EFL language assessment literacy among Jordanian EFL secondary school teachers.

El-Freihat Sara Mohammad [a] *, Al-Balqa' Applied University Ringgold Standard Institution Educational Science Jordan Irbid. Jordan.

Abstract

The study aims to define EFL language assessment literacy among Jordanian EFL secondary school teachers. The study sample consisted of (214) EFL teachers at Irbid Governorate selected using random sampling method. To achieve the study objectives, a questionnaire consisted of (36) items was distributed on the study sample. The study showed that knowledge level of language assessment among Jordanian EFL teachers was low. The study revealed statistically significant differences in the knowledge level of language assessment among Jordanian EFL teachers due to years of experience, in favor of more than 10 years and due to qualification, in favor of PhD, while there were no statistically significant differences in light of gender. In light of the results the study suggests to pay more attention by university administrations to design training programs able to fulfill the actual needs of EFL pre-service teachers in Jordan.

Keywords: Assessment Literacy, EFL Language.

---

* ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE El-Freihat Sara Mohammad, Al-Balqa' Applied University Ringgold standard institution Educational Science Jordan Irbid. Jordan.
  E-mail address: sara.freihat@bau.edu.jo

1. Introduction

Educational systems always seek to develop students' skills by providing them with rich learning experiences. This cannot be achieved unless teachers' preparation programs working on qualifying teachers are active participants in promoting learning teaching process. Teachers are a key pillar for the educational process considering the fact that they interact with students, making them more able to define their needs, problems and weaknesses. As such, teachers are in a better place to transfer the content of the learning material to students. As English is one of the basic school subjects working on transforming information and knowledge to students in an unfamiliar language for them when knowing that their native language is Arabic, this foreign language has many semantics and structures making it difficult for teachers to assess students' needs unless they interact with them face to face.

The Ministry of Education in Jordan (2020) acknowledged the importance of teachers as key factors in its quest to promote the quality of education. This has urged the educational authorities to include different teaching skills in their teachers' preparations programs and to focus on the various assessment tools that can help teachers in the development of the quality of the learning – teaching process. Assessment as indicated by Rayan (2015) is one of the tools educators employ in identifying the problems learners face while acquiring specific school subject. It is also one of the tools assisting educators identify the most influential factors affecting learners' competence in acquiring learning content. Therefore, assessment helps educators and education decision makers make objective judgments about the real performance of students; something that is very significant to determine the quality of school subjects and the ability to achieve the learning outcomes. In the same vein, NVAO (2016) indicates that successful assessment is based on using a set of standards and indicators; that are employed to obtain the needed information about students' performance objectively. Additionally, assessment can inform educators and decision makers about the needed amendments, whether in the educational objectives or in the teaching methods adopted to improve the quality of the learning material. For these reasons, having basic knowledge about the fundamentals of assessment is of vital significance for teachers, and this dictates the need for preparation programs to include the basics of assessment such as designing assessment tools, applying them, judging their reliability and validity as instruments for data collection.

Assessment is the use of various tools, tests, measures and indicators that can give a clearer picture about the improvement in students' performance in academic, psychological and social domains. It also identifies teachers' practices towards achieving the learning- teaching process objectives by using different assessment tools such as projects, role playing, interviews, tests and quizzes and presentations (Coombe, 2018). The importance of assessment in the educational process stems from the fact that it provides guiding indicators to make judgments concerning the quality of the learning process and the instructional methods used by teachers. For the majority of teachers, assessment is the main source for obtaining an accurate feedback about students' performance and it verifies their mastery level of the learned skills. It also gives teachers some valid benchmarks about strengths and weaknesses among students, their attitudes, tendencies, and interests which can help in guiding educational supervision (Alkharusi and Al-Hosni, 2015). Assessment, as postulated by Alkharusi (2017), is a tool that may be used to evaluate the learning- teaching process, in designing class activities and learning content so as they can achieve the learning objectives. It is an instrument to raise the quality of educational outcomes and can be also employed to make active decisions about

teachers' compliance in presenting the school curricula in away conforming with the educational philosophy. It also identifies to how extent teachers are adopting high quality teaching strategies and that they are using assessment tools that may define individual differences among students.

