

Rating Scale Development Study for the Evaluation of the Prepared Speeches

Berker Bulutⁱ

Adnan Menderes University

Nuri Karasakaloğluⁱⁱ

Adnan Menderes University

Abstract

The lessons related to mother tongue education in schools are given by classroom teachers in primary school and by Turkish teachers in secondary school. In this sense, it is necessary to include courses that will contribute to the good and effective use of the mother tongue in Turkish and classroom teaching undergraduate programs. It can be said that the practice hours in undergraduate programs should be increased in order to improve the prepared speaking skills of teacher candidates. In addition, determining the prepared speech performance levels of teacher candidates is also important in terms of the quality of practice activities. In this way, the teacher candidate can have information about their state and keep track of their development. Accordingly, the aim of this study was to develop a rating scale for the evaluation of teacher candidates' prepared speaking skills. For that reason, the research was designed according to the screening model. The study group of the study consisted of the third-year students of the Turkish Education department who were studying at the education faculty of a state university and took the "Speaking Education" course in the spring semester. In order to determine the validity of the measurement tool, the scope and criterion validity were examined. In order to determine the reliability of the assessment tool, Kendall's W test and variance analysis were applied to the evaluations of three different independent raters. Results of study obtained within the scope of validity and reliability studies are strong evidence showing that the rating scale is valid and reliable.

Keywords: Prepared Speech, Rating Scale, Teacher Candidates.

DOI: 10.29329/ijpe.2021.332.27

ⁱ **Berker Bulut**, Assist. Prof. Dr., Temel Eğitim Bölümü, Aydın Adnan Menderes University, Faculty of Education, ORCID: 0000-0001-8221-5440

Correspondence: berkerbulut09@gmail.com

ⁱⁱ **Nuri Karasakaloğlu**, Prof. Dr., Turkish Education, Aydın Adnan Menderes University, Faculty of Education, ORCID: 0000-0002-5577-4551

INTRODUCTION

Speaking, which is defined as the ability to express one's feelings and thoughts verbally, is one of the language skills that the individual uses most when communicating with their environment in daily life. According to Sever (2011), speech is a reflector of personality formation and social relations as well as verbal communication of emotions, thoughts and desires. Doğan (2009) also states that in the communication process, people perform the verbal action so that they can express themselves and explain their feelings and thoughts. At the same time, it is stated that the speaking skill is used to share thoughts with others, to generate new thoughts in the sharing process, and thus, to prevent rusting of the mind (Yakıcı, Yücel, Doğan & Yelok, 2005).

It is seen that communication and thought are the most striking concepts among the definitions for speaking skill. Indeed, Taşer (2001) states that speaking is the product of social life. Considering that an important part of the interaction between people in daily life is done verbally, it can be said that speaking skill forms the basis of the healthy communication expected to be established in social life. However, according to Onan (2011), the fact that there is a direct thought production in the speaking process shows that the speaking skill has a direct connection to the concept of thought when compared to other language skills. In addition, Plato thinks that thinking is an internal conversation with oneself and that the expression of thought occurs through the skill of speaking. Descartes also argues that speaking skill must be acquired in order to think (Altınörs, 2003, p. 83-93). As it can be seen, with the use of verbal language, which ensures understanding between people, individuals become involved in social life and acquire an identity by conveying their thoughts through speaking skills.

As mentioned above, for the development of speaking skill, which has such importance in human life, it should be valued to the same degree at every level of education from basic to higher. On the other hand, Tompkins (2005) states that, just like the listening skill, the speaking skill acquired before school age is a language skill that develops spontaneously, hence the idea that this skill does not have to be included in the curriculum is dominant. However, the development of speaking skill is very important for students to communicate, learn and convey their feelings, thoughts and knowledge confidently. As Calp (2010) and Özbay (2005) stated, to get children who have learned the structure of their mother tongue substantially until they reach school age to sense the structure and functioning of the mother tongue, eliminate their speaking deficiencies and improve their speaking skills by correcting their mistakes in a certain order with formal education are some of the main goals of schools in verbal expression.

