

## **CHAPTER II**

### **REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE**

This chapter addresses the explanation related to assessment types used in assessing students' progress or understanding by English teachers. It consists of the theoretical framework and relevant studies.

#### **2.1 Theoretical Framework**

##### **2.1.1 Assessment**

Assessment in education is defined as all activities teachers carry out to aid students' learning and gauge their improvement (Black & William, 1998). Brown (2001) recommends that assessment defines what students regard as important, how they spend their time, and how they come to see themselves as individuals. Gibbs and Simpson (2004) propose that assessment exerts a profound influence on student learning: what students focus on, how much they study, their quality of engagement with learning tasks, and, through feedback, their understanding and future learning.

Furthermore, in education systems worldwide, at any level, assessment is a crucial component for measuring learning progress (Das, Shaheen, Shrestha, Rahman, & Khan, 2014; Irons, 2008). Monitoring progress is also essential in the classroom context, as a reliable assessment of progress can inform teacher instruction and appropriate interventions (Llosa, 2012). Meanwhile, Cheng and Fox (2017) assumed that it is incorrect to think of assessment as nothing more than evaluating students' progress at the end of a teaching/learning unit. Instead, it

should be seen as a method of gathering information about students' progress toward their learning objectives and what they need to do.

Moreover, in the world of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, assessments have taken on many purposes and many shapes, and the assessment of language is no exception (Hamp-Lyons, 2016). For many years, assessment researchers have mentioned that assessment plays a central role in classrooms (Turner & Purpura, 2016). It also applies to language classrooms, as it was stated by Cheng and Fox (2017) that assessment plays an essential role in language teaching and learning. Language testing/assessment developments in the early 21<sup>st</sup> century have tended to focus on understanding learners and their needs as people, not only as test consumers (Hamp-Lyons, 2016). One of the directions modern language testing/assessment has taken concerns with test purpose, the need to ensure that a test or assessment instrument is fit.

## **2.1.2 Assessment Purpose**

### **2.1.2.1 Assessment for Learning**

Assessment for learning (AfL) determines where students are in their learning process, where they need to go, and the best way to get there; teachers and students employ assessment for learning, which is looking for and interpreting evidence (Cheng & Fox, 2017). AfL (Assessment for Learning) puts students at the center of classroom learning and encourages them to take more responsibility for their learning while teachers monitor, provide feedback, and guide learners in identifying areas needing improvement (Colby-Kelly, 2014). The fundamental principles of AfL are that teachers work with learners to ensure each learner

perceives a gap between their current and desired knowledge or ability; that then the learner must actively work to close that gap and reach the desired goal; and, importantly, that learners receive appropriate and timely feedback on their active efforts (Hamp-Lyons, 2016).

The concept of AfL (Assessment for Learning) is somewhat ambiguous, sometimes considered very specific, at other times equated with formative assessment, and at others being used more widely to suggest a contrast to traditional norm-referenced examination-dominated assessment systems (Hamp-Lyons, 2016). It is in line with Colby-Kelly (2014) that AfL is essentially a philosophy of how to use formative assessment (classroom assessment used for learning purposes) in a manner best suited to enhance learner motivation and learning outcomes.

Moreover, the last 15–20 years have seen an unprecedented interest in and a growing concern about the alignment of assessment and learning, commonly referred to as "formative assessment" or "Assessment for Learning" (AfL) (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Gardner, 2012). In addition, it was adopted by Burner's (2015) study, and he used both as the same term. His research indicated that the increasing emphasis on formative assessment and AfL affects EFL writing instructors and students differently. Students mention local faults, like grammatical ones, and a broad syllabus as subject-related challenges. Those fit nicely with the extensive written assessment procedures language teachers use and the limited EFL instructional time. However, when it comes to student interaction, text revision, and self-assessment, teachers are reluctant to put AfL into practice.

Furthermore, the study suggested that more research is needed to understand how the identified gaps can be decreased to develop successful AfL (Burner, 2015).