Any given language entails four basic skills: reading, writing, speaking and listening. Teachers' assessment of these four language skills needs that school language curricula and students ability to master these skills to be assessed. This assessment process may inform making any changes on the nature of the language textbook to ensure their effectiveness and ability to promote different language skills. It also indicates that these textbooks are able to achieve the basic standards for assessment while ensuring their ability to give teachers a thorough vision whether students are acquiring these skills (Shadiev and Yang, 2020). Using language skills assessment, Coombe (2018) emphasizes that teachers should obtain a comprehensive feedback related to students' performance in the different language skills. It also guides them to select the most appropriate assessment tools. This, in turns, implies that teachers should be more than qualified in making assessment in and out of class as it may help in obtaining a clearer perspective about students' performance. Therefore, language teachers' preparation programs should include formal and informal assessment strategies so teachers can make objectives decisions about their ability to achieve the educational goals.

Despite the importance of the EFL language skills, teachers are still facing significant problems hindering their students' acquisition of such language skills. In this respect, Dhlan (2019) indicates that teachers are still in a great need of pre-service and in-service training programs to qualify them to be active actors in making objectives assessment about the performance of their students; something that need more investigation. This was emphasized by the Jordanian Ministry of Education (2020) in its guidelines for the promotion of teachers preparation programs provided by the public and private universities.

Different studies have examined teachers' language assessment literacy skills in the different educational contexts. For example, Ali (2011) conducted a study in Bangladesh to define teachers' and students' perspectives concerning the assessment of English secondary language teaching (EFL) curriculum. Interviews were conducted with (6) English teachers and (9) high school students with varying degrees of proficiency in English language. The study showed that the level of assessing English secondary language teaching (EFL) curriculum does not reflect the development of all language skills. Concentration is placed on reading and writing skills and other skills were neglected. There is a contradiction between the objectives of the English language curriculum and teaching methods presented in schools. The study showed that teachers use self-evaluation strategies to motivate students learning. It also showed that English language teaching (EFL) curriculum needs redesigning so that all four skills are included in the evaluation system.

Gonzales and Aliponga (2012) compared classroom assessment preferences of Japanese language teachers in Philippine and English language in Japan. The study sample included (61) Japanese language teachers and (55) English language teachers who responded to a questionnaire measuring classroom evaluation preferences of language teachers. The study found that the most preferred assessment practice by the teachers from both countries was assessment as learning, while the least preferred assessment practice was communicative function of assessment (assessing to inform). It also found no statistically significant differences in the preferences for assessment of learning and assessment as learning.

In Turkey, Han and Kaya (2014) investigated the assessment practices and habits of Turkish EFL teachers using a sample consisted of (95) teachers in a number of primary and secondary schools

who responded to a questionnaire. The study results found that teachers give less importance to listening and writing skills and that speaking is the most challenging skill to assess. The study showed no statistically significant difference in the teachers' assessment preferences in light of gender, assessment training, teaching hours, and number of tests.

Using a questionnaire administrated to a sample consisted of (24) EFL junior high school teachers, Saefurrohman (2015) tried to identify classroom assessment preferences among EFL teachers. The study found that EFL teachers' main classroom assessment preference purpose was assessment for learning, followed by the classroom assessment of learning, and last classroom assessment as learning. It also showed that the most frequently used classroom assessment for learning for Indonesian EFL teachers was to group their students for instruction purposes in the class, it also showed that the most frequently used classroom assessment was assessment for learning among EFL teachers.

Another study by Kalajahi and Abdullah (2016) examined the level of assessment literacy among a sample of (65) lecturers working in a Malaysian university. To achieve the study objectives, a questionnaire was used. The study revealed that the state of assessment literacy among lecturers was low.

