



Assessing Feedback Efficacy in Classroom Assessment: The Art of Grading With a Wink and a Nod

I Putu Andre Suhardiana^{1*} 

¹Universitas Hindu Negeri I Gusti Bagus Sugriwa, Denpasar, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received June 16, 2024

Accepted August 15, 2024

Available online August 25, 2024

Kata Kunci:

efektivitas umpan balik; metode penilaian; pendidikan tinggi; penilaian kelas.

Keywords:

feedback efficacy; assessment methods; Higher Education; classroom assessment.

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.23887/jpbi.v12i2.84255>

ABSTRAK

Meskipun pendidikan tinggi menggunakan berbagai metode penilaian, masih terdapat ketidakpastian tentang seberapa efektif umpan balik diberikan kepada mahasiswa. Studi ini difokuskan pada evaluasi praktik umpan balik terkini dalam penilaian kelas dalam Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris di tingkat universitas. Studi yang dilakukan sebagai studi kuantitatif deskriptif ini melibatkan 87 partisipan yang dipilih melalui stratified random sampling, yang terdiri dari 8 dosen dan 79 mahasiswa. Data dikumpulkan menggunakan kuesioner dan dianalisis menggunakan perangkat lunak SPSS. Temuan penelitian mengungkapkan bahwa dosen lebih banyak menggunakan tes kelas (62%), latihan, dan pekerjaan rumah untuk evaluasi, dengan preferensi untuk format esai (87,5%) dan pilihan ganda (75%). Meskipun demikian, baik dosen (50%) maupun mahasiswa (65,82%) mengidentifikasi tantangan seperti keterlambatan pengembalian tes yang telah dinilai, distribusi hasil yang tidak efisien, penjelasan kesalahan yang tidak memadai untuk revisi, dan komunikasi hasil yang tidak efektif kepada orang tua. Memang, beberapa dosen memberikan umpan balik, membimbing perkembangan mahasiswa, dan menggunakan penilaian untuk tujuan konseling. Studi ini menyimpulkan bahwa meskipun metode penilaian tradisional digunakan, diperlukan praktik umpan balik yang lebih efisien.

ABSTRACT

Although higher education used a range of assessment methods, yet there remains uncertainty about how effectively feedback is provided to students. This study focused on evaluating current feedback practices in classroom assessments within the English Language Education Study Program at the university level. The study, conducted as a descriptive quantitative study, involved 87 participants selected through stratified random sampling, comprising 8 lecturers and 79 students. Data was collected using a questionnaire and analysed using SPSS software. Findings revealed that lecturers predominantly utilized class tests (62%), exercises, and homework for evaluation, with a preference for essay (87.5%) and multiple-choice formats (75%). Nevertheless, both lecturers (50%) and students (65.82%) identified challenges such as delays in returning graded tests, inefficient distribution of results, unclear explanation of errors, lack of student motivation for improvement, inadequate support for revisions, and ineffective communication of results to parents. Indeed, some lecturers provided feedback, guided students' development, and used assessments for counseling purposes. The study concluded that although traditional assessment methods were used, there was a need for more efficient feedback practices.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.
Copyright © 2024 by Author. Published by Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha.



1. INTRODUCTION

Feedback is considered a challenging issue in higher education. While it is known to be essential for improving student learning, a lot of research in this area shows mixed results. Feedback is seen as a method to help students become independent learners who can monitor, evaluate, and regulate their own learning (S. C. Huang, 2016; Prasetya & Syarif, 2022; Rouhshad et al., 2022). Despite evidence supporting the benefits of feedback for student learning, many student surveys worldwide highlight dissatisfaction with the feedback they receive on their coursework. Students often report not getting enough feedback or receiving it too late, while lecturers say students do not use the feedback provided (Gokturk-Saglam & Sevgi-Sole, 2023; Mäkipää et al., 2021). It is clear that lecturers need to rethink their feedback methods. This dissatisfaction is supported by evidence that students find the feedback from lecturers hard to understand, not useful, or not actionable. Lecturers also find grading and marking frustrating, time-consuming, and not very productive, partly because feedback has to justify grades, commentary, and meet quality assurance demands (Batlle & Seedhouse, 2022; Clayton Bernard & Kermarrec, 2022). Another problem is that students and lecturers often have different ideas about what feedback is and what it should accomplish (Reyes et al., 2020; Solano et al., 2021). First-year undergraduates are used to the close relationships and guidance they received in high school, which lead to unrealistic expectations that

* Corresponding Author: I Putu Andre Suhardiana : putuandresuhardiana@gmail.com

feedback should tell them exactly what to do to get good grades. When students view feedback as simple guidance, they become unprepared for the more independent learning required in higher education. Lecturers, on the other hand, expect students to take a more active role in the feedback process than some students are ready for (J. Huang & Chen, 2022; Kassem, 2018).

As a result, how feedback is understood and defined is both important and debated. A common view is to see feedback as information given by someone (like a lecturer and peer) about performance or understanding (Aben et al., 2023; Widiastuti, 2021).. This view is similar to dictionary definitions of feedback, which describe it as someone telling you how well or badly you are doing and how you could improve. This idea of feedback as sharing information is called the 'old paradigm' of feedback, which does not fully acknowledge recent ideas emphasizing the learner's role in creating, understanding, and using feedback. The 'new paradigm' of feedback focuses more on the student's role in using feedback to improve (Vattøy, 2020; Vattøy & Gamlem, 2020). This approach, influenced by social constructivism, puts the learner at the center of feedback processes, using methods like peer feedback and self-assessment. New paradigm feedback practices stress the importance of students creating and acting on feedback in various forms.

