

## TEACHER ASSESSMENT LITERACY: INDONESIAN EFL SECONDARY TEACHERS' SELF-PERCEIVED ON CLASSROOM-BASED ASSESSMENT PRACTICE

**Dewi Aria**

*Department of English Education, Faculty of Language and Literature Education,  
Indonesia University of Education, Bandung, Indonesia*  
Email: dewiariadi@upi.edu

**Didi Sukyadi**

*Department of English Education, Faculty of Language and Literature Education,  
Indonesia University of Education, Bandung, Indonesia*  
Email: dsukyadi@upi.edu

**Eri Kurniawan**

*Department of English Education, Faculty of Language and Literature Education,  
Indonesia University of Education, Bandung, Indonesia*  
Email: eri\_kurniawan@upi.edu

APA Citation: Aria, D., Sukyadi, D., & Kurniawan, E. (2021). Teacher assessment literacy: Indonesian EFL secondary teachers' self-perceived on classroom-based assessment practice. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 10(1), pp. 15-26. doi: <https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v10i1.5349>

Received: 15-08-2021

Accepted: 05-10-2021

Published: 31-12-2021

**Abstract:** Assessing students' performance is an essential part of a teacher's job. Hence, they are believed to be familiar with various kinds of assessments, especially classroom-based assessments (henceforth CBA). Language teaching and assessment are two interrelated that affect each other to a great extent. Undoubtedly, language assessment becomes a more complicated activity in the field of language teaching. The major objective of this study was to describe how EFL secondary teachers' self-perceived on the basic principles of assessment and their own practice in CBA. This study was conducted in the form of a descriptive survey research. Shim's (2009) survey instrument was adapted to collect data and gathered using an online survey. 48 respondents willingly fulfilled the online survey containing 80 statements concerning classroom assessment procedures. The data obtained were analyzed using descriptive statistics. The findings of the current study revealed that teachers seemed to practice assessment *for learning* (henceforth AfL), in which most teachers conducted assessments to support students' learning and used the results as feedback to improve and revise their teaching. The teachers in this study appeared to be literate and excellent in understanding the concept and using it in practice. However, a question remains as to whether their classroom practice was excellent. Since most studies have largely reported results on teacher's assessment literacy (henceforth TAL), future programs and research should be directed toward classroom-based research on how the CBAL can improve students' learning and improve the quality of teacher instructions. The implications of the result are expected to provide a clear understanding and theoretical foundations of CBAL.

**Keywords:** *assessment literacy; classroom-based assessment practice; EFL secondary teachers.*

### INTRODUCTION

An assessment is a crucial activity in the teaching and learning process (Cheng & Fox, 2017 in Xu, 2018; Ashraf & Zolfaghari, 2018) besides it has been widely acknowledged as the essential element of a teachers' job (Khadijeh & Amir, 2015; Luthfiyyah, Basyari, & Dwiniasih, 2020; Vogt, Tsagari, & Spanoudis, 2020). Furthermore, this is

increasingly being recognized as an integral part of teacher professionalism (Giraldo, 2018; Tian, Louw, & Khan, 2021). This is due to teachers spend their professional time performing classroom assessment activities (DeLuca, LaPointe-McEwan, & Luhanga, 2015); up to 50 percent of their time (Howell, 2013) to monitor their students' achievement towards learning outcomes (Giraldo &

Murcia, 2018) and influence their quality of instruction towards the quality of the assessments used (Rad, 2019; Rusli, 2017). To this end, teachers must have an adequate assessment literacy level to properly assess students' learning outcomes (DeLuca et al., 2015; Koh, Burke, Luke, Gong, & Tan, 2017; Luthfiyyah et al., 2020; Popham, 2011; Zulaiha, Mulyono, & Ambarsari, 2020).

Studies concerning assessment literacy (henceforth AL) have been appearing in education literature since 1990s (Stiggins, 1991). Since then, many scholars have proposed the meaning of AL. One of them defined AL as the ability of teachers to properly design, select, interpret, and use the assessment results for educational decisions (Quilter & Gallini, 2000). A literate teacher can incorporate assessment with teaching (Pastore & Andrade, 2019); hence they are able to draw accurately and efficiently students' achievement as well as to communicate the assessment results to the relevant stakeholders (Scarino, 2013). Therefore, it seems that AL reinforces teachers' assessment practices substantially influence the students' learning quality (Coombs, DeLuca, LaPointe-McEwan, & Chalas, 2018).