 In Turkey, Onalan and Karagul (2018) attempted to define EFL teachers' beliefs about the uses of assessment in teaching English. The study sample totaled (70) EFL teachers responded to a 20-item 5-Likert scale questionnaire. The study showed that EFL teachers' beliefs on assessment were high on using assessment for formative purposes, followed by self-assessment procedures. It also found no statistically significant differences in EFL teachers' assessment preferences in light of specialization and years of experience

.In Jordan, Asassfeh (2019) investigated EFL teachers' perceptions and practices associated with learners' language progress assessment by using a questionnaire distributed on (107) EFL teachers. The study revealed high level of EFL teachers' positive perceptions of the effectiveness of the assessment of learners' language progress, and that the level of challenges encountered by EFL teachers in assessing learners' language progress was high.

Olmezer-Ozturk and Aydin (2019) conducted a study in Turkey to provide an overall picture regarding general and skill-based language assessment knowledge level among EFL teachers by using a questionnaire distributed on (542) EFL teachers working at schools of foreign languages. The study found that the level of language assessment knowledge among EFL teachers was moderate. The results also revealed that teachers were the most knowledgeable in assessing reading, whereas they had the lowest score in assessing listening. No statistically significant differences in the level of language assessment knowledge among EFL teachers were found in light of years of experience, educational background, the BA program being graduated, workplace, testing course in BA, attending trainings, and being a testing office member.

Another study in Iraq by Muhammed and Bardakci (2019) aimed to investigate the assessment literacy levels of Iraqi EFL teachers. Data was collected by using a survey from a sample consisted of (101) teachers working at secondary and preparatory schools. The study revealed that the level of Iraqi EFL teachers' assessment Literacy was low. The results also showed that teachers' highest score was on using assessment results for decision-making, then developing appropriate methods of assessment, while the lowest score was recognizing unethical or illegal assessment practice and communicating assessment results.

Reviewing previous studies, it can be noticed that the majority of studies have focused on language assessment preferences among EFL teachers. For example, both Saefurrohman (2015) and Gonzales and Aliponga (2012) aimed to define teachers assessment preferences. Few studies examined EFL teachers language assessment literacy and knowledge, study by Muhammed and Bardakci (2019) attempted to define EFL teachers' language assessment literacy and found that it was low.

Problem of the Study

Language assessment is one of the main challenges facing language teachers since it requires special skills other than these that should be mastered by different school subjects. Language assessment is essentially a requirement for making objective judgments about different aspects of language teaching process. Asserting this fact, Dhlan (2019) indicates that teachers' use of traditional assessment tools in language classes imposes many difficulties as they are not able to have comprehensive perspectives about students' actual performance. When knowing that language assessment is based on observation and interaction, not written tests in most cases, having language assessment skills means that teachers are more able to design effective instructional strategies that may help students acquire the targeted language skills.

Stressing the fact that teachers' lack the needed skills for assessing language skills, Al-Sawalha (2020) contended that teachers are still relaying on traditional assessment tools. The author further added that language teachers' assessment skills and literacy are under the optimal level, which has negative effect on students' academic performance. In the same vain, Alamreen (2020) emphasizes different facts that students mastering the four basic EFL skills are still under the desired levels. He attributed this to teachers' lack of the basic language assessment tools and skills that may help them increase the quality of their instruction and to provide an accurate feedback about the level of learning content presented in schools.

Questions of the study

The study attempted to answer the following questions:

1- What is of language assessment skills level among Jordanian EFL teachers?

2- Are there statistically significant differences in language assessment skills level among Jordanian EFL teachers due to gender, years of experience, qualification?

Significance of the Study

The significance of this study is two folded; firstly, it is one of the pioneering studies examining Jordanian EFL teachers' literacy level of language assessment tools, thus, it may open new ventures for future research for further investigations. Secondly, it may inform educators responsible of designing pre-service preparation programs and in-service training programs to include language assessment strategies to improve teachers' knowledge about such skills.

Objectives of the Study

The study seeks to define the knowledge level of language assessment among Jordanian EFL teachers, and to reveal the differences in the knowledge level of language assessment among Jordanian EFL teachers in light of gender, years of experience, and qualification.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of the study included that the sample of the study was confined to a number of EFL teachers at Irbid governorate. Furthermore, the generalization of the results is limited by the psychometric properties of the instruments used for data collection in this study.