An important concept in new paradigm feedback is internal feedback. This means the insights students gain when they compare their current knowledge and skills to some reference, like their peers' work. Previous study believes that for feedback to help on-going development, external information must be turned into internal feedback (Weiss et al., 2021). Based on these ideas, this chapter defines feedback as interactive processes where learners create performance-related information to improve their work or learning strategies. Performance-related information includes how learners understand their learning progress, the performance of others, assessment outcomes, and peers' responses (Kim & Kim, 2021; Yesilyurt, 2023).

The importance of assessment and feedback in student learning has been discussed in previous research. Reports and surveys show that students are not happy with the assessment and feedback system (Ray et al., 2022; Shah, 2022). This ongoing issue has been a problem for both lecturers and students. Previous study reviewed many articles on assessment feedback and found that the main problems come from the fact that more students are in higher education, which puts pressure on resources and academic staff (Hass, 2022; Hooda et al., 2022). Other study studied the opinions of 540 students and 70 educators on assessment and feedback, finding several problems already mentioned in the literature (Andrews et al., 2018). These problems include students not being involved or motivated by assessment feedback, educators being unhappy because students do not collect their feedback, and high numbers of student making it hard to give personalized feedback.

Despite many educational institutions' policies requiring feedback to connect educators' goals, students' needs, and educational policies, the practice of giving feedback is declining (Alt et al., 2023; Clack & Dommett, 2021). Providing feedback to students is important for improving their achievement. Easy access to feedback is highly valued by students, and online feedback helps make this access easier. The potential of technology to help educators give more personal and rich feedback has been noted in several publications (Castleberry et al., 2023; Waskito et al., 2022). Other study state that technology 'provides the innovative edge that can help students study more effectively with their feedback' (Day et al., 2021). A literature review shows that even though various technologies like audio, video, screencast, and podcast are used to improve assessment feedback, large class sizes still cause problems for educators. These problems include extra workload, difficulty in providing personalized feedback, and lack of communication.

In the past fifteen years, there has been a lot more focus on feedback in undergraduate education. Two important developments within the new paradigm of feedback are mentioned. The first focuses on the impact of feedback, emphasizing how feedback helps students improve their work or learning abilities. This approach highlights the importance of closing feedback loops and showing that students have used the feedback to make improvements (Kvasova, 2022; Xiao & Yang, 2019). The second development covers understanding and researching student feedback literacy, which is the ability to make good academic judgments and use feedback effectively (Jónsson et al., 2018; Li & Mohamad, 2023).. If students do not develop these skills, feedback might not lead to improvement.

Despite the recognition that feedback is an influential tool to enhance student learning and encourage self-regulated students, there is a gap between the theoretical benefits of feedback and its implementation in higher education. The gap between the theoretical expectation that feedback should encourage self-regulation and critical thinking and the reality of providing feedback in higher education creates a need for research. The novelty of this study reassess feedback strategies, especially in the English Language Education Study Program, to guarantee that feedback aligns with educational goals and meets the needs of students and lecturers. Therefore, this research bridges this gap by exploring current feedback practices and identifying ways to improve the efficacy of feedback in classroom assessment.

2. METHOD

This study used a descriptive quantitative research design to evaluate feedback practices in classroom assessments, specifically within higher education English language programs (Putri et al., 2017). The descriptive approach was chosen to quantitatively analyze the perceptions surrounding feedback efficacy. This design allowed for the collection of data from lecturers and students, followed by a statistical analysis. The research design was structured to gather both statistical and descriptive data. The study involved 87 participants, including 8 lecturers and 79 students, all from various courses within the English Language Education Study Program. The sample was selected using stratified random sampling. Lecturers were chosen based on their experience in conducting assessments and delivering feedback, while students were selected to reflect a range of academic levels. Data was collected through a structured questionnaire, designed to produce detailed responses from both lecturers and students regarding their experiences with classroom assessments and feedback. The questionnaire included closed-ended questions with Likert scales. An instrument grid was used to categorize the questions into themes. The questionnaire underwent validity testing. The validity of the instrument was established through a content validity test, where experts in education assessment reviewed the questions. Data gathered from the questionnaires were analyzed using IBM SPSS statistical software. Descriptive statistics, such as mean, standard deviation, and frequency distributions, were calculated to summarize the data. Inferential statistics, including correlation and regression analyses, were used to examine the relationships between variables, such as the impact of feedback on student performance and motivation. The results were presented in tables and charts to represent the findings.

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

The Assessment Tools and Formats used by Lecturers

The assessment methods evaluated include tests, exercises, homework, group work, and trial work during lessons. Each method is categorized based on the frequency of use, with responses classified as "Used very often," "Used often," "Used occasionally," and "Not used." Table 1 presents an analysis of preferences for classroom assessment methods as reported by lecturers and students.

Table 1. Preferences of Lecturers and Students on Assessment Tools

| Assessment Tools | Responses of lecturers (Frequencies with percentages) | | | | Responses of students (Frequencies with percentages) | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--------------|-------------------|--------------|--|----------------|-------------------|----------------|
| | Used very often | Used often | Used Occasionally | Not Used | Used very often | Used often | Used Occasionally | Not Used |
| 1. Test | 5 (62%) | 2 (25%) | 1 (13%) | 0 (0%) | 64 (73.56%) | 8 (9.20%) | 3 (3.45%) | 4 (4.60%) |
| 2. Exercise | 5 (62.5%) | 3 (37.5%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 57 (72.15%) | 17 (21.52%) | 2 (2.53%) | 3 (3.80%) |
| 3. Homework | 4 (50%) | 1 (12.5%) | 2 (25%) | 1 (12.5%) | 43 (54.43%) | 14 (17.72%) | 12 (15.19%) | 10 (12.66%) |
| 4. Group work | 1 (12.5%) | 2 (25%) | 1 (12.5%) | 4 (50%) | 10 (12.66%) | 11 (13.92%) | 22 (27.85%) | 36 (45.57%) |
| 5. Trial work during lesson | 2 (25%) | 1 (12.5%) | 3 (37.5%) | 2 (25%) | 22 (27.85%) | 31 (39.24%) | 15 (18.99%) | 11 (13.92%) |

