

REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
ÇAĞ UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

**PRE-SERVICE ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHERS' CONCEPTIONS OF
ASSESSMENT AND ASSESSMENT PRACTICES**

THESIS BY

Zeynep YÜCE

SUPERVISOR

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şehnaz ŞAHİNKARAKAŞ

MASTER OF ARTS

MERSİN, JANUARY 2015

REPUBLIC OF TURKEY

ÇAĞ UNIVERSITY

DIRECTORSHIP OF THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES


We certify that thesis under the title of “**PRE-SERVICE ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHERS’ CONCEPTIONS OF ASSESSMENT AND ASSESSMENT PRACTICES**” is satisfactory for the award of **Master of Arts** in the Department of **English Language Teaching**.

.....


Supervisor-Head of Examining Committee: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şehnaz ŞAHİNKARAKAŞ

.....


Member of Examining Committee: Assist. Prof. Dr. Hülya YUMRU

.....


Member of Examining Committee: Assist. Prof. Dr. Kim Raymond HUMISTON

I certify that this thesis conforms to formal standards of the Institute of Social Sciences.

.....

09/01/2015

Assist. Prof. Dr. Murat KOÇ

Director of Institute of Social Sciences

Note: The uncited usage of the reports, charts, figures and photographs in this thesis, whether original quoted for mother sources is subject to the Law of Works of Arts and Thought .No:5846.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Firstly, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şehnaz ŞAHİNKARAKAŞ, for her constructive feedbacks, guidance, and suggestions. She always found time for answering my questions, and thanks to her assistance and advice, I could complete this study.

I would also thank to the members of my thesis committee, Assist. Prof. Hülya YUMRU and Assist.Prof. Dr. Kim Raymond HUMISTON for their professional suggestions.

My thanks also go to my dear friends and colleagues, Mevlüde ÖZBEK, Sümeyye PENBE, Selma OĞUZ, and Rukiye KÖK for their valuable support during my thesis.

I owe special thanks to my elder sister, Nazlı METİN, and my cute nephew, Sefa METİN for providing a good working atmosphere. I wish also express my heartfelt and warm thanks to my family, especially my father, Muzaffer YÜCE, and my mother, Fatma YÜCE. I would have never been able to aspire for this level of education without their support.

Finally, extra special thanks to my fiancé, İbrahim ZAPTİYEÖĞLU for all the support he has given me thought my thesis. I truly treasure his patience and all the sacrifices that he has made for me.

9th of January, 2015

Zeynep YÜCE

ÖZET

SON SINIF İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMEN ADAYLARININ ÖLÇME VE DEĞERLENDİRME SÜRECİNE İLİŞKİN KAVRAYIŞLARI VE DEĞERLENDİRME UYGULAMALARI

Zeynep YÜCE

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı

Tez Danışmanı: Doç. Dr. Şehnaz ŞAHİNKARAKAŞ

Ocak 2015, 84 sayfa

Bu çalışmanın temel amacı, son sınıf İngilizce öğretmen adaylarının ölçme ve değerlendirme sürecine ilişkin kavrayışlarının belirlenmesidir. Ayrıca bu araştırmayla, son sınıf İngilizce Öğretmen adaylarının, İngilizce öğretimine başladıklarında hangi değerlendirme uygulamalarını kullanmayı düşündüklerinin de ortaya konulması amaçlanmıştır. Veriler, Brown(2001-2003, 2008) tarafından geliştirilen, “Gelişim”, “Okul Sorumluluğu”, “Öğrenci Sorumluluğu” ve “Önemsizlik” olarak dört yönlü kavrayışa ayrılan 27 maddelik “Öğretmenlerin Ölçme ve Değerlendirme Sürecine İlişkin Kavrayışları”ölçeğinin kısaltılmış hali ve bir kontrol listesi ile toplanmıştır. Veriler, Konya’da iki üniversitedeki son sınıf İngilizce öğretmen adaylarından elde edilmiştir.

Betimleyici çalışma, bir yandan son sınıf İngilizce öğretmen adaylarının ölçme ve değerlendirmeyi, öğretme ve öğrenci öğreniminde niteliği arttırma, okulların niteliğini ölçme ve öğrenci öğrenimini onaylamada bir yol olarak kavrarken; diğer yandan son

sınıf İngilizce öğretmen adaylarının ölçme ve değerlendirmeyi önemsiz olarak kavradıklarını göstermektedir. Üstelik, çalışmanın korelasyon analiz bulguları da “Gelişim”, “Okul Sorumluluğu” ve “Öğrenci Sorumluluğu” arasında anlamlı bir ilişki olduğunu ortaya koymaktadır ve bu kavrayışlar aynı zamanda “Önemsizlik” kavrayışıyla da orta düzeyde ilişkili olduğunu göstermektedir.

Son olarak betimleyici çalışmanın sonuçları, son sınıf İngilizce öğretmen adaylarının kendi öğretmenlerine nazaran daha çok alternatif değerlendirme uygulamalarını kullanmayı düşündüklerini ortaya koymaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Ölçme ve Değerlendirme, Kavrayış, Son Sınıf İngilizce Öğretmen Adayı, Ölçme ve Değerlendirme Uygulamaları

ABSTRACT

PRE-SERVICE ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHERS' CONCEPTIONS OF ASSESSMENT AND ASSESSMENT PRACTICES

Zeynep YÜCE

Master of Arts Thesis, Department of English Language Teaching

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şehnaz ŞAHİNKARAKAŞ

January 2015, 84 pages

The main purpose of this study was to investigate pre-service English language teachers' conceptions of assessment. It was also aimed at finding out which assessment practices pre-service English language teachers think of using when they undertake teaching English. Data were gathered through the short version of Teacher Conceptions of Assessment Scale (TCoA- IIIA) which was developed by Brown (2001-2003, 2008), and had 27 items categorized under four-facet model including *Improvement*, *School Accountability*, *Student Accountability*, and *Irrelevance*, and a checklist. The data were obtained from 133 pre-service English language teachers from two universities in Konya.

The descriptive results revealed that on one hand pre-service English language teachers conceived assessment as a way of improving the quality of teaching and student learning, measuring the quality of schools and certifying the students learning, on the other hand most of pre service English language teachers also think assessment as irrelevant. Moreover, correlation results of the study showed that Improvement,

School Accountability, and Student Accountability were significantly correlated with each other, and they were also moderately correlated to Irrelevance conception.

Finally, the descriptive results revealed that pre-service English language teachers think of using alternative assessment practices more than their own language teachers did.

Key Words: Assessment, Conception, Pre-service English Language Teacher,
Assessment Practices

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Items Related to Improvement Conception.....	40
Table 2. Items Related to School Accountability Conception.....	41
Table 3. Items Related to Student Accountability Conception.....	42
Table 4. Items Related to Irrelevance Conception.....	43
Table 5. Correlations among Pre-Service English Language Teacher Conceptions of Assessment (N=133).....	45
Table 6. Frequency of Assessment Tool Preferences Used for Evaluating Pre-service English Language Teachers' Language Performance.....	46
Table 7. Frequency of Assessment Tool Preferences Thought to be Used by Pre-service English Language Teachers.....	47

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

TCoA-IIIA	: Teacher Conceptions of Assessment Abridged Scale
STACC	: Student Accountability
SCACC	: School Accountability
IMP	: Improvement
IRR	: Irrelevance
N	: Sample Size

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COVER	i
APPROVAL PAGE	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	iii
ÖZET	iv
ABSTRACT.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES	viii
ABBREVIATIONS	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	x

CHAPTER 1

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem	3
1.3. Purpose of the Study	3
1.4. Significance of the Study	4
1.5. Research Questions	5
1.6. Limitations	5
1.7. Definitions of Terms	6

CHAPTER 2

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	8
2.1. Assessment	8
2.1.1. Summative Assessment	10
2.1.2. Formative Assessment	12
2.1.3. Alternative Assessment	15
2.2. Conceptions of Assessment.....	16
2.2.1. Improvement Conception	16
2.2.2. School Accountability Conception	19
2.2.3. Student Accountability Conception	21
2.2.4. Irrelevance Conception	23
2.3. Pre-Service English Language Teachers Training in Turkey	25
2.4. Assessment Practices Used in Teaching English	27

CHAPTER 3

3. METHODOLOGY.....	34
3.1. Introduction	34
3.2. Design of the Study	34
3.3. Participants	35
3.4. Data Collection Instruments	36
3.5. Data Collection Procedure	37
3.6. Data Analysis.....	38

CHAPTER 4

4. RESULTS.....	39
4.1. Research Question 1	39
4.2. Research Question 2	44
4.3. Research Question 3	45
4.4. Research Question 4	47

CHAPTER 5

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	48
5.1. Summary of the Study	48
5.2. Discussion of Descriptive Results of Conceptions	49
5.3. Discussion of Correlation Results of Conceptions	50
5.4. Discussion of Assessment Preferences of Language Teachers and Pre-Service English Language Teachers	51
5.5. Recommendations	55
6. REFERENCES	57
7. APPENDICES	69
7.1. Appendix A: Teachers' Conceptions of Assessment Questionnaire	69
7.2. Appendix B: Checklist	72

CHAPTER 1

1. INTRODUCTION

In this part, in order to draw a general frame of the study, background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, significance of the study, research questions, limitations, and some important definitions used in the study are presented.

1.1. Background of the Study

Assessment has an important role in education. Ali (2011) defines assessment as “a process that teachers use to identify the learners’ current levels of understandings and to target areas for further teaching and learning” (p.8). Through the appropriate assessment process, the teachers can classify and grade their students, give them feedback on how their teaching is going, and teachers can structure their teaching. From the point of students, assessment helps them “to check out how well they are developing as learners” (Brown, Race & Smith, 2004, p.5). Thus, assessment process influences both teachers and students in many aspects. For example; on one hand, it influences teachers’ professional image and the teaching strategies they adopt, on the other hand, it influences students’ learning strategies and both teachers’ and students’ motivation (Libman, 2010). Moreover, through the appropriate assessment strategies, the students take responsibility of their own learning.

There are different types of assessment in educational fields, such as summative, formative, and alternative assessments. Assessment of learning is the other name of summative assessment. It is generally used to summarize the students’ development at a particular time. According to Volante, Beckett, Reid and Drake (2010), “summative assessment methods are typically paper-and-pencil measures such as quizzes, tests,

exams, essay, or project that form a portion of a students' final grade" (p.3). Formative assessment is also called as assessment for learning. Formative assessment is "an active and intentional learning process that partners, the teacher and the students to continuously and systematically gather evidence of learning with the express goal of improving student achievement" (Moss & Brookhart, 2010, p.6).

Because of having different purposes, types of assessment are mostly preferred to be explained separately. Harlen (2005) says that "the same information, gathered in the same way, would be called formative if it were used to help learning and teaching, or summative if it were not so utilized but only employed for recording and reporting" (p. 208).

Teachers tend to assess their students with standardized assessment, as it does not take too much time to develop and administer when compared to the other types of assessment (Nasri, Roslan, Sekuan, Bakar & Puteh, 2010). However, when summative assessment is generally used by the teachers for gauging their students' achievement at the end of a course or a term, the teachers may not find an opportunity to realize and remove the gaps between current performance and expected performance of the students (Kealey, 2010). To remove the gap, teachers should give feedback as in formative assessment. Contrasts to summative assessment, students are intentionally engage in learning in formative assessment process. So, teachers make adjustments for students' continuous improvement. Thus, students become more motivated and confident as they are aware the goals of the course at the beginning of the lesson, and they can find an opportunity to assess their own learning progress (Moss & Brookhart, 2010).

Brown (2001-2003, 2008) developed a scale named as "Teachers' Conceptions of Assessment Scale" so as to better understand the teachers' conceptions of

assessment. Brown (2002) says that “assessment informs the improvement of students’ own learning and improves the quality of teaching” (p.27). On the other hand, he states that the quality of schools can be measured through assessment. Moreover, the teachers can compare the students’ work against criteria and make a decision if their students meet the qualification standards. However, there are some factors that lead students to conceive assessment as being irrelevant. For instance, if assessment results are ignored or not treated cautiously by the teachers, assessment may be conceived as being irrelevant by the students.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Mertler (2003) says that “various reform efforts are forcing teachers to be held accountable for their assessment of student learning. However, teachers do not feel adequately prepared to meet this challenge” (p.3). In addition to this, many studies have revealed that in-service and pre-service teachers also do not have enough knowledge, skills and experiences in the field of assessment (Mertler, 2003; Şahin&Karaman, 2013). Yaman and Karamustafaoğlu(2011) also state that pre-service teachers regard their assessment knowledge inadequate. However, “pre-service teachers need to understand how to design and implement assessments that are equitable to all types of learners regardless of their language ability or cultural background” (Siegel, 2014).

