

## Investigation of Teachers' Beliefs About Classroom Assessment<sup>1</sup>

Hasan Şahin<sup>2</sup> Cihad Şentürk<sup>3</sup>

### Article Type

Original Research

*International Journal of  
Modern Education Studies*  
2025

Volume 9, No 2

Pages: 610-650

<http://www.ijonmes.net>

### Article Info:

Received 19.09.2025

Revision 19.11.2025

Accepted 01.12.2025



### Abstract:

This study examined teachers' beliefs about classroom assessment using a mixed-methods sequential explanatory design. Participants were primary, middle, and high school teachers in public schools in Karaman, Türkiye, during the 2024–2025 academic year. Data were collected through the Classroom Assessment Beliefs Scale and semi-structured interviews. The findings indicated that teachers were undecided about traditional assessment but strongly supported alternative, student-centered approaches. No significant differences were observed with respect to gender or subject taught. However, undergraduate teachers and those with 16–20 years of experience reported stronger traditional beliefs, while graduate teachers and those with 1–5 years of experience reported stronger alternative beliefs. Middle school teachers reported stronger traditional beliefs than did primary and high school teachers. Qualitative results indicated that while teachers valued alternative assessment, implementation was hindered by time limitations, large classes, curriculum intensity, lack of materials, student-related challenges, and the dominance of centralized exams. It is recommended that curricula and national examinations be revised to better align with alternative assessment approaches.

### Keywords:

Assessment, traditional assessment, alternative assessment, classroom assessment beliefs, teachers

### Citation:

Şahin, H., & Şentürk, C. (2025). Investigation of teachers' beliefs about classroom assessment. *International Journal of Modern Education Studies*, 9(2), 610-650. <https://doi.org/10.51383/ijonmes.2025.441>

<sup>1</sup> This article is based on the master's thesis prepared by the first author under the supervision of the second author.

<sup>2</sup> Teacher, Ministry of National Education, Karaman, Türkiye. [hasansahin3570@gmail.com](mailto:hasansahin3570@gmail.com)

<https://orcid.org/0009-0000-7674-6747>

<sup>3</sup> Assoc. Prof. Dr., Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University, Education Faculty, Karaman, Türkiye.

[cihadsenturk@gmail.com](mailto:cihadsenturk@gmail.com) <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1276-8653>



This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original authors and source are credited.

## INTRODUCTION

Determining students' levels of competence and determination, analyzing the causes of any deficiencies or delays that arise during the acquisition of these outcomes, and taking necessary corrective measures play a critical role in the effectiveness and quality of the teaching process (Özçelik, 2016). In this context, assessments in education are integral components of the teaching process; they play a critical role in monitoring the quality of learning, guiding the learning process, and evaluating the effectiveness of teaching activities. It is also of great importance for monitoring, managing, and evaluating students' learning processes and their academic achievement. Teachers' approaches to classroom assessment and their perceptions of this process directly affect the quality of instruction. In this context, the extent to which teachers value the assessment process, the methods they prefer, and their perceptions of these methods are critical research areas for improving educational quality.

Assessments are among the fundamental components of learning, as they provide teachers and students with opportunities to reflect meaningfully on how learning can occur more effectively and to receive constructive feedback (Brookhart & Durkin, 2003; McMillan & Nash, 2000; Wormeli, 2006). For teachers to plan and implement instruction effectively, they need to develop a deep understanding and knowledge of students' learning processes. At this point, teachers' beliefs directly shape not only the teaching-learning process but also the assessment process (Chan & Elliott, 2004; Lyon, 2011). In recent years, beliefs have been emphasized as a key factor in understanding teachers' classroom practices. Educational researchers have attributed special importance to teachers' beliefs in order to better understand how they think about teaching, learning, and other school-related issues (Seferoğlu et al., 2009). Indeed, one of the underlying factors influencing teachers' classroom behaviors is their beliefs (Marland, 1998). Such beliefs function as a filter through which classroom practices are interpreted and enacted, thereby shaping teachers' instructional behaviors (Richardson, 2003). Numerous studies have revealed strong relationships between teachers' beliefs and their classroom practices (Kagan, 1992; Pajares, 1992).

Beliefs about assessment express teachers' preferences regarding assessment and evaluation practices, as well as their understanding of the roles of students and teachers in these practices (McMillan & Nash, 2000; Thomas, 2012). In line with these beliefs, teachers may adopt different approaches to assessment (McMillan, 2008; Popham, 2000). For example, teachers with traditional beliefs about assessment prefer methods based on paper-and-pencil tests, in which students are assessed by recognition rather than by reproduction of knowledge (Windschitl, 1999). This approach focuses on identifying and developing the cognitive aspects of teaching (Segers & Dochy, 2001) and aims to measure the extent to which students have acquired the basic knowledge and skills outlined in the curriculum (Nitko & Brookhart, 2011). In contrast, teachers who hold alternative beliefs about assessment and evaluation tend to use performance-based tools such as portfolios, peer and

group assessment, performance tasks, and projects more frequently (Anderson, 1998). These teachers argue that performance- and process-oriented assessments are more effective for measuring complex mental skills such as analytical, reflective, and critical thinking, and problem-solving (Haladyna et al., 2002).

Research conducted in Türkiye reveals that the majority of teachers hold traditional perspectives on assessment, preferring exam-focused methods that measure success through numerical data (Evin Gencil & Özbaşı, 2013; Kılıç, 2020; Özenç & Çakır, 2015; Özeren & Akpınar, 2020). Similarly, a study of teaching staff reported that they adopted contemporary assessment approaches only to a moderate extent (Şad & Göktaş, 2013). In addition, several studies have shown that teacher candidates often display negative or moderate attitudes toward assessment courses and that their assessment-related self-efficacy is also moderate (Çardak, 2018; Şahin & Uysal, 2013; Yaşar, 2014). Other studies have indicated that teachers hold misconceptions about assessment (Üztemur & Metin, 2015). Furthermore, it has been found that teachers' beliefs about assessment are not aligned with the principles of assessment and evaluation embedded in teaching programs based on contemporary educational approaches (Öztürk Çetinkaya & Saka, 2022). These findings contradict the student-centered, process-oriented assessment approaches required by contemporary teaching and alternative assessment practices (Özdemir, 2010). The widespread use of traditional methods, such as multiple-choice tests and conventional exams, in teachers' classroom practices may be insufficient to measure students' higher-order thinking skills or to discover and develop their talents (Ornstein & Lasley, 2004; Thompson et al., 2001).

The studies conducted in the Turkish context, as noted above, reveal limitations in teachers' assessment competencies, frequent implementation errors, a persistent reliance on traditional approaches, and significant challenges in the classroom application of contemporary assessment methods. Existing research has largely remained confined to descriptive analyses of the current situation and problem identification; however, studies that offer structured professional development models, pedagogically grounded processes for integrating alternative assessment tools, or evidence supporting the development of assessment literacy among preservice teachers are remarkably scarce. This imbalance between problem-focused descriptive studies and research offering practical solutions highlights a notable gap in the literature. Such a gap presents challenges for policymakers and teacher educators seeking to design evidence-based strategies to improve assessment practices. Within this context, the present study provides concrete, feasible, and context-sensitive recommendations aimed at enhancing teachers' assessment literacy, integrating alternative and process-oriented assessment tools into classroom practice, and transforming the existing assessment culture. By emphasizing the problems, gaps, implementation errors, and misalignments between curriculum approaches and assessment practices identified in the findings, and by giving particular attention to those discussed in the Discussion section, this study is expected to make meaningful contributions to the literature.

## The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine the beliefs of teachers in elementary, middle, and high schools regarding assessment and to reveal their views on the assessment process. In this context, teachers' tendencies toward traditional and alternative assessment approaches, the factors influencing these beliefs, and how they are reflected in professional practices are analyzed. The data obtained from the research are expected to provide insights that can be used to update the content of teacher education programs, plan in-service training, and improve assessment processes. In this context, the study seeks to answer the following questions:

**RQ1:** What are teachers' beliefs about classroom assessment?

**RQ2:** Are there any significant differences in teachers' beliefs about classroom assessment based on variables such as gender, subject taught, educational background, teaching experience and the level of education (primary, middle or high school) at which they teach?

**RQ3:** What are teachers' views on the classroom assessment process?

## METHOD

In this part of the study, the research model, the procedure, the data collection tools, and the analysis of the data are presented.

### Research Model

This research was conducted using a mixed-methods design. Mixed-methods research is defined as an approach in which both quantitative and qualitative data are collected, integrated, and used to better understand research problems and to draw conclusions from the resulting data set (Creswell, 2009). This method is widely used, particularly in the health, social, and behavioral sciences. In this study, the mixed-methods approach was chosen to leverage the strengths of both quantitative and qualitative methods while minimizing the limitations of each (Ayden & Gündoğdu, 2022). Specifically, the sequential explanatory design, one of the mixed-methods designs, was employed. The explanatory design is a type of mixed-methods approach in which qualitative data are collected after the quantitative data have been gathered and analyzed, with the aim of providing a deeper understanding of the results. In this design, the researcher first identifies general trends from numerical data and then conducts a detailed qualitative analysis to understand the reasons for, or processes underlying, these trends. In this regard, the explanatory design is highly effective at revealing the deeper structures underlying quantitative findings (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018).

### Participants

In line with the mixed-methods research model, the study group included participants in both the quantitative and qualitative phases. The study group comprised 461 teachers

working in state primary, middle, and high schools in the central district of Karaman, Türkiye, during the 2024–2025 academic year. The distribution of the demographic characteristics of the teachers who participated in the quantitative phase of the research is presented in Table 1. The qualitative phase of the study comprised 32 teachers who volunteered from among those included in the quantitative phase. To ensure the diversity and representativeness of the qualitative data, participants' educational levels were considered, with attention to achieving balanced participation among teachers at the primary, middle, and high school levels. Information about the participants in the qualitative phase of the study is provided again in Table 1.

**Table 1**

*Demographic Characteristics of Teachers in the Quantitative and Qualitative Phases of the Study*

Variable		Participants in the Quantitative Phase		Participants in the Qualitative Phase	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Gender	Female	221	47,9	17	53,1
	Male	240	52,1	15	46,9
Subject Taught	Primary Education Teacher	156	33,8	10	31,2
	Subject Teacher	305	66,2	22	68,8
Educational Background	Undergraduate	312	67,7	18	56,2
	Graduate	149	32,3	14	43,8
Teaching Experience	1–5 Years	39	8,5	6	18,7
	6–10 Years	74	16,1	4	12,5
	11–15 Years	119	25,8	7	21,9
	16–20 Years	83	18,0	4	12,5
	21–25 Years	99	21,5	7	21,9
	26 Years and Above	47	10,2	4	12,5
Educational (School) Level	Primary School	156	33,8	10	31,2
	Middle School	176	38,2	11	34,4
	High School	129	28,0	11	34,4
Total		461	100	32	100

### *Data Collection Instruments*

Both quantitative and qualitative data collection tools were used in the study. The data collection tools used in the study are presented below.

### *Classroom Assessment Beliefs Scale*

In the study, the “Classroom Assessment Beliefs Scale” developed by Şentürk and Baş (2023) was used to determine teachers’ beliefs about assessment. The scale was developed in Turkish. The scale consists of 22 items and is a five-point Likert scale with the following response options: “strongly disagree,” “disagree,” “undecided,” “agree,” and “strongly agree.” The scale is two-dimensional: the first dimension reflects “traditional assessment beliefs” (e.g., classroom assessment should primarily be used for grading students), and the second reflects “alternative assessment beliefs” (e.g., classroom assessment should consider various authentic and alternative assessment techniques). The Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was 0.92 for the first dimension and 0.91 for the second dimension. According to the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) results, the model’s fit indices are as follows:  $\chi^2/df = 1.85$ ; RMSEA = 0.06 (90% CI: [2.37–2.99]); IFI = 0.91; CFI = 0.91; TLI = 0.91. These values indicate that the scale demonstrates an acceptable fit with respect to construct validity. In this study, Cronbach’s alpha for the scale was found to be 0.83 for the first dimension and 0.87 for the second dimension. Based on these values, the scale used in this study is valid and reliable.

