



Research Article

Assessment Literacy Disparities among Iranian EFL Teachers: Schools vs. Language Institutes

Saeideh Rahimpour¹, Leila Akbarpour*², Firooz Sadighi³

1, 2, 3. Department of English Language, Shiraz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shiraz, Iran

* Corresponding author: Leila Akbarpour, Email: akbarpourleila@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Submission History

Received: 2024-11-28
Accepted: 2025-01-25

Keywords

Assessment literacy
Educational contexts
Iranian EFL teachers
Institutes
Schools

ABSTRACT

Reviewing the literature shows that the role of educational context in EFL teachers' assessment literacy has remained largely unexplored. Therefore, the current study was done to compare the assessment literacy of Iranian EFL teachers in terms of the educational contexts, school and institute. To do the study, 127 EFL teachers (54 teachers from schools and 73 teachers from private language centers) selected through convenience sampling were considered as the participants of the study. A questionnaire developed by the researchers assessing language assessment literacy was utilized as the instrument of the study. The questionnaire evaluated the teachers' assessment literacy based on six components. To compare the EFL school and institute teachers in terms of the six components of assessment literacy, a one-way multivariate analysis of variance (one-way MANOVA) was run. The results revealed that institute teachers enjoyed higher levels of knowledge in four components of assessment literacy: test functions, test construction, technical knowledge, and statistical knowledge compared to their school counterparts. The findings also demonstrated that the two groups were not different in terms of their understanding of assessment consequences and alternative assessment methods.

Introduction

Assessment represents an integral component of the instructional and learning paradigms, as it significantly influences both the quality of pedagogical delivery by teachers and the learning experiences of students. Studying the assessment capabilities of English as a Foreign Language (EFL)

teachers is important for recognizing how educational frameworks shape instructional techniques and student outcome measures. Assessment literacy encapsulates an educator's proficiency in comprehending and deploying a variety of assessment techniques adeptly, which is vital for enhancing student learning and

progression (Ashraf & Zolfaghari, 2018). Within Iran, the educational milieu is marked by heterogeneous teaching settings, notably contrasting public educational institutions with private language academies. This contrast affords a valuable opportunity to examine the ramifications of these disparate environments on educators' assessment literacy.

Recent empirical inquiries have underscored considerable deficiencies in the assessment literacy of Iranian EFL educators, particularly regarding their preparatory experiences during pre-service training (Alavi et al., 2022; Firoozi et al., 2019). A multitude of studies indicate that, despite teachers acknowledging the significance of diverse assessment competencies, they encounter challenges in integrating assessment with instructional practices in accordance with modern assessment theories and principles (Amiri & Birjandi, 2015; Jalilzadeh et al., 2023). Moreover, their training frequently lacks the comprehensiveness necessary to adequately prepare them for the exigencies of classroom assessment (Tavassoli & Farhady, 2018).

The research by Alavi et al. (2022) highlights that Iranian EFL instructors perceived their pre-service training as deficient in essential areas like interpreting students' testing outcomes and formulating decisions based on assessment data. This disparity prompts inquiries into the literacy of Iranian EFL teachers concerning contemporary assessment methodologies. Moreover, evidence points to a significant number of EFL educators still adhering to established evaluation models, potentially limiting their opportunities to integrate modern assessment strategies that promote student learning (Firoozi et al., 2019).

The current body of literature pertaining to assessment literacy among Iranian EFL educators reveals a notable research lacuna concerning the comparative evaluation of assessment literacy

between instructors in public schools and those within private language institutes. Although numerous studies have scrutinized the overarching assessment literacy of EFL educators in Iran, including their perceptions of pre-service training and professional development requisites (Alavi et al., 2022; Firoozi et al., 2019), there remains a deficiency of concentrated inquiries that specifically compare the assessment literacy of educators across these two distinct educational contexts.