METHODOLOGY

Design of the Study

The design of the study was based on an analytical descriptive approach which included the use of a questionnaire to identify EFL teachers' language assessment literacy skills.

Population and Sample of the Study

The population of the study consisted all EFL teachers working at the public schools in Irbid governorate, Jordan. The sample of the study consisted of (214) EFL teachers at Irbid Governorate selected using random sampling method. Table (1) shows the study sample distribution based on its variables.

Table (1): Distribution of the Study Sample Based on the Study Variables

Variable	Categories	Frequencies	%
Gender	Male	104	48.6
	Female	110	51.4
Years of Experience	5 years or less	53	24.8
	6-10 years	67	31.3
	More than 10 years	94	43.9
Qualification	Bachelor	113	52.8
	Master	61	28.5
	PhD	40	18.7
	Total	214	100%

Instruments of the Study

To achieve the objectives of the study, the researcher used a questionnaire developed by Asassfeh (2019) consisting in the preliminary format of (50) items distributing on (5) domains: Motive behind assessment, the purpose behind assessment, source of assessment techniques, the common types/forms of assessment, and the challenges or difficulties associated with assessment.

Validity of the Instrument

To ensure the face validity of the instrument, a jury of expertise specialized in English language, measurement and evaluation were asked to give any remarks about the items of the instrument. After their remarks were taken into consideration, the instrument consisted in the final format of (36) items, distributing on (3) domains: The purpose behind assessment, source of assessment activities, EFL assessment techniques and their use frequency by teachers.

Reliability of the Instrument

To verify the reliability of the study instrument, test-retest method was used by administrating the instrument for the first time and re-administrating the same instrument to a sample totaling (30) EFL teachers from the same population and out of the original sample of the study. Then, Pearson correlation was calculated between their scores on the two administrations. Furthermore, Cronbach alpha coefficient for internal consistency was calculated. Table (2) shows test-retest and internal consistency reliabilities for the individual domains and the total instrument. As seen these values are appropriate to achieve the objectives of the study.

Table (2): Test-Retest, Cronbach Alpha Internal Consistency Reliabilities for Individual Domains and Total Instrument

Domain	Test-Retest Reliability	Internal Consistency Coefficient
The Purpose Behind Assessment	0.83	0.77
Source of Assessment Activities	0.85	0.82
EFL Assessment Techniques and their Use Frequency by Teachers	0.89	0.78
Total	0.86	0.79

RESULTS AND DISCCUSION

Results of the First Question: What is of language assessment skills level among Jordanian EFL teachers?

To answer the first question of the study, means and standard deviations of the of language assessment skills level among Jordanian EFL teachers were computed as presented in tables (3).

Table (3): Means and standard deviations of language assessment skills level among Jordanian EFL teachers in a descending Order

Rank	N	Domain	Mean	Std. Deviation
1	2	Source of Assessment Activities	2.45	.782
2	1	Purposes Behind EFL Assessment	2.31	.747
3	3	EFL Assessment Techniques and their Use Frequency by Teachers	2.25	.791
		Total Score	2.31	.743

Table (3) shows that "Source of Assessment Activities" received the highest means score (M=2.45), followed by "Purposes behind EFL assessment" with a means score of (M=2.31), while "EFL assessment techniques and their use frequency by teachers" ranked last with a means score of (M=2.25). This table also shows that the total means score is (M=2.31) with a low level of knowledge. This indicates that the total means score for the assessment literacy skills level was low. This result may be attributed to that EFL teachers' preparation and training programs are still inadequate despite the importance of language assessment skills. Asserting this fact, both Earl and Katz (2006) indicate that teachers' preparation programs do not address the needs of prospective EFL teachers in language assessment skills, and despite the fact that Jordanian Ministry of Education have realized the

importance of EFL teachers acquisition of language assessment skills, there still a lack of awareness among Jordanian EFL teachers about the significant role of such skills in promoting the quality of their education.