### *Semi-Structured Interview Form*

The researcher prepared a semi-structured interview form to examine teachers’ beliefs about assessment, to explore their views on the classroom assessment process, and to gain an in-depth understanding of teachers’ thoughts on this subject, and to identify their opinions and suggestions. The semi-structured interview form, used as a qualitative data collection tool in this study, was designed in line with the main objective of the research and structured to allow participants to express their thoughts in depth. Compared with structured interviews, the semi-structured interview offers greater flexibility; it allows the researcher to guide the interview with prepared questions and enables participants to express their perspectives and original ideas comfortably (Barbour & Schostak, 2005).

To ensure content validity, the interview form was developed based on a literature review in the relevant field and aligned with the main objective of the research. Subsequently, opinions were sought from three academic experts in educational programs and teaching to evaluate the form’s content validity. Necessary corrections and improvements were made based on feedback from academic experts, and the form was finalized. In addition, the interview form was reviewed by a language expert to ensure its linguistic accuracy. Pilot interviews were conducted with three participants to improve the form’s comprehensibility, functionality, and measurement properties. Based on the feedback obtained during this preliminary application process, expressions that participants did not understand or found inadequate were revised to increase the validity and reliability of the data collection tool.



### *Data Collection Process*

The study was conducted in accordance with legal permissions, and participation was voluntary. Prior to the study, participants were informed about its purpose, scope, and procedures. In line with ethical principles, the identities of the participants were kept confidential, and pseudonyms were used when presenting the data. Participants were explicitly informed that they had the right to withdraw from the study at any time. During the quantitative data collection phase, the researcher adopted an objective stance in administering measurement instruments, entering data, and conducting analyses, taking care to ensure that the data were collected in accordance with the principles of scientific validity and reliability. During the qualitative phase of the research, the researcher aimed to gain an in-depth understanding of participants' experiences and perceptions through semi-structured interviews. To that end, the researcher provided a neutral, transparent, and reassuring environment to encourage data collection that was as natural and sincere as possible. During the interviews, the researcher refrained from being directive, allowing participants to express their thoughts in their own words.

### *Data Analysis*

The research data were analyzed and interpreted in two dimensions. First, quantitative data were analyzed using Jamovi 2.6; then qualitative data were interpreted in line with the research objectives to validate and support the quantitative findings.

#### *Quantitative Data Analysis*

In the first stage of data analysis, normality tests were conducted to determine whether the dataset followed a normal distribution; the results confirmed normality. Accordingly, parametric tests were employed in the analysis. Descriptive statistics, including frequency ( $f$ ), percentage (%), arithmetic mean ( $\bar{x}$ ), and standard deviation ( $SD$ ), were used to examine the data. Independent-samples  $t$ -tests and one-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) were used to examine group differences on various variables. When a significant difference was identified in the ANOVA results, the  $LSD$  post hoc test was used to determine which groups differed.

#### *Qualitative Data Analysis*

After collecting quantitative data, the researcher transferred the written notes from interviews with teachers to a computer. All recorded qualitative data were classified for each participant. Each file was assigned a separate code number during classification. This dataset was subsequently analyzed using content analysis methods. Content analysis is a systematic and repeatable technique that enables the analysis of specific expressions in texts by reducing them to smaller content categories through coding based on specific rules (Büyüköztürk et al., 2019). In this study, the content analysis method, which is widely used in qualitative research and allows data to be classified according to codes and themes and to be interpreted in ways understandable to readers, was preferred (Patton, 2014). The

researcher first read the obtained data multiple times to establish overall coherence and then coded the data and grouped these codes under themes (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2016).

The researcher repeatedly reviewed the qualitative dataset and preliminary coding conducted iteratively. The resulting draft codes were compared to ensure consistency. Following this stage, the main coding process was initiated, during which themes were identified by grouping codes into meaningful patterns (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003; Yin, 2017). To enhance reliability, support was also sought from two teachers and two academics specializing in educational sciences to determine how codes should be grouped into themes. In addition, coding consistency was examined to minimize errors in the analysis of the interview data. For this purpose, three randomly selected interview forms were independently coded by another expert, and inter-coder agreement was calculated using Miles and Huberman's (2021) reliability formula.  $Reliability = \left( \frac{Agreement}{Agreement + Disagreement} \right) \times 100$ . As a result, the agreement coefficient between the two coders was found to be  $125 / (129 + 6) \times 100 = 92.6\%$  (0.926). The themes generated in the study were compared with coding performed by subject-matter experts to ensure consistency and reliability, resulting in the final determination of themes, subthemes, and codes. To support the research findings, direct quotations from participants were also included. In these quotations, participant codes [T1, T2, T3, ...] were used instead of personal information, in accordance with ethical principles.

In qualitative research, the primary aim is to examine phenomena in depth. Reporting theme and subtheme frequencies in the findings can help clarify patterns and emphases within the data. In this study, frequencies were presented to demonstrate the intensity of relationships among themes and subthemes and to support a more systematic interpretation of the findings. The literature also emphasizes that frequencies may be used in a supportive manner within qualitative content analysis to enhance the clarity and transparency of data reporting (Schreier, 2012; Vaismoradi et al., 2013). Accordingly, the frequencies (*f*) used in the present research represent repeated instances of the codes and provide an additional layer of evidence that strengthens the analytic rigor of the study.

### *Ethical Considerations*

In the course of this research, we paid scrupulous attention to ethical guidelines, ensuring that the integrity and reliability of the study were never compromised. For the quantitative phase, data were collected meticulously, face-to-face, ensuring respondents' privacy and anonymity. The absence of demographic data collection further cemented this confidentiality. Moving on to the qualitative portion, every interviewee was formally apprised of the research objectives, methodologies, and potential implications. Importantly, they were reassured in writing about their right to withdraw from the study without any repercussions. All acquired data, including the interview tools and participants' consent forms, were securely stored on the researcher's personal computer and protected by stringent password measures.

Aligned with the overarching commitment to ethics, this study strictly adhered to all provisions delineated in the "Higher Education Institutions Scientific Research and



Publication Ethics Directive.” No instances of activities that might infringe the provisions set forth in “Actions Against Scientific Research and Publication Ethics” were identified.

Ethical Review Board: [Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University Ethics Committee for Social and Human Sciences Research and Publications]

Date of Ethics Review Decision: [21/05/2024]

Ethics Assessment Document Issue Number: [08-2024/204]

## FINDINGS

This section presents the analysis of the data collected to address both the quantitative and qualitative research questions, together with the findings and interpretations derived from these analyses.

### Findings Related to the Quantitative Phase of the Research

In this section, teachers’ assessment beliefs were examined in the order of the quantitative research questions and compared across selected variables.

#### Findings Regarding Teachers’ Beliefs About Classroom Assessment

The first research question of the study is: “What are teachers’ beliefs about classroom assessment?” To address this question, teachers’ beliefs about classroom assessment were analyzed, and the results are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2**

*Teachers’ Beliefs About Classroom Assessment*

Classroom Assessment Beliefs	<i>n</i>	$\bar{x}$	<i>SD</i>	<i>The Meaning</i>
Traditional Classroom Assessment Belief	461	3,25	,640	Undecided
Alternative Classroom Assessment Belief	461	4,37	,630	Totally Agree

Table 2 shows that teachers’ beliefs about traditional assessment are “neutral” meaning teachers express neither a clear positive nor a clear negative opinion. Their beliefs regarding alternative assessment, however, are at the “strongly agree” level, indicating that teachers’ levels of belief about alternative assessment are relatively high. Based on these findings, it can be concluded that teachers hold beliefs favoring alternative assessment over traditional assessment.

#### Findings on Teachers’ Beliefs About Classroom Assessment Across Variables

The study’s second research question is: “Are there significant differences in teachers’ classroom assessment beliefs across gender, subject taught, educational background, teaching experience, and educational level (primary, middle, or high school)?” To address this research question, teachers’ classroom assessment beliefs were analyzed across these variables.

### *Findings Regarding Teachers' Beliefs About Classroom Assessment According to the Gender*

Table 3 presents the *t*-test results for teachers' beliefs about classroom assessment by "gender".

**Table 3**

*Teachers' Beliefs About Classroom Assessment According to the Gender*

Classroom Assessment Beliefs	Gender	<i>n</i>	$\bar{x}$	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Traditional Classroom Assessment Belief	Female	221	3.21	.039	-1.310	.191
	Male	240	3.28	.044		
Alternative Classroom Assessment Belief	Female	221	4.42	.040	1.656	.098
	Male	240	4.33	.042		

Table 3 indicates that no statistically significant gender differences were found in teachers' beliefs regarding either traditional assessment approaches [ $t_{(459)} = -1.310, p > .05$ ] or alternative assessment approaches [ $t_{(459)} = 1.656, p > .05$ ]. These findings indicate that teachers' beliefs about classroom assessment approaches do not differ significantly by gender, suggesting that male and female teachers hold similar beliefs regarding both traditional and alternative assessment approaches. These findings indicate that gender is not a determining factor in shaping teachers' assessment beliefs and that both female and male teachers develop their orientations toward traditional and alternative assessment approaches in similar ways.

### *Findings Regarding Teachers' Beliefs About Classroom Assessment According to Subject Taught*

The *t*-test results examining teachers' beliefs about classroom assessment across the "subject taught" variable are presented in Table 4.

**Table 4**

*Teachers' Beliefs About Classroom Assessment According to Subject Taught*

Classroom Assessment Beliefs	Subject Taught	<i>n</i>	$\bar{x}$	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Traditional Classroom Assessment Belief	Primary Education Teacher	156	3.21	.641	-.788	.431
	Subject Teacher	305	3.26	.640		
Alternative Classroom Assessment Belief	Primary Education Teacher	156	4.38	.553	.193	.847
	Subject Teacher	305	4.37	.667		

Table 4 indicates that no statistically significant differences were found between classroom and subject teachers in their beliefs about either traditional [ $t_{(459)} = -0.788, p > .05$ ] or alternative assessment approaches [ $t_{(459)} = 0.193, p > .05$ ]. This suggests that teachers' assessment beliefs are consistent regardless of the subject they teach. These findings indicate that teachers' beliefs about classroom assessment approaches do not differ significantly by subject taught; both groups hold similar beliefs regarding traditional and alternative assessment approaches.

### *Findings Regarding Teachers' Beliefs About Classroom Assessment According to Educational Background*

Results of  $t$ -tests examining teachers' beliefs about classroom assessment by "educational background" are presented in Table 5.

**Table 5**

*Teachers' Beliefs About Classroom Assessment According to Educational Background*

Classroom Assessment Beliefs	Educational Background	<i>n</i>	$\bar{x}$	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Traditional Classroom Assessment Belief	Undergraduate	312	3.30	.649	2.541	.011*
	Graduate	149	3.14	.609		
Alternative Classroom Assessment Belief	Undergraduate	312	4.33	.634	-2.375	.018*
	Graduate	149	4.47	.612		

\* $p < .05$

Table 5 shows statistically significant differences in teachers' assessment beliefs across educational backgrounds. Teachers with undergraduate degrees reported stronger traditional assessment beliefs [ $t_{(459)} = 2.541, p < .05$ ], whereas those with graduate degrees reported stronger alternative assessment beliefs [ $t_{(459)} = -2.375, p < .05$ ]. These findings indicate that teachers' beliefs about assessment approaches differ according to their educational background. These findings indicate that as teachers' educational level increases, they tend to favor alternative assessment approaches over traditional ones.

