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

AN INVESTIGATION OF TURKISH PRE-SERVICE EFL TEACHERS' LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT LITERACY

MASTER'S THESIS

Rabiye Bahar TAMERER

KOCAELİ 2019

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

AN INVESTIGATION OF TURKISH PRE-SERVICE EFL TEACHERS' LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT LITERACY

MASTER'S THESIS

Rabiye Bahar TAMERER

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Doğan YÜKSEL

KOCAELİ 2019

AN INVESTIGATION OF TURKISH PRE-SERVICE EFL TEACHERS' LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT LITERACY

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

Tezi Hazırlayan: **Rabiye Bahar TAMERER**
Tezin Kabul Edildiği Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu Karar ve No: 26/06/2019 – 18

Jüri Başkanı: **Doç. Dr. Doğan YÜKSEL**

Jüri Üyesi: **Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Mehmet ALTAY**

Jüri Üyesi: **Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Orhan KOCAMAN**

KOCAELİ 2019

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To my beloved parents

Rabiye Bahar TAMERER
Kocaeli, 2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

1. INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER TWO

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

CHAPTER THREE

3. METHODOLOGY

CHAPTER FOUR

4. FINDINGS

CHAPTER FIVE

5. DISCUSSION

ABSTRACT

**AN INVESTIGATION OF TURKISH PRE-SERVICE EFL TEACHERS'
LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT LITERACY**

This study aimed to investigate Turkish pre-service language teachers' stated training levels and their perceived training needs in language assessment literacy (LAL) at Kocaeli University. 30 4th grade pre-service EFL teachers took part in this study. In data collection process, two different methods were used. Firstly, Vogt and Tsagari's (2014) teachers' questionnaire was used in this study for quantitative data collection. In the second part of the data collection process (qualitative), semi-structured written interview questionnaires were used and 10 participants took part in the interviews. The results of the quantitative data (questionnaires) were analyzed through the use of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) 15.0 and qualitative data (semi-structured written interviews) were analyzed according to their similarities and differences one by one. The overall findings revealed that participants had low levels of language assessment literacy and they stated a basic training need in this area.

Keywords: Pre-service EFL teachers, language testing and assessment, language assessment literacy

ÖZET

TÜRK İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMEN ADAYLARININ DİL DEĞERLENDİRME OKURYAZARLIĞI ARAŞTIRMASI

Bu çalışma, Kocaeli Üniversitesindeki Türk İngilizce öğretmen adaylarının dil değerlendirme okuryazarlığı eğitim seviyelerini ve dil değerlendirme okuryazarlığı eğitim ihtiyaçlarını incelemeyi hedeflemektedir. Çalışmaya 4. sınıfta okuyan 30 adet Türk İngilizce öğretmen adayı katılmıştır. Veri toplama sürecinde iki farklı metot kullanılmıştır. İlk olarak, nicel verilerin toplanmasında Vogt ve Tsagari'nin (2014) öğretmen anketi kullanılmıştır. İkinci veri toplama metodu olarak ise yarı yapılandırılmış yazılı görüşme anketi kullanılmıştır ve görüşmelere 10 öğretmen adayı katılmıştır. Nicel veriler Sosyal Bilimler İstatistik Paketi (SPSS) 15.0 kullanılarak, nitel veriler ise benzerlik ve farklılıklarına göre tek tek değerlendirilerek analiz edilmiştir. Tüm sonuçlar, katılımcıların dil değerlendirme okuryazarlığının düşük olduğunu ve bu alanda eğitime ihtiyaç duyduklarını göstermiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İngilizce öğretmen adayları, dil ölçme ve değerlendirme, dil değerlendirme okuryazarlığı

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ELT: ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

LTA: LANGUAGE TESTING AND ASSESSMENT

AL: ASSESSMENT LITERACY

LAL: LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT LITERACY

LIST OF TABLES

PREFACE

Use of tests and assessment in language teaching have been increased along with the importance of foreign language learning in today's world and the increase in this area made language teachers more responsible in assessment (Fulcher, 2012: p. 113). Teachers' increased responsibility in assessment brought the need for training and competence in language testing and assessment (LTA). The competence needed in LTA which was termed as language assessment literacy (LAL), has become a prominent issue in recent years (Davison and Leung, 2009: p. 394; Fulcher, 2012: p. 113; Vogt and Tsagari, 2014: p. 374).

To emphasize the prominence of language testing and assessment (LTA) and language assessment literacy (LAL), this research aimed to explore language assessment literacy levels and language assessment literacy training needs of 30 4th grade pre-service EFL teachers at Kocaeli University in Turkey between the years of 2018-2019. Two different data collection tools were used to collect data in this research. Firstly, Vogt and Tsagari's (2014) teachers' questionnaire was used for quantitative data collection. In the qualitative part of the data collection process, semi-structured written interview questionnaires were used and 10 participants took part in the interviews. The results of the quantitative data (questionnaires) were analyzed through the use of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) 15.0 and qualitative data (semi-structured written interviews) were analyzed according to their similarities and differences one by one. The overall findings of this research revealed that participants had low levels of language assessment literacy and they stated a basic training need in this area.

CHAPTER ONE

1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the background to the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, significance of the study, research questions, limitations of the study and finally the definitions.

1.1. Background to the Study

In today's world, foreign language teaching/learning has become a prominent issue and at the beginning of the 21st century, language teachers have become more responsible in language testing and assessment with the increased use of tests and assessments in language teaching (Fulcher, 2012: p. 113). This increase in language testing brought the need for training in language testing profession and teachers' competence in language testing and assessment (LTA) has gained importance in recent years (Davison and Leung, 2009: p. 394; Fulcher, 2012: p. 113; Vogt and Tsagari, 2014: p. 374). The competence needed in language testing and assessment was operationalized firstly by the American Federation of Teachers in 1990 as "assessment literacy" (AL) and it was defined as being competent in selecting, developing, administering, scoring tests and using these test scores to make decisions by communicating the results with stakeholders and being aware of the ethical and appropriate use of tests (Fulcher, 2012: p. 115). Later on, various definitions were provided by other researchers such as being able to differentiate sound assessments and unsound assessments from each other (Stiggins, 1995: p. 4) and familiarity of the teachers with the basics of measurements related to what goes on in the classrooms (Popham, 2009: p. 4).

The emergence of the term assessment literacy has received considerable attention by the researchers (Popham, 2009: p. 4; Webb, 2002: p. 1) and scholars have started to conduct studies on this topic (Vogt and Tsagari, 2014: p. 375). Along with

the growing interest in AL and with the increasing growth in use of tests and assessment in teaching around the world, another term, parallel to assessment literacy, has come out, which is called as "language assessment literacy" (LAL) and defined shortly as being able to combine language specific competencies with AL skills (Inbar-Lourie, 2008: p. 389). Besides defining the term, researchers also emphasize the cruciality of language assessment literacy in language education (Scarino, 2013: p. 310) and indicate that LAL enable teachers to discover their understanding, perceptions and knowledge, helps them to understand the nature of the assessment, and to develop self-awareness (Scarino, 2013: p. 311). Researchers also indicate that if language teachers have a strong background in LAL, they will be able to make use of appropriate forms of teaching by integrating assessment with instruction (Coombe et al., 2012: p. 21) and they will be able to choose the most appropriate learning tools which meet learning objectives (Siegel and Wissehr, 2011: p. 375).

Despite the emphasized cruciality of language assessment literacy in language education, it has been indicated in the previous LAL studies that most of the language teachers' language assessment literacy is low and underdeveloped (Büyükkarci, 2016: p. 344; Fives and Barnes, 2017: p. 86; Hasselgreen et al., 2004: p. 7; Razavipour et al., 2011: p. 160; Tsagari and Vogt, 2017: p. 42; Vogt and Tsagari, 2014: p. 391; Volante and Fazio, 2007: p. 764). In accordance with these study results, researchers express that teachers need training in language assessment because of their lack of practice, training, experience and knowledge in LAL (Giraldo and Murcia, 2018: p. 60; Hasselgreen et al., 2004: p. 7; Kavakli and Arslan, 2019: p. 228; Mede and Atay, 2017: p.58). The researchers also point out that LAL research is still infant and underdeveloped (Fulcher, 2012: p.117; Vogt and Tsagari, 2014: p. 375). Furthermore, they state that vast majority of AL studies have been conducted with in-service teachers and highlight the need for studies with pre-service teachers (Büyükkarci, 2016: p. 344; Deluca and Klinger, 2010: p.422; Pill and Harding, 2013: p. 382).

As a result, conducting more studies with pre-service teachers is needed in order to fill the gap in language assessment literacy literature as the researchers suggest (Büyükkarci, 2016: p. 344; Deluca and Klinger, 2010: p.422; Pill and Harding, 2013: p. 382).

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Language teachers are accepted as one of the most prominent figures in language testing and assessment (Vogt and Tsagari, 2014: p. 374). Because of this reason, their competency in LAL become crucial along with the increased use of language testing and assessment (Fulcher, 2012: p. 113; Popham, 2009: p. 4; Vogt and Tsagari, 2014: p. 375). However, previously conducted LAL studies showed that language teachers have low levels of language assessment literacy (Büyükkarci, 2016: p. 334; Hasselgreen et al., 2004: p. 7; Razavipour et al., 2011: p. 160; Vogt and Tsagari, 2014: p. 391; Volante and Fazio, 2007: p. 764) and most of these studies examined in-service teachers' language assessment literacy (Büyükkarci, 2016: p. 334; Deluca and Klinger, 2010: p.422; Pill and Harding, 2013: p. 382). Therefore, it is necessary to conduct more studies with pre-service language teachers on language assessment literacy (Deluca and Klinger, 2010: p.422; Pill and Harding, 2013: p. 382).

1.3. Purpose of the Study

The aim of this study is to explore pre-service language teachers' training levels in language assessment literacy by using pre-service language teachers' questionnaire which is adapted from Vogt and Tsagari's (2014) teachers' questionnaire. The study also aims to identify pre-service language teachers' training needs in language assessment literacy by using the same questionnaire and their personal ideas about their own training levels and needs in LAL have been asked individually via an interview.

