Available online at www.jlls.org

JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTIC STUDIES

ISSN: 1305-578X

Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, *18*(Special issue 1), 01-17; 2022

ESL teachers' assessment literacy in classroom: A review of past studies

Charanjit Kaur Swaran Singh [a 1], Harsharan Kaur Jaswan Singh [b], Tarsame Singh Masa Singh [c], Sasigaran Moneyam [d], Nadiah Yan Abdullah [e], Muhamad Fadzllah Zaini [f]

[a,b,d,e,f] *Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris, Malaysia*
[c] *Institute of Teacher Education, Tuanku Bainun Campus, Pulau Pinang, Malaysia*

APA Citation:

Singh, C. K. S., Singh, H. K. J., Singh, T. S. M., Moneyam, S., Abdullah, N. Y., & Zaini, M. F. (2022). ESL teachers' assessment literacy in classroom: A review of past studies. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 18*(Special issue 1), 01-17.

Submission Date:04/06/2021

Acceptance Date:25/10/2021

Abstract

English Language teachers faced problems in assisting their students to attain a higher level of academic achievement. This problem occurred due to their low-level mastery of assessment literacy. Studies show that teachers are unable to assess students accordingly as they lacked the assessment skills and consequently make erroneous decisions. Even more disturbing is that most teachers still have some confusion over the 'what' and 'how' of implementing best classroom assessment practices. The purpose of this study is to review past studies to examine in-service ESL teachers' assessment literacy. As such, there is a dire need to review past studies on assessment literacy frameworks that would facilitate in-service English teachers assessing student learning outcomes and in turn lead to informed decisions and educational policy. The emphasis on social constructivist theory will assist teachers in designing assessment tasks that will involve students to take charge, be responsible to think about their learning through the use of different assessment tools.

Keywords: Assessment literacy; in-service teachers; English language; knowledge; skills; ESL students

1. Introduction

ESL teachers struggled and faced a lot of pressure to find the best ways to assess student knowledge and skills that will allow students to reach their full potential (Suah, 2012). Major reformation took place in the Malaysian education system moving from the traditional assessment to implementation of school-based assessment (SBA) in both primary and secondary schools. In line with the government's move in revamping the assessment system, teachers are equally expected to be equipped with sound educational knowledge and skills in assessing student learning. Yet, studies revealed that ESL teachers lack solid knowledge in assessment literacy (Quyen & Khairani, 2017). Lian and Yew (2016) stated that teachers lacked assessment literacy knowledge and this created problems in assessing their students accurately. Teachers' low-level understanding of assessment literacy obstructed students from attaining their full potential. Literature showed that teachers do not

[1] Corresponding author.
E-mail address: charanjit@fbk.upsi.edu.mt

adhere to the main principles of educational assessment as recommended by scholars when assessing student learning (Rohaya, 2014; Nor Shidrah, Gilmore, & Mayo, 2013; Scoboria & Fisico, 2013).

According to Mertler (2005), teacher education programs are to blame because classroom assessment is not made a compulsory graduation requirement. Teacher education programs in Malaysia expose the student teachers to the theoretical aspects of classroom assessment at the surface level and not in-depth (Singh, 2018). Egan and Archer (1985) and Llosa (2008) have argued that teacher beliefs regarding assessment and the nature of learning, in general, can affect their evaluation of learner performance. Other disturbing problems include teachers' uncertainty on planning and deciding the most appropriate and beneficial assessment practices (Stiggins, Frisbie, & Griswold, 1989; Tek et al., 2020), lack of exposure to assessment training in Malaysia (Suah, 2012), poor assessment knowledge and skills caused discrepancies in using classroom assessment (Quyen & Khairani, 2017). In Malaysia, a few studies had been carried out on teachers' assessment practices and assessment literacy (Asri, 2007; Chang, 1988; Rohaya & Mohd Najid, 2008; Suah, 2012). Analysis carried out by the researcher on the related studies revealed that most of these studies were merely concerning (a) investigating assessment skills and knowledge among preservice teachers, (b) checking and evaluating in-service teachers on assessment, (c) teachers' needs in training on assessment practices, (d) students' views on the teachers' assessment practices and (e) teachers' knowledge on assessment for learning (AFL) during lessons. Less attention was given to developing an assessment literacy framework that the ESL teachers can use as a guide in comprehending what assessment approaches will give reliable data on learner achievement in the classroom. When the ESL teachers are well-versed with the assessment literacy framework, it will enhance their assessment capability.

2. Literature Review

The assessment literacy framework will enable the ESL teachers to assess student performance in the classroom. Disparity exists between ESL teachers' assessment practices and assessing students' learning quality (Mertler, 2005). According to Hashim (2003), teachers' belief of their teaching competency refers to their assessment of their teaching competence. Rohaya (2014) discovered that ESL teachers were unprepared to assess their students in their classrooms; these teachers lacked the requisite assessment knowledge and skills. The number of years of teaching experience significantly influenced teachers' perceptions of their knowledge and skills in assessment. Many factors such as teachers' orientation toward teaching focus on traditional assessment, curricular requirements and myths about using the correct assessment procedure inhibit assessment of student learning (Hashim, 2003; Alaa et al., 2019; Tek et al., 2021). Therefore, we need to look at how ESL teachers apply classroom assessment practices in teaching English. This study hopes to review past studies on ESL teachers' assessment literacy for measuring competencies and application of classroom assessment practices. The emphasis on social constructivist theory will assist teachers in designing assessment tasks that will involve students taking charge and being responsible for their learning through the use of different assessment tools.

2.1 Selection criteria

To identify appropriate studies, only one strategy was employed. First, the researchers conducted an electronic search in two main databases: Web of Science Core Collection and Scopus. It is based on the following criteria:

a) We used the keyword (Assessment* Literacy*) in any field and refined the search to the educational context.

b) The studies were from the period 2010 to 2020. This search generated 551 results. The last search was carried out in September 2020. The final sample included 65 studies covering teachers' assessment literacy. The articles reviewed were categorized based on teachers' formative and summative assessment, assessment knowledge and practices, methods of assessment: peer-assessment and self-assessment, reliability and validity, classroom assessment practices and portfolio assessment.
c) Past studies on English as a Second or Foreign language concentrating on teachers' assessment literacy.
d) Past studies gleaned and reviewed were published in proceedings and peer-reviewed journals published in Scopus and Web of Science.