### *Findings Regarding Teachers' Beliefs About Classroom Assessment According to Teaching Experience*

The results of the ANOVA examining teachers' beliefs about classroom assessment across the "teaching experience" variable are presented in Table 6.

**Table 6***Teachers' Beliefs About Classroom Assessment According to Teaching Experience*

<b>Classroom Assessment Beliefs</b>	<b>Teaching Experience</b>	<b>n</b>	<b><math>\bar{x}</math></b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>p</b>	<b>LSD</b>
Traditional Classroom Assessment Belief	1–5 Years	39	3.30	.501	3.316	.006*	6-10 years < 16-20 years
	6–10 Years	74	3.11	.589			
	11–15 Years	119	3.14	.657			11-15 years < 16-20 years
	16–20 Years	83	3.46	.612			
	21–25 Years	99	3.27	.705			16-20 years > 21-25 years
	26 Years and Above	47	3.25	.603			
Alternative Classroom Assessment Belief	1–5 Years	39	4.74	.470	3.941	.002*	1-5 years > 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, 21-25, 26 years and above
	6–10 Years	74	4.39	.558			
	11–15 Years	119	4.31	.625			
	16–20 Years	83	4.43	.459			16-20 years > 26 years and above
	21–25 Years	99	4.32	.755			
	26 Years and Above	47	4.20	.731			

\* $p < .05$ 

Table 6 indicates statistically significant differences in teachers' assessment beliefs across levels of teaching experience. For traditional assessment, ANOVA results showed significant variation across experience groups [ $F_{(5, 455)} = 3.316, p < .05$ ]. Similarly, regarding alternative assessment, teachers' beliefs differed significantly according to years of teaching experience [ $F_{(5, 455)} = 3.941, p < .05$ ]. The LSD post-hoc test was subsequently applied to identify the groups in which these significant differences emerged for both traditional and alternative assessment beliefs. According to the LSD results, significant differences in traditional assessment beliefs were observed between teachers with 6–10, 11–15, and 21–25 years of teaching experience and those with 16–20 years. In each case, the difference favored teachers with 16–20 years of teaching experience who demonstrated a more traditional understanding of assessment than other groups. Significant differences in alternative assessment beliefs were found between teachers with 1–5 years of teaching experience and those with 6–10, 11–15, 16–20, 21–25, and 26+ years, and between teachers with 16–20 years and those with 26+ years of teaching experience. These differences indicated that teachers with 1–5 years of teaching experience held stronger beliefs in alternative (contemporary) assessment approaches than their more experienced counterparts, while teachers with 16–20 years of experience demonstrated a greater preference for alternative (contemporary) assessment approaches than those with 26 or more years of experience.

### *Findings Regarding Teachers' Beliefs About Classroom Assessment According to Educational (School) Level*

The results of the one-way ANOVA examining teachers' beliefs about classroom assessment across the “*educational (school) levels*” at which they work are presented in Table 7.

**Table 7**

*Teachers' Beliefs About Classroom Assessment According to Educational Level*

<b>Classroom Assessment Beliefs</b>	<b>Educational (School) Level</b>	<b><i>n</i></b>	<b><math>\bar{x}</math></b>	<b><i>SS</i></b>	<b><i>F</i></b>	<b><i>p</i></b>	<b><i>LSD</i></b>
Traditional Classroom Assessment Belief	Primary School	156	3.21	.641	5.395	.005*	Middle school > Primary school, high school
	Middle School	176	3.36	.630			
	High School	129	3.13	.632			
Alternative Classroom Assessment Belief	Primary School	156	4.38	.553	.767	.465	-
	Middle School	176	4.41	.569			
	High School	129	4.32	.780			

\* $p < .05$

Table 7 shows that teachers' beliefs about traditional assessment differed significantly according to the level of education at which they worked (elementary school, middle school, high school) [ $F_{(2, 458)} = 5.395, p < .05$ ]. However, no significant differences in their alternative assessment beliefs were found across school levels [ $F_{(2, 458)} = 0.767, p > .05$ ]. The *LSD* post-hoc test was then applied to identify the groups in which significant differences in traditional assessment beliefs emerged. The results indicated a significant difference between teachers working in middle schools and those working in primary and high schools. Based on this finding, it can be concluded that middle school teachers hold stronger beliefs about traditional assessment than their counterparts in primary and high schools.

### **Findings Related to the Qualitative Phase of the Research**

In this section of the study, teachers' views on the assessment process were examined in line with the qualitative research questions. The findings from the analyses are presented.

### *Findings Regarding Teachers' Views on Classroom Assessment Processes and Practices*

The third research question of this study is: “*What are teachers' perspectives on classroom assessment processes and practices?*” To address this question, items on the interview form were administered to participants, and their responses were systematically analyzed. In this section, the questions posed to teachers are presented and examined sequentially, together with the insights derived from their responses.

**Question 1:** What are teachers' perspectives on the assessment approaches and practices they employ in the classroom?

The findings related to this research question provide a detailed examination of teachers' perspectives on the conceptions they adopt, the approaches they prefer, and the methods they employ in classroom assessment processes. Within this framework, both their theoretical orientations and their practical applications were evaluated to provide a comprehensive understanding of how teachers conceptualize assessment in the teaching process. The results concerning teachers' assessment approaches, beliefs, and classroom practices were systematically categorized into themes, sub-themes, and codes and are presented in Table 8.

**Table 8**

*Teachers' Views on Assessment Approaches and Practices Employed in the Classroom*

Theme	Sub-Theme	Codes	<i>f</i>
Assessment Approaches	Alternative / Student-Centered Approaches	Project, performance, portfolio, self/peer assessment, process-based assessment, rubric, concept map, drama, observation, digital tools, product file	21
	Traditional / Teacher-Centered Approaches	Written exam, multiple-choice test, classical exam, fill-in-the-blank, true-false, short-answer, matching	11
Challenges Encountered in the Process of	Time/Process/Participation-Related Issues	Lack of time, crowded classrooms, curriculum intensity, shortage of materials	17
Alternative Assessment	Student-Related Issues	Lack of motivation, distraction, insufficient interest and readiness	21

Table 8 shows that a considerable number of teachers employ student-centered and alternative assessment approaches in the classroom assessment process ( $f = 21$ ). This indicates a clear tendency toward alternative assessment approaches. Process-oriented and multidimensional assessment tools are generally preferred. Accordingly, a significant proportion of teachers endorse alternative assessment. In this regard, some teachers expressed the following views:

*"Classroom assessment approaches are essential for understanding students' learning processes, monitoring their development, and guiding instruction. An effective assessment process should take both quantitative and qualitative data into account, be student-centered, and be carried out in a way that helps shape the teaching process." [T1]*

*"To understand students' learning levels and guide the teaching process, assessment approaches should be varied, provide process-oriented feedback, and, most importantly, be student-centered." [T17]*



*“Assessing students solely through written and oral exams prevents assessments from being distributed throughout the term. Students should not be evaluated solely on their performance in a single class session. Therefore, continuous assessment throughout the process should be included.” [T31]*

Although more than half of the teachers adopted an alternative understanding of assessment and evaluation, some continued to prefer traditional approaches and tools ( $f = 11$ ). This finding also supports the study's quantitative results, indicating that a proportion of teachers continue to hold beliefs aligned with traditional assessment and evaluation. Representative excerpts from teachers' statements are presented below to illustrate this finding:

*“Because of limitations, I must focus on result-oriented assessment.” [T20]*

*“Alternative assessment takes time and effort, so I stick with traditional assessment.” [T27]*

*“Since students encounter multiple-choice questions on exams, such as LGS and scholarship tests, I use that type of assessment.” [T16]*

Teachers who implemented the alternative assessment approach in their classrooms also reported encountering certain challenges during this process. They emphasized that issues such as time constraints, overcrowded classrooms, and an intensive curriculum posed significant barriers, making it difficult to effectively apply alternative assessment practices. Representative excerpts from teachers' statements regarding this issue are provided below:

*“I try to diversify the assessment approaches I use in the classroom as much as possible, but I find it difficult to implement multiple methods because of time constraints.” [T8]*

*“The process should be more student-centered; however, due to limited resources, we're forced to focus on results-oriented assessment, which creates problems for learning.” [T20]*

In addition to the challenges arising from the process itself, teachers highlighted certain student-related issues. They noted that problems such as low motivation, lack of attention, limited interest, and insufficient readiness negatively affect the implementation of alternative assessment practices. Representative excerpts from teachers' statements on this issue are presented below:

*“Students have difficulty understanding the process of alternative assessment, and I always feel the need to explain it to them. Although I try to adapt to their level, I still find it challenging.” [T4]*

*“Students' lack of interest in the lesson and their unwillingness to read negatively affect the learning process.” [T7]*

*“Students' lack of motivation negatively impacts the process.” [T13]*

The findings of this research reveal that teachers predominantly adopt alternative and student-centered approaches to classroom assessment. This demonstrates that teachers tend to embrace an assessment orientation that is not solely outcome-based but also process-oriented, taking individual differences into account and aiming to monitor students' development. These results are consistent with the findings from the quantitative phase of the study regarding teachers' classroom assessment beliefs.

Teachers' views indicated that the alternative assessment process encompasses a wide range of multidimensional tools, including projects, portfolios, self- and peer assessment, process-based assessment, rubrics, concept maps, drama, observation, product files, and digital tools. Teachers who adopted this approach described alternative assessment as a structure that supports learning, guides instruction, and provides high-quality feedback. Nevertheless, teachers who adopted student-centered and process-centered alternative assessment approaches reported encountering implementation-related challenges.

Factors such as time constraints, overcrowded classrooms, and intensive curriculum content were identified as barriers to the effective implementation of alternative assessment practices. In addition, teachers highlighted student-related problems that negatively affected the process. Low motivation, lack of attention, insufficient interest, and inadequate readiness were identified as significant factors reducing the effectiveness of the assessment process.

**Question 2:** What are teachers' views regarding the assessment approach of the current curriculum?

Within the scope of this research question, teachers' perceptions and evaluations of the assessment approaches embedded in the current curriculum were systematically examined. Particular attention was given to their positive and negative evaluations of assessment processes, the challenges they encounter in classroom practice, and their views on the extent to which the curriculum effectively supports student-centered, performance-based, and process-oriented assessment. In this regard, the study aimed not only to identify the strengths of the existing curriculum but also to highlight its limitations from the perspective of practitioners who implement assessment practices.

Furthermore, teachers' feedback regarding the implementation of assessment practices was explored in depth, providing insight into both structural and pedagogical issues that influence the feasibility of these approaches in real classroom settings. The qualitative data were analyzed using content analysis, through which themes, sub-themes, and codes were generated based on recurring patterns and commonalities in teachers' responses. This thematic categorization enabled a multidimensional understanding of teachers' perspectives, offering a more nuanced picture of how assessment approaches are interpreted, experienced, and operationalized in practice.

The findings derived from this analysis were systematically organized and are presented in Table 9, thereby clearly demonstrating the thematic structure and its alignment with the broader aims of the study.

