CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Language assessment literacy

Karin Vogt[1], Henrik Bøhn[2] and Dina Tsagari[3]

[1]University of Education Heidelberg, Heidelberg, Germany, [2]University of South-Eastern Norway, Borre, Norway and [3]Oslo Metropolitan University, Oslo, Norway
Corresponding author: Karin Vogt; Email: vogt@ph-heidelberg.de

Introduction

Numerous references to 'new' literacies have been added to the discourse of various academic and public domains, resulting in a multiplication of literacies. Among them is the term 'language assessment literacy' (LAL), which has been used as a subset of Assessment Literacy (AL) (Gan & Lam, 2022) in the field of language testing and assessment and has not been uncontested. LAL refers to the skills, knowledge, methods, techniques and principles needed by various stakeholders in language assessment to design and carry out effective assessment tasks and to make informed decisions based on assessment data (e.g., Fulcher, 2012*; Inbar-Lourie, 2008*[1]; 2013; Taylor, 2009*, 2013*).

The concept of LAL was developed from discussions on AL in educational assessment in the early 1990s (AFT, NCME, & NEA, 1990). Stiggins (1991), who coined the term 'assessment literacy', argued that assessment literate stakeholders would have to know what characterizes high-quality assessment and be able to apply that knowledge to different measures of student achievement. He also held that the scope of AL research and training needed to be broadened from standardized testing to classroom assessment.

This view was echoed by Brindley (2001*), who paved the way for the development of AL in language education. He conceptualized teacher LAL as consisting of knowledge and skills relating to the following five components: (i) the social context of assessment; (ii) defining and describing proficiency; (iii) constructing and evaluating language tests; (iv) the role of assessment in the language curriculum; and (v) how to put assessment into practice. The idea that LAL comprised knowledge and skills components was supported in later publications by, for example, Davies (2008*) and Inbar-Lourie (2008*), who also added a principles component, involving awareness of the use and impact of language assessments. An even more comprehensive LAL framework was developed by Fulcher (2012*), who amalgamated knowledge and skills into practice and added the notion of context, which places practice and principles within a contextual framework, including, for example, historical and social factors.

Subsequent discussions picked up from Stiggins (1991) and Taylor (2009*) the notion that various stakeholders might need different levels of LAL (e.g., Jeong, 2013; Malone, 2013*). Against this background, suggestions were put forward that literacy should be described as a continuum of proficiency (Pill & Harding, 2013*). Combining these different perspectives, Taylor (2013*) hypothesized that LAL may be regarded as a multidimensional and differential construct, in which stakeholders will need different levels of competence regarding the different dimensions. Other scholars took up the idea of a developmental (Yan & Fan, 2020*) and multidimensional model with competence levels for various stakeholders in LAL and diversified it, giving it a sounder empirical basis – for example, recent work by Baker & Riches (2018*), Bøhn & Tsagari (2021*) and Kremmel & Harding (2020*).

---

*Indicates full reference appears in the subsequent timeline.

Other LAL conceptualizations also exist. Baker (2016), for example, views LAL as consisting of propositional, procedural and collaborative knowledge, whereas Villa Larenas (2020) sees it as comprising disciplinary knowledge (the 'what'), knowledge of language assessment (the 'how'), and knowledge of assessment in a broader social paradigm (the 'why'). More recently, the concept of LAL has been further diversified and specialized – for example, critical LAL (Tajeddin et al., 2022*) or LAL for classroom-based language assessment (CBLA) (Giraldo, 2018; Lan & Fan, 2019*) or second language writing (Crusan et al., 2016).

The primary focus of LAL research has been on in-service teachers (Inbar-Lourie, 2017; Kim et al., 2020), but other stakeholder groups have come to the center of attention, e.g. pre-service teachers (Hildén & Fröjdendahl, 2018; Ho & Yan, 2021), learners (Butler et al, 2021*; Lee & Butler, 2021*; Vogt et al., 2020*, Watanabe, 2011), language testers (Jeong, 2013), university admission officers (Baker, 2016; Deygers & Malone, 2019*; O'Loughlin, 2013) and test developers (Malone, 2013*).

Empirical insights on LAL regarding aspects such as the training needs of teachers, LAL levels and professional development initiatives have now come from many different contexts, for example: Iran (Firoozi et al., 2019), Tunisia (Hidri, 2016), Bangladesh (Sultana, 2019), Mexico (Bustamante, 2022), Turkey (Mede & Atay, 2017), Ukraine (Kvasova & Kavytska, 2014; Ukrayinska, 2018), South Africa (Weideman, 2019), Pakistan (Shahzadi & Ducasse, 2022), Nigeria, (Ugwu & Ezeokoli, 2022), Colombia (Giraldo & Murcia, 2018*; Janssen, 2022), Taiwan (Wu, 2014), Singapore (Koh et al., 2018), or China (Cui et al., 2022; Gu, 2014; Koh et al., 2018; Xie & Tan, 2019). The growing body of research from various educational contexts can be seen as a sign of the globalization of LAL as a vibrant research field. In addition, the recent increase in reviews, some of them systematic or scoping reviews, is an indication that LAL has become an established area of research within language testing and assessment (Coombe & Davidson, 2021; Coombe et al., 2020; Fanrong & Bin, 2022; Gan & Lam, 2022; Wang et al., 2023).

As touched upon above, the way LAL is theorized in the field is an ongoing process with conceptualizations constantly being expanded and with new dimensions added. To date, there is no conclusive definition of the term LAL, but many scholars have provided much-cited working definitions – for example: Fulcher (2012*), Inbar-Lourie (2013) and O'Loughlin (2013). With the powerful impact of contextual factors (Tsagari & Vogt, 2022), a static and uniform conceptualization of LAL might not do justice to this complex construct. The way forward might be to continue developing context-sensitive, pluralistic and differential heuristics, appropriately accommodating the needs of various stakeholders and situations.

Regarding future directions for LAL research, another issue is whether the term is appropriate any longer, given its potentially negative connotation as the bare minimum of competence. Alternative terms such as 'language assessment competence' have been suggested but not conclusively discussed in the field. Operationalized models of LAL have only rarely been tested empirically so far, and inventories have often been based on assumptions of LAL heuristics. In trying to solve this problem, a dilemma emerges. How can one create a valid, generic model which also takes into account contextual LAL characteristics? Attempts to resolve this dilemma have been undertaken by Fulcher (2020*), for example, whose Apprenticeship Model is based on an operationalization of Fulcher (2012*), but more work is needed. Conceptualizations of LAL need to be empirically validated, which is not only important to establish an empirical basis but also to have LAL professional initiatives grounded in theoretical frameworks of LAL as another important area to be investigated (e.g., Giraldo, 2021*).

