



A STUDY ON ASSESSMENT TOOLS USED BY TURKISH LANGUAGE TEACHERS IN RESPECT TO THE PROMOTION OF HIGHER-ORDER THINKING SKILLS

Esin Yildirim
Ankara University
TURKEY

Assist. Prof. Dr. Kaan Zülfikar Deniz
Ankara University
TURKEY

Abstract

Nowadays, living conditions are changing gradually, technological and scientific developments are rapidly entering our lives. To adapt these changing conditions, people must expand their knowledge about themselves, realize the life around, think and decide faster. In order to do these, people need to have higher-order thinking skills. Turkish language courses can be used as an effective tool to gain the higher-order thinking skills. To gain higher-order thinking skills in teaching Turkish language, appropriate questions and student-based assessment methods must be used. Measurement and evaluation activities are expected to steer students to be critical thinker, inquisitive, deductive and observer. In this study, measurement and evaluation tools are discussed in terms of gaining the higher-order thinking skills. The aim of the study is defined as: to determine the compatibility of the item formats and student-based assessment tools with higher-order thinking skills and to determine item formats by analyzing exam papers. To achieve the overall aim, general screening model is used and a descriptive study was carried out to set forth the current situation. 102 Turkish language teachers from 20 different secondary schools who work in Çankaya, Mamak and Yenimahalle districts are formed the working group of the research. A questionnaire which prepared by the researchers was administered to Turkish language teachers to find out their item formats and student-based assessment methods. Chi-Square test was used in assessing teachers answers to questionnaire. Besides, examination papers used in 2015-2016 education year by targeted Turkish literature teachers were collected. Questions in these papers are examined with respect to document analysis method and grouped according to item formats. According to the study's findings, Turkish language teachers frequently used multiple-choice questions and open-ended questions of which answers are given in the text in their exams which are inappropriate with higher-order thinking skills.

Key Words: Measurement of higher-order thinking, student-based assessment.

INTRODUCTION

Thinking is "an informed, active, dynamic, purposeful and sequential process involving several mental processes" (Aslan, 2013: 11). It is an activity in which the mind compares information on a subject, examines their relationships to reach a judgment or a decision (TDK, 2005: 592). High order thinking, on the other hand, "is a way of thinking that is based on reasoning and complex, requires a consistency among information, a relationship and extensive mental activities, is based on research and inquiry, and aims at clarity, and in which results are presented based on scientific data" (Aslan, 2013: 11). Some of high order thinking skills are understanding, problem solving, decision making, critical thinking, reasoning, creative thinking, analytical thinking, inquiry, evaluation and synthesis (Aydın & Yılmaz, 2010; Çakır, 2013; Demirel, 2004; Haladyna, 1997).

Haladyna (1997) classified high order thinking skills in a cognitive-domain taxonomy including understanding, problem solving, critical thinking and creative thinking. Of high order thinking skills, understanding includes situations such as definition of facts, concepts and procedures, creation of their characteristics and selection of their examples (Haladyna, 1997). Problem solving includes skills such as coping with a problem, collecting data about the problem, developing solutions for the problem, and testing the developed solutions (Seferoğlu & Akbıyık, 2006:193-200). Critical thinking requires an individual to be inquisitive, view facts and circumstances from different perspectives and objectively and make predictions. The basis of critical thinking is sources of information including observations, experiences and facts, and inferences (Paul, 2006:5). Creative thinking, on the other hand, is a way of thinking that requires being original, being sensitive to problems, going beyond the boundaries, arguing new thoughts, taking risks and being curious (Açıkgöz, 2003; Özden, 2004).

Turkish classes can be used as an effective tool to promote the said high order thinking skills. Individuals with developed language skills can be more inquisitive, view events from different perspectives, and use evaluation and decision making processes more comfortably (Özgen-Tuncer, 2010:35). One of the most general objectives of Turkish language education is to develop students' understanding, expressing and thinking skills. In a rapidly changing world, high order thinking is of great importance in upbringing of individuals needed by democratic societies (Tsui, 1999: 185).

Promoting high order thinking skills in Turkish language education requires making use of appropriate texts, questions and student-based assessment methods. Measurement and evaluation activities must encourage students to think, be inquisitive, draw inferences, think critically and make evaluations.

Questions in measurement and evaluation tools drive students' cognitive processes and develop their thinking skills (Aydemir & Çiftçi, 2008, Büyükalın, 2004). A high level questions also bring high order thinking with them (Aslan, 2009).

It is hard to examine high level behaviors by short-answer, multiple-choice and true-and-false questions used in traditional measurement and evaluation tools (Küçük & Geçit, 2012:35, Üstüner & Şengül, 2004:202, Bahar, 2008:44, MEB, 2005). A study conducted by Anıl and Acar (2008) on problems faced by class teachers during measurement and evaluation process suggested that "written examinations was one of the least frequently used measurement and evaluation tools". Scoring written examination papers requiring long answers is also an affecting factor in this matter (Türkyılmaz, 2008). However, if it is desired to make an assessment-evaluation to assess high level skills, using open-ended questions are a must. Open-ended questions enable students to think, design and organize the answer (Turgut, 1992:47; Temizkan & Sallabaş, 2011:209). These questions have no single correct answer. Open-ended questions drive different cognitive processes. Open-ended questions may also enable students to use high order thinking skills including creative and critical thinking, problem solving, decision making, analysis, synthesis and evaluation (Özbay, 2007:166). Open-ended questions are also affective in assessing high level skills as they enable students to make interpretations, comparisons and analyses about a topic or situation (Çağlar, 1970). However, the quality of open-ended questions is also important at this point. A study of the research on problems faced by students suggested that students were mostly exposed to questions aiming at lower cognitive domains (Aydemir & Çiftçi, 2008; Güfta & Zorbaz, 2008; Aslan, 2011; Kavruk & Çeçen, 2013; Şengül, 2005; Sarar-Kuzu, 2013). And in that case, it is not possible to put high order thinking processes to work.