**Table 9***Teachers' Views on the Assessment Approach of the Current Curriculum*

Theme	Sub-Theme	Codes	<i>f</i>
Assessment Approaches	Alternative / Process-Oriented Approaches	Projects, performance tasks, portfolios, self/peer assessment, process-based assessment, rubrics, concept maps, drama, observation, digital tools, product files	20
	Traditional Approaches	Written/oral quizzes, tests	12
Implementation Methods	In-Class Practices	Written/oral quizzes, classroom observations, short written/oral assessments, quizzes, peer assessment	18
	Standardized Practices	Ministry of National Education (MoNE) centralized exams, national standardized tests	8
	Individual Practices	Portfolios, self-assessment, peer assessment	6
Challenges Encountered	System-Related Challenges	Lack of time, overloaded curriculum, insufficient materials	22
	Student-Related Challenges	Lack of interest, low motivation, insufficient readiness, diverse needs, inadequate higher-order skills	20
	Challenges During the Assessment Process	Lack of objectivity in evaluating open-ended questions, overcrowded classrooms, increased teacher workload	14
	Challenges Stemming from Inadequate	Inadequate assessment tools, implementation constraints, limited applicability, insufficient in assessing higher-order skills	7
	No Challenges	No difficulties encountered	1
Suggestions and Areas for Improvement	Flexibility and Diversity	Use of different methods, individualized assessment	10
	Technological and Resource Support	Utilization of digital tools, provision of materials, training opportunities	7
	Ease of Implementation	Reducing teacher workload, practical assessment tools	5

Table 9 shows that the majority of teachers ( $f = 20$ ) believe that the assessment approach in teaching programs is grounded in alternative, process-oriented practices. This finding suggests that teaching programs have adopted a contemporary perspective on assessment, emphasizing the learning process and employing tools such as projects, performance tasks, portfolios, self-assessment, rubrics, concept maps, and mind maps. Nevertheless, it is evident that traditional assessment approaches and instruments (e.g., written and oral quizzes and tests) remain important in the teaching process and widely practiced ( $f = 12$ ). According to teachers' views, this indicates that although teaching

programs emphasize alternative or contemporary approaches, they continue to incorporate traditional practices as well. At this point, some teachers expressed the following opinions:

*"I think that with the most recent curriculum change in Turkish Language and Literature, assessment has become more inclusive and process-oriented."* [T14]

*"The program has adopted a skill-based assessment approach."* [T8]

*"Recently, there has been increased adoption of student-centered, process-oriented, and multidimensional assessment approaches."* [T18]

According to teachers, the most commonly employed form is classroom-based assessment ( $f = 18$ ). In this approach, tools such as written and oral tests, classroom observations, quizzes, and peer assessment are particularly prominent. Teachers also noted that some assessments are administered via common or centralized examinations. In contrast, individual assessment tools (e.g., self-assessment, portfolios) appear to be used less frequently. Some teachers' views on this issue are presented below:

*"I use a variety of assessment tools."* [T3]

*"After teacher-centered instruction has been delivered, students are assessed orally or in writing to prompt them to reflect on what they have learned."* [T21]

*"When exam dates in the annual plans are taken into account, common exams are administered on the same date to all students at the same grade level."* [T28]

*"As a second-grade teacher, I try to do more individual assessments, like portfolios."* [T25]

Teachers also reported encountering numerous challenges in implementing the assessment processes of the current curriculum. At this point, multidimensional problems were identified, including system-, student-, and process-related issues. System-related challenges ( $f = 22$ ) were identified as a lack of time, curriculum overload, and shortages of instructional materials. Student-related challenges ( $f = 20$ ) included a lack of motivation, limited interest, and low readiness. Process-related challenges ( $f = 14$ ) were described as difficulties in ensuring objectivity when evaluating open-ended questions, time pressures in overcrowded classrooms, and increased teacher workload. Based on these difficulties, some teachers ( $f = 7$ ) expressed the view that the assessment approaches and practices within the current curriculum are inadequate and should be improved. Conversely, one teacher ( $f = 1$ ) reported that they did not experience any problems in practice. Teachers' views on this issue are presented below:

*"I experience problems, such as a lack of materials and time constraints."* [T8]

*"Because of students' lack of interest and unwillingness to participate, they do not take the process seriously and, as a result, we cannot carry out assessment and evaluation as intended."* [T5]

*"Conducting fair assessments of open-ended exam questions is difficult; therefore, achieving reliable assessment is challenging."* [T3]

*"I consider it is inadequate. It should be conducted more frequently and more holistically."* [T4]

*"I don't encounter many problems."* [T26]

Teachers also offered several recommendations, in line with the curriculum, regarding the challenges encountered in the assessment process. In this regard, they emphasized the need for assessment and evaluation practices to be more flexible, diverse, technology-supported, and easier to implement. Suggestions such as the integration of diverse methods, the expansion of opportunities for individualized assessment, and the use of digital tools reflect teachers' expectations for innovation in enhancing the implementation process. Some teachers' views on this issue are presented below:

*"The general framework is sufficient, but there should be more flexibility in practice." [T13]*

*"Digital tools should be integrated into the assessment and evaluation process." [T22]*

*"Solutions should be sought to reduce the teacher's workload in assessment and evaluation practices." [T30]*

These findings indicate that while teachers are generally open to employing alternative assessment tools, they encounter substantial challenges in practice due to various contextual and systemic factors. Such difficulties highlight a critical misalignment between the intentions of contemporary, student-centered assessment frameworks and the realities of classroom implementation. At this point, it is essential both to strengthen the system with adequate resources and support for teachers and to promote the adoption of student- and process-oriented, alternative or contemporary assessment practices.

**Question 3:** What are teachers' views on the impact of national examinations on classroom assessment practices?

In the qualitative phase of the study, the researchers specifically investigated teachers' perspectives on the influence of national examinations on classroom assessment processes. In this context, the study sought to capture not only teachers' general evaluations but also the ways in which these high-stakes examinations shape their instructional decisions, assessment strategies, and classroom practices. The analysis aimed to reveal how teachers perceive the alignment, or misalignment, between national assessment policies and the pedagogical demands of student-centered, formative, and process-oriented classroom evaluation.

The qualitative data were systematically analyzed through content analysis, allowing for the identification of recurring patterns and critical insights embedded in teachers' responses. Emerging perspectives were then organized into overarching themes, sub-themes, and codes, providing a structured framework to interpret the complexities of teachers' views. This thematic structuring facilitated a deeper understanding of the extent to which national examinations serve as either supportive or constraining forces in the implementation of classroom assessment practices. The findings from this analysis were categorized and are presented in Table 10, which offers a comprehensive overview of how teachers evaluate the role of national examinations in shaping classroom assessment approaches.

**Table 10***Teachers' Views on the Impact of National Examinations on Classroom Assessment Practices*

Theme	Sub-Theme	Codes	<i>f</i>
Positive Effects	Standardization and Objectivity	Ensuring standardized assessment; conducting objective measurement	9
	Motivation and Discipline	Enhancing students' motivation; fostering self-discipline	7
Negative Effects	Orientation Toward Rote Learning	Encouraging rote memorization; weakening creativity, critical and reflective thinking; undermining written and oral expression skills	17
	Causing Stress and Anxiety	Increased test anxiety; heightened stress levels	11
	Limitations and Misalignment	Restricting classroom-based assessment; ignoring individual differences; misalignment between classroom assessment and centralized exam questions	15
Challenges Encountered	Lack of Feedback	Inadequacy of feedback, Lack of feedback	9
	Traditional Nature of Assessment Tools	Dominance of multiple-choice questions; neglect of open-ended items; reliance on traditional assessment tools	7
	Reduction of Teacher Autonomy	Limiting teachers' roles and decision-making in assessment processes	5
	Deficiencies	Inadequacy of assessment tools; limitations in application; insufficient evaluation of higher-order thinking skills	6
	Adaptation Problems	Students' difficulties adapting to centralized exams; misalignment between curriculum assessment approaches and exam requirements; neglect of untested subjects	15
	No Problems	No issues encountered	2

Table 10 shows that teachers evaluated the effects of centralized exams on the classroom assessment process as both positive and negative, and highlighted problems associated with these exams. Teachers indicated that centralized exams contribute to fairness and consistency in assessment, because they are administered to all students under equal conditions, ensure objectivity, and provide a standardized evaluation. Furthermore, they noted that such exams foster work motivation and self-discipline among students ( $f = 22$ ). Some illustrative teacher statements on this issue are presented below:



*“Centralized exams ensure objective, reliable assessment results.” [T3]*

*“Since the same questions and assessments are administered in all schools through centralized exams, they have a positive effect on objectivity.” [T21]*

*“Students who will take centralized exams show greater willingness and attentiveness during classroom assessment activities.” [T5]*

Several participating teachers also highlighted the negative effects of centralized examinations. Teachers who expressed critical perspectives emphasized that such exams tend to encourage rote learning among students ( $f = 17$ ), increase test-related stress and anxiety ( $f = 11$ ), and have inherent limitations that hinder comprehensive assessment. Furthermore, they noted a misalignment between classroom-based assessment practices and the structure of centralized examinations ( $f = 15$ ). Below are some illustrative comments from teachers on this issue:

*“It makes us turn teaching into a test-focused process, pushing important skills like critical thinking and creativity into the background.” [T23]*

*“In centralized examinations, alternative assessment tools are marginalized. Students experience test anxiety, and their focus shifts toward surface-level and rote learning.” [T17]*

*“Overall, it has a negative effect. Even though the curriculum requires us to adopt a skill-based assessment approach, the centralized exams still rely on multiple-choice questions.” [T8]*

A content analysis of teachers' views indicates centralized examinations pose several challenges to classroom assessment processes. One of the most frequently emphasized issues is the misalignment between the assessment orientation of the current curriculum and that of centralized exams, which creates adaptation problems, such as students' difficulties aligning with exam expectations and a lack of interest in subjects not included in centralized assessments ( $f = 15$ ). In addition, the lack of feedback ( $f = 9$ ) emerged as a significant problem; teachers reported that students do not receive sufficient or high-quality feedback within assessment processes. The traditional nature of assessment tools ( $f = 7$ ) was also frequently highlighted, with teachers noting that the reliance on multiple-choice tests in centralized exams limits the use of diverse assessment methods. Under the theme of inadequacies ( $f = 6$ ), teachers pointed to shortcomings in the quality of assessment tools, difficulties in implementation, and insufficient evaluation of higher-order skills. Furthermore, under the theme “reduced teacher autonomy” ( $f = 5$ ), teachers expressed concerns that their decision-making authority in the assessment process is being restricted. Finally, although a small number of teachers ( $f = 2$ ) reported no issues in this regard, this proportion of teachers was notably low. Overall, these findings demonstrate that teachers articulate the challenges that centralized examinations pose to classroom assessment processes across multiple dimensions. Selected teachers' statements reflecting these concerns are presented below:

*“Centralized exams usually delay the provision of feedback. This makes it more difficult for students to understand their results quickly and to make improvements.” [T1]*

*“They influence the teacher's instruction and limit the use of classroom assessment tools.” [T13]*

*“In centralized exams, learning outcomes are often overlooked, assessment tools are standardized, and summative evaluations are used instead of developmental evaluations.” [T23]*

*“They cause students to prioritize exam-focused topics and neglect subjects not assessed by the exam. Students also want the exams to be administered mainly in multiple-choice format.” [T10]*

The findings reveal that teachers face various challenges related to the impact of centralized examinations on classroom assessment. According to participating teachers, the most frequently emphasized issues include the dominance of standardized exam structures that do not allow monitoring of students' individual development, the insufficient incorporation of process-oriented assessment approaches, and the consequent inadequacy of feedback practices. Teachers reported that due to the decisive influence of centralized examinations, they are often compelled to use traditional assessment tools that measure short-term success. In this context, the widespread use of methods that assess limited levels of knowledge —such as multiple-choice tests and true–false questions— has been reported to have a negative effect on teachers' motivation to employ alternative assessment tools. Furthermore, the exam-driven system was frequently noted to restrict teacher autonomy, making it difficult for teachers to design assessment strategies consistent with their pedagogical orientations. This reflects a misalignment between curriculum objectives and exam-focused practices, leaving teachers caught between the two. In particular, teachers emphasized that their attempts to assess students' higher-order thinking skills and creativity are undermined by the rigid structure of the examination system.

