



A Study of Socio-Cultural Conception of Writing Assessment Literacy: Iranian EFL Teachers' and Students' Perspectives

探究寫作評量素養中的社會文化觀:伊朗英語教師與學生的觀點

Maryam Ataie-Tabar¹ · Gholamreza Zareian¹  · Seyyed Mohammad Reza Amirian¹ · Seyyed Mohammad Reza Adel¹

Received: 19 February 2019 / Revised: 27 July 2019 / Accepted: 23 September 2019

Published online: 01 November 2019

© National Taiwan Normal University 2019

Abstract

This is a mixed method study aimed at assessing the extent to which writing assessment literacy (AL) of Iranian English language teachers reflects its socio-cultural construct. The five key aspects of quality assessment for writing based on Lee's 37 study and Coombs's 14 socio-cultural conception of AL are used as a framework to analyze both student and teacher data, acknowledging the importance of including students' perspectives. Quantitative data, collected through a questionnaire answered by 105 English language students, were combined and compared with qualitative data from three EFL teachers. Data were analyzed in relation to the key competencies for writing assessment. On the whole, limited writing assessment skills of EFL teachers were suggested from the perspectives of both groups of stakeholders (i.e., students and teachers). More specifically, results revealed that students' report of the teachers' writing AL did not reflect the five key principles. A general need to enhance the socio-cultural aspect of writing AL among Iranian EFL teachers was highlighted as well.

✉ Gholamreza Zareian
g.zareian@hsu.ac.ir

Maryam Ataie-Tabar
m.ataii@hsu.ac.ir

Seyyed Mohammad Reza Amirian
sm.amirian@hsu.ac.ir

Seyyed Mohammad Reza Adel
sm.adel@hsu.ac.ir

¹ Department of English Language and Literature, Hakim Sabzevari University, Sabzevar, Iran

摘要

本混合方法研究旨在探究伊朗英語教師的寫作評量素養(AL)反映其社會文化觀的程度。本研究基於Lee(2017)所提出關於寫作質量評量的五個關鍵面向,和Coombs(2017)關於評量素養的社會文化概念為框架,來分析學生和教師的數據,同時強調了包含學生觀點的重要性。我們綜合由105名英語學生填寫問卷所得之定量數據後,與根據3名英語教師所得之定性數據進行比較,接著分析了關係到寫作評量關鍵能力之相關數據。總體而言,兩組利益相關者(即學生和教師)皆點出英語教師有限的寫作評量技巧。具體而言,結果顯示學生在對教師寫作評量素養的回應中沒有反映出五個關鍵原則。本研究亦強調伊朗英語教師的寫作評量素養在社會文化面向上仍有加強的需要。

Keywords Assessment literacy · EFL teachers · Socio-cultural perspective · Writing assessment

關鍵詞 評量素養 · 英語教師 · 社會文化面向 · 寫作評量

Introduction

Research shows that teachers spend at least one-third of their instructional time on assessment-related activities [60]. For this reason, understanding and implementing effective assessments is essential to create more learning opportunities for all students. According to White [66], assessment-literate teachers should have a range of skills related to the basic principles of quality assessment practices which emphasize student learning rather than measurement. Several studies (e.g., [3, 10, 37, 48, 61, 68]) have unanimously highlighted an increased need for embedding learner-oriented assessment practices in teachers' training programs in an informed way that guides them to plan for and use assessment as an integral part of their good teaching practice.

More recently, AL has been conceptualized from the perspective of a socio-cultural view of learning supported by interactive, dynamic, and collaborative view of assessment in which the social and cultural life of the classroom is considered as an essential part of the teaching process [3, 14, 19, 22, 23, 39, 55, 67, 68].

As a widely shared view about the communicative nature of language from a socio-cultural perspective, assessment is a social practice that teachers and students do together through classroom interactions [45]. In this context, assessment practice requires dynamic interaction with curriculum and instruction and is in the service of learning [5]. The crucial roles of both the teacher and students have been considered as shapers or influencers of assessment process and practice. Hence, the socio-cultural conception of AL is a clear call to involve students more directly in the assessment process. Students' voice about their experiences is a pre-requisite for successful implementation of assessment and creates a space where teachers and students can participate in a dialogue about what is relevant and worthwhile learning [40, 45].

So, equipping teachers to be assessment literate can help them make day-to-day decisions in ways that will support student learning. For this purpose, Lee [37] provides a general picture of classroom assessment literacy for writing teachers and calls for their professional development in teaching, learning, and assessment of writing through developing a knowledge base in feedback literacy (mostly emphasized), assessment purposes, involvement, and different assessment tools and tasks. The present study is

theoretically founded on Lee's [37] general ideas complemented by Coombs's [14] more specific socio-cultural conception of AL that learning is socially and culturally constructed through active learning, collaboration, taking responsibility for one's own learning, scaffolding, and mediation.

Despite the fact that the dynamic value of assessment has been acknowledged as a necessary and productive process, available research reports by Janisch et al. [28] point to the fact that professional training in assessment provides little guidance and strategies on how to promote more learner-oriented assessment practices. One nagging issue for educational reform is about how much and how well teachers utilize assessment to support ongoing, continuous student learning, and make a difference in achievement [18]. Enhanced quality and equity in educational assessments is conditioned upon the relationship of AL and ability to ensure assessment is designed for learning purposes beyond accountability [26].

In EFL contexts, writing assessment is a fundamental basis for the development and improvement of the quality of writing learning and instruction [17, 37, 69]. Review of related literature indicates a relative lack of work on AL. As claimed by Volante and Fazio [65], teachers' AL is underdeveloped throughout the world. Researchers of writing assessment such as Crusan et al. [17], Dempsey et al. [20], Lee [37], and Yamtim and Wongwanich [69] maintained that teachers' understandings of writing assessment also are inadequate and they need AL to carry out effective writing assessments. In fact, it is argued that lack of AL and its attendant poor performance of students "can cripple the quality of education" ([48], p. 4). In the same way, Lee [37] believes that "assessment illiterate teachers are likely to fail their responsibility in designing sound and effective assessments, jeopardizing learning and teaching with dire consequences for students' future learning."

Considering the context of this study, the dissatisfaction with the status quo of Iranian EFL teachers' AL is documented as well [1, 29, 33]. Therefore, despite its increasing importance for AL in shaping teaching effectiveness, building competency in its basic principles that address socio-cultural conception of AL is a great challenge in Iran as an EFL context where traditional and summative approaches to English language assessment are still prevalent [8, 44, 50]. So, based on the view that teaching and learning is socially and culturally constructed [58], a possible range of effective and equitable writing assessment practices are presented for the student questionnaire development. The aim of this study was therefore to investigate how the socio-cultural aspect of writing AL has been reflected in the descriptions and discussions of Iranian EFL teachers' writing assessment practice. Moreover, the students' perceptions about their teachers' assessment practices are important in classroom improvement [16]. So, student data were also analyzed in relation to the key principles of writing assessment practices.

