T.C.

ISTANBUL AYDIN UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTRUCTORS' PERCEPTIONS AND PRACTICES OF FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT

M. A. THESIS

Mohammed Sherko MALAZADA

Department of English Language and Literature

English Language and Literature

Thesis Advisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Hülya YUMRU

July 2019

T.C.

ISTANBUL AYDIN UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTRUCTORS' PERCEPTIONS AND PRACTICES OF FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT

M. A. THESIS

Mohammed Sherko MALAZADA

(Y1412.020028)

Department of English Language and Literature

English Language and Literature

Thesis Advisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Hülya YUMRU

July 2019

ONAY FORMU

Enstitümüz İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı Y1412.020028 numaralı öğrencisi MOHAMMED SHERKO TAHER MALAZADA'nın **"English Language Instructors Perceptions and Pratices of Formative Assessment"** adlı tez çalışması Enstitümüz Yönetim Kurulunun 05.07.2019 tarih ve 2019/16 sayılı kararıyla oluşturulan jüri tarafından oybirliği/oyçokluğu ile Tezli Yüksek Lisans tezi 25.07.2019 tarihinde kabul edilmiştir.

	Unvan	Adı Soyadı	Üniversite	İmza
ASIL ÜYELER				
Danışman	Dr. Öğr. Üyesi	Hülya YUMRU	İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi	
1. Üye	Prof. Dr.	Türkay BULUT	İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi	
2. Üye	Prof. Dr.	Birsen TÜTÜNİŞ	İstanbul Kültür Üniversitesi	
YEDEK ÜYELER				
1. Üye	Dr. Öğr. Üyesi	Osman SABUNCUOĞLU	İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi	
2. Üye	Dr. Öğr. Üyesi	Cem ÖZIŞIK	İstanbul Kültür Üniversitesi	

ONAY

Prof. Dr. Ragıp Kutay KARACA
Enstitü Müdürü

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that all information in this thesis document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results, which are not original to this thesis.

Mohammed Sherko MALAZADA

To my parents and siblings…

FOREWORD

TABLE OF CONTENT

ABBREVIATIONS

ELA   : English Language Assessment
ELT   : English Language Teaching
SPSS   : Statistical Package for Social Sciences
ZPD   **:** Zone of Proximal Development

LIST OF TABLES

ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTRUCTORS' PERCEPTIONS AND PRACTICES OF FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT

ABSTRACT

Formative assessment is a kind of evaluation that takes place during the course of learning. In this type of assessment, the teacher and the students are actively engaged in the process of learning to discover whether the learning targets are achieved or not (Black & William, 2009). The teachers who use formative assessment modify their teaching strategies according to the learner needs. The learners become more independent as they learn to evaluate their own progress. The main goal of this study was to investigate English language teachers' perceptions and practices of formative assessment. In addition to discover the types of formative assessment English language instructors' prefer to use. This study was conducted with 50 English language instructors who teach at Salahaddin University in Erbil, Iraq in 2018-2019 academic year. In this study, quantitative research design was used. The data of this study was gathered via a questionnaire that was originally developed by Pat-El et al. (2013) and later adapted by Öz (2014). The findings of this study revealed that language instructors are well-aware of the importance of giving support to their students in the language learning process. It also became clear that all of the language instructors give feedback about the examination results yet less than half of them ignore sharing the examination papers with the students, which rarely help the learners to learn from their mistakes and/or their weaknesses to improve their language skills as pointed out by many researchers (Wiggins & McTighe, 2007; Black & William, 1998; Herrera, Murry & Cabral, 2007). Almost all of the instructors in the present study are open to make modifications in their teaching practices on noticing any problems in students' achievement of their learning goals and most of them are well aware of the importance of using questioning strategies to improve student learning. The findings of the study showed that the instructors prefer using the Multiple-choice and the Short-answer Exam methods of assessment the most, which are not considered as methods of formative assessment. The second most frequently preferred assessment methods are Essays; Fill in the Blanks, True and False, Matching, Oral Presentation, Peer Assessment and Group Work exams. Finally, Oral exams, Drama, Project, Portfolio, Performance Assessment, Self-Assessment, Observation Form, Structured Grid, are Rubric considered as the third preferred methods of assessment by English instructors.

Keywords: *English language teaching, Formative Assessment, Formative Assessment Practices*

İNGİLİZCE OKUTMANLARININ BİÇİMLENDİRİCİ DEĞERLENDİRME KONUSUNDAKİ ALGI VE UYGULAMALARI

ÖZET

Biçimlendirici değerlendirme öğrenme sürecinde gerçekleşen bir değerlendirme türüdür. Bu tür değerlendirme uygulandığında öğretmen ve öğrencileri öğrenme hedeflerinin gerçekleşip gerçekleşmediğini bulmak için öğrenme sürecine aktif bir şekilde katılırlar (Black & William, 2009). Bu tür değerlendirme yöntemi kullanan öğretmenler öğrencilerinin öğrenme ihtiyaçlarına göre öğretim stratejilerini değiştirirler. Öğrenciler de kendi öğrenmelerini değerlendirme sürecine katıldıkları için daha bağımsız öğrenciler olurlar. Bu çalışmanın amacı İngilizce okutmanlarının biçimlendirici değerlendirme konusundaki algı ve uygulamalarını araştırmak ve öğretme sürecinde en çok kullandıkları değerlendirme metodlarını bulmaktı. Bu çalışma 2018-2019 akademik yılında Irak, Erbil'de Salahaddin Üniversitesinde çalışan 50 İngilizce okutmanı ile yürütüldü. Çalışmanın bulguları Pat-El et al. (2013) tarafından geliştirilen daha sonra Öz (2014) tarafından adapte edilen bir anket yolu ile toplandı. Çalışmanın bulguları İngilizce okutmanlarının öğrenme süreçlerinde öğrencilere destek olmanın öneminin farkında olduklarını göstermiştir. Aynı zamanda tüm İngilizce okutmanlarının sınav sonuçlarını öğrencileriyle paylaştıklarını ancak çalışmaya katılan İngilizce okutmanlarının yarısından daha azının sınav sonrası öğrencilere sınav kağıtlarını dağıtmadıkları saptanmıştır ki bu da öğrencilerin eksik yanlarını görmelerini sağlamak veya hatalarından öğrenmelerine yardımcı olmanın önünü kesmektedir (Wiggins & McTighe, 2007; Black & William, 1998; Herrera, Murry & Cabral, 2007). Çalışmanın bir diğer sonucu da araştırmaya katılan hemen hemen tüm İngilizce okutmanlarının öğrencilerin öğrenme ihtiyaçlarına göre öğretim stratejilerini değiştirdikleridir. Aynı zamanda İngilizce okutmanları sorgulama tekniği kullanımının öğrenmeyi geliştirdiğinin farkındadırlar. Çalışma bulgularına göre İngilizce okutmanlarının kullanmayı en çok tercih ettiği değerlendirme yöntemleri çoktan seçmeli ve kısa cevaplı sınav yöntemleridir. Ancak bu yöntemler biçimlendirici değerlendirme metodları değildir. İkinci en çok kullanılan değerlendirme yöntemleri ise sırasıyla kompozisyon, boşluk doldurma, doğru-yanlış sınavı, eşleştirme, sözlü sunum, akran değerlendirmesi ve grup çalışmasıdır. Üçüncü en çok kullanılan değerlendirme yöntemleri ise sırasıyla sözlü sınavlar, drama, proje, dosyalama tekniği, performans değerlendirme, öz değerlendirme, gözlem formları, yapılandırılmış liste, değerlendirme ölçekleridir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *İngiliz dili öğretimi, biçimlendirici değerlendirme, biçimlendirici değerlendirme uygulamaları.*

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

In this section, the background of the study is presented. It mentions the most recent and related previous findings. Also the statement of the problem is discussed in this part of the thesis, which indicates the reason behind selecting the topic of the study as well as its significance. In addition, the research questions are highlighted so as to specify the target of the study. The other operational terms are clearly defined at the end of this section.