Student-based assessment requires use of high order thinking skills as it requires problem solving (Dikli, 2003:14). These methods also require process assessment (Karadüz, 2009). However, the studies on use of student-based assessment methods in Turkish language education have suggested that problems are experienced in student-based assessment application due to crowded classes and long hours of application (Yiğit & Kırımlı, 2014; Benzer & Eldem 2012; Yıldırım & Karakoç-Öztürk, 2009; Coşkun, Gelen & Kan, 2009). Project assignments focusing on the student-based assessment technique of high level cognitive skills involve adaptation of the school learning to real life conditions (Doğan & Kutlu, 2011:461). Project assignments make use of open-ended questions. Students are expected to solve problems that are presented to them and possible in real life using high level cognitive skills. Teachers can evaluate students' skills such as problem solving, decision making, inference and commenting (Kumandaş, 2008:9).

Self-assessment, a student-based assessment tool, involves self-assessment by students of their own work (Noonan & Duncan, 2005:2; Taşdemir, 2014; Black & William, 2001:7). Through self-assessment, students can make self-criticism and realize their strengths and weaknesses. When discussed in terms of its contribution to high order thinking skills, self-assessment is found to require students to engage in activities requiring high order thinking such as decision making, critical thinking and problem solving (Kutlu, Doğan & Karakaya, 2009:96).

Through peer-assessment, students can evaluate their friends' works and find out their strengths and weaknesses (Topping, 1998; Topping, Smith, Swanson & Elliot, 2000:150). Thus, they develop their inquiry capabilities and use high order thinking processes (Kaya, 2013:32). Group-assessments, on the other hand, involve group members evaluating the work performed by the group. Group-assessment is a process involving self and peer-assessment (Kutlu et al., 2009:105). In this respect, group-assessment can be used effectively in Turkish language teaching environments to develop high order thinking skills.

A study of the research on measurement and evaluation tools used in Turkish language education suggests that efforts are generally concentrated on the frequency of use of measurement and evaluation tools and the determination of cognitive levels of questions asked by teachers in examinations (Aydemir & Çiftçi, 2008; Güfta & Zorbaz, 2008; Şengül, 2005; Aslan, 2011, Sarar-Kuzu, 2013, Kavruk & Çeçen, 2013). These studies mention in a limited way appropriateness of item formats used in examinations in respect of the development of high order thinking skills.

Therefore, the present study investigates measurement and evaluation tools in respect of their contribution to the promotion of high order thinking skills. This study aims to determine whether or not item formats and student-based assessment tools used by Turkish language teachers in examinations aim to promote high order thinking skills and to identify item formats used by teachers. Under this general purpose, answers to the following questions were sought:

- 1) What item formats do Turkish language teachers use and how often?
- 2) How often do Turkish language teachers use "student-based assessment methods"?
- 3) Are project assignment topics assigned by Turkish language teachers as such that they require use of high order thinking skills?
- 4) Do item formats and student-based assessment methods used by Turkish language teachers vary based on seniority?
- 5) Are item formats used by Turkish language teachers as such that they require students to use high order thinking skills?

METHOD

Research Design

The present study that will investigate whether or not item formats and student-based assessment tools used by teachers require students to use high order thinking skills is a descriptive study that will reveal the current status using a general survey model.

Descriptive studies strive to describe the past or the present situations as they exist (Karasar, 2009: 77). Survey studies are grouped into two as general survey and case study. In general survey model, also used in this study, a group consisting of a large number of elements is studied to reach a general judgment about the group (Karasar, 2009:79).

Study Group

The study group is comprised of 102 Turkish language teachers serving at 20 middle schools in Çankaya, Mamak, Altındağ, and Yenimahalle sub-provinces in Ankara. Information regarding these teachers are provided in Table 1.

Table 1: A Breakdown of Turkish Language Teachers Based on Gender, Seniority and Major.

Variables		N	%
Gender	Female	62	60.8
	Male	40	39.2
	Total	102	100
Seniority	0-10 years	43	42.2
	11-20 years	37	36.3
	21 yers and plus	22	21.6
	Total	102	100
Graduation	Turkish teacher	57	55.9
	Turkish language and literature	36	35.3
	Other	9	8.8
	Total	102	100

When Table 1 is examined, 60.8% of the teachers are female, and 39.2% are male. The teacher distribution based on seniority is that 42.2% has 0-10 years of professional service, 36.3% has 11-20 years of professional service and 21.6% has 21 years or more of professional service. The teacher distribution based on faculties graduated is that 55.9% is a graduate of Turkish teaching, 16.7% of Turkish language and literature teaching, 18.6% of Turkish language and literature, and 8.8% of other departments.

Data Collection and Analysis

In order to determine the items to be used in the research, first the literature was screened. Survey items were developed based on the information obtained about the item formats and high order thinking skills. Opinion of four language and field experts and one measurement and evaluation expert was obtained about the survey items developed, in line with which, necessary corrections were made to have the final version of the survey.

Participants were administered the questionnaire prepared by the researchers. Also, examination papers used in Turkish language exams by these teachers during the 2014-2015 academic year were also collected. Questions in the examination papers collected from the teachers were examined with document analysis. In a document analysis, written resources that contain information regarding the researched topics are examined (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2011:187). Chi-square test was used in evaluation of the teacher responses to the questionnaire. The present study examined whether or not the item formats used by teachers varied based on seniority.

