzed, and the findings are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. *Teachers' Opinions Regarding the Frequency of Use of Assessment and Evaluation Tools and Their Preferred Assessment and Evaluation Tools*

Theme	Code		F
Frequency of Use of Assessment and Evaluation Tools	I use them frequently		8
	I use them occasionally		5
Theme	**Category**	**Code**	
Preferred Assessment and Evaluation Tools	Traditional assessment and evaluation tools	Open-ended questions	13
		Multiple-choice questions	10
		True/false items	9
		Matching	9
		Short-answer questions	6
		Fill-in-the-blank	5
		Written-oral exams	1
	Contemporary assessment and evaluation tools	Performance task	8
		Self-group assessment	7
		Rated scoring scale (rubric)	6
		Grading scale	5
		3-2-1 card	4
		Concept map	4
		Exit card	3
		Checklist	3
		Project	2
		Diagnostic branching tree	2
		Structured grid	1
		Information card	1
		Portfolio assessment	1

Table 4 shows that teachers' opinions regarding the frequency of using assessment and evaluation tools were coded as "I use them frequently (K1, K2, K5, K6, K7, K8, K9, K12)" and "I use them occasionally (K3, K4, K10, K11, K13)." The teachers' views regarding their preferred assessment and evaluation tools were grouped into the categories of "traditional assessment and evaluation tools" and "contemporary assessment and evaluation tools." The teachers' opinions in the category of traditional assessment and evaluation tools they preferred were coded as "open-ended questions (F=13)", "multiple-choice questions (K1, K2, K3, K4, K7, K8, K10, K11, K12, K13)", "true/false item types (K2, K3, K4, K5, K6, K8, K10, K12, K13)", "matching (K1, K4, K5, K6, K7, K8, K10, K12, K13)", "short-answer questions (K1, K3, K5, K6, K9, K11)", "fill-in-the-blank (K1, K3, K5, K7, K8)", and "written-oral exams (K11)".

Teachers' views on the preferred assessment and evaluation tools category were coded as: "performance task (K1, K2, K6, K7, K9, K11, K12, K13)" "self-group assessment (K1, K2, K5, K7, K8, K9, K12)", "graded scoring scale (rubric) (K1, K2, K4, K5, K8, K13)", "rating scale (K2, K5, K7, K9, K12)", "3-2-1 card (K1, K5, K7, K9)", "concept map (K1, K2, K6, K9)", "exit card (K5, K8, K9)", "checklist (K1, K2, K12)", "project (K2, K5)", "diagnostic branching tree (K1, K2)", "structured grid (K1)", "information card (K5)", and "portfolio assessment (K1)". Below are some direct quotations from teachers regarding their frequency of use of assessment and evaluation tools and their views on the traditional and contemporary assessment and evaluation tools they prefer:

K5: "I use them frequently. I often include open-ended questions to assess students' knowledge of learning outcomes and to reinforce that knowledge, thereby increasing retention. I also prefer alternative assessment and evaluation tools such as 3-2-1 cards, projects, exit cards, self and group assessments, rating scales, graded scoring scales, and knowledge cards, in addition to traditional assessment and evaluation tools such as short-answer questions, true-false, matching, and fill-in-the-blank questions.

K12: "I use them frequently. I often use open-ended, multiple-choice, and matching questions from traditional assessment and evaluation tools. I also prefer to use true-false questions that gain a new dimension with the addition of the phrase 'because...'. I also value using self-assessment forms, performance tasks, rating scales, and checklists from alternative assessment and evaluation tools. Structured grids are also among the tools I use.

K1: "I use them frequently. In traditional assessments and assessment tools, I use open-ended questions, fill-in-the-blank questions, matching questions, multiple-choice questions, and short-answer questions. From formative assessment and evaluation tools, I use performance tasks, portfolio assessment, 3-2-1 cards, diagnostic branching trees, concept maps, checklists, self-assessment, and rubrics."

K4: "I use them occasionally. I especially prefer open-ended, true/false, matching, and multiple-choice questions in the end-of-unit assessment and evaluation section. I have only used a graded scoring scale once. Because the teaching program is very intense, I worry that if I apply these tools in class, I won't be able to cover all the topics."

K11: "I use them occasionally. I prefer open-ended, multiple-choice, written, and oral exams, as well as short-answer questions. I also give students one performance task per semester."

K13: "I use them occasionally, especially when extracurricular activities coincide with class time, or when situations such as official holidays or snow days prevent the lesson from being taught on time. In my classes, I include open-ended questions, matching exercises, true/false questions, multiple-choice questions, rubrics, and performance tasks."