**Question 4:** What are teachers' views regarding the assessment and evaluation practices implemented by The Ministry of National Education (MoNE) of Türkiye starting from the 2023–2024 academic year?

Regarding this research question, teachers' views on the new assessment and evaluation practices introduced by the Ministry of National Education (MoNE) of Türkiye, effective in the 2023–2024 academic year, were systematically examined. In this regard, the study aimed to capture teachers' perceptions of both the intended pedagogical objectives of these practices and the practical challenges encountered during their classroom implementation. Particular attention was given to how these reforms were interpreted in relation to student-centered, process-oriented, and competency-based assessment approaches.

The qualitative data obtained from participating teachers underwent in-depth content analysis, through which recurring patterns were identified and systematically organized into overarching themes, sub-themes, and codes, as presented in Table 11. This analytical framework provided a structured lens through which teachers' perceptions, classroom experiences, and critical evaluations regarding these new practices could be explored multidimensionally. In doing so, the analysis not only highlights teachers' positive and negative evaluations but also offers insights into the broader implications of MoNE's reforms for classroom practice and assessment culture.

**Table 11**

*Teachers' Views on the Assessment Practices Implemented by the Ministry of National Education Starting from the 2023–2024 Academic Year*

Theme	Sub-Theme	Codes	<i>f</i>
Advantages	Development of Thinking Skills	Critical thinking, creative thinking, analysis-synthesis, interpretation, independent thinking, original thinking	18
	Development of Expressive Skills	Self-expression, written expression, language skills, imagination development	15
	Development of Self-confidence and Motivation	Increased self-confidence, generating original ideas, motivation to learn	8
	Contribution to the Learning Process	Moving away from rote learning, meaningful learning, deep learning, reinforcement of knowledge	12
Disadvantages	Assessment Challenges	Lack of objectivity, inconsistency in scoring, time-consuming practices	22
	Process-related Problems	Lack of gradual transition, misalignment with centralized exams, lack of rubrics	17
	Student Adaptation Problems	Lack of writing skills, difficulty in self-expression, anxiety, unfairness, challenges for disadvantaged students, students' readiness levels, misalignment with centralized exams	10
Proposed Solutions	Mixed Question Types	Combining open-ended and multiple-choice questions, ensuring variety in item types	7
	Gradual Transition	Preparation process starting from primary school, beginning from grade 5	5
	Training Support	Rubric guidance, sample applications, in-service training	4
	No Problems	No problems encountered	5

Table 11 shows that teachers evaluated the new assessment and evaluation practices introduced by the MoNE in the 2023–2024 academic year in terms of advantages and disadvantages and offered solution-oriented suggestions for identified drawbacks. Teachers reported that these practices contributed to the development of students' thinking skills ( $f = 18$ ), expressive skills ( $f = 15$ ), self-confidence and motivation ( $f = 8$ ), and overall learning processes ( $f = 12$ ). In particular, teachers emphasized that open-ended examinations enhanced students' critical thinking, creativity, analytical-synthetic reasoning, and interpretive abilities. Furthermore, they noted that open-ended questions strengthened students' written expression, self-expression, and language skills. Beyond these cognitive and linguistic benefits, teachers also highlighted that the practices fostered students' self-

confidence and learning motivation. Additionally, teachers emphasized that these practices, particularly common examinations, encouraged meaningful learning and reinforced knowledge retention. Selected teacher statements related to this issue are presented below:

*“Overall, it’s positive. I think it substantially helps students develop their thinking skills.” [T13]*

*“This practice improves not only students’ knowledge but also their thinking skills, analytical skills, and expressive skills. It enhances their ability to articulate their thoughts.” [T17]*

*“In written exams, it helps students distinguish, classify, and clearly define knowledge, and this also boosts their confidence in social interactions.” [T14]*

*“It encourages understanding-based learning, develops higher-order thinking skills, improves writing and language abilities, and fosters creativity and original thinking.” [T23]*

The participating teachers also highlighted several disadvantages of the assessment and evaluation practices implemented by the MoNE beginning in the 2023–2024 academic year. Teachers who reported disadvantages emphasized that these practices involved notable challenges in the assessment process ( $f = 22$ ), in implementation ( $f = 17$ ), and in student adaptation ( $f = 10$ ). One of the most frequently mentioned problems was the lack of objectivity and the time-consuming nature of the scoring process. Additional concerns included students’ inadequate writing skills, lack of familiarity with such practices, difficulties among disadvantaged students, and insufficient readiness. Furthermore, teachers pointed to the neglect of individual differences and the misalignment between classroom-based practices and centralized examinations as important drawbacks. Selected teacher statements reflecting these concerns are presented below:

*“The use of open-ended written exams makes it difficult to ensure objectivity and to achieve consistent, valid assessment.” [T3]*

*“There is insufficient time for practical examinations. Additionally, issues such as the lack of rubrics and sample assessments—even when alternative assessment tools are used— have arisen.” [T8]*

*“Students who struggle with writing sometimes submit illegible answers, which makes it difficult to grade them objectively.” [T30]*

*“It pushes anxiety levels substantially higher than they should be.” [T2]*

Teachers also provided several suggestions to address limitations in the assessment and evaluation practices introduced by the MoNE in the 2023–2024 academic year. These recommendations included use of mixed question types ( $f = 7$ ), gradual transition to the new system ( $f = 5$ ), and professional development opportunities to support teachers through targeted training ( $f = 4$ ). Teachers particularly emphasized the integration of open-ended and multiple-choice questions as a combined approach. Five participants reported no suggestions ( $f = 5$ ). Teachers noted that implementing these proposals would not only allow for more effective measurement of higher-order thinking skills but also ease the assessment process for educators. Furthermore, they suggested that the gradual introduction of these practices, beginning in the early grades of primary school, would help students adapt more smoothly to the system, with a stronger emphasis recommended from grade 5 onward. Additional suggestions highlighted the need for guidance in rubric development and use,

the provision of sample applications, and continuous support through in-service training programs. A small number of teachers refrained from providing opinions or recommendations, which may indicate either a neutral stance toward the implementation or limited knowledge of the practice. Selected teacher statements regarding these recommendations are presented below:

*"It's not right to be limited like this. There should be mixed assessments (open-ended and multiple-choice), not just open-ended ones." [T9]*

*"I think it should be implemented gradually. It should not be applied to all grade levels at once. It should have started in the fifth grade." [T18]*

*"Teachers should be given in-service training on this issue." [T31]*

*"Problems such as the lack of rubrics and sample assessments have emerged. Teachers should receive guidance on this." [T22]*

According to participating teachers, the assessment practices introduced by the Ministry of National Education in the 2023–2024 academic year offer significant pedagogical benefits, particularly by contributing to the development of students' higher-order thinking skills. However, the challenges encountered during the implementation process, most notably the ambiguity in scoring practices and students' lack of readiness, are noteworthy. These findings underscore the importance of providing teachers with training, rubric support, implementation guidelines, and sustained guidance services.

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this study, teachers' beliefs about classroom assessment and their perspectives on the assessment process were examined through a holistic approach that integrated quantitative and qualitative data analyses. The findings revealed that teachers generally hold positive beliefs toward alternative, student-centered, and learning-oriented assessment approaches. However, the results also indicated that various individual, institutional, and systemic factors hinder the transformation of these beliefs into actual classroom practices.

The findings of this study indicate that teachers predominantly adopt student-centered, process-oriented, and learning-supportive assessment approaches, highlighting the role of alternative assessment tools in fostering students' holistic development. This is consistent with research that frames assessment as a means to guide and enhance learning (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Stiggins, 2005). However, practical barriers such as time constraints and low student engagement often hinder effective implementation. Similar challenges were reported by Önel et al. (2020) and Ghanian and Mokhtar (2018), who found that teachers frequently felt unprepared to implement alternative methods. The relatively high adoption observed in this study may reflect the complex and multidimensional nature of alternative assessment (Warman et al., 2021). Likewise, low assessment literacy among preservice teachers (Gül, 2011) and the limited use of alternative methods by practicing teachers (Göğebakan, 2025) point to a continuing need for professional training.

The findings indicate that teachers' beliefs about assessment do not differ significantly by gender. This result is consistent with studies in Türkiye and internationally, which report no gender-based differences in classroom assessment beliefs or practices (Kılıç, 2020; Oppong et al., 2023; Özdemir, 2010; Uysal & Yumuşak, 2018). These studies emphasize that assessment practices are shaped primarily by professional development rather than demographic characteristics. Supporting this finding, Göğebakan (2025) found no gender-related differences in the use of alternative methods among physical education teachers. Collectively, the literature suggests that assessment beliefs are more strongly influenced by educational and structural factors than by gender. However, contradictory evidence exists. Some studies report that gender significantly affects teachers' assessment beliefs (Avan et al., 2019; Barçın, 2019; Hursen & Birkollu, 2019; İzci & Caliskan, 2017; Şimşek, 2022). Such inconsistencies may stem from contextual variables, including sample characteristics, institutional settings, professional experience, and the extent of in-service training, which likely account for divergent outcomes across studies.

The findings indicate that teachers' beliefs about assessment do not differ significantly across subject areas, suggesting that classroom and subject teachers share similar pedagogical orientations. This result aligns with earlier studies reporting no substantial disciplinary differences (Avan et al., 2019; Nazlıçiçek & Akarsu, 2008; Özdemir, 2010). Some research, however, reports limited variation in specific dimensions or measures. For instance, Avan et al. (2019) found differences in the affective dimension favoring science teachers; Bayram (2011) reported subject-related differences in competencies; and Özdemir (2010) noted that classroom teachers considered themselves more competent in portfolios and in self- and peer-assessment, whereas subject teachers emphasized projects and performance tasks. Yet, these differences were not statistically significant across all tools, indicating that a broadly shared belief system prevails. This convergence may stem from the standardized structure of teacher education programs in Türkiye and national curriculum regulations, which, together with centralized examinations, appear to foster a common approach to assessment across disciplines.

The findings reveal significant differences in teachers' assessment beliefs based on educational background. Teachers with graduate-level education were more receptive to alternative approaches, whereas those with only undergraduate degrees relied more on traditional tools. This suggests that advanced academic training, by fostering theoretical knowledge, critical thinking, and exposure to contemporary techniques, can diversify assessment perspectives. These results align with previous studies reporting that teachers with higher qualifications not only employ alternative assessment tools more frequently but also demonstrate stronger self-efficacy in their use (Aksoy, 2018; Baş & Beyhan, 2016; Kılıç, 2020). However, contradictory evidence exists. For example, Bağrıaçık (2025) found no significant differences in assessment literacy among ICT teachers across education levels. Such inconsistencies imply that the relationship between educational background and



assessment beliefs may be influenced by contextual factors, including specialization, institutional culture, and opportunities for professional development.

Teachers with graduate-level education are generally more receptive to alternative assessment approaches, a tendency that is linked to their advanced pedagogical knowledge, exposure to contemporary educational paradigms, and stronger critical thinking skills (Brookhart, 2011; Stiggins, 2007). Higher academic attainment thus fosters the adoption of more constructivist and student-centered assessment practices. Research further shows that graduate-trained teachers are more inclined toward critical thinking, problem solving, and innovative evaluation methods (Popham, 2011; Kahl et al., 2013). They are also more likely to employ alternative tools, such as portfolios, self- and peer assessment, and project-based evaluations, which facilitate monitoring students' development and aligning instruction accordingly (Nitko & Brookhart, 2011). By contrast, teachers with only undergraduate-level training tend to rely on traditional assessment tools such as multiple-choice and short-answer tests. As McMillan (2008) emphasizes, without sufficient theoretical and practical preparation, teachers often default to familiar practices and reduce assessment to grading rather than using it to support learning.

