

**T.C. KOCAELİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
YABANCI DİLLER EĞİTİMİ ANABİLİM DALI
İNGİLİZ DİLİ EĞİTİMİ BİLİM DALI**

**ASSESSMENT LITERACY PERCEPTIONS OF ENGLISH
LANGUAGE LITERATURE AND ENGLISH LANGUAGE
TEACHING GRADUATES**

(M. A. THESIS)

Bahar AKBABA

KOCAELİ 2022

**T.C. KOCAELİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
YABANCI DİLLER EĞİTİMİ ANABİLİM DALI
İNGİLİZ DİLİ EĞİTİMİ BİLİM DALI**

**ASSESSMENT LITERACY PERCEPTIONS OF ENGLISH
LANGUAGE LITERATURE AND ENGLISH LANGUAGE
TEACHING GRADUATES**

(M.A. THESIS)

Bahar AKBABA

Doç. Dr. Dođan YÜKSEL

KOCAELİ 2022

**T.C. KOCAELİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
YABANCI DİLLER EĞİTİMİ ANABİLİM DALI
İNGİLİZ DİLİ EĞİTİMİ BİLİM DALI**

**ASSESSMENT LITERACY PERCEPTIONS OF ENGLISH
LANGUAGE LITERATURE AND ENGLISH LANGUAGE
TEACHING GRADUATES**

(M. A. THESIS)

Tezi Hazırlayan: Bahar AKBABA

Tezin Kabul Edildiği Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu Karar ve No: 02.11.2022-29

Jüri Başkanı: Doç. Dr. Doğan YÜKSEL

Jüri Üyesi: Prof. Dr. Banu İnan KARAGÜL

Jüri Üyesi: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Sezen ARSLAN

KOCAELİ 2022



To my late father...

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

From the beginning to the end, writing my MA dissertation was a long process filled with both difficulties and great pleasure. I owe great gratitude to everyone whose effort and support went into my dissertation. This study would be impossible without their guidance and encouragement.

I want to start by expressing my sincere gratitude to my advisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Dođan YÜKSEL for his patience and support during this period. Additionally, I want to express my sincere gratitude to the members of my dissertation committee, Prof. Dr. Banu İNAN KARAGÜL, and Assist. Prof. Dr. Sezen ARSLAN. They are academics that I respect and value and who are also experts in their fields.

I would like to thank my dearest friends Dilan ATİLA, Ülkü Selin YILDIZ, and Zülal KARAKUŞ for encouraging and supporting me at all times and under all circumstances. Thanks to their support and love, I easily got through even the most challenging times.

I wholeheartedly thank my family: my mother Vediye ACAR and my brother Erol ACAR. I am grateful to them for not leaving me alone during the thesis writing process and being with me in every moment of my life. I had trouble putting into words how much they meant to me.

Finally, I want to express my gratitude to my one and only husband, Ođuzcan AKBABA, who has witnessed the entire process and has never ceased believing in me.

Bahar AKBABA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ii
ÖZET.....	iv
ABSTRACT.....	v
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
INTRODUCTION.....	1

CHAPTER I

1. INTRODUCTION.....	2
1.1. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY.....	2
1.2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.....	4
1.3. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY.....	5
1.4. RESEARCH QUESTIONS	6
1.5. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS	7
1.6. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY.....	8

CHAPTER II

2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	9
2.1. ASSESSMENT.....	9
2.1.1. Types of Assessment.....	11
2.1.2. Formative and Summative Assessment.....	11
2.2. ASSESSMENT LITERACY	12
2.3. LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT LITERACY.....	13
2.4. TEACHERS' ASSESSMENT BELIEFS.....	14
2.5. RESEARCH ON LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT LITERACY CONDUCTED IN TURKEY AND ABROAD.....	15
2.5.1. Research Conducted in Turkey.....	16
2.5.2. Research Conducted Abroad.....	20
3. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ELL AND ELT DEPARTMENTS.....	24

CHAPTER III

3. METHODOLOGY	28
3.1. RESEARCH DESIGN	28
3.2. SETTING AND PARTICIPANTS	28
3.3. DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS.....	29
3.4. DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE AND DATA ANALYSIS.....	30
3.4.1. Reliability and Validity	31

CHAPTER IV

4. FINDINGS.....	33
4.1. Quantitive Data Analysis.....	33

4.1.1. Results of Data Analysis for Research Questions 1 and 2.....	33
4.1.2. Results of Data Analysis for Research Question 3.....	36

CHAPTER V

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.....	38
5.1. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS FOR RESEARCH QUESTIONS 1 AND 2	38
5.2. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS FOR RESEARCH QUESTION 3.....	39
5.3. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH.....	40
CONCLUSIONS	41
REFERENCES.....	43
APPENDIX A	50
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	54

ÖZET

Bu çalışma, İngiliz dili edebiyatı ve İngilizce öğretmenliği mezunlarının değerlendirme okuryazarlığı algılarını araştırmayı amaçlamıştır. Bu çalışmaya farklı şehirlerden 38 İngiliz dili öğretmeni ve 30 İngiliz dili edebiyatı mezunu katılmıştır. Veri toplama sürecinde araç olarak Ölmezer-Öztürk'ün anketinden uyarlanan Dil Değerlendirme Bilgi Ölçeği (LAKS) kullanılmıştır. 69 maddelik beş ana bölümden oluşuyordu; demografik bilgiler, yazmayı değerlendirme, okumayı değerlendirme, dinlemeyi değerlendirme ve konuşmayı değerlendirme. Nicel verilerin (anketler) çıktılarını analiz etmek için Sosyal Bilimler için İstatistiksel Paket (SPSS) kullanıldı. İstatistiksel analiz sonucunda İngiliz dili öğretmenleri ile İngiliz dili edebiyatı mezunları yazmayı, okumayı, dinlemeyi ve konuşmayı değerlendirme açısından kendilerini iyi düzeyde görmektedir. Öğretmenlerin demografik özelliklerinin etkileri araştırıldığında, EL ve ELT mezunlarının değerlendirme okuryazarlığı inançlarında anlamlı bir farklılık bulunmamıştır. Söz konusu gruplar arasında anlamlı bir farklılık bulunmamıştır. Öğretmenlerin demografik özelliklerinin etkileri incelendiğinde, ELL ve ELT mezunlarının değerlendirme okuryazarlığı inançlarında gözle görülür bir farklılık yoktu. Genel olarak, katılımcılar dil değerlendirmesinde okuryazar olduklarına inanıyorlardı. Araştırmanın sonuçları literatür kapsamında tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Değerlendirme okuryazarlığı, İngiliz dili öğretmeni, İngiliz dili edebiyatı

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to investigate assessment literacy perceptions of English language literature and English language teaching graduates. 38 English language teachers and 30 English language literature graduates participated in this study in different cities. In the data collection process, a Language Assessment Knowledge Scale (LAKS) was used as an instrument adopted by Ölmezer-Öztürk (2018). It consisted of five main parts with 69 items; demographic information, assessing writing, assessing reading, assessing Listening, and assessing speaking. Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the outcomes of the quantitative data (questionnaire). As a result of the statistical analysis, English language teachers and English literature graduates consider themselves at a good level in evaluating writing, reading, listening, and speaking. When the effects of the demographic features of the teachers were investigated, there were no significant differences in the assessment literacy beliefs of ELL and ELT graduates. There was no significant difference between these groups. When the effects of the demographic features of the teachers were investigated, there were no noticeable differences in the assessment literacy beliefs of ELL and ELT graduates. Overall, participants believed they were literate in language assessment. The results of the research were discussed within the scope of the literature.

Keywords: Assessment literacy, English language teacher, English language literature,

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ELL	: English Language Literature
ELT	: English Language Teaching
LAL	: Language Assessment Literacy
SPSS	: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences



LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Profile of the Participants.....	27
Table 2. Reliability Analysis for Language Assessment Knowledge Scale (LAKS)	29
Table 3. Reliability Analysis for Reading, Listening, Writing, and Speaking.....	30
Table 4. Test of Normality.....	31
Table 5: How do you evaluate yourself as an assessor in the following areas/subskills? [reading].....	32
Table 6. How do you evaluate yourself as an assessor in the following areas/subskills? [Listening].....	32
Table 7. How do you evaluate yourself as an assessor in the following areas/subskills? [writing].....	33
Table 8. How do you evaluate yourself as an assessor in the following areas/subskills? [speaking].....	33
Table 9. Difference Between ELT and ELL Graduates Listening Beliefs.....	34
Table 10. Difference Between ELL And ELT Graduates' Listening Beliefs.....	34
Table 11. Difference Between ELT and ELL Graduates' Writing Beliefs.....	35
Table 12. Difference Between ELT and ELL Graduates' Speaking Beliefs.....	35

INTRODUCTION

In order to provide a broad picture of the participants' beliefs about language assessment, a quantitative research tool was used in the current study. In this study, a questionnaire that was adapted from Ölmezer-Öztürk (2018) was used as a tool. The participants' demographic information (gender, years of experience, educational background, graduated BA program, and type of school) and three additional questions were included in the first of the questionnaire's five sections. There were 15 separate items in the other 4 sections of the questionnaire, which assessed one's abilities in reading, listening, writing, and speaking (in total 60). The questionnaire for the data-gathering process was prepared and sent using Google Forms. The general and skill-based language assessment literacy attitudes of ELL and ELT graduates were investigated quantitatively using LAKS, as well as the effects of demographic factors such as teaching experience, educational background, and gender on their language assessment beliefs. Participants' responses to the survey were gathered once the author was permitted to use the survey instrument through email. The study's main objective was to collect quantitative data, and by the end of the process, 68 participants had completed the survey.

The first chapter of the current study presents the background of the study, statement of the problem, significance of the study, research questions, and definitions of terms. The second chapter provides a summary of the relevant studies divided into subheadings. The third chapter includes the methodology, research design, data collection instrument, data collection procedure and data analysis, and reliability and validity assessment literacy are situated with the methodology. The fourth chapter includes comprehensive coverage of the results of data analysis for research questions. The fifth chapter summarises discussion and conclusion as the last chapter.

CHAPTER I

1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter's introduction provides an overview of the study, its goals and relevance, the research questions, and definitions of key terms.

1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

English is one of the most commonly spoken languages in the world, and it is used for various reasons, such as education, commerce, and industry. As English has become widely used in many parts of life, the demand for teaching and learning English has risen in parallel. In an educational setting, teaching and assessment are thought to be two interconnected components. With the rising use of tests and assessments in language teaching, language teachers have become increasingly responsible for language testing and assessment (Fulcher, 2012). In that way, there has been a shift toward professionalism in the field of language testing and assessment. A new word, language assessment literacy (LAL), was coined by Stiggins (1991) to describe this process of improving teachers' abilities in testing-related activities. He claimed that teachers understand how to assess, why and what they consider, what the potential difficulties with assessment are, and how to avoid them with the help of assessment literacy knowledge.