Explaining the low level of language assessment skills literacy among Turkish EFL teachers, Saefurrohman and Balinas (2016) indicates that in order to improve the quality of EFL teaching in students, there is a need to raise the awareness of EFL teachers about the importance of language skills assessment literacy. Since this study is the first study in the Jordanian context -to the researcher limited knowledge-, the discussion of the study is based on the researcher knowledge and her interaction with different EFL teachers. Another explanation of the low levels of Jordanian EFL language assessment literacy may be due to their perceptions concerning such skills and the challenges they face when they attempt to use them in class. As public schools are overcrowded and the class period is limited, in addition to lack of adequate resources that may assess Jordanian EFL teachers in conducting language skills assessment, these intern avoid using authentic assessment procedures and they find it easier to employ written tests as they are easy to administer to students and do not need much effort in scoring.

Furthermore, Jordanian Ministry of Education imposes schedules time line for EFL teachers to cover EFL textbooks. This constitutes a major hurdle to employ language assessment in class. This has increased their negative attitude toward employing authentic assessment methods in EFL classes, which are the most appropriate assessment procedures to be used in language classes. This may explain the low levels of language assessment skills literacy among Jordanian EFL teachers.

Also, the results reporting that Jordanian EFL teachers low levels of language assessment skills may be due to that they adopt negative believes and attitude about the benefits about such an assessment. In light of this result, Caverice (2010) contended that teachers' believes was a significant factor influencing their reported low levels of language assessment literacy. In a similar context, and while examining teachers references in using different forms of language skills assessment, Munoz, Palacio and Escobar (2012) postulated that teachers prefer collecting direct feedback from their students with the least effort. Since language skills assessment needs time and effort by EFL teachers, it is logical to assume that they do not practice such assessment. The rule of thumb states that practice makes perfect; and teachers do not practice language skills assessment, thus, they do not develop such an important skill. This result is consistent with the result presented by Kalajahi and Abdullah (2016) study which revealed that the state of assessment literacy among lecturers was low, and the results of Muhammed and Bardakci (2019) study which showed that the level of Iraqi EFL teachers' assessment Literacy was low.

Results of the Second Question: Are there statistically significant differences in the language assessment skills level among Jordanian EFL teachers due to gender, years of experience, qualification?

To answer this question, t- test, One-Way ANOVA, Pair wise Multiple Comparisons Post Hoc Test using Scheffe were employed.

Results Related to Gender

T-Test for independent variables was calculated to define the differences significance between the responses in light of gender.

Table (4): T-Test Results Related to Gender

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Purposes Behind EFL Assessment	**Male**	**104**	**2.35**	**.698**	**.610**	**212**	**.542**
	Female	**110**	**2.28**	**.793**			
Source of Assessment Activities	**Male**	**104**	**2.51**	**.724**	**1.082**	**212**	**.280**
	Female	**110**	**2.40**	**.833**			
EFL Assessment Techniques and their Use Frequency by Teachers	**Male**	**104**	**2.32**	**.749**	**1.168**	**212**	**.244**
	Female	**110**	**2.19**	**.828**			
Total Score	**Male**	**104**	**2.37**	**.691**	**1.013**	**212**	**.312**
	Female	**110**	**2.26**	**.789**			

Table (4) shows there are no statistically significant differences at (α= 0.05) due to Gender in all variables. This result is consistent with common sense as teachers from both genders are exposed to similar university courses during their pre-service. Also, the content of preparation programs are identical for both males and females. As indicated before, it is logical to assume that the gender invariance in the language assessment literacy can be due to that both male and female Jordanian EFL teachers are exposed to the similar school environments and they teach the same textbooks. As a result, there are no statistically significant differences in their language assessment literacy.

Furthermore, this result can be explained by the fact that both male and female EFL teachers in the different educational systems share similar assessment references. Indicating this fact, Gonzales and Aliponga (2012) indicated in their result that EFL teachers prefer resorting to tradition assessment strategies and they avoid using new and creative assessment techniques. They also feel that they are not fully equipped for conducting language assessment in class and this may explain the invariance in their language assessment literacy level.

