



## Are English Language Teachers Assessment Literate?

Ali IŞIK<sup>a</sup> (ORCID ID - 0000-0002-3305-7922)

Rahim SARI<sup>b</sup> (ORCID ID -0000-0002-0422-500X)

<sup>a</sup>İstinye Üniversitesi, İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Fakültesi,  
İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü, İstanbul/Türkiye

<sup>b</sup>İstinye Üniversitesi, İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Fakültesi,  
İngilizce Mütercim ve Tercümanlık Bölümü, İstanbul/Türkiye



### Article Info

DOI: 10.14812/cufej.877706

#### Article history:

Received 09.02.21

Revised 20.06.21

Accepted 03.09.21

#### Keywords:

Language assessment literacy,  
English teachers,  
English teaching,  
Teacher training,  
Assessment.

### Abstract

The study was conducted to bring the language assessment literacy (LAL) of English language teaching (ELT) teachers into focus. It also attempted to investigate how the pre-service education background of ELT teachers, and the departments they graduated from, affected their assessment literacy. The data were obtained from 180 ELT teachers using a mixed-methods research design through a questionnaire and follow-up interviews. The results indicated that the ELT teachers' LAL was low, but they did not feel any serious need for assessment training. It was also found that the ELT teachers had different academic backgrounds in assessment. As ELT graduates received training in assessment, the graduates of other departments working as English teachers didn't. Thus, it was observed that pre-service education background has a significant effect on teachers' assessment literacy.

## İngilizce Öğretmenleri Yabancı Dilde Ölçme ve Değerlendirmede Okuryazarlar mı?

### Makale Bilgisi

DOI: 10.14812/cufej.877706

#### Makale Geçmişi:

Geliş 09.02.21

Düzeltilme 20.06.21

Kabul 03.09.21

#### Anahtar Kelimeler:

Yabancı dilde ölçme okuryazarlığı,  
İngilizce öğretmenleri,  
İngilizce öğretimi,  
İngilizce öğretmen eğitimi,  
Yabancı dilde ölçme ve  
değerlendirme

### Öz

Bu araştırma, İngilizce öğretmenlerinin yabancı dilde ölçme ve değerlendirme okuryazarlığına odaklanmaktadır. Aynı zamanda İngilizce öğretmenlerinin mezun oldukları bölümlerin ölçme ve değerlendirme okuryazarlığını nasıl etkilediği de araştırılmıştır. Veriler 180 İngilizce öğretmeniyle yürütülen anket ve bu anketin içeriğine yönelik müteakip görüşmeler yoluyla karma metot araştırma yöntemi kullanılarak elde edilmiştir. Sonuçlara göre, İngilizce öğretmenlerinin dil ölçme ve değerlendirme seviyelerinin düşük olduğu, ancak ölçme ve değerlendirme ihtiyacı duymadıkları tespit edilmiştir. Ayrıca İngilizce öğretmenlerinin farklı akademik ölçme ve değerlendirme geçmişleri olduğu görülmüştür. İngilizce öğretmenliği bölümü mezunu İngilizce öğretmenleri ölçme ve değerlendirmeye yönelik eğitim almışken, diğer bölümlerden mezun olan İngilizce öğretmenlerin bu eğitimi almadıkları tespit edilmiştir. Böylece, mezun olunan programın öğretmenlerin yabancı dilde ölçme ve değerlendirme okuryazarlığı üzerinde büyük bir etkisi olduğu görülmüştür.

<sup>a</sup> Author: isikal@hotmail.com

<sup>b</sup> Author: rahim.sari@istinye.edu.tr

### Introduction

How language teachers design, implement, evaluate, and exploit assessment has been studied extensively (Brunfaut, 2014; Fulcher, 2012; Jiang, 2017; Rea–Dickins, 2004; Tsagari, 2016; Vogt, Tsagari and Spanoudis, 2020). Apparently, the assessment training offered in language teacher training programs has received considerable attention (Coombe, Vafadar and Mohebbi, 2020; Hill and McNamara, 2011; Leung, 2009; Scarino, 2013). To offer the best possible assessment content to

trainees, all aspects and uses of assessment have been discussed widely, especially within the context of teacher-training programs (Davies, 2008; Hill, 2017; Leung, 2009; Levi and Inbar-Lourie, 2020; Malone, 2013; Purpura, 2016; Vogt and Tsagari, 2014; Wall and Taylor, 2014). In this respect, teacher “assessment literacy” has received wider attention, and the research on it has blossomed (Alderson, Brunfaut and Harding, 2017; Brunfaut, 2014; McNamara, 2014; Menken, Hudson and Leung, 2014; Taylor, 2009; Tsagari, 2020; Vogt, Tsagari and Csépes, 2020).

As the research on LAL has been expanding, it still needs to be enriched by data obtained from different language education contexts. As highlighted by Inbar-Lourie (2017), Kremmel and Harding (2020), and Vogt et al. (2020a)\*, the LAL of ELT teachers needs to be studied locally and cross-culturally to build up a global body of knowledge. Since the evidence on LAL is scarce in Turkey, this study attempted to provide data from the English as a foreign language (EFL) education in the Turkish context to contribute to evolving empirical evidence on LAL. Moreover, as LAL has not received enough interest, there is a need to attract the attention of language teachers, teacher trainers, and other authorities to its essential role in language education and hence, pave the way for designing teacher training programs that can increase teacher assessment literacy.

### Literature Review

LAL has inspired the research on what English teachers know about assessment and how they practice it. Hasselgreen, Carlsen, and Helness (2004) indicated that the participants lacked proper training, knowledge, and skills and needed in-service training. Vogt and Tsagari (2014) replicated the research conducted by Hasselgreen et al. (2004) and found that undergraduate programs did not help teachers master the basic concepts of assessment and practical skills and they tried to compensate for their assessment-related insufficiency themselves and demanded in-service training in assessment. Similarly, Tsagari and Vogt (2017) reiterated that undergraduate programs did not prepare ELT teachers well enough in terms of LAL. They were inclined to go back to traditional assessment practice and required training. Likewise, Vogt et al. (2020b)<sup>†</sup> reported that although teachers adopted a traditional assessment approach to testing, learners were content with it. They also pointed out low LAL levels for both teachers and learners as well as the need for assessment training for both groups. Vogt et al. (2020a) also pointed out that the contextual factors influenced how teachers perceived the notion of assessment, their LAL levels, and the need for assessment training. In a recent study, Levi and Inbar-Lourie (2020) noted that teachers’ LAL was formed by generic assessment, language-specific assessment, and contextual factors. They partially benefited from what they learned in generic assessment training and mostly disregarded language-related construct components when preparing their assessment tasks.

Similarly, the quality and content of the assessment courses offered for foreign language teachers at the universities have also captured the attention of the researchers. Bailey and Brown (1996) and Brown and Bailey (2008) investigated the content of the assessment courses and compared the results across twelve years. It was found that the assessment courses dealing with the fundamentals of assessment were evolving gradually. In another study, Shohamy, Inbar-Lourie, and Poehner (2008) concluded that teacher training in assessment was inadequate, and teachers followed a traditional assessment and merely assessed the linguistic aspects of language. From a different, yet similar, perspective Xu and Liu (2009) reported that the training teachers received and their experience formed their knowledge base. However, how they practiced assessment was also controlled by their need to conform to group norms in a given context. Likewise, Jin (2010) found that the assessment courses offered to train teachers were adequate in the content; however, that theoretical knowledge was not put into practice adequately. Following a similar line of inquiry, Scarino (2013) indicated that teachers needed to develop their theoretical knowledge base and be ready to implement context-sensitive assessment practices. Lam (2015) demonstrated that the language assessment training pre-service teachers received in Hong Kong

\* Vogt et al., (2020a) refers hereafter to Vogt, Tsagari and Spanoudis (2020).

