

REPUBLIC OF TURKEY

ÇAĞ UNIVERSITY

DIRECTORSHIP OF THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

We certify that thesis under “**ENGLISH TEACHERS’ CLASSROOM ASSESSMENT PRACTICES AND THEIR VIEWS ABOUT THE ETHICS OF CLASSROOM ASSESSMENT PRACTICES**” which was prepared by **Erdal CAN** with number **20148071** is satisfactory for the award of the degree of **Master of Arts** in the department of **English Language Education**.



ÖZET**İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN SINIF DEĞERLENDİRME
ALİŞTIRMALARI VE SINIF DEĞERLENDİRME ALİŞTIRMALARININ ETİK
BOYUTU HAKKINDAKİ GÖRÜŞLERİ****Erdal CAN****Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı****Tez Danışmanı: Doç. Dr. Şehnaz ŞAHİNKARAKAŞ****Nisan 2017, 64 sayfa**

Bu çalışma İngilizce öğretmenlerinin sınıf değerlendirme alıştırmaları ve sınıf değerlendirme çalışmalarının etik boyutu hakkındaki görüşlerini, öğretmenlerin çalıştıkları eğitim seviyesi, öğretmenlik deneyimleri, çalıştıkları kurumlar ve eğitim durumları açısından incelemektedir. Data 143 İngilizce öğretmeninden Değerlendirme Alıştırmaları Ölçeği ve araştırmacı tarafından yazılan örnek durumlar aracılığıyla toplanmıştır. Analizler için Betimsel ve Çıkarımsal İstatistikler (T-test, Tek Yönlü ANOVA) kullanılmıştır. Sonuçlara göre, öğretmenlerin çalıştıkları eğitim seviyesi yükseldikçe, kalem-kâğıt testlerine olan bağımlılıkları artmaktadır. Ayrıca, farklı tip kurumlarda (Devlet/Özel) çalışan öğretmenler sınıf değerlendirme alıştırmalarının etik boyutu hakkında farklı görüşlere sahiptir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Değerlendirme, Etik, Sınıf Değerlendirme Alıştırmaları, Geçerlilik ve Güvenirlilik, Notlandırma, Başarı dışı Temelli Notlandırma

ABSTRACT**ENGLISH TEACHERS' CLASSROOM ASSESSMENT PRACTICES AND
THEIR VIEWS ABOUT THE ETHICS OF CLASSROOM ASSESSMENT
PRACTICES****Erdal CAN****M.A. Thesis, Department of English Language Education****Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şehnaz ŞAHİNKARAKAŞ****April 2017, 64 pages**

This study investigates language teachers' classroom assessment practices and their views about the ethics of classroom assessment practices in terms of the education level the teachers teach at, the teachers' years of teaching experience, the institutions they work for, and their educational background. Data from 143 English teachers was collected through Assessment Practices Inventory (API) and the situations that are written by the researcher. Descriptive and Inferential Statistics (t-test, One Way ANOVA) were carried out for the analysis. According to the results, as the education level that teachers teach at increases, they depend more on paper-pencil tests. In addition, teachers who work for different types of institutions (public/private) have different views about the ethics of the classroom assessment practices.

Keywords: Assessment, Ethics, Classroom Assessment Practices, Validity and Reliability, Grading, Non-achievement Based Grading.

ABBREVIATIONS

UPP	:	Using Paper–Pencil Tests;
STRI	:	Standardized testing, Test Revision, and Instructional Improvement;
COMEG	:	Communicating Assessment Results;
UPA	:	Using Performance Assessment;
NG	:	Non-achievement-Based Grading;
ETVR	:	Ensuring Test Validity and Reliability



TABLE OF CONTENTS

COVER	I
APPROVAL PAGE	II
ÖZET	III
ABSTRACT	IV
ABBREVIATIONS	V
TABLE OF CONTENTS	VI
LIST OF TABLES	VIII

CHAPTER 1

1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background of the Study.....	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem.....	3
1.3. Purpose of the Study.....	3
1.4. Significance of the Study.....	4
1.5. Research Questions.....	5

CHAPTER 2

2. LITERATURE REVIEW	6
2.1. Assessment.....	6
2.1.1. Assessment in Language Learning	7
2.1.2. Classroom Assessment and Classroom Assessment Practices.....	7
2.1.2.1. Using Paper-Pencil Tests.....	9
2.1.2.2. Standardized Testing, Test Revision, Instructional Development.....	9
2.1.2.3. Communicating Assessment Results, Ethics and Grading.....	10
2.1.2.4. Performance Assessment.....	11
2.1.2.5. Non-achievement Based Grading.....	11
2.1.2.6. Ensuring the Test Validity and Reliability	12
2.2. Ethics.....	12
2.2.1. Ethics in Language Assessment.....	12
2.3. Summary	19

CHAPTER 3

3. METHODOLOGY	20
3.1. Research Design	20
3.2. Participants	21
3.3. Data Collection Tools and Procedures.....	22
3.4. Data Analysis	24

CHAPTER 4

4. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS	26
4.1. Data Analysis and Results related to Teachers' Classroom Assessment Practices	26
4.1.1. Descriptive Statistics related to Teachers' Classroom Assessment Practices	27
4.1.2. Inferential Statistics related to Teachers' Classroom Assessment Practices	32
4.2. Data Analysis and Results related to Teachers' Views about the Ethics of the Classroom Assessment Practices.....	37
4.3. Data Analysis and Results for the relation between Teachers' Classroom Assessment Practices and their Views about the Ethics of the Classroom Assessment Practices	41

CHAPTER 5

5. CONCLUSION	43
5.1. Summary	43
5.2. Discussion	44
5.3. Limitations of the Study.....	46
5.4. Implications and Suggestions for Further Studies.....	46
6. REFERENCES	48
7. APPENDICES	51
7.1. Appendix 1: Assessment Practices Inventory	51
7.2. Appendix 2: Situations about Classroom Assessment Practices.....	55

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Main Concerns of Fairness	13
Table 2.	A comparison of five different codes of ethics for testing	16
Table 3.	Demographic Characteristics of the Participants.....	22
Table 4.	Descriptive Statistics for English Teachers' Classroom Assessment Practices.....	27
Table 5.	Descriptive Statistics Classroom Assessment Practices in terms of six Factors	31
Table 6.	Results of t-test for Language Teachers' Classroom Assessment Practices by the Teachers' Educational Background.....	33
Table 7.	Results of t-test for Language Teachers' Classroom Assessment Practices by the School Type.....	34
Table 8.	Results of Descriptive Statistics for Language Teachers' Classroom Assessment Practices by the Education Level They Teach at.....	35
Table 9.	Results of One Way ANOVA for Language Teachers' Classroom Assessment Practices by the Education Level They Teach at.....	36
Table 10.	Descriptive Statistics for Teachers' Views about Ethics of Assessment Practices.....	38
Table 11.	Results of t-test and Descriptive Statistics for Language Teachers' Views about Ethics of the Classroom Assessment Practices by the School Type	41
Table 12.	Correlations between Teachers' Classroom Assessment Practices and Their Views about Ethics of the Assessment Practices.....	42

CHAPTER 1

1. INTRODUCTION

Classroom assessment practices used by the language teachers and the teachers' ideas with regard to ethics of classroom assessment practices are examined in detail in the course of this study. They were investigated in terms of the education level the teachers teach at, the teachers' years of teaching experience, the institutions they work for and their educational backgrounds. The study also examines the relation between the teachers' classroom assessment practices and their views about the ethics of classroom assessment practices. First chapter presents the background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, significance of the study and research questions.

1.1. Background of the Study

Language, not just the sound signaling system, is the most distinctive trait of human beings. Considering this complex trait, every pace of the language learning and teaching process should be carefully examined. Accordingly, assessment is a matter of supreme importance, for it is the key factor in deciding upon whether the process is appropriate for the goals of learning/teaching a language.

Assessment was once regarded as the process that decides whether the objectives were realized or not; therefore, it was crucial to assess the learners at the end of the instructional activities rather than assess them before or during the whole instruction process (William, 2011). Assessment, as a significant process in teaching, has been considerably affected with regard to developments in teaching and learning notion. More recently, assessment is defined as a process, which incorporates a wide area; accordingly, students' performance is even subconsciously evaluated by the instructors at whatever point they respond to a question, offers a remark, or tries out a new word or structure (Brown, 2004, p. 4).

Language assessment is the field of study, main focus of which is collecting valid and reliable data, particularly the data related to learners' language ability (Norris, 2000). The data that are gathered for language assessment may be related to one specific skill or integration of the skills. Language assessment has a large domain, so it is possible to observe a wide range of assessment tools and practices that are specifically used in language assessment. According to Tran (2012), language assessment practices

can be as simple as testing an individual student's language ability or an elaborated task of evaluating a whole language learning program. However, it is the subject and purpose of the assessment that determines the assessment practices. Deciding upon which assessment practices will be used in the assessment process is just an early step of the process. Performing predetermined assessment practices is also another crucial step in the language assessment and it brings some concerns.

Ethics of the assessment practices has been mostly stated while using the assessment practices. The concerns over the ethical application of the assessment practices are not a new issue and language testing has always received great attention in terms of ethical aspects. For ethical assessment, standards that are decided professionally have received great attention in the field of language testing. Some professional test makers published language testing codes while some others stressed the democratic aspects of the testing (Estaji, 2011, Jia, 2009 and Shohamy, 2001).

In a study, conducted by Zhang & Burry-Stock (2003), regarding the classroom assessment practices of teachers in terms of variables such as teaching level, experience and content areas, it is found out that teachers' preferences on choosing more objective tests mainly depends on the level of students. As the level of the students increase, the teachers tend to apply much more objective assessment practices because of their concerns over the quality of the assessment. According to Bachman (2010) and Estaji (2011), the notion of ethics in language assessment is one of the basic debates in the field; therefore, the study conducted by Estaji (2011) aims to review the principles of ethical language assessment from various aspects and the central question needs to be answered in the study is determining whether an assessment practice can be defined as ethical or moral.

The ethical concerns over the assessment practices have recently risen in many studies. The study conducted by Green, Johnson, Kim and Pope (2006) aims to review teachers' ideas about ethic of an assessment practice by presenting them scenarios of the practices and wanting them to define the practices as ethical or unethical. While more than half of the teachers who responded the scenarios have the same idea about practices, the others still have different ideas about the practices. It shows us that there are still debates over the notion of ethic of assessment practices and there is no consensus among the educators from various institutions. These studies show that there are ethical concerns over the assessment practices that are performed in the classroom

and this study specifically seeks to investigate language teachers' classroom assessment practices and their views about the ethics of the classroom assessment practices.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

In language assessment, it is possible to observe the ongoing process of concentrating on the assignments to be achieved by assessment of language, importance of the expected application of language practices in fulfilling these assignments and assessing the degree to which assignments of language assessment are being fulfilled with the assistance of assessment practices (Norris, 2000). Whereas the major principles of assessment and the assessment types enable language teachers to have a better understanding of classroom assessment process, it is the teachers that choose the most appropriate way of assessment. In this way, teachers have preliminary importance as the determiner of the assessment practices.

In the last few decades a great appreciable attention has been directed to how teachers perceive themselves in the application of the assessment practices (Estaji, 2011). There are various studies about the factors in the assessment practices and these factors define different aspects of the assessment practices. Implementation of assessment practices in the classroom and teachers' self-perceptions about the ethics of their assessment practices are also the focus of this study. Although there are many studies on both issues, this study investigates both issues in different contexts. It aims to examine teachers' classroom assessment practices and their views about the ethics of these practices in terms of certain variables and the factors (stated in following section). It also examines the relation between the teachers' classroom assessment practices and their views about the ethics of these practices. Accordingly, the study intends to expand the current research on the both issues and to present more elaborated interpretations about both issues, which were already studied, in terms of different contexts.

1.3. Purpose of the Study

Examining the classroom assessment practices and viewing teachers' ideas about the ethics of classroom assessment practices have gained prominence in recent years. This study seeks to expand current research on the language teachers' classroom assessment practices and their views about ethics of classroom assessment practices in relation to the education level the teachers teach at, the teachers' years of teaching

experience, the institutions they work for and their educational background. The teachers' views about the ethics of the classroom assessment practices are also examined in terms of factors such as "using paper-pencil tests; standardized testing, test revision, and instructional improvement; communicating assessment results, ethics, grading; using performance assessment; non-achievement-based grading; and ensuring test reliability and validity" (Zhang & Burry-Stock, 2003). In addition, the study tries to find out whether there is a relation between language teachers' classroom assessment practices and their views about ethics of the classroom assessment practices.