The predominant focus of previous research has largely been on public school educators, thereby overlooking the distinctive challenges and methodologies encountered by those operating in private language institutes (Tavassoli & Farhady, 2018; Firoozi et al., 2019). This oversight is particularly consequential, as the operational structures, assessment standards, and pedagogical strategies can vary significantly between these contexts, potentially impacting educators' assessment literacy. Consequently, this study aims to address this gap through the comparison of the assessment literacy of Iranian EFL instructors in public educational institutions and private language academies.

Literature Review

Although terms like assessment, measurement, testing, and evaluation have distinct meanings, they are often used interchangeably in literature and practice (Mathew & Poehner, 2014). Assessment involves procedures to describe individual characteristics, measurement assigns numbers to test questions, testing refers to answering questions within a set time, and evaluation involves judging an individual's skills (Griffin & Nix, 1991). Thus, assessment encompasses testing, measurement, and evaluation (Griffin & Nix, 1991; Miller et al., 2013).

Classroom assessment differs from large-scale tests by focusing on interpreting student

performance relative to learning goals and instructional processes (Mathew & Poehner, 2014). Hill and McNamara (2012) define classroom assessment as teacher-applied assessments promoting instruction and reporting achievement. In educational settings, assessment gathers information about student learning for decision-making (McMillan, 2014; Popham, 2014).

Assessment processes include defining purposes, selecting methods, grading, interpreting results, making decisions, and reporting to stakeholders (Russell & Airasian, 2012; Miller et al., 2013; McMillan, 2014; Popham, 2014). Validity and reliability are crucial in assessment decision-making (Miller et al., 2013; McMillan, 2014; Popham, 2014). The definition of literacy has evolved, ranging from reading and writing to electronic and cultural literacy (Street, 2009; Wagner, 2009). Brockmeier and Olson (2009) argue for a broad range of competencies in literacy, analyzed in linguistic, cognitive, semiotic, technological, and cultural terms. The concept of AL, introduced by Stiggins (1995), has various definitions. Stiggins (1995) states that assessment-literate teachers understand what and why they measure, design tasks to represent student performance, and prevent assessment issues. Popham (2006, 2009) believes assessment-literate teachers develop appropriate tasks, apply different methods, interpret data, and address bias in self-made assessments.

In language education, AL is a nascent concept. Davies (2008) defines it as teachers' familiarity with theoretical knowledge, practical skills, and assessment principles. Malone (2013) describes AL as teachers' understanding of testing definitions and their application in classroom practices. Fulcher (2012) defines LAL as the knowledge, skills, and abilities required to develop and evaluate tests, understand test processes, and recognize the impact of testing.

Various frameworks have been proposed to conceptualize AL. Siegel and Wissehr (2011) focused on pre-service teacher AL, emphasizing classroom assessment principles. Kahlet et al. (2012) suggested an AL Domain Framework, highlighting standards application, result usage, and measurement design. Gareis and Grant (2015) developed a teacher-focused framework categorizing AL into types of measures, quality of measures, and results usage. These frameworks emphasize teachers' roles in assessment, incorporating professional development due to the lack of assessment training (Popham, 2009). Professional development is essential as assessment practices evolve (Xu & Brown, 2016). Context-specific definitions of AL are necessary, with each teacher requiring diverse assessment knowledge.

The assessment literacy of Iranian EFL teachers is a critical area of research that highlights both strengths and weaknesses in their understanding and application of assessment practices. Various studies indicate that while teachers possess some theoretical knowledge, there is a significant gap in exploring the factors that affect teachers' assessment literacy.

Regarding the assessment literacy levels, the findings of the studies conducted by Sohrabi et al., (2022) and Tayyebi et al., (2022) revealed that many Iranian EFL teachers demonstrate a positive attitude towards assessment but lack practical skills, especially in using assessment rubrics effectively. Another study by Tayyebi et al., (2022) also revealed inadequate levels of writing assessment knowledge among teachers, indicating a reliance on personal experience rather than systematic training.

Concerning the impact of teachers' assessment literacy on their well-being, Rezai (2024) conducted a mixed-method study on the role of assessment literacy of Iranian EFL teachers in their job stress and burn out. He found that teacher assessment literacy is linked to job stress and burnout,

suggesting that higher literacy can lead to improved job satisfaction and productivity. Qualitative findings of his study also indicated that effective assessment practices enhance classroom management and teacher confidence.