In schools, mother tongue teachers have a great responsibility to develop the language skills that the child acquires indiscriminately from family and social environment. Children who have speech problems other than anatomical causes can overcome this problem with an effective mother tongue education offered in the school environment. Taşkaya (2014) states that in-class conversations and activities the teachers will do in Turkish courses are important for improving speaking skills in schools. In this sense, it is expected that mother tongue teachers have more responsibility to take on this issue (Başaran & Erdem, 2009). On the other hand, apart from the activities that mother tongue teachers practice, they must be role models for their students by making correct, nice and effective speeches in accordance with the rules of the language. As a matter of fact, it is inevitable that the mother tongue education given by a teacher who has difficulties in using Turkish effectively and in accordance with the rules will also fail (Bulut, 2015). In this regard, it is expected that teacher candidates will have a good speaking education in order to get students to gain an effective speaking skill.

The lessons related to mother tongue education in schools are given by classroom teachers in primary school and by Turkish teachers in secondary school. In this sense, it is necessary to include courses that will contribute to the good and effective use of the mother tongue in Turkish and classroom teaching undergraduate programs. With the inclusion of the aforementioned courses in undergraduate programs, it is expected that these courses will allow prospective teachers to make a

habit of using Turkish correctly in terms of both theory and practice. Although it is not the subject of this study, it is a matter of debate whether the course contents in the related programs meet the needs especially in the field of application. As a matter of fact, Arslan (2012) states that teacher candidates do not want to take part in activities that require public speaking due to reasons such as lack of self-confidence, sarcastic behavior of the audience, fear of giving incomplete information, embarrassment when speaking in front of the community, and not having a good command of Turkish. Based on this, it can be said that the practice hours in undergraduate programs should be increased in order to improve the prepared speaking skills of teacher candidates. In addition, determining the prepared speech performance levels of teacher candidates is also important in terms of the quality of practice activities. In this way, the teacher candidate can have information about their state and keep track of their development.

Since the speech to be made will not always have the same qualification, the speech type differs according to the people and place the speech will take. Basically, the types of speech can be grouped under two headings as prepared and impromptu speech. Impromptu speech does not require any prior preparation; it is defined as daily conversations that are a part of our daily life and whose place, time and to whom to talk are not predetermined (Kaya, 2016). In prepared speeches, the subject is determined in advance, necessary research is done, information is collected, and the main idea to be emphasized or the message to be given is created. The data are organized within a plan, speech text is prepared and presented. It is stated that speech anxiety is generally seen in prepared speeches which are to be given in front of an audience (Özdemir, 2018). On the other hand, studies show that giving feedback to individuals about their performance after speaking practices reduces speech anxiety (Katrancı & Kuşdemir, 2015; Sevim, 2014).

Since speaking is a performance-based language skill, measuring this skill requires the use of appropriate measurement tools. Performance in the assessment and evaluation process is defined as the effort an individual makes while creating a new product by using his / her knowledge and skills (Kutlu, Doğan & Karakaya, 2010). In addition to the fact that performance-based assessment includes real-life situations and focuses on high-level mental processes, another difference from classical assessment methods is that the individual's performance while using his / her knowledge and skills and development processes can be observed (Popham, 2000; Wortham & Hardin, 2015). Performance-based state determination can be used in cognitive, affective and psychomotor areas. At this point, the first steps to be considered are the definition of performance and the preparation of the scoring criteria. Apart from the rater, the scoring criteria must also guide the person subject to evaluation. The individual whose performance is evaluated should be able to see where he/she has made a mistake and to follow his/her development according to performance criteria. Based on this, the checklist, rating scale, rubric and observation forms can be counted as measurement tools used in performance evaluation.