The findings revealed significant differences in teachers' beliefs about traditional and alternative assessment approaches based on teaching experience. Experienced teachers tended to emphasize traditional tools, while less experienced teachers were more open to process-oriented and student-centered alternatives. Aksoy (2018), Kılıç (2020), and Duran (2017) reported similar results, finding that veteran teachers relied more on traditional practices. Bayram (2011) also identified differences in the frequency of using alternative methods, and Göğebakan (2025) observed variations among physical education teachers according to length of service. Conversely, Bağrıaçık (2025) found no significant relationship between ICT teachers' seniority and assessment literacy. International evidence mirrors these patterns: Al-Nouh et al. (2014) reported that less experienced teachers in Kuwait were more receptive to innovative assessment practices and felt more competent in applying them. Overall, these findings suggest that seniority shapes assessment beliefs through accumulated experience, exposure to instructional approaches, and systemic changes. Sustaining alternative practices requires engaging teachers at all career stages in ongoing professional development and supporting their adoption of contemporary strategies.

The findings indicate no significant differences in teachers' beliefs regarding alternative assessment across educational levels. This contrasts with Kılıç (2020), who reported greater competence among primary school teachers, and with Baş and Beyhan (2016), who found stronger self-efficacy at the primary level. In this study, variation emerged only in traditional assessment beliefs: middle-school teachers expressed stronger traditional assessment orientations than primary- or high-school teachers. Such differences may reflect curriculum structures, student profiles, institutional expectations, and assessment cultures specific to each level. The dominance of exam-oriented practices and high-stakes testing pressures at the middle school level likely reinforces reliance on

traditional methods. Supporting this, Alnıaçık (2025) reported widespread negative views among teachers toward the “High School Placement Exam” (LGS), underscoring its influence on assessment practices. Overall, the results suggest that educational level shapes teachers’ traditional beliefs more than their alternative beliefs. Future research should examine school-level pedagogical contexts in greater depth to clarify their role in shaping assessment orientations.

The qualitative findings reveal that although teachers hold positive attitudes toward process-oriented and multidimensional alternative assessment, they face structural, organizational, and student-related barriers in practice. Commonly reported challenges, including time constraints, large class sizes, a lack of materials, and low student engagement, are consistent with earlier studies (Bayat & Şentürk, 2015; Demir & Akyürek, 2025; Eker & Yıldırım, 2025; Yıldız & Genç, 2016). These barriers highlight the need for supportive resources, such as guidance materials and digital tools. Similar difficulties have been reported internationally: Nasri et al. (2010) found that teachers in Malaysia and Brunei valued alternative assessment but considered it burdensome due to paperwork and workload, while Janisch et al. (2007) noted that U.S. teachers struggled with limited time, resources, and student motivation. In the Turkish context, Deniz (2023) emphasized comparable challenges and recommended aligning national examinations with alternative practices, strengthening ministerial support, and promoting graduate-level training to enhance teachers’ expertise.

The findings indicate that although most teachers express favorable views toward alternative assessment, they encounter structural and student-related barriers in practice. Strengthening teacher support and fostering student motivation may enhance the effectiveness of these practices. Accordingly, policy adjustments, institutional support, and greater resource allocation are needed to enable teachers to integrate alternative assessment more effectively. Such measures would promote fairer, more multidimensional, and higher-quality evaluations of learning. Despite curricular emphasis on student-centered, process-oriented assessment, traditional tools —particularly written exams— continue to dominate classroom practice. This misalignment creates tensions in teachers’ pedagogical beliefs and discourages the use of innovative approaches. Similar findings in prior research highlight that while curricula theoretically promote alternative assessment, traditional methods remain prevalent in practice (Baş & Beyhan, 2016; Korkmaz & Kaptan, 2003). Overall, these results suggest that teachers’ practices are strongly constrained by exam-oriented systems.

Within the “Türkiye Century Education Model” [Türkiye Yüzyılı Maarif Modeli (TYMM)], multiple assessment methods are embedded for each learning outcome to evaluate the teaching and learning processes. Although teachers are encouraged to adapt these methods to their instructional practices, implementing an assessment at the end of each instructional process is mandatory. The aim is to ensure active student participation, to identify learning gaps promptly, and to support remediation (MoNE, 2024). To achieve a holistic evaluation of student performance, teachers are expected to use diverse tools, such

as portfolios, projects, performance tasks, presentations, checklists, examinations, observations, interviews, surveys, role-playing, group work, and reflective writing, as well as self-, peer-, and group assessments (MoNE, 2025). Expanding the use of alternative approaches, particularly self- and peer-assessment, can strengthen program effectiveness by fostering students' individual development. However, teachers' limited competence in applying these methods may constrain the implementation of these methods. Thus, enhancing professional development opportunities is essential for supporting the effective integration of alternative assessment strategies (Güneş & Alıcı, 2025).

In conclusion, while teachers generally endorse the contemporary assessment orientation of the curriculum, they emphasize that it is not fully reflected in classroom practice (Deniz, 2023; Yıldırım, 2024). Structural, pedagogical, and time-related constraints limit the effective use of student-centered, process-oriented approaches, thereby contradicting the role of assessment as both a measure of achievement and a tool to enhance learning (Cauley & McMillan, 2010). Strengthening teachers' competencies and integrating alternative assessment methods into instruction are therefore essential, alongside the restructuring of processes to promote student participation and foster a sustainable assessment culture. Teachers also highlighted the dual impact of centralized examinations. Positively, they were observed to promote fairness through objectivity, standardization, and equality, and to foster student motivation and self-discipline. However, teachers emphasized negative consequences, including reinforcement of rote learning, test anxiety, limited feedback, misalignment with curriculum goals, and reduced teacher autonomy. The dominance of multiple-choice formats was also reported to discourage the use of alternative, multidimensional tools.

At the national level, assessment for classification and ranking is primarily conducted through centralized examinations. Designed by central authorities and operating outside teacher–student interactions, these standardized tests often overlook individual differences and serve functions such as rewarding, penalizing, labeling, and allocating educational resources (Blake, 2012). Their standardized structure grants them considerable influence on students' academic and social lives, positioning them as key instruments in shaping education policy and reform. However, this traditional format tends to reinforce conventional practices and to discourage teachers from adopting alternative process-oriented approaches. Empirical studies highlight both benefits and drawbacks. Teachers in Acar and Buldur's (2020) research emphasized that centralized exams ensure objectivity, equality, and parental awareness, but criticized them for fostering rote preparation, discouraging innovative pedagogy, limiting extracurricular learning, and privileging memorization over inquiry. Similarly, Çetin and Ünal (2019) found that teachers aligned objectives, content, and methods with exam demands, relying heavily on expository teaching, test practice, and multiple-choice formats. Such findings echo the broader literature acknowledging both advantages and critiques of centralized exams (Azili & Tutkun, 2021; Buldur & Acar, 2019). Ultimately, the dominance of centralized testing

narrows classroom practices toward exam success at the expense of meaningful learning, problem-solving, and life skills (Kızıkan & Nacaroglu, 2019). To address this structural misalignment, scholars advocate integrating student-centered, process-oriented, and holistic evaluation practices into centralized systems, thereby enhancing pedagogical flexibility and supporting students' multidimensional development (Altan, 2017; Özdaş, 2019).

In September 2023, the MoNE introduced the Regulation on Measurement and Evaluation (MoNE, 2023a), authorizing common written examinations at the district, provincial, or national levels under the supervision of local education directorates. *The Directive on Written and Practical Examinations (MoNE, 2023b) further required that school-based assessments be administered as written exams consisting of open-ended and short-answer questions.* Qualitative interviews revealed that teachers perceived both benefits and challenges in this new assessment approach. Positively, open-ended examinations have been reported to foster critical and creative thinking, improve expressive skills and self-confidence, and encourage meaningful learning beyond rote memorization. At the same time, teachers highlighted difficulties in ensuring objectivity, time constraints when grading, inconsistencies with centralized multiple-choice exams, the absence of rubrics, and students' limited writing skills and difficulties adapting. To address these issues, they recommended diversifying question types, implementing a gradual transition, and providing stronger professional development opportunities. A minority of teachers, however, reported no substantial difficulties with the system.

Bakırcı et al. (2024) found that teachers viewed MoNE's open-ended questions as effective in fostering higher-order thinking, reading comprehension, and written expression, but raised concerns about students' lack of preparedness, scoring objectivity, and limited response time, which are also reflected in the present study. Similarly, Tozluoglu and Güven (2025) noted the potential of open-ended items to promote critical and creative thinking, yet criticized their low difficulty and limited discriminative power, which undermine scoring reliability. They recommended developing school-specific item banks, integrating AI-based scoring systems, and expanding in-service training. Teachers in this study also raised concerns about objectivity, suggesting detailed scoring rubrics as a solution. In contrast, Arduç (2024) reported that most teachers opposed using common open-ended exams, a finding that contradicts both this study and earlier research.

In conclusion, this study found that teachers identified the advantages and disadvantages of the open-ended written exam practice introduced by the Ministry of National Education (MoNE) in the 2023–2024 academic year and offered suggestions to address these challenges. While acknowledging its pedagogical benefits, teachers consistently emphasized a fundamental misalignment between open-ended assessments and the multiple-choice format of centralized examinations, underscoring the contradictions this creates. Therefore, it is essential that centralized exams be aligned with both the

assessment philosophy of the national curriculum and the provisions of MoNE's Regulation on Measurement and Evaluation (2023).

The findings also underscore several ethical implications associated with teachers' assessment beliefs, particularly in relation to fairness, student rights, bias, and transparency. Traditional assessment beliefs raise critical concerns regarding justice and equity because test-oriented, uniform evaluation procedures often overlook individual performance differences and may inadvertently disadvantage certain student groups (Brookhart, 2013; Stobart, 2005). Although alternative assessment is generally perceived as more equitable, inconsistent implementation due to contextual constraints can create new ethical challenges, limiting equal access to authentic evaluation opportunities and thereby affecting students' developmental rights (Black & Wiliam, 2009). Inaccurate or inappropriate assessment choices may also influence students' self-confidence, academic progression, and future educational opportunities, highlighting the ethical responsibility teachers have to ensure that their beliefs do not lead to unfair judgments (Popham, 2017). Furthermore, both traditional and alternative approaches entail risks of bias: test-based assessments may reduce students to single-score labels, whereas performance-based assessments can be influenced by subjective teacher judgments unless safeguards are in place (McMillan, 2013). Ethical assessment also requires transparency, as students have the right to understand the criteria on which they are evaluated, but the limited use of alternative assessments in practice restricts students' access to meaningful feedback, essential for learning (Green et al., 2007). These considerations demonstrate that integrating ethical awareness into assessment literacy is vital for promoting fair, unbiased, and learner-centered evaluation practices that align with teachers' pedagogical intentions.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

When considered as a whole, the study demonstrates that teachers exhibit highly positive attitudes toward alternative assessment approaches; however, these approaches are not sufficiently implemented in classroom practice due to a range of barriers. This situation highlights the need to reconsider teacher education, curriculum design, school climate, and centralized examinations in a more coordinated manner. Within this framework, both strengthening teachers' professional competencies and addressing systemic contradictions are crucial to ensure the effective use of alternative assessment tools.

