



An In-Depth Examination of Writing Assessment Literacy Among University Preparatory Students in Turkish Higher Education

Türk Yükseköğretiminde Üniversite Hazırlık Öğrencilerinin Yazma Değerlendirme Okuryazarlığının Derinlemesine İncelenmesi

Doğukan Hazar Özçubuk¹  Ali Merç² 

¹ Lecturer, Anadolu University, School of Foreign Languages, Eskişehir, Türkiye

² Prof. Dr., Anadolu University, Faculty of Education, Eskişehir, Türkiye

Makale Bilgileri

Geliş Tarihi (Received Date)

29.01.2024

Kabul Tarihi (Accepted Date)

05.06.2024

*Sorumlu Yazar

Doğukan Hazar Özçubuk

Anadolu University, School of Foreign Languages, Yunus Emre Campus – Eskişehir, Türkiye.

dhozubuk@anadolu.edu.tr

Abstract: As a nascent research domain, there is a scarcity of research studies that examine the levels of assessment literacy, perceptions, beliefs, and practices among students concerning their Student Writing Assessment Literacy (SWAL). To address this research gap, the present study adopts a mixed-methods design, incorporating the Scale of SWAL (Xu et al., 2023) alongside semi-structured interviews. 134 students answered the scale, while an additional twelve students volunteered to participate in the interviews. Student responses from the scale were subjected to analysis through descriptive statistics, revealing a notable correlation between students' comprehension of assessment objectives and the manifestation of positive attitudes towards learning. Nevertheless, a misalignment was noticed between their theoretical understanding and beliefs and their pragmatic implementation regarding written assignments. Interview data underwent analysis through thematic analysis, elucidating four main themes: (1) feedback valuation, (2) scoring criteria awareness, (3) feedback delivery preferences, and (4) alternative assessment avoidance. Implications emphasise the importance of involving students in the assessment process and advocate for teacher training initiatives to enhance SWAL. Future research could broaden their scope to reach diverse academic levels and integrate grades as a variable. Overall, the present study provides valuable insights into SWAL, shedding light on assessment practices at the tertiary level.

Keywords: Assessment knowledge, assessment literacy, student writing assessment literacy, writing assessment, writing assessment literacy

Öz: Yeni gelişmekte olan bir araştırma alanı olarak, öğrencilerin Öğrenci Yazma Değerlendirme Okuryazarlığı (SWAL) ile ilgili dil değerlendirme okuryazarlık düzeylerini, algılarını, inançlarını ve uygulamalarını inceleyen araştırma sayısı oldukça azdır. Bu araştırma boşluğunu gidermek için, bu çalışma, yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmelerin yanı sıra SWAL Ölçeğini (Xu vd., 2023) içeren karma bir yöntem tasarımı benimsemiştir. 134 üniversite hazırlık sınıfı öğrencisi ölçeği yanıtlarken, on iki öğrenci de görüşmelere katılmak için gönüllü olmuştur. Öğrencilerin ölçekten aldıkları yanıtlar tanımlayıcı istatistikler aracılığıyla analize tabi tutulmuş ve öğrencilerin değerlendirme hedeflerini anlamaları ile öğrenmeye yönelik olumlu tutum sergilemeleri arasında kayda değer bir korelasyon olduğu ortaya çıkmıştır. Bununla birlikte, öğrencilerin teorik anlayışları ve inançları ile yazılı ödevlere ilişkin pragmatik uygulamaları arasında bir uyumsuzluk olduğu fark edilmiştir. Yarı-yapılandırılmış görüşme verileri tematik analiz yoluyla analiz edilmiş ve dört ana tema ortaya çıkmıştır: (1) geribildirim değerlemesi, (2) puanlama kriterleri farkındalığı, (3) geribildirim verme tercihleri ve (4) alternatif değerlendirmeden kaçınma. Bulgular, öğrencileri değerlendirme sürecine dahil etmenin önemini vurgulamakta ve SWAL'ı geliştirmek için öğretmen eğitimi girişimlerini savunmaktadır. Gelecekteki araştırmalar, farklı akademik seviyelere ulaşmak ve notları bir değişken olarak entegre etmek için kapsamalarını genişletebilir. Genel olarak, mevcut çalışma SWAL konusunda değerli bilgiler sunmakta ve yükseköğretim düzeyindeki değerlendirme uygulamalarına ışık tutmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Değerlendirme bilgisi, değerlendirme okuryazarlığı, öğrenci yazma değerlendirme okuryazarlığı, yazma değerlendirmesi, yazma değerlendirme okuryazarlığı

Özçubuk, D. H. & Merç, A. (2024). An in-depth examination of writing assessment literacy among university preparatory students in Turkish Higher Education. *Erzincan University Journal of Education Faculty*, 26(2), 291-304. <https://doi.org/10.17556/erziefd.1427430>

Introduction

Assessment literacy (AL), referring to the capacity of individuals involved in education to identify and effectively use assessment instruments for educational and evaluative purposes (Taylor, 2009) has garnered substantial research attention in the early twenty-first century. This heightened attention towards AL can be attributed to its significant potential impact on the dynamics of instruction and learning within the educational setting. For this reason, AL imposes a consequential responsibility on stakeholders, necessitating that each party involved possess a comprehensive understanding of the fundamental concepts and principles governing assessment (Jeong, 2013; Popham, 2009). Language assessment literacy (LAL), encompassing competencies in designing, executing, and assessing evaluation instruments, pertains to the compendium of expertise, proficiencies, and methodologies linked to in-class assessment within the cadre of educators,

alluding to enhancing teaching and learning (Davies, 2008; Inbar-Lourie, 2008; Stiggins, 1991; Taylor, 2013). In recent years, while LAL has drawn noteworthy global attention (Lam, 2019; Ölmezer-Öztürk & Aydın, 2018; Tian et al., 2021), there remain numerous uncharted areas warranting further investigation. To date, most research on LAL has centred on educators, whereas investigations concentrating on students as the focal point are notably scarce and sporadic.

In response to the current research gap concerning student assessment literacy (SAL), and to enhance our understanding of writing assessment knowledge, the present study endeavours to examine student writing assessment literacy (SWAL) of a group of English preparatory school students at a state university in Turkey. Employing a mixed-methods approach, this study seeks to explore students' foundational knowledge regarding SWAL, along with their perspectives

and opinions regarding writing assessment within the context of their educational experiences.

Literature Review

A noteworthy body of research has delved into LAL domain, exploring conceptual frameworks, stakeholders' perceptions, beliefs, practices, and their LAL levels in previous studies (e.g., Fulcher, 2012; Scarino, 2013; Vogt & Tsağari, 2014). To illustrate, investigating the evolution of assessment methodologies in three stakeholder groups (professional language testers, EFL teachers, and graduate students in language studies programmes), Yan and Fan (2020) conducted one-on-one semi-structured interviews with twenty participants. The findings revealed that the cultivation of LAL is primarily contingent on the contextual nuances and experiential facets. Additionally, it was discerned that teachers and students engaged in language testing studies exhibited a greater familiarity with LAL terminologies and a heightened capacity for self-assessment of their LAL profiles.

Conversely, to address the existing research gap concerning teacher candidates in Japan, Roslan et al. (2022) executed a mixed-methods investigation involving fifty-six participants. Their findings revealed a notable deficiency in language testing and assessment (LTA) knowledge among teacher candidates, irrespective of their levels of teaching experience. The study findings additionally signified that the participants underwent neither pre-service nor in-service training, implying that their acquisition of knowledge in LTA occurs experientially within their professional milieu, facilitated by mentorship or collaborative interactions with peers in educational institutions.

