Assessment Beliefs and Practices of Language Teachers in Primary Education

Kağan Büyükkarcı
Asst. Prof., Süleyman Demirel University, Turkey, *kaganbuyukkarci@sdu.edu.tr*

The use of assessment, the process of collecting information on student achievement and performance, has long been advocated so that learning cycles can properly be planned; instruction can be adjusted during the course of learning, and programs can be developed to enhance student learning. Shifting to a more pedagogical conception, the assessment moves from source of information to an inseparable part of teaching and learning. Theory and research propose that especially formative assessment can play a critical role in adjusting teaching for student learning because assessment for learning (formative assessment) provides information to be used as feedback to adjust the teaching and learning activities in which the students and teachers are engaged. This study aims to show primary school teachers' beliefs about formative assessment. Besides, the study reveals the information about English language teachers' real assessment practices in the primary education context. Despite course requirements, teachers' positive beliefs and attitudes, the results of the study show that language teachers do not apply formative assessment practices as required in the national curriculum. Instead of using assessment formatively, they mostly use assessment for summative purposes.

Keywords: Assessment, Formative, Summative, Language Teacher, Teacher Beliefs, Practices

INTRODUCTION

It's generally agreed that assessment is necessary part of teaching, by which teachers make a judgment about the level of skills or knowledge (Taras, 2005), to measure improvement over time, to evaluate strengths and weaknesses of the students, to rank them for selection or exclusion, or to motivate them (Wojtczak, 2002). Furthermore, assessment can help individual instructors obtain useful feedback on what, how much, and how well their students are learning (Taras, 2005; Stiggins, 1992). Its systematic process provides evaluating with teachers an opportunity to meaningfully reflect on how learning is best delivered, gather evidence of that, and then use that information to improve.

Regarding what components make up assessment, Marshal (2005) states that assessment includes gathering and interpreting information about a student's performance to determine his/her mastery toward pre-determined learning objectives or standards. Typically, results of tests, assignments, and other learning tasks provide the necessary

performance data. This data can help the teacher to determine the effectiveness of instructional program at school, classroom, and individual student levels. Assessment is based on the principle that the more clearly and specifically you understand how students are learning, the more efficiently you can teach them.

In the relevant literature, assessment may be classified in two main categories: The first one is summative assessment which is also called as assessment of learning (Stiggins, 2002; Earl, 2003). In an educational setting, these types of assessments are typically used to assign students a course grade at the end of a course or project. Taras (2005) states that summative assessment is a judgment which summarizes all the evidence up to a given point. This certain point is seen as finality at the point of the judgment. This type of assessment can have various functions, such as shaping how teachers organize their courses or what schools offer their students, which do not have an effect on the learning process.

The second category, on the other hand, is formative assessment, also called as assessment for learning, ongoing assessment, or dynamic assessment (Stiggins, 2002; Derrich and Ecclestone, 2006). According to Black and Wiliam (1998b), assessment refers to all those activities undertaken by teachers, and by their students in assessing themselves, which provide information to be used as feedback to change the teaching and learning activities in which they are engaged. Such assessment becomes formative assessment when the evidence is actually used to adapt the teaching work to meet the needs. In Threlfall's (2005) terms "formative assessment may be defined as the use of assessment judgments about capacities or competences to promote the further learning of the person who has been assessed" (p. 54).

In general terms, formative assessment is concerned with helping pupils to improve their learning. In practice, formative assessment is a self-reflective process that intends to promote student attainment (Crooks, 2001). Cowie and Bell (1999) define it as the bidirectional process between teacher and student to improve, recognize and respond to the learning. Similarly, Shepherd (2005: 66) explains formative assessment as 'a dynamic process in which supportive teachers or classmates help students move from what they already know to what they are able to do next, using their zone of proximal development'. Formative or dynamic assessment aims at optimizing the measurement of students' intellectual abilities. They try to provide a more complete picture of child's real and maturing cognitive structures and performance and, on this basis, advance the diagnosis of learning difficulties (Allal & Ducrey, 2000).