2.2 Assessment literacy

Stiggins (1995) defined "Assessment literacy" as the ability to distinguish between sound and unsound assessment. Stiggins (1995) stated that assessment-literate teachers are acquainted with the content and learning outcome to be assessed; the purpose; the best way to assess students; develop quality instruments for evaluating student performance; were aware of potential problems with assessment; preventing the problem; and aware of the potential negative consequences of inaccurate assessment (Stiggins, 1995).

Scholars have reported that ESL teachers are very comfortable with the traditional examination, a practice deeply rooted in traditional pedagogical and assessment methods they experienced in their schooling (Singh & Arshad, 2013). In Malaysia, the education scenario emphasizes the number of A's scored by the students and this has somehow influenced teachers' classroom teaching (Gopala et al., 2014). ESL teachers are more prone to approach rote memorization and drilling-based exercises that would be tested in the final examinations that ultimately develop a memorization culture among students (Chan & Sidhu, 2011).

2.3 Theoretical Framework

The constructivist model assists learners in transforming information by creating new understandings arising when cognitive structures change (Gardner, 1991; Jackson, 1986). Given such demands, the study is intended to provide teachers assistance and guidance by developing an assessment literacy framework for teaching English so that the teachers can develop the best ways to assess knowledge and skills that will allow learners to reach their full potential. The constructivist approach encourages the development of an assessment literacy framework that teachers can use to measure their competencies and classroom assessment practices (Willis & Mehlinger, 1996). Combining constructivist theory in developing assessment literacy is likely to lead to meaningful learning to assess and facilitate students' knowledge and skills in learning (Rakes, Fields, & Cox, 2006).

This transformation can be neither mandated nor thwarted. Teachers' role in the constructivist model is unique in the sense that they can motivate students to learn by posing problems and structuring learning around primary concepts. While teachers appreciate students' points of view, the learner transform deeper understanding through rethinking former cognitive structures and ideas. Assessment in the constructivist paradigm is real and occurs naturally when the context is meaningful while involving student difficulties and problems (Brooks & Brooks, 1993). Authentic assessments relate to a specific body of knowledge, but unlike traditional tests, they encourage students to show what has been internalized personally through the application. The assessment literacy framework that will be developed can be the vehicle for authentic and meaningful assessment in a constructivist paradigm. Teachers can assess students' samples of work collated over some time frame to demonstrate how much learning has taken place. Assessing and instructing are inseparable and

mutually reinforcing in constructivism. In short, assessment through teaching, learning between teachers and students' interactions will inform the assessment. Thus, learning is monitored throughout the process.

The present study will investigate the current assessment literacy levels of in-service English teachers in Malaysia by developing an assessment literacy framework for in-service English Language teachers.

3. Classification of Teachers' Assessment Literacy

a) Formative assessment and summative assessment

A study by Muhammad Ilyas Mahmood et al. (2020) unearthed the reasons for the inability of undergraduates to perform in writing and how formative assessment assisted them in improving. Data were elicited through a survey among 100 male and 100 female undergraduates from different private and public universities in Punjab, Pakistan. The results showed that daily formative assessment can assist students to perform well in academic writing. The results align with that of Huot (1996), Ferris and Roberts (2001), Khan (2002) as well as Jan and Ways (2009). Students also could activate their critical thinking to write based on the instructor's guidance or questions. Black and Wiliam (1998) also found a high correlation between student progress in academic writing and formative assessment. Despite the positive impact of formative assessment, Muhammad Ilyas Mahmood et al. (2020) reported some disadvantages including the undergraduates finding time constraint of semesters as an obstruction for successful assessment implementation. Similarly, Widiastuti et al. (2020) reported incongruence between teachers' beliefs and formative assessment among selected junior school English teachers from different Continuing Professional Development (CPD) streams.

3.1 Assessment knowledge and principles

Siti Zulaiha et al. (2020) investigated teachers' views of classroom-based assessment. Twenty-two teachers took part in the study and data collection involved questionnaires, document analyses and interviews. Their findings suggest teachers mastered assessment principles and could apply these concepts into classroom practice. However, a mismatch occurred between teachers' mastery of assessment and its application into their teaching and learning process. Teachers divulged that they need support from the schools and stakeholders including parents to ease the assessment process and monitoring. Students' negative attitudes toward learning and poor attendance impeded the classroom assessment process. According to Ashraf and Zolfaghari (2018), assessment cannot be detached from the instructional process; hence teachers must find strategies to engage students in the process of assessment through classroom activities. Apart from assessing students for learning, teachers can also adopt assessments to track students' growth and achievement (Earl, 2003). Assessment is not limited to one purpose (Brown, 2004; Djoub, 2017) and teachers are aware of their roles in infusing assessment into classroom activities and professional practice (Abell & Siegel, 2011; Coombe et al., 2009). It is thus critical that educators possess adequate assessment literacy to evaluate, monitor and track student learning (DeLuca & Klinger, 2010; Koh, 2011; Koh et al., 2018).

A recent study conducted by Veloo, Ramlu and Khalid (2016) on selected English teachers in Malaysian secondary schools revealed that teachers' school-based assessment practices are at an average level. According to Jaba (2013), teachers are responsible for determining the output to be assessed, creating the assessment instrument, analyzing and reporting the assessment output and following up in school-based assessment. Achieving valid, reliable and accurate, assessment demands a strong grasp of assessment knowledge and skills (Veloo et al., 2016). Yet according to Rohaya (2014), ESL teachers in Malaysia were unable to understand and implement school-based assessment

(SBA) and implementation was at an unsatisfactory level. Teachers' inability to master the skills in implementing SBA and lack of knowledge affected their confidence in assessment (Chun, 2006). Other problems teachers faced include the inability to construct the examination instrument (Ruzlan, 2015; Suah, 2012). Nair et al. (2014) also revealed that teachers were biased and awarded high marks to their favorite students as they were unable to present a standard rubric showing transparency in allocating marks. All these issues discussed have some implications regarding teachers' feeble assessment practice and knowledge in implementing classroom assessment.