### **2.1.2.2 Assessment of Learning**

Assessment of learning (AoL) conducted after learning has taken place. It is employed to make claims on a student's level of learning at a specific period (Cheng & Fox, 2017). The major purpose of AoL is to rank students' academic achievements by marks or grades (Lam, 2015). Cheng and Fox (2017) categorize this type of assessment activity as evaluations that take place after learning to identify whether or not learning has taken place. They are used to make statements regarding a student's learning status at any time. Assessment of learning is equivalent to summative assessment when it is used in the learning process (Earl, 2003).

### **2.1.2.3 Assessment as Learning**

Assessment as learning (AaL) focuses on the students themselves, taking responsibility for their learning through self- and peer-assessment, monitoring their progress towards their goals, and employing strategies for achieving them (Cheng & Fox, 2017). In addition, as Stiggins (2002) stated classroom assessment as learning has a significant benefit for students learning, such as students being actively engaged in the process, but also because the process develops the skills that underpin the effective development, monitoring, and reporting, of personal learning goals. Moreover, classroom assessment as learning also helps to remove the student/teacher barrier, develop enterprising competencies in students, and can lead to greater motivation (Stiggins, 2002).

Besides, the studies conducted in the AaL field, such as in Lam (2015), investigated the extent to which assessment as learning (AaL), used as an alternative to high-stakes assessment, can support writing instruction and student learning. The paper makes the case that AaL, when kept in classroom-based portfolios, can foster teacher proficiency in teaching writing, student motivation for education, and text improvement. It bases this argument on data from educational assessments and EFL writing.

### **2.1.3 Assessment Types**

#### **2.1.3.1 Formative Assessment**

Black and William (2009) define formative assessment as evidence of classroom practice where students can know their achievements and teachers and students can change the next instructions or evaluation. It is not much different from Cizek (2010), which describes it as measuring students' understanding, strengths, and weaknesses, and as a source of reference for teachers in the next planning. Students can also use it to develop their understanding of achievement. Further, Colby-Kelly (2014) stated formative assessment refers to an assessment that does not count toward grades but informs about learning progress.

Taber, Riga, Brindley, Winterbottom, Finney, and Fisher (2011) show that formative assessment follows assessment for learning, where assessment processes are carried out collaboratively, and the assessment decisions are primarily about the direction in which teaching and learning should go. Research evidence that formative modes of assessment contribute more to student learning has, in recent years, led to strong recommendations that most classroom

assessments should be Assessment for Learning (AfL) (Taber, Riga, Brindley, Winterbottom, Finney, & Fisher, 2011).

Furthermore, the paper focuses on formative assessment has been researched by researchers in different contexts. Leenknecht, Wijnia, Köhler, Fryer, Rikers, and Loyens' (2021) study explores the relationship between formative assessment and student motivation in higher education. Krumsvik and Ludvigsen's (2013) study examines the theoretical and methodological challenges associated with implementing formative assessment. Meanwhile, Cagasan, Care, Robertson and Luo (2020) demonstrate the development of a protocol designed to evaluate formative assessment practices in the educational system of the Philippines. In their study, Cagasan et al. (2020) explored ways of capturing teachers' formative assessment behavior in Philippine classrooms conducted in English and Mathematics lessons. The results concluded that the combination of the recent adoption of formative assessment approaches to pedagogy, cultural factors in the Philippines that influence teacher-student interactions, and large class sizes present challenges to the effective implementation of formative assessment strategies. The study claimed that the classroom observation of formative assessment tools provides a resource that can be used for the professional development of teachers in the set of instructional strategies. In other research, Krumsvik and Ludvigsen's (2013) paper focusing on issues of formative assessment found the typical challenges in implementing formative assessment, such as high student numbers, time constraints imposed by lengthy curricula, a lack of interaction because of poor classroom management, and resources are all contributing factors.

Partin (2009) viewed formative assessment means improving students' learning and identifying areas where children are suffering so that the teacher can take corrective action to make instructional decisions. He stated some alternatives that can be used in formative assessment practice in the class include the following: (a) some tests, (b) homework, (c) quizzes, (d) research reports, (e) oral questions with adequate time for students to answer, (f) feedback on seatwork, (g) thoughtful, reflective class dialogues, (h) grading rubrics, (i) comments, (j) checklists, (k) self-evaluations, (l) teacher conference, (m) in-class writing assignment, (n) lab worksheets, and (o) student journals. Furthermore, Frey and Fisher (2011) explained that several instructional techniques could be used effectively to check for understanding in formative assessment systems. The techniques are presented in the following.

