Language Assessment Literacy in Online EFL Reading Class: What Novice and Experienced Teachers Reveal

Radina Anggun Nurisma[1], Oktavia Tri Sanggala Dewi[2*], Rika Irawati[3], Rina Sari[4], Nunung Suryati[5], Utami Widiati[5]

[1]Politeknik Elektronika Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia
[2]Universitas PGRI Adi Buana, Surabaya, Indonesia
[3]Politeknik Negeri Pontianak, Indonesia
[4]Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim, Indonesia
[5]Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia
*Corresponding author's email: sanggaladewi@unipasby.ac.id
* https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9372-642X
 https://doi.org/10.54855/callej.252619

ABSTRACT

Reading on online platforms becomes more prevalent, and technology adoption to support reading assessment continues to proliferate. As teacher competence to accurately assess students' reading competence in online platforms is paramount, this study concerns how novice and experienced teachers conduct assessment practices in online reading in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) under the language assessment literacy (LAL) principles proposed by Giraldo (2018). A mixed-methods approach was employed by gathering data through a close-ended questionnaire from 60 participants to examine the level of LAL perceived by novice and experienced teachers, while semi-structured interviews with six selected participants were conducted to uncover the factors influencing LAL from the lens of both novice and experienced EFL teachers. The findings indicated that novice and experienced teachers' LAL was at moderate level, and few others found hurdles to optimally utilizing skills in LAL. The qualitative elaboration revealed three factors influencing teachers' LAL in online EFL reading: technology factors, individual factors, and teacher's knowledge factors. Portraying the factors would equip teachers to better enhance their LAL knowledge and optimize the assessment practice despite numerous limitations. The finding calls for assessment training, which provides teachers with necessary skills to effectively conduct assessment practice in online reading.

Introduction

Assessment, teachers, students, resources, and context are the five essential elements that determine the quality of instruction (Yamtim & Wongwanich, 2014). Since assessment becomes a crucial factor in figuring out students' level of academic achievement, teacher

competence to accurately assess students' learning outcomes is paramount. Understanding the value of assessment literacy leads to the use of assessment procedures appropriately, as well as being aware of the theoretical and philosophical foundations for evaluating students' learning (DeLuca & Klinger, 2010).

Language assessment literacy, or LAL for short, is a concept that has recently emerged to describe the combination of assessment literacy abilities and language-specific competencies. This concept emphasizes skills, knowledge, and guidelines for language testing (Malone, 2008). According to Giraldo (2018), language assessment literacy revolves around three central elements, as outlined by Davies (2008), namely knowledge, skills, and principles. Knowledge reflects the theoretical concern for terms like validity and reliability. Skills include instructional skills into assessment practices followed by the development of test item on four language skills. Principles, on the other hand, deal with the practice of assessment such as fairness and ethics. These three elements are intertwined with teachers' thought processes and actions in conducting assessment (Scarino, 2013). Incorporating these elements enable teachers to create and administer fair assessments that align with educational goals and accurately measure students' language skills.

Numerous research projects investigating the various aspects of language assessment literacy (LAL) were conducted in numerous reports (Ashraf & Zolfaghari, 2018; Berry et al., 2019; Bøhn & Tsagari, 2021; Giraldo, 2018; Lan & Fan, 2019; Sultana, 2019). Some of the previous studies conceptualized the principles in the LAL framework, whereas others examined teachers' attitudes toward LAL in the field of teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL). Regarding the importance of assessment literacy, several empirical investigations reveal that language teachers have a low level of assessment literacy in terms of knowledge and skills (Fulcher, 2012; Lam, 2015; López Mendoza & Bernal Arandia, 2009; Jin, 2010).

In Indonesian context, numerous studies on assessment literacy were also conducted (e.g., Bahtiar & Purnawarman, 2020; Luthfiyyah et al., 2020; Nurdiana, 2021; Puspawati, 2019; Zulaiha et al., 2020). The studies shed light on how teachers perceive the knowledge of assessment principles and practice the knowledge in class. Findings from the aforementioned studies show that some teachers generally had sufficient knowledge of assessment practices while others showed a lack of knowledge. Zulaiha et al. (2020) revealed that the discrepancy between teachers' knowledge and assessment practice in the classroom was somewhat noticeable, particularly in the implementation and monitoring stages. Regarding this issue, teachers are encouraged to develop assessment knowledge through assessment training (Nurdiana, 2021; Nurdiana, 2022) ; Zulaiha & Mulyono, 2020), enabling teachers to select or develop the test and practice the assessment in class.

Studies on how assessment practices are implemented in speaking (e.g. Fan & Yan, 2020; Forrester, 2020; Huang, 2018; Huang et al., 2021; Khabbazbashi & Galaczi, 2020; Lam, 2019; Zhang et al., 2021) and writing have been reported in numerous issues yet more information is needed about reading assessment (e.g. Bouwer et al., 2023; Fitriyah et al., 2023; Grabe & Jiang, 2013; Susanti et al., 2022; Taufik et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2020). Recently, it has been demonstrated that online learning substantially impacts how students' work is assessed (Fitriyah & Jannah, 2021; Mohamadi, 2018). Concerning the development and implementation of the new mode of assessment, the practice of online language assessment can be seen in several tests, such as adaptive tests, TOEFL internet-based test (Sofa & Sulistyo, 2017), standardized tests or online English courses with assessment. As computers and new media will probably change how reading tasks and tests develop (Grabe & Jiang, 2013), online reading assessment deserves further attention. Assessing reading is complex as it requires the language assessment

literacy that are needed by teachers to assess the students comprehensively. In order to complement instruction and address students' needs, teachers must have a working knowledge of all aspects of assessment Herrera Mosquera and Macías V (2015). Thus, LAL is required for both pre-service teachers and in-service (Herrera & Macías, 2015; López Mendoza & Bernal Arandia, 2009).

Several studies on how novice and experienced teachers perceived their LAL had been conducted (Estaji & Ghiasvand, 2022; Fitriyah & Jannah, 2021; Tajeddin et al., 2018). However, the studies were mainly related to the novice and experienced teachers' knowledge and abilities on assessment in general. The exploration on how novice and experienced teachers perceive their assessment literacy in specific language skills has received little attention. Xu (2017) reported that novice teachers were reported to deal with more fluctuations in professional development compared to experienced teachers. Comparing between experienced and novice teachers can offer rich information about the knowledge and skill of assessment in reading classroom.

Underpinned by this background, the components of assessment in online EFL reading classes that the authors chose to work on this study were instructional skills and design skills for assessments under language assessment literacy (LAL) model by Giraldo (2018). It is necessary to figure out the instructional skills and design skills for language assessment in online reading under LAL principles from novice and experienced teachers in order to address specific areas of improvement to ultimately contribute to the optimization of teachers' skills in LAL. Two research questions guided our data collection and analysis.

RQ1: What is the perceived level of novice and experienced teachers' language assessment literacy in online EFL reading?

RQ2: What are the factors influencing novice and experienced teachers' skill under language assessment literacy principles in online EFL reading?

