

T.C
KARABUK UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

AN EVALUATION OF PORTFOLIO BASED SPEAKING
ASSESSMENT: KBU SAMPLE

MASTER'S THESIS

Prepared By
Kübra KIRAÇ

Thesis Supervisor
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Özkan KIRMIZI

Karabuk
JUNE/2019

T.C
KARABUK UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

AN EVALUATION OF PORTFOLIO BASED SPEAKING
ASSESSMENT: KBU SAMPLE

MASTER'S THESIS

Prepared By
Kübra KIRAÇ

Thesis Supervisor
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Özkan KIRMIZI

Karabuk
JUNE/2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS




TABLE OF CONTENTS	1
THESIS APPROVAL PAGE	4
DECLARATION	5
FOREWORD	6
ABSTRACT	7
ÖZ (ABSTRACT IN TURKISH)	8
ARCHIVE RECORD INFORMATION	9
ARŞIV KAYIT BİLGİLERİ (IN TURKISH)	10
ABBREVIATIONS	11
CHAPTER ONE: Introduction	12
1.1. Subject of the Study	12
1.2. Purpose and Significance of the Study	13
1.3. Method of the Study	14
1.4. Research Questions	15
1.5. Population and Sample of the Study	15
1.6. Scope and Limitations	16
1.7. Conclusion	16
2. CHAPTER TWO: Literature Review	17
2.1. Theoretical Background	17
2.2. Some Key Terms	20
2.3. Constructivist Learning Theory and Assessment	21
2.4. Assessment Types	24
2.4.1. Alternative Assessment	24
2.4.2. Summative Assessment	26

2.4.3. Formative Assessment.....	28
2.4.4. Dynamic Assessment	29
2.5. Portfolio Based Language Assessment	31
2.5.1. Positive Sides of Portfolios.....	32
2.5.2. Negative Sides of Portfolios	41
2.6. Portfolio Assessment Within the Scope of CEFR.....	44
2.7. Portfolio Types	45
2.7.1. Speaking Based Electronic Portfolios	45
2.8. Studies about Speaking Portfolios	46
2.9. Conclusion.....	50
3. CHAPTER THREE: Methodology.....	52
3.1. Setting.....	52
3.2. Participants.....	53
3.3. Instruments	56
3.3.1. Likert Type Questionnaire	56
3.3.2. Interviews.....	56
3.3.3. Students' Self Reflection Questionnaire.....	57
3.4. Data Acquisition Process	57
3.5. Data Analysis Methods	58
3.6. Data Analysis	59
3.6.1. The Model of the Research.....	59
3.6.2. Data Analysis Process	61
3.7. Findings of the Research	62
3.7.1. Findings about Validity and Reliability of the Scale.....	64
3.7.2. Findings of Descriptive Information	64
3.7.3. Findings about Basic Variables on Speaking Portfolio Assignments ...	66
3.7.4. Comparison of Speaking Portfolio Assignments by Descriptive Information.....	78
3.7.5. Findings about the Relationship between the Basic Variables and Sub Dimensions of Speaking Portfolio Assignments	78
3.7.6. Relevant Findings Regarding Basic Variables of Speaking Portfolio Assignments and Subdimensions	82
3.8. Instructors' Views Regarding Speaking Portfolio Tasks	85
3.8.1. Instructors' Views Regarding Self Confidence Dimension	89

3.8.2. Instructors' Views Regarding Learner Autonomy Dimension.....	91
3.8.3. Instructors' Views Regarding Skill Development Dimension.....	93
3.8.4. Instructors' Views Regarding Self Efficacy Dimension	94
3.8.5. Instructors' Views Regarding Challenges Subdimension	94
3.8.6. Instructors' Suggestions Regarding Speaking Portfolio Tasks	97
3.9. Conclusion.....	99
4. CHAPTER FOUR: Conclusion.....	101
4.1. Introduction	101
4.2. Discussion of the Research Findings	101
4.2.1. Participants' General Tendencies Towards Speaking Portfolio Assignments	101
4.2.2. Participants' Beliefs Towards Different Subcategories and Their Correlation.....	103
4.2.3. Participants' Beliefs Towards Different Variables (Gender, Age, Module, Department).....	109
4.3. Pedagogical Implications	110
4.4. Suggestions.....	113
4.5. Conclusion.....	114
LIST OF TABLES	133
APPENDICES	134
Appendix 1: Sample Speaking Portfolio Task and Rubric	134
Appendix 2: Questionnaire.....	136
Appendix 3: Questionnaire (the translation).....	138
Appendix 4: Students' Interview Questions	141
Appendix 5: Instructors' Interview Questions	142
Appendix 6: A Sample Transcript of A Student Interview.....	143
Appendix 7: A Sample Transcript of Instructors' Interview.....	145
Appendix 8: Pre-Task Questionnaire.....	149
Appendix 9: Self Reflection Questionnaire.....	151
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	153

To Karabuk University Directorate of Institute of Social Sciences

This thesis entitled " An Evaluation of Portfolio Based Speaking Assessment/KBU Sample " submitted by Kübra KIRAÇ was examined and accepted by the Thesis Board unanimously/by majority as a MA thesis.

	Academic Title, Name and Surname	Signature
Head of Thesis Board	:Prof. Dr.Arif SARIÇOBAN	
Advisor Member	:Assoc. Prof. Dr. Özkan KIRMIZI	
Member	:Dr. Faculty Member İrfan TOSUNCUOĞLU	
Member	:.....
Member	:.....

Thesis Exam Date: 12.06.2019

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this thesis is the result of my own work and all information included has been obtained and expounded in accordance with the academic rules and ethical policy specified by the institute. Besides, I declare that all the statements, results, materials, not original to this thesis have been cited and referenced literally.

Without being bound by a particular time, I accept all moral and legal consequences of any detection contrary to the aforementioned statement.

Name Surname : Kbra Kira

Signature : 

FOREWORD

Writing this thesis was one of the most important experiences in my life. Therefore, I would like to express my special thanks and appreciation to those who always supported me in this challenging process.

First and foremost, I would like to express my gratitude and thanks to my thesis advisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Özkan KIRMIZI for his invaluable guidance, patience and trust. His feedback enlightened me and contributed me to do my best in this difficult process.

I also thank to Prof. Dr. Ali GÜNEŞ, Prof. Dr. A. Serdar ÖZTÜRK and all the faculty members whom I had an opportunity to take courses.

I would also thank to Prof. Dr. İsmail KARACAN, the director of Yenice Vocational School, and to the director of School of Foreign Languages, Inst. Asım AYDIN for giving me permission to attend MA program.

I am grateful to all the participants (both the instructors and students) in my study for their voluntary participation and cooperation.

I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my friends and beloved ones. I am so grateful to them for their encouragement and great motivation.

Finally, my deepest gratitude goes to my parents Semahat KIRAÇ , Sadık KIRAÇ and sisters M.D. İrem KIRAÇ UTKU and M.D. Zeynep KIRAÇ ÜNAL for their endless encouragement, unconditional love and great support.

ABSTRACT

This study aims at evaluating the effectiveness of speaking portfolio tasks in Karabük University preparatory school. At the beginning of the academic year, the views of the learners regarding speaking portfolio tasks were taken by giving randomly selected students a sheet of paper to get their ideas about speaking portfolio assignments at the first sight. After each speaking task, the same process continued by giving some reflective questions. A Likert type questionnaire which included five different subheadings (learner autonomy, speaking skills, self-confidence, self-efficacy, challenges) was implemented on 289 randomly selected students to collect the quantitative data. Furthermore, the researcher made interviews with 6 students and 5 instructors to get more qualitative data. SPSS 23 for Windows program and a thematic analysis were used to analyze the overall data. The results give clues about the positive effects of portfolio based speaking assessment on the learner autonomy, speaking skill development, self-confidence and self-efficacy of the tertiary level students whereas it also includes challenges the students may face in portfolio preparation and presentation process.

Keywords: Alternative assessment, portfolio, speaking assessment, learner autonomy, self-confidence, speaking skill, self-efficacy.

ÖZ (ABSTRACT IN TURKISH)

Bu çalışma, konuşma portfolyosu ödevlerinin Karabük Üniversitesi hazırlık sınıfı öğrencileri üzerindeki etkisini değerlendirmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Akademik yılın başında, öğrencilerin konuşma portfolyosu ödevleriyle ilgili görüşleri, rastgele seçilen öğrencilere ilk bakışta konuşma portfolyo ödevleri hakkında fikirlerini belirtmeleri için bir sayfa kâğıt verilerek alınmıştır. Her konuşma portfolyosu ödevinden sonra aynı süreç devam etmiştir. Bazı yansıtıcı sorular verilerek, nicel verileri toplamak amacıyla rastgele seçilen 289 öğrenciye beş farklı alt başlık (öğrenen özerkliği, konuşma becerileri, özgüven, öz yeterlilik, zorluklar) içeren bir Likert ölçeği uygulanmıştır. Ayrıca, araştırmacı, daha fazla nitel veri elde etmek için 6 öğrenci ve 5 öğretim görevlisi ile röportajlar yapmıştır. Genel verilerin analizinde SPSS 23 Windows programı ve tematik analiz kullanılmıştır. Sonuçlar, öğrencilerin portfolyo hazırlık ve sunum sürecinde karşılaşılabilecekleri bazı zorlukları içerirken, portfolyo temelli konuşma değerlendirmesinin yükseköğretim düzeyindeki öğrencilerin öğrenen özerkliği, konuşma becerisinin geliştirilmesi, kendine güven ve öz yeterliliği üzerindeki olumlu etkileri hakkındaki ipuçları verir.

Anahtar Kelimeler (Keywords in Turkish): Alternatif değerlendirme, portfolyo, konuşma değerlendirmesi, öğrenen özerkliği, kendine güven, konuşma becerisi, öz yeterlilik.

ARCHIVE RECORD INFORMATION

Title of the Thesis	An Evaluation of Speaking Based Portfolio Assessment/KBU Sample
Author of the Thesis	Kübra KIRAÇ
Supervisor of the Thesis	Assoc. Prof. Dr. Özkan KIRMIZI
Status of the Thesis	Master of Arts
Date of the Thesis	12.06.2019
Field of the Thesis	English Language and Literature
Place of the Thesis	Karabük University Graduate School of Social Sciences
Total Page Number	146
Keywords	Alternative assessment, portfolio, speaking assessment, learner autonomy, self-confidence, speaking skill, self-efficacy.

ARŞIV KAYIT BİLGİLERİ (IN TURKISH)

Tezin Adı	Konuşma Portfolyosu Ödevlerinin Bir Değerlendirmesi / Karabük Üniversitesi Örneği
Tezin Yazarı	Kübra KIRAÇ
Tezin Danışmanı	Doç. Dr. Özkan KIRMIZI
Tezin Derecesi	Yüksek Lisans
Tezin Tarihi	12.06.2019
Tezin Alanı	İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı
Tezin Yeri	Karabük Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü
Tezin Sayfa Sayısı	146
Anahtar Kelimeler	Alternatif değerlendirme, portfolio, konuşma değerlendirme, öğrenen özerkliği, kendine güven, konuşma becerisi, öz yeterlilik.

ABBREVIATIONS

CEFR	: Common European Framework
EFL	: English as a Foreign Language
ELT	: English Language Teaching
ESL	: English as a Second Language
etc.	: et cetera
KBU	: Karabuk University
SPSS	: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
Vs	: Versus
ZPD	: Zone of Proximal Development

CHAPTER ONE: Introduction

1.1. Subject of the Study

Testing and assessment are the terms that have been used interchangeably therefore, they are mostly confused. Dikili (2013) clearly makes a distinction between assessment and testing. According to her definition, “While testing is formal and often standardized, assessment is based on a collection of information about what students know and what they are able to do” (p.13).

English is a language which enables the speakers to communicate beyond the borders. To know a foreign language requires the learners to be proficient in reading, listening writing and speaking. Although many people can comprehend what they listen to or read in a foreign language, they are unable to make spoken interaction. This situation stems from the fact that speaking is the last station a language learner stops. In the more recent teaching methods, fluency precedes accuracy, therefore to be fluent in a foreign language means to know a language. However, speaking skill is mostly set aside in Turkish language education. According to Üstünoğlu (2009), “Because of the policies of Higher Education Institution and Ministry of Education, English teaching is exam oriented, aiming at training students for proficiency exams and focusing on grammar use, reading comprehension and writing skills” (p.152). As speaking skill is ignored, most of the time it has not been usually assessed in primary or secondary schools in Turkey. Therefore, some alternative methods such as portfolios are used in higher education to observe the development of students’ speaking performance. In higher education level, in some preparatory departments, it is assessed as a form of speaking exam or speaking skill is integrated to students’ portfolios.

Throughout the history, different teaching methods have been used by the teachers to teach foreign languages more effectively. However, with the changing global world, the role of the teachers has taken a different form. In the 21st century, new methods which take the students in the center of learning have been adopted. Classes have turned into productive learning atmospheres. Students’ needs have been taken into consideration and some terms such as learner autonomy and self-efficacy started to be more popular. In that learning environment, assessment procedures have also altered.

In the past, students' knowledge was evaluated based on tests which were applied at the end of unit or term. Summative evaluation, also called standardized tests, do not usually give clues about students' overall performance. They are sudden and time dependent tests which are open to environmental factors such as anxiety or lack of motivation. Alan & Pierson (2000) claimed that "it is better for the students to be taught by instructors who know the time to change the assessment type and use assessment types which are more student centered" (p.105). According to Nasab (2015), "in traditional selected-response assessments, students do not generate any language". Hence, students' "receptive skills" are measured with these tests (p.171). Therefore, they do not show students' full potential. At this point, "there is a need for new types of assessment" (Chang et al, 2005, p.30). Recently, teachers are not only responsible for the evaluation of students' performance at the end of each unit or term. On the contrary, they are aware of the advantages of assessments in each phase of learning (Stoynoff, 2012).

Along with traditional tests, alternative testing methods which take students' learning process into consideration started to be applied in the classrooms. Instead of traditional tests that are "totalitarian and authoritative in nature", "more democratic, less stern and less formal assessment" started to be more popular in ELT environments (Chandio & Jafferri, 2015, p.165). In other words, traditional assessment types turned into more dynamic and formative assessments. Teacher as a guide or facilitator aimed at providing more dynamic and active classroom atmosphere by using group/pair works, portfolio studies, observations and discussions.

Recently, speaking as a productive skill in EFL environments has started to gain importance. Therefore, speaking skill has been adapted to portfolio contexts in new and innovative language classes. The purpose is the same with other kinds of portfolios which assess the other skills of the students: to see the progress of the students, to help the students to assess themselves and therefore, improve more in speaking. With all these advantages, it is not surprising to see speaking based portfolio assessment on tertiary level. Hence, this study aims at evaluating the overall effectiveness of speaking portfolio tasks on students' language development.

1.2. Purpose and Significance of the Study

Portfolio based assessment has started to be a common way of evaluating the performance of the learners in higher education. Hence, it has been researched by

many scholars (e.g. Brown, 2004; Little, 2015; Ekbatani, 2000; Rost, 2002; Segers et al., 2003). Nevertheless, most of the studies about portfolios are restricted to writing skill. It seems that portfolio assessment which focuses on the speaking skill is not emphasized. There are just a few studies regarding to speaking skills in portfolio context (Master, 1998; Efthymiou, 2012; Wang & Chang, 2012; Huang & Hung, 2010; Soruç, 2011). Nevertheless, the views of the lecturers do not exist in most of the studies. It is possible to claim that the views of the lecturers are as important as the students' ideas. Therefore, it is necessary to learn more about lecturers' as well as the students' beliefs regarding the effects of speaking based portfolio assessment on tertiary level.

Recently, there has been a tendency to use new tools to assess speaking skills in Turkish preparatory departments. Even though there are some difficulties which the instructors and student may face during portfolio implementation process, such as “scoring objectivity, mistrust etc.” (p.233), portfolio seems to be a convenient way both for instructors and students if some of the precautions are taken and portfolio system is organized well (Soruç, 2011). Even though alternative assessment methods have been mentioned in ELT environments during the last few decades, the studies about portfolio evaluation are mostly restricted to writing portfolio studies. There are not enough studies which focus on the assessment of speaking skill in portfolio context. As it is seen, there is a necessity for more studies regarding to speaking based portfolio assessment. This study will shed light on further studies as it portrays the opinions of students and instructors regarding to portfolio based speaking assessment at a state university's preparatory school department in Turkey. It will also give clues about the speaking assessment on higher education level in Turkey.

Views of the students and instructors regarding to speaking tasks will not only give evidence about speaking assessment in portfolio context, but they will also show the effects of speaking portfolio tasks on students' speaking skills, learner autonomy, self-efficacy and self-confidence skills. Looking from the instructors' and students' side will give fruitful information about the speaking-based portfolio studies and may cause some other studies.

1.3. Method of the Study

The present study consists of qualitative and quantitative data to evaluate speaking based portfolio assessment at Karabuk University preparatory department by getting the responses of learners to surveys, self-reflection questionnaires and interviews. Moreover, the ideas of the instructors were taken by applying interviews on them. The current study focused on five different domains based on the survey questionnaire: learner autonomy, speaking skills, self-confidence, self-efficacy and challenges. The detailed information about the participants, setting and instrument can be found in methodology part.

1.4. Research Questions

In this study, to understand the effects of portfolios on students and instructors on different dimensions better, some research questions were formed:

- 1) What are learners' views regarding learner autonomy and speaking portfolio assessment?
- 2) What are the problems students faced while speaking portfolio tasks are implemented?
- 3) Do speaking portfolio tasks help the learners to improve their self-confidence and self-efficacy?
- 4) What are the learners' attitudes towards the effects of speaking portfolio tasks to skill development?
- 5) Is there a significant difference among students from different modules in terms of self-efficacy, self-confidence and learner autonomy after the speaking portfolio tasks are carried out?
- 6) Are there any correlation among age, department and any of the subheadings mentioned in the questionnaire?

1.5. Population and Sample of the Study

Sheets of papers which had different questions were delivered to 60 students who were randomly selected and agreed to give answers to the questions in the written format before each speaking portfolio task. After the tasks, the reactions of the students were taken by giving a self-reflection questionnaire. Moreover, a survey which was formed in the form of Likert scale questionnaire was administered to 289 students who

were in different modules, genders and departments. Furthermore, 5 randomly selected students who were in different modules and 6 instructors were interviewed. More detailed information about the population and sample can be found in participants section in methodology part.

1.6. Scope and Limitations

In this study, the participants were the students who were from three different modules and it was not possible to get the views of the upper intermediate level students as their numbers were limited. Moreover, the students were in the same or similar departments as English preparatory programme is compulsory in these departments. Therefore, it was not possible to get an overall conclusion regarding the effects of departments on changing views of the learners about speaking portfolio tasks. Furthermore, it was not possible to mention a big effect of the “age” variable as there was not a huge age gap among learners participated in this study. Besides, the learners did not mention peer feedback in students’ responses as there were not separate feedback sessions in evaluation process. If they had made evaluations of their peers’ performances in class atmosphere, they would have made interpretations regarding the effects of peer evaluation.

1.7. Conclusion

In this chapter, the subject of the study, purpose and significance of the study, method of the study in a general sense, research questions which form the base of the study and scope and limitations of the study were presented. Literature review will be presented in the following chapter. In chapter three, one can find the methodology consisting of the participants, setting, instrument, data acquisition process and data analysis methods. In chapter four, it is possible to find discussion of the results, pedagogical implications and the overall conclusion.

2. CHAPTER TWO: Literature Review

The methods and techniques to teach English has been changing during the years. Assessment methods are affected by these changes as well. While standardized exam types were very common assessment methods until a few decades ago, nowadays new and innovative assessment methods which focus on the evaluation of learners' progress are emphasized. In portfolio-based language assessment, it is possible to see the improvement of the learners in a process. Portfolios can be used to see the progress of the learners in their productive skills. In addition to writing portfolios, speaking portfolios started to get the attention in ELT field.

Even though studies about writing portfolio assessment abound, there are several studies regarding to speaking based portfolio assessment. The purpose of this study is to interpret the views of students and instructors regarding to portfolio based speaking assessment at a state university's preparatory school department in Turkey. It is estimated that these views will provide an insight into speaking portfolio assessment on higher education level and give rise to further studies.

This chapter consists of several subheadings. It summarizes theoretical background of portfolio evaluation system, the relevant literature which starts from the two different language theories, different assessment types, pros and cons of the portfolios, portfolio assessment in speaking context and in CEFR and some previous research in existing literature.

2.1. Theoretical Background

Changing language teaching methods during the last decades has affected assessment techniques. Language teaching has turned to be more student-centered, and therefore alternative assessment methods have become more popular. Jacqueline Ancess , Linda Darling-Hammond and Beverly Falk (1995) suggests the necessity of using the alternative assessment methods more than two decades ago. They offered "performance assessments" instead of traditional assessment methods (p.15). Later, some researchers made some categorizations about assessments. Whereas Reeves (2000) subdivides alternative assessment methods as; "performance or authentic assessment and portfolio assessment", Giligan (2007) adapts Erickson (2001)'s categorization of alternative assessment methods as "standard-based assessments,

performance assessments, portfolio assessments, and authentic assessments” (p.13). Furthermore, Wolfe & Miller (1997) argues that “portfolio assessment is becoming a popular form of assessing student outcomes because it provides a means of linking classroom instruction and assessment to large-scale testing” (p. 235). Portfolio studies started to be discussed as an alternative testing method starting from the 1990’s and now are used in higher education as a part of evaluation process. However, the discussions regarding the alternative assessment methods date back to 1980’s. Portfolio studies which have been more common in recent years are used in preparatory classes in Turkey as a kind of assessment.

In classes where portfolio studies are used as assessment instruments, the roles of the teachers are not traditional as well. The classes which use portfolio-based assessment are more student- centered and the teachers whose roles were only being the sole authority of class start to behave like mentor or coach by guiding the students. According to Minstrell (2001), “The responsibility of teacher then is no longer to teach, but rather be responsible for students’ learning” (p. 122).

Using portfolio as an assessment tool enables learners to be aware of their improvements and the solutions to deal with the possible problems. Hence, it fulfills “diagnostic tool” and thus helps learners to be “independent learners” (Barootchi & Keshavarz, 2002, p.281). Portfolio studies are not the kind of assessments which are applied at the end of the school term. Rather, they are implemented throughout the term and thus they are part of formative assessment. In that sense, they are different from the traditional assessment methods.

Portfolio studies reviews the students’ performances “over a period” (Hashemian & Fadaei, 2013, p.136) and tend to give more productive results about the performances of students during the whole term. What is more, students find the opportunity to improve themselves and get higher scores if they become unsuccessful in one of the portfolio tasks as they see their deficiencies and give a chance to compensate for it. Students take the responsibility for the unknown points or the topics which are not understood. Hence, it is an ongoing assessment process which tries to move the students forward in terms of learning.

The student-centered learning environment which portfolio offers to learners supports the autonomy of the students. According to Neamtipour (2001), “in order to

contribute to the development of learner centered education in language classrooms, it's vital that students be involved in taking control of their own learning" (p.126).

The fact that portfolio studies encourage self-learning and promote learner autonomy has been explained by different scholars. Brown (2004) maintains that portfolio studies "foster intrinsic motivation and responsibility, individualize learning, provide tangible evidence of a student's work, offer opportunities for collaborative work with peers and facilitate critical thinking" (p.257). Students see their weak sides and try to take the necessary steps to cover their deficiencies. Therefore, portfolio does not only help the students to learn independently but it also "serves as a means for critical self-analysis," (Demirel & Duman, 2014, p.2636).

Portfolio evaluation has been used to evaluate speaking performances of the learners in higher education. They have similar functions with other portfolio types, that is, to see the progress of learners in speaking. Some studies were carried out to see the effects of portfolios on students and different dimensions. To set an example, Nosratinia & Abdi (2017) compared the autonomy and anxiety levels of different groups consisting of portfolio and summative assessment. The results portrayed the benefits of "portfolio studies on learners' autonomy, writing skills and anxiety levels" (p.831). Another study focused on the portfolio and peer assessment in Iranian EFL context. There was not a significant difference between two different groups researched but it was stated that "portfolio and peer assessment are accompanying tools for students' engagement and empowerment which should be used along with teacher assessment" (Yaghoubi & Mobin, 2015, p.2509). Moreover, in a different study, the relation of portfolios with the learners' metacognitive skills were examined by Abhakorn (2014). Two different groups were contrasted to see the effects of portfolios on students' metacognitive skills in Thai educational context. The results portrayed the positive effects of portfolios on students' metacognitive skills. The fact that portfolio studies provide a productive learning environment has been emphasized in the study of Ricky Lam and Icy Lee (2009). With the help of the ongoing function of portfolio studies, students improved their writing skills and regular teacher and pair feedback contributed positively on students' views about portfolio. At the end of the research, even in the environment where teachers are not familiar with the portfolios had positive effects on students.

According to Alexandra Nunes, (2004) reflective function of portfolios promoted learner autonomy among students. In other words, it was concluded that portfolio studies give the students opportunity to observe their improvement and this make them more independent learners. Similarly, Pauline Mak and Kevin Wog's study (2017) about writing portfolios showed the contributions of portfolios on learners "self-regulatory" skills (p.60). At the end of the study, it was concluded that self-regulatory skills do not only gives clues about learner autonomy, but they also require the active usage of metacognitive skills and reflective skills. The studies mentioned above showed the positive effects of portfolio studies on students' different skills. As one can notice, most of the studies are restricted to writing portfolio work and its effects on students. Therefore, the necessity of more studies about speaking portfolio works can be noticed more clearly.

2.2. Some Key Terms

Speaking (oral) portfolios: The main aim of the oral portfolios is to assess speaking skills of the learners. Portfolios show the progress of the learners over a period. They give concrete evidence of the learners' current speaking performance by looking at the speaking portfolio folder which is in audio or video format .They show the learners' overall speaking development starting from the beginning (the beginning of a term or module, or the first task) to the end (the end of the term, module or the last task). Oral portfolios can be used as a substitute term for speaking portfolio. In fact, oral portfolios generalize all kinds of speaking portfolios such as electronic, video based or audio portfolios.

Electronic portfolios: Electronic portfolios are currently popular as a part of integrating technology to assessment. Electronic portfolios are mostly used to assess students' productive skills. They are beneficial for students' self-assessment like any other portfolio work. In this study, only speaking based electronic portfolios will be focused on.

Video Based Portfolios: In this kind of portfolio work, individual presentations or group or pair role plays are video recorded and recorded works are uploaded into CD or flash memory. In this way, students can have an opportunity to see their strong and weak sides and it contributes to their self-assessment process.

Audio portfolios: Audio portfolios are parts of video-based portfolios. They consist of voice recordings of learners. Like video portfolios, they are uploaded into CD or flash memory. They are good for observing the developmental path of the learners in terms of speaking skills.

Speaking portfolio tasks: They refer to the tasks which are parts of portfolio preparation process. They can be individual presentations, pair work dialogue in a given context, and group role play tasks, voice recordings or self-reflections of the students at the end of the term, module or tasks. All of them are parts of speaking assessment process. They are recorded by using mobile phones or recording devices and then put into portfolio folder.

Speaking portfolio mentioned in this study: In this study, speaking portfolio assignments in a Turkish preparatory school will be examined. Students are assigned 3 speaking tasks in each module (10 weeks period). Each task is different in each module. Students are assigned some topics beforehand to present individually in class, pair work dialogues in a given context, or group role play tasks. During in class presentations, students are recorded by their classmates by using mobile phones. Sometimes, in upper levels, they are asked to video record themselves about a given topic. Sometimes, video recording assignments can be in the form of pair work. The assessment criteria for each task and level and rubric are used by the instructors (see Appendix 1). They are based on CEFR level descriptors and course objectives.

2.3. Constructivist Learning Theory and Assessment

Constructivism in language teaching and assessment has been adapted in higher education by many stakeholders at least on theory basis. Latest concerns show the benefits of constructivist learning environment on students' second language acquisition. Constructivist ideas about education did not stay stable. The pioneer of constructivist learning theory, Dewey focused on the empirical nature of learning while Piaget gave importance to cognitive processes in learners' mind and became a prominent figure in "modern constructivism" (1972). He asserted the terms "assimilation" and "conformability". On the other hand, Vygotsky's ideas about constructivism formed a basis for the recent ideas in foreign language teaching. He claimed that learning is a "social construction" and "social and cultural rather than individual phenomena" (Kozulin et al., 2003, p.1).

Moreover, in Vygotskian constructivist learning theory, learning is possible when a learner can associate the knowledge which has been already had with the new one as learning is “neither single nor independent” (Vygotsky,1987, p. 201). Therefore, “meaning is created by the learner” (Holzman & Newman, 1993, p.46). At this point, it is necessary to mention the term ZPD “zone of proximal development” which was put forward by Vygotsky. ZPD provides an insight into current favorite learning environment, role of teachers and students as it is defined as the link between what a student is able to do without assistance or guide and what a student is not able to do with the help of someone else’s assistance. In the literature, Vygotsky’s definition can be interpreted as the students’ problem-solving ability with guidance of a classmate or teacher or their ability to deal with the problem without assistance (Vygotsky, 1978).

Learning is not provided only in the classroom environment but “students ultimately need opportunities to use the language productively outside the classroom” (Gül, 2016, p.3-4). With the help of the guidance of the teachers and help of the peers or teachers, students produce knowledge. They are active in all parts of the learning process and take the responsibility of their learning path as they are supposed to produce their own learning by using their existing knowledge (Jia, 2010). To make it clearer, here is a list of the features of students in the constructivist learning environment which was summarized well in O’Maggio and Hadley (2001)’s article (cited in Colon, 2007):

1. Learners have their own aims and they are responsible for their learning paces, so they arrange their aims to be in harmony with the lesson aims.
2. Learners evaluate themselves and interpret their leaning process.
3. Learners also benefit from their classmates with the help of group/ pair works and this situation contributes them to “construct” their own knowledge.
4. Students get the knowledge by discovering, meanly by searching for the answers, making inference, try to link between the existing and new knowledge and dealing with the possible problems.
5. Students know they will learn more and associate it with the former one (Omaggio -Hadley, 2001, p.9).

