GEFAD / GUJGEF44(2): 1281-1321(2024)

Teacher Autonomy and Professionalism as Predictors of Curriculum Adaptation Patterns

Öğretim Programını Uyarlama Örüntülerinin Yordayıcıları Olarak Öğretmen Özerkliği ve Profesyonelliği*

Özge Ceren ÇELİK[1], Melek Gülşah ŞAHİN[2]

[1]*Gazi Üniversitesi, Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü, Eğitim Programları ve Öğretim Ana Bilim Dalı, ocerencelik@gazi.edu.tr*
[2]*Gazi Üniversitesi, Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü, Eğitimde Ölçme ve Değerlendirme Ana Bilim Dalı, mgulsahsahin@gazi.edu.tr*

Makale Türü/Article Types: *Araştırma Makalesi/ Research Article*
Makalenin Geliş Tarihi: 06.02.2024 ***Yayına Kabul Tarihi: 28.05.2024***

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to investigate teacher autonomy and occupational professionalism as predictors of teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns. The study group of the present correlational study was composed of 153 teachers. For data analysis, t-test, ANOVA, correlation analysis, and regression analysis were performed. Results showed that the models established for predicting teachers' use of adaptation patterns by teacher autonomy and occupational professionalism were found to be significant, except for omitting. The highest variance was obtained in the model for predicting the frequency of extensions. In this model, teachers' autonomy and occupational professionalism significantly explained teachers' use of the extending pattern, and occupational professionalism was a significant predictor. It can be suggested that autonomy and professionalism should be considered as teacher characteristics that are indispensable components of curriculum adaptation patterns and that the number of similar studies exploring the interaction and relationships between teachers and curriculum should be increased.

Keywords: *Curriculum Adaptation, Autonomy, Professionalism*

*Reference: Çelik, Ö. C., & Şahin. M. G. (2024) Teacher autonomy and professionalism as predictors of curriculum adaptation patterns. *Gazi University Journal of Gazi Education Faculty*, *44*(2), 1281-1321.

ÖZ

Bu çalışmanın amacı, öğretmenlerin öğretim programı uyarlama örüntülerinin yordayıcıları olarak öğretmen özerkliği ve mesleki profesyonelliğini incelemektir. Bu korelasyonel araştırmanın çalışma grubunu 153 öğretmen oluşturmaktadır. Veri analizinde t testi, ANOVA, korelasyon analizi ve regresyon analizi kullanılmıştır. Bulgular, öğretmenlerin uyarlama örüntülerini kullanım sıklıklarının, özerklik ve mesleki profesyonellik tarafından yordanmasına yönelik kurulan modellerin, atlamaya yönelik uyarlama alt boyutu hariç anlamlı olduğunu göstermiştir. En yüksek varyans, genişletme sıklığını yordayan modelde elde edilmiştir. Bu modelde öğretmen özerkliği ve mesleki profesyonellik öğretmenlerin genişletme örüntüsünü kullanma sıklığını anlamlı bir şekilde açıklarken, mesleki profesyonellik anlamlı bir yordayıcı olmuştur. Özerklik ve mesleki profesyonelliğin, programı uyarlama örüntülerinin kullanımından ayrı düşünülmemesi gereken öğretmen özellikleri arasında değerlendirilmesi ve öğretmen ile program arasındaki etkileşim ve ilişkileri inceleyen benzer çalışmaların sayısının artırılması önerilmiştir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: *Öğretim Programı Uyarlama, Özerklik, Profesyonellik*

INTRODUCTION

There has been a wide range of debate and research on the curriculum design and its reflections on the classroom and the quality of education. Recently, there are two opposing views worldwide where some educators support a more centralized curriculum for standardization based on the curriculum as a political text, while others prefer a more local or contextual curriculum for improving educational practice by understanding school and class realities (Saban, 2021). In Turkey, there is a centralized education system, operated by the Ministry of National Education (MoNE) that mandates all formal and non-formal educational activities (Akar & Kandemir, 2022). Within this framework, curriculum development activities are carried out in coordination with the relevant units of the MoNE. Curricula are prepared for all grade levels in the formal education system, from preschool to high school (MoNE, 2023).

Although a mandated curriculum is expected to guarantee equality for all (Maniates, 2010), it is also widely argued that a formal curriculum differs from the curriculum implemented in the classroom. Drake and Sherin (2006) argue that no curriculum is "teacher-proof" as there are interactions between teachers and curricular materials that result in changes in teachers' instructional practices. Teachers continuously adapt and

transform the prescribed curriculum (Mathou, 2018) to suit their own teaching situations (Loucks, 1983). Meidl and Meidl (2011) depicted this process as "tweaking" the curriculum, which refers to the ways the curriculum is adapted to create a "good program". When the mandated curriculum organized by one-size-fits-all objectives does not fit the children in the class, teachers "tweak" the curriculum to eliminate the limitations. A wide range of research was conducted to examine the factors that influence what happens as the curriculum is enacted (enacted curriculum) (Bernard, 2017; Edwards, 2011), and teacher qualities, one of those factors, have an invaluable role in terms of curriculum adaptation (Brown, 2009; Bümen et al., 2014). With a focus on exploring the interaction between teacher qualities and curriculum adaptation, this study questioned the influence of teacher professionalism and autonomy.

Professionalism refers to the attitudinal or psychological attributes of those who aspire to be considered professionals (Ingersoll & Merrill, 2018). Autonomy, a crucial ingredient of professionalism, is an individual's ability to make independent decisions (Aprile, 1998). As a commonly accepted professional criterion, autonomy refers to professionals' control over their work and their own theoretical knowledge (MacBeath, 2012). That is, the loss of autonomy is regarded as a dilution of professionalism (Evans, 2011). For the teaching profession, on the other hand, the sense of autonomy is defined as the perception that teachers are in control of their work (Pearson & Hall, 1993). While autonomy is regarded as a defining feature of teacher professionalism (Parker, 2015), today's understanding of professionalism has substantially been influenced by standardization of curricula and externally imposed accountability (Buyruk & Akbaş, 2021; OECD, 2016). The explosion of accountability policies, standardized testing, and common learning standards have challenged teacher autonomy (Parcerisa et al., 2022). Frostenson (2015), also focusing on teachers as the agents whose autonomy is challenged, argued that the decrease in professional autonomy equal to de-professionalisation may be misleading. In this sense, autonomy is composed of levels, and teachers' autonomy at the level of practice may not be influenced by the loss of professional autonomy at the general level

(Frostenson, 2015). In this study, teachers' autonomy beliefs regarding the practice level have been questioned.

While it is known that a high level of autonomy is associated with higher student performance, Turkey is one of the countries with the least autonomy for schools regarding decision-making about curricula, assessments, and resource allocation (OECD, 2011). Still, at the contextual level, teachers may feel autonomous in their classroom (Frostenson, 2015). While teacher autonomy has been investigated with increasing popularity, research is required to explore the relations between teacher autonomy and curriculum use and adaptation (Tokgöz Can & Bümen, 2021). Understanding how autonomous teachers feel, how they adapt the curriculum, and to what extent their beliefs in terms of autonomy are correlated with the way they adapt the curriculum is deemed necessary for explaining the process of curriculum adaptation. On the other hand, teacher professionalism, as a positively correlated variable with student achievement and instructional quality (Parlar & Cansoy, 2017; Yılmaz & Altınkurt, 2014), is one area that needs more research (Korkmazgil & Seferoğlu, 2021), and literature review on the relationship between professionalism and curriculum adaptation is quite limited. More research on the interdependence of autonomy perceptions, professionalism, and curriculum adaptations is deemed necessary (Steh & Pozarnik, 2005). It is believed that revealing the links between those interrelated variables bears significance in contributing to curriculum development and implementation by understanding to what extent autonomy and professionalism influence teachers' practices while adapting curriculum and whether adaptation practices could be improved through enhancement in teacher-related factors, which are limited to autonomy and professionalism in this study.

Theoretical Background

Teachers' Curriculum Adaptation Patterns

Today, the important role of teachers in achieving the goals of the prescribed or official curriculum is widely accepted (Agodini & Harris, 2016; Tokgöz, 2013). In the flow of everyday instruction, the teacher–tool dynamic and the interactions between the qualities

of teachers and curriculum materials occur, which results in differences between the official and enacted (Brown, 2009; Bümen & Yazıcılar, 2020). Despite using the same curriculum, the outcomes may differ since teachers have different curriculum approaches that influence teachers, students, and curriculum, which results in significant differences in the learned curriculum compared to the formal curriculum (Shawer, 2010). According to Shawer et al. (2009), teachers' approaches to curriculum differ as curriculum-transmitters, curriculum developers, or curriculum-makers. Curriculum-transmitters use the prescribed curriculum materials and topics without additions or substantial differences, while curriculum-developers include new components and make substantial changes based on the prescribed curriculum. Curriculum-makers develop curricula without referencing official curriculum materials and topics. Although there are different classifications in terms of curriculum approaches of teachers, researchers agree upon the fact that while implementing curricula in the class, teachers inevitably make some adaptations due to differences in region, school, class context, and student and teacher characteristics (Akbulut-Taş, 2022; Yazıcılar Nalbantoğlu et al., 2022; Yazıcılar Nalbantoğlu & Bümen, 2024). According to Shawer (2010), curriculum adaptation stimulates interactions between teachers, students, and curriculum and enfranchises teachers to shape curriculum based on the classroom context. Sherin and Drake (2009) defined adaptation as significant changes teachers make in the intended curriculum, which include the activities for omitting portions of a lesson and making significant and creative changes and additions to the curriculum. Curriculum adaptation is regarded as a purposeful effort to bring existing instructional materials to align with new visions by making additions, adaptations, or transformations. It differs from curriculum development, which requires creating totally new materials within the framework of a new policy (Debarger et al., 2017).