2.4. Views on the Challenges Experienced During the Implementation of Assessment and Evaluation Tools

The responses provided by teachers to the fourth interview question of the study, "What difficulties did you encounter during the implementation phase of the assessment and evaluation tools specified in the teaching program?", were analyzed, and the findings are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. *Teachers' Views on the Difficulties They Face in Implementing Assessment and Evaluation Tools*

Theme	Category	Code	F
Challenges Encountered During the Implementation of Assessment and Evaluation Tools	Student-related challenges	Students are not behaving objectively	7
		Students' low level of preparedness	6
		Students' lack of interest	5
		Students' lack of awareness that they are being assessed based on the process	3
		Students' lack of knowledge about using assessment and assessment tools	2
	Teacher-related challenges	Evaluating students individually takes too much time.	7
		Printing out evaluation forms for each student is quite costly.	6
		It increases the teacher's workload.	6
		Being unable to break out of the routine	2
	Learning environment-related challenges	Classes are too crowded.	8
		The applications cause too much noise in the classroom.	6
		There is no internet connection.	3
		Malfunctioning smart boards	2
	Teaching program and textbook-related challenges	The constant redirection of assessment and evaluation practices to the Education Information Network (EBA)	5
		Insufficient class time	2
		Some QR codes in the book are not opening	2
		The teaching program is being too intensive	2
		Assessment scales are not being recorded on EBA	1
	-	No difficulties encountered	2

Table 5 shows that teachers' views on the challenges they encounter in the implementation phase of assessment and evaluation tools are grouped under the categories of "student-related difficulties," "learning environment-related difficulties," "teacher-related difficulties," and "teaching program and textbook-related difficulties." The opinions of the teachers participating in the study in the student-related difficulties category are: "students not behaving objectively (K2, K3, K4, K5, K7, K8, K10)", "students' low level of preparedness (K3, K4, K6, K7, K8, K10)", "students' lack of interest (K3, K4, K8, K11, K13)", "Students' lack of awareness that they are being assessed based on the process (K3, K7, K10)", and "students' lack of knowledge about using

assessment and evaluation tools (K5, K6)". Below are direct quotations from some of the teachers' views on student-related difficulties during the implementation phase of assessment and evaluation tools.

K2: "Unfortunately, students are not objective when filling out self-assessment and group assessment forms and may give answers that do not reflect reality. Therefore, the forms remain merely a formality."

K3: "The assessment and assessment tools in the Maarif Model are very important in terms of developing students' thinking, interpretation, and self-expression skills. However, during implementation, I observe that students have difficulty expressing their thoughts. The students' insufficient level of preparedness is a major factor in this."

K8: "Students are extremely reluctant to participate in classroom activities. This leads to negative behavior during class."

K7: "Students are unaware that they are being assessed throughout the process, so they fill out the assessment tools provided at the end of the activities carelessly."

K6: "Students have gaps in their knowledge regarding the use of assessment and evaluation tools. Specifically, they do not know what to pay attention to when filling out evaluation forms."

The views of teachers participating in the study regarding teacher-related challenges were: "evaluating students individually takes too much time (K2, K4, K5, K8, K10, K11, K13)", "printing out evaluation forms for each student is quite costly (K2, K4, K5, K8, K11, K13)", "increases the teacher's workload (K2, K4, K5, K10, K11, K13)", and "being unable to break out of the routine (K12, K13)". Below are direct quotations from some teachers' views on teacher-related difficulties in the implementation phase of assessment and evaluation tools.

K4: "Evaluating all students is both laborious and time-consuming, as well as quite costly. I teach RCEK to five different 9th-grade classes at school. There is an average of 25 students in each class. Therefore, printing evaluation forms for approximately 125 students every two weeks, reviewing them one by one, and writing feedback takes up a lot of my time. This increases our workload."

K13: "The new teaching program contains many innovations, so not being able to break out of my comfort zone brought various difficulties. Unfortunately, due to the novelty of the program, I was unable to fully adapt. During this process, we should have undergone comprehensive in-service training."

The teachers' views on challenges related to the learning environment category were: "classes being too crowded (K2, K3, K4, K6, K7, K8, K10, K11)", "activities causing too much noise in the classroom (K2, K3, K4, K5, K7, K8)", "lack of internet connection (K7, K8, K10)", and "malfunctioning smart boards (K7, K8)". Below are direct quotes from some of the teachers' views regarding difficulties related to the learning environment during the implementation of assessment and evaluation tools.

K6: "Some classes at our school are crowded, which causes difficulties during implementation."

K5: "There is too much noise in the classroom when using assessment and evaluation tools. Students are literally out of control during activity implementation."

K8: "We are experiencing serious problems with internet access in some of our classrooms."

K7: "The smartboards are constantly malfunctioning because students use them without permission during breaks. The boards are opened with an application assigned to us on our phones. However, IT class students disable these applications and use the boards."