Empirical Studies on EFL Teachers' Assessment Practice of Writing

Several studies have been conducted in the area of teachers' knowledge and practice of formative assessment to identify the strengths, achievements, and shortcomings in the students' writing and provide feedback for overcoming their problems [6, 12, 31, 34, 37]. However, according to Elwood [21], many researchers and teachers consider it as

an individual activity without emphasizing the contextual affordances for learning. From a socio-cultural perspective, assessment is a collective, mediated, and collaborative activity considered as an essential part of the teaching process ([3, 14, 19, 22, 23, 39]; Poehner & Lantolf 47; [55, 67, 68]). This conception of AL is basically similar to the process approach to L2 writing in which students are engaged throughout the entire process of planning, drafting, revising, editing, and distribution, as opposed to requiring students to submit a single final draft for feedback and evaluation [56]. However, socio-cultural theory emphasizes both the process and the product of learning as well as the social and cultural context of learning and assessment and pays particular attention to who participates in the assessment [23]. Therefore, as similarly stated by Slavkov [56], the process approach to writing is fully compatible with socio-cultural theory and can indeed be regarded as one of its integral aspects.

Despite the importance of socio-cultural aspects of writing assessment practices as mentioned above, it still remains an under-researched area both internationally and locally. At the global level, few researchers (e.g., [3, 14, 37]) have attempted to elucidate the principles teachers should know about socio-cultural aspects of assessment. Moreover, there has been little discussion on what assessment practices are effective to direct teachers in implementing socio-cultural principles of assessment into their practice. In the same way, Oxenford-O'brian [45] states that a socio-cultural interpretation of assessment and the critical attributes of that practice are unclear in the literature and consequently these practices will continue with uneven success. Hence, this study has gone some way towards enhancing our understanding of practical or instructional examples of assessment practice regarding socio-cultural aspect of assessment literacy principles. From a local perspective, Naghdipour [43] reported that Iranian teachers' use of traditional pedagogical approaches in their classes and formative assessment tools, collaborative tasks, portfolio writing, and other process- and genre-based strategies were among activities absent from the majority of writing classes. Recently, Tavakoli et al. [63] investigated the assessment practices as well as the teachers' and students' attitudes towards these practices through a large-scale questionnaire survey. They developed a writing formative assessment model through which teachers and students can become more aware of the possible formative assessment practices to assess their students' writing more effectively and make them more independent and autonomous writers. The present study is a step beyond these international and local studies by using both quantitative and qualitative data to focus on the extent to which writing teachers are assessment literate and practice AL from a socio-cultural perspective.

Theoretical Background of Assessment Literacy

Since the early decades of the twentieth century, researchers and teachers have had different conceptions of writing starting with a form-focused mechanical view, towards a cognitive conception, and most recently to socio-cultural theories of writing [7]. Similarly, DeLuca et al. [19] analyzed the AL landscape from 1999 to the present indicating noticeable shifts from teachers' psychometric knowledge and summative forms of measurement to knowledge of assessment for learning as a modern and dominant conception in teacher assessment training with an

emphasis on the socio-culturally shaped situated practice. Coombs [14] identified specifically three conceptions of teacher AL: a traditional conception, an expanded conception, and finally a socio-cultural conception. Traditional conception of AL is built upon understanding the values of employing statistics and testing technical skills in development and administration of standardized tests [49]. More specifically, it refers to standards that were primarily conceptualized by American Federation of Teachers, National Council of Measurement in Education, and National Educational Association [4] which served as a foundation for research on teachers' assessment literacy [41, 42, 46].

Some researchers, however, argue that the standards-based or summative conceptions of assessment failed to address the expanded notions of assessment for formative purposes (i.e., assessment for learning, assessment as learning) or student-centered assessment [14]. Brookhart's [10] study is one of the leading research attempts to conceptualize an expanded view of AL reflecting changes in contemporary classroom assessment use to make fair educational decisions and effectively support students in their learning.

From the socio-cultural view of AL, interactions and engagement through assessment practices for effective teaching and learning are acknowledged and valued [3, 19, 67, 68]. Assessment became a more collaborative enterprise between teacher and students, and assessment data gathered through interaction in the classroom can be used to guide teaching and learning [62]. Coombs [14] claimed that the socio-cultural conception of AL, while supporting formative assessment practices and student-centered assessment (expanded conception), represents "a more rounded understanding of classroom assessment by placing an increased importance on the teacher-student learning dynamic" ([14], pp. 12-13). Broadly, the idea behind socio-cultural conceptions of assessment literacy is that learning occurs as a result of interactions between learners and teachers or as a dynamic output of interaction [23] that requires teachers to activate learning, offer feedback, and engage students in the assessment process.

In sum, we suggest the socio-cultural perspective of AL as a student-centric activity that includes skills in framing assessment as a formative process and a collaborative inquiry, encouraging reflection and promoting active learning through the provision of feedback and scaffolding to students. This aspect of AL is in line with Hasim [25], Sardare and Saad [53], and Shepard [54] on the socio-cultural perspective of assessment. It seems that classroom assessment practice is a good fit with socio-cultural learning theories especially with the part that supports students' ability to take responsibility for and regulate their own learning through interaction rather than transmission of instruction [59]. Considering AL as a necessary attribute of effective teachers [24], adding a socio-cultural perspective allows to engage with quality assessment at the classroom level.

Regarding what teachers need to know about assessment as a student-centric activity, Brookhart [10], Lee [37], and Vogt and Tsagari [64] offered a framework for describing classroom AL. In this paper, we refer to writing AL. To explore this topic, we focus specifically on classroom AL of writing teachers offered by Lee [37]. Lee [37] defined AL for writing teachers in terms of their ability to do the following:

- 1) understand the different purposes of classroom writing assessment and how they can be used to maximize student learning, 2) utilize feedback effectively to improve student learning, 3) involve students in self-assessment/peer assessment,

goal setting, self-monitoring, and self-reflection, 4) employ different classroom writing assessment tools to maximize student learning, e.g., teacher feedback forms, error ratio analysis, the error log, peer feedback, and portfolio assessment, 5) design effective classroom writing assessment tasks to evaluate student writing, e.g., technology-enhanced writing tasks, 6) use assessment effectively to motivate students and help them learn, 7) make use of classroom assessment to improve instruction. (p. 150)

These competencies were formulated to direct teachers in implementing classroom writing assessment effectively. Following Lee's [37] attributes of an assessment-literate teacher as a framework, the present study seeks to explore the status quo of writing AL from the perspective of both students and teachers who are crucial agents of change [40]. They are asked to express their personal experience on the current teachers' writing AL. The research question of this study is presented as follows: how do students' and teachers' perspectives of classroom assessment practices in writing courses reflect key principles of writing AL?

