

# **Initial findings from a pilot Italian study of foreign language teachers' stated language assessment knowledge-base and needs**

Elizabeth M.C. Guerin  
Lancaster University

## **Abstract**

This paper reports results from a survey of 100 foreign language teaching professionals in relation to their (i) knowledge of, and (ii) perceived needs for language assessment literacy. Respondents were asked to rate their knowledge of classroom-focused foreign language testing and assessment as regards language testing and assessment purposes, as well as language testing and assessment concepts and content. The survey results indicate a range in the knowledge of the concepts and content associated with language testing and assessment. Respondents also perceive definite needs for professional development in the area of language testing and assessment. The results of this study are useful (i) as a "snapshot" of current language assessment literacy within the foreign language teaching community in Italy, and (ii) as evidence that a need for education in the area of language assessment literacy exists.

## Introduction

In 2008, an on-line survey was carried out in Italy into language assessment literacy (henceforth, LAL) in general and foreign language classroom assessment in particular. The aim of the study was to get an insight into foreign language teacher knowledge of assessment literacy, as well as their perceived needs for professional development in the area of LAL. This paper reports the initial findings in relation to (i) the knowledge-base of a sample of 100 foreign language teachers (FLTers), and (ii) the perceived needs of the respondents in relation to the need for education in the area of language assessment literacy.

## Language Assessment Literacy

Professional educational associations and members of measurement, teaching, and teacher preparation and certification communities started working together in the late 1980s to develop standards for teacher competence in student assessment. Since then, interest in the area of educational assessment has been growing. The Standards for Teacher Competence in Educational Assessment of Students, a document drawn up by collaborating professional and educational groups defines assessment as a process to obtain information so as to 'make educational decisions about students ... give feedback ... judge instructional effectiveness ... and to inform policy' (AFT, NCME, & NEA, 1990: 30). The same document describes the educators' professional role and responsibilities in relation to classroom activities and argues that 'teachers need competence in student assessment and sufficient time and resources to complete them in a professional manner. Five areas of teacher assessment competencies – where assessment competences are defined as "the knowledge and skills critical to a teacher's role as educator" – are identified within the above-mentioned document.

The term 'assessment literacy' emerges from the field of Educational Measurement (e.g., Stiggins, 1991). Popham (2003: v) directly associates the explosion of interest in testing and assessment with the issue of accountability whereby policymakers and other stakeholders identify learner test performance as the 'ultimate yardstick by which we measure a school's effectiveness'. He defines assessment literacy as 'the basic knowledge and skills that an individual needs in order to: avoid misusing educational tests and make accurate interpretations regarding students' test scores'.

Research in the field of language testing and assessment identifies at least two distinct strands. The first strand relates to language competence in the context of the language of schooling, while the second strand deals with the testing and assessment of foreign language competence. However, given increased mobility and globalization, the clear distinction between the two above-mentioned strands is becoming blurred since, in many education contexts, there are growing numbers of first-generation or

immigrant learners whose mother-tongue is not the language which is used in their schooling. Educational research has highlighted this issue and drawn attention to competence in the language of schooling as being a key-factor in poor educational achievement.

In the field of foreign language testing and assessment, where a foreign language is interpreted as a separate discipline, the concept of LAL is relatively recent (see for example, Boyles, 2005) even though, in the US, as in Europe and further afield, interesting initiatives seem to be underway.

In a European context, the initial ENLTA European Survey of Language Testing and Assessment Needs carried out in 2004 aimed at determining the need for language testing and assessment (henceforth, LTA) literacy initiatives throughout Europe (Hasselgreen, Carlsen & Helness, 2004; Hasselgreen et al., 2005; Huhta and Hirvelä, 2005). The European Association of Language Testing and Assessment (EALTA) which was set up in 2004, has used the results of the ENLTA survey to develop assessment literacy through its workshops, conferences, online resources, and special interest groups (SIGs). Edelenbos (2005) compiled a useful final report on foreign language assessment cultures in EU countries but, unfortunately, information on the Italian context is lacking. Erickson and Gustafsson (2005) reported interesting insights into students and teachers' views on language testing and assessment. In 2008, EALTA drew specific attention to the concept of LAL through its 5<sup>th</sup> EALTA Conference held in Athens (G) on the theme of 'Assessment Literacy in Europe and Beyond: Realities and Prospects'. As a result, some EALTA members have begun to research the above-mentioned themes in their own contexts in more detail (Vogt, Guerin, Sahinkarakas, Tsagari, D., Pavlou, & Afiri, 2008, Tsagari, 2009).

