International Journal of Education, Vocational and Social Science
https://e-journal.citakonsulindo.or.id/index.php/IJEVSS
E-ISSN : 2963 4954
IJEVSS

Development Of Curriculum Validation Instruments For Educational Units (KSP) In Schools Of Selayar Islands Regency

Sirajuddin[1]
[1]Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia
Syahrul[2]
[2]Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia
Patahuddin[3]
[3]Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: Sirajuddin.tapa@gmail.com ; syahrul@unm.ac.id; patahuddin@unm.ac.id

Abstract

This study aims to develop a standardized validation instrument for the School-Based Curriculum (Kurikulum Satuan Pendidikan/KSP) in schools of the Selayar Islands Regency to address the absence of objective and consistent evaluation tools. The research employed a Research and Development (R&D) approach by adapting the Borg and Gall model, which includes stages of preliminary study, planning, product development, expert validation, limited and large-scale trials, revision, and finalization. The instrument was designed based on the 2025 revised curriculum guidelines and consists of five factors with 30 items. Data were analyzed using content validity (Aiken's V), construct validity through Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), reliability tests using McDonald's Omega and Cronbach's Alpha, as well as practicality and effectiveness assessments through user responses. The results indicate that the instrument has very high content validity (Aiken's V = 0.971), strong construct validity with factor loadings ≥ 0.50, excellent reliability (ω = 0.948; α = 0.939), and very high practicality (96.8%) and effectiveness. The instrument is proven to be accurate, consistent, easy to use, and capable of improving the quality of curriculum documents, making it suitable for implementation by school supervisors, principals, and curriculum development teams.

Keywords: Curriculum Validation, School-Based Curriculum (KSP), Instrument Development, Educational Evaluation

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License

International Journal of Education, Vocational and Social Science
https://e-journal.citakonsulindo.or.id/index.php/IJEVSS
E-ISSN : 2963 4954
IJEVSS

INTRODUCTION

The curriculum is one of the most fundamental components in the implementation of education, as it determines the direction, content, and process of learning within educational institutions. It serves as a primary guideline for all stakeholders in designing, implementing, and evaluating educational activities. The quality of education is largely influenced by how well the curriculum responds to students' needs and aligns with the demands of societal and technological developments. Therefore, curriculum management at the educational unit level must be conducted systematically, continuously, and based on clear standards. In this context, the Educational Unit Curriculum (Kurikulum Satuan Pendidikan/KSP) plays a crucial role as the main document that reflects the vision, mission, objectives, and learning structure of a school, developed based on its characteristics, regional potential, and learners' needs (Suh & Ahn, 2022).

In line with national education policies, particularly Law Number 20 of 2003 concerning the National Education System and Government Regulation Number 57 of 2021 on National Education Standards, schools are granted autonomy to develop their own curricula. This autonomy provides opportunities for schools to design contextual and innovative curricula; however, it also presents challenges, particularly in ensuring that the developed curriculum meets national standards and is effectively implemented. In practice, many schools still face difficulties in aligning curriculum documents with actual classroom implementation. Often, curriculum documents are prepared merely to fulfill administrative requirements without thorough analysis of school needs and context. This results in discrepancies between planning and practice, which ultimately affects the quality of learning outcomes(Tashtoush et al., 2024) .

One of the main factors contributing to this issue is the absence of a standardized instrument for validating the Educational Unit Curriculum. Currently, curriculum evaluation is often conducted subjectively, depending on individual interpretations, which can lead to inconsistent and unreliable results. As a consequence, schools encounter challenges in identifying weaknesses and making targeted improvements to their curricula. Evaluation processes tend to be formalities carried out during accreditation or supervision, rather than being integrated into a continuous quality improvement cycle. Ideally, curriculum evaluation should be systematic, data-driven, and accountable, forming part of an ongoing cycle of planning, implementation, evaluation, review, and revision(Lambriex-Schmitz et al., 2020) .

