



SDU International Journal of Educational Studies

English Language Teachers' Views on Teaching and Assessment of Writing Skills

Serdal KALAY¹, Kağan BÜYÜKKARCI²

¹Ministry of National Education

²Süleyman Demirel University

To cite this article:

Kalay, S. & Büyükkarcı, K. (2020). English language teachers' views on teaching and assessment of writing skills. *SDU International Journal of Educational Studies*, 7(2), Page 262- Page 286. Doi:10.33710/sduijes.710062

SDU International Journal of Educational Studies (SDU IJES) is published biannual as an international scholarly, peer-reviewed online journal. In this journal, research articles which reflect the survey with the results and translations that can be considered as a high scientific quality, scientific observation and review articles are published. Teachers, students and scientists who conduct research to the field (e.g. articles on pure sciences or social sciences, mathematics and technology) and in relevant sections of field education (e.g. articles on science education, social science education, mathematics education and technology education) in the education faculties are target group. In this journal, the target group can benefit from qualified scientific studies are published. The publication languages are English and Turkish. Articles submitted the journal should not have been published anywhere else or submitted for publication. Authors have undertaken full responsibility of article's content and consequences. *SDU International Journal of Educational Studies* has all of the copyrights of articles submitted to be published.

English Language Teachers' Views on Teaching and Assessment of Writing Skills

Serdal Kalay^{1*}, Kağan Büyükkarcı²

¹Ministry of National Education

Orcid ID: 0000-0003-1890-8896

²Süleyman Demirel University

Orcid ID: 0000-0002-7365-0210

Received: 27/03/2020

Accepted: 11/11/2020

Abstract

This research investigates the techniques used by English language teachers for teaching and assessing writing skills in their classes at secondary school level. In this study, both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods were used. The data were obtained from 97 English language teachers working in public and private secondary schools through two different surveys. The first survey aimed to measure the teaching writing techniques and the second one aimed to investigate the teachers' assessment techniques for writing. Beside the surveys, 6 randomly selected teachers were interviewed to collect more detailed information. The analysis results of the quantitative data collected through the surveys demonstrated that teachers preferred teacher-centered and direct instruction methods for teaching writing. When it comes to assessment, teachers' scores were higher in more mechanical, exam-oriented and paper based assessment techniques. The quantitative findings also revealed that gender, teaching experience and the school type do not significantly influence English language teachers' preferences of teaching and assessment techniques. The qualitative findings of the study revealed that teachers' choices of teaching and assessing writing techniques were affected by time, lack of motivation, course book contents, lack of in-service training and grading.

Keywords: Teachers' views, Teaching writing skill, Assessing writing skill, Secondary school level.

INTRODUCTION

Writing is one of the basic skills in foreign language education. Many researchers (Demirezen, 1994; Hyland, 2002; Kroll, 1990; O'Brien, 2004; Raimes, 2008; Reid, 2001) agree that teaching writing has always been important in language education. To manage this teaching act while teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL), teachers must feel comfortable with teaching and assessment techniques that will work for their students. However, having worked at the Turkish secondary education for sixteen years, it has become apparent to the researcher that writing is a challenge for both students and teachers.

Accordingly, Aydin and Başöz (2010) claim that it is difficult to argue if writing competences can be properly acquired by Turkish EFL learners since writing instruction is neglected during the language learning process at primary and secondary schools, except for those schools with intensive language programs. Since only three 40-minute class times are allocated for the teaching of English in the 5th and 6th grades and four 40-minute periods for 7th and 8th grades, the emphasis on teaching writing cannot appropriately applied in Turkish secondary schools. Exam-oriented classes and grammar or reading-based textbooks are other factors that may cause negative attitudes towards writing in English among learners as well as teachers.

*Corresponding Author: Serdal Kalay, Ministry of National Education, serdalkalay81@gmail.com

Apart from the demographic differences such as gender and teaching experience, this study focuses on another question for teaching writing, the effect of school type, in other words, whether the teachers work at public or private school has an important effect on teaching writing. Larenas, Moran & Rivera (2011), argue that because of the factors such as experience, preferences, institutional policies and funding, teaching styles of EFL instructors differ between public and private schools. Due to environment and contextual factors, there is a significant difference exists among public and private school teachers' practices (Gholami, Sarkhosh & Abdi, 2016).

This study is intended to investigate the teaching writing techniques which language teachers follow in their classes. In the field of writing, this paper will help teachers in secondary schools to gain insights into techniques for motivating their students to write. Students at secondary school level show great variations of capacities as they are still developing both linguistically and cognitively. Therefore, offering variety in teaching writing techniques may help students develop their writing capacities. As acquiring a proper writing ability is a difficult issue among Turkish EFL students, this study tries to investigate teaching writing practices in secondary schools in EFL writing lessons.

As a second goal, this study will try to find out the techniques which language teachers apply to assess the writing skills of students at secondary school level. Assessment is an undeniable motivation for students for their writings. It is as important as devising techniques for teaching writing. If teachers keep responding to their students writing, students will have the feeling of admiration and try hard to write better. Whether or not to evaluate students' writing for grading, a wide range of assessment will help students to gain interest in writing and develop confidence as a writer. It is in recognition of this need that this study aims to collect the information which covers the areas of techniques for assessment of writing at secondary schools.

This research also tries to emphasize the significance of assessment in writing process. Although assessment is an important part of writing, and assessing is necessary to arrange the writing courses to make them more lively and productive for students, it has sometimes been ignored. If assessment is added just to the end of writing process, it may become a last step for teachers and a bore for students. Teachers will make differences by practicing different assessment techniques by using it in all steps of writing so that assessment can become a tool for devising materials, preparing lessons and a motivation for the students. To see the framework of what assessment techniques which EFL teachers use regarding their background information may help others to develop new ideas, suggestions, and examples of assessment strategies.

In their study, Aydn and Başöz (2010), indicate that age, gender, educational background and language proficiency significantly correlate with teachers' attitudes towards teaching and evaluation of EFL writing. According to Ağcam and Babanoğlu (2016), class hours affect teacher attitudes, and private schools offer more class hours than public ones. In the light of previous studies, this research will try to find the variety of assessment techniques which EFL teachers use in secondary school writing classes in terms of gender, teaching experience and school type.

Above-mentioned objectives will be investigated through the demographic backgrounds of language teachers on their teaching and assessment techniques of writing. In line with these objectives, the following research questions are sought to be answered:

1. What are the writing techniques used by teachers of English in secondary schools?
 - 1.a. Do teachers' techniques of teaching writing change according to their gender?
 - 1.b. Does teaching experience have an impact on teaching writing techniques?
 - 1.c. Are there any differences between the teaching techniques used by teachers in public schools and private schools?
2. What are the assessment techniques for writing used by teachers of English in secondary schools?
 - 2.a. Do the assessment techniques for writing change according to gender?

- 2.b. Does teaching experience have an impact on teachers' writing assessment techniques?
2.c. Are there any differences between the assessment techniques used by teachers in public schools and private schools?

Conceptual Framework and Related Studies

This part will present the conceptual framework of teaching writing in EFL and assessment of writing in EFL at secondary school level. Furthermore, related research in foreign language education will be given for each main concept: teaching writing and assessing writing.

Writing in Foreign Language Teaching

Writing is a way of communication. Polio (2017) defines writing in language learning as something through which one communicates information to a wide audience, a tool through which one accomplishes real life tasks, or a modality in which teachers construct pedagogical activities to help students learn language. Writing is transforming thoughts into language; it means that we need to think about the content of our writing first and then arrange the ideas using appropriate language (e.g. grammar and vocabulary). According to Graham and Perin (2007), writing well is a necessity not just an option for young people. Aziz (2011) states that 'The writing skill is important because it is a good way to reinforce what students have learned and enrich them with new vocabulary in written form' (p.371).