Several studies revealed the need for training and development of Iranian EFL teachers. For instance, Sohrabi et al., (2022) and Mohammadkhah et al., (2022), based on their findings, reported that there is a pressing need for structured pre-service and in-service training programs to enhance teachers' assessment literacy, particularly in writing and pragmatic assessment. Their Recommendations included integrating assessment literacy into teacher education curricula to better prepare EFL teachers for their roles.

Regarding the role educational context in teachers' familiarity with assessment practices, several studies have been done. For example, Asamoah et al. (2024) who compared teachers in Ghana and Brunei based on their perceptions of school assessment climate and realities of assessment practices, found that Teachers' familiarity with assessment practices varies significantly based on their educational context. Teachers in Ghana and Brunei exhibited different assessment practices influenced by their perceptions of school assessment climates, impacting their assessment preferences. The researchers concluded that in contexts with examination-oriented climates, teachers may feel pressured to prioritize summative assessments, which can conflict with their beliefs about effective assessment. They also concluded that educational assessment climate significantly shapes teachers' assessment preferences and practices.

Brown et al. (2024) also carried out a study aimed at exploring teachers' perspectives on assessment literacy within Victorian Junior Secondary Schools. From their findings, they determined that government policies significantly

influence teachers' conceptual understanding and beliefs regarding assessment. Such policies can establish a framework for teachers' practices, frequently resulting in a dependence on standardized testing and constraining creative assessment methods (Brown et al., 2024).

In another study, Fang and Yu (2023) explored language assessment literacy of EFL teachers in East Asia and found that the educational context significantly influences EFL teachers' assessment literacy by forming their conceptions, practices, and training needs. Their results emphasized incorporating social, cultural, and educational factors into assessment literacy conceptualization amidst globalization and digital advancements.

The current body of research regarding the assessment literacy of EFL teachers has unveiled significant gaps in both knowledge and practical application. While previous studies indicated that many teachers hold favorable attitudes toward assessment, they often lack the necessary skills and structured training to utilize effective assessment practices. Furthermore, the influence of teachers' assessment literacy on their overall well-being, as emphasized by Rezai (2024), highlights an important connection between literacy levels and job satisfaction, indicating that improving assessment literacy may reduce job-related stress and enhance classroom management. In spite of the recognition of these issues, there remains a lack of thorough research exploring the assessment literacy of EFL teachers working in different educational contexts, particularly in Iran. Thus, this study is essential as it seeks to bridge the gap by investigating the assessment literacy of EFL teachers in Iranian schools and institutes, offering insights that could inform targeted training programs and ultimately enhance educational outcomes. As a result, this study attempted to compare Iranian EFL teachers based on the

educational context, school, and institute, by posing the following research question:

1. Is there any significant difference between Iranian EFL school and institute teachers in terms of their assessment literacy?

Method

Participants

The participants engaged in this study were chosen utilizing a convenience sampling methodology, which facilitated the effective recruitment of EFL teachers from a variety of educational settings across Iran. A total of 127 EFL teachers took part in the study, which included 54 teachers from schools and 73 teachers from private language centers. Within the cohort of school-based teachers, 21 were employed at secondary schools and 33 at high schools, presenting a gender distribution of 38 females and 16 males. The age distribution of these participants ranged from 29 to 42 years, reflecting a diverse group of teachers with varying levels of experience (ranging from one to 17 years) and professional backgrounds. Conversely, the teachers from the language institutes comprised 43 females and 25 males, with their ages ranging from 24 to 43 years and their teaching experience spanning from one to 13 years. This demographic heterogeneity is pivotal for obtaining a holistic understanding of assessment literacy in different teaching contexts.