Method

Participants and Setting

The participants in this study were 105 undergraduate students (61 females, 44 males) of English language literature from five universities in Iran. All the students in this major are required to take writing courses and those participating in the present study were randomly selected with the intended criteria of having experienced discourse-level writing. They were surveyed to express their personal experience of teachers' writing AL. Three EFL writing teachers (with the pseudonyms of T1, T2, and T3) were invited to participate in interviews. They were selected purposefully from the same five universities in Iran. They were 32, 33, and 37 years old, respectively. The three teachers held Masters in TEFL and taught university-level writing for 15, 7, and 10 years, respectively. It is noteworthy that these three teachers taught at more than one university each term so that all five universities were represented in the study.

Procedure and Instruments

The questionnaire used to collect quantitative data was developed to enable researchers to portray students' perspectives of their teachers' writing AL. A theoretical blueprint based on the aforementioned Lee's [37] principles of writing AL and Coombs's [14] socio-cultural conception of AL was used as the foundation of the instrument development and the interview protocol. Lee's [37] study then guided us in extracting the items and classifying them into five constructs related to student-centric writing AL. Following the revisions, the online survey was piloted with 75 students. Initial statistical analyses indicated that the questionnaire had reasonably sound psychometric properties. For example, parallel analysis indicated a five-factor solution which largely corresponded to the seven competencies determined at the stage of questionnaire development and the internal consistency reliability estimate was computed at 0.81. Additionally, the

individual scales reached acceptable levels of reliability ranging from .78 to .85. The final questionnaire had 32 questions, designed based on a five-point Likert scale of frequency (1 = never and 5 = always) and fell into five key categories, each of which represented one aspect of writing AL. In the questionnaire, four items based on aligning instruction with assessment by sharing learning intention and criteria for assessment success, seven items based on the purposes of writing assessment, six items based on strategic instruction that help students move forward, eight items based on student involvement, and seven items based on effective communication of results (Appendix 1).

Semi-structured interviews were conducted to explore EFL teachers' perspectives of writing AL. All the EFL teachers were interviewed once, and this was audio recorded. The interviews lasted between 30 and 45 min. The interview encompassed 13 open-ended questions on each aspect of writing AL (Appendix 2). For the sake of convenience in comparing students' and teachers' views, the same five aspects of writing AL in the student questionnaire were also adopted when developing interview protocol. *In other words, interview questions should be parallel to the underlying constructs and sub-constructs of the student questionnaire. With the parallel technique, the five aspects of writing AL act as a prompt to remind the same areas to probe for the interview stage.*

Data Analysis

Data were screened for missing, outlier, and implausible values, and found to be normally distributed. Percentages were used to show students' reports on the frequency of the most common student-centric (socio-cultural) writing assessment practices. A theoretical comparative analysis [15] was undertaken of the teachers' qualitative data with the aim of finding the related assessment practices which were in line with the socio-cultural construct of writing AL. Through the comparative method of analysis, the researchers collected qualitative data for pre-established concepts and then they compared each incident in the qualitative data with other incidents to find similarities and differences ([15], cited in [63]). Finally, the results from the analysis of teachers' qualitative data on socio-cultural aspects of assessment competencies were compared with findings in students' quantitative data in order to examine the extent to which students' and teachers' perspectives were congruent.

Results

In the present study, Lee's [37] ideas on feedback literacy, assessment purposes, involvement, and different assessment tools and tasks in addition to Coombs's [14] socio-cultural views on active learning, collaboration, taking responsibility for one's own learning, scaffolding, and mediation were used to present a clear picture of the nature of writing literacy and the process of activating that knowledge in classroom for student-centric assessment of writing. We use them as a framework to analyze both student and teacher data. The results from student quantitative data in relation to the findings from teacher qualitative data sorted under subheadings following the socio-cultural principles of writing AL.

Constructive Alignment: Learning Intentions and Success Criteria Drive Teaching, Learning, and Assessment

The first three interview questions (Appendix 2) tapped teachers' AL to give students accurate performance information and make assessment results more valid and reliable. What all three teachers had in common was the importance of sharing explicitly the learning target with students as an early phase of assessment that provides a road map for implementation of instructional activities. T1 said, "when students can identify and understand the expectations, they are better prepared to take responsibility for their own learning. Students usually hear the learning targets." T2 explained, "I try to follow this dimension of quality assessment as a starting point to provide assistance to students. It is an integral part of a good teaching. I write the learning targets on the board and students write them in their notebooks." T3 believed that "goals and expectations provide central requirements to change or differentiate our practice based on local needs. Besides writing them on the board I ask students restate them." Interviewees tended to believe that good assessment practice starts with sharing clear purposes. The importance of sharing expectations and learning goals was evident through teachers' comments on their practices to make students more aware of what they are learning or focus students on achieving the learning targets. They asserted that introducing main points of teaching or analyzing samples of writing with reference to success criteria gives students directions about their writing task. While the socio-cultural aspect of constructive alignment was stated by the three teachers (e.g., students take responsibility for their own learning; it provides assistance to students; it helps teacher change or differentiate his or her practice based on local needs), none of the three teachers confirmed the practice of the most important socio-cultural aspect of constructive alignment which was involving students in a discussion about writing goals or success criteria to check their understanding.

Table 1 shows the results for students' experience of constructive alignment in their writing classes. The most frequently experienced writing assessment practices were item 1 and item 2 in the writing AL instrument. The majority of the respondents (77.5 % and 62.6%) claimed that their teachers shared the writing goals (item 1), and

Table 1 Percentage of students' experience of writing AL principle 1 (constructive alignment)

Item	Response percentages (%)				
	Never	Rarely	Often	Always	Often + always
1. Teacher shares explicitly the learning goals with students before writing task	2.5	20	53	24.5	*77.5 (<i>N</i> = 82)
2. The requirements of good writing are available to students before students start to write.	9.6	27.8	44.6	18	*62.6 (<i>N</i> = 66)
3. Teacher uses pair or group discussion to support students understanding.	11.1	45.5	35	8.4	43.4 (<i>N</i> = 45)
4. Teacher analyzes samples of writing with reference to given success criteria	8	34.4	40.5	17.1	57.6 (<i>N</i> = 60)

*Asterisks show the most common practices for the first principle of writing AL experienced by the majority of students

explained the requirements of good writing (item 2) before students started writing. The least frequently experienced item was item 3 (pair or group discussion to support students understanding) with only 43.4% of the respondents.