The views of teachers participating in the study regarding challenges related to the teaching program and textbooks were as follows: "The constant redirection of assessment and evaluation practices to EBA (K3, K7, K8, K10, K12)", "Insufficient class time (K2, K11)", "some QR codes in the book not opening (K8, K10)", "the teaching program being too intensive (K4, K13)", and "assessment scales are not being recorded on EBA (K8)". Below are direct quotations from some teachers' views on difficulties arising from the teaching program and textbooks during the implementation of assessment and evaluation tools.

K8: "At the beginning of the year, I had trouble accessing the QR codes in the section of the book with activities. These QR codes constantly redirected me to EBA, and I was asked for my e-government and MEBBIS passwords to log in. Naturally, I didn't want to log in. Later, I learned how to log in by creating an EBA code. These issues should have been addressed in the seminars."

K3: "Accessing the content in the activities in the textbook via QR codes that redirect to EBA is very time-consuming. Sometimes EBA doesn't even open. Previously, the Directorate of Religious Education had a separate page that was very useful. We could easily access the content there without needing a password. This page was moved to EBA, and the problems began."

K2: "The most significant difficulty I encountered during implementation was insufficient time. Having only two class hours per week poses problems in preparing learning outcomes and applying assessment and evaluation tools."

K4: "The teaching program is very intense, and the students' level of preparedness is low. This creates serious difficulties in the education process and can reduce student motivation."

The two teachers who participated in the study reported no difficulties during the implementation phase of the assessment and evaluation tools (K1, K9).

K1: "I didn't experience any difficulties."

2.5. Opinions on the Contributions Provided by the Application of Assessment and Evaluation Tools

The responses provided by teachers to the fifth interview question of the study, "What are the contributions provided by the implementation of the assessment and evaluation tools envisaged in the teaching program?", were analyzed, and the findings are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. *Teachers' Views on the Contributions Provided by the Implementation of Assessment and Evaluation Tools*

Theme	Category	Code	F
Contributions Provided by the Implementation of Assessment and Evaluation Tools	Contributions to the student	Ensuring the student's active participation in the process	10
		Contributing to students' lasting learning	6
		Contributing to the development of the student's higher-order thinking skills	6
		Increasing students' motivation	5
		Revealing students' different talents	3
		Ensuring the development of competent individuals in every sense	2
		Providing the opportunity for objective evaluation	5
	Contributions to the teacher	Providing an opportunity to get to know the student better	5
		Enabling the teacher to see the student's level	4

	Providing clear and understandable feedback to students	3
	Contributing to the identification of students' interests and needs	3
	Reducing the teacher's workload by incorporating various tools for assessment and evaluation	1

Table 6 shows teachers' views on the contributions of applying assessment and evaluation tools, grouped under the categories: "contributions to students" and "contributions to teachers." The opinions of the teachers participating in the research regarding the contributions of the implementation of assessment and evaluation tools to the student are coded as "ensuring the student's active participation in the process (K1, K2, K4, K6, K7, K8, K9, K10, K11, K12)" and "contributing to students' lasting learning (K1, K5, K6, K7, K10, K11)", "contributing to the development of students' higher-order thinking skills (K1, K3, K4, K5, K11, K12)", "increasing student motivation (K2, K8, K9, K12, K13)", "revealing students' different talents (K1, K8, K13)", and "ensuring the development of competent individuals in every sense (K2, K12)". Below are some direct quotes from teachers regarding the contributions that the implementation of assessment and evaluation tools provides to students.

K1: "With assessment and evaluation tools, students participate much more actively in class. This prevents me from being a teacher who just lectures all the time. I can involve students in the process. This interaction allows me to create a more active, effective, and efficient learning environment in the classroom."

K3: "The implementation of the assessment and evaluation tools proposed by the model contributes to the development of students' higher-order thinking skills. However, without sufficient infrastructure, achieving the desired outcome remains a pipe dream."

K8: "The implementation of various assessment and evaluation tools in class allows students' different talents to be revealed."

K4: "The effective use of assessment and evaluation tools increases students' interest in the course and their active participation. The opportunity for students to evaluate their own learning processes develops their self-awareness and responsibility skills."

The opinions of teachers participating in the study regarding the contributions that the application of assessment and evaluation tools coded as: "providing the opportunity for objective evaluation (K2, K8, K10, K12, K13)", "Providing an opportunity to get to know the student better (K1, K2, K8, K9, K10)", "enabling the teacher to see the student's level (K1, K5, K11, K13)", "providing clear and understandable feedback to students (K1, K2, K8)", contributing to the identification of the student's interests and needs (K5, K9, K13)", and "reducing the teacher's workload by incorporating various assessment and evaluation tools (K8)". Below are some direct quotes from teachers regarding the contributions of implementing assessment and evaluation tools.