If we consider the subject in terms of speaking skill, first of all, in order to evaluate a performance related to speech, it is necessary to describe the sub-dimensions and to use measurement tools that can determine performance levels in different criteria according to these dimensions. According to Göçer (2014), the speaking skill checklist, speaking skill rubric, speaking skill peer assessment form, speaking skill student observation form, and speaking skill rating scale can be used to evaluate the development of speaking skill in cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains. On the other hand, in his study, Bozkurt (2017) states that, there are no theoretically supported common evaluation criteria in Turkey, and the measurement tools developed to determine the proficiency levels of Turkish native speakers are few in number, and they do not show consistency in terms of naming, dimensions, criteria and behaviors. When the relevant literature is examined, it is seen that the measurement tools designed to measure the speaking skills of individuals whose native language is Turkish are mostly at the primary education level and are developed for impromptu speech.

Based on the explanations made, the subject of this study, in order to fill the gap in the literature, is the development of a measurement tool for the evaluation of prepared speech, which is an

important skill for prospective teachers. The rating scale, which is frequently used in performance-based evaluations, was preferred as the measurement tool. Accordingly, the aim of this study was to develop a rating scale for the evaluation of teacher candidates' prepared speaking skills.

METHOD

Research Model

In this study, it was aimed to develop a rating scale for an observer to evaluate prepared speech performances of teacher candidates whose native language is Turkish by rating them from weak to competent and to give feedback to teacher candidates about their situation. For that reason, the research was designed according to the screening model.

Study Group

The study group of the study consisted of the third-year students of the Turkish Education department who were studying at the education faculty of a state university and took the "Speaking Education" course in the spring semester. The fact that the students participating in the study were selected from Turkish education department, as mentioned before, is due to the fact that the teachers, who are the role models of the students in using Turkish effectively and in accordance with the rules, are mostly native language teachers. The reason for the inclusion of the third-year Turkish teacher candidates in the study is that the theoretical and practical courses for speaking skills are included in this year of university education. As a result, 46 third year Turkish teacher candidates participated in the validity and reliability studies conducted within the scope of the research.

The Development Phase of the Rating Scale

While developing a rating scale for the evaluation of prepared speech, first of all, the relevant literature was scanned, and the dimensions were determined based on the definitions of prepared speech. Then, behavioral criteria for prepared speaking skill were formed by taking the opinions of the experts who worked on the subject. The 30 items prepared were sent to five experts in the field for their evaluation in terms of scope and eligibility. In line with the expert opinions received, 5 items were removed based on criteria such as not being clear, understandable, directed at behavior and not purposeful, and the 25-item form was created. The items in the form were rearranged using the speech text plan proposed by Özdemir (2017) and the speaking skills assessment framework created by Bozkurt (2017), and a 4-point rating was formed in the form of "weak, medium, good, competent."

While creating the application form, as mentioned above, the behavioral criteria for prepared speaking skill were arranged based on Bozkurt's (2017) study. While creating the dimensions of the behavioral criteria, the speech text plan proposed by Özdemir (2017) was taken as a basis. As a result, based on the definitions of prepared speech, the presentation dimension of the rating scale, which was formed from three dimensions as beginning, presentation and closing, was divided into sub-dimensions according to the speaking skill assessment framework suggested by Bozkurt (2017). The proposed evaluation framework consists of five main areas under the titles of content, pronunciation, fluency, interaction, presentation, and language competence. The pronunciation sub-dimension under the presentation dimension in the rating scale developed in this study is the discourse area, which includes breathing, articulation, and volume, and the vocabulary and grammar sub-dimension is the language competency area, which includes making lexical-syntactic choices, and the consistency sub-dimension is the content explaining the arrangement of speech, the field of interaction and presentation associated with the use of body language, communication and presentation strategies, and lastly, the fluency sub-dimension is related to the fluency area, which includes speech speed, repetitions and pauses.

Before starting the implementation phase, teacher candidates were informed about speech types during the "Speaking Education" course. They gained experience by practicing impromptu and prepared speech types with various activities. At this point, teacher candidates learned about the draft forms prepared for evaluating their speaking performance. Later, for the main application, teacher candidates were asked to give a speech for 5-10 minutes on a text they prepared by adhering to the speech plan, on a topic they had chosen. Due to the pandemic, the teacher candidates recorded videos of their speeches and sent them to the researcher via "Google Classroom." In this way, data analysis was carried out for validity and reliability studies of the rating scale by using video recordings.

