

Investigating English Teachers' Comprehension in Language Assessment Literacy (LAL)

Irma Bahtiar ^{1, *}, Pupung Purnawarman ²

¹ *School of Postgraduate Studies, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia*

² *English Education Department, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia*

**Corresponding author. Email: irmabahtiar@upi.edu*

ABSTRACT

Assessment is still considered as the hardest part in the teaching process since it deals with a score which is crucial for students, but teachers' ability in assessing students is considered not really proficient. Consequently, this study investigated teachers' Language Assessment Literacy and their perceptions and experiences in assessing students. The participants of this research are 20 English teachers in Junior High School and 20 English teachers in Senior High School/Vocational High School. The research design used in this research was a qualitative descriptive design. Two data-collection instruments were used in this study, namely an interview and a questionnaire adopted from Giraldo (2018) and Lan & Fan (2019). Thematic analysis was used to analyse the interview data and Microsoft Excel was used to analyse the questionnaire data to find out the percentage. The results of this study showed that most of the teachers do not know the term Language Assessment Literacy (LAL) but their result of LAL is considered great. Most of the teachers also rate themselves as good in CBLAL. All of the teachers stated that they still need trainings or workshops to improve their ability in assessing students. Most of the teachers have already incorporate technology and internet in assessing their students.

Keywords: language assessment literacy, LAL, CBLAL, english teacher, technology, internet

1. INTRODUCTION

Assessment is considered as the most challenging part of the teaching process since it deals with several principles such as practicality, reliability, validity, and washback. It is supported by Jannati (2015) who stated that assessment is undoubtedly one of the most significant and at the same time complicated tasks. Then, teachers have the crucial role in assessment. It is in line with a study conducted by Vogt & Tsagari (2014) who stated that an important factor in classroom-based LTA is the teacher.

However, teachers seem not paying a lot of attention to formative assessment. Assessment is usually just focused on summative assessment which only measures students' ability with the middle test or final test. Students' strengths and weaknesses in the learning process are usually not noticed by the teachers. The score is considered as a crucial part of most of the students. Students who get a low score might influence the way they think about the teachers or the subject. However, there are many aspects in a test that might not be reliable or valid since most of the teachers still feel confused about how to assess English skills accurately.

Furthermore, Djoub (2017) also stated that language teachers nowadays should cope with the changing and challenging demands of society which requires more flexibility in assessment in order to support learning. Then, assessment is not only for giving grade to students but also creating feedback to students and other aspects. Therefore, teachers' comprehension in assessment is indicated crucial since a good understanding in assessment will affect to how the teachers assess their students.

Teachers' knowledge, skill, and principle, which is commonly known as Language Assessment Literacy (LAL) is still a relatively new concept in language assessment. Understanding teachers' LAL and their voices related to assessment might help the teachers to enhance their assessment. In the Indonesian context, LAL has not been researched well. Puspita (2019) stated that it is essential for teachers to hold sufficient knowledge on assessment literacy. However, in the context of Indonesia, assessment literacy is still an underexplored area, especially for classroom English language teachers. Then, there is limited publication that indicates or investigates the assessment literacy of English teachers in the context of Indonesia. This paper, therefore,

investigates to what extent English language teachers at the junior and senior level possess assessment literacy and how they perceive LAL.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Inbar-Lourie (2017) stated that Language Assessment Literacy (LAL) refers to the knowledge, skills and principles that stakeholders involved in assessment activities are required to master in order to perform assessment tasks. Then, Pill and Harding (2013) described the language assessment literacy as indicating a repertoire of competences that enable an individual to understand, evaluate and, in some cases, create language tests and analyse test data. In addition, Fulcher (2012) stated that the term “assessment literacy” has become accepted to refer to the range of skills and knowledge that stakeholders need to deal with the new world of assessment into which we have been thrust.

Furthermore, Herrera & Macías (2015) stated that assessment literacy is a skill needed by teachers for their long-term professional well-being, to benefit their students and programs or institutions in which they work. Moreover, Lam (2015) said that LAL is defined as the acquisition of knowledge, skills, and principles of test construction, test interpretation and use, test evaluation, and classroom-based assessments alongside the development of a critical stance about the functions of assessment within a broader educational context.