<sup>†</sup> Vogt et al. (2020b) refers hereafter to Vogt, Tsagari and Csépes (2020).

was inadequate and far from bridging the gap between theory and practice. Likewise, Gan and Lam (2020) revealed that language assessment training was not enough to meet teachers' classroom-based assessment needs in the Chinese context. Nevertheless, they did not want to receive advanced training due to various personal and contextual factors.

In Turkey, LAL has not been a popular topic among researchers. Mede and Atay (2017) found that teachers' LAL was limited concerning classroom-based assessment and assessment-related concepts, but good regarding testing grammar and vocabulary. Olmezer-Ozturk and Aydın (2018) shared the psychometric properties of Language Assessment Knowledge Scale (LAKS); however, they did not report anything about teachers' LAL. Apparently, enough data on LAL have not been accumulated in the Turkish EFL context. The research is scarce, and the ones carried out so far are not broad enough to provide insights into the ELT teachers' LAL in Turkey. Consequently, this study attempted to characterize their LAL and training needs by including the undergraduate programs the English teachers graduated from. It also focused on how the English teachers in Istanbul, Turkey evaluated the sufficiency of assessment training in pre-service education and their need for in-service training in assessment. More specifically the study focused on the following research questions:

1. Do Turkish EFL teachers perceive pre-service assessment training to be sufficient?
2. To what extent do Turkish EFL teachers feel the need for in-service training in assessment?
3. Do the undergraduate departments Turkish EFL teachers graduate from affect their LAL levels?
4. Do the undergraduate departments Turkish EFL teachers graduate from affect their perception of the need for in-service training in assessment?

## Methodology

### Participants

ELT teachers in Turkey have different pre-service education backgrounds. In addition to the graduates of English Teaching Departments, those of the Western Languages, English Language and Literature, American Literature, Linguistics, American Culture Studies, English Literature and Cultural Studies, American Literature and Cultural Studies, English Translation and Interpretation departments also serve as English teachers (Isik and Isik, 2020). Whereas the ELT majors are required to take an assessment course, the students in other departments are not.

Taking this diversity in their academic background into account, this study aimed to investigate their LAL. Through cluster sampling, 15 K-12 schools and five universities were identified, and the questionnaire used by Vogt and Tsagari (2014) was sent electronically to 207 teachers and 183 of the teachers answered the questionnaire and sent it back. Thirty-two teachers were teaching in primary, 41 in secondary, 54 in high schools, and 56 in universities. Two ELT teachers who graduated from the American Literature and Cultural Studies and one from Linguistics answered the questionnaire. However, they were excluded from the study for the sake of simplicity. Thus, the participants were from only three different undergraduate programs, ELT, English Language and Literature (ELL), and English Translation and Interpretation (ETI). The pre-service education background of the participants is summarized in Table 1, and the number of teachers receiving in-service assessment training in Table 2.

**Table 1.**

*The distribution of EFL teachers by pre-service education background*

Undergraduate Program	N	Percentage
ELT	90	50
ELL	53	29.4
ETI	37	20.6

**Table 2.***The assessment-related in-service training the EFL teachers have received so far*

	ELT	ELL	ETI
Number of teachers receiving in-service assessment training	3 (1.7%)	2 (1.1%)	0
Frequency of in-service training	1	1	0

For the interview, the interviewees were selected from among the EFL teachers who answered the questionnaire through stratified random sampling considering the size of the teacher population from each academic background to cover one-tenth of them. Namely, 9 ELT, 5 ELL, and 4 ETI graduates were interviewed.

### Data Collection

Using a mixed-methods research design, the data were collected via the questionnaire and the follow-up interviews in December 2019.

#### *Teachers' Questionnaire*

The data were gathered using the teachers' questionnaire adapted by Vogt and Tsagari (2014) (see Appendix 1). As only three teachers reported that they received in-service training, they were excluded from the analysis to focus only on pre-service training. The questionnaire was administered to the teachers in the final month of the semester. Vogt and Tsagari (2014) found that Cronbach's alpha for internal consistency reliability of subsections of the questionnaire changed from .78 to .93. For this study, Cronbach's alpha ranged from .81 to .87, indicating high internal consistency reliability.

#### *Follow-up Interviews*

The guiding questions from Vogt and Tsagari (2014) were used for the interviews (see Appendix 2). They were held in the week after the questionnaire was given to the teachers. The researcher interviewed one teacher at a time and recorded the interview. The recordings were transcribed for analysis.

### Data Analysis

SPSS was used to analyze the data obtained from the questionnaires. The responses were analyzed through descriptive statistics to obtain frequencies and percentages. One-way ANOVA was used to compare the data elicited from the teachers who graduated from the ELT, ELL, and ETI departments, and to determine if there were any significant differences among these groups. For multiple comparisons, a post-hoc Scheffe test was used. The data elicited from the interviews were categorized, coded, and the frequencies and percentages were presented.

## Results

### Teacher Questionnaire

The data obtained from the teacher questionnaire are discussed in three parts, namely, classroom-focused assessment literacy, the purposes of assessment, and the content and concepts of assessment literacy. To see if there was a significant difference among the three groups, their responses were compared item-wise. The results showed a clear difference between the ELT graduates and non-ELT graduates regarding the assessment course received in the undergraduate programs. As the assessment was a mandatory course in their undergraduate programs, ELT graduates differed significantly from the others in receiving training in "preparing classroom tests". Likewise, as for "productive and receptive skills", "integrated skills", "grammar, and vocabulary", and "using statistics" ELT graduates differed from the others (see Appendix 3 for the detailed findings).

*Classroom-Focused Assessment Literacy*

Table 3 summarizes the assessment-related training the participants received in their pre-service education and the need for training in classroom-focused assessment literacy.

**Table 3.**  
*Classroom- focused assessment literacy and need for training*

		Training Received							Training Needed					
		ELT		ELL		ETI			ELT		ELL		ETI	
		F*	P**	F	P	F	P		F	P	F	P	F	P
Preparing classroom tests	Not at all	0	0.0	20	38	22	60	None	86	96	53	100	35	95
	A little	8	9	32	60	15	41	Basic	3	3.3	0	0.0	2	5.4
	Advanced	81	91	1	1.9	0	0	Advanced	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Ready-made tests	Not at all	33	37	51	96	35	95	None	73	81	53	100	35	95
	A little	53	59	2	3.8	2	5.4	Basic	16	18	0	0.0	2	5.4
	Advanced	2	2.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	Advanced	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Giving feedback based on assessment	Not at all	81	90	53	100	37	100	None	85	94	53	100	36	97
	A little	8	8.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	Basic	4	4.4	0	0.0	1	2.7
	Advanced	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	Advanced	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Self-/Peer-assessment	Not at all	84	93	53	100	37	100	None	84	93	53	100	35	95
	A little	5	5.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	Basic	5	5.6	0	0.0	2	5.4
	Advanced	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	Advanced	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Informal assessment	Not at all	79	88	53	100	37	100	None	77	86	49	93	29	78
	A little	9	10	0	0.0	0	0.0	Basic	12	13	4	7.5	8	22
	Advanced	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	Advanced	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
ELP or Portfolio	Not at all	53	59	44	83	29	78	None	47	52	27	51	20	54
	A little	35	39	8	15	7	19	Basic	37	41	26	49	17	46
	Advanced	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.7	Advanced	5	5.6	0	0.0	0	0.0

\*F: Frequency    \*\*P: Percentage

What is prominent in Table 3 is that the “preparing classroom tests” item, was the only noticeably marked item as “more advanced” in this subsection. Concerning the training needed, the items in this subsection show a homogenous distribution. The only common item marked as “basic training” is “using European Language Portfolio”. The rest of the items are generally marked as “none”.