1.2 Background of the Study

Learning assessment has always become a discussable matter. The origin of the word assessment is proposed in the 20th century. Assessment is considered as a crucial step of the process of teaching and learning. Furthermore, through the regular assessments, students' improvement can be recorded systematically (Dhindsa, Omar & Waldrip, 2007). Linn and Miller (2005) claimed that we could consider learning process as a target of achievement. And then the process of assessment is an organized measurement to indicate the amount of the received information by the students. Linn and Miller (2005) also proposed that the students' performances are evaluated using certain methods including traditional paper and pen tests, writing essays, daily observation, and student self-report. However other studies have been designed to show the different attitudes of teachers in terms of altering old methods of assessment to the most recent ones. Mertler (1998) distributed a survey among six hundred and twenty-five teachers of K-12. The study aimed to find-out whether the teachers were still keen on applying the traditional way of assessment or the other alternative ones. The result revealed that the participants had different views according to school levels, locations and experience of working. Based on the result, Elementary teachers steered their interest towards to use the alternative methods of assessment.

The recent methods of learning are interested in the participation of the larger number of the students in the learning process (student-centered classrooms) or self-learning. Recently, the term assessment has also been improved and modified numerously. Farrell and Jacobs (2010) suggested another word for language assessment, which they called "Alternative Assessment". They believe that alternative assessment tries to create real-life situations for the students and helps them to improve their critical thinking. Nonetheless, the alternative assessment emphases on the meaning more than the form in which it helps the students to involve in the learning process. Black and Williams (1998) determined the significance of the effect of feedback for students' progression of learning thus, they suggested the alternative forms of assessment to be applied during the course of learning, the proposal titled as "Learning to learn" and "Assessment for Learning".

These days the students are allowed to share their own voice and experience and use their own ways of analyzing and evaluating the learning materials. This development of class evaluation leads us to the foundation of a new form of assessment, which is commonly and recently called "Formative Assessment". Herrera, Murry and Cabral (2007) also believe that the new form of assessment (Formative Assessment) enables the teachers to measure the regular progression of learning. Additionally, Farrell and Jacobs have also stated "Many teachers will tell you that they are required to test or assess their students these days more than at any other time in the past" (p. 99). Due to the recent development of classroom teaching, the students are endorsed to step into the process of learning with its all aspects including the assessment; therefore, formative assessment is considered the precise alternative assessment for the time being.

Formative assessment empowers the students by encouraging them to share their own learning experiences and by joining the process of learning effectively. During the process of learning, the teachers can use variety of tools to assess their students learning. These tools include writing portfolios, peer assessment, self-reports, etc. Writing Portfolios encourage the learners to trace their own learning and collect evidences to see their own progression (Gottlieb 2006). When involved in peer assessment, students are able to assess each other, which leads to learning. Another alternative used in formative assessment is self-

reports, which help the students to be aware of their own learning progress (Gottlieb, 2006).

1.3 Statement of the Problem

The process of assessment in general is essential to observe the learners' progression of the learning (Struyven, Dochy and Janssens, 2005). However, these days language assessment during the course of learning has been widely discussed to let the learners to be a part of the course. According to Herrera, Murry and Cabral (2007), the whole method of teaching has been changed recently. In other words, they claim that students are now being involved in the process of learning. Due to the significance of the formative in the process of learning, it is worth to examine the English language instructors' competence to find out their perceptions.

1.4 Purpose of the Study and Research Questions:

The main goal of this research was to investigate English language instructors' perceptions and practices of formative assessment at University level in Erbil, Iraq. This study is guided though the three following research questions:

- What are English language instructors' perceived monitoring practices of formative assessment?

- What are English language instructors' perceived scaffolding practices of formative assessment?

- What types of formative assessment do English language instructors prefer to use?

For the purpose of finding answers to the research questions, a questionnaire that was originally developed by Pat-El et al. (2013) and later adapted by Öz (2014) was used.

1.5 Significance of the study

Teaching and learning could be enriched by many possible thoughts or findings; as a result the assessment can be one of the suggestions. However, the complete

responsibility of learning and assessment relies on the teachers meanwhile the learners can be dragged to the process as well. Teachers may encourage effective learnering via helping learners to be self-regulated students; during this process, the teachers monitor the students' progress of learning covertly; suggesting activities and then letting the students to customize themselves to notice their own progression (Heritage, 2010). It is firmly believed that the results of the present research could motivate the English language instructors to prioritize the principles of formative assessment and to implement those principles during the course of teaching.

1.6 Operational Definitions

The Assessment: is a regular process of saving information about learner improvements. It is considered as a main part of teaching and learning (Dhindsa, Omar, & Waldrip, 2007).

Formative Assessment: is defined as the precise alternative and recent method of evaluation, which enables the teacher to provide descriptive feedback for the student progress and lead them in the future performance during the learning course.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter presents the basic elements of the topic, including the perspective of language learning from the pioneers of constructivist method of teaching. Additionally the types of language assessment are mentioned with a specific focus on summative and formative assessment practices.

2.1 Language Learning from Constructivist Perspective

Constructivist teaching is based on the learners' previous learning and life experiences. The learner actively involves in the process of learning though her/his experiences. The main concern of the constructivists is to avoid learners from memorizing and regurgitating the contexts, meanwhile they encourage the learners to investigate their own learning and have their own responses to the subject (Sharma, 2006). The applicants of constructivists believe that it is difficult to the learner to acquire the recent subject without linking it to what she/he has already learnt.

Throughout the history, there are numerous theories, which are previously suggested by the educators, and all of those theories can be applied in the classrooms such as behaviorism, cognitivism, constructivism, etc. According to behaviorism, learning is mostly concerned with forming habits in the learners. From this perspective, the teachers use drills to facilitate the process of learning. In this process, the learners are mostly passive and become listeners. Unlike behaviorism, constructivism strongly emphasizes engaging the learners in the learning process by asking and answering questions before introducing the lesson of the day. This type of active learner involvement is believed to lead the learners to share their own ideas and observe their learning. The learners become more active and aware of their progression.

The perspectives of constructivism can be understood by analyzing two of its pioneers; Jean Piaget and Lev Vygotsky. Jean Piaget (1896-1980) is a Swiss psychologist who proposed that cognitive constructivism as individual

perspective. Piaget's views switch the position of the learners to active in the learning process (Lowenthal & Muth, 2008). Accordingly, the learners are able to construct their own learning and the teachers become facilitators and monitors. Cognitive constructivism provides opportunities for the learners to indicate their own problems and later find the solutions. In brief, Piaget's cognitive constructivism motivates the learners to match the new information to their old one. Lev Vygotsky (1896-1934) is a Russian psychologist who proposed social-cultural constructivism. Vygotsky's theory focuses on the interaction among learners. As a result, the learners are enabled to share their own experiences with others. The social constructivists assume that learning takes place though making meaning in social encounters through communication (Lowenthal & Muth, 2008). This idea can be adapted in the classrooms where the learners actively step to the learning process via academic communication with each other. The teachers can easily collect feedback from the learners while they are keen on working in pairs or group-work activities. Another crucial point, which is highlighted by Vygotsky is his introduction to the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) in education field. Zone of Proximal Development is an estimated level of a learner's understanding or cognitive development which is close to but a bit behind of fully comprehension by the learners. The idea is letting us know that the learners are in-need of help by the others or teacher to make the complete progression. In other words, whenever new information is presented, the learners might have not completely but partially idea about it. In this case, the learners need less help from the teacher while they are allowed to have their own discussion among each-other.