1.4. Research Questions

The current study is designed to find answer for the following research questions:

1. What level of training do pre-service language teachers indicate in LAL?
2. What level of training do pre-service language teachers need in LAL?

1.5. Significance of the Study

Review of related literature have shown that research in assessment literacy is still in its early periods and especially LAL research with pre-service language teachers is limited (Büyükkarci, 2016: p. 334; Deluca and Klinger, 2010: p.422; Pill and Harding, 2013: p. 382). Therefore, more studies with pre-service language teachers are needed in this context. The current study is expected to fill this gap in LAL literature by focusing on pre-service language teachers' LAL training levels and their LAL training needs.

This study may be significant in providing pre-service language teachers a better understanding of their own LAL levels and LAL training needs which may help them to raise an awareness in this context.

The results of this study may be significant in providing evidence and implications for pre-/in-service teachers, teacher training programs and may influence researchers to promote future research in language assessment literacy.

1.6. Limitations of the Study

The current study is limited in terms of its sample and sample size. The data for this study, was collected from 30 4th grade ELT students at Kocaeli University. Therefore, the sample and the sample size of the study are not enough to generalize the research results for all 4th grade ELT students around Turkey.

1.7. Definitions

The definitions of the key terms that are used in this study are given below.

Assessment: An information gathering process to see the progress by using all types of measurements (Kizlik, 2012: p.3; Oz and Atay, 2017: p. 26).

Assessment Literacy: Knowing the nature of the assessment together with its theory and philosophy and being able to use it when assessing learners' progress in learning (Deluca and Klinger, 2010: p.420; Lan and Fan, 2019: p. 112).

Language Assessment Literacy: Language teachers' familiarity with the basics of assessment and being able to use their assessment knowledge in classroom while assessing language related issues (Malone, 2013: p. 329; Sultana, 2019: p. 2).

CHAPTER TWO

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter presents definitions of assessment, assessment literacy and language assessment literacy respectively. The chapter also presents previous research related to language assessment literacy around the world and in Turkey.

2.1. Assessment

The term assessment, which is mostly confused with measurement and test, is a general term for gathering information to check student learning (Kizlik, 2012: p. 3; Miller et al., 2008: p.28; Oz and Atay, 2017: p. 26). Measurement, on the other hand, is a process of assigning numbers to the assessment results (Miller et al., 2008: p.28) and test is a particular form of assessment which includes set of questions and used in a fixed period of time (Miller et al., 2008: p.28). Unlike test, assessment is an ongoing process and teachers subconsciously assess every actions of their students whenever the students answer a question or make a comment (Brown, 2004: p. 4) and this shows that assessment and teaching are inseparable (Oz and Atay, 2017: p. 26).

Assessment, as an inseparable part of teaching, is accepted as prominent in understanding teacher success, in revealing the problematic and successful parts of the education, in detecting student needs, in making necessary changes in instruction, in evaluating instruction quality, in having reliable data on learners' progress, in choosing appropriate feedbacks and in enhancing learners' success (Kavakli and Arslan, 2019: p. 223; Oz and Atay, 2017: p. 26). Overall, assessment plays a central role in each part of teaching and it is essential in education (Oz and Atay, 2017: p. 26).

In parallel with its importance, it is stated that assessment takes nearly half of the teachers' working time (Kavakli and Arslan, 2019: p. 224; Lan and Fan, 2019: p. 112; Mede and Atay, 2017: p.44; Plake,1993: p. 21; Stiggins, 1999: p 23). In order to

spend this time efficiently and to get high levels of achievement, teachers are expected to be assessment literate (Kavakli and Arslan, 2019: p. 224; Mede and Atay, 2017: p.44).

2.2. Assessment Literacy

Assessment literacy was firstly defined in 1990 by the American Federation of Teachers as to be skilled in choosing, developing, administering, scoring and interpreting assessment, in using assessment scores to make decisions about students and teaching, in developing valid grading systems, in communicating the results of the assessments with other teachers, parents and learners and to be skilled in recognizing legal, ethical and appropriate assessments (Büyükkarci, 2016: p. 334). Later on, other researchers defined assessment literacy as the ability to enhance instruction by understanding the difference between sound and unsound assessments (Stiggins, 1991: s. 539) being familiar with classroom related assessment basics (Popham, 2009: p. 4) and as understanding the concepts and the procedures that affect instructional decisions (Popham, 2011: p. 268).

Having a strong background in assessment literacy is considered to be one of the most critical competencies of educators (Büyükkarci, 2016: p. 334) which help them to know what, why and how to assess (Stiggins, 1995: s. 4), to enhance learning (Stiggins, 2014: p. 67), to increase the quality of teaching and learning (White, 2009: p. 10).

2.3. Language Assessment Literacy

Parallel to assessment literacy, language assessment literacy is defined as knowing what are the language related assessments and knowing how and why to use them (Inbar-Lourie, 2008: p. 390). It is also defined as the knowledge which includes educational assessment and language, as the skills that a language assessment literate have in technology, statistics and analysis and as the principles that the same language assessment literate have in professionalism and ethics (Giraldo, 2019: p. 38).

Language assessment literacy is accepted as crucial in language education (Scarino, 2013: p. 310) and researchers indicate that LAL helps language teachers in developing self-awareness, enables them to discover their perceptions, understanding and knowledge about language teaching and learning and it teaches the nature of the language assessment (Scarino, 2013: p. 311). With having a powerful background in language assessment literacy, teachers will be able to integrate assessment with instruction by making use of the most appropriate forms of language teaching (Coombe et al., 2012: p. 21) and they will be competent in choosing appropriate learning tools which meet their instructional objectives (Siegel and Wissehr, 2011: p. 375). The integration of assessment into language teaching enhances language teaching (Malone, 2013: p. 330) and accordingly, language teachers play a key role in this process as language assessment's agents (Rea-Dickins, 2004: p. 252).

2.4. Language Assessment Literacy Research

Research related to language assessment literacy that has been conducted around the world and in Turkey so far are given below respectively, in chronological order.

In 1991, a national study in United States, was designed to find out teachers' competency in seven standards which were identified by the National Council on Measurement and Education (NCME), National Education Association (NEA), American Association of Collages for Teachers in Education (AACTE) and American Federation of Teachers (AFT). 555 teachers participated in the study and they were only able to respond 23.20 items correctly out of 35 on average. The results revealed that teachers had a low level of literacy and they were not qualified enough in assessment (Plake, 1993: p. 23).

Zhang and Burry-Stock (1997) conducted a study to find out the effects of training and practice on teacher's AL competency by using Assessment Practice Inventory. 311 teachers participated in the study. Researchers found significant relation between experience and training and the results supported the need for further training in assessment (p. 8).

Campbell and Evans (2000) investigated the assessment practices of 65 pre-service teachers by examining their lesson plans. After the critical review of the pre-service teachers' lesson plans, researchers concluded that pre-service teachers were failed to apply recommended assessment practices (p. 354).

In Bachor and Baer's (2001) study, 127 pre-service teachers at the University of Victoria were asked to track three hypothetical students, to give them grades and to keep journals about their assessment processes throughout a term. The study aimed to examine pre-service teachers' assessment practices and the results revealed that some of the preservice teachers were tend to use unsound assessment practices because of their lack of training in assessment (p. 253).

In another study, Mertler (2003) measured and compared pre-service and in-service teachers' assessment literacy by using a survey called as Classroom Assessment Literacy Inventory which was designed parallel to the seven standards in Plake's (1993) study. 67 pre-service and 197 in-service teachers participated in the study and the results showed that there was a significant difference between the groups and in-service teachers scored higher than the pre-service teachers. Mertler concluded that teacher training is not sufficient enough to meet the needs of teachers' classroom practices (2003: p. 20).

Hasselgreen et al. (2004) investigated the training needs of teachers, teacher trainees and experts in Europe. To achieve the aim, a survey form was used and 914 respondents participated in the study. At the end of the study, researchers stated that teachers needed training in almost all areas of LTA and teacher trainees had the similar needs.

In Maclellan's (2004) study, 30 pre-service teachers' knowledge of assessment were analyzed by using written texts of pre-service teachers. After the analysis of the personal scripts, Maclellan stated that pre-service teachers' assessment knowledge is underdeveloped and he highlighted the importance of active assessment training, practice and experience in teacher education (p. 533).

Graham (2005) conducted a study to track 38 pre-service teachers' progress in assessment in mentored environment. The researchers interviewed pre-service teachers at the beginning and at the end of the process to see the change in their definitions and beliefs about the assessment. At the end of the study, researchers indicated that pre-service teachers considered assessment literacy as prominent but they still had some problems related to classroom assessment especially in alternative assessment (p. 607).

In a different study, Chen (2005) examined graduate and undergraduate pre-service teachers AL with 61 pre-service teachers. It was found out that graduate pre-service teachers have higher assessment literacy levels but the participants stated that they had difficulty in communicating the results of the assessments with the learners, parents and other teachers.

Mertler and Campbell (2005) developed an assessment literacy inventory to measure teachers' assessment literacy and pilot tested it firstly with 152 preservice teachers and then with 249 preservice teachers. At the end of the study, they concluded that the inventory that they developed was useful in measuring teachers' assessment literacy and in helping teacher development (p. 2).

In Volante and Fazio's (2007) study, pre-service teachers' assessment literacy levels and needs were examined by an assessment literacy survey. 69 pre-service teachers participated in the study and their perceived self-efficacy levels were found out to be too low (p. 764).

Guerin (2010) examined 100 language teachers' language assessment literacy knowledge and their training needs via survey. The researcher found out that participant language teachers need training in language assessment (p. 9).

Jin (2010) investigated language teachers' training courses in China. A survey was given to 86 participants to achieve this aim and at the end of the study, the researcher found that educational measurement and classroom practice received dramatically less attention while other aspects of LTA covered adequately in teacher

training courses in China (p. 555).