The table indicates that most of the ELT graduates received advanced training in “preparing classroom tests”, whereas, almost none of the ELL graduates and ETI graduates received such training. In terms of training needed in preparing classroom tests, almost all the teachers irrespective of their academic backgrounds indicated that they did not need any training.

Considering the “use of ready-made” tests, as about three-fifths of the ELT graduates reported “a little training”, the rest mentioned “no training”. Almost all the ELL and the ETI graduates stated that they did not take any training. For training needed for the “use of ready-made tests”, the majority of the ELT graduates and all the ELL, and nearly all the ETI graduates did not indicate any need.

For the item “giving feedback based on assessment”, all the graduates gave similar answers and stated that they did not receive any training, and they did not need any training. “Self-assessment and peer-assessment” was the other item that received the same answer from all the participants. They mentioned that they did not take any training on this topic and they did not need any training. The picture is no different for the “informal assessment” item, the participants did not report any received training and any need for training.

For the “ELP and portfolio” the majority of the ELT graduates and most of the ELL and ETI graduates indicated that they did not receive any training. About two-fifths of the ELT graduates reported that they received “a little training”. About half of all the graduates indicated the need for basic training.

*Purposes of Testing*

Table 4 illustrates the responses of the ELT teachers regarding the purposes of testing and the need for training in this area.

**Table 4.**  
*The purposes of testing and the need for training*

		Training Received							Training Needed					
		ELT		ELL		ETI			ELT		ELL		ETI	
		F	P	F	P	F	P		F	P	F	P	F	P
Giving grades	Not at all	85	94	52	98	37	100	None	87	97	53	100	36	97
	A little	4	4.4	1	1.9	0	0.0	Basic	3	3.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Advanced	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	Advanced	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.7
Finding out what needs to be taught/learned	Not at all	86	96	52	98	37	100	None	88	98	52	98	32	87
	A little	3	3.3	1	1.9	0	0.0	Basic	2	2.2	1	1.9	4	11
	Advanced	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	Advanced	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.7
Placing students	Not at all	83	92	51	96	36	97	None	63	70	36	68	32	87
	A little	6	6.7	2	3.8	1	2.7	Basic	22	24	17	32	3	8.1
	Advanced	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	Advanced	5	5.6	0	0.0	2	5.4
Awarding certificates	Not at all	86	96	50	94	35	95	None	63	70	31	59	24	65
	A little	3	3.3	3	5.7	2	5.4	Basic	22	24	18	34	10	27
	Advanced	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	Advanced	4	4.4	4	7.5	3	8.1

Table 4 indicates that about “giving grades” and “what needs to be taught/learned” all the teachers provided similar answers and almost all of them stated that they did not take any training and need any training. Concerning “placing students”, almost none of the teachers reported any training. About a quarter of the ELT and one-third of the ELL graduates wanted basic training. For “awarding certificates” the participants provided similar responses and indicated almost no training received. About a quarter of the ELT and ETI and one-third of the ELL graduates requested basic training.

*Content and Concepts of Assessment Literacy*

Table 5 presents the findings of the Content and Concepts of Assessment Literacy section of the questionnaire.

**Table 5.**  
*Content and concepts of assessment literacy and training needed*

		Training Received							Training Needed					
		ELT		ELL		ETI			ELT		ELL		ETI	
		F	P	F	P	F	P		F	P	F	P	F	P
Receptive skills (reading/listening)	Not at all	0	0.0	53	100	37	100	None	90	100	52	98	37	100
	A little	7	7.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	Basic	0	0.0	1	1.9	0	0.0
	Advanced	83	92	0	0.0	0	0.0	Advanced	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Productive skills (writing/speaking)	Not at all	0	0.0	53	100	37	100	None	90	100	52	98	37	100
	A little	34	38	0	0.0	0	0.0	Basic	0	0.0	1	1.9	0	0.0
	Advanced	56	62	0	0.0	0	0.0	Advanced	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Microlinguistic aspects (grammar/vocabulary)	Not at all	1	1.1	53	100	36	97	None	87	97	52	98	37	100
	A little	18	20	0	0.0	1	2.7	Basic	3	3.3	1	1.9	0	0.0
	Advanced	71	79	0	0.0	0	0.0	Advanced	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Integrated language	Not at all	34	38	53	100	37	100	None	78	87	47	89	34	92

skills	A little	51	57	0	0.0	0	0.0	Basic	11	12	6	11	3	8.1
	Advanced	5	5.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	Advanced	1	1.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
Aspects of culture	Not at all	86	96	51	96	10	27	None	86	96	50	94	37	100
	A little	3	3.3	2	3.8	21	57	Basic	3	3.3	3	5.7	0	0.0
	Advanced	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	16	Advanced	89	99	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Not at all	74	82	52	98	37	100	None	74	82	46	87	25	68
Reliability	A little	16	18	0	0.0	0	0.0	Basic	14	16	7	13	11	30
	Advanced	0	0.0	1	1.9	0	0.0	Advanced	1	1.1	0	0.0	1	2.7
	Not at all	74	82	52	98	37	100	None	63	70	42	79	23	62
Validity	A little	16	18	0	0.0	0	0.0	Basic	24	27	11	21	13	35
	Advanced	0	0.0	1	1.9	0	0.0	Advanced	2	2.2	0	0.0	1	2.7
	Not at all	10	11	51	96	36	97	None	75	83	28	53	16	43
Using statistics	A little	80	89	1	1.9	1	2.7	Basic	11	12	18	34	17	46
	Advanced	0	0.0	1	1.9	0	0.0	Advanced	3	3.3	7	13	3	8.1

Table 5 shows that regarding “receptive skills”, almost all the ELT graduates stated that they received advanced training; none of the ELL and ETI graduates reported any training. Considering the training needed, almost none of the teachers mentioned any need for training. For “productive skills”, two-thirds of the ELT graduates said that they received advanced training, but none of the ELL and ETI graduates stated receiving any training. For training needed almost none of the respondents indicated any training.

Concerning “micro linguistic aspects (grammar/vocabulary)”, most of the ELT graduates said that they took advanced training, while none of the ELL and ETI graduates indicated training. Almost none of the participants mentioned any need for training. With respect to “integrated language skills”, about one-third of the ELT and all the ELL and ETI graduates reported no training. The majority of the ELT graduates indicated that they took a little training. For the training needed, the overwhelming majority of the teachers indicated no need for training.

About “aspects of culture”, almost all the ELT and ELL graduates and a quarter of the ETI graduates said that they did not take any training. About half of the ETI graduates reported a little training. Regarding the training needed, almost none of the teachers wanted any training. On “reliability”, about four-fifths of the ELT, and all the ELL and ETI graduates reported received training. In terms of training needed, while most of the teachers did not want any training, about one-third of the ETI graduates wanted basic training. Similarly, for “validity” most of the teachers said that they did not receive any training. For training needed most of the teachers did not mention any need for training while one-fifth of the ELT, and one-third of the ETI graduates wanted basic training.

Finally, in terms of “using statistics”, most of the ELT graduates reported that they had taken a little training but almost none of the ELL and ETI graduates said that they had. On training needed, most of the ELT, and half of the ELL and ETI graduates did not report any need for training. About one-tenth of the ELT, one-third of the ELL, and half of the ETI graduates indicated the need for basic training.