Against this background of growing interest, the remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Section 3 presents the pilot study undertaken in Italy. In Section 4, the methodological approach adopted is illustrated. Section 5 presents the findings of the survey, while the final part (Section 6) discusses the results and limitations of this pilot study.

## **Contextualisation**

The focus of LAL in this study is on foreign language testing and assessment literacy and perceived needs of FLTers in Italy. This pilot study addressed FLTers throughout the different levels of the educational system in order to obtain a "snapshot" of the Italian context in general. The primary purpose of this exploratory study was to get an insight into the LAL knowledge-base of foreign language teachers in Italy. A secondary interest was to understand whether or not foreign language teachers were positively

disposed towards improving their LAL knowledge-base through professional development initiatives.

## **Methodology**

### **Instrumentation**

The instrument used for the purposes of data collection was a questionnaire composed of four sections with an overall total of 47 items. As can be seen in Appendix A, the first section contained 11 general information-type questions (i.e., gender, country/region, subject/s taught, qualification/s, work institution, role, experience, age of students, and knowledge of assessment), while each of the other three multi-item sections dealt, respectively, with classroom-focused testing and assessment literacy, the purposes of LTA, and LTA content and concepts. These three sections of the questionnaire contained 12, 8, and 16 items respectively (see Appendix A).

The semi-structured Likert-type questionnaire aimed at obtaining an overview of the LAL knowledge-base of foreign language teachers working in Italy. In many respects its purpose echoed in part that of the above-mentioned ENLTA (2004) in so far as it wanted to identify whether or not there was a need among language professionals for training in the area of assessment. However, it differed from the former study in that it specifically targeted foreign language teachers and aimed to identify both their LAL knowledge-base, and their perceived LAL needs. In this respect, the present survey had more in common with the Language Testing and Assessment Literacy (LTAL) Survey undertaken in 2008 in six European countries including central and south-eastern areas. The initial findings of this survey were presented as a poster and reported at the 5<sup>th</sup> EALTA conference (Vogt, Guerin et al., 2008); further in-depth analyses of the findings are forthcoming.

The present LAL survey was developed in the following manner. Both the ENLTA and the LTAL questionnaires were used in drawing up and refining the final items so as to reflect the purposes of the study. To this end, the questionnaires from two previous related studies (i.e., ENLTA and LTAL) constituted the basis for the development of the present survey. The initial ENLTA questionnaire was shortened and limited to the sections which related to the following stakeholders: foreign language teachers, and foreign language teacher trainers. The LTAL questionnaire was refined through the addition of a further three specific questions in the general section in part I of the questionnaire. These questions were added in order to gain a clearer picture of the population being investigated by the LAL questionnaire (Appendix A). The specific additional questions related to age-range of respondents, professional experience, and age-range of learners, so as to obtain more detailed information about the target population, and relate it to the local, regional and national contexts. Thus,

the present LAL survey investigated specified aspects of items which had only been dealt with in general in the LTAL survey.

## Methods

A pilot pen-and-pencil questionnaire was developed and shared with colleagues in Florence (I), Heidelberg (D), and Lancaster (UK) for feedback. Slight modifications were made based on the feedback received. The pen-and-pencil questionnaire was then trialled by administering it to a small sample group of 30 respondents made up of teachers and trainee-teachers from my own professional context. Following trialling of the questionnaire, I analyzed the responses in order to understand if the items had been clear in their intent or whether they had been open to misinterpretation. When I thought there was some evidence of misinterpretation, I returned to the trial-group to understand the cause of the misinterpretation. Following discussion with the trial-group, I re-formulated the item and then checked its interpretation again with the trial-group.