In order to understand and conceptualize how teachers adapt curricula, researchers have identified recognizable patterns (Bernard, 2017; Tokgöz Can & Bümen, 2021; Troyer, 2017). Bernard (2017) has formed five categories of adaptation. These categories are changing content, extending, reordering, rewording, and other purposes. Changing

content refers to changing the content of a problem or activity. Extending means following specified curriculum materials in addition to adding activities to extend the content. Reordering refers to reordering problems or activities found in curriculum materials. Rewording means reformatting the curriculum material without affecting the overall content. Other purposes refers to using the curriculum materials in such a different way that it is not planned to be used. A similar classification has been formed by Troyer (2017). According to this classification, by making additions, the teacher adds entire activities, questions, and words that are not in the lesson plan. Deletion occurs when the teacher does not use a material or activity planned to be used according to the lesson plan. Modification occurs when the teacher uses materials in a different way than what is presented in the lesson plan. On the other hand, this study has adopted the classification of Tokgöz Can and Bümen (2021), who have used three main adaptation patterns: omitting, extending, and replacing or revising. By extending, teachers include new materials and resources and create something new in teaching. They change the official curriculum's format, duration, and order by replacing and revising. They neglect the impractical or useless parts of the official curriculum by omitting them.

Considering the significance of curriculum and its use in the classroom, scholars also put effort into understanding factors that may have direct or indirect influences on curriculum adaptation. According to Brown (2009), instructional outcomes result from the interaction between curriculum and teacher resources. While curriculum resources include physical objects, domain representations, and procedures, teacher resources refer to teachers' subject matter knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, goals, and beliefs. The nature of teachers' goals and beliefs is highly relevant to understanding how teachers perceive, interpret, and use curriculum materials (Brown, 2009). Empirical data also show that teacher characteristics have an influence on the use and effect of curriculum (Agodini & Harris, 2016; Shawer, 2017). According to Forbes (2013), teacher-specific variables explain a higher percentage of the variance, whereas the influence of curriculum materials on teachers' curricular adaptations is relatively less. In this sense, understanding what teachers bring to this interaction is at least as crucial as understanding the features of the

curriculum (Drake & Sherin, 2006). Still, apart from the qualities of the teacher and curricula, there are also other factors, found to be related to teachers' adaptation practices. These factors are student characteristics, instructional context, and contextual factors, including time, school structure, administrative support, and family structure (Akbulut-Taş, 2022; Bernard, 2017; Leite et al., 2020). This study is limited to investigating teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns within the framework of teacher autonomy and professionalism as teacher qualities. Apparently, teacher qualities constitute only one determinant of curriculum adaptation. Nonetheless, research on investigating teachers' qualities in relation to how they adapt curricula is limited and believed to contribute to giving insight into understanding teachers' different practices in terms of curriculum adaptation in a centralized system, where a wide range of variables are standardized.

Teacher Professionalism

Professionalism is defined as individuals' attitudes and behaviors toward their occupation (Boyt et al., 2001). It refers to improving service quality (Hoyle, 2001). Evans (2008) regarded professionalism as a service-level agreement, and in this framework, the professionals should accept and adopt this agreement; otherwise, it is only a service-level requirement. In this framework, Evans argues that professionalism should be related to what professionals actually "do" rather than what the government asks professionals to do. A professional is depicted as someone who is not an amateur but is committed to a career and public service (Ingersoll & Merrill, 2018). School effectiveness literature heavily addresses the importance of the role of the teacher as a professional (Johnson, 1991). The goal of teacher professionalism is to attain the highest standards in the profession of teaching that is based on professional formation, knowledge, skill, and values (Demirkasımoğlu, 2010). In the conceptualization of OECD (2016), teacher professionalism comprises three domains: knowledge base, autonomy, and peer networks. That is, teacher professionalism includes teachers' knowledge necessary for teaching, teachers' decision-making regarding their work, and networks enhancing information exchange and support among teachers. Evans (2011) identified three components of professionalism: behavioural, attitudinal, and intellectual. While the

behavioural component of professionalism refers to what practitioners physically do at work, the attitudinal component refers to practitioners' attitudes. The intellectual component refers to the knowledge, understanding, and knowledge structures of practitioners. Within this study, the conceptualization of Yılmaz and Altınkurt (2014) has been adopted, who have conceptualized teacher professionalism within four dimensions: personal development, contribution to organization, professional awareness, and emotional labor. Personal development refers to teachers' efforts to improve themselves to do their profession better, such as following scientific publications, books, or activities related to their field, although it is not compulsory. Contribution to organization refers to teachers' use of their knowledge, experience, and relationships with others for the sake of the institution, such as voluntary and active participation in social, cultural, and professional activities and projects at school. Teachers with high professional awareness are professionals who are aware of their needs, open to new ideas and change, sensitive to professional ethical principles, communicate and cooperate with colleagues, strive to do their job in the best way possible, and are role models for students with their behavior. Emotional labor is the role-playing of employees in the work environment. In this sense, teachers with high levels of professionalism try not to reflect this to their work and relationships even if they have problems with school administration, colleagues, or in their personal lives.

Teachers Autonomy

Autonomy has long been considered a central component of professionalism. Professionals are allowed to draw on their knowledge, experience, and ethics to decide how best to provide safe, effective services to others (Mezza, 2022). Teacher autonomy is one of the terms used to describe and define teacher professionalism (Johnson, 1991). It is about teachers' beliefs that they have control over specific aspects of their work, including scheduling, curriculum, textbooks, and instructional planning (Short, 1994). According to Lamb (2008), while teacher autonomy can be conceptualized as the extent to which teachers can enhance their teaching through their efforts, it can also be defined

as the freedom to be able to teach in the way that one wants to teach, which is regarded as a manifestation of teacher autonomy.

Teacher autonomy is a difficult concept to define, and scholars have focused on different aspects of teacher autonomy (Han, 2020; Yan, 2010; Yu-hong & Ting, 2012). Focusing on its complex nature, Frostenson (2015) suggested levelling professional autonomy as general, collegial, and individual professional autonomy. General professional autonomy refers to the frames of professional work, such as the organisation of the school system and legislation. This is the level scholars mainly consider in relation to de-professionalisation of teachers. Collegial professional autonomy is about teachers' collective freedom to influence and decide on practice at a local level. Individual autonomy refers to the opportunity to influence the contents, frames, and controls of the teaching practice. Collegial professional autonomy and individual autonomy relate to autonomy at the level of practice. According to Frostenson (2015), it is necessary to make a distinction between levels because a loss of autonomy that exists at the general level does not mean a loss of professional autonomy at the level of practice. Considering the centralized system in Turkey, in this paper, teacher autonomy is considered at the level of practice based on the conceptualization of Ulaş and Aksu (2015), who defined three areas of autonomy for teachers, including teachers' autonomy in instructional planning and implementation, in professional development, and in determining the framework of the curriculum.

Prior research has investigated teachers' curriculum adaptation process (Akbulut-Taş, 2022; Bümen & Yazıcılar, 2020; Durdukoca, 2021; Gelmez-Burakgazi, 2020; İlhan & Bümen, 2023; Karakuyu, 2023). On the other hand, teacher autonomy has been examined based on different variables, including teacher self-efficacy (Ertay, 2022; Genç, 2022; Işık, 2022), professional motivation (Demir, 2023), professional burnout (Nalbant, 2023), curriculum literacy levels (Taşdemircanan, 2023). Tokgöz Can and Bümen (2021) analyzed teachers' perceived autonomy and preferences while adapting curricula based on mixed method design. Yazıcılar Nalbantoğlu (2021) and Yazıcılar Nalbantoğlu and Bümen (2024) investigated the influence of professional development on the curriculum

adaptation process. Buyruk and Akbaş (2021) focused on the correlation between teachers' occupational professionalism and autonomy. The main contribution of this study is to examine the correlation between teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns, autonomy, and professionalism. This study aims to investigate teacher autonomy and occupational professionalism as predictors of teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns. Within this framework, the research questions of this study are as follows:

1. Do teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns, professional autonomy, and occupational professionalism levels differ by graduation, school type, subject area, in-service training needs, and class size?

2. Are there significant relations between teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns, autonomy, and occupational professionalism?

3. Are teacher autonomy and occupational professionalism significant predictors of teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns?

METHOD

Research Design

This research investigated the relationships between teacher autonomy, occupational professionalism, and curriculum adaptation patterns. In this respect, this research is correlational. In correlational studies, hypotheses regarding at least two variables are tested. Additionally, this study examined whether the variables of teacher autonomy, occupational professionalism, and curriculum adaptation patterns differed according to the independent variables. In this respect, the research can be considered as causal-comparative research. In causal-comparative research, the cause or consequences of pre-existing differences between groups are examined (Fraenkel et al., 2012).

Study Group

The study group consisted of 153 teachers. Considering the suitability of the construct validity and reliability coefficients of the scales used in the research, the number of

variables and group size ratios (MacCallum et al., 1999), and the type of analyses to be carried out based on these research problems (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013), it was decided that the size of the study group was sufficient. Within the scope of the research, teachers with different school types, subject areas, and ages were included in the study. The participant demographics are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Participant Demographics

Variables	Categories	n	%
Gender	Female	127	83.0
	Male	26	17.0
Graduation	Undergraduate	106	69.2
	Graduate	47	30.7
	20-30	13	8.5
Age	31-40	64	41.8
	41-50	56	36.6
	51 and more	20	13.1
School level	Primary school	54	35.3
	Middle school	65	42.5
	High school	34	22.2
Subject area	Classroom teacher	50	32.7
	Branch teacher	103	67.3
School type	Public	125	81.7
	Private	28	18.3
Class size	0-20	43	28.1
	21-30	56	36.6
	31-50	54	35.3
In-service training needs regarding curriculum	Need	109	71.2
	No need	44	28.8

The participant demographics show that the majority of participants were women (83%) and had a bachelor's degree (69.2%). The distribution of teachers according to their subject areas indicates that approximately two-thirds (67.3%) were branch teachers (English, IT, Germany, Spanish, Mathematics, Physics, Turkish, Social Studies, Science, and History), and the majority of participants worked in public schools (81.7%) at middle school level (42.7%) In terms of class size, it was found that the majority of teachers (36.6%) had 21-30 students in their classes.