The contributions of constructivism to language classes might be clearly seen in different learning atmospheres. Recently, the classroom environment of language classes is different from traditional classes and these changing environments contribute to the learning aims in college level (Simons et al., 2000; Lea et al., 2003). One of the most common learning environments in a constructivist language class is “problem-based learning” (Gijbels et al., 2006, p.216). Hence, the features of problem-based environment are in parallel with the constructivist classes. Barrows (1996) (paraphrased in Gijbels, 2006) listed the problem-based learning and environment years ago:

1. The students are in the center of learning.
2. Group work or pair work is necessary to provide an effective learning and teacher should have the role of the guide.
3. The knowledge should be suitable to be used in the life.
4. The problems or difficulties should be the things which help them to get the ability to overcome and improve themselves in the end.
5. Lastly, students take the active role during the learning process and arrange themselves depending on different situations.

Constructivist learning theory presents different assessment methods which focus on the development of the learners. Vygotsky believes there is a need for “authentic activities”, or “those that involve applying learned knowledge and skills to complete real-world tasks within a meaningful cultural context” (Chen, 2007, p.54) in the classes. In that way, he does not support the common and traditional assessment methods which are far away from the life.

In constructivist learning theory, the demand of the students is prioritized as it has the philosophy of such: “If learning is individualistic (cognitive constructivism), the teacher has to know about the student’s personal information to provide suitable learning data. If learning is a social phenomenon (social constructivism), primarily the teacher himself must interact, and next they must find ways of making interaction among the learners, and this solely depends on a teacher’s reflection of their learners and their own teaching” (Al Mahmud, 2013, p.243).

In constructivist learning theory, testing and assessment are the instruments which give the test takers an opportunity to see the learning path of the learners from the developmental point of view. Test takers’ function is “teaching and assisting”

(p.103). On the other hand, in standardized tests, the concrete result which is the exam score is taken as a basis. Moreover, the test takers take a “neutral or “impartial” (static test) mission (Kozulin et al., 2003, p.103). Hence, constructivism favors new forms of assessment which are called as alternative assessment.

2.4. Assessment Types

In literature, assessment types have been categorized as traditional and alternative forms of assessments. However, there are also other names or categorizations which are the subheadings of “assessment”.

2.4.1. Alternative Assessment

Assessment constitutes an important part of the learning process therefore it can be defined as “the bridge between learning and teaching” (Andrade& Cizek, 2010, p.18). It was stated at the latest concerns about the change of assessment types. There is a tendency of choosing “decontextualized, atomic” kind of assessment to “authentic and contextualized” tests (Kulieke et al., 1990, p.5). Segers et al. (2003) interprets this change as such: “It refers to the shift from the so-called objective tests with item formats such as short answer, fill-in blank, multiple-choice and true/false to the use of portfolio assessment, project-based assessment, performance assessment, etc.” (p. 3). Constructivism looks at the assessment from a different viewpoint. New forms of assessment which are also called as “classroom-based, qualitative, informal, or performance assessment” (p.222) have great concerns in foreign language education environments. Alan and Pierson (2000) pointed to the importance of shifting to learner directed assessment from traditional assessment. Alternative assessment types give the learners freedom to be active and they get rid of the traditional role of sitting and doing whatever the teacher asks them to do. In this way, they start to be more autonomous as they also take an active role in learning process. According to Janisch, Liu & Akrofi (2007), there are several features of alternative assessments:

1. Constructivism forms a basis for alternative assessment. That means that the student-centered nature of constructivism suggests nontraditional assessment types.

2. Alternative assessments give outstanding results as they focus on the progress of the learners in a duration.
3. Alternative assessments are possible only with instructors who take initiative in selecting new forms of assessment types.

Turkish education system has been criticized for years in terms of the inefficiency of assessment procedures which have been applied on the students. In most state schools and colleges, students continue to give importance to grammar of the foreign language while ignoring the rest of three skills (reading, speaking and writing). They are not exposed to authentic activities and learning English is only limited to in class activities. On these kinds of non- authentic learning environments, students may have difficulty in linking their knowledge to real life. Their practices are mostly restricted to classroom environments. Although it is possible to see some alternative assessment methods on secondary and higher education level in foreign language education, one can observe some teaching and assessment practices which can be associated with the past. The evaluation of students' performance is provided with paper pencil tests. Most of the time, students are supposed to memorize the necessary information to keep it in their short-term memory. Present assessment types do not "encourage the students to synthesize the others' ideas with their own beliefs, thoughts, and ideas" (Gül, 2016, p.37). In that situation, they do not internalize the knowledge. Most learners tend to forget what they have learnt after an exam. However, some internal and external factors such as anxiety, physical atmosphere of the exam hall etc. can directly affect the performance of students. Hence, instead of focusing only on standardized exam types, other assessment types which give emphasis on the development and progress of the students must be suggested in EFL environments. Therefore, to create a modern language teaching classroom, stakeholders, instructors and education system should try to integrate modern teaching methods with assessment practices. Only by doing this, it is possible to see the productive effects of new forms of assessments on the students.

From this point forth, using alternative assessment methods in language classes seem to be more convenient way to minimize some probable effects of internal and external factors on the students. Constructivist learning theory supports portfolio assessment to demonstrate the current situation of the learners as students take an active role in portfolio implementation process and they create a folder consisting of

their work during the whole term. They select the pieces which show their potential. While doing this, they take an active part in assessing their own work and do it alone. At that point, it is necessary to mention self-assessment. Alternative assessment methods are based on students' effort and performance. Therefore, at the end of any task or during portfolio preparation process, students have an opportunity to examine their work carefully and make meaningful conclusions about themselves. It is good for students' learning path as "any approach that involves students in their education and that stimulates and excites them to evaluate themselves and build expertise is certainly worth the effort" (De Fina, 1992, p.65).

Briefly, it can be maintained that alternative forms of assessment give meaningful clues about learners' progress and their current levels. Moreover, it is not incorrect to state that portfolios are among the most popular alternative assessment methods in higher education as portfolio-based assessment contributes to the learners from many different aspects.

2.4.2. Summative Assessment

One of the earliest and best-known definitions of summative assessment is made by Sadler (1989). He described summative assessment as "summing up or summarizing the achievement status of a student and is geared towards reporting at the end of a course of study especially for purposes of certification" (Sadler, 1989, p. 120). It is a kind of assessment which can be named as "traditional" or "explicit" assessment in ELT literature. End of course or term tests are among that kind of assessment. Wiliam (2000) compared summative assessment with formative assessment: "The vast majority of summative assessments in education are assessments of what the individual has learnt, know, understands and can do. In contrast, formative assessment can be thought of as being prospective" (p.14).

Bachman & Palmer (2010) listed the common features of summative assessment by comparing it with formative assessment. Some of them are as follows:

1. They are not integrated to teaching process and therefore, students may be anxious during summative assessment because they know that they are assessed.
2. Learners focus on the skill that will be assessed therefore they can ignore the other skills.

3. Teachers do not focus on the students' progress, they tend to focus on the score the students get.
4. Unlike "implicit" assessment, learners also do not tend to use their metacognitive skills as much as they use in formative assessment (p.29).

One disadvantage of summative assessment is that they do not give enough feedback to learners to see their weak sides and take the necessary steps to improve them. Summative assessments are applied at the end of unit or term. Therefore, the students do not have enough time to correct their mistakes as most of the time it is too late. Despite some of the disadvantages, educators continue to use them (Yu & Li, 2014) as they take less time than formative assessment methods.



2.4.3. Formative Assessment

McManus (2008) describes formative assessment as “a process in which teachers and students provide feedback during instruction to organize the learning and teaching process in order to increase student achievement” (p. 3). There are several studies about the benefits of formative assessment on students’ learning process (Bennett, 2011; Rea-Dickins & Gardner, 2000; Brown, 2010; Clark, 2011). In these studies, the roots of formative assessment are explained, good effects of it on teaching/learning process is mentioned and while doing this, it is compared to summative assessment. In most of the studies, it is clearly stated that formative assessment contributes to students’ development, accumulation of language and learning process.

The basic features of formative assessment were listed by Andrade & Cizek (2010) as such: Formative assessment;

1. Promotes learner autonomy,
2. Diagnoses students’ level and shed light into further pace for students’ improvement,
3. Assesses the learners at regular intervals, and helps the learners to assess themselves and each other,
4. Helps learners to do needs analysis for their future development,
5. contributes the learners to reach their learning aims,
6. Assists learners to be aware of their weak and strong sides and take the necessary precautions,
7. Does not present an answer key but shows an assessment chart based on criteria,
8. Gives fruitful evidence about students’ ability to arrange their own work and set their aims,
9. Helps learners to get some other gains in addition to lesson objectives,
10. Shows ways the students to see their mistakes and draw conclusion to improve their work.

In some of the articles, instead of formative assessment, the term “assessment for learning” is used (William & Thompson, 2007). Moreover, it was stated that formative assessment contributed to learners’ development as they offered “feedback”

to the students. At that point, it may not be surprising to claim that portfolio-based assessment is one of the most common kind of formative assessment types.

Sometimes there may be some difficulties such as consistency while applying formative assessment methods to the classroom. As formative assessment methods are different from standardized testing which gives a holistic score of the students' work only with a single test carried out at the end of the term or year, they take all the efforts of the students throughout the whole term into consideration. Sometimes, the subjectivity problem can be experienced in projects or portfolio studies because there are not answer keys as in the standardized test. Rubrics are used in grading process and the same tasks may be interpreted differently by the graders.

2.4.4. Dynamic Assessment

Lussier and Swanson (2005, p. 66) describes dynamic assessment as “procedure that attempts to modify performance, via examiners assistance, in an effort to understand learning potential” (2005, p. 66). In other words, it is important to observe what the learners can do after some intervention. Therefore, dynamic assessment is directly in relation with Vygotsky's zone of proximal development which focuses on the link between the learners' abilities with or without help. Vygotsky claimed that the learners' tendency to get the knowledge in a group or with the help of a peer give clues about the learners' performance in the future. Hence, it is not so possible to get fruitful results only by examining the individual performances of the students. Focusing on the process and giving the necessary assistance is crucial to observe the developmental process of the language learners (Pohener, 2008). The process of learning is emphasized in dynamic assessment as there is a difference between “what a learner is capable of doing independently and what becomes possible with assistance from a teacher” (Davin, 2013, p.304). Vygotsky's view of point regarding “development” portrays that there should be an integration and balance between social and cognitive aspects so that one can mention the whole development of the learner. Therefore, not only the learners' own potential to learn, but also social factors play a crucial role in learners' development. From this point on, “assessment and instruction” are not separated from each other in teaching-learning process (Nazari, 2012, p.57). The necessity of dynamic assessment is summarized by Haywood& Lidz, 2007 as such:

1. The learners do not show their actual performance in standardized tests.
2. The progress of the learners is counted as “new” and more beneficial than learning without mediation.
3. Assessing what the learners can do contributes more than what they did.
4. It is difficult to diagnose all the tendencies of the learners with standardized tests (p.7).

In dynamic assessment, the role of the teachers is very important as they facilitate the learning by guiding the learners to show their actual performances (Dörfler et al., 2009). The teachers do not directly give the correct answers, but they just give some hints so that they can find the answer on their own by allowing them to take initiative in their learning process, help the learners when it is necessary, and let the learners behave as they want when they give up assistance. Moreover, teachers take the role of “mediator” to display the actual performance or the “potential” of the teaching-learning process (Bavali et al., 2011). The teacher can “give some hints, ask some leading questions, give prompts or examples” to the learners to enable the learners to find the correct answer and show their actual performances (Tavokoli & Nezakat–Alhossaini, p.212). In these processes, after giving some clues or “prompts” the teacher gives time to learners so that they can notice their errors and “correct” them. If the learners cannot correct for the first time, the teacher can change the “prompt” and give another one until they can reach the correct answer. This process is good for the learner autonomy of the learners as they try to find the correct way by using the clues given by their teacher on their own (Lantolf, 2012, p. 60). They can also be named as “metacognitive prompts” as they activate the thinking skills of the learners (Miller, 2011). Hence, this process-based assessment “promotes development rather than learning (see Haywood & Lidz, 2007 cited in Lantolf & Poehner, 2010, p.29).

Moreover, the learning process is seen as a developmental path for the learners. Therefore, the process which releases the actual performance of the learners is much more important than the content of the learning. Different from traditional exams, dynamic assessment may assist the learners to overcome the difficulties which may encounter “with direct instruction, guided practice, and effective strategies” (Siwathaworn, Wudthayagorn, 2018, p.143).

Dynamic assessment is categorized as “interventionist” and “interactionist” (Lantolf & Poehner, 2004, p.241). Both types focus on revealing learners’ abilities and correct their mistakes. In interventionist dynamic assessment, “pre and posttests” are carried out to see the improvement of the learners and after each test some feedback is given. Therefore, the teacher is not active while the test is administered, and this process lasts for a long time. On the other hand, in interactionist dynamic assessment, necessary feedback, or clues are given whenever it is necessary, and learners find the correct answer. Therefore, it can be claimed that compared to interventionist dynamic assessment, interactionist dynamic assessment takes less time (Dörfler et al., 2009, p.2).

The other point which may lead the educators to favour dynamic assessment is that it takes the social background of the learners into consideration contrary to standardized tests. The educators may clearly see the educational and social background of the learners and associate some problems with the differences between the learners. Therefore, they may take the necessary steps to assist the learners.

Even though dynamic assessment has several benefits over traditional exams, they can have some challenges. There may be problems about reliability in assessment. Examinants or assessors may interpret the same result in a different way. At that point, the educational backgrounds of the examiners may have a direct role on assessment process. Also, the most important point in dynamic assessment is to see the positive change in students’ performances in a period. Therefore, it is not so possible to reach a concluding data which can be shown as a summary as in traditional tests. Moreover, time is one of the most important problems for learners and educators in dynamic assessment. As the purpose is to see the learners’ potential, it does not seem possible to change in learners’ attitudes in a clear-cut moment. Hence, it may be time consuming for educators.

Portfolio based assessment and dynamic assessment may show some similarities as both base on the progress of the learners in a period. Also, feedback in portfolio-based assignment and mediation by the teachers in dynamic assessment may show that they are not totally different from each other.

2.5. Portfolio Based Language Assessment

It would be more suitable to list the various definitions of portfolio to get a common view about portfolio assessment. When the definitions are examined, it is not surprising to see similarities among them. One of the earliest and the most widely used definition of language portfolio was made by Paulson et al. (1991). They defined language portfolios as “a purposeful collection of students’ works that exhibits the student’s efforts, progress and achievements in one or more areas” (p.60). Segers et al. (2003) emphasized the process in portfolio works. He stated that portfolios are created “over a period of time”. In addition, they give clues about the different skills of the learners (p.36). Most of the time, portfolio is confused with any kind of folders. However, they mean more than a file of papers in educational context (Paulson & Meyer, 1991). Johnson, Mims-Cox, and Doyle-Nichols (2009) maintained that language portfolios as assessment tools “can be organized to assess competencies in a given standard, goal, or objective” (p. 5). Besides, Brown & Wolfe Quintero (1997) argued the attempts of instructors on portfolio usage in their definition: Portfolios give clues about “teacher’s efforts, skills, abilities, achievement and contributions to his/her students, colleagues, institution, academic discipline or community”(p.28).

Based on the various definitions of portfolio studies, it is not difficult to claim that portfolio studies are process based, give clues about learners’ improvement in a period, and has an educational aim. When it comes to the content of portfolios, all the writing tasks with first and last drafts, speaking tasks (in cd format), peer feedback and self-evaluation forms and some other homework assigned by the instructors can be included to portfolio studies (Rost, 2002). Although portfolio-based assessment refers to a folder prepared by students’ work during a period, most of the researchers believe they mean more than the collection of papers. Hamp-Lyons and Condon (2000) claim that portfolios are not only “undiscriminated collection of everything the student produced” (p. 120).

2.5.1. Positive Sides of Portfolios

Brown (1998) summarizes the advantages of portfolio-based language assessment: “It applies records of L2 learners’ work over time and in different modes to demonstrate the profundity and progress of L2 learners’ abilities” (p.102).

Portfolio has not only been used in language teaching as an alternative assessment method, but it is used extensively in many other areas. Portfolios do not

only represent an image of student's overall development, they also have benefits on students 'metacognitive and higher order skills as well: Banfi (2003) lists the positive effects on students as such:

1. Searching for and picking necessary data on the Internet and databases,
2. To be able to organize and present the information in a consistent way,
3. To provide group/peer work in a cooperative atmosphere.

Furthermore, Little (2015) claims that "compiling their portfolio isa key constituent of reflective learning" (p.323). Therefore, students have freedom of evaluating their own work and this helps them to get learner autonomy. Ekbatini (2011) lists the advantages of portfolio-based assessment and makes the connection with learner autonomy: "enables instruction to be linked to assessment, promotes reflection, helps learners to take responsibility for their own learning, enables learners to see gaps in their learning, and to take risks" (p.6-7).

What is more, Brown and Hudson (2002) maintains the positive effects of portfolios on the learners. They mention the new role of teachers in portfolio-based classes as a "mentor" or "coach" and teachers assist the students rather than dictates anything. Also, they refer to benefits of portfolios to their individual works as the learners try to discharge their responsibilities during portfolio creation process. At this point, it is important that the function of portfolio-based language assessment should be putting the students in the center of learning environment. Kolomeitseva & Makeyava (2006) give some fruitful advice for realizing this purpose. Their advice is mostly to the teachers as they look like the orchestra chef who are responsible for creating student-based classroom atmosphere.

1. Rather than being rulers who are mostly strict, set some rules and expect the listeners to obey, teachers should be facilitators who encourage the learners in portfolio preparation process.
2. At the end of portfolio presentation process, feedback giving should be realized. However, feedbacks should be supportive which help the learners to go beyond.
3. Supportive peer feedback should be promoted.
4. Rather than criticizing the students when they make mistakes, the main aim should be encouraging the students to learn from the mistakes.

In addition to benefits of portfolios to learning environment, Kan (2007) states some other contributions of language portfolios:

1. Lay a burden to stakeholders: Even though this may be a negative effect on teachers and administrators, they are good for learner,
2. Help the educators and learners to share the same aims in language learning,
3. Give fruitful evidence of the situation of the learners,
4. Make contributions to education process,
5. Portray the innovative approach in language assessment.

a) Learner Autonomy: The studies focusing on the autonomy abound in the literature. Little (1995), Benson (2001) and Chen (2012) are some of the scholars who contributed to “learner autonomy” term. Holec (1981) was the pioneer of the learner autonomy term with his definition which is still used in most of the academic works regarding to learner autonomy.

In addition to Holec’s (1981) definition of learner autonomy that is “someone who is taking charge of his own learning is autonomous”, the autonomous learning environment expects the learners not to stay passive during learning activity. More recent ideas regarding to learner autonomy also support and broaden learner autonomy concept. Busaidi and Maaammari (2014) claim that to label the learners as autonomous require them to behave independently outside the classroom environment. According to some researchers, to provide an autonomous environment, teachers need to take initiative of changing their traditional roles of being the center of learning environment. They should take the roles of “consultant and facilitator” (Zhuang, 2010, p.593). Also, they should not be blamed for every mistake the students made. The learners should put on the responsibility in their learning process. This is a crucial thing to create an autonomous learning environment and therefore autonomous learners.

New/alternative forms of assessment are at the center of ELT discussions during the last few decades. During these discussions, the feasibility of portfolio-based language environments to create more independent learners have been stated. At that point, it is better to mention learner autonomy of the learners and its relation to portfolio assessment. Several researchers explained the contributions of portfolio assessments in language classes on the learners’ autonomy in a positive way. One of the best explanations which was put forward by Brown (2004) is as such: Portfolio

studies in language classes “foster intrinsic motivation and responsibility, individualize learning, provide tangible evidence of a student’s work, offer opportunities for collaborative work with peers and facilitate critical thinking”(p.257). Therefore, it is possible to maintain that portfolio studies do not only help the learners to study on their own which facilitates their autonomy, they also help them to study with someone else and therefore give them opportunity to activate their brain and socialize.

The fact that using speaking skills in classrooms facilitate learner autonomy was stated by Qamar (2016). He claims that using speaking skills encourage the students to overcome their public speaking phobias and be more self-confident in spoken production in language learning. Hence, it is possible to maintain that speaking portfolio tasks are contributors for learner autonomy of the learners. Moreover, traditional roles of learners as just sit and listen to the teacher change as they take an active part in creating their speaking portfolio process. The learners are aware of the course objectives and learning outcomes and able to make conclusions about the results (Najeeb, 2013). Hence, it might be claimed that speaking portfolio preparation process does not only help the learners to be more autonomous, it also contributes to self-assessment.

Autonomous learners need to organize their learning process. Therefore, they can be named as “self-regulated learners” as well (Andrade& Cizek, 2010, p.34). According to Nicol &Macfarlane-Dick (2006), facilitating self-regulation has several advantages regarding to creating effective teaching teacher environment which is learner centered:

1. Promoting the learners to assess themselves,
2. Contributing an effective interaction between learners and the teacher,
3. Distinguishing between successful and ineffective classroom practices,
4. Providing broad feedback from teaching/learning practice,
5. Improving the motivation and self confidence levels of the students,
6. Taking necessary steps to develop classroom practices based on the feedback,
7. Ensuring the learners to have enough chances to benefit from the teaching effectively.

Nicol &Macfarlane-Dick (2006)’s conclusions about facilitating self-regulation can be linked to positive effects of portfolio assessment in language classes as both

have the same outcomes: Promoting learner autonomy, being able to get feedback, follow the improvement of the learners, providing an interaction in or outside the class.

At the same time, with the help of their individual work and studies with peers or group work, they can see their deficient points better. Therefore, portfolio studies can also become efficient instruments for “self-criticism and analysis” (Demirel & Duman, 2015, p.2636).

b) Self-Assessment: Self-reflection and evaluation are the terms that can be closely associated with portfolio-based assessment (Wang & Chang, 2011). It may be because students can see their current situation in foreign language learning and evaluate themselves by looking at their language portfolios. Portfolios give fruitful evidence of their learning path.

Portfolio based language assessment presents an environment which is suitable for self-evaluation and assessment because of the autonomous learning environment portfolios present. Learners can draw conclusions about their self-learning. According to Gardner (2000), self-assessment has several advantages on learners. Students do not try to depend on the others as they know they are on their own and they know all the possible outcomes are because of their preferences. Self-assessment also contributes to students’ overall views and their willingness towards learning. Therefore, it may be claimed that self-assessment contributes to learners’ motivation.

Self-assessment is the outcome of autonomous and reflective view of thinking. The learners notice their role in learning process tend to get more motivated for learning during portfolio-based assessment (Bruno & Dell’ Aversana, 2017).

The learners who can assess themselves show similar characteristics with autonomous learners as portfolio assessment has positive effects on both:

1. Their analytic thinking and self-criticism skills improve. These skills allow them to be make effective conclusions, improve speaking and writing skills, be more active in interaction.
2. They can work collaboratively with new groups or pairs. This helps their spoken interaction to improve.
3. Their ability to organize or decide their learning development individually improve.
4. Learners’ engagement for learning, their self-confidence, ability to deal with challenges develop (Birenbaum, 1996).

c) Peer Feedback: Portfolio based assessment presents an environment which facilitates peer dialogue. Interaction with the classmates helps the learners to practice what they have learnt. Hence, the assessment methods focus on the process rather than the result. Some parts of the speaking portfolio work include group pair works, role plays or presentations. At these times, the peers need to communicate with each other during preparation and presentation process. Moreover, in portfolio works, there is necessarily a feedback session. Feedback is either given by teachers or peers. When they are constructively organized, feedback sessions contribute to learners' improvement. According to Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick (2006), effective feedback has numerous effects on learners:

1. Feedback facilitates the interaction among the participants in class,
2. Shows evidence about the current level of the learners.
3. In addition to contribution to reflective way of thinking, feedback also contributes to students' engagement of learning.

Topping (1998) broadly described and categorized peer assessment more than two decades ago. According to his definition, peer assessment includes the feedback sessions and evaluating positive and negative sides of the students who are on the same level. Oscarson (1989) mentions the benefits of peer assessment and its importance on portfolio assessment. He asserts that peer feedback develops the learning process. Moreover, peer assessment and feedback give the learners opportunity to activate their brain by thinking critically and making interaction with each other (Strijbos & Sluijsmans, 2010).

d) Self-Confidence: Self-confidence is one of the key issues in teaching productive skills in foreign language education. Dörnyei's (2005) definition of self-confidence focuses on the ideas of learners about themselves that is their inner faith to themselves regarding to their future success or failures. When the term self-confidence is mentioned, it is more appropriate to mention the term anxiety since the learners who can overcome their anxiety in spoken production can be called as self-confident learners. Anxiety is commonly defined as "the feeling of tension and apprehension specifically associated with second language learning" (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994, p. 284). Learners become anxious and have lack of self-confidence especially before or during spoken production. They may have "stage fright" (Horwitz et al., 1986, p.30). Anxiety in language learning process does not always have a negative effect on

students' self-confidence. Anxiety has a dual function, which means that anxiety to some extent can be like stimulator for learners to go beyond; that is, it has a positive function on self-confidence and learning as well as the motivation. On the other hand, if anxiety level is more than it is expected, it can decrease the level of self-confidence, motivation and therefore the performance of the learners in the end (Brown et al., 2001).

There are many factors which may cause learners to lose their self-confidence and increase their anxiety level before or during speaking performances inside the class (Aydın, 2001). The learners' awareness of being evaluated in the class is one of the main reasons of their anxiety and lack of self-confidence. Moreover, they tend to believe they have more capable classmates than them inside the class. This makes them feel incompetent in speaking (Zhanibek, 2001).

However, this situation is not always permanent in language classes where speaking assessment is applied all the time. Even though the students may feel anxious or incompetent before their teachers or peers at the beginning, they get used to the situation over time and they may be eager for the upcoming tasks in time. Speaking assessment can be provided by tasks which are in portfolio format in language classes and they can help the self-confidence of the learners. They are beneficial in improving learners' self-confidence as the learners get prepared for their presentations and they can get rid of their anxiety in time (Boonkit, 2010).

e) Speaking skills: When speaking and writing skills are compared, speaking is the skill which is a more sudden production while writing requires preparation beforehand. Moreover, different kind of speaking activities such as role play activities which include group or pair work draw the attention of students and make them more motivated. Although there may be some challenges such as timing, technical problems or grading (subjectivity/objectivity problems), by integrating speaking skill into the curriculum, with the help of speaking portfolios, it is possible to help the students to get the communicative competence (Çepik & Yastıbaş, 2013).

The fact that speaking skill cannot be thought or learnt separately from other skills has been discussed in recent studies. Therefore, in portfolio studies, while assessing speaking skill, other skills can be included in the process. The relationship between speaking skills and other skills can be summarized as follow:

1. “How to learn” should be an indispensable phrase for the learners to awaken their metacognitive skills.
2. The instruments which are used in the class should be adapted to and taken from life.
3. Everyday communication and tasks in the classrooms should give the learners an opportunity to make the spoken interaction in the foreign language which is aimed to be taught (Akdemir et al., 2012).

Speaking cannot be considered separately from other skills. Saddhono and Slamet (2012) explains the relationship of speaking skill with the other skills as follows:

1. Even though there are two “productive skills” namely speaking and writing, both show different functions.
2. Speaking has a close relationship with listening skill as the learners tend to react what they have listened to.
3. To develop the quality of speaking requires having increased listening ability.
4. Reading skills are perceived later than speaking production.
5. Learners give sudden reactions and therefore listening and speaking skills can be called as “direct language skills”.
6. Note taking and creating diagrams can contribute to the improvement of spoken production.
7. Writing has some rules to be learnt. Therefore, speaking skill seems to be less planned and organized.
8. To be a good reader will also help to be a good speaker in time.
9. To learn some rhetoric and prosodic patterns such as intonation, stress etc. are necessary (p.55).

What is more, the needs of learners should be considered in any task inside the classroom. Instead of traditional teaching methods which date back to decades ago, new and innovative methods based on students’ improvement in communicative skills should be emphasized. In the classroom environment in which the spoken interaction is promoted, the learners start to get rid of their indecision and fear of speaking before audience. They start to practice the target language in their classes with the help of the activities and tasks in the classrooms and this situation helps them to know they can

come through their worries about speaking in foreign language (Taous, 2013). Moreover, apart from the positive effects of practicing speaking skills on students' motivation and self-confidence, it also contributes to other productive or receptive skills (Saeed et al., 2016).

Enhancing speaking skill in the class requires the change in the roles of students and teachers. Teachers' roles as guides give the students an opportunity to take the initiative of their own learning as spoken interaction in foreign languages is on an optimum level among students. Furthermore, classroom atmosphere is different from the traditional language environment which is mostly teacher centered. Therefore, the teaching methodology should also be in communicative format. Patiung et al. (2015) shows the positive effect of communicative language teaching method on students' speaking skills. Students are active, communicate with each other and do not hesitate to show their potential to reach their communicative competence.

Pronunciation constitutes the key part to developing the speaking skills. Even the definition of speaking is closely related to it. Years ago, Tarigan (1983) described speaking as "the ability to pronounce the articulation sounds or words to express thoughts, ideas, and feelings" (p.15). Therefore, it cannot be denied the effects of in class speaking activities or speaking tasks for portfolios on students' improvement of speaking skills, more specifically the pronunciation skills.

f) Self-Efficacy: Self efficacy is basically described as learners' emotions or feelings toward their future performances. Because of their feelings or emotions, they create their "judgments" (Bandura, 1981, p.31). The learners who have high level of self-efficacy share some common characteristics which are related to self-confidence and learner autonomy:

1. Learners who have self-efficacy are sure about their future achievements,
2. Always think of one step forward and as soon as complete one step, start to think of the next one,
3. Study to do their best,
4. Believe failure is because of the lack of dedication to learn (Ching, 2002).