## Follow-up Interviews

### Training

All the teachers with ELT background indicated that they received an assessment course in their undergraduate program. All the non-ELT graduates and 89% of the ELT graduates stated that the assessment course was theoretical to familiarize them with assessment in general. Forty-four percent of the ELT graduates said that they studied how to prepare tests for specific skills, grammar, and vocabulary and prepared items for one of them. Seventy-eight percent of the teachers indicated that the lecturers were not qualified enough to offer a language assessment course. Finally, 89% of the teachers found no relevance between the courses they received and what they practiced in schools.

### *Factors Affecting Assessment Practice*

Eighty-nine percent of the teachers stated that their current assessment practice was derived from their language learning and teaching experience, assessment tradition in their schools, and imitating their colleagues and the exam format adopted in their schools. Seventy-eight percent felt obliged to conform to the group norms and formed their assessment practice accordingly.

### *The Focus of Assessment*

All the participants indicated that they tested grammar, vocabulary, and reading comprehension. Writing was also tested by 33% of the teachers.

### *Definition of Assessment*

All the ELT teachers stated that assessment was an official requirement and a tool to assess learner performance which is eventually reported in the form of grades. Only 11% of the teachers with an ELT background mentioned that it could be useful to improve ELT programs.

### *Function of Assessment*

All the teachers considered assessment as a screening process through which student performance was stratified. The exam scores were utilized to rank students and to decide who passed or failed. All the teachers of the university prep classes reported that the different types of exams they used served different purposes. Achievement exam scores determined if students were qualified enough to take the proficiency exam and they also served as practice for final exams. The proficiency exam was defined by them as the gateway for students to start their academic programs. Finally, 6% of the teachers believed that assessment provided invaluable feedback about teacher performance and also functioned as leverage to revise the English program.

### *Exploiting Assessment Data*

About one-third of the teachers said that assessment provided valuable information about student learning and that it could be used to improve teaching. Besides, 22% stated that it provided feedback about their performance and also implied that the administration tended to evaluate their performance in accordance with the exam scores of their students. Finally, 11% indicated that assessment data could be used to evaluate a course in general.

### *Means of Assessment*

All the teachers considered the traditional techniques as the common means of assessment. Regarding other means, 17% of the teachers stated that projects, 33% homework and student participation, and 11% student language activities in their free time were considered to be a means of assessment.

### *Resources for Assessment*

With no exception, all the teachers said that they exploited the ready-made tests which were included in the coursebooks or used the tests they found on the internet. Similarly, 33% of the teachers stated that they obtained the texts from the internet but prepared their own test items.

### *Standardized Test Background*

None of the teachers said that they had training in standardized tests; however, 33% of the teachers said that they offered TOEFL or IELTS courses and learned how to prepare students for these tests themselves.



*Need for Assessment Training*

The teachers felt quite sufficient and confident about their assessment practice. None of the teachers mentioned any need for in-service training in traditional assessment. On the other hand, 11% of them reported the need for training in alternatives in assessment.

**Discussion**

The study investigated the assessment literacy of ELT teachers and the impact of their pre-service education background on their assessment literacy. The findings indicated a noticeable difference between the ELT graduates and non-ELT graduates regarding the assessment course received in the undergraduate programs. All the ELT graduates took assessment training in their pre-service training since the assessment course was mandatory in their academic program, whereas the non-ELT graduates reported that they had either insufficient or no training in assessment since it was not mandatory in their undergraduate programs.

Generally speaking, when the findings obtained from the classroom-focused language testing and assessment (LTA) section were examined, ELT graduates reported that they took advanced training in “preparing classroom tests”. Excluding this item, all the teachers from different academic backgrounds indicated that they did not receive enough training in their undergraduate programs. Considering “use of ready-made tests” and “ELP or portfolio”, the ELT graduates differed from the others in terms of the training they received as the majority of them took some training in “use of tests”, and some of them in “ELP or portfolio”. Regarding the need for in-service training LTA, they did not mention a strong need for training. Although the ELL and ETI graduates did not receive training in “preparing classroom tests”, they did not feel the need for training in this area.

The purposes of testing section showed a homogenous distribution among the participants in terms of the responses they provided for both the training received and needed. Irrespective of their academic backgrounds the majority of the teachers felt that they were not trained enough about the methods of exploiting assessment results. Generally speaking, they received almost no training even with regard to the basic practices of assessment, such as “giving grades” and “determining what is taught/learned”, nor did they feel any need for training in these topics. Regarding “training in the areas of placing students and awarding certificates”, the participants lacked training. While some ELT and ELL graduates asked for basic training, the ETI graduates did not state a significant need in that area. For “awarding certificates” a considerable number of teachers asked for basic training. For the item “finding out what needs to be taught/learned” the ETI group differed from the others regarding training needed as a few of them asked for some training in this area.

As for assessment literacy, where the “productive and receptive skills”, “integrated skills”, and “grammar, and vocabulary” were highlighted in an assessment course along with using basic statistics, all the ELT graduates were familiar with these topics. Thus, the analysis of assessment training in terms of content and concepts of assessment literacy revealed that the majority of the ELT graduates took advanced training in “receptive and productive skills”, and “grammar and vocabulary”, and a little training in “integrated skills”. Moreover, the ELT teachers reported a little training in “statistics”. The graduates of ELL and ETI reported almost no training in “productive and receptive skills” and “grammar, and vocabulary”. In short, there was a noticeable disparity between the ELT graduates on the one hand and ELL and ETI graduates on the other hand. Regarding “aspects of culture” ETI graduates differed from the others because they stated that they were trained in this topic. Astoundingly, despite the lack of training in these key areas of assessment, the teachers displayed almost little or no demand for training. Only a few teachers reported basic need in “reliability”, “validity” and “using statistics”. When the three groups of participants were compared, the reported need for training in these areas turned out to be the smallest in the “purposes of testing” category in comparison to the other two sections in the questionnaire.

The findings from the teacher interviews shed more light on the findings of the questionnaire. All the teachers reported that the training was inadequate and did not prepare them for the classroom context. Their current assessment practice was heavily influenced by their experience both as learners and teachers, imitation, and group norms. Likewise, they did not generally take any training in preparing students for standardized tests, and some teachers offered private courses on standardized tests with no previous training in this area. Consequently, the traditional pen-and-paper assessment was prevalent. The teachers did not generally prepare the items from scratch; they either exploited the exams included with their coursebooks or referred to the internet. They tested grammar, vocabulary, reading comprehension, and to some extent writing. Listening and speaking were not generally tested. Regarding how they conceptualized assessment, they considered it simply as an official procedure to determine the grades of their students and decide who passed or failed. For a considerable number of teachers, assessment was an official process that took their time and had little value. Finally, they did not notice any insufficiency in their assessment practice and kept following the requirements of the long-preached assessment practice. Hence, they thought they did not need assessment-related training.

Thus, for the first research question investigating assessment-related training the participants received in their undergraduate programs, the findings indicated that the non-ELT graduates did not receive any noticeable training. However, the ELT graduates reported that they received training in preparing classroom tests, testing receptive and productive skills, and grammar and vocabulary. Ultimately the first research question was answered partially positively. This finding supported those of Gan and Lam (2020), Hasselgreen, Carlsen, and Helness (2004), Lam (2015), Levi and Inbar-Lourie (2020), and Shohamy, Inbar-Lourie, and Poehner (2008) who indicated that teachers lacked proper training in assessment. However, it conflicted with the findings of Jin (2010), and Xu and Liu (2009) who reported enough assessment training for teachers but noted their inability to put it into practice. This finding also aligned with Scarino (2013), Tsagari and Vogt (2017), Vogt and Tsagari (2014), Vogt et al. (2020a), and Vogt et al. (2020b) who reported low LAL. It is also partially in line with the finding of Mede and Atay (2017) who reported low assessment literacy of teachers regarding classroom-based assessment and assessment-related concepts.