To confirm that ethical values were preserved during the research, every participant offered informed consent ahead of their involvement in the study. They also received comprehensive information regarding the objectives of the research and their entitlements as participants, which included a guarantee of anonymity concerning their contributions. All participants were native speakers of Farsi. By maintaining confidentiality and anonymity, the study aimed to create a safe

environment for participants to share their assessment literacy without apprehension of negative consequences. This methodological framework not only bolsters the validity of the data accrued but also honors the privacy and rights of all individuals engaged in the research.

Instrument

In this study, a questionnaire developed by the researchers was used to explore factors underlying Iranian EFL teachers' language assessment literacy. This questionnaire was developed based on the relevant literature on general assessment literacy and language assessment literacy, and interview findings.

The scale development procedure for assessing Language Assessment Literacy (LAL) was conducted over a six-month period. Initially, the researchers conducted an extensive literature review to identify key elements of LAL, followed by interviews with eighteen English language testing experts, which were recorded for thematic analysis. This analysis led to the creation of a tentative scale comprising thirty-nine Likert-scale items. The tentative scale was then administered to 248 English language instructors. Their responses were analyzed for construct validity through exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses. Ultimately, the refined assessment literacy scale was established, consisting of thirty-one Likert-scale items categorized into six main factors: knowledge of test functions, knowledge of test construction and administration, technical knowledge, statistical issues, assessment consequences, and alternative testing methods. The reliability of the questionnaire was again evaluated in the current study. Based on the results of the Cronbach's alpha, the questionnaire enjoyed an acceptable reliability ($r=.81$).

The items included in this questionnaire covered different technical knowledge, skills, and

social aspects, which were identified as the building blocks of language assessment literacy (Coombe et al., 2020; Fulcher, 2012). These items covered six main themes:

1. **Knowledge of test functions:** teachers should know about the different functions of language tests. Knowing the purpose of the tests is an inevitable part of a language teacher's knowledge, allowing them to employ tests efficiently.
2. **Test development and administration:** Teachers should be competent in developing assessment methods suitable for instructional decisions. They need to design and write items to examine their learners' performance.
3. **Technical knowledge:** Teachers should have technical knowledge, such as reliability, validity.

4. **Statistical knowledge:** teachers should know how to work with the collected numbers. They should understand mode, median, standard deviation, and other statistical measures.
5. **Assessment consequences:** Teachers should be aware of the potential effects of testing on their learners' future.
6. **Alternative assessment:** Teachers should know about alternative assessment options, such as peer assessment, self-assessment, portfolio assessment, and computerized tests in their responses.

The sample items related to each component are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Assessment Literacy Components and Their Corresponding Sample Items

Assessment Literacy Components	Sample Item
knowledge of test functions	Teachers should know that tests can be used to improve students' L2 learning.
Test development and administration	Teachers should know how to write cloze-test items.
Technical knowledge	Teachers should know how to ensure the reliability of their tests.
Statistical knowledge	Teachers should know how to use t-test, ANOVA, and correlation to analyze the test results.
Assessment consequences	Teachers should know about the educational consequences of their tests on their students.
Alternative assessment	Teachers should know about peer assessment.

Data Collection Procedure

The methodology employed for the data collection procedure in this research adopted a systematic framework to guarantee a heterogeneous and representative cohort of Iranian EFL educators. The instrument utilized, a validated questionnaire aimed at evaluating the assessment literacy among EFL teachers (54 school and 73 institute teachers), was distributed through various online platforms, notably including widely utilized messaging applications such as WhatsApp and Telegram. The selection of these platforms was due to their widespread use among teachers in Iran,

thereby facilitating easy access to potential respondents. The questionnaire was shared as a Google Form link, enabling participants to complete it with ease on their respective devices. In addition to the online distribution strategy, the questionnaire was also forwarded via electronic mail to colleagues engaged in and possessing experience with English language teaching. This dual approach aimed to maximize outreach and encourage participation from a broad range of teachers across different educational contexts.