Although teachers consider writing as a difficult skill to teach, teachers of English language include writing skills in the syllabus because this is an essential element for students' academic success (Kellogg, 2008; Özbay, 2004). According to Kurniasih (2011), in primary education, EFL teachers make their students' progress from simple words and phrases, to short paragraphs about themselves or about very familiar topics such as family, home, hobbies, friends, food etc. Students aren't capable linguistically or intellectually of creating a perfect written text at this level. Therefore, providing a model on which students can base their own works is important. Teachers generally apply the writing activities at the end of a unit so that students have been exposed to the language, structure and vocabulary they need.

Teaching Writing Skill in Turkish Educational Setting

In educational setting of Turkey, writing is one of the English language skills which is taught and tested at schools. Ministry of National Education (MoNE) designs and gives out a curriculum, ELC (English Language Curriculum) aiming to make learning English interesting, engaging and fun, taking into account the diverse needs of students at different developmental levels (ELC, 2018).

Based on the curriculum mentioned above, the students at secondary education level are expected to be able to write simple, descriptive texts, organize the paragraphs well, use the correct grammar or sentence structure, use the correct word choice or vocabulary, and use the appropriate spelling, punctuation, and capitalization. Teachers implement various activities and techniques to realize writing instruction considering the specific needs of the course, students' level and learning styles (Wulandari, 2012).

In designing the new English language curriculum, the principles and descriptors of the "Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment (CEFR)" were closely followed. The CEFR particularly stresses the need for students to put their learning into real-life practice in order to support fluency, proficiency and language retention (CoE, 2001); accordingly, the new curricular model emphasizes language use in an authentic communicative environment. The proficiency level for 5th and 6th grades is identified as A1.1 and A1.2. 7th and 8th classes are labeled

as A2.1. According to CEFR, for these levels overall written production and creative writing competence are given. In other words, there is a guideline for teachers indicating what to learn for writing. However, teachers can develop a variety of approaches, techniques and activities for the teaching of writing. These points are related to the issue of process of writing.

Related Studies

At high school level, Yıldırım (1991) studied writing skills in large classes in high schools through group and pair work. She carried out her study to find out the role of pair and group work techniques in improving writing skills specifically composition organization in large classes. In results of the study, students studying in pairs and groups achieved more organized compositions in their writing works.

Adığuzel (1998) researched the effect of the process approach to teaching writing on Turkish students' writing skills and overall language proficiency in EFL. In his experimental study, Adığuzel conducted pre- and post-tests to determine the effects of treatment on the subjects' writing skills, and to see its effects on students' overall language proficiencies, he used a multiple-choice post-test. Multiple-choice test showed the groups were equal in grammar, but examination of pre-and post-test compositions indicated a significant difference in favor of the experimental group. The treatment proved to have a significant effect on vocabulary level. Groups were post-experimentally equal in reading comprehension. With respect to the effects of the treatment on writing skills the experimental group was found to have written significantly more cohesive texts and had a significant linguistic improvement. Thus, Adığuzel underlined the importance of process approach to teach writing.

Bağçeci (2015) explored the development of writing skills through drama in English as a foreign language (EFL) classroom. The participants were the ninth grade students who took seven hours of English classes during the study. Bağçeci analyzed the attitudes and perceptions of the students towards drama activities in writing classes. The results of the analysis of the questionnaires, reflection papers, and teacher field notes show that drama activities in writing classes have a positive effect on the performance of students in the activities and they increased the motivation of students.

Ateş (2013) looked for the ways to reduce foreign language anxiety of prospective EFL teachers. Ateş searched the writing anxiety not only from the perspectives of prospective teachers but also from the viewpoints of the English Language Teaching (ELT) instructors as well. There were two subject groups in her study, one was prospective English teachers themselves, and the other was ELT instructors. According to the results, the ELT instructors thought that prospective EFL teachers' writing anxiety originated from linguistic factors, cognitive factors, affective factors, teaching procedures and student behavior.

Assessment of Writing Skill in Foreign Language Education in Turkey

Writing assessment meets an important purpose by enabling teachers to monitor students' progress and determine if changes in instruction are required to meet students' needs. In nature of writing assessment teacher judgment always plays an important role (O'Malley & Pierce, 1996). However, assessment of writing is not a simple task. Language teachers need to be clear about their objectives and criteria. What is wanted to be tested can be assessed through a variety of tasks which are suitable for the chosen objectives (Brown & Abeywickrama, 2010).

According to Köksal (2004), there is insufficient training in terms of assessment mainly in testing in Turkey. In order to choose the assessment practices, teachers commonly use the pathway which is shown through the curriculum. The study of Öz and Atay (2017) for assessment in Turkish EFL context revealed that, although most of the teachers were familiar with basic classroom assessment,

when it comes to classroom practice, there is an imbalance between assessment literacy and classroom reflection.

In Turkish educational setting, English Language Curriculum for 2nd-8th Grades (ELC) caused changes in language assessment because the new curriculum was arranged according to Common European Framework References of Languages (CEFR), different types of assessment were included in language teaching. The theoretical frame of testing, assessment and evaluation processes is primarily based on the CEFR, in which various types of assessment and evaluation techniques are emphasized. The curriculum includes alternative assessment techniques and process based assessment. Additionally, self-assessment and formal evaluation will be carried out through the application of written and oral exams, quizzes, homework assignments and projects in order to provide an objective record of students' success.

Each unit in the curriculum includes a list of achievements to be met by the students; this will be converted to self-assessment checklists which ask students to assess their own learning from an action-based perspective. Writing skill can be evaluated through formative and summative assessment practices beginning from the 4th grade. The curriculum offers tests to have consistency with the objectives of the course, and to have positive washback for the students.

Related Studies

Mede and Atay (2017) conducted a research with 350 participants by adapting a questionnaire from Vogt and Tsagari. They analyzed the testing practices of Turkish EFL teachers. It was found that the teachers were not competent with testing productive and receptive skills along with integrated skills which shows their need for further training in these fields. The only area teachers were comfortable with was testing micro-linguistic aspect of a language; in other words, grammar and vocabulary. Kibar (2018) studied with pre-service and in-service English teachers and asked to describe their perceptions of assessment in the classroom. It was found that both pre-service teachers and in-service teachers have positive attitudes towards classroom based language assessment. In her study, while no significant difference was found according to the participants' gender, teaching experience of teachers has been discovered to create a significant difference.

Oruç (1999) conducted a research to examine writing instructors' individual approaches to assessing writing and then to determine whether the use of a holistic scoring scale would result in an increase in the reliability of the writing assessment. The participants were six writing instructors from a state university preparatory school teaching writing to different levels. The results of the Oruç's study indicate that there is significant relationship between the grades given to the same paper by five different instructors before and after the training which means both of the systems were reliable within themselves. On the other hand, the Student T-Test results indicate that there is a large difference between the scores given to the same papers by the same instructors with two different writing assessment systems. The results of qualitative analysis indicate that inconsistencies arise from individual instructors' writing assessment practices and that this may be lessened with holistic scoring.

Another research on writing assessment tools was conducted by Polat (2003), aimed to find out the reliability levels of the holistic-analytic instrument that is being used at Anadolu University School of Foreign Languages English Preparatory Program. In his study a total of 50 papers of different achievement levels (unsuccessful, moderate, and successful) were graded by 10 graders who have a minimum of 3 years of experience in grading writing papers in this school. These graders were asked to grade these papers using the holistic-analytic criterion twice with a month interval. The same papers were graded with each criterion by the same graders for the 3rd time after six months. Results suggest that in the evaluation of writing exams the new analytic criterion would provide better reliability degrees than the holistic analytic criterion.

Uçar and Yazıcı (2016) investigated the effect of portfolios on developing writing skills among Turkish undergraduate learners in their paper. Their study underlines pedagogical important implications. First, instructors in ESP classes can use writing portfolios in order to promote overall writing performance and sub skills of writing. Second, through portfolio assessment technique, instructors can gain professionalism via active and meaningful involvement in students' evaluation.

METHODOLOGY

This chapter will give information on the participants, data collection process, data collection tools and data analysis. In this descriptive study, quantitative and qualitative research methods were used. Mixed methods research enables reciprocal feedback between qualitative and quantitative in a circular (Dörnyei, 2007). For the quantitative design, the researcher mainly used two different surveys to ask teaching methods and assessment techniques for writing skill. A semi-structured interview will be used to carry out the qualitative part of the study. Qualitative research method focus on smaller numbers of people yet provides detailed and rich data (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007).

