



EFL teacher educators' writing assessment literacy: Knowledge, beliefs, and practices

Yosieka Maharani^{✉1}, Dyah Sunggingwati¹, Effendi Limbong¹

¹Universitas Mulawarman, Indonesia

Article Info

Article History:
Received on 20 May
2024
Approved on 29
November 2024
Published on 30
November 2024

*Keywords: Writing
assessment literacy;
teacher educators;
writing skill*

Abstract

In the Indonesia context, there have been merely a small number of studies exploring teacher educators' writing assessment literacy. The study aimed to identify and address teacher educators' writing assessment literacy, as assessments serve two primary objectives: evaluating what students have accomplished in writing and improving their writing learning processes. This study adopted Crusan et al., (2016) framework, which focuses on knowledge, beliefs and practices. Two teacher educators from a private university and an Islamic private university participated to provide the data of their writing assessment literacy which were gathered from questionnaire, interviews and documents. The findings revealed that teacher educators' knowledge is shaped by their course writing activities, which focus on teaching academic writing, preparing students for IELTS, attending prior education programs, gaining teaching experience, and engaging in self-learning. However, their beliefs about writing assessment vary, influenced by challenges such as students' poor organization of ideas, disorganized structures, grammatical errors, limited class time, and low vocabulary mastery. Additional factors such as heavy workloads, subjectivity in grading, and maintaining accurate assessment practices also shaped their beliefs. In practice, teacher educators commonly used IELTS Writing Tasks and self-assessment for student reflection, but only one utilized portfolio assessment. Scoring rubrics were mostly adapted from research papers and the IELTS Writing Band Descriptors. These findings highlight the need for targeted professional development to enhance teacher educators' assessment literacy, particularly in diversifying assessment tools and addressing subjective and workload challenges. Supporting teacher educators in these areas could lead to more consistent and effective writing assessment practices.

[✉]Correspondence Address:
Universitas Mulawarman
Jl. Kuaro, Gn Kelua, Kota Samarinda,
Kalimantan Timur 75119
E-mail: yosimhrni@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Assessment plays an essential role in the teaching and learning processes (Cimen, 2022). However, several challenges during the assessment process have been identified, including teacher educators lacking the understanding to implement assessment effectively, struggling due to students' performance, and limited time to provide feedback (Prihantoro & Hermawan, 2021). Therefore, teacher educators must possess a range of skills and knowledge related to assessments literacy. This is necessary to promote teaching and learning, as assessment literacy enables teacher educators to design valid, reliable, and fair evaluations that enhance student outcomes (Davies, 2008). It includes selecting and developing appropriate assessment methods, administering and interpreting assessments, making decisions based on assessment results, planning marking standards, communicating results to stakeholders, recognizing test ethics principles, recording assessment data professionally, and having knowledge of quality assurance and control issues in assessment and testing.

In teaching writing, assessments have two objectives: to evaluate students' writing accomplishments and to improve their writing learning processes (Kong et al., 2022). However, the application of assessments in writing instruction has many challenges. Lee et al., (2019), identified key obstacles, including time limitations, insufficient knowledge and abilities of teacher educators, students lack of readiness, and lack of support from colleagues. Similarly, Bañales et al., (2020) listed several barriers that teachers encountered in writing classes such as knowledge distinguishing writing instruction, writing assessment, supporting the writing process, teaching writing genres, and employing pedagogical teaching approaches.

Additionally, earlier studies have addressed several issues related to the time-consuming nature of writing assessments, which can lack consistency and objectivity (Almusharraf & Alotaibi, 2022), and the lack of reliability (Ramesh & Sanampudi, 2022). Students also have limited opportunities for feedback on the content of their writing (Zhai & Ma, 2022), and teachers often face challenges in providing adequate feedback while managing time constraints. Rao & Li (2017) and Attali (2016) noted that teacher experience and rating practices further influence assessment outcomes, while Nenotek et al., (2022) highlighted the difficulties teacher educators face in addressing errors in all aspects of academic writing such as content and mechanics.

Given these challenges, assessment literacy is crucial for teacher educators to promote effective language learning. Davies (2008), defines language assessment literacy as a component of skills, knowledge, and principles. Skills refer to teachers' competency in techniques for developing tests and analyzing test outcomes. Knowledge refers to teachers' knowledge of assessment theories, language learning, and pedagogy. Principles refers to teachers' practical understanding, such as test ethics, objectivity, impact, and professionalism. Fulcher (2012) further defines assessment literacy as categorized into practical knowledge, theoretical and procedural knowledge, and an understanding of the socio-historical context. Contextual factors may arise from the specific context (e.g., subject taught and teaching grade), school and community (e.g., student characteristics, school support, teaching environments), or macro-social factors (e.g., examination culture) (Z. Yan et al., 2022).