Another psychologist, Bruner has also worked extremely hard throughout the entire twentieth century. Based on Bruner's theory, learning is an active process based on pre-existing knowledge. Accordingly, the teachers encourage the learners to select and then to transform the knowledge in their minds. Hence, the teachers have to devote the classroom activities to the learners' discoveries. Although, the learners and the teachers are actively engaged with the subject of the day, they would be able to construct their own knowledge based on their previous knowledge; this will also help them to demonstrate their weaknesses, later find the solutions on their own.

2.2 Types of Assessment in Language Teaching

Assessment is the process of collecting data from the learners by the teacher. The data indicates the measure of achievement (Hanna & Dettmer, 2004). However, the assessment process in teaching and learning has experienced a dynamic change in the last few years. The major concentration is on outcomes-based or standard-referenced assessment (Davison & Cummins, 2006). The modification suggests a better academic relationship between the teachers and the learners during the course of learning. The alteration also motivates more active teaching atmosphere. Although diverse number of assessments has been advocated, a few of them have been discussed a lot in the literature.

2.2.1 Summative Assessment

Summative assessment is a kind of evaluation, which we are most familiar with. Generally, this type of assessment is conducted in the last weeks of the learning course. Summative assessment helps the teacher to measure the existence knowledge of students at the end of the semester. It also demonstrates the ability of the individuals as to whether they are ready for the next level or not. This type of assessment causes nervousness in the learners while the result impacts their future in one way or another. Therefore, we are not surprised when we notice that the learners do their best in order to pass to the next level. The learners are keen on studying hard while the teacher is observing. Nevertheless, in some colleges, the learners have the second opportunity in case they fail from the first attempt. Due to risk of failing, the learners avoid using their own creative way of thinking towards the materials. Meanwhile, the learners prefer answering the questions as they have precisely learnt from the course-book (Biggs & Tang, 2007). Summative assessment is labelled in several names such as final examinations, final projects, term papers, final research papers, etc. The out-come degree of the assessment has the answer of the most crucial questions; whether the learner has achieved the basic information in the current level. Whether the learner is able to comprehend further information regarding the specific subject in the next level. Accordingly, Volante and Fazio (2007) conducted a survey study to test the assessment literacy of sixty-nine primary teachers who became candidates. The findings showed that most of the

candidates are interested in applying summative form of assessment and while a fewer showed their preference to formative assessment. In the conclusion section of their article, the researchers suggested the teachers' use of observational techniques and personal communication for effective learning to take place.

2.2.2 Formative Assessment

Formative assessment is another kind of evaluation. It takes place during the course of learning. In this type of assessment, the teacher and the students are both engaged in the process of collecting data in relation to whether the learning targets are achieved or not (Black & William, 2009). The teachers who use formative assessment collect both oral or written feedback to modify their teaching strategies according to the learner needs. The result of the formative assessment is able to assist both the learners and the teachers. The learners will know their weaknesses and strengths and this would encourage them to start studying hard while they are realizing the significant opportunities of improvement ahead of them. Not only the learners but also the teacher will find-out what they need the most. In other words, the teacher will be able to set targets for further progress (Ferris, 2003). Formative assessment provides opportunities for the learners to be involved in the process of assessment. The learners become more independent while they evaluate their own progress. For example, after taking a test, the teacher distributes the keys to the questions to the learners then let the learners work in pairs to score their own papers. Moreover, formative assessment promotes better learning atmosphere while the mistakes are taken seriously and the feedback is given immediately. According to Leki (1991), second language learners are interested in collecting feedbacks from their errors.

Formative assessment encloses the space between the learners and the subject. Whenever a problem is indicated, the teacher and the learners work closely together to fill in the gap (Heritage, 2010). The mission alters when the learners find another space in their learning; the whole process continues to decrease the gaps between learners' current level and the target achievement (Heritage, 2010). According to Berry (2008) there is significant evidence that shows that formative assessment enables the learners to take risks in learning and amplify

the level of self-esteem. The sense of failure decreases and the learners bear the difficulties as part of learning (Berry, 2008). Passive learners turn to be active and effective learners when they are aware of their own progress. The learners become self-regulated who observe themselves and set goals for further learning and apply certain techniques to familiarize themselves in order to learn more (Butler & Winne, 1995; Paris & Winograd, 2003; Zimmerman, 2000 as cited in Heritage, 2010). Sometimes the teachers have different attitudes towards formative assessment, they mostly emphasize giving marks and evaluating the students based on exam papers while less of them focus on giving positive feedbacks to the students during the course of learning (Carless, 2005). Cheng and Warren (2005) conducted an interview study among some Canadian and Chinese teachers. The outcome of this study demonstrated that the effect of giving feedback to the students after the exam either in the classrooms or individually was less than expected. Furthermore, the study also confirmed that whether the teachers give feedback to the students in a whole class or individually could almost have the same effect. There is another study, which investigated the effects of task-involving and ego-involving evaluation on interest and performance by Butler (1998). This study revealed that sharing the feedback among the students would motivate them positively. According to the study, the students who had achieved less in the assessment seemed to show their most interest while they were given comments.

2.3 Formative Assessment Techniques

Related literature provides the teachers with a variety of techniques and strategies that might be used to assess student learning in relation to learning outcomes. Most of them are easily adapted to any language classrooms, i.e. formative assessment has been introduced in different forms such as performance-based assessment, portfolios, self-assessment, peer-assessment, interview-based assessment, play-based assessment, cooperative groups assessment, dialogue, journal, and scaffold essays (Herrera et al.,2007). However, each form can be used as a technique in the classrooms while they all serve the same purpose.

2.3.1 Pre-assessment

The main aim of undertaking pre-assessment is to discover how much the learners already know in order to choose the correct course material of learning which matches the learners' needs. Wiggins and McTighe (2007) confirmed that pre-assessments are suggested to indicate the existence of knowledge and the ability levels of the students. It also discovers what methods of learning the students prefer. This sort of assessment is mostly given to the students at the beginning of a course, therefore the teacher would be able to understand the current ability of the learners and provide them what they exactly need to progress.

2.3.2 Portfolios

This technique of assessment can be applied in different times during the course of learning. Based on which the learners would be able to investigate their own progress and feel their own efforts (William and Thompson, 2008). Portfolios can be used in variety forms that match the learners' interest such as writing blogs, audio or video recordings, drawings, etc. The best products of the learners are recorded from their portfolios (Herrera et al., 2007). This type of assessment can be used as a technique to motivate the learners for better learning and involving them in the process of learning. While the portfolios are allocated in regular times, the learners would notice their own progress that leads them further learning. Alternative assessment techniques help the teachers to measure the qualitative and quantitative knowledge of the students while exposing them in real world like meaningful activities. For that matter, the students practice their own experience during different times in the course of learning (Corcoran et al 2004).

2.3.3 Self-assessment

This type of assessment allows the learners to evaluate their own progress based on a valid and provided criterion, which is shared by the teacher at the beginning of a task. Self-assessment helps the learners to be familiar with high-quality of performance and encourages them to discuss their own performance with their teacher and others (Black and William, 1998). Atkin, Black and Coffey (2001) claim that these kinds of assessment motivate the learners to

guide themselves to the right direction, while they could also see their current position and also would be able to see their next stop-learning to cover the gaps. Self-assessment encourages the active participation of the learners in the classroom while they indicate the learner's own errors and guide them to look for the solutions on their own or via discussions with the others around. During the time, the learners are aware of what they are doing.