1.4. Significance of the Study

This study has certain significant points in relation to its objectives. It aims to identify current classroom assessment practices; thus, instructors are aware of their assessment practices. When they have an idea about how often they use certain classroom assessment practices, they have the chance of revising their assessment practices in the classroom. Revising assessment practices requires more than changing the assessment practices. By revising the assessment practices, the teachers may revise almost all the instruction process.

Teachers' perception about ethics of classroom assessment practices helps them define their assessment practices as ethical or unethical. It also shows whether there are different perceptions about classroom assessment practices. As one of the teachers defines a practice ethical, one another cannot have the same idea about the same practice. Advantages of defining assessment practices and their ethical issues at the same time will help the teachers.

By examining the issues stated above, it is possible to enhance quality of all the learning/teaching process. Assessment practices help the teachers not only grading the students but it also gives the chance of examining every step of the learning process. Even the teachers can criticize themselves thanks to assessment process. As the assessment process is the best indicator of the education quality, high quality in assessment brings revised and successful instructional process.

1.5. Research Questions

1.1. What are the English teachers' classroom assessment practices?

1.2. Is there a significant difference in language teachers' classroom assessment practices in terms of following;

- a.** the education level the teachers teach at,
- b.** the teachers' years of teaching experience,
- c.** the institutions they work for,
- d.** their educational background,

2.1. What are English teachers' views about the ethics of classroom assessment practices?

2.2. Is there a significant difference in language teachers' views about ethics of the classroom assessment practices in terms of following;

- a.** the education level the teachers teach at,
- b.** the teachers' years of teaching experience,
- c.** the institutions they work for,
- d.** their educational background,

3. Is there a relation between language teachers' classroom assessment practices and their views about ethics of the classroom assessment practices?

CHAPTER 2

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter covers the literature reviewed for the study. Many studies have been conducted to examine classroom assessment practices and to view teachers' ideas about the ethics of the classroom assessment practices. Although the literature covers numerous numbers of studies, this chapter will focus on two major themes; assessment and ethics, which emerge repeatedly throughout the literature reviewed.

Firstly, assessment as a general term and assessment in the course of language learning will be reviewed. Accordingly, classroom assessment and classroom assessment practices need to be reviewed in detail. While examining the classroom assessment practices, the factors of Assessment Practices Inventory by Zhang and Burry-Stock (2003) will be based on; "Using paper-pencil tests; Standardized testing, Test revision and Instructional improvement; Communicating assessment results, Ethics, Grading; Using performance assessment; Non-achievement-based grading; and Ensuring test reliability and validity." On the other hand, ethics and ethics in language assessment will be reviewed with regard to aims of the study.

2.1. Assessment

As an ongoing process, assessment is a comprehensive field of study, which is closely related to such terms as testing, evaluation, measurement and so on; accordingly, there have always been various definitions of the term, assessment, with regard to different perspectives and contexts. A number of books, studies, articles and many other resources define assessment in different ways.

According to Brown (2004), assessment is a process of evaluation of students' performance by the instructors (p. 4). William (2011) suggests that assessment is the process that decides whether the objectives have been realized or not. Cowie & Sauki (2015) also define assessment as "a process of gathering information about student learning" (p. 273). And it is defined by Mundrake (2000) as describing all aspects of evaluation and testing.

For this study, assessment is a comprehensive process including every stage of education in and out of the classroom. In other words, all the practices used for the purpose of evaluating students' progress and performance are accepted as assessment

practices; “Paper-pencil tests, standardized tests and test revision, grading, evaluation of instructional development, performance assessment, non-achievement based grading, test reliability and validity, and ethical concerns” (Zhang and Burry-Stock, 2003).

2.1.1. Assessment in Language Learning

Assessment, which has a variety of definitions, is hard to define in language learning as well, so it does not seem to be a consensus what it precisely means in the field of language learning (Bachman, 2004, p. 6). According to Brown (2004), assessment is regarded as observation of any practice of students to interpret information about students’ performance (p. 304). Tran (2012) simply defines it as a process of testing individual student’s language ability. According to Norris (2000), language assessment is much more elaborated than simply applying a language test; instead, it is a testing process in which we gather information systematically or interpret information about students’ abilities through observations so that we can decide the efficiency of the classroom program. Afitska (2014) considers language assessment as a process in which all the teacher assess not only learners’ linguistic knowledge but also learners’ linguistic development through a number of assessment practices. In this study, language assessment will be defined incorporated with classroom assessment practices.

2.1.2. Classroom Assessment and Classroom Assessment Practices

Assessment process in the classroom, which requires a variety of practices, has a great many definitions and terms that need to be clearly defined. According to Shohamy (2001), assessment practices include certain basic principles;

1. Critical language testing needs to be used for examining the assessment practices
2. Assessment practices need to be developed with regard to shared and collaborative models
3. Those who engaged in development and usage of the assessment practices need to have a growing responsibility for it
4. Consequences of the assessment practices need to be examined carefully

5. Especially in the multicultural societies, assessment practices need to include different voices
6. Protection and guard of the rights of the test-takers need to be provided and misuse of the tests need to be prevented.

On the other hand, classroom assessment, concerns of which are effective learning and teaching processes, requires not only more systematic and elaborated observations of learners but also it gives an exceptional opportunity to the teachers for a better interpretation of learning process (Angelo & Cross, 1993). According to Chappius & Stiggins (2004), classroom assessment is a process in which the focus should be on increasing learning rather than testing the students. Classroom assessment should be considered a process, purposes of which are to know students' development in learning, accomplish the requirements of the learning program and get success in learning, rather than a product (Seafurrohman & Balinas, 2016). Moreover, according to Angelo & Cross (1993), there are seven assumptions on which classroom assessment is based;

1. There is close relationship between the quality of the learning and teaching, so the best way of improving learning is to improve quality of teaching.
2. Teachers firstly set learning goals and objectives and then get feedback about the process to know whether they achieve those goals and objectives to improve the process or not.
3. Feedback, which is appropriate for students, need to be given at the right time and with enough frequency so as to improve the learning process. The students also need to participate in self-assessment process.
4. The questions answered in the assessment process need to be revised according to issues or problems in the teaching/learning process.
5. As a source of motivation, improvement and revision, classroom assessment needs to provide teachers with certain challenges such as systematic inquiry that requires intellectual abilities.
6. Teachers of all fields need to involve in classroom assessment that does not require training but devoted teachers.
7. In order to enhance learning process, collaboration and students' active participants in classroom assessment practices need to be carried out.

Quality of the classroom assessment has also paramount importance and McMillian (1999) summarizes it; students' performance needs to be measured in a valid, reliable, and useful way to provide high quality classroom assessment, in which theoretical requirements incorporate with the practical outcomes. Therefore, by evaluating the outcomes, teachers will be aware of what makes the assessment process qualified and this will improve students' learning and professionalism. Accordingly, classroom assessment includes a range of activities; "Using Paper-Pencil Tests; Standardized Testing, Test Revision, and Instructional Improvement; Communicating Assessment Results, Ethics and Grading; Using Performance Assessment; Non-achievement-Based Grading, Ensuring the Test Validity" (Zhang & Burry-Stock, 2003).

2.1.2.1. Using Paper-Pencil Tests

As the most common used classroom assessment practice, using paper-pencil tests involves a wide variety of activities such as choosing the appropriate assessment methods, administering quizzes, writing test items that require different cognitive levels to answer them or revising any teacher-made test to match the instructional objectives. Davidson & Fulcher (2007) also states that test providers need to choose or develop tests that match with both the objectives and target learners and interpretations about test scores are to be investigated by them so as to generalize the conditions of the test (p. 23). For this paper, using paper-pencil tests as classroom assessment practices especially involves the items of Assessment Practices Inventory (Zhang and Burry-Stock, 2003).

2.1.2.2. Standardized Testing, Test Revision, Instructional Development

A standardized test is defined as "any examination that is administered or scored in a predetermined, standard manner" and the basic function of a standardized test is to provide the teachers with a valid interpretation about the knowledge or skills of the learners in a specific area (Popham, 1999, p. 8). Whether norm-referenced or criterion-referenced, standardization is provided through applying the test under the same conditions and used a fixed rubric in scoring while carrying out a standardized test (Ghaicha, 2016). Test revision and using assessment results for instructional development are also important steps of classroom assessment. A teacher can decide on

matters such as development of curriculum, evaluation of school improvement or planning of future teaching through revising assessment results.

2.1.2.3. Communicating Assessment Results, Ethics and Grading

As a standard for teacher competence in educational assessment, communicating assessment results is an important step for overall assessment process and there are certain ways of communicating the assessment results such as exhibits, conferences and rubrics; however, communicating interpretations about learners' achievement and improvement requires efficient oral, written and interpersonal communication skills (Brookhart, 1998). Besides being a teacher competence, communicating assessment is a two-way exchange of information in which there is a close relationship between assessment and communication. At this point, communicating assessment results to learners and sometimes to parents is a crucial step in classroom assessment process. Communicating assessment to learners, which is a cooperative process between learners and instructor, provides learners with feedback so that the learners have the chance of improving their work according to points that are stated through particular, descriptive feedbacks. On the other hand, informing parents about the learners' outcome will also help parents effectively support their children's learning and there are certain ways of giving information about learners' academic and learning skills such as conferences, personal letters or phone calls to parents, assessment reports, report cards that give information about weekly/monthly progress (O'Connor & Cooper, 2008).

Considering the overall assessment process, it is evident that testing has an important role in deciding upon the efficiency of learning and teaching. Accordingly, grading and validity of the tests are primary concerns of not only instructors but also the parents and learners. According to Gul (2014), grading is a process of evaluating learners by applying tests and assignments in the classroom and it serves four roles;

1. Evaluating the quality of student's work.
2. Communicating with students, parents, and the others.
3. Motivating the learner; thus, it shows them how to study, what they need to focus on and their involvement in the courses.
4. Organizing mark transition and focus of effort for both students and teachers.

2.1.2.4. Performance Assessment

According to Brown (2004), performance assessment, which means much more than just providing the learners with paper-pencil multiple choice tests, involves a variety of practices such as oral and written production, performance on integrated skills, open-ended responses and certain interactive group tasks; that's why, such an assessment process, in which the learners are observed in real-world tasks, requires much more effort, time and money (p. 10-11).

Alternative assessment includes such practices as observation, portfolios, open-ended questions, demonstrations, and many other assessment practices. The role of the instructors, at this point, is to increase the effectiveness of the performance assessment. According to Elliot (1994), instructors need to pay attention to the following points;

1. Choosing the assessment tasks that are clearly defined and connected to learning objectives.
2. Providing students with the scoring criteria of the tasks prior to work on the tasks.
3. Presenting clearly defined standards or/and models of performance at the very beginning.
4. Creating opportunities for students to evaluate themselves through self-assessment practices.
5. Making interpretations about learners' performances by comparing them according to appropriate standards.

2.1.2.5. Non-achievement Based Grading

In grading, regarded as the most crucial responsibility of the instructors, there has been ongoing debate whether it needs to be academic or non-academic or both of them at the same time (Yesbeck, 2011). At this point, the role of the teacher is to incorporate the non-achievement based grading with the assessment process; however, there is still controversy about the accountability of the process. For this study, non-achievement based grading will be considered as a classroom assessment practice and its ethical issues will be reviewed.

2.1.2.6. Ensuring the Test Validity and Reliability

Validity, which is a complex criteria for a test, is basic requirement of the all efficient tests, therefore, the main concerns of the instructors is how to establish the test validity. According to Brown (2004), it is difficult to find an ultimate measure of validity; instead, it is a variety of evidence that can be applied for supporting. However, the most crucial point in test validity is tests' being appropriate for assessing the course objectives or evaluating the learners for deciding upon whether they reached the established goals or not. For this study, the main concern of grading and test validity are primarily ensuring adequate content sampling, matching the assessment with the course objectives and developing systematic grading procedures.

2.2. Ethics

A number of books, journals, articles and a variety of other resources have currently attempted to define the concept of ethics in a comprehensive way. In addition, the terms such as fairness, moral, which are closely related to the ethics and even sometimes used interchangeably, make it challenging to define the extent of it. As the broadest definition, ethics is a kind of moral philosophy the aim of which is to distinguish between right and wrong. According to Velasquez, Andre, Shanks and Meyer (2010), ethics is not “whatever society accepts, abiding the law, what religion says or a matter of feeling,” instead, it is two things: firstly, ethic is well-established standards that are related to certain virtues such as honesty, compassion, or loyalty and certain rights such as the right of freedom and life, because such standards are always supported by well-founded reasons. Secondly, ethic is the development and study of ethical standards for ensuring the permanent effort of studying our own moral.