DeLuca and Klinger (2010) conducted a study to examine pre-service teachers' training in assessment and their confidence levels by using a questionnaire. 288 pre-service teachers took part in the study. The findings of the study revealed that pre-service teachers stated that they had higher levels of confidence in theoretical and practical knowledge than in philosophical domains. The results also highlighted that pre-service teachers needed direct training in some topics of assessment such as achievement reporting, assessment modifying, constructed-response item development, item validity and reliability (p. 419).

Siegel and Wissehr (2011) designed a study to explore 11 pre-service teachers' assessment literacy by analyzing their journals and teaching philosophies. The researchers examined pre-service teachers' reasons to use assessment and their understanding of assessment tools. In the study, pre-service teachers tended to use traditional forms of assessment instead of the other forms. Researchers concluded that teacher training programs need to pay more attention to assessment literacy development of pre-service teachers (p. 371).

Alkharusi et al. (2011) investigated the differences between 233 in-service and 279 pre-service teachers' perceived knowledge, skills and attitudes towards assessment in Oman. In the study, pre-service teachers had higher levels of knowledge, more positive attitudes towards assessment and low level of perceived skills in assessment than in-service teachers. As a result, the researchers stated that practice and experience is crucial in teacher training (p. 113).

In Iran, Razavipour et al. (2011) conducted a study to isolate 53 language teachers' AL effects from the washback effect of summative tests through a questionnaire and a test. At the end of the study, the researcher found out that the teachers had low level of knowledge in language assessment (p. 156).

Fulcher (2012), developed a survey to examine language teachers' language assessment literacy training needs. 278 participants participated in the study and the

results revealed that they need training in assessment, especially in statistics, reliability and validity. The participants also indicated that they need more practice and highlighted the need for a balance between standardized tests and classroom assessments (p. 122).

In 2013, Razavipour conducted another study to investigate what language assessment literacy means for language assessment literacy test developers, LAL teachers and LAL test-takers. Test developers' perceptions about LAL were examined through content analysis while the teachers' and the test takers' perceptions were analyzed through a survey which was developed by the researcher. The results showed that language assessment literacy for test designers was just knowledge and theory without skills and principles. On the other hand, teachers and test-takers perceived LAL as a matter of skills and also test-takers perceived LAL as challenging because of the statistical and theoretical aspects of it (p. 111).

Vogt and Tsagari (2014) and Tsagari and Vogt (2017) designed studies to measure the language assessment literacy levels of 853 language teachers from seven European countries. Data for the studies were collected through questionnaires and interviews. The results revealed that language teachers have insufficient training in language assessment and only certain elements of language teachers' assessment literacy was developed. Additionally, the majority of the teachers stated that they have training needs in language assessment and they do not feel themselves prepared. The researchers concluded the study by highlighting the importance of teacher education programs in providing language assessment training.

Jannati (2015) examined 18 Iranian language teachers' assessment practices and their perceptions through interviews. The findings showed that teachers are familiar with the basic assessment concepts and there was no effect of teaching experience on teachers' assessment perceptions. The researcher also stated that although the participant teachers are assessment literate, they do not reflect their literacy to their assessment practices (p. 26).

In Hong Kong, Lam (2015) investigated the effect of language assessment courses on pre-service teachers' language assessment literacy development and found out that LAL training in Hong Kong is not adequate and courses are not able to balance the gap between the theory and the practice in language assessment training (p. 169).

Odo (2016) conducted a study to explore assessment literacy development and perceptions of 5 pre-service teachers at a university in US by an individualized tutoring. Participants' written reflections and individual interviews were used to collect data. The findings showed that individualized tutoring and peer debriefing is useful in integrating theory into practice and in assessment literacy development (p. 31).

Xu and Brown (2017) investigated 891 Chinese language teachers' assessment literacy by using a questionnaire which they adapted it from Plake et al.'s (1993) questionnaire. Their study findings revealed that Chinese language teachers' assessment literacy levels are low and insufficient. The researchers concluded that Chinese language teachers need training in assessment.

Muhammad (2017) studied the level of Iraqi language teachers' assessment literacy levels in his masters' thesis. He used Mertler's (2005) assessment literacy inventory to collect data and 101 language teachers participated in his study. Findings of his thesis showed that Iraqi language teachers' assessment literacy levels are low. The inventory analysis also revealed that language teachers have the lowest scores in recognizing unsound assessments while they have the highest scores in making educational decisions with the results of the assessments. Muhammad concluded that teachers need more training in language assessment (2017: p. 46).

In Turkey, Hatipoğlu (2010) examined the assessment courses at Middle East Technical University and asked 81 pre-service language teachers' evaluations on assessment courses by using questionnaires and conducting interviews. The study results revealed that pre-service teachers need more testing courses other than having only one to be successful in language assessment and more practical issues needed to be covered in assessment courses (p. 49).

Following to her previous study, Hatipoğlu (2015) designed another study to find out 124 pre-service language teachers' knowledge and perceived needs in language assessment. To collect data, the researcher used questionnaires and interviews and the results showed that pre-service language teachers at Middle East Technical University have low level of language assessment literacy but unlike in the previous study, the participant pre-service teachers expressed that having only one language assessment course is enough to develop assessment literacy. The researcher concluded that the discrepancy between the results is related to the participant pre-service language teachers' beliefs and their previous experiences in language assessment (p. 124).

In his master's thesis, Yetkin (2015) studied pre-service language teachers' perceptions on assessment strategies with 30 pre-service language teachers at Mersin University. For data gathering, Yetkin used a questionnaire that was adapted from the Volante and Fazio's (2007) assessment literacy questionnaire and conducted written interviews with 5 pre-service language teachers. The study results revealed that pre-service language teachers regard classroom assessment as important both in teachers' and the students' success and they indicated that their teacher training program is sufficient for their assessment literacy development but they expressed a need for further training in some of the assessment strategies which were observation techniques, personal communication and performance assessment (p. 32).

Büyükkarcı (2016) designed a study to examine language teachers' assessment literacy levels and he also investigated the significance of post-graduate education and year of experience in language assessment literacy. 32 nonnative language teachers participated in the study and Mertler and Campbell's (2005) assessment literacy inventory was used to collect data. The researcher found out that assessment literacy levels of language teachers are quite low. Büyükkarcı also concluded that post-graduate education and year of experience do not contribute to language teachers' assessment literacy (p. 333).

In another study, Mede and Atay (2017) investigated language assessment literacy levels and training needs of English language teachers both at the state and

private universities in Turkey. In the study, Vogt and Tsagari's (2014) questionnaire was used to collect data and interviews were carried out with language teachers. 350 language teachers participated in the study. As a result, researchers found out that language teachers' language assessment literacy is limited and they need training in language assessment especially in productive and receptive skills together with integrated skills. Researchers also stated that the only areas in assessment that language teachers feel themselves competent is grammar and vocabulary assessment (p. 57).

Ölmezler-Öztürk and Aydın (2018) conducted another study to identify language instructors' language assessment literacy levels. The researchers developed a scale named as Language Assessment Knowledge Scale (LAKS) in their study. The scale measured the knowledge of assessment in four skills of language. 542 language instructors participated in the study and researchers stated that language instructors have higher scores in reading assessment and lower scores in listening assessment but their overall language assessment knowledge levels were found to be low and insufficient.

In another master's thesis, Sarıyıldız (2018) studied language assessment literacy levels and training needs of 101 4th grade pre-service language teachers at Middle East Technical University. Sarıyıldız used questionnaires and interviews for data gathering and she stated that pre-service language teachers' perceived training levels in language assessment are insufficient and they need further training in language assessment (p. 126).

Recently, Kavaklı and Arslan (2019) examined pre-service language teachers' assessment literacy levels at a state university in Turkey with 36 pre-service teachers. To achieve their aim, the researchers used a survey which was developed by Volante and Fazio (2007) and a questionnaire developed by European Network of LTA (2004). The researchers concluded that although participant pre-service language teachers are aware of assessment literacy concept, they perceive themselves inadequate in assessment literacy (Kavaklı and Arslan, 2019: p. 223).

CHAPTER THREE

3. METHODOLOGY

This chapter respectively presents the methodology of the study, research design, setting and participants, data collection tools, data collection procedure and data analysis.

3.1. Research Design

In the current study, both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods were used to benefit from the advantages of both research methods and to avoid the possible limitations of using a single research method. Mackey and Gass (2005) briefly define quantitative research as the statistical analysis while they define qualitative research as the interpretative analysis of data (p. 2). For the quantitative part of this study, a questionnaire was used to be able to generalize the language assessment literacy levels of the participant pre-service language teachers and for the qualitative part of the study, interviews were used to be able to gather more detailed and personalized data.

3.2. Setting and Participants

The current study was conducted in the ELT Department of Kocaeli University in Kocaeli, Turkey between the years of 2018-2019. 30 4th grade ELT students participated to the study and they were selected through convenience sampling method which is the most commonly used type of sampling method in second language research (Dörnyei and Taguchi, 2009: p. 61). Dörnyei and Taguchi define convenience sampling as the selection of the sample based on their availability, accessibility and convenience for the researcher (p. 61). The participants' age in this study ranged between 21 and 36. 25 (83.3%) of the participants were female while 5

(16.7%) of them were male. Their grade point averages (GPA) were between 2.22 and 3.82. All participants (N=30) were in 4th grade and 25 (83.3%) of them took LTA course while 5 (16.7%) of them did not take LTA course. 17 (56.7%) of the participants stated that they have not heard AL term before and 13 (43.3%) of them stated that they have heard the AL term before. Table 3.1 demonstrates the profile of the participants (N=30) in this study.

Table 3.2.

Participant Information (N=30)

		N	%
Gender	Female	25	83.3
	Male	5	16.7
Age	21	3	10
	22	11	36.7
	23	8	26.7
	24	3	10
	25	3	10
	28	1	3.3
	36	1	3.3
GPA	4.00 - 3.50	3	10
	3.49 - 3.00	8	26.7
	2.99 - below	19	63.3
Grade	4th	30	100
Took LTA Course	Yes	25	83.3
	No	5	16.7
Heard AL Term	Yes	13	43.3
	No	17	56.7

3.3. Data Collection Tools

In the current study, two different data collection tools were used to collect data and the first data collection tool was a questionnaire which was adopted and adapted from the Vogt and Tsagari's (2014) Teachers' Questionnaire.