1.3. Purpose of the Study

After graduating from the university, pre-service English language teachers will undertake teaching. What they know about their field, and how they think to implement and measure their students’ achievement is crucial. Taber, Riga, Brindley, Winterbottom, Finney and Fisher (2011) say that “new teachers entering the profession

bring their own existing conceptions of teaching and learning, and that these inevitably influence their interpretation of what they are taught during initial teacher education” (p.171).

1.4. Significance of the Study

To be able to keep up with other societies, the role of teachers and the quality of education is a must. Özyar (2003) claims that to have good students, firstly well-qualified teachers are needed. Teachers’ qualifications and professional development are not only a common issue for Turkey, but they are also on the agenda in many countries (Seferoğlu, 2004). Thus, attention is paid to teacher education. Assessment is critical to the teaching process. During the teacher education, pre-service English language teachers take some courses relevant to assessment such as, ‘Measurement and Evaluation’ and ‘Preparing and Evaluating English Exams’ courses.

Later, when they go practice schools at their last year, they are expected to prepare lesson plans and write lesson reports according to assessment criteria that they have learnt at these courses. Therefore, before they graduate from the university and undertake teaching, they need to use their assessment knowledge. “Assessment drives instruction for pre-service teachers as they identify their own performance levels from the criteria that are established by the teacher education program” (Traister, 2005, p.4). So, it is important to prepare future generation of pre-service English language teachers to be able to make valid judgments from assessment.

This study shed light on how pre-service English language teachers conceive of assessment, and what types of assessment practices they think of using after undertaking teaching.

1.5. Research Questions

Examining how pre-service English language teachers conceive of assessment and what types of assessment practices they think of using may help us at the point of refocusing on the way future teachers handle the assessment. Following this line of thought, the aim of the study is to find the answers to the questions below:

1. What are the pre-service English language teachers' conceptions of assessment in terms of:
 - a) improvement
 - b) school accountability
 - c) student accountability
 - d) irrelevance
2. How do the four components of assessment conceptions relate to each other?
3. What types of assessment practices have pre-service English language teachers been exposed for their language achievement, so far?
4. What types of assessment practices do pre-service English language teachers think of using as a future teacher?

1.6. Limitations

Firstly, this study was implemented in two universities of Konya. The TCoA-III Abridged Scale and a checklist were administered to 133 pre-service English language teachers who were students at these universities. Thus, the study is not sufficiently representative of the entire population of pre-service English language

teachers in Turkey. I agree with Mohammed (2013) who says “to get more transferable, generalized and accurate picture nationally, a larger sample should be used to cover many other regions” (p.102). More pre-service English language teachers from different universities may reflect different results of the study. However, the results of this study partially can be seen as an initial exploration into pre-service English language teachers’ assessment conceptions and assessment practices they think of using in the country.

Secondly, as I stated in the previous paragraph, 133 pre-service English language teachers responded to the data collection tools. However, as this study predominantly based on their conceptions about assessment, and assessment practices they think of using, to get a deeper understanding of their conceptions; a semi structured interview questions could be asked.

Thirdly, the checklist includes 12 assessment practices; however, as it is commonly known that there are some other assessment practices used in foreign language teaching such as, gap-filling, demonstrations, linkwork methods, concept maps, diagnostic branched tree, rating scale, structured grids etc. Thus, it is strongly recommended that more extensive assessment practices be included in the future studies.

1.7. Definitions of Terms

Below are the definitions of the terms used throughout the study.

Assessment: “a process for obtaining information that is used for making decisions about students; curricula, programs, and schools; and educational policy” (Brookhart&Nitko, 2008, p.3).

Conception: Thompson (1992) defines conceptions as “general mental structures, encompassing beliefs, meanings, concepts, propositions, rules, mental images, preferences, and the like” (p. 130).

Summative Assessment: It is also known as assessment for learning, and it is generally used to summarize the students’ development at a particular time. Summative assessment focuses on determining what the students have learnt at the end of a grade level or a unit.

Formative Assessment: “...the process of uncovering and understanding what students know in order to determine best path to learning” (Greenstein, 2010, p.2). The students become skilled learners, the teachers regulate their own professional knowledge, and learning becomes more authentic and transformational through formative assessment (Moss & Brookhart, 2010).

Alternative Assessment: Hamayan (1995) says that “alternative assessment refers to procedures and techniques which can be used within the context of instruction and can be easily incorporated into the daily activities of the school or classroom” (p. 213).

Pre-service Teacher: A pre-service teacher is a student teacher who has not yet undertaken any teaching and completed his training to be a teacher.

CHAPTER 2

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This study aims to investigate pre-service English language teachers' conceptions of assessment and assessment practices they think of using. Thus, this chapter firstly presents background information about assessment and types of assessment. Then, pre-service English language teachers' conceptions of assessment were discussed by referring to four main conceptions of assessment. In addition, information about English language teaching program in Turkey was provided to present the courses related to assessment that pre-service English language teachers take throughout their undergraduate program. This chapter concludes with the assessment practices used in teaching English to examine pre-service English language teachers' assessment practices.

2.1 Assessment

Fahim and Fahim (2011) say that “assessment is a prominent topic including everything from large scale tests to district benchmark or interim tests to everyday classroom tests” (p.906). Nasri et al. (2010) define assessment as a method which is “used to improve the quality of education because it can enhance life-long learning skills and elevate performance in various educational contexts” (p.37).

When Knight (2002) makes the definition of assessment, he draws attention to the differences between assessment and measurement, and he says that “assessment is ultimately about judgement, not measurement. Measurement is exact, assessment is not. Agreed, judgement and measurement can be synonyms when determinate achievements are concerned” (p.113). Assessment is such a broad concept that we come across with it

at any age, intuition or any teaching environment (Gülbahar&Büyüköztürk, 2008). Sainsbury and Walker (2008) whose views are on the same line with the views of Gülbahar and Büyüköztürk (2008) state that it is possible to describe assessment in many different ways because “the term assessment encompasses an array of definitions, concepts, and activities” (Moe, 2012, p.10).

Gülbahar and Büyüköztürk (2008) argue that most of time, assessment is seen as independent from instruction. However, in fact assessment in itself should be a part of students’ learning process (Biggs, 2003). Assessment should not be seen on its own. It is always part of teaching and learning processes.

As seen, assessment includes a range of functions. Cheng (1999) outlines that there are some reasons that make assessment inevitable in the current educational reform. “First, assessment results are relied upon to document the need for change. Second, assessments are seen as critical agents of reform. Third, assessment results are used to demonstrate that change has or has not occurred” (p.254).

As Libman (2010) states, there is a shift in education in regard to assessment. Changes in modes of assessment entail teachers, students, administer and even parents to be closely aware of these changes. Gülbahar and Büyüköztürk (2008) argue that as we cannot get under control some variables such as the teacher’s professional image, teaching environment, students’ level, assessment methods and processes are permanently constructed. Remesal (2011) whose view is on the same line with the view of Libman (2010) says that “assessment is a tool for certification to different audiences in society, such as families or school administrations” (p.473). Libman (2010) says that “this paradigmatic shift puts an emphasis on enabling the student to self-regulate and self-assess his/her own learning and fostering his/her responsibility for the learning

results; from traditional summative, end-of-course examinations-based assessment to formative, performance-based assessment approaches” (p.63). Thus, the students construct knowledge based on their prior experiences rather than reproduce the information in learning process which is viewed as an active process.

Muñoz, Palacio and Escobar (2012) put forward two goals of assessment in line with the literature that they have examined. These are pedagogical assessment and administrative assessment. They associate pedagogical assessment with formative assessment as it aims to improve students’ performance and provide feedback. In terms of teachers, pedagogical assessment “guides teacher decision making about future instruction” (p.145). Because of informing different stakeholders such as teachers, students, parents, administrators, and intuitions, administrative assessment is associated with summative assessment. Thus, administrative assessment is used generally at the end of course or unit.

2.1.1. Summative Assessment

Summative assessment is generally used to summarize the students’ development at a particular time. Summative assessment is a kind of “assessment which counts towards, or constitutes a final grade for, a module or course or where a pass is required for progression by the student” (Bloxham&Boyd, 2007, p.236). According to Volante et al (2010), “summative assessment methods are typically paper-and-pencil measures such as quizzes, tests, exams, essays, or projects that form a portion of a student’s final grade” (p.3). Summative assessment focuses on determining what the students learn at the end of a grade level or a unit, and this feature makes it different from the others (Moss, 2013).

The purpose of using summative assessments differs in terms of teachers and students. Moss (2013) states that if summative assessments are used for external purposes such as “certification for vocational qualifications, selection for employment or further education, and monitoring the school’s accountability or gauging the school’s performance” (p.238). As students find the work more motivating, they can learn during the assessment process. However, if summative assessments are used for internal purposes, such as “regular grading for record keeping, informing decisions about choices within the school, and reporting to parents and students”(p.238), teachers use feedback to motivate their students to ensure continuity of their works. In summative assessment process, the main concern is to decide whether standards are being met by teachers, students, schools and even districts.

While Brookhart (2013) described how assessment was only seen as measurement and accountability in her study, and gained insight about the early public education in USA. She states that teachers applied to summative assessment. Students’ achievements relied on teachers’ judgments. In that time, to demonstrate they had learned well, students recited the material that they had learned to pass the course at the end of year recitations. After this summative assessment process, teachers graded the students’ achievement and sent reports to their parents. In this way, students were subjected to such an evaluation system, and the decision was taken on whether they had passed or failed the class.

And today, this decision is taken partly through standardized tests in education. Summative assessments are generally associated with standardized tests. Nasri et al. (2010) claim that as the results of standardized tests are not affected by teachers’ biases, they are viewed as objective measures of students’ achievement. Agrey (2004) whose

view is on the same line with the views of Nasri et al. (2010) states that rising of the test score is envisaged as an indication meaning that students become more successful. However, there are many criticisms of standardized assessment (Peterson & Neil, 1999). Greenstein (2010) says that “the use of standardized tests alone as the measure of knowledge does not typically lead to improved learning” (p.26).

While mentioning about schools in Hong Kong, Brown, Kennedy, Fok, Chan and Yu (2009) state that the forms of assessment in the education system are mostly tests and examinations. Thus, they say that “these forms of assessment carry summative and high-stake characteristics that not only generate pressure to the students but jeopardize teaching and learning” (p.1). To remove the examinations’ adverse effect on Hong Kong schooling, various forms of assessment were recommended by Curriculum Development Council. Thus, standardized tests should not be perceived that they construct the whole assessment, but rather “they should be one of the assessment puzzle teachers must use to guide classroom instruction” (Moe, 2012, pp.6-7).

2.1.2. Formative Assessment

Moss and Brookhart (2010) say that formative assessment is “an active and intentional learning process that partners the teacher and the students to continuously and systematically gather evidence of learning with the express goal of improving student achievement” (p.6). The teachers and the students are in an active partnership in this ongoing process. At first by making the general definitions of assessment, Black and William (1998) draw attention to the position of formative assessment. They say that “assessment refers to all those activities undertaken by teachers, and by the students in assessing themselves, which provide information to be used as feedback to modify the teaching and learning activities in which they are engaged”(p.2). At this point, they

state that to turn assessment into formative assessment form, the information and the teaching process should be used in such a way that the main aim is to meet the students' needs. Because, through formative assessment, the learners are checked regularly (Fahim&Fahim, 2011).

Dochy (2001) claims that there is a shift from testing to assessment. This shift entails the new assessment version to adopt two main purposes: "First showing students their strong points, their weaknesses and their growth and secondly guiding students towards the achievement of the learning goals" (p.17). Fook and Sidhu (2010) state that the student's needs, learning style and interests are taken into consideration in a non-threatening and motivating atmosphere where formative assessment is adopted.

And contrast to summative assessment, according to Shepard (2005) formative is "immediately used to make adjustments so as to form new learning" (p. 4). Moss and Brookhart (2010) whose views are on the same line with the view of Shepard (2005), argue that "formative assessments must inform the decisions that teachers and their students make minute by minute in the classroom" (p.6). The important point is not what has been measured, but how the evidence has been gathered in the process (Greenstein, 2010).