Furthermore, the rapid changes in national curriculum policies, from the School-Based Curriculum (KTSP) to the 2013 Curriculum and the current Merdeka Curriculum, intensify the need for a reliable validation instrument. Each policy shift requires schools to adjust their curriculum

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License

documents accordingly. Without a standardized validation tool, these adjustments may be carried out inconsistently, potentially compromising the quality of education. In addition, limitations in human resources and inadequate understanding of curriculum development principles among educators further exacerbate the problem. Many educators still perceive the curriculum merely as an administrative document rather than as a comprehensive framework guiding the teaching and learning process (Nguyen & Habók, 2024).

Another critical issue lies in the supervisory process conducted by school inspectors and education authorities. In many cases, supervision focuses primarily on document completeness rather than on the substantive quality of the curriculum. This is largely due to the lack of standardized instruments that can objectively assess curriculum quality. As a result, supervision becomes administrative rather than developmental, limiting its effectiveness in improving educational quality. A well-developed validation instrument would provide clear criteria and indicators, enabling supervisors to conduct more objective, consistent, and comprehensive evaluations, as well as offer constructive feedback to schools(Cebrián et al., 2021) .

Considering these challenges, the development of a standardized curriculum validation instrument becomes highly urgent. Such an instrument would enable schools to conduct self-assessment, assist supervisors in providing objective evaluations, and support education authorities in making data-driven decisions. Moreover, it would strengthen the implementation of the Internal Quality Assurance System (SPMI), particularly in ensuring that the evaluation stage is conducted effectively as part of the continuous improvement cycle. From a theoretical perspective, this study also contributes to the limited body of research on curriculum validation instruments, as most existing studies focus on curriculum implementation rather than instrument development. Therefore, this research aims to develop a valid, reliable, practical, and effective instrument for validating the Educational Unit Curriculum, particularly in the context of assisted schools in Selayar Islands Regency, thereby supporting continuous improvement in educational quality.

Concept and Development of the Educational Unit Curriculum (KSP)

The concept of curriculum is fundamentally defined as a structured plan that guides educational objectives, content, learning processes, and evaluation. According to national education regulations, the curriculum is not merely a document but a comprehensive framework that shapes students' learning experiences. In the context of Indonesia, the Educational Unit Curriculum (Kurikulum Satuan Pendidikan/KSP) represents a decentralized approach that allows

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License

schools to design their own curriculum based on internal and external characteristics. This includes students' needs, regional potential, socio-cultural context, and institutional vision and mission. The KSP is expected to function not only as an administrative requirement but also as a "living document" that evolves through continuous reflection and improvement(Macrides et al., 2022).

The development of KSP is grounded in several key principles. First, it must align with the National Education Standards, including graduate competency standards, content standards, process standards, and assessment standards. Second, it should be contextual and responsive to local needs, ensuring relevance to students' real-life environments. Third, it must be flexible and adaptive to policy changes, such as the transition from the 2013 Curriculum to the Merdeka Curriculum. These principles emphasize that curriculum development is not a one-time activity but a cyclical process involving planning, implementation, evaluation, and revision(Tobón et al., 2020).

In practice, however, many schools face challenges in developing KSP effectively. One major issue is the tendency to replicate curriculum documents from other schools without conducting proper contextual analysis. This leads to a lack of alignment between curriculum design and actual learning practices. Additionally, there is often a gap between what is written in the curriculum document and what is implemented in classrooms. For instance, learning plans may not reflect actual teaching strategies, and character development programs may exist only on paper. These issues highlight the need for a more systematic and guided approach to curriculum development, supported by clear standards and evaluation mechanisms.

Curriculum Evaluation and Validation in Educational Practice

Curriculum evaluation is a critical component of the educational process, as it ensures that the curriculum functions effectively in achieving its intended goals. Evaluation is not limited to assessing learning outcomes but also involves examining the relevance, coherence, and implementation of the curriculum itself. In the KSP framework, evaluation is part of a continuous cycle that includes planning, implementation, evaluation, review, and improvement. This cycle reflects the principle of continuous quality improvement in education(R. Chen et al., 2020).