Büyükkarci (2016) states that teachers with good assessment literacy experience are considered essential skills. Sevimel-Sahin & Subasi (2019) defined assessment literacy as recognizing and using assessment trends to evaluate their assessment processes in the classroom. In addition, Luthfiyyah and Basyari (2020) explained assessment literacy as that it is skills, conceptions, and knowledge needed

to conduct an assessment. Popham (2014) stated that assessment literacy concerns a teacher's understanding of assessment concepts to construct an assessment that can transform educational targets into assessment activities and properly represent learner achievement and comprehension. It can be argued that to maintain and support the teaching/learning process; teachers must have the essential skills or capacity to assess and provide details regarding assessment techniques. It enables teachers to monitor their students, identify the curriculum's strengths and weaknesses, and determine the appropriate content and also ways to improve learning.

In line with assessment literacy, the term language assessment literacy appeared as a consequence of attempts to improve language teachers professionally. Although language assessment literacy is formed in the phrase assessment literacy, it has emerged as a separate field. Giraldo (2018) offered one of the most detailed definitions for LAL. He stated that teachers must possess four distinct sets of abilities. These are instructional skills, design skills for constructing language assessments, educational measurement skills, and technical abilities for language measurements, such as using programs, software, and the internet for assessment purposes, which are all important. These principles analyze teachers' actions and awareness about significant concerns in language assessment, like using assessment data to make decisions about students, critically examining the influence of standardized exams, and using transparent and fair language assessments. Moreover, according to O'Loughlin (2013), it includes a variety of skills that are needed in producing and interpreting test scores as well as evaluating the test results by taking the functions of assessment in education and society into consideration. LAL is correlated explicitly with language assessment, as indicated by the previous definitions, and covers not only the theory associated with language assessment but also the application of this theory effectively and appropriately in assessment practices.

The role of teachers in assessment practices results in coming out the term assessment literacy. Assessment literacy among teachers is seen as a critical link in the relationship between assessment effectiveness and student success (Mertler, 2002).

Language assessment literacy is the connection between language assessment knowledge and knowing how to put it into practice. In contrast, assessment literacy is the mixture of assessment knowledge and learning how to put it into practice. In this regard, they should know how to create a testing task, what appropriate language measurement instruments are, how and when to administer them, how to evaluate the results to improve teaching/learning, and how to identify language learners' requirements. One of the latest studies by Hakim (2015) showed that teachers' assessment practices and perceptions appear to be influenced by their former teaching experience. The way teachers evaluate students in the classroom has an impact on the quality of their learning.

With all this information in mind, this study aimed to depict assessment literacy perceptions of English language literature and teaching graduates.

1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

As Bachman (2014) points out, teachers spend most of their classroom time dealing with assessment issues; thus, their understanding of language assessment literacy is fundamental. Assessing students is crucial because how we assess them directly impacts what and how they learn, which can be even stronger than the teaching materials (Boud, 1998). Teachers use assessment throughout the teaching and learning process to see how the learning process is going and how much learners have learned in those activities. It is critical in both learning and teaching English since the more significant the importance of assessment, the greater the importance of LAL. On the other hand, many pre-service instructors stated that they lack adequate evaluation knowledge (Plake, 1993). Additionally, (Stiggins, 2010) emphasized this problem by saying, "assessment illiteracy abounds." This shows that teachers are in charge of assessing students, but whether they have the essential knowledge to do so is questionable. Teachers must be assessment literate to monitor and inspire learner development as well as improve teaching performance (DeLuca & Khadijeh & Amir, 2015; Klinger, 2010; Rogier, 2014). They must be aware of and informed about

assessment methods and testing ideas and be able to apply various assessment instruments according to different situations. It is very important that developing teachers' assessment literacy significantly affects language teachers to evaluate students appropriately and improve their language learning.

Despite spending significant time on assessment-related tasks, instructors have insufficient language assessment knowledge. A considerable amount of research conducted worldwide revealed a low level of LAL (Jannati, 2015; Semiz & Odabaş, 2016; Xu & Brown, 2017). When it comes to the Turkish setting, there are many studies on language assessment literacy among teachers, especially after 2010. As LAL is a relatively new area of interest, there is still a lack of research in this area and the environment in Turkey, particularly regarding teacher education and language assessment literacy (Hatipoglu, 2010). According to Öz and Atay (2017), all participants agreed that 'evaluation' is critical in a language program for getting feedback from students and keeping track of their progress. Another study by Sahinkarakas (2012) indicated that most teachers consider assessment an important part of education. Put it another way, they see evaluation as a tool to show that teaching and learning are taking place. Besides, pre-service or in-service assessment training has little effect on Turkish ELT teachers' assessment choices, according to Han and Kaya (2014), and they rely on their personal assessment preferences. It was aimed to investigate assessment literacy perceptions of English Language Literature and English Language Teaching graduates in light of these concerns and the gap in the literature.

1.3 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The significance of language assessment literacy in teaching has long been acknowledged. Because assessment knowledge influences the quality of instruction, instructors must be assessment literate as part of their professional competence in order to respond to contextual learning/teaching demands and enhance both students' and teachers' performance (Howerton, 2016; Khadijeh & Amir, 2015). As previously stated, however, there has been much research into this notion in the literature

(Hatipoglu, 2010; Öz & Atay, 2017; Sahinkarakas, 2012). As a result, studying LAL might help advance the area of such research and provide new perspectives on the research context. By investigating English teachers' assessment conceptions in the Turkish context and focusing on EFL teachers' assessment and testing training needs, levels, methods of assessment in their classes, and differences between their beliefs and practices, the present study is intended to fill a gap in the very limited literature of assessment in Turkey. The study's findings may provide important information to ELT teachers in Turkey when it comes to analyzing the function of assessment in language education quality and motivating them to take steps to improve the situation in their educational setting (s). To understand what teachers expect, understand, and feel in terms of assessment, it's critical to look into what they think, feel, and hope in terms of their teaching methods.

1.4 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Because there is a lack of study on LAL in the Turkish setting, further research is needed to investigate the LAL of ELT and ELL graduates. The current study is designed to explore the following research questions:

1. What are English Language Teaching (ELT) graduates' language assessment beliefs?
2. What are English Language Literature (ELL) graduates' language assessment beliefs?
3. Are there any differences between ELT and ELL graduates' assessment literacy beliefs?

1.5 DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

Assessment

The process of collecting and analyzing data from a variety of sources in order to gain a comprehensive picture of what students understand, know, and can achieve with their knowledge of academic experience (Stobart, 2008).

Assessment Literacy (AL)

Knowing the principles of assessment, as well as its philosophy and theory, and applying them while assessing learners' learning progress (Deluca & Klinger, 2010).

Language Assessment Literacy (LAL)

Refers to the knowledge, abilities, and skills necessary to evaluate and construct tests, as well as an understanding of assessment theory and the impact of assessment on communities and people (Webb, 2012).

Teacher Assessment Literacy

The key professional need within educational systems asserts that teachers need to be knowledgeable in terms of the different assessment standards throughout the world and a variety of assessment literacy measures that reflect various concepts of assessment literacy (DeLuca et al., 2016).

1.6 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study's main limitation is that just 30 ELT were conducted and 30 ELL graduates, some of whom work at primary, elementary, middle, and high schools in Turkey. In that way, the number of participants could have been more.



CHAPTER II

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, the terms assessment, assessment literacy, and language assessment literacy are all defined. Previous research on language assessment literacy from across the world and in Turkey is also presented in this chapter.

2.1 ASSESSMENT

For language learning and learners, teaching has significant power. Language teachers struggle to assess learners' progress with formal and informal assessments. It is undeniable that every testing situation is important and should have a particular role. To understand the outcomes of testing and assessment in language acquisition, it is necessary to understand testing ideas and their relationship between teaching and learning. Furthermore, language assessment serves as a guideline for learners to understand how they may improve their language abilities and how they've been doing. Assessment, testing, and evaluation are all terms that are used interchangeably in the context of language teaching and learning, but they have different meanings. Assessment is a broad phrase that covers a range of techniques, including tests, and is an essential part of the educational system (Clapham, 2000). According to Hatipoğlu (2015), it's one of the most important cornerstones of the educational process. Thus, an assessment may be defined as any tool, technique, or strategy used by teachers to elicit evidence of students' progress toward specified objectives (Chen, 2003). Even though the description of assessment differs, it is widely accepted that it is an essential component of teaching, and it provides educators with numerous opportunities, including assessing students' knowledge, skills, and development, diagnosing learners' weaknesses and strengths, and encouraging them (Taras, 2005). On the other

hand, a test is a specific type of assessment that consists of a collection of questions and is presented at a particular time (Miller et al., 2008: p.28). According to Rahman (2017), a test generally demonstrates one's ability-inability, competence-incompetence, and status on a scale of variables such as fail, pass, decent, satisfactory, good, and excellent. Unlike a test, assessment is a continuous process in which teachers evaluate their students' every action anytime they answer a question or comment. However, evaluation is a critical examination of a program to make program evaluations, increase program effectiveness, and/or inform programming decisions (Patton, 1987). Then there's the need to look at assessment in a broader context; it's not just about measuring with a pen and paper. Thomas, Allman, and Beech (2004) describe assessment as gathering information that helps decision-making. Language teachers frequently use the terms measurement and assessment interchangeably.

Teaching and assessment are two aspects of education that overlap. All language courses require a detailed analysis of learning outcomes, and they employ these features in order to maintain track of student development, identify the language program's weaknesses and strengths, and adjust educational policies accordingly (Khan, 2018). Assessment enhances and helps teachers to offer better learning environments for students by revealing whether or not the teaching is effective in terms of students' achieving or learning the goals of the lessons. Moreover, language assessment is one of the most significant aspects that influences the language learning setting because it provides information about teachers' and students' performance in the classroom and shapes how foreign languages are taught and used. Moreover, language assessment, according to Malone (2013), is an important and integrated aspect of education, and its role in the classroom enhances students' language learning. Teachers are expected to use various assessment tools to assess students' knowledge and integrate several assessment instruments to improve their own guidance and assess students' progress. In that way, one of the essential roles of teachers is student assessment because the quality of classroom instruction is directly related to the quality of the applied assessment. As a result, assessment literacy is critical for teachers.

2.1.1 Types of Assessment

One of the most critical responsibilities of teachers is to assess their students' performance, and it's important to choose a test type that best meets the assessment goals. There are many different assessment types, including formative and summative assessments. In the literature, formative and summative assessments are commonly identified in the assessment process (Brown, 2004).