FINDINGS

The survey findings about the first and second sub-goals of the study, which item formats and student based assessment methods are used by Turkish language teachers and how often, are as follows:

Table 2: Distribution of Frequency of Use of Measurement and evaluation Applications by Turkish Language Teachers

Survey Items	Frequency of application									
	Never		Rarely		Occasionally		Often		Always	
	F	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
N=102										
Questions for Lower Level Cognitive Stages										
I use matching questions.	1	1	10	9.8	51	50	31	30.4	9	8.8
I use true-false questions.	1	1	13	12.7	42	41.2	35	34.3	11	10.8
I use multiple-choice questions.	0	0	1	1	22	21.6	40	39.2	39	38.2
I use short-answer questions.	6	5.9	17	16.7	43	42.2	26	25.5	10	9.8
I use open-ended questions in which answer is directly provided within the text.	0	0	7	6.9	43	42.2	28	27.5	24	23.5
I ask the topic I expect to be written on by limiting it.	1	1	15	14.7	24	23.5	41	40.2	21	20.6
Questions for High Level Cognitive Stages										
I use open-ended questions in which answer is not directly provided, but implied within the text.	0	0	10	9.8	43	42.2	38	37.3	11	10.8
I use open-ended questions in which answer is not directly provided within the text, but can be reached by drawing detailed inferences.	5	4.9	32	31.4	32	31.4	23	22.5	10	9.8
I ask the topic I expect to be written on under a general heading.	12	11.8	19	18.6	40	39.2	27	26.5	4	3.9
I ask the topic I expect to be written on by using visuals.	6	5.9	24	23.5	47	46.1	22	21.6	3	2.9
Student-Based Evaluation Approaches										
I provide students with topics that require them to directly cite the information they have obtained in the projects.	4	3.9	18	17.6	46	45.1	31	30.4	3	2.9
I provide students with topics that require them to cite the information they have obtained in projects by interpreting it.	0	0	4	3.9	28	27.5	59	57.8	11	10.8
I provide students with topics that require them to criticize the information they have obtained in the projects and develop original answers.	1	1	16	15.7	32	31.4	41	40.2	12	11.8
I use self-assessment forms	15	14.7	35	34.3	30	29.4	17	16.7	5	4.9
I use peer-assessment forms	15	14.7	50	49.0	20	19.6	13	12.7	4	3.9
I use group-assessment forms	16	15.7	49	48	20	19.6	11	10.8	6	5.9

As seen in Table 2, there is no participant saying that they never use multiple choice questions, open-ended questions with the answer directly provided within the text, questions with the answer not directly provided, but implied within the text, and topics requiring students to cite the information they have obtained by interpreting it in the projects. These measurement and evaluation applications are always used. The number of teachers using multiple-choice questions is considerably high. There are 79 teachers (77.4%) who says that they

often and always use these types of questions. There are 52 teachers (51%) who say that they often and always use open-ended questions with the answer directly provided within the text. The number of teachers saying that they often and always use topics requiring students in a project study to cite information they have obtained by interpreting them is 70 (68.6%). The number of teachers saying that they never use the student-based assessment methods of self-assessment (14.7%), peer-assessment (14.7%) and group-assessment (15.7%), or rarely use them (self-assessment (34.3%), peer-assessment (49%) and group-assessment (48%)) is considerably high. The number of teachers saying that they always use these methods is considerably low.

The survey findings about the third sub-goal of the study, whether or not the project assignment topics provided by teachers require students to use high order thinking skills are as follows:

Item 17 of the questionnaire administered to the teachers asked them to write down the three project topics they used the most. Project topics written down by the teachers were examined by the researchers and by obtaining the opinion of an expert in the field, and the project topics at familiarity and reminder level that require use of forms of thinking such as interpretation, criticism, creative thinking and evaluation were classified as high level. While there are 49 teachers (48%) who give project assignments requiring students to use their low order thinking skills, there are 53 teachers (52%) who give project assignments requiring students to use high order thinking skills.

Chi-square analyses were conducted to determine whether or not the fourth sub-goal of the study measurement and evaluation applications used by Turkish language teachers vary based on seniority, which is the fourth sub-goal of the study. At this stage, survey response options “never” and “rarely”, and “often” and “always” were combined. After the combination, the cross-table results are provided below:

Chi-square analyses were conducted to determine whether or not the measurement and evaluation applications used by Turkish Language teachers vary based on seniority. Cross-table results attained at the end of the analysis are as follows.

Table 3: Use of Matching Questions (Aimed at Lower Level Cognitive Stages) by Turkish Language Teachers Based on Seniority

I use matching questions.			Never/Rarely	Occasionally	Often/Always	Total
Seniority	0-10 years	N	2	17	11	30
		%	6.7	56.7	36.7	100.0
	11-20 years	N	6	22	16	44
		%	13.6	40	36.4	100.0
	21 years and more	N	3	12	13	28
		%	10.7	42.9	46.4	100.0
Total		N	11	51	40	102
		%	10.8	50	39.2	100.0

When Table 3 is examined, “use of matching questions” does not significantly vary based on seniority of the Turkish language teachers. While the frequency of use (“often/always”) of matching questions by the teachers with 0-10 years of service and that of the teachers with 11-20 years of service are close to each other, the number of teachers with 21 years and more of service selecting the option of “often/always” is more than that of teachers with 0-10 years of service and 11-20 years of service.

Table 4: Use of True-False Questions (Aimed at Lower Level Cognitive Stages) by Turkish Language Teachers Based on Seniority

I use true-false questions.			Never/Rarely	Occasionally	Often/Always	Total
Seniority	0-10 years	N	3	13	14	30
		%	10	43.3	46.7	100.0
	11-20 years	N	7	17	20	44
		%	15.9	38.6	45.5	100.0
	21 years and more	N	4	12	12	28
		%	13.7	42.9	42.9	100.0
Total		N	14	42	46	102
		%	13.7	41.2	45.1	100.0

When Table 4 is examined, a majority of the Turkish language teachers are observed to often use true-false questions (0-10 years 46.7%; 11-20 years 45.5%, 21 years or more 42.9%). However, while the number of those saying that they never or rarely use them is less at 0-10 years of service (10%), it is more at 11-20 years of service (15.9%).

