

The Prediction of the History of Revolution and Kemalism Course Success on LGS Success

Research Article

Ibrahim SARI¹

¹ Dumlupınar University, Faculty of Education, Department of Turkish Language and Social Sciences Education, Kütahya, Turkey, ORCID: 0000--0001-5477-7067

To cite this article: Sari, I. (2019). The Prediction of the History of Revolution and Kemalism Course Success on LGS Success, *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 11 (3), 235-247.

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: 03.01.2019

Available online:
05.07.2019

ABSTRACT

This research was conducted in order to determine the extent to which the students' success in Revolution History and Kemalism predicted LGS success. This research was conducted with quantitative research method on data of 433 students from 4 secondary schools and 12 branches of public schools of Kütahya provincial directorate of education. The data of the study consisted of the fall and spring semester written exam success of the 8th grade of the History of Revolution and Kemalism course in the 2017-2018 academic year and the LGS success scores of the same course. In the analysis of the data, firstly, a correlational analysis was applied and then regression analysis was performed. As a result of the research, a positive, statistically significant relationship was found between .54 and .72 between the first and second written exam achievement scores of the History and Revolution and Kemalism courses of the fall and spring semester. According to the other result, the first and second written exam success scores in the fall semester together explain 48% of the LGS achievement score significantly. Discussion and suggestions were made based on the results of the research.

© 2019 IOJES. All rights reserved

Keywords:

The History of Revolution and Kemalism, Course Success, LGS Success

Introduction

The needs and living standards of humankind, from their own existence to the present day, are continuously making progress. This progress has also made it necessary for man to change and renew himself in a positive way. In addition to this, along with socialization, the responsibilities and certain behaviours expected from the person have come to the fore as part of this necessity. In order to ensure its continuity, society has introduced important rules, and these rules have guided the self-development and progress efforts of individuals. The most important area shaped by these efforts has been the field of education.

¹ Corresponding author's address: Kütahya Dumlupınar University
Telephone: +905058584215
e-mail: ibrahim.sari@dpu.edu.tr
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15345/iojes.2019.03.016>

In this respect, education shows the necessary activities for the individuals to have the knowledge and skills and the formation of their personalities. Education is a social institution and all social institutions realize themselves through certain social units. The social unit formed by education as a social institution is called the "Education System" (Hesapçioğlu, 1998). Education systems also provide students with the ability to live in harmony with the environment through integration with the communities they belong to.

The education system consists of elements such as input, process, output, environment, and feedback as in all other systems. These systems include a number of subsystems. The subsystems of the education system are education levels (Yavuz and Derinbay, 2014). In order to meet the needs of the society, today's Turkish Education System consists of 12 years of compulsory education, in which the individual obtains the citizenship knowledge and skills required by the age, including primary school (4), secondary school (4) and high school (4) and also higher education levels of different levels and periods. The evaluation of the students studying in these levels is another part of the system that should be dealt with.

In our education system, examinations are conducted to determine the extent to which the targeted gains have been achieved by the students, and with the scores obtained as a result of the exams, the students are allowed to pass to the next educational institution. Exams that are applied are required for two reasons. First, the number of students applying to enter the educational institution is higher than the current quota, and the second one is the preferred educational institution that wants to determine the most suitable ones among these students. These examinations which are conducted are important in terms of controlling, controlling, objectively measuring and evaluating the educational activities, ensuring supply-demand balance and determining the targets for the future (Erdoğan, Çiftçili and Meşeci, 2010). In any country, such tests which are performed are criticized by many sections of society. In spite of all these complaints, exams are essential for accurate decisions about students. Society knows two types of exams in practice. The first one is the exams which are developed and activated by teachers in order to measure the student's school success and the exams which include the application of tests called teacher-making. The second one is centrally designed and implemented exams (Büyüköztürk, 2016; Demirel, 2008). The exams which are used in the transition to secondary education of our children and which are known as LGS and are known as YGS and LYS, in brief, are examples of this type of examination.

In the last 50 years, the transitions between school levels are mostly provided by applications in the form of selection and placement tests. These transitions between educational levels were changed from time to time with the effect of political and social agenda. With these change efforts to meet the needs of society and the individual, it was aimed to provide individual, institutional and social transformations in education processes (Fındıkçı, 1998). Also in Turkey, exams such as LGS, YGS, LYS, which are the focus of discussion by relevant and irrelevant broad groups of society and where criticism arrows are directed, are the examinations used for the purpose of ranking the students through the scores obtained. The purpose of these types of examinations is to sort the students according to their success and to place them in specific schools or programs. In our country, the results of almost all exams applied at the national level are used for level-determining purposes.

In Turkey, the history of high school transition from secondary school exams dates back to 1955. In these years, colleges offering education in a foreign language accepted their students according to their exams and since 1964, Science High Schools and since 1985, Anatolian Imam Hatip High Schools and since 1990, Anatolian Teacher High School and The Social Sciences High School, which started to operate in 2003, got involved in the acceptance of students through examinations. In 1999, within the scope of the eight-year uninterrupted education, when the secondary levels of these high schools were closed down and Super High School classes were opened in the normal high schools, all the schools accepting students depending on the

results of a single examination came to agenda and firstly, since 2000, Entrance Examination for High Schools (LGS) has been implemented.