One of the essential aspects of curriculum evaluation is validation, which refers to the process of assessing whether a curriculum meets established standards and is suitable for implementation. Validation should be conducted systematically, using clear criteria and measurable indicators. It involves evaluating key components such as the alignment of vision and

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License

mission with educational goals, the coherence of curriculum structure, the relevance of learning content, and the effectiveness of assessment methods.

However, the implementation of curriculum validation in schools often faces significant challenges. One major problem is the lack of standardized instruments for conducting validation. As a result, evaluation processes are frequently subjective and inconsistent, relying on individual interpretations rather than objective criteria. This subjectivity can lead to discrepancies in evaluation results and hinder efforts to improve curriculum quality. Furthermore, evaluation activities are often carried out only during accreditation or supervision processes, rather than being integrated into regular school practices(Abbas, 2020).

Another challenge is the limited capacity of educators and school staff in conducting curriculum evaluation. Many educators lack a comprehensive understanding of evaluation principles and methods, leading to superficial assessments that focus on document completeness rather than substantive quality. This situation is further compounded by the absence of clear guidelines and tools that can support systematic evaluation. Therefore, the development of standardized validation instruments is essential to ensure that curriculum evaluation is objective, reliable, and meaningful(Foi, 2012).

Instrument Development for Curriculum Validation and Educational Quality Assurance

The development of instruments for curriculum validation is a crucial step in strengthening educational quality assurance systems. An effective validation instrument serves as a tool for assessing curriculum quality in a structured and measurable manner. It provides clear indicators and criteria that guide evaluators in examining various aspects of the curriculum, including its design, implementation, and outcomes. In the context of KSP, a validation instrument should encompass key components such as school vision and mission, curriculum structure, learning organization, instructional planning, and evaluation mechanisms(Karaca et al., 2021).

From a theoretical perspective, a good instrument must meet several criteria, including validity, reliability, practicality, and effectiveness. Validity refers to the extent to which the instrument measures what it is intended to measure. Reliability indicates the consistency of measurement results across different contexts and evaluators. Practicality relates to the ease of use and feasibility of the instrument in real-world settings, while effectiveness refers to its ability to provide useful information for decision-making and improvement(Osman & Yaakub, n.d.).

The process of developing a validation instrument typically follows a systematic research and development (R&D) approach. This includes stages such as needs analysis, design,

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License

development, expert validation, field testing, revision, and finalization. Each stage plays an important role in ensuring that the instrument is scientifically sound and practically applicable. For example, needs analysis helps identify gaps in existing evaluation practices, while expert validation ensures that the instrument's content is relevant and accurate. Field testing allows researchers to assess the instrument's performance in real settings and make necessary improvements(Ng et al., 2024).

In addition to its technical aspects, the development of a validation instrument also has practical implications for educational stakeholders. For schools, it provides a tool for self-evaluation and continuous improvement. For supervisors, it offers a standardized framework for conducting objective and consistent evaluations. For education authorities, it generates data that can inform policy decisions and support targeted interventions. Furthermore, the availability of a validated instrument can enhance the implementation of the Internal Quality Assurance System (SPMI), particularly in the evaluation and improvement stages(Relkin et al., 2020).

Overall, the development of curriculum validation instruments represents an important contribution to both theory and practice in educational evaluation. It addresses the need for more systematic, objective, and data-driven approaches to curriculum assessment, while also supporting the broader goal of improving educational quality. By providing a reliable and practical tool for evaluation, such instruments can help bridge the gap between curriculum design and implementation, ensuring that educational programs are both relevant and effective in meeting learners' needs.

DISCUSSION

The Need for Developing a Validation Instrument for the School-Based Curriculum (KSP) in Target Schools in the Selayar Islands Regency

The results of a preliminary study conducted through in-depth interviews with school supervisors, principals, and curriculum development teams in the Selayar Islands Regency revealed a critical issue: the absence of a standardized instrument for validating the School-Based Curriculum (Kurikulum Satuan Pendidikan/KSP). All informants (100%) indicated that the curriculum validation process has so far been carried out subjectively, administratively, and without clear standards. This situation leads to inconsistencies in assessment practices and undermines the credibility of curriculum evaluation processes across schools.