Crusan et al., (2016) suggest that assessment literacy integrates content delivery with teachers' knowledge, beliefs, and practices, enabling them to distinguish between accurate and inaccurate assessments. Teacher educators with adequate assessment literacy are better equipped to design reliable and effective assessments (Latif, 2021). Thus, developing assessment literacy is essential for ensuring the construction of accurate and reliable assessment methods that can significantly improve teaching and learning outcomes (Khadijeh & Amir, 2015).

According to Weigle (2007), writing assessment literacy is a group of skills that must be mastered by teachers, such as developing, administering, and scoring writing tasks. Writing teachers must define and measure course objectives, use formal and informal assessment methods, provide constructive feedback, select reliable scoring methods, and interpret results to improve instruction (Cushing Weigle, 2002). Crusan et al., (2016) further categorized writing assessment literacy into three main concepts: teachers' knowledge of writing assessment, their beliefs about the assessment of writing, and their writing assessment practices.

According to Crusan et al., (2016), teacher's knowledge of writing assessment is a fundamental aspect of assessment literacy. It includes understanding key principles such as the creation and application of fair assessments, the development of scoring rubrics, and the interpretation of assessment result to evaluate students' writing abilities effectively. Teacher must be knowledgeable about both formative and summative assessments, as well as the contextual factors

that influence writing performance, such as linguistics and institutional challenges. This knowledge allows them to make informed decisions about instructional practices and assessment strategies, ensuring alignment with educational objectives and ethical standards. Therefore, writing teachers need to thoroughly understand writing knowledge, such as writing levels, aspects, and teaching approaches, to make their classroom activities successful (Pham & Truong, 2021). Teachers may improve their knowledge of writing assessments by attending workshops, in-service training sessions, and studying specified literature (Farhady & Tavassoli, 2021).

Based on Crusan et al., (2016), teachers' beliefs about writing assessment are a crucial dimension of assessment literacy, reflecting their perspectives on the purpose, fairness, and effectiveness of various assessment methods. These beliefs shape how educators approach the scoring of writing, their attitudes toward formative and summative assessments, and the extent to which they view assessment as a tool for improving student learning. Teachers' beliefs are influenced by their teaching context, prior experiences, and professional training, which collectively inform their perceptions of what constitutes effective and meaningful writing assessment practices. These beliefs ultimately impact classroom strategies, including the use of rubrics, portfolios, and feedback mechanisms, as well as their alignment with institutional and instructional goals. In foreign language teaching and language testing and assessment, beliefs particularly will influence teachers' practices (Tsagari & Vogt, 2017).

According to Crusan et al., (2016), teachers' writing assessment practices encompass the strategies and methods they employ to evaluate students' writing in the classroom. These practices include the use of multiple drafts, rubrics, portfolios, and self-assessment to provide comprehensive evaluations of student performance. Effective practices also involve integrating writing assessment with other skills, such as reading or listening, to foster a holistic approach to language learning. Teachers' practices are influenced by their beliefs, knowledge, and the specific teaching context, including institutional expectations and resource availability. These practices aim to ensure that assessments are fair, reliable, and aligned with instructional objectives, ultimately supporting student development and learning outcomes.

In this present study, Crusan et al., (2016) conceptual framework: writing assessment literacy in terms of knowledge, beliefs, and practices was used to address the issues raised during teaching writing activities. This research aims to offer a more comprehensive understanding of teacher educators' writing assessment literacy across these three dimensions.

METHODS

The researchers adopted a case study design to investigate a program, event, activity, or process involving one or more individuals (Creswell, 2015). Data collection began with a questionnaire focusing on teacher educators' writing assessment literacy, specifically their knowledge, beliefs, and practices. The questionnaire served as a foundation for deeper exploration through interviews, designed to produce more comprehensive data in the same three areas.

Participants were selected through purposive sampling, which involves deliberately choosing individuals based on specific characteristics (Etikan, 2016). Participants voluntarily joined the study, and the selection criteria included graduating from the faculty of education, teaching writing in higher education, varying teaching experience, and willingness to participate. Ultimately, two teacher educators were chosen: one female teaching Academic Writing and Introduction to Essay Writing at a private university, and one male teaching Writing for Academic Contexts at a private Islamic university. Both participants taught in Samarinda, East Kalimantan, with the female educator (P1) having six years of experience and the male educator (P2) having four years.

The researchers employed a questionnaire, interview guidelines, and document analysis to collect data on teacher educators' writing assessment literacy. The 23-item questionnaire, adapted from Crusan et al. (2016) and Valizadeh (2019), examined knowledge, beliefs, and practices. Interviews provided in-depth perspectives, with face-to-face sessions lasting 15–30 minutes. Questions focused on writing assessment literacy and were informed by the questionnaire responses. Each interview was audio-recorded, transcribed, and analyzed. Document analysis involved reviewing scoring rubrics used by the participants in their writing courses to confirm and supplement the data.