2.2.1. Ethics in Language Assessment

The concerns over ethics of the assessment process are not a new issue at the base of education. In the field of language assessment, it was the 1990s that fairness, ethical issues and accountability became the main concerns of the testers and test takers; accordingly, the interest in fairness and ethical assessment of the language teaching/learning process increased our awareness of the issue (Karavas, 2013). In ethical test preparation, therefore, the teachers need to take a set of difficult ethical decisions about choosing the most appropriate materials to use because the common

sense is that “all should be adequately prepared for the form of the test” and this needs to provide no disadvantage because of the differential test practice effect (Hamp-Lyons, 2008, p. 334). According to Estaji (2011), under the term of ethics, language testing has received great attention and currently it is an undeniable fact that it has considerable effect not only on language testing but also on almost all academic practices. However, it is now almost impossible to define ethics without such terms as fairness, validity morality or some other related concepts.

Kunnan (2000) makes a conceptualization of fairness, the main concerns of which are validity, access and justice.

Table 1. Main Concerns of Fairness

<i>Main Concern</i>	<i>Specific Focus</i>
Validity	construct validity content and format bias differential items/test functioning insensitive language stereotyping of test taker groups
Access	financial: affordability geographical: location and distance personal: accommodations for disabled persons educational: opportunity to learn equipment and test conditions
Justice	social equity legal challenges

The focus of validity is defined as the equal test score interpretations for different test takers; correspondingly, it needs to be ensured for test developers and test takers that the reason for different performances is closely related to the abilities that are being assessed. The focus of access is on the accessibility of tests for the test takers from such backgrounds as financial, geographical, personal and educational, and on their acquaintance with test equipments and conditions. And lastly, the focus of justice is primarily based on legal challenges and social equity which specifically means equal validity and access (Kunnan, 2000, p.3-5).

Moreover, with the research in the field of assessment, according to Kunnan (2013), ethical dilemmas such as “right and wrong; fair and unfair; equality and

inequality; individual rights and common good; just and unjust” have kept receiving great attention and put forward two principles based on the standards and code of ethics.

1. **Principle of Fairness:** Fair assessment of all test takers is primarily based on the assumption of treating every test taker equally.
2. **Principle of Justice:** For a justice assessment, an institution needs to consider benefit and advance of the society by means of public reasoning.

However, Xi (2010) also made a different conceptualization of fairness in terms of three different views (p. 149-152).

1. **Fairness as an independent test quality;** according to this view, regardless of validity, fairness is characterized with test quality.
2. **Fairness as an all-encompassing test quality;** for this view, the priority is given to fairness of the test and the test quality goes beyond validity.
3. **Fairness linked directly to validity;** this view suggests that validity has a direct effect on the test fairness.

Like fairness, validity, which is an important concept in the field of ethics, is not only a property of assessment, but also meaning of the test scores. With some important shifts, test validity has changed in terms of definition and classification, and it has been divided into three to four basic types; “content validity, predictive and concurrent-related validity, and construct validity” (Messick, 1990). Traditional types of validity are defined by Messick (1990) according to (APA, 1954, 1966):

Content validity is evaluated by showing how well the content of the test samples the class of situations or subject matter about which conclusions are to be drawn.

Criterion-related validity is evaluated by comparing the test scores with one or more external variables (called criteria) considered to provide a direct measure of the characteristic or behavior in question.

Predictive validity indicates the extent to which an individual's future level on the criterion is predicted from prior test performance.

Concurrent validity indicates the extent to which the test scores estimate an individual's present standing on the criterion.

Construct validity is evaluated by investigating what qualities a test measures, that is, by determining the degree to which certain explanatory concepts or constructs account for performance on the test.

On the other hand, construct validity, which is a basic criterion for educational and psychological measurement, is a continuing process. Especially, the notion of validity as a unified concept includes six aspects of the construct validity, which are “content, substantive, structural, generalizability, external, and consequential aspects” (Messick, 1995, p. 744)

Besides ongoing debate over the definition of fairness, ethics and standards that are decided professionally have received great attention in the field of language testing. Accordingly, the need for defining ethical codes and standards became inevitable for professional test makers and they published five professional language testing codes; (1) International Language Testing Association’s Code of Ethics (ILTA, 2000) , (2) International Language Testing Association’s Code of Practices (ILTA, 2005), (3) the Association of Language Testers in Europe’s Code of Practice (ALTE, 1994, 2001), (4) European Association for Language Testing and Assessment’s Code of Practice (EALTA, 2006), and Japan Language Testing Association’s Code of Practices (JLTA, 2007) ; thus, the codes and standards became the guideline of language testing profession (Xi, 2010, p.154; Jia, 2009, p. 3). Jia (2009) summarizes the five codes according to similarities and differences they have;

Table 2. A comparison of five different codes of ethics for testing

<i>Code</i>	<i>ILTA Code of Ethics</i>	<i>ILTA Guidelines for Practice</i>	<i>ALTE Principles of Good Practice for ALTE Examinations</i>	<i>EALTA Guidelines for Good Practice in Language Testing & Assessment</i>	<i>JLTA Code of Good Testing Practice</i>
Salient points	9 principles & annotated gloss expressing altruistic aims with ample loopholes	10 duties of test designers/writers & 6 points about test administration & other concerns - 10 rights and 10 responsibilities of test takers are also included	Detailed guidelines on how to ensure validity, reliability, positive impact, practicality, and quality of service for all stakeholders	9 queries about testing & assessment education plus 31 considerations in developing tests	Very similar to the ILTA Guidelines with an extra proviso that 'Items written by nonnative speakers of the language being tested must be checked by competent native speakers'
Most recent version & current status	Adopted in March 2000	Drafted in July, 2005 and adopted in June 2007	Drafted in 1991-93 and adopted in 1994, then revised in October 2001	Adopted in May 2006	Proposed in September 2002 and adopted in 2006

Code of Ethics presented by *International Language Testing Association* (ILTA) is not an obligation or regulation; however, it serves a good guideline for test takers to conduct a test professionally and the code of ethics, which is a mixture of essential principles of beneficence, justice and respect for autonomy and civil society, defines 9 basic principles (Davies, 2012)

1. All test takers' needs, values and cultures are considered by language testing service and they are provided with best professional consideration in which humanity and dignity of all test takers are respected by testers.
2. Language testers are responsible for saving the obtained information confidentially and sharing such information professionally.

3. In any testing practice, language testers need to comply with ethical principles presented in national or international guidelines.
4. Misuse of professional knowledge or skills of the language testers shall not be allowed.
5. Language testers need to keep in touch with colleagues and other language professionals with respect to develop professional knowledge and share such knowledge.
6. Integration of the language testing profession needs to be responsibility of the language testers.
7. For improving the quality of the language testing, assessment and teaching services, language testers need to carry out their social roles; therefore, they will be beneficial to society in terms of language learning and language proficiency.
8. Language testers need to be aware of their responsibilities and recognize the responsibilities of their test takers.
9. Language testers need to take into account the long and short term effects of their projects on the test takers; accordingly, they serve professionally.

International Language Testing Association (ILTA) also presented a guideline for practice of ethical language assessment practices and it defines certain responsibilities for test developers, test takers. Although the code of practice has 7 main principles about practice of ethical language assessment, responsibilities of test designers and test takers will be reviewed elaborately, for this study preliminary concerns with the assessment practices of the teachers and the ethical concerns over their assessment practices. According to ILTA, responsibilities of test designers and test writers;

1. Tests' intended purposes should be presented in an explicit statement.
2. Measuring of the construct and how that construct will be operationalized must be decision of the test developers.
3. Test designer should spell the specifications of the test and how the test takers will carry out test tasks in a detailed way.
4. For preventing malfunctioning of tasks and items, the tasks and items need to be edited or pretested it is possible. If it is not, the task and items should be

analyzed after the administration and malfunctioning tasks and items should be omitted.

5. For implementing a reliable assessment of test takers' performance, the grading or marking schemes, which were prepared by the test developers, must be used for hand scoring.
6. Those who are trained enough to score should do scoring and reliability of scoring results should be calculated and the test takers should be provided with results.
7. For avoiding any unfair advantage of test takers, test materials should be handled with great care and confidentiality.
8. While administering the test, test makers must be sure that all the test takers are being treated equally.
9. For avoiding any grading mistake, procedures and routines of grading must be carried out with great attention.
10. The test takers and skate holders should be presented with such an appropriate way that they can understand the results easily.

The code of practice presented by *Association of Language Testers in Europe (ALTE)* serves basic standards not only for producers but also users of exams and it elaborately indicates the responsibilities of both. For an ethical assessment, it defines four responsibilities of ALTE members; "Developing Examinations, Interpreting Examination Results, Striving for fairness, and Informing Examination Takers" (ALTE, 2001). It also defines the responsibilities of the examination users as selecting appropriate examinations, interpreting examination results, striving for fairness and informing examination takers.

The *EALTA Guidelines for Good Practice in Language Testing and Assessment*, the purpose of which is to develop the interpretation of basic principles of language testing and assessment, and testing and assessment practices throughout Europe, presents considerations for teacher pre-service and in-service training in testing and assessment, for the classroom testing and assessment and for national or institutional testing units or centers. Unlike the previous codes, it asks numerous questions for each group to clarify the recommended practices. It has a huge list of questions especially for the testing centers or institutions and it has certain sub-codes such as; "test purpose and specification; test design and item writing; quality control and test analysis; test

administration; review; wash back; and linkage to Common European Framework” (EALTA, 2006).

The *JLTA Code of Good Testing Practice*, which is a similar version of code of practice with ILTA, includes six basic topics; “basic considerations for good testing practice in all situations; responsibilities of test designers and test writers; obligations of institutions preparing or administering high-stakes exams; obligations of those preparing and administering commercially available exams; responsibilities of users of test results; and special considerations “(JLTA, 2007).

In addition to fairness and validity, there are also efforts for creating more democratic testing practices and democratic perspectives of the assessment practices in terms of ethics become the concerns of the test takers and providers. Shohamy (2001) states following principles for democratic assessment practices;

1. There is a need for applying critical language testing (CLT) for the purpose of examining the use of tests as instruments, challenging their assumptions and investigating their conclusions.
2. There is a need for a process in which testing should be conducted and administered collaboratively and in cooperation with the test takers.
3. There is a need for those involved in testing, either a test taker or administers, act responsibly for the tests and their uses.
4. There is a need for a comprehensive test design in which knowledge of various groups are considered while designing the tests.
5. There is a need for protecting the test takers’ rights.

2.3. Summary

This chapter of the study has a review related to classroom assessment practices and the notion of ethics in language assessment. It has presented information about assessment, language assessment and classroom assessment practices. The study aims to investigate language teachers’ classroom assessment practices, so classroom assessment practices according to six factors of the Assessment Practices Inventory (Zhang & Burry-Stock, 2003) are reviewed separately. It also aimed to discuss the ethics of the classroom assessment practices and the literature about the ethics and ethics of the classroom assessment practices are reviewed. After comparing the ethical codes for language assessment, democratic perspectives of the assessment practices also viewed.

CHAPTER 3

3. METHODOLOGY

This chapter is dedicated to the methodology of the study, which basically consists of procedures followed by the researcher to find out quantitative information about the study. It provides elaborated knowledge related to the participants of the study. In addition, the procedures employed and the tools used while collecting the data, and finally the data analysis in which the statistical nature of the study is discussed are considerably stated in the methodology.

3.1. Research Design

Educational research, which requires more than just applying the basic steps in the research process, is conducted through quantitative or qualitative procedures according to its nature of research questions (Creswell, 2012, p. 11). As an educational research, this study aims to investigate language teachers' classroom assessment practices and their views about the ethics of the classroom assessment practices in terms of the education level the teachers teach at, the teachers' years of teaching experience, types of institutions they work for and their educational background. Identifying such practices and views in respect to various variables requires a quantitative research design, which refers to a process of producing information through constructing cause and effect relationship, and gathering, analyzing or demonstration of the data in numerical is the basis of this empirical inquiry process (Given, Lisa M., 2008, p. 713-717).

Furthermore, this study specifically has both survey and correlational designs from the quantitative research designs. It has a survey design, for it includes two sets of surveys that are administered to language teachers to investigate the teachers' classroom assessment practices and the teachers' views of ethics in classroom assessment practices. According to Creswell (2012), in survey designs, a questionnaire or survey is applied to a small group (sampling), and the attitudes, opinions, behaviors, or characteristics of this group is identified to make a generalization about the large group (population) (p. 21). Sukamolson (2010) also defines survey research as a systematic information gathering process, in which the information gathered from respondents is used for interpreting certain aspects of the behaviors of a group, and this research

process mainly deals with participants, administering surveys or questionnaires and analysis of the data.