Participants

The study was conducted with 97 English language teachers who work in public and private schools from Isparta city of Turkey. The demographic information obtained by the survey questions is presented in Tables 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. The demographic information includes the independent variables of this study.

Table 1. Distribution of participants' gender

Gender	Frequency (F)	Percent (%)
Female	66	68
Male	31	32
Total	97	100,0

Table 1 indicates that female teachers (N=66) outnumber male teachers (N=31) with the percentage of with the percentage of 68 %.

Table 2. Distribution of participants' educational level

Educational Level	Frequency (F)	Percent (%)
BA	92	94.8
MA	5	5.2
Ph.D.	0	0
Total	172	100,0

As can be seen in table 2, 94,8 % of English language teachers participated in the study have bachelor's degree while only 5,2 % of the participants have master's degree. None of the English teachers participated in the study finished a doctorate program.

Table 3. Distribution of participants' department of graduation

Department	Frequency (F)	Percent (%)
Teaching English as a Foreign Language	77	79.4
English Language and Literature	13	13.4
American Culture and Literature	1	1
Other	6	6.2
Total	97	100,0

Table 3 demonstrates the department of graduation of the participants. It is observed that most of the participants are graduated from the department of teaching English as a foreign language with a number of 77. While 13 teachers finished English language and literature program, 1 teacher graduated from American culture and literature. 6 teachers graduated from different departments and completed a pedagogical formation program for teaching profession.

Table 4. Distribution of participants' teaching experience

Teaching Experience	Frequency (F)	Percent (%)
1 year	4	4.1
2-5 years	15	15.5
6-10 years	11	11.3
10 years over	67	69.1
Total	97	100,0

Table 4 indicates that there are 4 English teachers (4.1 %) who have one year of teaching experience, and 15.5 % of the teachers ($N=15$) have 2-5 years-experience and 11.3 % of teachers ($N=11$) have 6-10 years of teaching experience. In this study, most of the teachers have more than 10 years-experience ($N=67$, 69.1 %).

Table 5. Distribution of participants' school type

School Type	Frequency (F)	Percent (%)
Public school	73	75.3
Private school	24	24.7
Total	97	100,0

According to Table 5, 73 English teachers (75.3 %) works at public schools and 24.7 % of the participants ($N=24$) works at private schools.

Table 6. Distribution of classes that participants teach

Grades	Frequency (F)
5 th grade	66
6 th grade	58
7 th grade	55
8 th grade	42

In the above table, the frequency value is given according to the grades taught by the English language teachers. Frequencies states how many teachers teach at the target grade level, because a teacher can teach only 5th grades, and also can teach more than one grade, i.e., teachers can teach just 5th grades or both 5th and 6th classes or all of them.

Data Collection Process

The participants of this study are English language teachers working at public and private schools in Isparta city centre. 97 ELT teachers voluntarily participated in the study. After getting the necessary permissions from ethics committee and provincial directorate of national education, the researcher collected the data at the beginning of the fall term of 2018-2019 academic year. Before getting results from the adapted and developed instruments of this study, a pilot study was held among 20 teachers to test the questionnaires. The researcher, himself, distributed the questionnaires to the participants in case there would be questions about the questionnaire. Participants were informed them about the confidentiality of the answers and the aim of the study.

During the first a few distribution of questionnaires, the researcher noticed that teachers do not feel comfortable answering the questions with the researcher so some specific terms were explained to

inform teachers before questionnaires were handed in and then let them enough time to answer the questions. To avoid the possible time problems, researcher learned the most appropriate time for each of the teachers so he let teachers answer the questions without any influence. It took about 20 minutes for participants to complete the surveys. Since it is a voluntary work, some of the teachers neither answered the questionnaires nor gave them back.

In result, the format of the surveys was modified and because the language of the items seemed a little bit difficult for some teachers, some terms were explained in parenthesis. Interviews with 3 teachers in pilot study were made to gain insights about their responses. Possible questions were defined according to the pilot study.

Data Collection Tools

In this study, data were obtained from two surveys and a semi-structured interview. The first survey measures the use of writing techniques that the ELT teachers apply in their classes, and the second one surveys the assessment techniques which teachers use for evaluation of their students' writing. As for the interview, it aims to give teachers the chance to share their ideas and feelings on the teaching and assessment of writing. The interview was carried out just after the teachers took the surveys when their thoughts and feelings were still fresh.

Surveys

As mentioned in the previous part, this study has a mixed research design and in order to collect data for this research, two types of data collection tools will be used; two surveys including items asking about teaching writing and writing assessment, and a semi-structured interview. As "surveys are relatively easy to construct, extremely versatile and uniquely capable of gathering a large amount of information quickly in a form that is readily processible" (Dörnyei, 2007), the researcher applied two surveys including items for teaching writing and assessing writing.

Survey on ELT Teachers' Techniques for Teaching Writing

Firstly, to realize the initial goal of the study, Gilbert and Graham's survey in their research of 'Teaching Writing to Elementary Students in Grades 4-6: A National Survey' (2010) was adapted. The two researchers surveyed a small portion of intermediate-grade writing teachers about their general background, preparation to teach writing, time spent on writing, and classroom instructional practices. The selected survey was created, field tested, peer reviewed, published, used within the last 5 years, and cited by other authors (Gilbert & Graham, 2010).

Gilbert and Graham's survey includes five sections. The first part is *teacher, student and general writing instruction information*. In this part, teachers were asked to provide demographic information about their gender, ethnicity, educational level, years spent teaching, and previous preparation to teach writing. The second section is *evidence-based practices* which asked teachers to indicate how often they use 19 different writing practices. The third section, *teacher self-efficacy*, includes nine statements regarding teachers' efficacy for teaching writing. In the fourth section, *writing assignments*, Gilbert and Graham asked teachers to indicate how often they ask their students engage in 28 specific types of writing. The final section is *adaptations for weaker writers*. This part of the survey asked teachers about 20 specific adaptations they make for weaker writers.

For this descriptive study, only the first two out of the five sections of the survey were used because the last three parts of the survey are not directly linked to this study. Teacher self-efficacy and adaptations for weaker writers are not the subjects of this study. Assessment of writing includes writing assignments, however, this study used Chen's survey named 'Survey on EFL teachers'

assessment methods in entry-level writing courses in technological universities in Taiwan' (2016) as a separate survey for the writing assessment part.

An important modification was made in the process of making the survey: Instead of an eight-point Likert-type scale, the adapted questions are going to be asked teachers to respond to a five item likert-type scale. In the original response options were *never, several times a year, monthly, several times a week, weekly, several times a week, daily* and *several times a day*. However, in Turkish EFL setting, the curriculum offers 3 hours of class time for 5th and 6th grades, and 4 hours of class time for 7th and 8th grades a week. English classes for these grades may be on different days according to the lesson schedule in schools.

In addition to this, each unit in English Language Curriculum of Turkey has a writing section. Because of these reasons, the options were adapted as five-point likert type which is *once a month, twice a month, three times a month, four times a month and more*.

In the first part, teachers were asked to provide demographic information about their gender, educational level, and years spent teaching, school categorization. The second section asked teachers to indicate how often they use 19 different writing practices. Six items asked about specific teaching techniques, including the process writing approach, indirect instruction of writing skills, sentence combining, inquiry, studying and imitating models of good writing, and verbal praise/reinforcement. These six items categorized as Factor 1. Four items focused on teaching the following skills: summarization, spelling, handwriting, and typing. These four items mentioned as Factor 2 in the study. The six items asked about word processing, student self-assessment, teachers' setting goals for students' writing, writing to facilitate content learning, prewriting activities and students working together to plan, draft or revise their compositions. These final six items classified as Factor 3. The final three items asked about teaching writing strategies for planning, revising/editing, and paragraph construction. These three items categorized as Factor 4.