Wei (2010) states that there are three assessors in formative assessment process; the teacher assess their students, students assess each other (peer-assessment) and student assess themselves (self-assessment). Thus, formative assessment comprises of 'multi-assessors'. He goes and states that besides three assessors, formative assessment consists of multi-assessing strategies and tools such as "testing and non-testing assessments, formal and informal procedures, numerous non-testing strategies,

including classroom observations, portfolios, questionnaires, interviews, student conference and the like” (p.838).

Teachers who have undertaken teaching and pre-service teachers who have still observed and tried to understand clearly how to undertake teaching wholesomely should diagnose where a student is and where they need to go next. To be able to make a decision on students’ achievement, they need to be aware of formative assessment, its criteria and implementation. For a teacher, adopting a different assessment method such as formative assessment entails him to change or improve himself in terms of professional image. “Formative assessment is also very much to do with teacher practice and its implementation has been seen as a form of professional development” (Baird, 2011, p.344). Muñoz et al. (2012) say that “the new assessment practices may have placed new demands on teachers’ knowledge and skills and challenged certain beliefs the beliefs the teachers had about the nature and goals of evaluation” (p.145).

Greenstein (2010) says that “it (formative assessment) helps teachers meet learners’ emotional needs by providing a record of learning and useful feedback that promotes feelings of efficacy” (p.141). Because teachers, who adopt formative assessment method, can fill the gaps in student achievement and they find an opportunity to recognize closely their students’ differences in teaching process. Formative assessment enables students to gain self-confidence in their ongoing learning process, and they carry out their works successfully with this self-confidence and they get both social and emotional support (Greenstein, 2010).

Through formative assessment process, teachers are closely aware of students’ needs and differences. They share their goals with their students, rearrange their teaching to remove students’ misconceptions, try to get the answer to the questions that

they have predesigned before the lesson, give clear descriptive feedback, and then let students assess their own performance to see students reflection for themselves. “Formative assessment encompasses a variety of strategies for revealing students’ understanding, allowing teachers to pinpoint and address any impediments to a student’s progress” (Greenstein, 2010, p.2). So, the teachers should keep in mind that this teaching process is not one-sided.

As formative assessment is a continuous and systematic assessment, teachers and students mutually affect each other. By exchanging ideas, teachers and students discuss on what is done and what needs to be done to meet at a common point. In this way, teachers and students find an opportunity to recognize themselves.

2.1.3. Alternative Assessment

Teachers mostly prefer to use traditional assessment for assessing their students’ performance. The reason why they prefer to use traditional assessment instead of alternative assessment is that; they are mostly used to the traditional assessment methods as they feel themselves quite confidence. As to alternative assessment techniques, in fact, they do not have sufficient knowledge about them (Yayla, 2011; Büyüktokatlı&Bayraktar, 2014). In addition to this, “many teachers consider that alternative assessment is generally more time-consuming and labour intensive than traditional assessment” (Şahin&Karaman, 2013, p. 406). However, “alternative assessment has incontestable advantages over traditional testing methods, as it takes into consideration the learning of each student, as well as each student’s cultural background and level of knowledge” (Chirimbu, 2013, p.93).

The teachers using alternative assessment techniques in their teaching process, do not concentrate on grading their students' language performance. Because, the teaching is more authentic and process oriented. Alternative assessment enables students to learn much better and observe their own performances. Chirimbu (2013) says "alternative testing offers both the teacher the opportunity not to compare levels and knowledge but to follow a student's evolution individually and in time" (p.93). The students find an opportunity to demonstrate and control what they have learnt through an appropriate alternative assessment process.

Thanks to alternative assessment, the learning becomes more authentic because it helps students improve their decision making and problem-solving skills (Brualdi, 1996). The teachers are also able to gain insight about their courses' effectiveness and make some arrangements if it is necessary. Alternative assessment approaches include project, performance assignments, concept maps, self-assessment, peer-assessment, observation, portfolio, drama, diagnostic tree, journals, posters, instructors, and student interviews (Anıl&Acar, 2008; Büyüktokatlı&Bayraktar, 2014).

2.2. Conceptions of Assessment

By discussing the teacher conceptions of assessment from New Zealand context, Brown (2002) proposed a four-facet model for teacher conceptions of assessment. These four conceptions will be discussed in the following part.

2.2.1. Improvement Conception

English language should be taught through an integrated structure. As the language has four main skills, it would not be appropriate to focus only on one of them through a traditional approach by ignoring the others. Both the language teachers and

students should be active through language process. Yayli (2012)says that “1997 reform promotes student-centered learning, that is the use of English for real communication in which students are encouraged to play an active role in their learning processes” (p.62).

“The improvement view of assessment requires teachers to be actively involved in diagnosing and ascertaining what students have learned utilizing a wide variety of evaluative techniques” (Brown, 2002, p.31). Thus,the teacher role in teaching and assessing the students’ performance in a foreign language is important. Through language teaching process, the teacher should rekindle hope among their students when they lose faith in themselves convince them that if they want, they can become capable learners, and attempt to maximize the students’ performance by giving constructive feedback. Barnes and Lock (2013) state that the teachers should be well qualified for FL teaching. And, at the beginning of the lesson, the objectives and appropriate assessment types should be predetermined. Properly assessment of the language is as important as teaching of the language.

While assessing the students’ language achievement, the teachers should use diverse assessment options such as student records, observations, questionnaires, peer-and-self assessment, portfolios, demonstrations, oral questioning etc. Because “the improvement view tends to reject formal testing if it simply means more multiple-choice tests of lower order cognitive skills, such as recall or knowledge of discrete facts” (Brown, 2002, p.29). Konur and Konur (2011)back up this view and say that “different assessment methods should be used to determine whether students’ learning is a surface learning or not” (p.139).

Improvement conception is associated with the term ‘formative’ (Hill, 2000). When teachers use formative assessment, not only teachers but also students become active in language process. Thus, a constructivist approach is adopted in language education. Because “the aim of learning is for a student to construct his or her own meaning, not just to memorize the correct answers and repeat someone else’s meaning” (Buyukkarci, 2010, p.17). When teachers use formative assessment, they can assess the students’ whole process because “formative assessment can be formal or informal, written or oral, graded or ungraded, and focused on individual student progress or on the class as a whole” (Kealey, 2010, p.67). By using various assessment tools, the teachers also find an opportunity to see their strong and weak sides in the field (Moss & Brookhart, 2010). The teachers should use both types of assessment. Formative assessment is for the need of learners’ whole process, and summative assessment is used for the need of accountability. “Teachers ultimately are responsible for both guiding their students and judging how successful their guidance has been” (Brookhart, 2001, pp.157-158).

To be able to select and develop effective assessment methods, being aware of them is not enough. They should also be able to apply them properly. Thus, they need to be skilled in administrating and scoring. After getting results, they should interpret them objectively.

Barnes and Lock (2013) used the five attribute categories (Rapport, Delivery, Fairness, Knowledge and Credibility, and Organization and Preparation) to find out how effective foreign language teachers are perceived by students in EFL classes where the development of academic English skills are emphasized. The students think that a foreign language teacher should develop good relationship with students, understand the

different student levels, give clear explanations, use good examples, and they should also be enthusiastic about teaching. The study's mean scores for fairness categories show that the students are generally of the opinion that a foreign language teacher should treat all students fairly, and then give students clear grading guidelines. To be able to perform assessment properly, the teacher should decide the right time by taking into consideration of some variables that are encountered while teaching a language. Because, "this conception is predicated on the assumption that the duty of teachers is to improve the learning of their students and that assessment is a process for obtaining information to assist in this process" (Brown, 2002, pp. 28-29). "Teachers need to remember that students are operating in a foreign language and need more time to understand questions and then prepare responses" (Barnes & Lock, 2013, p. 29). Thus, a language teacher should be enough qualified for when and how he can use assessment types through teaching process because "becoming assessment literate will increase the chances of identifying the correct audience for which assessment results would be most useful" (Gulek, 2003, p.47).

2.2.2 School Accountability Conception

"A second conception of assessment is that it can be used to account for a teacher's, a school's, or a system's use of society's resources" (Brown, 2002, p.33). This conception is based on the idea that assessment can provide us information about how well schools do, and it can also measure the quality and the worth of schools.

For English language learners, some assessment policies are arranged by states in USA. To be able to respond to the some acts such as Elementary and Secondary Education Act, then the America's Schools Act, and the 2001 No Child Left Behind Act, each state in USA "has formulated policies for including and accommodating

English language learners” (Acosta, Rivera & Willner, 2008,p.2). While explaining the states’ assessment policies, they argue that “states have struggled to keep with the requirements of develop assessment policies that address the needs of ELLs” (p.6). The states have developed new assessment policies to meet the needs of English language learners.

Fry (2008) argues that the public schools in states are formed most by English language learners. The public schools use standardized test to assess students’ performance in courses and they use the results to compare with other students in the same schools. However, “students from different states were administered different tests and proficiency levels vary across states, student performance and achievement gaps cannot be compared across states” (p.3).

To realize all gaps in the curriculum is not possible through intensive standardized tests. Tong (2011) states that through a curriculum which is backed up by a constructivist pedagogy and effective multi assessment task, students’ achievement in English language arts would increase. However, he argues that to be able to implement such a curriculum in schools, in fact some substantial changes are needed in terms of cultures and structures of schools. While explaining the structure of schools in Hong Kong he says that “public examinations are high stakes, the community expects them to be standardized and objective, whereas language Art is concerned with individualized development of students and assessment practices that tend to be subjective” (p.393). He based his study on performance-based assessment which allows students to think creatively and develop critical skills and use their knowledge effectively through a language process. The teachers in the study preferred to use open-ended tasks to assess their students by giving them opportunities to express their personal views through

language learning process. It would be difficult to judge students assessment in language arts and they stated that it seemed unreliable and inequitable. They felt that it was difficult to achieve standardization across classes because each teacher had a different understanding and interpretation of the criteria. So, it can be clearly understood from the views of the teacher the assessment in their school is based on summative assessment purpose. Vardar (2010) backs up this view and says that “the accountability conception is highly related with the requirements of summative assessment” (p.12). As Hong Kong has a high-stake assessment culture, students’ language performances are assessed through summative methods which are thought to be more objective, reliable and standardized. “Whatever the reason for accountability evaluation of schools, teachers, and students, it is clear that student assessment is seen as the ideal means for delivering accountability” (Brown, 2002, pp. 36-37).

2.2.3. Student Accountability Conception

Vardar (2010) says that “this conception consists of assigning grades for each student, comparing each student’s performance with others, checking for students’ progress according to the criteria determined before, selection of the students to higher level of educational institutions, informing parents or other policy-makers in the system (p. 13, cited in Brown, 2008).

Brown (2002) says that “student accountability is largely about high stakes consequences such as graduation or selection or being publicly reported on as earning a certain grade, level, or score” (p.41). “Test, particularly high-stakes tests, aim to induce consequences for the test-takers, teachers, administrators, parents, and the policy makers” (p.81). Akpınar and Çakildere (2013) state that these tests do not only have an effect on course designs and classroom practices but also on school administrators or

policy makers' views at the point of implementing educational policies. While explaining the assessment process of Turkey, they say that "Turkey as a foreign language setting has a lot of national and international language assessment exams which candidates need to go through for different purposes" (p.81).

As they state, there are some high stakes language tests which are carried out by OSYM. For instance, some national exams KPDS (State Personnel Examination), UDS (Inter-University Foreign Language Examination). However, in April 2013, OSYM began to implement YDS (Foreign Language Placement Exam). There are also some international exams such as IELTS (International English Language Testing System) or TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language Exam). The language learners are classified according their scores that they get from these national and international language exams (Gür, 2013). He states that if a language learner is classified as C1 level, it is expected from him to speak English fluently, able to express himself easily and understand complex, long texts including rich vocabulary items. He goes and argues that the course books, the curricula, exams and certificates are organized according to language learners' proficiency.

However, the high stakes language tests such as YDS does not meet the language learners' all needs at the point of being exactly mastery in language. Because, it only assesses the students reading comprehension and vocabulary knowledge, not speaking, listening, or writing skills. Gür, (2013) backs up this view and says that "considering the contemporary testing and assessment for foreign languages, several examinations such as KPDS/UDS do not compensate for today's needs. These examinations have turned to be the examination that lost the validity in an academical

sense” (p.32). The importance is given to the grammar, reading and vocabulary, however the others are ignored (Karabulut, 2007).