The questionnaire that was used in this study (See Appendix A for the questionnaire), consisted of two main parts as A and B. In part A demographic information such as age, gender and grade point average (GPA) were asked to the participant pre-service language teachers. Additionally, part A had two more questions related to language assessment literacy and assessment literacy in order to identify whether the participants had taken language assessment courses before and whether they had ever heard the "assessment literacy" term. In total part A consisted of 6 questions.

In part B of the questionnaire, Vogt and Tsagari's (2014) Teachers' Questionnaire was originally adopted because the aim of the original questionnaire was directly related to the current study's aim. This part of the questionnaire, divided into 3 other parts and included 36 items in total. The first part in part B of the questionnaire investigated the received and needed training in classroom-focused LTA and included 12 items. In the second part, the received and needed training in testing purposes were examined and this part consisted of 8 items. The last part aimed to identify the received and needed training in the content and concepts of LTA and included 16 items. In the questionnaire, 3-point Likert-type scale was used to measure the training levels and the training needs of the participant pre-service language teachers (not at all, a little, more advanced / none, yes, basic training, yes, more advanced training).

The second data collection tool that was used in this study was interview. To collect more reliable and detailed data, semi-structured written interviews were distributed to the participant per-service language teachers which allowed the researcher and the participants to ask more questions when needed (Mackey and Gass, 2005: p. 173). The interview questions were adapted from the Vogt and Tsagari's (2014) interview questions because the aim of the original interview was directly related to the current study's aim but the questions in the original questionnaire targeted language teachers. Therefore, the researcher adapted the interview questions to the target of the current study by making some changes (See Appendix B for the interview questions). The interview included 8 open-ended questions that aimed to gather detailed and personalized data in pre-service language teachers' language

assessment literacy levels and their training needs.

3.4. Data Collection Procedure and Data Analysis

In the data collection procedure, the researcher visited the 4th grade pre-service language teachers who were chosen through convenience sampling, at Kocaeli University with the permission of the course instructor. At the beginning of the data collection procedure, necessary information related to the aim of the study, the questionnaire and the written interview questions were given by the researcher. After providing the necessary information, the questionnaires and the written interview questions were distributed to the participant pre-service language teachers. The participant pre-service language teachers were asked to sign the questionnaire to verify their voluntary participation in the study and they were made sure that their participation is confidential. 30 participant pre-service language teachers agreed to fill in the questionnaire and 10 participant pre-service language teachers agreed to answer the written interview questions.

Table 3.4.

Interviewed Participants' Information (N=10)

		N	%
Gender	Female	8	80
	Male	2	20
Age	21	2	20
	22	2	20
	23	5	50
	36	1	10
GPA	4.00 - 3.50	2	20
	3.49 - 3.00	3	30
	2.99 - below	5	50
Grade	4th	10	100
LTA Course	Taken	9	90
	Not taken	1	10

AL Term	Heard	5	50
	Not heard	5	50

Table 3.4. presents the profile of the participant pre-service language teachers (n=10) who agreed to answer the written interview questions.

The researcher stayed in the classroom throughout the data collection process to be able to control the process and help the participant pre-service language teachers when they needed. The data collection process took approximately 30 minutes and at the end of the process 30 participant pre-service language teachers submitted questionnaires and written interview questions to the researcher. The researcher collected and checked the questionnaires and written interview questions in order to ensure that all the questionnaires and written interview questions were filled. The collected data from 30 participant pre-service language teachers was analyzed in two phases as the study used two types of data collection instruments.

In the first phase of the data analysis, questionnaires were analyzed through the use of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) 15.0. The quantitative data were entered into the SPSS 15.0 and frequencies, means and standard deviations were analyzed to find out 30 participant pre-service language teachers' current training levels and their training needs in language assessment.

Lastly, in the second phase of the data analysis, written interview questionnaires' contents were analyzed one by one and classified according to their differences and similarities by the researcher.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. FINDINGS

This chapter presents the findings of the study by addressing the research questions which aim to find out participant pre-service language teachers' current training levels and their training needs in language testing and assessment (LTA).

4.1. Findings for Research Question 1

First research question in this study aimed to find out participant pre-service language teachers' perceived training levels in language testing and assessment (LTA).

In part A of the questionnaire, participant pre-service language teachers were asked to identify whether they had taken LTA course before (Q.5) and whether they had heard the term "assessment literacy" (Q.6) (See Appendix A Part A for the questions).

Table 4.1.1.

Pre-service Language Teachers' LTA Course History and Their AL Term Knowledge (N=30)

		N	%
Took LTA Course	Yes	25	83.3
	No	5	16.7
Heard AL Term	Yes	13	43.3
	No	17	56.7

The results of the 5th and 6th questions in part A of the questionnaire are presented in Table 4.1.1. above. Majority of the participant pre-service language teachers (83.3%) stated that they had taken language testing and assessment course before and only 5 (16.7) of them stated that they had not taken language assessment literacy

course before. On the other hand, 56.7% of the participants indicated that they had not heard assessment literacy term before while 43.3% of them stated that they had heard.

Part B of the questionnaire was divided into three parts and the first part of the questionnaire investigated participant pre-service language teachers' current training in classroom-focused LTA.

Table 4.1.2.

Participants' Perceived Training Levels in Classroom-Focused LTA (N=30)

	N	Mean	SD	0	1	2
Preparing classroom tests	30	2.30	.535	1	19	10
Using ready-made tests from textbook packages or from other sources	30	2.50	.509	0	15	15
Giving feedback to students based on information from tests/assessments	30	2.30	.702	4	13	13
Using self- or peer-assessment	30	2.30	.596	2	17	11
Using informal, continuous, non-test type of assessment	30	2.17	.648	4	17	9
Using the European Language Portfolio, an adaptation of it or some other portfolio	30	1.53	.681	17	10	3

0 = Not at all, 1 = A little, 2 = More advanced

Table 4.1.2. presents the results of participant pre-service language teachers' current training levels in classroom-focused LTA. Participant pre-service language teachers had the highest mean value in using ready-made tests from textbook (M=2.50, SD=.509) and half of them indicated that they had received a little and the other half of them stated that they had received more advanced training. The second highest mean values were in preparing classroom tests (M=2.30, SD=.535), Using self- or peer-assessment (M=2.30, SD=.596) and giving feedback (M=2.30, SD=.702). 63.3% of the teachers stated that they had a little experience in preparing classroom tests and 33.3% of them stated that they had advanced training in this context while 3.3% of the participant pre-service language teachers indicated that they had no training. In using-

self or peer assessment, 56.7% of them indicated that they had a little training and 36.7% of them had more advanced training while 6.7% of them had no training in this issue. In giving feedback 43.3% of them stated that they had either a little or more advance training while 13.3% of them had received no training in this area. Their third highest mean value was in using informal tests (M=2.17, SD=.648) and 56.7% of them indicated that they had received a little training in this area while 30% of them had advanced training and 13.3% of them stated that had no training in using informal assessment. The lowest mean value in this part was in using European Language portfolio or some other portfolio (M=1.53, SD=.681). 56.7% of the participants reported that they had no training in using portfolio and 33.3% of them stated that they had a little training while only 10% of them had more advanced training in this area.

The second part of part B investigated participant pre-service language teachers' perceived training levels in purposes of testing.

Table 4.1.3.

Participants' Perceived Training Levels in Purposes of Testing (N=30)

	N	Mean	SD	0	1	2	3
Giving grades	30	2.17	.699	5	15	10	0
Finding out what needs to be taught/learned	30	2.60	.498	0	12	18	0
Placing students onto courses, programs, etc.	30	1.90	.759	7	16	6	1
Awarding final certificates (from school/program; local, regional or national level)	30	1.43	.679	17	10	2	1

0 = Not at all, 1 = A little, 2 = More advanced, 3 = No opinion

The results of the second part are given in the Table 4.1.3 above. The highest mean value of this part was in finding out what needs to be taught and learned (M=2.60, SD=.489). More than half of the participants (60%) reported that they had advanced training in finding out what needs to be taught and learned while 40% of them stated that they had a little training in this context. Participants' second highest

mean value was in giving grades (M=2.17, SD=.699). Half of the participants stated that they had received a little training in giving grades and 33.3% of them indicated that they had more advanced training while 16.7% percent of them stated that they had no training in this area. The lowest mean values in the second part of the questionnaire were in placing students (M=1.90, SD=.759) and awarding final certificates (M=1.43, SD=.679). 53.3% of the participants reported that they had a little training and 23.3% of the participants stated that they had no training in placing students while 20% of them had more advanced training and 3.3% of them had no opinion. In awarding final certificates 56.7% of them stated that they had no training and 33.3% of them had a little while 6.7% of them stated that they had more advanced training and 3.3% of them stated no opinion.

The last part of the part B examined participant pre-service language teachers' perceived training levels in content and concepts of LTA.

Table 4.1.4.