K2: "I believe I conduct more objective assessments by using evaluation tools such as checklists and rubrics in class. These tools enable me to provide clear and understandable feedback to students."

K9: "It provides an opportunity to get to know students better throughout the process and contributes to identifying students' interests and needs."

K5: "The implementation of the assessment and evaluation tools outlined in the teaching program contributes to students' holistic development. These tools are of great importance in determining the level at which students acquire different skills."

K8: "Frankly, since previous textbooks did not include such a variety of assessment and evaluation tools, I did not use alternative assessment and evaluation tools in my lessons. This is because preparing alternative assessment and evaluation tools is both difficult and requires considerable effort. Including these tools in textbooks has partially lightened our load."

Discussion, Conclusion, and Recommendations

In this study, which examined teachers' opinions on assessment and evaluation tools in the CTEM Secondary Education RCEK Course Teaching Program, five open-ended questions were posed to RCEK teachers within the scope of the study, and their responses were examined.

In the study, when teachers' opinions on how they evaluated assessment and evaluation practices were examined, it was determined that they gave positive evaluations for their process-oriented nature, their contribution to the development of students' higher-order thinking skills, their individualized feedback, their student-centered nature, their ability to identify learning deficiencies, their ease of access to assessment tools by scanning QR codes in the textbook, their inclusion of both traditional and contemporary assessment and evaluation tools, their opportunity for student participation in the assessment process, their inclusion of assessment and evaluation tools for almost every learning outcome, their provision of multifaceted assessment opportunities, and their provision of examples of assessment and evaluation practices. However, teachers evaluated assessment and evaluation practices as negative due to inadequate in-service training and the lack of a sample classroom lesson video for the RCEK course. A review of the literature reveals that there are studies supporting the research findings. A study by Üredi (2024, p. 22) stated that although a process-oriented assessment and evaluation approach was adopted in the 2018 teaching program, it was noted that in practice, a result-oriented approach prevailed due to the predominant use of standardized assessment tools and the lack of diversification of assessment tools. In contrast, the CTEM teaching program clearly emphasizes the adoption of a process-oriented approach; it emphasizes the importance of students deepening their learning through a continuous assessment approach and the inclusion of diverse assessment tools, which prioritize multifaceted assessment within the framework of holistic development. Teachers participating in the study appear to have positively viewed this change in assessment and evaluation practices within the new teaching program. A review of studies conducted by Ak and Köse (2024, pp. 132–169), Baz (2024, pp. 106–123), and Üredi (2024, p. 23) on the CTEM teaching program in various teaching fields reveals that teachers evaluated the assessment and evaluation practices positively for their process-oriented nature, the provision of diversity in assessment and evaluation, the inclusion of scales in the textbook's QR codes, student-centeredness, support for multifaceted development, and process-based evaluation. However, they also evaluated them as negative for their inadequate in-service training. These studies in the literature support the research findings. Furthermore, one-third of the teachers participating stated that in-service training was insufficient. Therefore, teachers' inadequate in-service training for program implementation raises concerns that it may hinder their adaptation to the new program and be inefficient in responding to student needs (Baz, 2024, p. 118). Teachers, who are primarily responsible for these practices, play a significant role in maximizing the benefits of assessment and evaluation practices (Bahar et al., 2025, p. 11). Therefore, the importance of training to improve teachers' knowledge and skills in assessment and evaluation tools should not be overlooked.

When the teachers' opinions regarding their level of competence in using assessment and evaluation tools were examined in the study, it was determined that most of them considered themselves partially competent due to the availability of previously unused assessment and evaluation tools, a lack of technological competence, and a lack of in-service training on how to use the new assessment and evaluation tools. However, some teachers considered themselves quite competent because they came to class prepared, examined the advantages and disadvantages of assessment and evaluation tools, received adequate training on these tools, and attended training seminars on them. Based on teachers' opinions, assessments must be objective and error-free for accurate evaluation to yield sound decisions. For accurate assessment to be performed, it is crucial to be well-versed in assessment and evaluation tools, understand their features, and

be aware of their advantages and limitations (Güler, 2025, p. 62). It was concluded that most participating teachers were only partially competent in using assessment and evaluation tools. Based on the research results, it can be said that teachers are particularly concerned about using contemporary (developmental) assessment and evaluation tools. Some participants (K11 and K12) stated that they were comfortable using traditional assessment and evaluation tools, but had not used contemporary tools in class before and considered themselves partially competent with these tools. In a study conducted by Çakmak (2011, pp. 124–127), which determined the proficiency levels of RCEK teachers' knowledge of assessment and evaluation tools, it was found that 76.3% of teachers were competent, 18.9% were partially competent, and 4.8% were incompetent in traditional assessment and evaluation techniques. In alternative assessment and evaluation techniques, 40.7% were partially competent, 46% were competent, and 13.3% were incompetent. Similarly, in a study conducted by Gelbal and Kelecioğlu (2007, pp. 135–145) on teachers' self-efficacy in using assessment methods, 60.9% of teachers were at a "moderate" level, 20.1% were at a "very" level, and 19% were at a "not at all" level. These studies in the literature support the research findings.