Overall, what the teachers valued in their practice (i.e., sharing success criteria with students) and what students figured out about the most frequently experienced writing assessment practices (i.e., related to constructive alignment) (items 1 and 2) exhibited no difference. Students' ratings validate that the teachers accomplished this aspect of writing AL. However, follow-up discussion about writing goals or success criteria (item 3) shared before writing tasks (items 1 and 2) was reported by both groups to be rarely used. It means that this aspect was less student-centric since the teachers did not address the important role of discussion with the students as an active participant in their learning.

Writing Assessment Purposes: Using a Variety of Assessment Techniques to Assess Both the Learning Process and the Product of Learning Encourages and Reinforces Good Teaching and Learning Practices

When writing assessment practices related to process writing (questions 4 and 5 in Appendix 2) were considered, all three teachers commented that more emphasis could be placed on process writing, drafting, and making revisions rather than the product which is a common practice in writing assessment. T1 highly valued student drafts, blogs, questioning or observations in class along with assessing students writing tasks or essays they have completed. T2 explained the importance of classroom observation,

Table 2 Percentage of students' experience of writing AL principle 2 (writing purposes)

Item	Response percentages (%)				
	Never	Rarely	Often	Always	Often + always
5. Before writing, teacher asks questions about the topic and helps students to share their ideas.	15	26.6	40.9	17.5	58.4 (N = 61)
6. Teacher gives students time to write an outline or mind map of the structure of their writing (e.g., list or group their ideas and show the relationship between different ideas).	6.1	27.8	45	21.1	*66.1 (N = 69)
7. Teacher asks questions that help students figure out what they think and how to put their ideas into a well-organized text.	20.6	37	30.6	11.8	42.4 (N = 54)
8. Teacher asks students to apply what they have learned from teacher's comments to a new, revised draft.	19	39.5	32	9.5	41.5 (N = 43)
9. Teacher asks students to deliver multiple drafts for one writing assignment.	30	45.6	18.8	5.6	24.4 (N = 26)
10. Students have to work alone on writing drafts at home	3	11	57.5	28.5	*86 (N = 90)
11. Teacher just assesses completed writing task	2	14.4	34.6	49	*83.6 (N = 88)

*Asterisks show the most common practices for the second principle of writing AL experienced by the majority of students

informal interactions, exemplar analysis, and assessing the students during the learning process. However, he stated that assessing the learning process and looking for students' responses rather than correctness did not happen often. T3 also expressed that he gives students opportunity to brainstorm with specific prompts, organize ideas in a coherent structure, and revise their drafts based on teacher's comments. However, he rarely asked students to do in-class assignments. All three teachers mainly indicated that they assess the products of learning (such as completed essays) instead of process writing which is time consuming to be implemented as a routine practice in classroom. Using ongoing and varied assessment processes and practices which contributes to the fairness of writing assessment practices was less implemented.

As far as students' experience of process writing and product writing is concerned, the majority of students reported that their teachers' assessment practice in writing courses often or always were in line with product learning (see items 10 and 11 in Table 2). Furthermore, item 6 showed that the majority of students had experienced process writing strategies such as the use of an outline or mind map techniques.

According to Table 2, for the majority of students, teachers' use of process writing strategies was limited (item 6). While all three teachers showed their awareness of this socio-cultural aspect of writing assessment (e.g., Teachers should use multiple drafts, blogs, questioning or in class observation; informal interactions, exemplar analysis, and assessing the students during the learning process; brainstorming with specific prompts, organizing ideas in a coherent structure, and revising), their writing assessment practices were limited to product-based writing. The students' view was reflected in the comments from the three teachers who mentioned that they mainly assess the product of learning which corresponds least to the socio-cultural conception of writing assessment.

Instruction: Informative Use of Writing Assessment Provides a Context of Ongoing Teaching and Learning to Move Students Forward

Regarding instruction, identifying students' strengths, areas for improvement, and the strategies to write better are crucial. All three teachers believed in the completion of a writing task that received different types of feedback. All three teachers claimed that they could not support students to move forward and make improvements without instructional activities such as scaffolding, feedback, discussion, and revision of tasks. T1 explained, "I guide the students to write quality essay explaining them what they need to do to improve with reference to the writing goals. Noticing the mismatch between students' writing task and what is considered quality writing provides more opportunities for students to demonstrate their progress and develop a sense of competence. T2 stated, "focusing just on grammatical and stylistic errors keeps the students performing only at lower level thinking. As a result, students may have difficulty to develop and shape ideas, organize, and edit their tasks for different genres in a creative way." Similarly, T3 assumed what mattered after pointing out gaps was making instructional adjustments based on students' needs. Error correction feedback on grammar, organization and discourse of students' writing was reported by all three teachers.

Table 3 shows that the majority of students reported that their teachers were concerned about lower-order issues. For example, they reported that their writing tasks

Table 3 Percentage of students' experience of writing AL principle 3 (instruction)

Item	Response percentages (%)				
	Never	Rarely	Often	Always	Often + always
12. Students receive feedback and multiple comments about their current level of writing.	17	25.8	45.9	11.3	57.2 (<i>N</i> = 60)
13. Teacher gives every student individually a clear idea of which aspects of writing she or he wants to focus more on.	14.5	27	43.6	14.7	58.3 (<i>N</i> = 61)
14. Teacher mainly treats grammatical or mechanical aspects of the writing.	9.5	21	51.6	17.9	*69.5 (<i>N</i> = 73)
15. Teacher provides students with feedback on the clarity of their writing such as carefully defined main ideas, logical organization, well-constructed sentences, and precise word choice.	24.2	37.6	29.8	8.4	38.2 (<i>N</i> = 40)
16. Teacher suggests solutions to students' writing problems during writing conferences.	28.1	39	21.7	11.2	32.9 (<i>N</i> = 34)
17. Teacher introduces blog-based writing or collaborative writing on wikis which helps students get more feedback when they write.	39.1	34.5	20.5	5.9	26.4 (<i>N</i> = 28)

*Asterisks show the most common practices for the third principle of writing AL experienced by the majority of students

were mainly judged grammatically or mechanically (item 14). The least frequently experienced writing assessment practices relates to items 17, 16, and 15 respectively which measures the extent EFL teachers were concerned about higher-order issues such as the main idea, organization, content, conferencing, and collaboration.