Data Collection Tools

Ethics committee approval was obtained before the data collection process. The Curriculum Adaptation Patterns Scale was developed by Yazıcılar Nalbantoğlu et al. (2022) to determine teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns. It was a 5-point Likert-type scale of 20 items to measure how frequently teachers use adaptation patterns. There were three subscales, which were omitting (seven items), extending (seven items), and replacing or revising (six items). Yazıcılar Nalbantoğlu et al. (2022) conducted Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) to test the validity of the data obtained from 361 teachers showed that the three-dimensional structure explained 52% of the total variance. Then, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was performed, and goodness-of-fit indices were as follows: RMSEA=0.065, SRMR=0.064, NFI=0.91, NNFI=0.94, CFI=0.94, GFI=0.88, and AGFI=0.85. The reliability coefficients found in the study were 0.72, 0.87, and 0.85 for extending, omitting, and replacing/revising, respectively (Yazıcılar Nalbantoğlu et al., 2022).

The Teacher Autonomy Scale was developed by Ulaş and Aksu (2015) to determine the level of autonomy of teachers. The scale has three subscales and 18 items in a 5-point Likert type. As a result of the EFA performed on the data obtained from 292 classroom teachers, the total variance explained by the subscales was 62.44%. The Cronbach alpha coefficients of the autonomy in determining the framework of the curriculum (three items), autonomy in instructional planning and implementation (11 items), and autonomy in professional development (four items) subscales were 0.86, 0.91, and 0.80, respectively. The overall reliability coefficient of the scale was reported as 0.89 (Ulaş & Aksu, 2015).

The Occupational Professionalism of Teachers Scale was developed by Yılmaz and Altınkurt (2014) to determine teachers' opinions on occupational professionalism. The scale consists of 24 items in a 5-point Likert type and has four sub-dimensions. These subscales are the contribution to the organization (eight items), emotional labor (six items), personal development (five items), and professional awareness (five items).

Yılmaz and Altınkurt (2014) conducted EFA and CFA for the construct validity of the scale implemented to 251 teachers. The exploratory factor analysis resulted in four subscales explaining 52.22% of the total variance. As a result of CFA, goodness-of-fit indices were as follows: χ^2/df=2.66; GFI=0.82, AGFI=0.78, RMSEA=0.08, RMR=0.05, SRMR=0.08, CFI=0.80, NFI=0.72, NNFI=0.77, PGFI=0.67. The Cronbach alpha coefficient was 0.79 for the personal development subscale, 0.86 for the contribution to organization subscale, 0.74 for the professional awareness subscale, and 0.80 for the emotional labor subscale (Yılmaz & Altınkurt, 2014).

Before performing analysis for the sub-problems of this study, the normal distribution of the data was controlled, and a second-level confirmatory factor analysis was conducted to check the construct validity of all three scales and to ensure that the sum of the scores could be calculated. As a result of the CFA, fit indices and χ^2/df values were obtained. For the Curriculum Adaptation Patterns Scale, the indices were as follows: χ^2=261.55; df=166, χ^2/df= 1.57; RMSEA=0.062; CFI=0.96; GFI=0.85; NFI=0.90; AGFI=0.81; NNFI=0.95. The indices for the Teacher Autonomy Scale were the following: χ^2=253.14; df=130, χ^2/df=1.94; RMSEA=0.079; CFI=0.97; GFI=0.82; NFI=0.94; AGFI= 0.76; NNFI=0.96. The Occupational Professionalism of Teachers Scale indices were as follows: χ^2=486.78; df=246, χ^2/df=1.98; RMSEA=0.080; CFI=0.96; GFI=0.77; NFI=0.92; AGFI=0.72; NNFI=0.95. According to Kline (2005), RMSEA ≤0.05 and GFI, CFI, NFI, NNFI≥0.95 indicate a perfect fit; RMSEA≤0.08 and GFI, CFI, NFI, NNFI ≥0.90 indicate a good fit. The fit indices obtained for the scales within the scope of the research generally indicated a good fit. Moreover, χ^2/df ≤ 3 for all three scales indicated a perfect fit.

Cronbach alpha internal consistency reliability values were calculated for Curriculum Adaptation Patterns, Teacher Autonomy, and Occupational Professionalism of Teachers Scales and their subscales. The reliability coefficients found in the study were 0.763, 0.804, and 0.858 for extending, omitting, and replacing/revising, respectively, while it was 0.853 for the whole of the Curriculum Adaptation Patterns scale. The Cronbach alpha coefficients for the subscales of determining the framework of the curriculum, autonomy

in instructional planning and implementation, and autonomy in professional development were 0.792, 0.923, and 0.834, respectively, while the overall reliability coefficient of the Teacher Autonomy Scale was calculated as 0.916. For the Occupational Professionalism of Teachers Scale, the coefficients calculated for the contribution to organization, emotional labor, personal development, and professional awareness were 0.847, 0.778, 0.843, and 0.846, respectively, and it was 0.926 for the whole scale. It was determined that the reliability coefficients were sufficient (Nunnually, 1978).

Data Analysis

Before performing analysis in line with the sub-problems, the missing values, outliers, and normality assumptions were examined. Since the data were collected online, there was no missing value, and analyses were carried out on the data obtained from 153 teachers. The scores obtained from each scale were converted into z-scores to determine univariate outliers. Analysis of the z-scores indicated no univariate outliers since all values were between +3.29 and -3.29 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). The skewness and kurtosis values of the scores obtained from both subscales and the overall scale were examined to test normality. The skewness and kurtosis values were in the range of +1 and -1 for all three scales (Table 2), which indicated that the data were normally distributed (Bowen & Guo, 2012).

In the study, the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was calculated to examine the relationships between curriculum adaptation patterns, autonomy, and occupational professionalism. Independent samples *t*-test was performed to examine the curriculum adaptation patterns, autonomy, and occupational professionalism based on graduation (undergraduate-graduate), school type (state-private), subject area (classroom teacher-branch teacher), and in-service training needs (need-no need). Before the independent samples *t*-test analysis, the homogeneity of variances in the sub-categories of the independent samples considered for the dependent variables was examined by the Levene test. One-way ANOVA results were performed to explore the differences in the dependent variables based on class size (0-20; 21-30; 31 and more). The homogeneity of variance assumption, one of the necessary assumptions for the ANOVA test, was

examined with the Levene test. Since the homogeneity of the variances of the dependent variables in the sub-categories of the independent variable is ensured, the Least Significant Difference (LSD) test, which is among the Post Hoc tests, was used to determine which variables the differences were found to be significant. LSD test was used, taking into account the number of independent variable categories and the number of sample sizes in the categories (Kayri, 2009).

In this study, the strength of the significant differences was checked with eta squared (η^2) effect size, which is one of the mostly used (Pallant, 2005). Eta squared, which varies between 0 and 1, expresses how much of the variance in the dependent variable is explained by the categories of the independent variable (Richardson, 2011). Cohen (1988) suggested that eta squared values of 01, .06, and .14 be used to indicate small, medium, or large effect size, respectively (Olejnik & Algina, 2000).

Finally, a multiple linear regression analysis was performed for the overall scale and its subscales to examine the effect of teachers' autonomy beliefs and occupational professionalism on curriculum adaptation patterns. Before performing the regression analysis, the Pearson correlation value between autonomy and occupational professionalism was examined to examine the multicollinearity problem between independent variables. A moderate correlation value (r=0.44; p<0.05) was obtained. Additionally, tolerance and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values were calculated. The tolerance value was 0.812 (>0.10), and the VIF value was 1.242 (<10). When the tolerance and VIF values obtained and the independent correlation value were evaluated, it was determined that there was no multiple-collinearity problem (Field, 2009). Based on all the obtained values, it can be stated that there was no multiple-collinearity problem between the independent variables. Additionally, to examine the multivariate outliers, Mahalanobis distances at p<0.001 level were compared with the value obtained from the chi-square table at the k=2 freedom level. Considering Cook's distance values, it was determined that the maximum value was less than 1. According to these results, it can be stated that no multivariate outliers were found in the data (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013).

FINDINGS

In this section, the results of the *t*-test, ANOVA, and regression analysis performed in line with the sub-problems are included. Table 2 indicates the descriptive statistics regarding teachers' occupational professionalism, autonomy, and curriculum adaptation patterns, which were extending, omitting, and replacing or revising.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics regarding Teachers' Curriculum Adaptation Patterns, Autonomy, and Occupational Professionalism

Variables	$\bar{X}$	SD	Skewness	SE	Kurtosis	SE
Curriculum adaptation patterns	2.75	0,43	0,23	0,19	-0.03	0.39
Extending	3.95	0.54	-0.05	0.19	-0.25	0.39
Omitting	1.71	0.58	0.73	0.19	-0.19	0.39
Replacing/revising	2.58	0.60	0.33	0.19	0.82	0.39
Autonomy	3.19	0.68	-0.28	0.19	0.32	0.39
Occupational professionalism	4.07	0.48	-0.02	0.19	-0.49	0.39

According to the results in Table 2, while extending ($\bar{X}$=3.95) is the most frequently used adaptation pattern, omitting ($\bar{X}$=1.71) is the least frequently used one.

Differences in Teachers' Curriculum Adaptation Patterns, Autonomy, and Occupational Professionalism

Independent samples *t*-test was performed to analyze teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns, autonomy, and occupational professionalism based on teachers' graduation degrees (undergraduate and graduate). Table 3 indicates the results of the independent samples *t*-test by graduation.