Data collection occurred over a specified of three months, during which participants were urged

to provide their responses on time. To enhance the quality of the data collected, explicit instructions were provided in conjunction with the questionnaire, emphasizing the importance of thoughtful and honest responses to each item. Participants were assured of their anonymity and the confidentiality of their responses, an essential element in cultivating trust and promoting forthright feedback. Following the completion of the data collection phase, all received questionnaires underwent a thorough review process to ascertain completeness and accuracy prior to analysis. This procedure ensured that only valid responses were incorporated into the statistical analyses. The gathered data were subsequently subjected to analyses, encompassing descriptive statistics and inferential analysis, to derive significant insights regarding the differences in assessment literacy between EFL teachers in public schools and those in private language institutes.

Data Analysis

To determine whether there are any differences between school and institute EFL teachers (as the independent groups) in terms of the assessment literacy component (as the

continuous dependent variables), the one-way MANOVA was used. As mentioned earlier, the assessment literacy encompassed six components: knowledge of test functions, knowledge of test construction and administration, technical knowledge, statistical issues, assessment consequences, and alternative testing methods.

Results

As mentioned earlier, to compare Iranian EFL School and institute teachers in terms of the assessment literacy components, a one-way MANOVA was run. Six dependent variables were used: knowledge of test functions, knowledge of test construction and administration, technical knowledge, statistical issues, assessment consequences, and alternative testing methods. The independent variable was educational context: school and institute. It is worth mentioning that preliminary assumption testing was conducted to check for normality, linearity, univariate and multivariate outliers, homogeneity of variance-covariate metrics, and multicollinearity, with no violations noted. The descriptive statistics results of the assessment literacy components for the school and institute teachers are provided in Table 2.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics

		N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Knowledge of test functions	School teachers	54	2.83	5.00	4.1265	.62356
	Institute teachers	73	2.83	5.00	4.4429	.50858
Knowledge of test construction	School teachers	54	3.11	4.89	4.1687	.51610
	Institute teachers	73	3.11	5.00	4.3379	.44884
Technical Knowledge	School teachers	54	2.20	4.60	3.7444	.61848
	Institute teachers	73	2.80	5.00	4.1342	.60005
Statistical Knowledge	School teachers	54	2.00	4.75	3.2917	.67424
	Institute teachers	73	2.25	5.00	3.6301	1.01731
Assessment Consequence	School teachers	54	3.00	5.00	3.9444	.52105
	Institute teachers	73	3.00	5.00	4.0594	.48541
Alternative Assessment	School teachers	54	3.00	5.00	4.0000	.46581
	Institute teachers	73	3.00	5.00	4.1644	.57618

As the descriptive statistics results presented in Table 2 show, in all assessment literacy components, the institute teachers gained higher scores compared with the school teachers. Furthermore, for the school teachers, knowledge of test construction ($M=4.16$, $SD= .51$) and statistical knowledge ($M=3.29$, $SD= .67$) had the highest and

the lowest mean scores, respectively. The institute teachers also received the highest mean score in the knowledge of test function component ($M=4.44$, $SD= .50$) and the lowest one in the statistical knowledge component ($M=3.63$, $SD=1.01$). Table 3 presents the results of the Multivariate test.

Table 3
Multivariate Tests

	Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.995	3861.165 ^b	6.00	120.00	.000	.995
	Wilks' Lambda	.005	3861.165 ^b	6.00	120.00	.000	.995
	Hotelling's Trace	193.058	3861.165 ^b	6.00	120.00	.000	.995
	Roy's Largest Root	193.058	3861.165 ^b	6.00	120.00	.000	.995
Educational Context	Pillai's Trace	.317	9.293 ^b	6.00	120.00	.000	.317
	Wilks' Lambda	.683	9.293 ^b	6.00	120.00	.000	.317
	Hotelling's Trace	.465	9.293 ^b	6.00	120.00	.000	.317
	Roy's Largest Root	.465	9.293 ^b	6.00	120.00	.000	.317

Table 3 showed that there was a statistically significant difference between the school and institute teachers on the combined dependent variables, $F(6,120) = 9.29$, $p=.00$; Wilk's Lambda=.68; partial eta square=.31. To consider the dependent variables (knowledge of test

functions, knowledge of test construction and administration, technical knowledge, statistical issues, assessment consequences, and alternative testing methods) separately, between-subject effects were explored (Table 4).