What emerged from the analysis and subsequent discussion with the pilot-group revealed that certain aspects which had been considered as implicit in the context of the questionnaire i.e., that the topic of investigation was specifically foreign language assessment literacy, was instead interpreted by questionnaire-respondents in the broader context of assessment literacy in general. Hence, this required that, at the risk of appearing redundant, the concept of foreign language assessment literacy needed to be made explicit so as to avoid making the responses irrelevant or null and void for the purposes of the study. This meant returning to the questionnaire and specifying the foreign language aspect within each section and its related statements.

As stated in section 4.1 above, other modifications were made. In the initial general information section, some changes were also made. *In toto*, a further three questions were added to the original LTAL set of eight. Firstly, respondents were asked to specify the region they worked in. The reason this information was requested was so as to obtain a clear picture of the distribution of the respondents across the country. This was important to understand the population sample that was being reached and to contribute to the overall quality of the data being gathered. Secondly, respondents were asked to provide information on their professional teaching experience in terms of years teaching. Here too, the objective was to understand the spread of responses and see whether responses were heavily weighed in terms of any specific group's teaching experience. Changes here included the addition of a question asking respondents to specify gender, as well as the addition of ten-year and five-year interval boxes to be ticked within questions related to teachers' age-range, and teachers' professional experience respectively. The items related to qualifications, institution type, and institutional role were re-phrased by offering choice lists which also included the option "other" and which provided space for respondents to specify

their answer. In addition, respondents were asked to indicate the language testing and assessment course attended, the institution where it was held, the duration, and the texts used. This input was requested so as to enrich the quality of the information being gathered, and thus contribute to the qualitative aspect of the data being reported.

## **Procedures**

During the period January-April 2008, the questionnaire survey was available online. The reason I decided to use an online version of the survey was so as to achieve a better overall picture of the LAL situation throughout Italy. This choice was also taken in order to maximize the response-rate given the relatively short time available for data collection.

A dedicated web space hosted the questionnaire and recorded access and time as well as date of access to the questionnaire. To ensure as far as possible from a technological perspective the reliability and validity of the responses of a given respondent, access to the online survey was set so that one and only one respondent could complete the questionnaire from a specific IP address. In brief, this meant that once the questionnaire had been accessed from a given computer its IP address was recorded. Any further attempt to access the survey from that IP address returned a message informing the would-be respondent that (s)he had already completed the survey. As I was later to discover, this aspect was to have both positive and negative consequences with regard to the access of the survey.

Information about the availability of the online questionnaire was provided for would-be respondents in the following ways:

- an e-mail containing information about the purposes of the survey and the direct link to it, was sent to a language teacher mailing-list which I had previously compiled from the list of participants at the dissemination conference on the CEFTrain Project (Guerin, 2005) held in Florence (I) in 2004;
- in collaboration with one of the national language teachers' associations, i.e., *Lingua e Nuova Didattica – LEND*, a link to the survey was placed on the LEND Homepage making it directly accessible from there.
- in-service language teachers who were also students attending an English Language Methodology workshop at the Faculty of Educational Sciences at the University of Florence for pre-service language teachers were directly informed about the survey and invited to participate.

The amount of time estimated to complete the questionnaire was c.10 minutes.

## Findings

The primary purpose of this exploratory study was to get an insight into foreign language teachers' assessment literacy knowledge-base in the context of Italy.

A secondary interest was to understand whether or not foreign language teachers were interested in improving their LAL knowledge-base through professional development initiatives.

## Data Analysis

The information provided by the 100 respondents to the online survey was first downloaded and then coded into SPSS version 15. In order to avoid errors in the coding and transcription processes, the resultant data was then double-checked by me and then cross-checked with the help of another person before proceeding to the data analysis. Descriptive statistics were used to calculate percentages, frequencies, means, averages, and distribution (e.g., see Table 1 above) for categorical and continuous (e.g., age) variables, and to screen the overall data set. Cronbach's  $\alpha$  was calculated to check intra and inter section reliability for a total of 36 items and was above .9 which, according to Pallant (2007: 98) would seem to suggest 'very good internal consistency reliability for the scale'. The results for the Summary Item Statistics can be found in Appendix B. To explore both the direction (positive or negative) and the strength of the relationship between two continuous variables the Pearson correlation was used (see Appendix C).