In 2002, University Grants Committee selected IELTS as a common English proficiency assessment for undergraduate students. The undergraduate students had to pass IELTS in order to graduate from the university (Zhengdong, 2009). The main aim was to graduate the students who were quite proficient in using actively English language in all four skills. As a country, they have already have enough standardized test formats, so it has been suggested the students, henceforward, should be ready to be well qualified new entrants for the business community. Thus, IELTS preparation courses were arranged, the teachers adopted themselves to the requirements of the exam. All in all, it can be said that the assessment way of English shapes the curriculum, and teachers’ teaching strategies.

While assessing students language performance, the scores they get from the examinations are used (Baş, 2013). Thus, the students’ future is shaped by some decisions which are based on various exams in Turkey. As the education system changes, the examination system changes, too. For instance, in 2008, OKS has been replaced by SBS and foreign language questions have been included (Doğan&Sevindik, 2011).

2.2.4. Irrelevance Conception

“The fourth conception is associated with assessment being irrelevant, based on the assumption that teachers know their students and the curriculum and therefore, there is no need to conduct formal assessment” (Muñoz et al., 2011, p.146). There are some factors that lead students to conceive assessment as being irrelevant. For instance, as

they are operating in a foreign language, they may encounter some complexity on the work that they are engaged in and the teacher assesses in order to come a conclusion about their language performance. Abedi (2002) puts forward some difficulties that English language learners experience. He states that when they take the test if they are not able to read enough fast and understand some complex structure of the test questions, they may not demonstrate their real language knowledge.

Vardar (2010) says that “sometimes teachers’ lack of enough knowledge or training about the importance of assessment techniques or how to use the assessment techniques are making the teachers consider the assessment as irrelevant” (p.15). The teachers sometimes adopt “teach to test” approach. At this point, the main aim is to meet the institutional needs and demands by ignoring the development of their skills (Chen, 2010). Neil (2006) argues the disadvantages of mandated test in USA caused by No Child Left Behind Project. He explains why the teachers show a distinct tendency towards test and says that “the pressure to raise test scores pushes teachers to imitate the state exams or benchmark tests in their own classroom assessment” (p.12). However, Gulek (2003) argues that “a test score is only an estimate of what a student knows and can do, not an exact amount” (p.48).

In order to take fair and valid results from the students’ language performance, the meaning of ‘fair’ and ‘valid’ should be clearly understood by students, teachers, school administrators, and even parents. Young, Cho, Ling, Cline, Steinberg and Stone (2008) say that “for a test to be valid and fair implies that resulting scores reflect content knowledge only and that the scores have not been affected by construct-irrelevant factors such as for ELLs, level of English language proficiency” (p.171). Li

and Suen (2012) are on the same opinion with the researcher and Young et al. (2008), and suggest that;

Within the context of the test accommodations for ELLs, fairness is related to both issues of equitable treatment during the testing process and equality in testing outcomes. The original concern has to do with being fair to ELLs in terms of ensuring that test takers with equal abilities should have equal outcomes and not be hampered by construct-irrelevant deficiencies in English language. (p.295).

The failures of the students arising from anxiety prevent them from being actually assessed by their teachers (Aydın&Zengin, 2008). Horwitz and Young (1991) classified the anxiety in language into three ways. These are communication apprehension test anxiety and fear of negative evaluation. When students think that they may not be able to master precisely in foreign language, they experiences communication apprehension. On the other hand, they may experience test anxiety if they have fear of anxiety. Lastly, they experience fear of being assessed negatively. Because of all these causes, the students lose their faith in the accuracy of assessment process. The students think the teachers are unable to assess properly the language performance.

2.3. Pre-Service English Language Teachers Training in Turkey

To become a student at English language departments in Turkey, the students have to graduate from the high school and take some centralized examinations. According to their test scores, the placement is determined. “In the Turkish educational system, ELT is a graduate profession with qualifications acquired mainly through a 4-year pre-service teacher education” (Kirkgöz, 2009, p.1862). Karakas (2012) states that

“the education normally takes four years unless the program entails one-year intensive English preparatory, in this case 1+4 years” (p. 2). After graduating from this four-year undergraduate program, they are required to enter the Examination for Selection and Placement of Candidates for Professional Post in Public Organizations (KPSS) and the field examination. Then, if they get a certain grade, they are appointed and they are able to work as English language teachers in Turkey (Yayli, 2012; Kilimci, 2009).

In an effort to improve English language teaching in Turkish schools, it would be useful to better understand pre-service English language teachers’ conceptions on English teaching and assessment. Bekleyen (2010) says that “a language teacher has many responsibilities, one of which is to test student performance during the teaching process” (p.20). Aksu, Demir, Daloglu, Yildirim and Kiraz (2010) assert that “today’s entering student teachers will have a substantial impact on the education of future generations” (p.91). Pre-service English language teachers are required to take a number of educational courses and field courses to complete their teacher education. Some of these courses help them to shape their assessment views in language progress. Gok, Erdogan, Altinkaynak and Erdogan (2012) say that “ the extent of the knowledge and skills concerning measurement and assessment that teachers possess and how much they are utilized, are closely correlated with the quality of the pre-service training teachers receive” (p.1997).

The courses that related to assessment have a crucial effect on their future teaching because “beginning teachers are now expected to effectively apply a variety of assessments and to provide evidence that students achieve the content standards” (Karp & Woods, 2008, p.329). For instance, the pre-service English language teachers learn the basic concepts related to measurement, and the qualifications and types of

measurement tools. They learn how assess the results in ‘Measurement and Evaluation’ course that they take at their 6th semester. In another course, ‘Preparing and Evaluating English Examination’ course, the pre-service English language teachers learn types of tests, test preparation techniques for four skills in English (Sanlı, 2009). And to be able to design and evaluate instructional materials in English language teaching, pre-service English language teachers learn how to adopt and develop various materials in English for different age groups and evaluate of these materials in ‘Material Evaluation and Adaptation’ course at their 7th semester. After taking such courses, at their 8th semester, for the sake of implement the previously acquired teaching, they go their practice schools and prepare lesson plans, then develop measurement and evaluation instruments, evaluate and measure students’ language performance.

2.4. Assessment Practices Used in Teaching English

Teachers use various assessment tools to evaluate students’ language performance. Because “assessment relates to learning improvement and supports the use of various strategies and tools in assessing students” (Azis, 2012, p.40). Teachers must participate in the teaching strategies and assessment tools (Dogan, 2011), and be provided “with the assessment tools needed to do the job” (Stiggins, 2002, p.761).

If teachers want to assess the students’ writing ability in English, they can use essay tests. “An essay test is a direct procedure for assessing candidates’ writing ability. Essay tests are comprehensive tests which target at measuring knowledge of language as a whole not only knowledge of isolated language components” (Badjadi, 2013, p. 4). As writing is a complex task, the teachers can assess the students’ grammar, vocabulary and spelling through essay tests.

However, a teacher should be an expert at assessing students' writing works (Gugin, 2014). While assessing students' essays and giving them oral or written feedback, the teacher should keep in mind that students who deal with a new language, are not be able to clarify their ideas and use appropriate style or grammar structure at the beginning.

If the teachers want to measure a great number of students quickly and effectively, they can use standardized tests in assessment process. Brown (2004) states that a standardized test is "a ready-made previously validated product that frees the teacher from having to spend hours creating a test" (p.68). Standardized tests' results are viewed as objective, fair and reliable (Solórzano, 2008). Solórzano (2008) says "the extended use of standardized tests to make high stakes decisions with regard to student placement, graduation, and promotion raises some fundamental issues relative to students, in general, and English language learners (ELLs), in particular" (p.260).

Questioning technique can be used by language teachers for many reasons. "In a language classroom, teachers' questions plays a significant role in stimulating thinking, checking students comprehension and progress, gathering attention, modelling appropriate usages, and creating interactive opportunities" (Kao, Carlin & Hsu, 2011, p.491). When teachers ask questions, students try to produce meaningful language in response (Brown, 2004). Through oral questions and answer, the speaking skill is also not ignored.

Janudom and Wasanasomithi (2009) argue that "it is of paramount importance for English teachers to find effective pedagogical techniques to help enhance students' speaking abilities, among other English skills they also need to develop" (p.2). The teacher can evaluate and check students' understanding of the course and diagnose their

readiness levels. However, the questions asked by language teachers should also prompt communications. “The main purposes of teachers’ questions are to evaluate students’ knowledge towards what is being taught and require a predetermined short answer” (Kao et al., 2011, p.495).

Another assessment tool used is homework. Warton (2001) gives a general definition of homework and says “homework is a multifaceted process that involves a complex interplay of factors in two contexts-home and school and a range of participants from school-system-level employees to individual students” (p.155). In foreign language process, homework has a crucial role. Carlsson (2009) states “homework is central to the learning of new words in the subject of English” (p.10).

Teachers do not only assess the students’ language performance, but they also help the students to reinforce what they have learned at school through homework (Warton, 2001; Carlsson, 2009). “Homework can show students that learning can occur at home as well as at school. Homework can foster independent learning and responsible character traits” (Costley, 2013, pp. 7-8). The homework given by language teachers should be directed to the development of four language skills. Papandreou (1991) backs up this view and states that “it should be emphasized that homework is not normally identified with a particular language skill, as, for instance, writing. Special care must be taken so that assignments dealing with all language skills, independently and in several combinations, are provided for students to study and work at home” (p.12).

In order to assess the students’ language performance, the language teachers do not always need to use a test or quiz or another material that give concrete data to the teachers. Thus, the students’ language performance can also be assessed through

unplanned observations. “All teachers, whether they are aware of it or not, observe their students in the classroom almost constantly. Virtually, every question, every response, and almost every nonverbal behavior is, at some level of perception, noticed” (Brown, 2004, pp. 266-267).

On the other hand, Brown (2004) argues that if a language teacher wants to observe the students’ language performance; he can use anecdotal records, checklists or rating scales to record their observation, and says that “observation as a systematic planned procedure for real time, almost surreptitious recording of student verbal and nonverbal behavior. One of the objectives of such observation is to assess students without their awareness of the observation so that the naturalness of their linguistic performance is maximized” (Brown, 2004, p.267).

Conferencing is another assessment tool used in language assessment process. Brown (2004) argues that “for a number of years, conferences have been a routine part of language classrooms” (p.264). And the teacher has more than one role in the classroom. He is “designers of the educational experience”, facilitator and guider not an administrators (Anderson, Rourke, Archer & Garrison, 2001). Brown (2004) says that “the teacher should not consider a conference as something to be scored or graded. Conferences are by native formative, not summative, and their primary purpose is to offer positive washback” (p.265). Thus, the teachers are able to give direct feedback to the students’ works that they are engaged in and they should review the students’ tasks, portfolios, and then comment on them. The interaction between teachers and students improve through all these teaching and learning process.

If a language teacher wants to assess the student works’ on language systematically and help them to develop their writing skills, it would be appropriate to

use portfolio in his classroom. To be able to evaluate student progress effectively, and help the students use the language actively, portfolios are used as an assessment tool in foreign language process (Aydin, 2010).

Brown (2004) states that a portfolio includes students' own reflections and others reflections, written feedbacks from teachers, checklists, journals, diaries, newspaper or magazine clippings, essay, tests, compositions in drafts etc. Gomez (2000) states "using assessment portfolios that include English language learners not only provides improved information about student achievement but also makes a positive impact on teaching and student learning"(p.4). Students work with their peers in a collaborative atmosphere and the interaction between peers and teachers improves. Through portfolio assessment, the students think critically and become responsible for their own learning (Ok, 2012). However, the students should be clearly informed about the goals and content of portfolio at the beginning by their teachers in order to overcome the challenges of portfolio (Brown, 2004).

If a language teacher wants his students to participate in assessment process, it would be appropriate to use self and peer-assessment tools in the classroom. Peer-assessment is defined by Topping (1998) as "an arrangement in which individuals consider the amount, level value, worth, quality or success of the products or outcomes of learning of peers of similar status" (p.250). On the other hand, Cheng and Warren (2005) state the functions of self- assessment in their study and say "it (self-assessment) provides learners with the opportunity to take responsibility for analyzing, monitoring and evaluating aspects of both the learning process and product of their peers" (p.94).