Thanks to previous studies, persuasive evidence has emerged, underscoring the influence of assessment on students' learning objectives and academic achievements (e.g., Davari Torshizi & Bahraman, 2019; Denton & McIlroy, 2017). However, there are limited number of research studies in which student assessment literacy (SAL) has been explicitly used (Hannigan et al., 2022). In this respect, a study conducted by Smith et al. (2013) stands out as one of the highly acclaimed contributions to SAL, which outlined the concept within a tri-dimensional framework. According to this conceptualization, students need to (1) understand the purpose of assessment and how it connects with their learning trajectory, (2) be aware of the processes of assessment and how they might affect students' capacity to complete the assessment, and (3) be able to judge their own responses to assessment tasks so that they can identify what is good about their work and what still needs to be improved. Building on this conceptualization, other research studies (e.g., Baird et al., 2017; Chan & Luo, 2021; Chen et al., 2023) have attempted to broaden our understanding of SAL and how it can contribute to the success of the learners (Stiggins, 2008).

Empirical research on students' LAL is notably lacking; however, previous research has suggested that LAL contributes significantly to improving student performance and achievement (Aitken, 2011). Namely, focusing on the students' perceptions of different assessment types, Pereira et al. (2016) aimed to depict the distinctions between Portuguese and Swedish students. The study findings revealed that despite similar perceptions of assessment, students' assessment experiences varied owing to disparities in the educational systems in both countries. Furthermore, Lodge (2008) asserted that students possess the capacity to assess their own learning through various criteria and strategies and that they can establish connections between their current learning

experiences and future practices. Additionally, other studies have pointed to the significance of teachers in encouraging their students to take ownership of their academic studies and to facilitate their mutual progression toward pedagogical objectives through self- and peer assessment (William, 2018). Overall, LAL hinges upon students engaging in active collaboration with educators to augment their ability for self-assessment (Charteris & Thomas, 2017). It is, therefore, vital for students to assume an active role and shoulder their own responsibilities within the assessment process (Alonzo, 2016).

More specifically, written assessment has entered the studies because of scholarly endeavours and calls in recent year to incorporate other skills in the language learning process in connection to SAL. More importantly, the act of writing is assumed to have a significant role in fostering the cultivation of problem-solving and critical thinking competencies, which are indispensable for students' pedagogical growth (White, 2009). Moreover, to engage in effective writing assessment methodologies, both teachers and students must possess a proficient understanding of LAL (Lee, 2017). The body of writing assessment literacy (WAL) research emphasises teachers, with fewer studies centred on students. For instance, Hirvela and Belcher (2007) discussed the importance of instructing teachers both during pre- and in-service and what kind of programmes can be implemented for this purpose. Similarly, Weigle (2007) proposed that writing instructors should receive comprehensive training to develop, implement, assess, and effectively convey the results of trustworthy and valid classroom assessment. Building on this proposal, Crusan (2010) asserted that second language (L2) writing teachers should possess the capacity to create writing prompts and recognise the salience of assessment criteria, as well as use the results from writing assessment to enhance teaching and learning. Likewise, Crusan et al. (2016) reported that 63% of the participant teachers learnt about writing assessment either in general or in a course; nevertheless, they still reported concerns about their assessment skills in writing. In contrast, Mellati and Khademi (2018) found out that educators with high LAL levels wielded a substantial influence on the writing proficiency of their students.

In recent years, there has been a transition in the emphasis on WAL, accompanied by a noticeable increase in research studies (e.g., Rezai et al., 2021), advocating for increased explorations into students' WAL levels, beliefs, and perceptions. For example, Colby-Kelly & Turner (2007) suggested that more emphasis should be placed on self- and peer assessment, and that teachers should implement formative assessment strategies in their curriculum. Moreover, Su (2014) proposed that a person-based approach, emphasising student self-guidance, holds significant implications for higher education institutions striving to enhance student achievement. Similarly, to learn more about learners' comprehension and perspectives on assessment, Butler et al. (2021) executed a sequence of semi-structured interviews with upper primary school students. Results indicated that, notwithstanding the absence of specific training in LTA, the participants demonstrated profound knowledge and familiarity with English-language assessments. The results emphasise that involving students in assessment discussions serves as a channel to enhance their self-reflective abilities about learning objectives, improving their understanding of assessment purposes and skills as a result. Further, Xu et al. (2023), who worked with university students to design and validate the Scale of SWAL, asserted that SWAL encompasses broader

considerations related to the evaluation of writing performance, both within and beyond the classroom context, which includes activities, such as self-assessment and receiving feedback from teachers and peers. The study also addressed various strategies employed in the written assignment, including scoring rubrics, technological tools, and personal expertise for managing diverse writing assessment tasks, supporting the previous research studies in SWAL (Crusan et al., 2016; Chan & Luo, 2021; Smith et al., 2013).

Hence, this brief literature review accentuates one salient point concerning WAL. There are few empirical studies which investigated the subject among students, and more research is warranted as the implementation of effective writing assessment methodologies is paramount for the development of SWAL. Additionally, as per the researcher's awareness, there is a dearth of empirical research with students as the central participants in the existing literature. Because of this "research-practice gap" (Crusan, 2022, p. 431), and as a response to the call for further research to enhance and rejuvenate discussions in LTA (Inbar-Lourie, 2013), the current study adopted a mixed-methods approach with Scale of SWAL (Xu et al., 2023) and semi-structured interviews. Overall, this study is informed by two research questions:

1. What are the levels of student writing assessment literacy (SWAL) among university preparatory school students concerning their proficiency in knowledge, belief, behaviour, and critique?
2. What are the perspectives and opinions of university preparatory school students towards writing assessment, and how do these opinions impact their motivation, engagement, and learning in their written assignments?

Methodology

Research Context

In Turkey, schools of foreign languages deliver intensive language instruction within preparatory programmes, which students must successfully complete before moving onto their departments. At the school in which the study was conducted, there are five language levels: A+ (upper-intermediate), A (intermediate), B (pre-intermediate), C (elementary), and D (beginner). Regardless of their levels, students participate in both classroom-based and extracurricular activities, in addition to completing graded assignments designed to improve their language proficiency. Notably, teachers routinely administer writing tasks both within and outside the classroom, at the end of which they provide detailed feedback, including error codes, to aid students' writing skills. Furthermore, the writing component contributes to twenty percent of the exam during the term and holds the same weight for the end-of-year examination. Consequently, it can be asserted that the acquisition of writing skills is critical for these students. Recognising the paramount significance of writing as a productive skill, this educational context was deliberately chosen due to its pivotal focus on writing instruction and assessment.

Participants

For the study, 134 students (56 male and 78 female) aged from 17 to 24 ($M=19.12$) studying at the preparatory programme of a state university in Turkey participated in the study. Table 1 presents information about the participants.

Table 1: Information on scale participants

Demographic Information	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	56	41.8%
	Female	78	58.2%
Age group	17-19	92	68.7%
	20-24	42	31.3%
Department	Communication Sciences	53	39.6%
	Economics and Administrative Sciences	46	34.3%
	Education	16	11.9%
	Humanities	11	8.2%
	Others	8	6.0%
Level	A+	27	20.1%
	A	20	14.9%
	B	26	19.4%
	C	33	24.6%
	D	28	20.9%
Year of study	First year	126	94.0%
	Second year	8	6.0%

As Table 1 shows, students studying at different departments participated in the study, Communication Sciences and Economics being the highest contributors ($n=53$, $n=46$ respectively), making 73.9% of the total participants. As for the proficiency level of the students, lower-level students contributed more to the study. It is also interesting to note that 94.0% of the participants were in their first year of the prep school.

For the semi-structured interviews, convenience sampling was employed due to the availability and accessibility of the participants within the contextual framework of the study (Dörnyei, 2007), and purposive sampling approach was also employed (Bernard, 2002). Table 2 presents information about the interview participants.

Table 2: Information on interview participants

Interviewee	Gender	Age	Department	Level	Year	Writing course
S1	F	18	Education	A+	1	No
S2	M	18	Education	A+	1	No
S3	F	17	Economics	A+	1	Yes
S4	F	18	Communication	A+	1	Yes
S5	F	19	Education	A+	1	Yes
S6	F	18	Humanities	A+	1	Yes
S7	F	18	Humanities	A	1	Yes
S8	M	18	Economics	B	1	No
S9	M	18	Economics	B	1	Yes
S10	F	18	Communication	B	1	Yes
S11	M	18	Economics	C	1	Yes
S12	F	18	Other (Graphic Arts)	D	1	No

As Table 2 shows, the highest number of interview participants came from A+, the highest level (upper-

intermediate) at the school. There were four male and eight female students, coming from all departments which represented the sample from the questionnaires. Although all the interview participants' year-of-study at the prep school was their first year, only four of the participants have taken a course on writing before.