The data analysis will examine each of the four sections contained in the questionnaire separately in Section 5.3. The following section presents information related to the survey respondents.

## Respondents

The sample of the population investigated can be described as a combination of "typical sampling" and "convenience sampling" in so far as those targeted were foreign language teachers who were contacted through institutions and language teacher associations, as well as via e-mail. A total of 100 respondents working in Italy completed the survey online. Of these, 91% were female and 9% male. Respondents were distributed throughout the country with the majority based in north-central Italy. The age of respondents ranged between 20-60+ years; 75% were aged between 41-60 years. Of the overall sample studied, 99% were foreign language teachers with the vast majority teaching English (78%) followed by French (6%), German and Italian (respectively 4%), other languages (5%), language teaching methodology (2%), and ICT

with language (1%). A total of 97% held a qualification which was a degree (82%), a diploma (6%), or other (9%). The results show that by far the role most occupied by respondents within their respective institutions was that of teacher (87%), followed by substitute teacher (10%), head of department (2%), and one respondent who worked in an advisory capacity to a public body. A total of 70% of respondents were employed in either secondary (59%) or primary (11%) level education, while the remainder worked in Higher Education (24%), kindergarten (1%), and other (5%) levels such as adult education and in private language schools. Based on the afore-mentioned distribution of teachers in the education system, not surprisingly, a glance at the average age of the learners the respondents taught shows that 70% of their learners fell into the 11-20 age range with 47% aged 16-20 years and 23% aged 11-15 years. The remainder of the learner population showed 15% aged between 5-10 years, and the remaining overall 15% aged between 21-50 years. As to the LAL knowledge-base of foreign language teachers (FLTer) investigated through item number 10, the majority of respondents (61%) answered that they had either pre- or in-service training in the areas of language testing assessment/practice as can be seen in Table 1. In the following section (Section 6 Limitations and Future Research) I will return to this item in greater detail.

The data obtained in the general information section was especially helpful in confirming that the target group had been reached, and in identifying the overall distribution of the respondents.

In the following section, I consider the findings from Section 1 of the questionnaire.

#### Q11 pre/in-service test/assess theory/practice

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	61	61.0	61.0	61.0
No	39	39.0	39.0	100.0
Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Table 1: FLTer stated LAL knowledge-base

### Questionnaire Section 1: Classroom-focused testing & assessment

Section 1 of the questionnaire was devoted to classroom-focused testing and assessment and investigated testing and assessment (T&A) training received (questions 1.1.1 – 1.1.6) and perceived T&A training needs (questions 1.2.1 – 1.2.6). Respondents were asked about the T&A training received and their perceived needs in relation to the following:

1. Preparing classroom tests



2. Using ready-made tests
3. Giving student feedback
4. Using self/peer assessment
5. Using informal, continuous, non-test type assessment
6. Using ELP (or similar).

The following Table 2 presents the overall data results related to this section of the questionnaire.

<b>Section 1: T&amp;A area investigated: Classroom-focused T&amp;A</b>	<b>Overall stated T&amp;A training received</b>	<b>Overall expressed T&amp;A training need</b>
Preparing classroom tests	21%	79%
Using ready-made tests	42%	58%
Giving student feedback	24%	76%
Using self/peer assessment	17%	83%
Using informal, continuous, non-test type assessment	23%	77%
Using ELP (or similar).	31%	69%

Table 2: T&A - Overall stated and needed training in specific areas

This table illustrates the deep-felt need for training in these areas expressed by respondents, and corroborates the results of previous studies undertaken in the T&A area through the ENLTA (2004) and LTAL (2008) surveys. Furthermore, it highlights the expressed needs within a small but, none the less, a representative sample in a specific national context.