The technological dimension of LAL has attracted little attention in the literature so far. The construct has to keep pace with technological progress, also in view of the lessons learnt from emergency remote language assessment (ERLA) in the context of the Covid-19 pandemic and in preparation for future educational crises (Maaoui et al., 2023).

So far, LAL has often been discussed from the points of view of language testers and language teachers. Learners as stakeholders have only recently attracted more scholarly attention (e.g., Lee & Butler, 2020*). There is a need to differentiate within this large group – for example, by investigating learners with diverse learning needs, including theoretical deliberations of equality, diversity and

inclusion in LAL conceptualizations. Likewise, LAL involving other languages than English, including less commonly taught languages, needs to be addressed. Work on teacher LAL of Russian as a Foreign Language (Drackert & Stadler, 2017) and Romance languages (Drackert et al., 2020) has provided some evidence, but the evidence base needs to be broadened. In addition, a sociocultural perspective in which LAL is co-constructed is increasingly discussed in theoretical and empirical work (e.g., Giraldo, 2020; Holzknecht et al., 2018; Vogt & Tsagari, 2022) and directs the attention towards a more fluid, situated and co-constructed praxis of LAL (Poehner & Inbar-Lourie, 2020).

Particularly in recent years, research activity in LAL has been remarkable. Hence, a large number of publications have been sifted out. The papers and books included here are based on the extent to which they have advanced the field by giving theoretical direction and/or contributed considerably to our understanding of LAL. More specifically, we have used a combination of citation metrics per publication per year and expert review to identify seminal publications. However, such metrics do not automatically identify the impact of scholarly works, as they do not control for self-citation, bi-directional mutual citations, the use of citations for non-scientific reasons, and so forth (see e.g., Herrmannova et al., 2018; Swacha, 2022). We also applied our expert knowledge (Taylor, 2011) to evaluate the reverberation that the publications have had in the LAL area in terms of conceptualizations of LAL, impact of empirical research on LAL and implications for teaching and learning. The papers of the timeline are therefore organized according to three major categories:

1. Conceptualizations of LAL.
2. Empirical research in LAL.
3. Pedagogical implications: Materials on or suggestions for how LAL can be developed and enhanced within a local or international teaching and learning context.

Note that these categories are not mutually exclusive, as one and the same publication may have given important contributions theoretically, empirically and practically. However, for each publication in the timeline below we single out the category or categories that we deem it to have had the strongest impact on.

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*. National Council on Measurement in Education.

Baker, B. (2016). Language assessment literacy as professional competence: The case of Canadian admissions decision makers. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *19*(1), 63–83. https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/CJAL/article/view/23033

Brindley, G. (2001). Language assessment and professional development. In C. Elder, A. Brown, K. Hill, N. Iwashita, T. Lumley, T. McNamara, & K. O'Loughlin (Eds.), *Experimenting with uncertainty: Essays in honour of Alan Davies* (pp. 126–136). Cambridge University Press.

Bustamante, A. (2022). Language assessment literacy of middle school English teachers in Mexico. *Languages*, *7*(1), 32. doi:10.3390/languages7010032

Coombe, C., & Davidson, P. (2021). Language assessment literacy. In H. Mohebbi & C. Coombe (Eds.), *Research questions in language education and applied linguistics* (pp. 343–347). Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-79143-8_61

Coombe, C., Vafadar, H., & Mohebbi, H. (2020). Language assessment literacy: What do we need to learn, unlearn, and relearn? *Language Testing in Asia*, *10*, 3. doi:10.1186/s40468-020-00101-6

Crusan, D., Plakans, L., & Gebril, A. (2016). Writing assessment literacy: Surveying second language teachers' knowledge, beliefs, and practices. *Assessing Writing*, *28*, 43–56. doi:10.1016/j.asw.2016.03.001

Cui, Y., Liu, Y., Yu, H., & Gao, Y. (2022). Developing English teachers' language assessment literacy in an EAP reform context through test design: A case study. *System*, *109*, 102866. doi:10.1016/j.system.2022.102866

Drackert, A., Konzett-Firth, C., Stadler, W., & Visser, J. (2020). An empirical study on romance teachers' subjective theories regarding assessment purposes and good tests. In D. Tsagari (Ed.), *Language assessment literacy. From theory to practice* (pp. 50–70). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Drackert, A., & Stadler, W. (2017). Beurteilungskompetenz von Russischlehrkräften in Deutschland, Österreich, der Schweiz und Südtirol (DACHS). Zwischen Status Quo und aktuellen Bedürfnissen. *Zeitschrift für Fremdsprachenforschung*, 28(1), 233–258. https://www.dgff.de/assets/Uploads/ausgaben-zff/ZFF-2-2017-Drackert-Stadler.pdf

Fanrong, W., & Bin, S. (2022). Language assessment literacy of teachers. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 864582. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2022.864582

Firoozi, T., Razavipour, K., & Ahmadi, A. (2019). The language assessment literacy needs of Iranian EFL teachers with a focus on reformed assessment policies. *Language Testing in Asia*, 9, 2. doi: 10.1186/s40468-019-0078-7

Gan, L., & Lam, R. (2022). A review on language assessment literacy: Trends, foci and contributions. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 19(5), 503–525. doi:10.1080/15434303.2022.2128802

Giraldo, F. (2018). Language assessment literacy: Implications for language teachers. *Profile Issues in Teachers` Professional Development*, 20(1), 179–195. doi:10.15446/profile.v20n1.62089

Giraldo, F. (2020). A post-positivist and interpretive approach to researching teachers' language assessment literacy. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 22(1), 189–200. doi:10.15446/profile.v22n1.78188

Giraldo, F., & Murcia, D. (2018). Language assessment literacy for pre-service teachers: Course expectations from different stakeholders. *GIST – Education and Learning Research Journal*, (16), 56–77. doi:10.26817/16925777.425

Gu, P. Y. (2014). The unbearable lightness of the curriculum: What drives the assessment practices of a teacher of English as a Foreign Language in a Chinese secondary school? *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 21(3), 286–305. doi:10.1080/0969594X.2013.836076

Hasselgreen, A., Carlsen, C., & Helness, H. (2004). European survey of language testing and assessment needs. Report: part one – general findings. http://www.ealta.eu.org/documents/resources/survey-report-pt1.pdf

Herrmannova, D., Patton, R. M., Knoth, P., & Stahl, C. G. (2018). Do citations and readership identify seminal publications? *Scientometrics*, 115, 239–262. doi:10.1007/s11192-018-2669-y

Hidri, S. (2016). Conceptions of assessment: Investigating what assessment means to secondary and university teachers. *Arab Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 19–43. http://www.tjaling.org.