Language assessment literacy is considered crucial for teachers since good LAL will affect to how the teachers assess their students effectively. Zulaiha & Mulyono (2020) claimed that the success of the assessment will influence the quality of learning and student achievement. Therefore, it is imperative that teachers have adequate assessment literacy. On the other hand, Sultana (2019) stated that the lack of assessment literacy of English teachers could be one of the contributor factors linked to the proclaimed decreasing standards of English language teaching in Bangladesh. In addition, Zulaiha & Mulyono (2020) also revealed that the training of teachers is one of the most critical factors in improving the quality of teaching and assessment in the classroom.

EFL teachers need to be literate in language assessment; this can be achieved through training. It is in line with a study by Saputra, Hamied & Suherdi (2020). They claimed that LAL is the starting point for a better implementation of classroom-based assessment and if

teachers are well-trained in assessment, learning could be fruitfully implemented.

Furthermore, Zhang (2018) claimed that teachers with poor assessment knowledge seemed to have greater training needs in fundamental topics in assessment knowledge, while those with good knowledge in assessment showed greater training needs in more advanced topics. In addition, Coombe, Vafadar & Mohebbi (2020) stated that teacher assessment training needs to become long and sustainable enough to engage teachers in profound learning about assessment, which will possibly help them improve and expand conceptions and practices about assessment.

Then, Ismael (2017) also said that raising assessment literacy means being aware of many assessment issues such as assessment procedures, designs, appropriateness, accuracy, fairness, the difference between assessments for English native-speakers and ELLs, students’ rights to know about test questions, answer formats, the need for self-assessment and peer- assessment, taking students’ viewpoints, language testing standards and professional morality. Based on several explanation above, it can be concluded that training is crucial to teachers since it might help them in improving their assessment in the class.

Stabler-Havener (2018) reviewed six models on Language Assessment Literacy (LAL). Firstly, the LAL model from Brindley (2001) consisted of the social context of assessment (essential), defining and describing proficiency (essential), constructing and evaluating language tests (optional), assessment in the language curriculum (optional), putting assessment into practice. Secondly, LAL model from Inbar-Lourie (2008) consisted of the reason for assessment(why), the trait to be assessed (what) and the method of assessment (how). The third, LAL model from Davies (2008) consisted of skills, knowledge and principles.

The fourth, the model from Fulcher (2012) consisted of practices, principles and contexts. The fifth, model from Pill and Harding (2013) consisted of Illiteracy, nominal literacy, functional literacy, procedural and conceptual literacy, and multidimensional literacy. The last, the model from Taylor (2013) consisted of knowledge of theory, technical skills, principles and concepts language pedagogy, sociocultural values, local practices, personal beliefs/attitudes, scores and decision-making.

Table 1 Demography of Participants

School	Location	Gender	Educational Qualifications	Number of years as an English language teacher
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Junior High School (20 teachers) Senior High School (20 teachers) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rural (18 teachers) Suburban (12 teachers) Urban (10 teachers) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Male (7) Female (33) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bachelor (37 teachers) Master (3 teachers) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> < 5 (33) 6-10 (5) 15-20 (1) 25-30 (1)

However, this study used the new model from Giraldo (2018) divided the descriptors of Language Assessment Literacy into three sections, namely knowledge, skill, and principles. The knowledge section consisted of awareness of applied linguistics, awareness of theory and concepts and awareness of own language assessment context. The skill section consisted of instructional skills, design skills for language assessments, skills in educational measurement and technological skills. The principles consisted of awareness of and actions towards critical issues in language assessment.

Puspita (2019) measured the level of LAL using 5 levels: (1) very poor: teachers are unfamiliar with language assessment concepts and methods; (2) poor: teachers understand specific terms and concepts related to language assessment, but may indicate misconceptions; (3) fair: teachers have a wide range of basic concepts and terms related to language assessment; (4) good: teachers understand central concepts of language assessment, and can use the knowledge in practice; and (5) excellent: teachers understand central concepts of language assessment, and can use the knowledge in practice. Those level are the same with the level of literacy proposed by Bybee (1997): (a) illiteracy: the 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.