Results Related to Years of Experience

One-Way ANOVA was calculated to define the differences significance between the responses in light of years of experience.

Table (5): One-Way ANOVA Results Related to Years of Experience

		N	Mean	Std. Dev.	F	Sig.
Purposes Behind EFL Assessment	**5 years or less**	**53**	**2.06**	**.714**	**5.575**	**.004**
	6-10 years	**67**	**2.29**	**.691**		
	More than 10 years	**94**	**2.48**	**.769**		
	Total	**214**	**2.31**	**.747**		
Source of Assessment Activities	**5 years or less**	**53**	**2.18**	**.775**	**5.817**	**.003**
	6-10 years	**67**	**2.43**	**.720**		
	More than 10 years	**94**	**2.63**	**.791**		
	Total	**214**	**2.45**	**.782**		
EFL Assessment Techniques and their Use Frequency by Teachers	**5 years or less**	**53**	**2.03**	**.723**	**6.853**	**.001**
	6-10 years	**67**	**2.13**	**.779**		
	More than 10 years	**94**	**2.47**	**.789**		

Total Score	**Total**	214	2.25	.791			
	5 years or less	53	2.07	.687	6.601	.002	
	6-10 years	67	2.24	.711			
	More than 10 years	94	2.50	.753			
	Total	214	2.31	.743			

Table (5) shows There are statistically significant differences at (α= 0.05) related to years of experience. Pair wise Multiple Comparisons Post Hoc Test using Scheffe method was conducted as in table:

Table (6): Pairwise Multiple Comparisons Post Hoc Tests Using Scheffe Method Related to Years of Experience

Dependent Variable	(I) Years of Experience	(J) Years of Experience	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Purposes Behind EFL Assessment	5 years or less	6-10 years	-.23	.135	.242
		More than 10 years	-.42(*)	.126	.005
	6-10 years	5 years or less	.23	.135	.242
		More than 10 years	-.19	.117	.270
	More than 10 years	5 years or less	.42(*)	.126	.005
		6-10 years	.19	.117	.270
Source of Assessment Activities	5 years or less	6-10 years	-.24	.141	.222
		More than 10 years	-.45(*)	.131	.004
	6-10 years	5 years or less	.24	.141	.222
		More than 10 years	-.20	.122	.262
	More than 10 years	5 years or less	.45(*)	.131	.004
		6-10 years	.20	.122	.262
EFL Assessment Techniques and their Use Frequency by Teachers	5 years or less	6-10 years	-.10	.142	.765
		More than 10 years	-.44(*)	.132	.004
	6-10 years	5 years or less	.10	.142	.765
		More than 10 years	-.34(*)	.123	.024
	More than 10 years	5 years or less	.44(*)	.132	.004
		6-10 years	.34(*)	.123	.024
Total Score	5 years or less	6-10 years	-.17	.133	.434
		More than 10 years	-.43(*)	.124	.003
	6-10 years	5 years or less	.17	.133	.434
		More than 10 years	-.26	.116	.079
	More than 10 years	5 years or less	.43(*)	.124	.003
		6-10 years	.26	.116	.079

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

The above table shows:

- There are statistically significant difference at (α=0.05) between 5 years or less and More than 10 years in favor of More than 10 years in Purposes behind EFL assessment, Source of Assessment Activities and Total Score.

- There are statistically significant difference at (α=0.05) between 5 years or less and More than 10 years in favor of More than 10 years, and between 6-10 years and More than 10 years in favor of More than 10 years in EFL assessment techniques and their use frequency by teachers.

This result can be explained that having more experience means that EFL teachers are more emerged with different teaching and learning situation which may affect their knowledge and literacy about language assessment skills. It can be also assumed that more experienced teachers can benefit from their interactions with their peers and have more knowledge about language assessment skills. Furthermore, novice teachers are still fresh graduate from universities and do not have the adequate repertoire to use language assessment skills in class as such an instructional practice needs high levels of class management and the availability of adequate assessment tools.