Survey on ELT Teachers' Techniques for Assessing Writing

In second part of the study, Chen's survey named 'Survey on Entry-level English Writing Teachers' Classroom Assessment Practices in Technological Universities in Taiwan' (2016) was used to check the assessment methods which teachers use to assess students' writing in their classes. Chen modified the items from Cheng, Rogers and Hu's (2004) survey to ask the assessment methods they used to assess students in their entry-level EFL writing class. First part of the survey asks for age, gender, education, years of teaching and school categorization of language teachers. In the second part of the survey, teachers were asked 10 assessment methods for writing assessment. Apart from the assessment techniques, teachers were also asked whether they use these assessment techniques for grading students.

Interviews

Teacher interviews were conducted with the participation of 6 teachers (2 males and 4 females), 3 from public secondary school and 3 from private secondary school. Teachers were selected in accordance with the random sampling technique. According to Dörnyei (2007), random sampling is the most important component of probability sampling, and the fact that the selection of the participants is completely based on probabilities here is expected to minimize most of the exterior factors making the sample more representative.

Five questions were included in interviews in order to investigate the views of teachers on teaching and assessment of writing. Before each interview, teachers were informed that it was going to be recorded as later on to be transcribed and utilized in the study. The interview data were used in an attempt to gain insights related to the topics of the research questions: teaching writing techniques

used by teachers of English in secondary schools, and the assessment techniques for writing used by teachers of English at secondary school level.

All the participants were visited in their schools and interviewed face-to-face. Interviews were conducted in Turkish. The researcher used a semi-structured interview type. The findings of the qualitative part of the study were analyzed in a descriptive format “primarily by non-statistical methods” (Dörnyei, 2007, p.43).

Data Analysis

The data collected through the surveys were analyzed with the help of version 20.0 of Statistic Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Reliability tests and factor analysis were used to check surveys, factors and the items. Factor analysis and reliability tests were carried out as to check the reliability and validity of the surveys, factors and the items. Descriptive statistics were utilized to analyze the frequencies of the survey takers’ answers for each item in the surveys, and finally, means, variables, and common tendencies were also described as to clearly explain the answers of the research questions.

The interviews were all recorded and transcribed. After the interviews were transcribed, the qualitative findings were analyzed in a descriptive format to get more detailed information regarding the teaching and assessment techniques by exploring English language teachers’ views in more depth.

Reliability Analysis of Surveys

A reliable test measures whatever it is measuring consistently and possible errors are minimized when the test has high coefficient of reliability (Best & Khan, 2006).

Table 7. Reliability analysis for survey I and survey II

Grades	Number of Items	Cronbach Alpha Coefficient
Survey I	19	0.92
Survey II	10	0.91

As seen in Table 7, the results of reliability analysis of items in Survey I which is about ELT Teachers’ Techniques for Teaching Writing about types of teaching practices has a high level of reliability with Cronbach’s Alpha of .92. The second survey which is for ELT Teachers’ Techniques for Assessing Writing is also reliable with Cronbach’s Alpha of .91.

RESULTS

In this chapter results of the surveys are presented through the tables. Analyses are presented following the order of research questions.

Teachers’ Choices of Teaching Techniques for Writing

This section clarifies the first research question of the study. To achieve this aim, frequency analysis was conducted, and also mean and standard deviation scores of Survey for Teaching Writing Techniques were given in Table 8.

Table 8. Frequency and mean of teaching techniques for writing

(Frequency for a month)	Once	Twice	3 times	4 times	More	\bar{X}	SD
Items							
Teach planning strategies	41	37	2	3	14	2.41	1.23
Teach revising strategies	48	13	18	9	9	2.40	1.21
Teach summarizing	15	14	4	17	37	2.49	1.26
Teacher-set writing goals	16	4	9	23	45	2.55	1.31
Peer collaboration	27	13	10	18	29	2.44	1.27
Use word processing	53	26	3	4	1	2.35	1.18
Prewriting activity	41	15	15	16	10	2.41	1.24
Process approach	48	17	5	18	9	2.40	1.21
Sentence combining	41	20	2	14	10	2.41	1.21
Inquiry/research	18	10	11	19	39	2.51	1.29
Imitate models	18	3	2	25	39	2.51	1.28
Teach paragraph writing	36	21	5	6	19	2.42	1.25
Verbal praise	11	17	10	19	40	2.52	1.30
Assess own writing	27	25	12	13	20	2.43	1.26
Writing as a learning tool	13	18	9	21	36	2.45	1.30
Direct instruction of skills	9	8	12	21	47	2.56	1.33
Teach spelling	41	28	5	13	10	2.41	1.25
Teach handwriting	18	10	9	21	39	2.51	1.29
Teach typing skills	50	19	15	6	7	2.39	1.20
Average	30.10	16.73	10.95	15.05	24.21	2.45	1.26

Table 8 demonstrates the frequency analysis with the mean and the standard deviation scores of the items that aim at measuring the participants' teaching techniques for writing. Considering the average score for the items as 2.45, it could be seen in the table that teachers moderately use the techniques below the general average.

The highest mean scores were observed to be pertaining to the item 16 (I use direct instruction methods -modeling, guided practice and review- to teach basic writing skills - grammar, usage etc. [$m=2.56$]), item 4 (I establish specific goals for what students are to include in their writing assignments [$m=2.55$]), item 13 (I provide verbal praise or positive reinforcement for some aspect of their writing [$m=2.52$]). By looking at these results, it can be seen that teachers prefer direct instruction techniques and set writing goals for students. Teachers also try to motivate their students by using verbal praise and positive reinforcement.

We might remark the lowest mean scores as item 6 (My students complete writing assignments using word processing [$m=2.35$]), item 19 (I teach typing skills [$m=2.39$]). It may be interpreted from these results that teachers prefer to see pencil and paper writing for their students' work instead of technology assisted ones.

Effect of Gender on Teachers' Teaching Techniques for Writing

This section provides information to clarify the first question of the study with its sub-questions, which queried whether the teachers' genders, teaching experiences and school types have an impact on teaching techniques and frequency of these teaching practices.

In an attempt to find out whether the teachers varied across the genders, experience and school types, an independent samples t-test was conducted in terms of factors in the first survey.

Table 9. Independent sample t-test results for gender

Gender		Sig.(2-tailed)	N	\bar{X}	SD
Female	Factor 1	.223	34	2.221	1.175
Male			17	2.635	1.037
Female	Factor 2	.578	33	2.598	1.30
Male			18	2.403	.963
Female	Factor 3	.534	38	2.167	.971
Male			20	2.333	.961

Table 9 indicates that gender does not have any influence on factor 1, factor 2 and factor 3 ($p<.05$). Factor 1 includes items for specific teaching techniques, factor 2 is for teaching writing skills, factor 3 includes other evidence based practices.

Effect of Teaching Experience on Teachers' Teaching Techniques for Writing

In order to investigate the significance of teaching experience among the three factors, descriptive analysis of mean scores and standard deviations were conducted. Table 10 presents the differences between the mean scores of the teachers' responses to the related items and their teaching experience.

Table 10. Independent sample t-test results for teaching experience

Experience		Sig.(2-tailed)	N	\bar{X}	SD
Less than 5 years	Factor 1	.779	11	2.445	1.041
Over 5 years			40	2.335	1.174
Less than 5 years	Factor 2	.117	12	3	1.496
Over 5 years			39	2.384	1.052
Less than 5 years	Factor 3	.573	12	2.083	.818
Over 5 years			46	2.261	.998

As could be seen in Table 10, no major differences were detected between teaching experience of English language teachers and their teaching techniques for writing ($p<.05$).

Effect of School Type on Teachers' Teaching Techniques for Writing

Regarding the effects of school types on teaching techniques, descriptive analysis of mean scores and standard deviations were conducted. Table 11 presents these scores.

Table 11. Independent sample t-test results for school type

School Type		Sig.(2-tailed)	N	\bar{X}	SD
Public school	Factor 1	.255	38	2.466	1.166
Private school			13	2.046	1.030
Public school	Factor 2	.922	38	2.52	1.106
Private school			13	2.558	1.44
Public school	Factor 3	.59	43	2.364	.981
Private school			15	1.822	.795

Table 11 revealed that whether English language teachers work at public schools or private schools has no significant effect on teaching practices of teachers who teach English at secondary school level.