The teachers did not report any remarkable need for in-service training, which provided negative evidence for the second research question. This finding conflicted with Tsagari and Vogt (2017), Vogt and Tsagari (2014), Vogt et al. (2020a), and Vogt et al. (2020b) who revealed that the teachers demanded training. For the third research question, partial positive evidence was obtained. Although all the ELT graduates indicated that they were trained in preparing classroom tests, receptive and productive skills, and grammar and vocabulary, they did not report any remarkable training received in the other areas of assessment. Excluding these areas, except for the ELT graduates, all the participants provided similar responses for the “training received” section, which shows that the academic background of the teachers only slightly affected the assessment-related training they received. As in the “training needed” section, a similarity was observed among all the participants and they did not demand in-service training in assessment. Thus, negative evidence was provided to the fourth research question.

### **Conclusion**

The findings indicated that the ELT teachers in Turkey differed significantly in terms of the assessment training they received in their undergraduate programs. The ELT graduates had to take an assessment course; however, non-ELT graduates didn't. Naturally, such diversity in backgrounds resulted in various levels of LAL. However, assessment training was found to be inadequate for all the ELT teachers including the ELT graduates, whose assessment literacy was comparatively better than that of others.

Even though the ELT teachers were found to be inadequate concerning assessment literacy, they were not aware of that inadequacy and thought that they were practicing it effectively. They learned to assess their schools by imitating others and following the long-established assessment tradition. Hence,

they did not feel the need for assessment training. Their lack of awareness that they were not qualified enough to practice assessment effectively did not spark the need for training. Thus, they did not take the initiative to improve their assessment literacy.

Since assessment is one of their job descriptions, low assessment literacy has serious repercussions for ELT teachers in Turkey. The teachers had a very limited perspective of assessment, which gave rise to low-quality assessment. Moreover, as assessment is an integral part of ELT education, the picture presented by the study raised serious doubts about whether it complements and supports ELT education or not.

The findings of the study indicated a manifested inefficiency in the language assessment practices in the Turkish language education context which was rooted in the limited conceptualization of assessment as a whole and the ineffective and insufficient assessment training and practices.

### **Implications**

This study suggested that teachers' LAL must be improved either by introducing new assessment courses to ELT, ELL, or ETI programs in universities or effective in-service training programs. Moreover, the currently used assessment methods and strategies must be scrutinized to upgrade or improve them. To reiterate, the overall mentality of language teachers must be altered regarding assessment before pushing them down the path of improving assessment practices in the classroom setting. Subsequently, the necessary tools and innovations must be introduced to bridge the gap between theoretical assessment concepts and actual in-class practices.

Moreover, there is a dire need to redesign the assessment course covering current issues and discussions about all aspects and uses of assessment. Also, ELT majors need to be provided with enough practice, which is inspired by the actual classroom applications. As the non-ELT graduates may start practicing assessment with no training in assessment, a meticulous in-service training program needs to be planned for them.

Finally, the authorities responsible for ELT programs are to focus scrupulously on the assessment component. Considering the effect of assessment on language education, the "washback effect", if they continue to conceptualize assessment as an official tool for grading students, ELT teachers are likely to behave accordingly and try to follow the official procedures, which helps the long-lasting traditional assessment practice survive. Hence, the authorities need to reconceptualize assessment. They should not only look for whether assessment is carried out in accordance with the rules, but it is planned, implemented, and evaluated properly and assessment data is exploited effectively.

This study has several limitations. The effects of the level of education at which the ELT teachers offer English courses and their length of experience were not studied when investigating their assessment literacy. These two factors were not included in the study for the sake of simplicity and scope brevity. Moreover, the data were collected only from ELT teachers from Istanbul. The geographical region might affect the results. Hence, assessment literacy of the ELT teachers could be studied concerning the level of education, length of teaching experience, and the geographical regions to have more complete information about their assessment literacy and its sources.

All rules included in the "Directive for Scientific Research and Publication Ethics in Higher Education Institutions" have been adhered to, and none of the "Actions Contrary to Scientific Research and Publication Ethics" included in the second section of the Directive have been implemented.

### References

- Alderson, J. C., Brunfaut, T., & Harding, L. (2017). Bridging assessment and learning: A view from second and foreign language assessment. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 24(3), 379-387.
- Bailey, K. M., & Brown, J. D. (1996). Language testing courses: What are they? In Cumming A & Berwick R (Eds.), *Validation in language testing*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, pp. 236–256.
- Brown, J. D., & Bailey, K. M. (2008). Language testing courses: What are they in 2007? *Language Testing*, 25(3), 349-383.
- Brunfaut, T. (2014). A lifetime of language testing: An interview with J. Charles Alderson. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 11(1), 103-119.
- Coombe, C., Vafadar, H., & Mohebbi, H. (2020). Language assessment literacy: what do we need to learn, unlearn, and relearn?. *Language Testing in Asia*, 10(1), 1-16.
- Davies, A. (2008). Textbook trends in teaching language testing. *Language Testing*, 25(3), 327–347.
- Fulcher, G. (2012). Assessment literacy for the language classroom. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 9(2), 113-132.
- Gan, L., & Lam, R. (2020). Understanding university English instructors' assessment training needs in the Chinese context. *Language Testing in Asia*, 10(1), 1-18.
- Hasselgreen, A., Carlsen, C., & Helness, H., (2004). European survey of language testing and assessment needs. Part one: General findings. Available at: <http://www.ealta.eu.org/resources.htm>
- Hill, K. (2017). Understanding classroom-based assessment practices: a precondition for teacher assessment literacy. *Papers in Language Testing and Assessment*, 6(1), 1-17.
- Hill, K., & McNamara, T. (2011). Developing a comprehensive, empirically based research framework for classroom-based assessment. *Language Testing*, 29(3), 395–420.
- Inbar-Lourie, O. (2017). Language assessment literacies and the language testing communities: A mid-life identity crisis? In: *39th Language Testing Research Colloquium*, Universidad de los Andes, Bogotá, Colombia.
- Isik, A., & Isik, B. (2020). Where Do the Problems in the Turkish Foreign Language Education Stem From? *International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching*, 8(1), 1-19.
- Jiang, J. (2017). Language assessment: Critical issues—an interview with Antony John Kunnan. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 14(1), 75-88.
- Jin, Y. (2010). The place of language testing and assessment in the professional preparation of foreign language teachers in China. *Language Testing*, 27(4), 555–584.
- Kremmel, B., & Harding, L. (2020). Towards a comprehensive, empirical model of language assessment literacy across stakeholder groups: Developing the Language Assessment Literacy Survey. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 17(1), 100-120.
- Lam, R. (2015). Language assessment training in Hong Kong: Implications for language assessment literacy. *Language Testing*, 32(2), 169-197.
- Leung, C. (2009). Developing formative teacher assessment: Knowledge, practice, and change. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 1, 19–41.
- Levi, T., & Inbar-Lourie, O. (2020). Assessment literacy or language assessment literacy: Learning from the teachers. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 17(2), 168-182.
- McNamara, T. (2014). 30 years on—evolution or revolution? *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 11(2), 226-232.
- Malone, M. E. (2013). The essentials of assessment literacy: Contrasts between testers and users. *Language Testing*, 30(3), 329-344.