The research process consisted of two stages. First, participants were contacted to explain the study and schedule the distribution of the questionnaire. This step aimed to assess teacher

educators' writing assessment literacy across knowledge, beliefs, and practices. In the second stage, semi-structured interviews were conducted to gather more detailed information and expand upon questionnaire findings. These interviews provided nuanced insights and were transcribed for efficiency during analysis.

The data from the questionnaire addressed research questions about EFL teacher educators' writing assessment literacy. Thematic analysis was applied to the interview transcripts to identify and analyze patterns. This approach involved six phases: familiarizing with the data, generating initial codes, identifying themes, reviewing potential themes, defining and naming themes, and producing the final report. By organizing data into themes, the analysis provided deeper insights into findings from the questionnaire and offered a comprehensive understanding of teacher educators' writing assessment literacy.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

EFL teacher educators' writing assessment literacy: Knowledge

The educators' ability to differentiate courses (e.g., Academic Writing and Introduction to Essay Writing) is better interpreted as reflective of curriculum knowledge rather than writing assessment literacy. True assessment literacy requires a focus on designing and implementing effective assessment tools. As Crusan et al., (2016) explain, writing assessment literacy involves mastering scoring, grading, and making informed judgments about student writing based on assessment criteria.

EFL teacher educators' writing assessment knowledge reflects a combination of formal education, teaching experience, and self-learning. However, it also exposes gaps that indicate a need for more structured professional development.

Both educators acknowledged acquiring foundational knowledge through undergraduate and graduate coursework, particularly courses on language assessment. While these courses provided theoretical insights, they were often insufficient to develop comprehensive assessment literacy. This aligns with Crusan et al., (2016) findings, which highlight that teachers frequently rely on graduate-level courses for initial exposure to assessment principles but may require further targeted training to translate theory into practice.

"At the university, there was a course called Language Assessment during my undergraduate and graduate studies. I also look up and study to find updated scoring rubrics." (P1)

"Usually, those teaching writing are from the writing field. Their undergraduate and thesis work are typically related to writing." (P2)

Neither teacher had attended specialized workshops on writing assessment. This lack of exposure to practical assessment training echoes Crusan et al., (2016) observation that significant portions of language teachers report little to no formal training in assessment, undermining their ability to address challenges such as subjectivity or fairness in grading.

"I haven't attended any workshops, but at the university, there was a course called Language Assessment during my undergraduate and graduate studies." (P1)

Regarding their understanding of assessment tools, both educators demonstrated knowledge of rubric use.

"Essay writing is assessed first by its structure, whether it is correct or not. Then its content, whether it aligns with the theme. Sometimes students misinterpret it and deviate from the requested topic. Also, mechanics and coherence are important. They cannot write without good flow. All these aspects are important." (P1)

Additionally, P1 incorporated formative assessment elements such as pre-writing activities and essay analysis, but her reliance on rubrics for summative tasks indicates a partial understanding of how to diversify assessment practices effectively.

"Before starting to write, there are usually techniques they need to know, like mapping or listing. They can choose which one they prefer. It could also be free writing, where they write freely until they get stuck, and then it is refined to make it better." (P1)

P2 showed even less engagement with alternative assessments, focusing primarily on preparing students for IELTS.

"For writing in academic contexts, because it is based on IELTS, we use the IELTS Band Descriptors." (P2)

These excerpts illustrate P1's emphasis on using rubrics to assess multiple components of writing and P2's reliance on IELTS band descriptors to align with institutional standards, particularly for test preparation purposes.

In practice, P2's teaching of various writing courses, such as General Information Writing and IELTS Writing Tasks, enhanced his exposure to diverse assessment contexts and improved his ability to adapt scoring methods. P1's encouragement of pre-writing activities and feedback further supported students' developmental writing needs, reflecting an understanding of formative assessment principles. Both educators also engaged in self-learning, with P1 updating scoring rubrics and P2 using computer software to streamline assessment.

EFL teacher educators' writing assessment literacy: Beliefs

The beliefs of the two teacher educators from the interview transcripts are influenced by their teaching context, professional training, and personal teaching philosophies. Both educators prioritized fairness in assessing writing, which aligns with Crusan et al., (2016) notion of using rubrics and descriptors to minimize subjective bias. P1 specifically stated,

"You have to rely on scoring rubrics to avoid subjectivity." (P1)

Similarly, P2 emphasized using IELTS Band Descriptors for consistency.

"We assess based on IELTS standards." (P2)

These beliefs reflect teacher educators' commitment to ensuring objective evaluations.

Related to their beliefs about the role of context, P2's belief in tailoring assessments to institutional goals, such as IELTS preparation, demonstrates how teaching context shapes assessment practices. He stated,

"From the start, learning and assessments are based on IELTS." (P2)

In addition, P1 emphasized the importance of formative assessment tools like pre-writing activities and self-assessment.