Though AL is perceived as a central core in language teaching, some researchers (Al-Bhalani, 2019; Muhammad & Bardakçi, 2019; Yamtim & Wongwanich, 2014) found that teachers' assessment skills are generally weak. Similarly, Stiggins (2001) states that he noticed unacceptably low levels of AL among teachers and administrators in schools. He also saw that assessment illiterate resulted in inaccurate assessment for students and would prevent them from reaching their full academic potential. The results from several empirical studies also found that there was a mismatch between teachers' knowledge and skills (Jannati, 2015; Lam, 2014; Luthfiyyah et al., 2020; Zulaiha et al., 2020) and more knowledgeable for summative assessment rather than formative assessment (Deluca & Klinger, 2010). Lam (2019) confirmed that teachers in his study had fundamental knowledge about CBA more than the theories of reliability and validity. Furthermore, this study also found that despite the teacher had good knowledge of CBA, the assessment practice was not more than grading activities. Additionally, some other researchers even point out some teachers knew only a limited set of language testing terminologies for their practical use (Vogt & Tzagari, 2014). Hence, those problems

urged this research to explore teachers' assessment literacy, especially in terms of CBA practice in different settings.

Although many researchers have conducted studies in the field of AL, similar studies in Indonesian context are still underexplored. This is due to AL is still a relatively new concept in language assessment (Bahtiar & Purnawarman, 2020). Puspawati (2019) investigated teachers' language assessment literacy in a higher education context. The findings showed that the teachers had a sound understanding of language assessments' knowledge, skills, and principles. Furthermore, Prasetyo (2018) researched a student-teacher experience of teaching practice in one of the senior high schools in Yogyakarta. It was found that the teacher got more experience in administrative tasks than guidance in teaching and assessment. Bahtiar & Purnawarman (2020) investigated language teachers' assessment literacy, perceptions, and experiences in assessing students. The participants were teachers in Junior and Senior High School. Thematically, the results showed that most of the teachers do not know the term of AL, and they still need training to improve their assessment ability. Then, a case study research by Saputra, Hamied, & Suherdi (2020) attempted to examine trajectory teachers who enrolled in a professional learning community (PLC) project. Findings showed that the PLC broadened teachers' understandings of AL and the use of authentic assessment in practice. The last, more recent studies by Luthfiyyah et al. (2020) and Zulaiha, et al. (2020). Luthfiyyah et al. (2020) examined Junior and Senior High School teachers, while Zulaiha, et al. (2020) examined only Junior High School teachers. Both studies investigated the alignment of teachers' perception of CBA and their classroom practices quantitatively.

Based on the previous studies in Indonesian context, a survey study on EFL secondary teachers' assessment literacy especially in term of classroom practice seems rarely discussed from such empirical studies. Therefore, this study intends to fulfill the gap focusing on surveying teachers' assessment literacy with the coverage of the study deals with teachers' self-perceived on classroom-based assessment practice in terms of the basic principles of CBA proposed by Shim (2009), i.e., planning, implementation, monitoring, as well as recording and dissemination. In particular, this study was aimed to address three research questions: (1) is

there any significant relationship between EFL teachers' perception of the basic principles of CBA and their self-perceived on their own practice, (2) how EFL secondary teachers' self-perceived the basic principles of assessment with their own practice of CBA? And (3) to what extent do the teachers perceive their classroom assessment practice?

The growing interest in studies of AL has resulted in a wealth of research conceptualizing and providing insight into understanding it. Many scholars also attempted to define the meaning of AL and developed measurements in assessing teacher assessment literacy. The main concept of AL and studies on it are floored below.

The term assessment literacy was firstly coined by Richard Stiggins almost thirty years ago in terms of assessment literate person characteristics. He argued that an assessment-literate educator realizes that effective instruction, learning, and assessment are to reach high-quality education, and they act assertively to prevent unsound assessment (Stiggins, 1991). However, Stiggins did not provide a clear definition of assessment literacy. He then portrayed teachers who are assessment literates know what they assess, why they do so, how best to assess the achievement of their students' interests, how to generate sound samples of students' performance, what can go wrong, and how to prevent those problems before they occur (Stiggins, 1995). Since then, assessment literacy has become a term commonly used by scholars and researchers trying to conceptualize the meaning of assessment literacy further. For instance, Davies (2008) suggested the combination of the practical (*the skills*) with the descriptive (*the knowledge*) and the theoretical (*the principles*) for assessment literacy. Skills describe the practical know-how in assessment and construction, and knowledge to the relevant background in measurement and language description (Davies, 2008; see also Fulcher, 2012) and principles concern the proper use of language tests, their fairness, and impact, as well as questions of ethics and professionalism, necessitating consideration of the growing professionalism of language testing, language testers' responsibilities and the impact of their work on a variety of stakeholders, as well as the ethical choices they must make (Davies, 2008).

Similarly, Webb (2002) defined AL as the knowledge for assessing what students know and

can do, interpreting the results from these assessments, and applying these results to improve student learning and program effectiveness. Moreover, Quilter & Gallini (2000) defined AL as the ability of teachers to properly design, select, interpret, and use the assessment results for educational decisions. McMillan (2001) in Pastore & Andrade(2019) defined teachers with a robust background in the assessment are well-positioned to integrate assessment with instruction so that they employ appropriate forms of teaching. Otherwise, (Koh et al., 2017) affirms that teachers' assessment literacy refers to their demonstrated understanding of the principles behind selecting and designing tasks, judging student works, and interpreting and using assessment data to support student learning. Taylor (2009) also described AL as stakeholders' ability to use assessment to fulfill both learning and grading purposes. From the sociocultural lens, Willis, Adie, & Klenowski (2013) offered the definition of AL as a dynamic, context-dependent social practice that involves teachers articulating and negotiating classroom and cultural knowledge with one another and with learners in the initiation, development, and practice of assessment to achieve the learning goals of students.