#### **2.1.3.1.1 Independent Task (Homework/Assignment/Task/Exercise)**

Frey and Fisher (2011) explained that in a formative assessment system, independent work allows for practice and application. It can also serve as a review for determining if students have grasped the prerequisite content or if additional instruction is necessary. Independent work should be used when students have demonstrated some level of success with content in the presence of their teacher and peers. Homework is assigned just after students have been introduced to the content. If, for example, students were just introduced to methods for calculating the slope of a line or adding fractions, it is probably best not to assign homework on that content on the same day—because that homework is premature in this instructional cycle. It is not that homework is bad or evil. It is just that it must

come when students are ready. Furthermore, they stated that many independent learning tasks are used as formative assessments, designed to check for understanding and to identify needs for reteaching.

#### **2.1.3.1.2 Questioning**

Frey and Fisher (2011) demonstrated the most common oral language used by the teacher to check for understanding is through questioning. In this paradigm, the teacher poses a question, selected students are called upon to respond, and the teacher evaluates the responses (Frey & Fisher, 2011). The teacher should also give opportunities to the students to talk with others around them about their answers, and they should initiate their questions. During student interaction, the teacher listens and determines areas of understanding that need additional instruction.

#### **2.1.3.1.3 Retelling**

Frey and Fisher (2011) viewed retellings can allow students to think about information and then orally describe what they know about it. Retellings challenge students to comprehend information by considering the order of ideas and events and their relative relevance. Retelling what the students have just read or heard is a great way to check to understand (Shaw, 2005). Further, Gambrell, Koskinen, and Kapinus (1991) supported retelling as more effective in checking for understanding than direct questioning.

#### **2.1.3.1.4 Think-Pair-Share**



A cooperative discussion method called "Think-Pair-Share" enables students to discuss their answers with a peer before presenting their thoughts to the entire class (Frey & Fisher, 2011). Lyman (1981) and his colleagues developed the three stages strategy of student action: (1) Think: in this stage, the teacher involves students in thinking with a question, prompt, reading, visual, or observation. The students were given a few moments (not minutes) to THINK about the questions. (2) Pair: students with their partners PAIR up to discuss their responses. They compare their thoughts and identify the answers they think are the best, most intriguing, most convincing, or most creative. (3) Share: after students talk to their pairs, the teacher asks pairs to SHARE their thinking.

This strategy offers excellent chances to check for understanding. The teacher can listen to the discussion and take notes on how their responses are being shared. Then, the teacher corrects the students' reactions in pair discussion for all to hear.

#### **2.1.3.1.5 Summary Writing**

Because it reveals to the teacher how the students distill knowledge, summary writing is helpful for gauging comprehension (Frey & Fisher, 2011). It is the same with retelling. It serves as a way for students to show their ability to synthesize what they have read, viewed, or done. Frey and Fisher (2011) showed that Précis is the standard form of summary writing, and it is a short piece that contains the central ideas or concepts of a topic. The emphasis is on an economy of words and an accurate rendering of the read or observed phenomena. Before assigning students to summarize, students must be taught how to summarize.

#### **2.1.3.1.6 Writing Prompts**

Frey and Fisher (2011) explained many writing prompt tools can help check understanding, such as exit slips, used for "closure" activities. In the exit slips activity, students write on a topic or question that the teacher supplies and hand the paper to their teacher on their way out of class. The teacher then reviews the exit slips for content information, deciding what students understand and what needs to be taught.

#### **2.1.3.1.7 Presentations**

Frey and Fisher (2011) stated that at some point, most teachers assign student-designed and student-led presentations about a topic studied in class. Students need opportunities to share information with peers to become more substantial public speakers who can discuss ideas. Presentations can also be an excellent way to assess student knowledge about a topic, as stated by Frey and Fisher (2011).

Additionally, Frey and Fisher (2011) investigated that there are ways to structure presentations to gather formative, not just summative, information. It can be formative by how students present the results of the topic or individual discussions, and other students can ask questions and give additional comments. Meanwhile, the teacher provides suggestions, corrections, and feedback for the group presented for improvement.