- Mede, E., & Atay, D. (2017). English language teachers' assessment literacy: The Turkish context. *Dil Dergisi*, 168(1), 43-60.
- Menken, K., Hudson, T., & Leung, C. (2014). Symposium: Language assessment in standards-based education reform. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(3), 586-614.
- Olmezer-Ozturk, E., & Aydın, B. (2018). Toward measuring language teachers' assessment knowledge: development and validation of Language Assessment Knowledge Scale (LAKS). *Language Testing in Asia*, 8(1), 20.
- Purpura, J. E. (2016). Second and foreign language assessment. *The Modern Language Journal*, 100(S1), 191-208.
- Rea-Dickins, P. (2004). Understanding teachers as agents of assessment. *Language Testing*, 21, 249-258.
- 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.
- Shohamy, E., Inbar-Lourie, O., & Poehner, M. (2008). Investigating assessment perceptions and practices in the advanced foreign language classroom. Report no. 1108.
- Taylor, L. (2009). Developing assessment literacy. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 29, 21-36.
- Tsagari, D. (Ed.) (2016). *Classroom-based assessment in L2 contexts*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Tsagari, D. (Ed.) (2020). *Language assessment literacy: From theory to practice*. Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Tsagari, D., & Vogt, K. (2017). Assessment literacy of foreign language teachers around Europe: Research, challenges and future prospects. *Papers in Language Testing and Assessment*, 6(1), 18-40.
- Vogt, K., & Tsagari, D. (2014). Assessment literacy of foreign language teachers: Findings of a European study. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 11(4), 374-402.
- Vogt, K., Tsagari, D., & Csépes, I. (2020). Linking learners' perspectives on language assessment practices to teachers' assessment literacy enhancement (TALE): Insights from four European countries. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 17(4), 410-433.
- 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*, 17(4), 386-409.
- Wall, D., & Taylor, C. (2014). Communicative Language Testing (CLT): Reflections on the "Issues Revisited" from the perspective of an examinations board. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 11(2), 170-185.
- Xu, Y., & Liu, Y. (2009). Teacher assessment knowledge and practice: A narrative inquiry of a Chinese college EFL teacher's experience. *TESOL Quarterly*, 43(3), 493-513.

**APPENDICES**

**Appendix 1. Questionnaire**

Part I. General Information

1. Please indicate your pre-service education background. \_\_\_\_\_
2. Please indicate the in-service training in assessment you received so far. \_\_\_\_\_

Frequency of in-service training \_\_\_\_\_

3. Please mark the level of school you work.

- Primary (1-4)
- Secondary (5-8)
- High (9-12)
- University

Part II. Questions About Training in LTA

1. Classroom-focused LTA

1.1. Please specify if you were trained in the following domains.

	Not at all	A little (1-2 days)	More advanced
a) Preparing classroom tests			
b) Using ready-made tests from textbook packages or from other sources			
c) Giving feedback to students based on information from tests/assessment			
d) Using self- or peer-assessment			
e) Using informal, continuous, non-test type of assessment			
f) Using the European Language Portfolio, an adaptation of it or some other portfolio			

1.2 Please specify if you need training in the following domains.

	None	Yes, basic Training	Yes, more advanced training
a) Preparing classroom tests			
b) Using ready-made tests from textbook packages or from other sources			
c) Giving feedback to students based on information from tests/assessment			
d) Using self- or peer-assessment			
e) Using informal, continuous, non-test type of assessment			
f) Using the European Language Portfolio, an adaptation of it or some other portfolio			

2. Purposes of testing

2.1. Please specify if you were trained in the following domains.

	Not at all	A little (1-2 days)	More advanced
a) Giving grades			
b) Finding out what needs to be taught/ learned			
c) Placing students onto courses, programs, etc.			
d) Awarding final certificates (from school/program; local, regional or national level)			

2.2. Please specify if you need training in the following domains

	None	Yes, basic Training	Yes, more advanced training
a) Giving grades			
b) Finding out what needs to be taught/ learned			
c) Placing students onto courses, programs, etc.			
d) Awarding final certificates (from school/program; local, regional or national level)			

3. Content and concepts of LTA

3.1. Please specify if you were trained in the following domains.

	Not at all	A little (1-2 days)	More advanced
1. Testing/Assessing:			
a) Receptive skills (reading/listening)			
b) Productive skills (speaking/ writing)			
c) Microlinguistic aspects (grammar/vocabulary)			
d) Integrated language skills			
e) Aspects of culture			
2. Establishing reliability of tests/assessment			
3. Establishing validity of tests/assessment			
4. Using statistics to study the quality of tests/assessment			

3.2. Please specify if you need training in the following domains

	None	Yes, basic Training	Yes, more advanced training
1. Testing/Assessing:			
a) Receptive skills (reading/listening)			
b) Productive skills (speaking/ writing)			
c) Microlinguistic aspects (grammar/vocabulary)			
d) Integrated language skills			
e) Aspects of culture			
2. Establishing reliability of tests/assessment			
3. Establishing validity of tests/assessment			
4. Using statistics to study the quality of tests/assessment			

**Appendix 2. Guiding Questions for Interviews**

1. During your pre-service teacher training did you learn about language testing and assessment (LTA)?
2. Did you feel appropriately prepared for your LTA tasks after pre-service training?
3. If not, how did you learn about LTA?
4. Do you know about more recent LTA methods e.g., portfolio assessment, self- or peer-assessment? Have you ever tried them?
5. Have you ever worked with standardized tests or have you advised learners in this area? What do you think of them?
6. What types of LTA do you use in your school/institution?
7. Have you received in-service training in LTA? If yes, what was the focus of this training?
8. How satisfied are you with in-service teacher training offered in LTA? What LTA training would you like in the short-term?

**Appendix 3. Comparison of the Teachers with Respect to their Academic Background**

## Classroom-focused assessment literacy (training received)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.*
Preparing classroom tests	Between Groups	84.673	2	42.336	245.199	0
	Within Groups	30.388	176	0.173		
	Total	115.061	178			
Ready-made tests	Between Groups	16.2	2	8.1	50.812	0
	Within Groups	27.896	175	0.159		
	Total	44.096	177			
Giving feedback based on assessment	Between Groups	0.362	2	0.181	4.37	0.014
	Within Groups	7.281	176	0.041		
	Total	7.642	178			
Self-/Peer- assessment	Between Groups	0.141	2	0.071	2.634	0.075
	Within Groups	4.719	176	0.027		
	Total	4.86	178			
Informal assessment	Between Groups	0.465	2	0.233	5.04	0.007
	Within Groups	8.08	175	0.046		
	Total	8.545	177			
ELP or Portfolio	Between Groups	2.064	2	1.032	4.897	0.009
	Within Groups	36.66	174	0.211		
	Total	38.723	176			

p &lt; .05

Dependent Variable	(I) background	(J) background	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.*
Preparing classroom tests	Translation	Literature	-.236*	0.089	0.032
		ELT	-1.505*	0.081	0
	Literature	Translation	.236*	0.089	0.032
		ELT	-1.269*	0.072	0
	ELT	Translation	1.505*	0.081	0
		Literature	1.269*	0.072	0
Ready-made tests	Translation	Literature	0.016	0.086	0.982
		ELT	-.594*	0.078	0
	Literature	Translation	-0.016	0.086	0.982
		ELT	-.610*	0.069	0
	ELT	Translation		0.078	0
		Literature	.610*	0.069	0
Giving feedback based on assessment	Translation	Literature	0	0.044	1
		ELT	-0.09	0.04	0.081
	Literature	Translation	0	0.044	1
		ELT	-.090*	0.035	0.041
	ELT	Translation	0.09	0.04	0.081
		Literature	.090*	0.035	0.041