The study also aims to show the relation between language teachers' classroom assessment practices and their views about the ethics of the classroom assessment practices. According to Creswell (2012), in correlational designs, the aim is to show the association or relation between two or more variables through using statistics, accordingly two or more scores are statistically examined for each person (p. 338). Williams (2011) also defines correlational research as a process of examining two different characteristics of a group of people and the correlational features of the group are examined by using statistical or numerical data.

Therefore, the study was methodologically conducted as a quantitative research and Assessment Practices Inventory (API) (Zhang & Burry-Stock, 2003) was administered to examine language teachers' classroom assessment practices and the situations that are developed by the researcher according to the items of Assessment Practices Inventory were used for identifying the teachers' views about the ethics of the classroom assessment practices. In addition, the association between the two instruments shows the correlative relationship between two groups of the data for the participants of the study.

3.2. Participants

The participants of the study were chosen from English teachers who are working in different types and levels of schools in Gaziantep region. For selecting the participants, convenience sampling from the non-probability sampling methods was used. The population of 143 English teachers from different schools and grade levels was invited to respond the inventory. Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of the participants.

Table 3. Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

Characteristics	N	%
Educational Background		
Graduate	99	69,23
Master	44	30,77
Years of Teaching Experience		
1-3 Years	49	34,27
4-6 Years	50	34,97
7-9 Years	21	14,69
10-12 Years	13	9,09
13 Years and More	10	6,99
Education Level They Teach at		
Primary School	16	11,19
Secondary School	68	47,55
High School	29	20,28
College	30	20,98
Types of Institutions They Work for		
Public	96	67,13
Private	47	32,87
Total	143	100

3.3. Data Collection Tools and Procedures

The data was collected through two basic instruments; the first one is the Assessment Practices Inventory (API) (Zhang & Burry-Stock, 2003) and the second was the Situations, which were developed by the researcher in relation to certain items of Assessment Practices Inventory. The Assessment Practices Inventory, which includes all together 67 items, was used in this study with the aim of identifying language teachers' classroom assessment practices. The instrument was originally developed by Zhang & Burry-Stock (2003) through primarily using the Standards for Teacher Competence in Educational Assessment of Students (AFT, NCME, & NEA, 1990) and the theoretical framework in the classroom assessment literature. With the 67 items, the survey involves a variety of assessment activities such as using paper-pencil tests, performance assessment, interpreting test scores and so on. In addition to item analyses

and teachers' feedback for revising the instrument, two piloting studies were conducted with the in-service teachers in the developing process (Zhang, 1995). The API was also used for another study by Zhang & Burry-Stock (2003) with the aim of identifying teachers' classroom assessment practices and their self perceived assessment skills. According to further factor analyses by the researcher, five of the items were omitted from the Assessment Practices Inventory and there are six factors for the classroom assessment practices and they are as follows: “ (1) Using Paper-Pencil Tests; (2) Standardized Testing, Test Revision, and Instructional Improvement; (3) Communicating Assessment Results, Ethics, Grading; (4) Using Performance Assessment; (5) Nonachievement-Based Grading; and (6) Ensuring Test Reliability and Validity” (Zhang & Burry-Stock, 2003). For this study, Assessment Practices Inventory was used for identifying language teachers' assessment practices, and it was presented as a five-point Likert-Scale ranging from 1 (not at all used), 2 (seldom used), 3 (used occasionally), 4 (used often), to 5 (used very often).

Identifying views of the language teachers about the ethics of the classroom assessment practices is also the aim of the study, and with regard to this aim, situations which were developed by the researcher according to certain items of the Assessment Practices Inventory were used. The situations were separately written according to six factors of the inventory and each factor had certain situations. After a few draft situations were approved by the supervisor, the process of writing situations for almost all the items started and 34 situations were written. Firstly, these situations were revised by the supervisor and then by the researcher. After the second rewording process, 38 situations related to Assessment Practices Inventory were ready for the piloting. For piloting, five teachers were determined via purposeful sampling strategy, as the power and logic of the purposeful sampling allow researcher to choose “information-rich cases” for deeply studying of the data so that researchers can obtain great deal from those “information-rich cases” (Patton, 2002, p. 46). Each of the participants was firstly provided with the situations and they administered the survey by describing the situations in the situations as “Ethical” or “Unethical”. Moreover, they simply commented on certain situations when they had difficulty in understanding. Their statements and comments were all noted. After this process, they were presented with the items, on which the situations were written. For each situation, they stated their opinions whether the situation was related to given item or not, they also supported their opinions with explanations. All of the five participants' explanations were recorded for

comprehensive analyses. With the feedback taken from the piloting, the rewording process started again. For each situation, the explanations were noted for examining why the situations were found related to the items or what their explanations were for finding the situations irrelevant. The situations, which were found irrelevant by most of the participants, were omitted from the scale or rewritten. There were eventually 27 situations that were ready for data collection. Therefore, two sets of data were ready, one for classroom assessment practices (API) and one for views of ethics (Situations). The “Assessment Practices Inventory” and “Situations” are presented in APPENDIX 1 and APPENDIX 2.

The instrument, which consists of two sets of data collection tools, was administered to English teachers who work at different levels of education and types of school, and have various educational backgrounds and years of teaching experience. While some of the participants were invited to respond the paper-based instrument, the others were invited to respond soft copy of the instrument and to send the results via e-mail. All of the participants were informed about the purpose and significance of the study then they were invited to give honest responses. Before administration process, managers of the institutions were also informed about the process.

3.4. Data Analysis

The primary purpose of the study is to investigate language teachers’ classroom assessment practices and their views about the ethics of the classroom assessment practices. With regard to research questions, this study specifically aims to identify language teachers’ assessment practices and their views about the ethics of the practices in terms of the education level the teachers teach at, the teachers’ years of teaching experience, types of institutions they work for and their educational background, and to investigate the relationship between language teachers’ classroom assessment practices and their views about the ethical issues on classroom assessment practices. As the study was methodologically quantitative, the data collected through the instruments, Assessment Practices Inventory and Situations, were analyzed by using Statistical Package of Social Sciences (SPSS), the version 16.0 for windows evaluation.

The data, collected through Assessment Practices Inventory with the aim of identifying language teachers’ classroom assessment practices in terms of certain variables, was subjected to descriptive and inferential statistics. For examining the

teachers' practices, the data was primarily subjected to descriptive statistics such as frequencies, means, percentages and standard deviation. For examining the difference in language teachers' classroom assessment practices and the institutions they work for (Public/Private) or teachers' educational background (Graduate, Master), Independent Sample t-test was administered. On the other hand, One-way ANOVA was used for the variables such as the education level the teachers teach at (Primary, Secondary, High, and College) and the years of teaching experience (1-3, 4-6, 7-9, 10-12 and 13 years or more).

The data, which was collected through developed situations with the aim of identifying language teachers' views about ethics of the classroom assessment practices in terms of certain variables and factors, was also subjected to further analysis. The data was not only examined through descriptive statistics such as frequencies, means, percentages and standard deviation but also through inferential statistics such as Independent Sample t-test and One-Way ANOVA in order to show the differences in the views of teachers in terms of variables and the factors.

Both sets of the data were lastly subjected to correlational statistics with the aim of investigating the relationship between language teachers' classroom assessment practices and their views about the ethics of the classroom assessment practices. These three basic steps of the data analyses provided results for making the interpretations with regard to research questions.

CHAPTER 4

4. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

In this chapter, the data analysis and results are presented. The data were collected through two data collection instruments and processed in response to aims stated in Chapter 1. Three fundamental goals drove the data collection and subsequent data analysis; (1) investigating English teachers' classroom assessment practices and determining whether there is a significant difference in teachers' classroom assessment practices in terms of their educational backgrounds, years of teaching experience, the institutions they work for and the education level they teach at, (2) investigating English teachers' views about the ethics of the classroom assessment practices and determining whether there is a significant difference in teachers' views in terms of their educational backgrounds, years of teaching experience, the institutions they work for and the education level they teach at, and (3) determining whether there is a relation between teachers' classroom assessment practices and their views about the ethics of the classroom assessment practices. This chapter, therefore, presents the descriptive, inferential and correlational statistics, and interpretations of the statistics in relation to aims.

4.1. Data Analysis and Results related to Teachers' Classroom Assessment Practices

For identifying teachers' classroom assessment practices, Assessment Practices Inventory (API), a 67 item likert scale developed by Zhang & Burry Stock (2003), was conducted. Both descriptive statistics such as frequencies, mean, standard deviation and inferential statistics such as Independent Sample t-test, one way ANOVA were used for interpreting the data. According to Berens (2009), descriptive statistics can be conducted for the purpose of investigating and summarizing important features of a sample while inferential statistics provide more specific hypothesis about the mean direction of a sample or multiple samples.

4.1.1. Descriptive Statistics related to Teachers' Classroom Assessment Practices

Table 4 shows the descriptive statistics for all the items of the Assessment Practices Inventory. The items are listed in a descending order according to their Means.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics for English Teachers' Classroom Assessment Practices

Items of Assessment Practices Inventory	N	M	SD
59. Providing oral feedback to students.	143	4,38	0,81
61. Communicating classroom assessment results to students.	143	4,23	0,99
30. Assessing individual class participation.	143	4,18	0,98
49. Informing students in advance how grades are to be assigned.	142	4,16	1,00
56. Incorporating effort in the calculation of grades.	142	4,12	0,93
51. Weighing differently projects, exams, homework, etc. when assigning semester grades.	143	4,12	1,00
57. Incorporating attendance in the calculation of grades.	142	4,11	0,96
14. Writing matching questions.	143	4,09	0,94
28. Assessing individual hands-on activities.	143	4,07	0,96
16. Writing fill-in-the-blank or short answer questions.	142	4,06	1,16
10. Developing assessments based on clearly defined course objectives.	142	4,06	0,97
11. Matching assessments with instruction.	141	4,01	0,97
42. Using assessment results when evaluating class improvement.	142	4,01	0,97
55. Incorporating improvement in the calculation of grades.	142	3,96	1,03
54. Incorporating classroom behavior in the calculation of grades.	142	3,95	1,05
58. Assigning grades.	138	3,93	1,00
27. Assessing group class participation.	143	3,91	0,97
41. Using assessment results when making decisions (e.g., placement, promotion) about individual students.	143	3,90	1,07
15. Writing true/false questions.	140	3,89	1,11
1. Choosing appropriate assessment methods for instructional decisions.	143	3,87	0,94
43. Using assessment results when evaluating school improvement.	143	3,87	1,04
13. Writing multiple-choice questions.	143	3,87	1,16
53. Incorporating ability in the calculation of grades.	142	3,85	1,00
2. Selecting textbook-provided test items for classroom assessment.	142	3,83	1,02
32. Following required procedures (time limit, no hints, no interpretation) when administering standardized tests.	142	3,83	1,08
21. Matching performance tasks to instruction and course objectives.	142	3,82	0,98
29. Assessing group hands-on activities.	143	3,82	1,08
52. Incorporating extra credit activities in the calculation of grades.	142	3,80	1,04
39. Using assessment results when planning teaching.	143	3,79	1,11
65. Protecting students' confidentiality with regard to test scores.	139	3,77	0,96

8. Determining if a standardized achievement test is valid for classroom assessment.	142	3,75	0,92
20. Ensuring adequate content sampling for a test.	141	3,73	0,97
23. Communicating performance assessment criteria to students in advance.	142	3,68	1,01
22. Defining a rating scale for performance criteria in advance.	142	3,68	1,08
4. Administering announced quizzes.	142	3,66	1,21
40. Using assessment results when developing curriculum.	142	3,63	1,15
3. Revising previously produced teacher-made tests to match current instructional emphasis.	143	3,56	1,05
45. Developing a grading philosophy.	143	3,55	1,22
24. Recording assessment result on the rating scale/checklist while observing a student's performance.	143	3,54	1,16
44. Developing systematic grading procedures.	142	3,54	1,10
9. Using a table of specifications to plan assessments.	143	3,50	1,19
66. Recognizing unethical, illegal, or otherwise inappropriate assessment methods.	142	3,49	1,46
67. Recognizing unethical, illegal, or otherwise inappropriate uses of assessment information.	142	3,48	1,48
47. Using criteria-referenced grading model.	142	3,48	1,16
60. Providing written feedback to students.	143	3,48	1,28
63. Communicating classroom assessment results to other educators.	142	3,46	1,16
48. Using systematic procedures to determine borderline grades.	142	3,33	1,04
37. Revising a test based on item analysis.	141	3,28	1,13
38. Obtaining diagnostic information from standardized tests.	138	3,23	1,10
36. Conducting item analysis (i.e., difficulty and discrimination indices) for teacher-made tests.	143	3,23	1,18
31. Using portfolios to assess student progress.	141	3,20	1,28
62. Communicating classroom assessment results to parents.	143	3,18	1,42
64. Avoiding teaching to the test when preparing students for tests.	139	3,18	1,20
19. Constructing a model answer for scoring essay questions.	141	3,16	1,30
25. Using concept mapping to assess student learning.	137	3,14	1,15
35. Calculating and interpreting central tendency and variability for teacher made tests.	143	3,10	1,10
46. Using norm-referenced grading model.	142	3,00	1,17
33. Interpreting standardized test scores (e.g., Stanine, Percentile Rank) to students and parents.	141	2,95	1,29
18. Writing test items for higher cognitive levels.	143	2,91	1,23
17. Writing essay questions.	142	2,72	1,37
34. Interpreting Percentile Band to students and parents.	142	2,64	1,20
5. Administering unannounced quizzes.	141	2,47	1,32

As seen in Table 4, there are 13 items that have a high usage frequency, means of which are higher than 4.00. Item 59 '*providing oral feedback to students*' is the item that the teachers most frequently use ($M_{59}=4.38$). It shows that most of teachers prefer giving oral feedback in their classrooms as an assessment practices. In addition, oral feedback is used more than other types of feedbacks, for item 60 '*providing feedback to the students*' has a lower frequency ($M_{60}=3.48$).