Instruments

In this study, the Scale of SWAL (Xu et al., 2023) was employed with certain adaptations. First, the scale was translated into Turkish to ensure accessibility for all participants. The scale was translated into Turkish by a native speaker, and then translated back into English by another native speaker. Second, to align with the characteristics of the study population and the research objectives, a series of adjustments were introduced. For instance, several examples and explanations were added in between parentheses to make the items clearer to students from all levels in terms of writing assessment at the school. As a result, certain items have been redefined and adjusted to better accommodate the specific practices within the university context. Finally, two experts were consulted who offered feedback to enhance the clarity and comprehensibility of the scale.

The first part of the scale involved questions related to participants' demographic characteristics, such as gender, age, department, proficiency level, and year of study at the school. The second part of the scale included twenty-four questions related to SWAL in four dimensions: knowledge (six items), belief (six items), behaviour (six items), and critique (six items). Each item in the scale were written in Likert-scale, '1' denoting "strongly disagree" to '5' signifying "strongly agree" (See Appendix A for the scale).

Data Collection

The participants for the scale were selected with the convenience sampling due to their accessibility and availability (Mackey & Gass, 2022). Students from each proficiency level have been selected so that the sample could represent the characteristics of the population. It took fifteen minutes to complete the questionnaire.

Second, a supplementary data collection tool was incorporated into the research design to improve the reliability and the internal validity of the study (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). After the scale completion, a subset of students was extended invitations to participate in semi-structured interviews, with participation being entirely voluntary. The interviews included questions about SWAL, the significance attributed to writing assessment, their beliefs and perspectives regarding writing tasks and assessments, receiving feedback, and their involvement in alternative assessment methods. Each semi-structured interview lasted between fifteen to twenty minutes, and all the interviews were conducted in Turkish, the interviewees' native language.

The study employed a mixed-methods approach to expound upon, enrich, and illustrate the outcomes derived from the quantitative results by complementing them with the outcomes gathered from the qualitative analysis, thereby augmenting the overall significance of the study (Greene, 2007).

Data Analysis

Data from the scale, which asked students about their knowledge, beliefs, behaviours, and critique about their SWAL, were analysed using descriptive statistics (i.e.,

frequency, percentage, means, and standard deviations). All analyses were conducted using SPSS version 26.

For the qualitative data analysis, semi-structured interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim. As the interviews were conducted in Turkish, all the transcriptions were translated into English for the data analysis. Thematic data analysis was chosen to analyse the data qualitatively because it presents a more approachable method of analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). It also presents a pragmatic and readily approachable method for conducting research, in cases where the alternative approaches may be obscure, intricate, or challenging (Braun & Clarke, 2012).

For the analysis of the data, the researcher systematically analysed the recurring patterns in the dataset. After a process of coding, categorising, and interpreting the information, the main themes of the study emerged within the dataset. First, the transcripts were broken into excerpts and grouped into codes (open coding). Later, these codes were put into categories (axial coding). Finally, these categories comprised the main themes of the study (Corbin & Strauss, 1990). Finally, decisive step was taken to ensure that themes reflected dependability and that the data analysis is trustworthy and credible (Nowell et al., 2017). For this purpose, a fellow researcher was asked to review the codes and themes to achieve consensus on the themes of the research.

Results

Results from the Scale

For the quantitative analysis, scale results are analysed using descriptive statistics. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated as .887, a commendable value, particularly considering the acknowledged standard of acceptability being above .60 (Dörnyei & Dewaele, 2022). Table 3 presents the results from the scale.

Table 3: Descriptive statistics (frequency, means, and standard deviation) of the scale

Item	1 ^a	2	3	4	5	M	SD
SWALQ1	1	9	24	65	35	3.93	.881
SWALQ2	-	1	8	77	48	4.28	.608
SWALQ3	1	11	21	58	43	3.98	.938
SWALQ4	2	10	22	58	41	3.95	.952
SWALQ5	3	7	38	55	31	3.78	.939
SWALQ6	-	3	20	56	55	4.22	.779
SWALQ7	3	4	9	47	71	4.34	.901
SWALQ8	1	1	4	51	77	4.51	.669
SWALQ9	1	2	16	43	72	4.37	.809
SWALQ10	2	12	32	40	48	3.90	1.042
SWALQ11	-	1	10	49	74	4.46	.668
SWALQ12	2	4	19	51	58	4.19	.894
SWALQ13	10	28	40	48	8	3.12	1.048
SWALQ14	17	36	22	33	26	3.11	1.341
SWALQ15	-	13	20	65	36	3.93	.897
SWALQ16	2	2	20	77	33	4.02	.770
SWALQ17	1	8	33	56	36	3.88	.902
SWALQ18	1	2	23	62	46	4.12	.795
SWALQ19	4	12	28	59	31	3.75	1.007
SWALQ20	2	7	19	68	38	3.99	.880
SWALQ21	1	3	12	65	53	4.24	.768
SWALQ22	9	17	34	45	29	3.51	1.162
SWALQ23	3	22	20	50	39	3.75	1.115
SWALQ24	4	6	25	53	46	3.98	.992

^a 1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree, M = means, SD = standard deviation

The first dimension of the scale was related to comprehending the objectives of assessment, potential adverse repercussions associated with writing assessment, and diverse methodologies employed in evaluating writing proficiency (Xu et al., 2023). In this dimension, the highest mean score came from the second item in the scale ($M=4.28$; $SD=.608$), closely followed by the sixth item ($M=4.22$; $SD=.779$). While participants demonstrated an inclination for elevated knowledge, their responses to the fifth item on the scale indicated a deficiency in their capacity to apply this knowledge in assessing their written tasks ($M=3.78$; $SD=.939$).

The second dimension of the scale is associated with the function of writing in fostering the development of writing proficiency, the influence of writing assessment on emotional responses, and the inclination to participate in writing assessment activities (Xu et al., 2023). Mean scores of the items in this dimension suggest that the participants are familiar with the functions of written assessment and that they are positively affected by the written activities. For instance, more than 95% of the participants responded that engaging with teacher corrective feedback is important to improve writing proficiency ($M=4.51$; $SD=.669$). Similarly, more than 91% think that writing assessment help them see their strengths and weaknesses in their written assessments ($M=4.46$; $SD=.668$). Although the participants indicated positive approaches towards writing assessment, they also responded that such an attitude does not encourage them to write more ($M=3.90$; $SD=1.042$).

The third dimension of the scale is related to the application of strategies for varied writing assessment tasks, deliberate reflection on the writing assessment process, and the discernment and utilization of assessment outcomes to enhance subsequent advancements in writing proficiency (Xu et al., 2023). In the scale, high mean scores of the participants in the 'belief' dimension are not reflected in the 'behaviour' dimension. For instance, less than 30% of the participants responded that they do not use the scoring criteria to assess their written work ($M=3.12$, $SD=1.048$). Similarly, the participants also responded that they do not use computer technology to assess their written work. Despite not actively engaging, participants expressed a commitment to enhancing their writing proficiency through reflective consideration of their assessment ($M=4.12$, $SD=.795$).

The fourth and final dimension of the scale encompasses six items concerning the critical analysis of writing assessment outcomes, including the evaluation of feedback, and actively participating in dialogues with peers or instructors to enhance the writing assessment process (Xu et al., 2023). For item 21, more than 80% of the participants affirmed their sense of responsibility towards their teachers to improve their written assessment. However, this is not reflected in their answers regarding communicating with their peers or teachers in items 23 and 24 respectively ($M=3.75$; $SD=1.007$, $M=3.98$; $SD=.992$). The results from the critique dimension were the lowest from all four dimensions, and the mean scores of the items showed the highest fluctuation regarding standard deviation.