2.3.4 Peer-assessment

Recently, the educators insist on learner involvement in pair-work and cooperating with one another in language learning process. As a result, peer-assessment can be highly recommended for more cooperative classrooms. Since the learners share their own assessments, they would be able to communicate with their peers and illustrate the difficulties that they experience. Later, they can help each other to find the answers to the questions. The learners are taught to set goals while they are assessing their peers (Black and William, 1998). Much the same as self-assessment, the criteria, which is proposed by the teacher is shared with the learners at the beginning of a task and the learners are guided to learn the criteria for success through discussions. This would lead them to point out their common responses in comparison to the accepted criteria (Herrera et al. 2007). Hasselgre (2000) discovered the impact of peer-assessment when he applied it to a group of primary students. The findings suggested that the participants were very realistic in demonstrating their own strengthens and weaknesses. In comparison to the teachers, the students were able to give almost similar feedbacks to their peers. The researcher also explained that the students would become more hard-working to feed their own needs when they had already indicated their own problems. In other words, the learners would try their best to handle their peer's misunderstandings, which motivates better quality of learning. Patri (2002) investigated the difference between the impact of teacher and student feedback. The researcher concluded that whenever the assessment materials are firmly designed, the students would be enabled to evaluate their peers as teachers. However, the study also uncovered that the way of assessment between the teachers – the students and student-student seemed differently. McManus (2008) considered peer-assessment as one of the strategies of formative assessment.

2.3.5 Questioning

The idea of inserting questioning to the form of assessment has a history. In this technique, the teacher asks the learners to share their own opinions towards numerous topics. According to Black, Harrison, Lee, Marshall, and William (2003) the teacher is supposed to provide more effective questions for the learners with facilities. That is to say, the teachers have to make sure that the learners understand the main purpose of the question. Black et al. (2003) emphasize the preparation, as they proposed that the questions have to be managed in three steps "frame questions" which holds discussable ideas and starts or ends with "Do you agree or disagree?" or "What is your opinion about it?" The second theme would be "wait time" in order the learners could have enough time to think about the subject and prepare their thoughts. Finally, the teacher applies "follow-up" technique through certain activities to make sure the learners understand the question. To limit the discrepancy between student understanding and the target-learning goal, the teachers need to ask questions and elaborate the subject on student possible answers (Hattie & Timperley, 2007).

2.3.6 Interview Based Assessment

Though applying this kind of assessment, the teacher is able to collect information among the students via effective interviews. Accordingly, the students' experiences can be used as the learning materials for example hobbies, thoughts or personal point of views. Herrera et al. (2007) stated that teaching materials and the students' information could be used to build a lesson on. Interview based assessment encourages the learners for better performance while they find their own life experience inside the assessment.

3. METHODOLOGY

This section presents the methodology of the current thesis. It includes the research design, the participants and the procedures used in data collection and analysis of the study.

3.1 Research Design

This study is dedicated to find out English language instructors' formative assessment perceptions and practices in addition to finding out their perceived monitoring and scaffolding practices of formative assessment. In this study, quantitative research design was used. The reason behind the use of the quantitative approach was to deal with a big number of data in order to conclude with accurate statistical results. Among the quantitative research collecting data instruments, a questionnaire was used to gather information so as to provide the answers to the research questions.

3.2 Participants of the Study

Fifty English language instructors became the participants of the study, mixed in gender, who teach at Salahaddin University-Erbil. During collecting the information, these instructors were teaching at certain colleges/departments such as college of Language, college of Education, college of basic Education and Salahaddin University-Erbil Language Centre. When choosing the participants of the study convenience sampling strategy was used. Convenience sampling strategy is a kind of non-probability sampling method of data collection (Lavrakas, 2008). Table 3.1 reveals the gender distribution of the participants of the study. As displayed in the table, twenty-eight of the participants were female while the rest of the twenty-two participants were male.

Table 3.1: Gender distribution of the participants

Gender

	Frequency	Percentage
Male	22	44.0
Female	28	56.0
Total	50	100.0

Table 3.2 displays the participants' years of teaching experience. Among the fifty participants, twenty of them had had only one to five years of teaching experience, which is recorded as the highest value. However, the second highest value goes to the participants who had worked for six to ten years. Eight of the participants had worked as English instructors for eleven to fifteen years. Another three of the participants had served for sixteen to twenty years; the study also included four of the participants, who had the most experience in this field, which was above twenty years. The biggest value is noticed from the first class, it means that 40% percentage of this sample has five years of working experience. And, in the second rate, 30% of the participants in the study was between six to ten years of working experience.

Table 3.2: Participant's years of working experience

Years of Working Experience

	Frequency	Percentage
1-5 year	20	40.0
6-10 years	15	30.0
11-15 years	8	16.0
16-20 years	3	6.0
20 years and above	4	8.0
Total	50	100.0

Table 3.3 illustrates the participants' educational background. The findings show that the distribution of the questionnaire was considered equally among the participants from the College of Education and the Language Centre.

However, the distribution of the questionnaire seemed also equally distributed among the participants from the College Basic Education and the College of Languages at Salahaddin University /Erbil.

Table 3.3: Participants' educational background

The Institutes of the Participants

	Frequency	Percent
College of Education	15	30.0
Language Centre	15	30.0
College of Basic Education	10	20.0
College of Language	10	20.0
Total	50	100.0

Table 3.4 reveals the findings about of the type of fields the participants have been working for. The findings show that 76% of the participants work at public sectors, meanwhile the rest of 24% of the participants work at private sectors.

Table 3.4: Participants' working sector

Participants' working sector

	Frequency	Percentage
Public	38	76.0
Private	12	24.0
Total	50	100.0

Table 3.5 presents the findings about whether the participants had taken any pre-service training in language assessment. The question provided them two possible answers to choose "YES" or "NO". On analyzing the findings, we found out that 42% of the participants had already taken "Pre-service Training" in language assessment before they started teaching English, but 58% of the

participants had not taken any training courses in language assessment before they started teaching English.

Table 3.5: Participants pre-service training in language assessment

Participants' pre-service training in language assessment

	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	21	42.0
No	29	58.0
Total	50	100.0

Table 3.6 indicates the results of in-service training in language assessment the participants had taken. The participants were asked "*Did you take any IN-SERVICE training in language assessment AFTER you began to teach English*? The question provided them two possible answers to choose "YES" or "NO". Sixty-eight percent of the participants who answered with "NO" have not taken any training courses of language assessment after they had started teaching English. Meanwhile, 32% of the participants who chose YES are currently taking training courses of language assessment.

Table 3.6: Participants' in-service training in language assessment

Participants' in-service training in language assessment

	Frequency	Percent
No	34	68.0
Yes	16	32.0
Total	50	100.0

Table 3.7 presents the classification of Faculty / college where the participants graduated from. Three choices were given to the participants to select: (1) *Faculty of Education (ELT)* (2) *Faculty of Science-Letters (English Language & Literature, English Linguistics, etc.)* (3) *Others*. The value of Faculty of

Education (ELT) was greater than the others with 52% percentage and the rate of Faculty of Science-Letters (English Language & Literature, English Linguistics, etc.) is %30. However, %18 of the participants is graduated from other faculties/colleges.

Table 3.7: Distribution of the participants' subject area

Faculty / colleges	Frequency	Percentage
Faculty of Education (ELT)	26	52.0
Faculty of Science - Letters (English Lang & Lit., English Linguistics, etc.)	15	30.0
Others	9	18.0
Total	50	100.0

3.3 Data Collection Instrument

The data of this study was gathered via a questionnaire called "Assessment for Learning Questionnaire for Teachers", which was originally developed by Pat-El et al. (2013) and later adapted by Öz (2014) (see Appendix 1). The questionnaire is divided into two sections. The aim of the first section is to collect background and demographic information about the participants of the study including gender, years of teaching experience, types of school that teachers are currently working for and the teachers' preferred methods of assessment in language teaching (see Section 3.2). The first part of the questionnaire was developed by Öz (2014). The second part of the questionnaire deals with English language teachers' perceived monitoring and scaffolding practices of formative assessment. The second part of the questionnaire involves twenty-eight statements based on a 5-point Likert type rating scale ranging from 1 "Strongly Disagree" to 5 "Strongly Agree". English language teachers' perceived monitoring practices of formative assessment were elicited through the responses given to Items 1-16, while their perceived scaffolding practices of formative assessment are gathered through Items 17-28.