2.1.2 Formative and Summative Assessment

To begin with, formative assessment is a method used by designers to collect information that can be used to revise the instruction and make it more useful and productive (Frunza, 2013). Formative assessment tries to increase student learning without involving evaluation and grading in terms of allowing teachers to discover skills and knowledge that aren't being learned well and prompting them to take some action while the course is still in progress. According to Black & William (1998), formative assessment is defined as any tasks completed by teachers or students that provide information that may be utilized as feedback to revise the learning and teaching tasks. When students understand that the purpose of formative assessment is to improve learning rather than to get high scores, they may take responsibility for their own learning (Trumbull and Lash, 2013).

On the other hand, summative assessment summarizes what students learn at the end of a course. It is used to judge students' learning (Popham, 2009). Essays, performances, and final exams are examples of summative assessments. Summative assessment, unlike formative assessment, focuses on students' achievement and is conducted after the learning process is concluded. Summative assessment is used to evaluate the teaching and learning process. When compared to formative assessments, summative assessments generally take longer (Migliacci, 2018). Ökten (2009) stated that formative assessment is used to determine a student's exact situation and what

should be done to improve it, and it offers information to both teachers and students on what and how much they are learning, as well as how well they are learning.

Overall, formative and summative assessments differ in their purpose, scope, design, and results that they give to learning and teaching processes. In this regard, administrators, teachers, policy and program makers should understand these two terms and how they work so that they may use the appropriate assessment methods for their educational context and purposes, which benefits the education system.

2.2 ASSESSMENT LITERACY

The need to create in foreign language teachers an awareness of the methods and ideas of assessment and testing, known as “assessment literacy,” was raised early in the conversations at the National Assessment Summit (Boyles, 2005). In addition, assessment literacy is regarded as a bridge between assessment quality and learner achievement (Mertler, 2009). Fulcher (2012) claimed that language assessment and testing had changed considerably in the first decade of the 21st century, resulting in a shift in language teachers’ needs. There are three reasons why literacy testing is important (Fulcher, 2012). Firstly, there has been significant growth in using exams and assessments. Additionally, as part of national immigration policy, the use of assessments and tests increased. Finally, language assessment has become a common practice in the field and part of classroom practice. Even though the mentioned reasons have made assessment literacy more crucial than ever, the difficulty is that defining assessment literacy remains a challenge. According to Malone (2011), language assessment literacy is required by teachers to assess student performance and lead them through the learning process. To highlight the significance of assessment literacy, Havnes (2004) claims that enhancing student learning requires improving the assessment system. Many researchers have attempted to define this term and what it covers in the literature. The following are a few of them:

According to Falsgraf (2006), assessment literacy is the ability to comprehend, analyze, and utilize information on student achievement to improve instruction. Moreover, assessment literacy refers to a teacher's understanding of evaluating what students know and using assessment data to improve students' learning and teaching methods (Webb, 2002). Understanding and appropriate use of assessment procedures and awareness of the philosophical and theoretical underpinnings in measuring students' learning are all part of assessment literacy (Stiggins 2002; Volante & Fazio 2007). In the educational setting, it is considered a continuous process that includes a variety of strategies, such as evaluating and commenting on students' responses and performance (Brown, 2004). According to Xu and Brown (2017), assessment literacy is critical to educational quality since abilities to assess student learning contribute to well-informed judgments. To sum up, according to many researchers' perspectives, the definitions of assessment literacy vary based on different contexts.

2.3 LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT LITERACY (LAL)

The word "language assessment literacy" comes from the phrase "assessment literacy," which refers to the knowledge and skills required to conduct assessment activities (Inbar-Lourie, 2013). According to Malone (2013), language assessment literacy is the knowledge of language teachers' testing and how they use that information in their classrooms to measure language ability. Even though assessment literacy and language assessment literacy contain many of the same components, language assessment literacy differs from assessment literacy in that language is the primary assessment construct in language assessment literacy (Giraldo, 2018). Language assessment literacy refers to the abilities, knowledge, and skills needed to maintain, design, evaluate, or develop classroom-based and/or large-scale standardized tests. Also, it refers to the similarity with test processes and understanding of the concepts and principles that underpin and guide practice, such as codes and ethics of practice (Fulcher, 2012).

Even though language assessment literacy is seen as an essential component of educational programs for teachers and other stakeholders (Taylor, 2009), language teachers play a significant role in language assessment because they are the primary test users. According to Mertler and Campbell (2005), one of the main roles of instructors is to assess students' progress and performance.

2.4 TEACHERS' ASSESSMENT BELIEFS

Teachers and researchers may use assessment to gather information on students' language abilities and achievements using various methods and resources (Coombe, Folse, & Hubley, 2007; Purpura, 2016). It affected all assessment stakeholders, particularly teachers, who must shift away from traditional testing and learn the necessary knowledge to create and implement various assessment techniques. As a result of these expectations, the role of teachers in the classroom has gotten a lot of attention in recent decades, with the belief that the teacher is the most significant part affecting student learning (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Wallace, 1991).

Creating paper-pencil tests and performance measures, interpreting, grading, communicating assessment results, and applying them to educational decisions are all part of traditional classroom assessment (Mede & Atay, 2017). Teachers generally devote a significant part of their working lives to evaluating their students' performance and learning, which entails several teacher activities such as task design, monitoring students' progress, and providing feedback. In addition, assessment is an important aspect of instruction since it allows teachers feedback on their teaching effectiveness. Teachers should be aware of different assessment techniques, their aims, functions, intended and unexpected consequences, and how to combine traditional and creative classroom tests. Assessment is an important part of the learning and teaching process, and teachers play a significant role in it. Teachers should be aware of the external uses of assessment and the ideas connected to these external uses of assessment because assessment is used for ranking, monitoring, and placement purposes (Inbar-Lourie, 2008).

Teachers must be aware of different assessment techniques, their aims, functions, intended and unexpected consequences, and how to combine traditional and innovative classroom assessments (Mede & Atay, 2017). With the rise of interest in assessment and testing, teachers' expectations for their classroom practices have changed (Hargreaves, Earl, & Schmidt, 2002). Teachers are increasingly encouraged to use various evaluation methods, as focusing on one approach makes it nearly impossible for teachers to adjust teaching and learning to meet the needs of students (Stiggins, 2002). Teachers are increasingly encouraged to use various evaluation methods, as relying on one approach makes it very hard for teachers to adapt learning and teaching to fit the requirements of students (Stiggins, 2002). Teachers collect data on their students' development and determine how well their instructional methods achieve the desired learning and teaching outcomes (Gronlund, 1998). The underlying meaning running through all of these views is that teachers should recognize and use various types of assessment. Teachers need to understand the strengths and weaknesses of any tests or performance measures they use and choose appropriate methods to assess various achievement targets aligned with course objectives and instruction. They should share the grading criteria with learners, analyze test scores properly, and use assessment data to make educational decisions for students.

2.5 RESEARCH ON LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT LITERACY CONDUCTED IN TURKEY AND ABROAD

Language assessment literacy research has been carried out worldwide, including in Turkey. Recently, it has gained popularity among researchers, and there is a growing body of literature on language assessment literacy for teachers. After realizing the need for effective and efficient assessment and testing techniques for quality and better teaching and learning, researchers have shifted their attention to this issue. The following paragraphs go through some of this research for further details.

2.5.1 Research Conducted in Turkey

According to a review of the literature, a large number of studies on language assessment literacy have been conducted in Turkey. The following sections go through some of this research in further detail.

Hatipoğlu (2010) analyzed the Middle East Technical University's assessment courses and obtained responses from 81 prospective language teachers via surveys and interviews. According to the study's findings, more testing courses than just one are necessary for pre-service teachers to succeed in language assessment. Assessment courses also need to cover more practical topics. Following her previous work, Hatipoğlu (2015) created a new survey to investigate the perceptions and knowledge of 124 pre-service language instructors on language assessment. The researchers applied interviews and questionnaires to gather data, demonstrating that Middle East Technical University's in-service language teachers have inadequate language assessment literacy. However, in contrast to the earlier study, the participating pre-service teachers stated that taking just one language assessment course was sufficient to improve assessment literacy. The researcher concluded that the participant pre-service teacher educators' previous experience and beliefs with language evaluation are responsible for the gap between the outcomes.

In another study, Han and Kaya (2014) investigated Turkish EFL teachers' assessment techniques and preferences. According to their findings, teachers regarded listening and writing abilities as less significant, while speaking skills were listed as the most challenging to measure. Furthermore, it was discovered that after receiving pre-and in-service assessment training, teachers' personal assessment preferences remained unchanged.

In 2014, Karaman and Şahin (2014) conducted research with pre-service fourth-grade teachers at the Education Faculty of a public university in Turkey. The study included participants with majors in seven different disciplines, including

English Language Teaching. Participants in the study came from seven majors, including English Language Teaching. The results showed that the fourth-grade pre-service teachers had insufficient literacy skills, and those students who majored in primary school teaching performed noticeably better than the other learners.

Additionally, Yetkin (2015) investigated the perspectives of 30 student teachers on how different assessment strategies were applied. Questionnaires were used to gather the necessary information. According to the data, classroom assessment was seen as a tool by the teachers for assessing teacher success and student development in their education. Teachers use assessment to modify their teaching practices and increase student motivation to improve student learning. Furthermore, participants stated that ELT programs help them enhance their theoretical knowledge as well as their language assessment literacy. Finally, it was discovered that pre-service teachers relied on observation more than other assessment techniques.

In research on the language assessment literacy of English language teachers in Turkey, Mede and Atay (2017) collected the necessary data by conducting focused group interviews and a questionnaire. 350 English language teachers with five years of teaching experience were involved in this study. Their findings revealed a lack of training in activities such as exam preparation and feedback provided in the classroom. The results also showed that they lacked sufficient competence in creating skill-based tests.

Another study was conducted by Öz and Atay (2017), who focused on the perspectives of Turkish EFL teachers about in-class language assessment and how it relates to their classroom practices. Twelve teachers participated in the study, and semi-structured interviews were used to collect the data. The findings demonstrated that while the teachers were aware of the basic terms associated with classroom assessment, they had difficulties integrating their assessment knowledge into their

teaching process. Hence, it was found that the teachers' classroom practices and assessment literacy were not parallel to each other.

Regarding language assessment literacy, Sarıyıldız (2018) conducted research on the levels of language assessment literacy and the requirements of pre-service language teachers. This study's data was gathered both qualitatively and quantitatively. This research included a total of 126 pre-service teachers. The findings of this study revealed that, despite receiving assessment and language testing training, these student teachers still needed more in these areas. Furthermore, they could not put their theoretical knowledge into practice in assessment and testing processes.