Table 3. Results of the Independent Samples *t*-test by Graduation

Variables	Undergraduate (n=106)		Graduate (n=47)		t (151)	p
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD		

Curriculum adaptation patterns	2.73	0.40	2.82	0.46	-1.337	0.183
Extending	3.92	0.52	4.01	0.57	-0.868	0.387
Omitting	1.67	0.58	1.81	0.58	-1.405	0.162
Replacing/revising	2.56	0.60	2.62	0.62	-0.656	0.513
Autonomy	3.17	0.71	3.27	0.62	-0.847	0.398
Occupational professionalism	4.06	0.47	4.09	0.50	-0.422	0.673

Results indicate that teachers' use of curriculum adaptation patterns did not differ by teachers' graduation ($t(151)=-1.34$). Although teachers with a graduate degree used all adaptation patterns more frequently than those with an undergraduate degree, this difference was not significant. Similarly, teachers' use of extending ($t(151)=-0.87$), omitting ($t(151)=-1.41$), and replacing/revising ($t(151)=-0.66$) did not significantly differ by teachers' graduation degrees. When the autonomy levels of the teachers were examined, although the teachers with a graduate degree had higher mean scores than those with an undergraduate degree, this difference was not statistically significant ($t(151)=-0.85$). Similarly, teachers' mean scores in terms of occupational professionalism were also higher for teachers with graduate degrees; however, this difference was not significant ($t(151)=-0.42$).

The results of an independent samples *t*-test to analyze teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns, autonomy, and occupational professionalism based on school type are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Results of the Independent Samples *t*-test by School Type

Variables	Public (n=125)		Private (n=28)		t (151)	p	η^2
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD			
Curriculum adaptation patterns	2.71	0.44	2.93	0.33	-2.15	0.013*	0.03
Extending	3.88	0.52	4.25	0.49	-3.40	0.001*	0.07
Omitting	1.70	0.59	1.74	0.54	-0.35	0.72	-
Replacing/revising	2.53	0.61	2.79	0.51	-2.02	0.045*	0.03
Autonomy	3.16	0.71	3.36	0.54	-1.42	0.158	-
Occupational professionalism	4.01	0.46	4.33	0.51	-3.33	0.001*	0.07

*$p<0.05$

Table 4 shows that there is a significant difference in the frequency of teachers' use of curriculum adaptation patterns based on school type (t(151)=-2.15). It was determined that teachers working in private schools used adaptation patterns more frequently. However, when the effect size of the difference was examined (η^2=.03), it was seen that it was a small effect size. Regarding the pattern of extending, it was found that the average use of teachers working in private schools was higher, and the difference was significant (t(151)=-3.40). The effect size of this difference was medium (η^2=.07), meaning that school type explained 7% of the variance in the relevant variable. Teachers' use of the omitting pattern did not differ by school type (t(151)=-0.35). On the other hand, teachers working in private schools were found to use replacing/revising patterns more frequently than others, and the difference was significant (t(151)=-2.02). When the effect size of this difference was examined (η^2=.03), it might be stated that it was low. In terms of the autonomy levels of teachers, although teachers working in private schools had higher mean scores than those in public schools, this difference was not significant (t(151)=-1.42). Moreover, teachers' occupational professionalism differed significantly according to the type of school (t(151)=-3.33). School type explained a 7% variance of the teachers' occupational professionalism and had a medium effect size level. (η^2=.07). Teachers working in private schools had higher mean scores regarding occupational professionalism.

The results of the independent samples *t*-test that was performed to determine whether teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns, autonomy, and occupational professionalism differed by teachers' subject areas are displayed in Table 5.

Table 5. Results of the Independent Samples *t*-test by Subject Area

Variables		Classroom teachers (n=50)		Branch teachers (n=103)		t(151)	p	η^2
		$\overline{X}$	SD	$\overline{X}$	SD			
Curriculum adaptation patterns		2.81	0.38	2.73	0.45	1.022	0.31	-
Extending		4.12	0.48	3.87	0.54	2.804	0.006*	0,05

Omitting	1.67	0.49	1.73	0.62	-0.607	0.545	-
Replacing/revising	2.60	0.58	2.57	0.62	0.244	0.808	-
Autonomy	3.26	0.67	3.17	0.69	0.753	0.452	-
Occupational professionalism	4.12	0.46	4.04	0.49	0.852	0.396	-

**p<0.05*

Table 5 indicates that the curriculum adaptation patterns used by teachers do not differ by their subject areas ($t(151)=1.022$). Regarding the subscales, it was found that classroom teachers made more extensions than branch teachers, and the difference was significant ($t(151)=2.80$). When the effect size of this difference was examined, it could be stated that it was a low effect size level ($\eta^2= .05$). On the other hand, it was also determined that teachers' use of omitting ($t(151)= -0.61$) and replacing/revising patterns ($t(151)=0.24$) did not differ by teachers' subject areas. Although classroom teachers had higher mean scores in terms of autonomy, the difference between classroom and branch teachers' scores was not significant ($t(151)=0.73$). Likewise, classroom teachers' occupational professionalism scores were higher than those of branch teachers; however, the difference was not statistically significant ($t(151)=0.85$).

Table 6 presents the results of the independent samples *t*-test for examining teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns, autonomy, and occupational professionalism based on teachers' in-service training needs.

Table 6. Results of the Independent Samples *t*-test by In-Service Training Needs

Variables	Need (n=109)		No need (n=44)		t (151)	p	η^2
	$\overline{X}$	SD	$\overline{X}$	SD			
Curriculum adaptation patterns	2.80	0.42	2.64	0.43	2.212	0.028*	0,03
Extending	3.99	0.52	3.84	0.56	1.555	0.122	
Omitting	1.74	0.57	1.64	0.62	0.945	0.346	
Replacing/revising	2.66	0.59	2.39	0.60	2.508	0.013*	0,04
Autonomy	3.23	0.61	3.11	0.83	1.041	0.300	
Occupational professionalism	4.11	0.46	3.95	0.51	1.930	0.056	

**p<0.05*

Table 6 indicates that teachers' use of the curriculum adaptation patterns differed significantly by teachers' in-service training needs ($t(151)=2.12$). It was found that the effect size of this difference ($\eta^2=.03$) was low. Teachers who stated that they needed in-service training used adaptation patterns more frequently. Regarding the subscales, there was a significant difference in teachers' use of replacing/revising patterns based on the in-service training needs ($t(151)=2.51$), and the difference was in favor of teachers who needed in-service training. However, the effect size of this statistical difference ($\eta^2= .03$) was low. On the other hand, although teachers with in-service training needs had higher mean scores on the frequency of using adaptations based on extending ($t(151)=1.56$) and omitting ($t(151)=0.95$), the difference was not statistically significant. In terms of teacher autonomy, it was revealed that the teachers with in-service training needs had higher mean scores than others; however, this difference was not significant ($t(151)=1.04$). Similarly, the occupational professionalism levels did not significantly differ by in-service training needs ($t(151)=1.93$).

Table 7 presents the results of ANOVA performed to examine teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns, autonomy, and occupational professionalism based on class size.

Table 7. Results of ANOVA by Class Size

Variables	Class size	$\bar{X}$	SD	F	p	η^2	Diff.
Curriculum adaptation patterns	0-20 [a]	2.94	0.42	5.877	0.003*	0,07	a>b
	21-30 [b]	2.68	0.43				a>c
	31 and more[c]	2.69	0.39				
Extending	0-20 [a]	4.15	0.49	4.719	0.010*	0,,06	a>b
	21-30 [b]	3.84	0.56				a>c
	31 and more[c]	3.90	0.51				
Omitting	0-20 [a]	1.84	0.66	1.542	0.217	-	
	21-30 [b]	1.67	0.57				
	31 and more[c]	1.65	0.52				
Replacing/revising	0-20 [a]	2.80	0.62	4.107	0.018*	0,05	a>b
	21-30 [b]	2.50	0.58				a>c

	31 and more[c]	2.48	0.58				
Autonomy	0-20 [a]	3.29	0.54	4.047	0.019*	0,05	a>c
	21-30 [b]	3.33	0.68				b>c
	31 and more[c]	2.99	0.75				
Occupational professionalism	0-20 [a]	4.21	0.49	3.331	0.038*	0,04	a>b
	21-30 [b]	3.96	0.48				
	31 and more[c]	4.06	0.45				

**p<0.05*

Table 7 indicates that the frequency of teachers' use of curriculum adaptation patterns differed significantly by class size (F=5.807). Class size variables explained a 7% variance in teachers' use of curriculum adaptation patterns and had a medium effect size level (η^2=.07). Teachers who taught in 0-20 classes used all adaptation patterns more frequently than teachers who taught in classes with 21 students and more. The frequency of teachers' use of extending (F=4.719) patterns differed significantly according to the class size, which had a medium effect size level (η^2=.06). Additionally, there was a significant difference in teachers' use of replacing or revising patterns, depending on the class size (F=4.107), which had a low effect size level (η^2=.05). Teachers' frequency of using adaptations for extending and replacing/revising in classes with a size of 0-20 was higher than those in classes with a size of 20-30 and 31 and more. On the other hand, teachers' use of adaptations for omitting did not differ significantly according to class size (F=1.542). Teachers' autonomy levels differed significantly according to the class size (F=4.047). The effect size of this difference (η^2=.05) was low. The level of autonomy of the teachers who taught in 0-20 classes was higher than those who taught in classes with 31 students and more. Additionally, the level of autonomy of the teachers who taught in classes with 21-30 students was higher than those who taught in classes with 31 and more. Teachers' occupational professionalism levels also differed significantly according to the class size (F=3.331), which had a low effect size level (η^2=.04). The occupational professionalism levels of the teachers who taught in classes with 0-20 students were higher than those with 21 students and more.