Results from the Semi-Structured Interviews

The data gathered from the semi-structured interviews were first analysed to be familiar with the dataset. Later, the researcher closely looked at the patterns that kept coming up in the dataset. After defining the recurrent keywords and phrases in the dataset, the broader categories were formed.

Finally, after classifying, categorising, and analysing the data, the categories were transformed into the main themes of the study. The following section presents the themes in detail.

Feedback valuation: prioritising feedback over grades

The predominant theme which consistently arose during the semi-structured interviews revolved around receiving corrective feedback on their written assignments (i.e., tasks and exams). When queried regarding the significance of feedback, students underscored the importance of receiving corrective and constructive feedback from their instructors upon the completion of a written assignment, asserting that it holds greater importance than merely receiving passing grades. When asked to express the relative importance, S3 articulated her perspective this way: "The feedback I receive is much more important for me because I don't make the same mistake again once I have been taught. That is why it is very important for me." Therefore, it can be suggested that the provision of corrective feedback to students on their written assessments may engender a positive washback effect on their overall learning objectives.

Similarly, S1 also thinks that the feedback she receives at the end of her written tasks is helpful for her future studies and motivates her to be more conscious about her writing progress. In the interview she said, "when I write again, I pay attention to my mistakes according to the feedback I received before." In this sense, the feedback S1 receives is valuable for her as it motivates her, highlights her strengths and areas of improvement, and guides her towards improvement because "the feedback I receive during the tasks is very useful. It shows me what I can and cannot do."

Furthermore, other students also recognised the significance of receiving feedback on their written assignments. Upon seeking clarification regarding their perspective on the benefits of feedback, S11 stated that "it is very important to see the mistakes I made and get feedback," while S12 said that "I want to see my mistakes, I want to know where I went wrong." In a comparable context, with a heightened emphasis on emotional aspects, S5 conveyed an eager anticipation for feedback on her written assignment, expressing curiosity about the evaluation of her paper. Likewise, S1 stated that she experiences negative feelings if she makes mistakes in her written tasks. She said, "there are mistakes that I did not notice when I was writing at the time, but I realised later. I say that I will pay more attention to my mistakes next time. Sometimes, I also get angry with myself for making mistakes, but it can happen." In this context, these findings align closely with Fulcher's (2010) proposition that "washback remains a significant and emotionally charged subject," (p. 278) a sentiment applicable not only to educators but also resonant among students.

Conversely, while other students articulated the perceived value of corrective feedback on their written assignments, their principal emphasis rested on receiving passing grades for their written assignments. To elaborate, S10 stated her preference for the grades. She stated that the first thing she does when she receives her written assessment paper is to look at the grade: "Unfortunately, I look at the grades first. Then I look at the feedback, but not in detail. I mostly look at my grade." Pointing to the distinction between a written task (formative assessment) and writing question in the exam (summative assessment), S7 stated that "in tasks, feedback is more important. I look at the feedback I receive there. But in the exam, I directly look at the grade first. It is necessary to get

good grades to pass.” While the student demonstrates heightened concern regarding the requisite grade for successful preparatory school completion, she concurrently exhibits commendable awareness of the imperative associated with both summative and formative assessment. It is, therefore, noteworthy that she stands alone among her peers in acknowledging the broader significance of summative assessment in a general context.

Scoring Criteria Awareness: Perspectives on the Descriptors

The second focal area in a sizeable portion of the semi-structured interviews revolved around students’ awareness of the scoring criteria used for the evaluation of their written compositions. To explain briefly, at the school in which the study was conducted, the scoring criteria consist of four descriptors (i.e., content, organisation, grammatical competence, and lexical competence). At the beginning of the academic term, students are provided with detailed information regarding the components of the scoring criteria. Subsequently, the results of their task assignments and examinations are disclosed, placing emphasis on the four components delineated within the scoring criteria.

Following this brief explanation, it is important to note that inquiries regarding students’ familiarity with the scoring criteria yielded diverse responses from each student in the interviews. For example, S2 vocalised a lack of awareness regarding the criteria. When prompted further, he emphasised that he was not interested in finding out how his written work would be assessed. However, after a brief overview of the four components of the scoring criteria, the student proposed that the coherence of ideas (i.e., organisation) and the production of grammatical accurate sentences (i.e., grammatical competence) hold greater significance in his written assignments.

In a similar vein, S5 stated her lack of knowledge regarding the scoring criteria. She said “I looked at the criteria, but I don’t remember much. It doesn’t matter.” Upon articulating her perspective on the scoring criteria, she elucidated an inclination for two of the components, asserting that the substance of her written works (i.e., content) and the range and variety of the vocabulary employed (i.e., lexical competence) hold paramount significance in her written assessments. Similarly, S6 also exhibited a lack of awareness regarding the scoring criteria applied to evaluate her written assignment. Nevertheless, after a brief explanation, she conveyed a viewpoint underscoring the significance of content in her written tasks, noting, “it is important that the content is rich.”

Strikingly, S9 emerged as one of the students who offered extensive insights into the scoring criteria. Upon inquiry into his awareness of the criteria, he articulated detailed ideas and perspectives, suggesting that his knowledge may have been cultivated through instruction on the use of the rubric from one of his classroom teachers. When asked about the component he sees most crucial, he expressed, “all of them seem to be very important in themselves, but I think it can be organisation. Vocabulary may also be important. Content depends on the person, but I still think all of them are important.” Likewise, S7 also outlined her perspectives into the scoring criteria, saying that “content is more important because organisation is easy when you know what to write about. Also, I don’t make grammar mistakes, so the rest is easy. I think content is much more important.” Furthermore, S3 also thought that content is more important than the other components. When asked about

her awareness of the scoring criteria, she stated, “they are all important, but I think the content should be perfect. If there is no content, grammar doesn’t matter anyway. The rest disappears.” It is, therefore, important to note that students from different proficiency levels show distinct levels of awareness concerning the scoring criteria. Also, they reported deeming different components of the scoring criteria as important for themselves.

Feedback Delivery Preferences: Verbal Communication for Increased Effectiveness

Another prevalent theme that surfaced during the interviews is associated with the students’ preferences for receiving corrective feedback on their written works. All students in the interviews expressed a preference for receiving feedback through both oral and written channels. Consistent with the thematic focus of the study, it is unsurprising to observe that students exhibit a strong preference for receiving feedback through more efficacious means.

All students were vocal about the effectiveness of verbal feedback. For instance, S8 advocated that receiving feedback is related to learning the language; therefore, he stated, “my teacher calls me with my paper, and shows me my mistakes one by one. He shows what I got right and wrong. Then he gives a detailed explanation. It is much more useful for me this way.” In preferring verbal feedback, S6 supported this notion by stating that “I want to have verbal feedback because, for example, when the teacher writes something on my paper, I may not even understand it. That’s why I think it is more useful to be able to receive verbal feedback.” She also emphasised her desire to improve her language proficiency effectively through her preparatory school education, suggesting that feedback she does not fully comprehend may impede this objective.

On a more emotional side, S12 expressed her wish to receive clearer feedback on her written assignment because she thought that it would make her feel better about her skills. She said, “sometimes when I write very long paragraphs, I want verbal feedback because then I may not be able to understand the written feedback. So, I would be much happier if I got verbal feedback.” Supporting this perspective, S3 also thought that receiving verbal feedback is more effective than receiving only written feedback because she said, “verbal feedback is much better because when I ask the teacher something, she follows it up and gives me examples and so on. That’s why it is much better for me to be able to hear it than simply writing it on my paper.” In the end, she also stated that her teacher devotes a full lesson hour to providing feedback to each student in the class, which is consistent with the report of S10, who stated that “we could even set aside a class time for this and show us our mistakes in that class time.” She expressed that, in such an instance, she could benefit from receiving verbal feedback, seeing it a more effective means of feedback for her.

