



Washback effects of high-stakes language tests of Turkey (KPDS and ÜDS) on productive and receptive skills of academic personnel

Kadriye Dilek Akpınar^{a*}, Bekir Cakildere^b

^a Gazi University, Faculty of Gazi Education, Department of Foreign Language Education, Ankara, 06500 Turkey

^b Abdullah Gül University, School of Foreign Languages, Kayseri, 38039, Turkey

Suggested Citation:

Akpınar, K. D., & Cakildere, B. (2013). Washback effects of high-stakes language tests of Turkey (KPDS and ÜDS) on productive and receptive skills of academic personnel. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 9(2), 81-94. Retrieved from <http://www.jlls.org/vol9no2/81-94.pdf>

Abstract

Washback, the impact of tests on education in general and language testing in particular, has become a popular area of study within educational research. This paper focuses on the washback effects of two high-stakes Foreign Language Tests (KPDS and ÜDS) of Turkey. The main concern of the study is to investigate the impact of these tests on receptive and productive language skills of academicians. 103 academic personnel working at Nevşehir University attended the study. A 26-item questionnaire was designed and administered to 103 academic personnel working at Nevşehir University. The data were analyzed using statistical analysis including descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation) and inferential statistics that use ANOVA to find whether there are significant differences between productive and receptive skills of the participants. It has been found out that there are significant differences between reading and writing; reading and listening, but reading and speaking provided insignificant results.

© 2013 The Authors and JLLS - Published by JLLS.

Keywords: High-Stake Tests; KPDS; ÜDS; YDS; Washback effect

1. Introduction

Tests, particularly high-stakes tests, aim to induce consequences for the test-takers, teachers, administrators, parents, and the policy makers. Scholars from different countries such as China (Qi, 2004), Hong Kong (Cheng, 2005), Korea (Choi, 2008), Japan (Watanabe, 2004b), and Taiwan (Chen, 2002) claim that these tests directly or indirectly affect educational policy of the national or international institutions to determine course designs and classroom practices. Shohamy (2001a, 2001b); Wall (1997); also support the power of tests on wider society such as policy makers or school administrators who try to use them to manipulate or implement educational policies.

Definitely, “testing is never a neutral process and always has consequences” (Stobart, 2003, p. 140). Negative or positive, strong or weak, the influence of tests on learning has been termed as ‘washback’ or ‘backwash’ (Biggs, 1995). The term is used as a synonym for ‘impact’, ‘effect’ or ‘consequence’ in educational context, particularly in the field of language assessment and applied linguistics. Washback studies in language testing include high-stakes tests of some countries such as, Sri Lanka (Wall & Alderson, 1993), Hong Kong (Andrews, 1995; Cheng, 1997, 1998, 1999; Andrews et al., 2002) and Israel (Shohamy et al., 1996) where English is used as a foreign or second language.

Turkey as a foreign language setting has a lot of national and international language assessment exams which candidates need to go through for different purposes. Apart from international exams such

* Kadriye Dilek Akpınar. Tel.: +90-312-202-8468
E-mail address: kadriyedilek@gazi.edu.tr

as TOEFL or IELTS the names of some national language tests held in Turkey are: State Personnel Language Examination, (Kamu Personeli Dil Sınavı; hereafter KPDS), Inter-University Foreign Language Examination (Üniversiteler Arası Dil Sınavı; hereafter ÜDS), and University Entrance Examination (Yükseköğretime Giriş Sınavı; hereafter YGS). They are high-stakes language tests administered by OSYM in Turkey. However, the name of KPDS and ÜDS has changed in April 2013. These two exams are combined and have been replaced by YDS (Foreign Language Examination).

Though KPDS and ÜDS are the most favored national high-stakes language tests in Turkey, there is only limited research in the literature about their outcomes particularly in terms of learning. Actually, not only in Turkish context but also throughout the whole world the washback researches generally focus on the effects of tests on teaching (Pan and Newfields; 2012) rather than learning. However, researchers such as Cheng (2008); Spratt (2005); Wall (2000) and Watanabe (2004) have emphasized the need to explore the influence of tests on learners, since they are directly affected by them (Pan and Newfields, 2012). Therefore, this study aims to explore the washback effects of KPDS and ÜDS on language development of the learners. More specifically, the study focuses on the impact of these high-stakes tests on receptive and productive language skills of academic personnel studying at Nevşehir University, Turkey.