Secondary Education Selection and Placement Exam (OCS) in 2004, Level Determination Exam (SBS) in 2008 and the Transition from Basic Education to Secondary Education Exam in 2013-2014 academic year (TEOG), respectively and finally, in 2018, the Transition System for High Schools (LGS) was put into practice (MEB, 2018). With this examination, students studying in the 8th grade of public and private secondary schools, imam hatip secondary schools and temporary education centres (GEM) were aimed to be placed to science high schools, social sciences high schools, educational institutions that implement projects and Anatolian technical programs of vocational and technical Anatolian high schools.

As mentioned above, the historical changes of the high school transition from secondary school exam in Turkey have brought many innovations and discussions to the agenda. This led many researchers to conduct many types of research about the features of the exams such as the content, validity and reliability of each exam put into place, the validity, scope and classification validity, comparison with other central exams, discussions about the elimination of the exam, the suitability of the exam questions to the program, the success and the student workbook, factors affecting the nature of the questions (Bakırcı and Kırıcı, 2018; Başol and Zabun, 2014; Çevik, 2009; Dinç, Dere and Koluman, 2014; Dinç, Uzun and Shepherd, 2014; Duban and Arısoy, 2017; Erol, 2015; Erol, 2016; Gündüver and Göktaş , 2011; Guzeller, 2005; Guzeller and Kelecioğlu, 2006; Kahveci, 2009; Karadeniz, Eker and Ulusoy, 2015; Karadeniz, Er and Tangulu, 2014; Karakoc and Köse, 2018; Koğar and Aygun, 2015; Ormanlı, Çepni and Ülger , 2018; Özden, Akgün, Çinici, Sezer, Yıldız and Taş, 2014; Özkan, Güvendir and the Seller, 2016; Özkanve Özdemir, 2014; Sarier, 2010; Şad and Şahiner, 2016; ; Yavuz, 2010; Yigittir and Caliskan, 2013).

It can be said that some of these researches are studies to predict the success of the students in the transition to high school examinations. It is observed that studies towards predicting the success of OKS, SBS and TEOG applied at the entrance to high schools are more likely to focus on variables such as exam anxiety, special course, perfectionism, parental attitudes, income, gender, which affect success (Aslan, 2017; Başol and Zabun, 2014; Erol, 2016; Önder, 2016; Özdemir, Yakar and Yavuz, 2017). In addition, it can be said that the number of researches for predicting mathematics success in TEOG examination on a course basis is relatively higher than the other courses (Çelikel and Karakuş, 2017; Dulkadir, 2017; Kesici and Asilioglu, 2017; Yavuz, Odabas and Ozdemir, 2016). This study is highly important in terms of determining the relationship between the success of the LGS exam and the written exams given by the teachers in relation to the History of Revolution and Kemalism course, and it is also very important that the results of the written exams determine how much of the variance in LGS success. In addition, the fact that this study was carried out on the first LGS exam data is important in terms of shedding light on future studies on the LGS exam. In this sense, the aim of this study is to predict the History of Revolution and Kemalism course LGS success of the 8th-grade secondary school students. For this purpose, the following sub-problems were sought.

1. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the students' first and second written exam success scores during the fall and spring semesters and LGS success?
2. Do the first and second written success scores of the Fall and Spring semesters of the History of Revolution and Kemalism course significantly predict LGS success separately and in groups?
 - 2.1. Are the students' first written exam success scores in the fall semester of the History of Revolution and Kemalism course a significant predictor of LGS success?
 - 2.2. Are the students' second written exam success scores in the fall semester of the History of Revolution and Kemalism course a significant predictor of LGS success?

- 2.3. Are the students' first and second written exam success scores in the fall semester of the History of Revolution and Kemalism course a significant predictor of LGS success?
- 2.4. Are the students' first written exam success scores in the spring semester of the History of Revolution and Kemalism course a significant predictor of LGS success?
- 2.5. Are the students' second written exam success scores in the spring semester of the History of the Revolution and Kemalism course a significant predictor of LGS success?
- 2.6. Are the students' first and second written exam success scores in the spring semester of the History of the Revolution and Kemalism course a significant predictor of LGS success?
- 2.7. Are the students' first and second written exam success scores in the fall and spring semester of the History of Revolution and Kemalism course a significant predictor of LGS success?

Method

Research Model

In this study, it was aimed to predict the success of LGS success of the 8th-grade students of the secondary school on the History of Revolution and Kemalism course and for this; the research was conducted by relational research method. In the correlational research method, the relationship between two or more variables is examined (Fraenkel and Wallen, 2000). Relational research is the study of the relationship between two or more variables without any interference in these variables (Neuman, 2006).