Analysis of Assessment Techniques

In this section frequency and chi-square analysis were conducted in order to reveal at what rate English language teachers use assessment techniques for teaching writing. Table 12 indicates the frequency analysis of writing assessment techniques.

Table 12. Frequency analysis of writing assessment techniques

Items	Use		Not Use	
	F	P	F	P
True-false items	92	94.8	5	5.2
Matching items	92	94.8	5	5.2
Multiple-choice items	85	87.6	12	12.4
Editing a sentence or a paragraph	64	65.2	33	34.8
Short-answer questions	80	82.5	17	17.5
Paragraph writing	58	59.8	39	40.2
Essay writing	19	19.6	78	80.4
Term project	62	63.9	35	36.1
Student journal	7	7.2	90	92.8
Peer assessment	36	37.1	61	62.9
Self assessment	41	42.3	56	57.7
Student portfolio	30	30.9	67	69.1
Standardized writing tests	21	21.6	76	78.4
Oral and/or written feedback	67	69.1	30	30.9

In Table 12, according to the results of frequency analysis, most commonly used assessment techniques by English language teachers are true-false items ($N=92$), with the percentage of 94.8%, matching items ($N=92$) with the percentage of 94.8, and multiple choice items ($N=85$), with the percentage of 87.6%. English language teachers use the essay writing ($N=19$) with the percentage of 19.6, and student journal technique the least with the percentage of 7.2% and ($N=7$).

Use of Assessment Techniques for Grading Students' Writing

Participants were asked to confirm or not to confirm the statement that 'I use assessments for grading students' writing'. Teachers who responded 'yes' outnumbered the teachers who did not use the assessments for grading with a percentage of 92,78% ($N=90$). Only 7 participants with a percentage of 7.22% stated that they did not use the assessment techniques for grading students' writing.

Gender Effect on Writing Assessment Techniques

Chi-square analysis was conducted to reveal the gender effect on English language teachers' writing assessment choices. In Table 13, it can be seen the results of teachers' preferences for using or not using the writing assessment techniques.

Table 13. Chi-square analysis of gender effect on writing assessment techniques

Items	N	Male	Female	χ^2
True-false items	97	31	66	0.692
Matching items	97	31	66	0.122
Multiple-choice items	97	31	66	0.225
Editing a sentence or a paragraph	97	31	66	0.338
Short-answer questions	97	31	66	0.804
Paragraph writing	97	31	66	0.837
Essay writing	97	31	66	0.968
Term project	97	31	66	0.411
Student journal	97	31	66	0.298
Peer assessment	97	31	66	0.5
Self assessment	97	31	66	0.693
Student portfolio	97	31	66	0.256
Standardized writing tests	97	31	66	0.496
Oral and/or written feedback	97	31	66	0.506

* $\alpha < .05$.

Table 13 indicates that there is no significant effect of gender on participants' choices of writing assessment practices ($\alpha < .05$).

Teaching Experience Effect on Writing Assessment Techniques

In order to find out the relation between teaching experience of English language teachers and their assessment techniques chi-square analysis was conducted. Table 14 indicates the results.

Table 14. Chi-square analysis of teaching experience effect on writing assessment techniques

Items	N	Less than 10 years	More than 10 years	χ^2
True-false items	97	30	67	0.587
Matching items	97	30	67	0.577
Multiple-choice items	97	30	67	0.028
Editing a sentence or a paragraph	97	30	67	0.662
Short-answer questions	97	30	67	0.882
Paragraph writing	97	30	67	0.023
Essay writing	97	30	67	0.005
Term project	97	30	67	0.056
Student journal	97	30	67	0.119
Peer assessment	97	30	67	0.005
Self assessment	97	30	67	0.557
Student portfolio	97	30	67	0.732
Standardized writing tests	97	30	67	0.792
Oral and/or written feedback	97	30	67	0.279

* $\alpha < .05$.

Chi-square analysis results were given in Table 14. According to the results, teaching experience of the participants has no significant effect on their writing assessment practices at secondary school level.

In techniques of multiple-choice items, paragraph writing, essay writing and peer assessment, teachers who have a teaching experience of more than 10 years outnumbered the less experienced teachers. The results can be seen in detail in Table 15.

Table 15. Frequency analysis for multiple-choice, paragraph writing and peer assessment

Experience		Use	Not Use
		F	F
Less than 5 years	Multiple-choice	23	7
		62	5
Over 5 years	Paragraph writing	23	7
		35	32
Less than 5 years	Peer Assessment	5	25
		31	36

School Type Effect on Writing Assessment Techniques

Table 16 indicates the results of chi-square analysis of school type effect on writing assessment techniques.

Table 16. Chi-square analysis of school type effect on writing assessment techniques

Items	N	Public School	Private School	χ^2
True-false items	97	73	24	0.417
Matching items	97	73	24	0.426
Multiple-choice items	97	73	24	0.004
Editing a sentence or a paragraph	97	73	24	0.452
Short-answer questions	97	73	24	0.898
Paragraph writing	97	73	24	0.001
Essay writing	97	73	24	0.011
Term project	97	73	24	0.252
Student journal	97	73	24	0.249
Peer assessment	97	73	24	0.659
Self assessment	97	73	24	0.684
Student portfolio	97	73	24	0.469
Standardized writing tests	97	73	24	0.494
Oral and/or written feedback	97	73	24	0.081

* $\alpha < .05$.

It can be seen from the Table 16; chi-square analysis of school type indicates no significant effect of English language teachers' school type was observed on assessment techniques for writing.

The Qualitative Findings

In order to have a deeper understanding of reaching writing practices and writing assessment techniques through the qualitative side, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 6 of the participants. Three of these randomly selected teachers were females, while the rest three were males. The five questions in the interviews were asked and the interviews were all recorded. Teachers' views about teaching and assessing writing were gathered by means of the following interview questions.

1.Do you think teaching writing skills is important for language learning? Why?

According to the answers, teachers stated the importance of appropriate teaching of writing skill and also the significance of writing. However, it can be concluded that teachers do not have positive attitudes and enough motivation for teaching this skill in English lessons. In other words, some of the teachers had problems in *motivation* and *catching students' attention*.

2.How much time do you spend for teaching writing?

What the results of the analysis on the teachers' responses to the second question revealed was that all of the teachers complain about the time dedicated for teaching writing, which was in support of the quantitative findings that were described in the previous sections. It is clear from the answers that time devoted for writing skill is not enough for teaching students appropriate techniques. All of the interviewees, even working at private secondary schools complain about class time in the English language programme. *Class time* is another problem for teaching and assessing of writing.

3.What are the difficulties you experience during writing classes?

When teachers' answers were examined, it was found out new issues were added to lack of time and motivation: *coursebook contents* and *need for in-service training*. Some of the interviewees found the coursebook contents insufficient for their students' learning. It was teachers even work at private schools need in-service training to explore new strategies for teaching writing.

4.Do you usually assess your students' writing?

It seems from the responses that teachers need to apply not only *traditional assessment* activities including pencil and paper tests but also *alternative assessments* focusing more on motivating students to take more responsibility for their own learning, and intending to make assessment an integral part of the learning experience.

5.Do you use your assessments for grading students?

Supporting the quantitative findings for *grading* item in the second survey, it was found out that *grading* is a must for the interviewees. Each of them has different criterion for grading students. That causes ambiguity in both teachers' and students' minds.

When the qualitative findings were examined, it was clear that we could describe the issues which teachers mentioned as *lack of motivation* and *catching students' attention*, *lack of class time*, *insufficient coursebook content*, *need for in-service training*, *traditional or alternative assessment* and *grading*.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this chapter, the findings of the study will be presented in the light of the previous studies. Each research question will be presented in subtitles and the answers will be given to the questions based on the findings of this study.

What are the Teaching Techniques for Writing Used by Teachers of English in Secondary Schools?