#### **2.1.3.1.8 Short Quizzes**

Although tests are most commonly used as summative assessments, they can also be used in formative ways, such as when they are used as quizzes to check for understanding (Frey & Fisher, 2011). For a quiz or test to be informative to the learner, it must include a mechanism for correction. If a quiz is corrected and graded, it is unlikely that much new understanding will occur. Finally, test-taking anxiety does little to enhance recall. Students who are more concerned about grades than their learning will view these quizzes with terror. The quizzes are proper and always presented as learning devices, not tests that merit a grade.

#### 2.1.3.1.9 Question-Answer Relationships

Frey and Fisher (2011) proposed that formative assessments can also explore why students choose correct or incorrect answers in addition to finding out about content knowledge. QAR was developed as a means for students to determine whether the relevant information for each question could be found directly in the text (text-explicit) or whether they need to infer the relevant information using a combination of the text and background knowledge (text-implicit).

Table 2.1 Formative Assessment Types

Author(s)	Year	Tools/Techniques of Formative Assessment	Description
Frey & Fisher	2011	Homework/Assignment/ Task/Exercise	In a formative assessment system, independent work allows for practice and application. It can also serve as a review for determining if students have grasped the prerequisite content or if additional instruction is necessary

Author(s)	Year	Tools/Techniques of Formative Assessment	Description
		Questioning	In this paradigm, the teacher poses a question, selected students are called upon to respond, and the teacher evaluates the responses
		Retelling	Retellings can allow students to think about information and then orally describe what they know about it
		Think-Pair-Share	A cooperative discussion method called "Think-Pair-Share" enables students to discuss their answers with a peer before presenting their thoughts to the entire class
		Summary Writing	It serves as a way for students to show their ability to synthesize what they have read, viewed, or done
		Writing Prompts	Many writing prompts tools can help check understanding, such as exit slips, used for "closure" activities
		Presentations	Most teachers assign student-designed and student-led presentations about a topic studied in class
		Short Quizzes	Although tests are most commonly used as summative assessments, they can also be used in formative ways, such as when they are used as quizzes to check for understanding. For a quiz or test to be informative to the learner, it must include a mechanism for correction
		Question-Answer Relationship	QAR was developed as a means for students to determine whether the relevant information for each question could be found directly in the text (text-explicit) or whether they need to infer the relevant information using a combination of the text and background knowledge (text-implicit).

### 2.1.3.2 Summative Assessment

Term summative assessment means evaluating students' learning achievement at the semester's or program's end (Cheng & Fox, 2017; Irons, 2008;

Torrance & Pryor, 2002). It is a final evaluation at the end of a chapter, unit, course, etc., (Cheng & Fox, 2017). Furthermore, Brown, Race, and Bull (1999, p. 6) demonstrated that summative assessment "tends to be the endpoint, essentially numerical and concerned mainly with making the evaluative judgment". A summary of all comes before within a designated time. The fact that summative assessments frequently come at the end of a study period may make it difficult for students to manage their time well or cause them to have too many summative assessments to complete simultaneously (Irons, 2008). An achievement test is a summative assessment instrument. Summative assessment results are often recorded as scores or grades within students' report cards (Cheng & Fox, 2017). Summative assessment is in line with the assessment of learning.

On the other side, some researchers compare formative and summative assessments. Harlen (2012) viewed formative as "helping to learn" and answered the question: What are the next steps in learning? Summative was considered "reporting on learning" and answering the question: What has been achieved to date? Harlen and James (1997) argue that formative assessment cannot be differentiated from summative assessment purely on the grounds of the type or form of the assessment tool being used to gather evidence of learning but by the purpose for which such assessment tools are put; to help learning, or to summarize learning. Summative tests provide numbers but do not look into teaching and learning, so they cannot be used to inform instruction. While formative assessment usually has as its core purpose the provision of information (usually in the form of feedback) to the learner in a form that the learner can use to extend and improve their learning (Hamp-Lyons, 2016). In other words, how the

information is used defines whether the assessment is formative or summative. Teachers find this situation confusing because different sources take different views (Turner & Purpura, 2016).