As the theories have been mentioned above, it can be seen that AL is constructed by some aspects, including knowledge, skill, practice, and interconnecting with other aspects such as experience, sociocultural, personal beliefs, and others that can improve both learning quality and teaching instruction. The following will discuss CBA.

Meanwhile, Chappuis & Stiggins (2020) describes CBA as an assessment carried out in the classroom by the teachers with formative assessment use day-to-day to gain its primary focus on the ongoing improvement of learning for all students. As a result, the terminology of assessment *for* learning (AfL) is used for assessment practices that are ongoing processes and take place during a lesson (DeLuca et al., 2015) or using assessment information (e.g., self, peer, or teacher feedback) to support learning (Lam, 2019). Assessment *as* learning (AaL) is typically considered a subset of AfL, emphasizing learner capacity to review and improve learning metacognitively via reflection and self-assessment (Lam, 2019). While, an assessment practice that serves an evaluative function (summarizing and judging student learning) at the

end of a unit or term refers to as assessment of learning (AoL) (Lam, 2019). In AfL, both teacher and learner use CBA information to modify teaching and learning activities. By applying the principles of AfL, teachers will get the effects that high-quality and formative assessment can have on student achievement (Chappuis & Stiggins, 2020).

In addition, Chappuis, Stiggins, Chappuis, & Arter (2014) defined classroom-based assessment literacy (henceforth CBAL) as the knowledge and skills needed to be required by the teacher to gather accurate information about student achievement and use the assessment process and its results effectively to improve student's achievements. In addition, Deluca & Klinger (2010) argued that a CBA literate employs various pedagogical techniques, including self and peer assessment, modeling various learning levels, offering continuous descriptive feedback, and establishing student-friendly expectations and assessment criteria to encourage focused and meaningful learning. Lan & Fan (2019) summarized the CBAL mainly includes the skills in designing, developing, and evaluating tests critically, using other assessment methods, grading and scoring assessment as the basis of knowledge, and the last, skills in interpreting and communicating the assessment results. From the research undertaken in CBA, there is a need for constant professional development for stakeholders (language teachers) to be up to date with the challenges and expectations that arise in CBA, which highlights the level of TAL (Vogt et al., 2020).

Regarding the level of TAL, Bybee (1997), as expanded by Kaiser & Willander (2005) and Pill & Harding (2013), identified and described it into five categories; a) illiteracy (ignorance of language assessment concepts and methods); b) nominal literacy (understanding that a specific term relates to assessment, but may indicate a misconception); c) functional literacy (sound understanding of basic terms and concepts); d) procedural and conceptual literacy (understanding central concepts of the field, and using knowledge in practice), and e) multidimensional literacy (knowledge extending beyond ordinary concepts including philosophical, historical and social dimensions of assessment). Before elaborating on teacher perception, standards for teacher competencies in student assessment are discussed in the following section.

To be assessment literate, teachers not only need to be knowledgeable and skilled in different areas of assessment, they need to use appropriate assessment methods that maximizes benefits for both students and teachers. In 1990, AFT, NCME, and NEA (Pastore & Andrade, 2019; Xu & Brown, 2016) developed a set of teacher competencies in assessment called *Standards for Teacher Competence in Educational Assessment of Students*, herein known as the *Standards*. There were seven standards that teacher should be skilled in: (1) Choosing assessment methods appropriate for instructional decisions. (2) Developing assessment methods appropriate for instructional decisions. (3) Administering, scoring, and interpreting the results of both externally produced and teacher-produced assessment methods. (4) Using assessment results when making decisions about individual students, planning teaching, developing curriculum, and school improvement. (5) Developing valid pupil grading procedures that use pupil assessments. (6) Communicating assessment results to students, parents, other lay audiences, and educators. (7) Recognizing unethical, illegal, and otherwise inappropriate assessment methods and uses of assessment information. (AFT, NCME, & NEA, 1990).

The Standards are the most widely cited in studies of teacher competence and have served as the basis for instruments to measure teacher competence in assessment (DeLuca et al., 2015). Two instruments which have been empirically tested and offer reports of reliability and validity, namely the *Teacher Assessment Literacy Questionnaire (TALQ)* and the *Assessment Practices Inventory (API)*. In addition, many studies use adaptations of these instruments to measure assessment literacy. For instance, a study conducted by Braney (2010) and Howell (2013) used *API* revised version called *API<sub>R</sub>*, Quilter & Gallini (2000) used only 21 of 35 items of *TALQ* in their study. In a very different study of TAL, Wang, Wang, & Huang (2008) developed a web-based model and investigated its effectiveness at promoting TAL, and Shim (2009) presented four stages in teachers' CBA; planning, implementation, monitoring, and recording and disseminating. Further discussion related to teacher perception.