Data Analysis

The scope and criterion validity were examined to determine the validity of the rating scale developed for evaluating prepared speech. For content validity, opinions of expert academicians on the subject were consulted. For criterion validity, its correlation with the "Speaking Skills Rating Scale (for Native Speakers of Turkish)" developed by Bozkurt and Arıca-Akkök (2019) was calculated. In order to determine its reliability, the correlation between the evaluations of three independent raters who observed each teacher candidate was examined.

FINDINGS

In this section, findings and comments on validity and reliability studies of the prepared speaking skill rating scale are included.

Validity Study

In order to determine the validity of the rating scale developed for evaluating prepared speech, the content validity was examined first. Therefore, the opinions of five expert academicians on the subject were consulted. While obtaining expert opinions, the 4-point rating system proposed by Davis (1992) (a-Item highly relevant, b-Item considerably relevant, c-Item partially relevant, d-Item not relevant) was used. The content validity indexes obtained from the opinions of field experts about the items are presented in the table below.

Table 1. Content validity indexes of the items in the prepared speaking skill rating scale

Dimensions	Criteria	Content Validity Index (CVI)
Starter	Using appropriate addressing / greeting expressions	0.8
	Starting the conversation to attract the attention of the audience	0.8
	Making a short explanation about the topic	1.0
Pronunciation	Speaking without local dialect features	1.0
	Producing sounds and syllables clearly, understandably, accurately and properly	1.0
	Articulating the sounds or syllables in words without swallowing, skipping, repeating, changing	1.0
	Speaking by following the rules about sounds in Turkish	0.8
Presentation	Avoiding circumlocutions such as "thing" when one cannot find the appropriate word while speaking	1.0
	Using words in the correct sense during the conversation	1.0
Vocabulary	Choosing words and phrases suitable for the purpose of speaking while conveying thoughts	0.8
	Making use of vocabulary elements such as proverb, idiom and reduplication throughout the speech	0.8

Grammar	Making sentences that do not contain incomprehensibility during the speech	1.0
	Paying attention to subject-verb agreement while speaking	1.0
	Including rich sentence structures (simple, compound, consecutive, subordinate) during the speech	0.8
Fluency	Not making sounds like "eeee, iiii (um, er) in between words in sentences.	1.0
	Making pauses in the appropriate places and intervals during the conversation	1.0
	Avoiding word and sentence repetitions throughout the speech	1.0
	Continuing the conversation at an appropriate pace	1.0
	Speaking in an audible and smooth voice	1.0
Consistency	Paying attention to stress and intonation from the beginning to the end of the conversation	1.0
	Making meaningful connections in transitions between sentences throughout the speech	1.0
	Using interesting examples and quotations without deviating from the purpose of the speech	1.0
	Using body language effectively in accordance with the content of the speech	1.0
Conclusion	Summing up the main points of the speech	0.8
	Ending the speech in a way that leaves an impact on the audience	1.0

According to Bozkurt and Arıca-Akkök (2019), the formula of dividing the number of experts who mark the "a-Item highly relevant" and "b-Item considerably relevant" options by the total number of experts is used in calculating the content validity index for an item. The value obtained is expected to be above 0.8 for each item. When Table 1 is examined, it is seen that there is no item with content validity index below 0.8 in the prepared speaking skill rating scale. According to that, it can be said that the content validity of the scale is ensured.

In order to determine the criterion validity after determining the content validity of the rating scale developed for the evaluation of prepared speech, its correlation with the "Speaking Skills Rating Scale (for Native Speakers of Turkish)" developed by Bozkurt and Arıca-Akkök (2019) was examined. Two rating scales were applied to determine the speaking performances of teacher candidates at different times, and Spearman Rank Differences Correlation analysis was applied to determine the connection between them. A positive and significant connection was found between the two scales ($r = .882$, $p < .01$). The correlation coefficient found was interpreted as a proof of the criterion validity of the developed scale.