Table 5: Use of Multiple-Choice Questions (Aimed at Lower Level Cognitive Stages) by Turkish Language Teachers Based on Seniority

I use multiple-choice questions.			Never/Rarely	Occasionally	Often/Always	Total
Seniority	0-10 years	N	0	9	21	30
		%	0	30	70	100.0
	11-20 years	N	0	7	37	44
		%	0	15.9	84.1	100.0
	21 years and more	N	1	6	21	28
		%	3.6	21.4	75	100.0
Total		N	1	22	79	102
		%	1	21.6	77.4	100.0

When Table 5 is examined, a majority of the Turkish language teachers are observed to often use multiple-choice questions (0-10 years 70%; 11-20 years 84.1%, 21 years or more 75%). However, while there is none saying that they never or rarely use them at 0-10 years of service and 11-20 years of service, there are few in the least at 21 years and more of service (3.6%).

Table 6: Use of Short-Answer Questions (Aimed at Lower Level Cognitive Stages) by Turkish Language Teachers Based on Seniority

I use short-answer questions.			Never/Rarely	Occasionally	Often/Always	Total
Seniority	0-10 years	N	8	13	9	30
		%	26.7	43.3	30	100.0
	11-20 years	N	11	17	16	44
		%	25	38.6	36.4	100.0
	21 years and more	N	4	13	11	28
		%	14.3	46.4	39.3	100.0
Total		N	23	43	36	102
		%	22.5	42.2	35.3	100.0

When Table 6 is examined, there is no significant relationship between the use of short-answer questions and seniority ($X^2(4) = 1.830, p > .05$). A majority of the Turkish language teachers are observed to sometimes use short-answer questions (0-10 years 43.3%; 11-20 years 38.6%, 21 years or more 46.4%). However, while the number of teachers with 0-10 years of service (26.7%) and that of teachers with 11-20 years of service (25%) saying that they never or rarely use them are close, There are few teachers with 21 years or more of service saying the same.

Table 7: Use of Open-Ended Questions with the Answer Directly Given within the Text (Aimed at Lower Level Cognitive Stages) by Turkish Language Teachers Based on Seniority

I use open-ended questions in which answer is directly provided within the text.		Never/Rarely	Occasionally	Often/Always	Total
Seniority 0-10 years	N	2	15	13	30
	%	6.7	50	43.3	100.0
11-20 years	N	1	14	29	44
	%	2.3	31.8	65.9	100.0
21 years and more	N	4	14	10	28
	%	14.3	50	35.7	100.0
Total	N	7	43	52	102
	%	6.9	42.2	51	100.0

When Table 7 is examined, a half the Turkish language teachers with 0-10 years of service is observed to sometimes use open-ended questions with the answer directly given within the text (0-10 years 50%), and those with 11-20 years of service is observed to often use them (65.9%). However, the number of those saying that they never or rarely use them is low (0-10 years 6.7%; 11-20 years 2.3%; 21 years and more 14.3%).

Table 8: Turkish Language Teachers' Asking the Topic They Expect to be Written on by Limiting It (Aimed at Lower Level Cognitive Stages) Based on Seniority

I ask the topic I expect to be written on by limiting it.		Never/Rarely	Occasionally	Often/Always	Total
Seniority 0-10 years	N	8	6	16	30
	%	26.7	20	53.3	100.0
11-20 years	N	6	11	27	44
	%	13.6	25	61.4	100.0
21 years and more	N	2	7	19	28
	%	7.1	25	67.9	100.0
Total	N	16	24	62	102
	%	15.7	23.5	60.8	100.0

When Table 8 is examined, the Turkish language teachers are observed to often provide the topics they expect to be written on by limiting them (0-10 years 53.3%; 11-20 years 61.4%, 21 years and more 67.9%). However, the number of Turkish language teachers with 0-10 years of service saying that they never or rarely use these topics is also high (0-10 years 26.7%).

A majority of the Turkish language teachers are observed to use matching, true-false, multiple-choice and short-answer questions and open-ended questions with the answer directly provided within the text aimed at lower level cognitive stages in their assessment-evaluation applications. Also, they are also seen to include essay-type questions such as "providing a topic expected to be written on by limiting it" in their assessment-evaluation applications, which may limit the student creativity.

Table 9: Use of Open-Ended Questions with the Answer not Directly Provided, but Implied within the Text (Aimed at Higher Level Cognitive Stages) by Turkish Language Teachers Based on Seniority

I use open-ended questions in which answer is not directly provided, but implied within the text.			Never/Rarely	Occasionally	Often/Always	Total
Seniority	0-10 years	N	2	11	17	30
		%	6.7	36.7	56.7	100.0
	11-20 years	N	1	21	22	44
		%	2.3	47.7	50	100.0
	21 years and more	N	7	11	10	28
		%	25	39.3	35.7	100.0
Total		N	10	43	49	102
		%	9.8	42.2	48	100.0

When Table 9 is examined, a majority of the Turkish language teachers are observed to often use open-ended questions with the answer not directly provided, but implied within the text (0-10 years 56.7%; 11-20 years 50%). However, the number of those saying that they never or rarely use them is low at 0-10 years of service (6.7%) and 11-20 years of service (2.3%). The number of teachers with 21 years and more of service saying that they never or rarely use open-ended questions with the answer not directly provided, but implied within the text is not low (25%).

Table 10: Use of Open-Ended Questions with the Answer not Directly Provided within the Text, but Attainable by Drawing Detailed Inferences (Aimed at Higher Level Cognitive Stages) by Turkish Language Teachers Based on Seniority

I use open-ended questions in which answer is not directly provided within the text, but can be reached by drawing detailed inferences.			Never/Rarely	Occasionally	Often/Always	Total
Seniority	0-10 years	N	5	15	10	30
		%	16.7	50	33.3	100.0
	11-20 years	N	17	10	17	44
		%	38.6	22.7	38.6	100.0
	21 years and more	N	15	7	6	28
		%	53.6	25	21.4	100.0
Total		N	37	32	33	102
		%	36.3	31.4	32.3	100.0

When Table 10 is examined, there is no significant variation based on seniority in use of questions with the answer not directly provided within the text, but attainable by drawing detailed inferences ($\chi^2(4) = 11.864$, $p < .05$). While there are 17 teachers with 11-20 years of service (38.6%) and 15 teachers with 21 years and more of service (53.6%) saying that they never use open-ended questions with the answer not directly given within the text, but attainable by drawing detailed inferences, there are 5 teachers with 0-10 years of service (16.7%) saying the same.