Hildén, R., & Fröjdendahl, B. (2018). The Dawn of assessment literacy: Exploring the conceptions of Finnish student teachers in foreign languages. *Apples - Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 12(1), 1–24. doi:10.17011/apples/urn.201802201542

Ho, E. C., & Yan, X. (2021). Using community of practice to characterize collaborative essay prompt writing and its role in developing language assessment literacy for pre-service language teachers. *System*, 101, 102569. doi:10.1016/j.system.2021.102569

Holzknecht, F., Kremmel, B., Konzett-Firth, C., Eberharter, K., & Spöttl, C. (2018). Potentials and challenges of teacher involvement in rating scale design for high-stakes exams. In D. Xerri, & P. Vella Briffa (Eds.), *Teacher involvement in high-stakes language testing* (pp. 47–66). Springer.

Inbar-Lourie, O. (2013). Guest editorial to the special issue on language assessment literacy. *Language Testing*, 30(3), 301–307. doi:10.1177/0265532213480126

Inbar-Lourie, O. (2017). Language assessment literacy. In E. Shohamy, S. May, & I. Or (Eds.), *Language testing and assessment* (3rd ed.) (pp. 257–268). Springer.

Janssen, G. (2022). Local placement test retrofit and building language assessment literacy with teacher stakeholders: A case study from Colombia. *Language Testing*, 39(2), 377–400. doi:10.1177/02655322221076153

Jeong, H. (2013). Defining assessment literacy: Is it different for language testers and non-language testers? *Language Testing*, 30(3), 345–362. doi:10.1177/0265532213480334

Kim, A. A., Chapman, M., Kondo, A., & Wilmes, C. (2020). Examining the assessment literacy required for interpreting score reports: A focus on educators of K–12 English learners. *Language Testing*, 37(1), 54–75. doi:10.1177/0265532219859881

Koh, K., Burke, L. E. C.-A., Luke, A., Gong, W., & Tan, C. (2018). Developing the assessment literacy of teachers in Chinese language classrooms: A focus on assessment task design. *Language Teaching Research*, 22(3), 264–288. doi:10.1177/1362168816684

Kvasova, O., & Kavytska, T. (2014). The assessment competence of university foreign language teachers: A Ukrainian perspective. *CercleS*, 4(1), 159–177. doi:10.1515/cercles-2014-0010

Maaoui, A., Tsagari, D., & Dammak, H. (2023). The relationship between language educators' perceptions and assessment practices during the COVID-19 crisis. *Languages*, 8(1), 54. doi:10.3390/languages8010054

Mede, E., & Atay, D. (2017). English language teachers' assessment literacy: The Turkish context. *Dil Dergisi*, 168(1), 43–60. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/780021

O'Loughlin, K. (2013). Developing the assessment literacy of university proficiency test users. *Language Testing*, 30(3), 363–380. doi:10.1177/0265532213480336

Poehner, M. E., & Inbar-Lourie, O. (2020). An epistemology of action for understanding and change in L2 classroom assessment: The case for praxis. In M. E. Poehner, & O. Inbar-Lourie (Eds.), *Toward a reconceptualization of second language classroom assessment. Praxis and researcher-teacher partnership* (pp. 1–20). Springer.

Shahzadi, A., & Ducasse, A. M. (2022). Language assessment literacy of teachers in an English medium of instruction university: Implications for ELT training in Pakistan. *Studies in Language Assessment (SiLA)*, 11(1), 92–118. https://arts.unimelb.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0010/4282561/SiLA-11.1-Shahzadi_and_Ducasse.pdf

Sheehan, S., & Munro, S. (2017). *Assessment: Attitudes, practices and needs*. British Council.

Stiggins, R. J. (1991). Assessment literacy. *Phi Delta Kappa*, *72*(7), 534–539. https://www.jstor.org/stable/20404455

Sultana, N. (2019). Language assessment literacy: An uncharted area for the English language teachers in Bangladesh. *Language Testing in Asia*, *9*(1), 1–14. doi:10.1186/s40468-019-0077-8

Swacha, J. (2022). A non-iterative constrained measure of research impact. *Information*, *13*(7), 319. doi:10.3390/info13070319

Taylor, J. (2011). The assessment of research quality in UK universities: Peer review or metrics? *British Journal of Management*, *22*(2), 202–217. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8551.2010.00722.x

Tsagari, D., & Vogt, K. (2022). Introduction to special issue 'Contextualizing language assessment literacy'. *Studies in Language Assessment (SiLA)*, *11*(1), ii–vii. https://arts.unimelb.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0005/4282556/SiLA-11.1-Front-matter_Introduction.pdf

Ugwu, E. O., & Ezeokoli, F. (2022). Assessment literacy and practices of literature-in-English teachers in Nigeria. *African Journal of Teacher Education*, *11*(2), 11–52. doi:10.21083/ajote.v11i2.6889

Ukrayinska, O. (2018). Developing student teachers' classroom assessment literacy: The Ukranian context. In S. Hidri (Ed.), *Revisiting the assessment of second language abilities: From theory to practice* (pp. 351–372). Springer.