Teacher perceptions of assessment are seen as an internal guiding framework on how teachers perceive the purposes and use the assessment in

relation to their beliefs (Xu & Brown, 2016). Therefore, it should be taken into consideration. The processing of a person's perception is connected with the person's conception, expectation, and knowledge which also influence his/her perception. Studies reported that teachers' assessment conceptions had influenced their assessment practices (Coombs et al., 2018; Lam, 2019; Luthfiyyah et al., 2020). Xu & Brown (2016) categorized into two dimensions of teacher conceptions of assessment; cognitive and affective dimensions. Cognitive refers to the teacher's perception towards assessment purposes (assessment of/for/as learning). In this case, studies (Brookhart, 2011; DeLuca et al., 2015) revealed that teachers tend to be more skillful and confident in performing *Assessment of Learning (AoL)* than *Assessment for/as learning (Af/aL)*. Otherwise, the affective dimension points to teachers' emotions towards assessment (Lam, 2019). Some teachers have a definite system belief of assessment (e.g., assessment can improve students' learning), and others do not (e.g., assessment is irrelevant, or the scoring methods is hard to do) so they did not particularly favour the assessment. Teacher's experiences in assessment practices in the classroom can impact the way they view the assessment in recent times (Vogt & Tsagari, 2014). Consequently, teachers who have positive conceptions about assessment may find some merits from assessment practices, while the negative conceptions may resist or upset in practicing assessment (Vogt & Tsagari, 2014). Thus, how teacher perceived the assessment is basic in assessment practices.

## METHOD

This study employed descriptive survey research. It aims to describe, compare, contrast, classify, analyze and interpret an individual or a group's beliefs, point of view, or practice about a particular issue (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Hamied & Malik, 2017). In this study, descriptive survey research utilizes to depict how EFL secondary teachers' self-perceived on the basic principles of assessment and their own practice in CBA. An online survey was conducted as remained the best way to collect the data during the pandemic covid-19. Other benefits include saving both time and money for the researcher.

Forty-eight EFL secondary teachers willingly participated in the online survey. They are teachers from senior and vocational high schools in Riau. Most participants were female (N=79.17%) aged between 31 and 35, with more than 11 years of teaching experience. Table 1 briefly describes the participants' demography includes gender, age, and teachers' ownership of competence certificates, and teaching experiences. Since this study was a small scale, the current study cannot represent or generalize the view of all EFL teachers in Indonesian context.

Table 1. *Demography data of the participants*

Demography	Category	N	%
Gender	Female	38	79.17
	Male	10	20.83
Age	26 – 30 years old	6	12.50
	31 – 35 years old	23	47.92
	> 35 years old	19	39.58
Competence	Certified	30	62.50
	Non-Certified	18	37.50
	< 3 years	0	0.00
Teaching Experience	3 – 10 years	17	35.42
	11 – 20 years	28	58.33
	> 20 years	3	6.25

The questionnaire was adapted from Shim (2009). It comprises three sections to examine participants' demographic information, teachers' perceptions of the basic principles of CBA, and self-perceived on their own practice, consisting of 80 statements (40 items regarding teacher perceptions and the rest related to teacher self-perceived on their own classroom practice) with four Likert scales from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree,” typed in Google Form. The questionnaire covers four sub-aspects based upon classroom-based assessment procedural principles, i.e., teachers' practice of planning, implementation, monitoring, and recording and dissemination. This questionnaire was translated in *Indonesia*; hence it is necessary to check the validity of the instrument. *Pearson Product Moment* was used to check the instrument item's validity. The result showed that all items were valid with the  $r > .284$  (N=48, Sig. 5%). The online questionnaire was then distributed through WhatsApp Teacher Group, known as *Musyawah Guru Mata Pelajaran (MGMP)*. The question items were tested on ten teachers to check the items' validity and reliability before they are distributed.

The data obtained from the questionnaire were tabulated and analyzed statistically using SPSS to calculate the frequency, mean (M), and standard deviation (SD) of all the questionnaire items. After screening and selecting the data, descriptive statistics were calculated to respond to the aforementioned research questions.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

*Results*

The results of this research were arranged under three research questions. Beforehand, the questionnaire findings also revealed that most teachers performed the assessments more than three times each semester. Table 2 below presents the descriptive statistic of assessment frequencies that the teacher has done in one semester.

Table 2. *Frequencies of assessment done by the teacher each semester*

Once	Two times	Three times	More than three times	Total
3	5	8	32	48
6.2	10.4	16.7	66.7	100%

It was seen that more than 60% of teachers performed the assessment tasks more than three times. It indicated that assessment practices were teachers' normal routine activities in their English classroom. The questionnaire findings also revealed that more than 64% of teachers constructed the assessment by themselves. This number indicated that the teacher might have had difficulty finding ready-serve assessments or perceived the assessment material they found questionable for their classroom.