1.1. Literature review

1.1.1. The notion of washback and washback studies

The notion of washback or backwash can be defined as the impact of a test on teaching and learning (Biggs, 1995, 1996, in Cheng, 2003). Alderson and Wall (1993) framed the term “washback” to “classroom behaviors of teachers and learners rather than the nature of printed and other pedagogic material” (p. 118). Messick (1996) and Hughes (2003) on the other hand, assert that whether positive or negative there is a direct relationship between the teaching process and the design and use of the examination. According to Frederiksen (1984) and Hughes (2003), if a test is poorly designed, the outcomes are possibly negative; adversely a well-prepared test can have positive impacts on teaching and learning process.

Many scholars conclude that washback seems to be associated primarily with high-stakes tests, which are mainly employed for making important decisions on wider fields of a society such as education and economy (Hughes, 2003; Li, 1990; Shohamy, 1993; Pearson, 1988; Luxia, 2005). The growing importance of high-stakes test, which are widely used both national and international context of education, makes the washback studies a popular research area.

A great number of researchers have investigated the effects of washback on learning/teaching second/foreign language so far. The most widely investigated topics regarding the impact of high-stakes tests are the stakeholders of the education process such as textbooks (Saville and Hawkey, 2004), teachers (including teaching assistants), (Cheng, 2005; Ferman, 2004; Saif, 2006; Wall, 2006), learners and learning (Andrews, Fullilove, and Wong, 2002; Watanabe, 2001), attitudes toward testing (Cheng, 2005; Jin, 2000), and test preparation behaviors (Lumley and Stoneman, 2000).

While some of these studies have focused on the impact of world-wide-known high-stakes test like TOEFL, TOEIC, and IELTS (Alderson and Hamp-Lyons, 1996; Newsfields, 2005; Reynolds, 2010), the others (Cheng, 1997; Hsu, 2009; Manjarres, 2005; Wall, 2005; Watanabe, 1996) have investigated nationwide exams. For instance, Alderson and Hamp-Lyons' (1996) study can be considered as a pioneer work in the area of washback effect. They investigated the washback effect of Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) preparation courses. They found that the TOEFL test has an impact on what and how teachers teach. However, the degree of this effect changes from teacher to teacher.

Additionally, their study has revealed that the difference between TOEFL versus non-TOEFL teaching is not clear since it is difficult to explain why the teacher taught in that way.

In another study, Rahimi and Nazhand (2010) focus on the washback effect of one of the most taken English exams in the world, IELTS. They have conducted a study on the washback effect of IELTS preparation courses to learn students' perceptions of speaking instructions. The students express what they think about the speaking instructions through questionnaires. In general, the IELTS exam has a negative washback effect on the development of speaking skill during the course periods as IELTS restricts the speaking skill due to the format of the exam. Another example of a washback study about national high-stakes exams has conducted by Li (1990). He has investigated the effects of the Matriculation English Test in China through a questionnaire and asserted positive effects for the test. Later in 1993, Shohamy has studied the effects of three language tests: The Arabic Test, the English Oral Test, and the Reading Comprehension Test. The study has revealed that all the three tests have some impact on teaching and learning practices. Wall (2005) has conducted a study by examining the effects of a national high-stakes test "English as a Foreign Language" on the education system of Sri Lanka. She reported that both the factors of the exam itself and the characteristics of the educational setting have an influence on the intended outcomes of the examination on the teachers and the learners. Finally, Muñoz and Álvarez (2010) have searched the washback effect of an oral assessment system (OAS) on some areas of EFL teaching and learning. Positive washback effect has been observed on the teachers' teaching and assessment practices and on students' oral production.

However, there are only a few national studies conducted in Turkey. Hughes (2003) for instance, has investigated the effects of an English proficiency test at Bogazici University in Istanbul. He has found out that the test achieved its main goal of motivating students to work harder on their English proficiency. Later in 2007, Sevimli has studied washback effects of foreign language component of the university entrance examination on the teaching and learning context of language groups in secondary education. She states that productive skills of speaking and writing and receptive skill of listening are totally neglected and not tested. She thought that this might have been the washback effect on the teaching and learning of the students and curriculum. Like Sevimli (2007), Karabulut in 2007 has studied on university entrance test. She has examined how foreign language component of the university entrance examination influences teachers and students in senior three classrooms (the last grade of high school) in Turkey. In her study she has also focused on the attitudes of different stakeholders and senior three English teaching in general towards the test. The most important result of her study is the students' and teachers' focusing more on the (grammar, reading, vocabulary) which is tested in the exam and ignoring the ones that are not tested (listening, speaking, writing).

Finally, Özmen (2011) has conducted a research on washback effects of inter-university foreign language examination (ÜDS) on candidate academics. Washback effects of ÜDS are investigated in a qualitative study. It is clearly seen that ÜDS has a negative washback effect on the test-takers. The results also reveal that the exam has both a micro level effect which can be defined as the effect on an individual or a small group of individuals, and a macro effect on a relatively populated group of individuals studying or working at university contexts.