Villa Larenas, S. (2020). An investigation of the language assessment literacy of teacher educators in Chile: knowledge, practices, learning, beliefs, and context. [Doctoral thesis, Lancaster University]. doi:10.17635/lancaster/thesis/1012

Vogt, K., & Tsagari, D. (2022). Language assessment literacy and test validation: Highlighting the role of language teachers. *Studies in Language Assessment (SiLA)*, *11*(1), 1–15. https://arts.unimelb.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0006/4282557/SiLA-11.1-Vogt_and_Tsagari.pdf

Wang, X., Zuo, J., Liu, F., & Sun, Z. (2023). A scientometric review of research trends in language assessment literacy. *Education Sciences*, *13*(2), 190. doi:10.3390/educsci13020190

Watanabe, Y. (2011). Teaching a course in assessment literacy to test takers: Its rationale, procedure, content and effectiveness. *Cambridge Research Notes*, *46*, 29–34. https://www.cambridgeenglish.org/images/23164-research-notes-46.pdf

Weideman, A. (2019). Assessment literacy and the good language teacher: Four principles and their applications. *Journal for Language Teaching*, *53*(1), 103–121. doi:10.4314/jlt.v53i1.5

Wu, J. (2014). Investigating Taiwanese teachers' language testing and assessment needs. *English Teaching and Learning*, *38*, 1–27.

Xie, Q., & Tan, S. (2019). Preparing primary English teachers in Hong Kong: Focusing on language assessment literacy. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, *16*(2), 653–673. doi:10.18823/asiatefl.2019.16.2.13.653

Karin Vogt is a Full Professor of Teaching English as a Foreign Language at the University of Education Heidelberg, Germany. Her research interests include language testing and assessment, inclusive foreign language teaching, intercultural learning, digital technology and AI in foreign language education, the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages and vocationally-oriented language learning. She has widely published in these areas and has been involved in various research projects – for example, TALE. She is a member of the Advisory Editorial Board of *Language Assessment Quarterly*. She is also a convenor of research groups such as the Multilingual language assessment SIG (European Association of Language Testing and Assessment) and is the leader of the doctoral colloquium for language teachers at the University of Education, Heidelberg.

Henrik Bøhn, Ph.D., is Associate Professor at the Department of Languages and Literature Studies at the University of South-Eastern Norway, where he teaches English didactics to pre-service and in-service English teachers. His research interests include language assessment, language assessment literacy, intercultural learning, metacognition, learner agency and feedback. He has co-authored and co-edited books and journals on intercultural competence, English language teaching and language assessment.

Dina Tsagari, Ph.D., is Professor at the Department of Primary and Secondary Teacher Education, Oslo Metropolitan University, Norway. She has also worked for the University of Cyprus, Greek Open University and Polytechnic University of Hong Kong. Her research interests include language testing and assessment, materials design and evaluation, differentiated instruction, multilingualism, distance education, learning difficulties and inclusive education. She is the editor and author of numerous books, journal papers, book chapters, and project reports. She coordinates research groups – for example: CBLA SIG – EALTA, EnA OsloMet, and is involved in EU-funded and other research projects (e.g. TEFF, TREL, KIDS4ALL, SCALED, NORHED, KriT, DINGLE, TRIBES, ENRICH, TALE, DysTEFL, among others).

Year	References	Annotations	Category
2001	Brindley, G. (2001). Language assessment and professional development. In C. Elder, A. Brown, K. Hill, N. Iwashita, T. Lumley, T. McNamara, & K. O'Loughlin (Eds.), *Experimenting with uncertainty: Essays in honour of Alan Davies* (pp. 126–136). Cambridge University Press.	Taking the Standards for Teacher Competence in Educational Assessment of Students (AFT, NCME, & NEA, 1990) as a starting point, **Brindley** suggested that LAL training for teachers could include the following units: (i) the social context of assessment, focusing on the social, educational and political aspects of assessment; (ii) defining and describing proficiency, including descriptions of language use and how to assess human performance; (iii) constructing and evaluating language tests; (iv) the role of assessment in the language curriculum; and (v) how to put assessment into practice. These suggestions were taken up and further elaborated on by INBAR-LOURIE (2008) and FULCHER (2012).	1
2008	Davies, A. (2008). Textbook trends in teaching language testing. *Language Testing*, 25(3), 327–347. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532208090156	In his analysis of changes in language testing textbooks since LADO (1961), **Davies** found that the LAL construct had been gradually expanded over the years to not only include knowledge and skills, but also PRINCIPLES – that is, issues such as test fairness and impact, including a focus on ethics and professionalism. These are notions that have been much discussed elsewhere (see e.g. FULCHER, 2012; HARDING & KREMMEL, 2016; TAYLOR, 2009).	1, 3
2008	Inbar-Lourie, O. (2008). Constructing a language assessment knowledge base: A focus on language assessment courses. *Language Testing, 25*(3), 385–402. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532208090158	Using BRINDLEY's (2001) suggestions as a starting point, **Inbar-Lourie** proposed a core LAL knowledge framework for assessment courses, related to the 'why', 'what' and 'how' of assessment (taken up in Villa Larenas' model of LAL, 2020). Informed by social-constructivist perspectives that promote a holistic and dynamic understanding of assessment, this framework sees LAL as mirroring contemporary views about the nature of language knowledge and the social role of assessment and focuses on both classroom-based and external assessment. It also emphasizes the context-dependent nature of LAL; a view that has been discussed elsewhere (e.g., TAYLOR, 2009; VOGT ET AL., 2020b).	1
2009	Taylor, L. (2009). Developing assessment literacy. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 29, 21–36. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190509090035	In line with DAVIES' (2008) conclusion that the testing field had seen a growing professionalization over the years, **Taylor** warned that this development could cause excessive specialization and be limiting to good quality assessment policy and practice. Hence, Taylor strongly encouraged the testing and assessment community to contribute to widely sharing their knowledge and skills in order to increase the LAL of non-specialist stakeholders, thus also putting the spotlight on the assessment competence of different stakeholders. Subsequent studies looking into this issue were, for example, PILL & HARDING, 2013).	1

Note. Authors' names are shown in small capitals when the study referred to appears elsewhere in this timeline.

