



A Landscape of EFL Teachers' Formative Assessment Literacy: An Insight from Indonesia

Diana Nur Utami ^a, Utami Widiati ^{a,*}, Mirjam Anugerahwati ^a,
Niamika El Khoiri ^a

^a Department of English, Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia

* Corresponding author Email: udin@umy.ac.id

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54392/ajir26322>

Received: 30-06-2026; Revised: 02-09-2026; Accepted: 26-09-2026; Published: 30-09-2026



Abstract: Although there have been studies on formative assessment (FA) for decades, research on teachers' formative assessment literacy (FAL) remains scarce, particularly in contexts where assessment reform is still emerging. Using a survey design and an Indonesian-adapted version of the Teacher Formative Assessment Literacy Scale (TFALS), comprising conceptual, practical, and socio-emotional dimensions, this study examined the self-reported FAL of 96 EFL teachers across junior high, senior high, and vocational secondary schools in East Java, Indonesia. Four multiple-choice items were added to gather complementary evidence of teachers' knowledge of FA methods and feedback. Data were analyzed descriptively, and Spearman's correlation was used to examine the associations among the three dimensions of the scale. Teachers reported a perceived high FAL across all three dimensions, with particularly strong confidence in aligning assessment with learning objectives and socio-emotional awareness of students' needs. However, teachers reported comparatively lower confidence in providing actionable feedback and facilitating peer and self-assessment, and a subset raised concerns about the ethical dimensions of assessment, including fairness and privacy. Notably, despite strong self-reported conceptual understanding, teachers' reported use of feedback in practice was dominated by summative formats such as scores, revealing a discrepancy between conceptual knowledge and reported classroom practice. The three FAL dimensions were significantly and positively associated with each other (all $p < .001$). These findings suggest that Indonesian EFL teachers' professional development should center on strengthening actionable feedback practices, structured peer and self-assessment, and the ethical and socio-emotional dimensions of assessment.

Keywords: Formative Assessment, EFL Teachers, Formative Assessment Literacy, TFALS

1. Introduction

Over the past decade, formative assessment (FA) has attracted the attention of educational scholars and practitioners (Amirian, 2025; Demekash *et al.*, 2024; Mirsanjari, 2025). Karaçöp & İnaltekin (2023) reported in their bibliometric analysis an increase in the number of FA studies since 2008. This phenomenon corresponds to a global paradigm shift in assessment practices. This shift was driven by a growing body of empirical evidence highlighting the numerous benefits of FA, including its role in promoting student engagement and enabling instructional adjustments based on learners' needs (Black & Wiliam, 2008; Nelson, 2020; Shao, 2025), fostering learners' autonomy (Chen, 2021; Fitriyah *et al.*, 2022; Nelson, 2020; Nicol & McFarlane-Dick, 2006; Ganajova, *et al.*, 2021), enhancing motivation and engagement (Baleni, 2015; Ehlers & Eigbrecht, 2024; Ma & Bui, 2021), and improving academic achievement (Chen, 2021; Ismail *et al.*, 2022; Muchlis *et al.*, 2020). These benefits can be achieved through effective FA practice.

Bennett (2011) argues that effective practice of FA should encompass both the process and the instrumentation specifically designed to elicit actionable insights into student learning. He maintained that FA must include structured tools that provide information not only about what students know and can do, but also about how instruction should be adjusted to support further learning. Drawing on Ramaprasad's three key processes of learning and teaching (establishing where the learners are in their learning, establishing where they are going, and establishing what needs to be done to get them there), Wiliam and Thompson (2008) proposed five key strategies



for operationalizing FA in the classroom: (1) clarifying and sharing learning intentions and success criteria; (2) eliciting evidence of student understanding through classroom discussions and tasks; (3) providing feedback that moves learners forward; (4) activating students as learning resources for each other; and (5) encouraging students to take ownership of their learning. These strategies highlight the interactive dialogue between teachers, students, and peers, with the ultimate goal of co-constructing knowledge and facilitating learning autonomy in the learning process. By clarifying learning objectives and defining success criteria, teachers and students can engage in discussions that reveal gaps in understanding. These gaps are addressed through targeted feedback and strategic questioning, with students actively participating in the learning process through self-and peer assessments. This involvement fosters essential skills, such as metacognition, self-regulation, and the ability to learn how to learn, thereby promoting greater autonomy in the learning process.

The successful implementation of FA in classroom settings is contingent on several factors, one of which is teachers' formative assessment literacy (FAL) (Araffii, 2020; Defianty, 2018; Han *et al.*, 2024). Yan and Pastore (2022) offer a comprehensive definition of FAL, describing it as "An interrelated set of knowledge, skills, and dispositions that a teacher can use to design and implement appropriate, context-based assessments aimed at promoting learning and improving teaching" (p.3). A comprehensive understanding of teachers' FAL must go beyond conceptual knowledge to include three dimensions: conceptual, practical, and socio-emotional knowledge (Haddadian *et al.*, 2024; Nazari *et al.*, 2023; Yan & Pastore, 2022). The conceptual dimension refers to teachers' understanding of the principles and purposes of FA, whereas the practical dimension involves the application of formative strategies to monitor, evaluate, and adjust instruction. The socio-emotional dimension pertains to teachers' consideration of students' emotions, motivation, and well-being during the assessment process. This dimension also involves collaboration with stakeholders to ensure that FA practices are aligned with students' needs and are ethically sound (Richardson, 2022). Nazari *et al.* (2023) argue that teachers who neglect any one of these dimensions can lead to ineffective assessment practices in their classrooms. Similarly, Yan and Pastore (2022) highlight that even when teachers possess adequate conceptual understanding, limitations in their socio-emotional dimension can hinder the impact of formative assessment in a way that they are not aware of the impact of feedback provision, for example, to students' engagement and motivation (Irons & Elington, 2021), anxiety (Di Loreto & Mc Donough, 2013), performance (Owen, 2016), and achievement (Orrel, 2006). Therefore, this situation influences the practical dimension of FA (Nicol and MacFarlane-Dick, 2006).