1.1.2. State Personnel Language Examination (KPDS) and Inter-University Foreign Language Examination (ÜDS)

Of all the aforementioned national foreign language high-stakes exams, KPDS and ÜDS are the most preferred ones in Turkey. Most common use of these two examinations for academic personnel can be divided into four categories; first of which is; using the scores of these exams to attend a PhD program. Universities in Turkey require students to get at least 55 points to be admitted as a PhD candidate. In other words, students have to get at least 55 points from a high stake language test accepted by YÖK in

order to be a PhD student in Turkish state universities. Secondly, these exams are used as a prerequisite for the academic promotion. Assistant professors in Turkey are supposed to get at least 65 points to be promoted, which is one of the several requirements of being promoted to associate professorship. Although there is no minimum limit, the higher scores the candidates have from these exams, the more chance they will have for admission. Thirdly, when applying to a master's degree program, applicants are also asked to provide their scores of these exams. Finally, the personnel who work for the government should attend to KPDS to get some amount of increment in their salaries depending on their proficiency level.

The content and format of both KPDS and ÜDS are almost similar but there are still a few differences between them. There are 80 questions both in KPDS and ÜDS. The allotted time for both of the exams is 180 minutes. KPDS consists of one type of exam whereas ÜDS is divided into three majors: Social Sciences, Life Sciences and Health Sciences. The first 40 questions of ÜDS are the same regardless of the major. KPDS and ÜDS share eight main headings under which the types of questions fit: Vocabulary, grammar, sentence completion, reading comprehension, translation, dialogue, paragraph completion and irrelevant sentence. However, there are two parts which only exist in KPDS, which are situational response and paraphrasing the sentences.

1.2. Research questions

The study addressed the following research questions:

1. What is the washback effect of KPDS and ÜDS on receptive skills (listening and reading) of the Turkish academic personnel?
2. What is the washback effect of KPDS and ÜDS on productive skills (writing and speaking) of the Turkish academic personnel?
3. Are there any significant differences between the development of participants' productive and receptive skills regarding the washback effect of KPDS and ÜDS?
4. What is the relationship between development of participants' productive and receptive skills regarding the washback effect of KPDS and ÜDS?

2. Method

2.1. Setting and participants

The study was conducted at Nevsehir University, which is one of the public universities in Turkey. Nevsehir University was founded in 2007. It has six faculties: Faculty of Education, Faculty of Science and Letters, Faculty of Fine Arts, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Faculty of Engineering and Architecture, Faculty of Tourism. The University also has a College of Health and three vocational schools. As of May 2013, it had 493 academic and 228 administrative staff.

2.1.1. Demographic characteristics of the participants

There were 51 male and 52 female participants who took part in the study. The average age for the participants was around 35.

As it is presented in Table 1, 26.2% of the participants consisted of assistant professors who have not got 65 or more points from KPDS or ÜDS or an equivalent exam accepted by YÖK. 47.6% of the participants were instructors which might imply that they do not plan an academic career. In Turkey, research assistants and assistant professors are expected to get promoted to a higher academic degree but university instructors do not necessarily plan an academic career.

Table1. Participants' field of study and title

		Field			
		Social Sciences	Science	Health	Total
Title	Assistant Prof.	18	5	4	27
	Research Assistant	21	3	3	27
	Instructor	27	15	7	49
	Total	66	23	14	103

As for the academic field of study, there were 66 academicians in the field of social sciences. The number of the participants in the field of health and science were 38 which is almost half of personnel in social sciences. The current study focuses on the academic personnel particularly who have not passed KPDS or ÜDS yet. Out of 115 academic personnel who have not acquired 65 points or above, 103 academic staff were included in the study. 12 academic personnel could not be included since they either did not volunteer to participate in the study or were out of town.

2.2. Instrument

In most of the washback studies, the methods used are based on surveys, interviews, testing measures, classroom observations or a combination of these (Alderson & Wall, 1993; Shohamy, Donitsa-Schmidt, Ferman, 1996 and Watanabe, 1996). The survey comprised of 5-point Likert-scale items (1=strongly disagree; 2=disagree; 3=no idea; 4=agree; 5=strongly agree). The survey examines i) which skills participants focus on ii) how they study while getting prepared for KPDS and ÜDS and, iii) their attitudes towards the influence of KPDS and ÜDS on their language development (see Appendix). All questionnaires were delivered in Turkish in order to prevent any misunderstandings of the survey items.

Chi-square test was used to determine the reliability of the survey questions. It is a “nonparametric statistical test of hypotheses for variables” (Joseph & Joseph, 1986 and Healey, 2005, p.544). The chi-square values were $\text{sig} < 0.05$ indicating adequate reliability for each of the dimension of the survey.