2012	Coombe, C., Troudi, S., & Al-Hamly, M. (2012). Foreign and second language teacher assessment literacy: Issues, challenges, and recommendations. In C. Coombe, P. Davidson, B. O'Sullivan, & S. Stoynoff (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to second language assessment* (pp. 20–29). Cambridge University Press.	This contribution represents one of the first state-of-the-art papers on LAL, similar to Coombe et al. ([2020]). **Coombe et al.** take up an early conceptualization of LAL that focuses on a knowledge base and embed it in classroom-based language assessment. They warn that low levels of LAL prevent learners' higher levels of academic achievement. Scarino (2013) later argues for a broadened LAL knowledge base.	1
2012	Fulcher, G. (2012). Assessment Literacy for the language classroom. *Language Assessment Quarterly, 9*(2), 113–132. https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2011.642041	On the basis of Davies' (2008) LAL conceptualization and empirical data, **Fulcher** developed an expanded LAL model, conceptualizing the construct as consisting of practices, principles and contexts. In this model, the knowledge and skills, making up the practices of language testing, are guided by the principles and concepts of assessment, and further mediated by historical, social, political and philosophical contextual factors. Fulcher also made suggestions concerning LAL training, using an apprenticeship approach that he later develops (Fulcher, 2020). The model has been referenced and built upon by a large number of scholars (e.g., Taylor, 2013; Hill, 2017; Brunfaut & Harding, 2018).	1, 2, 3
2013	Malone, M. E. (2013). The essentials of assessment literacy: Contrasts between testers and users. *Language Testing, 30*(3), 329–344. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532213480129	Referencing Taylor's (2009) call for the testing community to share their knowledge with other stakeholders, **Malone** investigated language testing experts' views on what LAL tutorials should include, comparing their suggestions with those of language instructors. The findings revealed that the experts tended to focus more on fidelity of definitions and how to use tests appropriately, whereas the language teachers were more concerned with clarity of definitions and how easily applicable tutorials are. In response to the question of how to reconcile such differing views, Malone insisted that the needs and expectations of the target audience of such LAL resources – that is, language instructors – must be heeded (see also Vogt et al., 2020b).	2
2013	Pill, J., & Harding, L. (2013). Defining the language assessment literacy gap: Evidence from a parliamentary inquiry. *Language Testing, 30*(3), 381–402. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532213480337	**Pill & Harding** investigated the LAL of policy makers in Australia, pointing to the question of who is responsible for non-specialist stakeholders' assessment competence (cf., Taylor, 2009). Concluding that the policy makers' LAL was seriously flawed, Pill and Harding expanded the LAL concept, introducing literacy levels to describe LAL proficiency. This idea was adopted by Taylor (2013), whose LAL profiles also involve competence levels. The authors also suggested measures for how policy makers can increase their LAL, and proposed that language testers should become more 'policy-literate', a view also held by Deygers & Malone (2019).	1, 2

(*Continued*)

Year	References	Annotations	Category
2013	Scarino, A. (2013). Language assessment literacy as self-awareness: Understanding the role of interpretation in assessment and in teacher learning. *Language Testing*, 30(3), 309–327. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532213480128	Drawing on sociocultural theories and the works of Brindley (2001) and Inbar-Lourie (2008), **Scarino** argued for a broadened conceptualization of the LAL knowledge base for teachers, incorporating knowledge from both traditional and alternative assessment paradigms, as well as relating knowledge to teachers' professional practices. She suggested amalgamating the domains of know-how with the (assessment) life-worlds of teachers, including language, culture and learning, thus taking into account both products of LAL and processes through which LAL is developed. These are reflections that are echoed by, for instance, Tsagari & Vogt (2017) and Yan et al. (2018).	**1, 2**
2013	Taylor, L. (2013). Communicating the theory, practice and principles of language testing to test stakeholders: Some reflections. *Language Testing*, 30(3), 403–412. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532213480338	Building on Taylor (2009), **Taylor** highlighted the growing diversity of stakeholders in language assessment and suggests a model for profiling the levels of LAL for test writers, classroom teachers, university administrators and professional language testers, targeting a continuum that describes progressive stages of literacy with eight different components of LAL. The continuum was developed from Pill & Harding (2013). Taylor's model has had a significant impact as it was discussed, taken up and expanded by many scholars – for example: Baker & Riches (2018), Kremmel & Harding (2020) and Bøhn & Tsagari (2021).	1
2014	Lam, R. (2014). Language assessment training in Hong Kong: Implications for language assessment literacy. *Language Testing*, 32(2), 169–197. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532214554321	**Lam** investigated university courses for teacher LAL in Hong Kong and their impact on pre-service teachers' LAL. His study was one of the first to empirically identify a theory-practice gap as his findings suggested that university-based assessment training failed to support adequate LAL development, leading not only to a theory-practice gap (Harsch et al., 2021), but also to a lack of consideration of localized needs of pre-service teachers.	2
2014	Vogt, K., & Tsagari, D. (2014). Assessment literacy of foreign language teachers: Findings of a European Study. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 11(4), 374–402. https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2014.960046	In a mixed-methods large-scale study that partly replicated Hasselgreen et al.'s (2004) study using questionnaires ($n = 853$) and interviews ($n = 63$), **Vogt & Tsagari** investigated the self-reported training in language testing and assessment (LTA) of language teachers across Europe and their perceived need for in-service teacher training in their local contexts. It found that the overall LTA literacy of language teachers was not well developed, particularly concerning informal or alternative forms of assessment. Teachers reportedly used compensation strategies like learning on the job or from mentors, leaving little space for theoretically grounded innovations in language assessment. The findings resonate with, for example, Lam (2014, 2019) and Lan & Fan (2019) in terms of a need for LAL professional development across the board.	**2, 3**