Therefore, students who have high level of self-efficacy can make comments about the future. They have plans, aims and points that they want to reach. To reach their aims, they can deal with some difficulties. Self-efficacy is linked with motivation, self-confidence and learner autonomy. Self-efficacy requires using metacognitive skills

in an effective way. Learners make plans about their performances to be successful and apply the best method to reach their aim. Therefore, they need to behave as autonomous learners to direct their learning process.

Moreover, self-efficacy is related to motivation. Students who do not have high self-efficacy tend to be pessimistic about the results of their learning (Pintrich, 1999). They are afraid of being unsuccessful. However, self-efficacious students see the failures or challenges are stimulators for learning. At this point, it can be claimed that self-efficacious students see portfolio assessment as beneficial for their learning process. They have high level of esteem and inner faith to be successful. Therefore, they may see even speaking portfolio tasks which intimidates most of the learners as triggers to gain more. As the speaking in the target language requires confidence, self-efficacious students may not have difficulty in speaking tasks.

Glazer and Brown (1993) summarizes the overall advantages of portfolios:

1. Develop problem solving skills and start to be aware of their strong sides and sides to be improved,
2. Increase the link between the learners and facilitate cooperation and teamwork,
3. Present autonomous learning environment,
4. Learners see their current situation with the help of the self and peer evaluation,
5. Help the learners to observe and link the other fields by using different contexts with the help portfolios,
6. Contribute to learning process. By examining the background and current situation of themselves, learners make plans about their future steps.

2.5.2. Negative Sides of Portfolios

Portfolio assessment is seen as one of the most updated kind of assessments which are based on performance of the learners. They are means of alternative assessment which focus on the process rather than the result. In this way, they are “formative” in nature. However, it is not easy to evaluate portfolio studies by just grading them as in the traditional exams. There may be some problems while evaluating portfolio works such as reliability (subjectivity-objectivity problem), validity (suitability to learning aims), timing (the allocated time to evaluate the

portfolio task/performance/work), other challenges such as memorization in speaking portfolio studies or lack of self confidence in presenting portfolio tasks.

a. Problems about Reliability and Validity: Reliability is the common problem during assessment process. Different scholars made similar definitions about reliability. Basically, reliability is the “consistency of results” when a test is assessed by different people and places. The terms “inter rater “and “intra rater reliability” are used while mentioning reliability problems. Inter rater reliability is being able to get the same results from different scorers while intra rater reliability is getting the similar results in different tasks. To provide both is essential to get a reliable result in assessment. Most of the time, the differences among different scorers “decreases the reliability of judgments unless there is a scoring mechanism designed to guide conversations and interpretations” (Thibodeau, 1999, p.5). At this point, it is possible to mention the necessity of rubrics which are designed to make standardized assessments of portfolio studies. Criteria in different categorizations are determined in rubrics so that scorers will give similar scores to the same task and therefore the assessment process will be reliable. Rubrics are also used to decrease the subjectivity problem. The same criteria are applied to all the learners and it is aimed to get the similar scores. Rubrics are also beneficial for realizing validity.

Validity can be described as the extent learning aims are realized. To label a task as valid requires its suitability to curriculum. Therefore, rubrics help to create validity as well as reliability. Moreover, rubrics “inform stakeholders of what are key concepts in the area, promoting a shared understanding of the instructional and assessment goals of the course and providing credibility to the portfolio” (Ponte, 2000, p.12). However, even though there are rubrics, reliability and validity can continue to be the problems in portfolio assessment. Moreover, peer feedback and evaluation are the part of portfolio assessment process. Fernsten & Fernsten (2005) gives some tips to learners to provide a valid and reliable peer feedback:

1. Learners should feel relaxed and not worry about their peers’ possible negative, comments and they should not hesitate to make a comment about other students’ work,
2. Spare some time in the class for feedback sessions and next steps to be taken,

3. As a teacher, direct the learners to provide a fruitful feedback session and show the processes to the learners and behave like a facilitator.

b. Problems about Time: One of the most challenging problems educators and learners face in portfolio assessment process is time. As portfolio is a performance-based assessment, it takes time for learners and educators in class. Both sides complain about “lack of time” or “limited time” they have. While the learners believe that preparation process for some of the tasks is not enough, the teachers think that portfolio assessment takes more time than classical end of course tests. Feedback sessions also take time. Therefore, it is the duty of teachers to organize the time. Hillmer & Holmes (2007) suggests some methods to overcome problems about time in portfolio assessment:

1. Organizing the times to be shared with the students for feedback,
2. “scheduling regular times” to discuss the parts that are unclear in tasks (p.11),
3. To put the portfolio folders always in class so that learners have a look at them to see their progress and the mistakes and therefore, they can draw some conclusions and do not repeat the same mistake. In this way, the time which is spent for feedback can be decreased to some extent.

c. Some Other Problems Regarding Portfolio Assessment: When all types of portfolios are taken into consideration, the common problem is that they are not standardized tests. Although portfolio assessment shows the overall improvement of a student in a process, it doesn't give a clear-cut evidence which is score based. Therefore, the stakeholders can sometimes have a “tunnel vision” regarding portfolio studies (p.227). They think that standardized exams give more concrete results. In Janish et al.'s study (2007), the learners' comments regarding the views of stakeholders on portfolio studies summarize the common view about portfolio studies: “The system as we currently see it is berserk over numbers! This is the biggest drawback. At the schools where I work, the administration is so totally focused on the new state test that they have tunnel vision” (Janish et al., 2007).

Moreover, based on the portfolio types, the difficulties the learners face can change. Most of the language learners may have problems in speaking. Although they are successful in paper pencil tests, they may have stage fright and self-confidence

problems in speaking portfolio tasks. This situation may stem from the fact that their peers also watch their performance (Zhanibek, 2001).

Dealing with all these problems might be challenging for teachers and administrators. Therefore, portfolio-based language assessment might be less favorable among educators. However, the positive sides of portfolio assessments such as facilitating learner autonomy, giving an opportunity for self-assessment, contributions on self-confidence, self-efficacy and productive skills and presenting a peer learning environment seem to prevail the negative effects.

2.6. Portfolio Assessment Within the Scope of CEFR

CEFR is the term which is mostly heard in foreign language education on higher education level. Although its roots date back to 1990s, its latest forms were shaped in 2001. Basically it is possible to define CEFR as “a common standard for language teaching”. (Council of Europe 2001a, 2001b, stated in Little 2001, p.39) In parallel with the changes in the teaching methods which are mostly communicative, taking the students at the center of learning environment and proposing dynamic learning environments, CEFR created the 21st century’s teaching standard. CEFR categorized and “labeled” the current situation of learners by categorizing them “six different levels” according to the proficiency of learners in the target language (Figueras, 2012, p.478). CEFR focused on the receptive and productive skills by not underestimating any of them. Students’ needs were taken into consideration and student-centered teaching methods became favorable. Therefore, the teacher centered nature of assessment which are mostly traditional tests also turns into more authentic and alternative forms of assessments.

CEFR holds some features which are on international basis:

1. The multicultural aspect of Europe ought to be a facilitator for the learners to learn more about different humanities.
2. It is better to know different cultures and learn different languages to provide a multicultural voice and interaction and sharing a common worldview shaping with humanistic understanding.
3. It is crucial for countries to adopt CEFR so that they follow a standard in teaching and learning.

Performance-based assessment is given importance in CEFR based learning environment. Portfolio based assessment is at the center of performance-based assessments. They are good assessment tools to diagnose the level of students in different phases. CEFR asks the learners to be responsible for all the skills. Hence, speaking skill is not undermined in CEFR based assessment process. In portfolio studies, different tasks which assesses different skills are assigned to the students. Speaking skill as the most necessary skill to communicate in the target language is given importance in CEFR context. Moreover, CEFR based “can do statements” contribute the learners to monitor their own progress at the end of each unit or speaking task (Council of Europe, 2001).

2.7. Portfolio Types

The aim of the portfolios can show difference (Gülbahar & Köse, 2006). Therefore, it is not surprising to see various kinds of portfolios which focus on different language skills. Most of the language portfolios include the written work of the learners, therefore they aim at improving writing skills. There are also electronic portfolios which the learners’ speaking skills on a technology-based environments and oral portfolios which include the video and audio recordings of learners’ performance inside or outside the class.

2.7.1. Speaking Based Electronic Portfolios

The development of technology has affected the language teaching and assessment methods during the recent years. As it is generally observed, portfolio-based language assessment is at the center of language teaching specialists.

Electronic portfolios are suitable to be used in colleges as they are among the most useful technology-based instruments in education (Rhodes, 2011). Electronic portfolios might be in the form of individual or group work. The learners can be expected to present their ideas about a given topic or pair, group work discussions may be recorded in audio or video recording format and transmitted to CDs or memory sticks, put in portfolio folder and delivered the instructors to be assessed. They can be presented in class by reflecting on the smartboards.

Electronic portfolios give the learners an opportunity to monitor their improvement as they can watch their works which were videotaped, see their mistakes

and make judgments about their own performances. Moreover, compared to in-class oral presentations, the learners feel more relaxed while video recording their performances out of the formal class setting (Huang & Hung, 2009). Also, the instructors can check the performance and progress of the learners whenever they want (Christianson et al., 2009). Therefore, e-portfolios give practicality in assessment (Pellegrino & Quellmalz, 2010).

Luyegu (2009) summarizes the advantages of electronic portfolios:

1. Electronic portfolios are good illustrators of learning path and development.
2. Electronic portfolios are good instruments to show the current situation of learners.
3. Electronic portfolios help the learners to develop their organizational skills as they are active in organizing their portfolios, select the best works that portray their actual level.
4. They are beneficial for self-assessment, teacher assessment and giving feedback (Luyegu, 2009).

Moreover, Gatlin and Jacob (2002) lists the benefits of portfolios as portraying the constant level of the learners, showing a full image of the tendencies and talents of the learners, portraying the skills of technology and movability.

On the other hand, electronic portfolios may contain some drawbacks as most of the performance-based assessment types may have. Technological developments directly affect the nature and application of electronic portfolios. Therefore, they are not stable and open to the innovations which cause the learners and instructors to learn progressively. This is time consuming for both sides (Hawisher and Self, 1997). Apart from the time, some technical problems may be encountered by learners and instructors during preparation and presentation process. Therefore, the necessary trainings may be given to the learners and teachers as assessors should be open to the unexpected problems regarding technology.

2.8. Studies about Speaking Portfolios

Padilla et al.'s study (1996) focuses on the use of portfolios in language classrooms. The instructors who teach Chinese, Korean, Japanese and Russian languages tried to reach a consensus regarding the effective implementation of portfolios in their language classes. In the study, writing and speaking portfolio tasks were

emphasized and the positive sides of portfolios and some difficulties which may be encountered were mentioned. The results indicated that portfolios should be designed by taking the aims of the portfolios and the curriculum into consideration. During the last part, some suggestions were made so that the teachers could provide an effective implementation of portfolio assessment. About speaking portfolios, these suggestions included the solutions to common problems in speaking portfolio implementation process:

1. The oral production of the learners should be video recorded. “Spontaneous speech” is important. Therefore, learners’ in class performances which do not necessarily require preparation should be video recorded to put into portfolio folders.
2. To prevent any misunderstandings in video recording oral portfolios, the learners should “introduce themselves” at the beginning of their speech/presentation/pair work discussion.
3. In video-recorded discussions, the number of participants is important. There should be no more than two students in one group so that equal distribution of roles is provided.
4. Time limit in oral portfolio works depends on the module of the learners. For instance, the learners in elementary levels should not be asked to present a five minutes’ speech as intermediate students are asked.
5. Teachers should give video recorded speech assignments and they should increase the difficulty and length of the assignments gradually (p.437-438).

As speaking portfolio assignments cover individual or groupwork presentations which are either in video format or form as in class presentations, it may not be inappropriate to mention the studies about oral portfolios in the literature. In King’s study (2002) some common challenges about speaking presentations such as “anxiety, boredom and lack of presentation skills” and possible solutions were investigated (p.401). King stated that if the presentation had lack of things that draw their attention and students just “memorize” and “recite” during presentation, the rest of the class did not feel curious about the rest of the presentation. Moreover, it was concluded that using gestures and body language also played a role in drawing the attention of learners. However, this may not be possible with anxious presenters. In this study, the

solution is convincing to the learners that as long as controlling the amount of anxiety level, it doesn't harm to the learners.

More recently, Chen (2015) conducted a study about the effects of anxiety levels in the language classes on learners' speaking performances. He carried out an extensive research including the views of learners by implementing them questionnaires before the performances, also interviews with learners after the performances, reflections of instructors and lastly some notes of the researcher to understand the strategies the learners use to overcome stress before performances. The results showed some interesting data about the reactions to speaking performance and the language anxiety. Although almost all the participants stated that they became nervous before the speaking performances, they did not affect all of them in the same way. For instance, learners who were less nervous than their peers before the presentations, did not necessarily got the higher points. That information showed the other variables which affect the performance of the learners in language classes. Moreover, it was claimed that "proficiency" in language did not correlate with language anxiety and learners should choose a correct method to overcome anxiety while instructors supported them. However, above all, the fact that peer feedback is among the most effective ways to overcome anxiety problems during speaking portfolio assessment was emphasized as a solution. Similarly, Wang and Chang (2011), examined the effects of peer feedback on the anxiety level of the learners. The participants observed the other students' speaking performances and gave feedback. At the end of the study, most of the learners benefited from the speaking performances. Based on their observations, they made the necessary corrections in their speaking portfolio work.

Speaking portfolios can improve the self and peer assessment skills of the learners. Patri (2002) conducted a study regarding self and peer assessments of learners after speaking presentations. This study may give clues about speaking based portfolio assessment. In the study, 56 students were divided as control and experimental groups and while in experimental group peer feedback was given shortly after the oral presentations were made by using criteria which was set before, in control group no peer feedback was given. When the learners were informed about the criteria, their feedback was like feedback of their instructors'. The results may give clues about the importance of criteria or rubrics in speaking based portfolio assessment. Moreover, Chang & Tseng

(2011)'s study may show the positive effects of speaking assessment in portfolio format on learners' self-monitoring and assessment skills. In his study, 60 university students who were English learners were separated as control and experimental groups and while students in experimental groups were given their speaking records including all the videos of speaking performances since the beginning of the term, in control group no videos were given. Before and after these processes, pre and posttest were applied to both groups. The results indicated that the students in the experimental group had opportunity for making a self-assessment of their speaking skills with the help of watching their videos of speaking performances. Similarly, Wang & Chang (2011) investigated the effect of self-assessment on learners' speaking skills. 60 students were separated as control and experimental groups. The results indicated that the students who were able to watch their video recorded performances performed better in the following tests.

Speaking portfolios may also contribute to learners' speaking skills and learner autonomy. In Efthymiou (2012)'s study, the participants consisted of primary school students and their views regarding to speaking portfolios were generally positive. Most of the participants found the speaking portfolio tasks as not boring and they thought they were good ways of monitoring their development. Moreover, they claimed that speaking tasks improved their speaking skills and helped them organizing their learning process to be independent learners. Also, most of the learners were satisfied with the oral portfolios and asked them to be a natural part of their learning environment and to be repeated periodically.

What is more, Castañeda and Rodríguez-González (2011) made a study about electronic oral portfolios. In their study, the learners video recorded their speeches and they were asked to give feedback of their performances. The results showed that most of the participants were satisfied with the positive effects of electronic portfolios on their speaking performance. Moreover, they asserted that evaluating their own performances contributed to their self-assessment skills.

In Daphni (2012)'s study, 22 English language teachers and 16 students answered the questions about speaking portfolios in a questionnaire. Also, 18 students' self-reflections about speaking portfolio assignments were taken. The self-reflection papers which were delivered after each speaking portfolio tasks portrayed the impressions of the learners about each task. Moreover, students' interviews revealed

that most of the learners believed in the positive impacts of speaking portfolio assignments on learners' motivation, autonomy skills and communication. Moreover, they liked performing out of classroom environment in video-recording tasks. They favored portfolio assessment as opposed to standardized tests. Teachers' ideas were in parallel with the students. They stated that learners became more active and engaged inside and outside the class with the help of speaking portfolio assignments.

Bolliger & Shephard (2010)'s study examined the functionality of electronic portfolios in language classes. A questionnaire was applied on some randomly selected learners and the results showed that most of the learners believed electronic portfolios were good tools to facilitate the interaction in classroom. Moreover, they maintained that electronic portfolios increased their motivation to learn. However, there were still some criticism regarding electronic portfolios as it was a long process to create an appropriate web-based environment which fits well with the curriculum.

In a nutshell, the studies about speaking portfolios have portrayed the contributions of them on learners in many ways. Yet, there aren't enough studies which demonstrate positive and negative sides of speaking portfolios in detail.

2.9. Conclusion

Portfolios as means of alternative assessment are popular in today's learner-based language teaching environments. Portfolios have an important role in developing the autonomy, self-confidence, self-assessment and monitoring skills of learners although they include some problems. Speaking portfolios emphasize the progress in speaking skills, learner autonomy, self-assessment and evaluation skills, and increase the motivation level of learners. Most of the studies regarding speaking portfolios portrayed the positive effects of oral portfolios on the sides mentioned above. However, it is possible to mention some challenges during the implementation process and some studies which do not give the similar results with the other ones.

In this chapter, the theoretical background of the portfolio-based assessment, assessment types, benefits and negative sides of the portfolios, portfolio assessment within the scope of CEFR, speaking as a language skill, speaking based portfolio assessment and lastly relevant studies about speaking portfolio assessment were examined by using the relevant literature. In the following chapter, the research

questions will be shown which includes participants, instruments, setting, and data acquisition process.



3. CHAPTER THREE: Methodology

In this chapter, detailed information about setting, participants who attended the study, instruments which were used to collect data, and the methods which were used to analyze the data, data analysis and findings of the study will be presented.

3.1. Setting

The study was conducted on 289 participants who were on beginner, pre-intermediate and intermediate levels and 6 instructors who taught English to different levels of learners at Karabuk University Foreign Language Education Department. There is a module system at Karabuk University School of Foreign Languages and in a school year, there are 4 modules and each module lasts for 10 weeks. Modules are categorized as D, C and B groups. For almost all groups, excluding English language and literature department students, for whom, B1 + is obligatory, passing level B is compulsory to be able to study at their departments. B1+ is optional for the students other than English language and literature department.

In Karabuk University School of Foreign Languages Department, portfolio studies are divided as writing and speaking portfolio and, in each module, 3 tasks are compulsory to be put in speaking portfolio folder. Speaking portfolio tasks consist of 10% of the overall grade. Furthermore, each speaking portfolio tasks task has objectives. While students use the necessary grammatical pattern, they gain talents such as speaking in front of audience, getting basic speaking skills, using gestures body language, and eye contact. Speaking portfolio information packs are given to the instructors at least one week before the deadline of the tasks and they are responsible for assigning the tasks and giving the necessary information about them. Speaking portfolio tasks are appropriate to the level of students. For instance, in d groups, the first speaking portfolio task is describing family in class for 2-3 minutes by using the suitable grammar pattern (possessive adjectives) while for b groups, first speaking portfolio task is discussing a given topic with a partner and video recording it. Role playing in class (c groups), video recording of a role play (d groups), book review as a form of presentation (b groups) and individual oral presentations about a given topic in class are other speaking portfolio tasks that are assigned in a module.

Two speaking tasks are graded out of 30 points and one of them is graded out of 40 points. Grading is based on a rubric. Criteria are categorized as overall performance, vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation and fluency and each of them are subdivided. Eye contact, gestures, mimes, intonation, presentation of the material are also taken into consideration while grading the tasks. For group role play or video recording as a pair, equal participation and length of a role play are important as well. To put it briefly, grading is trying to be standardized with the help of these criteria. What is more, each student's speaking portfolio task is recorded in a video format in case there may be any objection to the grade. And they are put in portfolio folder at the end of the module.

This study was administered during 2017-2018 academic year. 60 students' views regarding to speaking portfolio tasks were taken before and after each task with some open-ended questions during the first module. Students were randomly selected from different modules (only elementary, pre-intermediate and intermediate students) and asked to answer questions regarding the speaking portfolio tasks. The questions which were asked before and after the tasks were different. During the second module, a survey was applied on 289 randomly selected students who are on the 3 different modules via Google form format. The surveys were applied on the students by sending them a link to their mobile phones in classroom environment. The questions were categorized into different subheadings which were focused on different aspects. Lastly, during the last module, 5 randomly selected students and 6 voluntary instructors were interviewed.

3.2. Participants

Although there are 4 different modules in an academic year at Karabuk University School of Foreign Languages, only students from 3 different modules were included in the study. The participants were elementary, pre-intermediate and intermediate level students. The reason of not including upper intermediate students in the study is that there are limited number of students on B1+ level. Therefore, it is thought that they will not give meaningful data for the study.

In September, October and November, sheets of papers which had different questions were delivered to 60 students who were randomly selected and agreed to give answers to the questions in the written format. 20 students from 3 different levels

were interviewed before and after each task during the first module. The questions were about the preparation process for the speaking portfolio tasks. Students' views about speaking portfolio assignments before the tasks and reactions of them after the speaking portfolio assignments tasks were taken. In November, a survey was carried out with a pilot group consisting of 20 students, the researcher did not come across any problems, therefore she did not change any parts in the survey. The participants filled in the consent form prepared by the researcher to show the voluntary participation. Moreover, in December, a survey which was formed in the form of Likert scale questionnaire was administered to 289 students who were in different modules, genders and departments. 36 questions were asked, and the data was analyzed via SPSS program. Furthermore, 5 randomly selected students who were in different modules were interviewed at the end of April. The questions were parallel to Likert type survey but in the form of open-ended questions because the students were asked to express themselves in a more detailed way. Lastly, the views of the instructors were taken via interviews in June. As the instructors took active part during the speaking portfolio implementation process, interviews were made with 6 voluntary instructors who had 4 to 15 years foreign language teaching experience. All of them graduated from prominent universities in Turkey. One of the instructors had Celta teaching certificate and two of them were the level coordinators.

The table below shows the number of participants, and the timeline of the data collection methods.

Table 1: The Number of Participants and Data Collection Methods

The Number of Participants	Data Collection Methods	Dates
60	Students' Self Reflection	September, October, November
289	Likert type questionnaire	December
5	Student interviews	April
6	Instructor interviews	June

The table below shows the frequency and percent distributions of demographic characteristics of the participants.

Table 2: Frequency and Percent Distributions of Demographic Characteristics of the Students Included in the Survey (n = 289)

Variables	Groups	f	%
Gender	Female	94	32,5
	Male	195	67,5
Age	≥18	128	44,3
	19	81	28,0
	20	44	15,2
	≥21	36	12,5
Module	A1	134	46,4
	A2	81	28,0
	B1	74	25,6
Department	Electrical Engineering	49	17,0
	Automotive Engineering	29	10,0
	English Language Literature	58	20,1
	Computer Engineering	26	9,0
	Biomedical Engineering	20	6,9
	Mechanical Engineering	29	10,0
	Applied English/Translation	34	11,8
	Others	44	15,2

According to the distribution in Table 2, 32.5% (f = 94) of the 289 students within the scope of the study are female and 67.5% (f = 195) are male. When the distribution of the students according to their ages are examined, it is found that 44.3% (f=128) of them are either 18 or under 18 years old, 28% (f=81) of the students are 19 years old, 15.2% (f=44) of them are 20, 12,5% (f=36) of them are above 21. 46.4% (f = 134) of the students included in the survey is in A1 module, 28.0% (f = 81) is in A2 and 25.6% (f = 74) is in B1 module. When the collected data for the sections where the students have studied are examined; respectively 17.0% (f = 49) of the students study at electrical and electronical engineering department, 10.0% (f = 29) at automotive engineering, 20.1% (f = 58) at English language and literature, 9.0% (f = 26) at computer engineering, 6.9% (f = 20) at biomedical engineering, 10.0% (f = 29) at mechanical engineering and 11.8% (f = 34) at applied English and translation, and finally 11.8% (f = 34) get educated in the departments called as “other” (Mechatronic Engineering, Medical Engineering, Rail Systems Engineering, Industrial Engineering, Industrial Product Design).

3.3. Instruments

3.3.1. Likert Type Questionnaire

A Likert type questionnaire, adapted from the self-efficacy questionnaire of Pintrich and De Groot (1990), a learner autonomy questionnaire enhanced by Egel (2003) and a questionnaire developed by Özdemir Çağatay (2012) were administered to 289 students from different genders and modules. In December, the Likert type questionnaire prepared in google form was turned into a link. The link was sent to students' mobile phones with the help of different instructors. The researcher had 289 students from A1, A2 and B1 levels do the interview in the classroom environment. The instructors mentored the students while they responded the questions. The classes in which the questionnaires applied were randomly selected because "the random selection of individuals in large numbers gives a reasonable assurance that the sample represents the population accurately" (Sapsford & Jupp, 1996, p.103). The questionnaire was intended to be applied on the equal or close number of students so that the number of the students on one level would not predominate the ones in the other groups. The gathered data were analyzed by using "SPSS 23 for Windows" package program. The reliability and validity of the questionnaire were assured.

The questionnaires are composed of demographic information (age and gender) of the students, the departments, and the level. Totally 31 questions were divided into subcategories (speaking skills, learner autonomy, self-confidence, self-efficacy, challenges) and presented as Likert type items.

3.3.2. Interviews

Sometimes it is not possible for the people who participate in the study to answer questions in the survey enthusiastically, but they can be eager to answer the questions in interviewing process and feel more relaxed. This situation can depend on the way the questions are asked and the attitudes of the researcher. To provide a more suitable environment for data collection, and to see the gestures, mimics of the people and understand the reactions of the participants, a sample group was chosen to be interviewed. That group consisted of 6 instructors, who have years of ELT background and experience and 5 students who were in different modules and departments.

Students and instructors who were volunteer to be interviewed were included in the study. The interview questions were organized in parallel to the survey questions. The primary aim of the researcher was to take the views of students and instructors about the implementation of speaking portfolio tasks. Therefore, the researcher stated that students and instructors could make free comments on speaking portfolio tasks and give true feelings about them before the interviews as their names would stay anonymous in the study. The participants did not always adhere to interview questions and while giving examples about their experience, sometimes they answered the following questions, but the researcher did not interfere during these times as that situation contributed to the study in terms of having a broader look at the topic. Before asking the questions about portfolio implementation, interviewers asked questions about teaching experience and area of specialization were asked. Then, questions continued about the positive and negative sides of portfolios, general views toward speaking portfolios tasks, and the relations of speaking portfolio tasks with some subheadings. Lastly, some suggestions to make the portfolio implementation more effective were asked to the interviewees.

3.3.3. Students' Self Reflection Questionnaire

At the beginning of the academic year, the views of the learners regarding speaking portfolio tasks were taken by giving the randomly selected students a sheet of paper to get their ideas about speaking portfolio assignments at the first sight. The learners responded the questions in classroom environment so that there could be a formal setting which would affect the attitude of them. Moreover, after each speaking task, the same process continued by giving some reflective questions. The first questionnaire included 6 open ended questions about evaluation of speaking portfolio assessment and the preparation process while the second questionnaire was aimed to get the reflections of the students after speaking portfolios tasks were performed.

3.4. Data Acquisition Process

Firstly, administration was informed about the study and necessary permissions were obtained before the study was carried out in preparatory department.

At the beginning of academic year, (in September) as most students had no prior knowledge about speaking portfolio, after the first speaking portfolio task was assigned, a template including some questions about speaking portfolio assignments were given to get their first impressions of the participants in the pilot group. Pilot group consisted of intermediate level students and they were asked to answer some questions about positive and negative sides of the portfolios, students were also asked to write what they did each day during the preparation process. This part could be thought as journal as students were supposed to write what they did for speaking portfolio assignments on each day while getting prepared for the assignment. The same process was repeated after they presented their first speaking portfolio tasks. Their reactions and suggestions were taken before and after the speaking portfolio tasks, the same process was repeated with the students on beginner and pre-intermediate level students.

In December, a pilot group consisting of 20 students was chosen and a Likert type questionnaire was applied on the pilot group. After successful implementation of the questionnaire, students from different modules who were going to study at different departments were included in the survey. Total of 289 students were surveyed in different classes during two weeks in December.

In April, 5 students who were volunteer to be interviewed were included in the study. The interviews were tape recorded and the names of the students were kept as anonymous. The students were from different modules. The language of the interview was Turkish as the students would express themselves better. They were informed that participating this study was based on voluntariness and they could finish the interview whenever they wanted.

In June, at the end of spring term, 6 instructors were interviewed. The interviews were tape recorded and the instructors were asked some questions about the speaking portfolio tasks which were carried out at the preparatory department they worked. The questions were different from the ones applied on the students, but they were in parallel with them. The instructors also informed that they were free not to answer any question they did not want to talk about.

3.5. Data Analysis Methods

In this study, two different types of data collection methods were used to get quantitative and qualitative data. The data obtained from the questionnaire were analyzed using the "SPSS 23 for Windows" package program. Frequency analysis, arithmetic means, standard deviation and some parametric tests to measure the correlation among different subheadings were applied during data analysis process. All these processes will be discussed in the following part in detail. Moreover, a thematic analysis was used to analyze qualitative data which was gathered from self-reflection questionnaire and interviews.

3.6. Data Analysis

This part of the study examines the data analysis process of the questionnaire and interviews. It demonstrates the findings and the implications.

3.6.1. The Model of the Research

The present study is descriptive in nature. Descriptive studies seek answers to "what" and "what is happening" (Ural and Kılıç, 2006). In other words, descriptive studies are aimed at determining a situation and investigating the current situation in a given context (İftar, 1999).

Based on the research questions, following hypotheses were formulated to achieve the purpose of the research.

H₁: There is a significant difference between speaking portfolio assignments and gender of the students.