DeLuca, LaPointe-McEwan, and Luhanga (2016) note a clear trend in recent years toward highlighting the importance of formative assessment instead of summative assessment. This trend has also become visible in reforms of assessment education in many countries throughout the last decades (Berry, 2011).

In addition, the study concerned with summative assessment has done enough. Mottier Lopez and Pasquini's (2017) study examined the potential role of professional controversies in building teachers' summative assessment capacity. The findings support the potentially constructive role of professional discussions in supporting teachers' professional development for summative assessment. In comparison, Brookhart (2012) focused on using teacher judgment for summative assessment in the USA.

### **2.1.3.3 Self-Assessment**

Student-led assessment of their development. Self-assessment can take many forms and is encouraged through learning logs, diaries, 'can-do' checklists, questionnaires, and so on (Cheng & Fox, 2017). It is an individual's reflection on and evaluation of their proficiency, capability, knowledge, etc. This type of assessment encourages students to become more aware of their learning and more responsible for it. It provides students with experience, which helps them to set

more realistic goals for their learning and monitor their progress in achieving these on an ongoing basis.

#### **2.1.3.4 Peer-Assessment**

Peer assessment is the evaluation or feedback one student (or a group of students) provides for another (Cheng & Fox, 2017). It is in line with Herlinawati's (2019) paper that peer assessment is frequently described as an educational setting where students rate the quality of one another's work and give comments to one another. The utilization of students giving written feedback on each other's work might facilitate peer assessment (Wride, 2017). In Hidayanti (2020), she stated that students are taught how to receive and give feedback from the work context through the peer assessment procedure. In writing activity, students can swap papers and collaborate in pairs or small groups to discuss their writing during peer assessment to prepare for the corrections they will do later (Herlinawati, 2019). In other words, peer assessment could improve students' writing development. Furthermore, teachers' role in implementing peer assessment is needed to help students make informed decisions about revising, enhancing, and reflecting on the strengths and weaknesses of their writing development. In addition, peer assessment may serve as another benefit to developing students' critical thinking as an essential part of academic studies at all levels of education (Cheng & Fox, 2017).

Likewise, the study in the peer-assessment field has been conducted in various contexts. Nova, Pratidina, and Syarif's (2017) paper focusing on the teachers' perspectives on the implementation of peer-assessment in assessing

student's affective aspect in the Indonesian context found that the utilization of peer assessment has been utilized of numbers English teachers where most of them perceived the application of peer assessment regarding students' attitude performance positively. However, several teachers still believed that the students had no adequate competence in assessing their peers and were not confident performing peer assessments. This study suggested that teachers should promote the positive aspects of peer assessment by promoting students' cooperative and collaborative learning.

### **2.1.3.5 Portfolio Assessment**

In contexts where language is taught, portfolio evaluation has become widespread and is frequently linked to educational renewal or reform (e.g., Fox, 2014; Hargreaves, Earl, & Schmidt, 2002). Referring to Cheng and Fox (2017), the portfolio is a standard assessment method in the classroom for several subjects, including language arts, music, and arithmetic. Applying a portfolio in English as a second language (ESL) has become one of the best assessment tools for recording a student's language development over time (see Fox, 2014; Fox & Hartwick, 2011; Little, 2009). Portfolios provide a way to collect and present various performance data, creating a rich and comprehensive portrayal of each student's accomplishments' (Carpenter & Ray, 1995). It also provides a place such as a folder, a notebook, a binder, or a file where students and teachers can save and collect evidence of their work or students' learning in a language course. Commonly, there are two purposes for creating portfolios of student work, first is to keep track of what a student knows and can do. The second is for evidence of



ongoing learning, growth, or development over time (Cheng & Fox, 2017). Portfolios and portfolio assessments may document and support development in language skills (listening, reading, speaking, and writing) and develop students' self-awareness, goal-setting, responsibility for personal learning, and autonomy (Little, 2009).

Some items can be included in a portfolio if it provides evidence of a student's achievement over time. Commonly used items are examples of written work, journals and logs, standardized inventories, videotapes of student performances, audiotapes of presentations, mind maps and notes, web pages, group reports, tests and quizzes, charts and graphs, lists of books read, questionnaire results, peer reviews, and self-evaluations (Partin, 2009).