Reliability Study

In order to determine the reliability of the rating scale developed for the evaluation of prepared speech, the evaluations of three different independent raters were examined using Kendall's W. Kendall's W takes values between zero and one. If this value is close to zero, it indicates that there is no compatibility between the raters, and if the value approaches one (1), it indicates that there is compatibility. The high level of compatibility between raters also means that the measurement tool is reliable (Kutlu et al., 2010). The Kendall's W coefficient of compatibility calculated to determine the inter-rater reliability is presented in the table below.

Table 2. Kendall's W test results of the prepared speaking skill rating scale

	N	Kendall's W	df	p
The Prepared Speaking Skill Rating Scale	3	.87	45	.000

As seen in Table 2, the Kendall's W test result among the scores given by three different raters using the rating scale developed in this study regarding the prepared speeches of teacher candidates

was found as 0.87. Accordingly, it can be said that the compatibility between raters is at a good level ($\tau = .87, p < .001$).

Apart from the reliability studies performed above, it was examined whether there was a difference between the average scores calculated by the raters. As a matter of fact, the fact that the mean between raters is close to each other indicates that the measurement tool is reliable (Moskal & Leydens, 2000). ANOVA results regarding the mean scores between raters are shown in the tables below.

Table 3. The distribution of the scores given by the raters according to the prepared speaking skill rating scale

Raters	N	\bar{X}	S
R1	46	76.23	5.42
R2	46	77.52	5.27
R3	46	75.91	5.42

When Table 3 is examined, there are differences between the mean scores given by three different raters using the rating scale developed in this study regarding the prepared speeches of teacher candidates. ANOVA results regarding whether this difference is significant or not is presented in Table 4.

Table 4. ANOVA results regarding the scores given by the raters according to the prepared speaking skill rating scale

Source of the Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	p
Between Groups	120.449	2	60.225	2.085	.128
Within Groups	3900.217	135	28.890		
Total	4020.667	137			

Looking at Table 4, there is no statistically significant difference among the scores of three different raters for items in the prepared speaking skill rating scale ($F_{(2-135)} = 2.085, p > .05$). Accordingly, the mean scores of the raters given by using the measurement tool are similar to each other, and these results obtained within the scope of reliability studies can be interpreted as strong evidence about the reliability of the scale.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

In this study, validity and reliability studies of the measuring tool were carried out in order to evaluate the prepared speech performances of teacher candidates whose native language is Turkish by grading from weak to competent by an observer and to develop a rating scale to give feedback to them about their situation. The rating scale developed consists of three basic dimensions and 25 items.

In order to determine the validity of the measurement tool, the scope and criterion validity were examined. In order to ensure the scope validity, the opinions of expert academicians on the subject were consulted. The fact that the content validity indexes obtained from the opinions of the field experts on each item is at least 0.8 indicates that the content validity of the scale is ensured. In order to determine the criterion validity, its correlation with the "Speaking Skills Rating Scale (for Native Speakers of Turkish)" developed by Bozkurt and Arıca-Akkök (2019) was examined. The relationship between teacher candidates' speaking performance scores obtained from two rating scales was tested with Spearman Rank Differences Correlation analysis. The existence of a positive and significant relationship between the two scales is a proof of the criterion validity of the measuring tool.

In order to determine the reliability of the assessment tool, Kendall's W test and variance analysis were applied to the evaluations of three different independent raters. The fact that Kendall's

W test result is 0.87 shows that there is a good level of compatibility between raters. The absence of a significant difference as a result of the variance analysis indicates that the scores given by the raters using the measurement tool are close to each other. These results obtained within the scope of validity and reliability studies are strong evidence showing that the rating scale is valid and reliable.