From Table 1, it reveals that most lecturers and students use tests, exercises, homework, and trying out tasks during lessons the most. These methods were chosen by 8 lecturers and 75 students for class tests, 8 lecturers and 76 students for exercises, 7 lecturers and 69 students for homework, and 6 lecturers and 68 students for trial work during lessons. On the other hand, group work was used less frequently, with only 4 lecturers and 43 students preferring it. Therefore, it can be concluded that the most popular assessment tools in classrooms are tests, exercises, homework, and trial work during lessons, while group work is the least common tool. Preferences of lecturers and students on assessment formats is show in Table 2.

Table 2. Preferences of Lecturers and Students on Assessment Formats

| Assessment Formats | Responses of lecturers (Frequencies with percentages) | | | | Responses of students (Frequencies with percentages) | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------|-------------------|--------------|--|---------------|-------------------|---------------|
| | Used very often | Used often | Used Occasionally | Not Used | Used very often | Used often | Used Occasionally | Not Used |
| Essay questions | 7 (87.5%) | 1 (12.5%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 54 (68.4%) | 14 (17.7%) | 6 (7.6%) | 5 (6.3%) |
| Multiple choice questions | 6 (75%) | 1 (12.5%) | 1 (12.5%) | 0 (0%) | 48 (60.8%) | 23 (29.1%) | 3 (3.8%) | 5 (6.3%) |
| True/false questions | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (12.5%) | 7 (87.5%) | 12 (15.2%) | 3 (3.8%) | 17 (21.5%) | 47 (59.5%) |
| Matching items | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 8 (100%) | 7 (8.9%) | 8 (10.1%) | 13 (16.5%) | 51 (64.6%) |
| Completion items | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (25%) | 6 (75%) | 6 (7.6%) | 10 (12.7%) | 21 (26.6%) | 42 (53.2%) |

Table 2 shows views of lecturers and students about different formats used in classroom assessments. It is clear that most lecturers and students said essay questions and multiple-choice questions are the most frequently used. Lecturers reported using essay questions 8 times and multiple-choice questions 8 times, while students reported 74 and 74 times respectively. On the other hand, true/false questions, matching items, and completion items were used much less often. Lecturers used true/false questions 0 times, matching items 0 times, and completion items 0 times. Students reported using these formats 32, 28, and 37 times respectively. Therefore, the most common assessment formats are essay questions and multiple-choice questions, whereas true/false questions, matching items, and completion items are the least common.

The Assessment Feedback Practices used by the Lecturers

Table 3 shows what lecturers and students think about feedback practices in classroom assessments.

Table 3. Preferences of Lecturers and Students on Assessment Feedback Practices

| Assessment Feedback Practices | Responses of lecturers (Frequencies with percentages) | | | | Responses of students (Frequencies with percentages) | | | |
|---|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| | Always | More Often | Sometimes | Never | Always | More Often | Someti mes | Never |
| 1. I quickly check my students' tests and give them back. | 1 (12.5%) | 3 (37.5%) | 4 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 52 (65.82%) | 15 (18.99%) | 8 (10.13%) | 4 (5.06%) |
| 2. I organize the assessment results. | 0 (0%) | 1 (12.5%) | 2 (25%) | 5 (62.5%) | 7 (8.86%) | 9 (11.39%) | 25 (31.65%) | 38 (48.10%) |
| 3. I show students where they made mistakes on the test. | 1 (12.5%) | 1 (12.5%) | 2 (25%) | 4 (50%) | 8 (10.13%) | 14 (17.72%) | 21 (26.58%) | 36 (45.57%) |
| 4. I share the assessment results and my comments. | 6 (75%) | 2 (25%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 45 (56.96%) | 21 (26.58%) | 10 (12.66%) | 3 (3.80%) |
| 5. I encourage students to do better on their tests. | 3 (37.5%) | 2 (25%) | 3 (37.5%) | 0 (0%) | 41 (51.90%) | 23 (29.11%) | 12 (15.19%) | 3 (3.80%) |
| 6. I help students revise their tests. | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (12.5%) | 7 (87.5%) | 6 (7.59%) | 9 (11.39%) | 12 (15.19%) | 52 (65.82%) |

| Assessment Feedback Practices | Responses of lecturers (Frequencies with percentages) | | | | Responses of students (Frequencies with percentages) | | | |
|--|---|------------|--------------|--------------|--|----------------|---------------|----------------|
| | Always | More Often | Sometimes | Never | Always | More Often | Sometimes | Never |
| 7. I tell parents how their children did on the test. | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 8 (100%) | 1 (1.27%) | 1 (1.27%) | 9 (11.39%) | 68 (86.08%) |
| 8. I arrange extra classes for students who need more help. | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (12.5%) | 7 (87.5%) | 3 (3.80%) | 6 (7.59%) | 8 (10.13%) | 62 (78.48%) |
| 9. I advise students on how to improve their test performance. | 4 (50%) | 2 (25%) | 2 (25%) | 0 (0%) | 51 (64.56%) | 23 (29.11%) | 4 (5.06%) | 1 (1.27%) |
| 10. I use test results to guide and counsel students. | 5 (62.5%) | 2 (25%) | 1 (12.5%) | 0 (0%) | 46 (58.23%) | 26 (32.91%) | 2 (2.53%) | 5 (6.33%) |

Base on Table 3 Most lecturers and students said that lecturers did not quickly check and return the tests, did not organize the results, did not point out students' mistakes, did not motivate students to do better, did not help students revise their tests, did not inform parents about the results, and did not provide extra coaching for students who were struggling. The frequencies for these responses were 8, 3, 4, 8, 1, 0, and 1 for lecturers, and 75, 41, 43, 76, 27, and 17 for students. On the other hand, many lecturers and students said that lecturers did provide results with comments, guided students on how to improve, and used the test results for student guidance and counseling. The frequencies for these responses were 8, 8, and 8 for lecturers, and 76, 78, and 74 for students.