When teachers' frequency of using assessment and evaluation tools and their opinions on preferred assessment and evaluation tools were examined, it was concluded that most teachers used these tools frequently. It was determined that teachers most frequently used traditional assessment and evaluation tools, including open-ended questions, multiple-choice questions, true/false items, matching, short-answer questions, fill-in-the-blank questions, and written and oral exams. It was also concluded that they preferred contemporary assessment and evaluation tools such as performance tasks, self-group assessments, rubrics, 3-2-1 cards, rating scales, concept maps, exit cards, checklists, projects, diagnostic tree, structured grids, flashcards, and portfolio assessments, less than traditional assessment and evaluation tools. Furthermore, it was notable that teachers did not mention observation forms, worksheets, comparison tables, T-charts, and peer assessment forms. All of these can be attributed to a variety of factors. First, traditional assessment and evaluation tools have been present in our education system for years, offering teachers familiarity, greater time efficiency, and ease of implementation. In contrast, the increased time, planning, and effort required for contemporary assessment and evaluation tools (performance tasks, projects, portfolios, self-, peer-, and group assessments, etc.) not only limits their applicability but also increases teachers' workload. These factors can be interpreted as leading teachers to use traditional assessment and evaluation tools more frequently. They also indicate that teachers lack sufficient knowledge and skills regarding contemporary assessment and evaluation tools. A review of the literature reveals that studies other than Uygun's (2020, pp. 29–45) are consistent with the research findings. The studies conducted by Gündoğdu (2013, p. 93) and Çakmak (2011, pp. 128–131) found that RCEK teachers use traditional assessment tools more frequently than alternative assessment tools: among traditional assessment and evaluation tools, they most frequently use multiple-choice tests, while among alternative assessment and evaluation tools, they most frequently use performance tasks. A study by Ceylan (2025, p. 10) that evaluated the CTEM RCEK teaching program based on teacher opinions found that teachers preferred traditional assessment and evaluation tools more often than contemporary ones, and that they most frequently preferred open-ended and multiple-choice questions. Similarly, a study by Karbeyaz (2018, p. 216) found that open-ended questions were the most frequently used assessment and evaluation tool by RCEK teachers. A review of studies (Sönmez Ektem et al., 2016, pp. 661–680; Tokur Üner & Aşılıoğlu, 2022, pp. 25–50) conducted in different teaching fields revealed that teachers frequently preferred traditional assessment and evaluation tools. These findings support our research's findings.

In the study, when teachers' opinions about the challenges they experienced during the implementation of assessment and evaluation tools were examined, it was determined that they experienced student-related challenges due to students' lack of objectivity, low preparedness, disinterest, unawareness that they were being assessed, process-oriented, and lack of knowledge in using assessment and evaluation tools. They also experienced teacher-related challenges due to the excessive time required to assess students individually, the high cost of printing evaluation forms for each student, increased teacher workload, and the inability to deviate from established routines. Furthermore, they experienced learning environment-related challenges, including overcrowded classrooms, applications that caused excessive noise, a lack of internet

connection, and broken smart boards. They also experienced challenges related to the teaching program and textbook, including the assessment and evaluation applications constantly redirecting students to EBA, insufficient class time, some QR codes in the textbook not opening, the teaching program being dense, and the failure to register evaluation scales on EBA. However, it was concluded that two of the teachers experienced no challenges during the implementation of the assessment and evaluation tools. The CTEM teaching program began to be implemented in the 1st grade of primary school, the 5th grade of middle school, and the 9th grade of secondary school in the 2024-2025 academic year, without any pilot implementation. If the teaching program had been piloted, challenges in the educational process could have been identified and necessary measures taken by authorities. On the other hand, the challenges expressed by teachers can be considered significant factors that can make it difficult to achieve the teaching program's objectives and cause various disruptions in the implementation process. At this point, it is crucial to take the necessary measures. Studies supporting the research findings have been found in the literature. In studies conducted by Ceylan (2025, p. 10), Karbeyaz (2018, pp. 217–218), Yıldız and Genç (2016, pp. 61–75), Karataş, and Tabak (2010, pp. 60–61), RCEK teachers stated that they experienced challenges in assessment and evaluation practices due to student levels, crowded classes, time-consuming and labor-intensive practices, stationery costs, and insufficient lesson time. When examining the study by Ak and Köse (2024, pp. 147–148) on the CTEM across different teaching fields, teachers reported experiencing challenges due to insufficient time and crowded classes. In a study conducted by Duyul et al. (2025, pp. 1–19), teachers reported challenges stemming from the intensity of the teaching program, inadequate infrastructure and equipment, and the teacher adaptation process. In a study conducted by Baz (2024, p. 114), teachers reported challenges stemming from both teachers' and students' inability to adapt to innovations and a lack of infrastructure (lack of internet access and smart boards). In a study conducted by Bayat and Şentürk (2015, pp. 118–135), teachers reported challenges stemming from students' lack of prior knowledge, excessive class sizes, student disinterest, students' lack of impartiality in assessment, insufficient lesson hours, and their own lack of knowledge. These findings support the research findings. Indeed, when studies conducted across different teaching fields and changing curricula, particularly on the RCEK, are examined, it is observed that the challenges encountered largely stem from insufficient physical infrastructure in educational environments and overcrowded classrooms. This situation can be interpreted as significantly complicating the effective implementation of curricula.