The face validity of the survey instrument was ascertained by presenting the questionnaire to four experts studying in the Foreign Language Education department. The experts made some observations and modifications on the survey items.

2.3. Data collection

A survey research design was used to investigate the answer to the question of ‘What are the washback effects of high stake exams (KPDS and ÜDS) on receptive and productive skills of Turkish academic personnel?’ As it was thought that e-mailing the questionnaires to the academic staff would result in a low amount of feedback, the questionnaires were delivered in person by the researcher. To save time and energy, all of the academic personnel were called through their university telephone lines. To those personnel whom the researcher could reach through telephone, information about the study was given and they were requested to take part in the study if they have less than 65 from KPDS, ÜDS or an equivalent exam accepted by YÖK. When they had accepted to join the study, the researcher visited them in their office to hand out the questionnaires. Each questionnaire took approximately 5 minutes to fill in.

2.4. Data analysis

Descriptive statistics including frequency, percentage, means and standard deviations were used to find an answer for the first research objective: “What is the washback effect of KPDS and ÜDS on language skills?” The second objective, whether any difference exists between productive and receptive skills of the participants, was analyzed utilizing one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). Additionally, correlation analysis was used to determine the relationship between the productive and receptive skills. All statistical analysis was performed using SPSS software (SPSS Version 19).

3. Results

3.1. R.Q.1. What is the washback effect of KPDS and ÜDS on receptive skills of the Turkish academic personnel?

3.1.1. Washback on reading

To evaluate the impact of KPDS and ÜDS on reading participants were asked if they had studied to improve their reading skill while getting prepared for KPDS and ÜDS. 85.4% (the mean score is 3.7184) of the participants stated that they had studied to improve their reading skills since it was tested in KPDS and ÜDS. On the other hand, only 3.9% of the participants disagreed that they had studied to improve their reading skills. The high rate (85.4%) of agree implies that KPDS and ÜDS have strong positive washback effect on reading.

3.1.2. Washback on listening

Participants were asked whether they had studied to improve their listening skills although it was not tested in KPDS and ÜDS. 77.7% (the mean score is 2.3010) of the participants did not study for listening skills on account of the fact that it was not tested in KPDS and ÜDS.

As for proving the negative washback effect of KPDS and ÜDS on listening skills, the academicians were also asked whether they would study to develop their listening skill if it was tested. 83.5% of the participants stated that they would study to develop their listening skills if KPDS and ÜDS had a part that tested listening. Only 5.8% of the participants stated that even if KPDS and ÜDS tested listening skills, they would still not study to develop this skill.

3.2. R.Q.2. What is the washback effect of KPDS and ÜDS on productive skills (speaking and writing) of the Turkish academic personnel?

3.2.1. Washback on speaking

Academicians were asked whether they had tried to improve their listening skill or not although it was not tested in KPDS and ÜDS. 77.6% (the mean score is 2.1068) of the participants did not do anything to develop their speaking skills just because KPDS and ÜDS did not check how well they spoke. 77.6% of the participants’ not studying to develop their speaking skills as it was not tested implies that KPDS and ÜDS have a strong negative effect on learners’ speaking skills.

So as to clarify the negative washback effect of the tests on their speaking skills participants were also asked whether they would study to improve their speaking ability if it was tested. 85.5% of the participants stated that they would study to develop speaking skills if KPDS and ÜDS had a part testing it, which can be interpreted as the negative washback effect of these tests on oral skills.

3.2.2. Washback on writing

In the survey item related to writing skills, participants were asked if they had studied to improve their writing ability although it was not tested in KPDS and ÜDS. 78.7% (the mean score is 2.3592) of the participants stated that they did not study to develop their writing skills since it was not tested in KPDS and ÜDS. 78.7% of the participants' not studying to develop their writing skills as it was not tested implies that KPDS and ÜDS have a strong negative effect on learners' writing skills.

The next survey item about writing skill questions whether the participants would study to improve their writing skills if it was tested in KPDS and ÜDS. The strong negative impact of KPDS and ÜDS on writing skills confirms the findings of the previous survey item. 86.4% of the participants stated that they would study to develop their writing skills if KPDS and ÜDS had a part which test this skill.

3.3. R.Q.3. Are there any significant differences between the development of participants' productive and receptive skills regarding the washback effect of KPDS and ÜDS?

The ANOVA test as shown in Table 2 indicates that the differences in mean scores of reading between listening ($p < 0.001$) and writing ($p < 0.009$) are statistically significant. On the other hand, the mean scores of reading and speaking provides insignificant results at 0.114 significance level.