Participants' Perceived Training Levels in Content and Concepts of LTA (N=30)

	N	Mean	SD	0	1	2	3
Receptive skills (reading/listening)	30	2.60	.563	1	10	19	0
Productive skills (speaking/writing)	30	2.57	.568	1	11	18	0
Microlinguistic aspects (grammar/vocabulary)	30	2.63	.490	0	11	19	0
Integrated language skills	30	2.60	.563	1	10	19	0
Aspects of culture	30	2.13	.629	1	21	7	1
Establishing reliability of tests/assessment	30	2.57	.626	2	9	19	0
Establishing validity of tests/assessment	30	2.53	.629	2	10	18	0
Using statistics to study the quality of tests/assessment	30	2.00	.695	7	16	7	0

0 = Not at all, 1 = A little, 2 = More advanced, 3 = No opinion

Findings of participant pre-service language teachers' perceived training levels in content and concepts of LTA is presented in Table 4.1.4. above. In this part, grammar and vocabulary assessment had the highest mean value (M=2.63, SD=.490). 63.3% of the participant pre-service language teachers stated that they had received advanced training in this domain while 36.7% of them reported that they had a little training in grammar and vocabulary assessment. Followingly, receptive (M=2.60, SD=.563) and integrated skills assessment (M=2.60, SD=.563) had the same and the second highest mean value. In both assessment concepts, 63.3% of the participants stated that they had advanced training and 33.3% of them reported that they had received a little while 3.3% of them indicated that they had no training in this concept. The following values in productive skills assessment (M=2.57, SD=.568) and reliability establishment (M=2.57, SD=.626) were almost the same with the previous concepts' mean values. In the assessment of productive skills, %60 of the participant pre-service language teachers stated that they had advanced training and 36.7% of them had a little while 3.3% of them had no training in these domains. On the other hand, 63.3% of the participants reported that they had advanced training in establishing reliability of tests and assessments and %30 of them had a little training while 6.7% of them had no training in reliability establishment. Close to the previous concepts, validity establishment had the following mean (M=2.53, SD=.629). In this domain, 60% of the participants had received more advanced training and 33.3% of them had a little training while 6.7% of them stated that they had received no training in this issue. The lowest mean values in this part were in assessment of the cultural aspects (M=2.13, SD=.629) and using statistics (M=2.00, SD=.695). 70% of the respondents indicated that they had a little training in assessing cultural aspects and 23.3% of them had more advanced training while 3.3% of them stated that they had no training and 3.3% of them stated no opinion in this area. The other lowest value was in the use of statistics and 53.3% of the participants stated that they had a little training while 23.3% of them had more advanced and 23.3% of them had no experience in this domain.

Following to the previous findings in three different areas of LTA training, mean values of participant pre-service language teachers' perceived training levels in all areas of LTA were analyzed.

Table 4.1.5.

Participants' Perceived Training Levels in All Areas of LTA (N=30)

	Mean
Classroom-focused LTA	2.2
Purposes of testing	2.0
Contents and concepts of LTA	2.5
Total	2.2

The results of the analysis in all areas of LTA training is given in Table 4.1.5 above. The highest mean value was found in contents and concepts of the LTA (M=2.5) while the following mean value was in classroom-focused LTA (M=2.2). The lowest value was found in purposes of testing (M=2.0). Lastly, the overall mean value in participant's perceived training levels in LTA was found as 2.2 when all items (N=18) in all parts were analyzed.

4.2. Findings for Research Question 2

The second research question in this study aimed to find out participant pre-service language teachers' perceived training needs in language testing and assessment (LTA).

Part B of the questionnaire examined participant pre-service language teachers' current training needs in classroom-focused LTA in three parts and the first part aimed to investigate their training needs in classroom-focused LTA.

Table 4.2.1.

Participants' Perceived Training Needs in Classroom-Focused LTA (N=30)

	N	Mean	SD	0	1	2	3
Preparing classroom tests	30	5.27	.740	5	12	13	0
Using ready-made tests from textbook packages or from other sources	30	5.20	.714	5	14	11	0

Giving feedback to students based on information from tests/assessments	30	5.13	.860	9	8	13	0
Using self- or peer-assessment	30	5.13	1.252	6	8	15	1
Using informal, continuous, non-test type of assessment	30	5.43	.679	3	11	16	0
Using the European Language Portfolio, an adaptation of it or some other portfolio	30	5.57	1.135	0	7	22	1

0 = None, 1 = Yes, basic training, 2 = Yes, more advanced training, 3 = No opinion

Table 4.2.1. demonstrates the participants' training needs in classroom-focused LTA item by item. The highest mean value in this part was found in use of portfolio (M=5.57, SD=1.135). 73.3% of the participants stated that they need more advanced training in using portfolio and 23.3% of them reported that they need basic training while none of the participants indicated that they need no training and 3.3% of them stated no opinion. The second highest mean value in this part was in informal assessment (M=5.43, SD=.679). 53.3% of the respondents stated that they have advanced training need in informal assessment and 36.7% of them reported that they need basic training while 10% of them indicated that they do not need any training in this area. The following mean values were in preparing classroom tests (M=5.27, SD=.740) and ready-made test use (M=5.20, SD=.714). In preparing classroom tests, 43.3% of the participants reported advanced training need and 40% them indicated basic training need while 16.7% of them stated that they do not need any training in this area. In ready-made test use, 46.7% of the participants indicate a basic training need and 36.7% of them reported more advanced training need while 16.7% of them stated no training need in this domain. The lowest mean values of this part were in providing feedback (M=5.13, SD=.860) and using self-/peer-assessment (M=5.13, SD=1.252). In providing feedback, %43.3% of the respondents indicated that they need more advanced training and 26.7% of them need basic training while 30% of them reported that they need no training in this issue. Lastly, in the use of self-/peer-assessment, half of the participants reported more advanced training need and 26.7% of them expressed that they need basic training while 20% of them need no training

and 3.3% of them reported no opinion on this subject.

The second part examined participant pre-service language teachers' perceived training needs in purposes of testing.

Table 4.2.2.

Participants' Perceived Training Needs in Purposes of Testing (N=30)

	N	Mean	SD	0	1	2
Giving grades	30	5.23	.817	7	9	14
Finding out what needs to be taught/learned	30	5.03	.809	9	11	10
Placing students onto courses, programs, etc.	30	5.43	.679	3	11	16
Awarding final certificates (from school/program; local, regional or national level)	30	5.50	.731	4	7	19

0 = None, 1 = Yes, basic training, 2 = Yes, more advanced training

The results of the participant' perceived training needs in purposes of testing is presented in Table 4.2.2. above. The highest mean value in this part, was in awarding final certificates (M=5.50, SD=.731). 63.3% of the respondents reported that they need advanced training in awarding final certificates and 23.3% of the participants state that they need basic training while 13.3% expressed that they need no training. The second highest mean value of this part was in placing students (M=5.43, SD=.679). 53.3% of the respondents indicated that they need advanced training and 36.7% of them expressed basic training need while 10% of them reported that they do not need training in this domain. The third highest mean value of this part was in giving grades (M=5.23, SD=.817). 46.7% of the pre-service teachers indicated that they need more advanced training in giving grades and 30% of them expressed a basic need while 23.3% of them reported no training need. This parts' lowest mean value was in finding out what needs to be taught/learned (M=5.03, SD=.809). 36.6% of the pre-service teachers stated a basic need in finding out what needs to be taught/learned and 33.3% of them expressed that they need more advanced training while 30% of them indicated

that they need no training in this area.

In last part, participant pre-service language teachers' perceived training needs in contents and concepts of LTA was investigated.

Table 4.2.3.

Participants' Perceived Training Needs in Content and Concepts of LTA (N=30)

	N	Mean	SD	0	1	2	3
Receptive skills (reading/listening)	30	4.93	.785	10	12	8	0
Productive skills (speaking/writing)	30	5.10	.803	8	11	11	0
Microlinguistic aspects (grammar/vocabulary)	30	4.87	1.196	8	12	9	1
Integrated language skills	30	5.10	.759	7	13	10	0
Aspects of culture	30	5.20	.761	6	12	12	0
Establishing reliability of tests/assessment	30	5.17	.791	7	11	12	0
Establishing validity of tests/assessment	30	5.13	.819	8	10	12	0
Using statistics to study the quality of tests/assessment	30	5.43	.679	3	11	16	0

0 = None, 1 = Yes, basic training, 2 = Yes, more advanced training, 3 = No opinion

Table 4.2.3. provides the results of participant pre-service language teachers' perceived training needs in contents and concepts of LTA. The highest mean value of this part was in use of statistics (M=5.43, SD=.679). 53.3% of the respondents expressed that they need advanced training in using statistics and 36.7% of them stated that they need basic training while 10% of them perceived no training need in this context. The second highest mean in this part was in the assessment of aspects of culture (M=5.20, SD=.761). 40% of the pre-service teachers expressed advanced and 40% of them expressed basic training need in assessing cultural aspects while 20% of them stated no need in this subject. The following highest mean value of this part was in reliability establishment (M=5.17, SD=.791). In establishing reliability, 40% of the respondents indicated that they need more advanced training and 36.7 of them

expressed that they need basic training while 23.3% of them stated that they have no need in this area. The following mean values were in establishing validity (M=5.13, SD=.819), integrated language skills assessment (M=5.10, SD=.759) and assessing productive skills (M=5.10, SD=.803). In validity establishment, 40% of the respondents perceived advanced training need and 33.3 of them expressed basic training need while 26.7% of them indicated that they have no training need. In the assessment of integrated language skills, 33.3% of the participants indicated that they need more advanced training and 43.3% of them expressed a basic training need while 23.3% of the participants perceived no need in this aspect. On the other hand, in the assessment of productive skills, 36.7% of the participants reported advanced and 36.7% of them reported basic training need while 26.7% of them stated that they need no training. The lowest mean values of this part were in assessing receptive skills (M=4.93, SD=.785) and assessing microlinguistic aspects (M=4.87, SD=1.196). In the assessment of receptive skills, 26.7% respondents perceived advanced training need and 40% of them expressed that they need basic training while 33.3% of them stated that they need no training in this area. On the other hand, in assessing microlinguistic aspects, 30% of the participants indicated advanced training need and 40% of them need basic training while 26.7% of them expressed no need and 3.3% of them had no opinion in this subject.

Lastly, mean values of participant pre-service language teachers' perceived training needs in all areas of LTA were analyzed.

Table 4.2.4.

Participants' Perceived Training Needs in All Areas of LTA (N=30)

	Mean
Classroom-focused LTA	5.3
Purposes of testing	5.3
Contents and concepts of LTA	5.1
Total	5.2

An analysis of the participants' perceived training needs in all areas of LTA is given in Table 4.2.4. The highest mean values amongst the all areas of LTA were

found in classroom-focused LTA (M=5.3) and purposes of testing (M=5.3) while the lowest mean value was in contents and concepts of LTA (M=5.1). In total, the overall mean value in participant's perceived training needs in LTA was found to be 5.2 when all items (N=18) in all parts were analyzed.