When the three teachers' socio-cultural AL was considered in practice, the results were revealed to be less student-centric. Although all the three teachers knew the beneficial effects of instructional strategies as a way to move students forward and progress, their efforts in writing improvement focused more on the current problems in writing which were not in line with this socio-cultural aspect of writing AL. In other words, the more student-centric instructional practices such as descriptive feedback, conferencing practice, and use of technology for a more collaborative writing were absent. Their students' rating of informative use of assessment for writing improvement was underrepresented too (items 17, 16, and 15).

Involvement: Writing Assessment Entails a Context-Rich Interaction

With regard to the interview questions (9 and 10) on student involvement, all three teachers acknowledged the importance of one-to-one interactions between teachers, students and peers to learn more from each other. However, having students actively participate in the classroom assessment process engaging in self- and peer assessment was not reported. All three teachers claimed that evaluation and revisions of students' works were the teacher's primary responsibility. So, self-assessment or peer-assessment strategies were not popular in their writing courses. All three teachers believed that they were often limited in their choice of self-assessment or peer assessment due to low

Table 4 Percentage of students' experience of writing AL principle 4 (involvement)

Item	Response percentages (%)				
	Never	Rarely	Often	Always	Often + always
18. Students obtain assistance from teacher to develop better writing.	11.1	23	49	16.9	*65.9 (<i>N</i> = 70)
19. Teacher encourages students to obtain assistance from each other to develop better writing.	22	41.4	33.5	3.1	36.6 (<i>N</i> = 57)
20. Teacher and students build a shared pleasure for dialogue, discussions, and questioning.	13	38.2	48.4	0.4	48.8 (<i>N</i> = 51)
21. Teacher lets students participate in the feedback and assessment process.	32	48	14.6	5.4	20 (<i>N</i> = 21)
22. Teacher asks students to reflect on their own writing and revise it after feedback.	14	33.6	47.5	4.9	52.4 (<i>N</i> = 55)
23. Students assess their own writing.	36	39	23.5	1.5	25 (<i>N</i> = 26)
24. Students assess their peers' writing and have their writing assessed by peers.	21.5	35	30	13.5	43.5 (<i>N</i> = 45)
25. Students are confident enough to write independently on a new task through assessment criteria.	35.6	41	20.4	3	23.4 (<i>N</i> = 24)

*Asterisks show the most common practices for the fourth principle of writing AL experienced by the majority of students

proficiency level of students that made it difficult for them to be confident and honest about themselves or their peers. For example, T3 mentioned “class discussions and the whole-class feedback session helped students add quality to their work. More modification of writing drafts was observed when I asked students share or read their writing for their classmates. However, a challenge for me when I used peer feedback and asked students to make suggestions was that my students were not competent or qualified to do this. I had to restrict this practice to students' listening to each other. Writing good feedback is hard and it is my own job. The full potential of writing assessment as a collaborative enterprise does not seem to be realized by the three teachers due to their students' limited language proficiency that made teachers the mere source of feedback provision.”

As Table 4 shows, the reports from students on their independence from the teacher's assistance (item 26) confirm the picture of self-assessment and peer-assessment strategies as not a very regular practice in writing (items 19, 22, 23, 24, and 25). Item 18 had the highest percentage (65.9%) and pertained to the teacher and students' interactions for writing improvement.

Students' low report of involvement experiences coincides with results from the three teachers' data. It confirmed that the teachers and students did not spend adequate time for more direct involvement of students which aims at making students feel an ownership to their learning and enhancing their motivation and active role in the writing [34]. It seems that this socio-cultural concept of AL had not been the concern of any of the three teachers. All the teachers were doubtful about the students' qualifications for self or peer assessment. None of the three teachers referred to specific

strategies to make students autonomous to monitor their own learning, use assessment feedback to determine next steps, and set individual learning goals.

Effective Communication of Results: the Major Owners of Writing Assessment Results Are Students

The last aspect of the socio-cultural conception of AL deals with open, frequent, and ongoing communication of results with students. While the teachers showed agreement about the importance of helping students understand why and how they receive a specific grade using different writing assessment tools, e.g., teacher feedback forms, error ratio analysis, the error log, and portfolio assessment, they used them less as valuable tools to maximize student learning. All three teachers mentioned that they interpret and evaluate student work against existing criteria that they developed to increase students' understanding of writing assessments. They also commented on sharing knowledge of grades and grading criteria with students to know the features of high-quality writing task that empower them to make changes in their writing practice. As already alluded to, the teachers were aware that students were the prime owners of assessment results. However, they expressed that they rarely discussed assessment results with students purposefully. All three teachers expressed that assigning a final grade to students' current level of writing was their responsibility and they were forced to adhere to the accountability system of education. So, they all benefited from numerical scores to show writing improvement to their students. None of them suggested strategies for making writing grading more supportive of learning. For example, T1 explained that he gave comments and scored students' writing with reference to the learning objectives and success criteria.

As Table 5 clearly shows, no practice was reported by the majority of students to have been used by their teachers often or always. Assessment practices which aim at building a supportive learning atmosphere through de-emphasizing scores in writing

Table 5 Percentage of students' experience of writing AL principle 5 (effective communication of results)

Item	Response percentages (%)				
	Never	Rarely	Often	Always	Often + always
26. Teacher regularly communicates results of writing tasks against existing success criteria.	21.6	40	31.4	7	38.4 (<i>N</i> = 40)
27. Teacher uses a range of reporting strategies in addition to grades such as rubrics, error log, and conferences.	35	47.5	15.1	2.4	17.5 (<i>N</i> = 18)
28. Teacher communicates formatively the results of each writing tasks	21.5	37	38.6	2.9	41.5 (<i>N</i> = 44)
29. Teacher makes writing portfolios.	33.1	39.6	20.1	7.2	27.3 (<i>N</i> = 29)
30. Students use feedback forms or error log to monitor their writing progress.	36	49.5	13.6	0.9	14.5 (<i>N</i> = 15)
31. Students are clear why and how they receive a specific grade.	18.6	32	42.9	6.5	49.4 (<i>N</i> = 52)
32. Students know what is needed to do to receive a better grade after completion of writing task.	14	49.4	33	3.6	36.6 (<i>N</i> = 38)

tasks were found to be never or rarely utilized in writing courses (items 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30). Nearly half of the student respondents (49.4%) stated that the grading of their writing tasks was informative about their current level of writing (item 31). However, they believed grading strategies without receiving feedback on what they needed to do for improvement after they completed the writing task did not guide them to improve their future writing (item 32).