Table 2. Analysis of one-way ANOVA for significant differences between reading and other skills

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
listening	Between Groups	18.805	4	4.701	4.961	.001
	Within Groups	92.865	98	.948		
	Total	111.670	102			
speaking	Between Groups	6.214	4	1.553	1.912	.114
	Within Groups	79.612	98	.812		
	Total	85.825	102			
writing	Between Groups	19.236	4	4.809	3.612	.009
	Within Groups	130.473	98	1.331		
	Total	149.709	102			

The ANOVA Test results (as it is seen in Table 3) also indicates significant differences between the mean scores of listening and reading, between listening and speaking ($p < 0.000$) and between listening and writing ($p < 0.001$).

Table 3. Analysis of one-way ANOVA for significant differences between listening and other skills

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
reading	Between Groups	41.108	4	10.277	9.014	.000
	Within Groups	111.727	98	1.140		
	Total	152.835	102			
speaking	Between Groups	43.860	4	10.965	25.607	.000
	Within Groups	41.965	98	.428		
	Total	85.825	102			
writing	Between Groups	52.786	4	13.196	13.343	.001
	Within Groups	96.923	98	.989		
	Total	149.709	102			

3.4. R.Q.4. What is the relation between development of participants' productive and receptive skills regarding the washback effect of KPDS and ÜDS?

The correlation analysis of the data indicates a positive relationship between reading and listening (.404**) and a positive but low correlation between reading and speaking (.263**). As it is shown in table 4, there is a positive correlation between reading and writing.

Table 4. Analysis of Correlations

	reading	listening	speaking	writing
reading	1			
listening	.404**	1		
speaking	.263**	.681**	1	
writing	.353**	.525**	.512**	1

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4 indicates that there is a high and positive correlation between listening and speaking (.681**) and a positive relationship exists between listening and writing (.525**). There is also a positive relationship between speaking and writing ($r=.512^{**}$).

4. Discussion

The aim of this study is to investigate the washback effect of two high-stakes language tests (KPDS and ÜDS) in Turkey on the receptive and productive skills of the Turkish academic personnel. The results of the survey analysis both descriptively and statistically reveal that the most positively affected skill by these language tests is reading skill. This is an indication of the negative washback effect of KPDS and ÜDS particularly on the productive skills of speaking and writing and the receptive skill of listening. The findings of the study are in line with Sevimli (2007) who has studied washback effects of foreign language component of the university entrance examination. There is also similarity with the findings of Karabulut (2007) who found that students and teachers focus more on the grammar, reading and vocabulary which are tested in YGS and ignore the ones that are not tested (listening, speaking, writing). Rahimi and Nazhand's (2010) findings about the washback effect of IELTS preparation courses are also parallel to the results of the current study. They asserted that IELTS exam has a negative washback effect on the development of speaking skill since the format of the IELTS restricts the speaking skill.

This result induces the students to work more at developing their receptive skills than their productive ones with the overflow of multiple-choice questions (Weiping and Juan, 2005). When the structure of these exams is taken into consideration, it is quite necessary for the participants to try to develop their reading skills as 75% of the exam requires individuals to have a highly developed reading skill. If people learn a language with the aim of passing an exam at the end of the learning process, they usually tend to study the subjects or improve the skills that they will be tested. For example; if an English test does not involve listening skills, most of the attendees will not have a tendency to improve that specific skill. This outcome is in line with Wall and Alderson (1993) who assert that a test will influence what students study. Most of the academic personnel who take KPDS and ÜDS as an academic requirement of YÖK will mostly focus on passing the exam. As a result, they will not spend any effort to improve the skills such as listening, speaking and writing that are not included in these tests. This result matches with that

of Ferman (2004) who explains how washback is observed through an increased focus on skills included on the test, resulting in “an increase in time allotted for the development of these skills” (p. 204).

The negative washback effect of KPDS and ÜDS on writing skills of the participants is rather surprising since the academicians are also expected to publish in international journals to promote in their academic career which means they should develop their writing ability. However, the results indicate that the participants are not motivated even by this situation and most of them do nothing to improve their writing ability. This can be due to the effect of the tests on test takers which is also supported by Shohamy (1992) and Shohamy et al. (1996) who emphasize that a measurement-driven system leads to cramming for the test and concentrates attention on the skills that are tested.

Finally, the results of the current study reveal significant differences between the development of productive and receptive skills of the participants. They do not focus on the skills which are not tested in the exams. These findings are in line with the findings of Smith (1991), and Shepard (1997) that the test itself determines what people will study and test like activities are all consequences of external testing.