2016	Harding, L., & Kremmel, B. (2016). Teacher assessment literacy and professional development. In D. Tsagari, & J. Banerjee (Eds.), *Handbook of second language assessment* (pp. 413–427). Mouton De Gruyter.	This chapter summarizes and analyzes conceptual approaches to teacher LAL starting from definitions and models and their development. Acknowledging TAYLOR's (2013) consideration of several stakeholder groups as a rich theoretical basis to inform LAL training, **Harding & Kremmel** review available professional development measures for teachers. They conclude that there is a need for agreement of core components of LAL that can give insights on a realistic trajectory of LAL development in view of different stakeholder needs.	**1, 3**
2017	Hill, K. (2017). Understanding classroom-based assessment practices: A precondition for teacher assessment literacy. *Papers in Language Testing and Assessment*, 6(1), 1–17. http://www.altaanz.org/uploads/5/9/0/8/5908292/3.si1hill_final_formatted_proofed.pdf	Building on previous research on reflective classroom-based assessment practices by HILL (2012) and HILL & MCNAMARA (2012), **Hill** suggested a reflective framework for language teachers that encompasses various aspects of classroom-based assessment (CBA), supplemented with the notion of teacher LAL. The framework takes up and develops FULCHER's (2012) dimensions of LAL (practices, principles and contexts), designed to encompass the entire range of CBA practices and giving teachers an opportunity to reflect on these.	**1**
2017	Tsagari, D., & Vogt, K. (2017). Assessment literacy of foreign language teachers around Europe: Research, challenges and future prospects. *Papers in Language Testing and Assessment*, 6(1), 41–63. https://www.altaanz.org/uploads/5/9/0/8/5908292/5.si3tsagarivogt_final_formatted_proofed.pdf	Using a subset of the data of the study on language teachers' LAL levels and training needs (VOGT & TSAGARI, 2014), **Tsagari & Vogt** found that teachers in Cyprus, Germany and Greece reported having low LAL levels and receiving inadequate training, corroborating results by, for example, LAM (2014). Language teachers' low confidence in LAL makes them resort to compensation strategies that do not necessarily reflect innovative LTA practices. In order to enhance their confidence in LTA and professionalize teachers' language assessment practices, Tsagari and Vogt make suggestions for professional development opportunities to develop a dynamic and contextually sensitive LAL culture (GIRALDO & MURCIA, 2018).	**2, 3**
2017	Xu, Y., & Brown, G. T. L. (2017). University English teacher assessment literacy: A survey-test report from China. *Papers in Language Testing and Assessment*, 6(1), 133–158. https://arts.unimelb.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0011/2349947/6_1_SI7XuBrown.pdf	Rather than relying on self-reported data (e.g., VOGT & TSAGARI, 2014; YAN & FAN, 2021) **Xu & Brown** used a scenario-based method to measure Chinese university teachers' LAL levels and to confirm a model of AL. The results resonate with INBAR-LOURIE (2008), who identified the need for a grounded LAL as well as with TAYLOR (2013) for the need to conceptualize the language component of LAL.	**2**

(*Continued*)

(*Continued*)

Year	References	Annotations	Category
2018	Baker, B. A., & Riches, C. (2018). The development of EFL examinations in Haiti: Collaboration and language assessment literacy development. *Language Testing*, 35(4), 557–581. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532217716732	**Baker & Riches** focused on language teachers and language testing professionals and their LAL development, which they discussed on the basis of Taylor's (2013) heuristic depiction as well as Evant's (2004) typology. They found that while teachers demonstrated LAL development with regard to knowledge, skills and principles, the testing professionals acquired enhanced propositional knowledge and developed positive attitudes towards collaboration. As an implication, the authors further expanded on Taylor's (2013) LAL heuristics by adding a collaborative component highlighted in, for example, Harsch et al. (2021).	2, 3
2018	Brunfaut, T., & Harding, L. (2018). Teachers setting the assessment (literacy) agenda: A case study of a teacher-led national test development project in Luxembourg. In D. Xerri, & P. V. Briffa (Eds.), *Teacher involvement in high stakes language testing* (pp. 161–162). Springer.	This study acknowledged teachers' empowering involvement in high-stakes language testing and their LAL development in the process. A three-year LAL-training programme was designed, based on Davies' (2008) knowledge and skills and Brindley's (2001) modules, with a hands-on practice approach proposed by Fulcher (2012). The programme was designed as a test development project for a low-stakes exam in secondary schools, using an actual test cycle embedded in a praxis approach (Poehner & Inbar-Lourie, 2020). The LAL training with the test development gave teachers confidence and enabled them to run the test cycle of the new test independently, enhancing teachers' agency in the subsequent development of a high-stakes test.	2, 3
2018	Stabler-Havener, M. L. (2018). Defining, conceptualizing, problematizing, and assessing language teacher assessment literacy. *Working Papers in Applied Linguistics & TESOL*, 18(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.7916/salt.v18i1.1195	**Stabler-Havener** reviewed three standardized tests to measure teacher LAL both outside and inside the US context. She concluded that most current tests judged the data yielded by these tests as incapable of making reliable decisions about teachers' LAL levels. She called for a more effective operationalization of teacher LAL on the basis of practice-oriented model specifications that are based on for-learning heuristics, resonating with Fulcher (2020), for example.	1
2018	Yan, X., Zhang, C., & Fan, J. J. (2018). 'Assessment knowledge is important, but…': How contextual and experiential factors mediate assessment practice and training needs of language teachers. *System*, 74, 158–168. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.03.003	**Yan et al.** investigated Chinese EFL secondary school teachers' training needs, using Taylor's (2013) hypothesized LAL profiles as a point of comparison. The results pointed to the individual character of teachers' LAL training needs, depending on context and the experience of the teachers in terms of career stage. Corroborating Berry et al.'s (2019) results, the authors identified the significance of assessment practice as a means to address teachers' LAL training needs.	2

2019	Berry, V., Sheehan, S., & Munro, S. (2019). What does language assessment literacy mean to teachers? *English Language Teaching Journal, 73*(2), 113–123. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccy055	As a summary of Sheehan and Munro (2017), **Berry et al.** conducted a mixed-methods study with a focus on language teachers' attitudes towards assessment. The findings showed that the teachers had little assessment training but compensated with experience, using informal routes to good assessment practices. They also seemed to experience a divide between teaching and testing (cf., Levi & Inbar-Lourie, 2020) and attributed good assessment practices to teaching rather than to assessment, revealing contradictory attitudes towards assessment. In order to enhance language teachers' LAL, the authors recommend an experiential and a reflective component of LAL training.	2
2019	Deygers, B., & Malone, M. (2019). Language assessment literacy in university admission policies, or the dialogue that isn't. *Language Testing, 36*(3), 347–368. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532219826390	In an attempt to open the LAL debate to other stakeholders and to enhance the understanding of policy literacy in the LAL discussion rather than demanding an understanding of LAL from stakeholders' point of view (e.g., Pill & Harding, 2013), **Deygers & Malone** found policy makers to be pragmatists who have to compromise to solve problems rather than be convinced by empirical evidence. Their perspectives and agenda tend not to align with that of LAL researchers. LAL researchers should therefore develop policy literacy as a key instrument to influence policy.	2, 3
2019	Lam, R. (2019). Teacher assessment literacy: Surveying knowledge, conceptions and practices of classroom-based writing assessment in Hong Kong. *System, 81*(2), 78–89. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.01.006	In his study on secondary EFL teachers' classroom-based writing assessment literacy in Hong Kong, **Lam** reported a gap between teachers' low LAL levels, particularly regarding Assessment as Learning and their substantial assessment training and experience. Contrary to Yan et al. (2018), for example, he did not find teachers fully adapting their roles as assessors to assessment reform or updating their language pedagogies. He suggested teacher communities of practice enhance their awareness and deep understanding of phenomena like Assessment as Learning, a view touched upon by Bøhn & Tsagari (2021).	2, 3
2019	Lan, C., & Fan, S. (2019). Developing classroom-based language assessment literacy for in-service EFL teachers: The gaps. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 61*, 112–122. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2019.03.003	In their study on classroom-based language assessment literacy as a variant of LAL, **Lan & Fan** replicated the questionnaire from Vogt & Tsagari (2014), adapting it with Pill & Harding's (2013) five levels of language assessment literacy and Taylor's (2013) profile for teachers. The China-based EFL teachers identified their current and desirable LAL profiles and the corresponding gaps to be filled with professional development activities. The respondents saw their LAL at a functional level, with 'technical skills' and 'language pedagogy' perceived clearly lower than Taylor's hypothesized profile. The need voiced for professional development across the board corroborates findings by, for example, Lam (2014).	2