Self-/Peer- assessment	Translation	Literature	0	0.035	1
		ELT	-0.056	0.032	0.218
	Literature	Translation	0	0.035	1
		ELT	-0.056	0.028	0.145
	ELT	Translation	0.056	0.032	0.218
		Literature	0.056	0.028	0.145
Informal assessment	Translation	Literature	0	0.046	1
		ELT	-0.102	0.042	0.055
	Literature	Translation	0	0.046	1
		ELT	-.102*	0.037	0.026
	ELT	Translation	0.102	0.042	0.055
		Literature	.102*	0.037	0.026
ELP or Portfolio	Translation	Literature	0.089	0.099	0.664
		ELT	-0.154	0.09	0.232
	Literature	Translation	-0.089	0.099	0.664
		ELT	-.244*	0.08	0.011
	ELT	Translation	0.154	0.09	0.232
		Literature	.244*	0.08	0.011

p < .05

#### Classroom-focused assessment literacy (training needed)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.*
Preparing classroom tests	Between Groups	0.07	2	0.035	1.278	0.281
	Within Groups	4.791	176	0.027		
	Total	4.86	178			
Ready-made tests	Between Groups	1.174	2	0.587	6.883	0.001
	Within Groups	15.015	176	0.085		
	Total	16.19	178			
Giving feedback based on assessment	Between Groups	0.067	2	0.034	1.233	0.294
	Within Groups	4.793	176	0.027		
	Total	4.86	178			
Self-/Peer- assessment	Between Groups	0.115	2	0.058	1.534	0.218
	Within Groups	6.611	176	0.038		
	Total	6.726	178			
Informal assessment	Between Groups	0.432	2	0.216	1.867	0.158
	Within Groups	20.35	176	0.116		
	Total	20.782	178			
ELP or Portfolio	Between Groups	0.134	2	0.067	0.216	0.806
	Within Groups	54.614	176	0.31		
	Total	54.749	178			

p < .05

Dependent Variable	(I) background	(J) background	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.*
Preparing classroom tests	Translation	Literature	0.054	0.035	0.313
		ELT	0.02	0.032	0.82
	Literature	Translation	-0.054	0.035	0.313
		ELT	-0.034	0.029	0.501
	ELT	Translation	-0.02	0.032	0.82
		Literature	0.034	0.029	0.501
Ready-made tests	Translation	Literature	0.054	0.063	0.689
		ELT	-0.126	0.057	0.092
	Literature	Translation	-0.054	0.063	0.689
		ELT	-.180*	0.051	0.002
	ELT	Translation	0.126	0.057	0.092
		Literature	.180*	0.051	0.002
Giving feedback based on assessment	Translation	Literature	0.027	0.035	0.747
		ELT	-0.018	0.032	0.857
	Literature	Translation	-0.027	0.035	0.747
		ELT	-0.045	0.029	0.294
	ELT	Translation	0.018	0.032	0.857
		Literature	0.045	0.029	0.294
Self-/Peer- assessment	Translation	Literature	0.054	0.042	0.43

		ELT	-0.002	0.038	0.998
	Literature	Translation	-0.054	0.042	0.43
		ELT	-0.056	0.034	0.25
	ELT	Translation	0.002	0.038	0.998
		Literature	0.056	0.034	0.25
Informal assessment	Translation	Literature	0.141	0.073	0.158
		ELT	0.081	0.067	0.475
	Literature	Translation	-0.141	0.073	0.158
		ELT	-0.059	0.059	0.604
	ELT	Translation	-0.081	0.067	0.475
		Literature	0.059	0.059	0.604
ELP or Portfolio	Translation	Literature	-0.031	0.119	0.967
		ELT	-0.069	0.109	0.82
	Literature	Translation	0.031	0.119	0.967
		ELT	-0.038	0.097	0.927
	ELT	Translation	0.069	0.109	0.82
		Literature	0.038	0.097	0.927

p < .05

Purposes of testing (training received)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.*
Giving grades	Between Groups	0.059	2	0.029	1.081	0.342
	Within Groups	4.801	176	0.027		
	Total	4.86	178			
Finding out what needs to be taught/learned	Between Groups	0.031	2	0.015	0.694	0.501
	Within Groups	3.88	176	0.022		
	Total	3.911	178			
Placing students	Between Groups	0.054	2	0.027	0.564	0.57
	Within Groups	8.493	176	0.048		
	Total	8.547	178			
Awarding certificates	Between Groups	0.022	2	0.011	0.248	0.78
	Within Groups	7.621	176	0.043		
	Total	7.642	178			

p < .05

Dependent Variable	(I) background	(J) background	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.*
Giving grades	Translation	Literature	-0.019	0.035	0.868
		ELT	-0.045	0.032	0.382
	Literature	Translation	0.019	0.035	0.868
		ELT	-0.026	0.029	0.662
	ELT	Translation	0.045	0.032	0.382
		Literature	0.026	0.029	0.662
Finding out what needs to be taught/learned	Translation	Literature	-0.019	0.032	0.839
		ELT	-0.034	0.029	0.511
	Literature	Translation	0.019	0.032	0.839
		ELT	-0.015	0.026	0.847
	ELT	Translation	0.034	0.029	0.511
		Literature	0.015	0.026	0.847
Placing students	Translation	Literature	-0.011	0.047	0.974
		ELT	-0.04	0.043	0.644
	Literature	Translation	0.011	0.047	0.974
		ELT	-0.03	0.038	0.739
	ELT	Translation	0.04	0.043	0.644
		Literature	0.03	0.038	0.739
Awarding certificates	Translation	Literature	-0.003	0.045	0.998
		ELT	0.02	0.041	0.883
	Literature	Translation	0.003	0.045	0.998
		ELT	0.023	0.036	0.818
	ELT	Translation	-0.02	0.041	0.883
		Literature	-0.023	0.036	0.818

p < .05

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.*
Giving grades	Between Groups	0.07	2	0.035	0.902	0.408
	Within Groups	6.791	176	0.039		
	Total	6.86	178			
Finding out what needs to be taught/learned	Between Groups	0.584	2	0.292	5.161	0.007
	Within Groups	9.963	176	0.057		
	Total	10.547	178			
Placing students	Between Groups	0.675	2	0.338	1.156	0.317
	Within Groups	51.425	176	0.292		
	Total	52.101	178			
Awarding certificates	Between Groups	0.91	2	0.455	1.249	0.289
	Within Groups	63.77	175	0.364		
	Total	64.68	177			

p < .05

Purposes of testing (training needed)

Dependent Variable	(I) background	(J) background	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.*
Giving grades	Translation	Literature	0.054	0.042	0.44
		ELT	0.02	0.038	0.869
	Literature	Translation	-0.054	0.042	0.44
		ELT	-0.034	0.034	0.614
	ELT	Translation	-0.02	0.038	0.869
		Literature	0.034	0.034	0.614
Finding out what needs to be taught/learned	Translation	Literature	.143*	0.051	0.021
		ELT	.140*	0.047	0.012
	Literature	Translation	-.143*	0.051	0.021
		ELT	-0.004	0.041	0.996
	ELT	Translation	-.140*	0.047	0.012
		Literature	0.004	0.041	0.996
Placing students	Translation	Literature	-0.132	0.116	0.526
		ELT	-0.159	0.106	0.325
	Literature	Translation	0.132	0.116	0.526
		ELT	-0.028	0.094	0.958
	ELT	Translation	0.159	0.106	0.325
		Literature	0.028	0.094	0.958
Awarding certificates	Translation	Literature	-0.058	0.129	0.904
		ELT	0.103	0.118	0.686
	Literature	Translation	0.058	0.129	0.904
		ELT	0.161	0.105	0.311
	ELT	Translation	-0.103	0.118	0.686
		Literature	-0.161	0.105	0.311

p < .05

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.*
Receptive skills (reading/listening)	Between Groups	165.193	2	82.597	2253.993	0
	Within Groups	6.449	176	0.037		
	Total	171.642	178			
Productive skills (writing/speaking)	Between Groups	117.145	2	58.573	490.632	0
	Within Groups	21.011	176	0.119		
	Total	138.156	178			
Microlinguistic aspects (grammar/vocabulary)	Between Groups	139.287	2	69.643	663.321	0
	Within Groups	18.479	176	0.105		
	Total	157.765	178			
Integrated language skills	Between Groups	20.338	2	10.169	60.565	0
	Within Groups	29.551	176	0.168		
	Total	49.888	178			
Aspects of culture	Between Groups	21.498	2	10.749	92.255	0
	Within Groups	20.39	175	0.117		
	Total	41.888	177			