In the study, teachers' views on the contributions of implementing assessment and evaluation tools were examined, and it was determined that they contribute to students by ensuring active student participation in the process, contributing to students' lasting learning, contributing to the development of students' higher-order thinking skills, increasing student motivation, revealing students' diverse talents, and fostering the development of competent individuals in every sense. Furthermore, it was concluded that they contribute to teachers by providing objective assessment opportunities, providing the opportunity to understand students better, enabling students to assess their level, providing clear and understandable feedback to students, contributing to the identification of students' interests and needs, and easing teacher burden by including a variety of assessment and evaluation tools. Based on the teachers' views, it can be interpreted that the assessment and evaluation tools used within the CTEM serve the overall objectives of the model (Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, 2024b, p. 5) by supporting not only academic achievement but also the development of individuals in terms of values, attitudes, and skills. Thus, they contribute to the development of competent and virtuous individuals. It is anticipated that the tangible impact of these contributions will become more evident over time during the teaching process and as students progress. A review of the literature reveals studies that support the research findings. Regarding the contributions of the implementation of assessment and evaluation tools, teachers emphasized that in the study conducted by Karataş and Tabak (2010, p. 60), it increased student motivation towards the lesson; in the study conducted by Duyul et al. (2025, p. 13), it increased student achievement through individualized instructional methods and was aimed at equipping students with analytical thinking and problem-solving skills; in the study conducted by Ak and Köse (2024, pp. 145–151), it enabled students to be active; in the study conducted by Sönmez Ektem et al. (2016, p. 667), it provided the opportunity to evaluate students in all aspects, ensured student participation in the evaluation process, and provided the opportunity to monitor student development; and in the study conducted by Bayat and Şentürk (2015, p. 125), it was highlighted that it

contributed by revealing students' different talents, increasing student achievement, providing the opportunity to know students better, and providing the opportunity for objective evaluation. These findings support the research findings. Based on the results of the study, the following recommendations can be developed:

- In-service training can be provided to teachers by experts to promote the use of contemporary assessment and evaluation tools prescribed in the teaching program.
- The technological and physical infrastructure of schools can be improved to facilitate the implementation of the assessment and evaluation activities prescribed in the teaching program.
- All the contemporary assessment and evaluation tools, accessible through QR codes at the end of the activities, can be directly included in textbooks.
- Students can be trained in the assessment and evaluation practices included in the CTEM teaching program and on the use of assessment and evaluation tools.
- Studies can be conducted to examine students' opinions on the assessment and evaluation practices included in the teaching program.

Declarations

Authors' contributions: Designing the Study: TK (40%), FB (30%), AAD (30%), Data Collection: TK (35%), FB (40%), AAD (25%), Data Analysis: TK (40%), FB (40%), AAD (20%), Submission and Revision: TK (40%), FB (40%), AAD (20%)

Competing interests: No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Funding: No funds, grants, or other support was received.

Ethics approval and consent to participate: Ethical commission approval dated 03.06.2025 and numbered 197094 was obtained from the Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Board of Muş Alparslan University. In addition, a research application permit dated 25.04.2025 and numbered MEB.TT.2025.023883 was obtained through the Ministry of National Education Research Application Permits System.

Publisher's Note: Religious Education Journal remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliation.

Plagiarism Statement: This article has been scanned by iThenticate.

References

Ak, B. S., & Köse, M. (2024). 2024 fen bilimleri dersi öğretim programı hakkında öğretmen görüşlerinin incelenmesi. *APJEC - Academic Platform Journal of Education and Change*, *7*(2), 132-169. https://doi.org/10.55150/apjec.1582677

Akbulut, Y. (2012). Veri çözümleme teknikleri. In A. Şimşek (Ed.), *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma yöntemleri* (pp. 162–196). Anadolu Üniversitesi.