Literature Review

Language Assessment Literacy in EFL Teaching

As mentioned earlier, language assessment literacy (LAL) basically came from assessment literacy (AL). Assessment literacy refers to the aptitude for educational assessment and the proficiency in utilizing this knowledge to gauge students' academic progress (Lo & Leung, 2022). Teacher assessment literacy encompasses the competency of educators in comprehending principles, skills, and knowledge, which is crucial in creating and organizing appropriately designed assessments (Lam, 2019). The importance of assessment literacy lies in its ability to enable teachers to discern, interpret, and implement evaluation outcomes effectively, thereby contributing to practical educational assessment (Khadijeh & Amir, 2015).

Language is used as the construct in LAL, which generally sets it apart from AL (Giraldo, 2018). LAL integrates AL skills with language competency. Three essential elements of LAL include skills, knowledge, and principles (Davies, 2008). Additionally, further exploration of each component was provided (Giraldo, 2018). The four skills in the teachers' skill component in LAL include instructional skills, language assessment design skills, educational measurements skill, as well as technical language measurements skill. Meanwhile, teachers should have three types of knowledge: applied linguistics, language assessment theories and concepts, and teachers' language assessment knowledge. Finally, principles assess teachers'

awareness and action toward language assessment crucial issues, for example, using assessment results to make decisions about learners, critically analyzing the impact of standardized tests, and being aware of the importance of using fair and transparent language assessments.

Assessment Literacy in Online EFL Reading Classes

Assessment literacy in EFL class entails understanding the fundamental principles of language testing, selecting the appropriate format for testing, creating tests that are valid and reliable, accurately interpreting test scores, providing students with constructive feedback on their performance, and utilizing test results to enhance instruction (Weng & Shen, 2022). Assessment literacy in online reading classes refers to a set of abilities and knowledge related to the construction of reading competency measurement of a digital course. In other words, it is the process of gathering information utilizing various methods and technologies to measure reading competency in a virtual course (Susuwele-Banda, 2005).

Assessment literacy is crucial in online EFL reading classes as it helps teachers identify students' strengths and weaknesses in reading comprehension skills. It represents teacher achievement and demonstrates what works well and needs to be changed or improved. Teachers can use the results of assessments to design practical reading activities and provide personalized feedback to students. Moreover, assessment literacy helps teachers identify areas that require improvement in their teaching methods and modify their teaching to enhance students' reading comprehension skills (Coombe et al., 2007).

Reading Comprehension Assessment

Reading comprehension is challenging as it requires readers to create meaning on their own from the text by visualizing information explicitly and implicitly (Cao & Kim, 2021). Assessing reading skills is crucial for monitoring and supporting learners' development of vocabulary and comprehension in English. Consequently, there are many different techniques and formal processes for assessing students' reading comprehension abilities, for example, standardized assessments. Assessments on reading come in a variety of forms, with different administration times, costs, availability to users, ease of scoring, and specific comprehension skills tested (Keenan & Meenan, 2014).

In face-to-face learning environments, assessments often take the form of quizzes, cloze exercises, and vocabulary tests. In online settings, reading assessments utilize digital tools to measure learners' progress in meeting reading objectives. These digital tools now serve as platforms for comprehension quizzes and vocabulary assessments. Recent advancements in information accessibility and processing enable immediate and personalized feedback through these tools. This immediate and automated feedback assists instructors in adjusting their teaching strategies and providing necessary interventions, ensuring that students are adequately prepared for future academic reading tasks (Karagoz & Bangun, 2023). Furthermore, interactive tools allow learners to organize ideas from reading texts and engage in discussions to share their interpretations. The transition from face-to-face to online reading assessments requires the teacher to have understanding of language assessment literacy, including proficiency in digital tools and an awareness of the obstacles and advantages that online platforms offer.

However, many reading assessments need to clearly outline the comprehension abilities being assessed or how understanding could improve over time. Instead, many assessments use a common format that involves integrating comprehension abilities into a collection of short passages on various subjects (Sabatini et al., 2014). Instead of being taken directly from existing sources, the passages are typically original works by test designers. Most of the tests are made

up of a sequence of close activities, sentence recognition questions, true or false questions, or multiple-choice items (Morsy et al., 2010). This method of measurement provides a snapshot of students' overall reading ability at a given moment, but it is not beneficial for teachers who are working with struggling readers.

Methodology

Research design

This study used a mixed-method approach, adhering to a sequential explanatory design in which the data are obtained in quantitative and qualitative stages (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). In the quantitative phase, the findings were reported using statistical descriptive means to generate data on novice and experienced teachers' language assessment literacy in online reading. Meanwhile, the qualitative phase enabled us to explore the factors impacting novice and experienced teachers' language assessment literacy in online reading. This study collected quantitative data by distributing close-ended questionnaires to participants, whereas qualitative data was obtained through semi-structured interviews. The data gathered from the questionnaires and interviews were examined separately.

Setting and Participants

The participants for this study were 60 teachers consisting of 30 novice teachers who had taught English less than 10 years and 30 experienced teachers who had taught English for more than 10 years, respectively. They were selected from several universities in Indonesia through purposive sampling who had experiences in teaching EFL reading and assessed students' reading performance in online mode. Thus, teachers who administered online EFL reading assessments were selected as respondents in this study. Sixty teachers filled out the close-ended questionnaire comprising 30 experienced and 30 novice teachers. The selected respondents were involved based on the criteria of the study in terms of classroom experiences in teaching EFL reading reflecting the educational qualification between experienced and novice teachers. For this research, teachers with 1 to 10 years of teaching experience are considered as novice teachers whilst teachers with more than 10-year teaching experiences are classified into experienced teachers with substantial experience and expertise (see Table 1).

The qualitative approach was used in this research to understand the depth and complexity of reading online assessment, rather than on generalization to a broader population. While qualitative research may not prioritize generalization in the same way as quantitative research, it still involves the creation of representations or interpretations of the studied phenomena. Therefore, the authors chose six teachers representing the sample population in the survey to conduct semi-structured interviews. Meanwhile, six teachers representing the sample population in the survey were involved in semi-structured interviews. The three teachers categorized as novice teachers and three teachers categorized as experienced teachers were selected based on their score level on a questionnaire on language assessment literacy (LAL). Every category has three score levels; low, high, and moderate, and each level was represented by one teacher for semi-structured interviews.

Table 1.
Demography of the Participants

Category	Experienced Teachers	n	Novice Teachers	n
Gender	Male	8	Male	7
	Female	22	Female	23
Age	30-39	5	< 25	3
	40-49	15	25-29	10
	50-59	9	30-39	10
	> 60	1	40-49	7
Years of teaching EFL Reading	15 years	11	3 years	26
	> 15 years	19	6 years	4
Educational Background	Master in ELT	26	Master in ELT	27
	Doctorate in ELT	4	Doctorate in ELT	3
Region	Java	22	Java	21
	Sumatra	3	Sumatra	3
	Kalimantan	3	Sulawesi	2
	Nusa Tenggara	2	Kalimantan	4
HE Institution	University	21	University	29
	Polytechnic	9	Polytechnic	1

Data Collection Instruments

The primary instrument used to collect data in this study is a questionnaire on language assessment literacy (LAL) which was used to induce data about the knowledge of assessment practices of EFL teachers in Indonesia. The questionnaire consisted of three sections: Section I was to elicit participants' demographic information, Section II was to profile Indonesian EFL teachers' teaching experiences in online reading, and Section III was to measure teachers' level of language assessment literacy in online reading. The items in the close-ended questionnaire represented the dimensional functions of the language assessment literacy (LAL) model adapted from Giraldo (2018). There were 23 items covering the constructs representing two sub-sections: instructional skills and design skills for language assessments under LAL principles (Table 2). Then, follow-up questions in semi-structured interviews were administered to unveil the factors impacting teachers' language assessment literacy in online reading. The questions in semi-structured interviews were adapted from Giraldo (2018) comprising two parts. Part I profiles teachers' professional qualifications, while Part II scrutinizes EFL teachers' assessment practices following the principle from Giraldo. We have taken several steps to ensure the reliability and validity of instruments. To guarantee the clarity of the instructions and the content validity of the items in the questionnaire, we moderated the survey questionnaire by seeking input from two professionals and five English teachers. We also conducted the try-out test with 15 potential teachers and evaluated the reliability of the questionnaire items using a statistical measure. The Cronbach's Alpha value was 0.91 signifying that all of the items were reliable.