These findings are consistent with previous research by Rahmawati (2020), which identified that most schools in Indonesia lack standardized curriculum evaluation instruments,

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License

resulting in evaluation practices that are often merely procedural formalities. Similarly, Sutopo and Mulyani (2021) argued that curriculum supervision frequently focuses only on checking document completeness rather than evaluating the substantive quality of the curriculum itself. This indicates a systemic issue in how curriculum quality is assessed and ensured at the school level(Jang et al., 2022).

The absence of a standard validation instrument has tangible consequences in practice. School supervisors reported difficulties in providing objective and consistent assessments across their supervised schools. Meanwhile, principals and curriculum development teams admitted that they lack clear guidelines for designing high-quality curricula. As a result, curriculum documents often serve only administrative purposes, such as fulfilling accreditation or supervision requirements, rather than functioning as meaningful guides for instructional implementation(Andrian et al., 2018).

This issue becomes even more urgent in light of the implementation of the Merdeka Curriculum policy, which grants significant autonomy to educational institutions in developing their operational curricula. While this flexibility encourages innovation, it also creates the potential for wide disparities in quality among schools. Without a standardized validation mechanism, it becomes difficult to ensure that each school's curriculum meets minimum quality standards. Therefore, based on these findings, the need for a KSP validation instrument in the Selayar Islands Regency is अत्य pressing, both as a validation tool for supervisors and as a guideline for principals and curriculum developers. This need forms a strong foundation for continuing research on instrument development(Kasapoglu, 2020).

Procedures and Design for Developing the KSP Validation Instrument

This study adopted and modified the development model proposed by Borg and Gall (1983) to suit the specific needs of the research. The development procedure consisted of eight main stages: (1) preliminary study, (2) planning, (3) product draft development, (4) expert validation, (5) limited trial, (6) product revision, (7) large-scale trial, and (8) final product development. This systematic approach ensures that the resulting instrument undergoes rigorous testing and refinement(Handage & Chander, 2021).

The selection of the Borg and Gall model was based on its systematic and comprehensive characteristics, making it suitable for development research that requires a thoroughly tested product. Sugiyono (2017) also emphasized that this model is particularly appropriate for educational research due to its clear and structured steps. By following this model, the study

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License

ensures that each stage of instrument development is carried out carefully and methodically.

The instrument design consists of five factors and 30 statement items, developed based on the 2025 Revised Guidelines for School-Based Curriculum Development issued by the Directorate General of Early Childhood Education, Primary Education, and Secondary Education. The five factors include: analysis of school characteristics (6 items), vision, mission, and objectives (6 items), organization of learning (6 items), learning planning (6 items), and evaluation, professional development, and mentoring (6 items)(P. Chen et al., 2021).

Each item in the instrument is accompanied by a scoring rubric on a scale of 1–4 and a systematic user guide. This design allows the instrument to be used flexibly by various stakeholders—school supervisors, principals, and curriculum development teams—while maintaining a high level of consistency. The structured development process ensures that the instrument is not only theoretically grounded but also practically applicable. As noted by Fitriani et al. (2022), instruments developed without proper procedures tend to lack validity and reliability. Therefore, the rigorous development process employed in this study is essential for producing a high-quality evaluation tool.

Validity of the KSP Validation Instrument

The validity of the instrument was tested using two approaches: content validity through expert judgment and construct validity through Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA).The results of expert validation involving five validators—curriculum experts, educational evaluation lecturers, educational research lecturers, school supervisors, and curriculum development practitioners—showed that all 30 instrument items achieved Aiken's V values of ≥ 0.80, with an average of 0.971, categorized as very high. This indicates that experts agreed that the instrument items are relevant, clear, and appropriate for measuring curriculum validation.