*The relationship between EFL teachers' perception of the basic principles of CBA and their self-perceived on their own practice.*

To answer the first research question concerning the correlation between teachers' perceptions of principles of CBA and their self-perceived on their own practice was run by *Pearson Correlation*. The results were displayed in Table 3.

Table 3. *The correlations between teachers' perceptions and their practices*

Teachers' Perceptions	Teachers' Practices

			s
Teachers' Perceptions	Pearson Correlation	1	.706**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	48	48
	<hr/>		
Teachers' Practices	Pearson Correlation	.706**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	48	48
	<hr/>		

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

As seen in Table 3 above, there was a significant relationship ( $\rho < 0.01$ ) between teachers' perceptions of the classroom-based assessment principles and their self-perceived on their own practice. In addition, there was a positive relationship which indicated that teachers' perceptions reflect on what and how they did in classroom assessment practice.

*How EFL secondary teachers' self-perceived the basic principles of assessment with their own practice of CBA.*

Furthermore, to assess the second research question regarding how EFL secondary teachers self-perceived the basic principles of assessment with their own practice in CBA according to Shim's classroom-based assessment principles, the summary of descriptive statistics was shown in Table 4 below.

Table 4. *A summary of descriptive statistics of assessment literacy competences*

	N	Min	Max	Mean	Convers (100)
Teachers' Perceptions	48	129	168	151.5	90.2
Teachers' Practices	48	105	168	147.0	87.5
Total N (listwise)	48				

The average score of teachers' perceptions on the principles of classroom-based assessment based on the table above ( $M=151.5$ ) or after converting ( $M=90.2$ ) was more than satisfactory. In addition, the average score of teachers' practice ( $M=147.0$ ) or after converting ( $M=87.5$ ) was also satisfied. Furthermore, the average score of those two variables was 88.85. The statistics showed that EFL

secondary teachers' perceptions and the way they perceived their own practices of CBA in this study were on the *Procedural and Conceptual Literacy* level based on Bybee's categories as expanded by Kaiser & Willander (2005) and Pill & Harding (2013). The level indicates that the teachers seemed to understand the concepts of the classroom-based assessment principles and use their knowledge in practice.

*To what extent do the teachers perceive their classroom assessment practice?*

To elaborate the answer of research question 3 regarding what extent the teachers perceive their classroom assessment practice, it was demonstrated as follows. Table 5 presents teachers' planning in CBA practice.

Table 5. *Teachers' classroom practice of Shim's planning assessment principles*

Q	Propositions	M	SD
Q16	I make sure that all students are given the same learning opportunities in their classroom	3.79	.410
Q17	I make sure that assessment is not affected by students' personal characteristics such as gender, appearance, and economic and social background.	3.73	.449
Q7	Assessments (tasks) are meaningful to the students.	3.67	.519
Q12	Assessment focuses on students' progress and achievement rather than on comparisons between the students in the classroom.	3.67	.476
Q8	Assessment (tasks) is designed in such a way as to obtain information about what students know at that particular time.	3.63	.489
Q14	I receive advance 'informed consent' from the students or their parents with regard to carrying out the assessment.	3.62	.570
Q6	Assessment (tasks) is related to what the students do in real class time.	3.56	.542
Q13	I give the students advance notice, so that the students are able to prepare for the assessment.	3.54	.582
Q4	I balance the attainment targets with the students' needs when I design the assessment	3.52	.652
Q3	I consider what the students' needs are when I design the assessment.	3.50	.715
Q9	Assessment (tasks) is designed in such a way as to obtain information about what students can do at that particular time.	3.50	.546
Q2	I consider the standards or attainment targets which the curriculum requests when I design the assessment.	3.48	.583
Q11	The appropriateness of assessment (tasks) are checked by calling for peer comment or with reference to published guidelines (if these are available).	3.46	.544
Q1	I first identify the purpose of the assessment when I design the assessment.	3.46	.771
Q5	I use assessment specifications when I carry out the assessment.	3.46	.544
Q10	Assessment (tasks) is designed in such a way as to obtain information about students' potential to use the language effectively.	3.42	.539
Q15	I respect the privacy of the students and guarantee confidentiality.	3.04	.824

From Table 5 above, the propositions Q16, Q17, Q7, and Q12 obtained the highest score (M>3.65), indicating that teachers perceived CBA tend to focus on students' progress rather than grading and comparing students. The results also indicated that

teachers avoid discrimination against students. However, little concern was given to proposition Q15, showing that teachers less respect students' privacy and confidentiality. Table 6 below describes teachers' implementation of the CBA principles.

Table 6. *Teachers' classroom practice of Shim's assessment implementation principles*

Q	Propositions	M	SD
Q24	Assessment (tasks) processes are completed within a manageable time considering the given context.	3.58	.498
Q20	Students understand the desired outcome of the assessment (tasks).	3.56	.580
Q23	I give students immediate feedback after they complete each assessment (task).	3.54	.504
Q18	I inform the students of the reasons why they are being assessed.	3.50	.652

Q22	I provide students with an opportunity to monitor their own work while they are performing the assessment (tasks).	3.48	.583
Q21	Students are supported when they have a problem hindering their completing the assessment (tasks).	3.46	.683
Q19	I explicitly instruct the students how to do the assessment (tasks).	3.44	.580

From Table 6 above, propositions Q24 and Q20 obtained the highest mean score in this stage (M=3.58 and M=3.56), indicating the teachers strongly agree that assessment is done within a manageable time and the students should know the desired outcome of the assessment they did.