- **H₁₋₁**: There is a significant difference between the gender of the students and students' "learner autonomy" skills.
- **H₁₋₂**: There is a significant difference between the gender of the students and students' "skill development" skills.
- **H₁₋₃**: There is a significant difference between the gender of the students and students' "self-confidence" skills.
- **H₁₋₄**: There is a significant difference between the gender of the students and "challenge" dimension.
- **H₁₋₅**: There is a significant difference between the gender of the students and students' "self-efficacy" skills.

- **H₂**: There is a significant difference among speaking portfolio assignments, sub dimensions and the age of the students.
 - **H_{2.1}**: There is a significant difference between the age of the students and students' "learner autonomy" skills.
 - **H_{2.2}**: There is a significant difference between the age of the students and students' skill development skills.
 - **H_{2.3}**: There is a significant difference between the age of the students and students' "self-confidence" skills.
 - **H_{2.4}**: There is a significant difference between the age of the students and "challenge" dimension.
 - **H_{2.5}**: There is a significant difference between the age of the students and students' "self-efficacy" skills.
- **H₃**: There is a significant difference among the departments which the students study and the speaking portfolio assignments and subdimensions of them.
 - **H_{3.1}**: There is a significant difference between the departments which the students study and students' learner autonomy skills.
 - **H_{3.2}**: There is a significant difference between the departments which the students study and students' "skill development" skills.
 - **H_{3.3}**: There is a significant difference between the departments which the students study and students' "self-confidence" skills.
 - **H_{3.4}**: There is a significant difference between the departments which the students study and "challenge" dimension.
 - **H_{3.5}**: There is a significant difference between the departments which the students study and students' "self-efficacy" skills.
- **H₄**: There is a significant difference among speaking portfolio assignments, subdimensions, and the modules which the students study.
 - **H_{4.1}**: There is a significant difference between the modules which the students study and students' "learner autonomy" skills.
 - **H_{4.2}**: There is a significant difference between the modules which the students study and students' "skill development" skills.
 - **H_{4.3}**: There is a significant difference between the modules which the students study and students' "self-confidence" skills.

- **H_{4.4}**: There is a significant difference between the modules which the students study and “challenge” dimension.
- **H_{4.5}**: There is a significant difference between the modules which the students study and students’ “self-efficacy” skills.
- **H₅**: There is a significant correlation between the basic variables of speaking portfolio assignments and all sub-dimensions.
 - **H_{5.1}**: There is a positive correlation between speaking portfolio assignments and students' self-confidence "skills.
 - **H_{5.2}**: There is a positive correlation between the speaking portfolio assignments and the "learner autonomy" skills of the students.
 - **H_{5.3}**: There is a positive correlation between speaking portfolio assignments and the "self-efficacy" level of the students.
 - **H_{5.4}**: There is a positive correlation between the "skill development" and the "learner autonomy" skills of the students.
 - **H_{5.5}**: There is a positive correlation between the "self-confidence" dimension of the students and the "learner autonomy" skills.
 - **H_{5.6}**: There is a positive correlation between the "self-efficacy" dimension of the students and the "learner autonomy" skills.

3.6.2. Data Analysis Process

The quantitative data obtained from the questionnaire were analyzed using the "SPSS 23 for Windows" package program.

In the process of quantitative data analysis, survey questions were divided into subcategories which were mentioned in literature review part (learner autonomy, speaking skills, self-confidence, self-efficacy etc.).

In this framework, frequency analysis was conducted in the first stage to determine the demographic and descriptive information of the participants. In the second phase of the study, arithmetic mean and standard deviation values of the expressions related to the scales were analyzed. In studies, to provide 95% confidence level, parametric test are used in the comparison of quantitative variables among themselves and with other groups As is known, the pre-requisites to use parametric tests are as follows: “Quantitative data, normal distribution, homogeneity, random

sample selection, independence of the samples and sample size have to be at least 30 and over” (Ural & Kılıc, 2013, p.81).

In the third phase of the study, related tests were performed on the normal distribution of the data (Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test). The results showed that p values were less than 0.05. Moreover, when the values of Skewness and Kurtosis of the data were examined, it was found that the values were not between +1.50 and -1.50 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Therefore, non-parametric tests were used because parametric test conditions were not met. In this framework, The Mann-Whitney U Test was used to compare two independent groups and to achieve the purpose of research the Kruskal-Wallis H Test was used to compare more than two independent groups. In the fourth phase of the study, to determine the relationship between variables Spearman's rho correlation test, which is not parametric, was applied. In this context, the level of the relationship between the variables is characterized as “very weak” if the correlation coefficient is in the range of 0.00-0.25, “very weak” for 0.26-0.49, “weak”, for “0.50-0.69 “medium” for 70-0.89 “high” and “very high” for 0.90-1.00. Spearman's rho correlation is also between -1 and +1, like the Person correlation coefficient. “As the correlation coefficient approaches +1, it is mentioned that there is a strong positive correlation between the variables and when the correlation coefficient approaches -1, there is a strong negative correlation” (Nakip, 2016, p.75).

In addition to quantitative data which were collected by questionnaires, interviews which were made with students and instructors were included in data analysis process and all them were audio recorded. Interviews were made in participants’ native language so that all the questions could be comprehended easily. Also, participants were supposed to express themselves easily in their native languages. After that process, audio recordings were transcribed. A sample interview both in Turkish and English might be found in Appendix 6 and Appendix 7. Moreover, a self-reflection questionnaire before and after each speaking task was implemented on the students. Thematic analysis was used to analyze qualitative data (Tuckett, 2005). The data was coded based on the subheadings of the Likert type questionnaire.

3.7. Findings of the Research

In this part of the research, the reliability of the scale, the demographic and descriptive characteristics of the participants, the arithmetic meanings of the

explanatory scale and dimensions, whether the basic variables and sub-dimensions of the speaking portfolio assignments of the participants show significant difference in relation to the personal and descriptive information are mentioned.



3.7.1. Findings about Validity and Reliability of the Scale

After the questionnaire was answered, the reliability of the statements related to the basic variables and sub-dimensions of the speaking portfolio assignments in the questionnaire was measured by the "Cronbach Alpha" method. Cronbach Alpha is a value that determines whether the expressions used on the scale express a whole that shows a homogeneous structure (Kalayci, 2010). Within this scope, Table 3 shows the reliability analyses of Karabuk University preparatory school students' views regarding the basic variables and subscales of the speaking portfolio assignments used in language learning.

Table 3: Findings of Reliability Analysis

	Number of questions	Reliability Coefficient (α)
Speaking Portfolio Assessment	36 items	0.962
Learner Autonomy	8 items	0.913
Skill Development	12 items	0.969
Self Confidence	5 items	0.927
Challenges	6 items	0.899
Self-Efficacy	5 items	0.894

According to the analysis results in Table 3; the reliability results of the scale used to determine the perspective of the students on the basic variables and sub-dimensions of speaking portfolio tasks used in language learning show that the scale is highly reliable with $\alpha = 0,962$. According to Cronbach's Alpha coefficients, reliability of the scale is higher than $\alpha = 0.70$ (Kayış, 2009).

3.7.2. Findings of Descriptive Information

Table 4 presents the values of the frequency and percentage distributions for the demographic characteristics (gender and age) and the descriptive information (the departments and the modules which the students study) of the students included in the survey.

Table 4: Frequency and Percent Distribution of the Demographic Characteristics of the Students Included in the Study (n = 289)

Variables	Groups	f	%
Gender	Female	94	32.5
	Male	195	67.5
Age	18 and below	128	44.3
	19	81	28.0
	20	44	15.2
	21 and above	36	12.5
Module	A1	134	46.4
	A2	81	28.0
	B1	74	25.6
Department	Electrical Engineering	49	17.0
	Automotive Engineering	29	10.0
	English Language and Literature	58	20.1
	Computer Engineering	26	9.0
	Biomedical Engineering	20	6.9
	Machine Engineering	29	10.0
	Applied English and Translation	34	11.8
	Others	44	15.2

According to the distribution in Table 4, 32.5% (f=94) of the 289 students included in the study are female and 67.5% (f=195) of the students are male. When the distribution of the students according to their ages are examined, it is found out that 44.3% of the students are (f=128) 18 and below, 28.0% (f=81) of the students are 19, 15.2% (f =44) of the students are 20 and lastly, %12.5 (f=36) of the students are 21 years old and over. 46.4% (f=134) of the students included in the survey are in A1 module, 28.0% (f=81) of the students are in A2 and 25.6% (f=74) of the students are in B1 module. When the collected data for the departments which the students have studied are examined; 17.0% (f=49) of them study at electrical engineering department, 10,0% (f=29) of them study at automotive engineering, 20.1% (f=58) of the study at English language and literature, 9.0% (f=26) of them study at computer engineering, 6.9% (f=20) study at biomedical engineering, 10.0% (f=29) of them study at mechanical engineering and 11.8% of them study at (f=34) applied English and translation , and finally 11.8% (f=34) of study at the departments called as “other”

(mechatronic engineering, biomedical engineering, railway systems engineering, industrial engineering, industrial product design).

The findings of qualitative and quantitative data gathered from questionnaire and student interviews can be found in the first phase of the findings in different subcategories: learner autonomy, speaking skills, self-confidence, self-efficacy and challenges. Results from student interviews can be found immediately after the findings of questionnaire related to each subcategory. In the second phase of the findings, instructors' interviews related to each category were interpreted.

3.7.3. Findings about Basic Variables on Speaking Portfolio Assignments

In this part of the study, participants' findings on frequency distributions, arithmetic mean, and standard deviation values of responses to basic variables related to speaking portfolio assignments were included. In this context, in Table 5, the mean, standard deviations and levels of participation of the respondents are given for the "learner autonomy" dimension, which is the sub-dimension of the basic variables related to speaking portfolio assignments.

Table 5: Findings Regarding Learner Autonomy

	Frequency Level					M	s. d.
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)		
I believe in myself to do best in speaking portfolio assignments.	f 28	43	67	115	36	3,30	1,16
	% 9,7	14,9	23,2	39,8	12,5		
I anticipate doing better than the other students in class in speaking portfolio assignments.	f 32	45	80	98	34	3,20	1,17
	% 11,1	15,6	27,7	33,9	11,8		
I can comprehend the instructions about the speaking portfolio assignments without any help or more teacher guidance.	f 34	49	70	91	45	3,22	1,24
	% 11,8	17,0	24,2	31,5	15,6		
Compared to the other students in the class, I am better at using the oral production patterns that are taught in the class.	f 33	58	103	60	35	3,02	1,16
	% 11,4	20,1	35,6	20,8	12,1		
I can handle the problems while preparing for the speaking portfolio task.	f 29	30	52	114	64	3,53	1,22
	% 10,0	10,4	18,0	39,4	22,1		
I am the decision maker during the process of speaking portfolio preparation.	f 35	30	60	112	52	3,40	1,24
	% 12,1	10,4	20,8	38,8	18,0		
Despite the misunderstandings or unclear points in assigning the speaking portfolio tasks, I am able to comprehend by myself.	f 38	43	76	94	38	3,18	1,22
	% 13,1	14,9	26,3	32,5	13,1		
I am the only responsible person about the any misunderstood points parts about speaking portfolio tasks.	f 69	64	64	62	30	2,72	1,32
	% 23,9	22,1	22,1	21,5	10,4		
GENEL						3,20	0,961

(1): Strongly Disagree, (2): Disagree, (3): Undecided, (4): Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

In Table 5, when the arithmetic average values are examined, it is detected that the general average value of this dimension corresponds to the "undecided" option (M= 3, 20). This value indicates that the students have a moderate attitude towards the learner autonomy dimension. The participants agreed moderately to the statement "I believe in myself that I will do my best in speaking portfolio assignments." with the average of M=3, 30. About the learner autonomy dimension, participants with M = 2.72 average value stated that the only responsible person for the points that were misunderstood in speaking portfolio assignments were not themselves. After the first two speaking portfolio assignments were set, most of the intermediate level students thought while preparing their tasks, they learnt to organize dialogue/speech /opinions. They took responsibility for their learning to some extent and admitted their mistakes about pronunciation, content etc. However, they sometimes criticized the module system, the topic, and the length of the presentations and did not take the whole responsibility for their failures or mistakes. The quantitative data obtained from questionnaire and the qualitative data of the students' ideas before and after the tasks might show that students are eager to present something in English. However, they are not sure about deciding the reason of their mistakes. Sometimes, they tend to find something or someone to accuse (system, administration, topic etc.).

When it comes to interviews with the students which were applied in April, their answers regarding to learner autonomy vary according to the level they study.

Interviewer: (Question 5) In what ways do speaking portfolio tasks contribute you to be responsible of your own learning? Do you need help while getting prepared for the task?

I am an elementary level (A1) student. When I get prepared for speaking portfolio tasks, I need to get help from my friends especially from the ones who are on upper levels. I have difficulty in getting prepared for the task on my own (Student 1-A1 level).

(...) We have to study a lot while planning and organizing speaking portfolio tasks during preparation process. For sure, our teachers guide us during this process, but we are responsible for the task that we must prepare. But on this level, I think we are expected a lot; therefore, we need to study more and more. Sometimes I don't have any idea about what we are going to do or what we are expected to do. So, I can say that speaking portfolio tasks can sometimes turn into nightmares for me.

During the interviews, upper level students agreed on the contributions of speaking portfolio tasks on their learner autonomy with these sentences:

(...) Even though I sometimes have difficulty in getting prepared for the task, when I compare the same process with A1 level, I have a grasp of speaking portfolio tasks better. Also, when we have difficulty in understanding the topic, organizing our speeches or the arranging the time of our presentations, we can ask our instructors during office hours. So, I can say that I take initiative for solving the problems by myself during speaking portfolio task preparation process (Student 2- A2 level).

(...) I try to prepare the script of my speaking portfolio task on my own so that I can learn better. I don't have problems, or I don't need much help during preparation.

When the suggestion of the students is compared with the ones who are on lower levels, it is possible to conclude that the positive effects of speaking portfolio tasks on the autonomy of the students can be seen better on the students who are on upper levels. Also, the students who are on upper levels can compare their current situation in speaking with their past. Therefore, they seemed to be aware of their developmental process with the help of speaking portfolio tasks.

One student from B1 level mentioned the content of speaking portfolio tasks which may refer to autonomy level of the students as they want to have a voice in determining the speaking portfolio task topics.

(...) The topics of the speaking portfolio tasks can be determined as optional or students can choose their topics (Student 4- B1 level). In this way, we cannot be restricted to some specific topics and we can perform better as we would have a good knowledge of the topic.

As it is shown above, even though the responses of the upper level students in the interviews seem that they are more autonomous compared to lower levels, the results of the questionnaire show that they still need their teacher as a counselor especially in preparation process for the speaking portfolio tasks. Also, the results of the surveys point out that the students do not take the whole responsibility of failure themselves contrary to student interviews.

Table 6: Findings Regarding Skill Development Dimension

Statements	Frequency Level					M	s. d.
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)		
I believe I will improve my speaking skills with the help of speaking portfolio tasks.	f 50	36	42	96	65	3,31	1,40
	% 17,3	12,5	14,5	33,2	22,5		
Thanks to speaking portfolio tasks, I can now follow my progress in speaking more easily.	f 44	42	63	92	48	3,20	1,30
	% 15,2	14,5	21,8	31,8	16,6		
Speaking portfolio assignments are good evaluation tools for speaking skills.	f 49	36	59	100	45	3,19	1,31
	% 17,0	12,5	20,4	34,6	15,6		
Speaking portfolio tasks in my speaking portfolio allowed me to demonstrate my speaking skill ability exactly as it is.	f 54	40	74	79	42	3,05	1,32
	% 18,7	13,8	25,6	27,3	14,5		
Speaking portfolio tasks contributed to my speaking skills.	f 50	40	66	85	48	3,14	1,33
	% 17,3	13,8	22,8	29,4	16,6		
Speaking portfolio tasks contributed to my speaking skills in terms of planning my talk.	f 40	31	46	110	62	3,42	1,31
	% 13,8	10,7	15,9	38,1	21,5		
Speaking portfolio tasks contribute to my speaking skills in terms of stress.	f 51	36	67	82	53	3,17	1,35
	% 17,6	12,5	23,2	28,4	18,3		
Speaking portfolio tasks contribute to my speaking skills in terms intonation.	f 50	38	65	82	54	3,18	1,35
	% 17,3	13,1	22,5	28,4	18,7		
Speaking portfolio tasks contribute to my speaking skills in terms of vocabulary.	f 43	32	43	107	64	3,40	1,34
	% 14,9	11,1	14,9	37,0	22,1		
Speaking portfolio tasks contribute to my speaking skills in terms of grammar.	f 46	32	68	78	65	3,29	1,35
	% 15,9	11,1	23,5	27,0	22,5		
I would like to have speaking portfolio assignments in the upcoming modules.	f 85	47	51	54	52	2,79	1,48
	% 29,4	16,3	17,6	18,7	18,0		
I believe the speaking portfolio assignments to be given in the upcoming modules will help improve my speaking skills.	f 59	39	60	72	59	3,11	1,41
	% 20,4	13,5	20,8	24,9	20,4		
GENEL						3,19	1,17

(1): Strongly Disagree, (2): Disagree, (3): Undecided, (4): Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

In Table 6, descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage distributions, arithmetic mean, standard deviation) of the participants' opinions on each expression in the skill development sub-dimension of the speaking portfolio assignments used for language learning are presented. The statistical values show that the participants believe the speaking portfolio assignment contributed to "skill development" in language learning with the M= 3, 19 value on the moderate level. Participants partially agree on the

statement that their speaking skills will improve with the help of speaking portfolio assignments with $M=3,31$ average level.

The participants believed the improvement of speaking skills could be followed much more easily thanks to the speaking portfolio assignments on a moderate level with $M=3.20$ average value. Also, participants noted that speaking portfolio assignments contributed to speaking skills partially with $M=3.14$ average value. More specifically, the participants pointed out that speaking portfolios mostly contributed to speaking skills in the category of "planning my talk" in a moderate level ($M=3.42$). The participants agreed that the speaking portfolio assignments contributed to their speaking skills on the average level in terms of "vocabulary" ($M=3.40$, grammar ($M=3.29$ "intonation", ($M=3.18$)" and stress" ($M=3.17$). Finally, the participants declared that they did not agree on the statement: "I would like to have the speaking portfolio assignments in the upcoming modules" with an average value of 2.79.

After the first two speaking portfolio assignments were set, most of the beginner level students stated that "I understood that I was not able to speak English. Therefore, now I study more." They also see the portfolios as the best assessment type to test their speaking skills in terms of pronunciation.

With these results, it can be maintained that speaking portfolio tasks have affected the students 'speaking skills in a positive way. Students' vocabulary and grammar knowledge developed, and portfolio tasks contributed to metacognitive skills as well as they learnt to organize their talk without teacher help. However, their motivation to perform speaking portfolio tasks for the upcoming terms were low. It might be because of students 'bad experiences in preparation or presentation process. Their unwillingness can be because of their adaptation problem to system of preparatory school, grading, or their lack of experience in high school.

When it comes to interviews with the students the answers of students regarding to skill development, all the students from different modules agreed on the positive effects of speaking portfolio tasks on their speaking skill.

The answers to questions 2 and 3 give broad reference to the positive effects of speaking portfolio tasks on the improvement of pronunciation and speaking skills of the students.

Interviewer: (Question 2) In what ways speaking portfolio tasks at your department are effective? /What are the advantages of speaking portfolio tasks?
(Question 3) In what ways do speaking portfolio tasks affect your speaking skills?

(...) Even though we don't have excellent pronunciation, this situation can be tolerated in classroom environment. We have foreign friends in the class. Their pronunciation is better than ours. They contribute to our pronunciation as well. We can speak better outside (in the real life) by making our mistakes in the classroom environment (Student 1-A1 level).

(...) We try to pronounce better so that we cannot be disgraced in the class. To get a better grade, firstly we organize our speech or the script then we study the pronunciation of some words and lastly, we repeat. As you know, talking English is not something we do frequently. In that way, we have an opportunity to practice in English (Student 1-A1 level).

(...) Speaking portfolio tasks contribute to pronunciation (Student 2- A2 level).

(...) As we search for some topics which we have never known before, we learn new vocabulary. Also speaking portfolio tasks contribute to pronunciation and presentation skills as well. Also, as we build sentences to create scripts, speaking portfolio tasks contribute to our ability to make sentences (Student 6- B1 level).

The results of the surveys, student interviews and the reflections of the learners which were taken after speaking tasks show that learners believe that their speaking skills improve with the help of speaking portfolio tasks. However, there is a contrasting idea that they do not want to have more speaking portfolio tasks during the following modules. This idea may stem from the fact that they have some difficulties while preparing and presenting speaking portfolio tasks. The difficulties which the learners have will be mentioned in "challenge" subcategory in the following parts.

Table 7: Findings Regarding Self Confidence Dimension

Statements	Frequency Level					M	s. d.
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)		
Speaking portfolio tasks enabled me to gain self confidence in speaking English.	f 48	46	67	92	36	3,07	1,28
	% 16,6	15,9	23,2	31,8	12,5		
Speaking portfolio tasks allowed me to overcome my stress and anxiety about public speech.	f 58	41	71	80	39	3,0	1,32
	% 20,1	14,2	24,6	37,7	13,5		
I think speaking portfolio tasks should be assigned frequently.	f 94	59	66	35	35	2,50	1,36
	% 32,5	20,4	22,8	12,1	12,1		
Speaking portfolio task helped me to learn talking before the audiences and gaining self-confidence.	f 55	40	73	83	38	3,03	1,31
	% 19,0	13,8	25,3	28,7	13,1		
It is not a problem if students are assigned speaking portfolio tasks periodically.	f 53	47	67	86	36	3,02	1,30
	% 18,3	16,3	23,2	29,8	12,5		
GENEL						2,92	1,15

(1): Strongly Disagree, (2): Disagree, (3): Undecided, (4): Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

In Table 7, descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage distributions, arithmetic mean, standard deviation) of participant opinions on each expression on the self-confidence subdimension of speaking portfolio exercises used for language learning are presented.

When the arithmetic average values are examined, the general average value of this dimension corresponds to the "I do not agree" or "undecided" option (M= 2.92).

Speakers expressed their indecisiveness about the statements: "Speaking portfolio task helped me to learn talking before the audiences and gaining self-confidence" (M=3.03) and speaking portfolio tasks enabled me to gain self confidence in speaking English" (M=3.07). However, it was detected that participants did not agree on the statement "Speaking portfolio assignments should be given frequently" with an average value of (M=2.50). However, the results of questionnaires show inconsistency with student interviews and the views of the students before and after speaking portfolio tasks. After the ideas of beginner level students were asked about the first two speaking portfolio assignments, most of them believed speaking portfolio assignments were the good facilitators for learners. When they realized that they were able to speak, they became more self-confident and this situation motivated them to study more for the upcoming speaking portfolio assignments. Students' indecisiveness about the quantitative data may stem from the fact that they didn't have much experience about the assessment of their speaking skills in high school. When the

students were asked about presentations, they said that their lack of experience in high school caused them to be unconfident in speaking in English. Therefore, they got nervous when they performed their speaking portfolio assignments before their classmates.

When it comes to interviews with students regarding to self-confidence dimension, the responses show the positive effects of speaking portfolio tasks on students' self-confidence. Interview questions 2 and 4 search for the effects of speaking portfolio tasks on students' self confidence levels. However, some students from lower levels state their nervousness and lack of self-confidence during speaking portfolio tasks and they don't see themselves knowledgeable enough to present something in a foreign language.

Interviewer: (Question 4) In what ways do speaking portfolio tasks contribute to your self-confidence and self-efficacy?

(...) Sometimes, some of our friends and I have difficulty in making presentations. We have lots of hesitations about making a successful presentation. I think speaking portfolio tasks should begin on A2 level (Student 1- A1 level).

(...) At the same time, they admit that speaking portfolio tasks contribute to their self-confidence and presentation skills as well (Student 2- A1 level).

Even though participants who were interviewed admit the positive effects of speaking portfolio tasks on their self-confidence, they stated their nervousness and fear of public speech.

(...) For sure, speaking assessment and grading is necessary. But we get nervous in classroom environment a lot. As I get nervous too much, even though I got prepared for the task, I did not present one of the tasks in the class. It was because of my fear of being unsuccessful (Student 1-A1 level).

One of the elementary level students gave a suggestion about presentations because of his/her lack of self confidence in presenting something in English:

(...) Therefore, I believe speaking tasks that were in the form of video recordings outside of the class help us to feel more comfortable and less anxious. In addition, they are easier than in class speaking tasks (Student 2-A1 level).

(...) Actually, when you make 2 different speaking assignments, you get relaxed. As you present something in the same environment and before the same people. This situation helps you to gain your self-confidence. You see what you can do (Student 1-A1 level).

(...) Speaking portfolio tasks contribute students' self-confidence. When you make presentations in a small class, the classroom atmosphere changes in a positive way. And you feel like you can do this (Student 1 A2 level).

Student interviews showed students' positive attitudes of learners about the positive effects of speaking portfolio tasks on their self-confidence while they stay neutral in the student surveys. Moreover, the students do not want to have more speaking portfolio tasks in the following modules. This information is not in parallel with the surveys as well. The reason of the neutral or negative attitudes of the learners regarding speaking portfolio tasks may be seen clearer when "challenges" subdimension is examined.

Table 8: Findings Regarding Challenges Dimension

Statements	Frequency Level					M	s.d.
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)		
Time limit made the speaking portfolio tasks more difficult.	f 30	49	53	72	85	3,46	1,34
	% 10,4	17,0	18,3	24,9	29,4		
Being recorded while presenting the speaking portfolio tasks was a big problem (makes us anxious and nervous)	f 34	54	52	83	66	3,32	1,33
	% 11,8	18,7	18,0	28,7	22,8		
Technical things (video recording etc.) made the speaking tasks more challenging)	f 29	50	57	78	75	3,41	1,30
	% 10,0	17,3	19,7	27,0	26,0		
I had difficulty in time management during the speaking portfolio tasks.	f 39	49	62	75	64	3,26	1,33
	% 13,5	17,0	21,5	26,0	22,1		
Group work in speaking portfolio tasks made the preparation process longer.	f 36	59	69	61	64	3,20	1,32
	% 12,5	20,4	23,9	21,1	22,1		
I made a lot of effort in preparing speaking portfolio assignments.	f 27	32	66	94	70	3,51	1,23
	% 9,3	11,1	22,8	32,5	24,2		
GENEL						3,36	1,07

(1): Strongly Disagree, (2): Disagree, (3): Undecided, (4): Agree, (5): Strongly Agree

Descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage distributions, arithmetic mean, and standard deviation) of each participant's opinions in the Challenges sub-dimension of the speaking portfolio assignments used for language learning are given in Table 8.

In Table 8, with the average score of M=3.36, the participants stated that speaking portfolio assignments contributed to the sub dimension of challenges on a moderate level. Particularly, participants agreed on the statement that they made a lot of effort in preparing speaking portfolio assignments with an average value of M=3.51.

Participants agreed that the time limit made speaking portfolio assignments more difficult, with an average of $M=3.46$. Finally the participant partially agreed on the statement that the group work in speaking portfolio assignments (role play, discussions, etc.) extended the preparation process with the average value of $M=3.20$. After the ideas of beginner level students were asked about the first two speaking portfolio assignments, most of them claimed that to be able to present something in another language before their classmates and teachers was really difficult and challenging but that challenge was beneficial for their improvement despite the fact that they got nervous before the presentation. The difficulties which intermediate level students had were similar to the ones of beginner level students. However, most of the students maintained that time limit was a big problem for them as most of the time they exceeded it and preparation process lasted for a long time. They further stated that one of the tasks which required the students to record a video was really demanding as the technical process made the preparation process longer. Moreover, they claimed that video recording assignments were suitable for cheating as some of the students only read the text while talking or they just memorized the text. Therefore, they thought in class presentations were more effective in assessing speaking skill though time limit or technical problems could be problems.

Participants stated the problems they faced during presenting or preparing for the speaking portfolio tasks honestly during the student interviews. Their statements were in parallel with the questionnaire.

(...) We have difficulty in arranging the time during the presentations. Also speaking portfolio task topics are so limited (Student 1-A1 level).

(...) As we have problems in pronunciation, the presentation that we prepare must be listened by our teachers like a rehearsal before the presentation (Student 2-A1 level).

About time management, contrary to lower level students, students from upper levels complained about the shortage of time determined for the tasks.

(...) Sometimes, we don't have enough time to present something in English. 5 minutes is not enough (Student 1-B1 level).

(...) Speaking assignments are good and enough. The only problem is there is a time limit. We present the assignments fast as we can as we are so nervous. But, when our presentations finish, we realize that only a short time passed (Student 1-A2 level).

One of the B1 level students mentioned the memorization or reading problems in video recording speaking portfolio tasks:

(...) Speaking portfolio tasks are beneficial but in video assignments, students start to read the texts they prepared. If speaking portfolio tasks are controlled from these aspects, they can be beneficial. Therefore, I think that in class speaking portfolio tasks are more beneficial rather than video recordings (Student 1-B1 level).

Students recommended some ideas so that speaking portfolio tasks could be implemented better.

(...) I advise the number of group works should be increased. As there will be a group, we will have an opportunity to discuss on a topic and share our views. And this situation helps us to feel more confident (Student 2-B1 level).

(...) The number of video recording assignments can be increased. It is difficult for us to present something in front of a board. During video assignments, as there are group works, I feel more relaxed. And I don't feel the nervous as in the class (Student 1-A1 level).

As it might be clearly seen, there may be some problems regarding speaking portfolio tasks such as timing, memorization problem, some technical problems etc. These problems may affect the attitudes of the learners towards speaking portfolio tasks. The reason of students' neutral or negative attitudes in the surveys in "speaking skill" and "self-confidence" subdimensions may be because of these challenges mentioned above.