Subsequently, Yan and Pastore (2022) developed a self-report questionnaire to assess teachers' FAL based on these dimensions. This instrument, known as the Teacher Formative Assessment Literacy Scale (TFALS), was designed to measure teachers' knowledge and practices in alignment with Wiliam and Thompson's (2008) five key FA strategies. This study attempted to capture the complexity of teachers' FAL by studying three dimensions and examining how these dimensions relate to one another, rather than assuming that one dimension produces or determines another.

Empirical evidence from previous studies highlights the critical role of teachers' Formative Assessment Literacy (FAL) in the implementation of FA in the classroom. Defianty (2018) reported that teachers were reluctant to change their summative assessment practice to formative assessment because they had a limited understanding of FA. In other contexts, formative assessment teachers practice may lack important features such as peer and self-assessment as aids to promote autonomous learning (Antoniou and James, 2014), teachers have difficulty translating the curriculum-mandated assessment (Araffii, 2020), and teachers struggle with implementing FA (Isnawati, 2023; Hidayat & Purnawarman, 2024). These findings underscore the essential role of teachers' FAL and the urgent need to study it.

Although teachers' FAL is widely acknowledged as a critical component in the effective implementation of assessment, scholarly attention to this area remains limited (Khodabakhshzadeh *et al.*, 2018). A bibliometric analysis by Sultan *et al.* (2024) revealed that over the past decade, research in the field of FA has predominantly focused on keywords such as students, assessments, and learning outcomes rather than teachers' literacy. This trend is further supported by Halim *et al.* (2024), who found that studies conducted between 2017 and 2021 were primarily centered on subthemes such as assessment diversity, assessment strategies, and student learning development, with limited emphasis on the role and teachers' literacy. This limited research on teachers' FAL remains a gap, especially because most FA research originates from developed countries, where assessment reform is more advanced and formative



assessment is a common practice (Karaçöp & İnaltekin, 2023). In the Indonesian context, where educational systems are shifting from a reliance on summative assessment to an emphasis on formative assessment, without valid and thorough information about teachers' FAL, the assessment reforms may not be translated into effective classroom practice and professional development of teachers' FAL (Arrafii, 2020; Clifton, 2023). Consequently, FA intended to support learning through effective feedback provision, data-driven decision-making, and activation of interaction among learning agents, which would not be implemented successfully (Fulcher, 2012; Leung, 2020). This highlights the importance of conducting this study, which addresses this gap by providing empirically grounded, context-specific evidence of Indonesian EFL teachers' FAL.

This study aims to address the critical gaps identified in the literature by examining Indonesian EFL teachers' FAL through the conceptual, practical, and socioemotional dimensions. By providing a comprehensive portrait of teachers' self-reported capabilities in this specific context, this study aims to serve two key purposes. First, it will provide stakeholders, particularly policymakers and teacher trainers in Indonesia, with the foundational knowledge required to develop more targeted and effective professional development programs for EFL teachers. Second, it aims to contribute to a more balanced global discourse on FA, informing policy and professional development efforts in Indonesian educational settings to this end. Because the TFALS is a self-report instrument, the findings reported here reflect teachers' perceived FAL rather than independently observed or performance-based assessment competence. To address the objectives of this study, the following research questions were formulated:

1. How do EFL teachers perceive their FAL in the conceptual dimension?
2. How do EFL teachers perceive their FAL in the practical dimension?
3. How do EFL teachers perceive their FAL in the socio-emotional dimension?
4. What is the correlation among the three dimensions of teachers' FAL?

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Research Design

This study employed a survey design as the primary method for collecting quantitative data, aligning with the objectives of identifying patterns of attitude, behavior, and characteristics within the population (Cohen *et al.*, 2007), trends and relationships among variables (Creswell, 2012), and generalizations concerning EFL teachers' FAL. A survey was deemed appropriate for gathering standardized data from a large sample, as this study sought evidence. Given the need to generate broad insights that can inform policy and professional development, the survey approach was also supported by Dillman *et al.* (2014) and Wallen and Fraenkel (2019), who emphasized its utility in educational research. In this study, the survey was particularly suitable for capturing a broad and systematic understanding of Indonesian teachers' FA literacy.

2.2 Research Setting and Participants

The participants of this study were EFL teachers who taught in secondary schools in East Java, Indonesia. The accessibility and availability of prospective participants were the basis for participant selection. Therefore, convenience sampling was employed to select participants who were EFL teachers in secondary schools, including junior high schools, senior high schools, and vocational schools. The questionnaires were distributed online through WhatsApp English teachers' groups and direct messages to the participants. In total, approximately 250 teachers were invited to complete the questionnaire. Ninety-six EFL teachers from three different types of secondary schools completed the questionnaires. Although the response rate was lower than the anticipated target, the data remained valid as the 96 respondents represented all three levels of secondary education in Indonesia, encompassing schools under the jurisdiction of both the Ministry of Education (MoE) and the Ministry of Religious Affairs (MoRA). The participant sample also demonstrated diversity in terms of gender, teaching experience, and educational background (Table 1). This demographic variety enhanced the validity of the study; however, given that the sample was obtained through the procedure described above rather than random probability sampling, claims of generalizability are limited to secondary EFL teachers with characteristics similar to those represented in this sample rather than to the broader population of Indonesian teachers. Following ethical considerations, this research was reviewed and approved by the



Table 1. The EFL Teacher Participants

Demographic Characteristics of the EFL Teachers		N	%	N Total
Types of secondary school	Junior High School	24	25.0	96
	Senior High School	28	29.2	
	Vocational High School	44	45.8	
Gender	Male	23	23.9	96
	Female	73	76.0	
Years of teaching	0-5 years	5	5.2	96
	6-10 years	11	11.4	
	11-15 years	22	22.9	
	More than 15 years	58	60.4	
Educational background	Bachelor in English Education	50	52.0	96
	Master in English Education	33	34.3	
	Doctor in English Education	1	1.0	
	Bachelor in English Literature	9	9.3	
	Graduated from other fields	3	3.1	
Have participated in assessment training	Yes	63	65.6	96
	No	33	34.4	

2.3 Instrument and Data Collection

The data collection instrument for this study was adapted from the Teachers' Formative Assessment Literacy Scale (TFALS) developed by Yan and Pastore (2022), with modifications made to suit the Indonesian context. The adaptation process began by seeking permission from the original developers through email. Upon receiving their approval, the instrument underwent review, with the primary modification being the language of the questionnaire.