3.4 Data Collection Procedures

The procedure of the data collection started with receiving a letter of questionnaire survey implementation permission from İstanbul Aydın University. Then, the researcher contacted the head departments of the target colleges to arrange a visit. While the researcher was meeting the head of each department, he informed her/him about the project on receiving the letter of consent from the Social Sciences Institute of İstanbul Aydın University. A week later, the researcher visited the colleges on his own to meet the candidates face to face in the teacher's room. Among the fourteen English instructors in the college of basic Education/Salahaddin University for instance, only ten of them had become participants of the study. This same procedure was applied for the rest of other target colleges. While the researcher was introducing himself to the candidates, he double-checked whether the candidates were interested in participating in this study or not. Later, the questionnaire was handed to the participants; the researcher explained the whole-procedure. The researcher informed the candidates that the information would be used for the purposes of the study only. At the end, the researcher collected the papers back from the participants. The procedure of the data collection went smoothly and quietly, the participants were not allowed to ask each other's opinion to assure that the participants give their own personal responses. The whole process took nearly one hour.

3.5 Data Analysis

As the fifty questionnaire papers were collected from the participants, the researcher double-checked all the papers to make sure that all the questions were answered and all the statements were marked. No errors or missing data was found. The quantitative data gathered from the questionnaire was subjected to the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) software, version 22 (SPSS Inc. USA). The results of the SPSS were shown in tables. The data was presented in the form of frequency and percentages. Mostly, the collected data from the questionnaire is divided into two independent groups: Monitoring (1-16) and Scaffolding (17-28).

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

The main goal of this study was to investigate English language teachers' perceptions and practices of formative assessment. In addition to discover the types of formative assessment English language instructors' use. The findings of the study are presented in three sections. The first section presents English language instructors' perceived monitoring practices of formative assessment (Section 4.2). The second section reveals English language instructors' perceived scaffolding practices of formative assessment (Section 4.3). The third section presents the types of formative assessment English language instructors' prefer to use (Section 4.4).

4.2 English language instructors' perceived monitoring practices of formative assessment

This section presents the findings on English language instructors' perceived monitoring practices of formative assessment. The questionnaire items from 1-16 were used in order to find out the instructors' perceived monitoring practices of formative assessment. Table 4.1reveals the instructors' responses to the related questionnaire items.

Table 4.1: Instructors Perceived Monitoring Practices of Formative Assessment

The statements 1-16 (Perceived Monitoring)	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		Mean
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
1. I encourage my students to reflect upon how they can improve their language learning	1	2	2	4	9	18	28	56	10	20	3.88
2. After a test, I discuss the answers given with each student	1	2	10	20	17	34	16	32	6	12	3.32
3. While working on their assignments, I ask my students how they think they are doing	1	2	7	14	11	22	22	44	9	18	3.62
4. I involve my students in thinking about how they want to learn English at school	2	4	4	8	12	24	25	50	7	14	3.62
5. I give my students the opportunity to decide on their language learning objectives	2	4	4	8	17	34	20	40	7	14	3.52
6. I ask my students to indicate what went well and what went badly concerning their assignments	1	2	4	8	14	28	21	42	10	20	3.7
7. I encourage students to reflect upon their learning processes and how to improve their learning	0	0	5	10	6	12	30	60	9	18	3.86
8. I inform my students on their strong points concerning language learning	1	2	3	6	16	32	19	38	11	22	3.72
9. I inform my students on their weak points concerning language learning.	0	0	2	4	15	30	23	46	10	20	3.82
10. I encourage my students to improve on their language learning processes	1	2	2	4	11	22	24	48	12	24	3.88
11. I give students guidance and assistance in their language learning	1	2	2	4	8	16	25	50	14	28	3.98
12. I discuss assignments with my students to help them understand the content better	5	10	1	2	9	18	22	44	13	26	3.74
13. I discuss with my students the progress they have made in learning English	2	4	1	2	13	26	28	56	6	12	3.7
14. After an assessment, I inform my students on how to improve their weak points	2	4	5	10	9	18	25	50	9	18	3.68
15 I discuss with my students how to utilize their strengths to improve on their assignment	2	4	3	6	12	24	27	54	6	12	3.64
16 Together with my students, I consider ways on how to improve on their weak points	1	2	7	14	14	28	23	46	5	10	3.48

As shown in Table 4.1, the mean scores gained for the statements 1-16 display the monitoring factors were close to the scale. Most of the participants of the study have chosen "Neutral" or "Agree" from the questionnaire (see Table 4.1). As seen, Statement 11 has the highest mean (3.98). Table 4.1 shows that 26 participants strongly believe that English students need the teacher guidance and assistance during the course of learning. This could tell us that the participants monitor their students and follow their needs. It also shows that most of the participants tend to help their students within the process of learning. There are plenty ways of supporting and assisting students such as giving advice to guide and help the students. Black and William (1998) also argue that teachers can

give advice to their students based on their observations while the students are on task. They also add that the teachers' feedback could always help the students to improve their weaknesses in language learning process. This kind of assistance can be given during the course of learning which students can find it useful. On the other hand, the lowest mean (3.32) has gone to Statement 2 (see Table 4.1). This is an evidence to indicate that the English university instructors are less interested in sharing the exam results with their students. Therefore, the students would have less opportunity to know their mistakes from exam papers. It seems that most of the English university instructors arrange mid-term and final examinations for their students, which rarely help the learners to improve their skills (Wiggins & McTighe, 2007; Black & Wiliam, 1998; Herrera, Murry & Cabral, 2007). However, considering the responses given to this statement as the lowest mean in the whole questionnaire, there are still some instructors with the percentage %34, who selected the option "Neutral", meanwhile those instructors who had chosen the option "Agree" with a percentage of %32. In other words, the findings indicate that %66 of the participants showed their agreement to discuss the exam papers with their students to indicate the problems later fulfil the needs.

4.3 English language instructors' perceived scaffolding practices of formative assessment

This section presents the findings on English language instructors' perceived scaffolding practices of formative assessment. The questionnaire items from 17-28 elicited the instructors' perceived scaffolding practices of formative assessment. Table 4.2reveals the instructors' responses to the related questionnaire items.

Table 4.2: Instructors Perceived Scaffolding Practices of Formative Assessment

The statements 17-28 (Perceived Scaffolding)	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		Mean
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
17. I adjust my language teaching whenever I notice that my students do not understand a topic	3	6	3	6	2	4	20	40	22	44	**4.1**
18. I provide my students with guidance to help them gain understanding of the content taught	3	6	4	8	5	10	29	58	9	18	**3.74**
19. During my class, students are given the opportunity to show what they have learned.	2	4	6	12	10	20	17	34	15	30	**3.74**
20. I ask questions in a way my students understand	1	2	2	4	3	6	23	46	21	42	**4.22**
21. By asking questions during class, I help my students gain understanding of the content taught	3	6	2	4	4	8	20	40	21	42	**4.08**
22. I am open to student contribution in my class	2	4	2	4	10	20	21	42	15	30	**3.9**
23. I allow my students to ask each other questions using English during class	1	2	4	8	6	12	17	34	22	44	**4.1**
24. I ensure that my students know what areas they need to work on in order to improve their results	1	2	5	10	8	16	23	46	13	26	**3.84**
25. I give my students opportunities to ask questions	1	2	4	8	8	16	18	36	19	38	**4**
26. My students know what the evaluation criteria for their work are	2	4	10	20	9	18	16	32	13	26	**3.56**
27. I ensure that my students know what they can learn from their assignments.	1	2	3	6	14	28	24	48	8	16	**3.7**
28. I can recognize when my students reach their language learning goals.	0	0	2	4	7	14	29	58	12	24	**4.02**