"Self-assessment can be used in writing but not for grading; it's for their evaluation." (P1)

Both educators emphasize the importance of rubrics to minimize bias, reflecting the belief in fair and standardized assessment practices. In addition, both teacher educators struggle with the subjective nature of writing assessment. Their beliefs about fairness are shaped by their reliance on objective criteria, even as they recognize the limitations of achieving absolute accuracy.

"As much as possible, assessments should be accurate and impartial." (P1)

"Subjectivity is dangerous... That's why I take a safer route [by relying on standardized rubrics]." (P2)

Subjectivism and inaccuracy were the primary concerns raised by both educators. Therefore, they aimed to evaluate student work as accurately as possible to avoid bias. P1 emphasized the importance of trying for accuracy despite the inherent uncertainty in writing, as it differs from the preciseness of mathematics. On the other hand, P2 acknowledged the difficulty and subjective nature of assessing writing, indicating that subjectivism was also observed in terms of tolerance. These challenges illustrate the

difficulty of assessing writing and the need for educators to deal with subjectivity while maintaining objectivity in their assessments. To add more, heavy work-loaded also influenced their writing assessment since assessing students' work required a lot of effort.

As a result, teacher educators employed several efforts to avoid subjectivism and inaccuracy by relying on scoring rubrics as a tool to ensure objectivity.

"Whether we like it or not, we have to stick to the scoring rubric to avoid subjectivity. This way, we can assess the work objectively. So, when it comes to subjectivity, it's not the case. We strive to be as objective as possible so that students can receive fair evaluations of their work." (P1)

Besides that, teacher educators also addressed heavy work-loads during assessing writing that resulted in them not being able to give feedback frequently because it will take much time. Therefore, teacher educator traded her leisure time to assess students' essays so that she can provide feedback or comment.

"I assess them during my free time. When I have a time, I give score immediately and some comments. Whether it is underline to give error sign or I just write very good or excellent." (P1)

"Since I do not have assistant, I had to assess it by myself and there were a lot of it. I had to constantly back to the scoring rubrics to ensure it was not subjective. The objective was to assess as objective as possible. So, it would not be accurate to say it was subjective. The goal was to be as objective as possible so that students would receive fair scores of their works." (P1)

Another teacher educator, P2, utilized computer software to help him with proofreading to assess students' writing.

"When I taught Writing in General Information, I have tried computer application which provides the coding for assessing writing since it takes time to assess them. It is difficult and subjective. Since I have no time, I used it." (P2)

Thus, teacher educators demonstrate a commitment to fostering fairness and objectivity in the assessment process despite challenges that they encountered during teaching and assessing writing. In conclusion, multiple challenges were identified during the writing courses both from educators and students' sides. The findings highlight the importance of addressing challenges from students and teacher educators' sides because it is unconsciously influenced their beliefs toward assessing writing. The efforts made by teacher educators to promote fairness and objectivity demonstrate their commitment to providing students with accurate assessments and enhancing students' writing abilities.

In addition, their beliefs are also influenced by how they design their scoring rubrics components. Teacher educators were categorizing various components to assess students' writing products. The components were structure, content, mechanical, coherence, grammatical accuracy and vocabulary. Both teacher educators defined their assessment practices based on their understanding.

"Essay writing assessed from the structure first. Whether it is right or not. After that, the content. Whether it suits the theme or not because some students misinterpret it. Out of from the topic requested. Next, mechanics and coherence also important. They cannot write if the flow is not good. All of the aspects are important." (P1)

Similarly, P2 also showed his aspects on writing assessment. It includes mechanics, ideas organization, grammatical accuracy and vocabulary. He underlined that his writing course expected students to follow the rules. They were required to present the data on essays.

"It is similar to IELTS scoring. Structure and ideas are needed to make the sentences connected within the paragraph. In addition to that, IELTS also emphasizes following the rules and guidelines set for the test." (P2)

In conclusion, both teacher educators categorized and assessed students' essays based on various components. P1 focused on structure, content, mechanics, coherence, grammatical accuracy, and vocabulary. She used these components because when assessing students' essays, she referred to her

scoring rubrics. On the other hand, P2's components showed that his scoring rubrics strictly follow the IELTS requirements since his considerations are mechanics, ideas organization, grammatical accuracy, vocabulary, and emphasizing the importance of following the IELTS rules. Despite their different approaches, both educators recognized the significance of these components in assessing and improving students' writing skills.

EFL teacher educators' writing assessment literacy: Practices

There are three writing assessment tools that appeared as teacher educators' practice during assessing writing such as portfolio, self-assessment and IELTS writing tasks. Despite they shared learning objectives of academic writing and IELTS preparation, teacher educators have different choices to implement the assessments. In the context of portfolio usage, teacher educators have differing beliefs regarding its implementation in their classrooms.