Table 11: Condition of Turkish Language Teachers Based on Seniority in Asking the Topic They Expect to be Written on under a General Heading (Aimed at Higher Level Cognitive Stages)

I ask the topic I expect to be written on under a general heading.			Never/Rarely	Occasionally	Often/Always	Total
Seniority	0-10 years	N	11	7	12	30
		%	36.7	23.3	40	100.0
	11-20 years	N	11	24	9	44
		%	25	54.5	20.5	100.0
	21 years and more	N	9	9	10	28
		%	32.1	32.1	35.7	100.0
Total		N	31	40	31	102
		%	30.4	39.2	30.4	100.0

When Table 11 is examined, there is no significant variation based on seniority in use of questions providing the topic expected to be written on under a general heading ($X^2(4) = 8.363, p < .05$). A majority of Turkish language teachers with 0-10 years of service (40%) and 11-20 years of service (35.7%) are observed to often or always ask the topic expected to be written on under a general heading, and the teachers with 11-20 years of service (54.5%) are observed to sometimes ask such questions under a general heading. However, the number of those saying that they never or rarely use them is also high (0-10 years 36.7%; 11-20 years 25%; 21 years and more 32.1%).

Table 12: Condition of Turkish Language Teachers Based on Seniority in Asking the Topic They Expect to be Written on by Using Visuals (Aimed at Higher Level Cognitive Stages)

I ask the topic I expect to be written on by using visuals.			Never/Rarely	Occasionally	Often/Always	Total
Seniority	0-10 years	N	7	16	7	30
		%	23.3	53.3	23.3	100.0
	11-20 years	N	11	23	10	44
		%	25	52.3	22.7	100.0
	21 years and more	N	12	8	8	28
		%	42.9	28.6	28.6	100.0
Total		N	30	47	25	102
		%	29.4	46.1	24.5	100.0

When Table 12 is examined, there is no significant variation based on seniority in use of questions providing the topic expected to be written on by using visuals ($X^2(4) = 5.223, p < .05$). A majority of the Turkish language teachers are observed to sometimes ask the topics expected to be written on by using visuals (0-10 years 53.3%; 11-20 years 52.3%). However, a majority of teachers with 21 years and more of service (42.9%) is observed to never or rarely use such questions.

Part of the Turkish language teachers are observed to use open-ended questions with the answer not directly provided within the text that can be used for higher level cognitive stages in assessment-evaluation applications. Also, they are also seen to “sometimes” include essay-type questions that will support the student creativity such as “providing the topic expected to be written under a general heading or by using visuals” in assessment-evaluation applications.

Table 13: Condition of Turkish Language Teachers Based on Seniority in Providing Topics in Project Assignments, a Student-Based Evaluation Approach, Requiring Students to Directly Cite the Information They Have Obtained

I provide students with topics that require them to directly cite the information they have obtained in the projects.			Never/Rarely	Occasionally	Often/Always	Total
Seniority	0-10 years	N		14	9	30
		%	7	46.7	30	100.0
	11-20 years	N	9	20	15	44
		%	20.5	45.5	34.1	100.0
	21 years and more	N	6	12	10	28
		%	21.4	42.9	35.7	100.0
Total		N	22	46	34	102
		%	21.6	45.1	33.3	100.0

When Table 13 is examined, there is no significant variation based on seniority in providing topics in project assignments requiring students to directly cite the information they have obtained ($X^2(4) = .273, p < .05$). A majority of the Turkish language teachers are observed to sometimes provide topics in project assignments requiring students to directly cite the information they have obtained (0-10 years 46.7%; 11-20 years 45.5%; 21 years and more 42.9%) However, the number of those saying that they never or rarely use them is also high (0-10 years 23.3%; 11-20 years 20.5%; 21 years or more 21.4%).

Table 14: Condition of Turkish Language Teachers Based on Seniority in Providing Topics in Project Assignments, a Student-Based Evaluation Approach, Requiring Students to Cite the Information They Have Obtained by Interpreting Them

I provide students with topics that require them to cite the information they have obtained in projects by interpreting it.			Never/Rarely	Occasionally	Often/Always	Total
Seniority	0-10 years	N		6	24	30
		%	0	20	80	100.0
	11-20 years	N	1	14	29	44
		%	2.3	31.8	65.9	100.0
	21 years and more	N	3	8	17	28
		%	10.7	28.6	60.7	100.0
Total		N	4	28	70	102
		%	3.9	27.5	68.6	100.0

When Table 14 is examined, a vast majority of the Turkish language teachers with 0-10 years of service (80%) is observed to often provide topics in project assignments requiring students to cite the information they have obtained by interpreting them. It is also considerably high among the teachers with 11-20 years of service (65.9%) and 21 years and more of service (60.7%). Also, while there is no teacher with 0-10 years of service saying that she/he never or rarely uses such questions, There are few teachers with 11-20 years of service (2.3%) and 21 years and more of service (10.7%) saying the same.