Another study carried out by Abdul Aziz (2011) showed that high school teachers in Malaysia have a very low level of understanding of test reliability. The findings revealed that high school teachers' understanding of testing is somewhat ambiguous and perplexing. The high school teachers interviewed did not exhibit a good understanding of reliability and its concept. Findings based on the interview transcripts indicate that the teachers generally did not follow some good models of test development practices particularly about using test specifications. These findings concur with Oescer and Kirby (1990) who showed most teachers admit their level of discomfort with the quality of tests they developed themselves. Several implications can be inferred from the reviews made. ESL teachers still lacked an understanding of the principles of testing. The development of the assessment literacy framework is important to equip teachers with the necessary assessment skills. The theoretical framework guiding this study is based on the development of an assessment literacy framework for teaching English within a constructivist learning approach based on Stiggins (1995). Second language assessment involves the cognitively demanding task using the constructivist-oriented pedagogical approach to encourage a transformation of traditional assessment to alternative assessment.

3.2 Methods of assessment: Peer-assessment and Self-assessment

Nejad and Mahfood (2019) conducted a study on the effectiveness of alternative assessments namely self and peer assessment in evaluating EFL students' oral presentation. Student attitudes toward self and peer assessment were examined. Sixty Iranian students enrolled in four advanced English courses formed the sample of the study. The researchers noted that peer assessment seems to be more practical than traditional assessment, a result reflected in past studies (e.g., Orsmond, Merry, & Reiling, 2000; Pope, 2005). At present, teachers and educators at the tertiary level are told to 'cooperate with students and train them to apply self and peer assessment' (Pantiwati & Husamah, 2017, p. 187). Learners can be guided in terms of their vital role in peer assessment and self-assessment. These two forms of assessment have received attention because they promote learner autonomy and independent learning and have pedagogical importance (Patri, 2002). Past studies revealed that self-assessment is viewed as practical and workable as it allows students to show more interest in learning and exhibit accountability and responsibility for their learning (Sadler & Good, 2006). Self-assessment can be standardized to augment students' dynamic and active involvement to show how they learn and reflect on their own learning experiences (Dochy, Segers, & Sluijsmans, 1999). Self-assessment has seen renewed interest in recent times in EFL teaching as it 'provides chances for students to reflect on their own learning experiences' (Ratminingsih, Marhaeni, & Vigayanti, 2018, p. 277). Meanwhile, past studies show that peer assessment plays a strong role in assisting student learning (Ballantyne, Hughes, & Mylonas, 2002; Carless, 2005). It also encourages autonomy in assessment (Bryant & Carless, 2010, p. 3). When students are involved in peer assessment they motivate their peers by providing comments (Chen, 2010). When assessing their peers' products, the students attain improvement and self-reflection (Chang, Tseng, & Lou, 2012). Despite these benefits, some students find peer assessment very challenging (Falchikov, 1986; Kearney, 2013).

3.3 Reliability and validity

Marshall et al. (2020) looked into comparative judgment (Pollitt, 2012) an approach that seeks to develop or report student assessment outcomes. This study is crucial as it explains the origins and process of comparative judgment to reliability and validity. The researchers discussed two studies that were evaluated to English assignments and secondary school statistics in New Zealand. A study by Nimehchisalem et al. (2019) to find out ESL teachers' and student's conceptions of the assessment showed that they view assessment as tests and scores. Teachers on the other hand were more concerned with standards and validity. Assessment is also viewed as anxiety inducing from both the students' and teachers' views. Additional interpretations emerging from the qualitative findings showed that teachers were familiar with terms such as validity, reliability, standardization, formative, summative, learning outcomes and time-consuming. Teachers were also aware of the need to know the fundamentals and principles of assessment, types of assessment and process for designing tests. Other interesting emerging themes extracted from both teachers and students showed assessment fear and anxiety. Both teachers and students are aware of the classroom assessment practices that include assignment, instruction and its process, reflection, transparency of assessment, checklist and feedback to improve student learning.

3.4 Classroom assessment practices

A mixed-method study conducted by Narathakoon et al. (2020) on the extent of primary school teachers' beliefs about classroom assessment in English showed that teachers frequently used final examination, mid-term examination and student observation for classroom assessment. Furthermore, the questionnaire findings showed teachers had a clear understanding of one of the most often used classroom assessment practices namely multiple choice followed by sentence completion. Findings obtained from stimulated recalls and classroom observation showed that teachers implemented assessment frequently in the classroom. The assessment practices comprised posing questions to the students, distribution of worksheets, read aloud and observation. The observation was deemed important because teachers wanted to track student learning progress by giving them feedback based on the worksheets or activities assigned. Also, teachers incorporated other classroom assessments including group work, games, role play, or translation. Teachers in this study did not implement self-assessment or peer-assessment projects.

Another study by Frey and Schmitt (2010) showed that teachers have some knowledge of different types of classroom assessment. The most apparent practice was on traditional paper-and-pencil testing. The teachers opted for standardized testing because they lacked training in test construction. Similarly, Wicking (2017) explored teachers' beliefs and classroom assessment practices among 148 English teachers in Japan; a survey was administered to look at teachers' mastery of assessment purpose, procedures and methods. The findings showed that teachers' classroom assessment practices focused on engaging students in the final examination. Another interesting finding was that teachers were unsure about applying assessment concerning their professional development. In the Turkey context, a study by Acar-Erdol and Yildizli (2018) among 288 teachers indicated that teachers still implement assessment of learning mainly on the end product of the assessment. There seems to be some incongruence between classroom assessment and teachers' beliefs due to different factors namely teacher's actual classroom practices, curriculum, technology, national examinations and students. A similar study based on teachers' beliefs about writing assessment was also conducted by Wang et al. (2020) based on a survey among 136 Chinese EFL teachers. Data were drawn from teachers' interviews. The findings revealed that EFL teachers were able to align their beliefs-practice with assessment for learning. It was apparent from the findings that AFL informs students to take charge of their learning, be more responsible and accountable where writing is involved. Teachers' classroom