Table 2.
Dimensional Framework of the LAL Model

Dimensional functions	Questionnaire items (n)
Instructional skills	11
Design skills for language assessments	12

Source: Giraldo (2018)

Data Collection Procedures

The participants were asked to complete the adapted Likert-scale questionnaire in Google form and to get involved in semi-structured interviews. While the Likert-scale questionnaire measured the level of language assessment literacy in online reading from the lens of a teacher, semi-structured interview was meant to clarify the answers provided by the questionnaire by collecting data related to factors influencing experienced and novice teachers' language assessment literacy in online reading. The participants responded to the five-point Likert-scale items by indicating the option to which it applied with them, starting from point 1 as strongly disagree, 2 as disagree, 3 as neutral, 4 as agree and 5 as strongly agree. Participants were prompted for their consent before any data was collected. Interviews were conducted in English for approximately 15 minutes. The researcher recorded the conversation and took notes.

Data Analysis Procedures

The quantitative data gathered from the Likert-scale questionnaire were analysed using descriptive statistics. Meanwhile, the qualitative data collected from semi-structured interviews were analysed using thematic analysis. The quantitative data was gathered from the responses of 60 EFL teachers, which were descriptively tabulated to result in frequencies and percentages. Research tool IBM SPSS ver.24 could analyse the raw data for means and correlations and compared means between experienced and novice teachers in language assessment literacy (LAL). Regarding the qualitative data, the questions in semi-structured interviews addressed factors influencing EFL teachers' contribution to the knowledge of assessment practices in online reading. Similarly, it unveiled teachers' decisions to go through particular levels of aspects in language assessment literacy (LAL). The qualitative data was coded, and the codes were classified into themes (Creswell & Poth, 2018). There were three steps to analyse the interview questions' data: familiarizing and organizing, coding and recording, and summarizing and interpreting. The responses from 3 novice teachers and 3 experienced teachers as participants were coded as N1, N2, N3 and E1, E2, E3. Finally, the data were interpreted accordingly.

Results

Perceived Levels of novice and experienced teachers' language assessment literacy (LAL) in online reading

Section III of the questionnaire was meant to obtain data about novice and experienced teachers' language assessment literacy in online reading. Teachers' responses to the close-ended questionnaire items were analysed descriptively using the research tool IBM SPSS ver.24 and presented in the following sections. Table 3 demonstrates that of the 30 experienced teachers, the minimum value is 60, and the maximum is 115. The statistical data for experienced teachers is similar to novice teachers. For novice teachers, the minimum value is 59, and the maximum is 115. The mean value for experienced and novice teachers is 90.03 and 90.93, respectively.

Table 3.
Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Experienced	30	60	115	90.03	14.236
Valid N (listwise)	30				
Novice	30	59.00	115.00	90.9333	12.29503
Valid N (listwise)	30				

Based on the calculation results, the criteria for the variables are as follows. Table 4 compared the description of novice and experienced teachers' LAL levels across three categories, low, medium, and high. Generally, both experienced and novice teachers shared similar responses toward LAL in online reading. The table informs data about experienced teachers' attitudes toward LAL with a total frequency of 13.3%, 70%, and 16.7%, respectively. The figures indicate that 21 out of 30 teachers are at a medium level, four teachers are at the low level, and five teachers are at the high level.

Table 4.
Description of Experienced and Novice Variable

Experienced	Score Interval	Frequency	Percentage
Low	X < 75,8	4	13,3%
Medium	75,8 < X < 104,26	21	70,0%
High	104,26 < X	5	16,7%
Novice	**Score Interval**	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Low	X < 78,64	3	10,0%
Medium	78,64 < X < 103,22	23	76,7%
High	103,22 < X	4	13,3%

Meanwhile, the data about novice teachers is reported with a total frequency of 10%, 76.7%, and 13.3%. Specifically, there are 23 out of 30 teachers at the medium level, three teachers at the low level, and four teachers at the high level. Hence, the average level of teachers' knowledge and skill in language assessment perceived by experienced and novices at the medium level had been dominant. Teachers' attitudes shown at a particular level represented their understanding of the principles of conducting language assessment in online reading, including instructional skills and design skills for assessments.

Table 5.
Experienced and Novice Teacher's Skills of LAL in online EFL Reading

Teacher	Factor	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Experienced	Instructional Skills	29	55	44.13	5.752
	Design skills for Language Assessments	26	60	45.90	8.857
Novice	Instructional Skills	31	55	44.40	5.550
	Design skills for Language Assessments	28	60	46.53	7.036

Table 5 shows the data on how experienced and novice teachers perceived the knowledge of language assessment literacy (LAL) in online EFL reading using a five-point Likert scale online survey. Furthermore, in order to ensure the accuracy of self-assessment, the author implemented various strategies. Initially, the author conducted a try out with a small group of teachers to assess the consistency and accuracy of their self-assessments. Additionally, standardized scales like Likert scales were employed to provide a structured framework for participants to rate themselves, facilitating the analysis and interpretation of their responses. Moreover, participants were guaranteed that their responses would remain confidential and anonymous. Lastly, the survey included sections for open-ended questions or comments, allowing participants to provide feedback, express concerns, or offer suggestions.

For experienced teachers, the mean value for instructional skills is 44.13. More than half the number of teachers, with 59.6% of respondents, were willing to show their abilities in handling classroom assessment practices. The feature was also noted in 22% of responses who shared a similar attitude on their instructional skills. They agreed with their abilities to deal with what it takes to manage classroom assessment. The mean value of instructional skills from experienced teachers did not significantly differ from novice teachers. For novice teachers, the mean value for instructional skills is 44.40. Some 60.8% of novice teachers also expressed concern about instructional skills, followed by 22.3% of responses.

Regarding the design skills for language assessments in experienced teachers, the mean value is 45.90. The ability to construct valid assessments was represented in 52% of responses, whereas only 7.7% of teachers showed inadequate design skills for language assessment. The design skills for language assessments in novice teachers occurred in 56% of responses, similar to those of experienced teachers. However, only 3.3% of novice teachers showed inadequate knowledge of design skills for language assessments, which is slightly lower than those of experienced teachers. For novice teachers, the mean value for instructional skills is 46.53.