However, the other students also favoured receiving only written feedback if they received everything in detail in written form. For instance, S9 said, “I can understand what my teacher wants me to see in the notes on the paper, that’s enough for me. Some people prefer both written and verbal, but I think it might be difficult, so written feedback is enough for me.” On this note, S5 also conveyed a preference for exclusively written feedback, provided that her teacher includes comprehensive comments directly on her paper. She voiced a preference for discovering and understanding her errors

through written feedback, indicating a greater affinity for this mode than verbal communication. Moreover, S11 shared an experience in which his teacher shared his written paper along with a voice recording which included his feedback. As a result, it can be inferred that the students collectively exhibit a substantial comprehension of their preferences regarding the reception of corrective feedback on their written assessments.

Alternative Assessment Avoidance: Limited Engagement in Self- and Peer Assessment

The ultimate and most striking theme that surfaced during the interviews was the notable absence of engagement among students in either self- or peer assessment concerning written assessment. When asked about if they were engaged in practices associated with alternative assessment, all the students in the study demonstrated a lack of awareness of such practices. For instance, following a brief exploration of awareness regarding scoring criteria, students were subsequently queried about their engagement in grading their written papers. It is noteworthy that certain students refrained from drafting additional and extracurricular written tasks independently. Among those who dedicated time to create written tasks for feedback, there was an absence of self-assessment. Instead, their reported practice centred around the processes of editing and proofreading their work prior to submission to their teachers.

When asked about her involvement in alternative assessment, S4 associated self- and peer assessment with editing her written work, and said, “we did an activity in the class, I showed my activity to my pair, and she showed her paper to me.” When prompted further, S4 said that her involvement primarily extended to looking for grammatical aspects within her peer’s paper. Similarly, S9 stated that he does not show his written work to any of his classmates, expressing a reluctance to engage in the review of their papers because he “might miss it because [he doesn’t] know.” Furthermore, indicating a potential sense of inadequacy in grading others’ papers, S12 remarked, “I will write, but grading...it is my teacher’s job,” alluding to a perceived low level of assessment literacy.

On a distinct note, S7 conveyed that she and her classmates actively participate in the review of each other’s written works. However, their primary aim is to provide constructive feedback to one another for mutual improvement. She said, “my friends and I look at what we write, but we do not grade what we write. At this stage, feedback is more effective than grades.” Similarly, S8 engaged in a similar activity through an in-class activity. However, he reported not grading each other’s papers. In this sense, he said, “I made a few trials, but not to evaluate the paper. Grades are not important for me. I showed my paper to get opinions, to get feedback, and to write better.” While these two students point to the attributes of alternative assessment, their comments imply a lack of instruction on the efficacy of self- and peer assessment methodologies.

Discussion, Conclusion, and Suggestions

While the scale results yielded meaningful insights into students’ SWAL, it is crucial to consider each dimension in the scale individually, as they each highlight distinct features that require attention. It can be argued that students indicated a low level of written assessment knowledge, indicated by their responses in the first dimension. They reported being familiar with the purposes of written assessment, but when it comes to

the specifics, such as the scoring criteria, their responses indicated a lack of knowledge, indicating a lack of ability to use what they know at the end of a written assessment. This result can be related to the fact that they are not instructed on the written assessment and the scoring criteria at the beginning of their prep school education. It is, therefore, crucial to inform students of the steps included in the evaluation of their written tasks. As Watanabe (2011) suggested, knowledge about language assessment can help students learn the language more efficiently, which is evidenced by the student responses in the scale.

Mean scores of the items in the second dimension were also low. The responses revealed that engaging in the activities that occur at the end of the written assessment, such as writing more ungraded compositions, are not held highly by the students. This might suggest that students might see extracurricular activities and formative assessment as extra and tedious. However, it is noteworthy to note that students are advised to actively endeavour to use each assessment to enhance their understanding for subsequent improvement (Stiggins, 2007). Because of student responses in the third dimension, there may be a misalignment between students’ beliefs and their actions. Six items in this dimension allowed us to see that students are not acting on their beliefs, as the mean scores from this dimension yielded the lowest in the scale. Further, it is important to instruct students in the processes included in written assessment and guide them to engage in more effective written performance. However, it can be conjectured that students’ beliefs and thoughts may not manifest in their actions, as suggested by the answers in the study. It is also important to acknowledge that previous studies have suggested that even meticulously crafted feedback on an assignment may carry limited significance for students unless students engage in written assessment (O’Donovan et al., 2004).

The final dimension also revealed significant insights into students’ lack of awareness and capability in terms of alternative assessment methods. The reason behind this incompetence in terms of self- and peer assessment could be because these two alternative methods are not included in the school programme and its curriculum. Also, it should be carried in mind that teachers were not a variable in the study, and it cannot be known for certain if teachers had the knowledge to instruct their students in terms of alternative assessment. As a result, given the pivotal role that self- and peer assessment play in the context of formative assessment, it is unexpected to observe their limited and ineffective implementation. Similarly, previous studies also showed that use of self- and peer assessment is less prevalent (e.g., Pereira et al., 2017).

In addressing RQ1, the quantitative data analysis revealed affirmative outcomes concerning students’ perspective on their written assessments, as evident in the responses within the ‘belief’ dimension. Likewise, while the responses within the ‘knowledge’ dimension indicated a heightened degree of proficiency in assessment literacy, student responses in the latter part of the scale revealed a stark contrast, wherein student responses underscored a misalignment between their professed beliefs and the practical application of these beliefs. Consequently, it can be suggested that there exists a correlation between their perspectives on assessment and their approaches to learning (Struyven et al., 2005). Also, it can be proposed that when responding to the questions in the behaviour and the critique dimensions, participants appeared

not to translate their knowledge and beliefs into actions regarding written assessment. This also suggests a potential misalignment between their cognitive understanding and practical application in the context of assessing written work.

In terms of the first theme of the study, participants have been found to prioritise impactful corrective feedback over mere attainment of passing grades. This underscores the pivotal role of Assessment for Learning (AfL) can play, serving as a valuable tool for teachers to enhance student success in their writing assessment (DeLuca & Klinger, 2010). As a result, it is imperative to adeptly convey this perspective to the students, the most pivotal stakeholder group in education, ensuring that they do not perceive formative assessment as superfluous or nonessential work (Yorke, 2003). It is, therefore, essential to bear in mind that the primary objective of integrating formative assessment into students' educational experiences is to facilitate the cultivation of a disposition towards lifelong learning, guided by the language teachers (Homayounzadeh & Razmjoo, 2021). It can also be argued that the reason students do not regard receiving passing grades as important could be related to the fact that the curriculum at the target school gives careful attention to formative assessment, with written tasks accounting for nearly half of the second part of the overall grades.

Second, the responses provided by the students regarding their awareness and comprehension of the scoring criteria used for the evaluation and assessment of their written tasks present a narrative distinct from what is proposed in the existing literature. To elucidate, it is recommended that students assume a leading role in their own learning, undertaking responsibilities as deemed necessary (Hawe & Dixon, 2014) because students should possess a clear understanding of the direction of their academic development (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). It is also suggested in the literature that teachers might still be regarded as the sole owners of knowledge within a classroom setting, but relying solely on teachers as the primary source of instruction and feedback might no longer be adequate or appropriate, as this poses the risk of fostering dependence on others for information about individual progress and academic achievement (Sadler, 2010). However, in the current case, teachers are supposed to inform students about the use of scoring criteria as indicated by the curriculum of the prep school programme. Whether the instructors inform the students about the scoring criteria at the beginning of the term is open to interpretation, and the lack of knowledge on students' behalf might be related to teachers' low level of LAL.

A noteworthy subject that surfaced in students' feedback preferences is related to the use of error codes in the feedback provided on written assessments. During the interviews, most students conveyed instances where their teacher employed error codes, while others recounted experiences wherein their teachers meticulously explained their mistakes and areas necessitating improvement in more detail. It is important to note that it falls on the teachers' shoulders to guide students towards the use of error codes before they give corrective feedback on their students' written assignments. In the literature, critiques of assessment design highlight the excessive emphasis on content and task orientation, also casting students in a more passive role as mere recipients of feedback information (Carless, 2011; Tai et al., 2018). As a result, it can be posited that preference for verbal over written feedback may be attributed to factors beyond their assessment literacy capabilities. Overall, it can be suggested that the

reason students are favouring detailed verbal feedback might be related to the possibility that they are not equipped with the necessary tools to decode error codes and put them into use to strengthen their written skills, which might indicate low SWAL levels.