Study Group

The population of the study consists of 58 secondary schools and 14,203 students in the city centre of Kütahya. The sample was determined according to the appropriate sampling method. The sample of the study consisted of 433 students from 4 secondary schools and 12 branches in the public schools of Kütahya Provincial Directorate of National Education. The descriptive data for sampling are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic Features of Students Participating in the Research

Demographic Features		Frequency	Percentage	Fall 1st written exam	Fall 2nd written exam	Spring 1st written exam	Spring 1st written exam	LGS	
First Secondary School	Gender	Female	23	69.7	91.36	83.18	77.27	77.27	87.88
		Male	10	30.3					
		Total	33	7.6					
Second Secondary School	Gender	Female	43	43.9	80.77	73.28	68.65	79.32	76.33
		Male	55	56.1					
		Total	98	22.6					
Third Secondary School	Gender	Female	44	51.2	70.49	76.83	58.36	76.10	73.37
		Male	42	48.8					
		Total	86	19.9					
Fourth Secondary School	Gender	Female	99	45.8	79.44	84.56	74.52	77.09	83.10
		Male	117	54.2					
		Total	216	49.9					
Total		433	100						

When Table 1 is examined, it is seen that schools have at least 33 and at most 216 students in the student numbers variable. According to the gender variable, it is seen that 48% (209) of 433 students are female and 52% (224) of them are male students.

Data Collection Tools and Data Collection Process

The data of the study were collected in two stages. Firstly, following the announcement of LGS exam results on 30 June 2018, in the 2017-2018 academic year, 8th grade the History and Revolution and Kemalism course written exam success scores were obtained with the gender variable provided that the identity information of the students was kept confidential from the slips taken by the social studies teachers from the e-school. Subsequently, the number of correct answers of the questions towards the LGS of the same course from the school administration was obtained.

Data Analysis

Pearson correlation coefficient and regression analyses were applied to the obtained data. These analysis techniques were used because the data met the necessary assumptions of parametric tests. Statistical analyses were performed using SPSS Statistics. In the data, the values outside of the + and -2 standard deviations at .05 significance level should be below 5% (Çokluk, Şekercioğlu and Büyüköztürk, 2010). At the .05 significance level, there are 5 values outside the +2 and -2 standard deviations. When the data structure is examined, it is seen that this number is met. It was observed that the data showed normal distribution characteristics and P-Plot graph and histogram graphs showed normal distribution characteristics. In addition, data from the scatter plot was found to be distributed close to homogeneous (Büyüköztürk, 2006; Yurdugül and Askar, 2008). There should be no high correlation between the predictive variables (Tavşanlı, 2005). There is a moderate relationship between the predictive variables. The Durbin-Watson coefficient should be between 1.5 and 2.5 (Kline, 2011). According to the results obtained in the analysis, there is no autocorrelation between the predictive variables. Tolerance and VIF values were also analysed. Tolerance value should be above .01 and VIF value should be 10 or less (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007). When Tolerance and VIF values are evaluated together, there is no high correlation.

Findings

The descriptive statistics of the students about the History of Revolution and Kemalism course on LGS exam are given in Table 2.

Table 2. Descriptive Data on LGS Exams of Students Participating in the Research

School	Exams	Sample	Min.	Max.	Mean	Standard Dev.
First Secondary School	LGS	33	50	100	87.88	14.949
Second Secondary School	LGS	98	10	100	76.33	23.436
Third Secondary School	LGS	86	0	100	73.37	23.445
Fourth Secondary School	LGS	216	20	100	83.10	19.074

When Table 2 is examined, it is seen that while two of the four schools (Ahteri İmam Hatip Secondary School and Linyit Secondary School) have an average success in the 80-90 point range, while the success rate of the other two schools (Atatürk Secondary School and Şule Mete Tetik İmam Hatip Secondary School) is between 70-80 points in the success of the LGS exam, the History of Revolution and Kemalism course.

Findings related to the first sub-problem

Descriptive statistics regarding the relationship between first and second written exam success scores and LGS success scores in fall and spring semesters are given in Table 3.

Table 3. The relationship between the first and second written exam success scores and LGS success in the fall and spring semesters

	LGS	Fall Term 1 st written exam	Fall Term 2 nd written exam	Spring Term 1 st written exam	Spring Term 1 st written exam
LGS	1	.568*	.551*	.655*	.541*
Fall Term 1 st written exam		1	.676*	.660*	.641*
Fall Term 2 nd written exam			1	.634*	.581*
Spring Term 1 st written exam				1	.710*
Spring Term 2 nd written exam					1

(p<0.01)

When the Pearson correlation coefficients given in Table 3 are analysed, it is observed that there is a moderate and statistically significant and positive relationship between the fall semester first (r=.57, p<0.01) and second written exam (r=.56, p<0.01) and the spring semester second written exam success scores (r=.54, p<0.01) and the LGS success scores of the 8th grade students in the History of Revolution and Kemalism course. However, there is a high level of a statistically significant and positive relationship between the first and second written exam success scores and the LGS success scores (r=.66, p<0.01). One of the reasons why the relationships encountered is at these levels can be teachers' thoughts about preparing students for the LGS exam through written exam questions. Another possible reason can be that the contents and the measured properties are similar.

Findings related to the second sub-problem

The analysis of the level of predicting LGS success of the first written exam success scores of the students in the fall semester of the History of Revolution and Kemalism course is given in Table 4.