Inferential Analysis

An independent sample t-test was conducted to explore three research questions: whether male and female lecturers differ in their opinions on tools used in classroom assessment, whether they differ in their opinions on formats used in classroom assessment, and whether they differ in their opinions on feedback practices in classroom assessment. The results summarized in Table 7.

Table 7. Independent Sample T-Test Results for Opinions on Classroom Assessment dimension by Gender

| Classroom assessment dimension | Gender | N | Mean | Std.D | Df | M.D | T | Sig. |
|--------------------------------|--------|---|-------|-------|----|------|------|------|
| Tools | Male | 4 | 24.50 | 1.75 | 6 | 2.50 | 2.45 | 0.05 |
| | Female | 4 | 22.30 | 1.50 | | | | |
| Formats | Male | 4 | 26.40 | 2.10 | 6 | 3.40 | 2.23 | 0.07 |
| | Female | 4 | 23.00 | 1.80 | | | | |
| Feedback practices | Male | 4 | 25.75 | 1.58 | 6 | 2.75 | 3.10 | 0.02 |
| | Female | 4 | 23.00 | 1.10 | | | | |

Table 7 shows that male and female teachers indeed have different opinions in these areas. For tools used in classroom assessment, there was a mean difference of 2.50, with a t-value of 2.45 and a significance level of 0.05. Regarding formats used in classroom assessment, the mean difference was 3.40, with a t-value of 2.23 and a significance level of 0.07. Lastly, for feedback practices in classroom assessment, the mean difference was 2.75, with a t-value of 3.10 and a significance level of 0.02. These results show significant differences between male and female lecturers' opinions in all three aspects of classroom assessment.

Discussion

The data from the study shows that lecturers and students prefer traditional assessment methods like tests, exercises, homework, and in-class practice. These methods focus on individual learning and understanding of the material. They are widely used because they offer clear ways to measure how well students are learning. Tests are especially popular, with 62% of lecturers and 73.56% of students using them. It suggests they are trusted for

assessing what students know. Exercises are also common, used by 62.5% of lecturers and 72.15% of students. It signifies they help reinforce what students have learned and give regular feedback. Homework remains a staple in assessment (50% of lecturers and 54.43% of students) (Parnabas et al., 2023; Sukmawati et al., 2022). It means its importance in extending learning beyond the classroom and promoting independent study habits. Trial work during lessons is used very often by 25% of lecturers and 27.85% of students. It shows the value of real-time, formative assessment methods that allow for immediate feedback.

In contrast, group work is used much less frequently (12.5% of lecturers and 12.66% of students). It implies potential challenges in its implementation, such as difficulty in ensuring equal participation and the complexity of coordinating group activities. Regarding assessment formats, essay questions and multiple-choice questions are the most frequently used. A majority of lecturers (87.5% for essay questions and 75% for multiple-choice questions) and students (68.4% and 60.8%, respectively) report using these formats very often. This preference indicates a balanced approach to assessing both critical thinking and factual knowledge (Khasanah et al., 2017; Tofade et al., 2013). Less frequently used formats include true/false questions, matching items, and completion items, with many lecturers not using them at all and students indicating low usage rates. This suggests that these formats are perceived as less effective in assessing higher-order thinking skills and providing a comprehensive evaluation of student learning (Al Mamun et al., 2022; Cohen et al., 2020).

The results of this study align with previous research on evaluation methods in the field of education. Prior research has highlighted the dependability and extensive recognition of conventional evaluation techniques, such as tests and homework, in producing standardized outcomes (Basori & Mubarak, 2020; Boylu, 2021). The continuous relevance of these techniques is demonstrated by the preference they receive in educational contexts. These techniques have long been relied upon for their proven reliability in producing measurable results. Educators value tests and homework because they present a structure for assessing individual student learning and progress (Huo et al., 2020; Menbet, 2018). The predictability of these techniques guarantees that student performance can be evaluated standardized. In an academic context emphasizing accountability, standardized tests and assignments allow uniform assessment across classes. Tests, especially those using multiple-choice formats, are valued for assessing a range of factual knowledge. Homework encourages independent study habits and helps reinforce learning outside the classroom. However, the widespread use of these techniques can also create an overreliance on traditional assessment techniques (Cohen et al., 2020; Srivastava et al., 2018). Tests and homework focus primarily on factual recall and lower-level cognitive skills, which only partially capture the full range of competencies students need to develop. These techniques often overlook critical skills such as creativity, collaboration, and problem-solving. The continued focus on standardized assessments can limit the depth and variety of learning educators can evaluate.

Furthermore, the utilization of essay and multiple-choice questions is consistent with previous research that has recognized both formats as successful in assessing various cognitive abilities (Kjell et al., 2024; Meidasari, 2017; Son, 2017). Essays are highly regarded for evaluating advanced cognitive skills and the capacity to produce original ideas, but multiple-choice questions are commended for their effectiveness in assessing a wide range of information and delivering prompt feedback (Hwang et al., 2022; Prasad et al., 2023). Essays are esteemed for their ability to assess advanced cognitive skills, such as critical thinking, synthesis, and the capacity to articulate original ideas. Essays require students to commit to the material and show higher-order thinking skills. Essays go beyond memorizing information and encourage students to apply their knowledge analytically. On the other hand, multiple-choice questions serve a different but equally important purpose in assessment.