5. Conclusions

In conclusion, KPDS and ÜDS have positive washback effect only on reading skills of the Turkish academics while these tests have negative on writing, listening and speaking skills. In other words, productive skills of speaking and writing and receptive skill of listening are totally neglected by the participants of these tests since these skills are not tested. Alderson and Wall (1993) and Watanabe (1996) also suggest that tests will have washback effects for some learners, but not for others. When the structure and content of these exams are taken into consideration, the reason why the participants do not do any kinds of listening, writing, speaking activities for getting prepared these exams could be easily understood. Participants are highly interested in developing their reading skills since these exams require individuals to have highly developed reading skills and knowledge of grammar to get a high score.

However, language tests are expected to integrate all the four skills for assessing test takers' language performance. Particularly for speaking skills, Poonpon (2010) found out that speaking tests are necessary for learners, so this should be included in tests. Furthermore, this is also supported by the finding of Andrews, Fullilove and Wong (2002), who suggested that adding an oral test would have some influence on the students' spoken performances. It is the same for all other receptive and productive skills. That is, they should take part in a language test if it is expected to assess a more valid construct of what it really means to know a language. Supporting this, Frederiksen (1984) claims that if tests fail to assess the abilities that are desired to be fostered, they may cause test bias against teaching crucial skills that are not tested.

A language test should definitely be multi-faceted. As KPDS and ÜDS test only grammar and reading comprehension skill rather than writing, speaking and listening skills, we can say that they are not multi-faceted tests. In this case, though the primary purpose of these exams is to push the learners to learn a language with all its dimensions, a complete language learning process is hardly managed due to the structure and content of these exams.

Consequently, the test designers in Turkey should design and use alternative language assessment tests which include all the dimensions of language performance considering the fact that academicians have to compete with their counterparts in the international arena. It should well-motivate the test takers and consider the other elements of the language education context such as teaching practices, learners' needs, curricular objectives, materials and so forth instead of just focusing on academic promotion.

References

- Alderson, J. C. and Wall, D. (1993). Does washback exist? *Applied Linguistics*, 14, 115-129.
- Alderson, J. C., and Hamp-Lyons, L. (1996). TOEFL Preparation Courses: a study of washback. *Language Testing*, 13 (3), 280-297.
- Andrews, S., Fullilove, J., & Wong, Y. (2002). Targeting washback: a case study. *System*, 30(2), 207-23.
- Biggs, J. B. (1995). Assumptions underlying new approaches to educational assessment. *Curriculum Forum*, 4 (2), 1-22.
- Cheng, L. Y. (1997). How does washback influence teaching? Implications for Hong Kong. *Language and Education*, 11, 38-54.
- Cheng, L. (2002). The washback effect on classroom teaching of changes in public examinations. In S. J. Savignon (Ed.), *Interpreting communicative language teaching: Contexts and concerns in teacher education* (pp. 91-111). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Cheng, L. (2003). Looking at the impact of a public examination change on secondary classroom teaching: A Hong Kong case study. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 38(1), 1-10.
- Cheng, L. (2005). *Changing language teaching through language testing: A washback study. Studies in language testing*, 21. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Choi, I. (2008). The impact of EFL testing on EFL education in Korea. *Language Testing*, 25(1), 39-62.
- Frederiksen, J. R., & Collins A. (1989). A system approach to educational testing. *Educational Researcher*, 18(9), 27-32.
- Hsu, H.-F. (2010). *The impact of implementing English proficiency tests as a graduation requirement at Taiwanese universities of technology* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of York, United Kingdom.
- Hughes, A. (2003). *Testing for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jin, Y. (2000). The backwash of the CET-SET on teaching. *Foreign Language World*, 4, 56-61.
- Karabulut, A. (2007). *Micro level impacts of foreign language test (university entrance examination) in Turkey: A washback study* (Unpublished master's thesis). Iowa State University, USA.
- Li, X. (1990). How powerful can a language test be? The MET in China. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 11(5), 393-404.
- Lumley, T. & Stoneman, B. (2000). Conflicting perspectives on the role of test preparation in relation to learning? *Hong Kong Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 5(1), 50-80.
- Luxia, Q. (2005). Stakeholders' conflicting aims undermine the washback functioning of a high-stakes test. *Language Testing*, 22, 142-173.
- Manjarrés, N. B. (2005). Washback of the foreign language tests of the state examination in Colombia: A case study. *Arizona Working Papers in SLAT – Vol. 12*, 1-19. Retrieved from <http://slat.arizona.edu/sites/slat/files/page/awp12manjarres.pdf>
- Messick, S. (1996). Validity and washback in language testing. *Language Testing*, 13(3), 241-256.
- Munoz, A. P., and Alvarez, M. E. (2010). Washback of an oral assessment system in the EFL classroom. *Language Testing*, 27 (1), 33-49.