In his 2016 study, Büyükkarcı explored the importance of post-graduate education and years of experience in LAL and looked at the assessment literacy levels of instructors. The study included 32 non-native teacher educators, and data were gathered using the assessment literacy inventory developed by Mertler and Campbell (2005). The researcher discovered that teacher educators' levels of assessment literacy are pretty low. Additionally, Büyükkarcı came to the conclusion that post-graduate training and years of experience had little effect on language teachers' ability to assess students.

Ölmezer-Öztürk (2018) conducted another significant research on LAL in Turkey. Her Ph.D. dissertation focused on developing and validating the Language Assessment Knowledge Scale (LAKS), which includes 60 items and four skills: writing, reading, speaking and listening. It also looked at the psychometric aspects of LAKS. In order to obtain specific information on what lecturers believed about language assessment knowledge, 11 lecturers were interviewed using open-ended questions for the qualitative section of the research. According to her study, the participant lecturers were not competent enough in language assessment. The reasons stated were that the lecturers were unaware of their level of assessment knowledge and the necessity of language assessment and testing and that they were unwilling to confront their inadequacy. According to another aspect of the research, their LAK level did not vary in response to their perceived self-competence level. In another sense,

there is no statistical difference in language assessment knowledge between those who consider themselves not very competent, competent, and very competent. Furthermore, respondents indicated that lecturers lacked competence in language assessment and testing, and they believed this was due to a lack of in-service and pre-service training.

The assessment literacy levels of 36 pre-service instructors at a state institution in Turkey were assessed by Kavaklı and Arslan (2019). The researcher applied a survey created by Volante and Fazio (2007) as well as a questionnaire developed by the European Network of LTA to achieve their goal (2004). The researchers came to the conclusion that even though the respondent pre-service language teachers were aware of the concept of assessment literacy, they felt insufficient in assessment literacy.

Muhammad and Bardakçı (2019) attempted to investigate the LAL of Iraqi teachers. Data were gathered using the Classroom Assessment Inventory created by Mertler (2003). 101 secondary and preparatory school teachers took part in the study. Even though 77% of the respondents claimed to have had adequate training for assessment, the findings revealed they had limited assessment literacy. They also suggested changing the preparation for professional training courses and teacher training programs.

Doğru (2020) aimed to determine the assessment literacy requirements of English language instructors working at a Turkish aviation school in her master's thesis. She also concentrated on the differences between their assessment beliefs, attitudes, techniques, and practices. Instruments, both qualitative and quantitative, were used to gather the information. The findings showed that despite receiving training in language assessment and testing, the participants felt their knowledge was insufficient. 32 teachers filled out the survey for the quantitative section, and 7 of the participants also took part in the semi-structured interviews for the qualitative part.

The results of the interviews also revealed that the participants' assessment beliefs and practices did not match.

To sum up, many studies about language assessment literacy have been done in Turkey, and they continue to be done. According to the results of many studies, teachers feel insufficient in both language assessment and testing. Additionally, some of the research revealed that even though the participating teachers feel proficient in assessment, their practices don't reflect their proficiency. Parallel to this, although the teachers were familiar with the basic terms used in classroom assessment, they had trouble applying their knowledge of assessment to their teaching.

2.5.2 Research Conducted Abroad

Language assessment literacy research is reviewed in this section, which includes research on LAL conducted in other countries.

Duboc (2009) conducted research with three different elementary schools English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers in Brazil to research language assessment literacy from the perspective of new literacy studies. Three major issues were discovered due to the findings: The first was that measurement and assessment were thought to be synonymous. The second was that the participants emphasized linguistic code assessment, especially vocabulary and grammar, and so neglected other aspects of language development. Last but not least, teachers primarily used written tests instead of classroom or alternative assessments.

Mertler and Campbell (2005) researched the understanding and use of classroom assessment concepts among pre-service teachers. Their studies revealed that teachers' assessment literacy is greatly influenced by their teaching experience. In their research, in-service teachers performed better in interpreting, administering, and scoring assessment procedures but not so well in designing reliable grading procedures.

Munoz, Palacio, and Escobar's (2012) research looked at EFL teachers' practices, perceptions, and beliefs about language assessment. They interacted with 62 EFL teachers who worked at a private university's language center in Colombia. The research results revealed a mismatch between their practices and beliefs; they believed reflection, self-assessment, and formative assessment were beneficial and should be used. However, their assessment methods focused on a more summative assessment of their students. As a result, the researchers suggested that professional development programs should help teachers put their beliefs into practice rather than relying solely on summative evaluation.

Wach (2012) researched the practices and beliefs of EFL teachers about language assessment. She looked into the roles and perspectives of both school and university teachers when it came to language assessment and whether they were non-native or native English speakers. Therefore, it was investigated if the school style and whether or not the teachers were native or non-native English speakers impacted their responsibilities and beliefs in Poland. Almost all participants focused on assessing vocabulary and grammar and saw assessment as separate from teaching. Teachers' thoughts on being native or not differed when it came to being native or not. Consequently, the researchers proposed that EFL teachers should be taught several assessment types that value evaluating many language skills and areas.

Zhang and Burry-Stock's (1997) research investigated the impacts of measurement training and teaching experience on teachers' perceptions of assessment competency. According to the research findings, teachers with at least 4 years of teaching experience and measurement training regarded themselves as more proficient than teachers with equivalent teaching experience but no informal observation and measurement training in performance assessment. All in all, the outcomes of this research show that teaching experience and measurement training impact language assessment literacy.

Some research focused on teachers' language assessment requirements to determine their assessment training needs. Fulcher (2013) created a survey instrument to determine language teachers' assessment training requirements. Online software was used to gather the data from 278 language teachers. The results revealed that language teachers know their assessment-related needs, which are currently unmet in the materials available to help them enhance their assessment literacy. In order to increase assessment literacy, it was also emphasized that skills, knowledge, and principles should be combined. It was also decided that students should design and use a website and a textbook to learn more about language testing policies and regulations.

Jeong (2013) also examined the impact of course lecturers on language assessment programs in teacher preparation programs from the perspectives of non-language testers and language testers. Language testers were experienced in the field of language testing, whereas non-language testers were experienced in the methodology used in teaching languages and with assessment tasks. The survey's findings indicated that there were few differences between testers in terms of the course material for language assessment. Although language testers were more comfortable performing technological tests, non-language testers generally preferred classroom-based evaluation over technical testing.

Similarly, Jannati (2015) investigated EFL teachers' perceptions and practices about language assessment based on their teaching experience. As a result, the researcher divided EFL teachers into three categories based on their teaching experience: low, mid, and high-experienced teachers. After conducting semi-structured interviews, the researcher discovered that almost all EFL teachers working at language institutions in Iran firmly understood basic terms and concepts related to language assessment. On the other hand, their knowledge did not reflect their behaviors; they could not put their knowledge into practice. It had little effect on EFL teachers' assessment techniques regarding experience. As a result, teachers needed to learn how to put their assessment skills to use in the classroom.

Xie and Tan (2019) researched Hong Kong's language assessment literacy needs of both pre-service and in-service primary school teachers. Participants stated a need to use various formal and informal assessment methods in terms of assessment design. All of the teachers indicated that they used a marking system developed by their schools and were proficient in applying it; nevertheless, they showed little confidence in designing it. When asked about ethical issues, many participants indicated their challenge and concern in protecting their kids' assessment results from overprotective parents. Another finding was that teachers were less enthusiastic about the concept or theory of assessment than about conducting the assessment, and many claimed that issues of reliability and validity were unimportant. Finally, the participants believed they were capable of providing feedback to students and parents despite their lack of confidence in understanding their assessment scores.

Sultana (2019) researched Bangladesh to investigate the usefulness and nature of language assessment literacy among English teachers. This study aimed to determine if English teachers are equipped to use various testing tasks in their classrooms and how they recognize language assessment literacy. The findings showed that, although this was a small-scale study, participants lacked language assessment. Their language assessment practices and thoughts raise concerns regarding their language assessment abilities and knowledge quality.

Berry et al. (2019) also researched with a group of teachers from Spain, France, and the United Kingdom to explore their views on assessment and assessment practices. They used classroom observations with interviews, follow-up interviews, and focus group discussions. It was discovered that teachers successfully applied various assessment techniques despite their lack of confidence in their knowledge. The participants also had negative feelings about grading and testing and interchanged the terms 'testing' with 'assessment.' Another outcome of the research was that owing to a lack of confidence in their ability to create their own materials; participants chose to rely on external testing companies or ready-made tests.

All in all, many studies about language assessment literacy are conducted abroad. These studies support the idea that in order to make up for their deficiencies, English teachers need to have training in language assessment literacy. The results of some research make it apparent that pre-service education has some restrictions on language testing and assessment, and those pre-service teachers are not given the essential training in pre-service education in relation to language assessment. The majority of the current studies on language assessment revealed that teachers had a low level of English language assessment, according to a review of the literature. Moreover, some studies investigated whether teachers' demographic features impact teachers' assessment literacy. While some research showed that experience had little effect on teachers' assessment literacy beliefs, others revealed that teaching experience significantly impacted teachers' assessment literacy.

3. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ELL AND ELT DEPARTMENTS

In order to become an English teacher in Turkey, it is necessary to meet certain conditions. It is required to be either a graduate English language teacher or English language literature. The English Language and Literature (ELL) department aims to provide students with specialized courses in the subject and a general understanding of the literature. In the English language literature (ELL) department, candidates must complete a certificate that includes all methodology courses. After completing a certificate program that lasts two semesters, students receive this certificate upon graduation. On the other side, the department of English language teaching (ELT) teaches students the main practical and theoretical challenges in language teaching. Students must complete all methodology courses in the program and the other courses needed to graduate certified entirely to teach English in Turkish elementary and secondary schools and higher education institutions. While ELL courses primarily concentrate on language, literature, and culture, ELT courses emphasize learning and teaching.

According to Hatipoğlu (2010), the pre-service ELT students only took one course on language assessment. They felt this was insufficient time to study and

practice the language assessment principles. They could not thoroughly evaluate their assessment procedures since the gap between practice and theory was not balanced. Additionally, Hatipoğlu and Erçetin (2016) agreed that covering all of the issues and concepts related to language assessment in a single course is impossible. There may not be enough time for practice; therefore, a lecturer may only assist their prospective ELT teachers in raising their understanding of assessment basics. Furthermore, his research showed that pre-service ELT teachers' perceptions of assessment courses are negatively impacted by local assessment contexts, cultures, and previous assessment experiences.

A study also examined language teachers' background knowledge of assessment and how that knowledge affected their assessment practices. According to López and Bernal's (2009) research, language teachers who have received training in assessment use assessment procedures to enhance teaching and learning. In contrast, those without such training merely use them to increase their students' grades. Additionally, the majority of the instructors in this research chose summative over formative methods.