Brown (2004) takes attention to the principle 'autonomy' for self-assessment. The language learner should set his goals and in order to actualize these goals, he

should develop intrinsic motivation. On the other hand, for peer assessment, the main principle is ‘cooperative learning’. He says “peer-assessment is simply one arm of a plethora of tasks and procedures within the domain of learner centered and collaboration education” (p.270). However, subjectivity is an obstacle for both self and peer assessment. The students should be trained adequately and the assessment criteria should be obvious at the beginning so as to overcome such an obstacle (Freeman, 1995). Otherwise, “students may be either too harsh on themselves or too self-flattering, or, they may not have the necessary tools to make an accurate assessment. Also, especially in the case of direct assessments of performance, they may not be able to discern their own errors” (Brown, 2004, p. 270). Although the importance of self and peer assessment types are known, they should be designed and administered carefully.

According to Brown (2004), a) the students should be informed for the purpose of assessment by their teachers at the beginning, b) the tasks that given should be clearly explained by their teachers, c) the students should be encouraged to participate in performance evaluation of their and peers in order to overcome subjectivity, d) some follow-up tasks such as teachers’ written feedback or journal reflection should be reinforced to ensure useful washback.

In foreign language teaching process, the teachers sometimes prefer to assess their students’ language performances through written tests made by them. While preparing such written tests, the teachers should take into some factors which will have a negative impact on assessment process. Saricoban (2011) argues that “written foreign language tests seem to lack such important issues as validity, reliability, washback effect, language skills and areas including spelling, contextualization, time, typing students’ foreign language proficiency level (simple or complex structures), and

instructions” (p.398). The teacher should clearly state what he wants to measure (Koksal, 2004).

CHAPTER 3

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

This chapter is organized to present information about the research design, participants, and instruments used to gather data, data collection procedures, and data analysis applied. The purpose of the study is to identify and describe how pre-service English language teachers conceive assessment, and what types of assessment practices they think of using when they become English language teachers in the future.

3.2. Design of the Study

A quantitative research method is utilized to conduct the study. Creswell (1995) defines quantitative research method as; “quantitative research is a type of educational research in which the researcher decides what to study, asks specific, narrow questions, collects numeric (numbered) data from participants, analyses these numbers using statistics, and conducts the inquiry in an unbiased, objective manner” (p.39). Contrary to qualitative research methods, quantitative research methods let the researcher make generalization that are applicable to the larger population, and describe the phenomena in numbers instead of words and does not investigate deeply into the respondents’ opinions and emotions. According to Fraenkel and Wallen, (2000), “quantitative research includes comparisons between alternative methods of teaching; examining research among variables; comparing groups of individuals in terms of existing differences on certain variables; or interviewing different groups of educational professionals such as teachers, administrators, and counselor” (p.429).

Survey based research is used in order to explore pre-service English language teachers' conceptions of assessment. "A survey is an instrument to collect data that describes one or more characteristics of a specific population" (Gay, Mills & Airasian 2009, p.175). There are two types of survey studies. These are longitudinal survey and cross-sectional survey. The data in longitudinal surveys are collected at two or more times. In contrast to the longitudinal survey, the data in cross-sectional surveys are collected at a single point of time from selected participants (Gay et al., 2009) say that;

Cross-sectional designs are effective for providing a snapshot of the current behaviors, and beliefs in a population. This design also has the advantage of providing data relatively quickly you do not have to wait for years (as is often the case in longitudinal studies) before you have your data and can begin to analyze and draw conclusions. (p.176).

As the data were collected at a single point of time from pre-service English language teachers, a cross-sectional survey was used.

3.3. Participants

133 pre-service English language teachers participated in this study. 97 out of 133 were female and the other 36 were male students. One of the reasons why the researcher chose this sample was to easily access to all pre-service English language teachers in Konya. They were 4th grade students in English Language Teaching Departments of Ahmet Keleşoğlu Education Faculty of Necmettin Erbakan University and Education Faculty of Mevlana University. They took all of the courses that were required to graduate from the program. Two weeks were only left and they were preparing for the final exams.

3.4. Data Collection Instruments

Considering the purpose, the participants and the research questions, the researcher adopted quantitative research methods to conduct her study. A questionnaire and a checklist were used.

Doğandere (2006) says “questionnaires are relatively popular means of obtaining data while carrying out a study in second language teaching since they are easy to construct” (p.18). Stufflebeam (2000) says “checklists are valuable evaluation devices when carefully developed, validated, and applied” (p.1). Scriven (2000) who refers the advantages of using checklists says that “checklists are mnemonic devices, i.e., they reduce the chances of forgetting to check something important. They reduce errors of omission. Checklists in general are easier for the lay stakeholder to understand and validate that most theories or statistical analyses” (p.3).

The questionnaire is “Teachers Conceptions of Assessment Abridged Scale” (TCoA-III Abridged Scale). The original version of the scale is Teachers Conception of Assessment Scale which was developed and used by Brown (2001-2003, 2008) (See Appendix A). The short version of TCoA was handed out to the participants in this study. It has 27 items on a 6-point rating scale degreed from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 6 (Strongly Agree).

The second data collection instrument was a checklist. On the first page of original version of the questionnaire that was used in this study, there were 12 assessment practices. Brown (2001-2003, 2008) asked teachers to indicate assessment practices that they had in mind when they thought about assessment. The researcher of this study turned the assessment practice part into a two-column checklist (See

Appendix B). For the first column, pre-service English language teachers were asked to indicate the assessment practices that their English language teachers had used to assess their English performance so far. Then, they were asked to state the assessment practices that they thought they would use when they become English language teachers on the second column.

3.5. Data Collection Procedure

How data collection procedure was taken place is explained step by step in this part. Before administrating the questionnaire and the checklist to the participants, the researcher firstly met the Head of English Language Teaching Departments of Ahmet Keleşoğlu Education Faculty of Necmettin Erbakan University and Education Faculty of Mevlana University, and shared her ideas and research interest with them.

Secondly, a suitable time was determined in the 2013-2014 second semester. Before the lesson, the researcher informed the instructors about the study. Thirdly, the researcher introduced herself to the classrooms, gave information about the study, and then asked them to participate to the study.

The classrooms where the study took place were quiet wide and spacious. Pre-service English language teachers were informed that participation was voluntary. In fact, the original version of TCoA-III Abridged scale, the items about teachers' demographic were included in detailed. For instance, the teachers were asked their role in education, education level, and teaching experience. However, pre-service English language teachers who participated in this study, had not graduated from the program, and their future teaching subject, undergraduate intuitions were obvious. They did not have any experience as a language teacher.

Meanwhile, the researcher had already asked the instructors if they had international students, and as there were no international students, demographic information did not include ethnicity item. In conclusion, it took approximately 20 minutes to complete the data collection instruments.

3.6. Data Analysis

To find out the answers of the research questions 1, 3 and 4, frequencies and percentages were calculated through descriptive statistics and for research question 2, Pearson Correlation was used. In total, 140 questionnaires and checklists were filled out, but seven were discarded because they were incomplete. The respondents to the other 133 questionnaires and checklists were entered into the SPSS.

CHAPTER 4

4. RESULTS

This chapter reveals the data analyses of the study collected through quantitative research methods. The research questions of the study are presented one by one.

4.1. Research Question 1

TCoA-III A Scale (The Conceptions of Assessment Abridged Scale) developed by Brown (2001-2003, 2008) was used to find out pre-service English language teachers' conceptions of assessment. TCoA-III A Scale consisted of 27 items and these items were classified into 4 subgroups by Brown (2007). Thus, pre-service English language teachers' conceptions of assessment were analyzed in terms of these four subgroups; *Improvement*, *School Accountability*, *Students Accountability* and *Irrelevance*.

Table 1 reveals pre-service English language teachers' conceptions of assessment in the present study regarding the items in the subgroup *Improvement* as identified by Brown (2007). As Table 1 presents, items 3, 4, 5, 6, 12, 13, 14, 15, 21, 22, 23, and 24 were related to Improvement Conception. The item that was strongly disagreed by the participants was item 21. According to the participants, assessment did not contribute to the students' higher order cognitive skills, such as analysing and judging. The same number of participants (13 participants) mostly disagreed with the item 14, 22, and 24.

Table 1. Items Related to Improvement Conception

Item No.	Strongly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Mostly Agree	Strongly Agree
I3. Assessment is a way to determine how much students have learned from teaching	3	11	39	26	40	14
I4. Assessment provides feedback to students about their performance	6	10	20	28	43	26
I5. Assessment is integrated with teaching practice	4	12	25	43	38	11
I6. Assessment results are trustworthy	3	21	32	48	22	7
I12. Assessment establishes what students have learned	3	9	33	44	31	13
I13. Assessment feeds back to students their learning needs	1	11	28	34	46	13
I14. Assessment information modifies ongoing teaching of students	1	13	30	37	41	11
I15. Assessment results are consistent	7	19	44	38	18	7
I21. Assessment measures students' higher order thinking skills	12	14	35	40	27	5
I22. Assessment helps students improve their learning	7	13	23	43	32	15
I23. Assessment allows different students to get different instruction	8	12	29	42	33	9
I24. Assessment results can be depended on	7	13	27	41	33	12
Total	62	158	365	464	404	143

On the other hand, item 6, 15, and 24 were related to assessment results. The participants moderately agreed with these 3 items. They were on the opinion that if assessment was desired to be valid, assessment results should be trustworthy, consistent

and objective. The item that was mostly agreed by the participants was item 13. In addition to this, the item that was strongly agreed by the participants was item 4. These two items were related to feedback. As it is understood, the participants were aware of the importance of assessment as a means of feedback.

Table 2. Items Related to School Accountability Conception

Table 2 reveals pre-service English language teachers' conceptions of assessment in the present study regarding the items in the subgroup *School Accountability* as identified by Brown (2007).

Table 2

Item No.	Strongly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Mostly Agree	Strongly Agree
I1. Assessment provides information on how well schools are doing	12	12	28	39	25	11
I10. Assessment is an accurate indicator of a school's quality	7	16	32	45	23	10
I19. Assessment is a good way to evaluate a school	5	21	25	44	29	13
Total	24	49	85	128	77	34

As Table 2 presents, the items 1, 10, and 19 were related to School Accountability. The item that was strongly disagreed by the participants (12 strongly disagree, 12 mostly disagree) was item 1 which showed that the participants did not approve the idea that assessment provides information about how well schools do. The item 10 was slightly agreed by 32 participants and moderately agreed by 45 participants. It indicated that the participants were on the opinion that assessment measures partially the quality or the worth of schools.

Lastly the item that was strongly agreed by the participants (13 strongly agree, 29 strongly disagree) was item 19. It showed that the participants thought the worth of the schools was appropriately determined through a good assessment.

Table 3. Items Related to Student Accountability Conception

Table 3 reveals pre-service English language teachers' conceptions of assessment in the present study regarding the items in the subgroup *Student Accountability* as identified by Brown (2007).

Item No.	Strongly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Mostly Agree	Strongly Agree
2. Assessment places students into categories	6	12	20	34	20	8
11. Assessment is assigning a grade or level to student work	2	14	15	38	23	9
20. Assessment determines if students meet qualifications standards	3	6	22	38	27	2
Total	11	32	57	110	70	19

As Table 3 presents the items 2, 11, and 20 were related to Student Accountability Conception. Table 3 displays the responses given by participants to this conception. The item that was strongly disagreed by the participants (6 strongly disagree and 12 mostly disagree) was item 2; "Assessment places students into categories". This indicated that the participants strongly rejected the idea that to make placement or selection decisions about students could be determined by using assessment tools.

The item 11 was moderately agreed by the participants. The participants were aware of the importance of assessment as a means of the assignment of students'

language achievement grades. On the other hand, the item that was moderately agreed by the participants was item 20. The participants were moderately on the opinion that “assessment certifies that students have learned or met standards” (Brown, 2002).

Table 4. Items Related to Irrelevance Conception

Table 4 reveals pre-service English language teachers’ conceptions of assessment in the present study regarding the items in the subgroup *Irrelevance* as identified by Brown (2007).