3. METHOD

This study adopted a qualitative approach to investigate EFL teachers’ Language Assessment Literacy (LAL) and their perceptions and experiences in assessing students. The participants involved in this study were 40 teachers who filled the questionnaire and ten teachers who were involved in depth-interview. The demography of the participants is summarized in the following Table 1.

Two instruments were used in this research, namely a questionnaire as a primary instrument and an interview as a secondary instrument to support the result from the questionnaire. The first instrument used was a questionnaire which consists of 66 items (part 1-3) and 18 items (part 4), and all the question were written in English. The researcher adopted the questionnaire from Giraldo (2018) and Lan & Fan (2019). All the items in the questionnaire were translated into Indonesian to assist teachers comprehend the information given in the instrument properly. The questionnaire had four parts. The first part aimed to capture respondents’ knowledge

of LAL. The second part aimed to know teachers’ skill in LAL. The third part aimed to know teachers’ principle in LAL. The fourth part aimed to know teachers’ self-rating about their own assessment. The web-based questionnaire creator tool (Google Forms) was utilized for collecting data from respondents personally. Then, the questionnaire data were analyzed by using Microsoft Excel to find out the percentage.

In addition to the questionnaire, semi-structured interviews were conducted to follow up on the findings from the questionnaire. The interview questions were compiled by the researcher related to the questions in the questionnaire. It consisted of four questions. The researcher interviewed (semi-structured interview) 10 respondents, and each respondent was asked four questions related to their perceptions and experiences of their assessment. The interview was conducted by using English and Indonesian since the researcher gave choices to the respondents to use English or Indonesian during the interview. The data from the interview were analyzed by applying thematic analysis by Miles & Huberman (1994) which consists of three stages, namely data reduction, data display, and conclusion.

4. RESULT

4.1. Questionnaire Findings

This study adopted the descriptors from Giraldo (2018) to obtain the level of teachers’ language assessment literacy (LAL) which consisted of three main parts (knowledge, skill, and principle) and each section has several subparts that will be presented using the table below (Table 2, 3, 4, and 5). Then, this study also adopted a questionnaire from Lan & Fan (2019) which consisted of 18 aspects to find out how the teachers rate themselves in classroom-based language assessment literacy and what aspects that they want in a language assessment training or workshop (Table 2). Moreover, this study also asked several questions (school location, school level, number of years as an English teacher, and their understanding about LAL) to have an in-depth comprehension related to how the teachers understand the concept of language assessment literacy.

Table 2 Teacher’s Knowledge in LAL

No	Statement	Yes (Average)	No (Average0)
1	Awareness of applied linguistics	68%	32%
2	Awareness of theory and concepts	70%	30%
3	Awareness of own language assessment context	73%	27%
Average Total		70%	30%

The first part is knowledge in assessment which consists of three parts (awareness of applied linguistics,

awareness of theory and concepts, awareness of own language assessment context). Table 2 presents that teachers' knowledge in LAL was considered good since most of the respondents answered YES (70%) and only 30% answered NO. From three aspects in teachers' knowledge in LAL, teachers' knowledge in their own language assessment context had the highest percentage (73%). Meanwhile, their knowledge in applied linguistics got the lowest score (68%) compared to the other aspects. In addition, teachers' knowledge in theory and concept was 76%. It is shown in the table that almost most of the respondents (92.5%) could contrast assessment methods, with their advantages and disadvantages. On the other hand, only 27.5% of the respondents could calculate statistics procedures for investigating the validity and interpret reliability in language assessment and its implications.

The second part is skills in assessment which consists of four sections (instructional skills, design skills, skills in educational measurement, and technological skills

Table 3 Teacher's Skills in LAL

No	Statement	Yes (Average)	No (Average)
1	Instructional skills	88%	12%
2	Design skills for language assessments	76%	24%
3	Skills in educational measurement (advanced skills not always needed)	50%	50%
4	Technological skills	66%	34%
Average Total		76%	24%

Table 3 shows that teachers' skills in LAL was indicated good as the average of teachers who chose YES was 70 %, and only 30% chose No. From four aspects of teachers' skill in LAL, teachers' skill in instructional has the highest score (88%). It is shown in the table that all of the respondents (100%) could collect formal data (e.g., through tests) and informal data (while observing in class) of students' language development, and the vast majority of the teachers (97.5%) could plan, implement, monitor, record, and report student language development.