Yalcin-Arslan (2014) conducted research with 40 pre-service teachers who were senior students at two separate public institutions in Turkey participated in this study. There were 20 ELL students and 20 ELT students among them. Nearly all of the participants were between the ages of 21 and 22. According to her research findings, pre-service teachers' perceptions of what defines a good teacher vary slightly between ELL and ELT departments. When all of the quantitative analysis's results for the subcategories are taken into account, it becomes clear that there is little distinction between pre-service ELL and ELT graduates. Only the degree of error correction separates their perceptions. While ELL courses primarily concentrate on language, culture, and literature, ELT courses especially emphasize the learning and teaching process. Additionally, it can be inferred from the variations in the item analysis that ELL students may possess pedagogical competence in teaching language. They lack the knowledge of ELT students, nevertheless. The responses analysis revealed that while ELL students provided more generic responses, ELT students could support their thoughts with more specific details.

Along with these, Lam (2015) studied general language assessment education in Hong Kong universities, focusing on how two language assessment courses helped or hindered pre-service teachers' ability to assess language. The researcher evaluated ELT-related programs per a set of criteria before selecting five for in-depth investigation. In addition to obtaining documents such as the curriculum, handbook, and outline for these five programs, the researcher also conducted focus groups with 40 students and interviews with nine instructors from two assessment courses. The goal of the interview was to learn the participants' perceptions of the assessment courses' design, content, usefulness, and suitability for LAL. The programs' analysis revealed that the training and support for LAL were insufficient. Three themes emerged based on the participants' perspectives: perceptions of LAL in a culture that emphasizes exams, experiences with course-based assessment training, and limited applications of LAL in real-world educational settings.

To sum up, the term language assessment literacy, which derives from the term assessment literacy, is one of the most researched topics recently. Since there is currently limited tool to measure it, the research mainly focuses on English language teachers' demands in language assessment. Studies also aim to demonstrate the ineffectiveness of pre-service education and a lack of professional training through participant self-reports on their assessment knowledge or practices. The majority of research that involved English teachers focused on the perceptions of English instructors regarding language assessment. Researchers agree that teachers' language assessment literacy is inadequate despite differences in language assessment literacy needs across various regional contexts. The findings of some studies indicate that measurement training and teaching experience have an impact on language assessment literacy.

When these findings are considered, it is clear that language assessment literacy training is necessary for English instructors in order to make up for their inadequacy in this field. Despite the fact that there has been some research on this subject, it is apparent that there are still few in the Turkish context that addresses the assessment of

productive skills. Some studies focus on English teachers' language assessment literacy levels in higher education settings, particularly in preparatory schools, where students are getting ready to take a proficiency test that includes all four skills. On the other hand, although there is still lots of research about language assessment literacy, there is limited research on the difference between English language literature and English language teacher graduates' assessment literacy beliefs.



CHAPTER III

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

This research aims to find out and compare ELL and ELT graduates' assessment literacy beliefs. Thus, this research is designed as descriptive and comparative research. In this current research, a quantitative research instrument was used.

3.2 SETTING AND PARTICIPANTS

The current research was conducted online to understand ELT and ELL graduates' beliefs about language assessment literacy using LAKS (Ölmezer-Öztürk, 2018). The participants in this study were selected based on their particular profiles, which included gender, years of experience, undergraduate degrees, and types of institutions (private or public schools). All participants from different teaching levels filled out an online version of the scale via Google Forms. A total of 68 teachers were included in the study's sample.

In total, 68 ELL and ELT graduates participated in this research. Regarding the study's gender distribution, 21 (30.9%) participants were male, and 47 (69.1%) were female. The majority of the participants had 1-5 years of experience (51.5%), which was followed by 6-10 (16.2%), 16-20 years (11.8%), 21+ years (11.8%), and 11-15 years (8.8%). Considering their educational background, 54 (79.4%) of the participants had a BA degree, 9 (13.2%) had a MA degree, and 5 (7.4%) of the

participants had a Ph.D. degree. Most of the participants (55.9%) were graduates of English Language Teaching (ELT) departments, while 44.1% were graduates of English Language Literature (ELL) departments. Regarding types of schools, most participants worked at state schools (75%), and others (25%) worked at private schools. Table 1 below shows the demographics of the research participants (N=68).

Table 1. Profile of the Participants (N=68)

		<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Gender	Male	21	30.9
	Female	47	69.1
Years of Experience	1-5	35	51.5
	6-10	11	16.2
	11-15	6	8.8
	16-20	8	11.8
	21+	8	11.8
Educational Background	BA	54	79.4
	MA	9	13.2
	PhD	5	7.4
Graduated BA Program	ELL	30	44.1
	ELT	38	55.9
Type of School	State	51	75.0
	Private	17	25.0

3.3 DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT

A quantitative research instrument was used in the current research to provide an overall picture of the participants' language assessment beliefs. In the most basic sense, quantitative research methods involve gathering and analyzing structured data that may be represented numerically (Goertzen, 2017). One of the main goals is to provide reliable and accurate measurements that can be analyzed statistically. Quantitative research uses a representative sample to establish statistically significant conclusions about the population (Creswell, 2003). There are two main categories of quantitative analysis: experimental and descriptive. The accuracy of a hypothesis is tested in experimental research by establishing if the independent variable(s) influences the dependent variable (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). In addition, a

descriptive study gives a clear overview of a sample at a certain point in time and simply provides the demographics of that group (Lowhorn, 2007).

As a tool, a questionnaire was adopted from Ölmezer- Öztürk (2018) in this research. This questionnaire consisted of 5 parts, and in the first part, the demographic information of the participants (gender, years of experience, educational background, graduated BA program, and type of school) and 3 additional questions. In the other 4 parts of the questionnaire (assessing reading, listening, writing, and speaking, respectively), there were 15 items separately (in total, 60).

3.4 DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE AND DATA ANALYSIS

For this current research, quantitative data was gathered to fulfill the research aim and objectives. The questionnaire was prepared and sent via Google Forms in the data collection procedure. Quantitative data was collected using LAKS to investigate ELL and ELT graduates' general and skill-based language assessment literacy perceptions and the impact of demographic characteristics like teaching experience, educational background, and gender on their language assessment beliefs. Participants obtained survey data after getting permission to use the survey instrument through e-mail from the author. The total number of participants who answered the survey was 68 at the end of the quantitative data-gathering process, which was the study's primary focus.

The data acquired through questionnaires were entered into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) to analyze the quantitative data. At first, descriptive statistics were used to calculate percentages and frequencies of participants' years of experience, gender, school level, and whether they had taken a university-level assessment and testing course. The Likert scale was used in the remaining four sections. The data was analyzed using SPSS in terms of percentages,

means, and frequencies to determine the language assessment literacy of ELT and ELL graduates.

3.4.1 Reliability and Validity

Before carrying out tests, it is necessary to define the aims and functions of the test, as well as select the most relevant test types. They are, however, insufficient to get a good test. Teachers should focus on two major assessment principles: reliability and validity. When using a measuring tool, researchers need to grasp two essential concepts: validity and reliability (Ary et al., 2010).

One of the most important principles in assessment and testing is validity. According to Henning (1987: p. 89), validity is the “appropriateness of a given test or any of its components as a measure of what it is purported to measure.” In addition, validity is defined as the measuring instrument’s serving level for the purpose (Gelbal, 2013).

The LAKS’ content validity was assured through multiple processes, including a review of the literature, opinions of different groups of experts in the creation of the items, and the piloting process, which may be used to show the contents of each item serve their purpose Ölmezer- Öztürk (2018). The Cronbach Alpha coefficient was provided for each construct in this research to maintain internal consistency. It is shown in the table below.

Table 2. Reliability Analysis for Language Assessment Knowledge Scale (LAKS)

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach’s Alpha	N of Items
.916	60

The Cronbach Alpha coefficient of LAKS was found to be .916 in total, as shown in Table 2. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient helps determine a scale's internal consistency. Regarding the instrument's internal consistency reliability, according to Dörnyei (2010), the Cronbach Alpha value was .916, showing a high-reliability level. According to Table 2, the reliability of LAKS was statistically high.

Table 3. Reliability Analysis for Reading, Listening, Writing, and Speaking

Reliability Statistics		
	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
Reading	.675	15
Listening	.740	15
Writing	.817	15
Speaking	.758	15

According to the results of Cronbach's Alpha values, reading, listening, writing, and speaking have a high level of reliability. As shown in tables two and three, the Cronbach Alpha values are reliable when looking at the individual skills and the reliability of the questionnaire as a whole.

CHAPTER IV

4. FINDINGS

4.1 QUANTITATIVE DATA ANALYSIS

This chapter summarizes the current research outcomes, which aimed to discover ELT and ELL graduates' attitudes on language assessment literacy and any differences in their beliefs. Before initiating the quantitative analysis process, the first step was to determine the normality of data to decide how to perform the statistical analyses (via non-parametric or parametric) since, as Kirkgöz and Ünal argue, normality is critical for obtaining statistically significant results and making appropriate inferences.

For that purpose, descriptive statistics were prepared using IBM SPSS 20.0, and the normality test was performed using parametric statistics (standard deviation, Shapiro-Wilk, skewness, kurtosis, and standard error). According to the results of the descriptive statistics, the data set was not normally distributed. Results can be found in Table 4 below.

Table 4. Test of Normality

	Statistic	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Shapiro-Wilk	.93	68	.00

4.1.1 Results of Data Analysis for Research Questions 1 and 2

The study's first research question investigated ELT graduates' language assessment literacy beliefs.

Table 5. How do you evaluate yourself as an assessor in the following areas/subskills? [reading]

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Competent	36	52.9	52.9	52.9
	Competent	31	45.6	45.6	98.5
	Not Competent	1	1.5	1.5	100.0
	Total	68	100.0	100.0	

As seen in Table 5, 52.9% of the participants thought they were very competent reading. In addition, 31 participants (45.6%) selected competent, and only one participant (1.5%) chose just not competent in reading skills. On the other hand, none of the participants chose the ‘not very competent’ option in the questionnaire.

Table 6. How do you evaluate yourself as an assessor in the following areas/subskills? [Listening]

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Competent	21	30.9	30.9	30.9
	Competent	42	61.8	61.8	92.6
	Not Very Competent	4	5.9	5.9	98.5
	Not Competent	1	1.5	1.5	100.0
	Total	68	100.0	100.0	

Regarding the listening part of the questionnaire, contrary to the reading, most participants (61.8) thought they were competent, as seen in Table 6 above. Moreover, 21 participants (30.9%) selected ‘very competent’ in the listening field. On the other side, 5.9% of the participants believed they were not very competent, and only one participant (1.5%) was not competent in listening. All in all, 63 of 68 participants chose

‘competent’ and ‘very competent’ in total, which means they believed they were competent in listening.