Improving teachers' attitudes toward alternative assessment requires a multifaceted strategy, including enhancing individual competencies, providing adequate institutional support, and improving systemic conditions. Consistent with the findings, teachers' assessment practices should be supported not only through in-service training but also through graduate-level programs. Particularly, advanced studies in educational sciences can enrich teachers' theoretical foundations and practical skills, thereby enhancing the quality of classroom assessment processes.



It has been demonstrated that when teachers share their knowledge, instructional experiences, and learning challenges with colleagues and engage in collaborative work, they are likely to improve their teaching practices and thereby facilitate student learning (Atasoy & Yalçın, 2023). Collaboration among teachers in the domain of assessment is likewise crucial for enhancing the consistency, validity, and fairness of assessment practices. Through joint planning, shared reflection, and collective examination of student work, teachers can develop a common understanding of assessment criteria and reduce individual biases. Such collaboration also supports professional learning by enabling teachers to exchange effective strategies, align assessment practices with curricular goals, and foster a more coherent and equitable assessment culture within schools.

### LIMITATIONS

The present research is not without its limitations, and these should be taken into account when interpreting the findings. First, the study was conducted with a relatively small sample of teachers, which inherently reduces statistical power and limits the extent to which the results can be generalized to broader teacher populations. Accordingly, the conclusions should be viewed as context-specific rather than universally applicable. Second, the participants were drawn from a single geographical region and shared similar cultural and educational backgrounds. This regional and contextual homogeneity may have shaped participants' perceptions and responses, making it difficult to determine whether the relationships identified in this study would hold across more diverse cultural, institutional, or educational environments. Such factors limit the ability to draw firm conclusions about the stability and validity of the observed patterns in different contexts.

Future research would benefit from employing larger, more heterogeneous, and geographically varied samples, which would allow for cross-cultural comparisons and more robust testing of the relationships examined. Studies conducted in multiple educational systems and cultural settings could provide deeper insights into the generalizability of the findings and contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of the phenomena under investigation.

### 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>
- Aksoy, A. G. (2018). *İlkokul ve ortaokul öğretmenlerinin alternatif ölçme araçları öz yeterliklerinin incelenmesi* [Examination of primary and secondary school teachers' self-efficacy about alternative measurement tools] [Unpublished master's thesis]. Süleyman Demirel University.



- Aksu Dünya, B. (2021). Tamamlayıcı/alternatif ölçme ve değerlendirme araç ve yöntemleri [Complementary/alternative assessment tools and methods]. In A. Taşgın (ed.), *Eğitimde ölçme ve değerlendirme [Assessment in education]* (pp. 95-122). Vizetek Publications.
- Alnaçık, S. (2025). Ortaokul öğretmenlerinin ölçme değerlendirme ve liseye geçiş sistemine yönelik görüşleri [Secondary school teachers's on the assessment and evaluation and high school transition system] [Unpublished master's thesis]. Atatürk University.
- Al-Nouh, N. A., Taqi, H. A., & Abdul-Kareem, M. M. (2014). EFL primary school teachers' attitudes, knowledge and skills in alternative assessment. *International Education Studies*, 7(5), 68-84. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v7n5p68>
- Altan, M. Z. (2017). Standartlaştıran, tek tipleştiren, zarar veren ve mutsuzluğa açılan kapı: TEOG [Standardizing, homogenizing, harmful, and a gateway to unhappiness: TEOG]. *Eğitime Bakış: Eğitim-Öğretim ve Bilim Araştırma Dergisi*, 13(40), 4-14.
- Anderson, R. S. (1998). Why Talk About Different Ways to Grade? The Shift from Traditional Assessment to Alternative Assessment. *New directions for Teaching and Learning*, 74, 5-16. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.7401>
- Arduç, M. A. (2024). Comparison of the Ministry of National Education common written exam and the teacher written exam and teacher opinions. *EKEV Academy Journal*, 99, 234-249. <https://doi.org/10.17753/sosekev.1483026>
- Atasoy, R., & Yalçın, M. T. (2023). Team innovativeness, teachers' professional practices, and teachers' instructional practices: testing a mediation model. *Türk Akademik Yayınlar Dergisi (TAY Journal)*, 7(3), 972-997. <https://doi.org/10.29329/tayjournal.2023.610.11>
- Auerbach, C. F., & Silverstein, L. B. (2003). *Qualitative data: An introduction to coding and analysis*. New York University Press.
- Avan, Ç., Akbaş, V., & Gülgün, C. (2019). The attitudes of the teachers towards assessment and evaluation: Kastamonu sample. *Gazi Journal of Education Sciences*, 5(3), 20-31. <https://doi.org/10.30855/gjes.2019.05.03.002>
- Ayden, C., & Gündoğdu, G. (2022). Social e-health readiness measurement tool: An exploratory sequential mixed methods study. *Hacettepe Journal of Health Administration*, 25(3), 533-548.
- 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.
- Bağrıaçık, G. (2025). Bilişim teknolojileri öğretmenlerinin ölçme değerlendirme okuryazarlık durumlarının çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi [Investigation of information technologies teachers' measurement assessment literacy status in terms of various variables] [Unpublished master's thesis]. Gazi University.

- Bakırcı, H., Şevgin Uçar, E., & Genel, Y. (2024). Teachers' opinions on the application of open-ended questions in science lesson evaluations. *International Journal of the Pursuit of Excellence in Education (IJPEE)*, 4(1), 1-12.
- Barbour, R., & Schostak, J. (2005). Interviewing and focus groups. In B. Somekh & C. Lewin (Eds.), *Research methods in the social sciences* (pp. 41–48). Sage Publications.
- Barçın, İ. (2019). *Türkçe öğretmenlerinin ölçme ve değerlendirme sürecini uygulama ve önemseme düzeyleri üzerine bir araştırma (Bitlis ili örneği)* [A study on the levels of implementation and assessment of measurement assessment process of turkish teachers the case of Bitlis province]. [Unpublished master's thesis] Yüzüncü Yıl University.
- Baş, G., & Beyhan, Ö. (2016). Examination of teachers' self-efficacy perceptions on educational measurement and evaluation in terms of some variables. *Journal of Measurement and Evaluation in Education and Psychology*, 7(1), 18-32.
- Bayat, S., & Şentürk, Ş. (2015). Physics, chemistry, biology teachers' views on alternative assessment and evaluation techniques in secondary school. *Amasya Education Journal*, 4(1), 118-135.
- Bayram, E. (2011). *The examination of qualifications of teachers for assessment and evaluation* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Hacettepe University.
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 21, 5–31. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-008-9068-5>
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan* 80(2), 139-144. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003172171009200119>
- Blake, J. E. (2012). High-Stakes testing: A (mis)construed, normalizing gaze. *International Journal of Educational Policies*, 6(1), 5-23.
- Brookhart, S. M. (2013). *Grading and group work: How do I assess individual learning?* Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Brookhart, S. M. (2011). *Educational assessment: Principles and practices for effective standards-based instruction* (6th ed.). Pearson.
- Brookhart, S. M., & Durkin, D. T. (2003). Classroom assessment, student motivation, and achievement in high school social studies classes. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 16, 27-5. [https://doi.org/10.1207/S15324818AME1601\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15324818AME1601_2)
- 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.2543>
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E. K., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş. & Demirel, F. (2019). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* [Scientific research methods]. Pegem Akademi Publications.

- Cauley, K. M., & McMillan, J. H. (2010). Formative assessment techniques to support student motivation and achievement. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 83(1), 1-6. <https://www.doi.org/10.1080/00098650903267784>
- Chan, K. W., & Elliott, R. G. (2004). Relational analysis of personal epistemology and conceptions about teaching and learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20(8), 817-831. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2004.09.002>
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Çardak, Ç. S. (2018). Attitudes of prospective teachers towards measurement and assessment course: Anadolu University example. *Adiyaman University Journal of Social Sciences*, 10(29), 401-453.
- Çetin, A., & Ünsal, S. (2019). Social, psychological effects of central examinations on teachers and their reflections on teachers' curriculum implementations. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 34(2), 304-323. <https://www.doi.org/10.16986/HUJE.2018040672>
- Demir, G., & Akyürek, S. (2025). The use of alternative measurement tools by Imam Hatip high school vocational course teachers and the problems they face. *Journal of Erciyes Academy*, 39(2), 499-523.
- Deniz, B. F. (2023). 12. sınıf matematik öğretmenlerinin yapılandırmacı ölçme-değerlendirme tekniklerini kullanabilme yeterliklerinin Metfessel-Michael program değerlendirme modeline göre değerlendirilmesi [The evaluation of the qualifications of 12th grade mathematics teachers to use constructive assessment and assessment techniques according to Metfessel-Michael program evaluation model] [Unpublished master's thesis]. Niğde Ömer Halisdemir University.
- Duran, U. (2017). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin alternatif ölçme değerlendirme yöntemlerinin kullanımına ilişkin öz yeterlik algılarının incelenmesi [The review of self-efficacy perceptions of classroom teachers regarding using alternative assessment methods] [Unpublished master's thesis]. Gaziantep University.
- Eker, G., & Yıldırım, Y. (2025). Developmental assessment practices in early childhood education: An analysis of teacher approaches and strategies. *International Journal of Modern Education Studies*, 9(1), 249-271. <https://doi.org/10.51383/ijonmes.2025.423>
- Evin Gencil, İ., & Özbaşı, D. (2013). Investigating prospective teachers' perceived levels of competence towards measurement and evaluation. *Elementary Education Online*, 12(1), 190-201.
- Ghania, O., & Mokhtar, K. (2018). Teachers' perceptions of classroom assessment practices in the Algerian primary school. *Journal of Translation and Languages*, 17(1), 93-102. <https://doi.org/10.52919/translang.v17i1.550>

- Green, S. K., Johnson, R. L., Kim, D. H., & Pope, N. S. (2007). Ethics in classroom assessment practices: Issues and attitudes. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(7), 999-1011. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.04.042>
- Göğebakan, A. (2025). *Beden eğitimi ve spor öğretmenlerinin alternatif ölçme değerlendirme yöntem ve araçlarını kullanma düzeyleri ve karşılaştıkları problemler [The levels of physical education and sports teachers' use of alternative assessment and evaluation methods & tools and the problems encountered during the implementation]*. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Necmettin Erbakan University.
- Gül, E. (2011). *İlköğretim öğretmen adaylarının ölçme-değerlendirme okuryazarlığı ve ölçme-değerlendirmeye ilişkin tutumlarının belirlenmesi [Preservice elementary teachers assessment literacy and attitude towards assessment]*. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Firat University.
- Gunes, I., Dursun, F., & Alci, B. (2025). Analysis of the assessment and evaluation approach in the Türkiye Century Education Model secondary school mathematics curriculum. *Istanbul Education Journal*, (2), 132-159. <https://doi.org/10.71270/istanbulegitim.istj.1648231>
- Haladyna, T. M., Downing, S. M., & Rodriguez, M. C. (2002). A review of multiple-choice item writing guidelines for classroom assessment. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 15(3), 309-334. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15324818ame1503\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15324818ame1503_5)
- Hursen, Ç., & Birkollu, S. (2019). Determining the relationship between teachers' attitudes towards the use of process-oriented measurement tools and self-efficacy perceptions. *The Folklore/Literature Journal*, 25(97), 440-454.
- İzci, K., & Caliskan, G. (2017). Development of prospective teachers' conceptions of assessment and choices of assessment tasks. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science*, 3(2), 464-474. <https://doi.org/10.21890/ijres.327906>
- Janisch, C., Liu, X., & Akrofi, T. (2007). Implementing alternative assessment: Opportunities and obstacles. *The Educational Forum*, 71(3), 221-230. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131720709335007>
- Kagan, D. M. (1992). Implication of research on teacher belief. *Educational Psychologist*, 27(1), 65-90.
- Kahl, S. R., Hofman, P., & Bryant, S. (2013). *Assessment literacy for the 21st century educator*. Assessment Training Institute.
- Kılıç, M. Y. (2020). Investigation of teachers' opinions on alternative assessment and evaluation techniques. *International Journal of Current Approaches in Language, Education and Social Sciences*, 2(2), 483-508. <https://doi.org/10.35452/caless.2020.26>
- Kızıkan, O., & Nacaroglu, O. (2019). Science teachers' opinions about central exams (LGS). *Neşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University Journal of ISS*, 9(2), 701-719.