Table 4. The predictive level of the first written exam success scores of the History of Revolution and Kemalism course in the fall semester

Variables	B	Std. Error	β	R	R ²	Adj. R ²	t	p	F
Constant	26.548	3.825					6.941	.000	
Fall Term 1 st Written Exam	.648	.047	.568	.568	.323	.321	14.326	.000	205.226*

*p<0.01

As it is seen in Table 4, the first written variable of the fall term predicted the success of LGS exam (R² = .32, p < 0.01). Approximately 32% of the variance in LGS exam scores of 8th-grade students in the History of Revolution and Kemalism course is explained by the first written success points of the fall semester. This can be explained by the similarity of the exams in terms of content.

The analysis of the level of predicting LGS success of the second written exam success scores of the students in the fall semester of the History of Revolution and Kemalism course is given in Table 5.

Table 5. The predictive level of the second written exam success scores of the History of Revolution and Kemalism course in the fall semester

Variables	B	Std. Error	β	R	R ²	Adj. R ²	t	p	F
Constant	29.354	3.794					7.737	.000	
Fall Term 2 nd Written Exam	.630	.046	.551	.551	.303	.302	13.700	.000	187.680*

*p<0.01

As can be seen in Table 5, it was determined that the second written variable of the fall semester predicted the success of the LGS test statistically ($R^2 = .30$, $p < 0.01$). It is seen that approximately 30% of the variance in LGS exam scores of 8th-grade students is explained by the second written success scores of the History of Revolution and Kemalism course made by teachers. This can be explained by the similarity of the exams in terms of content as in the first articles.

The analysis of the level of predicting LGS success of the first and second written exam success scores of the students in the fall semester of the History of Revolution and Kemalism course is given in Table 6.

Table 6. The predictive level of the first and second written exam success scores of the History of Revolution and Kemalism course in the fall semester

Variables	B	Std. Error	β	R	R ²	Adj. R ²	t	p	F
Constant	17.853	3.963					4.505	.000	
Fall Term 1 st Written Exam	.430	.062	.360	.611	.374	.371	6.953	.000	128.324*
Fall Term 2 nd Written Exam	.351	.059	.307				5.929	.000	

*p<0.01

When Table 6 is examined, it is seen that when the fall term 1st written exam and fall term 2nd written exam variables are considered as independent variables, it explains about 37% of the variance related to LGS ($R^2 = .37$, $p < 0.01$). In the model, it is seen that the first written exam results of the fall semester and the second written exam results of the fall semester are important predictors in explaining the variance in LGS exam success. When the coefficients were taken into consideration, the relative significance of the predictor variables on the LGS scores was the first written exam in the fall term ($\beta = .36$, $p < 0.01$) and the second written exam in the fall term ($\beta = .31$, $p < 0.01$). One of the possible reasons for the low level of predictions of the second written exam compared to the first written exam may be that the LGS subject distribution has less time.

The analysis of the level of predicting LGS success of the first written exam success scores of the students in the spring semester of the History of Revolution and Kemalism course is given in Table 7.

Table 7. The predictive level of the first written exam success scores of the History of Revolution and Kemalism course in the spring semester

Variables	B	Std. Error	β	R	R ²	Adj. R ²	t	p	F
Constant	33.856	2.678					12.642	.000	
Spring Term 1 st Written Exam	.657	.037	.655	.655	.429	.428	17.994	.000	323.770*

*p<0.01

As can be seen in Table 7, it was determined that the first written variable of spring term predicted the success of LGS exam ($R^2 = .43$, $p < 0.01$). It is seen that approximately 43% of the variance in LGS exam scores of 8th-grade students is explained by the first written exam success scores of the History of Revolution and Kemalism course made by teachers. This finding may indicate that teachers are careful to prepare written exam questions similar and close to LGS exam questions.

The analysis of the level of predicting LGS success of the second written exam success scores of the students in the spring semester of the History of Revolution and Kemalism course is given in Table 8.

Table 8. The predictive level of the second written exam success scores of the History of Revolution and Kemalism course in the spring semester

Variables	B	Std. Error	β	R	R ²	Adj. R ²	t	p	F
Constant	30.969	3.767					8.220	.000	
Spring Term 2 nd Written Exam	.633	.047	.541	.541	.293	.291	13.367	.000	178.665*

*p<0.01

As can be seen in Table 8, the second written exam variable in the spring term predicts the success of LGS exam statistically significant (R² = .29, p <0.01) was determined. It is seen that approximately 29% of the variance in LGS exam scores of 8th-grade students is explained by the second written exam success scores of the History of Revolution and Kemalism course made by teachers. One possible reason for this may be that the topics covered up to this writing have a smaller share in the distribution of subjects in the LGS exam.

The analysis of the level of predicting LGS success of the first and second written exam success scores of the students in the spring semester of the History of Revolution and Kemalism course is given in Table 9.

Table 9. The predictive level of the second written exam success scores of the History of Revolution and Kemalism course in the spring semester.