Factors influencing novice and experienced teachers' language assessment literacy (LAL) in online reading

The quantitative phase analysis revealed that teachers' language assessment literacy (LAL) in online EFL reading is at medium level, and few others are at low and high levels. A qualitative phase analysis was then carried out to examine the issues relating to teachers' roles in further detail. Responses from the interview were thematically coded to generate the pattern referring to the related construct. The results are presented in Table 6.

Table 6.

Factors Contributing to Novice and Experienced Teachers' LAL in Online EFL Reading

	Instructional skills	**Design skills for Language Assessments**
Technology Factors	• Integrating technologies to plan and implement students' reading assessment in online environment is quite a challenge. • Challenges to giving encouraging feedback through online due to disconnecting students from face-to-face relationships. • Challenges to observing students' performance in online reading classes.	• Teachers' digital skills to design and construct multiple methods of reading assessment in online platforms.
Individual Factors	• Students with different interests perceived different engagement in online reading activities. • Students with different proficiency levels perceive teachers' instruction in online reading assessments differently.	• Students' knowledge to understand the test formats. • Students' tendency to cheat during online assessments determines the test validity.
Teachers' Knowledge Factors	• Teachers' experience in planning, implementing, and monitoring reading assessment appropriately. • Teachers' ability to provide feedback based on assessment results.	• Teachers' knowledge to design valid and reliable assessments. • Teachers' professional training to design question items for reading and a rubric for assessment. • Teachers' ability to write question items such as multiple-choice, true-false, and matching.

Table 6 describes some potential factors that could affect how novice and experienced teachers perceive the role of LAL in online EFL reading. The analysis revealed that teachers addressed factors that lead to different dimensions in LAL, namely instructional skills and design skills for language assessments. Factors that fell under each stage of LAL were coded into three categories: technology factors, individual factors, and teachers' knowledge factors.

In instructional skills, integrating technologies to plan and implement students' reading assessments online might present various challenges. For instance, some students might need access to reliable internet connectivity, which could affect their ability to complete reading activities online. Moreover, giving encouraging feedback online can be difficult due to the need for face-to-face interactions. The inability to read students' body language and facial expressions could hinder teachers' ability to provide supporting feedback, which could reduce students' engagement and motivation to read. Finally, observing students' performance in an online reading class could be challenging for teachers to track students' progress and identify areas for improvement. With regard to the most frequently mentioned issues, we obtained responses as reported by the teachers below:

> Assessing reading in online platform involves multimedia components like videos, images, or interactive graphics. I have to learn more how to assess students' reading skills

using those formats. [...] For me it is a complex task which requires further exploration. (E3)

I should organize an effective assessment in the best way [...] I must be able to operate web-based tools, like kahoot, google forms, quizizz, LMS moodle or others. It is not a simple job somehow. (N1)

Regarding the individual factor, students' individual differences could also impact their engagement in online reading activities. Students' proficiency levels can impact their understanding of teachers' instructions in online reading assessments. Some students might find it challenging to comprehend the assessment instructions, while others required more advanced reading activities to engage well. Teachers' responses were as follows.

Assessing reading in online eliminates the direct interaction with the text, students cannot highlight the paper directly. [...] they can have distractions and affect their focus [...] but, it is not obstacle for smart students. (E1)

Not all students have ability to understand the instruction in online platform. [...] I must provide clear instruction repeatedly on how students will be assessed, especially to slow learner. (N2)

As for the teachers' knowledge factors, teachers' experiences in planning, implementing, and monitoring reading assessments were crucial. Teachers' abilities to choose appropriate reading materials, design engaging reading activities, and provide constructive feedback could significantly impact students' reading proficiency. Teachers' responses were as follows.

I once had experience making reading questions and input them in LMS moodle although I never join special training [...] I hope to receive training to stay updated in online assessment and enrich my knowledge. (E2)

I got confused sometimes, how to give online reports that accurately evaluate students' performance in reading. (N3)

Regarding the design skills for language assessments, technology could help teachers to design reading assessments and construct multiple reading assessment methods in online platforms. However, some students might need to become more familiar with reading assessments in online platforms. The teachers could clearly inform the test formats to the students so they understood well about what to do in reading tests. Teachers' responses were as follows.

Designing assessment tasks for reading in online can be complex. I should be able to write various question items, such as multiple-choice, true-false, short answer or matching. [...] The challenging part is how to present them in digital format. (E3)

As teacher, I have to make sure the test items are clear enough [...] some students are sometimes confused to understand the test format presented in online. (E1)

It is important to monitor students in online. They can easily collaborate and share answers during test behind the camera [...] it is crucial to prevent cheating or plagiarism. (N1)

We need some training and support to learn how to design different types of test items especially in online together with scoring rubric [...] we need to learn to make our own, nut just copy paste from the existing material. [N2]

This point of individual factor linked between the instructional skills and the design skills for Language Assessments. However, as the reading test was well designed in an online platform,

the students tended to cheat online. Teachers must observe students' performance in online reading classes about this issue. Related to the teachers' knowledge factors in designing skills for language assessments, the teachers are encouraged to improve their knowledge in designing valid and reliable assessments. Participating in professional training could assist the teachers to gain knowledge and skills in online reading assessment. Teachers could understand how to write selected-response items for online reading such as multiple-choice, true-false, and matching.

Discussion

Perceived Levels of novice and experienced teachers' language assessment literacy (LAL) in online reading

The first research question examined the perceived levels of novice and experienced teachers' language assessment literacy in measuring online reading. The analysis showed that the scores range for experienced teachers is between 60 and 115, while for novice teachers, it is between 59 and 115. The mean score for experienced teachers is 90.03, slightly lower than that for novice teachers at 90.93. This information suggests there may not be a significant difference in the teaching abilities of experienced and novice teachers regarding their scores range. This may be because experienced teachers have become satisfied with their teaching methods or have developed a certain level of rigidity in their approach. On the other hand, novice teachers tend to be more open-minded and willing to explore various teaching methods, which could result in a slightly higher average score.

Other factors could influence teaching abilities, such as experience, training, and personal qualities. (Johansson et al., 2023) found that teacher competence is the most crucial resource factor in determining student outcomes. Bedasse (2017) examined the liaison among particular feature of teacher and attainment of the student in low-performing schools and found that the data, for example years of experience, sick leave taken in the given year, turnover rate, teaching in their field of speciality, and highly qualified status, were all examined. However, study has shown that several unique features of teacher impact outcomes of classroom (Buddin & Zamarro, 2009). These studies suggest that while experience and training influence teaching abilities, personal qualities, and other variables also play a role.

Schools and educational institutions must evaluate and provide ongoing support to all teachers, regardless of their experience level. This is because more than experience is needed to ensure effective teaching. Training and support can help teachers improve their skills and stay up-to-date with the latest teaching methods and technologies. A study conducted by Oluremi (2013) found that professional development programs can enhance educational effectiveness by improving teacher skills and knowledge. Another study found that teacher competence, work motivation, school principal leadership, and organizational culture were predictors of teacher performance (Kanya et al., 2021). Therefore, schools and educational institutions should invest in professional development programs and provide ongoing support to teachers to help them improve their teaching abilities and enhance student outcomes. This can include mentoring programs, peer observation and feedback, and access to training and resources (OECD Observer, 2009).