In the context of portfolio usage, teacher educators have differing beliefs regarding its implementation in their classrooms. P1 believes that the portfolios compiled by her students may assist her in monitoring their writing development. On the other hand, P2 perceives portfolios as comprising numerous documents, making it impractical for him to employ it in his classroom.

"Students' portfolio consists of essays, outlines, mapping or free-writing. They submit it as portfolio that collected in a WhatsApp group." (P1)

"Portfolio consists of many documents. Not all documents can be graded using a rubric. A portfolio is supposed to collect everything that the students have worked on, right? I'm not sure if we have a different understanding of a portfolio because it's not just about submitting assignments. It's about collecting all the tasks throughout the writing process to assess their performance and see if they truly understand the subject matter. We see the process. For me, I don't use it." (P2)

P2's beliefs that not all documents can be graded using a rubric was countered by P1's arguments that even portfolios cannot be assessed by using rubrics, she assessed students' activities besides writing essays.

"It can be used because it showed students' ability. Whether they get better or not. So, it is not only during exams but in daily activities other than writing essays. Maybe when they make an outline like that." (P1)

Her excerpts indicated that all of the students' works became part of learning that should be assessed. This reason may arise related to the background of writing courses and the course's objectives. If P2 does not use a portfolio, it is consistent with his statements before that the courses he teaches focus on practicing IELTS writing. As a result, his writing course process was teaching students the basic knowledge about writing, practicing IELTS writing and assessing students' essays immediately. It is different from the writing course held by P1. She started her course by conducting activities that focus on enhancing students' knowledge such as pre-writing before asking students to write. Therefore, she managed to assess students' journey since her course asked students to work in stages.

Next, self-assessment is also utilized in both of the teacher educators' writing courses. However, it plays a role only as reflection. Teacher educators agreed that self-assessment could not be taken as students' grade.

"For self-assessment, it can be used but not for my assessment. Just to evaluate them. Students did self-assessment just for proofreading. So, they are looking for which one is wrong, but not for my grading. It is a drilling activity for them to understand better how to write well, because reading from their friends can reveal where they went wrong. If we read our own, maybe we don't know where the mistake is, right? Hopefully, when I assessed them later, they make a progress. After writing, there is an editing section, so that was when they did self-assessment. They revised it by themselves, but not as a scoring assessment." (P1)

"Self-assessment... I've practiced it but directly. Not using a rubric or anything. Yes, because children are not familiar with rubrics, right? So, if we want to conduct self-assessment, we must give them a rubric and they will definitely need time to understand. What do you think the friend's writing is worth from so to so much? What's the value for this? Then we average. Including writing. That was after we review it. So, they know exactly what they are doing wrong because many students do not understand what is

wrong here. So, when I asked to rate, they just answer good writing, sir. So, let's review first, oh this is wrong, the problem is here. If I give them, please give this value yourself, never. The system is voting and usually we immediately... tell me where is the wrong sentence? So, they find themselves. So, some of the students, because it was explained before, might be assigned again, they know they made a mistake here, because the mistake was the same as their friend's. So, they know." (P2)

Teacher educators employed self-assessment as a reflective tool in the writing course. However, it is not considered as a basis for grading students' work. All of them agreed that self-assessment as a means for students to evaluate their own writing, particularly for proofreading purposes. It allows students to identify errors and gain a better understanding of how to improve their writing by learning from their peers' work. The process took place during the editing phase where students revise their written drafts. The use of rubrics is not common, as it may require additional time for students to comprehend and apply it effectively. As an alternative, teacher educators guide students in identifying their own mistakes and understanding the reasons behind them. This approach helps students recognize and learn from their errors, particularly when they encounter similar mistakes made by their peers. Overall, self-assessment serves as a valuable tool for students' reflection rather than a scoring assessment in these writing courses.

Following this, both teacher educators refer to IELTS writing, but use different strategies for its application. They both utilize the IELTS topic as a learning resource for students working on essays, but they have distinctive assessment beliefs and practices.

"We still use our own scoring rubric, because for IELTS, it is going to be in band 1, that is how it is. We do not score like that. So, we keep using the scoring rubric which can be used later, but the writing rules are the same as IELTS." (P1)

"We give an assessment according to the IELTS standard. It doesn't make sense if we use the IELTS scoring rubric from the others." (P2)

In summary, both teacher educators incorporate the IELTS writing component into their courses, but they differ in the approaches related to the assessment. P1 maintained the use of their own scoring rubric while aligning with the IELTS writing rules, emphasizing the need to maintain consistency with her grading practices. However, P2 emphasized the importance of assessing students according to the IELTS standard and finds it unnecessary to rely on external scoring rubrics. Both educators recognize the four key aspects of IELTS writing: comprehension, cohesion, coherence, and vocabulary. Thus, despite utilizing the IELTS topic as a learning resource, teacher educators have distinct beliefs and practices regarding assessment in relation to the IELTS standards.