Variables	B	Std. Error	β	R	R ²	Adj. R ²	t	p	F
Constant	27.609	3.369					8.194	.000	
Spring Term 1 st Written Exam	.548	.051	.546	.664	.441	.438	10.656	.000	169.433*
Spring Term 2 nd Written Exam	.180	.060	.154				3.008	.003	

*p<0.01

When Table 9 is examined, it is seen that when the first written spring and second written exam variables of the spring term are considered as independent variables, it explains 44% of the variance related to LGS (R² = .44, p <0.01). In the model, it is seen that the first written exam results of the spring semester and the second written exam results of spring semester are important predictors in explaining the variance in LGS exam success. When the coefficients were taken into consideration, the relative significance of the predictive variables on LGS scores was the first written exam in spring (β = .55, p <0.01) and the second written exam in spring (β = .15, p <0.01). One of the possible reasons for this may be that the subjects covered by the LGS exam are mostly involved in this period.

The analysis of the level of predicting LGS success of the first and second written exam success scores of the students in the fall and spring semester of the History of Revolution and Kemalism course is given in Table 10.

Table 10. The predictive level of the second written exam success scores of the History of Revolution and Kemalism course in the fall and spring semester.

Variables	B	Std. Error	β	R	R ²	Adj. R ²	t	p	F
Constant	17.068	3.841					4.444	.000	
Fall Term 1 st Written Exam	.185	.064	.155				2.882	.004	
Fall Term 2 nd Written Exam	.168	.058	.146	.689	.475	.470	2.877	.004	96.638*
Spring Term 1 st Written Exam	.418	.056	.417				7.505	.000	
Spring Term 2 nd Written Exam	.072	.062	.061				1.155	.249	

*p<0.01

When Table 10 is examined, it is seen that when the variables of first written exam in fall semester, second written exam in fall semester, first written exam in spring semester and second written exam in spring semester are considered as independent variables, it explains about 48% of variance related to LGS ($R^2 = .48$), $p < 0.01$). In the model, it is seen that the results of the first written exam in the fall semester, second written exam in the fall semester and first written the exam in the spring semester are important predictors in explaining the variance in LGS exam success. When the coefficients were taken into consideration, the relative importance of predictive variables on LGS scores was the first written exam in spring ($\beta = .42$, $p < 0.01$), the first written exam in autumn ($\beta = .16$, $p < 0.01$) and the second written exam in autumn ($\beta = .15$, $p < 0.01$). When all variables are employed, one of the possible reasons for the second written exam of the spring semester to be meaningless in the model may be that the topics covered towards the end of the second semester have less share in the central exam.

Discussion and Conclusion

In the LGS exam, while two of the four schools have an average success of 80-90 points in the success of the History of Revolution and Kemalism course, the average of the other two schools is between 70-80 points. There are many reasons for school differences in success in descriptive data as indicated in the literature. These possible reasons can be any situations such as individual differences, motivation, self-regulation strategies, attitude, examination-oriented stress level, selective attention skills, competence of educational resources in the school, education level of parents, education expenditures for children, number of siblings, housing income, having a working room (Aslan, 2017; Başol and Zabun, 2014; Dulkadir, 2017; Kesici and Aşılıoğlu, 2017; Okutan and Daşdemir, 2018; Özçakır Sümen and Çalışıcı, 2017; Önder, 2016; Yavuz, Odabaş and Özdemir, 2016; Yüksel, Sevim and Çelimli, 2018).

As a result of the study, when the relationships between the variables obtained as a result of the research were examined, it was seen that there was a medium level relationship between 8th grade students in the History of Revolution and Kemalism course fall semester 1st written exam success scores, fall semester 2nd written exam success scores and spring semester 2nd written exam success cores with the Revolution History and Kemalism course LGS success scores and also seen that there was a statistically significant and positive relationship between the 1st written success scores of the spring semester and the Revolution History and Kemalism course LGS success scores. One of the possible reasons for the relationships encountered at these levels may be the teachers' written exam questions and the ideas of preparing students for central examinations (Çelikel and Karakuş, 2017). At the same time, as determined in the studies on the TEOG examination, the central exam, curriculum, and student workbook compliance (Erol, 2015) may also be valid for this exam and may have an important role in the results that have been reached in this case.

At the end of the research, when 32% of the fall semester 1st written exam variable, 30% of the fall semester 2nd written exam variable, 37% of fall semester 1st written exam and fall semester 2nd written exam variables, 43% of the 1st term written exam variable, 29% of the 2nd term written exam variable, 44% of spring term 1st written exam and spring term 2nd written exam variables and fall semester first written exam, fall semester 2nd written exam, spring semester 1st written exam and spring term 2nd written exam variables are assigned as an independent variable, in the LGS exam, it is observed that the variance about the success in the history of Revolution and Kemalism was about 48%. In all these relationships, in non-predictable parts, as indicated in the studies conducted on SBS, the activities to support extra-curricular learning (Gündüver and Gökdaş, 2011; Karadeniz, Er and Tangülü, 2014; Sarier, 2010; Şad and Şahiner, 2016), parental attitude (Ötken and Anıl, 2016), perfectionism, test anxiety (Başol and Zabun, 2014), parents' educational background, and monthly income of the family and daily working time of the students (Yavuz, 2010) may have been effective.