4.3. Findings of the Written Interviews

In the qualitative analysis part of this study, participants' individual and detailed perceptions of their training levels and training needs in LTA were analyzed trough semi-structured written interviews. The written interviews included 8 open-ended questions and 10 pre-service language teachers participated in this part of the study. The results for each question were analyzed according to their similarities and differences one by one.

The first question was asked in order to identify whether they had learned about LTA during their pre-service training or not. Most of the participants (80%) indicated that they had learned LTA during their preservice training while 20% of them stated that they had not.

In the second question the participants were asked to explain whether they feel appropriately prepared for their tasks in LTA after graduation and their answers were varied. Half of them stated that they were not ready for LTA tasks and found themselves unexperienced because they only knew the theoretical part of the assessment. On the other hand, 30% of them expressed that they felt themselves ready and they were confident in themselves. Lastly, 10% of them reported that they had no idea while the other 10% of them stated that they felt so-so prepared.

The following question was directly related to the previous one and it investigated the participants future plans on LTA training after graduation. More specifically, the question aimed to ask whether the participants plan to study on LTA in the future or not. 90% of the participants stated that they want to study on LTA because of their practice need in this area and they stated that they plan to use different sources like online programs to improve their LTA practices. 10% of them answered

the question only by writing no.

The participants were asked whether they knew the recent LTA methods and they were expected to list some of them in the next question. Majority of the respondents (90%) stated that they studied, they knew and they experienced recent LTA methods but none of them listed any examples. Only 1 participant wrote "formative assessment, summative assessment" (P1) which were not the methods but the types of LTA.

In the fifth question, participants' familiarity with standardized tests and their perceptions about it were asked. 60% of them indicated that they had no experience in standardized tests and in general they did not express their perceptions. Only one of the respondents expressed her/his thoughts as follows "I have not worked with standardized tests or advised learners. I do not feel confident in my ability to prepare my learners for standardized tests. I focus on language skills in my teaching most of the time" (P3). On the other hand, 20% of the participants reported that they had experience in standardized tests by indicating as follows "Time to time, especially in the end of a specific process I apply the standardized tests. They are so practical and time saving, not for productive skills but for assessing receptive skills" (P6), "I have worked with them. I think they are required but we should not always work with them" (P4). Lastly, the other 20% of the participants expressed that they had no opinion in this area.

The next question examined participant pre-service language teachers' preferred types of LTA and asked whether they will use them when they start teaching. 70% of them listed portfolio assessment and peer-/self-assessment while 1 of the participants only stated communicative assessment. On the other hand, 20% of them did not indicate any type of LTA in their writings and one of them said that "I will decide when I start teaching" (P6).

Seventh question aimed to find out whether the respondents received any other training apart from their pre-service trainings in LTA. Half of the participants stated that they had no other training in LTA while 30% of them indicated that they received

training by stating as follows "I had online training on teaching grammar communicatively and contend-based teaching" (P3), "Yes, I have. It was about how we could prepare a better test" (P4).

Last question investigated whether the participants were satisfied with their pre-service training in LTA or not and they were asked to identify what other training they would like to have. 70% of the respondents indicated that they were not satisfied with their current pre-service training in LTA and they added that "I would like to see other kinds of assessments" (P1), "I would like to have more classes on how to test language communicatively and have microteachings or practice sections in order to see my abilities in this area" (P3) "It would be better if we had used more updated books. Our coursebook is old (1987)" (P4). On the other hand, 30% of the participant pre-service language teachers were satisfied with their current pre-service training in LTA.

CHAPTER FIVE

5. DISCUSSION

This chapter aims to discuss the findings of the current study and compare and contrast the current results with the related studies in literature and concludes the study with providing pedagogical implications and suggestions for further research.

5.1. Discussion of the Findings

The findings of this study were examined under three parts. The first part investigated the results related to first research question which aimed to find out pre-service language teachers' current training in LAL under four subparts.

The first subpart aimed to examine participants' perceived training levels in classroom-focused LTA. Their highest perceived training in this context was in using ready-made tests (50%) while their lowest perceived training was in using portfolio (56.7%). The overall mean value in this part was found to be 2.2 when all 6 items were analyzed. Based on these results, it can be asserted that participants' perceived LTA training in classroom focused LTA is insufficient and this result is in line with Sarıyıldız's (2018) and Vogt and Tsagari's (2014) study results. In both of the studies the participants' classroom focused LTA was found underdeveloped. All these findings of the current study provide cogent evidence that pre-service language teachers' LAL in classroom-focused LTA is not adequate and more training is required on this domain for LAL development.

In the second subpart, participant pre-service language teacher's perceived training levels in purposes of testing were analyzed and the highest perceived training in this context was found in finding out what needs to be learned and taught (60%) while the lowest one was in awarding final certificates (56.7%). The overall mean value of this part was calculated as 2.0 when 4 items were analyzed and the results

revealed that training levels of the respondents in purposes of testing are not sufficient. These findings are again consistent with Sarıyıldız's (2018) and Vogt and Tsagari's (2014) studies in which participants' training levels in purposes of testing were found to be insufficient. The current findings of this study offer evidence that LAL levels of pre-service language teachers are not developed and they need training to improve their LAL levels.

The third subpart investigated participants' perceived training levels in content and concepts of LTA. The stated highest training in this domain was in assessing grammar and vocabulary (63.3%) while the lowest training level was in use of statistics (23.3%). This part's overall mean score was calculated as 2.5 when all 8 items were analyzed and the overall mean score showed that perceived training levels of pre-service language teachers are quite low. These results support the study results of Sarıyıldız (2018) and Vogt and Tsagari (2014) in which all researchers found participants' perceived training levels in content and concepts of LTA as insufficient. The present findings of this study prove that the overall training level of the participants are not adequate and they need further training to develop their LAL levels.

In the last part, participants' overall perceived training levels in all three areas were examined to provide answer for the first research question which aimed to find out perceived LAL levels of the participants. All 18 items in all areas were calculated and the overall mean value was found to be 2.2 which concluded that participants' perceived training levels in all areas of LTA are very low. This finding is consistent with the previous findings in the related literature (Alkharusi et al., 2011: p. 113; Bachor and Baer, 2001: p. 253; Büyükkarcı, 2016: p. 333; Hatipoğlu, 2015: p. 124; Kavaklı and Arslan, 2019: p. 223; Lam, 2015: p. 169; Maclellan, 2004: p. 533; Mede and Atay, 2017: p. 57; Muhammad, 2017: p. 46; Ölmezler-Öztürk and Aydın, 2018; Plake, 1993: p. 23; Razavipour et al., 2011: p. 156; Sarıyıldız, 2018: p. 126; Tsagari and Vogt, 2017 p. 53; Xu and Brown, 2017: p. 153; Vogt and Tsagari 2014: p. 374). Furthermore, the least developed LTA area of the current participants was in purposes of testing which is also consistent with the previous research results (Sarıyıldız, 2018: p. 115; Vogt and Tsagari 2014: p. 384). All these results prove that pre-service

language teachers have low levels of LAL and also the results highlight the importance of teacher training programs as it was previously indicated in the related research (Alkharusi et al., 2011: p. 113; Siegel and Wissehr, 2011: p. 371; Tsagari and Vogt, 2017 p. 53; Vogt and Tsagari 2014: p. 374).

The second part of the data analysis aimed to answer second research question which was related to the pre-service language teachers' perceived training needs in LAL and just like the first part, this part was analyzed under four subparts.

The first subpart investigated participants' perceived training needs in classroom-focused LTA. The results showed that the highest need in this area was in using portfolio (53.3%) while the lowest perceived needs were in giving feedback (26.7%) and in using self-/peer-assessment (26.7%). The overall mean score of this part was found as 5.3 when all 8 items were analyzed and the overall mean score proved that pre-service language teachers' perceived training needs are basic. These findings corroborate with the study results of Sarıyıldız (2018) in which the participants' perceived training needs in classroom-focused LTA were found to be basic and also the results corroborate to some extent with Vogt and Tsagari's (2014) study in which nearly all participants perceived a basic or more advanced training need in all areas of LTA. (Sarıyıldız, 2018: p. 116; Vogt and Tsagari 2014: p. 385). The current results revealed that perceived training needs of the participants are basic although their training levels are not adequate in this domain. The reason for this discrepancy may be related to the lack of awareness in LTA's prominence.

In the following subpart, participants' perceived training needs in purposes of testing were examined. The highest need was found in awarding final certificates (63.3%) while the lowest need was found in finding what needs to be learned/taught (36.6%). When all 8 items were analyzed in this part, overall mean score was found as 5.3 and the mean score revealed that participants' perceived training needs in purposes of testing are basic. The results are in line with Sarıyıldız's (2018) study results in which the participants' perceived training needs in purposes of testing were basic (Sarıyıldız, 2018: p. 118). The results also consistent to some extent with Vogt and Tsagari's (2014) study in which majority of the participants perceived a basic or more

advanced training need in all areas of LTA. (Vogt and Tsagari 2014: p. 385). The findings of the present study showed that perceived training needs of the participants are basic despite of their insufficient training levels in this domain. This discrepancy may be related to the lack of importance given to LTA in teacher development.

The third subpart aimed to find out participants' perceived training needs in content and concepts of LTA. Their highest perceived need in this domain was found in using statistics (53.3%) while their lowest perceived need was in assessing grammar and vocabulary (40%). The total mean score of this part was found to be 5.1 when all 8 items in this category were analyzed. The total score revealed that participant pre-service language teachers need basic training in this area. The findings support the findings of Sarıyıldız (2018) which indicated that the participants need basic training in this domain (Sarıyıldız, 2018: p. 119). The findings are also congruent to some extent with Vogt and Tsagari's (2014) results which showed that majority of the participants perceived a basic or more advanced training need in all areas of LTA. (Vogt and Tsagari 2014: p. 385). The current study's results revealed that, in spite of their low training levels, the participants perceived a basic need in this area. The contrast between these two results may be connected with the lack of importance given to LTA in teacher training.