Finally, students should be able to be their own assessors and play a more active role in the assessment process, especially in alternative assessment. It is proven that when incorporated within the instructional framework, formative assessment can play a particularly significant role in facilitating student-centred teaching by providing instructors insights into students' acquired knowledge or skills and into areas that require further attention (Shepard, 2000).

Overall, as a response to RQ2, the qualitative findings corroborated the findings gathered from the quantitative analysis, emphasising the consolidation of the mismatch between students' stated beliefs and presumed knowledge and their general assessment practices. A particularly noteworthy discovery from the qualitative analysis was the absence of alternative assessment practices, a phenomenon that resonates with the existing literature. Previous research studies into the alternative assessment also highlight that students are not engaged in self- and peer assessment (e.g., Pereira et al., 2017). Moreover, there are other research studies which aimed to increase the assessment literacy levels of students using self- and peer assessment (e.g., Chen et al., 2023). The research by Francis (2008) revealed a mismatch between students' self-assessment and the grading criteria. Similarly, self-regulated learning also adds to the performance of students because it is evidenced that self-regulated learning, as part of self-assessment, can increase the assessment literacy levels of students (Panadero et al., 2016). In conclusion, the challenges identified in students' engagement with self- and peer assessment highlight the need for effective strategies to increase their assessment literacy levels. As evidenced by the emergent themes in this study, ongoing efforts, such as those centred on fostering self-regulated learning, offer promising avenues to elevate students' successes in writing assessment literacy.

Implications, Limitations, and Future Directions

It is important to acknowledge that "students who have well-developed assessment capabilities" (Absolum et al., 2009, p. 5) have more at their disposal to be successful learners. The results of the study indicated that students who are aware of what is being asked of them have more positive attitudes and perceptions towards writing assessment. Previous research in the field have also shown comparable results (O'Donovan et al., 2001; O'Donovan et al., 2008). Consequently, social learning mechanisms, including peer review and the incorporation of pedagogical training for students, aim to enhance their familiarity with assessment procedures.

That is why students should be included in the assessment process (Deeley & Bovill, 2017) and must be active participants in their own learning (Rust et al., 2003). To achieve this, instruction on assessment can be implemented in their undergraduate courses (Volante & Fazio, 2007).

Second, it is important to remember that teachers will still play a prominent role in improving their students SWAL because they are responsible for implementing effective approaches to provide assessment information, guiding students in achieving their educational objectives. As a result, it can be argued that it is also important to foster LAL levels of teachers if we want a successful teacher-student

collaboration. It is crucial to acknowledge that the process of learning emerges through dynamic interactions between educators and learners (Gipps, 1999), necessitating teachers to stimulate learning, provide feedback, and involve students actively in the assessment process (Ataie-Tabar et al., 2019). It is evident from the study findings that teachers are responsible for guiding students towards test awareness as seen in the case of error codes, which can be improved through improvements in teaching education programmes (Lee & Mao, 2024). For this purpose, workshops, training sessions, undergraduate lessons, and even graduate lessons that focus on LAL could be developed in the future for pre-service teachers. This also calls for teachers to be actively engaged in not only teaching and assessing writing but also giving efficient and useful feedback, which asks teachers to be equipped with feedback literacy (Yu & Lee, 2024). It must also be acknowledged that previous studies have evidenced that literacy levels of the writing instructors have an important effect on students' writing abilities (e.g., Mellati & Khademi, 2018).

On the other side, the exclusive focus on preparatory programme students during their initial years at the university might limit the generalisability of the findings to a broader student population. Expanding the scope of future research into various academic levels and institutions would provide a more comprehensive understanding of SWAL across varied contexts. Additionally, different institution with unique assessment practices, scoring criteria, or even teaching methodologies can play a significant role on students' assessments. Moreover, the semi-structured interviews, while providing valuable insights, may be limited by the small sample size of participants ($n=12$). Thematic analysis enhanced the elucidation and exemplification of the scale-derived data. However, future research studies can expand the participant pool to acquire a more extensive of the qualitative data. Incorporating a larger and more diverse participant cohort can enrich the depth and breadth of insights, which can enrich the robustness and generalisability of research findings. In addition, the current study refrained from considering students' writing grades, thus rendering it intricate to establish more conclusive correlation between students' written assessment grades and their attitudes, beliefs, and perspectives on the assessment process. To address this limitation, future studies may integrate written grades as a variable and adopt a triangulation approach, using diverse data collection tools as well, such as in-class observation and reflective journals. Therefore, it is advisable to conduct research within the context of written assignments (Brown et al., 2016; Flores et al., 2019; Peterson et al., 2015) as this approach plays a pivotal role in augmenting students' awareness of the assessment process. Delving into the dynamics involved in the evaluation of written assignments, future studies can gather valuable insights into students' comprehension, engagement, and perceptions of assessment, fostering a more comprehensive understanding of their writing assessment literacy.

Author Contributions

All authors equally took part in all processes of the article. All authors had read and approved the final version of the work.

Ethics Declaration

This study was carried out with the approval decision at the Social Sciences and Humanities Scientific Research and

Publication Ethics Committee of Anadolu University (Protocol No: 624060) at the meeting dated 31.10.2023.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest with any institution or person within the scope of the study.

References

- Absolum, M., Flockton, L., Hattie, J., Hipkins, R., & Reid, I. (2009). Directions for assessment in New Zealand: Developing students' assessment capabilities. *Unpublished paper prepared for the Ministry of Education*.
- Aitken, N. (2011). Student Voice in Fair Assessment Practice. In *Leading Student Assessment* (pp. 175-200). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-1727-5_9
- Alonzo, D. (2016). Development and Application of a Teacher Assessment for Learning (AfL) Literacy Tool. *unsworks.unsw.edu.au*. <https://doi.org/10.26190/unsworks/18809>
- Ataie-Tabar, M., Zareian, G., Amirian, S. M. R., & Adel, S. M. R. (2019). A Study of Socio-Cultural Conception of Writing Assessment Literacy: Iranian EFL Teachers' and Students' Perspectives. *English Teaching & Learning*, 43(4), 389-409. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42321-019-00035-0>
- Baird, J.-A., Andrich, D., Hopfenbeck, T. N., & Stobart, G. (2017). Assessment and learning: fields apart? *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 24(3), 317-350. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594x.2017.1319337>
- Bernard, H. R. (2018). *Research methods in anthropology: qualitative and quantitative approaches* (Sixth edition. ed.). Rowman & Littlefield.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2012). Thematic analysis. In H. Cooper, P. M. Camic, D. L. Long, A. T. Panter, D. Rindskopf, & K. J. Sher (Eds.), *APA handbook of research methods in psychology, Vol. 2. Research designs: Quantitative, qualitative, neuropsychological, and biological* (pp. 57-71). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/13620-004>
- Brown, G. T. L., & Wang, Z. (2016). Understanding Chinese university student conceptions of assessment: cultural similarities and jurisdictional differences between Hong Kong and China. *Social Psychology of Education*, 19(1), 151-173. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-015-9322-x>
- Butler, Y. G., Peng, X., & Lee, J. (2021). Young learners' voices: Towards a learner-centered approach to understanding language assessment literacy. *Language Testing*, 38(3), 429-455. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532221992274>
- Carless, D., Salter, D., Yang, M., & Lam, J. (2010). Developing sustainable feedback practices. *Studies in Higher Education*, 36(4), 395-407. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075071003642449>
- Chan, C. K. Y., & Luo, J. (2021). A four-dimensional conceptual framework for student assessment literacy in holistic competency development. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 46(3), 451-466. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1777388>
- Chen, G., Wang, X., & Wang, L. (2023). Developing assessment literacy among trainee translators: scaffolding