In cases where there is a low relationship, it is also determined in the previous researches about the central examination (SBS), and some of the questions may not be related to the aim of the course, aiming at the skills other than the main skills that the course aims (Tonga, 2014) and being away from the goal of measuring the objectives of the program may have played a role (Çevik, 2009). Again in a study about TEOG, the fact that the number of questions coming from the determined units was not directly proportional to the number of gains and even not asking any questions from some units (Karadeniz, Eker and Ulusoy, 2015) may be among the reasons of low relations. In the researches conducted on the Student Selection Examination for Secondary Education Institutions (OKÖSYS), it is seen that the social studies subtest is not effective in both predicting and classifying or less effective than other tests. (Guzeller and Kelecioğlu, 2006).

Results similar to those of the written exam scores predicting central exam scores have been reported in previous studies on central examinations (Güzeller, 2005; Sarı, 2018). In a study conducted on the TEOG centre exam, it was found that the variable predicting the success of the TEOG exam in Turkish, mathematics, science, religious culture and moral knowledge and social studies subtest was written exam variable (Karakoç and Köse, 2018). Similarly, in previous studies related to central examinations, situations (in the context of TEOG) such as the form of the central examination, the number of questions (Özkan and Özdemir, 2014), the method of examination, the type of question which are similar to the written exams of the mentioned course, and coherence with the course syllabus and activities (Akman, 2017; Erol, 2015; Erol, 2016; Özkan and Karataş, 2016; Yapıcı, 2016), and at the same time, (in the context of SBS) in part, may also be valid for this exam to ensure coverage validity. This may be one of the possible reasons for the results we have reached. Therefore, it can be said that the findings obtained in the research coincide with the literature.

Based on the discussions above, it is important from two perspectives that the results of the written exams prepared by the teachers are an important predictor of the LGS exam sub-test results of the related course. First, it is an indication that the written exam questions prepared by the teachers fit the purpose of the LGS exam questions. The second importance is that it provides information on the scope validity of the central examination for the transition to high schools. Conducting this study in a more comprehensive way in order to predict the success of LGS in the 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th-grade course successes will both increase the widespread effect of the research and will contribute to revealing the principle of stratification of the content emphasized in the curriculum.

REFERENCES

- Akman, O. (2017). *Temel eğitimden ortaöğretime geçiş sınavlarına ilişkin 9. Sınıf öğrencilerinin görüşleri* (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Bartın Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Bartın.
- Aslan, G. (2017). Determinants of Student successes in the transition from basic education to secondary education (TEOG) examination: An analysis related to non-school variables. *Education & Science/Eğitim ve Bilim*, 42(190), 211-236.
- Bakırcı, H. ve Kırıcı, M. G. (2018). Temel eğitimden ortaöğretime geçiş sınavına ve bu sınavın kaldırılmasına yönelik fen bilimleri öğretmenlerinin görüşleri, *YYÜ Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (YYU Journal of Education Faculty)*, 2018; 15(1):383-416.
- Başol, G. ve Zabun, E. (2014). Seviye belirleme sınavında başarının yordayıcılarının incelenmesi: Dershaneye gitme, mükemmeliyetçilik, ana-baba tutumu ve sınav kaygısı. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 14(1), 63-87.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2006). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı*. Pegem Yayıncılık, Ankara.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2016). Sınavlar üzerine düşünceler. *Kalem Eğitim ve İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6 (2), 345-356.
- Çelikel, F. ve Karakuş, M. (2017). TEOG sınavının matematik dersindeki akademik başarıyla ilişkisinin ve matematik dersi öğretim süreci üzerindeki etkilerinin incelenmesi. *NEF-EFMED*, 11(2), 5-18.
- Çevik, E. (2009). *İlköğretim II. kademe sosyal bilgiler dersi öğretmenlerinin yazılı sınav soruları ile seviye belirleme sınavı sorularının programa uygunluğunun incelenmesi* (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Niğde Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Niğde.
- Çokluk, Ö., Şekercioğlu, G. ve Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2010). *Sosyal bilimler için çok değişkenli istatistik: SPSS ve LISREL uygulamaları*. Pegem A Yayıncılık, Ankara.
- Demirel, Ö. (2008). *Kuramdan Uygulamaya Eğitimde Program Geliştirme*. Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık.
- Dinç, E., Dere, İ. ve Koluman, S. (2014). Kademeler arası geçiş uygulamalarına yönelik görüşler ve deneyimler, *Adıyaman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, Yıl : 7, Sayı: 17, 397-423.
- Dinç, E., Uzun, C. ve Çoban, O. (2014) Eğitimde kademeler arası geçişle ilgili öğretmen görüşlerinin incelenmesi, *Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2014, 7/3, 209-234.
- Duban, N. ve Arısoy, H. (2017).8. Sınıf öğrencilerinin temel eğitimden orta öğretime geçiş (TEOG) sınavına ilişkin algılarının metaforlar aracılığıyla incelenmesi, *Kalem Eğitim ve İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 7 (1), 67-98.
- Dulkadir, K. (2017). *Sekizinci sınıf öğrencilerinin matematik sınavı kaygısı* (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Malatya.
- Erdoğan, İ., Çiftçili, V. ve Meşeci-G. F. (2010). *SBS sonuçlarına göre işte ilköğretim*. İstanbul: Kitapsal Basın Yayın.
- Erol, H. (2015). Temel eğitimden ortaöğretime geçiş sınavı (TEOG) T.C inkılap tarihi ve Atatürkçülük dersi sınav sorularının öğrenci çalışma kitabıyla ilişkisi açısından bir inceleme. *Turkish Studies- International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 10(11), 607-628.
- Erol, H. (2016). TEOG sınavında "T.C. İnkılap Tarihi ve Atatürkçülük dersi ile ilgili sorulan sorular hakkında sosyal bilgiler öğretmenlerinin görüşleri. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 15(57), 548-567.
- Fındıkçı, İ. (1998). Bilgi toplumunda eğitim ve öğretmen. *Bilgi ve Toplum Dergisi*, S. 1, s. 83-84.
- Fraenkel, Jack R. ve Norman E. Wallen. (2009). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education*. New York. McGraw-HillCompanies.
- Gültekin, İ. ve Arhan, S. (2014). Seviye belirleme sınavında (SBS) Türkçe alanında sorulan soruların kapsam geçerliliği açısından incelenmesi. İçinde N. Büyükbaş ve F. Güneş (Ed.), *Cumhuriyetin Kuruluşundan Günümüze Eğitimde Kademeler Arası Geçiş ve Yeni Modeller Uluslararası Kongresi* (s.521-554). Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları.
- Gündüver, A. ve Gökdaş, İ. (2011). İlköğretim öğrencilerinin seviye belirleme sınav başarılarının bazı değişkenlere göre incelenmesi. *Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2(1),30-47.