Item 61 '*communicating assessment results to students*' also has a high frequency ($M_{61}=4.23$), and it shows that teachers communicate the assessment results to the students more than communicating to other educators or parents. And the items 63 and 62 '*communicating the results to other educators*' and '*communicating assessment results to parents*' have lower frequencies, they both have medium frequencies ($M_{63}=3.46$, $M_{62}=3.18$).

According to Table 4, item 30 '*assessing individual class participation*' has a high frequency and it shows the importance of the performance assessment in the classroom assessment process and participating in the lessons actively are noted by the teachers. Brown (2004) also defines the assessment process much more than just providing students with paper pencil tests; therefore, oral production or performance of the learners also needs to be considered (p. 10-11). Moreover, item 28 '*assessing individual hands-on activities*' has a high frequency ($M_{28}=4.07$), and it supports the idea that assessment is more than just written exams. Both item 30 and item 28 show that performance of the students is also considered by teachers.

Table 4 also shows that item 56 '*incorporating effort in the calculation of grades*' and item 57 '*incorporating attendance in the calculation of grades*' have high frequencies ($M_{56}=4.12$, $M_{57}=4.11$). Both of the items present evidence for teachers' consideration on non-achievement based grading. It suggests that the teachers not only consider written exams in grading process, they also regard the learners' effort or attendance for calculating the overall grades of the students. Yesbeck (2011) states that there has been an ongoing debate on how to grade students and it is discussed whether grading needs to be academic or nonacademic or both of them at the same time. At this point, the study shows that the teachers choose to incorporate non-achievement based grading with the assessment process.

Item 14 "writing matching questions and item 16 '*writing fill in the blanks or short answer questions*' are stated as highly used questions types according to Table 4 ($M_{14}=4.09$, $M_{16}=4.06$). Accordingly, the results suggest that matching, fill in the blanks

and short answer questions are used more often than other types of question which stated in Table 4.

On the other hand, Table 4 shows the items that are rarely used by the teachers as classroom assessment practices and item 5 '*administering unannounced quizzes*' has the lowest frequency ($M_5=2.47$). The teachers rarely administer unannounced quizzes; instead, they administer announced quizzes and item 4 '*administering announced quizzes*' has a higher frequency, which can be regarded as more than average ($M_4=3.66$).

Item 17 '*writing essay questions*' ($M_{17}=2.72$) and item 18 '*writing test items for higher cognitive levels*' ($M_{18}=2.91$) are the items that have low moderate frequencies. They suggest that teachers sometimes use essay question as classroom assessment practices. As stated above in items 14 and 16, teachers write matching, fill in the blanks and short answer questions rather than writing essay questions or questions for higher cognitive level.

Therefore, the study provides interpretations about the teachers' classroom assessment practices. Whereas oral feedback is mostly preferred by teachers, written feedback is sometimes used. Teachers communicate assessment results to the students rather than communicating to other educators or parents. In addition, non-achievement based grading such as participation, effort or any productions by learners are considered by the teachers in the assessment process.

The study also aims to investigate teachers' classroom assessment practices according to factors that the data collection instrument has. As stated in Chapter 3, after the factor analysis, five of the items were omitted from the instrument and the results show that the instrument has six factors; "(1) Using Paper-Pencil Tests; (2) Standardized Testing, Test Revision, and Instructional Improvement; (3) Communicating Assessment Results, Ethics, Grading; (4) Using Performance Assessment; (5) Nonachievement-Based Grading; and (6) Ensuring Test Reliability and Validity". Table 5 shows the descriptive statistics for the six factors of classroom assessment practices and the descriptive statistics for the total of the items.

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics Classroom Assessment Practices in terms of six Factors

	M	SD	n	Min.	Max.
NG	3.99	0.80	143	1.00	5.00
UPA	3.86	0.82	143	1.60	8.40
COMEG	3.68	0.68	143	2.00	7.73
ETVR	3.66	0.72	143	1.57	5.00
UPP	3.56	0.51	143	1.92	4.69
STRI	3.47	0.67	143	1.44	4.89
Total	3.64	0.50	143	2.48	4.74

Note. UPP = Using Paper–Pencil Tests; STRI = Standardized testing, Test Revision, and Instructional Improvement; COMEG = Communicating Assessment Results, Ethics, and Grading; UPA = Using Performance Assessment; NG = Nonachievement-Based Grading; ETVR = Ensuring Test Validity and Reliability (API, Zhang & Burry-Stock, 2003)

According to Table 5, Non-achievement Based Grading (NG) has a higher frequency than the other five factors ($M_{NG}=3.99$). Using Non-achievement Based Grading as classroom assessment practices require to incorporate ability, classroom behavior, improvement, effort and attendance in the calculation of grades (Items: 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57). The study reveals that teacher consider not only paper-pencil tests but also certain non-academical processes in the classroom assessment.

Table 5 also states that frequency of Using Performance Assessment (UP) can be regarded as higher than average with the mean of 3.86. According to study using performance assessment includes considering such factors as participation individual hands-on activity, group hands-on activity, individual class participation, and student progress (Items: 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31). Accordingly, the study shows that teachers consider performance assessment as an important component of the assessment process and they often use those practices in calculating the grades.

As stated in Table 5, both using non-achievement based grading and performance assessment have higher frequencies than other factors in the classroom assessment process. Since both of them refer to using alternative assessment in the process, the study reveals that teachers usually use alternative ways of assessment rather than just using traditional paper-pencil tests. Performance, participation or production is not only an important part of assessment process, but they are also vital for whole educational process.

On the other hand, Table 5 shows that the two factors, “*Communicating Assessment Results, Ethics, Grading*” and “*Ensuring Test Reliability and Validity*”, have average frequencies ($M_{\text{COMEG}} = 3.68$, $M_{\text{ETRI}} = 3.66$). “*Communicating Assessment Results, Ethics, Grading*” basically deals with providing various types of feedback, communicating assessment results and recognizing unethical, illegal or inappropriate assessment practices (Items: 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 66, 67). Table 4 and Table 5 reveal that whereas teachers usually provide oral feedback or communicate the assessment results to the students, they rarely provide written feedback or communicate assessment results to the other educators and parents. Moreover, teachers carry out certain classroom assessment practices for ensuring test validity and reliability, according to Table 4, the most frequently used practices for ensuring validity and reliability are “*developing assessment based on clearly defined course objectives*” and “*matching the performance tasks to the instruction and course objectives*”. These practices show that realizing the course objectives and applying the classroom assessment practices with regard to these objectives are preliminary important for the teachers. And lastly, Table 5 shows that “*Using Paper-Pencil Tests*” and “*Standardized Testing, Test Revision, and Instructional Improvement*” are the factors, practices of which are used less than other four types of practices.

Therefore, despite the high frequency of certain factors, the total usage of classroom assessment practices by language teachers has a frequency that is higher than average ($M_{\text{TOTAL}} = 3.64$). It clearly shows that the teachers usually use the classroom assessment practices in the assessment process.

4.1.2. Inferential Statistics related to Teachers’ Classroom Assessment Practices

The study also aims to identify language teachers’ classroom assessment practices in terms of the education level the teachers teach at, the teachers’ years of teaching experience, the institutions they work for, and their educational background. For identifying teachers’ classroom assessment practices in terms of the institutions they work for and their educational background, Independent Sample t-test was conducted and for the education level the teachers teach at and the teachers’ years of teaching experience, One-way ANOVA was conducted. Table 6 shows the results of the t-test for language teachers’ classroom assessment practices in terms of the teachers’ educational backgrounds.

Table 6. Results of t-test for Language Teachers' Classroom Assessment Practices by the Teachers' Educational Background

	Educational Background						95% CI for		t	df
	BA			MA			Mean Difference			
	M	SD	n	M	SD	n				
UPP	3.59	0.46	99	3.48	0.60	44	-0.07	0.30	1.25	141
STRI	3.55	0.69	99	3.28	0.61	44	0.03	0.51	2.26*	141
COMEG	3.74	0.73	99	3.57	0.56	44	-0.08	0.41	1.37	141
UPA	3.80	0.68	99	4.00	1.07	44	-0.49	0.10	-1.29	141
NG	4.10	0.66	99	3.76	1.02	44	0.05	0.62	2.32*	141
ETVR	3.68	0.70	99	3.62	0.77	44	-0.20	0.32	0.44	141
Total	3.69	0.50	99	3.53	0.48	44	-0.02	0.34	1.80	141

Note. UPP = Using Paper–Pencil Tests; STRI = Standardized testing, Test Revision, and Instructional Improvement; COMEG = Communicating Assessment Results, Ethics, and Grading; UPA = Using Performance Assessment; NG = Nonachievement-Based Grading; ETVR = Ensuring Test Validity and Reliability (API, Zhang & Burry-Stock, 2003)

According to descriptive statistics stated in Table 6, total mean scores show that teachers with BA degree has higher frequency of using classroom assessment practices than the teachers with MA degree, though the difference is minor ($M_{BA}=3.69$, $M_{MA}=3.53$). However, Table 6 also shows that there is not a significant difference between teachers' classroom assessment practices and their educational background in total scores while there is significant difference in their assessment practices in terms of the categories of Standardized testing, Test Revision, and Instructional Improvement; and Nonachievement-Based Grading according to their educational background ($t_{STRI}=2.26$, $t_{NG}=2.32$; $p<0.5$).

Accordingly, the teachers with BA degree tend to incorporate ability, classroom behavior, improvement, effort and attendance in calculation of grades more than the teachers with MA degree, and it reveals that the teachers with MA degree focus on academically assessing their students rather than using non-academical ones. Moreover, the teachers with BA degree often use assessment results when planning teaching, developing curriculum or evaluating school improvement, and they use statistical analysis of the test results (item analysis, central tendency, variability, and percentile rank) more than their colleagues with MA degree. Table 7 shows the results of t-test for language teachers' classroom assessment in terms of the types of schools they work at.

Table 7. Results of t-test for Language Teachers' Classroom Assessment Practices by the School Type

	School Type						95% CI for		t	df
	Public			Private			Mean Difference			
	M	SD	n	M	SD	n				
UPP	3.55	0.45	96	3.57	0.60	47	-0.20	0.15	-0.26	141
STRI	3.49	0.65	96	3.41	0.72	47	-0.16	0.32	0.67	141
COMEG	3.68	0.73	96	3.69	0.60	47	-0.25	0.24	-0.04	141
UPA	3.77	0.70	96	4.06	1.01	47	-0.58	-0.01	-2.03*	141
NG	4.08	0.72	96	3.82	0.93	47	-0.02	0.54	1.81	141
ETVR	3.63	0.71	96	3.74	0.74	47	-0.36	0.14	-0.85	141
Total	3.64	0.48	96	3.64	0.54	47	-0.17	0.19	0.10	141

Note. UPP = Using Paper–Pencil Tests; STRI = Standardized testing, Test Revision, and Instructional Improvement; COMEG = Communicating Assessment Results, Ethics, and Grading; UPA = Using Performance Assessment; NG = Nonachievement-Based Grading; ETVR = Ensuring Test Validity and Reliability (API, Zhang & Burry-Stock, 2003)

As descriptive statistics in the table 7 shows, total mean scores of the teachers work in the public and private schools are the same ($M_{\text{PUB.}}=3.64$, $M_{\text{PRVT.}}=3.64$), and the results of the t-test also shows that there is not significant difference between the total scores of the language teachers' classroom assessment practices and the teachers' school type while there is significant difference in teachers' practices in terms of Using Performance Assessment ($t_{\text{UPA}}= -2.03$; $p<0.5$). The study suggests that language teachers who work in private schools assess their students' individual or group class participation and the students' hand-on activities in the classroom assessment process, and they often use such practices more than the teachers who work in public schools. It also shows how important the consideration of performance assessment in private schools. Table 8 shows the descriptive statistics for language teachers' classroom assessment practices according to education level they teach at.