The evidence indicates that high quality formative assessment certainly has a powerful impact on student learning. Black and William (1998a) report that the studies of formative assessment show an effect size on standardized tests of between 0.4 and 0.7, which is larger than most known educational interventions. (The effect size is the ratio of the average improvement in test scores in the improvement to the range of scores of typical groups of pupils on the same tests; Black and William recognize that standardized tests are very limited measures of learning). On the contrary, formative

assessment is especially effective for students who have not done well in school, thus narrowing the gap between low and high achievers while raising overall achievement.

Principles in Formative Assessment

As teachers try to implement formative assessment into classroom practice, they have to decide what to try and what to develop in their context. This is because they have to make judgments about how formative assessment can be implemented within the constraints of their own assessment procedures and those of their school. The Assessment Reform Group (2002) has set out 10 principles for formative assessment. According to these principles, assessment for learning should:

- be part of effective planning of teaching and learning,

- focus on how students learn,

- be recognized as central to classroom practice,

- be regarded as a key professional skill for teachers,

- be sensitive and constructive because any assessment has an emotional impact,

- take account of the importance of learner motivation,

- promote commitment to learning goals and a shared understanding of the criteria by which they are assessed,

- enable learners to receive constructive guidance about how to improve,

- develop learners' capacity for self-assessment so that they can become reflective and self-managing,

- recognize the full range of achievements of all learners.

Among these principles, Black and Wiliam (1998a) set out four main headings for formative assessment practice: *sharing learning goals, questioning, self/peer assessment,* and *feedback*. Formative assessment is a systematic process to continuously gather evidence about learning. This data are used to identify a student's current level of learning and to adapt lessons to help the student reach the desired learning goal. In formative assessment, students are active participants with their teachers, *sharing learning goals* and understanding how their learning is progressing, what next steps they need to take, and how to take them.

Sharing learning goals, moreover, gives the students a chance to become involved in what they are learning through discussing and deciding the criteria for success, which they can then use to recognize proof of improvements. Therefore, information about learning objectives and success criteria needs to be presented in clear, explicit language which students can understand. Quite often, messages can be expressed in language that is intelligible to the sender but meaningless to the recipient. Teachers should avoid such misunderstandings when sharing with students what they are to learn.

According to Young (2005), as well as helping pupils to be more involved in their own learning, sharing and using success criteria also provides a link into assessment of learning. If success criteria are used well, they will help pupils to identify evidence to show that they are closing the gap between where they were and where they want to be. Finding consistency in matching evidence of learning with pre-determined success criteria is also important for teachers seeking to share standards through local moderation.

Questioning is another key aspect of the teaching and learning process. It is also an important element in formative assessment (Harlen, 2007). The quality of the assessment is affected by the quality of the questioning. Thus, questions should be planned and prepared so that they elicit an appropriate response from the children that shows what they know, can do and understand. However, Black and et al. (2004) state that many teachers do not plan what to ask and say to their students. According to them, there are two main aspects in questioning: one is framing the question to be asked; and the other is timing, especially the time allowed for answering.

Similarly, Burns (2005) advocated questioning as a formative assessment practice which helps students to take active part in their assessment and learning. Whether verbal or written, planned questions can be used to explore student responses and elicit student reasoning. These kinds of questions provide teachers insights into student thinking that can guide their refinement of future lessons. It also helps students reflect on their own thought processes. Additionally, Black and Wiliam (1998b) identify another use of questioning to explore and develop students' prior knowledge. This kind of use requiring students to compose answers with explanations to explore their prior knowledge of new work improve learning, and this helps learners to relate the old information to the new information and to avoid superficial conclusions about the new content.