This finding aligns with Aiken's (1985) criterion, which states that a V value of ≥ 0.80 indicates good content validity. The high V values also reflect strong agreement among validators, suggesting that the instrument is built upon a solid theoretical foundation. This ensures that the content of the instrument accurately represents the domain it is intended to measure.

The large-scale trial involving 120 respondents was analyzed using CFA, which showed that the five-factor measurement model had a good fit with empirical data. All 30 items demonstrated standardized factor loadings of ≥ 0.50 and were statistically significant ($p < 0.001$), with loadings ranging from 0.501 to 0.865. The highest loading was observed for Item 27 (0.865) in Factor 5 and Item 9 (0.806) in Factor 2.

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License

Factor loadings of ≥ 0.50 are considered practically significant. Therefore, the ksp validation instrument meets the criteria for construct validity, as all indicators significantly represent the constructs being measured. This result also supports previous studies, such as Rahmawati (2020) and Fitriani et al. (2022), which developed curriculum evaluation instruments. However, this study offers a significant advantage by employing CFA to confirm the factor structure, providing stronger empirical evidence for construct validity(P. Chen et al., 2021).

Reliability of the KSP Validation Instrument

The reliability of the instrument was tested using McDonald's Coefficient Omega (ω) and Cronbach's Alpha (α) in a large-scale trial involving 150 respondents. The results showed very high reliability, with a total ω of 0.948 and a total α of 0.939. Based on the criteria proposed by George and Mallery (2003), an alpha value of ≥ 0.90 is categorized as "excellent," indicating that the instrument is highly reliable.

Several important findings emerged regarding reliability. First, the consistency between Omega and Alpha values across all factors (with differences ≤ 0.02) indicates that the tau-equivalent assumption is well satisfied, suggesting that the measurement model is appropriate. Second, there was a significant improvement in reliability from the limited trial (ω = 0.831) to the large-scale trial (ω = 0.948), demonstrating that revisions based on expert feedback and initial testing effectively enhanced the instrument's quality.

Additionally, Factor 3 (Organization of Learning), which initially had a reliability of ω = 0.627 (moderate), improved to 0.794 (reliable) after revisions. This highlights the effectiveness of item refinement in improving measurement consistency. These findings are consistent with Djaali's (2000) theory that a reliable instrument produces consistent results when used repeatedly. With its very high reliability, the KSP validation instrument can be confidently used in various curriculum evaluation contexts.

Practicality of the KSP Validation Instrument

The practicality of the instrument was assessed through a user response questionnaire involving 12 respondents, including principals, teachers, and school supervisors. The questionnaire consisted of 10 indicators covering five aspects of practicality.

The results indicated that the strongest aspect was time efficiency, with a score of 3.96. A perfect score of 4.00 on the indicator "the instrument can be completed efficiently" suggests that the instrument is designed with user convenience in mind. This is an important factor, as time

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License

constraints are often a major concern for educators and supervisors.

The standard deviation of 0.16 indicates consistent perceptions among respondents regarding the instrument's practicality, with no significant differences between user groups. Furthermore, the relevance aspect scored 3.83, showing that the instrument meets the needs of curriculum validation in target schools, in line with the findings of the preliminary study.

A product is considered practical if experts and users agree that it is easy to use and applicable in real-world conditions. With an overall score of 96.8%, the KSP validation instrument meets the criteria for excellent practicality. This finding also supports Sutopo and Mulyani (2021), who emphasized the importance of designing curriculum supervision instruments that are practical for widespread use. This study adds further value by involving multiple user groups in the practicality assessment(Aslam et al., 2024).

Effectiveness of the KSP Validation Instrument

The effectiveness of the instrument was evaluated through user response questionnaires involving 12 respondents, using 10 indicators across five aspects of effectiveness. The results showed that the strongest aspect was measurement capability, with a score of 3.96. A perfect score of 4.00 on the indicator related to accurately measuring the feasibility of KSP documents confirms the instrument's validity from the user's perspective.