Table 15: Condition of Turkish Language Teachers Based on Seniority in Providing Topics in Project Assignments, a Student-Based Evaluation Approach, Requiring Students to Criticize the Information They Have Obtained and Develop Their Own Answers

I provide students with topics that require them to criticize the information they have obtained in the projects and develop original answers.			Never/Rarely	Occasionally	Often/Always	Total
Seniority	0-10 years	N	4	9	17	30
		%		13.3	30	56.7
	11-20 years	N	7	17	20	44
		%	15.9	38.6	45.5	100.0
	21 years and more	N	6	6	16	28
		%	21.4	21.4	57.1	100.0
Total		N	17	32	53	102
		%	16.7	31.4	52	100.0

When Table 15 is examined, there is no significant variation based on seniority in providing topics in project assignments requiring students to criticize the information they have obtained and create their own answers ($\chi^2(4) = .2868, p < .05$). A majority of the Turkish language teachers are observed to often provide topics in project assignments requiring students to criticize the information they have obtained and develop their own answers (0-10 years 56.7%; 11-20 years 45.5%; 21 years and more 57.1%)

Table 16: Condition of Turkish Language Teachers Based on Seniority in Use of the Student-Based Evaluation Approach of Self-assessment Forms

I use self-assessment forms			Never/Rarely	Occasionally	Often/Always	Total
Seniority	0-10 years	N	11	11	8	30
		%	36.7	36.7	26.7	100.0
	11-20 years	N	24	10	10	44
		%	54.5	22.7	22.7	100.0
	21 years and more	N	15	9	4	28
		%	53.6	32.1	14.3	100.0
Total		N	50	30	22	102
		%	49	29.4	21.6	100.0

When Table 16 is examined, there is no significant variation in use of self-evaluation forms in relation to the seniority ($\chi^2(4) = 3.680, p > .05$). More than half the Turkish language teachers with 11-20 years of service (54.5%) and 21 years and more of service (53.6%) are observed to never or rarely use self-evaluation forms, and this percentage is observed to be lower in teachers with 0-10 years of service (36.7%).

When Table 17 is examined, there is no significant variation in use of peer-assessment forms in relation to the seniority ($\chi^2(4) = 5.339, p > .05$). A majority of the Turkish language teachers with 0-10 years of service (73.3%) is observed to never or rarely use the peer-assessment forms, and this percentage is lower in teachers with 11-20 years of service (61.4%) and 21 years and more of service (57.1%).

Table 17: Condition of Turkish Language Teachers Based on Seniority in Use of the Student-Based Evaluation Approach of Peer-assessment Forms

I use peer-assessment forms			Never/Rarely	Occasionally	Often/Always	Total
Seniority	0-10 years	N	22	3	5	30
		%	73.3	10	16.7	100.0
	11-20 years	N	27	8	9	44
		%	61.4	18.2	20.5	100.0
	21 years and more	N	16	9	3	28
		%	57.1	32.1	10.7	100.0
Total		N	65	20	17	102
		%	63.7	19.6	16.7	100.0

Table 18: Condition of Turkish Language Teachers Based on Seniority in Use of the Student-Based Evaluation Approach of Group-assessment Forms

I use group-assessment forms.			Never/Rarely	Occasionally	Often/Always	Total
Seniority	0-10 years	N	19	5	6	30
		%	63.3	16.7	20	100.0
	11-20 years	N	28	7	9	44
		%	63.6	15.9	20.5	100.0
	21 years and more	N	18	8	2	28
		%	64.3	28.6	7.1	100.0
Total		N	65	20	17	102
		%	63.7	19.6	16.7	100.0

When Table 18 is examined, there is no significant variation in use of group-assessment forms in relation to the seniority ($X^2(4) = 3.691, p > .05$). The Turkish language teachers are observed to never or rarely use group-assessment forms (0-10 years 63.3%; 11-20 years 63.6%; 21 years and more 64.3%).

A majority of the Turkish language teachers are observed to provide topics requiring students to use thinking skills in project assignments (such as interpreting, criticizing). However, they are seen to not sufficiently benefit from self, peer and group-assessment.

Findings about the fifth sub-goal of the study, which item formats teachers use in examinations are as follows: In the present study, 1152 questions from 88 examination papers collected from 88 teachers were examined through document analysis. As a result, 44.3% of the questions used in the examinations were found to be multiple-choice questions and 31.3% of them to be open-ended questions with the answer provided within the text. Other question types used by teachers in the examinations are as follows: True-false questions (3.1%), matching questions (2.2%), short-answer questions (2.1%), open-ended questions with the answer implied within the text (12.6%) and open-ended questions requiring detailed inferences (4.4%). The fact that the Turkish language teachers include multiple-choice questions and open-ended questions with the answer provided within the text suggests that they ask questions aimed at lower level cognitive stages. Questions requiring high order thinking skills (open-ended questions with the answer implied within the text and open-ended questions requiring detailed inferences), on the other hand, are not adequately used.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The result of the research is that the Turkish language teachers do not adequately benefit from measurement and evaluation tools that require high order thinking skills. The teachers are seen to often use multiple-choice questions and sometimes use matching questions, true-false questions and short-answer questions intended

for lower level cognitive domain stages. Results obtained from the examination of the written examination papers also support this situation. Similar to these results, the pre-test results of the study conducted by Aslan (2011) on teachers' question preparation skills suggest that a majority of prospective teachers ask lower level questions. However, in this study, post-test was conducted after the prospective teachers were trained in questioning skills, and an increase was observed in the question levels. The study conducted by Kavruk and Çeçen (2013) on written examination questions in Turkish classes in relation to cognitive domain stages concluded that a majority of teachers asked questions at the knowledge, comprehension and practice stage. The study conducted by Aydemir and Çiftçi (2008) on questioning skills of Turkish language and literature teachers, on the other hand, concluded that teachers did not possess questioning skills intended for higher level cognitive stages and that questions remained intended only for lower level cognitive stages.

Considering that Turkish language classes subsume reading, listening, speaking and writing skills, the skills, clearly, cannot be assessed by such questions. If it is desired to promote high order thinking skills, open-ended questions with the answer not directly provided within the text, project assignments requiring students to interpret and criticize the information they have obtained and student-based assessment tools must be used. For, multiple-choice, matching, true-false and short-answer questions are limited in promoting high order thinking skills. Such questions generally remain at knowledge, comprehension and practice level.