The first question aimed to reveal the teaching techniques for writing used by English language teachers. The results of the descriptive analyses showed that teachers used various teaching writing techniques with different frequencies. The results are similar to the findings of some studies in the literature. In their study 'Teaching Writing to Elementary Students in Grades 4-6: A National Survey',

Gilbert & Graham (2010) found out that teachers use various teaching writing strategies for planning, revising/editing writing including.

The highest frequency score belongs to the item 16 -I use direct instruction methods (modeling, guided practice and review) to teach basic writing skills (grammar, usage etc.) This finding is consistent with Özbays' (2004) research. In his study, Özbay tried to discover tertiary level EFL teachers' perceptions of the role and importance of writing skills in English Language Teaching and to determine the place of writing skill in EFL curriculum. According to the findings of his study, EFL teachers are most keen on correcting grammar and organization errors. Newel (1996), contrarily, stated that 10th grade students were not able to achieve higher post-test scores than in their written works under teacher-centered instructional tasks than the students whose task were reader-based ones.

Descriptive analysis indicated that item 4 (I establish specific goals for what students are to include in their written assignments) had the second highest frequency. According to the scores of these two items, it can be understood that English language teachers prefer choosing and setting goals for their students and prefer to teach basic writing skills. Similarly, McLane & McNamee (1990) remarked that teachers using traditional approach focus on the formal, mechanical aspects of the writing. Thus with this approach there is a danger that, for many students writing becomes an exercise in formal mechanics divorced from personal content and intentions.

According to the findings of the current research, teachers pay attention to rewarding and motivating students in writing classes. Item 13 (I provide verbal praise or positive reinforcement for some aspect of their writing) was the item which had the highest frequency score after items 16 and 4. The results were similar to the findings of Çetin's (2018) research. 14 instructors in the study used positive reinforcement in their classes as much as possible by having different aims such as motivation, value and reinforcing the improvement. It was found out that reinforcers had a significant effect on English learning as they made learners motivated and created a safe learning environment.

Adığüzel (1998) remarked the importance of creating a supportive classroom environment in which students work collaboratively with peers and the teacher. The findings of his study with high school students revealed that the students who produced their written work under the process approach that teachers used in the class were more successful in their post-test results. In our study, the process approach- item 8 (I use a process approach to writing instruction in my classroom) was one of the most rarely preferred teaching techniques with the frequency of 48 (once a month).

Teachers' frequency scores are above the average when it comes to the item 5 (My students work together to plan, draft, revise or edit a paper). Similarly, Yıldırım (1991) found out group and pair-work techniques were helpful to teachers in teaching writing skills, specifically for composition organisation in large classes. High school students in her study achieved good organisation skills through group and pair-work.

We might remark the lowest mean scores as item 6 (My students complete writing assignments using word processing), and item 19 (I teach typing skills). It may be interpreted from these results that teachers prefer to see pencil and paper writing for their students' work instead of technology assisted ones. The study of Zhang and Burry-Stock (2003) revealed similar results. They studied with 297 teachers on their teaching practices in classroom through a questionnaire. The teachers differed in their answers according to their teaching levels. Secondary school teachers mostly used paper-based techniques according to the findings.

These findings consist of contradictions with some studies which signified the importance of technology use in learning and teaching process. Sondolo (2010), indicated in her thesis that technology allowed students to enhance their writing by adding more precise details into their writing pieces and it initiates self revisions. Halsey (2007) and Martin (2008), stated that teachers had a better student motivation in their classes, because technology made it easier to write and helped students to become better writers.

Do Teachers' Teaching Techniques for Writing Change According to Their Gender?

According to the statistical findings of this question which aimed to find out whether teaching techniques of writing change according to teachers' gender, no major influence of gender was found on selection or frequency of the teaching techniques of writing at secondary school level. This finding is consistent with previous literature results of Yeşilyurt's (2008) study. Yeşilyurt's findings revealed that the data obtained from the students in ELT department did not significantly vary according to their gender.

Similarly, in his study on the effect of using the reading for writing approach on developing the writing ability, İbrahim (2006) found that gender was not a significant factor in terms of the attitudes towards writing in English. However, the findings of this study differ from the study results of Aydin & Başöz (2010). In their study with 162 participants, it is found that female teachers had generally more positive attitudes towards EFL writing. Onbaşı (2014) stated that female teachers were more efficacious in encouraging their students in writing than male teachers in terms of gender.

Does Teaching Experience Have an Impact on Teaching Writing Techniques?

When the relationship between teaching experience and teaching techniques of English language teachers was examined, it was found out that no impact detected for teaching experience on teaching writing strategies. These findings differ from the results of Onbaşı's (2014) findings. Onbaşı found out that teachers with a 6-10 year teaching writing experience were more efficacious in terms of instructional strategies and student engagement.

Are There Any Differences Between the Teaching Techniques Used by Teachers in Public Schools and Private Schools?

The statistical findings for the relationship between participants' selections and frequency of teaching techniques indicated that no significant difference was observed according to the school type. Whether teachers work in public school or private school does not affect their preferences. This was quite parallel to Yeşilyurt's (2008) findings which revealed that no significant differences were found among participants from different types of school.

The results of the analysis differ from some studies. AĞÇAM & BABANOĞLU (2016) examined teachers' attitudes towards teaching a foreign language. Teachers considerably diverged in their responses. The researchers stated that private schools offer more class hours than public schools, and class hours affect teacher attitudes and preferences.

The quantitative findings also contradict with Larenas, Moran and Rivera's (2011) research results. They compared teaching styles of EFL instructors in the public and private sector. Larenas, Moran and Rivera argued that EFL instructors' teaching styles and preferences change according to their school types. Gholami, Sarkosh and Abdi (2016) also tried to explore the teaching practices of private, public, and public-private EFL teachers in Iran. They stated that a significant difference exists among public and private school teachers' practices.

What are the Assessment Techniques for Writing Used by Teachers of English in Secondary Schools?

The analysis results of the assessment techniques for writing revealed that most commonly used assessment techniques by English language teachers are from teacher-made tests. Teachers preferred true-false items (Item 1a) and matching items (Item 1b) most with the same frequency. Multiple

choice items (Item 1c) which a considerable number of the participants chose follow true-false and matching items. These results are quite parallel to Hughes' (2003) assertion which pointed that teachers need to use teacher-made tests as building blocks of English writing in entry-level writing courses.

In Turkish EFL context, the education is test-driven, and students have to pass exams to proceed to the next level. That context may have a powerful influence on teachers' approaches towards assessment (Kibar, 2018). Büyükkarcı (2010) revealed that in his study high school teachers used multiple-choice tests to support their students during the process of preparing for university entrance exam. For these reasons, teachers may prefer multiple-choice exams in secondary schools or even starting from primary schools to prepare their students for the next large scale examinations. However, too much focus on test preparation at the expense of other activities may cause negative washback which means the undesirable effects on teaching and learning of a specific test (Alderson & Wall, 1993).

The results are also in similar vein with the findings of Rea-Dickins and Rixon (1999). In their research with young learners, Rea-Dickins and Rixon found out that teachers preferred multiple-choice tests for grammar and vocabulary. Teachers also chose vocabulary matching items in tests they prepared.

As cited in the previous literature review, teachers use various assessment techniques for the assessment of writing (Brown & Abeywickrama, 2010). The findings of this study presented that the frequency of portfolio (Item 8) usage in assessment was below the mean. However, Babayıgit (2015); Koroğlu (2011); Uçar and Yazıcı (2016) remarked that using portfolio-based learning and adopting portfolios in assessment increased student efficacy.

Findings showed that a considerable number of the participants use the term projects (Item 4) as a writing assessment technique. Kırkgöz and Ağcam (2012) stated in their paper that students were graded on their performance with written exams, homework assignments and projects by the teacher as an assessor. They also indicate that written pencil and paper exams have sustained popularity in the Turkish education system despite the English Language Curriculum's alternative assessment recommendations.