(*Continued*)

Year	References	Annotations	Category
2020	Fulcher, G. (2020). Operationalizing language assessment literacy. In D. Tsagari (Ed.), *Language assessment literacy. From theory to practice* (pp. 8–28). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.	**Fulcher** discussed the need to operationalize the LAL construct and presented a model of LAL acquisition for teachers, starting from Fᴜʟᴄʜᴇʀ (2012). His apprenticeship model is based on the principles of dialogue, involvement, support and control. Illustrative tasks were offered to contribute to the pedagogy of LAL.	1, 3
2020	Gan, L., & Lam, R. (2020). Understanding university English instructors' assessment training needs in the Chinese context. *Language Testing in Asia*, *10*, 11. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-020-00109-y	Using the questionnaire by Vᴏɢᴛ & Tsᴀɢᴀʀɪ (2014) in the Chinese context to investigate tertiary EFL teachers' LAL training levels and needs, complemented by document analysis and semi-structured interviews, **Gan & Lam** found that university teachers tended to have insufficient LAL training but did not wish to close the gap by advanced training. Findings resonate with Yᴀɴ ᴇᴛ ᴀʟ. (2018) and Lᴀᴍ (2014). Gan and Lam set up a LAL training agenda for university teachers in the Chinese context, consisting of flexible ongoing and praxis-related training opportunities.	2, 3
2020	Hill, K. & Ducasse, A. M. (2020). Advancing written feedback practice through a teacher-researcher collaboration in a university Spanish program. In M. E. Poehner, & O. Inbar-Lourie (Eds.), *Towards a reconceptualization of second language classroom assessment. Praxis and teacher-researcher partnership* (pp. 153–172). Springer.	Based on an innovative praxis orientation in L2 assessment that highlights teacher-researcher collaboration, **Hill & Ducasse** engaged in a collaborative dialogue (Sᴄᴀʀɪɴᴏ, 2013) on feedback practices as a vital part of teacher LAL. Reflections were guided by an adaptation of Hɪʟʟ's (2017) LAL framework. Aiming at a more thorough understanding and an advancement of the teachers' feedback practices, as well as testing the utility of the LAL framework for this purpose, the framework proved helpful in stimulating systematic reflection on feedback practices as part of teacher LAL. The authors acknowledged a relationship of trust as a precondition for teacher-researcher collaboration on the process and interpersonal levels.	2
2020	Kremmel, B., & Harding, L. (2020). Towards a comprehensive, empirical model of language assessment literacy across stakeholder groups: Developing the language assessment literacy survey. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, *17*(1), 100–120. https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2019.1674855	**Kremmel & Harding** reported on the development of the Language Assessment Literacy Survey designed to explore the self-perceived LAL needs of assessment developers, assessment researchers and language teachers, as well as to empirically validate Tᴀʏʟᴏʀ's (2013) hypothesized LAL dimensions. The study broadly confirmed Taylor's assumptions, but found the construct to comprise nine rather than eight distinct LAL components. It also confirmed differences between the groups. The study provides valuable empirically backed insights into the nature of the LAL construct, taking into account variations in the LAL needs of the three important stakeholder groups.	1, 2

2020	Lee, J., & Butler, Y. G. (2020). Reconceptualizing language assessment literacy: Where are language learners? *TESOL Quarterly*, *54*(4), 1098–1111. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.576	**Lee & Butler** focused on learners as an important but under researched stakeholder group. In their review of 52 empirical studies on LAL, they found that learners' perspectives were hardly considered. They called for a systematic inclusion of learners' voices to better understand LAL, taken up by Lee et al., (2021) and Vogt et al. (2020), permitting a learner-centered approach to LAL that could be beneficial to assessment practices in teacher education and to curriculum development. Communication between stakeholder groups regarding assessment purposes and roles is seen as a vital part of LAL (Vogt et al., 2020a).	1
2020	Levi, T., & Inbar-Lourie, O. (2020). Assessment literacy or language assessment literacy: Learning from the teachers. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, *17*(2), 168–182. https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2019.1692347	Contrary to surveys of self-reported teacher LAL subsequently matched with LAL definitions (Fulcher, 2012; Vogt & Tsagari, 2014), **Levi & Inbar-Lourie** analyzed teachers' assessment artifacts and teachers' reflections, following a general course on formative assessment, and related them to teachers' LAL. Teachers' LAL seemed to amalgamate general AL, a language-specific part and contextual features, with contents and formats of high-stakes exams dominating their assessment ecology and AL. Results showed little alignment between the teachers' artifacts and current conceptualizations of language competencies and their assessment practices, pointing to strong washback effects of external exams on teachers' assessment practices.	1, 2
2020	Vogt, K., Tsagari, D., Csépes, I., et al. (2020a). Linking learners' perspective on language assessment practices to teachers' assessment literacy enhancement (TALE): Insights from four European countries. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, *17*(4), 410–433. https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2020.1776714	This large-scale survey of assessment practices and LAL needs in four different European contexts (similar to Vogt & Tsagari, 2014) links data from teachers and their learners and highlights learners' perspectives (as do Lee & Butler, 2020). The analyses revealed contextual differences regarding assessment patterns, and perceived learner LAL needs matched these patterns. Consistent differences between learners' and teachers' perceptions in terms of assessment practices and feedback use point to a lack of awareness of assessment activities among learners. LAL for learners could be enhanced indirectly if involved in assessment procedures. Teacher LAL seems a prerequisite to enhance learners' assessment awareness and learner LAL.	2
2020	Vogt, K., Tsagari, D., & Spanoudis, G. (2020b). What do teachers think they want? A comparative study of in-service language teachers' beliefs on LAL training needs. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, *17*(4), 386–409. https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2020.1781128	This mixed-methods study on language teachers' perceptions of assessment, LAL training and LAL professional development (PD) needs revealed that teachers in different educational contexts (Germany and Greece) had diverging perceptions of LTA despite similar basic beliefs on assessing language. Supporting data from interviews showed the impact of interacting contextual factors on macro-, meso- and microlevels regarding teachers' assessment practices. Assessment practices are operationalizations of LTA beliefs which impact on their perceived PD needs, resonating with Yan et al. (2018).	2