#### **2.1.3.6 Diagnostic Assessment**

Cheng and Fox (2017) describe the diagnostic assessment used. It most often occurs at the beginning of a course. A diagnostic test or assessment procedure is fully specified to test for specific capabilities related to the target or intended competencies, skills, or abilities. Further, the information provided by the diagnostic test should trigger specific pedagogical interventions designed to address an individual's weaknesses and strengths through a classroom activity. In other words, diagnostic assessment is not entirely diagnostic unless it leads directly to teaching that responds to an individual's language or learning profile.

Whereas assessment for placement has the purpose of grouping students based on what they share, diagnostic assessment examines their individual and

unique capabilities and weaknesses (Cheng & Fox, 2017). It identifies specific activities that address those capabilities to support an individual's development.

### **2.1.3.7 Performance Assessment**

Partin (2009) views performance assessments as requiring students to demonstrate mastery of a skill or procedure by showing it. He indicated performance assessment has long been a part of the curriculum in some courses, such as shop, home economics, physical education, or the arts.

Further, Partin (2009) stated that direct assessments have the advantage of greater validity because the objective being assessed is observed directly. Indirect measures, such as a paper and pencil test on cooking a soufflé, may not accurately predict how well a person would perform baking a real soufflé. Performance assessments are more useful in assessing complex skills and higher-level understanding.

Even though not new, the trend toward including live performances and products in educational assessment schemes has grown recently. The expanding interest in performance or authentic assessments is a reaction to paper-and-pencil tests' limitations and disparities. Here are some valuable ideas from successful teachers, as explained by Partin (2009):

- The events or activities to be assessed are content specific and emerge from the course objectives. The tasks may be very brief or long and complex. The performance tasks may be completed individually or sometimes in groups.

- Problem-solving tasks related to real-world problems are often used in performance assessments. They may be embedded in a simulated or case study scenario.
- Some schools have adapted a rite-of-passage experience, often required for graduation. These might include mastery exhibits, oral presentations, a résumé, essays, products, artwork, and role plays.
- Classmates may be able to evaluate performance tasks. It is essential to provide a rubric with the evaluative criteria listed with some form of a rating scale for each standard.
- Sometimes students have a choice in the types of products they will develop to prove mastery of the skill or knowledge.

### 2.1.3.8 Criterion-Referenced Assessment

Cheng and Fox (2017) define criterion-referenced assessment as a type of measurement that describes knowledge, skill, or performance through descriptive criteria. Criteria are typically related to levels across a continuum of language development. These levels are often labeled as standards or benchmarks and distinguish one level of mastery from the next. For example, CEFR identifies different levels of language proficiency from A1 to C2.

Tabel 2.2 Assessment Types

Author(s)	Year	Type of Assessment	Description
Cizek	2010	Formative Assessment	Formative assessment measuring students' understanding, strengths, weaknesses, and as a source of reference for teachers in the next planning.
Cheng & Fox	2017	Summative Assessment	Final evaluation at the end of a chapter, unit, course, etc.

Cheng & Fox	2017	Self-Assessment	An individual's reflection on and evaluation of their proficiency, capability, knowledge, and so on.
Cheng & Fox	2017	Peer-Assessment	Peer assessment is the evaluation or feedback one student (or a group of students) provides for another.
Carpenter & Ray	1995	Portfolio Assessment	Portfolios provide a way to collect and present various performance data, creating a rich and comprehensive portrayal of each student's accomplishments'.
Cheng and Fox	2017	Diagnostic Assessment	A diagnostic test or assessment procedure is fully specified to test for specific capabilities related to the target or intended competencies, skills, or abilities.
Partin	2009	Performance Assessment	Partin (2009) views performance assessments as requiring students to demonstrate mastery of a skill or procedure by showing it. He indicated performance assessment has long been a part of the curriculum in some courses, such as shop, home economics, physical education, or the arts.
Cheng and Fox	2017	Criterion-Referenced Assessment	Cheng and Fox (2017) define criterion-referenced assessment as a type of measurement that describes knowledge, skill, or performance through descriptive criteria. Criteria are typically related to levels across a continuum of language development.