Item No.	Strongly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Mostly Agree	Strongly Agree
I7. Assessment forces teachers to teach in a way against their beliefs	11	22	33	32	26	9
I8. Teachers conduct assessments but make little use of the results	2	16	31	46	25	13
I9. Assessment results should be treated cautiously because of measurement error	1	9	33	35	35	20
I16. Assessment is unfair to students	8	27	34	38	17	9
I17. Assessment results are filed & ignored	6	28	42	28	21	8
I18. Teachers should take into account the error and imprecision in all assessment	4	13	29	33	41	13
I25. Assessment interferes with teaching	1	14	27	46	38	7
I26. Assessment has little impact on teaching	7	23	30	24	37	12
I27. Assessment is an imprecise process	5	12	31	49	23	13
Total	45	164	290	331	263	104

Table 4 presents the responses given by participants to Irrelevance Conception. The items 7, 8, 9, 16, 17, 18, 25, 26, and 27 were related to Irrelevance Conception. The

item that was strongly disagreed by participants were item 7. In addition to this, the item ticked as mostly disagree was item 17. As it is understood, the participants were on the opinion that teachers made the evaluation process in line with their own beliefs, and the data obtained through assessment process was taken into consideration by teachers. On the other hand, the item that was moderately agreed by the participants (31 slightly agree, 49 moderately agree) was item 27. It showed that assessment process was seen as inaccurate.

The item 18 was mostly agreed by participants (41 mostly agree). It indicated that while carrying out the evaluation for students' language performance, some factors such as measurement error or imprecision in assessment should not be ignored. "Awareness of measurement error in assessment may lead to an irrelevance view of assessment" (Brown, 2002, pp. 25-26). Lastly, the item that was strongly agreed by 20 participants was the item 9. According to the participants, using assessment results appropriately and carefully would enable teachers to rectify the error in assessment process.

4.2. Research Question 2

The second research question was about how the four components of assessment conceptions called as *Improvement*, *School Accountability*, *Student Accountability*, and *Irrelevance* relate to each other. Correlation analyses were implemented to reveal the relationship between these four components.

Table 5.

Correlations among Pre-Service English Language Teacher Conceptions of Assessment (N=133)

	IMP	SCACC	STACC	IRR
IMP	1	.76**	.67**	.42**
SCACC		1	.72**	.37**
STACC			1	.45**
IRR				1

** $p < 0.01$ (2-tailed).

Table 5 presents four components of pre-service English language teachers' assessment conceptions. All correlations between components are in positive direction. The table shows that the correlation between Improvement and School Accountability was significant ($r=76$, $p < .001$). The correlation between Improvement and Student Accountability was also positive and significant ($r=67$, $p < .001$). However, the positive correlation between Improvement and Irrelevance was moderately ($r=42$, $p < .001$). There was a strong correlation between School Accountability and Student Accountability ($r=72$, $p < .001$). The correlation between School Accountability and Irrelevance was moderately ($r=37$, $p < .001$). Lastly, the correlation between Student Accountability and Irrelevance was moderately ($r=45$, $p < .001$), as in the correlation between Improvement and Irrelevance and School Accountability and Irrelevance.

4.3. Research Question 3

The third research question about what types of assessment tools have been used to evaluate pre-service English language teachers' language performance was answered. So, the frequencies are presented to show assessment tools which were commonly used by English language teachers of pre-service English language teachers.

4.3.1 Results for Frequency of Assessment Tools

Table 6.

Frequency of Assessment Tool Preferences Used for Evaluating Pre-service English Language Teachers' Language Performance.

Assessment Techniques	N	%
1. Unplanned Observation	78	59 %
2. Oral Question & Answer	90	68%
3. Planned Observation	78	59%
4. Student Written Work	87	65%
5. Marked Homework	89	67%
6. Student Self or Peer Assessment	77	58%
7. Conferencing	52	39%
8. Portfolio / Scrapbook	71	53%
9. Teacher Made Written Test	90	68%
10. Standardized Test	86	65%
11. Essay Test	69	52%
12. 1-3 Hour Examination	73	55%

As shown in Table 6, Oral Question & Answer and Teacher Made Written Test (68%), Marked Homework (67%), Student Written Work and Standardized Test (65%), Unplanned Observation and Planned Observation (59%), Student Self and Peer Assessment (58%), 1-3 Hour Examination (55%), Portfolio/ Scrapbook (53%), and Essay Test (52%) were the assessment tools commonly preferred to assess pre-service English language teachers' language performances. However, Conferencing (39%) was the less preferred assessment technique.

4.4. Research Question 4

The assessment tools that were used to assess pre-service English language teachers' language performance were examined in third research question. In fourth research question, it was aimed to find out what types of assessment practices pre-service English language teachers think of using as a future teacher.

As shown in Table 7, Student Written Work (79%), Student Self and Peer Assessment (76%), Oral Question & Answer, Planned Observation, and Teacher Made Written Test (72%), Essay Test and Portfolio/ Scrapbook (67%), Standardized Test (59%), Marked Homework (58%), Conferencing and 1-3 Hour Examination (53%) were the assessment tools commonly thought to be used by pre-service English language teachers in the future. However, they indicated that Unplanned Observation (49%) was going to be used the less.

Table 7. *Frequency of Assessment Tool Preferences Thought to be Used by Pre-service English Language Teachers.*

Assessment Techniques	N	%
1. Unplanned Observation	61	46%
2. Oral Question & Answer	96	72%
3. Planned Observation	97	72%
4. Student Written Work	105	79%
5. Marked Homework	78	58%
6. Student Self or Peer Assessment	101	76%
7. Conferencing	71	53%
8. Portfolio / Scrapbook	89	67%
9. Teacher Made Written Test	96	72%
10. Standardized Test	78	59%
11. Essay Test	89	67%
12. 1-3 Hour Examination	70	53%

CHAPTER 5

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this chapter, a summary, discussion of all findings, and recommendations for further studies were presented.

5.1. Summary of the Study

The study investigated pre-service English language teachers' conceptions of assessment, and assessment practices they think of using when they become an English language teacher in the future. The following questions were asked to 133 pre-service English language teachers from two universities in Konya, during 2013-2014 academic year:

1. What are the pre-service English language teachers' conceptions of assessment in terms of; *Improvement*, *School Accountability*, *Student Accountability*, and *Irrelevance*?
2. How do the four components of assessment conceptions relate to each other?
3. What types of assessment practices have pre-service English language teachers been exposed for their language achievement, so far?
4. What types of assessment practices do pre-service English language teachers think of using as a future teacher?

For the first and second research questions, Teacher Conceptions of Assessment Abridged Scale (TCoA-III A) was used. There are 27 items rated on a 6 point rating scale degraded from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 6 (Strongly Agree). "Teacher Conceptions of Assessment Scale" is the original version of TCoA-III Abridged Scale developed by Brown (2001-2003, 2008). The items were subclassified under four main conceptions of

assessment. Descriptive statistics was used to find out the answer of research question 1, and how four main conceptions relate to each other, Pearson Correlation was used. The researcher of this study turned the assessment practice part of the original questionnaire into two-column checklist for third and fourth research questions. So, descriptive findings were analyzed through percentages for research questions 3 and 4.

5.2. Discussion of Descriptive Results of Conceptions

According to the descriptive results of conceptions of assessment, the pre-service English language teachers at most moderately agreed with the items related to Improvement Conception. They believe that assessment results should be trustworthy, consistent and objective. “Validity of assessment is obtained when the assessment method is consistent with the material and curriculum being taught and if the results of the assessment are accurate” (Brown, 2002, pp. 30-31). Moreover, pre-service English language teachers are also on the opinion that feedback has a crucial role in point of assessing the students’ language performances. Butler and Winne (1995) state that teachers are able to monitor students’ progress and check their understanding of implementing feedback strategies. Teachers also improve their teaching practices as they also become aware of their weakness and strengths.

In general, pre-service English language teachers are in a moderate agreement for the items related to School Accountability as in improvement conception. Pre-service English language teachers are on the opinion that the value of schools can appropriately be determined through a good assessment. Brown (2002) says that “school accountability may lead to a raising of educational standards that will in turn lead to improved ability of students to receive qualifications and recognition of achievement” (p.146).

“Student accountability is largely about high stakes consequences such as graduation or selection or being publicly reported on as earning a certain grade, level or score” (Brown, 2002, p.41). Pre-service English language teachers in this group agree with the opinions of Brown (2002). Pre-service English language teachers are aware of the significance of assessment as a means of assignment of students’ language achievement grades. However, it is surprising that although pre-service English language teachers conceive of assessment as a way of improving the quality of teaching and student learning, certifying the students learning and measuring the quality of schools, most of them also think assessment as “irrelevant to teaching, as something bad for students, and as inaccurate” (Brown 2002, p.93).

5.3. Discussion of Correlation Results of Conceptions

The correlation results showed that there was a significant correlation between Improvement, School Accountability ($r=76$, $p<.001$), and Student Accountability ($r=67$, $p<.001$). The correlation between School Accountability and Student Accountability was also significant ($r=72$, $p<.001$). It can be said that pre-service English language in this group conceived of assessment as diagnosing and improving students learning in order to meet standards of student achievement.

Moreover, they conceived of assessment as a good and accurate indicator to raising of educational standards. The correlation results between Improvement and School Accountability are consistent with the study conducted by Brown (2011). According to the results of his study, there was a moderate correlation ($r=54$, $p<.001$) between Improvement and School Accountability. He states that this correlation is “suggesting a clear association between student grading and improved teaching and learning” (p.8).

It is surprising that Irrelevance was also moderately correlated with Improvement ($r=42$, $p<.001$), School Accountability ($r= 37$, $p<.001$), and Student Accountability ($r=45$, $p<.001$). The correlation between Irrelevance and these three other conceptions showed that pre-service English language teachers also moderately conceived assessments as being bad for students, inaccurate or to be used but, the results are ignored. If pre-service English language teachers' language performance assessments largely had been relied on some assessment practices such as Unplanned Observation and results had been ignored, this might lead pre-service English language teachers to think assessment as irrelevant. For instance, according to the descriptive results of assessment tool preferences used for evaluating pre-service English language teachers' language performance (See Table 6), Unplanned Observation technique was used by teachers of pre-service English language teachers with a percentage 59. However, the descriptive results of assessment tool preferences thought to be used by pre-service English language teachers (See Table 7) show that pre-service English language teachers think of using Unplanned Observation technique with a percentage of 46. Brown (2004) stated that teachers using Unplanned Observation technique do not systematically evaluate their students' language performance by using anecdotal records, or checklists. Thus, they may think that assessment can be more reliable and relevant if the assessment results are obtained systematically through written records.

5.4. Discussion of Assessment Preferences of Pre-Service English Language Teachers

Pre-service English language teachers stated that they were assessed through Oral Question & Answer and Teacher Made Written Test with a percentage of 68. It shows that on one hand, pre-service English language teachers' comprehension and

progress were checked orally through Oral Question & Answer assessment technique, on the other hand, their language skills and areas such as spelling, grammar and contextualization were assessed through Teacher Made Written Test assessment technique.

Marked Homework assessment technique was also used (67%) by their teachers to help them reinforce what they learnt at school, and take over responsibility for learning. Student Written Work and Standardized Test assessment techniques were equally used to gauge pre-service English language teachers' language achievement with a percentage 65. This indicates that pre-service English language teachers' language performances were assessed through their own written works such as activity sheets, and because of some fundamental issues such as their placement or graduation, Standardized Test technique of which results were viewed as objective and reliable was used.

Pre-service English language teachers stated that their language performances were also assessed through Planned and Unplanned Observation, Student Self or Peer Assessment, 1-3 Hour Examination, Portfolio/ Scrapbook, and Essay Test assessment techniques. Thanks to Conferencing technique, the teachers are able to give direct feedback to the students' works orally or in a written way, and they become as facilitators and guiders in language teaching process, however, pre-service English language teachers stated that it was the less preferred (39%) assessment tool by their language teachers.

Pre-service English language teachers also think of using at most Student Written Work (79%). While assessing students' written works, corrective feedback has an important role. Pre-service English language teachers are mostly on the same opinion

that the students should also participate in language assessment process. According to pre-service English language teachers, while students to develop an instinct motivation and self-autonomy for their own language assessment; they should also be able to assess their peers' language performances, give them feedback and work in a cooperative atmosphere. Thus, pre-service English language teachers stated that they would use Student Self or Peer Assessment technique with a percentage 76.

Oral Question & Answer (72%), Planned Observation (72%), and Teacher Made Written Test (72%) considered being used by pre-service English language teachers at the same rate. These three assessment techniques have the third highest percentage. While they think to observe the students' language performance by using some tools such as anecdotal records, checklists or rating scales through Planned Observation, they also think to use Oral Question & Answer in order to check the students' understanding and give them an opportunity to produce meaningful language in response. Besides observing systematically and keeping speaking at the forefront through Planned Observation and Oral Question & Answer, they also think to use written tests prepared by themselves to assess the students' language performances.