assessment practices clearly show the knowledge that they implement for students to assess learning (McMillan, 2013). The shift is now infusing teaching and learning to support students' understanding rather than the emphasis on grades (Shepard, 2000). Over the last two decades, teachers have come to realize that classroom assessment is aimed at encouraging assessment for learning to produce students holistically (Black & Wiliam, 2009). However, classroom assessment today is still dominated by assessment of learning as in English as a foreign language (EFL) whereby students' writing tasks are assessed to produce summative results (Parr, 2013). Assessment for learning has the potential to improve classroom writing assessment (Lee, 2017). Teachers can use AFL to develop student achievement in English to sustain competencies (Bennett, 2011; Deneen & Boud, 2014; Leong & Tan, 2014). Teachers' competency and ability in relating assessment for learning are strongly linked to present definitions of assessment literacy (Deneen & Brown, 2016; Leong, 2016). High-stakes examinations are always the main focus of today's curricula, therefore the main purpose of assessment for learning is often neglected and given less attention (Deneen & Brown, 2016; Leong, 2016). For this reason, it is often very difficult for teachers to implement and develop activities for students based on assessment for learning. Deneen et al. (2019) conducted a study looking at teachers' intricate bond with assessment for learning. The researchers used survey methodology to investigate the AFL values, practices, and proficiencies of 1054 selected Singaporean secondary school teachers. Data obtained were analyzed using confirmatory and exploratory factor analysis. Findings revealed that teachers agreed that assessment must be aligned with the curriculum as they use the assessment to engage students in the learning process that includes peer and self-assessment. This finding is in line with many studies (e.g., Barnes, Fives, & Dacey, 2015; Bonner, 2016; Brown, 2008; Guskey, 2007; Gopal & Singh, 2020) concluding that teachers recognize assessment for learning to collect information about student learning and their active participation that would help to improve instruction. However, teachers are not confident when carrying out AFL due to a lack of autonomy to infuse new forms of assessment. Classroom assessment practices among secondary EFL students in China were examined by Gan et al. (2020). Past studies reviewed discussed mostly classroom assessment practices by the teachers but the study conducted by Gan et al. (2020) examined EFL students' classroom assessment practices. The researchers developed a questionnaire to elicit feedback from 198 students. Findings showed that assessment practices in the class were still dominated by teachers; however, findings showed that self-assessment and informal assessment between teacher-student proved to be the predictor of students' success that contributed to positive attitudes and intrinsic motivation. This is supported by Knoch and Macqueen (2017) that assessment processes are apparent in foreign or second language education regardless of the teaching approaches employed. The types of assessment carried out were class discussion, self-assessment, peer-assessment, observations by teachers, teacher feedback to students and also mid-term and final-exam (Knoch & Macqueen, 2017; Purpura, 2016; Ichsan et al., 2021). Most of the L2 classroom assessment research has focused on teacher beliefs and knowledge (e.g., Choi & Leung, 2017; Davison & Leung, 2009; Leung, 2009; Rea-Dickins, 2007), high stakes examinations including external and updating reports on classroom assessment practices (Davidson, 2004), teachers' assessment knowledge, practices and marking student work based on grades (Cheng, Rogers, & Wang, 2008; Cheng & Sun, 2015).Shen et al. (2020) researched how peer assessment affected learner autonomy among 70 English major students in China. Since in China more emphasis is on teacher-centered and exam-oriented instruction (Deng & Carless, 2010), this resulted in Chinese students demonstrating little self-study (Chen, 2006; Guo & Qin, 2010). So, these students later in tertiary studies find it difficult to adapt to the English language courses and classes (Xu, 2014). To assist the students, autonomous learning was introduced as a part of the education reform in China (Lin, 2018). Peer assessment was deemed important as an approach to teaching English because it has the potential to improve student motivation for learning (Adachi, Tai, & Dawson, 2018; Shih, 2011; Zhao, 2010). Peer assessment, also recognized as peer review, refers to 'an interaction process in

which learners are given a platform to have dialogues connected to performance and standards' (Liu, & Carless, 2006, p. 280; Yunus et al., 2021). Peer assessment is seen as formative assessment and collaborative learning in the second language (L2) writing; it enables the writers to share their texts to understand others' explanations (Hyland, 2000). Students can improve their writing with peer feedback (Zhao, 2010), it creates awareness and motivates students to write (Shih, 2011), and assists students by improving their creative and critical thinking (Joordens, Pare, & Pruesse, 2009).

3.5 Portfolio assessment

A study conducted by Arumugham (2019) on teachers' understanding and knowledge on portfolio assessment among selected primary school students showed that teachers encourage students to keep the portfolio to track their learning progress. Feedback is compulsory to be given to the student each time the student compiles the materials in the portfolios. A similar study by Singh et al. (2015) showed that teachers adhered to certain guidelines before implementing portfolio assessment. Their study developed a portfolio assessment model based on classroom observations made over some time. The researchers stated clearly the processes involved including stating the purpose of having the portfolio assessment, appropriate planned activities, students' selection of the best work to indicate their performance, teacher feedback and remedial and enhancement activities for both able and moderate learners. In another similar study in Malaysia, Singh et al. (2017) studied lecturers' assessment practices in some selected higher learning institutions. Their findings revealed that lecturers implemented some techniques such as peer assessment and oral questioning; lecturers provided feedback to correct students' answers. Peer assessment allowed students to give comments during presentations so that they can correct each other's mistakes and then provide constructive feedback. Singh and Arshad Abdul Samad (2013) conducted a qualitative study examining ESL teachers' portfolio assessment implementation in Malaysian secondary schools. Classroom observations and interviews with the nine participating teachers showed that, with portfolio implementation, students were found able to monitor their learning. Nevertheless, teachers also mentioned portfolio assessment drawbacks including time constraints and storing of student portfolios.

4. Discussion

A review of past studies showed that teachers to some extent have a good mastery of assessment literacy that indicates teachers have sound and clear knowledge when it comes to assessment and its implementation. They were able to associate assessment with the belief system, learner autonomy, motivation, peer assessment, self-assessment, dynamic assessment, alternative assessment, formative assessment, summative assessment and also centralized examination. Some of the past studies reviewed showed the combination of employing both summative and formative assessment. Teachers have a clear understanding in terms of the selected-response format and constructed-response format. Teachers observed student learning so that they could provide feedback to students who have difficulties in understanding the content taught.

Teachers assess students through a variety of classroom activities, worksheets, group work, role-play, games, presentation and read-aloud and posing questions to students based on units or topics taught (Singh et al., 2020); Mulyadi et al., 2021). Some past studies reviewed show that teachers can complement summative assessment together with the formative and alternative assessments. Teachers also must comprehend the principles of language assessment that should be applied to formal tests and also other types of assessment of all kinds. Based on the past studies reviewed, issues on practicality were not discussed extensively; more emphasis was given to assess reliability and validity. Findings from the past studies did indicate teachers' concern over issues including scoring of assessment tasks and students' negative attitudes to assessments. Teachers shared that lack of training impedes their attempts to experiment with more activities that can allow them to assess student performance.