Relations among Teachers' Curriculum Adaptation Patterns, Autonomy, and Occupational Professionalism

The Pearson correlation coefficients that were calculated to examine the relationships between teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns, autonomy, and occupational professionalism are displayed in Table 8.

Table 8. The Pearson Correlation Coefficients between Teachers' Curriculum Adaptation Patterns, Autonomy, and Occupational Professionalism

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6
Curriculum adaptation patterns (1)	1.00					
Extending (2)	0.63*	1.00				
Omitting (3)	0.75*	0.07	1.00			
Replacing/revising (4)	0.85*	0.37*	0.56*	1.00		
Autonomy (5)	0.27*	0.27*	0.14	0.20*	1.00	
Occupational professionalism (6)	0.25*	0.50*	0.01	0.07	0.44*	1.00

**p<0.05*

Results indicated a positive, low-level, significant relationship (r=0.27) between teachers' use of adaptation patterns and teacher autonomy. Furthermore, it was found that there was a positive and low-level relationship (r=0.25) between teachers' use of adaptation patterns and occupational professionalism. There was a positive and moderate relationship (r=0.37) between the teachers' use of adaptations for extending and the levels of use of adaptations for replacing/revising. It can be stated that there was a positive and low-level significant relationship (r=0.27) between teachers' use of the extending pattern and teacher autonomy. There was a positive and moderate significant correlation (r=0.50) between teachers' occupational professionalism and the frequency of making extensions. There was a positive, moderate, and significant relationship between teachers' use of adaptations for omitting and adaptations for replacing/revising (r=0.56). A positive, and significant relationship existed between teacher autonomy and occupational professionalism levels (r=0.44).

Prediction of Curriculum Adaptation Patterns

Multiple linear regression analysis was performed for the overall scale and three subscales to investigate the effect of teachers' autonomy and occupational professionalism on teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns. Results are presented in Table 9.

Table 9. Regression Analysis Results regarding the Prediction of Curriculum Adaptation Patterns

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	β	t	p	R^2	F	p
Curriculum adaptation patterns	Autonomy	0.194	2.24	0.027*	0.09	7.77	0.00*
	Occupational professionalism	0.167	1.928	0.056			
Extending	Autonomy	0.059	0.756	0.451	0.25	25.29	0.00*
	Occupational professionalism	0.473	6.02	0.00*			
Omitting	Autonomy	0.165	1.837	0.068	0.02	1.68	0.10
	Occupational professionalism	-0.069	-0.770	0.443			
Replacing/ revising	Autonomy	0.208	2.334	0.021*	0.04	3.12	0.04*
	Occupational professionalism	-0.02	-0.224	0.823			

**p<0.05*

The regression model established to predict teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns based on occupational professionalism and autonomy beliefs was significant (F=7.77). These predictive variables explained 9% of the total variance in teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns. It was determined that teacher autonomy (β=0.194), one of the predictive variables, was a significant predictor of the level of curriculum adaptation. On the other hand, it was determined that occupational professionalism (β=0.167) was not a significant predictor. In general, it can be stated that the model was significant while the variance it explained was low.

The regression model established for predicting teachers' use of the extending pattern based on their occupational professionalism and autonomy beliefs was significant (F=25.29). Together, these predictive variables explained 25% of the total variance in teachers' use of the extending pattern. It was determined that while occupational professionalism (β=0.473) was a significant predictor, teacher autonomy (β=0.059) was not a significant predictor. In general, the model was significant, and it can be stated that the variance it explained was higher than the other established models.

It was determined that teachers' occupational professionalism and autonomy beliefs did not have significant relationships with teachers' use of the omitting pattern (F=1.68). The predictive variables of teachers' occupational professionalism and autonomy beliefs together explained 2% of the variance in teachers' use of the omitting pattern. In short, teacher autonomy (β=0.165) and occupational professionalism (β= -0.069) were not significant predictors of adaptations for omitting.

The regression model established to predict teachers' use of replacing/revising patterns based on the variables of teachers' occupational professionalism and autonomy beliefs was significant (F=3.12). Together, these predictive variables explain 4% of the total variance in teachers' use of replacing/revising pattern. It was determined that teacher autonomy (β=0.208), one of the predictive variables, was a significant predictor of teachers' use of replacing/revising pattern. It was determined that the teachers' occupational professionalism variable (β=0.02) was not a significant predictor variable. In general, it can be stated that the model was significant, whereas the variance it explained was low.

DISCUSSION

This study investigated the relationships between teacher autonomy, occupational professionalism, and teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns. It also examined whether these dependent variables differed by the independent variables, including teachers' graduation degree, school type, subject area, in-service training needs, and class size. As a result, it was determined that the most frequently used adaptation pattern was extending

while the least frequently used pattern was omitting. That is, teachers avoided omitting or neglecting any components of the curriculum. Instead, they put extra effort into making additions by extending. This may result from teachers' efforts to meet the minimum requirements of the curricula. They might regard all components as necessary, or they believe that it is an obligation for them to use the formal curriculum as it is because of the centralized education system. There are parallel results in the literature. Burkhauser and Lesaux (2017) also revealed that teachers tended to add or extend existing activities instead of omitting any activity or certain parts. Some studies also found the same order in terms of the adaptation patterns (Bümen & Holmqvist, 2022; İlhan & Bümen 2023; Yazıcılar Nalbantoğlu, 2021). In these studies, the most frequently used adaptation patterns were extending, revising, and omitting, respectively. According to İlhan and Bümen (2023), making omissions less is natural for a country that has been centrally managed since its establishment, while making more extensions may indicate that the resources need to be supported or extended, as argued by Yazıcılar Nalbantoğlu (2021).

It was determined that teachers' scores obtained from the curriculum adaptation patterns scale did not show a significant difference based on graduation degree and subject area variables. On the other hand, it was found that the school type created a significant difference in the adaptation patterns. Although the effect size was small, teachers working in private schools used all patterns of adaptation more frequently than other teachers. Similarly, İlhan and Bümen (2023) also determined that teachers' adaptation patterns also showed significant differences based on the school type in favor of teachers working in private secondary schools. Regarding teachers' need for in-service training, another independent variable of the study, there was a significant difference in teachers' use of adaptation patterns with a low effect size. Teachers who stated they had in-service training needs used curriculum adaptation patterns more frequently than other teachers. The class size variable also resulted in a significant difference in the use of adaptation patterns with a medium effect size. The frequency of use of teachers whose class size was between 0 and 20 students was found to be higher. Otukile-Mongwaketse et al. (2016), focusing on teachers' understanding of curriculum adaptations, concluded that large class

size was one factor that made it impossible to adapt curriculum effectively. Akbulut-Taş (2022) also found that crowded classrooms were among the factors related to the school and teachers that influenced teachers' fidelity to the curriculum.

Regarding the subscales of the curriculum adaptation patterns, it was found that none of the adaptation patterns differed by teachers' graduation degree. As a contradictory finding, Karakuyu (2023) found that there was a significant difference in teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns in the replacing or revising dimension in favor of the teachers with a bachelor's degree. School type resulted in a significant difference in teachers' use of the extending and replacing/revising patterns, while the effect sizes were medium and small, respectively. That is, teachers working in private schools frequently made extensions and replacements or revisions while using the curriculum compared to those working in public schools. On the other hand, the frequency of omissions did not differ based on school type. Teachers' use of the extending pattern also differed significantly according to the subject area. While the effect size was low, it was revealed that classroom teachers used extensions more frequently than branch teachers. Among all adaptation patterns, only replacing and revising patterns differed significantly by the need for in-service training with a low effect size. Teachers who stated that they needed in-service training often made revisions/replacements compared to teachers who did not. On the other hand, regarding the class size, it was found that when the class size increased, teachers made extensions and revisions/replacements less frequently, and the difference was significant. While class size resulted in a low-level effect size for teachers' use of replacing or revising patterns, it was a medium-level effect size for extending patterns. Overall, results indicate that the contextual factors need consideration, particularly for the frequency of extensions, replacements, or revisions, since they were found to be influenced by the subject of the course, the number of students in the classroom, and whether the school was private or public.

Teacher autonomy did not differ by the independent variables of graduation, school type, subject area, and in-service training needs. However, it was found that teachers' autonomy levels differed significantly according to class size. Although the effect size

was low, the autonomy level of the teachers who taught in 0-20 classes was higher than those who taught in classes with 31 students or more. Additionally, the autonomy level of teachers who taught in classes with 21-30 students was higher than those who taught in classes with 31 and more. There are both parallel and contradictory findings in the related studies. For instance, Buyruk and Akbaş (2021) found that teacher autonomy did not differ by teachers' subject area and graduation. On the other hand, Khezerlou (2014) found that teachers with undergraduate degrees had higher levels of curriculum autonomy than teachers with graduate degrees. Regarding those independent variables, it can be concluded that there is a need for further research.

Teachers' occupational professionalism did not differ by graduation, subject area, and in-service training needs. In contrast, significant differences were found in professionalism based on the school type and class size. For the school type, the effect size was at the medium level, and teachers working in private schools had higher mean scores regarding occupational professionalism. Furthermore, the occupational professionalism levels of the teachers who taught in classes with 0-20 students were higher than those with 20-30 students. Buyruk and Akbaş (2021) also found that graduation did not result in a significant difference in occupational professionalism, whereas the subject area variable resulted in a significant difference in occupational professionalism in favor of classroom teachers.

It was found that the relationship between teacher autonomy and adaptation patterns scale as a whole and its subscales were low. A low and medium level of relations were found between teachers' occupational professionalism and adaptation patterns scale and the extending subscale, respectively. Moreover, there was also a moderate relationship between occupational professionalism and teacher autonomy. The models established for predicting the curriculum adaptation scale and its subscales by the variables of teacher autonomy and occupational professionalism were found to be significant, except for the omitting subscale. Among these models, the highest variance was obtained in the model for predicting the subscale of extending. In this model, teachers' autonomy and occupational professionalism significantly explained teachers' use of the extending

pattern, and occupational professionalism was a significant predictor. As teachers' occupational professionalism levels increased, the frequency of extensions in the curriculum also increased. On the other hand, the regression model established for the overall scale and the patterns of replacing/revising was significant, but the explained variance was very low, and it was determined that teacher autonomy was a significant predictor in those models.