As shown in Table 4.2, the descriptive analysis of the data indicates that the mean scores received for the statements 17-28 were close to the scale. Most of the participants of the study have chosen "*Neutral*" or "*Agree*" for the questionnaire items. The highest mean (4.22) scored for Statement 20 (see Table 4.2). This is also recorded as the highest score mean in the questionnaire. Most

of the participants have selected "*Agree*" or "*Strongly Agree*" for this statement. Meaning that the instructors are keen on providing questions for the students in a way that could match the students' ability of understanding. Moreover, we can say that the instructors are serious about the language they use in the classroom in addition to caring about the students' understanding. Accordingly, there seems to be a strong relationship between the teachers and the students. Before the question is asked, the teacher is aware of how much information the student has already got, accordingly the required knowledge would be given. Black et al. (2003) claimed that the teachers have to be aware of the three themes before asking the questions to the students: first, the question has to have its value. Next, the students have to have enough time to think before answering. Last, the teacher has to provide the students more follow-up questions and make sure the students understood everything. On the contrary, the lowest mean is (3.56) has been marked for Statement 26 demonstrating that there is fewer students' awareness of the process of evaluation. The students' knowledge about the teacher's own method of assessment is somehow restricted. In this case, the students would be less familiar with different techniques of assessment. However, some educators such as Fisher, Waldrip and Dorman (2005) suggested that the students should be asked in making decisions regarding assessments. Additionally, we can also add that %20 of the participants disagreed to share their own evaluation criteria with the students (See table 4.2). As a result, the students would not be involved in the process of evaluation and they would not be aware of their own progression. We can state that some English language instructors still suggest that the method of their own assessment should be kept from them. However, formative assessments (self-assessments, peer-assessments, and group-assessment) have to be based on validity and reliability, which they call "Criterion" that the teachers and the students can understand applying to rate the work (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Herrera et al., 2007).

4.4 Types of formative assessment English language instructors prefer to use

The questionnaire allowed the participants to select more than one method of assessment among the sixteen suggested methods: *Essay-type exam, Short-*

answer exam, Fill in the blank, Multiple choice, True-False, Matching, Oral presentation, Oral exam, Drama, Project, Portfolio, Performance assessment, Peer assessment, Self-assessment, Group work, Observation form, Structured grid, Rubric, Others. As shown in Table 4.3 University instructors showed their most interest to *the Multiple-choice and the Short-answer Exam* methods of assessment, which are not considered as methods of formative assessment. The frequency of their usage and related percentage was %58.0 for the Short-answer Exams and %60.0 for the Multiple-choice Exams.

Table 4.3: The first preferable methods of assessment

		Count	Percentage %
Short-answer Exam	None	21	42.0%
	Ticked	29	58.0%
Multiple Choice	None	20	40.0%
	Ticked	30	60.0%

Ticked: preferred option; None: un-preferred option

Reflecting on the findings of the study, it became clear that the participants of the study prefer using the classical methods of assessment. More specifically, they prefer using short-answer and multiple-choice exams. This may present the fact that the English instructors believe that summative ways of assessment are the only methods of assessment that could elaborate the accurate level of the students' ability. In other words, from the participants' perspective, the process of assessment is preceded to convince both the teachers and the students about how much information is received by the students at the end of the course of learning. In relation to subjectivity, most the participants could possibly excuse that the *Short-answer* and *Multiple-choice* exams are considered as the least objective assessments in which the teachers' feelings would not affect the result. Additionally, the teachers are less able to provide new information to their students via the traditional forms of assessment; however, *Multiple-choice* and others which are similar could help the schools to compare their students (Herrera et al. 2007). On the other hand, short-answer exams can also be useful

to reduce the students' anxiety while they are asked to give short answers rather than writing long essays (Berkowitz, Desmarais, Hogan, & Moorcroft, 2000).

However, there are numerous methods of assessment, which are ticked almost by the half of the participants meanwhile the rest have left them un-ticked as shown in Table 4.4 *Essay Type, Fill in the Blanks, True and False, Matching, Oral Presentation, Peer Assessment* and *Group Work exams*. Interestingly, essay type, oral presentation, peer assessment and group work exams are considered as methods of Formative assessment which are used by the University instructors during the process of learning. It is also worth to mention that the traditional methods of assessment such as *Fill in the Gaps*, *True and False* and *Matching* should not be ignored when they surely demonstrate the students' progression. Meanwhile the alternative methods of assessment are still recommended because they are on-going exams, but the traditional methods are mostly one-time exams (Farrell & Jacobs, 2010).

Table 4.4: The second preferable methods of assessment

		Count	Percentage %
Essay Type Exam	None	25	50.0%
	Ticked	25	50.0%
Fill in the Blank	None	24	48.0%
	Ticked	26	52.0%
True or False	None	22	44.0%
	Ticked	28	56.0%
Matching	None	23	46.0%
	Ticked	27	54.0%
Oral Presentation	None	26	52.0%
	Ticked	24	48.0%
Peer Assessment	None	23	46.0%
	Ticked	27	54.0%
Group Work	None	25	50.0%
	Ticked	25	50.0%

Ticked: preferred option; None: un-preferred option

Moreover, the rest ten choices; *Oral exams, Drama, Project, Portfolio, Performance Assessment, Self-Assessment, Observation Form, Structured Grid, Rubric* and *Others* are considered as the third preferred methods of assessment by English language instructors as shown in table 4.5. However, these types of exams are mostly related to the practice of the formative assessment (Black et

al. 2003, Chen et al., 2013). Now, we take some of them as examples to discuss according to the result of the questionnaire. *Portfolio* as the first example, there are only sixteen participants out of fifty preferred using it during the course of learning, whereas *Portfolio* is esteemed as a common form of formative assessment that illustrates the best progression of the students (Herrera et al. 2007). Furthermore, the participants also mostly disregard *Self-assessment*. While among fifty of them only seventeen tend to use it in their classrooms. According to Chappuis and Stiggins (2002), *Self-assessment* helps the students to take the control of their own learning. Based on the work of (Herrera et al. 2007), English teachers can give their students *Rubric* in which the students can assess themselves, but according to the result, only eight participants have chosen *Rubric*.

Table 4.5: The third preferred methods of assessment

		Count	Percentage %
Oral Exam	None	32	64.0%
	Ticked	18	36.0%
Drama	None	43	86.0%
	Ticked	7	14.0%
Project	None	33	66.0%
	Ticked	17	34.0%
Portfolio	None	34	68.0%
	Ticked	16	32.0%
Performance	None	34	68.0%
Assessment	Ticked	16	32.0%
Self-assessment	None	33	66.0%
	Ticked	17	34.0%
Observation Form	None	38	76.0%
	Ticked	12	24.0%
Structured grid	None	45	90.0%
	Ticked	5	10.0%
Rubric	None	42	84.0%
	Ticked	8	16.0%
Others	None	31	62.0%
	Ticked	19	38.0%

Ticked: preferred option; None: un-preferred option

To sum up, the teachers in general tend to dedicate the tests to measure the students' progression through learning (Boraie, 2012; Popham, 2009, Stiggins, 2005, 2008). In other words, the teacher's understanding for assessment mostly links to summative and traditional, they believe that the assessments should be set in way that could tell that whether the students received what they have been taught or not.

5. CONCLUSION

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the summary of the study and also the conclusions. In addition, the limitation of the current study is also pointed out to the readers with the belief that this could help others in their future studies.

5.2 Summary of the Study

In comparison to other areas of research, formative assessment has been ignored (Black et al., 2003; OECD, 2005). If we take the result of the present study as a proof, we can state that English language instructors pay less attention to the recent literature of assessment. Therefore, this study is dedicated to investigate the English language instructors' perceptions of formative assessment, in both monitoring and scaffolding practices at university level. Moreover, this research aimed to discover the types of assessments the language instructors prefer using in their classrooms. Fifty in-service English language instructors at Salahaddin University-Erbil (including three colleges one language centre) have become the participants of the study. Quantitative research design was employed, though a valid questionnaire which was developed by Pat-El et al. (2013) and later adapted by Öz (2014) (see Appendix 1). The collected data was analyzed via statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) software, version 22 (SPSS Inc. USA).