The last subpart tried to find answer for the second research question which aimed to find out participant's perceived needs in LAL. 18 items in all three areas were calculated and the overall mean score was found to be 5.2 which revealed that participants perceive a basic training need in all areas of LTA which is also consistent with the previous research results (Sarıyıldız, 2018: p. 120; Vogt and Tsagari 2014: p. 384). These results proved that although pre-service language teachers have low levels of LAL they perceive basic training need in all areas of LTA. The reason for this contradiction is already explained in the above discussions as the lack of prominence given to LTA in the education of teachers. However, the overall study results revealed a general need in LTA training which support the previous study results (Bachor and Baer, 2001: p. 253; Deluca and Klinger, 2010: p.419; Fulcher, 2012: p. 122; Guerin, 2010: p. 9; Hasselgreen et al., 2004; Mede and Atay, 2017: p. 57; Mertler, 2003: p. 20; Muhammad, 2017: p. 46; Sarıyıldız, 2018: p. 126; Tsagari and Vogt, 2017 p. 53; Xu

and Brown, 2017: p. 153; Vogt and Tsagari 2014: p. 374, Yetkin, 2015: p. 32; Zhang and Burry-Stock, 1997: p. 8) and highlight the prominence of teacher training as in the previous studies (Alkharusi et al., 2011: p. 113; Siegel and Wissehr, 2011: p. 371; Tsagari and Vogt, 2017 p. 53; Vogt and Tsagari 2014: p. 374).

Finally, in the last part of the data analysis written interviews were examined. 10 pre-service language teachers participated in this part of the study and the papers were analyzed according to their similarities and differences. The results of the first question in the written interview showed that 80% of the participants have learned LTA during their pre-service trainings while 20% of them have not but when the overall results in LTA training were examined their overall LTA levels were found to be low. This result may be related to the gap between theory and the practice that makes them feel weak in assessment as it was indicated in Fulcher's (2012) study (Fulcher, 2012: p. 122) along with the need for further training which is one of the main findings of this study.

In the second question, half of the participants indicated that they do not feel themselves ready for LTA tasks after graduation while 30% of them feel themselves ready and 20% of them stated no idea on this topic and 20% of them indicated that they feel so-so prepared. This result is in line with the previous results of this study which stated that participants have low levels of LTA and accordingly, this makes them feel unprepared for their future LTA tasks.

The third question investigated whether the participants plan to study on LTA after graduation and 90% of the participants stated that they will study because they need more practice which supports the inference that was made for the first question.

The next question examined participants' knowledge of recent LTA methods and none of the participants listed any examples of LTA methods. This result supports the previous findings in this study which revealed that participants have low levels of LTA and they need further training.

Fifth question aimed to find out the participants familiarity with standardized tests and 60% of them stated that they have no experience with standardized tests while

20% of them stated that they have. This result is again in line with the Fulcher's (2012) findings which stated the gap between theory and practice (Fulcher, 2012: p. 122) and highlighted the need for further training which is one of the main findings of this study.

In the following question participants preferred LTA types were asked and 70% of them wrote exactly the same thing which was already given in the question as an example while 20% of them stated nothing. This finding confirms the previous result of this study which indicates that participants have a low level of language assessment literacy.

The seventh question tried to identify whether the participants had received any other training related to LTA apart from their pre-service trainings and half of the participants stated that they have not received any other training while 30% of them reported that they received. The result of this question is in line with the overall result of this study and proves that participants' LTA training is quite low.

The last question of the written interview aimed to find out whether the participants were satisfied with their current pre-service training in LTA or not. 70% of them reported that they were not satisfied with their current training in LTA and they expressed that they wanted to have more practical training and wanted to learn more about LTA while 30% of them were satisfied with their training in LTA. These expressions and results support all the previous findings of this study.

To conclude, the overall analysis of the written interviews revealed and supported the previous study results which indicated that participants' LTA levels are insufficient and they need training in LTA. All these results were in line with the previous studies in the literature especially with Sarıyıldız's (2018) and Vogt and Tsagari's (2014) studies (Sarıyıldız, 2018: p. 126; Vogt and Tsagari 2014: p. 374).

CONCLUSION

This study aimed to investigate pre-service language teachers' perceived training levels and their training needs in LAL. To achieve this aim, Vogt and Tsagari's (2014) teachers' questionnaire and semi-structured written interviews were used to collect data. 30 4th grade pre-service language teachers took part in the study and 10 of them filled the written interviews. The results of the questionnaires and the written interviews were analyzed and the overall findings revealed that participants have low levels of assessment literacy and they need further training in this area.

The findings of this study may provide new insights for the pre-service language teachers, teacher trainers and for decision makers. The results may provide an awareness in the prominence of assessment in education and teacher development. In this way, the importance given to LAL may be highlighted. Also, language teacher training programs may be improved and ELT course programs may be revised by the inclusion of more LAL related contents. To achieve this, experience-based activities such as micro-teachings may be performed, teacher talks may be arranged, workshops and conferences may be held in this area. However, this study is limited to its sample, sample size and its data collection methods. Conducting more studies in different settings with different participants and with higher sample sizes may provide more evidence in this context.

REFERENCES

1. Books

Coombe, C. A., Davidson, P., O'Sullivan, B., & Stoynoff, S. (2012). The Cambridge guide to second language assessment. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Douglas, B. H. (2004). Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practice. San Fransisco: San Fransisco State University.

Dörnyei, Z., Taguchi, T. (2009). Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing. New York: Routledge.

Mackey, A., Gass, S. M. (2005). Second language research: Methodology and design. America: Routledge.

Miller, M. David, Robert L. Linn, Norman E. Gronlund. (2008). Measurement and assessment in teaching. New Jersey: Pearson.

2. Articles, Papers, Other Printed Publications

Alkharusi, H., Kazem, A. M., Al-Musawai, A. (2011). "Knowledge, skills, and attitudes of preservice and inservice teachers in educational measurement." Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 39(2), 113-123.

Bachor, D. G., Baer, M. R. (2001). "An examination of preservice teachers' simulated classroom assessment practices." Alberta journal of educational research, 47(3), 244.

Büyükkarci, K. (2016). "Identifying the areas for English language teacher development: A study of assessment literacy." Pegem Egitim ve Ogretim Dergisi, 6(3), 333-346.

Campbell, C., Evans, J. A. (2000). "Investigation of preservice teachers' classroom assessment practices during student teaching." The Journal of Educational Research, 93(6), 350-355.

Chen, P. P. (2005). "Teacher candidates' literacy in assessment." Academic Exchange Quarterly, 9(3), 62-67.

Davison, C., Leung, C. (2009). "Current issues in English language teacher-based assessment." TESOL Quarterly, 43(3), 393-415.

Deluca, C., Klinger, D. A. (2010). "Assessment literacy development: Identifying gaps in teacher candidates' learning." Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice,17(4), 419-438.

Falsgraf, C. (2005). "Why a national assessment summit? New visions in action." National Assessment Summit, 6.

Fives, H., Barnes, N. (2017). "Informed and uninformed naive assessment constructors' strategies for item selection." Journal of Teacher Education, 68(1), 85-101.

Fulcher, G. (2012). "Assessment literacy for the language classroom." Language Assessment Quarterly, 9(2), 113-132.

Giraldo, F. (2019). "Language Assessment Practices and Beliefs: Implications for Language Assessment Literacy." HOW Journal, 26(1), 35-61.

Giraldo, F., Murcia, D. (2018). "Language Assessment Literacy for Pre-Service Teachers: Course Expectations from Different Stakeholders." GIST Education and Learning Research Journal, 16, 56-77.

Graham, P. (2005). "Classroom-based assessment: Changing knowledge and practice through preservice teacher education." Teaching and Teacher Education, 21(6), 607-621.

Guerin, E. M. C. (2010). "Initial findings from a pilot Italian study of foreign language teachers' stated language assessment knowledge-base and needs." Paper presented at the Lancaster University Postgraduate Conference in Linguistics & Language Teaching, Lancaster, the United Kingdom.

Hatipoğlu, Ç. (2010). "Summative evaluation of an English language testing and evaluation course for future English language teachers in Turkey." ELTED, 13, 40-51.

Hatipoğlu, Ç. (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.

Inbar-Lourie, O. (2008). "Constructing a language assessment knowledge base: A focus on language assessment courses." Language Testing, 25(3), 385-402.

Jannati, S. (2015). "ELT teachers' language assessment literacy: Perceptions and practices." The International Journal of Research in Teacher Education, 6(2), 26-37.

Jin, Y. (2010). "The place of language testing and assessment in the professional preparation of foreign language teachers in China." Language Testing, 27(4), 555-584.

Kavaklı, N., Arslan, S. (2019). "Towards a continuum from know-how to show-how for developing EFL student-teachers' assessment literacy." International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET), 6(1). 223-232.

Kizlik, B. (2012). "Measurement, assessment, and evaluation in education." https://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/40351563/DrJJ-Measure-assess-evaluate-ADPRIMA-n-more-17052012.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAIWOWYYGZ2Y53UL3A&Expires=1559250463&Signature=3NmDX2MVdSRgNtOxvSAJwE9tuGk%3D&response-content-disposition=inline%3B%20filename%3DDr_JJ-Measure-assess-evaluate-ADPRIMA-n-.pdf / May 2019.

Lam, R. (2015). "Language assessment training in Hong Kong: Implications for language assessment literacy." Language Testing, 32(2), 169-197.

Lan, C., Fan, S. (2019). "Developing classroom-based language assessment literacy for in-service EFL teachers: The gaps." Studies in Educational Evaluation, 61, 112-122.

Maclellan, E. (2004). "Initial knowledge states about assessment: Novice teachers' conceptualizations." Teaching and Teacher Education, 20(5), 523-535.

Malone, M. E. (2013). "The essentials of assessment literacy: Contrasts between testers and users." Language Testing, 30(3), 329-344.

Mede, E., Atay, D. (2017). "English language teachers' assessment literacy: The Turkish context." Ankara Üniversitesi TÖMER Dil Dergisi, 168(1), 43-60.

Mertler, C. A. (1998). "Classroom Assessment Practices of Ohio Teachers." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 428 085.