Table 4
Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Educational Context	Knowledge of test functions	3.107	1	3.107	9.899	.002	.073
	Knowledge of test construction	.888	1	.888	3.880	.041	.030
	Technical Knowledge	4.716	1	4.716	12.761	.001	.093
	Statistical Knowledge	3.556	1	3.556	4.508	.036	.035
	Assessment Consequence	.410	1	.410	1.634	.203	.013
	Alternative Assessment	.839	1	.839	2.961	.088	.023

When the results of the dependent variables were considered separately, four differences reached statistical significance: knowledge of test functions $F(1,125)= 9.89$, $p= .00$, partial eta square=.07, knowledge of test construction $F(1,125)= 3.88$ $p= .04$, partial eta square=.03,

technical knowledge $F(1,125)= 12.76$, $p= .00$, partial eta square=.09, statistical knowledge $F(1,125)= 4.50$, $p= .03$, partial eta square=.03.

An inspection of the mean scores (Table 2) indicated that institute teachers had higher levels of assessment literacy in terms of the mentioned

components compared with the school teachers. The results of the between-subject effects also revealed that school and institute teachers were not different in terms of knowledge of assessment consequences ($p=.20$) and alternative assessment ($p=.08$).

Discussion and Conclusion

The objective of this research was to compare the assessment literacy of Iranian EFL teachers from schools and language institutes, focusing on six key components: knowledge of test functions, test development and administration, technical knowledge, statistical knowledge, assessment consequences, and alternative assessment methods. The findings revealed significant differences in assessment literacy between the two groups, as indicated by a one-way MANOVA, which showed a statistically significant difference on the combined dependent variables. Specifically, institute teachers exhibited higher levels of knowledge in test functions, test construction, technical knowledge, and statistical knowledge compared to their school counterparts.

The results of the study are in congruence with the findings of the study done by Asamoah et al. (2024), who explored teachers' familiarity with assessment practices in different educational contexts. They also found that educational assessment climate has a significant role in shaping teachers' assessment preferences and practices. The results are also in agreement with the findings of Fang and Yu (2023), who concluded that the educational context significantly influences EFL teachers' assessment literacy.

The higher levels of knowledge among institute teachers in these particular domains can be seen as a reflection of the more focused training and resources generally accessible in language institutes. These establishments often emphasize language proficiency and teaching methodologies

designed specifically for language instruction, potentially incorporating thorough training on assessment practices. Consequently, teachers in institutes are likely to have more exposure to both the theoretical foundations and practical applications of assessment literacy, allowing them to grasp not just the roles of tests but also how to create valid assessments that align with educational objectives.

Furthermore, the focus on technical knowledge, such as reliability and validity, suggests that institute teachers may undergo more intensive training in psychometric concepts. This insight is crucial for crafting effective assessments that accurately reflect student learning outcomes. Conversely, school teachers may have limited access to such specialized training resources, resulting in deficiencies in their technical skills pertaining to assessment.

This observation can be linked to the specialized training they receive, the quality of professional development offered, and the motivational aspects connected with operating in a competitive educational setting. These elements together foster a more comprehensive understanding of assessment practices among institute teachers when compared to their counterparts in schools.

Regarding the quality of professional development provided, the institutional environment plays a crucial role in shaping the quality and emphasis of teacher training programs. Language institutes frequently prioritize preparing their teachers with the essential skills required to deliver superior language instruction, which encompasses a strong focus on assessment literacy. This prioritization is backed by research indicating that effective teacher preparation programs are vital for improving assessment practices (Kunnan, 2018).

Furthermore, the perception of language institutes as centers of excellence for language education may contribute to a more motivated and engaged teaching workforce. Teachers working in such settings might feel a greater pressure to improve their assessment practices due to higher expectations from learners and parents alike. This motivation could result in a more proactive approach to acquiring knowledge and skills related to assessment. While in schools, the government policies establish a framework within which teachers operate, often leading to a reliance on standardized testing and constraining innovative assessment practices (Brown et al., 2024).