The teachers were observed to mostly use multiple-choice questions when their written examination papers were examined. Contrary to this conclusion, the study conducted by Benzer and Eldem (2012) on knowledge levels of Turkish language and literature teachers on measurement and evaluation tools" concluded that almost half the teachers mostly used open-ended questions and less often used multiple choice questions in written examinations. The study conducted by Küçük (2002) on "challenges in measurement and evaluation in Turkish language education" concluded that the teachers generally preferred written examinations and neglected test assessments. The study conducted by Beyhan (2011) on "measurement and evaluation practices in Turkish language education" suggested that a majority of the group mostly used written examinations (and therefore open-ended questions). The study conducted by Çakmak (2009) on "measurement and evaluation in Turkish language classes" concluded that a majority of the group used open-ended questions. What matters in open-ended questions is the context of the question. However, these studies did not focus on the context of the questions and did not determine whether or not they were intended for higher levels.

Another result obtained from the examination of the examination papers of the teachers is that they use open-ended questions with the answer provided within the text in the examinations. Similar to this result, the study conducted by Akyol, Yıldırım, Ateş and Çetinkaya (2013) on "evaluation of text questions prepared by teachers in relation to written resources" concluded that single, context-based questions on the text at simple and comprehension level with the answer provided within the text were often used.

The present study also suggests that the student-based assessment tools of self-assessment, peer-assessment and group-assessment are not adequately used. Similar to this result, the research conducted by Yıldırım and Karakoç-Öztürk (2009) on teacher views about measurement and evaluation practices in Turkish language classes concluded that almost a half the teachers very rarely or never used self-assessment, peer-assessment and group-assessment. The study conducted by Benzer and Eldem (2012) on "knowledge levels of Turkish language and literature teachers about measurement and evaluation tools" suggested that self-assessment and peer-assessment were not adequately used and that a very small number of teachers used them. The study conducted by Yiğit and Kırımlı (2014) on student-based assessment methods used by Turkish language teachers concluded that, for reasons such as low number of class hours and high number of students attending classes, a vast majority of teachers were not able to adequately benefit from student-based assessment methods.

In line with the results obtained from the study, the following may be recommended to future researchers:

- The present study focuses on the student-based assessment methods of self-assessment, peer-assessment and group-assessment. Other student-based assessment methods may also be studied.
- Goals of the Turkish language education program may be compared with the questions asked in examinations conducted by teachers.

- Based on the findings of this study conducted as a survey, an experimental study may be conducted on teachers by training them in measurement and evaluation of high level behaviors.

Practitioners may be recommended the following:

- The teachers may believe that their open-ended questions are intended for high order thinking skills.
- Therefore, qualities of the written questions must be reviewed.
- The teachers may look into the conformity of the questions asked with the program goals and accordingly design the examination questions.

REFERENCES

Açıkgöz-Ün, K. (2003). Etkili öğrenme ve öğretme. 5. baskı. İzmir: Eğitim Dünyası.

Akyol, H., Yıldırım, K., Ateş, S. ve Çetinkaya, Ç. (2013). Anlamaya yönelik ne tür sorular soruyoruz? Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 9(1), 41-56.

Anıl, D. ve Acar, M. (2008). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin ölçme-değerlendirme sürecinde karşılaştıkları sorunlara ilişkin görüşleri. Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 5(2), 44-61.

Aslan, C. (2009). Anadili Öğretmenlerinin Sınavda Sordukları Soruların “Yüksek Düzeyli Düşünme Becerilerini” Geliştirmesi Bakımından İncelenmesi. Ürgüp: 2. Uluslararası Türkçenin Eğitimi-Öğretimi Kurultayı.

Aslan, C. (2011). Soru sorma becerilerini geliştirmeye dönük öğretim uygulamalarının öğretmen adaylarının soru oluşturma becerilerine etkisi. Eğitim ve Bilim Dergisi, 36 (160), 236-249.

Aslan, C. (2013). Çocuk ve gençlik edebiyatı yoluyla düşünme. Kum Dergisi, 72-73, 11-18.

Aydemir, Y. ve Çiftçi, Ö. (2008). Edebiyat öğretmeni adaylarının soru sorma becerileri üzerine bir araştırma. Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 5 (2), 103-115.

Aydın, N. ve Yılmaz, A. (2010). Yapılandırmacı yaklaşımın öğrencilerin üst düzey bilişsel becerilerine etkisi. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (H. U. Journal of Education), 39, 57-68.

Bahar, M. (2008). Geleneksel-alternatif ölçme ve değerlendirme. 2. baskı. Ankara: Pegem.

Black, P. & Wiliam, D. (2001). Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom Assessment. London: School of Education, King's College.

Benzer A. ve Eldem E. (2013). Türkçe ve edebiyat öğretmenlerinin ölçme ve değerlendirme araçları hakkında bilgi düzeyleri. Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi, 2, 649-664.

Beyhan, S. (2012). Türkçe öğretmenlerinin ölçme değerlendirme uygulamalarına ilişkin görüşleri –düzce ili örneği-, Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi, Bolu.

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç-Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş. ve Demirel, F. (2010). Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri. 5. Baskı. Ankara: Pegem.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2011). Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı. 12. baskı. Ankara: Pegem.

Calp, M. (2005). Özel öğretim alan olarak Türkçe öğretimi. 2. baskı. Konya: Eğitim.



Coşkun, E. Gelen, İ. ve Kan, M. O. (2009). Türkçe derslerindeki performans ödevleri konusunda öğretmen ve öğrenci görüşlerinin değerlendirilmesi. Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 6 (11).

Çağlar, D. (1970). Başarının ölçülmesi ve istatistik metotlarla değerlendirme. Ankara: Çağdaş Eğitim.

Çakır, N. (2013). Üniversite Eğitiminin Üst Düzey Düşünme Becerilerinin Gelişimine Etkisi, Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Çakmak, A. (2009). Türkçe programıyla ilgili ölçme değerlendirme sürecinin işlevselliği üzerine bir araştırma (Tekirdağ ili örneği), Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi, Bolu.

Çiftçi, Ö. ve Aydemir, Y. (2008). Edebiyat öğretmeni adaylarının soru sorma becerileri üzerine bir araştırma. Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 2, 103-115.