Table 8. Results of Descriptive Statistics for Language Teachers' Classroom Assessment Practices by the Education Level They Teach at

	Education Level														
	Primary			Secondary			High			College			Total		
	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n
UPP	3.39	0.66	16	3.68	0.42	68	3.52	0.42	29	3.41	0.61	30	3.56	0.51	143
STRI	3.47	0.78	16	3.65	0.53	68	3.41	0.76	29	3.11	0.70	30	3.47	0.67	143
COMEG	3.58	0.60	16	3.70	0.58	68	3.82	0.98	29	3.56	0.60	30	3.68	0.68	143
UPA	3.97	0.78	16	3.82	0.62	68	3.85	0.73	29	3.91	1.26	30	3.86	0.82	143
NG	4.29	0.63	16	4.05	0.67	68	4.05	0.84	29	3.65	1.02	30	3.99	0.80	143
ETVR	3.80	0.90	16	3.69	0.63	68	3.63	0.77	29	3.57	0.79	30	3.66	0.72	143
Total	3.64	0.60	16	3.73	0.42	68	3.64	0.55	29	3.44	0.54	30	3.64	0.50	143

Note. UPP = Using Paper–Pencil Tests; STRI = Standardized testing, Test Revision, and Instructional Improvement; COMEG = Communicating Assessment Results, Ethics, and Grading; UPA = Using Performance Assessment; NG = Nonachievement-Based Grading; ETVR = Ensuring Test Validity and Reliability (API, Zhang & Burry-Stock, 2003)

Table 8 shows that using classroom assessment practices have a frequency that is higher than average for the total scores ($M_{TOTAL}=3.64$) and the teachers who work in secondary schools prefer using classroom assessment practices more frequently. On the other hand, Performance Assessment and Nonachievement Based Grading practices are the most used assessment practices by the teachers working in the primary schools. Paper-Pencil Tests are mostly used in the secondary school and high school levels by the teachers. Accordingly, it reveals that the teachers who work with young learners prefer using assessment practices which are more individual based. It also reveals that as grade level increases, the teachers use more objective practices in classroom assessment. Zhang & Burry-Stock (2003) also states that educators' dependence on more objective tests in the classroom assessment increases, as level of the grades increase. Table 9 shows the statistics for teachers' classroom assessment practices according to education level they teach at.

Table 9. Results of One Way ANOVA for Language Teachers' Classroom Assessment Practices by the Education Level They Teach at

		Education Level			F	P
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square		
UPP	Between Groups	2,15	3	0,72	2,91	0,04*
	Within Groups	34,21	139	0,25		
	Total	36,36	142			
STRI	Between Groups	6,20	3	2,07	4,93	0,00*
	Within Groups	58,28	139	0,42		
	Total	64,48	142			
COMEG	Between Groups	1,21	3	0,40	0,85	0,47*
	Within Groups	65,39	139	0,47		
	Total	66,59	142			
UPA	Between Groups	0,38	3	0,13	0,18	0,91
	Within Groups	95,71	139	0,69		
	Total	96,09	142			
NG	Between Groups	5,28	3	1,76	2,85	0,04*
	Within Groups	85,96	139	0,62		
	Total	91,24	142			
ETVR	Between Groups	0,66	3	0,22	0,41	0,74
	Within Groups	73,19	139	0,53		
	Total	73,84	142			
Total	Between Groups	1,76	3	0,59	2,41	0,07*
	Within Groups	33,86	139	0,24		
	Total	35,62	142			

Note. UPP = Using Paper–Pencil Tests; STRI = Standardized testing, Test Revision, and Instructional Improvement; COMEG = Communicating Assessment Results, Ethics, and Grading; UPA = Using Performance Assessment; NG = Nonachievement-Based Grading; ETVR = Ensuring Test Validity and Reliability (API, Zhang & Burry-Stock, 2003)

The results show that there is a significant difference in the language teachers' classroom assessment practices among the teachers working in primary, secondary, high schools or colleges, in particular, in terms of UPP, STRI, COMEG, and NG ($p= 0.07$, $p<0.5$). The results suggest that teachers who work in secondary school use paper pencil tests more than the teachers who work at the other levels of education and the teachers who work in the primary school use the paper-pencil tests less than the other levels of education. As table 8 shows that primary school teachers use performance assessment in a high level ($M=3.97$), it suggests that primary school teachers depend more on practices that include performance assessment practices rather than using paper pencil tests. On the other hand, high school teachers use the assessment practices related to

communicating the assessment results more than the teachers who work in other levels of education ($M=3.88$). They communicate assessment results to the children, parents or other educators and give more feedback to the students. And primary school teachers often use non-achievement based grading in the assessment process, so they incorporate participation, effort, improvement in calculating the grades for the young learners.

As a conclusion, teachers use assessment practices related to the factors such as NG, UPA, and COMEG more than the practices of other factors such as UPP, STRI, and ETVR. And there is a significant difference in teachers' using assessment practices in terms of their educational background, school type and education levels they teach at while there is not a statistically difference in terms of their years of teaching experience.

4.2. Data Analysis and Results related to Teachers' Views about the Ethics of the Classroom Assessment Practices

The study also aims to identify language teachers' views about the ethics of the classroom assessment practices in terms of the education level the teachers teach at, the teachers' years of teaching experience, the institutions they work for, their educational background. As Table 10 shows, the teachers responded to the situations "Ethical" or "Unethical" and it shows the frequencies of responds of the teachers.

Table 10. Descriptive Statistics for Teachers' Views about Ethics of Assessment Practices

Situations	Ethical		Unethical	
	F	%	F	%
Using Paper-Pencil Tests				
1. You announce the quizzes a week before.	114	79,72	26	18,18
2. You do not announce the quizzes beforehand.	39	27,27	101	70,63
3. You write various types of questions from different cognitive levels.	129	90,21	10	6,99
4. You always follow the time limit and give no hints or interpretations to the students while administering the standardized tests.	96	67,13	44	30,77
21. While preparing your students for a national/international exam, you make your students complete such test types during your teaching almost all of the time.	106	74,13	30	20,98
Standardized Testing, Test Revision, and Instructional Improvement				
5. When you conduct a standardized test, you only announce test scores to students, without doing further analysis.	25	17,48	115	80,42
6. You do some statistical analysis (e.g. central tendency, mean) to make some interpretations from teacher-made tests.	122	85,31	16	11,19
7. When you conduct teacher-made tests, you try to find out if there are certain questions which are not answered even by a student or certain questions are answered by all the students. You make further analysis for each item.	126	88,11	12	8,39
8. After assessing the exam results, you take into account the exam results for planning of the following instruction.	132	92,31	7	4,90
9. You revise and sometimes omit certain questions from teacher-made tests after analyzing the test items.	118	82,52	18	12,59
10. You analyze assessment results to give you ideas about developing the curriculum.	127	88,81	12	8,39
18. You use assessment results of individual students when you need to make a decision about him/her (e.g. placement, promotion).	110	76,92	26	18,18
19. You evaluate improvement of your classroom by using assessment results.	122	85,31	15	10,49
Communicating Assessment Results, Ethics and Grading				
14. You give oral feedback to students	134	93,71	5	3,50
15. You give written feedback to your students.	122	85,31	17	11,89
16. You communicate classroom assessment results to your students	132	92,31	7	4,90
17. You communicate classroom assessment results to parents.	112	78,32	27	18,88

20. You communicate classroom assessment results to other teachers.	90	62,94	44	30,77
22. After, you have finished grading your students' tests, you communicate the results to all the students (e.g. hanging the list on your office door)	70	48,95	65	45,45
Using Performance Assessment				
11. You use portfolios to assess your students' progress.	127	88,81	11	7,69
13. While deciding on your students' overall grade at the end of the semester, there are some other criteria except paper-pencil tests (e.g. participation, individual hands-on, group hands-on).	130	90,91	8	5,59
Non-achievement-Based Grading				
23. For each student, you take into account students' abilities, attendance, effort, improvement, and/or classroom behaviors in the calculation of grades	128	89,51	8	5,59
26. While assigning semester grades, you incorporate exams, projects and homework grades. And you give different percentage to each of them in calculating semester grade.	121	84,62	16	11,19
Ensuring Test Validity and Reliability				
24. You assigned to students certain performance tasks that are related to instruction and course objectives.	124	86,71	13	9,09
25. You define a rating scale for the performance criteria and you communicate the scale with the students by presenting a sample of the rating scale.	119	83,22	18	12,59
12. You observe the students' performance and you use checklists or rating scales to record their assessment results.	131	91,61	8	5,59

According to Table 10, the statistics for “*Using Paper-Pencil Tests*” show that 90 % of the teachers find Situation 3 “*You write various types of questions from different cognitive levels*” as ethical classroom assessment practices while 27 % of the teachers find Situation 2 “*You do not announce the quizzes beforehand*” as ethical. Teachers often have ethical concerns over the questions of an exam and they try to prepare or apply the exams, the questions of which are valid and reliable. They also think that announcing the dates of the exam beforehand is ethical, because Table 10 shows that 79 % of the teachers find Situation 1 “*You announce the quizzes a week before*” as ethical.

The statistics for “*Standardized Testing, Test Revision, and Instructional Improvement*” in Table 10 suggests that making further analysis for the exams and using the results for the following instruction or developing curriculum are ethical practices in the classroom assessment process. 92 % of the teachers think that Situation

8 “*After assessing the exam results, you take into account the exam results for planning of the following instruction*” as ethical and it has the highest percentage in the factor of STRI. It also suggests that the teachers mostly prefer doing further exam analysis for the exam results and they do not finish the assessment process with just announcing the scores to the students. On the other hand, Situation 5 “*Announcing the test scores without doing any further analysis after conducting a test*” is found highly unethical.

Table 10 shows that “*Communicating Assessment Results*” has the highest percentage for being considered ethical. Situation 14 “*You give feedback to students*” not only has the highest percentage in its factor, but also it is the highest of all 26 situations. 93 % of the teachers find giving oral feedback to the students as ethical while 92% of the teachers consider communicating assessment results to the students as an ethical process. Both of these high levels of frequency reveal teachers’ attention for making learners be aware of the assessment process, and they think those kinds of practices are ethical assessment practices.

According to the statistics in Table 10, situations that related to “*Using Performance Assessment*” and “*Non-achievement Based Grading*” are considered highly ethical. Situation 13 shows that 90% of the teachers think that considering such criteria as participation, group or individual hands-on activities also require highly ethical process.

The results of the inferential statistics for teachers’ views about the ethics of the classroom assessment practices show that there is not significant difference in the teachers’ views about the assessment practices in terms of the education level the teachers teach at, their years of experience and their educational background. Teachers from different grade levels or educational background has similar views about the ethics of the classroom assessment practices and their views do not change through the years because their years of experience do not affect their views. However, there is a significant difference in teachers’ views about the ethics of the assessment practices in terms of the institutions they work for. Table 11 shows the results of the t-test for the views of the teachers in terms of types of schools they work in.

Table 11. Results of t-test and Descriptive Statistics for Language Teachers' Views about Ethics of the Classroom Assessment Practices by the School Type

	School Type						95% CI for		t	Df
	Public			Private			Mean Difference			
	M	SD	n	M	SD	n				
UPP	1,31	0,15	94	1,30	0,18	46	-0,05	0,06	0,15	138
STRI	1,17	0,12	94	1,26	0,19	46	-0,13	-0,03	-3,14*	138
COMEG	1,26	0,16	93	1,32	0,17	46	-0,11	0,00	-1,94	137
UPA	1,04	0,13	93	1,13	0,25	46	-2,89	137,00	-0,16*	-0,03
NG	1,07	0,19	92	1,12	0,24	45	-0,12	0,02	-1,36	135
ETVR	1,07	0,17	93	1,14	0,24	46	-0,14	0,00	-2,19*	137
Total	1,19	0,09	94	1,25	0,13	46	-0,09	-0,01	-2,97*	138

Note. UPP = Using Paper–Pencil Tests; STRI = Standardized testing, Test Revision, and Instructional Improvement; COMEG = Communicating Assessment Results, Ethics, and Grading; UPA = Using Performance Assessment; NG = Nonachievement-Based Grading; ETVR = Ensuring Test Validity and Reliability (API, Zhang & Burry-Stock, 2003). * $p < .05$.