Because the original TFALS was written in English, a back-to-back translation method was applied to ensure accurate interpretation in the Indonesian context. Initially, the questionnaire was translated into Indonesian by an English teacher with advanced English proficiency, as evidenced by a TOEFL score of 589. After the translation was completed, three teachers were invited to review the Indonesian version to ensure clarity and a shared understanding of the items. Subsequently, another native Indonesian speaker with exceptional English skills translated the questionnaire back into English. A comparison between the back-to-back translated and original English versions revealed no significant discrepancies, confirming the accuracy of the translation.

To further validate the instrument, expert validation was conducted to ensure the content validity of the questionnaire. An assessment expert who had been teaching assessment subjects in a higher education setting provided her review and validation of the modified questionnaire. Based on the expert's review and suggestions, given that the questionnaire relied on self-reported data, four additional items were incorporated to assess teachers' knowledge of FA types and feedback content. These items were structured as closed-ended questions with multiple-choice answers to obtain evidence of the teachers' knowledge of FA methods and feedback provision, which was not elicited in the questionnaire. Subsequently, the Indonesian version of the questionnaire was piloted with seven English teachers. The validity of the questionnaire was examined using Pearson's product-moment correlation with a two-tailed significance test, and the coefficients ranged from 0.76 to 0.90, providing evidence that all items had satisfactory construct validity. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .93 demonstrated a strong internal consistency in this small pilot study sample. Because reliability estimated from a small pilot sample may not generalize well,



Cronbach's alpha was also computed using the full study sample ($N = 96$), both overall and separately for each of the three dimensions: overall $\alpha = .87$, conceptual $\alpha = .84$, practical $\alpha = .89$, and socio-emotional $\alpha = .87$. In its adapted form, the TFALS consists of 25 Likert-scale items (four-point scale), which are divided into three sections, and four additional multiple-choice questions. The table 2 outlines the distribution of items and their alignment with the study's research questions.

Table 2. Distribution of the questionnaire items and the research questions

Research questions	Dimension	Items Number	Types
1. How do EFL teachers perceive their FAL in the conceptual dimension?	Conceptual dimension	Items number 1-7 Items number 9, 11	Statements with a 4-point Likert scale
		Items number 8, 10	Questions with optional answers
2. How do EFL teachers perceive their FAL in the practical dimension?	Practical dimension	Item number 1 Item number 3 -10	Statements with a 4-point Likert scale
		Items number 2, 11	Questions with optional answers
3. How do EFL teachers perceive their FAL in the socio-emotional dimension?	Socio-emotional dimension	Items number 1 - 7	Statements with a 4-point Likert scale

The questionnaire was distributed online via Google Forms to secondary school EFL teachers. After an initial two-week period, 54 responses were received, which was below the anticipated target. Consequently, an additional week was allotted for data collection, resulting in 96 responses. Based on the total number of teachers invited to participate, the response rate was 39 %.

2.4 Data Analysis

The data were organized and analyzed into three dimensions of teachers' FAL: conceptual, practical, and socio-emotional. First, a descriptive analysis was conducted to obtain the mean score and standard deviation of each item. The mean score provided information about the average response for each item, whereas the standard deviation indicated the degree of variation in the data. The mean score for each item was confirmed with the levels of FAL as very low, low, moderate, and high (Table 3).

Table 3. The Classification of FAL

Mean	Level
3.01 – 4.00	High
2.01 – 3.00	Moderate
1.01 – 2.00	Low
0.00 – 1.00	Very low

Subsequently, the frequency of the scale of each item was calculated and presented as a percentage. Following this, an analysis to examine the teachers' responses to the closed-ended questions concerning teachers' knowledge of FA types and feedback was conducted by calculating response frequencies and percentages, which offered further insight into the extent of teachers' knowledge of specific aspects of FA and complemented the self-reported data from the Likert-scale items. For the correlation analysis, each respondent's score for a given dimension was computed by averaging the respondent's item scores within that dimension. This procedure produced a single composite score for each FAL dimension for every respondent. Finally, the relationships among the three FAL

dimensions were analyzed using Spearman's rank-order correlation to identify potential associations among the dimensions.

3. Results

3.1 RQ.1 How do EFL teachers perceive their conceptual knowledge of FA?

The data highlighted teachers' strong self-reported understanding of FA concepts. This was evidenced by the high percentage of agreement across key items related to their conceptual knowledge. Table 4. Shows the EFL teachers' responses on the conceptual dimension of the Teachers' FAL Scale (TFALS). A significant majority of teachers either strongly agreed or agreed that they could explain the rationale for conducting FAs in their classrooms. The high mean score in all items (>3.15) reflects a robust understanding of the necessity of FA. The low standard deviation ($< .73$) indicates consistent agreement across respondents, suggesting a widely shared conceptual grasp of the purpose of FA. This was also evident in other items, such as items 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, with a high percentage of agreement. This indicates that teachers acknowledged that FA helped them identify their students' learning needs, that FA must be purposely linked to specific learning objectives, that assessment strategy must elicit evidence on the student's learning progress, that teachers were well-versed in using formative data to adapt instruction, and that teachers understood the formative role that active student participation plays in the learning process. However, lower results were found for items 7, 9, and 11. The relatively low mean score and higher standard deviation indicate areas that need improvement. The items were related to teachers' confidence in using various assessment methods, providing effective feedback, and facilitating self- and peer-assessment.