However, proposition Q19 indicates the teachers less agree that the students need explicit instruction. Table 7 presents the survey findings regarding teachers' perceived their own practices on monitoring assessment principles.

*Table 7. Teachers' classroom practice of Shim's monitoring assessment principles*

Q	Propositions	M	SD
Q30	I use the results of assessment positively not negatively	3.77	.425
Q31	I make assessment a part of teaching and learning.	3.77	.425
Q29	I use the results of assessment for revising my teaching.	3.67	.519
Q25	I construct a marking system as a part of the whole assessment process.	3.63	.489
Q33	The overall feedback enables students to know how to improve their work and take their learning forward.	3.54	.504
Q28	I mark the students' performance consistently.	3.52	.583
Q26	Marking criteria are connected with the aims of the assessment and the learner's characteristics in a given context.	3.50	.583
Q34	The whole process of assessment is consistent in terms of procedure and administration.	3.40	.536
Q36	I monitor the misuse of the overall consequences of the assessment as a tool of power.	3.31	.719
Q27	I let students have detailed information about the marking criteria.	3.27	.818
Q35	The process of assessment is supported by the involvement of the parents.	3.15	.684
Q32	I share the findings of assessment with other teachers	3.08	.767

Table 7 above showed that the four propositions (Q30, Q31, Q29, and Q25) achieved the highest scores, indicating that teacher did the assessment for learning; the assessment is used to improve learning both students and teachers. The students used the result to improve their learning, while teachers used the result of CBA to improve and

revise their teaching. However, teachers' responses to Q32 suggest that teachers preferred not to share their assessment findings for certain reasons with other colleagues. The findings concerning teachers' self-perceived their own practices on recording and dissemination assessment principles are presented in Table 8.

*Table 8. Teachers' classroom practice of Shim's recording and disseminating assessment principles*

Q	Propositions	M	SD
Q38	I am aware of my responsibilities for the output of my professional work.	3.79	.410
Q39	Local or nationwide report systems about the students' progress and achievement are provided.	3.58	.539
Q37	I consider students' rights as assessment takers; they must never be harmed by the assessment.	3.56	.681
Q40	My schools develop their own report system of students' progress and achievement	3.48	.583
Q42	A formal review of a student's progress and achievement is reported to the local education authority and the central government	3.27	.610
Q41	I am involved in the development of the report system at all levels.	3.10	.722

Table 8 shows that the teachers generally agreed to all propositions presented. Proposition Q38 had

the highest score (M = 3.79, SD = .410), with the lowest proposition Q41 (M = 3.10, SD = .722),



indicating that the teachers strongly believed that assessment becomes the responsibilities of their professional work and they less agreed that they should be involved in reporting at all levels, perhaps they thought that they did not teach at all levels.

### Discussion

This study surveyed EFL secondary teachers' perceptions of CBA principles and their self-perceived on their own CBA practice. There was a significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of CBA principles and their self-perceived of their own practice. This is aligned with the idea of some scholars (Coombs et al., 2018; Lam, 2019; Luthfiyyah et al., 2020), who believed that teachers' assessment conceptions had influenced their assessment practices. The questionnaire results also indicated that teachers had an excellent understanding of the CBA concepts and using their knowledge into practice.

As a whole, the current study indicated that teachers seemed to practice assessment *for* learning, in which most teachers conducted assessments to support students' learning and using the results as feedback to improve and revise their teaching. Teachers also tried to be transparent regarding the desired outcome of the assessment would be done. The teachers also realized that assessment activities are the responsibilities of their professional work. Moreover, these results were consistent with the findings of Jannati (2015) and Zulaiha et al. (2020) that some teacher focused on improving their teaching and monitoring students' progress, while others still viewed assessment merely as a tool for measuring or scoring students' achievement (learning outcome). However, findings revealed that teachers had better respect students' privacy and maintain students' confidentiality in relation to assessment results. It is aligned with the idea of MacCarthy (2014) that test scores could be considered "*sensitive*" confidential information. Therefore, the teachers must be able to use the results of the assessment positively.

### CONCLUSION

In general, the teachers in this study appeared to be literate and excellent in understanding the concept and using it in practice. However, a question remains as to whether their practice in the classroom was excellent. Therefore, future programs and research should be directed toward

classroom-based research on how the CBAL can improve students' learning, especially involving four language skills and improving the quality of teacher instructions. Document analysis and classroom observation are also deemed necessary in future research. This study also had some limitations on the number of participants due to time constraints and resources as well as the setting of the study, which involved only EFL secondary teachers in one province. Despite these limitations, the findings of this study could contribute to a better understanding of teachers' assessment literacy in their particular context as they intensively interact with relevant assessment materials and assessment stakeholders.