They can quickly assess a range of knowledge instrumental in large-scale testing environments. This format also allows for a more objective assessment. Providing immediate feedback is another advantage of multiple-choice questions. Different students excel at different types of assessments. Some may excel in essay writing, where they can display their creative thinking and analytical skills (Fitzsimons, 2015; Setyowati et al., 2022). In contrast, others may perform better in the structured environment of multiple-choice tests, where their ability to recall information quickly and accurately is highlighted.

The limited use of group work reinforces the conclusions of previous research that highlights the difficulties linked to collaborative assessment, such as ensuring equitable grading and handling group interactions (Papadima-Sophocleous, 2022; Taghizadeh & Mazdayasna, 2023). Group work often encourages students to develop interpersonal skills, teamwork, and the ability to solve problems collectively. However, its limited use highlights the practical difficulties in managing group dynamics and assessing fairness because student effort and contribution can vary widely. Assigning a single group grade can mask differences in effort and achievement. While some students succeed in collaborative settings, others may struggle because of personal preferences or unequal contributions. Instructors can be hesitant to implement group work because of these risks since the success of collaborative works often depends on factors beyond their control, such as the compatibility of group members and the division of labor within the group (Binmahboob, 2020; Magulod, 2019). Additionally, managing conflict within the group can be time-consuming and difficult for instructors.

In addition, the restricted use of true/false, matching, and completion items corresponds with criticisms of these formats due to their tendency to oversimplify intricate ideas and promote superficial learning instead of profound comprehension (Davis et al., 2018; Pfingsthorn & Weltgen, 2022; Yao et al., 2021). These findings suggest that there is a need for a more advanced utilization of these formats, possibly integrating them into additional assessment techniques to offset their limits. True/false and matching questions are often considered too simple to assess complex cognitive skills. These formats focus on surface-level learning, such as recognizing facts rather than applying or analyzing them. Matching items, while helpful in assessing factual knowledge and recall, often fall short when assessing students' understanding of the relationships between concepts or ideas. Similarly, completion items (or fill-in-the-blank questions) may test recall but often fail to capture students' ability to express ideas in more creative ways. Reliance on these simplified assessment formats can inadvertently encourage shallow learning, as students focus on memorization rather than developing a deep understanding of the subject matter (Davis et al., 2018; Mambu et al., 2023). This is primarily a concern in educational contexts that aim to foster critical thinking and problem-solving. When assessments focus less on factual recall, they do not encourage students to commit deeply to the material.

The findings reveal that many lecturers do not promptly return tests, organize assessment results, or actively point out students' mistakes, as indicated by both lecturer self-reports and student perceptions. These aspects are critical for providing timely and constructive feedback, which is widely acknowledged in educational research as essential for improving student learning outcomes (Chukharev-Hudilainen & Ockey, 2021; Elaish & Shuib, 2019). Despite these shortcomings, there are positive practices noted, such as providing comments on assessments, guiding students on how to improve, and using test results for counseling purposes. However, the discrepancy between lecturers' and students' views on feedback practices suggests a need for clearer communication and more consistent implementation of effective feedback strategies. Enhancing professional development opportunities for lecturers to improve their feedback skills and involving students more actively in assessment and feedback processes could help bridge these gaps and foster a more supportive learning environment, aligning with recommendations from existing educational literature on feedback efficacy (Giraldo, 2018; Heydarnejad, 2023).

The results from Table 6 show that a number of lecturers do not swiftly return examinations, organize assessment results, or actively identify students' mistakes, as reported by both lecturers themselves and students' perspectives. These factors need to be considered for delivering feedback, which is recognized in educational research for enhancing student learning outcomes (Rouhshad et al., 2022; Shrestha, 2022). Although there are certain limitations, there are also positive practices observed, such as offering feedback on assessments, instructing students on how to enhance their performance, and utilizing test findings for counseling purposes. Nonetheless, the difference between the perspectives of lecturers and students about feedback procedures reveals a requirement for improved communication and application of successful feedback strategies. Thus, it is recommended to provide lecturers with enhanced professional development opportunities to improve their feedback skills. Additionally, it is further suggested to involve students more actively in assessment and feedback processes. These actions align with recommendations from existing educational literature on feedback efficacy (Prasetya & Syarif, 2022; Xiao & Yang, 2019).

The independent sample t-test done in this study indicates differences in the viewpoints of male and female lecturers regarding the tools, methods, and feedback techniques employed in classroom evaluation. Male lecturers had a greater average preference for evaluation tools ($M = 24.50$) compared to female lecturers ($M = 22.30$), with a mean difference of 2.50 and a t-value of 2.45, which was statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Male lecturers expressed stronger preferences for assessment formats ($M = 26.40$) compared to female lecturers ($M = 23.00$), with a mean difference of 3.40 and a t-value of 2.23, which was statistically significant at the 0.07 level. There was a significant difference in feedback practices between male professors ($M = 25.75$) and female lecturers ($M = 23.00$). Male lecturers showed stronger preferences, with a mean difference of 2.75 and a t-value of 3.10, which was statistically significant at the 0.02 level.

These findings highlight the differences in how male and female lecturers perceive and favor certain parts of classroom assessment. Male lecturers consistently have higher average scores across all aspects. It shows a pattern in which they possess a preference for specific tools, formats, and feedback procedures more than their female colleagues. This is consistent with other research that has also recognized gender difference in teaching methodologies and evaluation methods. Other study discovered similar difference in teacher perspectives on evaluation methods (S. C. Huang, 2016). These variations arise from various educational backgrounds and pedagogical ideologies that impact teaching responsibilities. Additional research should explore the elements that contribute to these gender differences, such as individual pedagogical beliefs or institutional regulations.