Table 7. How do you evaluate yourself as an assessor in the following areas/subskills? [writing]

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Competent	24	35.3	35.3	35.3
	Competent	33	48.5	48.5	83.8
	Not Very Competent	10	14.7	14.7	98.5
	Not Competent	1	1.5	1.5	100.0
	Total	68	100.0	100.0	

Concerning the writing assessment beliefs of ELL and ELT graduates, 48.5% of the participants saw themselves as ‘competent.’ In addition, 35.4% of the participants thought they were ‘very competent.’ On the other hand, 14.7% of them selected ‘not very competent,’ and 1.5% of the participants chose ‘not competent’ while filling out the questionnaire. Writing assessment beliefs of ELL and ELT graduates’ can be seen in Table 7 above.

Table 8. How do you evaluate yourself as an assessor in the following areas/subskills? [speaking]

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Competent	20	29.4	29.4	29.4
	Competent	35	51.5	51.5	80.9
	Not Very Competent	12	17.6	17.6	98.5
	Not Competent	1	1.5	1.5	100.0
	Total	68	100.0	100.0	

As for listening and writing skills, most participants chose the option ‘competent’ in speaking skills. More than half of the participants (51.5%) thought they were competent in speaking skills. Moreover, 29.4% of the participants selected ‘very competent.’ On the flip side, 17.6% of the ELL and ELT graduates thought they were not very competent, and 1.5% of them also chose not to be competent in speaking skills.

4.1.2 Results of Data Analysis for Research Question 3

The third research question looked at whether there was a difference between ELT and ELL graduates. In total, 38 ELT graduates and 30 ELL graduates answered the questionnaire. In order to find if there was a difference between ELL and ELT graduates’ reading beliefs, the Mann-Whitney U test was used because the data set was not normally distributed.

Table 9. Difference Between ELT and ELL Graduates Listening Beliefs

Group	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Rank	<i>u</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>
ELL	30	37.02	1110.50	<i>494.50</i>	<i>-.93</i>	<i>.34</i>
ELT	38	32.51	1235.50			

Table 9 above shows no significant difference in reading skills between ELT and ELL graduates because the p-value was .348. If the p value was less than 0.05, it could be said that there is a significant difference. In addition, the mean reading skills rank was 37.02 for ELL graduates and 32.51 for ELT graduates. For reading skills, mean rank and sum of rank scores can be found in Table 9 above.

Table 10. Difference Between ELL And ELT Graduates’ Listening Beliefs

Group	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Rank	<i>u</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>
ELL	30	34.77	1043.00	<i>562.00</i>	<i>-.09</i>	<i>.92</i>
ELT	38	34.29	1303.00			

Table 10 above shows no significant difference in reading skills between ELT and ELL graduates because the p-value was .921. If the p value was less than 0.05, it could be said that there is a significant difference. In addition, the mean listening skills rank was 34.77 for ELL graduates and 34.29 for ELT graduates. For listening skills, mean rank and sum of rank scores can be found in Table 10 above.

Table 11. Difference Between ELT and ELL Graduates' Writing Beliefs

Group	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Rank	<i>u</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>
ELL	30	35.10	1053.00	552.00	-.22	.82
ELT	38	34.03	1293.00			

With regard to the writing beliefs of ELL and ELT graduates, the mean ranks are 35.10 and 34.03, respectively. In Table 11, the mean rank and sum of rank scores were indicated above. Considering the writing beliefs of ELL and ELT graduates, there was no significant difference between them because the p value was .823, as shown in Table 11. Since the data set was not normally distributed, the Mann-Whitney U test was used. It is possible to state that there is a significant difference if the p-value is less than 0.05.

Table 12. Difference Between ELT and ELL Graduates' Speaking Beliefs

Group	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Rank	<i>u</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>
ELL	30	38.68	1160.50	444.50	-1.55	.12
ELT	38	31.20	1185.50			

According to the results of the findings, the mean rank score for ELL graduates' speaking beliefs was 38.68, whereas the mean score for ELT graduates was 31.20. The mean rank and sum of rankings scores are listed above in Table 12. As the p-value was .119, there was no significant difference between the writing beliefs of ELL and ELT graduates, as indicated in Table 12. The Mann-Whitney U test was used since the data set was not normally distributed. If the p-value were less than 0.05, it would be possible to argue that there was a significant difference.

CHAPTER V

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This chapter's goal was to describe the study's findings concerning the research questions. Following that, conclusions were drawn, and recommendations for further research were made.

5.1 DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS FOR RESEARCH QUESTIONS 1 AND 2

The study's first research question investigated ELT and ELL graduates' perceptions of language assessment literacy. According to the results of the research, most of the participants thought that they were very competent in reading skills. Additionally, concerning listening skills, many of them chose 'competent,' which means they were competent in listening skills. Moreover, approximately half of the participants chose competent writing skills, and for speaking, participants selected competent, too. All in all, most of the participants thought that they were competent in all skills. A literature survey revealed that most previous research contradicts the current study's conclusions, claiming that ELL graduates' language assessment knowledge levels are low (Mede & Atay, 2017; Öztürk & Aydın, 2019; Xu & Brown; 2017). To begin, Öztürk and Aydın (2019) looked at the general and skill-based assessment knowledge of ELL graduates and discovered that the LAK level of the participants was very low. A questionnaire was created by Vogt and Tsagari (2004) to collect quantitative data, and the findings showed that teachers had inadequate knowledge of language assessment and needed further training in the field. Finally, Xu and Brown (2017) applied the Teacher Assessment Literacy Questionnaire in research with Chinese EFL instructors working in universities. They discovered that the participants' assessment literacy was unsatisfactory because of a lack of assessment training and standards. In addition, according to Mertler and Campbell's (2015)

research, assessment literacy is greatly influenced by teachers' teaching experience. Moreover, Zhang and Burry-Stock's research results demonstrated that teachers with at least 4 years of teaching experience are more proficient than less experienced teachers. On the other hand, this current research showed no difference between teachers' experience and their language assessment beliefs. All of the research stated above contradict the conclusions of the recent study, which found that ELL graduates have a high LAK level.

In contrast to the conclusions of the previous studies, Kaya's (2020) study agrees with the present research's findings. To analyze their LAK level and investigate their opinions of assessment, the researcher conducted a mixed-methods study with EFL teachers working in colleges in Istanbul. According to current research findings, ELL graduates understand language assessment well. Moreover, Sarıyıldız (2018) researched that teachers who received assessment and language testing training still needed more in these areas. Additionally, in Ölmezer- Öztürk's research, participants thought they lacked competence in language assessment literacy and testing. Additionally, Jannati (2015) conducted research, and the result of his research showed that teachers needed to learn how to put their assessment skills to use in the classroom. In another research by Sultana (2019), the results showed that participants lacked language assessment. Their language assessment thoughts and practices raise some concerns regarding the quality of their language assessment knowledge and abilities. On the other hand, this research revealed that both ELL and ELT graduates see themselves as assessment literate in listening, reading, writing, and speaking.

5.2 DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS FOR RESEARCH QUESTION 3

The results showed that participants who graduated from ELT and ELL departments are not so different regarding language assessment beliefs. In other words, whether or not teachers have an ELT background has no effect. Similarly, according to the findings of the Ölmezer-Öztürk (2018) research, one of the demographic features, namely the BA program from which

h the participating instructors graduated, did not influence their LAK level. In other words, the language assessment knowledge of the participants was unaffected by the program from which they graduated, whether ELT or non-ELT.

According to Kaya's research (2020) results, in terms of graduating subjects, there was no noticeable difference between the LAK level of the EFL teachers and the BA program from which they graduated. Graduates of an ELT program and graduates of a non-ELT program had equal levels of LAK. This suggests that EFL teachers' language assessment knowledge was not enhanced by graduating from an ELT department. These results contradict those of Tao's research (2014). He also looked at the effect of graduation subjects on teachers' assessment knowledge, showing that those who majored in English in undergraduate education had a higher level of assessment knowledge than those who did not. However, Öztürk and Aydın (2018) studied the impacts of graduation on EFL educators' language assessment literacy. Their research showed that having graduated from a non-ELT or ELT department did not affect EFL educators' LAK level, which is consistent with the current research's findings.

5.3 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The current study provides many limitations and suggestions for future research. In the research, it could have been worked with a larger group in terms of the validity and reliability of the study. On the other hand, in this current research, participants were selected randomly, and there were no criteria for their demographic information. Choosing the participants according to specific standards (age, graduation degree, years of experience, etc.) can make the study more specific. ELT and ELL graduates may be selected more precisely according to their demographic information. The outcomes of the current research primarily conflict with those of various previous research that has already been done in this field. In other words, there is still a lot of confusion about language assessment literacy among English language literature and

English language literature graduates. Therefore, a bigger sample size might be used to replicate the current study. Additionally, some participants felt that some of the scale's items were unclear. As a result, the scale's elements could all be revised once again to ensure that they are all concise and easy to grasp. Moreover, only teacher perceptions of assessment literacy beliefs were looked at in this study. Future studies may examine teacher and student opinions to learn more about how ELL and ELT graduates assess their language literacy. In addition, another variable could have been used besides participants' language assessment literacy beliefs. Moreover, qualitative research could be added in addition to quantitative analysis. In order to achieve a greater degree of precision on this subject, future studies should concentrate on utilizing more data collection methods, such as classroom observation and interviews.

CONCLUSIONS

The teaching and learning processes are intertwined, and assessment plays an essential role in both. They inform one another, which in turn affects one another (Malone, 2013). The improvement of the learning and teaching process depends on effective assessment practices. The first stage and sub-component of LAL are selecting appropriate assessment techniques for the teaching aims. Before deciding on assessment techniques, teachers must understand the purpose, intended participants, test material, and skills. Since all of these actions are performed by teachers, they have significant responsibilities in assessment-related activities. The issue is that while teachers are at the heart of all these assessment-related tasks and are in charge of evaluating students, it is debatable whether they are qualified to handle all of these tasks. Due to the importance of teachers being at the center of this whole process, this research aimed to see if there was a difference in language assessment beliefs between ELT and ELL graduates.

Understanding ELT and ELL graduates' perceptions of language assessment literacy using LAKS (Ölmezer-Öztürk, 2018) was the goal of the current study. Quantitative data revealed that there was no difference in language assessment literacy beliefs between ELT and ELL graduates in terms of reading, listening, writing, and

reading skills. The assessment literacy beliefs of ELL and ELT graduates did not significantly differ when the effects of the instructors' demographic characteristics were investigated. The majority of the participants believed they were very proficient readers. Moreover, about half of the participants selected competent writing abilities, and individuals also chose 'competent' speaking abilities. Overall, the majority of participants believed that they were competent in all skill sets. Moreover, the findings showed that participants graduating from ELT and ELL departments had similar views on language assessment. So it doesn't matter if teachers have experience teaching English as a foreign language. Additionally, several of them selected "competent" for listening skills, indicating that they have these abilities. Regarding the study's findings, the respondents said there was no knowledge gap in language assessment and testing. Concerning listening, writing, and speaking skills, ELT and ELL graduates thought they were competent. All in all, participants generally saw themselves as language assessment literate.