However, 10% of the respondents did not incorporate technologies in assessing students. Furthermore, teachers' skill in design is 76%. It can be seen in the table that 97.5% of the teachers could identify and state the purpose for language assessment and 95% of the teachers could write selected-response items such as multiple-choice, true-false, and matching. Moreover, teachers' skill in technology is only 66%. It is shown in the table that almost all of the teachers (92.5%) used internet resources such as online tutorials and adapted contents for his/her particular language assessment needs, but only 30% of the respondents who used software such as

Statistical Package for the Social Sciences for assessing students. Besides, teachers' skill in educational measurement gets the lowest score (50%). It can be seen from the table that almost all teachers (97.5%) could infer students' strengths and weaknesses based on data, but only 22.5% of the teachers who could calculate reliability and validity indices by using appropriate methods such as Kappa, PPMC, and others.

Table 4 Teachers' Principle in LAL

Statement	Yes (Average)	No (Average)
Awareness of and actions towards critical issues in language assessment	91%	9%

Based on the table 4, teachers' principles in LAL is considered excellent since 91% of the teachers chose YES, and only 9% chose NO. All the respondents (100%) treated all students with respect. From the three aspects in LAL proposed by Giraldo (2018), teachers' principle in LAL had the highest score (91%) compared to teachers' skills (76%) and teachers' knowledge (70%).

Table 5 Teachers' Principle in LAL

Number of Respondents	Yes	No	Yes, but ...
40 teachers	10 (25%)	15 (37.5%)	15 (37.5%)

Table 5 shows that most of the respondents (37.5%) did not know the term LAL (Language Assessment Literacy) and knew the term LAL but they could not explain it, and only 25% of the respondents could explain the term LAL properly. Two teachers have a perfect score (100%). They had three years of teaching experience and taught in the rural and suburban area. On the other hand, there was one teacher who got the lowest score (27.23%). She/he taught in the urban area for three years.

Table 6 Teachers' Self-Rating about Classroom-Based Language Assessment Literacy (CBLAL) and Teachers' Need in Training/Workshop

Number of Aspect	Information	Average
0	Very poor/ Illiteracy	-
1	Poor/Nominal literacy	9%
2	Fair/Functional literacy	25%
3	Good/Procedural and conceptual literacy	56%
4	Excellent/Multidimensional literacy	10%

Based on the table 6, most of the teachers' rated themselves good (56%), fair (25%), excellent (10%), and poor (9%). On the other hand, no respondent rated themselves very poor in classroom-based language assessment literacy (CBLAL). Table 5 above also

presents that the majority of the teachers needed training related to establishing validity (71.8%) and reliability of tests/assessment (76.9%). 64.1% of the respondent wanted to have a training related to assessing productive skills (speaking/writing). On the other hand, 56.4% of the teachers needed a training related to how to assess/test micro linguistics aspects (grammar/vocabulary) and training concerning how to test/ assess receptive skills (reading/listening).

4.2. Findings from Follow-up Interview

4.2.1. Teachers' Perception of Their own Assessment

Based on the interview result, only 27.5% of the teachers (11 out of 40) felt satisfied with their assessment. They felt satisfied because of many reasons such as they have made and modified the relevant assessment for the students, they could reflect their assessment, evaluate the students' progress confidently, they knew their students' ability accurately so that they could assess the students objectively. The students did well in the test so that they thought that their assessment was good enough. Meanwhile, the majority of the teachers (65%) sometimes felt satisfied and sometimes not. One of the teachers stated that she felt satisfied when the students got a good score but felt not satisfied when the students got low score. On the other hand, only 7.5% (three teachers) did not feel satisfied with their assessment. One of the teachers sometimes questioned her own assessment whether it was already good or not and she also occasionally did not use the rubric in assessing students even though she realized that it is a must to use rubric. Then, one of the teachers stated that she never felt satisfied with her assessment because she did not have much time to think about the assessment due to the other demand from the school like administrative matter so that she did not feel good with her assessment.