All in all, these results show that both students and the three teachers limited the writing grading practices to the questions about accountability and summative assessment. The teachers' grading practices for writing assessment were not in line with the effective communication of results principle that may cause student writing to progress over time. The teachers' responses to interview questions as well as their students' reports on the AL instrument could show the absence of good record-keeping strategies to encourage students' further reflection on how to improve their subsequent writing performance. In fact, teachers dominantly communicated the current state of student performance rather than future progress.

Discussion

Based on Lee's [37] study, the five socio-cultural writing assessment principles were identified in both students' and teachers' perspectives of assessment practices in Iran. The majority of students reported few experiences regarding the key principles-constructive alignment, assessment purposes, instruction, involvement, and effective communication of results, and it was only in regard to the less student-centric assessment practices which were reported to be experienced by the majority of students.

The majority of students reported limited implementation of socio-cultural (student-centric) writing AL principles (9.37%). Moreover, the analysis of the three teachers' data revealed that they valued and emphasized the importance of following the five socio-cultural aspects of writing AL. However, their writing assessment practices from the majority of students' view cannot be considered to reflect those principles. This finding resonates in a multitude of previous teacher writing assessment practice studies conducted in the Iranian context [8, 44, 50, 63]. Looking at the results of these studies, assessment practices of EFL writing teachers carry a primarily summative function. For example, Iranian teachers did not use a variety of tools to assess writing. Many other forms of writing assessment practices such as portfolios, journals, and self or peer assessment were reported by Iranian teachers to be never or rarely used [32, 51, 63]. Regarding instruction, teachers grade students' completed product with their concentration on grammatical errors in great detail. Students are not encouraged to have multiple writing drafts to close any gap. This finding is in line with the results of similar studies done by Lee [35, 36], Smith [57], Burner [12], and Saliu-Abdulahi et al. [52]. Considering students' involvement, indicated by Ahmadi and Mirshojaee [1], Cheng and Wang [13], and Brown [11], teachers do not appear to consider student involvement in the process of assessment or include students on discussions of how best to interact with other partners to be as learning resources for one another. Looking at sharing assessment results with students for learning purposes, it can be seen that teachers' practice has more a summative than formative function. Likewise, other

scholars, Alkharusi [2] and Brookhart [9], underscore teachers' effort to accomplish it for the sake of being accountable.

While teachers in the study had grasped the possible benefits of writing AL to help all students achieve their potential, they had to adhere to conventional practices of summative functions of assessment. The full potential of socio-cultural aspects of writing AL does not seem to be realized in the context of this study since many of the assessment practices were less student-centric. The results of this mixed method study revealed a gap between teachers' writing AL and the related practice in reality as perceived by students. Coombs [14] and similarly James and Pedder [27], Lee [36], and Junqueira and Payant [30], also referred to the existence of the gap between what a teacher knows about writing assessment and what she/he does or implements in classrooms.

Moreover, our study demonstrated the challenge of limited teachers' socio-cultural assessment practices in EFL writing courses, as reported by students. This finding is in line with the results of a similar study done by Lee and Coniam [38] as they suggest that such potential benefits for improving students writing performance do not necessarily follow when teachers attempt to implement classroom assessment.

Conclusion

We were interested in how Iranian EFL students and teachers perceive writing assessment as a student-centric activity that serves learning. In doing this, we used Lee's [37] major skills for EFL writing teachers as a framework to develop a questionnaire with five factors to collect students' quantitative data which were compared with results from the analysis of qualitative data from EFL writing teachers. Data were analyzed in relation to the five key principles of writing AL. This study demonstrated that Iranian teachers have many challenges to embed key principles of writing AL successfully in classrooms. Iranian teachers' assessment practices failed to realize its full potential as students' voices about their experiences showed the socio-cultural aspect of writing AL not being implemented. So, Iranian EFL teachers need to know more about the AL principles which involve students more directly in the process of writing assessment. In other words, the results of the current study showed that looking at classroom AL through the lens of socio-cultural perspective is an important area of development that requires teachers to acknowledge the five principles in their writing courses to engage students more actively in the learning process of writing. It provides a shared understanding of a new conceptualization of writing AL that can address issues for the student's ongoing learning and development. While the findings of this study threw light on the nature of classroom assessment in EFL writing courses, these findings could not be generalized to other EFL contexts because they are limited by a small sample size studying at a particular educational context. The teachers mostly believed in the usefulness of quality assessment practices; however, it was suggested that implementation of assessment is a practical challenge for Iranian EFL teachers of today. Since the instruments of the present study were limited to a questionnaire answered by 105 students and interviews with three teachers, further studies are needed, preferably with more data collection tools and a larger sample of students and teachers, to identify their concerns related to time, support, or knowledge on enactment of high-quality writing assessment practices. Moreover, the gap between teachers' writing

AL and the related practice in reality can be investigated through classroom observation.

Compliance with Ethical Standards

Conflict of Interest The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Appendix 1. Students' Perspectives of Their Teachers' Writing Assessment Literacy (AL)

Please rate your perspectives on the following statements related to your experience of writing assessment practices by placing a check mark in the appropriate box.

Writing AL Principle 1: Constructive Alignment	Never	Rarely	Often	Always	Often +Always
1. Teacher shares explicitly the learning goals with students before writing task.					
2. The requirements of good writing are available to students before students start to write.					
3. Teacher uses pair or group discussion to support students understanding.					
4. Teacher analyzes samples of writing with reference to given success criteria.					
Writing AL Principle 2: Writing Assessment Purposes	Never	Rarely	Often	Always	Often +Always
5. Before writing, teacher asks questions about the topic and helps students to share their ideas.					
6. Teacher gives students time to write an outline or mind map of the structure of their writing (e.g., list or group their ideas and show the relationship between different ideas).					
7. Teacher asks questions that help students figure out what they think and how to put their ideas into a well-organized text.					
8. Teacher asks students to apply what they have learned from teacher's comments to a new, revised draft.					
9. Teacher asks students to deliver multiple drafts for one writing assignment.					
10. Students have to work alone on writing drafts at home.					
11. Teacher just assesses completed writing task.					
Writing AL Principle 3: Instruction	Never	Rarely	Often	Always	Often +Always
12. Students receive feedback and multiple comments about their current level of writing.					
13. Teacher gives every student individually a clear idea of which aspects of writing she or he wants to focus more on.					