The findings highlight three writing assessment tools used by teacher educators: portfolio, self-assessment, and IELTS writing tasks. While the educators share learning objectives related to academic writing and IELTS preparation, they employ different assessment strategies. The use of portfolios, self-assessment, and IELTS writing tasks reflects their individual teaching approaches and priorities in evaluating students' writing skills.

Discussion

EFL teacher educators' writing assessment literacy: Knowledge

The findings revealed that their writing assessment literacy in terms of knowledge is mostly influenced by how they run the writing courses activity, prior knowledge about assessment, years of experience, and self-learning. This issue also has been confirmed by previous research and the results of questionnaire and interview. It found that teacher educators demonstrated their wide knowledge in regards to writing assessment including how teacher educators comprehend the concept of writing, design the assessment, conduct the assessment and employ the assessment results to enhance teaching and learning (Lee, 2017). These knowledges were acquired from prior education, years of experience and self-learning. Previous education contributes to the improvement of teacher educators' writing assessment knowledge, as they have taken language assessment courses during their undergraduate and graduate degrees. A study by Soltanpour Fatemeh & Valizadeh Mohammadreza (2019) proved that educational background formed the writing assessment knowledge of teacher educators. This aligns with Crusan et al., (2016) that highlighted academic qualifications play a role as the baseline of knowledge of how to teach and assess writing. However, the language assessment course covered all English skills and not specific skills. Therefore, it forced them to rely on a variety of teaching experiences in order to gather more knowledge about various

writing assessments alongside their teaching writing journeys. The absence of professional development which focused on writing assessment issues also contributed to the lack of development writing assessment knowledge. As a result, teacher educators seek knowledge to extend their writing assessment knowledge through self-learning. It is similar to Valizadeh (2019) which found teachers in Turkey did not receive any training at all. Whereas, Tsagari & Vogt (2017) underlined that training of pre-service and in-service teachers is one of the most essential aspects of language assessment quality assurance. For this reason, teacher educators may enhance their writing assessment knowledge by attending workshops, in-service training sessions, and studying specified literature (Farhady & Tavassoli, 2021).

EFL teacher educators' writing assessment literacy: Beliefs

Other points to underlined were teacher educators have different beliefs regarding writing assessment due to the different teaching writing strategies and several issues raised during writing class. As mentioned before, both educators have different beliefs since they conduct the activities differently. Teacher educators' beliefs that essays are best to use as an assessment tool. The essay could provide the illustration of students' difficulties during writing such as writing aspects including content, vocabulary, organization, grammar and mechanics (Toba et al., 2019). Therefore, they beliefs that assessing essays by using rubrics are important because the use of rubrics is an efficient approach for making teacher expectations obvious offering useful feedback, and supporting students' learning (Mahmoudi & Buğra, 2020). However, teacher educators noted several barriers during the writing activities. Various aspects of academic writing, including content, coherence, punctuation, and mechanics, presented being significant challenges for students. In contrast with Nenotek et al., (2022) that found students' difficulties mostly dominant in area of thesis statement, the use of cause and effect, comparison and contrast, practical introduction, topic sentence, reference, and related to development of ideas.

From teacher educators' perspectives, they argued that writing assessment is time consuming, lacks objectivity and inaccurate. It is in line with Ramesh & Sanampudi (2022) that found assessing in a manual way is time consuming, lack of reliability and many more. Therefore, several studies suggested to use automated essay scoring to make it efficient when grading essays. In this present study, only one teacher educator utilized computer application to assess essays automatically. A study from Zhai & Ma (2022) conducted to find out whether automated writing evaluation brings benefits to students. Their study claimed automated writing evaluation is more beneficial for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) and English as a Second Language (ESL) learners than Native English Speaker (NES) learners. Other studies by Almusharraf & Alotaibi (2022) confirmed that the total number of errors spotted by automated essay scoring is substantially higher than human raters. It is also supported by Shin & Gierl (2021) whose evaluated automated essay writing performs better than human raters. Therefore, the usage of assessment application brings several benefits for teacher educators and proved that P2's beliefs toward assessing essays using technology was a valid reason for him to implement it further on his writing course. To add more, P2 also suggested employing computer technology in writing assessment since it is helpful and could avoid time limitations (Valizadeh, 2019).