According to Table 11, there is statistically mean difference in teachers' views in terms of the institutions they work for ($t = -2.97$, $p < 0.5$). There is significant difference especially in terms of the factors, STRI, UPA, and ETVR. And the results reveals that teachers who work in private school mostly use performance assessment practices and find the practices as ethical while teachers who work in the public schools use the assessment practices less. The teachers also have different ethical views in terms of assessment practices such as standardized testing, test revision, and instructional improvement.

4.3. Data Analysis and Results for the relation between Teachers' Classroom Assessment Practices and their Views about the Ethics of the Classroom Assessment Practices

The study lastly aims to examine the relation between the teachers' classroom assessment practices and their views about the ethics of the classroom assessment practices. Table 12 shows the statistics for the correlations between language teachers' classroom assessment practices and their views about the ethics of the classroom assessment practices.

Table 12. Correlations between Teachers' Classroom Assessment Practices and Their Views about Ethics of the Assessment Practices

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. P-UPP	-	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	0,47	0,89	0,54	0,65	0,70	0,69	0,75
2. P-STRI	.00	-	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	0,66	0,83	0,25	0,54	0,68	0,75	0,72
3. P-COMEG	.00	.00	-	.00	.00	.00	.00	0,25	0,30	0,04*	0,38	0,54	0,12	0,05
4. P-UPA	.00	.00	.00	-	.00	.00	.00	0,55	0,90	0,64	0,43	0,13	0,91	0,79
5. P-NG	.00	.00	.00	.00	-	.00	.00	0,20	0,39	0,08	0,28	0,00***	0,27	0,04*
6. P-ETVR	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	-	.00	0,03*	0,26	0,40	0,10	0,77	0,07	0,06
7. P-TOTAL	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	-	0,20	0,59	0,14	0,65	0,50	0,35	0,16
8. E-UPP	0,47	0,66	0,25	0,55	0,20	0,03	0,20	-	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
9. E-STRI	0,89	0,83	0,30	0,90	0,39	0,26	0,59	.00	-	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
10. E-COMEG	0,54	0,25	0,04*	0,64	0,08	0,40	0,14	.00	.00	-	.00	.00	.00	.00
11. E-UPA	0,65	0,54	0,38	0,43	0,28	0,10	0,65	.00	.00	.00	-	.00	.00	.00
12. E-NG	0,70	0,68	0,54	0,13	0,00***	0,77	0,50	.00	.00	.00	.00	-	.00	.00
13. E-ETVR	0,69	0,75	0,12	0,91	0,27	0,07	0,35	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	-	.00
14. E-TOTAL	0,75	0,72	0,05	0,79	0,04*	0,06	0,16	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	-
M	3,56	3,47	3,68	3,86	3,99	3,66	3,64	1,30	1,20	1,28	1,07	1,09	1,09	1,21
SD	0,51	0,67	0,68	0,82	0,80	0,72	0,50	0,16	0,15	0,16	0,18	0,21	0,20	0,11
RANGE	1-5	1-5	1-5	1-5	1-5	1-5	1-5	1-2	1-2	1-2	1-2	1-2	1-2	1-2

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Note. P-UPP = API - Using Paper-Pencil Tests; P-STRI = API - Standardized testing, Test Revision, and Instructional Improvement; P-COMEG = API -Communicating Assessment Results, Ethics, and Grading; P-UPA = API - Using Performance Assessment; P-NG = API – Non-achievement-Based Grading; P-ETVR =API - Ensuring Test Validity and Reliability. . E-UPP = Situation - Using Paper-Pencil Tests; E-STRI = Situation - Standardized testing, Test Revision, and Instructional Improvement; E-COMEG = Situation -Communicating Assessment Results, Ethics, and Grading; E-UPA = Situation - Using Performance Assessment; E-NG = Situation - Nonachievement-Based Grading; E- ETVR = Situation - Ensuring Test Validity and Reliability

Table 12 shows that there is no correlation between language teachers' classroom assessment practices and their views about the ethics of the classroom assessment practices in terms of total scores and the other six factors.

CHAPTER 5

5. CONCLUSION

Assessment process in the classroom, which requires a variety of assessment practices, needs to be clearly defined. Classroom assessment, concerns of which are effective learning and teaching processes, requires more systematic and elaborated processes for learners. There have been new or supportive researches on the issue identifying the importance of the classroom assessment practices. This study aims to be one of these researches that identify the classroom assessment practices of the language teachers.

5.1. Summary

This part covers certain features of the study and gives specific information about the purpose, methodology and the results. As examining the classroom assessment practices and viewing teachers' ideas about the ethics of classroom assessment practices have gained prominence in recent years, this study seeks to expand current research and it was conducted to investigate language teachers' classroom assessment practices and their views about the ethics of classroom assessment practices in terms of the education level the teachers teach at, the teachers' years of teaching experience, the institutions they work for, and their educational background. The relation between language teachers' classroom assessment practices and their views about the ethics of the classroom assessment practices are also examined in the study.

This study was carried out with 143 English teachers from different levels of schools. A five-point Likert Scale including 67 items, Assessment Practices Inventory (API) (Zhang & Burry-Stock, 2003) was conducted for identifying teachers' classroom assessment practices while the situations written by the researcher was used for examining the teachers' views about the ethics of the assessment practices. Descriptive statistics (frequencies, means, percentages and standard deviation), inferential statistics (t-test, ANOVA) and correlation statistics (Pearson Correlation) were carried out for analysis.

The results of the study show that there is a significant difference in the language teachers' classroom assessment practices in terms of the education level they work at and the teachers' views about ethics of the classroom assessment practices in

terms of the institutions they work for. However, there is no correlation between language teachers' classroom assessment practices and their views about the ethics of the classroom assessment practices.

5.2. Discussion

This study revealed many data related to teachers' classroom assessment practices and their views about the ethics of the classroom assessment practices in terms of the education level they teach at, the institutions they work for and their educational background. Both descriptive and inferential statistics make it possible to interpret the data. According to descriptive statistics with regard to teachers' classroom assessment practices, there are significant interpretations about classroom assessment practices in terms of '*Communicating Assessment Results*', '*Using Performance Assessment*' and '*Non Achievement Based Grading*'.

The teachers give oral feedback in their classroom more than giving other types of feedback and they prefer communicating assessment results to the students rather than parents or other educators. Giving feedback to the students will inevitably help learners improve themselves, but the timing and frequency of the feedback is vital. Learners can be aware of their strengths and weaknesses. They review their learning process and so on. The teachers mostly prefer giving feedback orally, because giving written or any other types of feedbacks may require much more effort. '*Communicating Assessment Results to the students*' is one the most frequently used assessment practices in the classroom. It provides the learners with the outcomes of the assessment process. The teachers mostly use this practice because the assessment results are always regarded as the basic indicator of the learning. It explains many things about the whole process of learning. However, communicating assessment results only to students is again the simplest way in the process and the teachers prefer communicating the assessment results to the students more than communicating to the parents or other educators. Though it is more difficult to share the results and the ideas about the students with parents and other educators, it develops the collaboration of school and home. It is possible to improve family-school relationship in this way. Collaboration with other educators also enhances the quality of the education at the school. It helps other educators assess the students in terms of many fields. The results show that feedback is significant in language assessment and the students need to be provided

with various types of feedbacks. While communicating assessment results to the students is critical, the parents and other educators also need to be involved in the assessment process.

The teachers also assess the students' individual class participation and hands-on activities as important process; it supports the idea that classroom assessment is more than just written exams. Teachers prefer using performance assessment, for it explains more than paper-pencil tests. Although performance assessment requires much more time and effort, it demonstrates many things about the learners such as their production, responses to every type of questions, classroom behaviors and skills. Performance assessment also provides the teachers with the chance of observing the learners in real-world tasks. This result also shows that learners' performance and participating in the lessons are noted or appreciated by the teachers.

The teachers incorporate ability, classroom behavior, improvement, effort or attendance in the calculation of grades. This shows that teachers prefer using non-achievement based grading. As there are many factors that affect students' success, the teachers use both academic and non-academic grading in the calculation of grades. Students' success do not only means getting high grades from written exams. Effort, attendance or improvement also needs to be considered by the instructors, because noting these behaviors will enhance the students' motivation and it may bring the academic success together.

Thanks to inferential statistics, it is possible to make significant interpretations about teachers' classroom assessment practices in terms of the education level they teach at and the institutions they work for. Teachers who work in private schools use performance assessment practices more than the teachers who work in public schools. As performance assessment requires much more effort, time and money (Brown, 2004, p. 10-11), the English teachers who work in public schools may use the performance assessment practices less than the teachers who work in private schools. Because, teachers of private schools have more English classes in a week and English classes start at pre-school education in private schools.

The teachers who work in primary schools use more individual based performance assessment practices while the teachers who work in secondary or high schools prefer using more paper-pencil tests. The basic reason for this choice of primary school teachers may be the grading system in the primary schools. The students are graded as "*Very good*", "*Good*" or "*Need to be developed*". Considering such grading

and the age of the learners, using more performance-based grading may seem to be reasonable. On the other hand, central examinations are much more important in the secondary and high school and this make teachers rely more on paper-pencil tests. In other words, as the grade level increases, teachers focus more on objective tests. Zhang & Burry-Stock (2003) also states that educators' dependence on more objective assessment practices increases, as level of grade increases.

There are also significant interpretations about teachers' views about the ethics of the classroom assessment practices in terms of '*Communicating Assessment Results*', '*Using Performance Assessment*', '*Non Achievement Based Grading*' and the institutions teachers work for. The teachers who work in private schools use performance assessment practices more frequently and find these practices ethical. They also find using standardized tests and making test revision more ethical than the teachers who work in public schools. This means that teachers of private schools have different ethical views about the classroom assessment practices.

5.3. Limitations of the Study

The study was conducted just in a limited region in terms of the participants. It can be conducted with more participants from various cities of the Turkey. Therefore, it can also give us the chance of investigating the difference between classroom assessment practices and the cities. Moreover, the study once aimed to investigate classroom assessment practices in terms of educational backgrounds of the teachers such as BA, MA or PhD. As there were not enough participants in PhD, the study conducted according to two variables; BA and MA.

5.4. Implications and Suggestions for Further Studies

This study disclosed certain implications in terms of classroom assessment practices and the ethical prospect of the assessment practices. Firstly, the matters of giving feedback or communicating the assessment results to the students are significant for teachers in the classroom assessment process. They give opportunities to the students to be aware of their performance and to improve themselves. Students' making interpretations from the process will inevitably help them. Next, students' performances are evaluated by the educators; many criteria from classroom participation to effort are carefully considered by the teachers. It makes possible to control over assessment of the

integrated skills or any types of production of the students. Both communications of the results and assessment of non-academical behaviors will help the students become efficient learners.

In addition, the differences in views of the public and private schools teachers in terms of performance assessment shows the differences of opinions between two types of educational institutions. Actually, performance assessment is vital not only in every type of institutions but also in all levels of education. Even just primary schools or private schools teachers find performance assessment ethical more frequently; it should also be considered in all levels of education. The last implication of the study is classroom assessment practices' not being related to ethical concerns of the teachers, because the study suggests that there is no correlation between teachers' assessment practices and their views about ethics of the practices. However, the overall implication is that all the teachers that participated in the study have high frequency of using classroom assessment practices.

In further studies, it can be conducted with more participants from various backgrounds or levels so that it can show the implications of the larger groups. It is also possible to conduct certain qualitative studies in which teachers can state their personal opinions about the issue of ethics of the classroom assessment practices. Therefore, it will also be possible to investigate the ethics of the classroom assessment practices more elaborately.