(continued)

14. Teacher mainly treats grammatical or mechanical aspects of the writing.

15. Teacher provides students with feedback on the clarity of their writing such as carefully defined main ideas, logical organization, well-constructed sentences, and precise word choice.

16. Teacher suggests solutions to students' writing problems during writing conferences.

17. Teacher introduces blog-based writing or collaborative writing on wikis which helps students get more feedback when they write.

Writing AL Principle 4: Involvement

Never Rarely Often Always Often +Always

18. Students obtain assistance from teacher to develop better writing.

19. Teacher encourages students to obtain assistance from each other to develop better writing.

20. Teacher and students build a shared pleasure for dialogue, discussions, and questioning.

21. Teacher lets students participate in the feedback and assessment process.

22. Teacher asks students to reflect on their own writing and revise it after feedback.

23. Students assess their own writing.

24. Students assess their peers' writing and have their writing assessed by peers.

25. Students are confident enough to write independently on a new task through assessment criteria.

Writing AL Principle 5: Effective Communication of Results

Never Rarely Often Always Often +Always

26. Teacher regularly communicates results of writing tasks against existing success criteria.

27. Teacher uses a range of reporting strategies in addition to grades such as rubrics, error log, and conferences.

28. Teacher communicates formatively the results of each writing tasks

29. Teacher makes writing portfolios.

30. Students use feedback forms or error log to monitor their writing progress.

31. Students are clear why and how they receive a specific grade.

32. Students know what is needed to do to receive a better grade after completion of writing task.

Appendix 2. Teachers' Semi-Structured Interview

A. Constructive alignment

1. What do you think of the importance of aligning instruction with assessment and learning process (constructive alignment)?
2. How do you translate constructive alignment into the classroom writing assessment?
3. What do you think of the effective approach enabling students to get a deeper understanding of the classroom writing assessment practices?

B. Writing assessment purposes

4. How do you ensure that multiple writing assessment methods are fit for the improvement of learning purpose?
5. Do you have a plan for assessing your students' performance at different stages of writing? What is your experience like?

C. Instruction

6. Which types of instructional practices (scaffolding, feedback, error correction, discussion, and revision of tasks) do you most favor in your writing classes? Why?
7. What do you do to increase the effectiveness of your feedback in writing classroom?
8. What actions assist a teacher in ensuring students add quality to their writing?

D. Involvement

9. What do you think it looks like for students to be involved in classroom writing assessment?
10. What is the purpose and value of students' involvement in assessing their own writing or each other's writing?

E. Effective communication of results

11. What do you do to communicate the results of writing assessment to be truly formative for students?
12. What do you do when students fail to understand why and how they receive a specific grade for their writing performance?
13. What record-keeping strategies do you favor in classroom writing assessment? (grades, rubrics, error log, feedback forms, conferences, portfolios).

References

1. Ahmadi, A., & Mirshojaei, S. B. (2016). Iranian English language teachers' assessment literacy: the case of public school and language institute teachers. *The Iranian EFL Journal*, 12(2), 6–32.
2. Alkharusi, H. (2008). Effects of classroom assessment practices on students' achievement goals. *Educational Assessment*, 13(4), 243–266.
3. Alonzo, D. (2016). *Development and application of a teacher assessment for learning (AfL) literacy tool* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia.
4. American Federation of Teachers, National Council on Measurement in Education, National Education Association. (1990). Standards for teacher competence in educational assessment of students. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 9(4), 30–32.
5. Armour-Thomas, E., & Gordon, E. W. (2012). *Toward an understanding of assessment as a dynamic component of pedagogy*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
6. Beck, S. W., Llosa, L., Black, K., & Anderson, A. T. (2018). From assessing to teaching writing: what teachers prioritize. *Assessing Writing*, 37, 68–77.
7. Behizadeh, N., & Engelhard, G. (2011). Historical view of the influences of measurement and writing theories on the practice of writing assessment in the United States. *Assessing Writing*, 16, 189–211.
8. Birjandi, P., & Hadidi Tamjid, N. (2012). The role of self, peer and teacher assessment in promoting Iranian EFL learners' writing performance. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 37(5), 513–533.
9. Brookhart, S. M. (1994). Teachers' grading: practice and theory. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 7(4), 279–301.
10. Brookhart, S. M. (2011). Educational assessment knowledge and skills for teachers. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 30(1), 3–12.
11. Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language assessment: principles and classroom practices*. New York: Pearson Education.
12. Burner, T. (2016). Formative assessment of writing in English as a foreign language. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 60(6), 626–648.
13. Cheng, L., & Wang, X. (2007). Grading, feedback, and reporting in ESL/EFL classrooms. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 4(1), 85–107.
14. Coombs, A. J. (2017). *Teacher educators' approaches to assessment*, Unpublished master's thesis. Ontario: Queen's University.
15. Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
16. Cowie, B. (2005). Pupil commentary on assessment for learning. *The Curriculum Journal*, 16(2), 137–151.
17. Crusan, D., Plakans, L., & Gebril, A. (2016). Writing assessment literacy: surveying second language teachers' knowledge, beliefs, and practices. *Assessing Writing*, 28, 43–56.
18. Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 8(1). Retrieved from <https://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/viewFile/392/515>
19. DeLuca, C., LaPointe-McEwan, D., & Luhanga, U. (2016). Teacher assessment literacy: a review of international standards and measures. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 28(3), 251–272.
20. Dempsey, M. S., PytlikZillig, L. M., & Bruning, R. H. (2009). Helping pre-service teachers learn to assess writing: practice and feedback in a Web-based environment. *Assessing Writing*, 14(1), 38–61.
21. Elwood, J. (2006). Formative assessment: possibilities, boundaries and limitations. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 13, 215–232.
22. Elwood, J., & Murphy, P. (2015). Assessment systems as cultural scripts: a socio-cultural theoretical lens on assessment practice and products. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 22, 182–192.
23. Gipps, C. (1999). Socio-cultural aspects of assessment. *Review of Research in Education*, 24(1), 355–392.
24. Gotch, C. M., & French, B. F. (2014). A systematic review of assessment literacy measures. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 33(2), 14–18.
25. Hasim, Z. (2014). *An Integration of a process approach and formative assessment into the development of teaching and learning of ESL writing in a Malaysian university: a socio-cultural perspective* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand.