- Korkmaz, H., & Kaptan, F. (2005). An investigation on using electronic portfolio for assessing students' development in science education. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET*, 4(1), 101-106.
- Lyon, E. G. (2011). Beliefs, practices, and reflection: Exploring a science teacher's classroom assessment through the assessment triangle model. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 22(5), 417-435. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-011-9241-4>
- Marland, P. (1998). Teachers' practical theories: implications for preservice teacher education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education & Development*, 1(2), 15-23.
- McMillan, J. H. (2013). *Classroom assessment: Principles and practice for effective standards-based instruction* (6th ed.). Pearson.
- McMillan, J. H. (2008). *Assessment essentials for standards-based education* (2nd ed.). Corwin Press.
- McMillan, J. H., & Nash, S. (2000, April). *Teacher classroom assessment and grading practices decision making*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education, New Orleans, LA.
- MoNE [Ministry of National Education]. (2025). *Türkiye Yüzyılı Maarif Modeli öğretim programları ortak metni [The common curriculum framework of the Türkiye Century Education Model]*. Ministry of National Education.
- MoNE [Ministry of National Education]. (2024). *Türkiye Yüzyılı Maarif Modeli öğretim programları ortak metni [The common curriculum framework of the Türkiye Century Education Model]*. Ministry of National Education.
- MoNE [Ministry of National Education]. (2023). *Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı Ölçme ve Değerlendirme Yönetmeliği [Ministry of National Education Regulation on Measurement and Evaluation]*. Official Gazette, 09/09/2023, Number: 32304.
- Nasri, N., Roslan, S. N., Sekuan, M. I., Bakar, K. A., & Puteh, S. N. (2010). Teachers' perception on alternative assessment. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 7, 37-42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.10.006>
- Nazlıççek, N., & Akarsu, F. (2008). Physics, chemistry and mathematics teachers' approaches to assessment tools and their assessment practices. *Education and Science*, 33(149), 18-29.
- Nitko, A. J., & Brookhart, S. M. (2011). *Educational assessment of students* (6th ed.). Pearson.
- Oppong, S., Nugba, R. M., Asamoah, E., Quansah, N., & Ankoma-Sey, V. R. (2023). Teachers confidence of classroom assessment practices: a case of basic schools in upper denkyira west district, Ghana. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 10(11), 148-159. <http://dx.doi.org/10.46827/ejes.v10i11.5063>
- Ornstein, A. C., & Lasley, T. J. (2004). *Strategies for effective teaching* (4th ed.). The McGraw-Hill Companies Inc.



- Önel, F., Dalkılıç, F., Özel, N., Deniz, G., Balkaya, T., & Birel, G. K. (2020). How middle school mathematics teachers do measurement and assessment? A case study. *Kastamonu Education Journal*, 18(3), 1448-1459. <https://doi.org/10.24106/kefdergi.4113>
- Özçelik, D. A. (2016). *Ölçme ve değerlendirme [Measurement and evaluation]* (5th ed.). Pegem Akademi Publications.
- Özdaş, F. (2019). The evaluation of the teacher and student views on the central placement examination system. *Mukaddime*, 10(2), 688-707. <https://doi.org/10.19059/mukaddime.509244>
- Özdemir, S. M. (2010). Elementary teacher competencies and inservice training needs in alternative measurement and assessment tools. *The Journal of Turkish Educational Sciences*, 8(4), 787-816.
- Özenç, M., & Çakır, M. (2015). Exploring primary school teachers' competencies of alternative assessment and evaluation. *Elementary Education Online*, 14(3), 914-933. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17051/io.2015.22900>
- Özeren, E., & Akpınar, B. (2020). Investigation of teachers' epistemological beliefs and measurement evaluation practices in the context of Turkish education system. *Journal of History School*, 48, 3175-3200. <http://dx.doi.org/10.29228/Joh.45810>
- Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(3), 307-332. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543062003307>
- Patton, M. (2014) *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Popham, W. J. (2017). *Classroom assessment: What teachers need to know* (8th ed.). Pearson.
- Popham, W. J. (2011). *Transformative assessment in action: An inside look at applying the process*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Popham, W. J. (2000). *Modern educational measurement: Practical guidelines for educational leaders*. Allyn & Bacon.
- Richardson, V. (2003). Preservice teachers' beliefs. In J. Raths & A. C. McAninch (Eds.), *Teacher beliefs and classroom performance: The impact of teacher education* (pp. 1-22). Information Age Publishing.
- Schreier, M. (2012). *Qualitative Content Analysis in Practice*. Sage Publications.
- Seferoğlu, G., Korkmazgil, S., & Ölçü, Z. (2009). Gaining insights into teachers' ways of thinking via metaphors. *Educational Studies*, 35(3), 323-335. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03055690802648135>
- Segers, M., & Dochy, F. (2001). New assessment forms in problem-based learning: The value-added of the students' perspective. *Studies in Higher Education*, 26(3), 327-343. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070120076291>



- Stiggins, R. J. (2007). Conquering the formative assessment frontier. In J. H. McMillan (Ed.), *Formative classroom assessment: Theory into practice* (pp. 8-28). Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Stiggins, R. J. (2005). From formative assessment to assessment for learning: A path to success in standards-based schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 87(4), 324–328. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003172170508700414>
- Stobart, G. (2005). Fairness in multicultural assessment systems. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 12(3), 275–287. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09695940500337249>
- Şad, S. N., & Göktaş, Ö. (2013). Investigation of traditional and alternative measurement and evaluation approaches among teaching staff at higher education. *Ege Journal of Education*, 14(2), 79-105.
- Şahin, M., & Uysal, İ. (2013). Analysis of pre-service teachers' self-efficacy perceptions on measurement and evaluation. *Bartın University Journal of Faculty of Education*, 2(2), 190-207. <https://doi.org/10.14686/201321987>
- Şentürk, C., & Baş, G. (2023). Classroom assessment beliefs of teachers: scale validity and reliability study. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, 22(2), 301-323. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10671-023-09339-2>
- Şimşek, V. (2022). Determining the attitudes of RCE teachers towards assessment and evaluation according to different variables. *The Journal of Religious Studies*, 25(63), 553-578. <https://doi.org/10.15745/da.1183068>
- Thomas, M. (2012). Teachers' beliefs about classroom assessment and their selection of classroomassessment strategies. *Journal of Research and Reflections in Education*, 6(2), 103-112.
- Thompson, S. J., Benson, S. N. K., Pachnowski L. M., & Salzman, J. A. (2001). *Decision-making in planning and teaching*. Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers Inc.
- Tozluoğlu, E., & Güven, S. (2025). Evaluation of country and province-wide exams at secondary level comprising of open-ended questions based on teachers' opinions. *The Journal of International Lingual Social and Educational Sciences*, 11(1), 51-70. <https://10.0.133.89/jilses.1679832>
- Uysal, H., & Yumuşak, G. (2018). Self-efficacy of mathematics teachers' for using alternative assessment approaches. *Electronic Turkish Studies*, 13(11), 1421-1436. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.13348>
- Üztemur, S. S., & Çetin, M. (2015). Examining social studies teachers' misconceptions in assessment and evaluation and their self-efficacy beliefs. *Anatolian Journal of Educational Leadership and Instruction*, 3(2), 41-67.

- Vaismoradi, M., Turunen, H., & Bondas, T. (2013). Content analysis and thematic analysis: Implications for conducting a qualitative descriptive study. *Nursing & Health Sciences*, 15(3), 398-405. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nhs.12048>
- Warman, W., Suryaningsi, S., & Mulawarman, W. G. (2021). Overcoming obstacles in implementing 2013 curriculum policy. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Science*. 16(3), 967-980. <https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v16i3.5770>
- Windschitl, M. (1999). The challenges of sustaining a constructivist classroom culture. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80(10), 751-754.
- Wormeli, R. (2006). Accountability: Teaching through assessment and feedback, not grading. *American Secondary Education*, 34(3), 14-27.
- Yaşar, M. (2014). An investigation of candidate teachers' attitude towards "measurement and evaluation in education" course in terms of some variables. *Trakya University Journal of Education*, 4(2), 64-83.
- Yıldız, M., & Genç, M. (2016). Secondary school religious culture and ethic teachers' level of using alternative techniques of measurement and evaluation and the problems which they have encountered. *Journal of Ilahiyat Researches*, 45, 45-80. <https://doi.org/10.29288/ilted.304761>
- Yıldırım, L. (2024). *Din kültürü ve ahlak bilgisi öğretmenlerinin ölçme değerlendirme anlayışları ve dersin merkezî sınavlara dâhil edilmesi hakkındaki görüşleri* [Religious Culture and Ethics teachers' understanding of measurement and evaluation and their views on the inclusion of the course in central examinations] [Unpublished master's thesis]. Ankara University.
- Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2016). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri* [Qualitative research methods in the social sciences]. Seçkin Publications.
- Yin, R. K. (2017). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods*. Sage Publications.

## Data Availability Declaration

### Data Availability Upon Formal Request:

While the primary datasets utilized in this study are not publicly accessible due to certain constraints, they are available to researchers upon a formal request. The authors have emphasized maintaining the integrity of the data and its analytical rigor. To access the datasets or seek further clarifications, kindly reach out to the corresponding author. Our aim is to foster collaborative academic efforts while upholding the highest standards of research integrity.

## Author Contributions

All authors, Hasan Şahin and Cihad Şentürk, contributed equally to this work. They collaboratively handled the conceptualization, methodology design, data acquisition, and analysis. Each author played a significant role in drafting and revising the manuscript, ensuring its intellectual depth and coherence. All authors have thoroughly reviewed, provided critical feedback, and approved the final version of the manuscript. They jointly take responsibility for the accuracy and integrity of the research.

### *Author(s)' statements on ethics and conflict of interest*

**Ethics statement:** We hereby declare that research/publication ethics and citing principles have been considered in all the stages of the study. We take full responsibility for the content of the paper in case of dispute.

**Statement of interest:** The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

**Funding:** This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

**Acknowledgements:** This article is based on the master's thesis prepared by the first author under the supervision of the second author. The authors would like to express their gratitude to the school administrators who facilitated the data collection process, the teachers who voluntarily participated in the study, and all stakeholders who contributed to the research.

## Biographical notes:

**Hasan Şahin<sup>4</sup>** : He is a Religious Culture and Ethics Education teacher at the Turkish Ministry of National Education. He graduated from the Faculty of Divinity at Dokuz Eylül University and earned his master's degree from Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University. He currently works as a Religious Culture and Ethics Education teacher at a middle school in Karaman, Türkiye.

**Cihad Şentürk** : He is an associate professor of curriculum and instruction at the Faculty of Education, Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University, Karaman, Türkiye. He holds a PhD in curriculum and instruction from Necmettin Erbakan University. His research interests include curriculum and instruction, the teaching-learning process, primary education curriculum, learning styles, STEM education and educational research.



Scopus Author Identifier Number: 57193017700



Web of Science Researcher ID: P-6408-2018



Google Scholar Researcher ID: \_PW-oqoAAAAJ&hl=tr

---

<sup>4</sup> Corresponding Author