The following section presents the overall findings relation to the part of the questionnaire related to the purposes of testing.

## **Questionnaire Section 2: Purposes of Testing**

Section 2 of the questionnaire was devoted to the purposes of T&A and investigated T&A training received (questions 2.1.1 – 2.1.4) and perceived T&A training needs (questions 2.2.1 – 2.2.4). Respondents were asked about the T&A training received and their perceived needs in relation to the following:

1. Giving grades
2. Identifying learning/teaching needs
3. Student programme placement
4. Awarding certificates.

In Table 3, the overall percentages related to these section areas of the questionnaire are presented.

<b>Section 2: T&amp;A area investigated: Purposes of T&amp;A</b>	<b>Overall stated T&amp;A training received</b>	<b>Overall expressed T&amp;A training need</b>
Giving grades	25%	75%
Identifying learning/teaching needs	27%	73%
Student programme placement	28%	72%
Awarding certificates	26%	74%

Table 3: T&amp;A - Overall stated and expressed training needs

Table 3 highlights the fact that an overall minimum of 72% of respondents (max. 75% and average of 73.5%) expresses the need for T&A training in all areas investigated in this section of the questionnaire. Again, the results of previous studies undertaken in the T&A area through the ENLTA (2004) and LTAL (2008) surveys are corroborated. As with the results from Section 1, Section 2 also illustrates the expressed needs within a small but representative sample in a specific national context.

I now turn to the section in the questionnaire which dealt with language testing and assessment content and concepts.

### Questionnaire Section 3: Content and Concepts

The final part of the questionnaire, Section 3, was devoted to T&A content and concepts. This section investigated T&A training received (questions 3.1.1 – 3.1.8) and perceived T&A training needs (questions 3.2.1 – 3.2.8). Respondents were asked about the T&A training received and their perceived needs in relation to the following:

1. T&A of receptive skills
2. T&A of productive skills
3. T&A of micro-linguistic aspects
4. T&A of integrated language skills
5. T&A of aspects related to culture
6. Establishing T&A reliability
7. Establishing T&A validity
8. Using statistics to study T&A quality

The following Table 4 presents the overall data results related to this section of the questionnaire.

<b>Section 3: T&amp;A area investigated: T&amp;A content and concepts</b>	<b>Overall stated T&amp;A training received</b>	<b>Overall expressed T&amp;A training need</b>
---	---	--

T&A receptive skills	28%	72%
T&A productive skills	25%	75%
T&A microlinguistic aspects	27%	73%
T&A integrated language skills	19%	81%
T&A aspects of culture	15%	85%
Establishing T&A reliability	13%	87%
Establishing T&A validity	11%	89%
Using statistics to study T&A quality	9%	91%

Table 4: T&A - Overall stated and needed training in specific areas

This table illustrates the overall percentage range of the expressed need for training in the areas investigated as expressed by the respondents. As can be noted in table 4, the need percentages range from a minimum of 72% for T&A training in the areas of receptive i.e., listening and reading, skills to a maximum of a massive 91% in the area of using statistics to study T&A quality. The overall average of respondents who expressed a T&A training need for Section 3 was 81.63%. These results corroborate those of the previous ENLTA (2004) and LTAL (2008) surveys studies undertaken in the T&A area. Furthermore, they highlight the expressed needs within a small but representative sample in a specific national context.

Drawing on the information obtained in the three multi-item sections of the questionnaire, the overall percentage of T&A needs expressed by respondents per each of the three T&A sections is presented in Table 5 below. What emerges from the intersection comparison is the definite and very strong average overall need for T&A training which ranges from c. 74% in the first two sections of the questionnaire to a very high c. 82% as regards the third section. What respondents seem to be expressing is a very clear and very strong T&A training need.

T&A area investigated:	Average overall stated T&A training received	Average overall expressed T&A training need
Section 1: Classroom-focused T&A	26.3%	73.7%
Section 2: Purposes of T&A	26%	73.5%
Section 3: T&A content and concepts	18.4%	81.6%

Table 5: T&A - Overall stated and expressed training needs

In the final part of this paper, Section 6, the limitations of the survey are presented.