Table 4. The EFL teachers' responses on the conceptual dimension of the Teachers' FAL Scale (TFALS)

Items	Percentage of				Mean	Standard Deviation
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree		
1	58.3	38.5	3.1	0	3,55	0,56
2	55,2	41.7	2.1	1.0	3,51	0,60
3	80.2	18.8	1.0	0	3,79	0,43
4	62.5	35.4	2.1	0	3,60	0,53
5	74.0	22.9	2.1	1.0	3,70	0,56
6	62.9	35.4	2.1	0	3,60	0,53
7	41.7	50.0	8.3	0	3,33	0,63
9	30.2	60.4	9.4	0	3,21	0,60
11	33.3	49.0	16.7	1.0	3,15	0,73
Average					3.49	0.53

Overall, the findings revealed that the teachers reported a strong foundational understanding of FA concepts. Their conceptual literacy was particularly strong in areas related to aligning assessment with learning goals and using assessment data to inform instruction. However, teachers exhibited slightly less confidence in the implementation of diverse assessment methods and the provision of feedback.

Based on the teachers' responses to the questions in which they were required to choose from the given options, the methods they believed to be FA methods and FA feedback methods, interesting findings could be drawn. The highest percentage of teachers chose role play, teacher and peer observation, quizzes, and multiple-choice tests. The first two methods are commonly associated with formative assessment (FA) or assessment for learning. This indicates that teachers acknowledged FA methods by selecting corresponding methods such as role play and teacher and peer observations. Most teachers also selected multiple-choice tests and quizzes, formats often associated with high-stakes or summative testing. However, it is important to note that an assessment format is not inherently



formative or summative; its function depends on how the evidence it generates is used to support ongoing teaching and learning (Black & Wiliam, 2008; Bennett, 2011). Teachers' selection of these familiar formats may therefore reflect their versatility within Indonesian EFL classrooms rather than a misunderstanding of formative assessment principles. Nonetheless, methods such as presentations and projects, which are often integral to eliciting formative evidence of skills and knowledge in progress, were less frequently selected by the participants. This suggests that some teachers' repertoire of FA methods may be narrower than the range represented in the FAL literature—an area that could benefit from further support—rather than indicating ambiguity about what counts as formative assessment.

The feedback provision method that received the highest selection was written notes/feedbacks, as listed in table 5. This indicates that the teachers understood the role of feedback in FA. The other feedback provision methods that were more frequently selected as FA feedback were classical verbal feedback, self-assessment rubric, and audio/video feedback. This strengthened the evidence of teachers' literacy in FA, especially in the knowledge/conceptual dimension. Several teachers also selected feedback formats more closely associated with summative assessment, such as scores and interval scores. As with the assessment method items above, this pattern is better interpreted as reflecting the range of feedback formats familiar to teachers than as evidence of ambiguity about formative and summative purposes; further research using classroom observation could clarify how these formats are used in practice.

Table 5. The percentage of teachers' selections of the FA methods and feedback provision methods in FA

Items	Options	n	%
8. Which of the assessment methods below are FA?	Role-play	58	60.4
	Multiple choice test	48	50.0
	Quizzes (entry and exit quizzes, trivia quiz)	51	53.1
	Presentation	44	45.8
	Project	45	46.9
	Matching test	40	41.7
	Observation (teacher/peer)	62	64.6
	True/False test	45	46.9
	Journal/ learning log	34	35.4
	Short/long answer comprehension test	40	41.7
	Essay test	46	47.9
10. Which of these are the feedbacks in FA?	Score	34	35.4
	Interval score (A, B, C, D)	40	41.7
	Written notes/ feedback	74	77.1
	Peer assessment rubric	40	41.7
	Self-assessment rubric	51	53.1
	Grades	15	15.6
	Audio/video feedback	48	50.0
	Classical verbal feedback	52	54.2

In summary, teachers reported a high level of perceived literacy in the knowledge or conceptual dimension, as indicated by their understanding of the five key FA strategies. Teachers selected a broad range of assessment



and feedback methods, including some more commonly associated with summative assessment. Consistent with the interpretation above, this pattern likely reflects the breadth of formats familiar to Indonesian EFL teachers rather than confusion about formative assessment principles.

3.2 RQ.2. How do EFL teachers perceive their practical knowledge of FA?

Table 6 lists the EFL teachers' responses on the practical dimension of the Teachers' FAL Scale (TFALS). The results of the questionnaire in the practical dimension provided insights into how teachers perceived their FA practice. While teachers reported strong perceived FA literacy in the practical dimension, there were areas that needed to be taken into account. Some items (items number 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9) consistently received high levels of agreement from the teachers. The items were understanding the use of various assessment methods, engaging students in peer feedback, clarifying assessment purposes, sharing assessment criteria, guiding students to improve based on assessment results, and engaging students to use feedback to improve learning. The standard deviations of the items were relatively low, indicating little variation in the teachers' responses. A lower agreement percentage was observed for items 3, 6, and 11. The items were related to teachers' practical knowledge of helping students develop self-assessment skills, training students to act on assessment feedback information to improve their learning, and providing effective feedback that enhances learning.

Table 6. The EFL teachers' responses on the practical dimension of the Teachers' FAL Scale (TFALS)

Items	Percentage (%)				Mean	Standard Deviation
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree		
1	62.5	36.5	1.0	0	3,61	0,51
2	55.2	43.5	1.0	0	3,54	0,52
3	38.5	50.0	10.4	1.0	3,26	0,68
4	38.5	53.1	8.3	0	3,30	0,62
5	43.8	47.9	8.3	0	3,35	0,63
6	36.5	45.8	16.7	1.0	3,18	0,74
7	47.9	47.9	4.2	0	3,44	0,58
9	42.7	49.0	8.3	0	3,34	0,63
11	39.6	50.0	10.4	0	3,29	0,65
Average					3.36	0.62

In conclusion, the teachers reported strong confidence in the practical dimension of FAL. However, there were areas that needed improvement, especially in terms of knowledge of how to help students develop self-assessment skills, train students to act on assessment feedback, and provide effective feedback.

Compelling findings can be drawn from teachers' responses regarding the assessment methods and feedback provision types they used in their classrooms. While they reported a good understanding of FA methods and feedback provision in FA, their classroom practices revealed slightly different findings. It could be observed from the table that represented the teachers' practical use of assessment methods and feedback provision. Role-plays and presentations, in particular, aligned well with FA principles by fostering authentic, performance-based evaluation. This suggests that teachers understand the importance of using assessments that not only measure language skills but also provide immediate insights into students' communicative competence, which is critical for EFL learners.