Self-assessment accordingly is another fundamental element in learning. Crooks (2001) asserts that feedback on assessment cannot be effective unless students accept that their work can be improved and recognize important features of their work that they wish to develop. If students are supported to critically examine and comment on their own work, assessment can contribute powerfully to the educational development of students. Sadler (1989) similarly states that self-assessment is essential for progress as a learner: for understanding of selves as learners, for an increasingly complex understanding of tasks and learning goals, and for strategic knowledge of how to go about improving (In Brookhart, 2001). On the other hand, *peer-assessment* connects to similar principles, the most clear of which is cooperative learning (Brown, 2004). It has, as Black & et al. (2003) point out, uniquely valuable for several reasons for students' learning; the first one is that peer-assessment has been found to improve student motivation to work carefully. Another reason is that interchange in peer discussions is in the language that the students use between themselves, which can provide common language forms, and tenable models. Third reason is that feedback from a group to a teacher can take more

attention than that of an individual, and so peer-assessment helps strengthen the student voice and develops communication between teacher and the students about their learning.

Feedback is also a key element for formative assessment. According to Ramaprasad (1983), feedback is "information about the gap between the actual level and reference level of a system parameter which is used to alter the gap in some way" (p. 4; in Sadler, 1989, p. 120). Formative assessment aims to close this distance or gap, and feedback becomes one of the basic and necessary steps. Teachers usually use different types of feedback such as evaluative and descriptive feedback. Evaluative feedback is mostly grading. On the descriptive side, however, all of the feedback has a positive intention (Brookhart, 2008). Even criticism, if it is descriptive and not judgmental, is intended to be constructive. Descriptive feedback is telling children they are right or wrong, describing why an answer is correct, telling children what they have or have not achieved, and so on. By telling students they are right or wrong, teachers separate the correct from the incorrect; so that the students know which ways to follow in the future and which they would need to think about again. Formative feedback is even more effective when it gives details about why student's answer is correct or incorrect together with commentary on good or poor strategy. It is important to make a concerted effort to provide details such as *this poem shows very good use of adjectives- you have used "freckly" and "polished" which is a very good description of the top side of leaves*.

As obvious from the issues discussed above, formative assessment and its actual practices in classes can be said to be highly beneficial for students' learning process. Therefore, what language teachers think and actually do about formative assessment in their real classrooms is the main concern of this study. Also, it is believed that the results of this study will shed light on both the strong and problematic areas of teachers' ideas and actual practices about assessment for learning, which may lead to a better understanding of the importance of assessment in students' language learning processes.

METHODOLOGY

Purpose

The purpose of the study was to outline the formative assessment perceptions of primary school English teachers using the sample of sixty nine cases in Adana, Turkey. Moreover, this study aimed to show the difference (if any) in teachers' opinions and real formative assessment applications in English courses in Turkish primary schools.

Designed as a descriptive research, this study aims to find out answers to the following research questions:

1- What are English language teachers' beliefs about using formative assessment?

2- What are their actual assessment practices in their teaching environment?

3- What are the reasons for using/not using formative assessment in their classes?

For this aim, both qualitative and quantitative data collection tools were used, and they will be explained in the sections below.

Sampling

69 primary school English language teachers working at different state (primary) schools in Adana were investigated in this study. The teachers all had between five to fifteen years of experience in English language teaching. After getting the required permissions from Adana National Education Directory, the data collection tool was first sent to 60 (sixty) randomly selected primary schools –out of 100- in Adana city. Those schools have more than 200 English teachers. Only 69 of these teachers completed the questionnaire.

Data collecting tools

The data were collected using a questionnaire consisting of eight main headings with several items. After reviewing the related literature, items addressing the issues such as teachers' class size, average number of students, their class hours per week, their personal and professional development activities, and their ideas and applications of formative assessment were included in the questionnaire. The items were likert-scale type in each section.

The first version of the questionnaire was piloted with 20 teachers of English working for the Ministry of Education in different cities in Turkey. After analyzing the responses and suggestions of the teachers, some questionnaire items, which were analyzed using SPSS 18 to calculate statistics, were omitted or reworded, and some items remained unchanged.