There are limited findings in the literature regarding the link between autonomy and adaptation patterns. For instance, Yazıcılar Nalbantoğlu et al. (2022) also found that there is a low level of significant relationship between the extending and omitting patterns and teacher autonomy and explained this finding with teachers' lack of confidence in making adaptations or their preference to avoid responsibility. Tokgöz Can and Bümen (2021) also revealed correlations between teachers' autonomy scores and adaptation patterns. They found that teachers with a low level of autonomy preferred making replacements or revisions rather than extending and omitting as they tried to stick to the curriculum and avoid omitting while enacting the curriculum (Tokgöz Can & Bümen, 2021). Previous studies also yielded parallel results regarding the relationship between professionalism and autonomy. One belongs to Buyruk and Akbaş (2021), who revealed a moderate, positive, and significant correlation between teachers' occupational professionalism and autonomy. The subscales of teacher autonomy explained 34% of the variance for teacher professionalism. Karatay et al. (2020) also found a moderate significant relationship between teacher professionalism and teaching autonomy behaviors. Teacher autonomy explained 43% of the total variance for occupational professionalism. Pearson and Moomaw (2005) and Genç (2022) also determined a positive relationship between teacher autonomy and professionalism.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This study has added to the literature on curriculum adaptation by investigating the relationships between teacher autonomy, occupational professionalism, and teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns. It has also extended current knowledge of the factors

influencing curriculum adaptation by performing analysis based on teachers' graduation degree, school type, subject area, in-service training needs, and class size. Based on the results regarding independent variables, this study offers practical implications for effective curriculum implementation. Firstly, it can be concluded that the influence of school type and class size is noteworthy since these variables resulted in significant differences in teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns, except for omitting. Therefore, teachers in public schools could be supported through in-service training programs for curriculum adaptation. Furthermore, keeping the class size to a minimum could also contribute to the type and frequency of adaptation pattern use. On the other hand, the difference between teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns based on teachers' in-service training needs is interesting and requires further investigation as it was in favor of those who had higher levels of needs. This result might stem from the questions or problems teachers faced while trying to revise the curriculum. Teachers' efforts to make revisions might help them realize their strengths and weaknesses regarding how to implement and adapt the curricula. Although the results of this study confirmed that there are significant relations between teacher autonomy, professionalism, and curriculum adaptation patterns, it should be noted that there are low or medium-level relations between teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns, autonomy, and occupational professionalism, and enhancing teachers' autonomy and professionalism could only have a small effect on how teachers adapt the curricula.

Overall, this study mainly focused on teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns to contribute to previous research on the factors influencing curriculum use and adaptation. Previous research on the correlation between curriculum adaptation, autonomy, and professionalism is quite limited, and there is a need for increasing the number of similar studies exploring the links between teacher and curriculum resources. Furthermore, this current study was limited to quantitative data, and the relationship among the variables needs qualitative data support. In this aspect, mixed method studies can be conducted to better grasp how autonomy and professionalism influence curriculum adaptation. This may also result in realizing other independent variables that have a greater influence on

curricular adaptations. In order to have a better understanding, in addition to using the scale to determine curriculum adaptation patterns, data can be enriched with observations and documents, including lesson plans and other materials, to have a different data source other than the self-report data.

REFERENCES

Agodini, R., & Harris, B. (2016). How teacher and classroom characteristics moderate the effects of four elementary math curricula. *The Elementary School Journal, 117*(2), 216-236. https://doi.org/10.1086/688927

Akar, H., & Kandemir, A. (2023). Emergent educational policies towards mainstreaming migrants in public education: the case of Turkey. In S. S. Singh, O. Jovanović, and M. Proyer (Eds.), *Perspectives on transitions in refugee education: ruptures, passages, and re-orientations* (pp. 47–62). Verlag Barbara Budrich. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv32bm1gz.7

Akbulut-Taş, M. (2022). An investigation of curriculum adaptation efforts of teachers working in disadvantaged secondary schools. *Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction, 12*(1), 10-24. https://doi.org/10.47750/pegegog.12.01.02

Aprile, A.E. (1998). Professional autonomy. *CRNA, 9*(1), 10-8.

Bernard, A. M. (2017). *Curriculum decisions and reasoning of middle school teachers*. [PhD dissertation, Brigham Young University]. http://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/6488

Bowen, N. K., & Guo, S. (2012). *Structural equation modeling.* Oxford University Press.

Boyt, T. E., Lusch, R. F., & Naylor, G. (2001). The role of professionalism in determining job satisfaction in professional services: A study of marketing researchers. *Journal of Service Research, 3*(4), 321–330. https://doi.org/10.1177/109467050134005

Brown, M. W. (2009). The teacher-tool relationship: Theorizing the design and use of curriculum materials. In J. T. Remillard, B. A. Herbel-Eisenmann, & G. M. Lloyd (Eds.), *Mathematics teachers at work: Connecting curriculum materials and classroom instruction* (pp. 17–36). Routledge.

Bull, B. L. (1988, April 5-9). *The nature of teacher autonomy* [Paper presentation]. Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA, USA.

Burkhauser M.A., & Lesaux, N.K. (2017). Exercising a bounded autonomy: novice and experienced teachers' adaptations to curriculum materials in an age of accountability. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 49*(3), 291-312. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2015.1088065

Buyruk, H., & Akbaş, A. (2021). An analysis on the relationship between teachers' occupational professionalism and their autonomy. *Education and Science, 46*(208), 431-451. http://dx.doi.org/10.15390/EB.2021.9996

Bümen, N., & Holmqvist M. (2022). Teachers' sense-making and adapting of the national curriculum: A multiple case study in Turkish and Swedish contexts. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 54*(6), 832-851. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2022.2121178

Bümen, N., & Yazıcılar, Ü. (2020). A case study on the teachers' curriculum adaptations: Differences in state and private high school. *Gazi University Journal of Education, 40*(1), 183-224. https://doi.org/10.17152/gefad.595058

Bümen, N.T., Çakar, E., & Yıldız, D.G. (2014). Curriculum fidelity and factors affecting fidelity in the Turkish context. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, *14*(1), 203-228. https://doi.org/10.12738/estp.2014.1.2020

Debarger, A.H., Penuel, W.R., Moorthy, S., Beauvineau, Y., Kennedy, C.A., & Boscardin, C.K. (2017). Investigating purposeful science curriculum adaptation as a strategy to improve teaching and learning. *Science Education, 101*(1), 66-98. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21249

Demir, O. (2023). An analysis of the relationship between professional autonomy and professional motivation of teachers. *Education and Science, 48*(213), 231-254. http://dx.doi.org/10.15390/EB.2023.11700

Demirkasımoğlu, N. (2010). Defining "teacher professionalism" from different perspectives. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 9*, 2047-2051.

Drake C., & Sherin M. G. (2006). Practicing change: Curriculum adaptation and teacher narrative in the context of mathematics education reform. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 36(2), 153-187. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2006.00351.x

Durdukoca, S.F. (2021). Teachers' commitment to the curriculum and relevant parent opinions: A case study on Turkey. *International Journal of Progressive Education, 17*(4), 222-238. https://doi.org/10.29329/ijpe.2021.366.14

Edwards, R. (2011). Translating the prescribed into the enacted curriculum in college and school. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 43(1), 38-54. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-5812.2009.00602.x

Ertay, I. (2022). *An analysis of teacher self-efficacy and teacher autonomy in relation to a new distance learning era* (Thesis No: 773985) [Master's Thesis, Gaziantep University]. Turkish Council of Higher Education Theses Center.

Evans, L. (2008). Professionalism, professionality and the development of education professionals. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, *56*(1), 20–38. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20479569

Evans, L. (2011). The 'shape' of teacher professionalism in England: Professional standards, performance management, professional development, and the changes proposed in the 2010 White Paper. *British Educational Research Journal, 37*, 851–870. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23077054

Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. Sage.

Forbes, C. T. (2013) Curriculum-dependent and curriculum-independent factors in preservice elementary teachers' adaptation of science curriculum materials for inquiry-based science. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 24(1), 179-197. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-011-9245-0

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. R. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th ed.) McGraw-Hill.

Frostenson, M. (2015) Three forms of professional autonomy: Deprofessionalisation of teachers in a new light. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*, 2015(2), 28464. https://doi.org/10.3402/nstep.v1.28464

Genç, B. (2022). *Teacher autonomy and its relation with teacher professionalism, reflection and self-efficacy: A sample of high school EFL teachers in Çorum* (Thesis No: 722811) [Master's Thesis, Uludağ University]. Turkish Council of Higher Education Theses Center.

Gelmez-Burakgazi, S. (2020). Curriculum adaptation and fidelity: A qualitative study on elementary teachers' classroom practices. *Issues in Educational Research, 30*(3), 920- 942.

Grenville-Cleave, B., & Boniwell, I. (2012). Surviving or thriving? Do teachers have lower perceived control and well-being than other professions? *Management in Education, 26*(1), 3-5. https://doi.org/10.1177/0892020611429252

Han L. (2020). On the relationship between teacher autonomy and learner autonomy. *International Education Studies, 13*(6), 153-162. https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v13n6p153

Huang, J. (2005). Teacher autonomy in language learning: A review of the research. In K. R. Katyal, H. C. Lam, & X. Ding (Eds.), *Research studies in education* (pp. 203-218). Office of Research, Faculty of Education, University of Hong Kong.