Aksoy, E., Dülger, S., & Köksal, A. (2018). Bilimsel araştırmalarda evren, örneklem, varsayım ve değişken. In Ö. Güngör (Ed.), *Bilimsel araştırma süreçleri yöntem, teknik ve etiğe giriş* (pp. 137–167). Grafiker Yayınları.

Bahar, M., Nartgün, Z., Durmuş, S., & Bıçak, B. (2025). *Geleneksel-tamamlayıcı ölçme ve değerlendirme teknikleri*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Balaban Salı, J. (2012). Verilerin toplanması. In A. Şimşek (Ed.), *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma yöntemleri* (pp. 134–161). Anadolu Üniversitesi.

Bayat, S., & Şentürk, Ş. (2015). Fizik, kimya, biyoloji ortaöğretim alan öğretmenlerinin alternatif ölçme değerlendirme tekniklerine ilişkin görüşleri. *Amasya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *4*(1), 118-137.

Baz, B. (2024). Türkiye Yüzyılı Maarif Modeli'nin sınıf öğretmenlerinin görüşleri bağlamında incelenmesi. *Eğitim Felsefesi ve Sosyolojisi Dergisi*, *5*(2), 106–123. https://doi.org/10.29329/jeps.2024.1105.2

Bilmez, A. (2024). *Din Kültürü ve Ahlak Bilgisi dersinde proje*. Ankara: İlahiyat Yayınları.

Çakmak, A. (2011). *Din Kültürü ve Ahlak Bilgisi öğretiminde ölçme ve değerlendirme teknikleri ve öğretmenlerin bunları kullanma düzeyleri* [Master's thesis]. Sakarya Üniversitesi.

Çapcıoğlu, F., & Kalkan Açıkgöz, Ö. (2018). Nitel araştırmalarda kullanılan araştırma teknikleri. In Ö. Güngör (Ed.), *Bilimsel araştırma süreçleri yöntem, teknik ve etiğe giriş* (pp. 203–220). Grafiker Yayınları.

Ceylan, T. (2025). Türkiye Yüzyılı Maarif Modeli DKAB öğretim programlarının öğretmen görüşlerine göre değerlendirilmesi. *İlahiyat Tetkikleri Dergisi*, *63*, 1-16. https://doi.org/10.29288/ilted.1598481

Cingöz, O., & Akyürek, S. (2021). DKAB öğretmenlerinin, ölçme ve değerlendirme tekniklerini eleştirel düşünme eğitimine katkı sağlayacak şekilde kullanma durumları. *Bilimname*, *2021*(44), 239-278. https://doi.org/10.28949/bilimname.695541

Creswell, J. W. (2017). *Araştırma deseni nitel, nicel ve karma yöntem yaklaşımları* (S. B. Demir, Trans.; 3rd ed.). Eğiten Kitap Yayınları.

Çüm, S. (2021). Ölçme ve değerlendirmede temel kavramlar. In M. D. Şahin (Ed.), *Eğitimde ölçme ve değerlendirme* (pp. 1–21). Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.

Duyul, S., Duyul, Y., Kesman, M., & Kesman, M. (2025). Türkiye Yüzyılı Maarif Modeli konusunda öğretmen görüşleri. *Ulusal Eğitim Dergisi*, *5*(3), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15002346

Gelbal, S., & Kelecioğlu, H. (2007). Öğretmenlerin ölçme ve değerlendirme yöntemleri hakkındaki yeterlik algıları ve karşılaştıkları sorunlar. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *33*(33), 135-145.

Güler, N. (2025). *Eğitimde ölçme ve değerlendirme* (20th ed.). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Gündoğdu, Y. (2013). Din Kültürü ve Ahlak Bilgisi öğretmenlerinin tercih ettikleri ölçme araçları. *Journal of Istanbul University Faculty of Theology*, *27*, 85-112.

Işıkdoğan, D. (2014). Din Kültürü ve Ahlak Bilgisi dersi öğretmenlerinin yapılandırmacı ölçme ve değerlendirme yöntemlerine yönelik görüşleri Diyarbakır-Şanlıurfa örneği. *Dicle Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, *11*, 165-181.

Karasu, T. (2018). Eğitim felsefesi akımları açısından öğretmen modelliği. In M. A. Özdoğan, F. Çiftçi, V. Aba, S. Korkmaz, & İ. Kara (Eds.), *Uluslararası İslam ve model insan sempozyumu* (Vol. 2, pp. 249–255). Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi.

Karataş, S., & Tabak, N. (2010). İlköğretim Din Kültürü ve Ahlak Bilgisi Öğretim Programına ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. *Kuramsal Eğitimbilim*, *3*(1), 56–65.