6. REFERENCES

- Afitska, O. (2014) *Use Of Formative Assessment, Self- And Peer-Assessment In The Classrooms: Some Insights From Recent Language Testing And Assessment (LTA) Research*. *i-manager's Journal on English Language Teaching (JELT)*, 4 (1). 29 - 39. ISSN 2231-3333,E-ISSN2249-0752
- Angelo, T. A., & Cross, K. P. (1993). *Classroom assessment techniques: A handbook for college teachers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers
- Association of Language Testers in Europe. (2001). *Principles of good practice for ALTE examinations*.
- Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (2010). *Language assessment in practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Berens, P. (2009). CircStat: a MATLAB toolbox for circular statistics. *J Stat Software*, 31(10), 1-21.
- Brookhart, S. M. (1998). *Teaching about Grading and Communicating Assessment Results*.
- Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices*. New York: Pearson/Longman.
- Chappuis, S., & Stiggins, R. J. (2002). Classroom assessment for learning. *Educational Leadership*, 60(1), 40-44.
- Cooper, D., & O'Connor, K. (2008). *Communicating student learning: Guidelines for schools—In consultation with Manitoba Education, Citizenship and Youth*
- Cowie, N., & Sakui, K. (2015). Assessment and e-learning: Current issues and future trends. *JALT CALL Journal*, 11(3).
- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research: planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Elliott, S. N. (1994). *Creating Meaningful Performance Assessments: Fundamental Concepts*.
- Estaji, M. (2011). Ethics and validity stance in educational assessment. *English Language and Literature Studies*, 1(2), 89.
- European Association for Language Testing and Assessment. (2006). *EALTA Guidelines for good practice in language testing and assessment*.

- Fulcher, G., & Davidson, F. (2007). *Language testing and assessment*. London, NY: Routledge.
- Ghaicha, A. (2016). Theoretical Framework for Educational Assessment: A Synoptic Review. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(24).
- Given, L. M. (Ed.). (2008). *The Sage encyclopedia of qualitative research methods*. Sage Publications.
- Green, S. K., Johnson, R. L., Kim, D. H., & Pope, N. S. (2007). Ethics in classroom assessment practices: Issues and attitudes. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(7), 999-1011.
- Gul, S. B. A. (2014). Assessment and Understanding of Gujjar and Bakerwal Women's Health in Jammu And Kashmir. *Journal of Business Management & Social Sciences Research*, 3(3), 37-43.
- Hamp-Lyons, L. (1998). Ethical test preparation practice: The case of the TOEFL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(2), 329-337.
- Japan Language Testing Association. (2007). The JLTA Code of Good Testing Practice.
- Jia, Y. (2009). Ethical Standards for language testing professionals: An introduction to five major codes. *Shiken: JALT Testing & Evaluation SIG Newsletter*, 13(2), 2-8.
- Karavas, K. (2013). Fairness and Ethical Language Testing: The Case of the KPG. *Directions in Language Teaching and Testing*, 1
- Kunnan, A. J. (2000). *Fairness and validation in language assessment: selected papers from the 19th Language Testing Research Colloquium, Orlando, Florida* (Vol. 9). Cambridge University Press.
- Kunnan, A. J. (2013). *Validation in language assessment*. Taylor & Francis.
- McMillan, J. H. (1999). *Establishing High Quality Classroom Assessments*.
- Messick, S. (1990). Validity of test interpretation and use. *ETS Research Report Series*, 1990(1), 1487-1495.
- Messick, S. (1995). Validity of psychological assessment: Validation of inferences from persons' responses and performances as scientific inquiry into score meaning. *American psychologist*, 50(9), 741.
- Mundrake, G. A. (2000). The evolution of assessment, testing, and evaluation. In: Rucker, J. *Assessment in Business Education*, 38, NBEA Yearbook. Reston: NBEA

- Norris, J. M. (2000). Purposeful Language Assessment: Selecting the Right Alternative Test. (Vol. 38, No. 1, pp. 41-45). US Department of State. Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Office of English Language Programs, SA-5, 2200 C Street NW 4th Floor, Washington, DC 20037.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Performance Assessment: CEC Mini-Library. Council for Exceptional Children, 1920 Association Dr., Reston, VA 22091-1589
- Popham, W. J. (1999). Why standardized tests don't measure educational quality. *Educational leadership*, 56, 8-16.
- Saefurrohman, S., & Balinas, E. S. (2016). English Teachers Classroom Assessment Practices. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, 5(1), 82-92.
- Shanks, T., Andre, C., Velasquez, M., & Meyer, M. J. (2010). What is Ethics?.
- Shohamy, E. 2001. *The power of tests: A critical perspective of the uses of language tests*. Harlow: Longman
- Sukamolson, S. (2010). Fundamentals of quantitative research. *Language Institute, Chulalongkorn University*.
- Tran, T. H. (2012). Second Language Assessment for Classroom Teachers Paper presented at MIDTESOL 2012, Ames, Iowa.
- Wiliam, D. (2011). What is assessment for learning?. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 37(1), 3-14.
- Xi, X. (2010). How do we go about investigating test fairness?. *Language Testing*.
- Yesbeck, D. M. (2011). Grading practices: Teachers' considerations of academic and non-academic factors (Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Commonwealth University Richmond, Virginia).
- Zhang, Z. (1995). Investigating teachers' self-perceived assessment practices and assessment competencies on the Assessment Practices Inventory. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama
- Zhang, Z., & Burry-Stock, J. A. (2003). Classroom assessment practices and teachers' self-perceived assessment skills. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 16(4), 323-342.

7. APPENDICES

7.1. Appendix 1: Assessment Practices Inventory

Sayın Katılımcı,

Bu araştırma, Çağ Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Yüksek Lisans Programı dâhilinde yürütülmekte olan ‘İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Değerlendirme Uygulamaları ve Değerlendirme Uygulamalarının Etik Boyutu Hakkındaki Düşünceleri’ konulu Yüksek Lisans Tezi için yapılmaktadır. Elde edilecek bilgiler tamamen bilimsel amaçlı kullanılacak olup, ankette isim belirtme gerekliliği bulunmamaktadır. Ankette yer alan sorulara içtenlikle ve hiçbir soruyu atlamadan yanıt vermeniz araştırmanın bilimsel geçerliliği ve güvenilirliği açısından büyük önem taşımaktadır. Katkılarınız için teşekkür ederiz.

Erdal CAN
Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi

Doç. Dr. Şehnaz ŞAHİNKARAKAŞ
Danışman

1. Öğrenim Durumu

Lisans (.....)

Yüksek Lisans (.....)

Doktora (.....)

2. İş Tecrübesi

1-3 yıl (.....)
(.....)

4-6 yıl (.....)

7-9 yıl (.....)

10-12 yıl (.....)

13 yıl ve üzeri

3. Çalışmakta Olduğunuz Eğitim Seviyesi

İlkokul (.....)

Ortaokul (.....)

Lise (.....)

Üniversite (.....)

4. Çalıştığınız Kurum,

Devlet (.....)

Özel (.....)

5. Çalıştığınız Şehir

.....

Assessment Practices Inventory (8.0)

This inventory contains 67 items that address issues in classroom assessment of student learning. For each item, please use the following rating scales to indicate how frequently you use the assessment practice described by the item. (1 = not at all used, 2 = seldom used, 3 = used occasionally, 4 = used often, and 5 = used very often)

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Choosing appropriate assessment methods for instructional decisions.					
2. Selecting textbook-provided test items for classroom assessment.					
3. Revising previously produced teacher-made tests to match current instructional emphasis.					
4. Administering announced quizzes.					
5. Administering unannounced quizzes.					
6. Evaluating oral questions from students.					
7. Assessing students through observation.					
8. Determining if a standardized achievement test is valid for classroom assessment.					
9. Using a table of specifications to plan assessments.					
10. Developing assessments based on clearly defined course objectives.					
11. Matching assessments with instruction.					
12. Writing paper-pencil tests.					
13. Writing multiple-choice questions.					
14. Writing matching questions.					
15. Writing true/false questions.					
16. Writing fill-in-the-blank or short answer questions.					
17. Writing essay questions.					
18. Writing test items for higher cognitive levels.					
19. Constructing a model answer for scoring essay questions.					
20. Ensuring adequate content sampling for a test.					
21. Matching performance tasks to instruction and course objectives.					

22. Defining a rating scale for performance criteria in advance.					
23. Communicating performance assessment criteria to students in advance.					
24. Recording assessment result on the rating scale/checklist while observing a student's performance.					
25. Using concept mapping to assess student learning.					
26. Assessing individual class participation.					
27. Assessing group class participation.					
28. Assessing individual hands-on activities.					
29. Assessing group hands-on activities.					
30. Assessing individual class participation.					
31. Using portfolios to assess student progress.					
32. Following required procedures (time limit, no hints, no interpretation) when administering standardized tests.					
33. Interpreting standardized test scores (e.g., Stanine, Percentile Rank) to students and parents.					
34. Interpreting Percentile Band to students and parents.					
35. Calculating and interpreting central tendency and variability for teacher made tests.					
36. Conducting item analysis (i.e., difficulty and discrimination indices) for teacher-made tests.					
37. Revising a test based on item analysis.					
38. Obtaining diagnostic information from standardized tests.					
39. Using assessment results when planning teaching.					
40. Using assessment results when developing curriculum.					
41. Using assessment results when making decisions (e.g., placement, promotion) about individual students.					
42. Using assessment results when evaluating class improvement.					
43. Using assessment results when evaluating school improvement.					
44. Developing systematic grading procedures.					
45. Developing a grading philosophy.					
46. Using norm-referenced grading model.					
47. Using criteria-referenced grading model.					

48. Using systematic procedures to determine borderline grades.					
49. Informing students in advance how grades are to be assigned.					
50. Establishing student expectations for determining grades for special education students.					
51. Weighing differently projects, exams, homework, etc. when assigning semester grades.					
52. Incorporating extra credit activities in the calculation of grades.					
53. Incorporating ability in the calculation of grades.					
54. Incorporating classroom behavior in the calculation of grades.					
55. Incorporating improvement in the calculation of grades.					
56. Incorporating effort in the calculation of grades.					
57. Incorporating attendance in the calculation of grades.					
58. Assigning grades.					
59. Providing oral feedback to students.					
60. Providing written feedback to students.					
61. Communicating classroom assessment results to students.					
62. Communicating classroom assessment results to parents.					
63. Communicating classroom assessment results to other educators.					
64. Avoiding teaching to the test when preparing students for tests.					
65. Protecting students' confidentiality with regard to test scores.					
66. Recognizing unethical, illegal, or otherwise inappropriate assessment methods.					
67. Recognizing unethical, illegal, or otherwise inappropriate uses of assessment information.					

7.2. Appendix 2: Situations about Classroom Assessment Practices

This part contains 27 situations that address classroom assessment practices in terms of ethical issues. For each item, please use the following rating scales to indicate whether assessment practice described by the situation is ethical or not. (1 = Ethical, 2 = Unethical)

	1	2
1. You announce the quizzes a week before.		
2. You do not announce the quizzes beforehand.		
3. You write various types of questions from different cognitive levels.		
4. You always follow the time limit and give no hints or interpretations to the students while administering the standardized tests.		
5. When you conduct a standardized test, you only announce test scores to students, without doing further analysis.		
6. You do some statistical analysis (e.g. central tendency, mean) to make some interpretations from teacher-made tests.		
7. When you conduct teacher-made tests, you try to find out if there are certain questions which are not answered even by a student or certain questions are answered by all the students. You make further analysis for each item.		
8. After assessing the exam results, you take into account the exam results for planning of the following instruction.		
9. You revise and sometimes omit certain questions from teacher-made tests after analyzing the test items.		
10. You analyze assessment results to give you ideas about developing the curriculum.		
11. You use portfolios to assess your students' progress.		
12. You observe the students' performance and you use checklists or rating scales to record their assessment results.		
13. While deciding on your students' overall grade at the end of the semester, there are some other criteria except paper-pencil tests (e.g. participation, individual hands-on, group hands-on).		
14. You give oral feedback to students		

15. You give written feedback to your students.		
16. You communicate classroom assessment results to your students		
17. You communicate classroom assessment results to parents.		
18. You use assessment results of individual students when you need to make a decision about him/her (e.g. placement, promotion).		
19. You evaluate improvement of your classroom by using assessment results.		
20. You communicate classroom assessment results to other teachers.		
21. While preparing your students for a national/international exam, you make your students complete such test types during your teaching almost all of the time.		
22. After, you have finished grading your students' tests, you communicate the results to all the students (e.g. hanging the list on your office door)		
23. For each student, you take into account students' abilities, attendance, effort, improvement, and/or classroom behaviors in the calculation of grades		
24. You assigned to students certain performance tasks that are related to instruction and course objectives.		
25. You define a rating scale for the performance criteria and you communicate the scale with the students by presenting a sample of the rating scale.		
26. While assigning semester grades, you incorporate exams, projects and homework grades. And you give different percentage to each of them in calculating semester grade.		
27. You asked one of your colleagues to administer your exam on behalf of you. While grading the exam papers, you realized that most of the students had cheated, but you still graded the papers without taking any actions		