5.3 Conclusion

Reflecting on the findings of the study, we might conclude that most of the English language instructors' attitude towards the practices of formative assessment is neutral. It also became clear that, while sixteen English language instructors are quite familiar with formative assessment practices, thirty-four of them have not taken any training courses on assessment. The first research

question of the study aimed at finding English language instructors' perceived monitoring practices of formative assessment. The findings of this study revealed that language instructors are well-aware of the importance of giving support to their students in the language learning process. This conclusion is in line with the arguments put forward by Black and William (1998). Black and William (1998) highlight the importance of scaffolding when the students are on task. They believe effective feedback has a positive influence on students' language achievement. Regarding monitoring practices of formative assessment, we might also conclude that all of the language instructors give feedback about the examination results yet less than half of them ignore sharing the examination papers with the students, which rarely help the learners to learn from their mistakes and/or their weaknesses to improve their language skills as pointed out by many researchers (Wiggins & McTighe, 2007; Black & William, 1998; Herrera, Murry & Cabral, 2007).

The second research question of the study focused on the identification of English language instructors' perceived scaffolding practices of formative assessment. The findings of this study revealed that almost all of the instructors are open to make modifications in their teaching practices on noticing any problems in students' achievement of their learning goals. Additionally, we might conclude that most of the participants in the study are well aware of the importance of using questioning strategies to improve student learning. For this reason, they give the students opportunities to ask and answer teacher and peer questions. It also became clear that the teachers check students' understanding of the topics in discussion through comprehensible follow-up questions. However, we found out that only a few of the participants give less importance to sharing the success criteria with the students, which is a key feature of formative assessment (Black & William, 1998; & Fisher, Waldrip and Dorman, 2005).

The third research question of the study focused on the identification of the types of formative assessment English language instructors prefer to use. The findings of the study revealed that the instructors prefer using *the Multiple-choice and the Short-answer Exam* methods of assessment the most, which are not considered as methods of formative assessment Black & William, 1998).

The second most frequently preferred assessment methods are *Essays, Fill in the Blanks, True and False, Matching, Oral Presentation, Peer Assessment* and *Group Work exams.* Finally, *Oral exams, Drama, Project, Portfolio, Performance Assessment, Self-Assessment, Observation Form, Structured Grid,* are *Rubric* considered as the third preferred methods of assessment by English instructors.

Briefly, the English language instructors mostly apply the traditional methods of assessments with its all strategies; however, they are not completely against the alternative methods of assessment. In conclusion, we can state that the English language instructors would like to assess their students through the traditional methods of assessment rather than the resent ones. Reflection on the findings, it becomes clear that the participants of the study believe that summative assessments with its various types are more applicable for the university students than formative assessments.

5.4 Limitations

The researcher has tried to investigate the English language instructors competence regarding the formative assessment and its practices in the classrooms. To achieve the aim, we have attempted to examine a limited number of the English instructors. Not only this, but also one public university has been targeted in this study where all the participants currently work for "Salahaddin University-Erbil". However, it is not fair enough to state that all other instructors form different public universities in Iraq would have the same responses to the issue.

5.5 Recommendations

For further studies, we suggest adding larger number of the participants, including public and private universities. Moreover, other studies can be designed to figure out the students' perceptions of formative assessment. Whilst there could be another research done to find out the effects of the formative assessment strategies on teaching and learning process.

REFRENCES

Atktin, J . M., Black, P., & Coffey, J. (2001). *Classroom Assessment and National Science Education Standards*, Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Berkowitz, A. J., Desmarais, K.H., Hogan, K., & Moorcroft, T. A. (2000). *Authentic assessment in the informal setting*: How it can work for you. The journal of Environmental Educational, 31(3), 20-24.

Berry, R. (2008) *Assessment for learning*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2007). Using Constructive Alignment in Outcomes-Based Teaching and Learning Teaching for Quality at University. 3rd ed., pp. 50-63.

Black, P., & William, D. (1998). *Inside the Black Box.* Raising standards through classroom ...assessment. Phi Delta Kappan. 80. pp. 139-144.

Black, P., & William, D. (2009). *Developing the theory of formative assessment.* Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 1 (1) pp. 5-31.

Black, P., Harrison, C., Lee C., Marshall, B., & William, D. (2003). *Assessment for learning*. Putting it into practice. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Boraie, D. (2012) *Formative vs Summative Assessment: Does it matter?* TESOL Connections, September 2013. Retrieved on 10 December 2018 from http://newsmanager.commpartners.com/tesolc/issues/2012-09-01/3.html.

Bulter, R. (1988). *The Effects of Task- Involving and Ego-Involving evaluation on Interest and Performance.* Enhancing and Undermining Intrinsic Motivation. British Journal ...... of Educational Psychology. 58. 1-14.

Carless, D. (2005). " *Prospects for the implementation of assessment for learning*" Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 12, pp. 39-54.

Chappuis, S., & Stiggins, R. J. (2002). *Classroom Assessment for learning.* Educational Leardership. 60, 40-43.

Cheng. W. & Warren M. (2005). "*Peer Assessment of Language Proficiency*" Language Testing, 22, (1), pp.93 -121.

Corcoran, C. A., Dershimer, E. L., & Tichenor, M.S. (2004). *A teacher's guide to alternative assessment*: Taking the first step. The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies. Issues and Ideas, 77(5), 213-218.

Davison, C., & Cummins, J. (2006). A*ssessment and evaluation in ELT*: Shifting paradigms and practices . In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), International handbook of English language teaching (Vol. 1, pp. 415- 420). Norwell, MA: Springer.

Dhindsa, H., Omer, K., & Waldrip, B. (2007, August 1). *Upper Secondary Bruneian Science Students' Perceptions of Assessment*, International Journal of Science Education, 29(10), 1281-1280.

Ferris, D. (2003). *Responses to student writing*: Implications for second language student. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Fisher, D. L., Waldrip, B. G., & Doeman, J. (2005). *Student Perceptions of assessment*: Development and validation of a questionnaire. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.

Gottlieb, M. (2006). *Assessing English language learners*: Bridges from language proficiency to academic achievement. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Hanna, G. S., & Dettmer, P. A. (2004) *Assessment for effective teaching*: Using context- adaptive planning. Boston, MA: Pearson A&B.

Hasselgren, A. (2000). " *The assessment of the English ability of young learners in Norwegian schools*: an innovative approach" Language Testing, 17, (12), pp.261-177.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). T*he power of Feedback Review of Educational Research*, (77)(1), pp. 81-112.

Heritage, M. (2010). *Formative Assessment*: Making it happen in the classroom: California: Corwin.

Herrera, S. G., Murry, K. G., & Cabral, R.M (2007). *Assessment accommodations for classroom teachers of culturally and linguistically diverse students*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education Inc.

Hüseyin Ö. (2014). *Turkish Teachers' Practices of Assessment for Learning in the English as a Foreign Language Classroom*. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, Vol. 5, ... No. 4, pp. 775-785, July 2014.

Leki, I. (1991). *The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college-level writing classes*. Foreign Language Annal, 24. pp.203-218.

Linn, R. & Miller, M. (2005). *Measurement and Assessment in Teaching* (9th Ed.). Upper Saddle River NJ: Merrill- Prentice Hall.

Lowenthal, P., Muth, R. (2008). *Constructivism*. In E. F. Provenzo, Jr. (Ed.), Encyclopedia of the social and cultural foundations of education. Thousand Oaks, C. A.: Sage.

McManus, S. (2008). *Attributes of effective formative assessment*. Council of Chief State School Officers.

Mertler, C. A. (1998). *Classroom assessment practices of Ohio teachers*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Ron J., Pat-El. & Harm, T., & Mien S., & Paul V. (2013). *Validation of Assessment for Learning Questionnaires for Teachers and Students*. British Journal of Educational Psychology (2013), 83, 98-113.