Findings from portfolio assessment showed that teacher classroom assessment practices are also affected by contextual factors such as time constraints (Acar-Erdol &Yildizli, 2008; Chan, 2008) and inadequate assessment knowledge (Vandeyar & Killen, 2007). Teachers with CPD tend to show high mastery of assessment knowledge as compared to teachers with low CPD exposure. Teachers lacking in professional training may have problems assessing student learning in the classroom. Teachers have obtained some knowledge during their undergraduate study but that knowledge is only able to assist them theoretically and not practically. Therefore, teachers must have more training in assessment before applying that knowledge in daily classroom practice.

5. Conclusion

SL/EFL teachers should be guided and trained to participate in training that can expose them to different classroom assessment techniques. Teachers should also be exposed to the principles of assessment that they can adhere to when making decisions about student learning and achievement in the classroom. Teachers have exposure to theoretical aspects learned during their undergraduate studies; however, more hands-on training and CPD are required for them to apply the practical knowledge in the real classroom setting. Teachers must also understand the purpose of assessment is to measure learners' ability within a classroom unit based on the curriculum. Teachers can incorporate formative assessment and thereby help students to form their competencies and skills to help them to continue that growth process.

Acknowledgments

This research has been carried out under the Fundamental Research Grants Scheme 2019-0151-107-02 (FRGS/1/2019/SS109/UPSI/02/18) provided by the Ministry of Education of Malaysia. The authors would like to extend their gratitude to Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris (UPSI) that helped manage the grants. Equally, we would like to thank the participating in-service teachers who were truly cooperative and marvellous.

References

Alaa, M., Albakri, I. S. M. S., Singh, C. K. S., Hammed, H., Zaidan, A. A., Zaidan, B. B., Albahri, O. S., Alsalem, M. A., Salih, M. M., Almahdi, E. M., Baqer, M. J., Jalood, N. S., Nidhal, S., Shareef, A. H., & Jasim, A. N. (2019). Assessment and ranking framework for the English skill of pre-service teachers based on fuzzy delphi and TOPSIS methods. *IEEE Access, 7*, 126201-126223. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2019.2936898

Abell, S.K., Siegel, M.A. (2011). Assessment literacy: What science teachers need to know and be able to do. In J.D.D. Corrigan & R. Gunstone (Eds.), *The Professional knowledge base of science teaching, 12*, pp. 205-221. Dordrecht: Springer.

Acar-Erdol, T., & Yıldızlı, H. (2018). Classroom assessment practices of teachers in Turkey. *International Journal of Instruction, 11*(3), 587-602. doi: https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2018.11340a.

Adachi, C., Tai, J. H., & Dawson, P. (2018). Academics' perceptions of the benefits and challenges of self and peer assessment in higher education. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 43*(2), 294–306. doi: 10.1080/02602938.2017. 1339775

Alkharusi, H. (2011). Psychometric properties of the teacher assessment literacy questionnaire for preservice teachers in Oman. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 29*, 1614-1624.

Arumugham, K. S. (2019). Teachers' Understanding Towards Portfolio Assessment: A Case Study Among Malaysian Primary School Teachers. *Problems of Education In The 21stcentury, 7*(6), 695-704.

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

Association (AFT/NCME/NEA). (1990). Standards for teacher competence in educational assessment of students. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 9*(4), 30-32.

Ballantyne, R., Hughes, K., & Mylonas, A. (2002). Developing procedures for implementing peer assessment in large classes using an action research process. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 27*(5), 427-441.

Barnes, N., Fives, H., & Dacey, C. M. (2015). *Teachers' beliefs about assessment*. In H. Fives & M. Gregoire Gill (Eds.), International handbook of research on teacher beliefs (pp. 284-300). New York, NY: Routledge.

Bennett, R. E. (2011). Formative assessment: A critical review. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 18(1), 5-25.*

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy and Practice, 5*(1), 7-74.

Bonner, S. M. (2016). Teachers' perceptions about assessment: Competing narratives. In G. T. L. Brown,& L. R. Harris (Eds.), Handbook of human and social conditions in assessment (pp. 21-39). New York, NY: Routledge.

Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices*. New York: Pearson Education.

Brown, G. T. L. (2008). *Conceptions of assessment: Understanding what assessment means to teachers and students*. New York: Nova Science Publishers.

Brookhart, S. M. (2011). Educational assessment knowledge and skills for teachers. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 30*(1), 3-12.

Brooks, J. G., & Brooks, M. G. (1993). *In search of understanding: The case for constructivist classrooms. Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.*

Bryant, D. A., & Carless, D. R. (2010). Peer assessment in a test-dominated setting: Empowering, boring or facilitating examination preparation?. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice, 9*(1), 3-15.

Carless, D. (2005). Prospects for the implementation of assessment for learning. *Assessment in Education*: *Principles, Policy & Practice, 12*(1), 39-54.

Chan, W. M. (2013). *Combining electronic commenting and face-to-face interaction in peer review: A case study of the ESL writing classroom in Hong Kong.* (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hong Kong).

Chan., F. Y., & Sidhu, G. K. (2011). School-based assessment among ESL teachers in Malaysian secondary schools. *Malaysian Education Deans' Council Journal, 9*, 75-87.

Chang, C.-C., Tseng, K.-H., & Lou, S.-J. (2012). A comparative analysis of the consistency and difference among teacher-assessment, student self-assessment and peer-assessment in a Web-based

portfolio assessment environment for high school students. *Computers & Education, 58*(1), 303-320.

Chen, C.-h. (2010). The implementation and evaluation of a mobile self-and peer-assessment system. *Computers & Education, 55*(1), 229-236.

Chen, D. (2006). Shi lun zi zhu xue xi zai wo guo da xue ying yu jiao xue zhong de ding wei [A probe into an orientation of autonomous learning to college English teaching in China]. *Foreign Language World, 3,* 32–37.

Cheng, L., Rogers, T., & Wang, X. (2008). Assessment purposes and procedures in ESL/EFL classrooms. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 33*(1), 9–32.

Cheng, L., & Sun, Y. (2015). Teachers‟ grading decision making: Multiple influencing factors and methods. *Language Assessment Quarterly, 12*(2), 213–233.