## Limitations and Future Research

The present LAL survey investigated specified aspects of items which had only been dealt with in general in the both the ENLTA and LTAL surveys. Modifications made included specifying aspects of items in sections 1-3 as reported in the relevant sections above.

The initial findings from this pilot survey, notwithstanding the limited number of 100 respondents, seems to identify a strongly perceived need throughout the different educational levels in which foreign language teaching professionals operate, for the inclusion of at least some element of formal education and training in LAL.

The data obtained in the general information section was especially helpful in confirming the fact that the survey did reach the target group and identified the overall distribution throughout the educational system of the respondents. However, it also highlighted the fact that more research is needed to obtain more data for the rest of Italy.

The use of an online survey had both positive and negative aspects. The positive aspect (Section 3.4.2) contributed to the validity and reliability of the data collected. What emerged as a negative aspect of the online questionnaire was the difficulty many teachers reported due to the acceptance of only one IP address by the system. This meant that teachers who did not have access to (i) their own personal computer either at school or at home, and (ii) the Internet, found it difficult to participate in the survey. Moreover, many schools only had one computer available in the school and that had to be shared by all.

On reflection, item number 11 in this survey, which asked respondents about their education and/or training in relation to testing and assessment (theory and practice) during their pre-service and in-service training was not clear as formulated. The question was not clear because it asked (i) two questions in one, and (ii) it addressed two different groups. From one perspective, the question could be perceived as redundant because of course teachers have either theoretical or practical knowledge of testing and assessment in their pre- in-service training because they are assessed as learners and, as teachers they continuously test when they teach. The inappropriate formulation of this item may account for the surprisingly high-percentage of respondents answering in the affirmative.

An unexpected finding was that would-be respondents reported having "difficulty/ies" with the English testing terminology used in the survey. This finding highlighted a limitation of the study as well as the need to develop an Italian version of the survey for any further investigation of teacher language assessment literacy.

The lessons learned from this pilot study will be applied in further research into LAL on a broader scale in Italy.

## References

- American Federation of Teachers, National Council on Measurement in Education, & National Education Association (AFT, NCME, & NEA) (1990). Standards for teacher competence in educational assessment of students. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 9(4), 30-32.
- Boyles, P. (2005). Assessment literacy. In M. Rosenbusch (Ed.), *National Summit Papers*. Ames, IA: Iowa State University.
- Edelenbos, P. (2005). *Foreign Language Assessment Cultures: Policies and Practices in European Union Countries Final Report*. Groningen (NL): Dutch Ministry of Education, Culture and Science.
- Erickson, G., & Gustafsson, J. E. (2005). Some European Students' and Teachers' views on Language Testing and Assessment: A report on a questionnaire survey, ENLTA policy and practice survey report, Activity 4. Available online: [www.ealta.eu.org/documents/resources/enlta%20activity%204%20report.pdf](http://www.ealta.eu.org/documents/resources/enlta%20activity%204%20report.pdf)
- Guerin, E. (2005). Language Teacher Education and Training: Italy and Europe / Educazione e Formazione dei Docenti L2: Italia ed Europa : Trans-European contributions / Contributi transnazionali. Firenze: Firenze University Press
- Hasselgreen, A., Carlsen, C., & Helness, H. (2004). *European Survey of Language Testing and Assessment Needs: General Findings* (Needs Assessment No. 1). Bergen: University of Bergen.
- Hasselgreen, A., Carlsen, C., & Helness, H. (2005). *European Survey of Language Testing and Assessment Needs. Part Two: Regional Findings*. Available online: [www.ealta.eu.org/resources](http://www.ealta.eu.org/resources). [23.10.09]
- Huhta, A., & Hirvelä, T. (2005). European Survey of Language Testing and Assessment Needs. Report: part two: regional findings Available from [http://users.jyu.fi/~huhta/ENLTA2/First\\_page.htm](http://users.jyu.fi/~huhta/ENLTA2/First_page.htm)
- Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS Survival Manual: A step by step guide to data analysis* (3rd ed.). Crows Nest, NSW, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Popham, J. W. (2003). *Test Better, Teach Better: The Instructional Role of Assessment*. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Stiggins, R.J. (1991). Relevant classroom assessment training for teachers. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 10(1), 7-12.
- Tsagari, D. (2009). *The Complexity of Test Washback: An Empirical Study*. Frankfurt / Main: Peter Lang.