According to the findings, essay writing (Item 3) was not preferred by a considerable amount of the participants. Essay writing is by definition expressing ideas with a broad understanding by using complex vocabulary words and grammar structures (Jacob, 2010; Tran, 2012). Due to these necessities in this definition, it can be deduced that essay writing was one of the least preferred technique after the student journal (Item 5).

It was found out that English language teachers preferred the student journal technique the least. As stated in Chen's (2016) research, use of diary writing and use of student journal, in line with the findings of this study, were below the average score of the writing assessment techniques.

A majority of the participants confirmed the statement (I use the assessment for grading the students) at the end of the Survey II -Assessment Techniques for Writing-by responding 'yes'. The results revealed that assessing students' writing has always been accompanied by grading although grading is a difficult task for English language teachers (Han, 2013; Oruç, 1999; Sole, 2018).

Do the Assessment Techniques for Writing Change According to Gender?

In order to find out whether gender plays an important role on teachers' choices of assessment techniques, Independent Samples T-test analysis was conducted. Considering the results of the analysis, it can be inferred that English language teachers' gender does not have a significant effect on assessment techniques of writing.

The findings of this question were in line with Cizek, Fitzgerald and Rachor's (1996) study. They surveyed 143 American elementary and secondary school teachers concerning their assessment practices. The results indicated that assessment practices were highly variable and unpredictable from teacher characteristics such as practice setting, gender or experience.

Kibar (2018) also researched the pre-service and in-service English teachers' perceptions of testing and assessment in EFL classes. It was found that both pre-service teachers and in-service teachers have positive attitudes towards classroom based language assessment. In her study, no significant difference was found according to the participants' gender. This is also in line with the findings of Yetkin's (2018) study with prospective teachers on conceptions of assessment. He put forward the possible explanation for that as an effect of educational policy in Turkey, and stated that regardless of their genders, teacher candidates used assessment for improving themselves and their students' learning (Yetkin, 2018).

Does Teaching Experience Have an Impact on Teachers' Writing Assessment Techniques?

The statistical analysis indicated that there is statistically no significant difference according to the teaching experience for participants' selections of writing assessment techniques. It was noticed, during the literature review, that there existed another study with similar findings in which teachers preferred instructional choices for assessment regardless of their teaching experience.

Cizek, Fitzgerald and Rachor (1996) found out that the teachers' classroom assessment practices in elementary and secondary school level varied, but not necessarily according to such contextual factors as gender, years of teaching experience, practice setting or knowledge of district assessment policies.

Öz and Atay (2017) collected data from twelve instructors, varying in experience between 1-15 years, and working in English Preparatory Program of a Turkish university. The research revealed that, although most of the teachers were familiar with basic classroom assessment, when it comes to classroom practice, there is not much relationship between the experience and assessment perception.

However, in Kibar's (2018) study, the difference between novice and experienced group was significant, in addition to the difference between experienced and most experienced group in the stage of planning assessment. In planning stage less experienced teachers had higher mean scores than more experienced ones. Kibar (2018) explained the possible reason for that as by the fact that they are educated recently with more modern approaches.

Are There Any Differences Between the Assessment Techniques Used by Teachers in Public Schools and Private Schools?

Independent Samples T-test analysis, descriptive analysis of mean scores and standard deviations and factor analysis were conducted to find out whether teaching techniques of writing change according to teachers' school type. The results indicated school type had no considerable influence on selection or frequency of the teaching techniques of writing at secondary school level. This result is similar to the findings of Kibar's (2018) study. The variation of the school types did not have enough effect to make a difference in the assessment perceptions of teachers.

Similarly, in their study with instructors from state and private universities, Özdemir-Yılmazer and Özkan (2017) also could not find any difference between the classroom assessment practices of instructors from different universities. The reason of this finding was explained by them as a result of control by a higher institution of the country. The same reason may be mentioned because at secondary school level, all secondary schools in Turkey are administered by the Ministry of National Education, regardless of whether it is a private school or a public school.

In conclusion, this study aimed to investigate the teaching practices and assessment techniques for writing used by English language teachers who teach writing at secondary school level. Two surveys were used to analyse each of the dependent variables. It was found out that teachers preferred teacher-centered and direct instruction methods for teaching writing. When it comes to assessment, teachers' scores were higher in more mechanical, exam-oriented and paper based assessment techniques. Therefore, it can be concluded that for writing classes, English language teachers are closer to traditional teaching writing methods and writing assessment techniques. According to the researcher, the reason for that may be the insufficient training of teachers for using technological devices or apps in teaching and assessment of writing. Negative attitudes toward using new methods or technology may lead teachers to stick to the methods which they learnt in their college education.

The study revealed that independent variables gender, teaching experience and school type do not have enough effect to make a difference on the use of teaching and assessment techniques for writing. An interview was made with the participants at the end of the surveys. As for the qualitative findings, it was found that teachers do not have positive attitudes towards teaching writing. Moreover, they have some problems such as time, teacher-student interaction, motivation, lack of in-service training.

Findings of the study suggest that other factors such as motivation, teacher-student interaction and in-service training should be investigated apart from gender, teaching experience and school type. English language teachers can be acquainted with new approaches for teaching and assessing writing through in-service programmes. In-service training programmes can also be provided for teachers to revise their teaching and assessment approaches for writing. Teachers can be guided to use technology more frequently for both teaching and assessment part of writing by administrators. Teachers can be encouraged to allocate time for teaching writing through designing more class time in curriculum by policy makers. Furthermore, designing such programs will increase teachers' motivation and also provide chances to find out new ways to develop better teacher-student interactions during the class time for teaching writing.

Limitations

This study contains several limitations which might restrict the generalizability of the results. Firstly, it aims at giving insights about teaching writing and assessing writing. Thus it is limited to a specific language skill and will not be generalizable to all areas of teaching English.

Second, it is limited with 97 teachers from public and private secondary schools since data were collected in Turkish EFL setting of Isparta city of Turkey, so the results of this study cannot be generalized for all population of teachers and contexts where English is instructed as a foreign language.

Third, this study is only limited with the data obtained by a teaching writing survey, a writing assessment questionnaire and a semi-structured interview. It should be noted that the surveys and the interview did not ask teachers about all possible writing or assessment activities at secondary school level.

Suggestions for Further Studies

Findings of the study suggest that other factors such as motivation, teacher-student interaction and in-service training should be investigated apart from gender, teaching experience and school type.

English language teachers can be acquainted with new approaches for teaching and assessing writing through in-service programmes. In-service training programmes can also be provided for teachers to revise their teaching and assessment approaches for writing. It may be necessary to conduct more

studies questioning the effect and sufficiency of the in-service training for teaching different skills of English as a foreign language.

Teachers can be guided to use technology more frequently for both teaching and assessment part of writing by administrators. Teachers can be encouraged to allocate time for teaching writing through designing more class time in curriculum by policy makers. Furthermore, designing such programs will increase teachers' motivation and also provide chances to find out new ways to develop better teacher-student interactions during the class time for teaching writing. More studies should be conducted on larger samples of teachers searching the different aspects which mentioned above for both teaching and assessing writing at secondary school level.