To support quantitative data, an interview was conducted with 10 (ten) randomly selected teachers (out of sixty-nine) who completed the questionnaire and agreed to be interviewed about their formative practices and their ideas about formative assessment. In social research interviews, the purpose is to elicit information from respondent or interviewee about their attitudes, norms, beliefs, and values (Bryman, 2008). The reason for using semi-structured interview is that it is more flexible than standardized methods such as the structured interview or survey. Although the researcher had some established general topics for examination in this study, this interview allowed for the exploration of rising ideas. During the semi-structured interview, the teachers were asked similar questions with the questionnaire. However, open-ended questions searching for more detailed explanations about formative assessment yielded a better understanding for ideas about formative assessment and the actual formative practices in the classroom.

Data analysis

In this part, firstly, the data will be discussed in terms of the participant teachers' student numbers in their classes and their course hours. Then, teachers' ideas about formative assessment usage in classrooms and their formative practices in their own classrooms will be compared to understand if there is a statistically significant difference between

them. As the questions in the interview mostly follow a parallel structure with the questionnaire for a deeper understanding, the qualitative data derived from the semi-structured interview will be explained after each table given below.

General Information about the Primary School Teachers

The participant teachers in the study will be explained in terms of their student numbers, total number of their weekly course hour.

Table 1: Overall information about the number of students in the classrooms

		Number of Students					Total
		10-20	*20-30*	*30-40*	*40-50*	*50-60*	
Teachers	Frequency	1	12	36	19	1	69
	Percent %	1.4	17.4	52.2	27.5	1.4	100

According to Table 1, only one teacher out of sixty nine (1.4%) has a class that has 10-20 students, which can be considered *ideal* student number in a classroom setting; twelve teachers (17.4%) have 20-30 students in their classes. On the other hand, 36 teachers' (52.2%) classes consist of 30-40 students, a class which can be regarded as a *crowded* classroom. Even worse, there are 19 teachers (27.5%) have *over-crowded* classes which consist of 40-50 students. Lastly, one teacher (1.4%) has 50-60 students in his/her classroom. Meanwhile, 56 teachers can be said to have more students than an average classroom. One of the teachers stated this situation in her interview as:

T1: ...Although I have 26 students in my classroom, which can be acceptable in Turkey's educational settings, it can still be considered as crowed for a language class...

On the other hand, another teacher, who had more than 35 students in her classroom, in the following excerpt found it almost impossible to teach English:

T2... There are almost 40 students in my classroom. They all have different educational and family backgrounds, which make it really difficult to teach them English...

English teachers' work load in their schools will be explained In Table 2 below. Their weekly course hours will be given and its effects on their language practices will be analyzed.

Table 2: Teachers' weekly class hours in their schools

Weekly Class Hours	*Frequency*	*Percent (%)*
10-15	1	1.4
15-20	14	20.3
20-25	32	46.4
25-30	22	31.9

In Table 2, only one teacher (1.4%) has 10-15 class hours in a week; fourteen teachers (20.3%) have at least 15 class hours. On the other hand, 32 teachers (46.4%) have 20-25

class hours in a week, and 22 teachers (31.4%) have 25-30 class hours in week time. As it is clear from Table 2, most of the teachers have crowded classes, and have more than 20 class hours in a week, which causes a really heavy work-load for the teachers. Another struggling problem that the interviewed teachers pointed was that they had a heavy course schedule:

T3: I have to teach English 30 hours in a week, which means six hours in a day…After finishing the classes in school, I have no power to do next day's preparations…

Besides having crowed classes, 54 teachers out of 69 (approximately 78%) have at least 25 or more classes in week (see Table 2 above), which is another remarkable difficulty for teaching English.