Another key finding is the comprehensive representation of curriculum components, with a perfect score of 4.00. This indicates that the instrument covers all essential aspects of the curriculum, including school characteristics, vision-mission-objectives, learning organization, learning planning, and evaluation and professional development.

The impact on quality scored 3.88, suggesting that the instrument not only evaluates but also encourages improvements in curriculum document quality. Similarly, the usefulness of results scored 3.88, indicating that the validation outcomes are beneficial for continuous curriculum improvement. This aligns with the PPEPP cycle (Planning, Implementation, Evaluation, Control, and Improvement), which emphasizes ongoing quality enhancement.

A product is effective if it achieves its intended objectives. In this case, the KSP validation instrument is effective because it serves as an accurate validation tool, measures curriculum feasibility reliably, promotes quality improvement, produces useful results, and is easily implemented in practice. These findings also support Fitriani et al. (2022), reinforcing the importance of standardized instruments in facilitating continuous curriculum reflection and improvement(Kholis et al., 2020).

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License

Integration of Findings and Theoretical Implications

This study contributes to the development of curriculum evaluation instrument theory in several ways. First, it confirms a five-factor model for curriculum validation, consisting of school characteristics, vision-mission-objectives, learning organization, learning planning, and evaluation and professional development. This model can serve as a reference for developing similar instruments in different contexts.

Second, the study demonstrates the integration of theory and practice by operationalizing curriculum theory—derived from national education laws and the 2025 KSP guidelines—into a practical and effective instrument. This bridges the gap between national curriculum policy and its implementation at the school level.

Finally, the use of Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) to test construct validity represents a significant methodological contribution, as it is still rarely applied in similar studies. This research provides a clear example of how CFA can be used to strengthen the validity of curriculum evaluation instruments, offering a more robust empirical foundation for future research(Khan et al., 2021).

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this study demonstrates that the development of a standardized validation instrument for the School-Based Curriculum (KSP) in the Selayar Islands Regency is both urgent and necessary due to the absence of clear, objective, and consistent evaluation tools in schools. Through a systematic development process based on the Borg and Gall model, the resulting instrument—comprising five key factors and 30 items—has been empirically proven to be highly valid, reliable, practical, and effective. The instrument not only ensures accurate and consistent curriculum validation but also supports continuous quality improvement in curriculum design and implementation. Furthermore, this study contributes theoretically by confirming a five-factor model of curriculum validation and methodologically by applying Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), thereby bridging the gap between curriculum policy and practical implementation in educational settings.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Future research should focus on expanding the application of the KSP validation instrument across diverse regions and educational levels to examine its generalizability and adaptability in different contexts. Further studies are also recommended to integrate digital or

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License

web-based platforms to enhance efficiency and real-time data analysis in curriculum validation processes. In addition, longitudinal research is needed to evaluate the long-term impact of the instrument on improving curriculum quality and student learning outcomes. Future developments may also explore the incorporation of additional variables, such as school culture, leadership, and stakeholder involvement, to enrich the comprehensiveness of the instrument. Finally, continuous refinement through broader user feedback and advanced statistical approaches is essential to ensure the instrument remains relevant, robust, and responsive to evolving educational policies and practices.

REFERENCES

Abbas, J. (2020). HEISQUAL: A modern approach to measure service quality in higher education institutions. Studies in Educational Evaluation, 67, 100933.

Andrian, D., Kartowagiran, B., & Hadi, S. (2018). The Instrument Development to Evaluate Local Curriculum in Indonesia. International Journal of Instruction, 11(4), 921–934.

Aslam, K., Khan, R. A., Aslam, M. A., & Zaidi, F. Z. (2024). Curriculum implementation challenges: Development and validation of an integrated curriculum implementation challenges tool. Pakistan Journal of Medical Sciences, 40(1Part-I), 89.

Cebrián, G., Junyent, M., & Mulà, I. (2021). Current practices and future pathways towards competencies in education for sustainable development. In Sustainability (Vol. 13, Issue 16, p. 8733). MDPI.