REFERENCES

1. Books

- Ary, Donald, Jacobs, L. Cheser, Irvine, C. K. Sorensen, & Walker, David (2018). *Introduction to research in education*. Cengage Learning.
- Boud, David (1988). Moving towards autonomy. In D. Boud (Eds), *Developing student autonomy in learning* (2nd ed.). London: Kogan Page.
- Brown, H. Douglas. (2004). *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. New York: Pearson/Longman, 2004.
- Campbell, T. Donald & Stanley, C. Julian (2015). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Ravenio books.
- Coombe, Christine, Folse, S. Keith & Hubley, J. Nancy (2007). *A practical guide to assessing English language learners*. University of Michigan Press.
- Creswell, W. John (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- DeLuca, Christopher & Klinger, A. Don (2010). Assessment literacy development: Identifying gaps in teacher candidates' learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 17(4), 419-438. doi:10.1080/0969594X.2010.516643
- DeLuca, Christopher, LaPointe-McEwan, Danielle & Luhanga, Ulemu (2016). Approaches to classroom assessment inventory: A new instrument to support teacher assessment literacy. *Educational Assessment*, 21 (4), 248-266.
- Duboc, A. P. Martinez (2009). Language assessment and the new literacy studies. *Lenguaje*, 37(1), 159-178.
- Frunza, Virgil (2014). Advantages and Barriers of Formative Assessment in the Teaching-learning Activity. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 114, 452-455. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.12.728>
- Fulcher, Glenn (2012). "Assessment literacy for the language classroom." *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 9(2), 113-132.
- Gelbal, Selehattin (2013). Ölçme ve Değerlendirme. Anadolu Üniversitesi Açıköğretim Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Goertzen, J. Melissa (2017). Introduction to quantitative research and data. *Library Technology Reports*, 53(4), 12-18.
- Miller, M. David, Robert L. Linn, Norman E. Gronlund. (2008). *Measurement and assessment in teaching*. New Jersey: Pearson.
- Popham, W. James (2014). *Classroom assessment: What teachers need to know* (7th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.

- Stiggins, Rick (2010). Essential formative assessment competencies for teachers and school leaders. In H. L. Andrade, G. J. Cizek (Eds.), *Handbook of formative assessment*, (pp. 233-250). New York, NY: Taylor and Francis.
- Stobart, Gordon (2008). *Testing times: The uses and abuses of assessment*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Thomas, Jan, Allman, Carol, & Beech, Marty (2004). *Assessment for the diverse classroom: A handbook for teachers*. Tallahassee, FL: Florida Department of Education, Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services. Retrieved from http://www.fldoe.org/ese/pdf/assess_diverse.pdf
- Wallace, J. Michael (1991). *Training foreign language teachers: A reflective approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

2. Articles, Papers, Other Printed Publications

- Bachman, F. Lyle (2014). *Ongoing challenges in language assessment*. In A. J. Kunnan (Ed.), *The companion to language assessment* (Vol. 3), (pp. 1586-1603). Oxford: John Wiley and Sons.
- Berry, Vivien, Sheehan, Susan & Munro, Sonia (2019, April). "What does language assessment literacy mean to teachers?". *ELT Journal*, 73(2), 113-123. doi:10.1093/elt/ccy055
- Black, Paul, & Wiliam, Dylan (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in education: principles, policy & practice*, 5(1), 7-74.
- Boyles, P. (2005). Assessment literacy. *National assessment summit papers*, 11-15.
- Büyükkarci, Kagan (2016). "Identifying the areas for English language teacher development: A study of assessment literacy." *Pegem Egitim ve Ogretim Dergisi*, 6(3), 333-346.
- Chen, H. (2003). *A study of primary school English teachers' beliefs and practices in multiple assessments: A case study in Taipei City*. Unpublished master thesis. Taipei: National Taipei Teachers College
- Clapham, Caroline (2000). Assessment And Testing. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 20,147-161. doi:10.1017/s0267190500200093
- Doğru, Dilay (2020). Assessment literacy conceptions and practices EFL teachers in higher education. Master's thesis, Bahçeşehir University, The Graduate School of Educational Sciences, İstanbul.
- Giraldo, Frank (2018). Language assessment literacy: Implications for language teachers. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 20(1), 179–195. <https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v20n1.62089>

- Hakim, Badia (2015). English language teachers' ideology of ELT assessment literacy. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 3(4), 42-48.
- Han, Turgay, & Kaya, H. İbrahim. (2014). Turkish EFL teachers' assessment preferences and practices in the context of constructivist instruction. *Journal of Studies in Education*, 4(1), 77-93. <https://dx.doi.org/10.5296/jse.v4i1.4873>
- Hargreaves, Andy, Earl, Lorna, & Schmidt, Michele (2002). Perspectives on alternative assessment reform. *American Educational Research Journal*, 39(1), 69-95.
- Hatipoğlu, Çiler (2010). Summative evaluation of an English language testing and evaluation course for future English language teachers in Turkey. *English Language Teacher Education and Development (ELTED)*, 13, 40-51.
- Hatipoğlu, Çiler (2015). English language testing and evaluation (ELTE) training in Turkey: Expectations and needs of pre-service English language teachers. *ELT Research Journal*, 4(2), 111-128.
- Hatipoğlu, Çiler & Ercetin, G. (2016). Türkiye'de yabancı dilde ölçme ve değerlendirme eğitiminin geçmişi ve bugünü. In S. Akcan & Y. Bayyurt (Eds), 3. *ulusal yabancı dil eğitimi kurultayı: Türkiye'deki yabancı dil eğitimi üzerine görüş ve düşünceler 23-24 Ekim 2014, konferanstan seçkiler* (pp. 72-89). İstanbul, Turkey: Boğaziçi University.
- Havnes, Anton (2004). Examination and learning: An activity theoretical analysis of the relationship between assessment and educational practice. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 29 (2),159-176.
- Howerton, M. Amy (2016). Elephant on a stepladder: an exploration of pre-service English teacher assessment literacy (Doctoral Dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 10240273) (Date of access: 25.04.2017).
- Inbar-Lourie, Ofra (2008). Constructing a language assessment knowledge base: A focus on language assessment courses. *Language Testing*, 25(3), 385-402.
- Inbar-Lourie, Ofra (2013). Guest editorial to the special issue on language assessment literacy. *Language Testing*, 30(3), 301-307.
- Jannati, Seyran (2015). "ELT teachers' language assessment literacy: Perceptions and practices." *The International Journal of Research in Teacher Education*, 6(2), 26- 37.
- Jeong, Heejeong (2013). Defining assessment literacy: Is it different for language testers and non-language testers? *Language Testing*, 30(3), 345-362. doi:10.1177/0265532213480334
- Karaman, Pınar, ve Şahin, Çavuş (2014). Öğretmen adaylarının ölçme değerlendirme okuryazarlıklarının belirlenmesi. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 15 (2), 175-189.
- Kavaklı, Nurdan, Arslan, Sezen (2019). "When student-teachers' benefits are not enough: The critical perspective of action-impact-desired outcome model for

- the evaluation of instruction.” In B. Tuncsiper, F. Sayın, B. Herguner, F. Irem Aydin (Eds.). Selected discussions on social science research. Frontpage Publications: London, 622-640.
- Khadijeh, Bayat and Amir, Rezaei (2015). Importance of teachers’ assessment literacy. *International Journal of English Language Education*, 3(1), 139-146. doi:10.5296/ijele.v3i1.6887
- Khan, Rubina (2018). What Is Assessment? Purposes of Assessment and Evaluation. *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*, 1-7.
- Lam, Ricky (2015). Language assessment training in Hong Kong: Implications for language assessment literacy. *Language Testing*, 32 (2), 169-197.
- Darling-Hammond, Linda (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 8(1), 1-44.
- López, Alexis & Bernal, Ricardo (2009). Language testing in Colombia: A call for more teacher education and teacher training in language assessment. *Profile: Issues in Teachers’ Professional Development*, 11(2), 55-70.
- Lowhorn, L. Greg (2007). *Qualitative and Quantitative Research: How to Choose the Best Design* [Paper presentation]. Academic Business World International Conference, Regent University, Virginia, U.S. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2235986>
- Luthfiyyah, Roghibatul, Basyari, W. Iin, & Dwiniasih, Dwiniasih (2020). EFL secondary teachers’ assesment literacy: Assessment conceptions and practices. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, 10(2), 402–421. <https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v10i2.2101>
- Malone, E. Margaret (2013). The essentials of assessment literacy: Contrasts between testers and users. *Language Testing*, 30(3), 329-344.
- Mede, Enisa & Atay, Derin (2017). English Language Teachers’ assessment literacy: The Turkish context. *Dil Dergisi*, 168 (1), 1-5.
- Mertler, A. Craig (2002). Classroom assessment literacy inventory. (Adapted from the Teacher Assessment Literacy Questionnaire (1993), by Barbara S. Plake & James C. Impara, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, in cooperation with The National Council on Measurement in Education & the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.
- Mertler, A. Craig (2009). Teachers’ assessment knowledge and the perceptions of the impact of classroom assessment professional development. *Improving Schools*, 12 (2), 101-113 DOI: 10.1177/1365480209105575
- Mertler, A. Craig & Campbell, Cynthia (2005). Measuring teachers’ knowledge & application of classroom assessment concepts: Development of the “Assessment Literacy Inventory.” *Online Submission*.
- Migliacci, Naomi (2018). Classroom Testing. In the *TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching* (eds J. I. Liontas, T. International Association and M. DelliCarpini). doi:10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0374

- Migliacci, Namomi (2018). Classroom testing. *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching*, 1-7.
- Muhammad, F. H. Najib, Bardakçı, Mehmet (2019). “Iraqi EFL Teachers’ Assessment Literacy: Perceptions and Practices.” *Arab World English Journal*, 10 (2) 420-430. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol10no2.33>
- Munoz, P. Ana, Palacio, M. & Escobar, Liliana (2012). Teachers’ beliefs about assessment in an EFL context in Colombia. *Profile*, 14(1), 143-158.
- O’Loughlin, Kieran (2013). Developing the assessment literacy of university proficiency test users. *Language Testing*, 30 (3), 363-380.
- Ökten, Ali (2009). *Effects of Formative Assessment Application on Students’ Language Proficiency and Beliefs in Language Learning in E.F.L Context: A Case Study*. [Unpublished Master’s Thesis]. Çukurova University, Adana.
- Ölmezer-Öztürk, Elçin (2018). Developing and validating language assessment knowledge scale (LAKS) and exploring the assessment knowledge of EFL teachers. Doctoral thesis, Anadolu University, Graduate School of Educational Sciences, Eskişehir.
- Ölmezer-Öztürk, Elçin & Aydın, Belgin (2019). Voices of EFL teachers as assessors: Their opinions and needs regarding language assessment. *Eğitimde Nitel Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 7(1), 373-390.
- Ölmezer-Öztürk, Elçin (2021). Developing Language Assessment Literacy of EFL Pre-service Teachers through Classroom Assessment Course. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research*, 8(3), 13-22.
- Patton, Q. Michael (1987). *How to use qualitative methods in evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Plake, S. Barbara (1993). Teacher assessment literacy: Teachers’ competencies in the educational assessment of students. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher*, 6 (1), 21- 27.
- Popham, W. James (2009). Assessment literacy for teachers: Faddish or fundamental? *Theory into Practice*, 48(1), 4–11.
- Purpura, E. James (2016). Second and foreign language assessment. *The Modern Language Journal*, 100(S1), 190-208.
- Rad, M. Rahimi (2019). The Impact of EFL Teachers’ Assessment Literacy on Their Assessment Efficiency in Classroom. *Britain International of Linguistics Arts and Education (BioLAE) Journal*, 1(1), 9-17.
- Rahman, Shidur (2017). The advantages and disadvantages of using qualitative and quantitative approaches and methods in language “testing and assessment” research: a literature review. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 6(1), 102-112. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/jel.v6n1p102>
- Rogier, Dawn (2014). Assessment literacy: Building a base for better teaching and learning. *English Language Teaching Forum*, 3, 2-13.