- Newfields, T. (2005). Washback effects on teachers: A pilot study at one university faculty. *English*, 31(1), 83-105.
- Özmen, K. S. (2011). Washback effects of the Inter-University Foreign Language Examination on Foreign Language Competences of Candidate Academics. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 5(2), 215-228.
- Pan, Y., & Newfields, T. (2012). Tertiary EFL proficiency graduation requirements in Taiwan: A study of washback on learning. *Electric Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 9(1), 3-13.
- Pearson, I. (1988). Tests as levers of change (or 'putting first things first'). In D. Chamberlain & R. Baumgartner (Eds.), *ESP in the classroom: Practice and Evaluation* (pp. 98-107). London: Modern English Publications in association with the British Council.
- Poonpon, K. (2010). Expanding a second language speaking rating scale for instructional and assessment purposes. *English Language Institute*, 8, 69-94.
- Qi, L. (2004). Has a high-stakes test produced the intended changes? In L. Cheng, Y. Watanabe & A. Curtis (Eds.), *Washback in language testing: Research contexts and methods* (pp. 171-190). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Rahimi, Z., & Nazhand, N. (2010). Perspectives on IELTS Preparation Courses to the learners: Iranian Learners Perspectives on IELTS Preperation Courses. *2010 International Conference on e-Education, e-Business, e-Management and e-Learning* (pp. 490-494). Los Alamitos: IEEE Computer Society.
- Reynolds, J. (2010). *An Exploratory Study of TOEFL Students as Evaluators of Washback to the Learners* (Unpublished master's thesis). The University of Queensland, Australia.
- Saif, S. (2006). Aiming for positive washback: A case study of international teaching assistants. *Language Testing*, 23(1), 1-34.
- Saville, N., & Hawkey, R. (2004). The IELTS impact study: Investigating washback on teaching materials. In L. Cheng, Y. Watanabe, & A. Curtis (Eds.), *Washback in language testing: Research contexts and methods* (pp. 73-96). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Sevimli, S. (2007). *Washback effects of foreign language component of the university entrance examination on the teaching and learning context of English language groups in secondary education* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Gaziantep, Turkey.
- Shepard, L. A. (1997). The centrality of test use and consequences for test validity. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 16(2), 5-13.
- Shohamy, E., Donitsa, S., & Irit, F. (1996). Test impact revisited: Washback effect over time. *Language Testing*, 13(3), 298-317.
- Shohamy, E. (1992a). Beyond proficiency testing: A diagnostic feedback testing model for assessing foreign language learning. *Modern Language Journal*, 76(4), 513-521.
- Shohamy, E. (1992b). New models of assessment: The connection between testing and learning. In E. Shohamy & R. Walton (Eds.), *Language assessment for feedback: Testing and other strategies*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt Publishing Company.
- Smith, M. L. (1991). Put to the test: The effects of external testing on teachers. *Educational Researcher*, 20(5), 8-11.

- Spratt, M. (2005). Washback and the classroom: The implications for teaching and learning of studies of washback from exams. *Language Teaching Research*, 9(1), 5- 29.
- Stobart, G. (2003). The impact of assessment: Intended and unintended consequences. *Assessment in Education*, 16, 139-140.
- Wall, D. (1996). Introducing new tests into traditional systems: Insights from general education and from innovation theory. *Language Testing*, 13(3), 334-354.
- Wall, D. (2000). The impact of high-stakes testing on teaching and learning: Can this be predicted or controlled? *System*, 28, 499-509.
- Watanabe, Y. (1996). Does grammar translation come from the entrance examination? Preliminary findings from classroom-based research. *Language Testing*, 13(3), 318- 333.
- Watanabe, Y. (2004). Teacher factors mediating washback. In L. Cheng, Y. Watanabe, & A. Curtis (Eds.), *Washback in language testing: Research contexts and methods* (pp. 129-146). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Weiping, G., & Juan, L. (2005). Test analysis of college students' communicative competence in English. *Asian EFL Journal*, 7 (2), 7.

Appendix A.

Questionnaire

1. **Age:** 22-31 () 32-41 () 42-51 () 52 + ()
2. **Gender:** Male () Female ()
3. **Title:**
Assistant Professor () Research Assistant () Lecturer ()
4. **Field of Study:**
Social Sciences () Science () Health ()
5. **How long have you been studying for KPDS and ÜDS?**
0-1Year () 2-4 Years () 5-7 Years () 8 or more ()

B- Please read the following items carefully and cross (x) the one that suits you best.					
	Definitely disagree	Disagree	No Idea	Agree	Definitely agree
1- I do reading activities such as reading a novel, an article, a magazine in order to get a valid point from KPDS and ÜDS.	()	()	()	()	()
2- I do listening activities in order to get a valid point from KPDS and ÜDS.	()	()	()	()	()
3- I do speaking activities in order to get a valid point from KPDS and ÜDS.	()	()	()	()	()