Choi, T.-H., & Leung, C. (2017). Uses of first and foreign languages as learning resources in a foreign language classroom. *The Journal of Asia TEFL, 14*, 587–604.

Coombe, C., Al-Hamly, M., & Troudi, S. (2009). Foreign and second language teacher assessment literacy: Issues, challenges and recommendations. *Research Notes, 38*(3), 14-18.

Chun, L. Y. (2006). *Practice and challenges of school-based formative assessment*. Presentation at the Conference of International Association for Educational Assessment: Assessment in an Era of Rapid Change: Innovations and Best Practices, Singapore.

Clark, I. (2012). Formative assessment: A systematic and artistic process of instruction for supporting school and lifelong learning. *Canadian Journal of Education, 35*(2), 24- 40. doi: 10.1007/s10648-011-9191-6

Coffey, J. E., Hammer, D., Levin, D. M., & Grant, T. (2011). The missing disciplinary substance of formative assessment. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48*(10), 1109-1136. doi: 10.1002/tea.20440

Davison, C. (2004). The contradictory culture of teacher-based assessment: ESL teacher assessment practices in Australian and Hong Kong secondary schools. *Language Testing, 21*, 305–334.

Davison, C., & Leung, C. (2009). Current issues in English language teacher-based assessment. *TESOL Quarterly, 43*(3), 393–415.

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. doi: 10.1080/0969594X.2010.516643

Deng, C., & Carless, D. (2010). Examination preparation or effective teaching: Conflicting priorities in the implementation of a pedagogic innovation. *Language Assessment Quarterly, 7,* 285–302.

Deneen, C. C., & Boud, D. (2014). Patterns of resistance in managing assessment change. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 39*(5), 577-591.

Deneen, C. C., & Brown, G. T. L. (2016). The impact of conceptions of assessment-on-assessment literacy in a teacher education program. *Cogent Education, 3*(1), 1e14.

Deneen, C. C., Fulmer, G. W., Brown, G. T. L., Tan, K., Leong, W. S., Tay, H. Y. (2019). Value, practice and proficiency: Teachers' complex relationship with assessment for learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 80,* 39-47. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.12.022.

Derrick, J., & Ecclestone, K. (2006). *Formative assessment in adult literacy, language and numeracy programmes: A literature review for the OECD*, DRAFT.

Djoub, Z. (2017). Revisiting EFL Assessment. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007 /978-3-319-32601-6

Dochy, F., Segers, M., & Sluijsmans, D. (1999). The use of self-, peer and co-assessment in higher education: A review. *Studies in Higher education, 24*(3), 331-350.

Earl, L. (2003). *Using Assessment to Motivate Learning. In Assessment as learning: Using classroom assessment to maximize student learning* (pp. 67-77). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Egan, O., & Archer, P. (1985). The accuracy of teachers' ratings of ability: A regression model. *American Educational Research Journal, 2*(2), 25–34.

Falchikov, N. (1986). Product comparisons and process benefits of collaborative peer group and self assessments. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 11*(2), 146-166.

Ferris, D, & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*(3), 161-184.

Fook, C. Y., & Sidhu, G. K. (2011). School-based assessment among ESL teachers in Malaysian secondary schools. *Malaysian Education Deans' Council Journal, 9*, 75-87.

Frey, B. B., & Schmitt, V. L. (2010). Teachers' classroom assessment practices. *Middle Grades Research Journal, 5*(3), 107-117.

Gan, Z., He, J., & Liu, F. (2019). Understanding Classroom Assessment Practices and Learning Motivation in Secondary EFL Students. *The Journal of Asia TEFL, 16*(3), 783-800. doi: 10.18823/asiatefl.2019.16.3.2.783

Gardner, H. (1991b). *The Unschooled Mind: How children think and how schools should teach*. New York: Basic Books.

Gopala, K.S.N., Roszainora Setia, Nor Zaitolakma Abdul Samad. Raja Nurul Huda Raja Zahri, Azyanee Luqman, V. Thenmolli, & Haslina Che Ngah. (2014). Teachers' knowledge and issues in the implementation of school-based assessment: A case of schools in Terengganu. *Asian Social Science, 10*(3), 186-194.

Gopal, R., Singh, C.K.S. (2020). Arising reading patterns in understanding literary texts. *Studies in English Language and Education, 7*(2), 407–420.

Guo, Y., & Qin, X. (2010). Yan jiu sheng ying yu zi zhu xue xi neng li ji xiang guan yingnxiang yin su de yan jiu [A study of postgraduates' autonomous English learning competence and influential factors]. *Journal of Beijing International Studies University, 6*, 66–71.

Guskey, T. R. (2007). Multiple sources of evidence: An analysis of stakeholders' perceptions of various indicators of student learning. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 26*(1), 19-27.

Hashim, R. (2003). Malaysian Teachers' Attitudes, Competency and Practices in the Teaching of Thinking. *Intellectual Discourse, 11*(1), 27-50.

Huot, B. (1996). Toward a new theory of writing assessment. *College Composition and Communication, 47*(4), 549- 566.

Hussain, S., Shaheen, N., Ahmad, N., & Islam, S. U. (2019). Teachers' classroom assessment practices: challenges and opportunities to classroom teachers in Pakistan. *Dialogue, 14*(1), 88-97.

Hyland, F. (2000). ESL writers and feedback: Giving more autonomy to students. *Language Teaching Research, 4*(1), 33–54.

Ichsan, I. Z., Rahmayanti, H., Purwanto, A., Sigit, D. V., Kurniawan, E., Tanjung, A., Panjaitan, R. G. P., Pertiwi, N & Singh, C. K. S. (2021). Thinking Level in Education: A Complete Revision of Anderson's Taxonomy. *Pedagogika, 141*, 53-78

Jackson, P.W. (1986). *The practice of teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Jan, W., & Ways, LW. (2009). *Modelling writing forms* (3rd ed.). South Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Joordens, S., Pare, D. E., & Pruesse, K. (2009). PeerScholar: An evidence-based online peer assessment tool supporting critical thinking and clear communication. In *Proceedings of the 2009 International Conference on E-Learning* (pp. 236–240).

Karimi, M. N., & Shafiee, Z. (2014). Iranian EFL teachers' perceptions of dynamic assessment: Exploring the role of education and length of service. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 39*(8), 143-162. https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2014v39n8.10

Kearney, S. (2013). Improving engagement: the use of 'Authentic self-and peer-assessment for learning' to enhance the student learning experience. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 38*(7), 875-891.