The moderate use of projects and observation methods further demonstrated teachers' literacy in formative practices, as these methods were conducive to continuous FA and could yield rich, individualized data on student progress. However, the relatively low use of journals or learning logs might indicate that while teachers recognized



traditional interactive formats, they might be less familiar or comfortable with reflective practices that require extensive monitoring and interpretation, highlighting a potential area for growth in assessment literacy.

An additional pattern worth noting concerns the multiple-choice test format: despite teachers' strong self-reported conceptual knowledge of FAL, their reported classroom use of multiple-choice tests remained high in the post-test. As noted above, this need not indicate a conceptual gap, since multiple-choice tests can serve formative purposes depending on how the results are used. Nonetheless, it points to a discrepancy between teachers' conceptual understanding and their reported classroom practice, which is examined further in the Discussion. Table 7. Shows the percentage of teachers' practical use of the FA methods and feedback provision methods.

Table 7. The percentage of teachers' practical use of the FA methods and feedback provision methods

Items	Options	n	%
8. I used the following assessment methods:	Role-play	69	71.9
	Multiple choice test	61	63.5
	Quizzes (entry and exit quizzes, trivia quiz)	42	43.8
	Presentation	67	69.7
	Project	49	51.0
	Matching test	40	41.7
	Observation (teacher/peer)	50	52.1
	True/False test	47	49.0
	Journal/ learning log	17	17.7
	Short/long answer comprehension test	46	47.9
	Essay test	50	52.1
10. I employ the following feedback in assessment activities.	Score	64	66.7
	Interval score (A, B, C, D)	41	42.7
	Written notes/ feedback	75	78.1
	Peer assessment rubric	45	46.9
	Self-assessment rubric	43	44.8
	Grades	17	17.7
	Audio/video feedback	38	39.6
	Classical verbal feedback	57	59.4

An intriguing finding emerged concerning feedback provision, revealing a low level of agreement among teachers regarding effective implementation. This observation was further substantiated by the high percentage of teachers selecting 'scores and interval scores' as feedback strategies they commonly employed, suggesting challenges in applying effective feedback in FA practices. These challenges may stem from several factors, including teachers' limited knowledge of effective feedback provision or external constraints such as school culture, time pressure, and workload. However, these explanations were not directly measured in this study and should be treated as possible avenues for future investigation rather than as established causes.

3.3 RQ.3. How do EFL teachers perceive their socio-emotional knowledge of FA?

The data offered valuable insights into teachers' self-reported socio-emotional dimension of FAL, which showed consistently high mean scores across all seven items (ranging from M = 3.36 to M = 3.61 on the four-point



scale; see Table 8). Teachers showed the strongest perceptions in aspects such as sharing a common understanding of FA among teachers and students (Item 1, $M = 3.59$), the impact of feedback on students' motivation (Item 4, $M = 3.50$), students' well-being (Item 6, $M = 3.51$), and students' right to benefit from FA practices (Item 7, $M = 3.61$).

Rather than indicating a weak socio-emotional dimension overall, this generally high profile shows some areas of comparatively, though still positively, lower confidence.

Relatively lower mean scores were found for understanding the ethical aspects of FA, such as fairness and student privacy (Item 5, $M = 3.36$), and for attending to students' emotional responses to assessment (Item 2, $M = 3.38$). These two areas, rather than the socio-emotional dimension as a whole, appear to be where teachers would benefit most from further professional development in managing ethical considerations—such as fairness and privacy—and in supporting students' emotional well-being throughout the assessment process.

Table 8. The EFL teachers' responses on the socio-emotional dimension of the Teachers' FAL Scale (TFALS)

Items	Percentage				Mean	Standard Deviation
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree		
1	59.4	40.6	0	0	3,59	0,49
2	44.8	47.9	7.3	0	3,38	0,62
3	43.8	51.0	5.2	0	3,39	0,59
4	54.2	41.7	4.2	0	3,50	0,58
5	46.9	43.8	8.3	1.0	3,36	0,68
6	55.2	41.7	2.1	1.0	3,51	0,60
7	64.6	33.3	1.0	1.0	3,61	0,57
Average					3.47	0.59

Overall, the findings suggest that teachers reported a high level of perceived socio-emotional FAL, particularly in terms of sharing a common understanding of FA with other teachers and students. Teachers were also aware of the impact of feedback on motivating or demotivating students and were generally conscious of the benefits of FA for students. However, the comparatively lower—though still positive—mean scores for ethical awareness and for attending to students' emotional responses indicate that these two specific areas, rather than the socio-emotional dimension as a whole, would benefit most from targeted professional development.

3.4 RQ. 4. How is the correlation among the three dimensions of teachers' FAL?

Correlation analysis revealed significant positive relationships among the three dimensions of FAL: conceptual, practical, and socio-emotional. Specifically, a strong positive correlation was found between the conceptual and practical dimensions ($r = .69$, $p < .001$). This indicates that a greater understanding of the conceptual aspects of FA is associated with a higher ability to apply these strategies in practice.

A similar positive relationship was observed between the conceptual and socio-emotional dimensions ($r = .55$, $p < .001$), suggesting that conceptual knowledge is linked to socio-emotional competence in this area. The strongest relationship was found between the practical and socio-emotional dimensions ($r = .73$, $p < .001$), indicating a robust association between teachers' practical application of FA and their socio-emotional skills (Figure 1).

As these correlations are based on cross-sectional, self-reported data collected using a single instrument, they indicate that the three dimensions tend to co-occur among the same respondents; they should not be interpreted as evidence that one dimension produces, builds, or strengthens another.

Correlations			Conceptual	Practical	Sosio-emotional
Spearman's rho	Conceptual	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	0.696**	0.550**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	0.000	0.000
		N	96	96	96
	Practical	Correlation Coefficient	0.696**	1.000	0.736**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	.	0.000
		N	96	96	96
	Sosio-emotional	Correlation Coefficient	0.550**	0.736**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	.
		N	96	96	96

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

Figure 1. The Correlation among EFL Teachers' FAL dimensions.