Demirel, Ö. (2004). Eğitimde program geliştirme. 6. baskı. Ankara: Pegem.

Dikli, S. (2003). Assessment at a distance: traditional and alternative assessments. The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology, 2(3), 1303-6521.

Filiz-Büyükalın, S. (2004). Öğretmenler için soru sorma sanatı. Ankara: Asil.

Güfta, H. ve Zorbaz, K. Z. (2008). İlköğretim ikinci kademe Türkçe dersi yazılı sınav sorularının düzeyleri üzerine bir değerlendirme. Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 2, 205-218.

Haladyna, T. M. (1997). Writing test items to evaluate higher order thinking. USA: Allyn & Bacon.

Karadüz, A. (2009). Türkçe öğretmenlerinin ölçme-değerlendirme uygulamalarının yapılandırmacı öğrenme kavramı bağlamında eleştirisi. Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 189-210.

Karasar, N. (2009). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.

Kavruk, H. ve Çeçen, M. A. (2013). Türkçe dersi yazılı sınav sorularının bilişsel alan basamakları açısından değerlendirilmesi. Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi, 1(4), 1-9.

Kaya, S. (2013). İşbirlikli Öğrenme ve Akran Değerlendirmenin Akademik Başarı, Bilişüstü Yeti ve Yardım Davranışlarına Etkisi, Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi, Sivas.

Kumandaş, H. (2008). İlköğretim 5. sınıf öğrencilerinin performans görevlerine ilişkin tutumlarını etkileyen faktörler, Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Kutlu, Ö., Doğan, D. ve Karakaya, İ. (2009). Öğrenci başarısının belirlenmesi. 2. baskı. Ankara: Pegem.

Kutlu, Ö. ve Doğan, D. (2011). Öğretmen adaylarının yeni durum belirleme yöntemlerini tercihlerinde etkili olan öğrenmeye ilişkin özellikler. Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi, 2(19), 459-474.

Küçük, M. ve Geçit, Y. (2012). Eğitimde ölçme ve değerlendirme. Ankara: Nobel.

Küçük, S. (2002). Örgün eğitim ikinci kademe Türkçe öğretiminde ölçme ve değerlendirme çalışmalarında karşılaşılan güçlükler. Milli Eğitim Dergisi, 153-154.

MEB (2005). Türkçe dersi öğretim programı. Ankara.

Noonan, B. ve Duncan (2005). Peer and self-assessment in high schools. Practical Assessment Research and Evaluation, 10(17), 1-8.



- Özbay, M. (2007). Türkçe özel öğretim yöntemleri II. Ankara: Öncü.
- Özden, Y. (2003). Öğrenme ve öğretme, 6. baskı. Ankara: Pegem.
- Özgen-Tuncer, Ç. (2010). Türkçe dersinde üst düzey düşünme becerilerinin geliştirilmesi. CITO Eğitim, Kuram ve Uygulama, 9, 34-50.
- Paul, R. & Elder, L. (2006). The miniature guide to critical thinking concepts and tools. 15.05.2015 tarihinde <http://www.criticalthinking.org> adresinden alınmıştır.
- Sarar-Kuzu, T. (2013). Türkçe ders kitaplarındaki metin altı sorularının yenilenmiş Bloom taksonomisindeki hatırlama ve anlama bilişsel düzeyleri açısından incelenmesi. Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 37(1).
- Seferoğlu, S. ve Akbıyık, C. (2006). Eleştirel düşünme ve öğretimi. H.Ü. Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (H.U. Journal of Education), 30, 193-200.
- Şengül, M. (2005). İlköğretim 8. Sınıf Türkçe Ders Kitaplarındaki Metinlere Dayalı Olarak Hazırlanan Sorular Üzerine Bir İnceleme, Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Fırat Üniversitesi, Elazığ.
- Taşdemir, M. (2014). Kendini değerlendirme, akran değerlendirme ve öğretmen değerlendirmenin yazılı sınav sonuçlarına etkisi ve başarı yordayıcılığı. International Periodical For The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic, 9 (5), 1911-1929.
- Temizkan, M. ve Sallabaş, M. E. (2011). Okuduğunu anlama becerisinin değerlendirilmesinde çoktan seçmeli testlerle açık uçlu yazılı yoklamaların karşılaştırılması. Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 30, 207-220.
- Topping, K. (1998). Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. Review of Educational Research, 68(3), 249-276.
- Topping, K. J., Smith, E. F. Swanson, I. & Elliot, A. (2000). Formative peer assessment of academic writing between postgraduate students. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 25(2), 149-169.
- Tsui, L. (1999). Courses and instruction affecting critical thinking. Research in Higher Education, 40 (2), 185-200.
- Turgut, M. F. (1992). Eğitimde ölçme ve değerlendirme metotları. Ankara: Saydam.
- Türk Dil Kurumu (2005). Büyük Türkçe Sözlük. Ankara.
- Türkyılmaz, M. (2008). Dil ve anlatım dersinde bir ölçme aracı olarak yazılı sınavların kullanımı konusunda öğretmen görüşleri. Kırşehir Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 9 (3), 1-14.
- Üstüner, A. ve Şengül, M. (2004). Çoktan seçmeli test tekniğinin Türkçe öğretimine olumsuz etkileri. Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 14(2), 197- 208.
- Yıldırım, A. ve Şimşek, H. (2011). Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri. 8. baskı. Ankara: Seçkin.
- Yıldırım F. ve Karakoç-Öztürk, B. (2009). Türkçe dersi öğretim programının ölçme ve değerlendirme ögesi hakkında öğretmen görüşleri. Çukurova Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 3 (37), 92-108.
- Yiğit F. ve Kırmımlı B. (2014). Türkçe öğretmenlerinin alternatif ölçme-değerlendirme yöntemlerini uygulama biçimleri ve uygulamada karşılaştıkları sorunlar. International Periodical For The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic, 9(3), 1621-1639.