(*Continued*)

(*Continued*)

Year	References	Annotations	Category
2020	Yan, X., & Fan, J. (2020). 'Am I qualified to be a language tester?': Understanding the development of language assessment literacy across three stakeholder groups. *Language Testing*, 38(2), 219–246. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532220929924	In the Chinese context, **Yan & Fan** interviewed three stakeholder groups, namely language testers, language teachers and PhD students (*n* = 20) on their assessment practices and self-perceived LAL development. The study also explored how contextual and experiential factors shaped their LAL profiles, displaying stark differences between the different groups. They proposed an apprenticeship-based model of LAL development, similar to FULCHER (2020), which resonates with LEE ET AL. (2021).	2, 3
2021	Bøhn, H., & Tsagari, D. (2021). Teacher educators' conceptions of language assessment literacy in Norway. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 12(2), 222–233. http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1202.02	**Bøhn & Tsagari** investigated teacher educators' conceptions of teacher LAL, shedding light on the construct from a novel perspective. Focusing on the Norwegian context and using TAYLOR's (2013) LAL model as a point of departure, the researchers explored five English teacher educators' general understanding of the construct and the relevance of the components of Taylor's model. The findings showed that the respondents resorted to broader conceptualizations of LAL than Taylor's model with some of their priorities differing from models of LAL by TAYLOR (2013) or KREMMEL & HARDING (2020).	1, 2
2021	Butler, Y., Peng, X., & Lee, J. (2021). Young learners' voices: Towards a learner-centered approach to understanding language assessment literacy. *Language Testing, 38*(3), 429–455. https://doi.org/10.1177/026553222199227	As one of the few LAL studies focussing on young learners' LAL, **Butler et al.** focused on learners' understanding of assessment purposes and theories, assessment skills and assessment principles (DAVIES, 2008; INBAR-LOURIE, 2008). The results from semi-structured interviews showed that young learners are able to elaborate views of assessment that show their capability to engage with approaches to LTA to a certain extent. The authors called for collaborative approaches (resonating with BAKER & RICHES, 2018), incorporating their voices to help them develop their own LAL and to further the conceptualization of LAL in an integrative way.	2
2021	Giraldo, F. (2021). A reflection on initiatives for teachers' professional development through language assessment literacy. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 23(1), 197–213. https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v23n1.83094	Focusing on measures to develop teacher LAL, **Giraldo** categorized initiatives for language teachers' professional development (PD), encompassing self-access materials and professional development programmes for LAL. Using DAVIES' (2008) conceptualization of LAL, he found that available LAL PD initiatives focused on the development of teachers' knowledge and skills, but only few aimed at fostering the principle component of LAL.	3

2021	Harsch, C., Seyferth, S., & Villa Larenas, S. (2021). Evaluating a collaborative and responsive project to develop language assessment literacy. *Language Learning in Higher Education*, *11*(2), 311–342. https://doi.org/10.1515/cercles-2021-2020	**Harsch et al.** reported on a LAL project for different stakeholders at a university language center in Germany. Using a collaborative approach (Baker & Riches, 2018) that is responsive to the LAL needs of the stakeholders involved, the project enabled the stakeholders to improve their assessment practices in situ as a community of practice (CoP). The participants reported positive changes in their assessment practices, which contributed to bridging the theory-practice gap of LAL.	**2, 3**
2021	Lee, J., Butler, Y. G., & Peng, X. (2021). Multiple stakeholder interaction to enhance preservice teachers' language assessment literacy. *Languages*, *6*(4), 213. http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/languages6040213	As one of the few studies that investigated the interconnected interaction of teachers, teacher educators and middle school students in a multi-stakeholder assessment project, **Lee et al.** carried out an exploratory case study, adopting a contextualized and hands-on approach to LAL development (Scarino, 2013) based on collaboration (Baker & Riches, 2018) and apprenticeship (Yan & Fan, 2020). The reciprocal approach to LAL enhancement resulted in increasing all stakeholders' LAL in an inclusive way, valuing the expertise of all stakeholders.	3
2021	Tian, W., Louw, S., & Khan, M. K. (2021). Covid-19 as a critical incident: Reflection on language assessment literacy and the need for radical changes. *System*, *103*, Article 102682. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102682	**Tian et al.** explored the LAL-related self-reflections of three language teachers, against the background of the critical incident of the COVID-19 pandemic. With a focus on Emergency Remote Online Assessment (ERLA), they applied a duoethnographic approach to reflect on the teachers' understanding of LAL, embrace teacher agency in ERLA and enrich their repertoires of assessment practice by sharing experiences. The project led to an unexpected depth of LAL development, despite the teachers' initial lack of confidence. Reflections situated in the teachers' interpretive frameworks (Scarino, 2013) were found to be a key to transformational professional development in an emergency situation.	2
2022	Delgado, J. Z., & Rodriguez, C. (2022). Language assessment literacy of language teachers in the context of adult education in Spain. *Studies in Language Assessment*, *11*(1), 64–91. https://arts.unimelb.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0009/4282560/SiLA-11.1-Delgado_and_Rodriguez.pdf	In the context of adult education in Spain that increasingly involves teachers in high-stakes language testing, **Delgado & Rodriguez** investigated the self-perceived impact of training courses on teachers' LAL and their ensuing training needs. Institutional involvement and tests as policy tools were found to act as a catalyst for teacher LAL development. The importance of contextual factors (e.g., Brunfaut & Harding, 2018; Vogt et al., 2020b) was evident in the prevalence of standardized testing and skills-based professional development in the LAL course, as well as further training needs voiced by teachers.	2

(Continued)