Table 9: Findings Regarding Self-Efficacy Dimension

Statements	Frequency Level					M	s.d.
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)		
It wasn't difficult for me to deal with problems while presenting and preparing speaking portfolio assignments.	f	44	36	88	90	31	3,10 1,21
	%	15,2	12,5	30,4	31,1	10,7	
I didn't get into panic easily while solving the problems about speaking portfolio assignments.	f	46	52	78	85	28	3,00 1,23
	%	15,9	18,0	27,0	29,4	9,7	
I am more aware of my weak sides in English after speaking portfolio tasks.	f	40	38	76	90	45	3,21 1,25
	%	13,8	13,1	26,3	31,1	15,6	
I know how to improve my weak sides in speaking by myself.	f	46	42	85	86	30	3,04 1,22
	%	15,9	14,5	29,4	29,8	10,4	
I plan to take the necessary steps to overcome the	f	37	23	61	105	63	3,46 1,27
	%	12,6	7,7	20,3	33,3	20,1	

deficiencies that I detected in my speaking.	%	12,8	8,0	21,1	36,3	21,8
GENEL						3,16 1,04

(1): Strongly Disagree, (2): Disagree, (3): Undecided, (4): Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

In Table 9, descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage distributions, arithmetic mean, standard deviation) of the participants' opinions on each expression on the self-efficacy sub-dimension of the speaking portfolio assignments used for language learning are presented.

Statistical values show that the participants think that the speaking portfolio given in language learning contributed to their self-efficacy with an average value of $M= 3.16$ on moderate level. Particularly, participants improved their positive thinking towards the expression “I plan to take the necessary steps to overcome the deficiencies that I detected in my speaking” with a mean value of $M=3.46$. Students partially agreed on the statement “I am more aware of my weak sides in English after speaking portfolio tasks” with $M= 3.21$ average value. They stated their indecisiveness about the statement “I didn’t get into panic easily while solving the problems about speaking portfolio assignments” with the average value of $M=3.00$. According to the results, it can be proposed that students are ready to overcome their deficiencies. In that sense, it is possible to claim that students admit they learn something about speaking from the tasks.

When it comes to the students’ interviews, all the students agree that speaking portfolio tasks have positive effect on their self-efficacy.

(...) Speaking portfolio tasks help us to learn how to present something. Therefore, presentation skills will help us in our departments or working life (Student 2- A1 level).

(...) I know I have some problems in pronunciation and vocabulary knowledge and with the help of speaking portfolio tasks, I realize my deficiencies and try to improve myself on these sides (Student 2-A2 level).

(...) After presenting my first speaking portfolio task, I decided to learn the pronunciation of each word I learnt (Student1-B1 level).

The qualitative and quantitative results of the students may imply that speaking portfolios help them to show their deficiencies and with the help of speaking portfolio task they diagnose their current level better. Based on the problematic areas they encounter with the help of speaking portfolio tasks, they can give emphasis on these parts.

3.7.4. Comparison of Speaking Portfolio Assignments by Descriptive Information

In this part of the study, the results of the "Mann-Whitney U" and "Kruskal-Wallis H" tests were examined to determine whether the perceptions of the speaking portfolio evaluation scale and subscales differed significantly from the demographic characteristics and the descriptive information of the participants. Table 10 presents the results of the Mann-Whitney U test to determine whether the views of participants speaking portfolio assessment scale and subscale of the participants in the survey show significant difference according to the genders.

3.7.5. Findings about the Relationship between the Basic Variables and Sub Dimensions of Speaking Portfolio Assignments

It was determined that the p values were less than 0.05 as a result of the tests conducted to see whether the data showed normal distribution (Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test). Also, it was detected that number of samples used in the research was low. For this reason, nonparametric tests were used in the statistical analysis of the study. Spearman's rho correlation test was used to reach the research purpose. In this part of the research, the relationship between the basic variables and sub-dimensions of the speaking portfolio assignments used in language learning is examined.

Table 10 presents the results of the Mann-Whitney U test which was carried out to determine whether the views of participants on speaking portfolio assessment scale and subscale in the survey show significant difference according to the genders.

Table 10: Comparison of Speaking Portfolio Assessment Scale and Subscale According to Genders of the Participants

Dimensions	Gender	N	Ranking Values Average	Sum of rank values	Mann-Whitney U	P
Speaking portfolio assignment	Male	195	146,51	28569,00	8871,000	,659
	Female	94	141,87	13336,00		
Learner autonomy	Male	195	149,22	29097,00	8343,000	,216
	Female	94	136,26	12808,00		
Skill Development	Male	195	144,38	28154,50	9044,500	,856
	Female	94	146,28	13750,50		
Self Confidence	Male	195	149,31	29115,00	8325,000	,206

	Female	94	136,06	12790,00		
Challenges	Male	195	138,91	27086,50	7976,500	,074
	Female	94	157,64	14818,50		
Self-Efficacy	Male	195	146,09	28487,50	8952,500	,749
	Female	94	142,74	13417,50		

* $p < 0,05$

As it can be seen in Table 10, whether the views of the participants on speaking portfolio assignments ($p=0.659$; $p>0.05$) and subscales of learner autonomy ($p=0.216$; $p>0.05$), skill development ($p=0.856$; $p>0.05$), self-confidence ($p=0.206$; $p>0.05$), challenges ($p=0.074$; $p>0.05$) and self-efficacy ($p=0.749$; $p>0.05$) are significantly different according to the genders ($p>0.05$) are presented.

When the arithmetic means are examined, both groups have almost same level of thoughts on the dimensions and generally male participants have more positive views on learner autonomy (Male:=149.22; Female:=136.26), self-confidence (Male:=149.321; Female:=136.06) and self-efficacy (Male:=146.09; Female:=142.74) dimensions than female participants except “challenges” (Male:=138.91; Female:=157.64) and “skill development” (Male:=144.38; Female:=146.28) dimensions.

In discussion part, there will be searched for the answers about the reasons for the differences in some subcategories according to the genders.

Table 11: Comparison of Speaking Portfolio Assessment Scale and Subscale According to Participants' Ages

Dimensions	Age	N	M.R.	Chi-Square	P
Speaking Portfolio Assessment	18 and below	128	145,13	10,570	,014
	19	81	153,91		
	20	44	110,89		
	21 and above	36	166,19		
Learner Autonomy	18 and below	128	140,90	5,253	,154
	19	81	155,20		
	20	44	125,28		
	21 and above	36	160,72		
Skill Development	18 and below	128	144,49	7,637	,054
	19	81	151,57		
	20	44	117,24		
	21 and above	36	165,96		
Self -Confidence	18 and below	128	142,70	4,826	,185
	19	81	152,99		

	20	44	124,24		
	21 and above	36	160,60		
	18 and below	128	149,30		
Challenges	19	81	136,22	1,549	,671
	20	44	142,67		
	21 and above	36	152,31		
	18 and below	128	143,47		
Self-Efficacy	19	81	156,33	10,312	,016
	20	44	112,41		
	21 and above	36	164,79		
*p<0,05					

As it can be seen in Table 11, it is possible to see that the views of the participants on speaking portfolio assignments ($p=0.014$; $p>0.05$) and on the subscales of learner autonomy ($p=0.154$; $p>0.05$), skill development ($p=0.054$; $p>0.05$), self-confidence ($p=0.185$; $p>0.05$), challenges ($p=0.671$; $p>0.05$) do not show significant difference ($p>0.05$) according to age.

Statistically significant differences according to ages were seen only in the self-efficacy ($p=0.016$; $p<0.05$) subscale ($p<0.05$). Regarding the difference, the participants who think that speaking portfolio assignments would make the greatest contribution to their efficacy were group 21 and above ($=164.79$) age group. This age group is respectively followed by the participants who are 19 years old and over with an average value of $M=156.33$, who are 18 years old and below with an average value of $M=143.47$ and who are 20 years old with an average value of $M=112.41$.

Table 12: Comparison of the Views of Participants on Speaking Portfolio Assessment Scale and Subscale According to Modules of the Participants

Dimensions	Module	N	M.R.	Chi-Square	P
Speaking Portfolio Assessment	B1	74	130,63	2,944	,229
	A1	134	150,13		
	A2	81	149,64		
Learner Autonomy	B1	74	137,73	2,079	,354
	A1	134	142,41		
	A2	81	155,93		
Skill Development	B1	74	127,74	4,352	,113
	A1	134	152,37		
	A2	81	148,58		
Self Confidence	B1	74	128,78	3,810	,149
	A1	134	151,56		
	A2	81	148,96		

Challenges	B1	74	155,86	2,258	,323
	A1	134	144,61		
	A2	81	135,72		
Self-Efficacy	B1	74	143,19	,459	,795
	A1	134	142,79		
	A2	81	150,31		

p<0,05

As it can be seen in Table 12, it might be said that the opinions of the participants on speaking portfolio assignments ($p=0.229$; $p>0.05$) and subscales of the learner autonomy ($p=0.354$; $p>0.05$), skill development ($p=0.113$; $p>0.05$), self-confidence ($p=0,149$; $p>0.05$), challenges ($p=0.323$; $p>0.05$) and self-efficacy ($p=0.795$; $p>0.05$) do not show significant difference.

Table 13: Comparison of the Views of the Participant on Speaking Portfolio Assessment Scale and Subscale According to the Departments They Study

Dimensions	Departments	N	M.R.	Chi-Square	P
Speaking Portfolio Assessment	Electrical Engineering	49	145,70	11,883	,104
	Automotive Engineering	29	111,31		
	English Language and Literature	58	155,88		
	Computer Engineering	26	145,15		
	Biomedical Engineering	20	140,95		
	Machine Engineering	29	119,59		
	Applied English and Translation	34	170,85		
Learner autonomy	Others	44	150,60	10,196	,178
	Electrical Engineering	49	163,78		
	Automotive Engineering	29	125,26		
	English Language and Literature	58	139,53		
	Computer Engineering	26	155,96		
	Biomedical Engineering	20	112,15		
	Machine Engineering	29	132,17		
Skill Development	Applied English and Translation	34	162,97	16,628	,020
	Others	44	147,34		
	Electrical Engineering	49	139,58		
	Automotive Engineering	29	105,90		
	English Language and Literature	58	163,75		
	Computer Engineering	26	138,50		
	Biomedical Engineering	20	147,48		
Self Confidence	Machine Engineering	29	122,24	6,550	,477
	Applied English and Translation	34	176,40		
	Others	44	145,55		
	Electrical Engineering	49	141,02		
	Automotive Engineering	29	121,14		
	English Language and Literature	58	157,71		
	Computer Engineering	26	156,12		
Challenges	Biomedical Engineering	20	154,30	5,527	,596
	Machine Engineering	29	123,95		
	Applied English and Translation	34	147,57		
	Others	44	149,50		
	Electrical Engineering	49	151,92		
	Automotive Engineering	29	132,47		

	English Language and Literature	58	134,99		
	Computer Engineering	26	131,71		
	Biomedical Engineering	20	129,98		
	Machine Engineering	29	152,19		
	Applied English and Translation	34	162,85		
	Others	44	154,90		
	Electrical Engineering	49	142,08		
	Automotive Engineering	29	120,41		
	English Language and Literature	58	166,25		
Self-Efficacy	Computer Engineering	26	159,63	10,153	,180
	Biomedical Engineering	20	136,63		
	Machine Engineering	29	119,40		
	Applied English and Translation	34	147,19		
	Others	44	146,78		

* $p < 0,05$

As it can be seen in Table 13, the participants' views on speaking portfolio assignments, ($p=0.104$; $p>0.05$) and subdimensions of learner autonomy ($p=0.178$; $p>0,05$), self-confidence ($p=0.477$; $p>0.05$), challenges ($p=0.596$; $p>0.05$) and self-efficacy ($p=0.180$; $p>0.05$) did not show any significant difference ($p>0.05$) according to their departments.

When the table is examined, the opinions of the participants on speaking portfolio assignments used in the language learning differ only on skill development ($p=0,020$; $p<0.05$) dimension according to the departments of the participants.

Statistical data which is examined to notice the differences in departments regarding skill development dimension show that the most positive attitudes towards this dimension is respectively English Language and Literature (=166.25), Computer Engineering (=159.63) and Applied English and Translation 147.19) students. The students in these departments may have positive attitudes towards the effects of speaking portfolio tasks in "skill development" dimension as they probably plan to use English in their future careers and therefore, they are aware of the importance of using English practically in their jobs in the future.

3.7.6. Relevant Findings Regarding Basic Variables of Speaking Portfolio Assignments and Subdimensions

It has been determined that the p values are less than 0.05 as a result of the tests which are conducted in order to decide whether the data show normal distribution (Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test) and the number of samples used in the research is low. For this reason, nonparametric tests were used in the statistical analyzes during the

study. Non-parametric Spearman's rho correlation test was used to reach the research purpose. In this framework, in this part of the research, the relationship between the basic variables and sub-dimensions of the speaking portfolio assignments used in language learning is examined.



Table 14: Correlation Analysis for Basic Variables and Dimensions of Speaking Portfolio Assignments

Spearman's Rho Correlation	Speaking Portfolio Assessment	Learner Autonomy	Skill Development	Self Confidence	Challenges	Self-efficacy
Speaking Portfolio Assessment	r	,710**	,930**	,845**	,254**	,804**
	p	1	0,000**	0,000**	0,000*	0,000**
Learner Autonomy	r	,710**	,539**	,496**	,259**	,503**
	p	0,000**	1	0,000**	0,000**	0,000**
Skill Development	r	,930**	,539**	,812**	,083	,731**
	p	0,000**	0,000**	1	0,000**	0,000**
Self Confidence	r	,845**	,496**	,812**	-,013	,736**
	p	0,000**	0,000**	0,000**	1	0,000**
Challenges	r	,254**	,259**	,083	-,013	,056
	p	0,013*	0,000**	0,159	,822	1
Self-efficacy	r	,804**	,503**	,731**	,736**	,056
	p	0,000**	0,000**	0,000**	0,000**	,343
						1

* $p < 0,05$

When the correlation coefficients in Table 14 were examined, it was determined that the sub-dimensions of the basic variables related to speaking portfolio assignments were significantly correlated on the level of significance of 0.05. In other words, the coefficients of correlation between the variables were found to be significant ($p < 0.005$). When the sub-dimensions of the basic variables related to speaking portfolio assignments were examined, there was no significant difference between the dimensions of the challenge ($p: 0.159 > 0.005$), self-confidence ($p: 0.822 > 0.005$) and self-efficacy ($p: 0.343 > 0.005$). There was a high positive correlation between the basic variables of speaking portfolio assignments and learner autonomy ($r = 0.710$), self-confidence ($r = 0.845$) and self-efficacy subscale ($r = 0.804$). There was a significant positive relationship between the basic variables of the portfolio projects and the skill development ($r = 0.930$) subscale, and a weak positive correlation with the challenge ($r = 0.254$) subscale. A positive moderate relationship was found between the skill development sub-dimension of the basic variables of speaking portfolio assignments and the learner autonomy sub-dimension ($r = 0.539$). The self-confidence subscale and the learner autonomy subscale ($r = 0.496$) were positively correlated on a low level. When we examined the relationship between the self-efficacy subscale and the learner autonomy subscale ($r = 0.503$), it appeared that there

was a moderately positive relationship between the two dimensions. Finally, it was found that there was a strong positive correlation between skill development subscale and self-confidence, ($r=0.812$) self-efficacy ($r=0.731$) and self-confidence subscale ($r=0.736$).

The high correlation of the dimensions of speaking portfolio questionnaire implies the effectiveness of speaking portfolios on students' learner autonomy, self-efficacy, self-confidence and skill development.

Table 15: Accepted Hypotheses of Research

H_{2.5}: There is a significant difference between the age of the students and their "self-efficacy" skills.	ACCEPTED
H_{3.2}: There is a significant difference between the departments the students study and "skill development" subdimension.	ACCEPTED
H_{5.1}: There is a positive correlation between the speaking portfolio assignments and students' "self-confidence" skills.	ACCEPTED
H_{5.2}: There is a positive correlation between the speaking portfolio assignments and students' "learner autonomy" skills.	ACCEPTED
H_{5.3}: There is a positive correlation between the speaking portfolio assignments and students' "self-efficacy" skills.	ACCEPTED
H_{5.4}: There is a positive correlation between the students' "skill development" and "learner autonomy" skills.	ACCEPTED
H_{5.5}: There is a positive correlation between the students' "self-confidence" and "learner autonomy" skills.	ACCEPTED
H_{5.6}: There is a positive correlation between the students' "self-efficacy" and "learner autonomy" skills.	ACCEPTED

3.8. Instructors' Views Regarding Speaking Portfolio Tasks

Instructors were interviewed to learn their thoughts about the speaking portfolio implementation in their units and their general views about speaking portfolio tasks as instructors. All the participants agreed on the positive effects of speaking portfolio tasks on students' speaking skills. Moreover, they stated that speaking tasks were

inseparable parts of foreign language education. Some outstanding views about the positive sides of speaking portfolio tasks might be examined below:

(...) Generally, I believe that speaking portfolio tasks improve students' speaking skills. Because they prepare these tasks on their own and even in this preparation process with repetitions, they improve their speaking skills (Instructor 5).

(...) I believe speaking evaluation is a must (Instructor 1).

(...) The types of speaking portfolio assignments that are carried out in our unit are video recording, individual presentation or group/pair role play tasks. I like video recording assignments as they show how much they integrated the things they have learnt. In class presentations prepare them for the department by developing speaking skills. Therefore, I have positive opinions about speaking portfolio assignments (Instructor 4).

(...) Speaking is an instant production. Time for thinking which is given to students are less in the tasks that are presented in class. Therefore, speaking portfolio tasks which are applied in class show the whole image about the knowledge of the students (Instructor 1).

Moreover, most of them stated that group/ pair work presentations give more meaningful clues about students' improvement in speaking. They agreed on the idea that speaking portfolio tasks given to students in each module should be in different form. To give some examples:

(...) Rather than individual presentations, pair work discussions are very beneficial for students. But as you know, it is only possible with upper level students. Therefore, I think that for lower levels, groupwork role plays or presentations and for upper levels, pair work discussions are more effective (Instructor 3).

(...) Group role play tasks by giving them authentic contexts and at the end of the presentations peer evaluation can be asked. These are creative, and they focus on production. Also, some presentations that prepare them to departments might be beneficial. They can learn some terms about their academic fields (Instructor 6).

Even though all instructors are of the same mind about the effectiveness of speaking tasks, there were some different notions about the implementation of them in the place where they work. One of the instructors explained his/her criticism about the implementation of speaking portfolio tasks as below:

(...) I think speaking tasks that are presented in the class are not enough in terms of the way our prep department applied. For instance, I think most of them are no speaking assignments. During the last module, we assigned 3 speaking tasks. Two of them were the ones that can be done just by memorizing. One of them was not spoken production task it was spoken interaction task. Therefore, what did we assess? Or what did it show? According to whom? I don't know. But I know that it is not necessary with this version. When it comes to video recording, it can be only said as homework. I don't think video recording tasks should be included in spoken assessment (Instructor 1).

Another instructor mentioned the imbalance of the level of the students. He/she maintained that assessment was a difficult process and to reach an ideal assessment was not so easy in the existing system.

(...) I think the content of speaking portfolio tasks is good and enough. But we have some problems in assessment part. We have some problems because of the professionalism of the teachers, the levels of the students, and some foreign students. Speaking abilities of foreign students are better than Turkish students. So, there might be some problems in standardized assessment or we can adapt our assessment criteria to the situation. We aim to reach to ideal assessment, but our assessment or system is not ideal because it is not possible to make an objective assessment (Instructor 2).

Nevertheless, some instructors asserted favoring remarks regarding to speaking portfolio system in their department:

(...) I think speaking portfolio tasks are very successful as these tasks are determined by 5 or 6 instructors by discussing about them and taking the needs and abilities of the students into consideration. Certainly, students need time to be proficient in presentation. They learn to search about the topic. The students in lower levels can turn to memorize the text they prepared. However, the benefits suppress the negative outcomes like memorization (Instructor 6).

(...) Enough and successful in short (Instructor 5).

The notions above portray real thoughts of the instructors about the implementation of speaking tasks in portfolio context. Whereas some instructors were satisfied with the implementation of speaking portfolio tasks, some of them emphasized the deficiencies of existing speaking portfolio task system.

Another instructor mentioned the necessity of integration of skills and their assessment types. He/she asserted that speaking skills cannot be isolated and should be in harmony with other skills in the process of teaching:

(...) I think that speaking assessment is not a kind of assessment which can be separated from other assessment types or we can't think it as different from other written assessments (vocabulary, grammar, reading and writing). Because we direct our students to written assessment methods in typical Turkish education system or sometimes we assess them with reading tasks. Unfortunately, speaking assessment is left behind or ignored. Therefore, speaking assessments should be integrated with other assessment types and should be obligatory in learning-teaching process (Instructor 6).

Instructors, like students, are aware of the alternative methods in assessment. Rather than traditional paper- pencil tests, instructors prefer alternative assessment methods based on evaluating four skills of a language. Assessing students' progress rather than only focusing on the overall results of the students was on the instructors' agenda. Therefore, they adopted portfolio-based language assessment.

(...) Alternative assessment can benefit learners and teachers in a variety of ways. Alternative assessments can include authentic, performance-based tasks, demonstrations that are carried out in realistic contexts while also allowing assessment and instruction to continuously interact and thereby helping teachers to gain clear picture of their learners' abilities. Portfolio evaluation is among these assessments and show the whole image of the students' performances during the term (Instructor 5).

(...) I think in addition to exams, alternative assessment methods especially portfolio studies should be applied periodically (Instructor 3).

One of the instructors emphasized the changes and innovations in foreign language teaching in recent years and the growing concerns about portfolio-based language assessment by giving examples from his/her teaching career.

(...) When I look at my teaching experience, I can realize the considerable differences between the speaking assessment 10 years ago and now. I prefer alternative assessment methods like portfolios. Developing technology, innovative teaching methods, students' tendencies to use technology, applications, social media or Internet masterfully affect this situation. Rather than traditional exams or tests, these portfolio tasks give students more freedom (Instructor 6).

Some of the instructors agreed on the idea that speaking portfolio tasks in the form of portfolio evaluation should be a part of foreign language education. On the available system, 3 tasks are obligatory but the number of them can be increased when it is necessary. Also, speaking exams are only applied in end of year test. Therefore, they stated that speaking exam must be held at the end of each module.

(...) In every module, 3 speaking tasks are obligatory and the number of speaking portfolio tasks might be increased, and we don't carry out speaking test in every module. But I think at the end of each module, speaking skills should be examined. Speaking skills should be considered as a primary skill that learners have to get in prep department as it is important for them to be able to express themselves in a foreign language in their future careers (Instructor 3).

On the other hand, one of the instructors proposed a different idea. He/she agreed on the integration of skills and held a speaking examination at the end of module. But he/she suggested changing the duration and content of the tasks and speaking exams as well.

(...) I think that the number of speaking portfolio tasks should be decreased. Rather than spoken interaction tasks, we integrate speaking with reading and watching. In addition to speaking portfolio task, speaking exams should be changed. For example, we can ask our students to watch a movie and present the summary of it or we can ask them to read a book and make a presentation about it or we can give some short videos (30 seconds or 1 minutes) and ask them to talk about them. This can be named as speaking exams. However, the unit that will assess it should be more limited. 10 instructors instead of 40 instructors should be selected and they are asked to assess them. Do they last for a long time? That means that some instructors have burden. However, the process goes from lead in to production, that means to a better way and it is worth (Instructor 1).

3.8.1. Instructors' Views Regarding Self Confidence Dimension

Most of the instructors referred to students' lack of experience in speaking tasks especially in individual presentations. They mentioned the ignorance of speaking skill in Turkish education system. Therefore, most of the students don't know how to present something in a foreign language as they are proficient in reading, writing and

listening but not in speaking. This situation affects their self-confidence especially in lower levels or at the beginning of the terms.

(...) Students who are in A1 level do not know what to say while presenting speaking portfolio tasks as they have never presented something in English, therefore they have a stage fright. Also, they have limited vocabulary in target language. They don't know how to state they want to say in the easiest way. They tend to make more complicated sentences. However, in A2 and B1 levels, they get their self-confidence and they can use the patterns that they have learnt in a better way (Instructor 3).

Another instructor made further remarks about the self confidence levels of students from different modules:

(...) I believe speaking portfolio tasks not only contribute to the self confidence levels of the students, but they also provide a positive atmosphere for learners to express themselves in a better and clearer way. They have an opportunity to use some social English phrases that they can use in their daily lives such as asking for directions or ordering food or shopping. For upper levels, speaking tasks might be composed of pair work discussion. In this situation, speaking portfolio tasks assist learners to think critically about an issue. In both situations, we cannot deny the constructive function of speaking portfolio tasks on learners (Instructor 3).

It is possible to assert that can-do statements and self confidence levels of the students are in parallel with each other. To be able to make can-do statements, students must never hesitate to make mistakes. Only in that way, they can be proficient in English. An instructor broadened this idea as below:

(...) When the students realize that they can speak in English, they notice and say I can do it, I can express myself in English and I can make some correct sentences in English with these awareness, their self confidence levels increase because the more self-confidence they have, the more enthusiastic they are about speaking in English at the same time. Their awareness about their abilities increase and they feel more comfortable while speaking in English (Instructor 2).

It is easier for instructors to observe self confidence levels of the students since most of the students give clues about their self-confidence with their gestures, posture, tone of voice or their physical reactions. One instructor helped us to visualize the classroom atmosphere and the mood of the students during speaking portfolio

presentations. The reactions of the students varied according to the levels of the students or the period (beginning of the school year or end of the module etc.).

(...) When it comes to self-confidence, let's talk about my observations. When I compare the first and 3rd task of my pre-intermediate level students, I can notice the big difference in terms of their self-confidence. During the first task, students' hands shake, or they tremble, or we can understand their nervousness from the facial expressions. But in the last task, even though these things don't disappear completely, their effect decreases, or it does not interrupt the speaking portfolio task (Instructor 6).

Without exception, all of the tasks are video recorded even the ones presented in class so that students can see their mistakes and instructors can have an opportunity to check the students' improvement. Sometimes, these recordings may help the students to see their improvements, strong or weak sides. One instructor exemplified the improvement of one student in terms of self-confidence with the help of video recordings of speaking portfolio tasks:

(...) Speaking portfolio tasks help to integrate the class members as well. Pair or group works lead to increase the dialogue between the students, make opportunity for them to practice what they have learnt, and they feel more relaxed. Therefore, their self-confidence increase. They see they can speak, and their motivation improve. To give an example, one of the students showed the video recording of their in-class pair work presentation to her father. She stated her father's pleasure with a great happiness. Even though the student was in beginner level, her father's reaction made her motivated and contributed to her self-confidence. From now on, they are not afraid of making mistakes as most of the students realize making mistakes is a part of learning process (Instructor 4).

Nevertheless, sometimes group or pair works can have negative effect on students' self-confidence. One instructor mentioned the negative impacts of group/ pair work on beginner level students' self-confidence and motivation:

(...) Sometimes one student can be more dominant. So, in lower levels individual work is better, as students can lose their self-confidence if their partners are better themselves at speaking (Instructor 1).

3.8.2. Instructors' Views Regarding Learner Autonomy Dimension

The repetition of the tasks in each module provides an opportunity for the students to practice and this helps them to see their mistakes in a clear way. The improvement of self-confidence also leads them to be more autonomous in the target language they strive to learn.

(...) The more they speak, the more self-confidence they will get at the end of speaking tasks. Even though they become unsuccessful in a task, they will be aware of their self-development and this will trigger them to study more for the upcoming task. In this way, they will get their self-confidence and learn to study independently (Instructor 3).

According to some instructors, speaking tasks as their nature provides, are good stimulators for language learners to be autonomous.

(...) Speaking is not a kind of skill that is taught externally. It is an output of learning, so learner autonomy is very important here because students are in the center of learning in tasks and for example they get information from a reading text that is from outside but here a flow of information is provided from the students to outside (Instructor 2).

(...) Students prepare the tasks on their own or they share the responsibilities in group/pair works. All this process is beyond us. We only give instruction and the rest is up to students' performances. They decide the organization or scripts in role play tasks. The instructors only function as guide. We do not direct or condition our students much. Therefore, I believe speaking portfolio tasks are very beneficial in terms of learner autonomy of the students (Instructor 4).

Instructors referred to group/pair works more regarding to their contributions to learner autonomy:

(...) Group/pair work speaking portfolio tasks improve collaboration of the students, work together and division of work. For instance, when they present something together, one of them says, "You can prepare the slides, I can start write dialogues", then they make the last corrections together. In that way, teamwork as well as learner autonomy develops (Instructor 4).

Instructors emphasized the improvement of learner autonomy especially in the task preparation process and one of them made a further comment which can also be thought as a suggestion:

(...) About learner autonomy, yes, speaking portfolio tasks have positive effect especially during the task preparation process. But as a suggestion, we can arrange tasks which require the students to search more. In other words, students should learn to use the written documents and internet sources. In that way, speaking portfolio tasks contribute to learner autonomy more (Instructor 6).

3.8.3. Instructors' Views Regarding Skill Development Dimension

All the instructors who were interviewed agreed that speaking tasks improve the pronunciation skills of the students.

(...) Not only for speaking skills, let's say the pronunciation, but they are also more effective in terms of the improvement of intonation, grammar and vocabulary use rather than writing tasks. They affect these aspects in an immediate way (Instructor 1).

In addition to pronunciation skills, speaking portfolio tasks also help students to learn new vocabulary, grammar and develop intonation skills. Instructors summarized the contributions of speaking portfolio tasks on students' speaking skills as such:

(...) First of all, preparing speaking portfolio tasks causes the students to improve high level of vocabulary. If they research any topic like a biography, a historical event, or a role play in a hospital or shopping context, the students learn the terms or vocabulary about the related field. Therefore, I think in a speaking task, a student learns at least 10 or 15 new words. In role play speaking portfolio tasks, the students transfer the knowledge they learn in the class to role play or dialogue. In terms of the implementation and the addition of other skills to speaking portfolio tasks, I find them enough and rich in context (Instructor 6).