Pre-service English language teachers think of using Portfolio/Scrapbook and Essay Test with a percentage 67. As it is understood, most of pre-service English language teachers are on the same opinion that although portfolios include partly some works related to writing skill, to help the students improve their skills in higher-order thinking and written expression, pre-service English language teachers think that Essay Test should be used in the same equivalence with Portfolio /Scrapbook.

In addition to assessing the students' language performance with the concrete data, the language teachers can also assess them through observation. However, pre-

service English language teachers indicated that Unplanned Observation (49%) was going to be used the less.

There are some differences between the techniques (See Table 6) used by teachers of pre-service English language teachers, and techniques (See Table 7) thought to be used by pre-service English language teachers in the future. They think of using Essay Test technique more than their teachers did. Badjadi (2013) says that “the use of essays as an assessment procedure has been a promising area of research into the reliability and validity of writing measures” (p.5).

Moreover, pre-service English language teachers also think of using Portfolio/ Scrapbook more than their teachers did. Ersoy (2006) who conducted a study to find out teachers candidates’ opinion about portfolio assessment, says “teachers candidates have stated that portfolio is an objective, and vital assessment technique which fairly measures performance” (p.85).

In addition to these techniques, pre-service English language teachers also think of using Student Written Work and Conferencing assessment tools more than their teachers did. A concerning factor is that, pre-service English language teachers’ language performances were assessed through Planned and Unplanned Observation at the same rate (59%) by their teachers. On one hand, while pre-service English language teachers think of using Planned Observation technique in the future more than their teachers did, on the other hand they think of using Unplanned Observation in the future less than their teachers did. Namely, pre-service English language teachers mostly prefer to assess their students’ language performances systematically by using checklist or rating scale rather than observing in an unplanned way. If their language performances had not been treated cautiously by their teachers in that time through

Unplanned Observation assessment technique, this negative assessment process might lead pre-service English language teachers consider the assessment as irrelevant.

Brown (2004) says “for a number of years, conferences have been a routine part of language classrooms” (p.264). Pre-service English language teachers know how Conferencing technique is important for the assessment of language achievement. They think of using Conferencing technique more than their teachers did.

5.5. Recommendations

The researcher conducted this study to investigate fourth grade pre-service English language teachers’ conceptions of assessment and assessment practices they think of using in Konya, and 133 pre-service English language teachers participated in this study. In further studies, more pre-service English language teachers from other cities of Turkey can be included to make generalizations of the results.

The same questionnaire and the checklist could be administered to the first, second, and third grade pre-service English language teachers in different universities so as to understand the differences and similarities between pre-service English language teachers.

As stated before in limitation part, the checklist used in this study included only 12 assessment practices. However, as it is commonly known that there are some other assessment practices used in foreign language teaching. Thus, it is strongly recommended that more extensive assessment practices be included in the future studies

Finally, this study predominantly based on pre-service English language teachers’ assessment conceptions and assessment practices. So, to be able to get a deeper

understanding of their conceptions and assessment practices they think of using, a semi structured interview questions can be included.

6. REFERENCES

- Abedi, J. (2002). Standardized Achievement Tests and English Language Learners: *Psychometrics Issues, Educational Assessment*, 8(3), 231-257, doi: 10.1207/S15326977EA0803_02
- Acosta, B. D., Rivera, C., & Willner, L. S. (2008). Best Practices in State Assessment Policies for Accommodating English Language Learners: A Delphi Study. *George Washington University Center for Equity and Excellence in Education*.
- Agrey. (2004). The Pressure Cooker in Education: Standardized Assessment and High-Stakes. *Canadian Social Studies*.38 (3).<http://www.quasar.ualberta.ca/css>
- Akpınar K, Çakildere B. (2013). Washback Effects of High-Stakes Language Tests of Turkey (KPDS and UDS) on Productive and Receptive Skills of Academic Personnel. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*. 9(2): 81-94. From <<http://www.jlls.org/vol9no2/81-94.pdf>> (Retrieved on 12 March 2014).
- Aksu, M., Demir, C. E., Daloglu, A., Yildirim, S., & Kiraz, E. (2010). Who are the future teachers in Turkey? Characteristics of entering student teachers. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 30(1), 91-101.
- Ali, M. (2011). Teachers' and students' perspectives on English language assessment in the secondary English Language Teaching (ELT) curriculum in Bangladesh. EDEM 691 : A thesis submitted to the College of Education of University of Canterbury.
- Anderson, T., Rourke, L., Archer, W., & Garrison, R. (2001). Assessing teaching presence in computer conferencing transcripts. *Journal of the Asynchronous Learning Network* 5(2).
- Anıl, D. & Acar, M. (2008). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin ölçme değerlendirme sürecinde karşılaştıkları sorunlara ilişkin görüşleri. *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 5(11), 44- 66.
- Aydın, S. (2010). EFL writers' perceptions of portfolio keeping. *Assessing Writing*, 15(3), 194-203. Doi: 10.1016/j.asw.2010.08.001.

- Aydın, S., & Zengin, B. (2008). Yabancı dil öğreniminde kaygı: Bir literature özeti. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 4(1), pp-81-94.
- Azis, A. (2012). Teachers' Conceptions and Use of Assessment in Student Learning. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics (IJAL)*, 2(1), 40-52.
- Badjadi, N. E. I. (2013). Conceptualizing Essay Tests' Reliability and Validity: From Research to Theory. *Online Submission*.
- Baird, J. A. (2011). Does the learning happen inside the black box?. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 18(4), 343-345.
- Barnes, B. D., & Lock, G. (2013). Student Perceptions of Effective Foreign Language Teachers: A Quantitative Investigation from a Korean University. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(2), n2.
- Baş, G. (2013). Seviye Belirleme Sınavı (SBS-2009): 6. Sınıf İngilizce Alt Testinin Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1(26), 44-62.
- Bekleyen, N. (2010). An Examination of Language Achievement Tests Administered in Primary Education. *Eğitim Araştırmaları- Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 10(41), 19-35.
- Biggs, J.B. (2003) *Teaching for quality learning at university: What the student does* (2nd ed.). Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press..
- Black, P., Wiliam, D., (1998). Inside the Black Box: Raising Standards Through Classroom Assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan* 80(2), 139-148. .
- Bloxham, S., & Boyd, P. (2007). *Developing Effective Assessment In Higher Education: A Practical Guide*: McGraw- Hill International.
- Brookhart, S. M. (2001). Successful students' formative and summative uses of assessment information. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 8(2), 153- 169.

- Brookhart, S. M. (2013). The use of teacher judgement for summative assessment in the USA. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 20(1), 69-90.
- Brookhart, S. M., & Nitko, A. J. (2008). *Assessment and grading in classrooms*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Brown, G. T. L. (2001–2003). *Teachers' conceptions of assessment (TCoA) inventory* (versions 1–3). Unpublished test. Auckland, NZ: University of Auckland.
- Brown, G. T. L. (2002). *Teachers' conceptions of assessment* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Auckland).
- Brown, G. T. L. (2007). *Teachers' conceptions of assessment: comparing measurement models for primary & secondary teachers in New Zealand*. Paper presented to the New Zealand Association for Research in Education (NZARE) Annual Conference, Christchurch, NZ.
- Brown, G. T. L. (2008). *Conceptions of assessment: Understanding what Assessment means to teachers and students*. New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.
- Brown, G. T. L. (2011). Self-regulation of assessment beliefs and attitudes: A review of the Students 'Conceptions of Assessment inventory. *Educational Psychology*, 31(6), 731-748.
- Brown, G. T., Kennedy, K. J., Fok, P. K., Chan, J. K. S., & Yu, W. M. (2009). Assessment for student improvement: Understanding Hong Kong teachers' conceptions and practices of assessment. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 16(3), 347-363.
- Brown, H.D. (2004). *Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practices*. New York: Pearson Education. Inc.
- Brown, S., Race, P., & Smith, B. (2004). *500 tips on assessment*. Routledge.
- Brualdi, A. C. (1996). *Multiple intelligences: Gardner's theory*. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearing house on Assessment and Evaluation. (ERIC Digest: ED 410 226)

- Butler, D. L., & Winne, P. H. (1995). Feedback and self-regulated learning: A theoretical synthesis. *Review of educational research*, 65(3), 245-281.
- Buyukkarci K 2010. *The Effect of Formative Assessment on Learners' Test Anxiety and Assessment Preferences in EFL Context*. PhD Dissertation, Unpublished. Adana, Cukurova University.
- Büyüktokatlı, N., & Bayraktar, Ş. (2014). Fen eğitiminde alternatif ölçme değerlendirme uygulamaları. *Pegem Eğitim ve Öğretim Dergisi*, 4(1), 103-126.
- Carlsson, T. (2009). Homework for English from the Students' Perspective. *Perspectice Laxor I Engelska ur ett Elevperspektiv*.
- Chen, R. J. (2010). Investigating models for pre-service teachers' use of technology to support student- centered learning. *Computers & Education*, 55(1), 32-42.
- Cheng, L. (1999). Changing assessment: Washback on teacher perceptions and actions. *Teaching and teacher education*, 15(3), 253-271.
- Cheng, W., & Warren, M. (2005). Peer-assessment: Washback on teacher perceptions and actions. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 15(3), 253-271.
- Chirimbu, S. (2013). Using Alternative Assessment Methods in Foreign Language Teaching. Case Study: Alternative Assessment of Business English for University Students. *Buletinul Stiintific al Universitatii Politehnica din Timisoara, Seria Limbi Moderne*, (12), 91-99.
- Costley, K. C. (2013). Costley, K. C. (2013). Does Homework Really Improve Achievement?. *Online Submission*.
- Creswell, J. W. (1995). Educational Research: *Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Peterson Education, Inc.
- Dochy, F. (2001). A new assessment era: different needs, new challenges. *Learning and Instruction*, 10, 11-20. Doi: 10.1016/S0959-4752(00)00022-0.

- Dogan, M. (2011). Student teachers views about assessment and evaluation methods in mathematics. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 6 (5), 417-431. Retrieved from: <http://www.academicjournals.org/journal/article-abstract/A3CC06C5232>
- Doğan, N., &Sevindik, H. (2011).İlköğretim 6.Sınıflar için uygulanan seviye belirleme sınavının uygunluk geçerliği. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 36(160), 309-319.
- Doğandere, Ç. I. (2006). Perspective of Young Learners of English Towards Assessment: Formative or Summative? Uludag University, Bursa.
- Ersoy, A. F. (2006). Opinions of Teacher Candidates as to the Portfolio Assessment. *Elementary Education Online*, 5(1), 85-95.
- Fahim, M., &Fahim, F. (2011). The Difference between Formative Assessment through Multiple Choice Questions and True False Questions in Iranian Intermediate EFL Learners' Grammar Learning. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(7), 906-911. Doi: 10.4304/tpls.1.7.906-911.
- Fook, C. Y., & Sidhu, G. K. (2010). Authentic assessment and pedagogical strategies in higher education.*Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(2), 153.
- Fraenkel, J. R.,&Wallen, N. E. (2000). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Freeman, M. (1995). Peer-assessment by groups of group work. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 20(3), 289-300.
- Fry, R. (2008). *The role of schools in the english language learner achievement gap*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center.
- Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. W. (2009).*Educational Research: Competencies for analysis and applications (7thed.)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Gok, B., Erdogan, O., Altinkaynak, S. O., & Erdogan, T. (2012). Investigation of Pre-Service Teachers' Perceptions about Concept of Measurement and Assessment

- Through Metaphor Analysis. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 1997-2003. Doi: .10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.05.417.
- Gomez, E. (2000). *Assessment portfolios: Including English language learners in large-scale assessments*. ERIC Clearing house on Languages and Linguistics.
- Greenstein , L. (2010). *What teachers really need to know about formative assessment*. ASCD.
- Gugin, D. (2014). A Paragraph- First Approach to the Teaching of Academic Writing. *English Language Forum*, 24-36.
- Gülbahar, Y., &Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2008). Değerlendirme tercihleri ölçeğinin Türkçeye uyarlanması. *HacettepeÜniversitesiEğitimFakültesiDergisi*, 35 (35).
- Gulek, C. (2003). Preparing for high-stakes testing. *Theory into Practice*, 42(1), 42-50. Doi: 10.1207/s15430421tip4201_6.
- Gür, O. (2013). Ölçme, Değerlendirme ve Kamu Personel Dil Sınavı (KPDS)- Bu Sınav Neyi Ölçüyor? *Sakarya University Journal Education* , 23-32.
- Hamayan, E.V. (1995). Approaches to alternative assessment. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 15, 212-226.
- Harlen, W. (2005). Teachers summative practices and assessment for learning- tensions and synergies. *Curriculum Journal*, 16(2), 207-223. Doi: 10.1080/09585170500136093.
- Hill, M. (2000) ‘Dot, Slash, Cross: How Assessment can Drive Teachers to Ticking instead of Teaching’, SET: *Research Information for Teachers* 1: 21–5.
- Horwitz, E. K.,&Young, D. J. (1991). *Language anxiety: From theory and research to classroom implications*. Pearson College Div.
- Janudom, R., &Wasanasomithi, P. (2009). Drama and questioning techniques: Powerful tools for the enhancement of students’ speaking abilities and positive attitudes towards EFL learning. *ESP World*, 5(26), 1-9.