The Differences between Ideas of the Teachers on Formative Assessment and Their Formative Assessment Practices

In this study the participant teachers were also asked to indicate their ideas and beliefs about formative assessment and whether it should be used in their classroom or not. The items in the questionnaire were in likert-scale type as: *strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), agree (3), and strongly agree (4).* The teachers were given the statements below to express their beliefs about formative assessment:

-   *Learning outcomes and aims of the lesson should be discussed with pupils.*

-   *Pupils are generally honest and reliable in both assessing themselves and others if they have a clear picture of the targets.*

-   *Oral and written feedback to students about their strengths and weaknesses without giving the students any grades or marks is a useful way to improve learning.*

-   *Assessment must be an integral and on-going part of the learning process, not limited to final products or tests.*

Then the teachers were requested to specify their actual formative practices in their classrooms. The items in the questionnaire were in likert-scale type as: *rarely or never (1), a few times in a month (2), a few times in a week (3),* and *almost every class (4).* The statements about in-class formative practices of teachers were as follows:

-   *I share learning outcomes with students*

-   *Students assess their own work*

-   *Students assess their classmates*

-   *I provide oral and written feedback to students in class*

In Table 3, the difference between English teachers' beliefs about formative assessment and their actual formative practices will be explained and discussed.

Table 3: Paired-sample T-test results of teacher beliefs on formative assessment and their formative assessment applications in classroom

	N	X	S	sd	t	p
Beliefs about Formative Assessment	67	3.15	.48			
				66	9.32	.000
Actual Formative Assessment Applications in Class	67	2.39	.57			

The mean of the teachers' beliefs about formative assessment is 3.15. This mean in Table 3 shows that they typically think that formative assessment can be useful in their classroom settings. However, when considered, the teachers' actual formative assessment mean is 2.39. That is, the teachers indicated that they only use formative practices *a few times in a month/week*. This positive belief about formative assessment can also be seen in their interviews:

T4: ...I am aware of the fact that what my students really care is their tests and assessments in the class. So it may be the best way to include my students in this process…

Another teacher stated that she finds it really useful to use peer/self-assessment in her classroom:

T5: If you show and explain them what and how to do, students are very reliable when they evaluate their own and their peers' work...sometimes they are even harder teachers during assessing their own sentences...

Although teachers' opinions about formative assessment is positive, the means of their beliefs about formative assessment and their actual formative assessment practices indicate a statistically significant difference (t(9,32)= 66, p=.000). This difference shows that although the teachers believe that formative assessment is beneficial for their students' learning and should be used in teaching English, they cannot use it frequently or in every class. A teacher explained why she cannot apply enough formative assessment practices in her classroom although she believes that they can be really helpful for his students' learning process:

T6: …*in the past I never shared my goals with the students, but now, I am trying to explain what and why they will learn at that lesson. However, it is not always possible to discuss what and why they will learn (for example: why they need "future tense") it in detail due to having limited time and very crowed classes.*

Another teacher stated that why it is so hard to do self/peer assessment:

T7: *there are 35 young learners in my classroom, and I have to teach 30 hours in week. Although they enjoy evaluating their peers' writings, sometimes they can be so hard to control during this assessment process… also, it is sometimes so difficult to give written and verbal feedback to each student individually due to crowded classroom setting and intense curriculum. That's why, I generally use their exam papers both for assessing what they learned-as summative purposes- and for giving feedback to my students …*

As can be seen from the quantitative and qualitative data above, there seems to be a gap between the teachers' beliefs about formative assessment and their real formative applications which include self/peer assessment, sharing learning goals, and giving written or verbal feedback.

DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

The data of the study have some important implications for this study. Firstly, it can clearly be seen that English teachers have positive attitudes about formative assessment. Besides, they believe that the basics of formative assessment such as *feedback, sharing learning goals, peer and self-assessment* should be applied in their classrooms, and that they can be useful for their students' learning process. Second finding is that they cannot use formative assessment practices in their classes very often and effectively. There are some reasons for this (statistically significant) difference between the teachers' positive beliefs and their actual formative practices in their classrooms. The first thing to consider is that most of the teachers have *crowded and overcrowded* classrooms. There sometimes can be up to 60 students in a class, which makes the use of formative assessment very hard to implement. Another reason for not using formative assessment is that the teachers have a heavy work load, most of them having more than 20 hours of class in a week and a lot of topics to teach. Even though they do not stop trying to use some of the formative practices for the sake of enhancing their students' learning, such issues make it difficult for English teachers to apply formative assessment effectively in their classes.