The analysis also revealed that most novice and experienced teachers have a medium level of LAL. This suggests that while both groups may have some knowledge and skill in language assessment, there is still room for improvement. It is important for teacher training programs to

address this issue and provide teachers with the necessary skills and knowledge to conduct language assessments in online reading effectively. Research in this area has shown that improving teacher knowledge and language assessment skills can improve student achievement. For example, a study found that formal teacher competence in the Swedish language positively correlated with students' reading test results and teachers' judgments of student performance (Johansson et al., 2023). A report by the Institute of Education Sciences found that better knowledge and skills improve classroom teaching, which in turn raises student achievement (Yoon et al., 2007). Additionally, a study found that Language Assessment Literacy (LAL) is a rapidly expanding area of study in second language assessment, and improving teacher knowledge, skills, and abilities in the operationalization of LAL can lead to improvements in student achievement (Kurt et al., 2022). These studies suggest that improving teacher knowledge and language assessment skills can improve student achievement. Therefore, schools and educational institutions must invest in professional development programs and provide ongoing support to teachers to help them improve their teaching abilities and enhance student outcomes.

The analysis also showed that more than half of the respondents were confident in their abilities to handle classroom assessment practices. This finding is consistent with a previous study suggesting that experienced teachers tend to understand better assessment practices (Zhang & Burry-Stock, 2003). The mean value of instructional skills for novice teachers was 44.40, which did not significantly differ from experienced teachers. This suggests that novice teachers may have similar confidence in their abilities to handle classroom assessment practices as experienced teachers.

Regarding the design skills for language assessments, experienced teachers had a mean value of 45.90, with over half of the responses indicating the ability to construct valid assessments. This result is consistent with the expectation that experienced teachers would have a better understanding of designing assessments. Novice teachers also had a similar level of knowledge in design skills for language assessments, with a mean value of 46.53. However, only 3.3% of novice teachers showed inadequate knowledge of design skills, which is slightly lower than experienced teachers.

Overall, the findings suggest that both experienced and novice teachers perceive themselves as having a good understanding of LAL in online EFL reading. This is an important finding, as teachers' perceptions of their own abilities can influence their instructional practices and ultimately impact student learning outcomes (Graham & Perin, 2007). The results of this study can serve as a starting point for further research and professional development opportunities to enhance teachers' knowledge and skills in language assessment literacy.

Factors influencing novice and experienced teachers' language assessment literacy (LAL) in online reading

The qualitative findings provide empirical evidence on how various factors might influence novice and experienced teachers' LAL in online EFL reading. As online reading differs from offline reading, assessment techniques must consider those differences (Coiro, 2011). It is crucial to examine how teachers reflect on their reading assessment practices to understand the skills and strategies students need to digest information in digital reading. Further, scrutinizing potential factors impacting how teachers perceive LAL in online EFL reading is pivotal. Research findings reporting several factors which influence the development of teachers' language assessment literacy have been enormously issued (Coiro, 2011; Luthfiyyah et al., 2021; Tsagari & Vogt, 2017; Ashraf & Zolfaghari, 2018; Zulaiha et al., 2020). The findings from the present study showed that three factors affected novice and experienced teachers' LAL,

particularly in instructional skills and language assessment design skills in online EFL reading. In this sense, the three factors comprise technology factors, individual factors, and teachers' knowledge factors.

Several potential factors impacted teachers' understanding in the stage of instructional skills. Technology factors presented both some benefits and hurdles to EFL teachers in this stage. The integration of technology in language teaching had offered some advantages. Accordingly, creating, conducting, and evaluating assessments is an enormous task for teachers. However, Luthfiyyah et al. (2021) pointed out that the abundance of online assessment platforms as meaningful platforms can assist teachers in carrying out the assessment more effectively. As result, more teachers explore and embrace the digital tools in assessment practices. Several novice teachers felt adequately prepared to integrate technology into the assessment practices in online EFL reading. However, utilizing technology to organize and implement assessments becomes a challenge in assessing online reading, especially for experienced teachers. This resonates with Coiro (2011) findings that rapid change in digital technology could be the potential factor to influence the online texts, tools, and reading contexts in online reading assessment.

Regarding the difficulties of employing online assessment in instructional practice, some experienced teachers had to bear the burden of navigating the technology features in online assessment platforms or dealing with technical problems rather than focusing on conducting the assessment. Apart from that, both novice and experience teachers revealed that the online platform setting limited student-teacher interaction, which led to difficulties in encouraging feedback for the learners. Feedback is a powerful instructional intervention to foster students' learning outcomes. It is also linked to the difficulties of monitoring learners' performance in an online setting. Not all teachers can observe online activities with a webcam or microphone or ensure the learners did not cheat during the assessment.

Individual factor becomes another factor affecting instructional skills, which corroborate Cairo's (2009) and Zulaiha et al. (2020) findings. Students with different levels of reading proficiency perceived different attitudes toward online EFL reading assessment. In the present study, students' attitudes toward online reading determined their engagement in online EFL reading assessment. Some novice teachers had abilities to conduct or modify assessment practice in online reading concerning the students' proficiency levels, while some others had less knowledge about how to deal with different proficiency levels due to lack of experiences in instructional practices. Moreover, Coiro (2011) pointed out that high-achieving online readers can show persistence, flexibility, healthy skepticism, and confidence as they navigate internet texts rapidly. Meanwhile, low-achieving online readers tend to give up and need more confidence in dealing with online materials.

Teachers' knowledge factors become the foremost factor in language assessment literacy, which function as a theoretical foundation to perform well-structured assessments considering the characteristics of test-takers and learning outcomes. In this study, teachers' knowledge factors were determined by teachers' experiences in carrying out online EFL reading assessments, which contributed to their understanding of language assessment. This resonates with findings from Ashraf and Zolfaghari (2018) and Sultana (2019), who reported that teachers' assessment practice was primarily based on their learning experiences rather than developing competencies through assessment literacy training. Most of novice and experienced teachers reported that they barely had the opportunity to participate in professional development program related to assessment, such as workshop and seminar despite the fact that it is important for them to enhance their understanding of language assessment literacy. Through this program,

they will gain knowledge and skills in utilizing several digital tools to assess EFL reading in online platform.

In the stage of design skills for language assessments, several potential factors emerged to contribute to teachers' understanding of design skills for online EFL reading assessment. In the present study, the technology features in the online assessment platform promoted several advantages to manage chosen response items, for example, multiple-choice, cloze test, true-false matching, and essay types. However, the potential drawbacks had come within technology factors where most experienced teachers encountered difficulties due to their limitation in constructing in-house reading tests with multiple item types in the online platform. Grabe and Jiang (2013) argued that computers and new media would likely alter how reading tests and tasks evolve. The individual factor was also found to impact teachers' LAL as the role of individual differences determines the perceived attitudes toward the test format, such as understanding the digital text. Jeon and Yamashita (2022) reported that teachers should closely monitor each student in their specific context and motivate them to accomplish their best performance. Teachers' decision to select digital text and construct assessment relied on test-taker characteristics. For example, decoding is for novice readers, whereas inferencing is for older and more advanced readers.