- Güzeller, C. (2005). İlköğretim akademik başarı not ortalamaları ile OKÖSYS alt test puanları arasındaki uygunluk geçerliliği çalışması. *Gazi Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 6(2), 133-143.
- Güzeller, C. ve Kelecioğlu, H. (2006). Ortaöğretim kurumları öğrenci seçme sınavının sınıflama geçerliği üzerine bir çalışma. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 30(30), 140-148.
- Hesapçioğlu, M. (1998). *Öğretim ilke ve yöntemleri*. İstanbul: Beta Yayın ve Dağıtım.
- Kahveci, S. S. (2009). *Ortaöğretim Kurumlarına Geçiş Sisteminde Uygulanan Sınavların Ailelere Maliyetinin Ailelerin Toplam Eğitim Harcamaları İçindeki Payı*, (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Karadeniz, O., Er, H. ve Tangülü, Z. (2014). 8. Sınıf öğrencilerinin SBS'ye yönelik metaforik algıları. *Uluslararası Avrasya Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 5(15), 64-81.
- Karadeniz, O., Eker, C. ve Ulusoy, M. (2015). TEOG sınavındaki T.C. İnkılâp Tarihi ve Atatürkçülük dersine ait soruların kazanım temelli olarak değerlendirilmesi, *Uluslararası Avrasya Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 6(18), 115-134.
- Karakoç, G. ve Köse, İ. A. (2018). İlköğretim akademik başarı ölçüleri ile temel eğitimden ortaöğretime geçiş sınav puanları arasındaki ilişki. *Cumhuriyet International Journal of Education*, 7(2), 121-142.
- Koğar, E. S. ve Aygun, B. (2015). Temel eğitimden orta öğretime geçiş sınavı (TEOG)'nın matematik temel alanına ait testlerin kapsam geçerliğinin incelenmesi, *Pegem Eğitim ve Öğretim Dergisi*, 5(5), 667-680.
- Kesici, A. ve Aşlıoğlu, B. (2017). Ortaokul öğrencilerinin matematiğe yönelik duyuşsal özellikleri ile temel eğitimden ortaöğretime geçiş (TEOG) sınavları öncesi yaşadıkları stresin matematik başarısına etkisi. *KEFAD*, 18(3), 394-414.
- Kline, R. B. (2011). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Kutlu, Ö. ve Karakaya, İ. (2007). Ortaöğretim kurumları öğrenci seçme ve yerleştirme sınavında kullanılan testlerin faktör yapılarının belirlenmesine ilişkin bir araştırma örneği. *İlköğretim Online Dergisi*, 6(3), 397-410,
- MEB, (2018). Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı Ortaöğretime Geçiş Yönergesi. https://www.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2018_03/26191912_yonerge.pdf
- Neuman, W. L. (2006). *Toplumsal araştırma yöntemleri, nitel ve nicel yaklaşımlar* (Ö. Sedef, Çev.). İstanbul: Yayın odası.
- Okutan, S. ve Daşdemir, İ. (2018). Analysis of science success of middle school students in TEOG Exam in terms of some variables. *İnönü University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 19(1), 66-81.
- Ormancı, Ü, Çepni, S. ve Ülger, B. B. (2018). Fen bilimleri öğretmenlerinin ortaöğretime geçiş ortak sınavları hakkındaki görüşleri, *ACJES Academy Journal of Educational Science*, Cilt 2, Sayı 1, 1-15.
- Önder, E. (2016). Okulların eğitsel kaynakları ve TEOG puanları. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 15(58), 837-848.
- Ötken, Ş. ve Anıl, D. (2016). İlköğretim 7. sınıf başarısını yordayan değişkenlerin belirlenmesi. *Anadolu Eğitim Liderliği ve Öğretim Dergisi*, 4(1), 1-15.
- Özçakır Sümen, Ö. ve Çalışıcı, H. (2017). Sekizinci sınıf öğrencilerinin özdüzenleme stratejileri ve motivasyonlarının matematik başarıları üzerindeki yordayıcı etkileri. *Dicle University Journal of Ziya Gokalp Education Faculty*, (30), 566-573.
- Özdemir, A., Yakar, L. ve Yavuz, S. (2017). Matematik dersi dönem sonu puanını oluşturan bileşenlerin incelenmesi: Performans görevlerinin kaldırılması. *Uşak Üniversitesi Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 3(1), 75-91.
- Özden, M., Akgün, A., Çinici, A., Sezer, B., Yıldız, S. ve Taş, M. M. (2014). Merkezi sistem ortak sınav fen bilimleri sorularının Webb'in bilgi derinliği seviyelerine göre analizi, *Adıyaman Üniversitesi Fen Bilimleri Dergisi*, 4 (2), 91-108.