Hoyle, E. (2001). Teaching: Prestige, status and esteem. *Educational Management & Administration, 29*(2), 139-152. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263211X010292001

Hyslop-Margison, E. J., & Sears, A. M. (2010). Enhancing teacher performance: The role of professional autonomy. *Interchange 41*, 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10780-010-9106-3

Ingersoll, R.M., & Collins, G.J. (2018). The status of teaching as a profession. In J. Ballantine, J. Spade, & J. Stuber (Eds.), *Schools and society: A sociological approach to education* (pp. 199-213). Pine Forge Press/Sage Publications.

Işık, U. (2022). *Examination of elementary school teachers' self-efficacy beliefs, curriculum autonomy and referral behaviors for special education* (Thesis No: 744287) [Master's Thesis, Aydın Adnan Menderes University]. Turkish Council of Higher Education Theses Center.

İlhan, B., & Bümen, N. T. (2023). Secondary school teachers' curriculum adaptations: Patterns, causes, and consequences. *TEBD, 21*(1), 303-334. https://doi.org/10.37217/tebd.1181074

Johnson, D. N. (1991). *Principal vision, environmental robustness, and teacher sense of autonomy in high schools* (Publication No: 9204372) [Doctoral dissertation, Portland State University]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global. https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.1320

Kayri, M. (2009). Araştırmalarda gruplar arası farkın belirlenmesine yönelik çoklu karşılaştırma (post-hoc) teknikleri. *Fırat University Journal of Social Science*, 19(1), 51-64.

Kara, M., & Bozkurt, B. (2022). The examination of the relationship between teacher autonomy and teacher leadership through structural equation modeling. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research*, *9*(2), 299-312. https://doi.org/10.33200/ijcer.1037128 Karakuyu, A. (2023). Investigation of the teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns. *Journal of Social Sciences and Education, 6*(2), 297-324.

Khalil, B., & Lewis, T. (2019). Understanding language teacher autonomy: A critical realist perspective on EFL settings in Turkey. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET), 6*(4), 749-763.Khezerlou, E. (2014). A cross-cultural study of teacher autonomy in curriculum development among Iranian and Turkish EFL teachers. *JALDA, 2*(1), 25-38. https://doi.org/10.22049/JALDA.2014.13516

Kline, R. B. (2005). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling: Methodology in the social sciences.* The Guilford Press.

Korkmazgil, S., & Seferoğlu, G. (2021) Teacher professionalism: Insights from Turkish teachers of English into the motives that drive and sustain their professional practices. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 47*(3), 366-378. https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2021.1897781

Lamb, T. (2008). Learner autonomy and teacher autonomy: Synthesizing an agenda. In T. Lamb & H. Reinders (Eds.), *Learner and teacher autonomy: Concepts, realities, and responses* (pp. 269-284). John Benjamins Publishing.

Leite, C., Fernandes, P., & Figueiredo, C. (2020). National curriculum vs curricular contextualisation: Teachers' perspectives. *Educational Studies 46*(3), 259–272. https://doi.org/10.1080/03055698.2019.1570083

Little, D. (1995). Learning as dialogue: The dependence of learner autonomy on teacher autonomy. *System, 23*(2), 175-81. https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X(95)00006-6

Loucks, S. F. (1983, April 11-15). *Defining fidelity: A cross-study analysis* [Paper presentation]. The annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

MacBeth, J. (2012). *Future of teaching profession.* The Cambridge Network.

MacCallum, R. C., Widaman, K. F., Zhang, S., & Hong, S. (1999). Sample size in factor analysis. Psychological Methods, 4(1), 84–99. https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.4.1.84

Maniates, H. (2010). *When highly qualified teachers use prescriptive curriculum: Tensions between fidelity and adaptation to local contexts* (Publication No: 3413430) [Doctoral Dissertation, University of California]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Mathou, C. (2018) Recontextualizing curriculum policies: a comparative perspective on the work of mid-level actors in France and Quebec. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 50*(6), 789-804. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2018.1513567

Meidl, T., & Meidl, C. (2011). Curriculum integration and adaptation: individualizing pedagogy for linguistically and culturally diverse students. *Current Issues in Education, 14*(1). http://cie.asu.edu/

Mezza, A. (2022). *Reinforcing and innovating teacher professionalism: Learning from other professions, OECD Education Working Papers, No. 276.* OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/117a675c-en

MoNE. (2023). *Monitoring and evaluation system of curricula.* https://mufredat.meb.gov.tr/SSS.aspx

Nalbant, S. (2023). *The relationship between the autonomy of Turkish EFL teachers and their professional burnout* (Thesis No: 793126) [Master's Thesis, Trakya University]. Turkish Council of Higher Education Theses Center.

Nelson, C., & Miron, G. (2005). *Exploring the correlates of academic success in Pennsylvania charter schools.* National Centre for the Study of Privatization in Education.

Nunnally, J. C. (1978*). Psychometric testing*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

OECD. (2011). *PISA in focus, no. 9. School autonomy and accountability: Are they related to student performance?* OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/5k9h362kcx9w-en

OECD. (2016). *Supporting teacher professionalism insights from TALIS 2013, TALIS.* OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264248601-en

Olejnik, S., & Algina, J. (2000). Measures of effect size for comparative studies: *Applications, interpretations, and limitations. Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 241–286. https: //doi:10.1006/ceps.2000.1040

Otukile-Mongwaketse, M., Mangope, B., & Kuyini, A.B. (2016). Teachers' understandings of curriculum adaptations for learners with learning difficulties in

primary schools in Botswana: Issues and challenges of inclusive education. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs, 16*, 169-177. https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12069

Öztürk, İ. H. (2011). Curriculum reform and teacher autonomy in Turkey: The case of the history teaching. *International Journal of Instruction, 4*(2), 113-128.

Pallant, J. (2005). S*PSS survival manual (2nd ed.).* Allen & Unwin.

Parker, G. (2015). Teachers' autonomy. *Research in Education, 93*(1), 19-33. https://doi.org/10.7227/RIE.0008

Parlar, H., & Cansoy, R. (2017). Examining the relationship between teachers' individual innovativeness and professionalism. *International Education Studies, 10*(8), 1-11.

Paulsrud, D., & Wermke, W. (2019). Decision-making in context: Swedish and Finnish teachers' perceptions of autonomy. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 64*(3), 1-22. https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2019.1596975

Pearson, L. C., & Hall, B. C. (1993). Initial construct validation of the teaching autonomy scale. *Journal of Educational Research, 86*(3), 172-177

Pearson, L. C., & Moomaw, W. (2005). The relationship between teacher autonomy and stress, work satisfaction, empowerment and professionalism. *Educational Research Quarterly, 29*(1), 38-54. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ718115

Parcerisa, L., Verger, A., Pagès, M., & Browes, N. (2022). Teacher autonomy in the age of performance-based accountability: A review based on teaching profession regulatory models (2017-2020). *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 30*(100). https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.30.6204

Richardson, J. T. (2011). Eta squared and partial eta squared as measures of effect size in educational research. *Educational research review*, 6(2), 135-147. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2010.12.001

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). The ‘‘what’’ and ‘‘why’’ of goal pursuits: human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*(4), 227–268. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01

Saban, A. (2021). Curriculum development through action research: A model proposal for practitioners. *Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction, 11*(1), 299–354. https://doi.org/10.14527/pegegog.2021.009

Shawer, S. F. (2010). Classroom-level curriculum development: EFL teachers as curriculum-developers, curriculum-makers and curriculum-transmitters. *Teaching and Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies, 26*(2), 173-184. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.03.015

Shawer, S.F., Gilmore, D.P., & Banks-Joseph, S.R. (2009). Learner-driven EFL curriculum development at the classroom level. *The International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 20*, 125-143.

Sherin, M. G., & Drake, C. (2009). Curriculum strategy framework: investigating patterns in teachers' use of a reform-based elementary mathematics curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 41*(4), 467-500. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220270802696115

Short, P. M. (1994). Defining teacher empowerment. *Education, 114*(4), 488-493.

Steh, B., & Pozarnik B. M. (2005). Teachers' perception of their professional autonomy in the environment of systemic change. In D. Beijoard P. C. Meijer, G. Morine-Dershimer, & H. Tillema (Eds.), *Teacher professional development in changing conditions* (pp. 349-363). Springer.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics*. Pearson.

Taşdemircanan, A. (2023). *An analysis of perceived autonomy of teachers and their curriculum literacy levels* (Thesis No: 774173) [Master's Thesis, Sivas Cumhuriyet University]. Turkish Council of Higher Education Theses Center.

Tokgöz, Ö. (2013). *Transformation of centralized curriculum into teaching and learning processes: Teachers' journey of thought curriculum into enacted one* (Thesis No: 345161) [Doctoral Dissertation, Middle East Technical University]. Turkish Council of Higher Education Theses Center.

Tokgöz Can, M., & Bümen, N. T. (2021). Turkish teachers' autonomy in using and adapting curriculum: A mixed methods study. *Issues in Educational Research, 31*(4), 1270-1292.

Troyer, M. (2017). Teachers' adaptations to and orientations towards an adolescent literacy curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 51*(2), 1–27.

Tschannen-Moran, M., Parish, J., & DiPaola, M. F. (2006). School climate and state standards: How interpersonal relationships influence student achievement. *Journal of School Leadership, 16*, 386-415.

Ulaş, J., & Aksu, M. (2015). Development of teacher autonomy scale for Turkish teachers. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences 186*, 344–349. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.023

Yan, H. (2010). A brief analysis of teacher autonomy in second language acquisition. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 1*(2), 175-176.

Yazıcılar Nalbantoğlu, Ü. (2021). *Examining the contributions of a professional development program to teachers in adapting the curriculum to the classroom* (Thesis No: 695410) [Doctoral Dissertation, Ege University]. Turkish Council of Higher Education Theses Center.