Vogt, K., Guerin, E., Sahinkarakas, Tsagari, D., S., Pavlou, P., & Affiri, Q. (2008). Assessment Literacy of Foreign Language Teachers in Europe - Current Trends and Future Perspectives. Poster presented at the 5<sup>th</sup> EALTA Conference, Athens, Greece, May 8<sup>th</sup>-11, 2008. Available online: [www.ealta.eu.org/conference/2008/programme.htm](http://www.ealta.eu.org/conference/2008/programme.htm)

## Appendix A: Language Assessment Literacy Questionnaire

A European on-line survey conducted by the European Association of Language Testing and Assessment (EALTA) has identified a need for training in language testing and assessment with teachers and teacher trainers.

In order to specifically determine the training needs of teachers and teacher trainers in Italy, the questionnaire used by EALTA has been adapted. The information obtained from the adapted questionnaire will help identify if there is a need in Italy for pre-service and in-service foreign language teacher education in language assessment literacy.

Therefore I would like to ask you to fill in the questionnaire and submit it. Your personal data will be not be made available to others and will be anonymous within the study.



Thanking you in advance for your time and co-operation ☺

### I. General information

Are you Male Yes  or Female Yes

Are you aged:

20 – 30 Yes

30 – 40 Yes

40 – 50 Yes

50 – 60 Yes

60 + Yes

Number of years teaching:

≤ 5 Yes

5 - 10 Yes

10 – 15 Yes

15 – 20 Yes

20 – 25 Yes

25 – 30 Yes

30 + Yes

1. Do you work in Italy?

Yes  No

Where do you work in Italy?

Region: \_\_\_\_\_ City: \_\_\_\_\_

Where do you work outside Italy?

Country: \_\_\_\_\_ Region: \_\_\_\_\_ City: \_\_\_\_\_

2. Which subject(s) do you teach?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

3. Which subjects have you studied?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

4. Which is your highest qualification?

Degree (please specify):  
\_\_\_\_\_

Diploma (please specify):  
\_\_\_\_\_

Other (please specify):  
\_\_\_\_\_

5. Type of school you teach at:

\_\_\_\_\_

6. Average age of pupils:

\_\_\_\_\_

7. Your functions at school:

Teacher

Head of department at school

Mentor



Advisory function for authorities (local government, ministry etc.)

\_\_\_\_\_

8. During your pre-service or in-service teacher training, did you learn/study anything about testing and assessment (theory and practice)?

Yes (please specify: )

\_\_\_\_\_

Type of Course :

\_\_\_\_\_

Name of Institution :

\_\_\_\_\_

Textbook/s used:

\_\_\_\_\_

No

If you are interested in the results of the survey please submit your e-mail address:

\_\_\_\_\_

## **II. Questions for teachers**

### ***1. Classroom-focused testing and assessment***

#### **1.1. Please specify if you were trained in the following domains.**

	Not at all	a little more (1-2 days)	advanced
a) Preparing classroom tests	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) using ready-made tests from textbook packages	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Giving feedback to students based on information from tests / assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Using self/ peer assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Using informal, continuous, non-test type assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Using the European Language Portfolio,			

an adaptation of it or some other portfolio

**1.2. Please specify if you need training in the following domains.**

	None	Yes, basic Training	Advanced Training
a) Preparing classroom tests	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Using ready-made tests from textbook packages or from other sources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Giving feedback to students based on information from tests / assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Using self / peer assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Using informal, continuous, non-test type of assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Using the European Language Portfolio, an adaptation of it or some other portfolio	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**2. Purposes of testing**