4- I do writing activities in order to get a valid point from KPDS and ÜDS.	()	()	()	()	()
5- Going abroad for language education is necessary in order to get a valid point from KPDS and ÜDS.	()	()	()	()	()
6- Extra help such as attending a private English course is needed in order to get a valid point from KPDS and ÜDS.	()	()	()	()	()
7- Test strategies and tactics need to be learned in order to get a valid point from KPDS and ÜDS.	()	()	()	()	()
8- Too many preparation tests should be solved in order to get a valid point from KPDS and ÜDS.	()	()	()	()	()
9- KPDS and ÜDS increase my willingness of learning English.	()	()	()	()	()
10- KPDS and ÜDS decrease my willingness of learning English.	()	()	()	()	()
11- I feel stressed and pressurized due to KPDS and ÜDS.	()	()	()	()	()
12- I feel more anxious because I have to pass KPDS or ÜDS to get a academic promotion.	()	()	()	()	()
13- Feeling that I will not be able to get a valid point from KPDS or ÜDS negatively affects my studies and my attitude towards English.	()	()	()	()	()
14- I study to improve my grammar knowledge since it is tested in KPDS and ÜDS.	()	()	()	()	()
15- I study to improve my vocabulary knowledge since it is tested in KPDS and ÜDS.	()	()	()	()	()
16- I study to improve my reading comprehension since it is tested in KPDS and ÜDS.	()	()	()	()	()
17- I do not study to improve my pronunciation since it is not tested in KPDS and ÜDS.	()	()	()	()	()
18- I would study to improve my pronunciation if it was tested in KPDS and ÜDS.	()	()	()	()	()
19- I do not study to improve my speaking since it is not tested in KPDS and ÜDS.	()	()	()	()	()
20- I would study to improve my speaking if it was tested in KPDS and ÜDS.	()	()	()	()	()
21- I do not study to improve my listening since it is not tested in KPDS and ÜDS.	()	()	()	()	()
22- I would study to improve my listening if it was tested in KPDS and ÜDS.	()	()	()	()	()
23- I do not study to improve my writing since it is not tested in KPDS and ÜDS.	()	()	()	()	()
24- I would study to improve my writing if it was tested in KPDS and ÜDS.	()	()	()	()	()
25- KPDS and ÜDS influence my English in a positive way.	()	()	()	()	()
26- KPDS and ÜDS influence my English in a negative way.	()	()	()	()	()

Türkiye’de düzenlenen iki önemli dil sınavının (KPDS ve ÜDS) akademik personelin algısal ve üretken dil becerileri üzerine geriye dönük etkisi

Öz

Testlerin, genel olarak eğitim özel olarak da dil eğitimi üzerindeki etkisi anlamına gelen geriye dönük etki çalışmaları, günümüzde eğitim alanında oldukça popülerdir. Bu çalışma, Türkiye’de düzenlenen iki önemli sınav olan KPDS ve ÜDS üzerine odaklanmıştır. Çalışmanın temel amacı, bu testlerin akademisyenlerin üretken ve algısal becerileri üzerindeki etkisini araştırmaktır. Araştırmaya Nevşehir Üniversitesinde çalışan 103 akademik personel katılmıştır. 26 ögeli bir anket tasarlanıp 103 akademik personele uygulanmıştır. Veriler betimsel (frekans, yüzdeler, medyan, standart sapma) ve istatistiksel olarak üretken ve algısal beceriler arasında anlamlı fark olup olmadığını bulmak için ANOVA kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir. Sonuç olarak, okuma ve yazma; okuma ve dinleme arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı fark bulunmuş fakat okuma ve konuşma arasında anlamlı fark bulunmamıştır. *Anahtar sözcükler:* Önemli Sınavlar; KPDS; ÜDS; geriye dönük etki

AUTHORS’ BIODATA

Kadriye Dilek Akpınar graduated from Selçuk University, English Language and Literature department. She got her MA in English Literature from the same university. She received her Ph.D. degree in Foreign Language Education from Gazi University, Ankara. She is still working at the same university as an assistant professor. Her research areas include Teacher Training, Intercultural Competence and Sociolinguistics, Language and Discourse and Language Testing

Bekir Cakildere graduated from Erciyes University, English Language and Literature department. He got his MA in English Language Teaching from Gazi University, English Language Teaching department. Currently, he is a Ph.D. candidate in Hacettepe University English Language teaching department, Ankara. He works at Abudullah Gül University, School of Foreign Languages as an instructor. His research areas include TEYL and language assessment.