Pertaining to this issue, teachers' knowledge factors underpin the theoretical basis in design skills for language assessments. Teachers should be able to construct the test before performing assessment practices, such as writing multiple item types and designing valid and reliable assessments. Both experienced, and novice teachers expressed a need for more confidence to conduct practical assessments due to their limitation on appropriate knowledge in LAL and the absence to receive actual training related to LAL in online EFL reading. The ability of a teacher to engage in multiple teaching, learning, and assessment approaches is critical. Concerns have been expressed about the level and quality of teacher assessment training. (Fulcher, 2012; Crusan et al., 2016). Plenty of studies have called for the need for teachers' language assessment training to foster the quality of classroom instruction (Derakhshan & Ghiasvand, 2022; Herrera & Macías, 2015; Lan & Fan, 2019; Nurdiana, 2021; Sultana, 2019; Zulaiha et al., 2020). Lan & Fan (2019) pointed out the significance of assessment literacy training in in-service EFL teacher training programs, which is also crucial for novice and experienced teachers. Several studies assert that pre-and in-service teachers should acquire LAL to improve teaching and learning (Herrera & Macías, 2015; López & Bernal, 2009).

Conclusion

The findings of this study highlighted the level of novice and experienced teachers' LAL in online EFL reading and scrutinized the factors influencing teachers' LAL in online EFL reading. Based on the quantitative and qualitative data analysis, most novice and experienced teachers' assessment literacy was moderate. There was no significant difference in how novice and experienced teachers in Indonesia perceived their skills of LAL in online EFL reading. Most teachers devoted themselves to enacting their abilities following the principles of instructional skills and language assessment design skills. Despite the moderate level of acceptance in language assessment practice, some novice and experienced teachers still needed to optimize their skills of LAL in online EFL reading. The details were provided by teachers' views on their perceived attitudes toward LAL in online EFL reading. It defined the three closely relevant factors contributing to teachers' LAL, namely technology factors, individual factors, and teachers' knowledge factors. The interplay among the three factors influenced how

teachers built assessment literacy and employed the assessment practice in language classrooms encompassing the development, implementation, and evaluation of assessment tasks.

The findings give implications for EFL teacher as a central component which entail the need for developing knowledge or skills within the scope of LAL that teachers are expected to have through language assessment training such as professional development or study groups. The empirical evidence from this study also contributes to the future direction of LAL practices, particularly in online EFL reading. As this study is limited to instructional and design skills under the LAL framework, exploring other areas in LAL for language teachers requires attention. It should be further explored in future studies. Observing how novice and experienced teachers gain knowledge from language assessment training and implement the skills in assessment practice helps to capture LAL in greater detail.

Acknowledgment

References

Ashraf, H., & Zolfaghari, S. (2018). EFL Teachers' Assessment Literacy and Their Reflective Teaching. *International Journal of Instruction*, *11*(1), 425–436. https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2018.11129a

Bachman, L., & Palmer, A. (2022). *Language assessment in practice: Developing language assessments and justifying their use in the real world*. Oxford University Press.

Bahtiar, I., & Purnawarman, P. (2020). Investigating English teachers' comprehension in Language Assessment Literacy (LAL). *1st International Conference on Information Technology and Education (ICITE 2020)*, 303–310.

Bedasse, M. M. (2017). *The Effect of Teacher Characteristics on Student Achievement in Low Performing Schools*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida).

Berry, V., Sheehan, S., & Munro, S. (2019). What does language assessment literacy mean to teachers? *ELT Journal*, *73*(2), 113–123. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccy055

Bøhn, H., & Tsagari, D. (2021). Teacher educators' conceptions of language assessment literacy in Norway. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *12*(2), 222–233. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1202.02

Bouwer, R., Van Steendam, E., & Lesterhuis, M. (2023). Guidelines for the validation of

writing assessment in intervention studies. In *Conceptualizing, Designing, Implementing, and Evaluating Writing Interventions (pp. 199-223). Brill.* DOI: https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004546240_011

Buddin, R., & Zamarro, G. (2009). Teacher qualifications and student achievement in urban elementary schools. *Journal of Urban Economics*, *66*(2), 103–115. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jue.2009.05.001

Cao, Y., & Kim, Y.-S. G. (2021). Is retell a valid measure of reading comprehension? *Educational Research Review*, *32*, 100375.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100375

Coiro, J. (2011). Predicting Reading Comprehension on the Internet: Contributions of Offline Reading Skills, Online Reading Skills, and Prior Knowledge. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *43*(4), 352–392. https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X11421979

Collins, A. A., Lindström, E. R., & Compton, D. L. (2018). Comparing students with and without reading difficulties on reading comprehension assessments: A meta-analysis. *Journal of learning disabilities*, 51(2), 108-123. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219417704636

Coombe, C. A., Folse, K. S., & Hubley, N. J. (2007). *A practical guide to assessing English language learners*. University of Michigan Press.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design (4th ed.)*. Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.

Crusan, D., Plakans, L., & Gebril, A. (2016). Writing assessment literacy: Surveying second language teachers' knowledge, beliefs, and practices. *Assessing Writing*, *28*, 43–56. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2016.03.001

Davies, A. (2008). Assessing Academic English. *Studies in Language Testing*, *23*.

DeLuca, C., & Klinger, D. A. (2010). Assessment literacy development: Identifying gaps in teacher candidates' learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, *17*(4), 419–438. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2010.516643

Derakhshan, A., & Ghiasvand, F. (2022). Demystifying Iranian EFL teachers' perceptions and practices of learning-oriented assessment (LOA): challenges and prospects in focus. *Language Testing in Asia*, *12*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-022-00204-2

Estaji, M., & Ghiasvand, F. (2022). Teacher assessment identity in motion: the representations in e-portfolios of novice and experienced EFL teachers. *Issues in Language Teaching*, *11*(2), 33–66.

Fan, J., & Yan, X. (2020). Assessing speaking proficiency: a narrative review of speaking assessment research within the argument-based validation framework. *Frontiers in psychology,* 11, 330. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00330

Fitriyah, I., & Jannah, M. (2021). Online Assessment Effect in EFL Classroom: An Investigation on Students and Teachers' Perceptions. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics,* 5(2), 265–284. https://doi.org/10.21093/ijeltal.v5i2.709

Fitriyah, I., Gozali, I., Widiati, U., El Khoiri, N., & Singh, A. K. J. (2023). EFL Writing Teachers' Practices and Values of Assessment for and as Learning in A Constrained Context. *Computer-Assisted Language Learning Electronic Journal*, *24*(2).

Forrester, A. (2020). Addressing the challenges of group speaking assessments in the time of the Coronavirus. *International Journal of TESOL Studies,* 2(2), 74-88. https://doi.org/10.46451/ijts.2020.09.07

Fulcher, G. (2012). Assessment literacy for the language classroom. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, *9*(2), 113–132. https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2011.642041

Giraldo, F. (2018). Language assessment literacy: Implications for language teachers. *Profile*

Issues in TeachersProfessional Development, *20*(1), 179–195.
https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v20n1.62089

Grabe, W., & Jiang, X. (2013). Assessing reading. *The Companion to Language Assessment*, *1*, 185–200. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118411360.wbcla060

Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). A Meta-Analysis of Writing Instruction for Adolescent Students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *99*(3), 445–476. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.99.3.445

Hallin, A. E., Danielsson, H., Nordström, T., & Fälth, L. (2022). No learning loss in Sweden during the pandemic: Evidence from primary school reading assessments. International *Journal of Educational Research,* 114, 102011. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijer.2022.102011

Herrera, L., & Macías, D. F. (2015). A Call for Language Assessment Literacy in the Education and Development of English Language Teachers. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, *17*(2), 302. https://doi.org/10.14483/udistrital.jour.calj.2015.2.a09

Herrera Mosquera, L., & Macías V, D. F. (2015). A call for language assessment literacy in the education and development of teachers of English as a foreign language. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, *17*(2), 302–312.