## 2.2 Relevant Studies

The studies focusing on assessment in the Indonesian EFL classroom context tend to focus on teachers' views on classroom-based assessment (Puad & Ashton, 2020) and the purpose of classroom assessment practices and assessment procedures in terms of the items and tasks (Saefurrohman & Balinas, 2016). However, there is less research on what types of assessment teachers use to assess students' progress or understanding in English classrooms.

In the research that conducted in Indonesia, Puad and Ashton's (2020) paper focused on teachers' views on classroom assessment. They found that teachers frequently viewed formative rather than summative aspects of classroom-based assessment. Much emphasis was placed on evaluating pupils' classroom

attitudes and behaviors in addition to their academic performance. Additionally, grades and test results were viewed as a means of holding pupils responsible for their learning and accomplishments in front of their teachers and parents (Puad and Ashton, 2020).

Meanwhile, Saefurrohman and Balinas's (2016) collaborative research conducted in Indonesia and the Philippines explored teachers' practice of classroom assessment in terms of their purposes of classroom assessment that consists of assessment for learning, assessment of learning, and assessment as learning. The results showed that in classroom assessments for learning, the highest percentage was 'to group students for instruction,' and the lowest was 'to prepare their students for standardized tests in the future'. For assessment of learning, the highest percentage of Filipino English teachers formally documented growth in learning, whereas Indonesian English teachers were to determine the students' final grades and provide information to the central administration. In contrast, in assessment as learning, Filipino and Indonesian teachers used it to support students' independence in learning. From the results, assessment for learning became the primary purpose of assessment. Internet and published textbooks became the source of Filipino and Indonesian Junior High School English teachers making the assessments.

Regarding assessment strategies used in English classrooms in the global context, Huang and Jiang's (2020) study involved 11 focal secondary English teachers using authentic assessment (AA) in their classroom assessment. The study showed that portfolios, projects in the form of writing letters for real-world purposes and writing a response letter to a news article on an authentic social

topic were used as authentic assessment implementation in their classroom. As the implementation, however, there are several factors for teachers' limited uptake of AA in practice, namely high-stakes testing culture, limited resources, teachers' assessment literacy, and misconceptions about students. Because the limited number of teachers produced limited context, the study suggested further understanding and theorizing more mechanisms concerning teachers' perceptions and practices of AA across contexts. Future research should also include classroom observation from more teacher participants over extended periods (Huang & Jiang, 2020).

Patekar (2021) focused on examining the practices and challenges of assessing the writing of young EFL learners in Croatia. An open-ended question and the observation stated that teachers used various writing tasks whose difficulty level differs for each school year in grading students. For year 4, many teachers apply more complex tasks that are cognitively demanding. The use of dictation during year 2 became a specific problem since it was used to oppose the objectives of the national curriculum. However, it is a cognitively challenging talent that goes beyond writing ability. Many teachers also start unscaffolded writing tasks in year 3. That was inversely proportional to what the author believed. In his opinion, writing should always be evaluated using scaffolded activities for young students in grades 1 through 4, whether pictures provide the scaffolding, words, models, templates, or simply explicit directions that establish the scene. While for the writing tasks on the tests, there was no authenticity and communication orientation. As for the challenges in assessing young learners, the teachers still lack the education and training to teach and assess young learners

and struggle to find and make the tests. Therefore, this study suggested that teachers get education and training to better understand young learners' development characteristics so that assessment and teaching can also have a good impact.

As for Das, Shaheen, Shrestha, Rahman, and Khan's (2014) study, the data revealed that teachers most practice formative assessment techniques in evaluating were questions and answers to the individual or whole class in various styles, such as multiple choice questions, open-ended, and close-ended. Another method was namely written tasks in notebooks or on the blackboard. Pair and group work also became one of the assessment techniques. In comparison, summative assessment uses terminal examinations as prominent features. It was mentioned that summative exam papers only focused on testing writing and reading.

Moreover, the research conducted in the assessment field mainly focused on one specific assessment. Additionally, in Indonesia, less previous research has been conducted in the assessment field, specifically on English teachers' assessment types in assessing students' progress or understanding. Therefore, this research brings out the context of English classrooms in Indonesia, focusing on overall assessment types to cover more than one assessment.