- Özkan, Y., Güvendir, M. ve Satıcı, D. (2016). Temel eğitimden ortaöğretime geçiş (TEOG) sınavının uygulama koşullarına ilişkin öğrenci görüşleri, *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, , 12(6), 1160-1180.
- Özkan, E. ve Karataş, İ. H. (2016). Ortaöğretime geçiş sisteminde yapılan değişikliklere ilişkin öğrenci görüşlerinin analizi. *Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5(1), 225-234.
- Özkan, M. ve Özdemir, E. B. (2014). Ortaokul 8. sınıf öğrencilerinin ve öğretmenlerinin ortaöğretime geçişte uygulanan merkezi ortak sınavlara ilişkin görüşleri. *Tarih Okulu Dergisi*, 7(20), 441-443.
- Sarı, İ. (2018). The prediction of success of TEOG in the History of Revolution and Kemalism course at the stage of transition from TEOG to LGS. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 6(12), 2925-2930.
- Sarıer, Y. (2010). Ortaöğretime giriş sınavları (OKS-SBS) ve PISA sonuçları ışığında eğitimde fırsat eşitliğinin değerlendirilmesi. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 11(3), 107-129.
- Şad, S. N. ve Şahiner, Y. K. (2016). Temel eğitimden ortaöğretime geçiş (TEOG) sistemine ilişkin öğrenci, öğretmen ve veli görüşleri. *İlköğretim Online*, 15(1), 53-76.
- Tabachnick, B. G. ve Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education Inc.
- Tavşancıl, E. (2005). *Tutumların ölçülmesi ve SPSS ile veri analizi*. Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, Ankara.
- Tonga, D. (2014). Seviye belirleme sınavı (SBS) sosyal bilgiler testi üzerine bir değerlendirme. İçinde N. Büyükbaş ve F. Güneş (Ed.), *Cumhuriyetin Kuruluşundan Günümüze Eğitimde Kademeler Arası Geçiş ve Yeni Modeller Uluslararası Kongresi* (s.555-566). Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları.
- Yapıcı, H. (2016). Sosyal bilgiler öğretmenlerinin temel eğitimden ortaöğretime geçiş (TEOG) sınavı hakkındaki görüşleri. *Electronic Turkish Studies*, 11(21), 437-450.
- Yavuz, M. (2010). A study on variables that affect class scores of primary education students in placement test. *İlköğretim Online*, 9(2), 705-713.
- Yavuz, M. ve Derinbay, D. (2014). Türkiye’de ortaöğretime geçiş için bir model önerisi. *Cumhuriyet’in Kuruluşundan Günümüze Eğitimde Kademeler Arası Geçiş ve Yeni Modeller Uluslararası Kongresi*, 16- 18 Ocak / January 2014 Antalya, 181-201.
- Yavuz, S., Odabaş, M. ve Özdemir, A. (2016). Öğrencilerin sosyoekonomik düzeylerinin TEOG matematik başarısına etkisi. *Eğitimde ve Psikolojide Ölçme ve Değerlendirme Dergisi*, 7(1), 85-95.
- Yiğittir, S. ve Çalışkan, H. (2013). Seviye belirleme sınavında (SBS) sosyal bilgiler alanında sorulan soruların kapsam geçerliği açısından incelenmesi. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 42(197), 145-157.
- Yurdugül, H. ve Askar, P. (2008). An investigation of the factorial structures of pupils’ attitude towards technology (PATT): A Turkish sample. *Primary Education Online*, 7(2), 288-309.
- Yüksel, M. Y., Sevim, E. ve Çelimli, Ç. (2018). Examination of the relationship between test anxiety and selective attention among adolescents. *Elementary Education Online*, 17(2), 864-873.