Karbeyaz, P. (2018). DKAB öğretmenlerinin alternatif ölçme değerlendirme tekniklerini kullanma düzeyi. *Kilis 7 Aralık Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *8*(16), 201-225. https://doi.org/10.31834/kilissbd.452693

Kaya, M., & Köseoğlu, Z. (2024). Dijital etik ve ahlak eğitimi: Din Kültürü ve Ahlak Bilgisi dersi öğretim programları üzerine bir inceleme. *ISPEC International Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, *8*(3), 73–83. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13771458

Köseoğlu, Z. (2025). Türkiye Yüzyılı Maarif Modeli bağlamında 2018 ve 2024 Din Kültürü ve Ahlak Bilgisi müfredatlarının karşılaştırmalı analizi. *Pearson Journal Of Social Sciences & Humanities*, *8*(31), 85–115. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14965514

Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı. (2024a). *Din Kültürü ve Ahlak Bilgisi dersi öğretim programı (9, 10, 11 ve 12. sınıf) 2024*. https://tymm.meb.gov.tr/upload/program/2024programdin9101112Onayli.pdf

Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı. (2024b). *Türkiye Yüzyılı Maarif Modeli öğretim programları ortak metin 2024*. https://tymm.meb.gov.tr/upload/brosur/2024programortakmetinOnayli.pdf

Şimşek, A. (2018). Evren ve örneklem. In A. Şimşek (Ed.), *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma yöntemleri* (pp. 108–134). Anadolu Üniversitesi.

Şimşek, E. (2018). Öğretmen adaylarının ölçme ve değerlendirme genel yeterlik algıları: Atatürk Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi örneği. *Amasya Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, *11*, 59-80. https://doi.org/10.18498/amauifd.503794

Şimşek, V. (2022). Farklı değişkenlere göre DKAB öğretmenlerinin ölçme ve değerlendirmeye yönelik tutumları. *Dini Araştırmalar*, *25*(63), 553-578. https://doi.org/10.15745/da.1183068

Sönmez Ektem, I., Keçici, S., & Pilten, G. (2016). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin süreç odaklı ölçme ve değerlendirme yöntemlerine ilişkin görüşleri. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *17*(3), 661-680.

Tokur Üner, B., & Aşılıoğlu, B. (2022). İngilizce öğretiminde ölçme ve değerlendirme sürecine ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. *EKEV Akademi Dergisi*, *89*, 25-50.

Turan, Ş., & Nazıroğlu, B. (2024). Türkiye Yüzyılı Maarif Modeli'nin din öğretimi yaklaşımında birey ve toplumun ideolojik tahayyülü. *Rize İlahiyat Dergisi*, *27*, 15-33. https://doi.org/10.32950/rid.1507279

Üredi, P. (2024). Öğretmen yetiştirme programlarına yön vermek üzere bütüncül ölçme ve değerlendirme uygulamalarının öğretim programlarında uygulanma düzeyleri. *Eğitim ve Yeni Yaklaşımlar Dergisi*, *7*(1), 10-30. https://doi.org/10.52974/jena.1497259

Uygun, N. (2020). Sınıf öğretmeni adaylarının matematik dersindeki ölçme ve değerlendirme tekniklerine ilişkin görüşleri: Birleştirilmiş sınıf uygulaması örneği. *Harran Maarif Dergisi*, *5*(2), 29-45. https://doi.org/10.22596/2020.0502.29.45

Üzümcü, M., & Abanoz, S. (2024). Program tasarımı yaklaşımları bağlamında Türkiye Yüzyılı Maarif Modeli Din Kültürü ve Ahlak Bilgisi dersi öğretim programı. *Mevzu – Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *12*, 795-826. https://doi.org/10.56720/mevzu.1495250

Yaşar, M. (2024). Yeni Din Kültürü ve Ahlak Bilgisi Öğretim Programları üzerine bir değerlendirme. *Disiplinlerarası Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *16*, 19–47.

Yeşilbaş Özenç, Y. (2022). Eğitim araştırmalarında durum çalışması deseni nasıl kullanılır? *Uluslararası Eğitimde Nitel Araştırmalarda Mükemmellik Arayışı Dergisi (UEMAD)*, *1*(2), 57–67.

Yiğit, Y. (2024). *Din öğretimi özelinde eğitimde ölçme ve değerlendirme* (2nd ed.). Ankara: Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.

Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2008). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri* (7th ed.). Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.

Yıldız, M., & Genç, M. F. (2016). Ortaokul Din Kültürü ve Ahlak Bilgisi öğretmenlerinin alternatif ölçme ve değerlendirme tekniklerini kullanma düzeyleri ve karşılaştıkları sorunlar. *İlahiyat Tetkikleri Dergisi*, 45, 45-80. https://doi.org/10.29288/ilted.304761