Koh, K. H. (2011). Improving teachers' assessment literacy through professional development. *Teaching Education, 22*(3), 255-276. doi: 10.1080/10476210 .2011.593164

Koh, K., Burke, L. E. C. A., Luke, A., Gong, W., & Tan, C. (2018). Developing the assessment literacy of teachers in Chinese language classrooms: A focus on assessment task design. *Language Teaching Research, 22*(3), 264–288. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/ 1362168816684366

Knoch, U., & Macqueen, S. (2017). Assessment in the L2 classroom. In S. Loewen & M. Sato (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of instructed second language acquisition* (pp.181–202). New York, NY: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.

Khan, H. (2002). *Developing Students' Writing Skills Through Feedback*. Master's Dissertation, Unpublished. Karachi, Pakistan: Aga Khan University.

Kuze, M. W., & Shumba, A. (2011). An Investigation into formative assessment practices of teachers in selected schools in fort beaufort in South Africa. *Journal of Social Sciences, 29*(2), 159-170. doi: 10.1080/09718923.2011.11892966

Leong, W. S. (2014). Knowing the intentions, meaning and context of classroom assessment: A case study of Singaporean teachers' conceptions and practices. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 43*, 70-78.

Leong, W. S. (2016). Teachers' assessment literacies and practices: Developing a professional competency and learning framework. *Advances in Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 2*(2), 1-20.

Lee, I. (2017). *Classroom writing assessment and feedback in L2 school contexts*. Singapore: Springer.

Leung, C. (2009). Developing formative teacher assessment: Knowledge, practice, and change. *Language Assessment Quarterly, 1*, 19–41.

Lim Hooi Lian & Wun Thiam Yew, (2016, May). A Framework for Examining Assessment Literacy of Preservice Teachers. *US-China Education Review A, 6*(5), 294-300. doi: 10.17265/2161-623X/2016.05.003

Lin, L. (2018). Da xue ying yu cu jin xue xi zhe zi zhu yan jiu: Fang fa wen ti yu si kao-Ji yu 2004-2017 nian wai yu lei CSSCI qi kan wen xian fen xi [promoting learner autonomy in college English teaching—Methods, problems, and implications: A literature review of CSSCI journals of foreign languages published from 2004 to 2017]. *Foreign Language World, 5,* 80–88.

Llosa, L. (2008). Building and supporting a validity argument for a standards-based classroom assessment of English proficiency based on teacher judgments. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 27*(3), 32–42.

McMillan, J. M. (2013). Why we need research on classroom assessment? In J. H.McMillan (Ed.). *Sage handbook of research on classroom research* (pp. 3-16). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Mertler, C. A., & Campbell, C. (2005). *Measuring teachers' knowledge and application of classroom assessment concepts: Development of the "Assessment Literacy Inventory."* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, QC.

Min, H. T. (2005). Training students to become successful peer reviewers. *System, 33*(2), 293–308.

Muhammad Ilyas Mahmood, Mubashra Mobeen and Muhammad Ahmad Hashmi. (2020). A Study of the Perception of Undergraduates about the Role of Formative Assessment in the Improvement of English Writing Skill. *Int J Edu Sci, 28*(1-3), 1-6(2020). doi: 10.31901/24566322.2020/28.1-3.1081

Mulyadi, D., Wijayatiningsih, T. D., Singh, C. K. S., & Prastikawati, E. F. (2021). Effects of technology enhanced task-based language teaching on learners' listening comprehension and speaking performance. *International Journal of Instruction, 14*(3), 717-736. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2021.14342a

Muñoz, A. P., Palacio, M., & Escobar, L. (2012). Teachers' beliefs about assessment in an EFL context in Colombia. *Profile Issues in Teachers Professional Development, 14*(1), 143-158.

Narathakoon, A., Sapsirin, S., & Subphadoongchone, P. (2020). Beliefs and Classroom Assessment Practices of English Teachers in Primary Schools in Thailand. *International Journal of Instruction, 13*(3), 137-156.

Nejad, A. M., & Mahfoodh, O. H. A. (2019). Assessment of Oral Presentations: Effectiveness of Self-, Peer-, and Teacher Assessments. *International Journal of Instruction, 12*(3), 615-632. doi: 10.29333/iji.2019.12337a

Nor Shidrah Mat Daud, Gilmore, A., & Mayo, H. E. (2013). Exploring the potency of peer evaluation to develop critical thinking for tertiary academic writing. *World Applied Sciences Journal, 21*, 109-116.

Orsmond, P., Merry, S., & Reiling, K. (2000). The use of student derived marking criteria in peer and self-assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 25*(1), 23-38.

Pantiwati, Y., & Husamah. (2017). Self and peer assessments in active learning model to increase metacognitive awareness and cognitive abilities. *International Journal of Instruction, 10*(4), 185-202.

Parr, J. (2013). Classroom assessment in Writing. In J. H. McMillan (Ed.) *Sage handbook of research on classroom assessment* (pp. 489-501). Los Angeles: Sage.

Pope, N. K. L. (2005). The impact of stress in self-and peer assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 30*(1), 51-63.

Purpura, J. E. (2016). Second and foreign language assessment. *Modern Language Journal, 100,* 190–208.

Quyen, N. T. D., & Khairani, A. Z. (2017). Reviewing the challenges of implementing formative assessment in Asia: The need for a Professional Development Program. *Journal of Social Science Studies, 4*(1), 160-177.

Rakes, G. C., Fields, V. S., & Cox, K. E. (2006). The Influence of Teachers' Technology Use on Instructional Practices. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 38*(4), 411-426.

Ratminingsih, N., Marhaeni, A., & Vigayanti, L. (2018). Self-assessment: The effect on students' independence and writing competence. *International Journal of Instruction, 11*(3), 277-290.

Rea-Dickins, P. (2007). Classroom-based assessment: Possibilities and pitfalls. In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 505–520). New York, NY: Springer.

Rohaya Talib, Mohd Zaki Kamsah, Hamimah Abu Naim, & Adibah Abdul Latif. (2014). From principle to practice: Assessment for learning in Malaysian school-based assessment classroom. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Education, 4*(4), 850-857.