The Ministry of Education in Turkey encourages a more formative assessment-based process in the classes in the *English Language Curriculum for Primary Education* (2006) by stating that "…What is more, the pedagogical functions of the ELP– making the language learning process more transparent to learners, helping them to develop their capacity for reflection and self-assessment, and thus enabling them gradually to assume more and more responsibility for their own learning – coincides with the emphasis on learning how to learn and developing critical thinking skills that are found in contemporary language teaching approaches and methods… (p.23)", but the actual in-class formative practices of the teachers in English classes are not reflected in this curriculum. Even if formative assessment has really positive effects such as enhancing student learning (Svihla, 2006) on student assessment and learning (Black & Wiliam, 1998a; Black & Wiliam 1998b; Brookhart, 2001), due to heavy work-load and crowed classes, the teachers have to choose mostly summative assessment in their schools.

Despite the limitations of this study, it stills points to the difficulty of promoting formative assessment in real classrooms. Even if the use of more formative modes of assessment appear to be essential and useful in order to support student learning, other specific factors (such as the effects of high-stakes exams on students' and teachers' ideas, teachers' individuals beliefs about teaching and learning, and/or the biases in curriculum and realities of classroom settings and students, etc.) influencing teachers' approaches need to be taken into consideration in order to use assessment for learning purposes (Black & Wiliam, 2003).

REFERENCES

Allal, L. & Ducrey, G. P. (2000). Assessment of-or in- the zone of proximal development. *Learning and Instruction, 10*, 137-152.

Assessment Reform Group (2002). *Assessment for Learning*: *10 research-based principles to guide classroom practice*. Retrieved 7th November, 2009 from http://www.assessment-reform-group.org/CIE3.PDF

Black, P. & Wiliam, D. (1998a). Inside the black box-raising the standards through classroom assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan, 80/2*, 139-148.

Black, P. & Wiliam, D. (2003). 'In praise of educational research': formative assessment. *British Educational research Journal, 29/5*, 623-637.

Black, P. & Wiliam, D. (1998b). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 5/1*, 7-74.

Black, P., Harrison, C., Lee, C., Marshall, B. & Wiliam, D. (2003). *Assessment for learning: putting it into practice*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Black, P., Harrison, C., Lee, C., Marshall, B., & Wiliam, D. (2004). Working inside the black box: assessment for learning in the classroom. *Phi Delta Kappan. 86/1*, 8-21.

Brookhart, S. M. (2001). Successful students' formative and summative uses of assessment information. *Assessment in Education*, *8/2,* 153-169.

Brookhart, S. M. (2008). *How to give feedback to your students*. United States. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Retrieved December, 04, 2009 from http://www.ascd.org/publications/books/108019.aspx

Bryman, A. (2008). *Social research methods*, Oxford University Press, New York.

Burns, M. (2005). Looking at how students reason. *Educational Leadership*, *63/3,* 26–31.

Cowie, B. & Bell, B. (1999). A model of formative assessment in science education, *Assessment in Education*, *6*, 101-116.

Crooks, T. (2001). *The validity of formative assessment*. Paper presented to the British Educational Research Association Annual Conference, University of Leeds, 13-15 September. Retrieved November 19th, 2009 from http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00001862.htm

Derrich, J. & Ecclestone, K. (2006). Formative assessment in adult literacy, language and numeracy programmes: a literature review for the OECD. Draft.

Earl, L. (2003). Assessment as learning: using classroom assessment to maximize student learning. Thousand Oaks, CA, Corwin Press.