4. Discussion

The findings of this study offer critical insights into EFL teachers' self-reported FAL, encompassing conceptual, practical, and socio-emotional dimensions. Although teachers reported a strong perceived understanding of FAL, some areas need improvement—particularly in actionable feedback provision, student involvement in peer and self-assessment, and specific aspects of the socio-emotional dimension, such as ethical awareness and responsiveness to students' emotional reactions. The central contribution of this study is not simply that teachers report generally high FAL, but that it identifies a specific discrepancy between teachers' confidence in FA principles and their reported use of feedback, peer assessment, self-assessment, and assessment methods in practice in their teaching. These findings contribute to and extend existing research on FA in EFL contexts, reinforcing the previous literature while highlighting the nuanced challenges that teachers face in practice.

A significant aspect of the findings is that EFL teachers generally reported solid perceived conceptual FA literacy, particularly in understanding its rationale and aligning assessment tasks with the learning objectives. This aligns with Arrafii (2020) and Popham (2018), who emphasized that FA must be integrated into instructional planning and learning objectives to be effective. Moreover, Walters (2009) underscored the necessity of interactive dialogue and common understanding between teachers and students to agree on what and how quality work is intended to achieve. However, the challenge lies in translating this knowledge into consistent and impactful practice.

Additionally, Karaçöp and İnaltekin's (2023) bibliometric analysis underscored that FA research has increasingly focused on the interaction between feedback and student learning. In this regard, our study complements this body of research by suggesting that, while teachers recognize the value of feedback, their confidence in ensuring that students effectively use feedback for improvement is relatively low. Although teachers recognized the importance of providing actionable feedback (Fitriyah *et al.*, 2022; Widiastuti *et al.*, 2020), the study found that teachers' feedback was dominated by formats commonly associated with summative assessment, such as scores and interval scores, rather than by feedback explicitly designed to move learning forward. Addressing this gap could enhance the overall efficacy of FA in EFL classrooms, as feedback is integral to student progress in language learning.

The study also underscores an important gap in teachers' ability to engage students in FA processes, particularly in the areas of peer and self-assessment. Leung (2020) advocated for FA as part of a broader learning-oriented assessment (LOA) framework, which emphasises student agency and involvement in the assessment process. This is also evident in feedback provision, revealing a discrepancy between conceptual and practical literacy. The discrepancy observed in this study suggests that while teachers acknowledge the theoretical value of student involvement and effective feedback provision, they might encounter obstacles in implementation, potentially due to classroom constraints, a lack of training, or resistance from students who are unfamiliar with such practices



(Widiastuti *et al.*, 2019). However, these factors were not directly measured in the present study and should be regarded as possible explanations warranting further investigation rather than confirmed causes of the observed discrepancy. This aligns with previous research indicating that students' active participation in FA can be challenging when teachers are not confident in structuring and facilitating these activities effectively (Oeksuez *et al.*, 2026; Yan & Pastore, 2022). The findings thus point to the need for professional development programs that focus not only on conceptual understanding but also on practical strategies for fostering student engagement in assessment.

Another notable challenge identified in this study pertains to the ethical considerations of FA. While much of the existing literature focuses on the technical and pedagogical aspects of FA (Bennett, 2011; Meng *et al.*, 2025; Black & Wiliam, 2008), ethical dimensions—such as fairness, transparency, and the psychological impact of assessment on students—require greater attention. Karaçöp and İnaltekin (2023) argue that ethical considerations should be an integral part of FAL, ensuring that assessment practices do not inadvertently disadvantage students or create undue stress for them. The findings suggest that EFL teachers may require further training in ethical assessment practices, particularly in ensuring that feedback mechanisms are equitable and culturally sensitive. This is particularly relevant in Indonesia, where the curriculum emphasizes FA but may not sufficiently address the ethical complexities involved in its implementation (Muchlis *et al.*, 2020; Defianty, 2018; Widiastuti *et al.*, 2019).

The significant positive correlations found among the conceptual, practical, and socio-emotional dimensions of FAL indicate that these dimensions tend to co-occur among the teachers in this sample, consistent with an integrated view of effective assessment practice; because the data are cross-sectional and self-reported, however, this association cannot itself establish that strengthening one dimension causes improvement in another. This finding is broadly consistent with prior arguments that the three dimensions—conceptual, practical, and socio-emotional knowledge—are interrelated (Haddadian *et al.*, 2024; Yan & Pastore, 2022), and that neglecting one of the dimensions may be associated with less effective assessment practice (Nazari *et al.*, 2023).

Therefore, the study's findings call for targeted interventions to support teachers in bridging the gap between conceptual knowledge and classroom application. The evidence most directly supports professional development focused on actionable feedback provision, structured strategies for peer and self-assessment, and the ethical and socio-emotional dimensions of assessment, as these are the areas measured in this study. Broader policy adjustments concerning institutional resources, training systems, and school-wide assessment culture may also be beneficial. However, because these institutional factors were not directly investigated in this study, such recommendations should be treated as tentative and considered alongside further research. Ultimately, by addressing these challenges, educators can move towards a more comprehensive and effective FA framework that enhances student learning outcomes.

The findings of this study contribute to the growing body of research on FAL, particularly in the EFL context. While teachers report the benefits conceptual and practical knowledge of FA, there are clear areas for improvement, especially in ethical aspects, emotional awareness, implementation of peer and self-assessment, and effective feedback provision. These findings align with previous empirical studies by Sadler (1989), Bennett (2011), Li and Gu (2024), Leung (2020), Clifton (2023), and others, which have underscored the complexities and challenges of FA in educational settings. The discrepancy in the methods of formative and summative assessments and feedback provision between the conceptual and practical dimensions should be viewed with careful consideration of the possible factors. Walters (2009) mentioned that the dichotomy between formative and summative assessments may result in the failure of a productive relationship between them. The interconnections revealed in this study highlight the urgent need to equip teachers with all three dimensions of FAL. Professional development programs must move beyond a focus on theoretical knowledge alone and incorporate a strong emphasis on practical skills and socioemotional competence.