Yazıcılar Nalbantoğlu, Ü., Bümen N. T., & Uslu, Ö. (2022). Teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns: A scale development study, *Teacher Development, 26*(1), 94-116. https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2021.1996452

Yazıcılar Nalbantoğlu, Ü. Y., & Bümen, N. T. (2024). Changes in the curriculum adaptation skills of teachers as a result of professional development support: A

Turkish case study. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 137*, 104386. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104386

Yılmaz, K., & Altınkurt, Y. (2014). Validity and reliability study for the occupational professionalism of teachers scale (OPTS). *International Journal of Human Sciences, 11*(2), 332-345.

Yu-hong, J., & Ting, M. (2012). A review of the research on language teacher autonomy. *Sino-US English Teaching*, *9*(4), 1045-1055.

Zeng, Z. (2013). *Pathways to pre-service teachers professional development: insights from teacher autonomy* [Paper presentation]. International Academic Workshop on Social Science. Changsha, Hunan, China. http://dx.doi.org/10.299/iaw-sc.2013.194

GENİŞ ÖZET

Amaç

Bu araştırmada öğretmenlerin programı uyarlama örüntülerinin yordayıcıları olarak öğretmen özerkliği ve mesleki profesyonelliğinin incelenmesi amaçlanmıştır. Bu doğrultuda üç araştırma sorusuna yanıt aranmıştır:

(1) Öğretmenlerin öğretim programı uyarlama örüntüleri, mesleki özerklik ve mesleki profesyonellik düzeyleri mezuniyet, okul türü, branş, hizmet içi eğitim ihtiyacı ve sınıf mevcuduna göre farklılık göstermekte midir?

(2) Öğretmenlerin öğretim programı uyarlama örüntüleri, mesleki özerklikleri ve profesyonellikleri arasında anlamlı ilişkiler var mıdır?

(3) Öğretmen özerkliği ve mesleki profesyonelliği, öğretmenlerin öğretim programı uyarlama örüntülerinin anlamlı yordayıcıları mıdır?

Yöntem

Bu araştırma "Öğretim Programını Uyarlama Örüntüleri Ölçeği", "Öğretmen Özerklik Ölçeği" ve "Öğretmenlerin Mesleki Profesyonelliği Ölçeği"nden alınan puanlara yönelik ilişkinin belirlenmesi amaçlandığından ilişkisel bir araştırmadır. Araştırmanın çalışma grubunu farklı okul türü, branş, kıdem, mezuniyet derecesine sahip 153 öğretmen oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmanın alt problemleri doğrultusunda t testi, ANOVA, korelasyon analizi ve regresyon analizi gerçekleştirilmiştir.

Bulgular

Öğretim programını uyarlama örüntülerine ilişkin bulgular, öğretmenlerin en sık kullandığı uyarlama örüntüsünün genişletme olduğunu, en az kullandıkları örüntünün ise atlama olduğunu göstermiştir. Öğretmenlerin uyarlama örüntüleri okul türü, hizmet içi eğitim, sınıf mevcuduna göre anlamlı farklılık göstermiştir. Öğretmenlerin mesleki profesyonellik düzeyleri okul türüne ve sınıf mevcuduna göre anlamlı farklılık göstermiştir. Öğretmenlerin özerkliği ise yalnızca sınıf mevcudu değişkenine göre anlamlı farklılık göstermiştir. Öğretmen özerkliği ile uyarlama örüntüleri ölçeğinin bütünü ve alt boyutları arasındaki ilişkinin düşük olduğu bulunmuştur. Öğretmenlerin mesleki profesyonelizmi ve uyarlama örüntüleri ölçeği ile onun alt ölçeği olan genişletme örüntüsü arasında sırasıyla düşük ve orta düzeyde ilişkiler belirlenmiştir. Ayrıca, mesleki profesyonellik ile öğretmen özerkliği arasında da orta düzeyde bir ilişki vardır.

Öğretim programını uyarlama ölçeğinin genelinin ve alt ölçeklerinin kullanım sıklıklarının öğretmen özerkliği ve öğretmenlerin mesleki profesyonelliği değişkenleri tarafından yordanmasına yönelik kurulan modellerin atlamaya yönelik uyarlama alt boyutu hariç anlamlı olduğu belirlenmiştir. Bu modellerden en yüksek varyans genişletmeye dayalı uyarlamaları kullanım sıklıklarının yordanmasına ilişkin modelde elde edilmiştir. Öğretmenlerin özerkliği ve mesleki profesyonelliği, genişletmeye dayalı uyarlamaları kullanım sıklıklarını anlamlı düzeyde açıklamaktadır; mesleki profesyonellik anlamlı bir yordayıcıdır. Öte yandan ölçeğin tamamı için kurulan regresyon modeli ve değiştirme/düzeltme örüntüleri anlamlı bulunmuş ancak açıklanan

varyans çok düşük çıkmış ve bu modellerde öğretmen özerkliğinin anlamlı bir yordayıcı olduğu belirlenmiştir.

Tartışma ve Sonuç

Çalışmada en sık kullanılan uyarlama örüntüsünün genişletme olduğu, en az kullanılan örüntünün ise atlama olduğu saptanmıştır. Öğretmenler programın herhangi bir bileşenini atlamaktan veya ihmal etmekten kaçınırken, sıklıkla eklemeler yapmayı tercih etmiştir. Bu durumun, programın asgari gerekliliklerini karşılama çabası, programın tüm bileşenlerinin gerekli olduğuna dair inanış veya programı eksiksiz kullanmanın bir zorunluluk olarak algılanmasının bir sonucu olduğu düşünülmüştür. Alanyazında, ulaşılan bu bulguyu destekleyen araştırmalar olduğu görülmüştür (Burkhauser ve Lesaux, 2017; Bümen ve Holmqvist, 2022; İlhan ve Bümen 2023; Yazıcılar Nalbantoğlu, 2021).

Araştırmada öğretmenlerin kullandığı uyarlama örüntülerinde, görev yaptıkları okul türü ve sınıf mevcudu yönünden anlamlı farklılıklar olduğu belirlenmiştir. Bu bulguya dayalı olarak, devlet okullarında görev yapan öğretmenlere, program uyarlama konusunda destek olacak nitelikte hizmet içi eğitim programları düzenlenmesi ve sınıf mevcudunun minimum düzeyde tutulması yoluyla ise öğretmenlerin programı uyarlama sıklıklarının arttırılabileceği sonucuna varılabilir. Diğer yandan, öğretmenlerin program uyarlama örüntüleri ve yeniden düzenlemeye yönelik uygulamalarında hizmet içi eğitim ihtiyacı daha fazla olan öğretmenlerin lehine anlamlı farklılık olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Bu bulguya dayalı olarak, öğretmenlerin uyarlama ve özellikle yeniden düzenleme yaptıkları süreçte karşılaştıkları güçlüklerin, programı uyarlama konusundaki güçlü ve zayıf yönlerini fark etmelerine katkı sağladığı düşünülmüştür.

Öğretmen özerkliği ile uyarlama örüntüleri ölçeğinin bütünü ve alt boyutları arasındaki ilişkinin düşük olduğu belirlenmiştir. Öğretmenlerin mesleki profesyonelizmi ve uyarlama örüntüleri ölçeği ile onun alt ölçeği olan genişletme örüntüsü arasında sırasıyla düşük ve orta düzeyde ilişkiler bulunmuştur. Ayrıca, mesleki profesyonellik ile öğretmen özerkliği arasında da orta düzeyde bir ilişki olduğu belirlenmiştir. Kurulan modellerden en yüksek varyansın genişletmeye dayalı uyarlamaları kullanım sıklıklarının yordanmasına ilişkin modelde elde edilmesi, özerklik ve mesleki profesyonelliğin genişletmeye dayalı uyarlamaları kullanım sıklıklarını anlamlı düzeyde açıklaması ve bu modelde mesleki profesyonelliğin anlamlı bir yordayıcı olması dikkat çekici bir bulgudur. Mevcut araştırma bulguları ile kıyaslandığında sınırlı sayıda benzer araştırma bulgusu olduğu söylenebilir. Yazıcılar Nalbantoğlu ve diğerleri (2022) genişletme ve atlama örüntüleri ile öğretmen özerkliği arasında düşük düzeyde anlamlı bir ilişki olduğunu belirlemiştir. Paralel biçimde öğretmenlerin mesleki profesyonelliği ile özerkliği arasında orta düzeyde, pozitif ve anlamlı bir ilişki olduğunu ortaya koyan araştırmalar (Buyruk ve Akbaş, 2021; Karatay ve diğerleri, 2020) mevcuttur.

Öneriler

Programı uyarlama, özerklik ve profesyonellik arasındaki ilişkiye dair araştırmalar oldukça sınırlıdır ve öğretmen ile program arasındaki etkileşim ve ilişkileri inceleyen benzer çalışmaların sayısının artırılması katkı sağlayacaktır. Ayrıca bu çalışma nicel verilerle sınırlı olup, değişkenler arasındaki ilişkinin nitel veri ile desteklenmesinde yarar vardır. Bu yönüyle, özerklik ve profesyonelliğin programı uyarlama sürecini nasıl etkilediğinin daha iyi anlaşılması için karma

yöntemli araştırmalar yapılabilir. Bu aynı zamanda program uyarlamaları üzerinde daha büyük etkiye sahip olan diğer bağımsız değişkenlerin fark edilmesiyle de sonuçlanabilir.

ORCID

Özge Ceren ÇELİK ORCID 0000-0003-3280-0654

Melek Gülşah ŞAHİN ORCID 0000-0001-5139-9777

Contribution of Researchers

Both researchers contributed equally to this manuscript.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank all the teachers who participated in the research during the data collection process.

Conflict of Interest

The researchers do not have any personal or financial conflicts of interest with other individuals or institutions related to the research.

Ethics Committee Declaration

This study was conducted with the approval of Gazi University Ethics Commission dated 08.06.2022 and numbered 2022-776.