- Kao, S. M., Carlin, G., & Hsu, L. F. (2011). Questioning techniques for promoting language learning with students of limited L2 oral proficiency in a drama-oriented language classroom. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, 16(4), 489-515. Doi: 10.1080/13569783.2011.61399
- Karabulut, A. (2007). *Micro level impacts of foreign language test (university entrance examination) in Turkey: A washback study* (Doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University).
- Karakas, A. (2012). Evaluation of the English language teacher education program in Turkey. *ELT Weekly*, 4(15). <http://www.elweekly.com/elt-newsletter/2012/04/vol-4-issue-15-research-article-evaluation-of-the-language-teachereducation-program-in-8turkey-by-ali-karakas/>
- Karp, G. G., & Woods, M. L. (2008). Pre-service teachers' perceptions about assessment and its implementation. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 27(3), 327-346.
- Kealey, E. (2010). Assessment and evaluation in social work education: Formative and summative approaches. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, 30(1), 64-74. Doi: 10.1080/08841230903479557
- Kilimci, S. (2009). Teacher training in some EU countries and Turkey: How similar are they? *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1(1), 1975-1980. Doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2009.01.347.
- Kirkgöz, Y. (2009). Globalization and English language policy in Turkey. *Educational Policy*, 23(5), 663-684. Doi: 10.1177/0895904808316319.
- Knight, P. T. (2002). The Achilles' Heel of Quality: The assessment of student learning. *Quality in Higher Education*, 8(1), 107-115. Doi: 10.1080/13538320220127506
- Koksall, D. (2004). Assessing teachers' testing skills in ELT and enhancing their professional development through distance learning on the net. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 5(1).

- Konur, K. B., & Konur, B. (2011). Primary Teachers' Views Concerning the Assessment Methods Used by Them. *Necatibey Faculty of Education Electronic Journal of Science & Mathematics Education*, 5(2).
- Li, H., & Suen, H. K. (2012). Are Test Accommodations for English Language Learners Fair? *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 9(3), 293-309. Doi:10.1080/15434303.2011.653843
- Libman, Z. (2010). Alternative assessment in higher education: An experience in descriptive statistics. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 36(1), 62-68. Doi:10.1016/j.stueduc.2010.01.002
- Mertler, C. A. (2003). Pre-service versus inservice teachers' assessment literacy: Does classroom experience make a difference. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association, Columbus, OH, October.
- Moe, M. S. (2012). *Learning, knowing, and doing classroom assessment: exposure and understanding rates of assessment knowledge among elementary pre-service teachers*. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Iowa).. <http://ir.uiowa.edu/etd/3352>.
- Mohammed, A. (2012). *Senior High School (SHS) Social Studies Teachers' Formative Assessment Practices in Ghana*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Education).
- Moss, C. (2013). Research on classroom summative assessment. In J. McMillan (Ed.), *SAGE. Handbook of research on classroom assessment*. (pp. 235-256). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781452218649.n14>
- Moss, C. M., & Brookhart, S. M. (2010). *Advancing formative assessment in every classroom: A guide for instructional leaders*. ASCD.
- Muñoz, A. P., Palacio, M., & Escobar, L. (2012). Teachers' Beliefs about Assessment in an EFL Context in Colombia. *Profile Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 14(1), 143-158.

- Nasri, N., Roslan, S. N., Sekuan, M. I., Bakar, K. A. & Puteh, S. N. (2010). Teachers' Perception on Alternative Assessment. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 7 (C), 37-42.
- Neill, M. (2006). Preparing Teachers to Beat the Agonies of No Child Left Behind (NCLB). *Education Digest: Essential Readings Condensed for Quick Review*, 71(8), 8-12.
- Ok, S. (2012). Opinions of ELT students in freshman class on using portfolio as an assessment tool. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (Pamukkale University Faculty of Education Journal)*, 32, 1-11.
- Özyar, A. (2003). *Milli Eğitim Bakanlığının öğretmen yetiştirme politikaları*. Ankara. http://oyegm.meb.gov.tr/ortasayfa/gn_md_sunuu.htm, 10(6), 2010.
- Papandreou, A. (1991). Homework in Teaching and Learning.
- Peterson, B., & Neil, M. (1999). Alternatives to Standardized Tests. *Rethinking Schools* 13(3): 1, 4-5, 28. http://www.rethinkingschools.org/archieve/13_03/13_03.shtml
- Remesal, A. (2011). Primary and secondary teachers' conceptions of assessment: A qualitative study. *Teaching and teacher education*, 27(2), 472-482.
- Şahin, Ç., & Karaman, P. (2013). Sınıf öğretmeni adaylarının ölçme ve değerlendirmeye ilişkin inançları. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 28(28-2).
- Sainsbury, E. J., & Walker, R. A. (2008). Assessment as a vehicle for learning: extending collaboration into testing. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(2), 103-117.
- Sanlı, Ş. (2009). Comparison of the English language teaching (ELT) departments' course curricula in Turkey's education faculties. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1(1), 838-843. Doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2009.01.150
- Sarıcoban, A. (2011). A Study on the English Language Teachers' Preparations of Tests. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 41(41), 398-410.

- Scriven, M. (2000). The logic and methodology of checklists. Интернет-ресурс http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/checklists/papers/logic&methodology_dec07.pdf.
- Seferoğlu, S. S. (2004). Öğretmen Yeterlikleri ve Mesleki Gelişim. *Bilim ve Aklın Aydınlığında Eğitim*, (58), 40-45.
- Shepard, L. A. (2005, October). Formative assessment: Caveatemptor. In *ETS Invitational Conference, New York, NY*.
- Siegel, M. A. (2014). Developing Preservice Teachers' Expertise in Equitable Assessment for English Learners. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 25(3), 289-308.
- Solórzano, R. W. (2008). High stakes testing: Issues, implications, and remedies for English language learners. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(2), 260-329. Doi:10.3102/0034654308317845
- Stiggins, R. J. (2002). Assessment crisis: The Absence of Assessment for Learning. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 83(10), 758-765.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. (2000). Guidelines for developing evaluation checklists: the checklists development checklist (CDC). *Kalamazoo, MI: The Evaluation Center. Retrieved on January, 16, 2008*.
- Taber, K. S., Riga, F., Brindley, S., Winterbottom, M., Finney, J., & Fisher, L. G. (2011). Formative conceptions of assessment: trainee teachers' thinking about assessment issues in English secondary schools. *Teacher Development*, 15(2), 171–186. doi:10.1080/13664530.2011.571500.
- Thompson, A.G. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and conceptions: A synthesis of the research. In D. A. Grouws (Ed.), *Handbook of research on mathematic teaching and learning* (pp.127-146). New York: McMillan.
- Tong, S. Y. A. (2011). Assessing English Language Arts in Hong Kong Secondary Schools. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 20(2), 387-394.

- Topping, K. (1998). Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. *Review of Educational Research* 68, 249-276.
- Traister, C. A. (2005). *The perceptions of student teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors regarding the assessment of student teacher performance* (Doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University).
- Vardar, E. (2010). Sixth, Seventh and Eighth Grade Teachers' Conceptions of Assessment. University of Middle Technical University, Ankara.
- Volante, L., Beckett, D., Reid, J., & Drake, S. (2010). Teachers' Views on Conducting Formative Assessment within Contemporary Classrooms. Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (pp. 1–23).
- Warton, P. M. (2001). The forgotten voices in homework: Views of students. *Educational Psychologist*, 36(3), 155-165. DOI: 10.1207/S15326985EP3603_2
- Wei, L. (2010). Formative Assessment: Opportunities and Challenges. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(6), 838-841. doi:10.4304/jltr.1.6.838-841
- Yaman, S., & Karamustafaoğlu, S. (2011). Investigating prospective teachers' perceived levels of efficacy towards measurement and evaluation. *Ankara University Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences*, 44(2), 53-72.
- Yayla, G. (2011, April). Fen ve teknoloji öğretmenlerinin tecrübeleriyle alternatif ölçme ve değerlendirme yaklaşımlarına yönelik öz yeterlilikleri arasındaki ilişki. In *2nd International Conference on New Trends in Education and Their Implications, Antalya*.
- Yayli, D. (2012). Professional language use by pre-service English as a foreign language teachers in a teaching certificate program. *Teachers and Teaching*, 18(1), 59-73. Doi: 10.1080/13540602.2011.622555
- Young, J. W., Cho, Y., Ling, G., Cline, F., Steinberg, J., & Stone, E. (2008). Validity and fairness of state standards-based assessments for English language learners. *Educational assessment*, 13(2-3), 170-192.

Zhengdong, G. (2009). IELTS Preparation Course and Student IELTS Performance A Case Study in Hong Kong*. *RELC journal*, 40(1), 23-41.
Doi:10.1177/0033688208101449.

7. APPENDICES

7.1. Appendix A: Teachers' Conceptions of Assessment Questionnaire (TCoA-III A).



Conceptions of Assessment III Abridged Survey

This survey asks about your beliefs and understandings about ASSESSMENT, whatever that term means to you. Please answer the questions using YOUR OWN understanding of assessment.

1. Please give your rating for each of the following 27 statements based on **YOUR** opinion about assessment. Indicate how much you actually agree or disagree with each statement. Use the following rating scale and choose the one response that comes closest to describing your opinion.

- Strongly Disagree
- Mostly Disagree
- Slightly Agree
- Moderately Agree
- Mostly Agree
- Strongly Agree

Note that the ratings are ordered from Disagree on the LEFT to Agree on the RIGHT.

Please tick one box for each statement

Conceptions of Assessment	Strongly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Mostly Agree	Strongly Agree
1. Assessment provides information on how well schools are doing	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Assessment places students into categories	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Assessment is a way to determine how much students have learned from teaching	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Assessment provides feedback to students about their performance	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. Assessment is integrated with teaching practice	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Assessment results are trustworthy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Assessment forces teachers to teach in a way against their beliefs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Teachers conduct assessments but make little use of the results	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. Assessment results should be treated cautiously because of measurement error	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. Assessment is an accurate indicator of a school's quality	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. Assessment is assigning a grade or level to student work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. Assessment establishes what students have learned	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. Assessment feeds back to students their learning needs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. Assessment information modifies ongoing teaching of students	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Please continue ...

Please tick one box for each statement

Conceptions of Assessment	Strongly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Mostly Agree	Strongly Agree
15. Assessment results are consistent	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16. Assessment is unfair to students	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17. Assessment results are filed & ignored	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18. Teachers should take into account the error and imprecision in all assessment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
19. Assessment is a good way to evaluate a school	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
20. Assessment determines if students meet qualifications standards	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
21. Assessment measures students' higher order thinking skills	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
22. Assessment helps students improve their learning	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
23. Assessment allows different students to get different instruction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
24. Assessment results can be depended on	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
25. Assessment interferes with teaching	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
26. Assessment has little impact on teaching	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
27. Assessment is an imprecise process	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Please continue ...

7.2. Appendix B: Checklist

	Tick the box (es) that your English teachers have used to assess your English achievement so far.	Tick the box (es) that you think you will use when you become an English teacher.
1. Unplanned Observation		
2. Oral Question & Answer		
3. Planned Observation (e.g., Running Record, Checklist)		
4. Student Written Work (e.g., activity sheets, spelling)		
5. Marked Homework		
6. Student Self or Peer Assessment		
7. Conferencing		
8. Portfolio / Scrapbook		
9. Teacher Made Written Test		
10. Standardised Test		
11. Essay Test		
12. 1-3 Hour Examination		