Patri, M. (2002). " *The influence of peer feedback on self and peer-assessment of oral skills"* Language Testing, 19, (2). pp. 109-131.

Popam, W. J. (2009). *Assessment Literacy for Teachers: Faddish or Fundamental?* Theory into Practice, 48(1), 4-11.

Sharma, S. (2006). Constructivist Approaches to Teaching-Learning. NCERT, New Delhi.

Stiggins, R. (2008). *Assessment Manifesto: A Call for the Development of Balanced Assessment Systems*. Portland, OR: ETS Assessment Training Institute.

Struyven, K., Dochy, F., & Janssens, S. (2005, August 1). *Students' Perceptions about Evaluation and Assessment in Higher Education*: A Review. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 30(4), 325-341.

Thomas, S. C. Farrell, George, M. Jacobs. (2010) *Essentials for Successful English Languag*e *Teaching*. Continuum International Publishing Group. pp. 10-11.

Volante, L. & Fazio, X. (2007). *Exploring teacher candidates' assessment literary*: Implications for teacher education reform and professional development. Canadian ...... Journal of Education, 30, 3. pp. 749-770.

Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2007). *Schooling by design:* Mission, action and achievement. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

William, D., & Thompson, M. (2008). *Integration assessment with learning:* What will it take to make it work? In C. A. Dwyer (Ed.). The future of assessment: Shaping teaching and learning. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. pp. 53-82.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX 1. Questionnaire:

APPENDIX 1. Questionnaire:

Questionnaire: Teachers' Perceptions of Assessment for Learning (AfL) in the English as a Foreign Language Classroom

Dear Teacher,

This survey is conducted to collect information about your perspectives on assessment in English language teaching. Section I contains general questions that characterize you such as gender, years of teaching experience, etc. while Section II contains a total of 28 statements about your assessment perspectives and practices. In section II, there are no right or wrong answers in this list of statements. It is simply a matter of what is true for you. Your answers will have a valuable contribution to the study. Please also make sure that the responses you give in this survey will remain strictly confidential. Please read every statement carefully and choose the best option that explains your opinion.

Thank you very much for your participation.

Section I: General Information

1. What is your gender?
    - Female
    - Male

2. Years of Teaching Experience *
    - 1-5 years
    - 6-10 years
    - 11-15 years
    - 16-20 years
    - 20 years and above

3. Type of your College/Department where you teach

(Please choose the most relevant one if you teach at a combination of two or more (e.g. College of Education & Language Centre).
    - College of Education
    - College of Basic Education
    - College of Languages
    - Language Centre

4. Do you teach in a public or private educational institution?

- Public

- Private

5. Did you take any PRE-SERVICE training in language assessment BEFORE you began to teach English?

- Yes

- No

- In-service Assessment Training

6. Did you take any IN-SERVICE training in language assessment AFTER you began to teach English?

- Yes

- No

7. Faculty / college you graduated from

- Faculty of Education (ELT)

- Faculty of Science - Letters (English Lang & Lit., English Linguistics, etc.)

- Other

8. Methods of Assessment You Use

Below are some methods of assessment. Which of them do you use in assessing your language learners? (You can tick more than one answer)

- Essay-type exam

- Short-answer exam

- Fill in the blank

- Multiple choice

- True-False

- Matching

- Oral presentation

- Oral exam

- Drama

- Project

- Portfolio

- Performance assessment

- Peer assessment

- Self-assessment

- Group work

- Observation form

- Structured grid

- Rubric
- Other

Section II: EFL teachers' perspectives on assessment for learning

There are 28 statements below. Please select the number below that best represents how you feel about your language assessment perspective and practice.

1= Strongly disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neutral, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly agree.

1. I encourage my students to reflect upon how they can improve their language learning.

1 2 3 4 5

2. After a test, I discuss the answers given with each student.

1 2 3 4 5

3. While working on their assignments, I ask my students how they think they are doing.

1 2 3 4 5

4. I involve my students in thinking about how they want to learn English at school.

1 2 3 4 5

5. I give my students the opportunity to decide on their language learning objectives.

1 2 3 4 5

6. I ask my students to indicate what went well and what went badly concerning their assignments.

1 2 3 4 5

7. I encourage students to reflect upon their learning processes and how to improve their learning.

1 2 3 4 5

8. I inform my students on their strong points concerning language learning.

1 2 3 4 5

9. I inform my students on their weak points concerning language learning.

1 2 3 4 5

10. I encourage my students to improve on their language learning processes.

1 2 3 4 5

11. I give students guidance and assistance in their language learning.

1 2 3 4 5

12. I discuss assignments with my students to help them understand the content better.

1 2 3 4 5

13. I discuss with my students the progress they have made in learning English.

1 2 3 4 5

14. After an assessment, I inform my students on how to improve their weak points.

1 2 3 4 5

15. I discuss with my students how to utilize their strengths to improve on their assignment.

1 2 3 4 5

16. Together with my students, I consider ways on how to improve on their weak points.

1 2 3 4 5

17. I adjust my language teaching whenever I notice that my students do not understand a topic.

1 2 3 4 5

18. I provide my students with guidance to help them gain understanding of the content taught.

1 2 3 4 5

19. During my class, students are given the opportunity to show what they have learned.

1 2 3 4 5

20. I ask questions in a way my students understand.

1 2 3 4 5

21. By asking questions during class, I help my students gain understanding of the content taught. *

1 2 3 4 5

22. I am open to student contribution in my class.

1 2 3 4 5

23. I allow my students to ask each other questions using English during class.

1 2 3 4 5

24. I ensure that my students know what areas they need to work on in order to improve their results.

1 2 3 4 5

25. I give my students opportunities to ask questions.

1 2 3 4 5

26. My students know what the evaluation criteria for their work are.

1 2 3 4 5

27. I ensure that my students know what they can learn from their assignments.

1 2 3 4 5

28. I can recognize when my students reach their language learning goals.

1 2 3 4 5

APPENDIX 2. Etical approval form

T.C.
İSTANBUL AYDIN ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü

Sayı   : 88083623-044
Konu : Mohammed Sherko Taher MALAZADA
       Etik Onay Hk.

Sayın Mohammed Sherko Taher MALAZADA

Tez çalışmanızda kullanmak üzere yapmayı talep ettiğiniz anketiniz İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi Etik Komisyonu'nun 07.05.2019 tarihli ve 2019/07 sayılı kararıyla uygun bulunmuştur.
Bilgilerinize rica ederim.

e-imzalıdır
Prof. Dr. Ragıp Kutay KARACA
Müdür

13/05/2019 Enstitü Sekreteri   Büke KENDER

Mohammed Sherko Taher Malazada
Sharawani Qr. Erbil
Kurdistan Region of Iraq

Contact Info:

Turkey: +90 (537) 837 8271
Email: mohammed.sherko1@gmail.com
Iraq: +964 (750) 449 8387
 Iraqi Kurdish
BD: July 4. 1989
Gender: Male

Key Skills

A friendly, caring and hardworking with a range of related experience, I have a long experience in terms of Teaching, Administration, Running International Exams, Teacher Training, Consulting, Interpretation and Translation. I take a practical approach to work and can be methodical and accurate, able to provide creative solutions to problems, with the ability to get on well with others, and have a high sense of self responsibility towards the tasks and objectives that are given at the same time.

Education:
(Master Degree) English Language and Literature (2014 to date):
Istanbul Aydin University; Master student.

 (Bachelor's Degree) English Language and Literature (2010-2011)
College of Education for Human Sciences - English Language – Salahaddin University.

 (Baccalaureate Degree) Preparatory Stage
(2005-2006) Literary Department - Kurdistan
Preparatory School.

 Work Skills
-    Teaching English Language (Different Ages)
Running International Exams (ESOL; KET – PET – FCE and City & Guilds)