- self and peer assessment as an intervention. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 48(6), 888-902. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2022.2142515>
- Charteris, J., & Thomas, E. (2016). Uncovering 'unwelcome truths' through student voice: teacher inquiry into agency and student assessment literacy. *Teaching Education*, 28(2), 162-177. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2016.1229291>
- Colby-Kelly, C., & Turner, C. E. (2007). AFL Research in the L2 Classroom and Evidence of Usefulness: Taking Formative Assessment to the Next Level. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 64(1), 9-37. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.64.1.009>
- Corbin, J. M., & Strauss, A. (1990). Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria. *Qualitative Sociology*, 13(1), 3-21. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00988593>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (Fifth edition. ed.). SAGE.
- Crusan, D. (2010). *Assessment in the second language writing classroom*. University of Michigan Press.
- Crusan, D., Plakans, L., & Gebril, A. (2016). Writing assessment literacy: Surveying second language teachers' knowledge, beliefs, and practices. *Assessing Writing*, 28, 43-56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2016.03.001>
- Crusan, D. (2022). Writing Assessment Literacy. In *Research Questions in Language Education and Applied Linguistics* (pp. 431-435). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-79143-8_77
- Davari Torshizi, M., & Bahraman, M. (2019). I explain, therefore I learn: Improving students' assessment literacy and deep learning by teaching. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 61, 66-73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2019.03.002>
- Davies, A. (2008). Textbook trends in teaching language testing. *Language Testing*, 25(3), 327-347. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532208090156>
- Deeley, S. J., & Bovill, C. (2017). Staff student partnership in assessment: enhancing assessment literacy through democratic practices. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 42(3), 463-477. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2015.1126551>
- DeLuca, C., & Klinger, D. A. (2010). Assessment literacy development: identifying gaps in teacher candidates' learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 17(4), 419-438. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594x.2010.516643>
- Denton, P., & McIlroy, D. (2017). Response of students to statement bank feedback: the impact of assessment literacy on performances in summative tasks. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(2), 197-206. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2017.1324017>
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Dewaele, J.-M. (2022). *Questionnaires in Second Language Research*. Routledge.
- Flores, M. A., Brown, G., Pereira, D., Coutinho, C., Santos, P., & Pinheiro, C. (2019). Portuguese university students' conceptions of assessment: taking responsibility for achievement. *Higher Education*, 79(3), 377-394. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-019-00415-2>
- Francis, R. A. (2008). An investigation into the receptivity of undergraduate students to assessment empowerment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(5), 547-557. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930701698991>
- Fulcher, G. (2010). *Practical language testing*. London: Hodder Education.
- Fulcher, G. (2012). Assessment Literacy for the Language Classroom. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 9(2), 113-132. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2011.642041>
- Gipps, C. (1999). Socio-Cultural Aspects of Assessment. *Review of Research in Education*, 24. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1167274>
- Greene, J. C. (2007). *Mixed methods in social inquiry*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hannigan, C., Alonzo, D., & Oo, C. Z. (2022). Student assessment literacy: indicators and domains from the literature. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 29(4), 482-504. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594x.2022.2121911>
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2016). The Power of Feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81-112. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>
- Hawe, E. M., & Dixon, H. R. (2014). Building students' evaluative and productive expertise in the writing classroom. *Assessing Writing*, 19, 66-79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2013.11.004>
- Hirvela, A., & Belcher, D. (2007). Writing scholars as teacher educators: Exploring writing teacher education. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(3), 125-128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.08.001>
- Homayounzadeh, Z., & Razmjoo, S. A. (2021). Examining Assessment Literacy in Practice in an Iranian Context: Does it Differ for Instructors and Learners? *Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills)*, 40(2), 1-45.
- Inbar-Lourie, O. (2008). Constructing a language assessment knowledge base: A focus on language assessment courses. *Language Testing*, 25(3), 385-402. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532208090158>
- Inbar-Lourie, O. (2013). Guest Editorial to the special issue on language assessment literacy. *Language Testing*, 30(3), 301-307. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532213480126>
- Jeong, H. (2013). Defining assessment literacy: Is it different for language testers and non-language testers? *Language Testing*, 30(3), 345-362. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532213480334>
- Lam, R. (2019). Teacher assessment literacy: Surveying knowledge, conceptions, and practices of classroom-based writing assessment in Hong Kong. *System*, 81, 78-89. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.01.006>
- Lee, I. (2017). *Classroom Writing Assessment and Feedback in L2 School Contexts*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-3924-9>
- Lee, I., & Mao, Z. (2024). Writing teacher feedback literacy: Surveying second language teachers' knowledge, values, and abilities. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2024.101094>
- Yu, S., & Lee, I. (2024). Writing assessment and feedback literacy: Where do we stand and where can we go? *Assessing Writing*, 60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2024.100829>
- Lodge, C. (2008). Engaging student voice to improve pedagogy and learning: An exploration of examples of innovative pedagogical approaches for school improvement. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, 4(5), 4-19. <https://doi.org/10.5172/ijpl.4.5.4>

- Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2022). *Second language research: methodology and design* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Mellati, M., & Khademi, M. (2018). Exploring Teachers' Assessment Literacy: Impact on Learners' Writing Achievements and Implications for Teacher Development. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(6), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2018v43n6.1>
- O'Donovan, B., Price, M., & Rust, C. (2001). The Student Experience of Criterion-Referenced Assessment (Through the Introduction of a Common Criteria Assessment Grid). *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 38(1), 74-85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/147032901300002873>
- O'Donovan, B., Price, M., & Rust, C. (2004). Know what I mean? Enhancing student understanding of assessment standards and criteria. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 9(3), 325-335. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1356251042000216642>
- O'Donovan, B., Price, M., & Rust, C. (2008). Developing student understanding of assessment standards: a nested hierarchy of approaches. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 13(2), 205-217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510801923344>
- Ölmezer-Öztürk, E., & Aydin, B. (2018). Toward measuring language teachers' assessment knowledge: development and validation of Language Assessment Knowledge Scale (LAKS). *Language Testing in Asia*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-018-0075-2>
- Panadero, E., Jonsson, A., & Strijbos, J.-W. (2016). Scaffolding Self-Regulated Learning Through Self-Assessment and Peer Assessment: Guidelines for Classroom Implementation. In C. Wyatt-Smith (Ed.), *Assessment for Learning: Meeting the Challenge of Implementation* (pp. 311-326). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-39211-0_18
- Pereira, D., Niklasson, L., & Flores, M. A. (2016). Students' perceptions of assessment: a comparative analysis between Portugal and Sweden. *Higher Education*, 73(1), 153-173. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-016-0005-0>
- Peterson, E. R., Brown, G. T. L., & Jun, M. C. (2015). Achievement emotions in higher education: A diary study exploring emotions across an assessment event. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 42, 82-96. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2015.05.002>
- Popham, W. J. (2009). Assessment Literacy for Teachers: Faddish or Fundamental? *Theory Into Practice*, 48(1), 4-11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405840802577536>
- Rezai, A., Alibakhshi, G., Farokhipour, S., & Miri, M. (2021). A phenomenographic study on language assessment literacy: hearing from Iranian university teachers. *Language Testing in Asia*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-021-00142-5>
- Roslan, R., Nishio, Y., & Jawawi, R. (2022). Analysing English language teacher candidates' assessment literacy: A case of Bruneian and Japanese universities. *System*, 111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102934>
- Rust, C., Price, M., & O'Donovan, B. (2003). Improving Students' Learning by Developing their Understanding of Assessment Criteria and Processes. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28(2), 147-164. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930301671>
- Sadler, D. R. (2010). Beyond feedback: developing student capability in complex appraisal. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35(5), 535-550. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930903541015>
- Scarino, A. (2013). Language assessment literacy as self-awareness: Understanding the role of interpretation in assessment and in teacher learning. *Language Testing*, 30(3), 309-327. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532213480128>
- Shepard, L. A. (2000). The role of assessment in a learning culture. *Teaching and Learning*, 229-253.
- Smith, C. D., Worsfold, K., Davies, L., Fisher, R., & McPhail, R. (2013). Assessment literacy and student learning: the case for explicitly developing students' assessment literacy. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(1), 44-60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2011.598636>
- Stiggins, R. J. (1991). Assessment literacy. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 72(7), 534-539.
- Stiggins, R. J. (2007). Assessment through the student's eyes. *Educational Leadership*, 64(8), 22-26.
- Stiggins, R. J. (2008). *Student-involved assessment FOR learning* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Struyven, K., Dochy, F., & Janssens, S. (2005). Students' perceptions about evaluation and assessment in higher education: a review. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 30(4), 325-341. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930500099102>
- Su, Y. (2014). Self-directed, genuine graduate attributes: the person-based approach. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 33(6), 1208-1220. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2014.911255>
- Tai, J., Ajjawi, R., Boud, D., Dawson, P., & Panadero, E. (2017). Developing evaluative judgement: enabling students to make decisions about the quality of work. *Higher Education*, 76(3), 467-481. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-017-0220-3>
- Taylor, L. (2009). Developing Assessment Literacy. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 29, 21-36. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0267190509090035>
- Taylor, L. (2013). Communicating the theory, practice, and principles of language testing to test stakeholders: Some reflections. *Language Testing*, 30(3), 403-412. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532213480338>
- Tian, W., Louw, S., & Khan, M. K. (2021). Covid-19 as a critical incident: Reflection on language assessment literacy and the need for radical changes. *System*, 103. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102682>
- Vogt, K., & Tsagari, D. (2014). Assessment Literacy of Foreign Language Teachers: Findings of a European Study. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 11(4), 374-402. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2014.960046>
- Volante, L., & Fazio, X. (2007). Exploring Teacher Candidates' Assessment Literacy: Implications for Teacher Education Reform and Professional Development [Abstract]. *Canadian Journal of Education / Revue canadienne de l'éducation*, 30(3). <https://doi.org/10.2307/20466661>
- Watanabe, Y. (2011). Teaching a course in assessment literacy to test takers: Its rationale, procedure, content, and effectiveness. *Cambridge Research Notes*, 46(Nov. 2011), 29-34.
- Weigle, S. C. (2007). Teaching writing teachers about assessment. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(3), 194-209. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.07.004>