EFL teacher educators' writing assessment literacy: Practices

Next, only one teacher educator employed a portfolio in the writing course while the rest did not use it. As mentioned by Aisya Virgin & Anggani Linggar Bharati (2020) the possibilities of teachers not utilizing the portfolio were lack of preparation, the absence of students' self-assessment or reflection, and the absence of clear rubric that the teachers prepared. Although previous study from Aydin (2010) discovered that portfolio contributed to somewhat towards substantial development in vocabulary, grammar knowledge, reading, research, and writing abilities and latest experimental study by Al-Hawamdeh et al., (2023) find out E-portfolio assessment was found to be more effective than summative assessment in promoting learner autonomy, self-efficacy, and the writing complexity, accuracy and fluency (CAF) in EFL students, it still considered as difficult activities to be conducted. In this case, it is not easy for a teacher educator to collect students' portfolios since his writing course's aims to practicing IELTS. On the contrary, when a teacher educator conducts the activities from pre-writing stages, it is possible for her to collect students' portfolios which later can be considered during grading sessions. Whereas, applying portfolio or E-portfolio in writing courses is deemed beneficial for instruction and assessment since a well-constructed portfolio offers authentic language materials for assessment, enhances student engagement in the learning process, and encourages self-reflection (Wang & He, 2020).

Furthermore, teacher educators also incorporate IELTS writing to their writing courses as Green (2007) stated that the activity attempts to make students' focus on tasks and materials related to the IELTS exam. In contrast, Moore & Morton (2005) stated that it would be inappropriate to view test preparation as an adequate form of English for Academic Purpose (EAP) writing instruction. They argued that IELTS writing topics are more similar to non-academic public writing than university writing instruction. Since these two genres have distinct characteristics, it was suggested that IELTS writing preparation and EAP writing should be separated to avoid students being lost. To conclude it, teacher educators are shown similar writing assessment knowledge. However, their beliefs toward writing assessment differs from each other. It can be understood as one person's experience may influence his beliefs. Given that teacher educators hold distinct beliefs on writing assessment, the assessment practices they employ represent their beliefs. Optimistically, teacher educators are expected to acquire knowledge of how to successfully implement assessment on their writing courses. To develop this kind of writing assessment literacy demands positive beliefs in students, comprehension of feedback, and the ability to promote reflection in the classroom (Crusan et al., 2016).

Besides that, teacher educators' employ self-assessment as students' reflection and did not accumulate final scores. It is in line with Mammadova (2022) whose opinion said the process of writing such as exploring the topic, plotting the structure, composing the text, revising, editing and proofreading should become a non-graded assignment designed to improve students' writing and soft skills. Valizadeh (2019) study stated that even self-assessment is an advantageous technique, teachers who did not receive any training will likely not be confident to use it in their writing class. It can be possible reason why teacher educators did not use self-assessment as a real tool to assess students' essays rather than using it as reflective sessions due to the lack of training to use self-assessment in assessing writing. Therefore, teacher educators did not utilize self-assessments as a form of assessing students' writing performance.

However, the findings only represent a smaller context so it could not be generalized for other research settings. This finding also encountered several limitations such as it only presented two teacher educators with the same level of academic background, adopted a broad topic of writing assessment literacy in terms of knowledge, beliefs and practices and the data obtained only at the time the research was conducted. As a result, future researchers are recommended to gather many data from teacher educators with varied gender, academic background and amount of teaching experience and enlarge the scope by specifying the types of assessment which are being investigated.

CONCLUSION

In this present study, the researcher concludes that the two teacher educators writing assessment literacy are influenced by their writing courses objectives and processes. They shared similar writing assessment knowledge which was obtained from previous education, teaching experience and self-learning. Thus, teacher educators applied their knowledge during writing class in accordance with the context they have experienced and the knowledge that they acquired from learning by themselves. Along with that, their beliefs toward writing assessment are influenced by several factors such as students lacking in written structure, idea organization, time management, lack of vocabulary, incorrect use of punctuation marks, plagiarism, and cheating. To add more, teacher educators also faced challenges such as heavy workload, subjectivism in assessing and inaccurate assessments. Thus, their beliefs impacted their writing assessment practices as illustrated above. There was a teacher educator who employed portfolio, self-assessment and IELTS writing while other teacher educator only focused on IELTS writing preparation. Furthermore, as can be observed from the rubric, which includes assessments for each component students have, teacher educators' rubric also demonstrates that students are evaluated on their final result. The process by which students write a written product is not evaluated. Regarding teacher educators' writing rubrics, they used similar components however differ from the types of rubrics itself.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This study does not receive any fundings from any agencies or institutions.

REFERENCES

- Aisya Virgin, J., & Anggani Linggar Bharati, D. (2020). Teachers' perception, plan, and implementation of portfolio assessment in students' writing assessment. *English Education Journal*, 10(2). <http://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/eej>