4.2.2. Teachers' Perception of Language Assessment Training

The majority of the respondents (95%) stated that they needed training which related to language assessment. One of the respondents said that her knowledge from bachelor and master degree were just full of theory not practical experience to assess students. Moreover, one of the teachers also stated that she had ever known about the theory but the implementation of how to assess properly is difficult and complicated. Two out of ten teachers stated that they wanted to know more about how to validate questions using statistics in a training. Other teachers mentioned several topics that they wanted in a training such as how to assess properly in accordance with the students' situation and condition, how to assess students' writing, how to construct hot questions in a written assessment and construct rubric for

assessing the four skills, how to assess teenager students with different grade, portfolio assessment, formative and summative assessment, peer-assessment, process-focused assessment. However, 5% of the respondents stated that they did not need training since they have been satisfied with their own assessment. Thus, it is shown that most of the teacher still needed a training or workshop even though they had a good result of Language Assessment Literacy (LAL).

4.2.3. Teachers' Experience in Incorporating Technologies in Assessing Students

Based on the result of the questionnaire data, 4 out of 40 respondents did not incorporate technologies in assessing students. They did not utilize technologies in their assessment since the facilities in their schools are still inadequate such as lack of computers and some rules prohibit children to bring mobile phones to school. Therefore, in assessing students, they only used manual rubrics from experts to assess students, such as rubric from Brown and Harmer that adjusted to the conditions in the class. However, one respondent stated that she only used technologies like online learning platform because there is no face-to-face class during the covid-19 outbreak.

On the other hand, 36 out of 40 teachers (90%) incorporated technologies in assessing students such as Kahoot, Quizziz, Quizlet, Google Form, Edmodo, MOODLE, Online Crossword, Mentimeter, Anates, Mr. Excel, Youtube, Instagram and Google Drive. One of the teachers said that she conducted a need analysis before teaching and the result showed that most of the students wanted technology in her classroom. She realized that her target of teaching was Z generation who usually always stucked with their mobile phone and she wanted to be a good teacher who could facilitate the students to learn in fun way by incorporating technologies. In addition, four out of ten teachers stated that they incorporated technologies in assessing students because it will make them easier and faster to assess students. Then, two out of ten respondents said that there was a demand from the school to use technologies. It will help the students familiar in using technologies since their middle test and final test were done by using computer-based testing.

4.2.3. Teachers' Experience in Using Internet Resources Contents

Based on the result of questionnaire data, 92.5% of the respondents used internet resources contents, for instance, from several websites like Cambridge, British Council, Pinterest, Youtube, Quizziz, Kahoot, Padlet, Wondershare, Dailymail, Zenius Education, *teachingenglish.com*, *allthingsgrammar.com*, *allthingstopic.com*, *eslcollaborative*, online articles and other teachers' blogs. On the other hand, 7.5% of the

teachers did not use internet resources since the condition of the students who lived in remote areas which were not familiar with Internet. They thought that if they gave a test from Internet sources, it will burden them. Therefore, the teachers just used and modified the test from the book as the primary resources in assessing students.

5. DISCUSSION

From Table 1, it can be concluded that teachers' knowledge related to language assessment context is considered good (73%), but teachers' knowledge in applied linguistics is considered not good (68%). It also can be seen that using inferential statistics like measuring the Pearson Product Moment Correlation is still difficult for the majority of the students (only 27.3% could utilize it), but most of them can compute basic statistical analyses in their assessment. From the table 2, it is logical to conclude that teachers' skill in instructional is indicated good (88%) but teachers' skill in educational measurement is considered not good (only 50%). It also can be concluded from Table 2 that not all the teachers incorporate technologies in assessing their students (10% of the teachers), but 92.75% of the teachers use internet resources for assessing their students. In addition, the use of Statistical Package for the Social Sciences for assessing students is not well-applied since only 30% of the respondents who use it and only 22.5% of teachers who can calculate reliability and validity indices by using appropriate methods such as Kappa, PPMC, and others. This result is in line with the result shown in table 1 that the use of inferential statistics is considered hard for the teachers. From table 3, it can be concluded that teachers' principles in LAL are considered excellent (91%). It also can be seen that all of the respondents have a great principle in treating their students with respect. From the three tables (Table 1, 2, and 3), it can be concluded that teachers' principle (91%) is considered better than the two aspects which are teachers' knowledge (70%) and teachers' skill (76%). Therefore, the teachers should pay more attention to their skill specially their knowledge related to language assessment.