(...) In terms of pronunciation, speaking portfolio tasks are effective. Our main purpose in these speaking portfolio tasks is effective speaking ability of the students. These tasks are functional in terms of checking their understanding in vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation. While learning a language, 4 skills should be used. One of them is speaking and it is a productive skill. And to make an interaction, it is the most important one. So, speaking portfolio tasks are good mediators for practicing speaking (Instructor 2).

One of the instructors mentioned the importance of giving feedback after students' presentations:

(...) We give feedback to video recording assignments and the in-class presentations. While giving feedback, they can see their mistakes, and this helps the learner to improve their speaking skills (Instructor 4).

3.8.4. Instructors' Views Regarding Self Efficacy Dimension

It is possible to find links between learner autonomy and self-efficacy skills, as mentioned in literature review part, we can also list the positive ideas of instructors about the effects of speaking portfolio tasks on students' self-efficacy:

(...) Speaking is not a kind of skill that is taught externally. It is an output of learning, so learner autonomy is very important here because students are in the center of learning in tasks and for example they get information from a reading text that is from outside but here a flow of information is provided from the students to outside. While presenting the tasks, they find an environment to practice English and learn to be self-confident by using gestures and body language and using the language appropriately, speaking in front of a crowd. We teach not only to use a foreign language correctly, we also help our students internalize many things about the target language (Instructor 1).

Recently, syllabus and theoretical framework of the preparatory departments are based on CEFR descriptors as explained in literature review. CEFR aims the students to be to do the desired outcomes. It provides this aim with the help of "can-do statements". Speaking portfolio tasks are parts of these "can do statements" as each task require to realize one or more "can-do statements". This shows that in addition to learner autonomy, speaking portfolio tasks improve the self-efficacy skills of the students.

(...) Speaking portfolio tasks also help them to improve their self-efficacy skills. In this department, course maps were formed according to CEFR level descriptors. Also, at the end of each unit, they fill a chart formed with "can-do" statements. As speaking portfolio tasks are appropriate to the aim of these statements, we can say that students do something about their self-efficacy skill at the end of each speaking portfolio task (Instructor 3).

3.8.5. Instructors' Views Regarding Challenges Subdimension

When it comes to challenges subcategory, all the instructors mentioned the problems they faced during assessment or some challenges students came across in speaking portfolio preparation and presentation process. The most frequent responses were about test takers' objectivity. They pointed out that speaking portfolio assessments are relative and it is difficult to make a standardized assessment:

(...) The most important problem that a teacher can come across is objectivity problem. When 50 instructors try to assess and grade the same task, for sure, they can be subjective. The most important problem that a teacher can come across is subjectivity problem. I think it affects the productivity of the portfolio studies here in a negative way as well. The feedbacks that are given by students show the same problem (Instructor 1).

(...) One of the disadvantages is that ideal assessment is not possible. The assessment is not objective. Therefore, even though the same assessment criteria or rubric is used, the scores can show difference among different instructors (Instructor 2).

(...) Sometimes I have difficulty in grading. Some students get prepared for the role play tasks very well in terms of setting. Their gestures, mimics, and costumes are suitable for the task. Even though they make some minor mistakes, you want to ignore them. However, some of the students do not add any extra things to their presentations. They just sit in front of the board and present, but they present correctly. They get the same score. I think the first group should have a higher score but according to assessment criteria, they get the same score. Therefore, I am sometimes in two minds during grading. Students wait at the same time and they look at you. These things make you nervous (Instructor 4).

Another most common response about the challenges that instructors faced was memorization problem. According to different instructors, students tend to read their in-class presentations or video tasks and even though some of them don't read, they don't show the features of natural speech. They just speak without intonation, gestures or mimics that give clues about memorization.

(...) The students try to read what they have memorized rather than a spontaneous speech. Presumably that is the most important problem. And this can be a problem for instructors during the grading process (Instructor 2).

(...) Sometimes, as an instructor, you think that you evaluate a very well-done speaking assignment. But, in fact the student just memorized. When you ask a different question to the student, he/she can have difficulty in making a sentence. In that situation, evaluation and grading process might be challenging for instructors (Instructor 2).

Instructors also mentioned attention problem. Since they have to evaluate and grade at least 20 students consecutively during in class presentations, they can be distracted, and it affects grading. One of the instructors offered a solution for this problem:

(...) When I listen to many tasks successively, I sometimes have difficulty in attention. And I become mentally tired. Students also get tired of listening. Therefore, to make a more fruitful assessment, I tell my students to go out if they want or they can be ready for the next lesson. But our biggest advantage all the tasks are recorded. After grading my students if I have any hesitations about a student's grade, I can watch the video version at home or office and I become sure about the final grade. Video recording of all tasks gives us opportunity to check our grade. To be honest, this situation gives me confidence and it enables the students to rely on the system more (Instructor 6).

Students' lack of self-confidence can affect the classroom atmosphere during speaking presentation days. Instructors are responsible for creating a welcoming environment on these days. Nevertheless, it can be tiring for them especially in multicultural classes. One of the instructors explained this situation by comparing the attitudes of students from different cultures on speaking presentation days:

(...) Especially Turkish students are shy during presentations. They have problems about public speech. They are very shy when they are asked to say something in English because of their lack of self-confidence. However, we don't observe this situation frequently with foreign students. They are more relaxed, and they can use their body language, intonation and gestures comfortably as their education systems are based on the active involvement of students to the learning process and they mostly focus on productive skills and fluency in language learning. Therefore, they are not afraid of making mistakes. On the other hand, Turkish students come from authority-based education system that is, students are the listeners of the teachers and they don't take an active role during this process. When they are asked to

make a presentation, they find themselves in an unfamiliar situation as they used to sit and listen to the teacher in their previous education life. Some of their hands can shake or they have difficulty in speaking because of the nervousness. They mostly focus on making grammatically correct sentences rather than being able to make sentences. In other words, they focus on accuracy more than fluency. Therefore, they are afraid of making mistakes and lack of self-confidence. However, fluency should be predominant factor (Instructor 2).

Instructors also listed problems they faced during speaking assignments as students' lack of presentation skills and time management.

(...) Some of the students can have problems about time management. Sometimes, they present fast so that they can leave the stage and sit down as quickly as possible. This situation stems from their nervousness. On the other hand, some of the presentations can be unnecessarily long. Therefore, students need to develop their presentation skills (Instructor 4).

One of the instructors looked at the problems during speaking presentations from students' side. The instructor focused on the important role of instructors while assigning the tasks and during the presentations.

(...) When we mention students' confessions, once more, teacher. Sometimes the student does not want to present speaking portfolio task because of a teacher gives lower marks than he/she expects. Sometimes, their teacher nerves them and they don't want to do present their task before their teachers. Sometimes, teachers don't give instructions well and therefore students don't get prepared enough. So, I think that teachers play a key role before during and after the speaking portfolio tasks. I see teachers as responsible during this process (Instructor 1).

As mentioned above in instructors' views, even though there are some challenges that students and instructors may deal with, speaking portfolio tasks have positive impact on students' speaking skills, learner autonomy, self-confidence and self-efficacy skills.

3.8.6. Instructors' Suggestions Regarding Speaking Portfolio Tasks

Instructors made some suggestions so that speaking portfolio tasks will be implemented in a more efficient way. One of them mentioned the necessity of peer feedback and evaluation in speaking tasks.

(...) I think, in our system peer evaluation is limited or only depends on the instructor, if an instructor asks the learners to give feedback about their friends, they only tend to say good things or sometimes they reject commenting on their friends' presentations. This can be because of their habits in our education system. In our education system, we cannot teach our students to criticize. When they think of criticism, they associate this vocabulary with negative things in their schemas. Therefore, we have some deficiencies in peer feedback, I think. Briefly, while assigning the tasks, our main aim is to help student to gain their self-confidence and learn to present without getting nervous as you know before presentations most of them say "I am nervous", "we are anxious", "teacher, my hands are shaking and sweating", "I can hear my heartbeats". We aim at helping them to overcome all these problems. Therefore, in my opinion, speaking assessment and task should not be separated from the teaching process (Instructor 6).

Another instructor focused on the process in which the instructors give instruction before the speaking tasks. Students are generally nervous in this process. To overcome their nervousness before and during the presentations, the instructor offered some solutions.

(...) When I assign speaking portfolio task, I realize that most of the students get nervous. I can understand it from their faces. Presumably, they get nervous because of the presentation part rather than preparing something new. They know that most of the people will listen to them and it frightens them. While assigning the tasks, I must answer a lot of questions. Even some of the questions are not about the tasks but the students ask because they become nervous. If he/she thinks the task sedately, they can overcome the task. I think I have difficulty in creating a relaxed atmosphere while assigning the task. Before assigning the speaking portfolio tasks, I apply a method. Before the students present their tasks, we talk and discuss the texts they prepare, or we analyze the text to make it more natural. We can say that they rehearse the presentation before they present. They focus on their mistakes and try not to memorize. But it requires time you know as I must spare 10- 15 minutes for a student. Maybe before the presentations we don't have that time. During the presentation, we must deal with students' anxiety. Sometimes after starting the presentations, some students say teacher I will not be able to it. And they give it up or some of them start the presentation again and again and then say I give up. As teachers, the only thing we can

do might keep the calm atmosphere in the class or we might say our students: “this task is not your first or last assessment.” Also, I prefer assessing the task by sitting beside my students, I never sit on teachers’ chair. I want to create an atmosphere as if I am their friends. In that way, they get calmer (Instructor 6).

An instructor stated that students should know reading a prepared script is not a speaking production.

(...) The students mostly think about the score they get in the end. However, the process is more important. We examine how much the student talk. Therefore, students should give importance to learning process and should not be afraid of making mistakes. Memorization would not contribute to anything This awareness is not provided instantly. It is a long process starting from the early education life. It must be a part of education system (Instructor 2).

Other instructors mentioned some other alternative speaking assessment methods.

(...) Some activities to improve pronunciation can be implemented. Video recording speaking tasks in the form of street interviews can be very beneficial for students. The students can be asked to upload them to Internet. In that way, students can be more motivated (Instructor 4).

(...) We assign different topics in every speaking task. We can watch their presentations and give feedback without grading. We can allow them to present within the same week by asking them to take their mistakes into consideration. In this way, we can observe students’ progress better. If they have any questions, instructors can guide to them. If the main purpose is learning, learning by making mistake is more effective than only getting the grade. As there is not any score during the first performance, students can be more relaxed and motivated as well (Instructor 5).

3.9. Conclusion

In this section, quantitative data of students’ interviews and qualitative data of students’ and instructors’ interviews and self-reflection questionnaires were broadly examined. In the following section, discussion of the relevant data and the overall conclusion can be found.



4. CHAPTER FOUR: Conclusion

4.1. Introduction

In this section, the findings of data analysis will be discussed by integrating the results with the previous studies about speaking portfolio assignments. Later, pedagogical implications drawn from the study and some suggestions for further studies will be mentioned in the last part.

Different subcategories used in the data analysis part will be examined by making connection with the other studies and some conclusions will be drawn. The results will be discussed on three different subheadings:

1. Participants' General Tendencies Towards Speaking Portfolio Assignments
2. Participants' Beliefs Towards Different Subcategories (speaking skills, learner autonomy, self-confidence, self-efficacy, challenges) and Their Correlation
3. Participants' Beliefs Towards Different Variables (gender, age, module, department)

4.2. Discussion of the Research Findings

The study was administered to reach an evaluation of learners' and instructors' reviews regarding speaking portfolio tasks in a preparatory department of a state school by using quantitative (a questionnaire) and qualitative (interviews with students and instructors, self- reflection papers) data collection methods. The hypotheses were based on four different variables and the participants' beliefs were categorized on five different subheadings.

4.2.1. Participants' General Tendencies Towards Speaking Portfolio Assignments

The qualitative and quantitative data have shown that the learners and instructors believed the positive effects of speaking portfolio assignments on learners. Even though there may be some problems, which are called as "challenges" in the study, the participants were generally in favour of the benefits of speaking portfolio assignments. In Efthymiou (2012), Castañeda and Rodríguez-González (2011), Chang

(2011), Wang (2012), Daphni (2012) and Chen (2015), the participants stated the contributions of speaking portfolios on them even though they might come across some difficulties at some moments.

One of the most emphasized parts by the students regarding the benefits of speaking portfolio was that speaking portfolio assignments allowed them to see improvement in speaking skills in a period by giving them opportunity to see their current situation and compare it with the past. Moreover, the instructors stated that it was beneficial to draw fruitful conclusions about the learners in assessment process. This is parallel with the ideas of Hashemian & Fadaei (2013). They proposed that portfolio studies assisted the instructors to make productive inferences about learners' current situation. Moreover, they stated that speaking portfolio tasks allowed the learners to see their deficiencies and cover them.

In this study, the learners claimed that they were able to detect their mistakes with the help of portfolio works. This showed some clues about the development of metacognitive skills of the learners. The learners asserted that speaking portfolio preparation process made them active and enabled them to take the initiative of their own learning. Moreover, the instructors stated that planning the portfolio works especially group work required the students to collaborate with each other and therefore, it contributed to metacognitive development of the learners. This conclusion was in keeping with the study of Abhakorn (2014). In his study, the positive impacts of portfolio work on participants' metacognitive skills were emphasized. What is more, Gencel (2017)'s study agrees with it in terms of the contributions of portfolio works on learners' ability to plan their study, critical thinking and metacognitive skills.

Conversely, there were some problems which were called as challenges by the students and learners in portfolio implementation process. One of the most common problems stated by learners and instructors during the interviews was memorization. The instructors claimed that some of the students just presented what they memorized in video portfolio assignments or individual in class performances. Moreover, some of the learners confessed that as they did not feel confident in speaking English, they prepared their assignments and memorized them, or they just took the piece of paper and read. The instructors stated that it was not possible to assess these students' performances in this situation as they did not show their current situation regarding to speaking skill by presenting their memorized talk. These findings conform to Yastibaş

and Çepik (2015)'s study in which some of the participants read their speech in video recording assignments or they just presented their memorized performances. To deal with this problem, Yastıbaş and Çepik (2015) suggested that assignments should be organized in a way that promote "spontaneous speech" (p.524). Although this situation may get the learners more anxious at first, if it is implemented regularly in class, learners can get used to it. As a result, learners can become responsible of their learning process. However, Oanh (2006)'s study contradicted the findings of this study as memorization was not seen as a challenge. In that study, it was claimed that to some extent, memorization was beneficial to learners as they would assist the learners to practice what they learnt and therefore, enable them to make more natural speeches. Moreover, they categorized the memorization as "good" or "poor" (p.15) and the latter was stated as harmful to learners' speaking skills by some of the learners. It was stated by instructors and students that memorization was good for vocabulary development. Therefore, some of the instructors did not interrupt the students while they delivered their memorized talk.

Overall, it seemed that the participants had positive attitudes towards speaking portfolio assignments and they believed in the benefits of oral portfolios on learners from many aspects. Therefore, in the following part, participants' beliefs towards different subcategories and different variables will be mentioned.

4.2.2. Participants' Beliefs Towards Different Subcategories and Their Correlation

In the first place, the views of the students regarding to effects of speaking portfolio assignments on learner autonomy were examined. Most of the students believed that speaking portfolio tasks presented them a learning environment in which they were the authority of the process. In other words, especially during the speaking portfolio preparation process, the students took an active role and determined the key issues in speaking portfolio tasks. Therefore, they took the initiative of their own learning path. However, the average number of the learners stated that they were not the only responsible people for any misunderstood or unknown points in speaking portfolio assignments. This might stem from the fact that learners did not want to take the responsibility of failure while they were eager to adopt success. The students

tended to attribute to failure to the external factors such as the module system, time limit, topic etc. when they did not perform well in speaking portfolio tasks.

Moreover, during the student interviews, views of the learners changed according to the level of the learners. While one of the learners who was on the beginner level stated that she got help from her friends who were on upper levels to understand and prepared the topic well, one student from upper level claimed that he did not need help as much as before in speaking portfolio preparation process. Therefore, it is possible to claim that the knowledge of the learners may contribute to the learner autonomy of the students.

What is more, all the instructors who were interviewed maintained that speaking portfolio tasks contributed to autonomy of the learners with the environment it presented. They claimed that speaking portfolio tasks which required group/pair work promoted collaborative learning environment and peer learning. The learners benefited from each other and covered their deficiencies. Instructors claimed that in that learning environment, they put the responsibility to the learners and when they needed help, they acted as guides. One instructor criticized the present speaking portfolio system from one aspect. He proposed that the tasks should be arranged to promote the learners to search more and think critically. He further remarked that to reach this aim, firstly the learners should learn to use all the sources on every platform. The learners' and instructors' views confirm the findings of Qamar (2016) which show that student centred learning environment, with the help of activities and tasks, promote the learners to use their "reflective" skills and contribute their learner autonomy. In this learning environment, more autonomous learners use speaking skills better. Therefore, it might be claimed that it is a cycle in which the student-centred environment promotes student engagement and less teacher intervention, and lastly, it contributes to learner autonomy. Hence, the results of this study may propose that the environment which the speaking portfolio tasks present facilitates learner autonomy to a large extent. Two of the instructors stated that speaking portfolio tasks helped the learners to be aware of the learning outcomes and course objectives better and this shows the positive effects of speaking portfolio tasks on learner autonomy. This finding coincides with the study of Najeeb (2013) which proposes that portfolio works assist the learners to make prediction about the result of their learning.

When it comes to skill development dimension, most of the learners showed positive attitudes towards the speaking portfolio assignments in the self-reflection questionnaires, surveys and interviews. They believed that their speaking skills improved with the help of speaking portfolio assignments. More specifically, the learners agreed that speaking portfolio assignments mostly contributed to the ability to plan their talk. In other words, speaking portfolio assignments contributed them to develop their metacognitive skills and organize their talk without external assistance. Moreover, they supported the idea that speaking portfolio assignments helped them to improve their vocabulary, grammar and use prosodic patterns (intonation, stress etc.) better. The self-reflection questionnaire gave the learners an opportunity to compare their attitudes towards speaking portfolio assignments before and after the tasks. There were not many major changes regarding to attitudes of the learners. Most of the learners had positive attitudes in terms of the contributions of the speaking portfolio assignments on them. Moreover, in the student interviews, all the participants focused on the benefits of speaking portfolio assignments on their pronunciation. With these results, it might be maintained that speaking portfolio tasks have a positive effect on learners' speaking skills. In Efthymiou (2012), Daphni (2012), Tocaimaza-Hatch (2016) and Sharifi et al.'s studies, (2017), it can be found similar positive effects of speaking portfolio assignments on learners' speaking skills. These studies have confirming views that oral portfolios contribute to the development of pronunciation and vocabulary use. However, most of the students stated in the survey that they did not want to have speaking portfolio assignments on the following levels. The reason of these contradictory views might stem from students' prior experiences. Negative experiences in preparation and presentation process may lead to decrease in the motivation of the learners. The learners' hesitation and unwillingness about having upcoming speaking portfolio tasks might stem from different reasons. The learners might have difficulty in adapting to portfolio system of preparatory school as most of the learners clearly stated that they did not have much experience in speaking in their high schools. Moreover, they might have problems about grading as most of the learners used to take standardized exam scores rather than the scores and rubrics in portfolio-based assessment. Üstünoğlu (2009)'s views present the reason of this situation. He proposes that learners don't have enough experience in speaking skills until they start to get education on tertiary level. Students' practises are mostly limited

to writing skills in elementary and secondary level schools. Therefore, based on the student surveys and interviews, it might be concluded that speaking portfolio assignments on tertiary level present the learners a student-based learning environment which most of the learners did not use to before.

What is more, as Bruno & Dell' Aversana (2017) and Pellegrino & Quellmalz (2010) maintains, most of the instructors who were interviewed suggested that giving feedback caused the learners to see their mistakes and therefore, had a good effect on speaking skills. They further claimed that video recording speaking portfolio tasks gave the learners an opportunity to watch their performances later and evaluate themselves. Furthermore, the instructors stated that in class speaking presentations were also video recorded so that the instructors and the learners could watch their performances later.

They claimed that it had dual benefits:

1. The learners can watch their performances later and see their mistakes clearly. It is good for their self-assessment.
2. The instructors can watch the performances of the learners later as they might have some difficulties in assessing in class presentations when they watch the presentations successively in classroom environment. Hence, the video recording gives them practicality in assessment process.

Moreover, according to student interviews, they stated that being able to see the mistakes gives the learner an opportunity to cover them and therefore, contributes to speaking skills. Demirel & Duman (2015)'s study is in harmony with the ideas of the learners regarding to self-assessment. They see self-assessment or reflective thinking skills as the outcome of speaking based portfolio assessment and suggest the learners to benefit from it by covering the deficiencies in oral production.

When it comes to self-confidence dimension, contrary to student survey results which propose that students had negative or neutral opinions regarding the effects of speaking portfolio assignments on self-confidence, in student interviews, learners focused on the benefits of speaking portfolio assignments on their self-confidence. These views do not comply with Boonkit (2010)'s study which emphasizes the positive effects of speaking portfolio tasks on decreasing the anxiety level of the learners and gaining self-confidence. Moreover, these results do not agree with Xamaní (2013)'s study in which oral production assisted the learners to increase their

self-confidence. In the student interviews, the participants stated different opinions regarding portfolio assignments. Students from lower levels stated that speaking portfolio tasks made them nervous and they felt anxious while they presented the tasks, moreover, they admitted that they did not feel ready for making oral presentations on their current level. Therefore, some of the learners put forward the idea that speaking portfolio assignments should begin on the following levels. Despite the difficulties they had, they showed that they were aware of the advantages which speaking portfolio tasks gave them. The only problem is that they would like to find solutions to their anxiety problem. Their responses to interview questions showed that students from lower levels were afraid of speaking in front of the audience. This situation can be linked to the idea that they don't want to make mistakes, or they hesitate to make a presentation in a foreign language. However, most of the students on the upper levels did not express negative ideas about the relationship between speaking portfolio assignments and self-confidence. They mentioned their anxiety during presentations by using past expressions. This showed that most upper level students did not have much problem in terms of self-confidence on their current level. This information confirms the ideas of Yim (2014) which put forward that getting experience in a foreign language speaking environment decreases the anxiety level of the learners.

With respect to self-efficacy, most of the learners shared the belief that speaking portfolio tasks helped them to diagnose their deficiencies and take the necessary steps to improve their weak sides. Besides, they helped them to overcome the difficulties they had in portfolio preparation and presentation process. Siew & Wong (2005)'s, Herron (2007) et al.'s and Genç et al. (2016)'s studies can support this view in a way that self-efficacious learners are open to new and innovative strategies to learn more, therefore, they can find ways to cover their mistakes by trying different methods. Moreover, in the student surveys, the learners were neutral against the statement that they did not get into panic easily while solving problems about speaking portfolio assignments. This result might stem from the fact that the participants were students from different levels. It is possible to reach this conclusion by looking at the student interviews. Whereas the learners from lower levels stated that they felt nervous when they couldn't understand a point in preparation process, most upper level learners claimed that they were able to solve most of unforeseen problems they faced better compared to past. It might be because high self-efficacy is the indicator of

success (Tilfarlıoğlu & Çiftçi, 2011). Besides, the instructors looked at the self-efficacy dimension from different point of view. They stated that in preparatory school they worked, course maps were formed based on CEFR level descriptors and in each speaking portfolio task the students presented, they realize one or more “can -do statements”. Therefore, the instructors were of the opinion that speaking portfolio tasks contribute to self-efficacy of the learners with the CEFR based environment it presented.

When it comes to challenges dimension, the learners and instructors mentioned the problems they faced in speaking portfolio tasks in detail. One of the most emphasized problems by the learners was the time limit which was set for each task. Moreover, they mostly focused on the time they spent in preparation process for each task. Most of the learners claimed that they needed more time to get prepared for group works. Time limit is also a big challenge stated by the instructors as they need time evaluate the performances of the learners, giving feedback and watch the video recordings more than once when it necessary (Shauki & Benzie, 2014). This problem might be solved by reorganizing times to spare for each student to give feedback, arranging some certain times in order to correct the unclear points, putting the portfolios in class so that everyone can reach them easily to see their mistakes or progress (Hillmer & Holmes, 2007). Besides, the video recordings of speaking portfolio assignments can be shared on a larger platform so that each student can see their works and make necessary changes to improve their works.

Another important point stated solely by instructors was subjectivity problem. All the instructors who were interviewed maintained that they had difficulty in scoring the performances of the learners successively. Even though they had a rubric which they used in grading, they stated that it was possible to see differences between the instructors on the same performance of a learner. In this situation, it was not possible to mention a standardized assessment. It can be understood from the interviews with the instructors that they sometimes felt nervous in grading process. This problem might be because of the lack of peer feedback in the environment where the study was carried out. Involving the learners to assessment process may contribute to reliability of the assessment as in the study of Magin & Helmore (2001) which suggests that other than teacher assessment, integrating peer feedback to assessment process may portray a more objective evaluation and give more reliable results. Moreover, with the

help of peer feedback, the learners may comprehend the grading process and focus on the different aspects of oral pronunciation. They can also understand the assessment rubrics which have criteria and “what is required for them” (Patri, 2002, p.111). What is more, the learners may be more focused on their learning path when they get feedback from their classmates, rather than their instructors (Murillo-Zamorano & Montanero, 2017). Discussing performance of the learners by using the criteria may create a reflective learning environment in class. In this way, the learners might be more active, and their anxiety level may decrease. Furthermore, they may not hesitate to express their ideas in target language as in the past. As a result, their oral production may be more natural.

What is more, the results of student interviews gave some meaningful conclusions about the correlation of different subdimensions. It was found out that there was a high positive correlation between speaking portfolio tasks and speaking skill subscale as most of the studies confirmed (Efthymiou (2012), Daphni (2012), Tocaimaza-Hatch (2016) and Maryam Sharifi (2017)). Moreover, the correlation analysis showed that there was a positive correlation between speaking portfolio assignments and subscales of learner autonomy, self-confidence, and self-efficacy subdimensions which showed the same results in many different studies (Genç et al., 2016, Herron et al., 2007, Xamani, 2013). Lastly, the correlation analysis showed the positive correlation among the subscales of learner autonomy, self-confidence and self-efficacy subdimensions as it was pointed out in the studies of Andrade (2010) and Boonkit (2010).

4.2.3. Participants’ Beliefs Towards Different Variables (Gender, Age, Module, Department)

In the current study, the effects of age, gender, department and module of the learners on speaking portfolio assignments and its subdimensions were examined. In the first place, regarding the effects of gender, it was found out that male participants had more positive views on learner autonomy, self-confidence and self-efficacy. Regarding to learner autonomy, this conclusion contradicts some of the previous studies which propose that female learners are more proficient in learning process (Üstünoğlu, 2009; Genç, 2015) as it would be expected that female learners perceive the contributions of portfolios better. This situation may stem from the fact that as

female learners seem to be more autonomous in learning process, male learners see their deficiencies and can perceive the contributions of portfolio studies better. On the other hand, the results of this study are in parallel with some other studies which put forward that male learners are more self-confident and do not have many problems about self-efficacy and self-confidence as typical Turkish culture reinforces the male learners to be more self-confident and self-efficacious (Kukulu et al., 2012). Therefore, male learners may see the positive sides of oral portfolios better than female learners.

When it comes to “age” variable, the learners who think that speaking portfolio assignments would make the greatest contribution to their self-efficacy were group 21 and above age group which is the oldest among all participants. It might be because these learners’ metacognitive skills are more developed than younger age groups. Moreover, they may be more aware of the learning outcomes and results.

The views of the learners regarding to effects of the oral portfolios changed according to the departments of the students. The most positive attitudes towards the positive effects of oral portfolios on learners’ speaking skills were respectively English language and literature, computer engineering and applied English and translation students. The students in these departments may have positive attitudes towards the effects of speaking portfolio tasks in “skill development” dimension as they probably plan to use English in their future careers and therefore, they are aware of the importance of using English practically in their jobs in the future.

Finally, the views of the learners about the effects of speaking portfolio assignments on different subdimensions (learner autonomy, skill development, self-confidence, challenges, self-efficacy) did not show difference according to the module they study in students’ surveys. However, in student interviews, it was clearly seen that learners who were in upper levels had more positive attitudes about oral portfolios especially in learner autonomy subdimension. This situation may be linked to experience they had in foreign language learning. The time they spent as language learners might cause them to be more aware of their learning process and contributions of portfolio works on them (Çakıcı, 2015).

4.3. Pedagogical Implications

The current study shows some pedagogical implications which might shed light on the following studies by contributing to teaching-learning and assessment process

of learners, instructors and administrators. The clearest conclusion which might be drawn from the study is that speaking portfolio assessment contributed to speaking skills of the learners. Since most of the learners mentioned the lack of speaking practice in their previous learning environments, oral portfolio tasks might be facilitators to enable the learners to speak in the target language. Apart from in class speaking portfolio tasks, video recorded speaking portfolio tasks assist the learners to make spoken production in authentic settings. These tasks give the learners an opportunity to be ready to communicate in real life situations. Hence, speaking based portfolio assessment can be more beneficial than the standardized exams in terms of enabling the learners to get communicative competence (Weiping & Juan, 2005).