Mertler, C. A. (1999). "Assessing student performance: A descriptive study of the classroom assessment practices of Ohio teachers." Education, 120(2), 285-296.

Mertler, C. A. (2003). "Preservice Versus Inservice Teachers' Assessment Literacy: Does Classroom Experience Make a Difference?" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mide-Western Educational Research Association, Colombus, OH.

Mertler, C. A., Campbell, C. (2005). "Measuring Teachers' Knowledge & Application of Classroom Assessment Concepts: Development of the" Assessment Literacy Inventory"." Online Submission.

Muhammad, F. (2017). Northern Iraqi EFL Teachers' Assessment Literacy. Master's thesis, Institute of Social Sciences Gaziantep University, Gaziantep, Turkey.

Odo, D. M. (2016). "An Investigation of the Development of Pre-Service Teacher Assessment Literacy through Individualized Tutoring and Peer Debriefing." Journal of Inquiry and Action in Education, 7(2), 31-61.

Ölmezer-Öztürk, E., Aydın, B. (2018). "Investigating language assessment knowledge of EFL teachers." Hacettepe University Journal of Education. Advance online publication. doi: 10.16986/HUJE.2018043465

Öz, S., Atay, D. (2017). "Turkish EFL instructors' in-class language assessment literacy: Perceptions and practices." ELT Research Journal, 6(1), 25-44.

Pill, J., & Harding, L. (2013). "Defining the language assessment literacy gap: Evidence from a parliamentary inquiry." Language Testing, 30(3), 381-402.

Plake, B. S. (1993). "Teacher assessment literacy: Teachers' competencies in the educational assessment of students." Mid-Western Educational Researcher, 6(1), 21-27.

Plata, S. (2018). Minding the Gap:2018 Exploring Assessment Education in CHED's Teacher Preparation Program in the Context of PPST and DepEd's Assessment Reform. Presented at the DLSU Research Congress 2018 De La Salle University, Manila, Philippines.

Popham, W. J. (2009). "Assessment literacy for teachers: Faddish or fundamental?" Theory into practice, 48(1), 4-11.

Popham, W. J. (2011). "Assessment literacy overlooked: A teacher educator's confession." The Teacher Educator, 46(4), 265-273.

Razavipour, K. (2013). "Assessing assessment literacy: insights from a high-stakes test." Research in Applied Linguistics, 4(1), 111-131.

Razavipour, K., Riazi, M., Rashidi, N. (2011). "On the interaction of test washback and teacher assessment literacy: The Case of Iranian EFL Secondary School Teachers." English Language Teaching, 4(1), 156- 161.

Sarıyıldız, G. (2018). A Study into Language Assessment Literacy of Preservice English as a Foreign Language Teachers in Turkish Context. Master's thesis, Institute of Social Sciences, Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.

Scarino, A. (2013). "Language assessment literacy as self-awareness: Understanding the role of interpretation in assessment and in teacher learning." Language Testing, 30(3), 309-327.

Siegel, M. A., Wissehr, C. (2011). "Preparing for the plunge: Preservice teachers' assessment literacy." Journal of Science Teacher Education, 22(4), 371–391.

Sultana, N. (2019). "Language assessment literacy: an uncharted area for the English language teachers in Bangladesh." Language Testing in Asia, 9(1), 1.

Stiggins, R. J. (1991). "Assessment literacy." Phi Delta Kappan, 72(7), 534-39.

Stiggins, R. J. (1995). "Assessment literacy for the 21st century." Phi Delta Kappan, 77(3), 238- 245.

Stiggins, R. J. (1999). "Evaluating classroom assessment training in teacher education programs." Educational measurement: Issues and practice, 18(1), 23-27.

Stiggins, R. (2014). "Improve assessment literacy outside of schools too." Phi Delta Kappan, 96(2), 67-72.

Taylor, L. (2009). "Developing assessment literacy." Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 29, 21-36.

Tsagari, D., Vogt, K. (2017). "Assessment literacy of foreign language teachers around Europe: Research, challenges and future prospects." Papers in Language Testing and Assessment, 6(1), 41-63.

Vogt, K., Tsagari, D. (2014). "Assessment literacy of foreign language teachers: Findings of a European study." Language Assessment Quarterly, 11(4), 374-402.

Volante, L., Fazio, X. (2007). "Exploring Teacher Candidates' Assessment Literacy: Implications for Teacher Education Reform and Professional Development." Canadian Journal of Education, 30(3), 749-770.

Webb, N. (2002). "Assessment literacy in a standards-based urban education setting." In annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Xu, Y., Brown, G. T. (2017). "University English teacher assessment literacy: A survey-test report from China." Papers in Language Testing and Assessment, 6(1), 133-158.

Yetkin, C. (2015). An investigation on ELT teacher candidates' assessment literacy. Master thesis, Institute of Social Sciences, Çağ University, Mersin, Turkey.

Zhang, Z., Burry-Stock, J. (1997). Assessment Practices Inventory: A Multivariate Analysis of Teachers' Perceived Assessment Competency. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED408333.pdf / May 2019.

3. Electronic Sources

American Federation of Teachers. (1990). Standards for teacher competence in educational assessment of students. https://buros.org/standards-teacher-competence-educational-assessment-students / May, 2019.

Hasselgreen, A., Carlsen, C., Helness, H. (2004). European survey of language testing and assessment needs. Report: Part one – general findings. Retrieved from http://www.ealta.eu.org/documents/resources/survey-report-pt1.pdf / May 2019.

APPENDIX A. PRE-SERVICE LANGUAGE TEACHERS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear participant,
This survey is designed to find out your training level and your training needs in language testing and assessment (LTA). Please be assured that there are no "right" or "wrong" answers and all your information in this survey is confidential.

If you agree to participate in this research, please sign below.

SIGNATURE:_____

Thank you very much for your invaluable participation.

R. Bahar TAMERER
Kocaeli University – English Language Teaching Department

PART A. General Information
1. What is your age? ………………………………………..._____
2. What is your gender? ………………………………….Female ☐ Male ☐
3. What is your current GPA?............................ _____
4. Which grade are you in? …………...…1st. ☐   2nd. ☐   3rd. ☐   4th. ☐
5. Have you ever taken any courses related to language testing and assessment (LTA) before? …………………………………………………Yes ☐ No ☐
6. Have you ever heard the term "assessment literacy"? ….........Yes ☐   No ☐

PART B. LTA Training Questions
1. Classroom-focused LTA
1.1. Please specify if you <u>were trained</u> in the following domains.

	Not at all	A little	More Advanced
a) Preparing classroom tests			
b) Using ready-made tests from textbook packages or from other sources			
c) Giving feedback to students based on information from tests/assessments			
d) Using self- or peer-assessment			
e) Using informal, continuous, non-test type of assessment			

f) Using the European Language Portfolio, an adaptation of it or some other portfolio			

1.2. Please specify if you <u>need training</u> in the following domains.

	None	Yes, basic training	Yes, more advanced training
a) Preparing classroom tests			
b) Using ready-made tests from textbook packages or from other sources			
c) Giving feedback to students based on information from tests/assessments			
d) Using self- or peer-assessment			
e) Using informal, continuous, non-test type of assessment			
f) Using the European Language Portfolio, an adaptation of it or some other portfolio			

2. Purposes of testing
2.1. Please specify if you <u>were trained</u> in the following domains.

	Not at all	A little	More Advanced
a) Giving grades			
b) Finding out what needs to be taught/learned			
c) Placing students onto courses, programs, etc.			
d) Awarding final certificates (from school/program; local, regional or national level)			

2.2. Please specify if you <u>need training</u> in the following domains.

	None	Yes, basic training	Yes, more advanced training
a) Giving grades			
b) Finding out what needs to be taught/learned			
c) Placing students onto courses, programs, etc.			
d) Awarding final certificates (from school/program; local, regional or national level)			

3. Content and concepts of LTA
3.1. Please specify if you <u>were trained</u> in the following domains.

	Not at all	A little	More Advanced
1. Testing/Assessing:			
a) Receptive skills (reading/listening)			
b) Productive skills (speaking/writing)			
c) Microlinguistic aspects (grammar/vocabulary)			
d) Integrated language skills			
e) Aspects of culture			
2. Establishing reliability of tests/assessment			
3. Establishing validity of tests/assessment			
4. Using statistics to study the quality of tests/assessment			

3.2. Please specify if you <u>need training</u> in the following domains.

	None	Yes, basic training	Yes, more advanced training
1. Testing/Assessing:			
a) Receptive skills (reading/listening)			
b) Productive skills (speaking/writing)			
c) Microlinguistic aspects (grammar/vocabulary)			
d) Integrated language skills			
e) Aspects of culture			
2. Establishing reliability of tests/assessment			
3. Establishing validity of tests/assessment			
4. Using statistics to study the quality of tests/assessment			

APPENDIX B. INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1) During your pre-service training did you learn about language testing and assessment(LTA)?

_____
_____
_____

2) Do you feel appropriately prepared for your LTA tasks after pre-service training?

_____
_____
_____

3) If not, do you plan to study on this topic after your graduation?

_____
_____
_____

4) Do you know about more recent LTA methods e.g., portfolio assessment, self- or peer-assessment? Have you ever practiced or studied them? If yes, please list some of them.

_____
_____
_____

5) Have you ever worked with standardized tests or have you advised learners in this area?   What   do   you   think   of   them?

_____
_____
_____

6)   What   types   of   LTA   will   you   use   when   you   start   teaching?

_____
_____
_____

7) Have you received any other training related to LTA? If yes, what was this training about?

_____
_____
_____
_____

8) How satisfied are you with your current pre-service training in LTA? What LTA training   would   you   like   to   have?

_____
_____
_____
_____

CURRICULUM VITAE

Rabiye Bahar TAMERER was born in Sakarya in 1993. She completed her primary school education at Sanayicilier Primary School in Tekirdağ/Çerkezköy and her high school education at Sakarya High School in Sakarya. She graduated from the ELT department of Sakarya University in 2015 and started her MA in ELT at Kocaeli University in 2016.