Additionally, Han and Kaya (2014) indicate that EFL teacher pre-service training programs lack the adequate courses addressing language assessment skills which mean that acquiring them comes from interacting with different school environment imposing various educational experiences.

Results Related to Qualification

Table (7): One-Way ANOVA Results Related to Qualification

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
Purposes Behind EFL Assessment	**Bachelor**	113	2.17	.675	6.291	.002
	Master	61	2.36	.754		
	PhD	40	2.64	.835		
	Total	214	2.31	.747		
Source of Assessment Activities	**Bachelor**	113	2.30	.713	5.573	.004
	Master	61	2.53	.780		
	PhD	40	2.75	.884		
	Total	214	2.45	.782		
EFL Assessment Techniques and their Use Frequency by Teachers	**Bachelor**	113	2.07	.756	8.756	.000
	Master	61	2.35	.773		
	PhD	40	2.63	.771		
	Total	214	2.25	.791		
Total Score	**Bachelor**	113	2.15	.684	7.913	.000
	Master	61	2.39	.735		
	PhD	40	2.66	.794		
	Total	214	2.31	.743		

Table (7) shows There are statistically significant differences at (α= 0.05) related to qualification. Pair wise Multiple Comparisons Post Hoc Test using Scheffe method was conducted as in table:

Table (8): Pairwise Multiple Comparisons Post Hoc Tests using Scheffe Method Related to Qualification

Dependent Variable	(I) Years of Experience	(J) Years of Experience	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Purposes Behind EFL Assessment	Bachelor	Master	-.19	.116	.242
		PhD	-.47(*)	.134	.005
	Master	Bachelor	.19	.116	.242
		PhD	-.28	.148	.270
	PhD	Bachelor	.47(*)	.134	.005
		Master	.28	.148	.270
Source of Assessment Activities	Bachelor	Master	-.23	.122	.222
		PhD	-.45(*)	.141	.004
	Master	Bachelor	.23	.122	.222
		PhD	-.22	.156	.262
	PhD	Bachelor	.45(*)	.141	.004
		Master	.22	.156	.262
EFL Assessment Techniques and their Use Frequency by Teachers	Bachelor	Master	-.28	.121	.765
		PhD	-.56(*)	.140	.004
	Master	Bachelor	.28	.121	.765
		PhD	-.28	.155	.024
	PhD	Bachelor	.56(*)	.140	.004
		Master	.28	.155	.024
Total Score	Bachelor	Master	-.24	.114	.434
		PhD	-.51(*)	.132	.003
	Master	Bachelor	.24	.114	.434
		PhD	-.27	.146	.079
	PhD	Bachelor	.51(*)	.132	.003
		Master	.27	.146	.079

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

The above table shows that there are statistically significant difference at (α=0.05) between bachelor and PhD in favor of PhD. Knowing that having a higher degree means that one has acquired more academic knowledge and faces new knowledge, this result may be explained by that PhD holders have more experience in the educational field as teachers and they are more informed about the importance of language assessment as a result of their educational degree. As such, they show more language assessment literacy when knowing that they read more books as part of their MA and PhD programs; are more familiar with language teaching theories and practices in addition to having more awareness level about the importance of language assessment as a part of their professional development and its vital role in promoting students' academic performance.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the results, the study suggests:

- Including language assessment skills in EFL pre-service teachers' programs to develop their language literacy level.

- More attention by university administrations to design training programs able to fulfill the actual needs of EFL pre-service teachers in Jordan.

- Providing the needed resources in schools to help EFL teachers adopt language skills assessment as a part of their daily teaching practices.

- Future research examining difficulties facing Jordanian EFL teachers when using language assessment is needed.

REFERENCES

Alamreen, A. (2020). Linguistic communication and its impact on developing the skill of listening to ninth grade students in Jordan. *The Arab Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences, 4*(5), 135-150. https://doi.org/10.26389/AJSRP.A030819 .

Ali, M. (2011). *Teachers' and students' perspectives on English language assessment in the secondary English language teaching (EFL) curriculum in Bangladesh*. Unpublished Master Thesis, University of Canterbury, New Zealand.