What is more, the current study gave some clues about the benefits of speaking portfolio tasks on developing the autonomy of the learners. The learners stated the contributions of speaking portfolio tasks on their learner autonomy. The most fruitful results from the students were taken in interviews and it was found out that the upper level learners could see their development better and take initiative of their learning path. Similarly, the instructors agreed with the learners in terms of the contributions of oral portfolios on learners' autonomy development by allowing them to use their metacognitive skills. Even though the learners were pleased with the benefits of speaking portfolio tasks on them, that they did not want to have tasks in the following modules might be because of the challenges they experienced in task preparation process. Therefore, to lessen the problems students might face, the instructors, as it would be expected in a classroom setting which was organized in constructivist theoretical framework, should be ready to guide the learners in any misunderstood points (Oliver, 2017). Furthermore, the learners who had lower levels of learner autonomy tended to memorize their presentations or just read from a piece of paper. In this situation, it was not possible to mention a good spoken production. To deal with this problem, it might be a good solution to foster the learners to make "spontaneous speech" (Yastıbaş & Çepik, 2015). In that way, learners can present their tasks which show their actual performance. Their autonomy level can also increase as they would see that they could manage to present a "spontaneous speech". However, the learners may feel anxious when they are asked to present their performances without preparation especially lower level students who do not have as much experience and knowledge in target language as upper level students. To overcome this problem, the

number of spontaneous speeches may be increased gradually. In this way, the learners may feel more confident and autonomous. Besides, the video recorded performances of the learners should be kept in a pace in the classroom which every learner can reach them easily (Hillmer & Holmes, 2007). Another suggestion drawn from this study might be that the performances of the learners might be shared in an open access platform on the Internet. In this way, the learners can watch their performances whenever they want, see their strong and weak sides and lastly, can take the necessary steps to improve their speaking skills. In this process, they take over the whole process, and organize their learning process therefore, they behave as an ideal autonomous learner.

Based on the views of the learners and instructors, it can be interpreted that speaking portfolio tasks are beneficial for improving reflective skills of the learners. Thanks to video recordings of oral portfolio works, the learners can watch their performances whenever they want, and it helps the learners to make evaluations of themselves. Nevertheless, as the learners did not use to make self-criticism in their high school, they may have difficulty in noticing their weak sides. Therefore, apart from the speaking portfolio tasks, the learners may be given some weekly assignments which include 1-2 minutes long video-recorded performances. In this way, they can promote their self-assessment skills. Moreover, other than video recorded speaking portfolio tasks, video recordings can be parts of in class speaking activities. The learners can be asked to record their performances during speaking activities whenever they want. Hence, the learners can see evaluate their performances and see their progress easily.

In this study, it was detected that there was a lack of peer evaluation since the instructors emphasized the contributions of peer assessment to language learning process. They stated that during the task assessment process, the ideas of the other learners who were available in the class see the deficient points in the presentations and made comments on them. The comments on the peers may be much more effective than the feedback of the teacher (Strijbos & Sluijsmans, 2010). Nevertheless, negative feedback of the learners may sometimes cause the presenters to decrease in their motivation and self confidence level. Therefore, before the feedback session, the learners in the class might be trained to use polite expressions so that the presenter will not feel nervous and inadequate. Moreover, the learners might also be warned not to use insulting remarks. All in all, peer feedback sessions might be added to overall

assessment process to draw the attention of the learners to the performance of the presenter, see strong and weak sides and finally make evaluations of their own performances by comparing the other performances.

In conclusion, in class and out of class speaking portfolio tasks might have positive effects on developing speaking skills of the learners (Coşkun, 2016). At the same time, they might contribute to learner autonomy, self-confidence and self-efficacy skills of the learners. As a result of this study, it was understood that some steps might be taken to cover the deficient points such as peer assessment, memorization and anxiety problem in portfolio evaluation process. When the instructors and the administration take the implications drawn from this study into the consideration, they can overcome the challenges they face.

4.4. Suggestions

Learners from different departments can be included in the future studies. In this way, whether the changing departments the learners study have an effect of the views of they have towards speaking portfolio assignments can be examined. Moreover, the learners from different genders can be distributed the study equally so that it will be possible to draw conclusions about the views of the learner towards speaking portfolio tasks according to gender. Furthermore, in the following studies, age range of the students can be expanded to see whether the age variable is a determinant factor for the views of the learners about speaking portfolio assignments. Besides, to get fruitful results about the changing views of the learners regarding to speaking portfolio assignments, students from all levels might be included in the following studies. In this way, the responses of the learners in different modules can be interpreted more clearly and it can be possible to make more expanded evaluations about speaking portfolio tasks. Finally, as there were not any feedback sessions in portfolio works in the preparatory school where the study was conducted, it was not possible to get the views of the learners regarding the effects of peer assessment. Therefore, the views of the learners might be taken after feedback sessions become the parts of assessment process in the following studies. In this way, the assessment process can be wholly adapted to constructivist learning theory and the learners might be more aware of their learning path.

4.5. Conclusion

This study has presented the views of the learners and instructors regarding speaking portfolio assessment process in Karabuk University School of Foreign Languages Department. It has portrayed the general views of the participants regarding speaking portfolio tasks, some subdimensions (skill development, learner autonomy, self-confidence, self-efficacy, and challenges), their correlation, and different variables (age, gender, module and department). Overall findings of the study have demonstrated that most of the instructors support speaking portfolio evaluation and emphasize advantages of them. They claim that speaking portfolio tasks are good indicators of learners' development in a period and have a great contribution on learners' speaking skills. Moreover, the instructors further propose that they are good tools for learners' autonomy development as the tasks promote using metacognitive skills and they help the learners to overcome anxiety during speaking portfolio presentations. What is more, the instructors maintain that on condition that some changes are made to solve some problems about the portfolio administration system such as lack of peer feedback sessions or learners' memorization problem, speaking portfolio evaluation system can contribute to learners' spoken production more. Furthermore, although most of the learners have similar views with the instructors regarding the benefits of speaking portfolio tasks, it can be inferred from the learners' views that the level of the learners can give clues about the autonomy level of them. Especially learners from lower levels believe that they still need guidance of their instructors rather than adopting them sole authorities and this suits well to ideas of constructivist learning theory which promotes student-based teaching and assessment system which takes the learners in the centre of learning environment. This might show that speaking portfolio assessment applied in tertiary level can be beneficial for speaking skill development with its student-based nature. Finally, although there may be some challenges which are faced during performing and evaluating process by students and instructors, it has been clearly inferred from the study that both sides are aware of the benefits of speaking portfolio tasks and they are mostly in favour of using them.



REFERENCES

- Abhakorn, M.L.J. (2014). Investigating the use of student portfolios to develop students' metacognition in English as a foreign language learning. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 5(1), 46-55.
- Akdemir, A. S., Barin, M., & Demiroz, H. (2012). Broadsheet English: Teaching speaking through newspaper articles. *Procedia-Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 46, 3967-3971.
- Al Mahmud, A. (2013). Constructivism and reflectivism as the logical counterparts in TESOL: Learning theory versus teaching methodology. *TEFLIN Journal*, 24(2), 237-257.
- Alan, H., & Pierson, H. (2000). Portfolios: Vehicle for authentic self-assessment. In G. Ekbatani, & H. Pierson (Eds), *Learner-directed assessment in ESL* (pp. 105-126). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Al-Busaidi, S.S., & Al-Maamari F.S. (2014). Exploring university teachers' understanding of learner autonomy. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(10), 2051-2060.
- Andrade, H., & Cizek, G. (Eds.) (2010). *Handbook of formative assessment*. New York: Routledge.
- Aydın, B. (2001). *A study of sources of foreign language classroom anxiety in speaking and writing classes*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Anadolu University, Eskişehir.
- Bachman, L., & Palmer, A. (2010). *Language Assessment in Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bandura, A., & Schunk, D.H., (1981). Cultivating competence, self-efficacy, and intrinsic interest through proximal self-motivation. *The Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 41, 586-598.

- Banfi, C. S. (2003). Portfolios: integrating advanced language, academic, and professional skills. *ELT Journal*, 57(1), 34-42.
- Barootchi N., & Keshavarz, M. H. (2002). Assessment of achievement through portfolios and teacher-made tests. *Educational Research*, 44(3), 279-288.
- Barrows, H.S. (1996). Problem-based learning in medicine and beyond. In L. Wilkerson and W.H. Gijsselaers, (Ed.), *Bringing problem-based learning to higher education: Theory and practice* (pp. 3–13). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc. Publishers.
- Bavali, M., Yamini, M., & Sadighi, F. (2011). Dynamic assessment in perspective: Demarcating dynamic and non-dynamic boundaries. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(4), 895-902.
- Bennett, R. E. (2011). Formative assessment: A critical review. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 18(1), 5–25.
- Benson, P. (2001). *Teaching and researching autonomy in language learning*. Harlow: Longman.
- Birenbaum, M. (1996). Assessment 2000: Towards a pluralistic approach to assessment. In M. Birenbaum, & F.J.R.C Dochy (Eds.), *Alternatives in assessment of achievements, Learning Processes and Prior Knowledge* (pp.3–29). Boston: Kluwer Academic Press.
- Bolliger, D. U., & Shepherd, C. E. (2010). Student perceptions of e portfolio integration in online courses. *Distance Education*, 31(3), 295–314.
- Boonkit, K. (2010). Enhancing the development of speaking skills for non-native speakers of English. *Procedia Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 2, 1305-1309.
- Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices*. U.S.A: Pearson Education.
- Brown, J. B., & Hudson. (2002). *Criterion- referenced language testing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Brown, J. D. (1998). *New ways of classroom assessment*. Bloomington, Illinois, USA: TESOL.
- Brown, J. D., Robson, R., & Rosenkjar, P. (2001). Personality, motivation, anxiety, strategies, and language proficiency of Japanese students. In Z. Dornyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 361-398). Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.
- Brown, J.D., & Wolfe-Quintero, K. (1997). Teacher portfolios for evaluation: A great idea or a waste of time? *Language Teacher*, 21, 28-30.
- Brown, S. (2010). Afterword. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35(3), 347–349.
- Bruno, A., & Dell'Aversana, G. (2017). Reflective practicum in higher education: the influence of the learning environment on the quality of learning. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(3), 345–358.
- Çakıcı, D. (2015). Autonomy in language teaching and learning process. *İnönü University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 16(1), 31-42.
- Carole J., Xiaoming, L. & Akrofi, A. (2007). Implementing alternative assessment: Opportunities and obstacles. *The Educational Forum*, 71(3), 221-230.
- Castañeda, M. & Rodríguez-González, E. (2011). L2 speaking self-ability perceptions through multiple video speech drafts. *Hispania*, 94(3), 483-501.
- Çepik, S., & Yastıbaş, A. E. (2013). The use of e-portfolio to improve English speaking skill of Turkish EFL learners. *The Anthropologist*, 16(1-2), 307–317.
- Chandio, M.D., & Jaffer, S. (2015). Teaching English as a language not subject by employing formative assessment. *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, 2(2), 151 - 171.
- Chang, C.-C., & Tseng, K.-H. (2011). *Using a Web-based portfolio assessment system to elevate project-based learning performances*. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 19(3), 211–230.

- Chang, Y. J., Wu, C.T., & Ku, H. Y. (2005). The introduction of electronic portfolios to teach and assess English as a Foreign Language in Taiwan. *Tech Trends*, 49(1), 30-35.
- Chen, N. (2012). Autonomous learning in the context of computer-based multimedia college English teaching and learning. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(12), 2541-2547.
- Chen, Y. (2015). *ESL students' language anxiety in in-class oral presentations* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1605978)
- Chen, Y. U. (2007). *Exploring the assessment aspect of differentiated instruction: College EFL learners' perspectives on tiered performance tasks*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Ching, L.C. (2002). Strategy and self-regulation instruction as contributors to improving students' cognitive model in an ESL programme. *English For Specific Purposes* 13, 261–289.
- Christianson, M., Hoskins, C., & Watanabe, A. (2009). Evaluating the effectiveness of a video- recording based self-assessment system for academic speaking. *Language Research Bulletin*, 24, 1-15.
- Clark, I. (2011). Formative assessment: Policy, perspectives, and practice. *Florida Journal of Educational Administration & Policy*, 4, 158–180.
- Colon, N. M.L. (2007). *A study on secondary English as a second language facilitators' emancipation toward a constructivist paradigm* (Doctoral dissertation) Retrieved from ProQuest Information and Learning Company. (3256816)
- Coşkun, A. (2016). Benefits of out-of-class speaking activities for EFL students. *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim Dergisi*, 5(3), 1448-1464.
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for language: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Strasbourg: Cambridge University Press.

- Daphni, A. (2012). The viability of alternative assessment methods in the Greek upper secondary school: the oral portfolio. *Research Papers in Language Teaching and Learning*, 3(1), 165- 188.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Anness, J., & Falk, B. (1995). *Authentic assessment in action: Studies of schools and students at work*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Davin, K. J. (2013). Integration of dynamic assessment and instructional conversations to promote development and improve assessment in the language classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, 17(3), 303–322.
- De Fina, A. (1992). *Portfolio assessment: Getting started*. NY: Scholastics Inc.
- Dewey, E. A. (1972). Understanding children's behaviour. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 3(2), 120–126.
- Dikili, S. (2003). Assessment at a distance: Traditional vs. alternative assessments. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 2(3), 13-19.
- Dörfler, T., Golke, S., & Artelt, C. (2009). Dynamic assessment and its potential for the assessment of reading competence. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 35(2-3), 77–82.
- Dornyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. London: Erlbaum.
- Duman, H., Demirel, M. (2015). The use of portfolio in English language teaching and its effects on achievement and attitude. *Procedia - Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 191, 2634 – 2640.
- Efthymiou, G. (2012). Portfolio assessment of speaking skills in English as a foreign language in primary education. *Research Papers in Language Teaching and Learning*, 3(1), 200-224.
- Egel, İ. P. (2003). *The Impact of the European Language Portfolio on the Learner Autonomy of Turkish Primary School Students*, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Anadolu University, Eskişehir.

- Ekbatani, G. (2000). *Moving toward learner-directed assessment. Learner-directed assessment in ESL*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Ekbatani, G. (2011). *Measurement and evaluation in post-secondary ESL*. NY: Routledge.
- Erickson, H. L. (2001). *Stirring the head, heart, and soul: Redefining curriculum and instruction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Fernsten, L. & Fernsten, J. (2005). Portfolio assessment and reflection: Enhancing learning through reflective practice. *Reflective Practice* 6 (2), 303-309.
- Figueras, N. (2012). The impact of the CEFR. *ELT Journal*, 66(4), 477-485.
- Gardner, D. (2000). Self-assessment for autonomous language learners. *Links & Letters* 7, 49-60.
- Gatlin, L., & Jacob, S. (2002). Standards-based digital portfolios: A component of authentic assessment for preservice teachers. *Action in Teacher Education*, 23(4),35-42.
- Genç, G. (2015). Investigation of the relationships between autonomous foreign language learning, learning styles and some variables. *Ankara University, Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences*, 48(1), 129-160.
- Genç, G., Kuluşaklı, E., & Aydın, S. (2016). Exploring EFL learners perceived self-efficacy and beliefs on English language learning. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*,41(2), 53-68.
- Gencil, İ.E. (2017). The effect of portfolio assessments on metacognitive skills and on attitudes toward a course. *Educational Sciences: Theory &Practice*, 17(1), 293-319.
- Gijbels, D., Van de Watering, G., Dochy, F., & Van den Bossche, P. (2006). New learning environments and constructivism: The students' perspective. *Instructional Science*, 34(3), 213-226.

- Giligan, M. E. (2007). *Traditional versus alternative assessments: Which type do high school teachers perceive as most effective in the assessment of higher-order thinking skills?* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest LLC. (3324163)
- Glazer, S. M. & Brown, C. S. (1993). *Portfolios and beyond*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.
- Gül, A. (2016). *Constructivism as a new notion in English language education in Turkey* (Doctoral dissertation) Retrieved from ProQuest LLC (10170132).
- Gülbahar, Y., Köse, F. (2006). Öğretmen adaylarının değerlendirme için elektronik portfolyo kullanımına ilişkin görüşleri. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 39(2), 75-93.
- Hamp-Lyons, L., & Condon, W. (2000). *Assessing the portfolio: Principles for practice, theory, and research*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Hashemian., M., & Fadaei, B. (2013). Fostering EFL learners' autonomy in light of portfolio assessment: Exploring the potential impact of gender. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 1(2), 135-151.
- Hawisher, G. & Self, C. (1997). Wedding the technologies of writing portfolios and computers. In K. Yancey & I. Weiser (Eds.), *Situating Portfolios: Four Perspectives* (pp.305–21). Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.
- Haywood, H. C., & Lidz, C. S. (2007). *Dynamic assessment in practice: Clinical and educational application*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hillmer T.L., & Holmes, K. P. (2007). Portfolios: From a pile of papers to a meaningful collection for student assessment. *Language & Literacy*, 9(2), 1-18.
- Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy and foreign language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70, 125-132.

- Huang, H.-T. D., & Hung, S.-T. A. (2009). Implementing electronic speaking portfolios: perceptions of EFL students. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 41(5), E84–E88.
- İftar, K. (1999). *Bilim ve araştırma*. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Janisch, C., Liu, X., & Akrofi, A. (2007). Implementing Alternative Assessment: Opportunities and Obstacles. *The Educational Forum*, 71(3), 221–230.
- Jia, Q. (2010). A Brief study on the implication of constructivism teaching theory on classroom teaching reform in basic education. *International Education Studies*, 3(2), 197-199.
- Johnson, R. S., Mims-Cox, J. S., & Doyle-Nichols, A. (2009). *Developing Portfolios in Education*. LA: Sage Inc.
- Kalaycı, Ş. (2010). *SPSS uygulamalı çok değişkenli istatistik teknikleri*. Ankara: Asil Yayın Dağıtım.
- Kan, A. (2007). Portfolyo değerlendirme. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 32 (32), 133-144.
- Kayış, A. (2009). Reliability analysis. In Kalaycı, Ş. (Ed.), *The applications of SPSS and multivariate statistic techniques* (pp.403-419). Ankara: Asil Yayın Dağıtım.
- King, J. (2002). Preparing EFL learners for oral presentations. *Dong Hwa Journal of Humanistic Studies*, 4, 401-418.
- Kolomeitseva, E. M., & Makeyeva, M. N. (2006). The use of portfolios in language assessment (in English). *Вестник Тамбовского государственного технического университета*, 12 (3-2), 833-837.
- Kozulin, A., Gindis, B., Ageyev, V., & Miller, S. (Eds.). (2003). *Vygotsky's Educational Theory in Cultural Context (Learning in Doing: Social, Cognitive and Computational Perspectives)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Kukulu, K., Korukcu, O., Özdemir, Y., Bezci, A., & Çalık, C. (2012). Self-confidence, gender and academic achievement of undergraduate nursing students. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing*, 20(4), 330–335.
- Kulieke, M., Bakker, J., Collins, C., Fennimore, T., Fine, C., Herman, J., Tinzmann, M. B. (1990). *Why should assessment be based on a vision of learning?* [online document] NCREL, Oak Brook: IL. Available from http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/rpl_esys/assess.htm
- Lam, R., & Lee, I. (2009). Balancing the dual functions of portfolio assessment. *ELT Journal*, 64(1), 54–64.
- Lantolf, J. P. (2012). Sociocultural theory: A dialectical approach to L2 research. In S. M. Gass & A. Mackey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 57–72). New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.
- Lantolf, J.P., & M. Poehner (2010). Dynamic assessment in the classroom: Vygotsky's praxis for second language development. *Language Teaching Research*, 15 (1), 11-33.
- Lea, S.J., Stephenson, D. & Troy, J. (2003). Higher education students' attitudes toward student-centred learning: Beyond 'educational bulimia'? *Studies in Higher Education* 28(3), 321–334.
- Little, D. (1995). Learning as dialogue: The dependence of learner autonomy on teacher autonomy. *System*, 23 (2), 175-181.
- Little, D. (2005). The common European framework and the European language portfolio: involving learners and their judgements in the assessment process. *Language Testing*, 22(3), 321–336.
- Little, D. (2015). Learner Autonomy and Second/Foreign language Learning. LLAS Centre for Languages, Linguistics and Area Studies, Avenue Campus, Highfield, University of Southampton, Southampton, S017 1BF. Retrieved 21 April 2019 from <https://www.llas.ac.uk/resources/gpg/1409#ref2>

- Lussier, C. M., & Swanson, H. L. (2005). Dynamic assessment: a selective synthesis of the experimental literature. In G. M. van der Aalsvoort, W. C. M. Resing & A. J. J. M. Ruijsenaars (Eds.), *Learning potential assessment and cognitive training: actual research and perspectives in theory building and methodology* (pp. 65-87). New York: Elsevier.
- Luyegu, E. A. (2009). *Students' perceptions of assessment and the electronic portfolio project in the college of education* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (305065772)
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1994). The Subtle Effects of Language Anxiety on Cognitive Processing in the Second Language. *Language Learning*, 44(2), 283–305.
- Magin, D., & Helmore, P. (2001). Peer and teacher assessments of oral presentation skills: How reliable are they? *Studies in Higher Education*, 26(3), 287–298.
- Mak, P., & Wong, K. M. (2017). Self-regulation through portfolio assessment in writing classrooms. *ELT Journal*, 72(1), 49–61.
- Master, E. (1998). Language Instruction: Use of portfolios in ESL conversation classes. The clearing house: *A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 71(3), 132–133.
- McManus, S. (Ed.) (2008). *Attributes of effective formative assessment*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Miller, R. (2011). *Vygotsky in perspective*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mills, N, Pajares, F., & Herron, C. (2007). Self-efficacy of college intermediate French students: Relationship to achievement and motivation. *Language Learning*, 57(3), 417-442.
- Minstrell, J. (2001). The role of the teacher in making sense of classroom experiences and effecting better learning. In D. Klahr & S. Carver (Eds.), *Cognition and Instruction: 25 Years of Progress* (pp. 121-149). Mahwah, NJ: LEA.

- Murillo-Zamorano, L. R., & Montanero, M. (2017). Oral presentations in higher education: a comparison of the impact of peer and teacher feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(1), 138–150.
- Najeeb, S. R. (2013). Learner autonomy in language learning. *Procedia- Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 70, 1238 – 1242.
- Nakip, M. (2006). *Pazarlama arařtırmaları teknikleri ve (SPSS destekli) uygulamalar*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Nasab, F. G. (2015). Alternative versus traditional assessment. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 2(6), 165-178.
- Nematipour, M. (2012). A study of Iranian EFL learners' autonomy level and its relationship with learning style. *English Linguistic Research*, 1(1), 126-136.
- Newman, F., & Holzman, L. (1993). *Lev Vygotsky: Revolutionary scientist*. London: Routledge.
- Nicol, D., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(2), 199-218.
- Nosratinia, M., & Abdi, F. (2017). The comparative effect of portfolio and summative assessments on EFL learners' writing ability, anxiety, and autonomy. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 8(4), 823-834.
- Nunes, A. (2004). Portfolios in the EFL classroom: Disclosing an informed practice. *ELT Journal*, 58(4), 327–335.
- Oanh, D. T. H. (2006). Memorization and EFL students' strategies at university level in Vietnam. *TESL-EJ*, 10(2), 1-21.
- Oliver, S. D. (2017). *Analyzing the pedagogical beliefs and practices of Texas teachers to determine if they subscribe to a constructivist paradigm* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.(10267306)

- Omaggio-Hadley, A. (2001). *Teaching language in context* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Oscarson, M. (1989). Self-assessment of language proficiency: rationale and applications. *Language Testing*, 6(1), 1–13.
- Özdemir Çağatay, S. (2012). *Speaking portfolios as an alternative way of assessment in EFL Context*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Bilkent University, Ankara.
- Padilla, A. M., Aninao, J. C., & Sung, H. (1996). Development and Implementation of Student Portfolios in Foreign Language Programs. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29(3), 429–438.
- Patiung, D., Tolla, A., Anshari, A. & Dolla, A. (2015). The study of learning speaking skills based on communicative approach. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 6(5), 1093-1098.
- Patri, M. (2002). The influence of peer feedback on self- and peer-assessment of oral skills. *Language Testing*, 19(2), 109–131.
- Paulson, F. L., Paulson, P. R., & Meyer, C. A. (1991). What makes a portfolio? *Educational Leadership*, 48(5), 60-63.
- Pellegrino, J., & Quellmalz, E. (2010). Perspectives on the integration of technology and assessment. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 43 (2), 119-134.
- Pintrich, P. R., & De Groot, E. V. (1990). Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82, 33-40.
- Pintrich, P.R. (1999). The role of motivation in promoting and sustaining self-regulated learning. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 31, 459-70.
- Poehner, M. E. (2008). *Dynamic Assessment: A Vygotskian approach to understanding and Promoting L2 Development*. New York: Springer.

- Ponte, E. (2000). *Negotiating portfolio assessment in a foreign language classroom* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (9979770).
- Qamar, M. B. (2016). The impact of learner's autonomy on teaching oral skills (speaking skills) in an EFL classroom. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 7(2), 293-298.
- Rea-Dickins, P., & Gardner, S. (2000). Snares and silver bullets: Disentangling the construct of formative assessment. *Language Testing*, 17(2), 215-243.
- Reeves, T. C. (2000). Alternative assessment approaches for online learning environments in higher education. *Educational Computing Research*, 23(1), 101-111.
- Rhodes, T. L. (2011). Making learning visible and meaningful through electronic portfolios. *Change*, 43(1), 6-13.
- Rost, M. (2002). *Teaching and researching listening*. Great Britain: Pearson Education.
- Ruijsenaars (Eds.), *Learning potential assessment and cognitive training: actual research and perspectives in theory building and methodology*. New York: Elsevier.
- Saddhono, K., & Slamet, S.Y. (2012). *Meningkatan Keterampilan Berbahasa. Indonesia: Teori dan Aplikasi*. Bandung: CV. Karya Putra Darwati.
- Sadler, D. R. (1989). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. *Instructional Science*, 18(2), 119-144.
- Saeed, K.M., Khaksari, M., Eng., L. S. & Ghani, A.M.A. (2016). The role of learner-learner interaction in the development of speaking skills. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 6(2), 235-241.

- Segers, M. S. R., Dochy, F. J. R. C., & Cascallar, E. (2003). *Optimising new modes of assessment: in search of qualities and standards*. (Innovation and Change in Professional Education). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Sharifi, M., Soleimani, H., & Jafarigohar, M. (2016). E-portfolio evaluation and vocabulary learning: Moving from pedagogy to andragogy. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 48(6), 1441–1450.
- Shauki, E. R., & Benzie, H. (2014). Enhancing students' oral presentation skills: Observation based on undergraduate accounting students. *Asia Pacific Journal of Accounting and Finance* 3 (Special Issue): 43–58.
- Simons, R.J., Van der Linden, J. & Duffy, T. (2000). New learning: Three ways to learn in a new balance. In R.J. Simons, J. Van der Linden and T. Duffy, (eds), *New learning* (pp. 1–20). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Siwathaworn, P., & Wudthayagorn, J. (2018). The impact of dynamic assessment on tertiary EFL students' speaking skills. *The Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 5(1), 142-155.
- Soruç, A. (2011). Teachers and students' perceptions regarding portfolio assessment in an EFL context: A cops and robbers chase. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 25, 228-236.
- Stoynoff, S. (2012). Looking backward and forward at classroom-based language assessment. *ELT Journal*, 66(4), 523–532.
- Strijbos, J. W., & Sluijsmans, D. (2010). Unravelling peer assessment: Methodological, functional, and conceptual developments. *Learning and Instruction*, 20(4), 265-269.
- Tabachnick, B.G. & Fidell, L.S. (2013). *Using Multivariate Statistics*. Boston: Pearson.
- Taous, B. (2013). *The role of classroom interaction in improving the students' speaking skill* (Unpublished master's thesis). Biskra University, Algeria.

- Tarigan, H.G. (1983). *Berbicara sebagai suatu Keterampilan berbahasa*. Bandung: Angkasa.
- Tavakoli, M., & Nezakat–Alhossaini, M. (2014). Implementation of corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language classroom through dynamic assessment. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 10, 211–232.
- Thibodeau, E. H. (1999). *The effect of a rubric on the portfolio assessment process* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (9928221).
- Tilfarlıoğlu, F. T., & Çiftçi, F. S. (2011). Supporting self-efficacy and learner autonomy in relation to academic success in EFL classrooms (A case study). *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(10), 1284-1294.
- Tocaimaza-Hatch, C. C. (2016). Mediated vocabulary in native speaker-learner interactions during an oral portfolio activity. *Foreign Language Annals*, 49(2), 336–354.
- Topping, K. (1998). Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. *Review of Educational Research*, 68(3), 249-276.
- Tuckett, A. G. (2005). Applying thematic analysis theory to practice: A researcher's experience. *Contemporary Nurse*, 19(1-2), 75–87.
- Ural, A., & Kılıç, O. (2006). *Bilimsel araştırma süreci ve SPSS ile veri analizi (SPSS10.00-12.0 for Windows)*. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- Ural, A., & Kılıç, O. (2013). *Bilimsel araştırma süreci ve SPSS ile veri analizi*. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- Üstünoğlu, E. (2009). Autonomy in language learning: Do students take responsibility for their learning? *Journal of Theory and Practice in Learning*, 5(2), 148-169.

- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman (Eds.). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1987). *The collected works of L.S. Vygotsky. Vol. 1*. New York: Plenum.
- Wang, L. Y., & Chang, H.F. (2011). Improve oral training: The method of innovation assessment on English speaking performance, *International Journal of Distance Education Technologies*, 9(3), 56-72.
- Weiping G. & Juan, L.(2005). Test analysis of college students' communicative competence in English. *Asian EFL Journal*, 7(2), 1-13.
- Wiliam, D. (2000). *Recent developments in educational assessment in England: The integration of formative and summative functions of assessment*. Paper presented at SweMas, Umeå, Sweden, May.
- Wiliam, D., & Thompson, M. (2008). Integrating assessment with instruction: What will it take to make it work? In Dwyer, C. A. (Ed.), *The future of assessment: Shaping teaching and learning* (pp. 53-82). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Wolfe, E. W., & Miller, T. R. (1997). Barriers to the implementation of portfolio assessment in secondary education. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 10(3), 235-251.
- Wong, M., & Siew, L. (2005). Language learning strategies and language self-efficacy. *RELC Journal*, 36(3), 245–269.
- Xamani, M. I. (2003). An analysis of the communication strategies employed by learners of English as a foreign language. *Linguistics and Literature Studies*, 1(2), 88 – 104.
- Yaghoubi, A., & Mobin, M. (2015). Portfolio assessment, peer assessment and writing skill improvement. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 5(12), 2504-2511.