- White, E. (2009). Are you assessment literate? Some fundamental questions regarding effective classroom-based assessment. *OnCUE Journal*, 3(1), 3-25.
- Wiliam, D. (2018). *Embedded formative assessment*. Second edition. In Solution Tree Press.
- Xu, J., Zheng, Y., & Braund, H. (2023). Voices from L2 learners across different languages: Development and validation of a student writing assessment literacy scale. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2023.100993>
- Yan, X., & Fan, J. (2020). “Am I qualified to be a language tester?”: Understanding the development of language assessment literacy across three stakeholder groups. *Language Testing*, 38(2), 219-246. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532220929924>
- Yorke, M. (2003). Formative assessment in higher education: Moves towards theory and enhancement of pedagogic practice, *Higher Education*, 45, 477–501.

Appendix

Scale of Student Writing Assessment Literacy

DEMOGRAFİK BİLGİLER

1. Cinsiyetiniz:
 Kadın Erkek Diğer/Söylemek istemiyorum
2. Yaşınız:
 17-18 19-20 21-22 23+
3. Bölümünüz:
4. Hazırlıktaki dil seviyeniz:
 D C B A A+
5. Hazırlıkta kaç dönemdir eğitim görüyorsunuz?
 1 2 3 4

Öğrenci Yazma Değerlendirmesi Okuryazarlık Ölçeği

Ölçekte, yazma becerilerinize ve yazma ödevlerine yönelik sorular bulunmaktadır. Sorulara aşağıdakilere göre puan verilmesi gerekmektedir. Sorular, tutumlarınızı ve görüşlerinizi almak üzere hazırlanmıştır. Her ifade için doğru veya yanlış cevap yoktur, bu nedenle lütfen cevaplarınızı dürüstçe veriniz.

1- Hiç katılmıyorum

2- Katılmıyorum

3- Ne katılıyorum ne katılmıyorum

4- Katılıyorum

5- Kesinlikle katılıyorum

		Hiç katılmıyorum (1)	Katılmıyorum (2)	Ne katılıyorum ne katılmıyorum (3)	Katılıyorum (4)	Kesinlikle katılıyorum (5)
BİLGİ						
1	Yazma dersinin değerlendirme ve not verme yöntemlerini anlarım (yazma ödevleri, ara sınav).					
2	Yazma derslerinde verilen ödevlerin amaçlarını bilirim (yeterlik, başarı, teşhis).					
3	Yazılı çalışmalarımın hangi kritere göre değerlendirileceğini ve notlandırılacağını biliyorum.					
4	Yazma becerisi yeterliğinin farklı yaklaşımlarla ve yöntemlerle değerlendirilebileceğini anlıyorum (farklı kriterler, okullar, şartlar vb.).					
5	Yazma ödevlerimi nasıl değerlendireceğimi ve notlandıracağımı biliyorum.					
6	Yazma ödevlerimin (ödevler ve ara sınav) değerlendirilmesinin ve notlandırılmasının neden olabileceği yan etkileri bilirim (ödevlerde yüksek alıp ara sınava çok çalışmamak vb.).					
İNANIS						
7	Yazma ödevlerimin değerlendirilmesi ve notlandırılması, bana yazma becerimi geliştirmek için yazılı düzeltici dönüt sağlar.					
8	Yazma becerilerimi geliştirmek için öğretmenlerin verdiği yazılı düzeltici dönütleri dikkate almak önemlidir.					
9	Öğretmenim, yazılı ödevimi değerlendirdiğinde ve notlandığında mutlu olurum.					
10	Yazma ödevlerimin değerlendirilmesi ve notlandırılması, beni yazmaya daha fazla teşvik eder.					
11	Yazma ödevlerimin değerlendirilmesi ve notlandırılması, benim yazma becerilerindeki güçlü ve zayıf yönlerimi ortaya koyar.					
12	Yazma becerilerinin değerlendirilmesi ve notlandırılması, beni yazma dersinin hedefine ulaştırır (örn; paragraf yazma, essay yazma).					

		Hiç katılmıyorum (1)	Katılmıyorum (2)	Ne katılıyorum ne katılmıyorum (3)	Katılıyorum (4)	Kesinlikle katılıyorum (5)
DAVRANIŞ						
13	Kendi yazılı çalışmalarımı değerlendirmek için değerlendirme kriteri kullanırım.					
14	Yazılı ödevlerimi değerlendirmek ve notlandırmak için bilgisayar teknolojisini kullanırım (Grammarly, OpenAI vb.)					
15	Yazma becerilerinde ne kadar iyi olduğumu anlamak için yazma ödevlerimi incelerim.					
16	Eksiklerimi belirlemek ve dili öğrenmem için neyi bilmem gerektiğini anlamak için yazma ödevlerimi incelerim.					
17	Öğretmenimin verdiği yazılı düzeltici dönütleri etkin bir şekilde kullanırım.					
18	Öğretmenimin verdiği notlar ve dönütler doğrultusunda yazma becerimi geliştirmek için çaba harcarım.					
ELEŞTİRİ						
19	Sınıf içi yazma ödevlerinin verimliliğini eleştirel bir şekilde sorgularım.					
20	Öğretmenimin verdiği yazılı düzeltici dönütleri incelerim ve kullanıp kullanmayacağıma karar veririm.					
21	Yazma ödevlerimin değerlendirilmesi ve notlandırılması ile ilgili öğretmenlerimle iletişim kurma sorumluluğumun olduğunun farkındayım.					
22	Hangi dönüt şeklinin bana daha uygun olduğunu öğretmenimle konuşurum (örneğin, sözlü veya yazılı).					
23	Yazma becerilerimi ve notlarımı nasıl geliştirebileceğim ile ilgili arkadaşlarımla iletişim kurarım.					
24	Yazma becerilerimi ve notlarımı nasıl geliştirebileceğim ile ilgili öğretmenlerimle iletişim kurarım.					