The study generally accentuates a preference for traditional assessment methods, such as tests, exercises, and homework, among lecturers and students. These methods are valued for their ability to measure individual learning and provide structured feedback. While essay and multiple-choice formats remain popular for assessing critical thinking and factual knowledge, less complex formats, such as true/false and matching items, are less

commonly used due to perceived limitations. Group work, although less commonly used, presents challenges in implementation, particularly around equitable participation. Feedback practices reveal a gap between faculty and student perceptions, underscoring the need for better communication and professional development to improve feedback effectiveness. Furthermore, gender differences in assessment preferences imply that male lecturers prefer certain feedback tools, formats, and methods more than their female counterparts, pointing to variations in teaching philosophies. Furthermore, this study's identification of gaps between student and lecturer perceptions of feedback practices points to the need for improvements in communication and professional development, themes that are under-explored in research focused on feedback efficacy. By integrating gender-specific assessment preferences and differences in feedback practices, this study adds new information to the body of knowledge. Future comparative studies could further investigate the institutional and pedagogical factors that influence these differences.

4. CONCLUSION

This research found that lecturers mainly use class tests, exercises, and homework to assess students. They prefer essay and multiple-choice questions for assessments. This reliance on conventional methods signifies that the lecturers' assessment focuses on individual learning and standardized evaluation of students' understanding. However, many lecturers and students said lecturers do not return graded tests quickly, organize results well, or explain mistakes to students. They also do not motivate students to improve, help them revise, inform parents of results, or offer extra help to struggling students. Without prompt and regular feedback, students miss chances to reflect on their performance and correct mistakes. Not telling students where they went wrong reduces their ability to learn from the assessment process. Feedback should not only inform students about their current performance but also guide them toward progress. On the positive side, some lecturers do give feedback, guide students on improving, and use assessments for counseling. This implies that when assessment is used suitably, it is not just a tool for assessment but also an integral part of the learning process, allowing students to understand their strengths. The study suggests the study program should monitor how lecturers assess students. Lecturers need lighter workloads to create and grade tests properly. Regular training on assessments is also needed. The study program should encourage parents to get involved in assessments. They should also create assessment plans aligned with the syllabus and share them on time. Lastly, there should be a better system to monitor and improve assessment practices.

5. REFERENCES

- Aben, J. E. J., Timmermans, A. C., Dingyloudi, F., & Strijbos, J. W. (2023). In the eye of the beholder: The relationship between perceived peer language skills, provided peer feedback and peer grading in secondary education. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2023.101248>.
- Al Mamun, M. A., Lawrie, G., & Wright, T. (2022). Exploration of learner-content interactions and learning approaches: The role of guided inquiry in the self-directed online environments. *Computers & Education*, 178, 104398. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2021.104398>.
- Alt, D., Naamati-Schneider, L., & Weishut, D. J. N. (2023). Competency-based learning and formative assessment feedback as precursors of college students' soft skills acquisition. *Studies in Higher Education*, 48(12). <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2023.2217203>.
- Andrews, M., Brown, R., & Mesher, L. (2018). Engaging Students With Assessment And Feedback: Improving Assessment For Learning With Students As Partners. *Practitioner Research in Higher Education*, 11(1). <https://callegj.org/index.php/journal/article/view/11>.
- Basori, B., & Mubarak, H. (2020). Formative Assessment in Language Evaluation Class. *Scope : Journal of English Language Teaching*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.30998/scope.v5i1.6535>.
- Battle, J., & Seedhouse, P. (2022). Affiliation and negative assessments in peer observation feedback for foreign language teachers professional development. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 13(6). <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2020-0001>.
- Binmahboob, T. (2020). YouTube as a Learning Tool to Improve Students' Speaking Skills as Perceived by EFL Teachers in Secondary School. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 9(6), 13. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.9n.6p.13>.
- Boylu, E. (2021). Turkish as a Foreign Language Teachers' Attitudes Towards Assessment and Evaluation. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.9n.1p.72>.
- Castleberry, C., Hanner, A., Burks, G., & Amos, J. (2023). Instructor perspectives on the use of tag-organised assessment to facilitate formative assessment strategies in STEM courses. *European Journal of*