- Yastibaş, A. E., & Çepik, S. (2015). Teachers' attitudes toward the use of e-portfolios in speaking classes in English language teaching and learning. *Procedia - Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 176, 514–525.
- Yim, S. Y. (2014). An anxiety model for EFL young learners: A path analysis. *System*, 42, 344-354.
- Yu, H., & Li, H. (2014). Group-based formative assessment: A successful way to make summative assessment effective. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(4), 839- 844.
- Zhanibek, A. (2001). *The relationship between language anxiety and students' participation in foreign language classes*. Unpublished master's thesis, Bilkent University, Ankara.
- Zhuang, J. (2010). The changing role of teachers in the development of learner autonomy based on a survey of 'English dorm activity. *Journal of Language and Research*, 1(5), 591-595.

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: The Number of Participants and Data Collection Methods.....	54
Table 2: Frequency and Percent Distributions of Demographic Characteristics of the Students Included in the Survey (n = 289).....	55
Table 3: Findings of Reliability Analysis	64
Table 4: Frequency and Percent Distribution of the Demographic Characteristics of the Students Included in the Study (n = 289).....	65
Table 5: Findings Regarding Learner Autonomy	66
Table 6: Findings Regarding Skill Development Dimension	69
Table 7: Findings Regarding Self Confidence Dimension	72
Table 8: Findings Regarding Challenges Dimension.....	74
Table 9: Findings Regarding Self-Efficacy Dimension.....	76
Table 10: Comparison of Speaking Portfolio Assessment Scale and Subscale According to Genders of the Participants	78
Table 11: Comparison of Speaking Portfolio Assessment Scale and Subscale According to Participants' Ages	79
Table 12: Comparison of the Views of Participants on Speaking Portfolio Assessment Scale and Subscale According to Modules of the Participants.....	80
Table 13: Comparison of the Views of the Participant on Speaking Portfolio Assessment Scale and Subscale According to the Departments They Study.....	81
Table 14: Correlation Analysis for Basic Variables and Dimensions of Speaking Portfolio Assignments.....	84
Table 15: Accepted Hypotheses of Research.....	85

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Sample Speaking Portfolio Task and Rubric

CRITERIA	EXCELLENT (6-5 pts.)	AVERAGE (4-3 pts.)	WEAK (2-0 pts.)
<p>Content & Organization</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Has a good command of the subject - Topic developed with relevant details - Development of ideas- logical, easy to follow - Good use of transitions/ signposting 			
<p>1. Language Use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Uses a wide range of appropriate level vocabulary and level structures with few errors - Uses vocabulary appropriate for the audience – explains difficult or technical words 			
<p>2. Speaking Skills</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Speech is intelligible - Speaks clearly with accurate pronunciation - Speaks fluently with only minor hesitations 			
<p>3. Delivery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Natural delivery – not read - Rate of speech – not too fast or too slow <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Volume – loud enough to be heard clearly - Eye contact with audience - Appropriate body language 			
<p>4. Presentation of the material</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presents the material in a creative way - Uses visual aids effectively (e.g. slides, posters, pictures, audio, video) - Captures the attention of the audience and sustains the interest - The presentation is within time limits. <u>(It lasts 2-3 minutes.)</u> 			

CRITERIA FOR SPEAKING (ORAL PRESENTATION) ASSESSMENT

A2 SP1 How was your last holiday? (30 pts.)

- Students are expected to have the answers of such questions;
- *Where / When did you go?*
- *Who did you go on holiday with?*
- *Where did you stay? What was the food like?*
- *What was the weather like?*
- *What did you do during the day?*

- *What did you do at night?*
- *Did you have a good time? What was special for this holiday?*
- *Did you have any problems? How did you solve it?*

If the presentation doesn't answer any of these questions, then you can deduct points from **Content & Organization** and **Language Use**.

- They are expected to use *past simple* and *past continuous* and linkers e.g. *and, but, because, later* properly. If they don't, deduct points from **Language Use**.
- If it is not authentic, give "0" to **Content & Organization, Language Use** and deduct points from **Presentation of the Material**.
- **If students read, give "0" to the task.**
- If content is irrelevant, give "0" to the task.

Appendix 2: Questionnaire

İZİN FORMU

KATILIMCIYA:

Lütfen anketteki ifadeleri okuyup, size en uygun numarayı cümleye katılma oranınıza göre seçiniz. Boş soru bırakmamanız, çalışmanın verimliliği açısından etkili olacaktır. Yardımlarınız için şimdiden teşekkür ederim.

Öğretim Görevlisi Kübra Kıraç

KİŞİSEL BİLGİLER

Cinsiyet:

Kadın() Erkek()

Yaş (Lütfen yaşıınızı yazınız).

Lütfen bölümünüzü yazınız.

Lütfen okuyor olduğunuz modülü (seviyeyi) işaretleyiniz.

A1()

A2()

B1()

Aşağıdaki her bir ifadeyi dikkatle okuyunuz .Speaking portfolio ödevleri hakkındaki görüşlerinizi katılım derecesine göre 1'den 5'e kadar olan rakamlardan sadece birini işaretleyerek değerlendiriniz.

1. Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum
2. Katılmıyorum
3. Kararsızım
4. Katılıyorum
5. Kesinlikle Katılıyorum

	Kesinlikle katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılmıyorum	Kesinlikle katılmıyorum
1.Speaking portfolyo ödevlerinde en iyisini yapacağım ile ilgili kendime inanırım	5	4	3	2	1
2. Speaking portfolyo ödevlerinde sınıftaki diğer kişilerden daha başarılı olmayı beklerim	5	4	3	2	1
3. Speaking portfolyo ödevlerinde bizden istenilenleri hiçbir yardım ve ekstra öğretmen yardımı olmadan anlayabilirim.	5	4	3	2	1
4.Sınıftaki diğer öğrencilere kıyasla sınıfta öğretilen speaking yapılarını kullanmada daha iyiyim.	5	4	3	2	1
5.Speaking portfolyo ödevlerini hazırlarken çıkan problemlerin üstesinden gelebilirim.	5	4	3	2	1
6.Speaking portfolyo hazırlama süresince karar merkezi benimdir.	5	4	3	2	1
7.Speaking portfolyo ödevi verilirken yanlış anlaşılmalara veya belirsiz noktalar olsa bile ödevi kendi başıma anlayabilirim.	5	4	3	2	1
8.Speaking portfolyo ödevlerinde yanlış anlaşılma noktaları için tek sorumlu kişi benimdir.	5	4	3	2	1
9.Speaking portfolyo ödevleri sayesinde konuşma becerilerimin gelişeceği düşüncesindeyim.	5	4	3	2	1
10.Speaking portfolyo ödevleri sayesinde konuşma becerilerimin gelişimini çok daha kolay takip edebildim.	5	4	3	2	1
11.Speaking portfolyo ödevleri konuşma becerilerini değerlendirmede iyi birer araçtı.	5	4	3	2	1
12.Speaking portfolyo ödevleri konuşma becerimi olduğu gibi göstermemeye olanak sağladı.	5	4	3	2	1
13.Speaking portfolyo ödevleri konuşma becerimde şunlara katkıda bulundu.	5	4	3	2	1
a)konuşmamı planlama	5	4	3	2	1
b)Vurgu	5	4	3	2	1
c)tonlama	5	4	3	2	1
d)Kelime	5	4	3	2	1
e)Dilbilgis(Gramer)	5	4	3	2	1
14.Önümüzdeki kurlarda speaking portfolyo ödevlerinin vermesini isterim	5	4	3	2	1
15.Önümüzdeki kurlarda verilecek speaking portfolyo ödevlerinin konuşma becerilerimin gelişmesine yardımcı olacağını düşünürüm.	5	4	3	2	1
16.Speaking portfolyo ödevleri İngilizce konuşmada kendime güven kazanmamı sağladı.	5	4	3	2	1
17.Speaking portfolyo ödevleri topluluk önünde konuşmayla ilgili stres ve endişemin üstesinden gelmemeye olanak sağladı.	5	4	3	2	1
18.Speaking portfolyo ödevleri sık sık verilmelidir.	5	4	3	2	1
19. Speaking portfolyo ödevleri topluluk önünde konuşma ve kendime güven sağlama hususlarında bana yardım etti.	5	4	3	2	1
20.Speaking portfolyo ödevlerinin periyodik aralıklarla verilmesi benim için bir sorun oluşturmadı.	5	4	3	2	1
21.Süre limiti speaking portfolyo ödevlerini daha zor hale getirdi.	5	4	3	2	1
22.Speaking portfolyo ödevini sunarken kayıt altına alınmak(kamerayla çekilmek) beni gergin ve endişeli yaptı.	5	4	3	2	1
23.Teknik süreç(video kaydı, çekimi vb) speaking portfolyo ödevlerini daha zor bir hale getirdi.	5	4	3	2	1
24.Speaking portfolyo ödevlerini sunarken zamanı ayarlama zorlandım.	5	4	3	2	1
25.Speaking portfolyo ödevlerindeki grup çalışmaları(role play, tartışma vb) hazırlık sürecini uzattı.	5	4	3	2	1
26.Speaking portfolyo ödevlerini hazırlamada çok çaba sarf ettim.	5	4	3	2	1
27.Speaking portfolyo ödevlerini hazırlarken ve sunarken çıkan problemleri çözmek benim için zor değildi.	5	4	3	2	1
28.Speaking portfolyo ödevlerini sunarken veya hazırlarken çıkan problemleri çözerken paniğe kapılmadım.	5	4	3	2	1
29.Speaking portfolyo ödevlerinden sonra İngilizce'deki zayıf yönlerimin daha çok farkına vardım.	5	4	3	2	1
30. Konuşma becerilerimdeki zayıf yönlerimi nasıl geliştirebileceğimi bilirim.	5	4	3	2	1
31.İngilizce konuşma becerilerimdeki tespit ettiğim eksik noktaların üstesinden gelmek için gereken adımları atmaya planlıyorum.	5	4	3	2	1

Appendix 3: Questionnaire (the translation)

CONSENT FORM

The primary goal of this survey is to provide the views of the learners regarding speaking portfolio assessment in a Turkish preparatory program. Your personal information will be kept secretly and will not be shared with other people. The data collection is based on voluntary participation.

I participate in this study by reading the information above and I am volunteer to participate. I know my personal information will not be used in any other studies. I permit the researcher to use the data I give in the other studies as well.

TO THE PARTICIPANT

Please, read the statements in the survey and circle the numbers according to your agreement. I would really appreciate your efforts for the effectiveness of the study if you did not miss any of the questions. Thanks for your contributions in advance.

Instructor Kübra Kıraç

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Gender:

Female() Male()

Age (Lütfen yaşınızı yazınız).

Write your department name:

Circle the module you currently study:

A1()

A2()

B1()

Read each statement below carefully. Evaluate your opinions by marking the numbers ranging from 1 to 5 depending on your agreement.

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Disagree
3. Undecided
4. Agree

5.Strongly Agree

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I believe in myself to do best in speaking portfolio assignments.	5	4	3	2	1
2. I anticipate doing better than the other students in class in speaking portfolio assignments	5	4	3	2	1
3. I can comprehend the instructions about the speaking portfolio assignments without any help or more teacher guidance.	5	4	3	2	1
4. Compared to the other students in the class, I am better at using the oral production patterns that are taught in the class.	5	4	3	2	1
5. I can handle the problems while preparing for the speaking portfolio task.	5	4	3	2	1
6. I am the decision maker during the process of speaking portfolio preparation.	5	4	3	2	1
7. Despite the misunderstandings or unclear points in assigning the speaking portfolio tasks, I am able to comprehend by myself.	5	4	3	2	1
8. I am the only responsible person about the any misunderstood points parts about speaking portfolio tasks.	5	4	3	2	1
9. I believe I will improve my speaking skills with the help of speaking portfolio tasks.	5	4	3	2	1
10. Thanks to speaking portfolio tasks, I can now follow my progress in speaking more easily.	5	4	3	2	1
11. Speaking portfolio assignments are good evaluation tools for speaking skills	5	4	3	2	1
12. Speaking portfolio tasks in my speaking portfolio allowed me to demonstrate my speaking skill ability exactly as it is.	5	4	3	2	1
13. Speaking portfolio tasks contributed to my speaking skills	5	4	3	2	1
a)Speaking portfolio tasks contributed to my speaking skills in terms of planning my talk.	5	4	3	2	1
b)Speaking portfolio tasks contribute to my speaking skills in terms of stress.	5	4	3	2	1
c)Speaking portfolio tasks contribute to my speaking skills in terms intonation.	5	4	3	2	1
d)Speaking portfolio tasks contribute to my speaking skills in terms of vocabulary.	5	4	3	2	1
e)Speaking portfolio tasks contribute to my speaking skills in terms of grammar.	5	4	3	2	1
14. I would like to have speaking portfolio assignments in the upcoming modules.	5	4	3	2	1
15. I believe the speaking portfolio assignments to be given in the upcoming modules will help improve my speaking skills.	5	4	3	2	1
16. Speaking portfolio tasks enabled me to gain self confidence in speaking English.	5	4	3	2	1
17. Speaking portfolio tasks allowed me to overcome my stress and anxiety about public speech.	5	4	3	2	1
18. I think speaking portfolio tasks should be assigned frequently	5	4	3	2	1
19. Speaking portfolio task helped me to learn talking before the audiences and gaining self-confidence.	5	4	3	2	1
20. It is not a problem if students are assigned speaking portfolio tasks periodically.	5	4	3	2	1
21. Time limit made the speaking portfolio tasks more difficult.	5	4	3	2	1
22. Being recorded while presenting the speaking portfolio tasks was a big problem (makes us anxious and nervous)	5	4	3	2	1
23. Technical things (video recording etc.) made the speaking tasks more challenging)	5	4	3	2	1
24. I had difficulty in time management during the speaking portfolio tasks	5	4	3	2	1
25. Group work in speaking portfolio tasks made the preparation process longer.	5	4	3	2	1
26. I made a lot of effort in preparing speaking portfolio assignments.	5	4	3	2	1
27. It wasn't difficult for me to deal with problems while presenting and preparing speaking portfolio assignments	5	4	3	2	1
28. I didn't get into panic easily while solving the problems about speaking portfolio assignments.	5	4	3	2	1
29. I am more aware of my weak sides in English after speaking portfolio tasks.	5	4	3	2	1
30. I know how to improve my weak sides in speaking by myself.	5	4	3	2	1
31. I plan to take the necessary steps to overcome the deficiencies that I detected in my speaking.					



Appendix 4: Students' Interview Questions

- 1) What do you think about the speaking assessment in your department?
- 2) In what ways speaking portfolio tasks at your department are effective? /What are the advantages of speaking portfolio tasks?
- 3) In what ways do speaking portfolio tasks affect your speaking skills?
- 4) In what ways do speaking portfolio tasks contribute to your self-confidence and self-efficacy?
- 5) In what ways do speaking portfolio tasks contribute you to be responsible of your own learning?
- 6) What problems do you face while presenting the speaking portfolio tasks?
- 7) Are there anything you want to change about speaking portfolio tasks? What are they?

Appendix 5: Instructors' Interview Questions

- 1) What do you think about the speaking assessment? Would you prefer alternative assessment methods in assessing speaking skill?
- 2) What do you think about the speaking portfolio tasks at your department?
- 3) In what ways are speaking portfolio tasks effective assessment methods?
- 4) In what ways speaking portfolio tasks contribute to the development of learners in terms of speaking skills, learner autonomy, self-efficacy and, self-confidence?
- 5) What do you think about the other skills students get with the help of speaking portfolio tasks?
- 6) What are the problems instructors face about speaking portfolio task?
- 7) What are the problems students face while presenting speaking portfolio task?
- 8) Do you have difficulty in assessing or grading the speaking portfolio task?
- 9) What are your suggestions for using speaking portfolio tasks more appropriately?

Appendix 6: A Sample Transcript of A Student Interview

R: Researcher

P: Participant

R: Bulunduğun kurdaki konuşma becerisi değerlendirmesi hakkındaki genel düşüncelerini öğrenebilir miyim?

P: A1 kurundayım. Bölümüm endüstri ürünleri tasarımı. Speaking değerlendirmede puan tabiki olmalı ama sınıf ortamında çok fazla geriliyoruz. Çok paniklediğim için bir speaking ödevini yapmamıştım, başarısızlık korkum yüzünden. Video olarak çektiğimiz speakingler daha kolay. Çünkü kalabalık önünde konuşmak zorunda kalmıyorsun. Bu da seni daha rahat yapıyor. Ayrıca hata yaptığımızda bırakıp tekrar tekrara videoyu çekme imkanımız oluyor.

R: Anladım. Peki, konuşma portfolyosu değerlendirmesi hangi bakımdan sana yarar sağlıyor? Avantajları nelerdir? Hangi bakımlardan iyi bir değerlendirme aracı?

P: Bölümde 4 sene boyunca yapacağım sunumlar için bir hazırlık oluyor, nasıl sunum yapmamız gerektiğini öğrendiğimiz için. İngilizce olduğu için ilerki iş hayatımızda bize yardımcı olacak bir durum. Aslında bir yönden faydalı ama a1 kuru için biraz zor birşey. Çünkü çok İngilizce bilgimiz yok kelimedede sıkıntı yaşıyoruz. Türkçe'den İngilizce'ye çevirmek durumunda kalıyoruz o anda iki şeyi birden olmuyor. Ama yine de özellikle yeni kelime öğrenme ve öğrendiğini pratiğe dökebilme açısından yararlı olduğunu düşünüyorum. Çalışırken, kendi kendimize prova yaparken herhangi bir sunum ödevi için, kelimelerin İngilizce telaffuzlarına dikkat ediyoruz, bu da konuşma becerimize katkıda bulunuyor diye düşünüyorum. Ayrıca o anki seviyemizi gösteriyor. Bu da iyi bir değerlendirme aracı olduğunun göstergesi.

R: Peki biraz daha dar kapsamlı bahsederseniz, konuşma portfolyosu hangi bakımlardan konuşma becerilerine katkıda bulunuyor?

P: Kelimeleri daha doğru telaffuz etmeye çalışıyoruz ki arkadaşlarımıza karşı rezil olmayalım. Hem de daha iyi puan almak için önce metin yazıyoruz sonra telaffuza dikkat ediyoruz, tekrar ediyoruz. Normalde, günlük hayatımızda ana dilimiz olmadığından yapmadığımız bir şey İngilizce konuşmak. Bu sayede pratik yapmış oluyoruz.

R: Peki ,Konuşma portfolyosu kendine güven ve öz yeterlilik becerileri bakımından katkıları nelerdir?

P: Öz yeterlilik?

R: Yani, kendi kendine yetebilme, üstesinden gelebilme.

P: Anladım, Aslında bir iki kere yaptıktan sonra rahatlıyorsunuz aynı ortamda aynı insanlara karşı, güvenimiz artmaya başlıyor. Yapabildiğimizi görüyoruz. Bu yüzden kendine güveni ve öz yeterliliği arttırdığını düşünüyorum.

R: Konuşma portfolio ödevlerini hazırlarken yardım alıyor musun?

P: Arkadaşımdan yardım alıyorum hazırlanırken, daha üst seviyedeki arkadaşarımdan yardım almaya çalışıyorum, tek başıma hazırlanmakta zorlanıyorum.

R: Anladım, peki hiç zorluk yaşıyor musun hazırlık veya sunma aşamasında? Konuşma portfolio ödevlerini hazırlarken yaşadığın problemler neler?

P: Süre benim en büyük problemim. İstenilen süreyi dolduramama problem yaşadığım en büyük sıkıntı.

R: Peki, konuşma portfolyosunun daha etkili uygulanması için önerilerin var mı?

P: Konular daha geniş kapsamlı olabilir, bu sayede süreyi de doldurabiliriz.

Appendix 7: A Sample Transcript of Instructors' Interview

R: What do you think about the speaking assessment? Would you prefer alternative assessment methods in assessing speaking skill?

P: I think speaking assessment is not a kind of assessment which can be separated from other assessment types or we can't think it as different from other written assessments...vocabulary, grammar, reading and writing. Because we direct our students to written assessment methods in typical Turkish education system or sometimes we assess them with reading tasks, unfortunately speaking assessment is left behind or ignored. Therefore, speaking portfolio assessments should be integrated with other assessment types and be obligatory in learning-teaching process.

R: What do you think about the speaking portfolio tasks at your department?

P: Because when I look at my teaching experience, I can realize the considerable differences between the speaking assessment 10 years ago and now. I prefer alternative assessment methods like portfolios. Developing technology, innovative teaching methods, students' tendencies to use technology, applications, social media or Internet masterfully affect this situation. Rather than traditional exams or tests, these portfolio tasks give students more freedom. Group role play tasks by giving them authentic contexts and at the end of the presentations peer evaluation can be asked. These are creative and focus on production. Also, some presentations that prepare them to departments might be beneficial. They can learn some terms about their academic fields. I think, in our system peer evaluation is limited or only depends on the instructor, if instructor ask the students to give feedback about their friends, they only tend to say good things or sometimes they reject commenting on their friends' presentations. This can be because of their habits in our education system again. In our education system, we can't teach our students to criticize. When they think of criticism they associate this vocabulary with negative things in their schemas. Therefore, we have some deficiencies in peer feedback, I think. Briefly, while assigning the tasks our main aim is to help students to gain their self-confidence and learn to present without getting nervous. As you know before presentations most of them say "I am nervous" we are anxious" teacher my hands are shaking and sweating. I can hear my heartbeats" we aim at helping them to overcome all these problems. Therefore, in my opinion, speaking assessment and task should not be separated from the teaching process.

R: In what ways are speaking portfolio tasks effective assessment methods?

P: I think speaking portfolio tasks are very successful as these tasks are determined by 5 or 6 instructors by discussing about them by taking the needs and abilities of the students into consideration. Certainly, students need time to be proficient in presentation. they learn to search about the topic., in lower levels the students can turn to memorize the text they prepared. However, the benefits suppress the negative outcomes like memorization. Speaking portfolio tasks in our department are determined by a commission. Therefore, I think that our assessment methods and criteria are enough to assess the speaking tasks which are carried out.

R: In what ways speaking portfolio tasks contribute to the development of learners in terms of speaking skills, learner autonomy, self-efficacy and, self-confidence?

P: Certainly, they contribute to all these features as the students don't present anything in class until they come to preparatory school. They start college life by not having an active role in any project. But with speaking portfolio tasks, we disclose the fear they have already had, and they realize that they need to change something to overcome their fear. It is important because the students and we see the weak points of them. When it comes to self-confidence, let's talk about my observations. When I compare the first and 3rd task of my pre-intermediate level students, I can notice the big difference in terms of their self-confidence. During the first task, students' hands shake, or they tremble, or we can understand their nervousness from the facial expressions. But in the last task, even though these things do not disappear completely, their effect decreases, or it does not interrupt the speaking portfolio task. About learner autonomy, yes, speaking portfolio tasks have positive effect especially during the task preparation process. But as a suggestion, we can arrange tasks which require the students to search more. In other words, students should learn to use the written documents and internet sources. In that way, speaking portfolio tasks contribute to learner autonomy more.

R: What do you think about the other skills students get with the help of speaking portfolio tasks?

P: First of all, preparing speaking portfolio tasks causes the students to improve high level of vocabulary. If they research any topic like a biography, a historical event, or a

role play in a hospital or shopping context, the students learn the terms or vocabulary about the related field. Therefore, I think in a speaking task, a student learns at least 10 or 15 new words. In role play speaking portfolio tasks, the students transfer the knowledge they learn in the class to role play or dialogue. In terms of the implementation and the addition of other skills to speaking portfolio tasks, I find them enough and rich in context.

R: What are the problems instructors face about speaking portfolio task?

P: We can say these in a progressive way. When I assign a speaking portfolio task, I realize that most of the students get nervous. I can understand it from their faces. Presumably, they get nervous because of the presentation part rather than preparing something new. They know that most of the people will listen to them and it frightens them. While assigning the tasks, I must answer a lot of questions. Even some of the questions are not about the tasks but the students ask because they become nervous. Actually, if he/she thinks the task sedately, they can overcome the task. I think I have difficulty in creating a relaxed atmosphere while assigning the task. Before assigning the speaking portfolio tasks, I apply a method. Before the students present their tasks, we talk and discuss the texts they prepare, or we analyse the text to make it more natural. We can say that they rehearse the presentation before they present. They focus on their mistakes and try not to memorize. But it requires time you know as I must spare 10- 15 minutes for a student. Maybe before the presentations we don't have that time. During the presentation, sometimes we must deal with students' anxiety. After starting the presentations some students say to teacher "I will not be able to it". And they give it up or some of them start the presentation again and again and then say I give up. As teachers, the only thing we can do might keep the calm atmosphere in the class or we might say our students: "These tasks are not your first or last assessment." Also, I prefer assessing the tasks by sitting beside my students, I never sit on teachers' chair. I want to create an atmosphere as if I am their friends. In that way, they get calmer.

R: What are the problems students face while presenting speaking portfolio task?

P: The biggest problem which the students face during presenting speaking portfolio tasks may be self-confidence. Sometimes the students' hands may shake because of their high level of anxiety and nervousness. As they don't have much experience in

making a presentation before, some students may have difficulty in this process. Also, the students may have some problems such as time management or organization. For instance, some of the students think that the time limit makes them nervous. Sometimes, they try to present their tasks as quickly as possible because of their nervousness or they write everything on their power point slides. They need to improve their presentation skills.

R: Do you have difficulty in assessing or grading the speaking portfolio task?

P: When I listen to many tasks successively, I sometimes have difficulty in attention. And I become mentally tired. Students also get tired of listening. Therefore, to make a more fruitful assessment, I tell my students they can go out if they want or they can be ready for the next lesson. But our biggest advantage all the tasks are recorded. After grading my students if I have any hesitations about a student's grade, I can watch the video version at home or office and I become sure about the final grade. Video recording of all tasks gives us opportunity to check our grade. To be honest, this situation gives me confidence and it enables the students to rely on the system more.

R: What are your suggestions for using speaking portfolio tasks more appropriately?

P: I have some suggestions. Our students think that the main thing they are assessed is their presentation in English. But the real situation is different. They realize the importance of talking before audience or they notice the difficulty of it. It becomes the first activity they do. Hence, we can show some presentations or alternative activities which focuses on talking before audience and we can dictate that the audiences or teachers are not different from the speakers. In that way, we can help them to overcome their anxiety. We can assist our students to be calmer before presentations by asking some warmup questions. I focus on anxiety because most of the students suffer from it before tasks. For example, while talking about phobias in our lessons in one of my classes a student said to teacher, "all of us have gloss phobia." Gloss phobia means fear of public speech. English teaching can be linked with cognitive process. Therefore, students can deal with their problems about speaking portfolio tasks by studying, asking for advice, focusing on peer check if necessary.

Appendix 8: Pre-Task Questionnaire

Cinsiyetiniz:

Erkek _____ Bayan _____

Yaşınız _____ Bölümünüz _____

Lütfen speaking portfolyo hakkındaki soruları cevaplayınız.

1. Speaking portfolyo ödevlerini hazırlarken nasıl bir yöntem izliyorsunuz?

2. Bugün speaking portfolyo ödevi için ne yaptınız? Nasıl yaptınız?

Pazartesi:

Salı:

Çarşamba:

Perşembe:

Cuma:

Cumartesi:

Pazar:

3) Speaking portfolyonun olumlu ve olumsuz yönleri nelerdir?

Speaking Portfolyonun olumlu yönleri	Speaking Portfolyonun olumsuz yönleri

4) Speaking portfolyo ödevlerinin etkili bir konuşma ve iletişim yolu olduğunu düşünüyor musunuz? Açıklayınız.

5) Speaking portfolyo ödevlerinin etkili bir değerlendirme aracı olduğunu düşünüyor musunuz? Açıklayınız.

6) Speaking portfolyolar ne sıklıkla olmalıdır?/Neden?

Appendix 9: Self Reflection Questionnaire

Cinsiyetiniz:

Erkek _____ Bayan _____

Yaşınız _____ Bölümünüz _____

Lütfen speaking portfolyo hakkındaki soruları cevaplayınız.

Speaking portfolyo ödeviniz nasıl geçti?/Beklediğiniz gibi miydi?

Speaking portfolyo ödevinin size kattığı olumlu yönleri nelerdir?

Speaking portfolyo ödevini sunarken yaşadığınız sorunlar nelerdir?

Speaking portfolyo ödevi etkili bir değerlendirme aracı mıydı? Neden?

Bu ödevden sonra, Speaking portfolyo ödevlerinizin etkili bir konuşma ve iletişim yolu olduğunu düşünüyor musunuz? Açıklayınız.

Speaking portfolyo ödevleri ne sıklıkla olmalıdır?

Lütfen verilen ifadeleri kendinize uygun olacak şekilde tamamlayınız.

Portfolyo ödevini şu nedenle sevdim:

Portfolyo ödevini şu nedenle sevmedim:

Portfolyo ödevi şu nedenle kolaydı:

Portfolyo ödevi şu nedenle zordu:

CURRICULUM VITAE

Kübra KIRAÇ was born in Karabük, on March 25, 1991. As a senior student, she attended Erasmus+ program within the scope of Ministry of European Union and worked as a language assistant for 8 months in a primary school in Czechia. She graduated with a BA degree in Bogazici University Foreign Language Education in 2014 as an honor student. Since December 2014, she has been working as an English instructor at Karabuk University School of Foreign Languages. She co-authored one article with Assoc. Prof. Dr. Özkan KIRMIZI, titled “A Comparative Study of Learner Autonomy in Terms of Gender and Learning Contexts”. She also attended 10th International ELT Research Conference “New Perspectives in Quality Learning and Teaching in ELT” as an active participant in Antalya. Her research interests include alternative assessment, learner autonomy, and skill development.