When the studies in the relevant literature are examined, it is seen that the data collection tools used for speaking skill are mostly in the form of observation and evaluation forms (Bulut, 2015; Kartallıoğlu, 2015; Maden, 2010; Orhan, 2010; Öztürk, 1997; Sallabaş, 2011; Sargin, 2006; Temizkan, 2009; Temizkan & Atasoy, 2016). On the other hand, it is seen that the number of studies carried out directly in accordance with the stages of scale development remains limited (Çintaş-Yıldız & Yavuz, 2012; Kuzu & Suna, 2012). In the meantime, there are some studies to develop a rubric that is used in determining performance-based status, albeit in a limited number (Aykaç, 2011; Erdem, 2012; Erdem & Erdem, 2014; Yüceer, 2014). On the other hand, there is only one study specific to speaking skills in rating scale development studies, which are frequently used in preferred performance-based evaluations, which was also preferred in this study (Bozkurt & Arıca-Akkök, 2019). The importance of this study is evident based on the explanations made. The fact that the study includes prepared speeches and was conducted on Turkish teacher candidates, as per the subject of the study, reveals its contribution to the literature.

Recommendations based on the results of the research and in line with the discussed literature information are presented below:

1. By using the prepared speaking skill rating scale developed in this study, a descriptive study can be conducted to determine the prepared speaking performances of teacher candidates.
2. This research was carried out specifically for the prepared speech type. In future studies, a scale development study for the impromptu speech type can be done.
3. Studies can be carried out to determine teacher candidates' anxieties in prepared speech and to eliminate this anxiety.
4. It is recommended to carry out applied studies on how to measure language skills in undergraduate courses, especially for Turkish and classroom teacher candidates.

REFERENCES

- Altınörs, A. (2003). *Dil felsefesine giriş*. İstanbul: İnkılap Yayınevi.
- Arslan, A. (2012). Üniversite öğrencilerinin “topluluk karşısında konuşma” ile ilgili çeşitli görüşleri (Ağrı İbrahim Çeçen Üniversitesi örneği). *Turkish Studies*, 7(3), 221-231.
- Aykaç, M. (2011). *Türkçe öğretiminde çocuk edebiyatı metinleriyle kurgulanan yaratıcı drama etkinliklerinin anlatma becerilerine etkisi* [Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi]. Ankara Üniversitesi.
- Başaran, M., & Erdem, İ. (2009). Öğretmen adaylarının güzel konuşma becerisi ile ilgili görüşleri üzerine bir araştırma. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 17(3), 743-754.
- Bozkurt, B. Ö. (2017). Türkçe anadili konuşucuları için konuşma becerisi değerlendirme çerçevesi önerisi. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, 5(4), 924-947.
- Bozkurt, B. Ö., & Arıca-Akkök, E. (2019). Anadili Türkçe olan konuşucular için konuşma becerisi derecelendirme ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi. *İlköğretim Online*, 18(1), 416-436.