REFERENCES

- Adığuzel, M. F. (1998). *The effect of the process approach to teaching writing on Turkish students' writing skills and overall language proficiency in EFL*, Unpublished master's thesis, Mersin University, Mersin, Turkey.
- Ağçam, R., & Babanoğlu, M. P. (2016). An investigation on EFL teachers' attitude toward teaching profession. *Higher Education Studies*, 6(3), 21.
- Alderson, J. C., & Wall, D. (1993). Does Washback Exist? *Applied Linguistics*, 14, 115-129.
- Ateş, S. (2013). *Foreign language writing anxiety of prospective EFL teachers: How to reduce their anxiety levels*, Unpublished master's thesis, Başkent University, Ankara.
- Aydın, S., & Başöz, T. (2010). The attitudes of pre-service teachers towards EFL writing. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 6(2), 54-69.
- Aziz, S. S. (2011). Analysis of errors in paragraph writing in English by second year geography and history students at university of Baghdad. *Journal of College of Education for Women*, 22(2), 371-387.
- Babayiğit, M. V. (2015) *The role of portfolios in boosting young adult learners' writing skills*, Unpublished master's thesis, Çağ University, Mersin, Turkey.
- Bağçecı, E. (2015). *Developing writing skills through drama in EFL classroom*, Unpublished master's thesis, Muğla Sıtkı Koçma University, Muğla, Turkey.
- Best, J.W. and Kahn, J.V. (2006). *Research in Education*. Cape Town: Pearson Education Inc.
- Brown, H. D., & Abeywickrama, P. (2010). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices*. White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.
- Büyükkarcı, K. (2010). *The effect of formative assessment on learners' test anxiety and assessment preferences in EFL context*, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Çukurova University, Adana, Turkey.
- Chen, C. W. (2016). A survey on EFL teachers' assessment methods in entry-level writing courses in technological universities in Taiwan. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 20(1), 21-36.
- Cheng, L., Rogers, T., & Hu, H. (2004). ESL/EFL instructors' classroom assessment practices: Purposes, methods, and procedures. *Language Testing*, 21, 360-389.
- Cizek, G.J., S.M. Fitzgerald, and R.E. Rachor. (1996). Teachers' assessment practices: preparation, isolation, and the kitchen sink. *Educational Assessment*, 3(2), 159-179.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education*. London: Routledge.

- Council of Europe (CoE). (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Çetin, S. (2018). *Instructors' perceptions about the use of positive reinforcement in English language classes*, Unpublished master's thesis, Çağ University, Mersin, Turkey.
- Demirezen, M. (1994). *The essentials of composition and short essay writing*. Ankara: Adım publications.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- ELC (2018). *English language curriculum for 2nd and 8th Grades-2018*. Ministry of National Education.
- Gholami, J., Sarkhosh, M., & Abdi, H. (2016). An exploration of teaching practices of private, public, and public-private EFL teachers in Iran. *Journal of Teacher Education for Sustainability*, 18(1), 16-33.
- Gilbert, J., & Graham, S. (2010). Teaching writing to elementary students in grades 4-6: A national survey. *The Elementary School Journal*, 110(4), 494-518.
doi: 10.1086/651193
- Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). *Writing next: Effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high school*. Washington DC: The Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Hyland, Ken. (2002). *Teaching and researching writing*. Harlow: Longman.
- Halsey, S. (2007). Embracing emergent technologies and envisioning new ways of using them for literacy learning in the primary classroom. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 6, 99-107.
- Han T. (2013). *The impact of rating methods and rater training on the variability and reliability of EFL students' classroom-based writing assessments in Turkish universities: An investigation of problems and solutions*, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Atatürk University, Erzurum, Turkey.
- Hughes, A. (2003). *Testing for language teachers (2nd ed.)*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- İbrahim, H. (2006). *The effect of using the reading for writing approach on developing the writing ability of Egyptian EFL learners and their attitudes towards writing*. Online Submission. ERIC(ED498363)
- Jacob, C. L. (2010). *How to write better tests: A handbook for improving test construction skills*.
- Kellogg, R. T. (2008). Training writing skills: A cognitive developmental perspective. *Journal of Writing Research*, 1(1), 1-26.
- Kırkgöz, Y., & Ağçam, R. (2012). Investigating the written assessment practices of Turkish teachers of English at primary education. *The Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 8(2), 119-136.
- Kibar, E. P., (2018). *Pre-service and in-service English teachers' perceptions of testing and assessment in EFL classes*. Unpublished master's thesis, Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Köksal, D. (2004). Assessing teachers' testing skills in ELT and enhancing their professional development through distance learning on the net. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education (TOJDE)*, 5(1), 1- 11.
- Köroğlu, Ü. M., (2011). *The effects of project-based and portfolio based learning on high school students' reading and writing skills in English*, Unpublished master's thesis, Uludağ University, Bursa, Turkey.

- Kroll, B. (1990). *Second language writing: Research insights from the classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kurniasih, E. (2011). Teaching the four language skills in primary EFL classroom: Some considerations. *Journal of English Teaching*, 1(1), 70-81.
- Larenas, C. H. D., Moran, A. V. R. & Rivera, K. J. P. (2011). Comparing teaching style and personality types of EFL instructors in the public and private sectors. *Profile*, 13(1), 111-127.
- Martin, D. (2008). The Authors Gallery: A Meaningful Integration of Technology and Writing. *Teaching with Technology: A Necessity with a Downside*, 13-17.
- McLane J. B., & McNamee G. D. (1990). *Early Literacy*. Harvard University Press.
- Mede, E., & Atay, D. (2017). English language teachers' assessment literacy: The Turkish context. *Dil Dergisi*, 168(1), 43-60.
- Newel, G. E. (1996). Reader-based and teacher-centered instructional tasks: Writing and learning about a short story in middle-track classroom. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 28(1), 147-172.
- O'Brien, T. (2004). Writing in a foreign language: Teaching and learning. *Language Teaching*, 37, 1-28. Cambridge University Press.
- O'Malley, J. M., & Pierce, L. V. (1996). *Authentic Assessment for English Language Learners: Practical Approaches for Teachers*. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co.
- Onbaşı, M. (2014). *EFL instructors' self-efficacy in relation to student achievement and student perception of instructors' efficacy in teaching writing*, Unpublished master's thesis, Marmara University, İstanbul, Turkey.
- Oruç, N. (1999). *Evaluating the reliability of two grading systems for writing assessment at Anadolu University preparatory school*, Unpublished master's thesis, Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Öz, S., & Atay D. (2017). Turkish EFL instructors' in-class language assessment literacy: perceptions and practices. *International Association of Research in Foreign Language Education and Applied Linguistics ELT Research Journal*, 6(1), 25-44.
- Özbay, A. S., (2004). *Tertiary level EFL teachers' perceptions of the role and importance of writing skill in English language teaching*. Unpublished master's thesis, Karadeniz Technical University, Trabzon, Turkey.
- Özdemir-Yılmazer, M., & Özkan, Y. (2017). Classroom assessment practices of English language instructor. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 13(2), 324-345.
- Polat, M. (2003). *A Study on developing a writing assessment profile for English preparatory program of Anadolu University School of Foreign Languages*, Unpublished master's thesis, Anadolu University, Eskisehir, Turkey.
- Polio, C. (2017). *Teaching second language writing*. New York: Routledge.
- Raiimes, A. (2008). *Keys for writers*. Princeton, N.J: Recording for the Blind & Dyslexic.
- Rea-Dickins, P., & Rixon, S. (1999). Assessment of young learners' English: reasons and means. In Rixon, S. (Ed), *Young learners of English: some research perspectives*. Harlow: Addison Wesley Longman/The British Council, 89-101.
- Reid, J. (2001). Writing. In R. Carter & D. Nunan (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to*

- teaching English to speakers of other languages.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 28-33.
- Sole, E. S. (2018). *Rater discrepancy resolution in second language writing assessment: An analysis of rater negotiations*, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yeditepe University, İstanbul.
- Sondolo, L. (2010). How can the use of technology enhance writing in the classroom? *Education Masters*, 194.
- Tran, T. (2012). Second Language Assessment for Classroom Teachers. *MIDTESOL*, 1-23.
- Uçar, S., & Yazıcı, Y. (2016). The impact of portfolios on enhancing writing skills in ESP classes. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 232, 226-233.
- Wulandari, A. (2012). *Improving students' writing skill using modelled writing technique*, Unpublished master's thesis, Sebelas Maret University, Surakarta, Indonesia.
- Yeşilyurt, S. (2008). *A self-determination approach to teaching writing in pre-service EFL teacher education*, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Atatürk University, Erzurum, Turkey.
- Yetkin, R. (2018). Exploring prospective teachers' conceptions of assessment in Turkish context. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 4(5), 133-147.
- Yıldırım, R. (1991). *Improving writing skills in large classes in high schools through group and pair work*. Unpublished master's thesis, Çukurova University, Adana, Turkey.
- Zhang, Z., & Burry-Stock, J. A. (2003). Classroom assessment practices and teachers' self-perceived assessment skills. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 16(4), 323-342.