Huang, H. T. D. (2018). Modeling the relationships between anxieties and performance in second/foreign language speaking assessment. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 63, 44-56. DOI: 10.1016/j.lindif.2018.03.002

Huang, B. H., Bailey, A. L., Sass, D. A., & Shawn Chang, Y. H. (2021). An investigation of the validity of a speaking assessment for adolescent English language learners. *Language Testing*, 38(3), 401-428. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532220925731

I. Karagoz and I. Bangun, "Trends and Challenges in Formative Assessment of Reading and Writing: Online EAP Contexts," *Emerg. Pract. Online Lang. Assessment, Exams, Eval. Feed.*, pp. 1–20, 2023.

Ingersoll, R. M., & Smith, T. M. (2003). The wrong solution to the teacher shortage. Educational Leadership, 60, 30–35.

Jeon, E. H., & Yamashita, J. (2022). Individual Difference Factors for Second Language Reading. In *The Routledge Handbook of Second Language Acquisition and Individual Differences* (pp. 364–380). Routledge.

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. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532209351431

Johansson, S., Gustafsson, J. E., Hansson, Å., & Alatalo, T. (2023). Estimating effects of teacher characteristics on student achievement in reading and mathematics: evidence from Swedish census data. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2023.2175252

Khabbazbashi, N., & Galaczi, E. D. (2020). A comparison of holistic, analytic, and part marking models in speaking assessment. *Language testing,* 37(3), 333-360. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532219898635

Kanya, N., Fathoni, A. B., & Ramdani, Z. (2021). Factors affecting teacher performance. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, *10*(4), 1462–1468. https://doi.org/10.11591/IJERE.V10I4.21693

Keenan, J. M., & Meenan, C. E. (2014). Test differences in diagnosing reading comprehension deficits. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, *47*(2), 125–135. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219412439326

Khadijeh, B., & Amir, R. (2015). Importance of teachers' assessment literacy. *International Journal of English Language Education*, *3*(1), 139–146. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijele.v3i1.6887

Lam, R. (2015). Language assessment training in Hong Kong: Implications for language assessment literacy. *Language Testing*, *32*(2), 169–197. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532214554321

Lam, R. (2019). Teacher assessment literacy: Surveying knowledge, conceptions and practices of classroom-based writing assessment in Hong Kong. *System*, *81*, 78–89. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.01.006

Lan, C., & Fan, S. (2019). Developing classroom-based language assessment literacy for in-service EFL teachers: The gaps. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, *61*, 112–122. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2019.03.003.

Lo, Y. Y., & Leung, C. (2022). Conceptualising assessment literacy of teachers in Content and Language Integrated Learning programmes. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *25*(10), 3816–3834. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2022.2085028

López Mendoza, A. A., & Bernal Arandia, R. (2009). Language testing in Colombia: A call for more teacher education and teacher training in language assessment. *Profile Issues in TeachersProfessional Development*, *11*(2), 55–70.

Luthfiyyah, R., Aisyah, A., & Sulistyo, G. H. (2021). Technology-enhanced formative assessment in higher education: A voice from Indonesian EFL teachers. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature and Culture*, *6*(1), 42. https://doi.org/10.30659/e.6.1.42-54

Luthfiyyah, R., Basyari, I. W., & Dwiniasih, D. (2020). EFL secondary teachers' assessment literacy: Assessment conceptions and practices. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, *10*(2), 402–421. https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v10i2.2101

Malone, M. E. (2008). Training in language assessment. *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, *7*, 225–239. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-30424-3_178

Mohamadi, Z. (2018). Comparative effect of online summative and formative assessment on EFL student writing ability. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, *59*, 29–40. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2018.02.003

Morsy, L., Kieffer, M., & Snow, C. (2010). Measure for Measure: A Critical Consumers' Guide to Reading Comprehension Assessments for Adolescents. Final Report from Carnegie Corporation of New York's Council on Advancing Adolescent Literacy. *Carnegie Corporation of New York*.

Nurdiana, N. N. (2021). Language Teacher Assessment Literacy: A Current Review. *Journal of English Language and Culture*, *11*(1), 66–74. https://doi.org/10.30813/jelc.v11i1.2291

Nurdiana, N. N. (2022). Language teacher assessment literacy: A current review. *Journal of English Language and Culture*, *11*(1).

OECD Observer. (2009). The professional development of teachers. In *OECD Observer*.

Oluremi, O. F. (2013). Enhancing educational effectiveness in Nigeria through teacher's professional development. *European Scientific Journal*, *9*(28).

Puspawati, I. (2019). Understanding teachers' knowledge, skills, and principles on language assessment: a survey on teachers' language assessment literacy. *Third International Conference on Sustainable Innovation 2019–Humanity, Education and Social Sciences (IcoSIHESS 2019)*, 70–75. https://doi.org/10.2991/icosihess-19.2019.11

Reed, D. K., Martin, E., Hazeltine, E., & McMurray, B. (2020). Students' perceptions of a gamified reading assessment. *Journal of Special Education Technology,* 35(4), 191-203. https://doi.org/10.1177/0162643419856272

Sabatini, J. P., O'Reilly, T., Halderman, L. K., & Bruce, K. (2014). Integrating scenario-based and component reading skill measures to understand the reading behavior of struggling readers. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, *29*(1), 36–43. https://doi.org/10.1111/ldrp.12028

Scarino, A. (2013). Language assessment literacy as self-awareness: Understanding the role of interpretation in assessment and in teacher learning. *Language testing*, *30*(3), 309-327. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532213480128

Sofa, S., & Sulistyo, G. H. (2017). A MODEL OF AN ONLINE READING COMPREHENSION SUMMATIVE TEST FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS. *IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education)*, *4*(2), 168–187. https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v4i2.8344

Sultana, N. (2019). Language assessment literacy: An uncharted area for the English language teachers in Bangladesh. *Language Testing in Asia*, *9*(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-019-0077-8

Supiani, S., Rahmawati, N. M., Widyaningsih, T. L., Suryati, N., & and Mukminatien, N.. (2023). EFL Students' Language Accuracy Development through Self-Assessment from Online Written Feedback: How Do They Experience and Perceive It? *Computer-Assisted Language Learning Journal* 24, no. 2.

Susanti, A., Widiati, U., Cahyono, B. Y., & Sharif, T. I. S. T. (2022). Assessing episodes in verbalization process of EFL students' collaborative writing. *Studies in English Language and Education,* 9(2), 539-553. DOI: https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v9i2.20165

Susuwele-Banda, W. J. (2005). *Classroom assessment in Malawi: Teachers' perceptions and practices in mathematics*. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Tajeddin, Z., Alemi, M., & Yasaei, H. (2018). Classroom Assessment Literacy for Speaking: Exploring Novice and Experienced English Language Teachers' Knowledge and Practice. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, *6*(3), 57–77.