- Al-Hawamdeh, B. O. S., Hussen, N., & Abdelrasheed, N. S. G. (2023). Portfolio vs. summative assessment: Impacts on EFL learners' writing complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF); self-efficacy; learning anxiety; and autonomy. *Language Testing in Asia*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-023-00225-5>
- Almusharraf, N., & Alotaibi, H. (2022). An error-analysis study from an EFL writing context: Human and automated essay scoring approaches. *Technology, Knowledge and Learning*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10758-022-09592-z>
- Attali, Y. (2016). A comparison of newly-trained and experienced raters on a standardized writing assessment. *Language Testing*, 33(1), 99-115. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532215582283>
- Aydin, S. (2010). EFL writers' perceptions of portfolio keeping. *Assessing Writing*, 15(3), 194-203. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2010.08.001>
- Bañales, G., Ahumada, S., Graham, S., Puente, A., Guajardo, M., & Muñoz, I. (2020). Teaching writing in grades 4-6 in urban schools in Chile: A national survey. in *Reading and writing* (Vol. 33, Issue 10). Springer Netherlands. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-020-10055-z>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Cimen, S. S. (2022). Exploring EFL assessment in Turkey: Curriculum and teacher practices. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET)*, 9(1), 531-50. <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6840-6558>
- Creswell, J. W. (2015). *Educational research - Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (5th ed.). Pearson.
- 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>
- Cushing Weigle, S. (2002). *Assessing writing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Davies, A. (2008). Textbook trends in teaching language testing. *Language Testing*, 25(3), 327-347. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532208090156>
- Etikan, I. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11>
- Farhady, H., & Tavassoli, K. (2021). EFL teachers' perceptions and practices of their language assessment knowledge. *Language Testing in Asia*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-021-00135-4>
- Fulcher, G. (2012). Assessment literacy for the language classroom. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 9(2), 113-132. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2011.642041>
- Green, A. (2007). *IELTS washback in context: Preparation for academic writing in higher education*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kong, Y., Molnár, E. K., & Xu, N. (2022). Pre- and in-service teachers' assessment and feedback in EFL writing: Changes and challenges. *SAGE Open*, 12(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221126672>
- Latif, M. W. (2021). Exploring tertiary EFL practitioners' knowledge base component of assessment literacy: Implications for teacher professional development. *Language Testing in Asia*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-021-00130-9>
- Lee, I. (2017). Classroom assessment literacy for L2 writing teachers. in *Classroom writing assessment and feedback in L2 school contexts* (pp. 147-157). Springer Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-3924-9_10
- Mahmoudi, F., & Buğra, C. (2020). The effects of using rubrics and face to face feedback in teaching writing skill in higher education. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET)*, 7(1), 150-158.
- Mammadova, T. (2022). Academic writing and information literacy instruction in digital environments. in *Academic writing and information literacy instruction in digital environments*. Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-19160-2>
- Moore, T., & Morton, J. (2005). Dimensions of difference: A comparison of university writing and IELTS writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 4(1), 43-66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2004.02.001>
- Nenotek, S. A., Tlonaen, Z. A., & Manubulu, H. A. (2022). Exploring university students' difficulties in writing English academic essay. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 14(1), 909-920. <https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v14i1.1352>

- Pham, V. P. H., & Truong, M. H. (2021). Teaching writing in Vietnam's secondary and high schools. *Education Sciences*, 11(10). <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11100632>
- Prihantoro, A., & Hermawan, T. (2021). Success and failure of English-as-a-Foreign-Language lecturers in applying the assessment as learning in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Spectrum*, 3(2), 131-149. <https://doi.org/10.47806/ijesacademic.896661>
- Ramesh, D., & Sanampudi, S. K. (2022). An automated essay scoring systems: A systematic literature review. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 55(3), 2495-2527. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-021-10068-2>
- Rao, Z., & Li, X. (2017). Native and non-native teachers' perceptions of error gravity: The effects of cultural and educational factors. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 26(1-2), 51-59. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-017-0326-5>
- Soltanpour Fatemeh, & Valizadeh Mohammadreza. (2019). Iranian EFL teachers' writing assessment beliefs, literacy and training needs: Do majors matter? *I-Manager's Journal on English Language Teaching*, 9.
- Toba, R., Noor, W. N., & Sanu, L. O. (2019). The current issues of Indonesian EFL students' writing skills: Ability, problem, and reason in writing comparison and contrast essay. *Dinamika Ilmu*, 57-73. <https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v19i1.1506>
- Tsagari, D., & Vogt, K. (2017). Assessment literacy of foreign language teachers around Europe: Research, challenges and future prospects. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/316981583>
- Valizadeh, M. (2019). EFL teachers' writing assessment literacy, beliefs, and training needs in the context of Turkey. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 10(6), 53. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.s.v.10n.6p.53>
- Wang, L., & He, C. (2020). Review of research on portfolios in ESL/EFL context. *English Language Teaching*, 13(12), 76. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v13n12p76>
- Weigle, S. C. (2007). Teaching writing teachers about assessment. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(3), 194-209. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.07.004>
- Yan, Z., Chiu, M. M., & Keung Cheng, E. C. (2022). Predicting teachers' formative assessment practices: Teacher personal and contextual factors. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103718>
- Zhai, N., & Ma, X. (2022). The effectiveness of automated writing evaluation on writing quality: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07356331221127300>