26. Hey, P., & Penney, D. (2013). *Assessment in physical education: A socio-cultural perspective*. New York: Routledge.
27. James, M., & Pedder, D. (2006). Beyond method: assessment and learning practices and values. *The Curriculum Journal*, 17(2), 109–138.
28. Janisch, C., Liu, X., & Akrofi, A. (2007). Implementing alternative assessment: opportunities and obstacles. *The Educational Forum*, 71(3), 221–230.
29. Jannati, S. (2015). ELT teachers' language assessment literacy: perceptions and practices. *The International Journal of Research in Teacher Education*, 6(2), 26–37.
30. Junqueira, L., & Payant, C. (2015). "I just want to do it right, but it's so hard": a novice teacher's written feedback beliefs and practices. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 27, 19–36.
31. Keen, J. (2005). Assessment for writing development: trainee English teachers' understanding of formative assessment. *Teacher Development*, 9(2), 237–254.
32. Ketabi, S. (2015). Different methods of assessing writing among EFL teachers in Iran. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, 5(2), 3–15.
33. Kiomrs, R., Abdolmehdi, R., & Rashidi, N. (2011). On the interaction of test washback and teacher assessment literacy: the case of Iranian EFL secondary school teachers. *English Language Teaching*, 4(1), 156–161.
34. Lee, I. (2004). L2 writing teachers' perspectives, practices and problems regarding error feedback. *Assessing Writing*, 8(3), 216–237.
35. Lee, I. (2007). Assessment for learning: integrating assessment, teaching, and learning in the ESL/EFL writing classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 64(1), 199–213.
36. Lee, I. (2011). Bringing innovation to EFL writing through a focus on assessment for learning. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 5(1), 19–33.
37. 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.
38. Lee, I., & Coniam, D. (2013). Introducing assessment for learning for EFL writing in an assessment of learning examination-driven system in Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22(1), 34–50.
39. Lund, A. (2008). Assessment made visible: individual and collective practices. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 15, 32–51.
40. McNemey, D. M., Brown, G. T., & Liem, L. G. D. (2009). *Student perspectives on assessment: what students can tell us about assessment for learning*. Charlotte, NC: IAP.
41. Mertler, C. A. (2003). *Pre-service versus in-service teachers' assessment literacy: does classroom experience make a difference?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Educational Research Association, Columbus, Ohio.
42. Mertler, C. A., & Campbell, C. (2005, April). *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. Quebec, Canada: Montréal.
43. Naghdipour, B. (2016). English writing instruction in Iran: implications for second language writing curriculum and pedagogy. *Second Language Writing Journal*, 32, 81–87.
44. Naghdipour, B. (2017). Incorporating formative assessment in Iranian EFL writing: a case study. *The Curriculum Journal*, 28(2), 283–299.
45. Oxenford-O'Brian, J. (2013). *Formative assessment in context*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), University of Colorado. Denver.
46. Plake, B. S. (1993). Teacher assessment literacy: teachers competencies in the educational assessment of students. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher*, 6(1), 21–27.
47. Poehner, M. E., & Lantolf, J. P. (2005). Dynamic assessment in the language classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, 9(3), 233–265.
48. Popham, W. J. (2009). Assessment literacy for teachers: faddish or fundamental? *Theory into Practice*, 48, 4–11.29.
49. Popham, W. J. (2011). Assessment literacy overlooked: a teacher educator's confession. *The Teacher Educator*, 46(4), 265–273.
50. Rahimi, M. (2009). The role of teacher's corrective feedback in improving Iranian EFL learners' writing accuracy over time: is learner's mother tongue relevant? *Reading and Writing*, 22(2), 219–243.
51. Razavipour, K., & Rezagah, K. (2018). Language assessment in the new English curriculum in Iran: managerial, institutional, and professional barriers. *Language Testing in Asia*, 8(1), 1–18.
52. Saliu-Abdulah, D., Hellekjær, G. O., & Hertzberg, F. (2017). Teachers' (formative) feedback practices in EFL writing classes in Norway. *Journal of Response to Writing*, 3(1), 31–55.
53. Sardareh, S. A., & Saad, M. R. M. (2012). A sociocultural perspective on assessment for learning: the case of a Malaysian primary school ESL context. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 66, 343–353.

54. Shepard, L. A. (2005). Linking formative assessment to scaffolding. *Educational Leadership*, 63(3), 66–70.
55. Silseth, K., & Gilje, Ø. (2017). *Multimodal composition and assessment: a socio-cultural perspective* (pp. 1–17). *Principles, Policy & Practice: Assessment in Education*.
56. Slavkov, N. (2015). Socio-cultural theory, the L2writing process, and Google drive: strange bedfellows? *TESL Canada Journal*, 32(2), 80–94.
57. Smith, K. (2011). Professional development of teachers: a prerequisite for AfL to be successfully implemented in the classroom. *Studies in Education Evaluation*, 37, 55–61.
58. Smith, M. E., Teemant, A., & Pinnegar, S. (2004). Principles and practices of socio-cultural assessment: foundations for effective strategies for linguistically diverse classrooms. *Multicultural perspectives*, 6(2), 38–46.
59. Sriraman, B., & English, L. (2010). *Theories of mathematics education: seeking new frontiers*. In *Advances in mathematics education*. Berlin, New York: Springer Science & Business Media.
60. Stiggins, R. J. (1991). Assessment literacy. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 72(7), 534–539.
61. Stiggins, R. J. (1999). Are you assessment literate? *High School Magazine*, 6(5), 20–23.
62. Tsagari, D. (Ed.). (2016). *Classroom-based assessment in L2 contexts*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
63. Tavakoli, E., Amirian, S. M. R., Burner, T., Davoudi, M., & Ghaniabadi, S. (2018). *EFL teachers' and students' attitudes towards and experience of formative assessment of writing (Unpublished doctoral dissertation)*. Iran: University of HakimSabzevari.
64. Vogt, K., & Tsagari, D. (2014). Assessment literacy of foreign language teachers: findings of a European study. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 11, 374–402.
65. Volante, L., & Fazio, J. (2007). Exploring teacher candidates' assessment literacy: implications for teacher education reform and professional development. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 30(3), 749–770.
66. White, E. (2009). Are you assessment literate? Some fundamental questions regarding effective classroom-based assessment. *On CUE Journal*, 3(1), 3–25.
67. Willis, J., Adie, L., & Klenowski, V. (2013). Conceptualizing teachers' assessment literacies in an era of curriculum and assessment reform. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 40(2), 241–256.
68. Xu, Y., & Brown, G. (2016). Teacher assessment literacy in practice: a reconceptualization. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 58, 149–162.
69. Yamtim, V., & Wongwanich, W. (2014). A study of classroom assessment literacy of primary school teachers. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 2998–3004.