- Rosenbusch, M. Harmon (2006). *New Visions in Action: National Assessment Summit Papers. National K-12 Foreign Language Resource Center.*
- Sahinkarakas, Sehnaz (2012). The role of teaching experience on teachers' perceptions of language assessment. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 47, 1787-1792.
- Sarıyıldız, Gamze (2018). *A study into language assessment literacy of pre-service English teachers as a foreign language teacher in Turkish context.* [master's thesis, Institute of Social Sciences. Hacettepe University]. Ankara, Turkey.
- Semiz, Öznur & Odabaş, Kübra (2016). Turkish Efl Teachers Familiarity Of And Perceived Needs For Language Testing And Assessment Literacy. *Özgür Öztürk Dakam Yayınları June 2016, İstanbul.*, 66.
- Serpil, Öz, & Derin, Atay (2017). Turkish EFL instructors' in-class language assessment literacy: Perceptions and practices. *ELT Research Journal*, 6(1), 25-44.
- Sevimel-Sahin, Aylin & Subasi, Gonca (2019). An overview of language assessment literacy research within the English language education context. *Journal of Theoretical Educational Science*, 12(4), 1340– 1364.
- Stiggins, J. Richard (1991). Assessment Literacy. *Phi Delta Kappa* 72(7), 534-539.
- Stiggins, J. Richard (2002). Assessment crisis: The absence of assessment for learning. *Phi Delta Kappan* 83, no. 10: 758–65.
- Sultana, Nasreen (2019). Language assessment literacy: An Uncharted Area for the English Language Teachers in Bangladesh. *Language Testing in Asia*, 9(1), 1-14.
- Tao, Nary (2014). *Development and validation of classroom assessment literacy scales: English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers in a Cambodian Higher Education Setting.* Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Victoria University, Australia.
- Taras, Maddalena (2005). Assessment–summative and formative–some theoretical reflections. *British journal of educational studies*, 53(4), 466-478.
- Trumbull, Elise, & Lash, Andrea (2013). Understanding formative assessment. *Insights form Learn theory Meas theory San Fr WestEd*, 1-20.
- Vogt, Karin, & Tsagari, Dina (2014). Assessment literacy of foreign language teachers: Findings of a European study. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 11(4), 374-402.
- Volante, Louis & Fazio, E. Xaviar (2007). Exploring teacher candidates' assessment literacy: Implications for teacher education reform and professional development. *Canadian Journal of Education* 30, no. 3: 749–70.
- Wach, Aleksandra (2012). Classroom-based language efficiency assessment: A challenge for EFL teachers. *Glottodidactica*, 39(1), 81-92.

- Webb, L. Norman (2002). Assessment literacy in a standards-based urban education setting. In *annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans*.
- Xie, Qun, Tan, Siyan (2019). "Preparing primary English teachers in Hong Kong: Focusing on language assessment literacy." *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 16(2), 653-673.
- Xu, Yueting, Brown, T. L. Gavin (2017). "University English teacher assessment literacy: A survey-test report from China." *Papers in Language Testing and Assessment*, 6(1), 133-158.
- Yetkin, Caner (2015). An investigation on ELT teacher candidates' assessment literacy. [master's thesis, Cag University], Institute of Social Sciences, Mersin.
- Zhang, Zhicheng, & Burry-Stock, Judy (1997). Assessment Practices Inventory: A Multivariate Analysis of Teachers' Perceived Assessment Competency.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Language Assessment Knowledge Scale – LAKS

PART I: Demographic Information

1. Gender
 - a) male b) female

2. Years of experience
 - a) 1-5 years b) 6- 10 years c) 11- 15 years
 - d) 16- 20 years e) more than 21years

3. The BA programme you graduated from
 - a) English Language Teaching (ELT) b) non- ELT

4. Educational background
 - a) BA degree b) MA degree c) PhD degree

5. Where are you working at now?
 - a) a state university b) a private university

6. Have you ever been a member of a testing office?
 - a) yes b) no

7. Did you have a separate testing/assessment course in pre-service education?
 - a) yes b) no

8. Have you attended any professional development programmes/ courses/ training on language assessment?
 - a) yes b) no

9. How do you evaluate yourself as an assessor in the following areas/subskills?
 - a) **reading** (1) very competent (2) competent (3) not very competent (4) not competent
 - b) **listening** (1) very competent (2) competent (3) not very competent (4) not competent
 - c) **writing** (1) very competent (2) competent (3) not very competent (4) not competent
 - d) **speaking** (1) very competent (2) competent (3) not very competent (4) not competent

ITEMS	True	False	Don't Know
1. Asking learners to summarize the reading text is a way of assessing their reading skills.			
2. When asking several questions about a reading text, all the questions are independent of each other.			
3. Cloze test is used for assessing the main idea of the text.			
4. In a reading exam, using a text learners have encountered before is not a problem.			
5. One reading text is enough to be included in a reading exam.			
6. The language of the questions is simpler than the text itself.			
7. Errors of spelling are penalized while scoring.			
8. Taking vocabulary difficulty into consideration is necessary in assessing reading skills.			
9. Including not stated/doesn't say along with true/false items has advantages over true/false items.			
10. The more items a reading text is followed, the more reliable it becomes.			
11. Using the same words in the correct option as in the text is not a problem.			
12. Simplification of reading texts is avoided.			
13. Reading texts in a reading exam include various genres (essay, article, etc.).			
14. In top-down approach, assessment is on overall comprehension of the reading text.			
15. Using ungrammatical distractors in multiple choice questions in a reading exam is a problem.			

ASSESSING LISTENING

16. Using reading texts for listening purposes poses a problem.			
17. Including redundancy (e.g. what I mean to say is that) in a listening text poses a problem.			
18. Any type of listening text is used for note-taking.			
19. Spelling errors are ignored in scoring the dictation.			
20. Errors of grammar or spelling are penalized while scoring.			
21. A listening cloze test is a way of selective listening.			

22. Phonemic discrimination tasks (e.g. minimal pairs such as sheep-ship) are examples of integrative testing.			
23. Scoring in note-taking is straightforward.			
24. In discrete-point testing, comprehension is at the literal/local level.			
25. Using dictation diagnostically in assessing listening skills does not pose a problem.			
26. Giving learners a transcript of the listening text is a valid way of assessing listening skills.			
27. Dictation is a kind of discrete-point testing.			
28. Inference questions based on intelligence are avoided in listening tests.			
29. Asking learners to listen to names or numbers is called intensive listening.			
30. In selective listening, learners are expected to look for certain information.			

ASSESSING WRITING

31. Giving two options to learners and asking them to write about one ensure reliable and valid scoring.			
32. Analytic scoring is used to see the strengths and weaknesses of learners.			
33. The parts of a scoring scale and the scores in each part do not change for different levels of learners.			
34. When there is a disagreement between the scores of the two raters, they score the written work again.			
35. Learners are required to write about at least two tasks in the exam rather than one task.			
36. Giving restrictive prompts/guidelines to learners for the writing task is avoided.			
37. Giving learners an opinion and asking them to discuss it is a valid way of assessing their writing skills.			
38. Using visuals which guide learners for writing poses a problem.			
39. Holistic scoring is used to see whether the learner is proficient or not at the end of the term.			
40. Analytic scoring leads to greater reliability than holistic scoring in writing.			
41. In controlled writing, learners have the chance to convey new information.			
42. Classroom evaluation of learning in terms of writing is best served through analytic scoring rather than holistic scoring.			

43. Irrelevant ideas are ignored in the assessment of initial stages of a written work in process writing.			
44. Providing a reading text for writing is a way of assessing writing skills.			
45. Mechanical errors (e.g. spelling and punctuation) are dealt with in the assessment of later stages of a written work.			

ASSESSING SPEAKING

46. When the interlocutor does not understand the learner, giving that feeling or saying it poses a problem.			
47. Giving learners one task is enough to assess speaking skills.			
48. Interlocutors' showing interest by verbal and non-verbal signals poses a problem.			
49. When it becomes apparent that the learner cannot reach the criterion level, the task is ended.			
50. Using holistic and analytic scales at the same time poses a problem.			
51. Reading aloud is a technique used to assess speaking skills.			
52. In interlocutor-learner interviews, the teacher has the chance to adapt the questions being asked.			
53. In interactive tasks, more than two learners pose a problem.			
54. The interlocutor gives the score when the learner is in the exam room.			
55. In a speaking exam, production and comprehension are assessed together.			
56. Asking learners to repeat a word, phrase or a sentence is a way of assessing speaking skills.			
57. Discussion among learners is a way of assessing speaking skills.			
58. A checklist is a means of scoring oral presentations in in-class assessment.			
59. When the focus is to assess discourse, role plays are used.			
60. In peer interaction, random matching is avoided.			

CURRICULUM VITAE

Personal Information

Name- Surname : Bahar AKBABA

Educational Background:

2002- 2009 Kocatepe Primary School
2009- 2013 Çakabey Anatolian High School
2013- 2018 Kocaeli University- English Language Teaching

Professional Background :

2019 – 2022 Şehit Abdulhalık Araz Anatolian High School- English
Language Teacher

Certifications:

2021: IMASCON 2021 Spring Congress (Paper Presentation)