### REFERENCES

- Al-Bhalani, S. M. (2019). *Assessment literacy: A study of EFL teachers' assessment knowledge, perspectives, and classroom behaviors* [The University of Arizona]. <https://repository.arizona.edu/handle/10150/633240>
- American Federation of Teachers, & National Council on Measurement in Education, National Education Association (AFT, NCME, N. (1990). Standards for teacher competence in educational assessment of students. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 9(4), 30–30. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-3992.1990.tb00391.x>
- Ashraf, H., & Zolfaghari, S. (2018). EFL teachers' assessment literacy and their reflective teaching. *International Journal of Instruction*, 11(1), 425–436. <https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2018.11129a>
- Bahtiar, I., & Purnawarman, P. (2020). Investigating English teachers' comprehension in Language Assessment Literacy (LAL). *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 508, 303–310. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.201214.253>
- Braney, B. T. (2010). *An examination of fourth grade teachers' assessment literacy and its relationship to students' reading achievement* (Issue April 2009). University of Hartford.
- Brookhart, S. M. (2011). Educational assessment knowledge and skills for teachers. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 30(1), 3–12. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-3992.2010.00195.x>
- Chappuis, J., Stiggins, R., Chappuis, S., & Arter, J. (2014). *Classroom Assessment for Student Learning* (Second Edi, Vol. 2). Pearson Education Limited. <http://ir.obihiro.ac.jp/dspace/handle/10322/3933>

**Dewi Aria, Didi Sukyadi, & Eri Kurniawan**

*Teacher assessment literacy: Indonesian EFL secondary teachers' self-perceived on classroom-based assessment practice*

- Chappuis, S., & Stiggins, R. (2020). Classroom assessment for learning. *British Society for Middle Eastern Studies. Bulletin*, 60(1), 40–43. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13530198908705494>
- Coombs, A., DeLuca, C., LaPointe-McEwan, D., & Chalas, A. (2018). Changing approaches to classroom assessment: An empirical study across teacher career stages. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 71, 134–144. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.12.010>
- Creswell, W. J., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*.
- Davies, A. (2008). Textbook trends in teaching language testing. *Language Testing*, 25(3), 327–347. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532208090156>
- Deluca, C., & Klinger, D. A. (2010). Assessment literacy development: Identifying gaps in teacher Candidates' learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy and Practice*, 17(4), 419–438. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2010.516643>
- DeLuca, C., LaPointe-McEwan, D., & Luhanga, U. (2015). Teacher assessment literacy: a review of international standards and measures. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 28(3), 251–272. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-015-9233-6>
- Fulcher, G. (2012). Assessment literacy for the language classroom. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 9(2), 113–132. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2011.642041>
- Giraldo, F. (2018). Language assessment literacy: Implications for language teachers. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 20(1), 179–195. <https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v20n1.62089>
- Giraldo, F., & Murcia, D. (2018). Language assessment literacy for pre-service teachers: course expectations from different stakeholders. *GiST Education and Learning Research Journal*, 16(16), 56–77. <https://doi.org/10.26817/16925777.425>
- Hamied, F. A., & Malik, R. S. (2017). *Research Methods: A Guide for First-Time Researchers*. Bandung: UPI Press.
- Howell, C. A. (2013). *Development and Analysis of a measurement scale for Teacher Assessment Literacy*. East Carolina University.
- Jannati, S. (2015). ELT Teachers' language assessment literacy: perceptions and practices. *Educational Research Association The International Journal of Research in Teacher Education*, 6(2), 26–37.
- Kaiser, G., & Willander, T. (2005). Development of mathematical literacy: Results of an empirical study. *Teaching Mathematics and Its Applications*, 24(2–3), 48–60. <https://doi.org/10.1093/teamat/hri016>
- Khadijeh, B., & Amir, R. (2015). Importance of teachers' assessment literacy. *International Journal of English Language Education*, 3(1), 139. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijelev.v3i1.6887>
- Koh, K., Burke, L. E. C. A., Luke, A., Gong, W., & Tan, C. (2017). Developing the assessment literacy of teachers in Chinese language classrooms: A focus on assessment task design. *Language Teaching Research*, 22(3), 264–288. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168816684366>
- Lam, R. (2014). Language assessment training in Hong Kong: Implications for language assessment literacy. *Language Testing*, 32(2), 169–197. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532214554321>
- Lam, R. (2019). Teacher assessment literacy: Surveying knowledge, conceptions and practices of classroom-based writing assessment in Hong Kong. *System*, 81, 78–89. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.01.006>
- Lan, C., & Fan, S. (2019). Developing classroom-based language assessment literacy for in-service EFL teachers: The gaps. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 61(8), 112–122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2019.03.003>
- Luthfiyyah, R., Basyari, I. W., & Dwiniasih, D. (2020). EFL secondary teachers' assessment literacy: Assessment conceptions and practices. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, 10(2), 402–421. <https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v10i2.2101>
- MacCarthy, M. (2014). Student Privacy: Harm and Context. *International Review of Information Ethics*, 21, 11–24.
- Muhammad, F., & Bardakçi, M. (2019). Iraqi EFL Teachers' Assessment Literacy: Perceptions and Practices. *Arab World English Journal*, 10(2), 431–442. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol10no2.33>
- Pastore, S., & Andrade, H. L. (2019). Teacher assessment literacy: A three-dimensional model. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 84, 128–138. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.05.003>
- Pill, J., & Harding, L. (2013). Defining the language assessment literacy gap: Evidence from a parliamentary inquiry. *Language Testing*, 30(3), 381–402. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532213480337>
- Popham, W. J. (2011). Assessment literacy overlooked: A teacher educator's confession. *Teacher Educator*, 46(4), 265–273. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730.2011.605048>
- Prasetyo, A. H. (2018). Language assessment literacy development: a student-teacher's experiences in teaching practice program. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 21(2), 199–206.