Reliability	Between Groups	1.142	2	0.571	5.894	0.003
	Within Groups	17.048	176	0.097		
	Total	18.19	178			
Validity	Between Groups	1.142	2	0.571	5.894	0.003
	Within Groups	17.048	176	0.097		
	Total	18.19	178			
Using statistics	Between Groups	31.834	2	15.917	190.839	0
	Within Groups	14.68	176	0.083		
	Total	46.514	178			

p < .05

Content and concepts of literacy assessment (training received)

Dependent Variable	(I) background	(J) background	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.*
Receptive skills (reading/listening)	Translation	Literature	0	0.041	1
		ELT	-1.921*	0.037	0
	Literature	Translation	0	0.041	1
		ELT	-1.921*	0.033	0
	ELT	Translation	1.921*	0.037	0
		Literature	1.921*	0.033	0
Productive skills (writing/speaking)	Translation	Literature	0	0.074	1
		ELT	-1.618*	0.068	0
	Literature	Translation	0	0.074	1
		ELT	-1.618*	0.06	0
	ELT	Translation	1.618*	0.068	0
		Literature	1.618*	0.06	0
Microlinguistic aspects (grammar/vocabulary)	Translation	Literature	0.027	0.069	0.927
		ELT	-1.748*	0.063	0
	Literature	Translation	-0.027	0.069	0.927
		ELT	-1.775*	0.056	0
	ELT	Translation	1.748*	0.063	0
		Literature	1.775*	0.056	0
Integrated language skills	Translation	Literature	0	0.088	1
		ELT	-.674*	0.08	0
	Literature	Translation	0	0.088	1
		ELT	-.674*	0.071	0
	ELT	Translation	.674*	0.08	0
		Literature	.674*	0.071	0
Aspects of culture	Translation	Literature	.854*	0.073	0
		ELT	.858*	0.067	0
	Literature	Translation	-.854*	0.073	0
		ELT	0.004	0.059	0.998
	ELT	Translation	-.858*	0.067	0
		Literature	-0.004	0.059	0.998
Reliability	Translation	Literature	-0.038	0.067	0.852
		ELT	-.180*	0.061	0.014
	Literature	Translation	0.038	0.067	0.852
		ELT	-.142*	0.054	0.034
	ELT	Translation	.180*	0.061	0.014
		Literature	.142*	0.054	0.034
Validity	Translation	Literature	-0.038	0.067	0.852
		ELT	-.180*	0.061	0.014
	Literature	Translation	0.038	0.067	0.852
		ELT	-.142*	0.054	0.034
	ELT	Translation	.180*	0.061	0.014
		Literature	.142*	0.054	0.034
Using statistics	Translation	Literature	-0.03	0.062	0.892
		ELT	-.861*	0.056	0
	Literature	Translation	0.03	0.062	0.892
		ELT	-.831*	0.05	0
	ELT	Translation	.861*	0.056	0

	Literature	.831*	0.05	0
--	------------	-------	------	---

p < .05

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.*
Receptive skills (reading/listening)	Between Groups	0.013	2	0.007	1.191	0.306
	Within Groups	0.981	176	0.006		
	Total	0.994	178			
Productive skills (writing/speaking)	Between Groups	0.013	2	0.007	1.191	0.306
	Within Groups	0.981	176	0.006		
	Total	0.994	178			
Microlinguistic aspects (grammar/vocabulary)	Between Groups	0.031	2	0.015	0.694	0.501
	Within Groups	3.88	176	0.022		
	Total	3.911	178			
Integrated language skills	Between Groups	0.117	2	0.059	0.488	0.615
	Within Groups	21.179	176	0.12		
	Total	21.296	178			
Aspects of culture	Between Groups	0.07	2	0.035	1.067	0.346
	Within Groups	5.728	175	0.033		
	Total	5.798	177			
Reliability	Between Groups	1.12	2	0.56	3.102	0.047
	Within Groups	31.599	175	0.181		
	Total	32.719	177			
Validity	Between Groups	0.891	2	0.446	1.825	0.164
	Within Groups	42.727	175	0.244		
	Total	43.618	177			
Using statistics	Between Groups	8.888	2	4.444	13.465	0
	Within Groups	57.428	174	0.33		
	Total	66.316	176			

p < .05

Content and concepts of literacy assessment (training needed)

Dependent Variable	(I) background	(J) background	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.*
Receptive skills (reading/listening)	Translation	Literature	-0.019	0.016	0.5
		ELT	0	0.015	1
	Literature	Translation	0.019	0.016	0.5
		ELT	0.019	0.013	0.348
	ELT	Translation	0	0.015	1
		Literature	-0.019	0.013	0.348
Productive skills (writing/speaking)	Translation	Literature	-0.019	0.016	0.5
		ELT	0	0.015	1
	Literature	Translation	0.019	0.016	0.5
		ELT	0.019	0.013	0.348
	ELT	Translation	0	0.015	1
		Literature	-0.019	0.013	0.348
Microlinguistic aspects (grammar/vocabulary)	Translation	Literature	-0.019	0.032	0.839
		ELT	-0.034	0.029	0.511
	Literature	Translation	0.019	0.032	0.839
		ELT	-0.015	0.026	0.847
	ELT	Translation	0.034	0.029	0.511
		Literature	0.015	0.026	0.847
Integrated language skills	Translation	Literature	-0.032	0.074	0.911
		ELT	-0.065	0.068	0.633
	Literature	Translation	0.032	0.074	0.911
		ELT	-0.033	0.06	0.862
	ELT	Translation	0.065	0.068	0.633
		Literature	0.033	0.06	0.862
Aspects of culture	Translation	Literature	-0.057	0.039	0.346
		ELT	-0.034	0.035	0.631
	Literature	Translation	0.057	0.039	0.346
		ELT	0.023	0.031	0.774
	ELT	Translation	0.034	0.035	0.631
		Literature	-0.023	0.031	0.774

Reliability	Translation	Literature	0.219	0.091	0.058
		ELT	0.17	0.083	0.129
	Literature	Translation	-0.219	0.091	0.058
		ELT	-0.05	0.074	0.797
	ELT	Translation	-0.17	0.083	0.129
		Literature	0.05	0.074	0.797
Validity	Translation	Literature	0.198	0.106	0.177
		ELT	0.087	0.097	0.667
	Literature	Translation	-0.198	0.106	0.177
		ELT	-0.111	0.086	0.438
	ELT	Translation	-0.087	0.097	0.667
		Literature	0.111	0.086	0.438
Using statistics	Translation	Literature	0.035	0.124	0.961
		ELT	.468*	0.114	0
	Literature	Translation	-0.035	0.124	0.961
		ELT	.433*	0.1	0
	ELT	Translation	-.468*	0.114	0
		Literature	-.433*	0.1	0

p &lt; .05