- Engineering Education*, 48(4). <https://doi.org/10.1080/03043797.2023.2173559>.
- Chukharev-Hudilainen, E., & Ockey, G. J. (2021). The Development and Evaluation of Interactional Competence Elicitor for Oral Language Assessments. *ETS Research Report Series*, 2021(1). <https://doi.org/10.1002/ets2.12319>.
- Clack, A., & Dommett, E. J. (2021). Student learning approaches: Beyond assessment type to feedback and student choice. *Education Sciences*, 11(9). <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11090468>.
- Clayton Bernard, R., & Kermarrec, G. (2022). Peer Assessment and Video Feedback for Fostering Self, Co, and Shared Regulation of Learning in a Higher Education Language Classroom. *Frontiers in Education*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2022.732094>.
- Cohen, J., Wong, V., Krishnamachari, A., & Berlin, R. (2020). Teacher coaching in a simulated environment. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 42(2), 208–231. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373720906217>.
- Davis, J. M. C. E., Norris, J. M., Malone, M. E., McKay, T. H., & Son, Y. A. (2018). Useful Assessment and Evaluation in Language Education. In *Useful Assessment and Evaluation in Language Education*. <https://doi.org/10.31046/wabashcenter.v1i2.1727>.
- Day, I. N. Z., Admiraal, W., & Saab, N. (2021). Designing assessment and feedback to improve student learning and student success. In *Student Retention and Success in Higher Education: Institutional Change for the 21st Century*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-80045-1_11.
- Elaish, M. M., & Shuib, L. (2019). Mobile Learning for English Language Learning Assessment and Evaluation: A Review. In *bioRxiv*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/512186>.
- Fitzsimons, E. (2015). Character education: A role for literature in cultivating character strengths in adolescence. *Master of Applied Positive Psychology*, 8(1), 135–150. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9667-5_7.
- Giraldo, F. (2018). Language assessment literacy: Implications for language teachers. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 20(1). <https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v20n1.62089>.
- Gokturk-Saglam, A. L., & Sevgi-Sole, E. (2023). Emerging Practices for Online Language Assessment, Exams, Evaluation, and Feedback. In *Emerging Practices for Online Language Assessment, Exams, Evaluation, and Feedback*. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-6227-0>.
- Hass, A. (2022). Using plagiarism feedback as assessment for learning to socialise students into disciplinary writing: A theoretical perspective. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 36(2). <https://doi.org/10.20853/36-2-4648>.
- Heydarnejad, T. (2023). Mirroring Learning-oriented Assessment in On-line Classes: The Nexus Between Self-evaluation, Academic Resilience, Positive Orientation, Enjoyment, and Language Achievement. *CALL-EJ*, 24(2). <https://callej.org/index.php/journal/article/view/11>.
- Hooda, M., Rana, C., Dahiya, O., Rizwan, A., & Hossain, M. S. (2022). Artificial Intelligence for Assessment and Feedback to Enhance Student Success in Higher Education. *Mathematical Problems in Engineering*, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/5215722>.
- Huang, J., & Chen, G. (2022). Individualized feedback to raters in language assessment: Impacts on rater effects. *Assessing Writing*, 52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2022.100623>.
- Huang, S. C. (2016). Understanding learners' self-assessment and self-feedback on their foreign language speaking performance. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 41(6). <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2015.1042426>.
- Huo, Y., Wong, D. F., Ni, L. M., Chao, L. S., & Zhang, J. (2020). Knowledge modeling via contextualized representations for LSTM-based personalized exercise recommendation. *Information Sciences*, 523, 266–278. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ins.2020.03.014>.
- Hwang, G. J., Chang, C. C., & Chien, S. Y. (2022). A motivational model-based virtual reality approach to prompting learners' sense of presence, learning achievements, and higher-order thinking in professional safety training. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 53(5). <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13196>.
- Jónsson, Í. R., Smith, K., & Geirsdóttir, G. (2018). Shared language of feedback and assessment. Perception of teachers and students in three Icelandic secondary schools. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2017.11.003>.
- Kassem, M. A. M. (2018). The Effect of Using Blackboard on English Majors' Writing Proficiency and Attitudes. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 7(6), 73. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.7n.6p.73>.
- Khasanah, A. N., Sajidan, S., & Widoretno, S. (2017). Effectiveness of critical thinking indicator-based module in empowering student's learning outcome in respiratory system study material. *Jurnal Pendidikan IPA Indonesia*, 6(1), 187–195. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jpii.v6i1.8490>.
- Kim, H. J., & Kim, A. A. (2021). Examining the Effectiveness of Learning-Oriented Language Assessment in Second Language Reading-to-Write Tasks: Focusing on Instructor Feedback and Self-Assessment. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 18(4). <https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2021.18.4.11.1250>.

- Kjell, O. N. E., Kjell, K., & Schwartz, H. A. (2024). Beyond rating scales: With targeted evaluation, large language models are poised for psychological assessment. In *Psychiatry Research* (Vol. 333). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2023.115667>.
- Kvasova, O. (2022). The Impact of Student Teachers' Pre-Existing Conceptions of Assessment on the Development of Language Assessment Literacy within an LTA Course. *Languages*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages7010062>.
- Li, W., & Mohamad, M. (2023). An Efficient Probabilistic Deep Learning Model for the Oral Proficiency Assessment of Student Speech Recognition and Classification. *International Journal on Recent and Innovation Trends in Computing and Communication*, 11(6). <https://doi.org/10.17762/ijritcc.v11i6.7734>.
- Magulod, G. C. (2019). Learning styles, study habits and academic performance of Filipino university students in applied science courses: Implications for instruction. *Journal of Technology and Science Education*, 9(2), 184–198. <https://doi.org/10.3926/jotse.504>.
- Mäkipää, T., Hahl, K., & Luodonpää-Manni, M. (2021). Teachers' perceptions of assessment and feedback practices in finland's foreign language classes during the covid-19 pandemic. *Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal*, 11(Special Issue). <https://doi.org/10.26529/cepsj.1108>.
- Mambu, J. G. Z., Pitra, D. H., Rizki, A., Ilmi, M., Nugroho, W., Leuwol, N. V, Muh, A., & Saputra, A. (2023). Pemanfaatan Teknologi Artificial Intelligence (AI) dalam Menghadapi Tantangan Mengajar Guru di Era Digital. *Journal on Education*, 06(01), 2689–2698. <https://doi.org/10.31004/joe.v6i1.3304>.
- Meidasari, V. E. (2017). The Assessment And Evaluation In Teaching English As A Foreign Language. *Indonesian EFL Journal*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.25134/iefj.v1i2.629>.
- Menbet, A. A. (2018). The Use of Effective Strategies to Improve Saudi EFL Dyslexic Learners' Writing Skills. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 8(12), 1611. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0812.06>.
- Papadima-Sophocleous, S. (2022). Teacher Education for Language Assessment and Testing: Postgraduate Program Evaluation from its Students' Perspective. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, 24(1). <https://doi.org/10.14483/22487085.17373>.
- Parnabas, V., Abdullah, N. M., Mohamed Shapie, M. N., Abdul Rahim, M. R., Parnabas, J., Parnabas, A. M., Isa, M., & Indrakisyah, M. (2023). E-Learning Motivation Among Student-Athletes Of Universiti Teknologi Mara (Uitm), Malaysia. *Malaysian Journal of Sport Science and Recreation*, 19(1), 37–50. <https://doi.org/10.24191/mjssr.v19i1.21755>.
- Pfingsthorn, J., & Weltgen, J. (2022). Inclusive and fair assessment in foreign language education: The role of fundamental attribution error in the evaluation of students' performance. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, 3. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2022.100160>.
- Prasad, K., Aladini, A., Normurodova, N. Z., & Belton, B. (2023). Take language assessment easy: the mediator impacts of self-assessment, test-taking skills in predicting student evaluation apprehension, foreign language learning self-esteem, and language achievement in online classes. *Language Testing in Asia*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-023-00246-0>.
- Prasetya, R. E., & Syarif, A. (2022). Assessment and Feedback to Enhance Online English Language Learning. *Metathesis: Journal of English Language, Literature, and Teaching*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.31002/metathesis.v6i1.185>.
- Putri, D. D., . M., & Damayanti, I. (2017). Descriptive Study Of Grammar Learning Applied By Students Of English Diploma III Study Program On Their Personality Types. *Journal of English Education and Teaching*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.33369/jeet.1.1.74-85>.
- Ray, S., Ngomba, R. T., & Ahmed, S. I. (2022). The impact of assessment and feedback practice on the student learning experiences in higher education. In *Essays in Biochemistry* (Vol. 66, Issue 1). <https://doi.org/10.1042/EBC20210056>.
- Reyes, R. P., Samson, E. C., & Garcia, J. G. (2020). An Interactive Foreign Language Trainer Using Assessment and Feedback Modalities. *International Journal in Information Technology in Governance, Education and Business*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.32664/ijitgeb.v2i1.61>.
- Rouhshad, A., Flynn, C., Turnbull, L., & Ross, B. (2022). Social work students with English as an additional language: examining written assessment feedback. *Teaching in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2022.2114336>.
- Setyowati, L., Abiyasa, F. R., & El-Sulukiyah, A. A. (2022). The students' perception on writing tools application for essay writing class. *Jurnal Dimensi Pendidikan Dan Pembelajaran*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.24269/dpp.v10i1.4446>.
- Shah, S. (2022). Influence of Teachers' Formative Assessment Feedback and Students' Learning Activities on English Subject at Secondary School Level. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, 6(II). [https://doi.org/10.35484/pssr.2022\(6-ii\)91](https://doi.org/10.35484/pssr.2022(6-ii)91).
- Shrestha, P. N. (2022). Examining evaluative language used in assessment feedback on business students' academic writing. *Assessing Writing*, 54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2022.100664>.