**2.1. Please specify if you were trained in the following domains.**

	Not at all	a little more (1-2 days)	advanced
a) To give grades	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) To find out what needs to be taught/ learned	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) To place students onto courses, programmes, etc.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) To award final certificates (from school / programme; local, regional or national level	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**2.2. Please specify if you need training in the following domains**

	None	Yes, basic Training	Yes, advanced
a) To give grades	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) To find out what needs to be taught/learned	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) To place students onto courses, programmes, etc.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- d) To award final certificates (from school/programme; local, regional or national level)

**3. Content and concepts**

**3.1. Please specify if you were trained in the following domains.**

	Not at all	a little more (1-2 days)	adv.
<b>1. Testing / Assessing</b>			
a) receptive skills (reading/listening)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) productive skills (speaking/writing)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) microlinguistic aspects (Grammar/vocab.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) integrated language skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) aspects of culture	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>2. Establishing reliability of tests / assessm.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>3. Establishing validity of tests / assessm.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>4. Using statistics to study the quality of tests / assessment</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**3.2. Please specify if you need training in the following domains**

	None	Yes, basic Training	Yes, Advanced
<b>1. Testing / Assessing</b>			
a) receptive skills (reading / listening)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) productive skills (speaking/writing)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) microlinguistic aspects (Grammar/vocab.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) integrated language skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) aspects of culture	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>2. Establishing reliability of tests / assessm.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>3. Establishing validity of tests / assessm.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**4. Using statistics to study the quality of tests / assessment**



## Appendix B: Summary Item Statistics

Reliability Statistics for 36 items

### TOTAL 36 ITEMS

#### Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.919	.920	36

#### Summary Item Statistics

	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	N of Items
Item Means	2.049	1.490	2.490	1.000	1.671	.073	36
Item Variances	.582	.434	.749	.315	1.726	.009	36
Inter-Item Covariances	.140	-.164	.655	.818	-4.000	.024	36
Inter-Item Correlations	.243	-.295	.954	1.249	-3.235	.069	36

**Appendix C: Pearson Correlations:**

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). \*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

		Q11 pre/in-service test/assessment theory/practice	Q1.2.1 specify need training in: train 4 preparing classroom tests	Q1.2.2 train 4 using ready-made tests from textbook, packages or other sources	Q1.2.3 train 4 give student test/assessment feedback	Q1.2.4 train 4 use self/peer assessment	Q1.2.5 train 4 use informal, continuous, non-test type assessment	Q1.2.6 train 4 use ELPortfolio, adaptation of it, or some other portfolio
Q11 pre/in-service test/assessment theory/practice	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	1	-.086	-.012	-.056	-.211(*)	-.102	-.012
Q1.2.1 specify need training in: train 4 preparing classroom tests	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	-.086	1	.552(**)	.486(**)	.434(**)	.338(**)	.594(**)
Q1.2.2 train 4 using ready-made tests from textbook, packages or other sources	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	-.012	.552(**)	1	.576(**)	.435(**)	.496(**)	.482(**)
Q1.2.3 train 4 give student test/assessment	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	-.056	.486(**)	.576(**)	1	.668(**)	.533(**)	.477(**)

ent feedback	tailed)							
	N	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Q1.2.4 train	Pearson							
4 use	Correlati	-	.434(**)	.435(**)	.668(**)	1	.680(**)	.465(**)
self/peer	on	.211(*)						
assessment	Sig. (2-	.035	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
	tailed)							
	N	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Q1.2.5 train	Pearson							
4 use	Correlati	-.102	.338(**)	.496(**)	.533(**)	.680(**)	1	.448(**)
informal,	on							
continuous,	Sig. (2-	.313	.001	.000	.000	.000		.000
non-test	tailed)							
type	N	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
assessment								
Q1.2.6 train	Pearson							
4 use	Correlati	-.012	.594(**)	.482(**)	.477(**)	.465(**)	.448(**)	1
ELPortfolio,	on							
ana	Sig. (2-	.902	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
adaptation	tailed)							
of it, or	N	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
some other								
portfolio								