Taufik, M., Mukminatien, N., Suharyadi, S., Karmina, S., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2022). Integrating Electronic Portfolio Assessment into Teaching Materials: An Exploratory Study on Speaking Course Syllabus Development. *Jurnal Pendidikan: Teori, Penelitian, dan Pengembangan,* 7(8), 309-319. DOI: 10.17977/jptpp.v7i8.15539

Taylor, L. (2009). Developing assessment literacy. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *29*, 21–36. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190509090035

VanMeveren, K., Hulac, D., & Wollersheim-Shervey, S. (2020). Universal screening methods and models: Diagnostic accuracy of reading assessments. *Assessment for Effective Intervention,* 45(4), 255-265. https://doi.org/10.1177/1534508418819797

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), 41–63. https://doi.org/10.58379/UHIX9883

Wang, L., Lee, I., & Park, M. (2020). Chinese university EFL teachers' beliefs and practices of classroom writing assessment. Studies in Educational Evaluation, 66, 100890. DOI: 10.1016/j.stueduc.2020.100890

Weng, F., & Shen, B. (2022). Language Assessment Literacy of Teachers. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.864582

Xu, H. (2017). Exploring novice EFL teachers' classroom assessment literacy development: A three-year longitudinal study. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, *26*(3–4), 219–226. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-017-0342-5

Yamtim, V., & Wongwanich, S. (2014). A study of classroom assessment literacy of primary school teachers. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *116*, 2998–3004. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.696

Yoon, K. S., Duncan, T., Lee, S. W.-Y., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. L. (2007). Reviewing the Evidence on How Teacher Professional Development Affects Student Achievement. *Issues and Answers Report*, *REL 2007-No. 33*, 62.

Zhang, Z., & Burry-Stock, J. A. (2003). Classroom Assessment Practices and Teachers' Self-Perceived Assessment Skills. *Applied Measurement in Education*, *16*(4), 323–342. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15324818AME1604_4

Zhang, W., Zhang, L. J., & Wilson, A. J. (2021). Supporting learner success: Revisiting strategic competence through developing an inventory for computer-assisted speaking assessment. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 689581. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.689581

Zulaiha, S., & Mulyono, H. (2020). Exploring junior high school EFL teachers' training needs of assessment literacy. *Cogent Education*, *7*(1), 1772943. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2020.1772943

Zulaiha, S., Mulyono, H., & Ambarsari, L. (2020). An Investigation into EFL Teachers' Assessment Literacy: Indonesian Teachers' Perceptions and Classroom Practice. *European Journal of Contemporary Education*, *9*(1), 189–201. https://doi.org/10.13187/ejced.2020.1.189

Biodata

Radina Anggun Nurisma is a faculty member at Politeknik Elektronika Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia. He holds B.Ed., M.Ed., and Ph.D. in English Language Teaching from Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia. Her research interests are primarily on English Language Teaching (ELT), English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and technology-enhanced language learning (TELL). Orcid id: *https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3423-9354*

Oktavia Tri Sanggala Dewi is a lecturer in English Language Education at Universitas PGRI Adi Buana Surabaya, Indonesia. She is currently pursuing her Ph.D. in English Language

Education at Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia. Her research interests include Mobile-Assisted Language Learning (MALL) and the integration of technology in English language teaching and learning. Orcid id*: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9372-642X*

Rina Sari is an assistant professor of English Literature Study Program at Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang, Indonesia, and a doctoral student in ELT at Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia. Her main interests are Teacher Professional Development, TEFL, and Material Development. Orcid id*: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4621-6339*

Rika Irawati is a lecturer at Politeknik Negeri Pontianak, Indonesia, and a doctoral student in ELT at Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia. Her main interests are English Language Teaching (ELT), English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and technology-enhanced language learning (TELL). Orcid id*: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9711-4474*

Nunung Suryati is Professor in English Language Teaching and the Head of the ELT research group of The Department of English, Universitas Negeri Malang. Nunung has been teaching for more than 20 years. She has taught basic skill courses and content courses such as Curriculum of English Instruction, Coursebook Evaluation, Material Development and TEFL to undergraduate and graduate ELT students. She has been involved in teaching and monitoring the Teacher Certification Program for many years. Her current research interest includes lesson study, literacy pedagogy, course book evaluation. Her publication topics include classroom interaction, oral corrective feedback, lesson study and teacher education. Orcid id*: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4672-2952*

Utami Widiati is a professor in English language teaching at the English Department, Faculty of Letters, Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia. She obtained her professorship in the area of literacy learning in 2009. Her research interests include foreign language literacy, SLA, curriculum and material development, and teacher professional development. She is a pre-and in-service teacher trainer and has written secondary school English textbooks prescribed by the Indonesian government. She also serves as the chief editor for TEFLIN Journal. Orcid id: *https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8603-4556*.

Appendix

Questionnaire of Teachers' Language Assessment Literacy (LAL)
in online EFL Reading

To respond to this questionnaire, please choose one of five options in each item which is suitable to your own situation and condition.

1: Strongly disagree, 2: Disagree, 3: Neutral, 4: Agree, 5: Strongly Agree

Instructional skills

1. I have the ability to align curriculum objectives, instruction, and assessment in online EFL Reading.

2. I have the ability to plan, implement, monitor, record, and report student language development in online EFL Reading

3. I have the ability to provide feedback on students' assessment performance (norm- and criterion-referenced) in online EFL Reading

4. I have the ability to collect formal data (e.g., through tests) and informal data (while observing in class) of students' language development in online EFL Reading.

5. I have the ability to improve instruction based on assessment results and feedback in online EFL Reading.

6. I have the ability to utilize alternative means for assessment; for example, portfolios in online EFL Reading.

7. I have the ability to use language assessment methods appropriately: to monitor language learning and nothing else.

8. I have the ability to provide motivating assessment experiences, giving encouraging feedback, or setting up self-assessment scenarios.

9. I have the ability to communicate test results to a variety of audiences: students, parents, school directors, etc.

10. I have the ability to use multiple methods of assessment to make decisions based on substantive information.

11. I have the ability to incorporate technologies (gform quiz, edmodo, kahoot, social media, LMS etc.) in assessing students in online EFL Reading.

Design skills for language assessments

1. I have the ability to clearly identify and state the purpose for language assessment in EFL Reading.

2. I have the ability to construct different types of questions on reading questions, such as vocabulary questions, main ideas, implied meanings, ideas organization, author's tone, etc.

3. I have the ability to design assessments that are valid not only in terms of course contents but also course tasks in online EFL Reading.

4. I have the ability to construct test specifications (or blueprints) to design parallel forms of a test in online EFL Reading.

5. I have the ability to write test syllabuses to inform test users of test formats, where applicable.

6. I have the ability to design assessments that are reliable, authentic, fair, ethical, practical, and interactive.

7. I have the ability to write selected-response items such as multiple-choice, true-false, matching and cloze test.

8. I have the ability to improve test items after item analysis, focusing on items that are either too difficult, too easy, or unclear.

9. I have the ability to design constructed-response items for reading along with rubrics for assessment in online platform.

10. I have the ability to design rubrics for alternative assessments such as portfolios and peer-assessment.

11. I have the ability to provide security to ensure that unwanted access to tests is deterred.

12. I have the ability to design training workshops for raters, whenever necessary.