- Puspawati, I. (2019). Understanding teachers' knowledge, skills, and principles on language assessment: a survey on teachers' language assessment literacy. *Atlantis Press*, 353(IcoSIHESS), 70–75. <https://doi.org/10.2991/icosihess-19.2019.11>
- Quilter, S. M., & Gallini, J. K. (2000). Teachers' assessment literacy and attitudes. *Teacher Educator*, 36(2), 115–131. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730009555257>
- Rad, M. R. (2019). The Impact of EFL teachers' assessment literacy on their assessment efficiency in classroom. *Britain International of Linguistics Arts and Education (BioLAE) Journal*, 1(1), 9–17. <https://doi.org/10.33258/biolae.v1i1.14>
- Rusli. (2017). EFL teachers' perception and practice on formative assessment. Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.
- Saputra, E. R., Hamied, F. A., & Suherdi, D. (2020). The development of beliefs and practices of language assessment literacy: does a professional learning community help? *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 46(3), 414–416. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2020.1761250>
- Scarino, A. (2013). Language assessment literacy as self-awareness: Understanding the role of interpretation in assessment and in teacher learning. *Language Testing*, 30(3), 309–327. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532213480128>
- Shim, K. N. (2009). *An investigation into teachers' perceptions of classroom-based assessment of English as a foreign language in Korean primary education* [the University of Exeter]. <http://hdl.handle.net/10036/67553>
- Stiggins, R. (1991). Assessment literacy. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 72(7) (Mar., 1991), Pp. 534-539, 72(7), 534–539.
- Stiggins, R. (1995). Assessment for the 21st literacy century. *Phi Delta Kappa International*, 77(3), 238–245.
- Stiggins, R. (2001). The unfulfilled promise of classroom assessment. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*.
- Taylor, L. (2009). Developing assessment literacy. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 29(April 2009), 21–36. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190509090035>
- Tian, W., Louw, S., & Khan, M. K. (2021). Covid-19 as a critical incident: Reflection on language assessment literacy and the need for radical changes. *System*, 103, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102682>
- Vogt, K., & Tsagari, D. (2014). Assessment literacy of foreign language teachers: Findings of a European study. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 11(4), 374–402. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2014.960046>
- Vogt, K., Tsagari, D., & Spanoudis, G. (2020). What do teachers think they want? a comparative study of in-service language teachers' beliefs on LAL training needs. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 00(00), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2020.1781128>
- Wang, T. H., Wang, K. H., & Huang, S. C. (2008). Designing a Web-based assessment environment for improving pre-service teacher assessment literacy. *Computers and Education*, 51(1), 448–462. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2007.06.010>
- Webb, N. L. (2002). Assessment literacy in a standards-based urban education setting. In *Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans*, 20 p.
- Willis, J., Adie, L., & Klenowski, V. (2013). Conceptualising teachers' assessment literacies in an era of curriculum and assessment reform. *Australian Educational Researcher*, 40(2), 241–256. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-013-0089-9>
- Xu, Y. (2018). Assessment in the language classroom: teachers support student learning, by L. Cheng and J. Fox (Eds.). London, UK: Palgrave, 2017, 246 pp., \$31, ISBN: 978-1-137-46483-5 (paperback). *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 15(4), 423–425. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2018.1446959>
- Xu, Y., & Brown, G. T. L. (2016). Teacher assessment literacy in practice: A reconceptualization. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 58, 149–162. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.05.010>
- Yamtim, V., & Wongwanich, S. (2014). A Study of Classroom Assessment Literacy of Primary School Teachers. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 2998–3004. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.696>
- Zulaiha, S., Mulyono, H., & Ambarsari, L. (2020). An investigation into EFL teachers' assessment literacy: Indonesian teachers' perceptions and classroom practice. *European Journal of Contemporary Education*, 9(1), 189–201. <https://doi.org/10.13187/ejced.2020.1.189>

**Dewi Aria, Didi Sukyadi, & Eri Kurniawan**

*Teacher assessment literacy: Indonesian EFL secondary teachers' self-perceived on classroom-based assessment practice*