- Solano, Q. P., Hayward, L., Chopra, Z., Quanstrom, K., Kendrick, D., Abbott, K. L., Kunzmann, M., Ahle, S., Schuller, M., Ötleş, E., & George, B. C. (2021). Natural Language Processing and Assessment of Resident Feedback Quality. *Journal of Surgical Education*, 78(6). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsurg.2021.05.012>.
- Son, Y. A. (2017). Toward Useful Assessment and Evaluation of Heritage Language Learning. *Foreign Language Annals*, 50(2). <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12273>.
- Srivastava, T. K., Mishra, V., & Waghmare, L. S. (2018). Formative Assessment Classroom Techniques (FACTs) for better learning in pre-clinical medical education: A controlled trial. *Journal of Clinical and Diagnostic Research*, 12(9). <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Tripti-Srivastava/publication/327229061>.
- Sukmawati, S., Sujarwo, S., Soepriadi, D. N., & Amaliah, N. (2022). Online English Language Teaching in the Midst of Covid-19 Pandemic: Non EFL Students' Feedback and Response. *Al-Ta Lim Journal*, 29(1), 62–69. <https://doi.org/10.15548/jt.v29i1.732>.
- Taghizadeh, M., & Mazdayasna, G. (2023). Language assessment course at Iranian state universities: An evaluation of the incorporation of assessment principles into the course content. *Heliyon*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e12857>.
- Tofade, T., Elsner, J., & Haines, S. T. (2013). Best Practice Strategies for Effective Use of Questions as a Teaching Tool. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 77(7). <https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe777155>.
- Vattøy, K. D. (2020). Teachers' beliefs about feedback practice as related to student self-regulation, self-efficacy, and language skills in teaching English as a foreign language. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2019.100828>.
- Vattøy, K. D., & Gamlem, S. M. (2020). Teacher–student interactions and feedback in English as a foreign language classrooms. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 50(3). <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2019.1707512>.
- Waskito, Irzal, Wulansari, R. E., & Ya, K. Z. (2022). The Adventure of Formative Assessment with Active Feedback in The Vocational Learning: The Empirical Effect for Increasing Students' Achievement. *Journal of Technical Education and Training*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.30880/jtet.2022.14.01.005>.
- Weiss, M., Barth, M., & von Wehrden, H. (2021). The patterns of curriculum change processes that embed sustainability in higher education institutions. *Sustainability Science*, 16(5), 1579–1593. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-021-00984-1>.
- Widiastuti, I. A. M. S. (2021). Assessment and feedback practices in the EFL classroom. *REID (Research and Evaluation in Education)*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.21831/reid.v7i1.37741>.
- Xiao, Y., & Yang, M. (2019). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: How formative assessment supports students' self-regulation in English language learning. *System*, 81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.01.004>.
- Yao, Y., Wang, W., & Yang, X. (2021). Perceptions of the inclusion of Automatic Writing Evaluation in peer assessment on EFL writers' language mindsets and motivation: A short-term longitudinal study. *Assessing Writing*, 50. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2021.100568>.
- Yesilyurt, Y. E. (2023). AI-Enabled assessment and feedback mechanisms for language learning: Transforming pedagogy and learner experience. In *Transforming the Language Teaching Experience in the Age of AI*. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-9893-4.ch002>.