Alkharusi, H. (2017). Predicting students' academic achievement: Contributions of perceptions of classroom assessment tasks and motivated learning strategies. *Electronic Journal of Research in Education Psychology, 14*(40), 515-533. doi:10.14204/ejrep.40.15177.

Alkharusi, H., & Al-Hosni, S. (2015). Perceptions of classroom assessment tasks: An interplay of gender, subject area, and grade level. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences, 10*(3), 205-217. doi:10.18844/cjes.v1i1.66.

Al-Sawalha, A. (2020). The effectiveness of using the electronic book in developing the language skills of kindergarten students. *Dirasat: Educational Sciences, 47*(2), 601-616. https://journals.ju.edu.jo/DirasatEdu/issue/view/726.

Asassfeh, S. (2019). EFL Teachers' Assessment preferences and PREVALENT Practices: The case of Jordan. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation, 2*(7). doi:10.32996/ijllt.2019.2.7.10.

Caverice, S. (2010). *Elementary teachers' assessment beliefs and practices*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Virginia Commonwealth University, USA.

Coombe, C. (2018). *An A to Z of Second Language Assessment: How Language Teachers Understand Assessment Concepts*. London: British Council.

Dhlan, O. (2019). The linguistic communication skills of Arabic language teachers in Gaza strip and the relation to their perceptions for performance efficacy. *Dirasat: Educational Sciences, 46*(3), 554-572.

Earl, L., & Katz, S. (2006). *Leading schools in a data-rich world: Harnessing data for school improvement*. California: Corwin Press Inc.

Gonzales, R., & Aliponga, J. (2012). Classroom assessment preferences of Japanese language teachers in the Philippines and English language teachers in Japan. *SSRN Electronic Journal, 36*(1), 1-19. doi:10.2139/ssrn.2746287.

Han, T., & Kaya, H. (2014). Turkish EFL teachers' Assessment preferences and practices in the context of Constructivist Instruction. *Journal of Studies in Education, 4*(1), 77. doi:10.5296/jse.v4i1.4873.

Kalajahi, S., & Abdullah, A. (2016). Assessing assessment literacy and practices among lecturers. *Pedagogika, 124*(4), 232-248. doi:10.15823/p.2016.65.

Muhammed, F., & Bardakci, M. (2019). Iraqi EFL teachers' assessment literacy: Perceptions and practices. *Arab World English Journal, 10*(2), 431-442. doi:10.2139/ssrn.3418574.

Munoz, A., Palacio, M. & Escobar, L. (2012). Teachers' beliefs about assessment in an EFL context in Colombia. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development, 14*, 143-158. http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=169224317010.

NVAO. (2016). *Assessment and demonstration of achieved learning outcomes: recommendations and good practices*. Belgium: NVAO.

Olmezer-Ozturk, E., & Aydin, B. (2019). Investigating language assessment knowledge of EFL teachers. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education, 34*(3), 602-620. doi:10.16986/huje.2018043465.

Onalan, O., & Karagul, A. (2018). A study on Turkish EFL teachers' beliefs about assessment and its different uses in teaching English. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 14*(3), 190-201.

Rayan, A. (2015). Assessment for Learning Practices (AFLP) among the Mathematics Teachers of the Basic Stage in Government Schools in Hebron from their Perspective. *The Islamic University Journal of Educational and Psychology Studies, 23*(1), 272-300. doi: 10.12816/0013592.

Saefurrohman, S. (2015). Classroom assessment preference on Indonesian junior high school teachers in English as foreign language classes. *Journal of Education and Practice, 6*(36), 104-110.

Saefurrohman, S., & Balinas, E. S. (2016). English teachers classroom Assessment Practices. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE), 5*(1), 82. doi:10.11591/ijere.v5i1.4526.

Shadiev, R., & Yang, M. (2020). Review of studies On Technology-Enhanced language learning and teaching. *Sustainability, 12*(2), 524. doi:10.3390/su12020524.

The Ministry of Education. (2020). *The Ministry of Education Strategic Plan 2018-2020*. Amman: Ministry of Education.