Chen, P., Goncharova, A., Pilz, M., Frommberger, D., Li, J., Romanova, O., & Lin, Y. (2021). International curriculum comparison in vocational education and training: A collaborative development of an analysis instrument. International Journal for Research in Vocational Education and Training (IJRVET), 8(4), 16–43.

Chen, R., Rodrigues Armijo, P., Krause, C., Force, S. R. T., Siu, K.-C., & Oleynikov, D. (2020). A comprehensive review of robotic surgery curriculum and training for residents, fellows, and postgraduate surgical education. Surgical Endoscopy, 34(1), 361–367.

Foi, L. Y. (2012). Development and validation of teacher curriculum paradigm and actual curriculum development practice instruments for Malaysian teacher curriculum paradigm model.

Handage, S., & Chander, M. (2021). Development of an instrument for measuring the student learning outcomes: A content validation process. Indian Journal of Extension Education, 57(3), 1–7.

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License

Jang, Y., Choi, S., & Kim, H. (2022). Development and validation of an instrument to measure undergraduate students' attitudes toward the ethics of artificial intelligence (AT-EAI) and analysis of its difference by gender and experience of AI education. Education and Information Technologies, 27(8), 11635–11667.

Karaca, O., Çalışkan, S. A., & Demir, K. (2021). Medical artificial intelligence readiness scale for medical students (MAIRS-MS)–development, validity and reliability study. BMC Medical Education, 21(1), 112.

Kasapoglu, K. (2020). Perceived Curriculum Literacy Scale for Teachers: A Scale Development and Validation Study. Inonu University Journal of the Faculty of Education (INUJFE), 21(2).

Khan, R. A., Spruijt, A., Mahboob, U., Al Eraky, M., & Van Merrienboer, J. J. G. (2021). Development and validation of teacher and student questionnaires measuring inhibitors of curriculum viability. BMC Medical Education, 21(1), 405.

Kholis, N., Kartowagiran, B., & Mardapi, D. (2020). Development and Validation of an Instrument to Measure a Performance of Vocational High School. European Journal of Educational Research, 9(3), 955–966.

Lambriex-Schmitz, P., Van der Klink, M. R., Beausaert, S., Bijker, M., & Segers, M. (2020). Towards successful innovations in education: Development and validation of a multi-dimensional Innovative Work Behaviour Instrument. Vocations and Learning, 13(2), 313–340.

Macrides, E., Miliou, O., & Angeli, C. (2022). Programming in early childhood education: A systematic review. International Journal of Child-Computer Interaction, 32, 100396.

Ng, D. T. K., Wu, W., Leung, J. K. L., Chiu, T. K. F., & Chu, S. K. W. (2024). Design and validation of the AI literacy questionnaire: The affective, behavioural, cognitive and ethical approach. British Journal of Educational Technology, 55(3), 1082–1104.

Nguyen, L. A. T., & Habók, A. (2024). Tools for assessing teacher digital literacy: a review. Journal of Computers in Education, 11(1), 305–346.

Osman, N., & Yaakub, K. B. (n.d.). Trust School Standards and Practices Measurement Instrument: Validity and Reliability.

Relkin, E., De Ruiter, L., & Bers, M. U. (2020). TechCheck: Development and validation of an unplugged assessment of computational thinking in early childhood education. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 29(4), 482–498.

Suh, W., & Ahn, S. (2022). Development and validation of a scale measuring student attitudes toward artificial intelligence. Sage Open, 12(2), 21582440221100464.

Tashtoush, M. A., Wardat, Y., Ali, R. Al, & Saleh, S. (2024). Artificial intelligence in education:

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License

mathematics teachers' perspectives, practices and challenges. Iraqi Journal for Computer Science and Mathematics, 5(1), 20.

Tobón, S., Juárez-Hernández, L. G., Herrera-Meza, S. R., & Núñez, C. (2020). Assessing school principal leadership practices. Validity and reliability of a rubric. Educación XX1, 23(2), 187–210.

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License