The results of the current study also demonstrated that the two groups did not show any significant differences in their understanding of assessment consequences and alternative assessment methods. This finding suggested that both groups possessed a comparable level of awareness regarding the implications of assessment practices on student learning outcomes and the use of diverse assessment strategies, such as peer assessments, self-assessments, and portfolios.

Explaining this result necessitates examining contextual factors. For example, it is crucial to acknowledge that both school and institute teachers operate within a national educational framework that delineates specific standards and expectations for assessment practices. National educational policies play a crucial role in shaping teachers' conceptual knowledge and beliefs about assessment (Brown et al., 2024). This framework may promote a common understanding of assessment consequences and alternative methods among teachers, thus reducing differences between different teaching environments.

Moreover, the growing focus on formative assessment practices in educational contexts may have similarly impacted both groups. As educational policies shift to emphasize student-

centered approaches and continuous feedback mechanisms, teachers from both contexts may have adapted their practices accordingly. This shift could result in a more consistent understanding of how assessments can function as instruments for learning rather than simply as evaluative tools.

The implications of this research go beyond the performance of individual teachers. The results revealed a necessity for teacher education programs that concentrate on thorough assessment literacy. Furthermore, policymakers should consider integrating statistical knowledge and alternative evaluation techniques in teacher preparation programs. By improving assessment literacy among EFL teachers, educational institutions can play a pivotal role in enhancing student outcomes and creating a more effective learning atmosphere.

This research has certain limitations that need to be recognized. The sample size (N=127) was rather limited, which could affect the generalizability of the findings. Furthermore, the dependence on self-reported measures may introduce bias, as participants might overestimate their perceived competencies due to social desirability influences (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Future investigations should target larger and more varied samples to improve the validity and reliability of the findings. Future studies can also employ more objective measures, such as direct observations or interviews, to gain a more in-depth and realistic understanding of teachers' assessment literacy.

Future studies should consider longitudinal designs to assess changes in assessment literacy over time as teachers gain experience and engage in professional development. Additionally, qualitative approaches could provide deeper insights into the specific challenges faced by EFL teachers regarding assessment practices. Investigating the impact of targeted professional development programs on

enhancing statistical knowledge and alternative assessment methods would also be beneficial.

References:

- Alavi, S. Y., Rezvani, R., & Yazdani, S. (2022). A gap analysis between EFL teachers' assessment literacy in Iranian public schools and their pre-service assessment curriculum. *TESL Quarterly*, 41(4), 59-86. doi:10.22099/TESL.2022.42432.3066
- Amiri, M., & Birjandi, P. (2015). Reliability and content validity of a comprehensive discourse completion test of interlanguage pragmatics for academic situations. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 12(9), 654-659.
- Asamoah, D., Shahrill, M., Norehedayah, S., & Latif, A. (2024). Teachers' perceptions of school assessment climate and realities of assessment practices in two educational contexts. *Frontiers in Education*, doi: 10.3389/educ.2024.1278187
- Ashraf, H., & Zolfaghari, S. (2018). EFL Teachers' assessment literacy and their reflective teaching. *International Journal of Instruction*, 11(1), 425-36.
- Brockmeier, J., & Olson, D. R. (2009). The literacy episteme from Innis to Derrida. In D. R. Olson & N. Torrance (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of literacy* (pp. 3-21). Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, T. D., Barnes, M., & Finefter-Rosenbluh, I. (2024). Teacher perspectives and experiences of assessment literacy in Victorian junior secondary schools. *Australian Journal of Education*, 68(1), 5-22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00049441231214022>
- 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), 2-16.
- Davies, A. (2008). Textbook trends in teaching language testing. *Language Testing*, 25(3), 327-347.
- Fang, L., & Yu, G. (2023). Language assessment literacy of EFL teachers in East Asia: From teachers' conceptions of language assessment to their practices in classrooms. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 58, 149-162. doi: 10.1007/978-981-19-6887-7_31
- Firoozi, T., Razavipour, K., & Ahmadi, A. (2019). The language assessment literacy needs of Iranian EFL teachers with a focus on reformed assessment policies. *Language Testing in Asia*, 9(2), 1-14.
- Fulcher, G. (2012). Assessment literacy for the language classroom. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 9(2), 113-132.
- Gareis, C. R., & Grant, L. W. (2015). Assessment literacy for teacher candidates: A focused approach. *Teacher Educators' Journal*, 4-21.
- Griffin, P., & Nix, P. (1991). *Educational assessment and reporting: A new approach*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Hill, K., & McNamara, T. (2012). Developing a comprehensive, empirically based research framework for classroom-based assessment. *Language Testing* 29(3), 395-420.
- Jalilzadeh, K., Dastgoshadeh, A., & Khosravi, R. (2023). Language assessment practices and training preferences of EL teachers: Iranian EFL teachers in focus. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 15(32), 144-160. doi: 10.22034/elt.2023.59200.2583
- Kahl, S. R., Hofman, P., & Bryant, S. (2013). *Assessment literacy standards and performance measures for teacher candidates and practicing teachers*. Measured Progress.
- Kunnan, A. J. (2018). Test fairness: A review. *Language Testing*, 35(2), 145-170.
- Malone, M. E. (2013). The essentials of assessment literacy: Contrasts between testers and users. *Language Testing*, 30(3), 329-344.
- Mathew, R., & Poehner, M. E. (2014). Monitoring progress in the classroom. In A. J. Kunnan (Ed.), *The companion to language assessment* (1st ed., Vol. 2), (pp. 631-645). John Wiley and Sons.
- McMillan, J. H. (2014). *Classroom assessment: Principles and practice for effective standards-based instruction* (6th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.
- Miller, M. D., Linn, R. L., & Gronlund, N. (2013). *Measurement and assessment in teaching* (11th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Mohammadkhah, Kiany, Gh. R., Tajeddin, Z., & ShayesteFar, P. (2022). EFL teachers' assessment literacy: A contextualized measure of assessment theories and skills. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, 29, 109-119.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879-903. doi:10.1037/0021-9101.88.5.879
- Popham, W. J. (2014). *Classroom assessment: What teachers need to know* (7th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Rezai, A. (2024). 1. The role of teacher assessment literacy in job stress and job burnout in EFL contexts: A mixed-methods investigation. *Asian-*

- Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 9, 3. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-023-00225-1>
- Russell, M. K., & Airasian, P. W. (2012). *Classroom assessment: Concepts and applications* (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Siegel, M. A., & Wissehr, C. (2011). Preparing for the plunge: Preservice teachers' assessment literacy. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 22(4), 371-391.
- Sohrabi, Z., Ghanbari, N., & Abbasi, A. (2022). Iranian EFL teachers' perceptions of writing assessment literacy: a countrywide study. *Language Testing in Asia*, 12, 23. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-022-00172-7>
- Stiggins, R. J. (1995). Assessment literacy for the 21st century. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 77(3), 238-245.
- Street, B. (2009). Ethnography of writing and reading. In D. R. Olson & N. Torrance (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of literacy* (pp. 329-345). Cambridge University Press.
- Tavassoli, K., & Farhady, H. (2018). Assessment knowledge needs of EFL teachers. *Teaching English Language*, 12(2), 45-65.
- Tayyebi, M., Moradi Abbasabady, M., & Abbassian, G. R. (2022). Examining classroom writing assessment literacy: A focus on in-service EFL teachers in Iran. *Language Testing in Asia*, 12, 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-022-00161-w>
- Wagner, D. A. (2009). New technologies for adult literacy and international development. In D. R. Olson & N. Torrance (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of literacy* (pp. 548-565). Cambridge University Press.
- Xu, Y., & Brown, G. T. (2016). Teacher assessment literacy in practice: A reconceptualization. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 58, 149-162. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.05.010>