To address these gaps, targeted professional development programs should focus on enhancing teachers' ability to engage students in self-regulated learning through peer and self-assessment, as well as on attending to the emotional and ethical dimensions of FA. By strengthening these areas, teachers can further develop their FAL, ultimately leading to improved student outcomes in EFL classrooms. A further, more tentative implication concerns school-level assessment culture: school stakeholders may wish to consider embedding formative evaluative practices more broadly into the school culture. However, this study did not directly examine institutional or school culture

factors; therefore, this suggestion should be treated as a direction for future research rather than a direct implication of the present findings.

5. Conclusion

The study indicates that EFL teachers report a robust, self-reported conceptual understanding of formative assessment literacy (FAL), particularly regarding the alignment of assessment tasks with learning objectives and rationale for formative assessments. The key contribution of this study lies in identifying the discrepancy between this reported conceptual understanding and teachers' reported classroom practice: teachers often depend on summative feedback formats, such as scores and interval marks, rather than reporting actionable formative feedback and encounter difficulties involving students in peer and self-assessment. Comparatively lower confidence in specific aspects of the socio-emotional dimension—namely ethical awareness (such as fairness and privacy) and responsiveness to students' emotional reactions—also warrants attention, particularly in the Indonesian context, where the curriculum emphasizes formative assessment but does not fully address these complexities.

These findings highlight the necessity of a comprehensive, integrated approach to FAL that concurrently enhances conceptual understanding, practical application and socio-emotional competence. Therefore, targeted professional development should extend beyond theoretical knowledge to equip teachers with concrete strategies for facilitating student-led assessment, ensuring that feedback is actionable and culturally sensitive, and promoting an ethical assessment culture in the classroom. Broader policy adjustments involving resources, training systems, and institutional support may further support the embedding of formative assessment into schools' daily practices. As these institutional factors were not directly investigated in this study, such recommendations are offered as directions for future research and policy dialogue rather than as direct findings of the present study.

References

- Amirian, S.M.R. (2025). Understanding EFL teachers' formative assessment literacy: insights from a mixed-methods study. *Language Testing in Asia*, 15, 25. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-025-00363-y>
- Antoniou, P., James, M. (2014). Exploring formative assessment in primary school classrooms: Developing a framework of actions and strategies. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 26(2), 153-176. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-013-9188-4>
- Arrafii, M. A. (2020). Towards FA: exploring English teachers' conceptions and practices of assessment in Indonesia. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Leicester). <https://doi.org/10.25392/leicester.data.13293359>
- Baleni, Z.G. (2015). Online FA in higher education: Its pros and cons. *Electronic Journal of e-Learning*, 13(4), 228-236.
- Bennett, R.E. (2011). Formative assessment: A Critical Review. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 18(1), 5-25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2010.513678>
- Black, P., Wiliam, D. (2009) Developing the Theory of Formative Assessment. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 21, 5-31. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-008-9068-5>
- Chen, Y. (2021). Exploring Secondary School EFL Teachers' Assessment Literacy in Practice: A Case Study in China. *English Language Teaching*, 14(12), 1-7.
- Clifton, G.J. (2023). *Language Assessment Literacy and Formative Assessment in Indonesian EFL Education: A Study of Assessment Policy, Teaching Materials, and Teacher Practices under Kurikulum Merdeka*. University of Maryland, Baltimore County.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., Morrison, K. (2007). *Research Methods in Education* (6th edition). Routledge.
- Creswell, J.W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. Pearson.
- Defianty, M. (2018). *The practice of FA by EFL teachers in secondary high schools in Indonesia* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Canberra).
- Demekash, A.M., Degefu, H.W. (2024). Secondary school EFL teachers' awareness for formative assessment for effective learning. *Heliyon*, 10(19). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e37793>



- Di Loreto, S., McDonough, K. (2013). The relationship between instructor feedback and ESL student anxiety. *TESL Canada Journal*, 31(1), 20-41.
- Dillman, D.A., Smyth, J.D., Christian, L.M. (2014). Internet, phone, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method. *Indianapolis, Indiana: Wiley*, 17, 161-176.
- Ehlers, U.D., Eigbrecht, L. (2024). I've Learnt Everything I Know from the World. A Future Skills Conversation with Andreas Schleicher. In *Creating the University of the Future: A Global View on Future Skills and Future Higher Education. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden*, 75-92.
- Fitriyah, I., Basthomi, Y., Khotimah, K., Gozali, I. (2022). Implementation of assessment for learning in online EFL writing class: A case of novice undergraduate teachers. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 15(2), 129-159. <https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/article/view/259925>
- Fitriyah, I., Masitoh, F., & Widiati, U. (2022). Classroom-based language assessment literacy and professional development need between novice and experienced EFL teachers. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 12(1), 124-134. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v12i1.46539>
- Fulcher, G. (2012). Assessment literacy for the language classroom. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 9(2), 113-132. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2011.642041>
- Ganajová, M., Sotáková, I., Lukáč, S., Ješková, Z., Jurková, V., Orosová, R. (2021). Formative assessment as a tool to enhance the development of inquiry skills in science education. *Journal of Baltic Science Education*, 20(2), 204-222. <https://doi.org/10.33225/jbse/21.20.204>
- Haddadian, G., Radmanesh, S., Haddadian, N. (2024). Construction and validation of a computerized formative assessment literacy (CFAL) questionnaire for language teachers: An exploratory sequential mixed-methods investigation. *Language Testing in Asia*, 14(1), 33. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-024-00303-2>
- Han, Z., Shigang, G., Saad, M.R.B.M. (2024). Formative Assessment in K-12 English as a Foreign Language Education: A Systematic Review. *Heliyon*, 10(10). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e31367>
- Hidayat, M.F., Purnawarman, P. (2024). Exploring EFL teachers' formative assessment literacy: An in-depth investigation. *ELTIN Journal: Journal of English Language Teaching in Indonesia*, 12(2), 321-336.
- Irons, A., Elkington, S. (2021). Enhancing learning through formative assessment and feedback. *Routledge*.
- Ismail, S.M., Rahul, D.R., Patra, I., Rezvani, E. (2022). Formative vs. summative assessment: Impacts on academic motivation, attitude toward learning, test anxiety, and self-regulation skill. *Language Testing in Asia*, 12(1), 40. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-022-00191-4>
- Isnawati, I. (2023). EFL teachers' assessment literacy. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 26(2), 760-769. <https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v26i2.3654>
- Karaçöp, A., İnaltekin, T. (2023). FA in educational research published at the beginning of the new millennium: Bibliometric analysis. *Journal of Formative Design in Learning*, 7(2), 106-125. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41686-023-00081-9>
- Khodabakhshzadeh, H., Kafi, Z., Hosseinnia, M. (2018). Investigating EFL teachers' conceptions and literacy of formative assessment: Constructing and validating an inventory. *International Journal of Instruction*, 11(1), 139-152.
- Leung, C. (2020). Learning-Oriented Assessment: More than the Chalkface. In: Poehner, M.E., Inbar-Lourie, O. (eds) *Toward a Reconceptualization of Second Language Classroom Assessment. Educational Linguistics, Springer, Cham*, 41, 85-106. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-35081-9_5
- Li, J., Gu, P.Y. (2024). Formative assessment for self-regulated learning: Evidence from a teacher continuing professional development programme. *System*, 125, 103414. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103414>
- Ma, M., Bui, G. (2021). Chinese secondary school teachers' conceptions of L2 assessment: A mixed-methods study. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 11(3), 445-472. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2021.11.3.7>
- Meng, Y., Cui, Y., Aryadoust, V. (2025). EFL teachers' formative assessment literacy and developmental trajectories: A comparative study of face-to-face and blended teaching modes. *System*, 132, 103694. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2025.103694>