- Bulut, K. (2015). *Mikro öğretim tekniğinin Türkçe öğretmen adaylarının konuşma beceri ve kaygılarına etkisi* [Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi]. Gazi Üniversitesi.
- Calp, M. (2010). *Özel eğitim alanı olarak Türkçe öğretimi* (4. bs.). Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Davis, L. L. (1992). Instrument review: Getting the most from a panel of experts. *Applied nursing research*, 5(4), 194-197.
- Doğan, Y. (2009). Konuşma becerisinin geliştirilmesine yönelik etkinlik örnekleri. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 7(1), 185-204.
- Erdem, A. (2012). *Yapılandırmacı karma öğrenme ortamlarının dinleme ve konuşma becerilerine etkisi* [Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi]. Hacettepe Üniversitesi.
- Erdem, A., & Erdem, M. (2014). “DinleİzleAnlat” dinleme ve konuşma yeterlikleri ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi. *Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 3(4), 418-432.
- Göçer, A. (2014). *Türkçe eğitiminde ölçme ve değerlendirme*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Kartallıođlu, N. (2015). *Bilişsel farkındalık stratejilerinin 7. sınıf öğrencilerinin konuşma becerilerini geliştirmeye etkisi* [Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi]. Gazi Üniversitesi.
- Katrancı, M., & Kuşdemir, Y. (2015). Öğretmen adaylarının konuşma kaygılarının incelenmesi: Sözlü anlatım dersine yönelik bir uygulama. *Dicle Üniversitesi Ziya Gökalp Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 24, 415-445.
- Kaya, A (2016). İletişime giriş: Temel kavramlar ve Süreçler. Alim Kaya (Ed.), *Kişilerarası ilişkiler ve etkili iletişim* içinde (ss.2-29). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Kutlu, Ö., Doğan, C. D., & Karakaya, İ. (2010). *Öğrenci başarısının belirlenmesi. Performansa ve portfolyoya dayalı durum belirleme*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Maden, S. (2010). Türkçe öğretmeni adaylarının sözlü iletişim becerileri üzerine bir araştırma. *EKEV Akademi Dergisi*, 44, 145-154.
- Moskal, B., & Leydens, J. A. (2000). Scoring rubric development: Validity and reliability. *Practical Assessment, Reseach & Evaluation*, 7(10), 71-81.
- Onan, B. (2011). *Anlama sürecinde Türkçenin yapısal işlevleri*. Ankara: Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.
- Orhan, S. (2010). *Görsellerle desteklenmiş altı şapka düşünme tekniğinin öğrencilerin konuşma becerilerini geliştirmesine etkisi* [Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi]. Atatürk Üniversitesi.
- Özbay, M. (2005). Ana dili eğitiminde konuşma becerisini geliştirme teknikleri. *Kafkas Üniversitesi Dergisi*, 16, 177-184.
- Özdemir, S. (2017). Konuşma metinlerinin hazırlanması. Ahmet Akçay, Sami Baskın (Ed.), *Etkinliklerle hafta hafta konuşma eğitimi* içinde (ss.257-283). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Özdemir, S. (2018). Türkçe öğretmeni adaylarının konuşma kaygısını gidermede hazırlıklı konuşmaların rolü. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 18(1), 361-374
- Öztürk, A. (1997). *Tiyatro dersinin öğretmen adaylarındaki sözel iletişim becerilerine etkileri* [Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi]. Ankara Üniversitesi.

- Popham, W. J. (2000). *Modern educational measurement: Practical guidelines for educational leaders*. Needham: Allyn and Bacon.
- Sallabaş, M. E. (2011). *Aktif öğrenme yönteminin ilköğretim ikinci kademe öğrencilerinin konuşma becerilerine etkisi* [Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi]. Gazi Üniversitesi.
- Sargın, M. (2006). *İlköğretim öğrencilerinin konuşma becerilerinin değerlendirilmesi* [Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Muğla Üniversitesi.
- Sever, S. (2011). *Türkçe öğretimi ve tam öğrenme* (5. bs.). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Sevim, O. (2014). Effects of drama method on speaking anxieties of preservice teachers and their opinions about the method. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 9(18), 734-742.
- Taşer, S. (2001). *Konuşma eğitimi*. Ankara: Dost Kitabevi.
- Taşkaya, S. M. (2014). Konuşma eğitimi. Muammer Yılmaz (Ed.), *Yeni gelişmeler ışığında Türkçe öğretimi* içinde (ss. 43-76). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Temizkan, M. (2009). Akran değerlendirmenin konuşma becerisinin geliştirilmesi üzerindeki etkisi. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 6(12), 90-112.
- Temizkan, M., & Atasoy, A. (2016). Konuşma becerisinde aşamalı gelişim modelinin etkililiği üzerine bir değerlendirme. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 13(34), 78-97.
- Tompkins, G. E. (2005). *Language arts: Content and teaching strategies* (4. ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Wortham, S. C., & Hardin, B. J. (2015). *Assessment in early childhood education*. USA: Pearson Education.
- Yakıcı, A., Yücel, M., Doğan, M., & Yelok, S. (2005). *Türkçe II sözlü anlatım*. Ankara: Bilge Yayınları.
- Yüceer, D. (2014). *Türkçe öğretmenliği birinci sınıf öğrencilerinin hazırlıksız konuşma becerileri üzerine bir araştırma* [Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Gazi Üniversitesi.