Harlen, W. (2007). Formative classroom assessment in science and mathematics. In J. H. McMillan. (2007). *Formative Classroom Assessment: From Theory to Practice*. *116-136*. Teachers College Press. New York.

Marshal, J. M. (2005). *Formative assessment: mapping the road to success*. Online Document. Retrieved February 24th, 2009 from http://www.dcsclients.com/~tprk12/Research_Formative%20Assessment_White_Paper.pdf

Sadler, D.R. (1989). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. *Instructional Science*, *18/2*, 119-144.

Shepard, L. A. (2005). Linking formative assessment to scaffolding. *Educational Leadership, 63/3*, 66-70.

Stiggins, R. (1992). *High quality classroom assessment: what does it really mean?* NCME Instructional Topics in Educational Measurement Series, Module 12, Summer 1992. (Online) at http://www.ncme.org/pubs/items/19.pdf

Stiggins, R. J. (2002). Assessment crisis: the absence of assessment for learning. *Online article. Kappan Professional Journal*. Retrieved 4th July, 2008, from http://electronicportfolios.org/afl/Stiggins-AssessmentCrisis.pdf.

Svihla, V. (2006). Formative assessment: reducing math phobia and related test anxiety in a geology class for non-science majors. *Proceedings of the 7th international conference on learning sciences.*

Taras, M. (2005). Assessment -summative and formative- some theoretical reflections. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 53/4*, 466-478.

Threlfall, J. (2005). The formative use of assessment information in planning – the notion of contingent planning. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, *53/1*, 54–65.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, Eds. And Trans.; original works published 1930–1935).

Wojtczak, A. (2002). *Glossary of medical education terms*. Retrieved 13th May, 2009, from http://www.iime.org/glossary.htm

Young, E. (2005). *Assessment for learning: embedding and extending*. Retrieved 5th November, 2009 from http://www.ltscotland.org.uk/Images/Assessment%20for%20Learning%20version%202 vp_tcm4-385008.pdf

Turkish Abstract

İlkokuldaki Dil Öğretmenlerinin Değerlendirme İnançları ve Uygulamaları

Öğrenci başarısı ve performansında bilgi toplama süreci olan değerlendirme, öğrenme döngüsünün düzenli olarak planlanmasını sağladığı için uzun zamandır desteklenmiştir. Eğitim öğrenme esnasında düzenlenebilir ve programlar öğrenmeyi artırmak için geliştirilebilir. Eğitsel bir kavrama doğru yön değiştiren değerlendirme, bilgi edinme kaynağı olmaktan çıkarak öğretme ve öğrenmenin ayrılmaz bir parçası haline gelmektedir. Teori ve araştırmalar göstermektedir ki özellikle biçimlendirici değerlendirme öğretme sürecinin yeniden düzenlenmesinde kritik bir rol oynamaktadır çünkü biçimlendirici değerlendirme (öğrenme için değerlendirme) öğrenci ve öğretmenlerin içinde bulunduğu öğrenme ve öğretme aktivitelerinin düzenlenmesi için geri bildirim sağlar. Bu çalışma ilkokul öğretmenlerinin biçimlendirici değerlendirme hakkındaki inanışlarını göstermeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bunun yanı sıra bu çalışma ilkokul İngilizce öğretmenlerinin gerçekte kullandıkları değerlendirme uygulamalarını ortaya koymaktadır. Çalışman sonuçları göstermektedir ki ders gereksinimlerine, öğretmenlerin pozitif inanış ve tutumlarına rağmen, yabancı dil öğretmenleri biçimlendirici değerlendirme uygulamalarını yapmamaktadır. Değerlendirmeyi öğretme ve öğrenme süreçlerini yeniden şekillendirmek yerine çoğunlukla bilgiyi ölçme amaçlı kullandıkları bulunmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Değerlendirme, Biçimlendirici, Özet, Dil Öğretmeni, Öğretmen İnanışları, Uygulamalar

French Abstract

L'Évaluation des Croyance et les Pratiques des Enseignants de Langues dans l'Enseignement Primaire.