- Mirsanjari, Z. (2025). Enhancing assessment literacy in EAP instruction: The role of teacher development courses in overcoming systemic barriers. *Language Testing in Asia*, 15, 30. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-025-00368-7>
- Muchlis, Ibnu, S., Subandi, Marfuah, S. (2020). Students' results of learning at Chemistry Department through assessment of, for, and as learning implementation. *International Journal of Instruction*, 13(2), 165-178. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2020.13212a>
- Nazari, M., Karimpour, S., Ranjbar, M. (2023). The ecology of language teacher assessment literacy: Insights from emotional critical incidents. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 78, 101285.
- Nelson, K. (2020). A qualitative study: Formative assessment practices of middle school ESOL teachers for improving language development. *Southwestern College (Kansas)*.
- Nicol, D.J., Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(2), 199-218.
- Oeksuez, S. S., Buholzer, A., Hascher, T., Zulliger, S., Maskos, K., Schulz, A. (2026). Enhancing primary teachers' formative assessment literacy: Effects of a professional development program on peer and self-assessment. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 181, 105662. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2026.105662>
- Owen, L. (2016). The impact of feedback as formative assessment on student performance. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 28(2), 168-175.
- Popham, W.J. (2018). Assessment literacy for educators in a hurry. ASCD.
- Richardson, M. (2022). Rebuilding public confidence in educational assessment. *UCL Press*.
- Sadler, D.R. (1989). FA and the design of instructional systems. *Instructional Science*, 18(2), 119-144. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00117714>
- Shao, S. (2025). Developing language assessment literacy: Formative assessment practice from pre-service teacher to novice teacher. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 34(4), 1507-1517. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-024-00961-z>
- Sultan, J., Ulwiyah, S.A., Retnawati, H., Kastara, R. (2024). Bibliometric analysis: Scopus-indexed FA learning research trends in the last decade. In *International Conference on Current Issues in Education Atlantis Press*, 268-279.
- Wallen, N.E., Fraenkel, J.R. (2013). *Educational research: A guide to the process*. Routledge.
- Walters, D. (2009). One vision, many eyes: A social constructivist approach to embedding FA and evaluation in a secondary school. *University of Exeter (United Kingdom)*.
- Widiastuti, I.A.M.S., Mukminatien, N., Prayogo, J.A., Irawati, E. (2019). Students' perception of assessment and feedback practices: Making learning visible. *International Journal of Sustainability, Education, and Global Creative Economic (IJSEGCE)*, 2(1), 1-8.
- Widiastuti, I.A.M.S., Mukminatien, N., Prayogo, J.A., Irawati, E. (2020). Dissonances between teachers' beliefs and practices of FA in EFL classes. *International Journal of Instruction*, 13(1), 71-84.
- William, D., Thompson, M. (2008). Integrating assessment with instruction: What will it take to make it work? In C. A. Dwyer (Ed.), *The future of assessment: Shaping teaching and learning*, 53-82.
- Yan, Z., Pastore, S. (2022). Are teachers literate in FA? The development and validation of the Teacher Formative Assessment Literacy Scale. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 74, 101183. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2022.101183>

Author Contribution Statement

Diana Nur Utami: Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Writing - Original Draft. Utami Widiati: Formal Analysis, Writing - Review & Editing. Mirjam Anugerahwati: Writing - Review & Editing. Niamika El Khoiri: Data curation, Writing - Review & Editing, Supervision. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.



Does this article screen for similarity?

Yes

Ethics Declaration

This study was reviewed and approved by the Ethics Committee of Human Research, Universitas Negeri Malang (Approval number. 16.05.03/UN32.14.2.8/LT/2025). Informed consent was attached to the questionnaire and obtained from all participating teachers during the data collection process.

Declaration on the use of Artificial Intelligence

During the preparation of this revised manuscript, the authors used an AI-based language assistant to support paraphrasing, language editing, and reduction of textual similarity in response to the editorial similarity/AI content requirements. All AI-assisted text was subsequently reviewed, verified, and edited by the authors, who took full responsibility for the content, accuracy, and originality of the published article. No AI tool was used to generate the original data, statistical results, or scientific claims.

Conflict of Interest

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare. There is also no financial interest to report. The author certifies that the submission is original work and is not under review at any other publication.

About the License

© The Author(s) 2026. The text of this article is open access and licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Licenses.

Cite this Article

Diana Nur Utami, Utami Widiati, Mirjam Anugerahwati, Niamika El Khoiri, A Landscape of EFL Teachers' Formative Assessment Literacy: An Insight from Indonesia, Asian Journal of Interdisciplinary Research, 9(3) (2026), 356-371. <https://doi.org/10.54392/ajir26322>