Based on table 4, it can be summarized that most of the teachers (56%) understood the central concepts in language assessment and use their knowledge in practice or it can be said that most of the teachers feel good with their assessment. It is supported by a study conducted by Jannati (2015) who claimed teachers were assessment literate and aware of the principles of assessment and testing. In addition, Zulaiha, Mulyono, & Ambarsari (2020) also stated that the teachers were assessment literate and aware of the principles of classroom-based assessment, reporting that they put most principles into practice. However, Sultana (2019) claimed that the teachers have the inadequacy of teacher assessment literacy. On the other hand, only 9% of the respondent in this study ignored the language assessment concepts and methods and only 10% of the teachers who have

knowledge extending beyond ordinary concepts including philosophical, historical and social dimensions of assessment.

From table 5, it can be concluded that reliability and validity in test/assessment are considered as the most challenging part in assessing students since the majority of the teachers still need training on how to establish reliability (76.9%) and validity (71.8%) in a test/assessment. It is not in line with a study conducted by Zulaiha & Mulyono (2020) who claimed that all teachers thought "validation" was the most required material, while perceiving "reliability" (as being less required). Another study conducted by Zhang (2018) revealed that Singapore primary Chinese Language teachers showed strong training need in knowledge regarding validity, reliability, test design and development, but relatively weaker need in large-scale standardized testing and classroom testing and washback.

In addition, most of the teachers in this study still need a training. A study conducted by Vogt & Tzagari (2014) also revealed that there is a need for training across the board. 64.1% of the respondents stated that they need training related to assessing productive skills (speaking/writing). However, only 56.4% of the teachers wants to follow a training concerning assessing receptive skills (reading/listening) and training related to assessing micro linguistics aspects (grammar/vocabulary). It can be concluded that assessing productive skills is considered more challenging than assessing receptive skills or micro linguistics aspects. As presented in table 6, even though most of the teachers (37.5%) do not know the term Language Assessment Literacy (LAL), the result of the questionnaire which measure LAL showed that they have a good result in LAL (the highest score is 100% and the lowest score is 22.5%). It also can be summarized that no relationship between number of years in teaching and teachers' result in LAL and it is also considered that no relationship between school location (rural, suburban and urban) and teachers' result in LAL since there are teachers who taught in urban area but have lower score than teacher who taught in rural area.

Based on the result of the interview, for the level of satisfaction with teachers' own assessment, findings from the interviews show that the 11 out of 40 teachers are satisfied with their assessment and 65% of the teachers are sometimes satisfied and sometimes not satisfied, but only three teachers who are not satisfied with their assessment. It is in line with the result of the first questionnaire since most of them have a good score in language assessment literacy (LAL). They are postgraduate students in one of the universities in Indonesia. It might be a reason why they have a good result in Language Assessment Literacy even though only two teachers can explain the term LAL in detail. Even though most of them feel satisfied with their assessment, most of them still need training to improve

their skills in assessing students. It is accordance with the result of the questionnaire, the interview results also showed that using inferential statistics is a topic that they really need.

In this 21st century era, it is indisputable that technology and the internet are two things that also influence the education field and also how the teachers assess their students. In this research, most of the respondents (90%) utilize technology when assessing their students. Only 10% of teachers do not incorporate technology since their school is in a rural area, so they have a lack of facility. It is also found that 92.5% of teachers utilize internet sources. However, only 7.5% of the teachers who do not use it since they think that it is not appropriate with their student's ability. Most of them also stated that technology helps them a lot to assess students since it is really easy and fast. Therefore, it can be concluded that technology-based assessment is not well-applied in the rural area.

6. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, most of the teachers still do not know the term Language Assessment Literacy, even though they have a good result in LAL. Most of the teachers rate themselves good and fair in classroom-based language assessment literacy (CBLAL). All of the teachers who are interviewed also stated that they still need training even though some of them already felt satisfied with their assessment. Most of the topic that they want to know more in a training is related to how to assess students properly and how to make a good question (related to validity and reliability). Teachers who teach in remote areas have a problem in incorporating technologies in assessing students because of the lack of facility.

Meanwhile, teachers from a city usually have already used technologies such as online application or website to assist in assessing students. Most of them used technologies because they help the teachers to assess students conveniently. In addition, the number of years as an English language teacher and the school location does not determine the good result in LAL. This study only employs 40 teachers who fill the questionnaire, which is still not enough to make a strong generalization about language assessment so that the future researcher is recommended to extend the number of the participants who represent the rural, suburban and urban areas.

REFERENCES

- [1] Coombe, C., Vafadar, H. & Mohebbi, H. (2020). Language assessment literacy: What do we need to learn, unlearn, and relearn?. *Language Testing in Asia*, 10(3), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-020-00101-6>
- [2] Djoub, Z. (2017). Assessment literacy: beyond teacher practice. In R. Al-Mahrooqi et al. (Eds.), *Revisiting EFL Assessment* (pp. 9-27). Springer International Publishing Switzerland.
- [3] Giraldo, F. (2018). Language assessment literacy: Implication for language teachers. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 20(1), 179-1195. <https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v20n1.62089>
- [4] Glenn Fulcher, G. (2012). Assessment literacy for the language classroom. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 9, 113-132. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2011.64204>
- [5] Herrera, L. & Macías, D. (2015). A call for language assessment literacy in the education and development of teachers of English as a foreign language. *Colomb. Appl. Linguist. J.*, 17(2), 302-312. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14483/udistrital.jour.calj.2015.2.a09>
- [6] Inbar-Lourie, O. (2017). Language assessment literacy. *Language Testing and Assessment, Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02261-1_19
- [7] Indah Puspawati, I. (2019). Understanding teachers' knowledge, skills, and principles on language assessment: a survey on teachers' language assessment literacy. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 353, 70-75. <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>
- [8] Ismael, A. D. (2017). Kurdish tertiary EFL teachers' assessment literacy in alternative assessments and its influence on the ethicality of their assessments. In R. Al-Mahrooqi et al. (Eds.), *Revisiting EFL Assessment* (pp. 29-45). Springer International Publishing Switzerland.
- [9] 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.
- [10] Lan, C. & Fan, S. (2019). Developing classroom-based language assessment literacy for in-service EFL teachers: The gaps. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 61, 112-122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2019.03.003>
- [11] 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>
- [12] Ricky Lam, R. (2015). Language assessment training in Hong Kong: Implications for language assessment literacy. *Language Testing*, 32(2), 169-197. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026553221454321>
- [13] Saputra, R. E., Hamied, A. F., & Suherdi, D. (2020). The development of beliefs and practices of language assessment literacy: Does a professional learning community help?. *Journal of Education For Teaching*, 1-3. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2020.1761250>
- [14] Stabler-Havener, L. M. (2018). Defining, conceptualizing, problematizing, and assessing language teacher assessment literacy. *Teachers College, Columbia University Working Papers in Applied Linguistics & TESOL*, 18(1), 1-22.

- [15] Sultana, N. (2019). Language assessment literacy: An uncharted area for the English language teachers in Bangladesh. *Language Testing in Asia*, 9(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-019-0077-8>
- [16] 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>
- [17] Zhang, L. (2018). Investigating the training needs of assessment literacy among Singapore primary Chinese language teachers. In K. C. Soh (ed.), *Teaching Chinese Language in Singapore* (pp. 167-177). Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd.
- [18] Zulaiha, S., & Mulyono, H. (2020). Exploring junior high school EFL teachers' training needs of assessment literacy. *Cogent Education*, 7(1), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2020.1772943>.
- [19] 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>.