L'utilisation de l'évaluation, le procesuss de collecte d'informations en réusite et en performance de létudiant,a été prôné depuis longtemps pour les cycles d'apprentissage peut être planifié ; l'instruction peur être developpés afin d'améliorerl'apprentissage de l'étudiant. Comme passage à une conceptions plus pédagogique, l'évaluation se déplace du source d'information à la partie inséperable de l'enseignement et l'apprentissage. La théroie et la recherche proposent que surtout l'évaluation formative peut jouer un rôle critique à ajuster l'enseignement pour l'apprentissage de l'étudiant. Parce que l'évaluation de l'apprentissage (l'évaluation formative) fournit l'information pour être utilisé comme feedback à ajuster les activités d'enseignement et d'apprentissage dans lesquelles les étudiants et les enseignants sont engagés. Cette étude vise á montrer les croyance des enseignants de l'école primaire sur l'évaluation formative. En plus, l'étude se rélève les information sur les pratiques d'évaluation réel des professeurs d'Anglais dans le context de l'éducation primaire. Malgré les exigences de cours et les croyances et les attidutes positives des enseignants, les résultats de l'étude montrent que les professeurs de langues n'appliquent pas les pratiques d'évaluation formative selon les besoins du programme d'enseignement national. Au lieu d'utiliser l'évaluation formative, ils utilisent plus souvent l'évaluation des objectives sommatives.

Mots clés: Evaluation; Formative; Sommative; Enseignant de la Langue; Croyance,; Pratiques des Enseignants.

Arabic Abstract

التقويم ، المعتقدات وممارسة اللغة من قبل معلمين يعملون في مراحل التعليم الأساسي

إن " التقويم " هي عبارة عملية يُراد بها جمع المعلومات عن الدارس من خلال إنجازاته و أستاذ مساعد / تركيا كاقان بايو هذا ، فالتقويم قد أوصى به المربون منذ عهد بعيد بهدف استمرار دوران عجلة التعلم. ومن خلال التقويم أدائة في الدراسة . يتم التخطيط السليم للتعليم ــ وعبر التقويم يُمكن ضبط سير التعليم ، كما يمكن تطوير طرق التعلم ووسائله مما يساعد ذلك في اذا أنتقلنا إلى مفهوم أخر نقول : أن التقويم سيتحول من مورد للمعلومات إلى الجزء الذي لا يتجزأ من تحسين أداء الطالب (أي : التقويم الذي يتم من واقع ما يُرى وما يُشاهد) التدريس و التعلم ، فالنظرية و البحث يؤكدان أن التقويم التشكيلي يمكن أنه يلعب دوراً هاماً في ضبط عملية التدريس ــ هنا ، التقويم من أجل التعلم يولد معلومات يمكن الأستفاده منها كتغذية كما و الأستفادة منها في ضبط أنشطة التدريس والتعلم ــ أي الأنشطه التي يعني بها كل مدرس وتلميذ هذه الدراسة راجعة الهدف منها و أظهار ما يفتقده مدرسوا المراحل الأساسية من مفهوم هام ، الا وهو التقويم التشكيلي ، بعلاوة على ذلك أن هذه الدراسة تبين المعلومات عن التقويم الحقيقي للدارسين من قبل مدرسي اللغة الأنجليزية الذين يعملون تحت مظلة التعليم والجدير بالذكر أنه رغم متطلبات المنهج ، ورغم الإعتقاد الإيجابي فيه ورغم الإتجاهات إلا أن نتائج الدراسة الأساسي . أثبتت أن مدرسي اللغة لا يطيقون ما يدعو له التقويم التشكيلي التي ورد في المنهج الوطني ، وبدلأ من ذلك فإنهم يستخدمون تقويماً من أجل الهدف الجمعي .

مفردات أساسيه : تقويم ، تشكيلي ، أجماعلي ، مدرس لغة ، معتقدات المدرس .