Sadler, P. M., & Good, E. (2006). The impact of self-and peer-grading on student learning. *Educational Assessment, 11*(1), 1-31.

Shen, B., Bai, B., & Xue, W. (2020). The effects of peer assessment on learner autonomy: An empirical study in a Chinese college English writing class. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 64,* 100-821. doi: 10.1016/j.stueduc.2019.100821

Shepard, L. A. (2000). The role of assessment in a learning culture. *Educational Researcher, 29*(7), 4-14.

Shih, R. C. (2011). Can Web 2.0 technology assist college students in learning English writing? Integrating Facebook and peer assessment with blended learning. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 27*(5), 829–845.

Singh, C. K. S., Othman Lebar, Napisah Kepol, Rafiah Abdul Rahman, & Kurotol Aini Muhammad Mukhtar. (2017). An observation of classroom assessment practices among lecturers in selected Malaysian Higher Learning Institutions. *Malaysian Journal of Learning and Instruction, 14*(1), 23-61.

Singh, C. K. S., & Samad, A. A. (2013). Portfolio as an Assessment Tool and Its Implementation in Malaysian ESL Classrooms: A Study in Two Secondary Schools. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities, 21*(4), 1255–1273.

Singh, C. K. S., Samad, A. A., Hussin, H., & Sulaiman, T. (2015). Developing a Portfolio Assessment Model for the Teaching and Learning of English in Malaysia L2 Classroom. *English Language Teaching, 8*(7), 164.

Singh, C. K. S., Gopal, R., Tek, O. E., Masa Singh, T. S., Mostafa, N. A., & Ambar Singh R. K. (2020). ESL teachers' strategies to foster higher-order thinking skills to teach writing. *Malaysian Journal of Learning and Instruction, 17*(2), 195-226. https://doi.org/10.32890/mjli2020.17.2.7

Siti Zulaiha, Herri Mulyono, & Lies Ambarsari. (2020). An Investigation into EFL Teachers' Assessment Literacy: Indonesian Teachers' Perceptions and Classroom Practice. *European Journal of Contemporary Education, 9*(1), 189-201.

Stiggins, R. J., & Conklin, N. F. (1995). I*n teachers' hands: Investigating the practices of classroom assessment*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Stiggins, R. J., Frisbie, D. A., & Griswold, P. A. (1989). Inside high school grading practices: Building a research agenda. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practices, 8*(2), 5-14.

Suah, S. L., & S. L. Ong. (2012). Investigating assessment practices of in-service teachers. *International Online Journal of Education Sciences, 4*(1), 91-106.

Tek, O. E., Govindasamy, D., Singh, C. K. S., Ibrahim, M. N., Wahab, N. A., Borhan, M. T., & Wei Tho, S. W. (2021). The 5e Inquiry Learning Model: Its Effect on The Learning of Electricity Among Malaysian Students. *Cakrawala Pendidikan, 40*(1), 170-182.

Tek O. E., Singh, C. K. S., Lay, Y. F., Singh, T. S. M., &Yunus. M. M. (2020). Conceptual Approach to Cooperative Learning: Its Effect on the Learning of Conceptual Approach among the Pre-service Biology Teachers. *Universal Journal of Educational Research, 8*(5), 1980-1990. DOI: 10.13189/ujer.2020.080535.

Vandeyar, S., & Killen, R. (2007). Educators' conceptions and practice of classroom assessments in post-apartheid South Africa. *South African J of Edu, 27*(1), 101-115.

Veloo, A., Ramli, R., & Khalid, R. (2016). Assessment Practices among English Teachers in Malaysian Secondary Schools. *International Journal for Infonomics (IJI), 9*(4).

Wen, M. L., & Tsai, C.-C. (2006). University students' perceptions of and attitudes toward (online) peer assessment. *Higher Education, 51*(1), 27–44.

Wicking, P. (2017). The assessment beliefs and practices of English teachers in Japanese Universities. *JLTA Journal, 20,* 76-89.

Widiastuti, I. A. M. S., Mukminatien, N., Prayogo, J. A., & Irawati, E. (2020). Dissonances between Teachers' Beliefs and Practices of Formative Assessment in EFL Classes. *International Journal of Instruction, 13*(1), 71-84. doi.org/10.29333/iji.2020.1315a

Willis, J., & Mehlinger, H. (1996). Information technology and teacher education. In J. Sikula (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education.* (pp. 978-1028). New York: Macmillan.

Xu, J. (2014). Wo guo da xue sheng ying yu zi zhu xue xi neng li xian zhuang yu si kao [the current situation and reflection on Chinese college students' autonomous English learning abilities]. *Language and Education, 2*(4), 2–7.

Xu, Y., & Brown, G. T. L. (2017). University English teacher assessment literacy: A survey-test report from China. *Language Testing and Assessment, 6*(1).

Yang, Y. F., & Meng, W. T. (2013). The effects of online feedback training on students' text revision. *Language Learning and Technology, 17*(2), 220–238.

Yu, S., & Lee, I. (2016). Exploring Chinese students' strategy use in a cooperative peer feedback writing group. *System, 58,* 1–11.

Yunus, M. M., Thambirajah, V., Said, N. E. M. & Singh, C. K. S. (2021). Designing a module as a strategic solution to enhance creativity in the teaching of writing. *International Journal of English Language and Literature Studies,* 94-104.

Zhao, H. (2010). Investigating learners' use and understanding of peer and teacher feedback on writing: A comparative study in a Chinese English writing classroom. *Assessing Writing, 15*(1), 3–17.

Zheng, C. (2012). Understanding the learning process of peer feedback activity: An ethnographic study of exploratory practice. *Language Teaching Research, 16*(1), 109–126.

AUTHOR BIODATA

Charanjit Kaur Swaran Singh is an associate professor at the Faculty of Languages and Communication, Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris.

Harsharan Kaur Jaswan Singh is a PhD candidate at the Faculty of Languages and Communication.

Tarsame Singh Masa Singh an Associate Professor at the Institute of Teacher Education, Tuanku Bainun Campus, Pulau Pinang.

Sasigaran Moneyam is the Director of Centre for Languages and General Studies (CEFLAGS), Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris.

Nadiah Yan Abdullah is a language teacher at the Centre for Languages and General Studies (CEFLAGS), Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris.

Muhamad Fadzllah Zaini is a senior lecturer at the Faculty of Languages and Communication, Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris.