Exploring assessment for learning and assessment as learning in Saudi EFL classrooms

By

Lamyaa Mohammed Alrashoud
Department of Curriculum and Instruction / College of Education /
University of Jeddah / Jeddah / Saudi Arabia
Email:Lalrashoud.stu@uj.edu.sa

Haitham Ali Althubaiti
Department of Curriculum and Instruction / College of Education /
University of Jeddah / Jeddah / Saudi Arabia
Email: Haalthubaiti@uj.edu.sa
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7755-1220

Abstract

This study explored the current practices of assessment for learning (AfL) and assessment as learning (AaL) among K-12 EFL teachers. To this end, a mixed-method explanatory sequential design was employed including an online close-ended questionnaire followed by semi-structured interviews. The participants of this study were intermediate and secondary EFL teachers working in public schools in Saudi Arabia. The questionnaire results revealed that EFL teachers highly integrate the principles of AfL in their assessment practices with less consideration for AaL. The semi-structured interviews suggested that certain factors contributed to this result, including years of teaching experience, qualifications, professional development, and resource constraints. Thus, based on these findings, this study highlights implications for teachers' assessment education and provides suggestions and recommendations for further research.

keywords: Formative assessment, assessment for learning, assessment as learning, feedback, EFL, assessment practices

1. Introduction

1.1 Assessment for Learning

There is no doubt that assessment is one of the most important elements of any curriculum. The assessment serves two roles: a formative role to improve the learning of students continuously and a summative role to measure what students have achieved at a particular point for certifying, ranking, and accountability in general (Black et al., 2004). Black and William (1998) defined formative assessment (FA) as an assessment "encompassing all those activities undertaken by teachers, and/or by their students, which provide information to be used as feedback to modify the teaching and learning activities in which they are engaged" (p.7). FA encompasses a wide range of aspects (Schildkamp et al., 2020). Assessment for learning (AfL) is one form of FA that has evolved over the past few decades (William, 2011). The purpose of AfL is to use assessment as a tool to support and enhance learning (Black & William, 1998). As Black and William (2009) explain, effective AfL practices include clarifying and sharing learning intentions and success criteria, facilitating effective classroom discussions and activities, providing feedback that moves learners forward, activating students as learning resources for one another and activating students as owners of their own learning. When these core AfL techniques are integrated into instruction, they can aid teachers in adjusting their teaching to learners' needs (Black & William, 1998).

1.2 Assessment as Learning (AaL)

Assessment as learning (AaL) extends AfL's focus on assessment as a means used mainly by teachers to enhance learning and teaching (Black & William, 1998) by emphasising the role of students as a key 'connector' between assessment and their ongoing EFL learning (Earl, 2013, p.3). Its primary purpose is to develop students'

metacognitive skills and self-monitor their EFL learning (Daan, 2014; Earl, 2013; Lam, 2020). This involves empowering students to set their own goals for learning English and reflect on their progress and the strategies they use to do what is necessary to improve their English (Davies et al., 2011; Daan, 2014; Lam, 2015; Lee, 2016). Furthermore, AaL involves students taking responsibility for observing, judging, and evaluating their progress (Lee, 2016). In this way, they can assess their English proficiency, determine their strengths and possible weak points in their English skills, and employ preferred strategies to improve their performance. With such embracement of students' voices, AaL seeks to develop students' ability to regulate their learning, so they can exert more agency over their EFL learning and remain engaged and focused as autonomous lifelong learners of English (Earl, 2013; Lee, 2016; Lee et al., 2019).

1.3 Formative Feedback

Teacher feedback is a key component of AfL framework (Black & William, 1998). As suggested by Hattie and Timperley (2007), teacher feedback should be meaningful, i.e., it identifies the learning goals, the progress being made toward the goals and the activities needed to achieve better progress. In this way, teachers guide student advancement rather than simply identifying errors or grading performance (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). In addition to teacher feedback, AaL emphasises the importance of receiving feedback from other student-centred resources (Daan, 2014; Lee et al., 2019). This includes applying certain strategies by which students reflect on and assess their work and that of their peers and consequently take responsibility for their learning (Daan, 2014; Ross, 2006; Topping, 2009;) and become more self-regulated and motivated learners (Beekman et al., 2021). As such, extensive guidance for students to self/peer assess their performance would be

indispensable to developing their assessment literacy skills (Panadero et al., 2016).

1.4 Formative Assessment in the Context of Saudi Arabia

In the context of Saudi Arabia, FA is highlighted as an important component of the curriculum in general education. The National Framework of Curriculum Standards released in 2022 highlights the incorporation of AfL and AaL into classroom assessments, with a dual purpose. This includes monitoring and enhancing students' learning while also assisting teachers in improving their instructional practices. Moreover, the framework calls on the implementation of AfL and AaL practices, including the provision of consistent feedback to enhance student learning, the use of a variety of assessment methods that foster student interaction, the integration of ICT, and the involvement of students in the process of assessment with more agentic strategies, e.g., reflection, self-assessments, and peer assessments (Education and Training Evaluation Commission [ETEC], 2022). The effective implementation of these principles underpinned by the framework primarily depends on teachers; therefore, it is essential to understand how teachers adopt this framework in their classroom assessments. This is particularly significant in the context of EFL teachers teaching a subject requiring cumulative communicative skills, with regular feedback and meaningful involvement of students to improve their language proficiency (Lee, 2017). Therefore, this study aims to explore the application of this framework by EFL teachers in daily classroom assessments at Saudi Arabian public schools. Specifically, the study aims to shed light on the self-reported practices of EFL teachers, with a particular focus on the principles of AfL that attempt to improve students' learning of English and in turn improve the quality of teaching. The study also addresses AaL practices,

focusing on how EFL teachers commonly involve students in the assessment process.

2. Literature Review

Oz (2014) surveyed 120 Turkish EFL teachers' use of AfL on a 5-point Likert scale. The findings revealed that Turkish EFL teachers primarily employ summative assessments in spite of extensive monitoring (82.86%) and scaffolding (86.94%) practices. The study also revealed significant differences in how teachers monitor student learning depending on their level of experience, gender, and school type. Likewise, Nasr et al. (2019) employed a mixed-method design to find out how Iranian EFL teachers view and implement AfL, focusing in particular on monitoring and scaffolding practices. The study involved 384 Iranian EFL teachers who completed a questionnaire assessing their AfL practices and 40 EFL teachers who participated in semi-structured interviews to validate survey results and identify implementation barriers. The results indicated that EFL teachers preferred scaffolding practices, e.g., questioning and encouraging student participation, with barriers related to students, teachers, curriculum, class time and size, as well as common attitudes. At the university level, Wu et al. (2021) employed multiple case studies to explore how three Chinese EFL teachers practise AfL in their instruction. They found that participant teachers use AfL convergently to guide students, and divergently to promote open-ended thinking. Furthermore, they have highlighted the positive role played by teachers' assessment literacy and belief in the interconnectedness between goal orientation and motivation, along with the relationship of trust they possess with students. In case study research, Yildirim and Bilican Demir (2022) interviewed 16 teachers, males and females, working in secondary schools to find out about their practices of AaL. The data analysis of interviews revealed that teachers' assessments are mainly teacher-centred with

limited use of self-regulated strategies, e.g., self-assessment and peer assessment or constructive feedback that improves learning; rather, their feedback is mainly for scoring. Yin et al. (2022) were particularly interested in exploring the role of assessment as learning using peer assessments in developing English oral skills. Using questionnaires and semi-structured interviews, they found that peer assessments are helpful for undergraduate students to develop their argumentative speaking in terms of organisation, delivery, and language use. Ali and Majidi (2024) interviewed 30 English teachers to explore their understanding of AfL and their assessment practices. They found that the English teachers use a number of assessment strategies, e.g., observations, presentations, group work, questioning and offering oral and written feedback. Yet, they ignore the core of AfL, which is identifying the current learning weaknesses to provide the necessary support. The scholars suggest the need for continuous professional development opportunities that offer teachers a practical understanding of assessing students to improve their performance during the learning process rather than at the end of the learning process.

According to Fulmer et al. (2017), teachers' assessment approaches are influenced by a variety of considerations at the individual level, at the school-wide level, or/ and at the societal level. Previous research on the study of teachers' classroom assessment practices found that certain teacher-related factors appeared to influence how they integrate FA into their daily classroom assessments. These include teachers' years of experience (Bol et al.,1998; Koloi-Keaikitse, 2012; Lewkowicz & Zawadowska-Kittel, 201; Matovu & Zubairi, 2014; Suah & Ong, 2012), higher academic qualifications (Koloi-Keaikitse, 2012; Matovu & Zubairi, 2014), assessment purposes (Gonzales & Aliponga, 2012; Saito & Inoi, 2017), and professional development

(Al-Nouh, 2014; Li, & Yongqi GU, 2023; Matovu & Zubairi, 2014; Nasr et al., 2019; Saito & Inoi, 2017; Widiastuti et al., 2020). Other researchers found additional influential factors related to students, such as their expectations of learning English, motivation, levels of proficiency (Nasr et al., 2019) and more importantly, their understanding of AfL and their active role in the assessment (Lee & Conaim, 2013). Likewise, literature on assessment practices reported certain meso-level factors significantly influencing teachers' effective assessment practices. For instance, researchers (e.g., Al-Nouh et al, 2014; Gonzales & Aliponga, 2012; Han & Kaya, 2014; Nasr et al., 2019) found that EFL teachers' assessment practices tend to be negatively affected by certain limitations, such as teachers' heavy workloads, large classes, and limited class time.

As can be observed from the abovementioned studies, scholars investigated AfL and AaL from different perspectives; nevertheless, exploring EFL teachers' practices of AaL in their instruction and the underlying factors influencing the assessment practices is still limited. Moreover, little is known about how EFL teachers in Saudi Arabian K-12 schools employ AfL and AaL in their teaching. Identifying this as a gap in the literature, this study aims to explore the current use of AfL and AaL in EFL classrooms in Saudi Arabian public schools. Specifically, this study is guided by the following three research questions:

RQ1-What are teachers' practices of assessment for learning (AfL)?

RQ2- What are teachers' practices of assessment as learning (AaL)?

RQ3- What are teachers' practices of formative feedback?

RQ4- What are the Influential Factors on EFL teachers' practices of AfL and AaL?

3. Research Methods

2.1 Design

We employed an explanatory mixed-method design with a
questionnaire, and semi-structured individual interviews to explore
the frequency of using AfL and AaL in EFL instruction among K-12
teachers. First, a close-ended questionnaire was developed and
distributed online among participants. Second, interviews were
conducted with teachers who volunteered to participate, where
teachers were asked to interpret questionnaire results from their
perspective. We selected this design primarily due to its suitability
for collecting data from a large sample of EFL teachers in Saudi
Arabia and optimising the use of quantitative and qualitative
methods (Cohen et al., 2007).

2.2 Participants

In total, 486 EFL teachers from Saudi Arabian public schools
teaching at intermediate and secondary levels volunteered to
participate in this study. As a percentage, 63% of participants are
females, while 37% are males. Regarding years of experience
teaching EFL, 12.1% (n = 59) had 1-6 years, 22.4% (n = 109) had 7-
11 years, and 65.4% (n = 318) had more than 11 years of experience.

2.3 Instruments and Data Collection

The first instrument is a four-Likert scale questionnaire designed
based on previous literature on AfL and AaL (e.g., Bartlett, 2015;
Black & William, 2009) covering all principles and feedback types,
which are essential components of AfL and AaL. Each selection
represents the frequency of practice of each item (always = 4 to
3.25, Occasionally = 3.24 to 2.50, Rarely = 2.49 to 1.75, Never=
1.74 to 1). A group of eight experts in curriculum and instruction
and applied linguistics reviewed the questionnaire to evaluate its

validity and provide any relevant language and content recommendations. The modified questionnaire was then piloted with a sample of 30 EFL teachers, included in the study sample, to obtain feedback on item comprehension and response time. Data from the pilot questionnaire resulted in the deletion of an unnecessary item. The final version of the questionnaire was analysed for reliability using Cronbach's alpha, yielding a coefficient value of .92, which is an acceptable level of reliability (Cohen et al., 2007). The final questionnaire was converted into an electronic format using Google Forms and distributed to all K-12 EFL teachers in Saudi Arabia via educational offices, professional social media networks and online community groups. The Collected data from the online questionnaire were analysed using SPSS (version, 25) to present the characteristics of participants and determine the frequency of assessment practices reported by EFL teachers.

2.4 Semi-structured interviews

Among the questionnaire participants who expressed their desire to participate in the interviews, five teachers were able to participate in the semi-structured interviews. To this end, we designed an interview protocol of main questions and follow-ups drawn from the quantitative results obtained from the questionnaire to guide the interviews with teachers. We conducted the semi-structured interviews virtually on Zoom, with each lasting for about 40 minutes. At the beginning of the interviews, we informed participants of the purpose of the interviews, its importance for understanding their FA practices, and confirmation of the anonymity of their data and their use solely for research purposes.

Table 1

EFL Teachers' Practices of AfL

N	Statement	M	SD	(%)	Practice frequency	Order
1	I examine students' prior knowledge of the subject before I begin teaching the assigned EFL skill.	3.19	0.83	79.75	High	12
2	I share learning objectives with students at the beginning of each lesson and for each skill.	3.50	0.76	87.5	Very High	2
3	I assign students activities that meet their language needs.	3.52	0.62	88	Very High	1
4	I design sequential activities to develop students' four English skills.	3.26	0.74	81.5	Very High	10
5	I engage students in collaborative activities to develop their English skills.	3.44	0.70	86	Very High	4
6	I grant students enough time to correct their common language errors in the class.	3.29	0.72	82.25	Very High	9
7	I share a checklist of criteria with students of what and how I will assess their assignments.	2.97	0.95	74.25	High	13
8	I give students opportunities to improve their writing assignments after receiving my feedback.	3.24	0.87	81	High	11
9	I make necessary adjustments to the way I teach English based on the assessment results.	3.34	0.68	83.5	Very High	8
10	I categorise students into groups based on their English assessment results.	2.75	1.00	68.75	High	14
11	I inform my students of their English strengths.	3.45	0.74	86.25	Very High	3
12	I inform my students of how to utilise their strengths to promote their English proficiency.	3.37	0.70	84.25	Very High	5
13	I inform my students of their English weak points.	3.35	0.73	83.75	Very High	7
14	I update students regularly of their progress in English.	3.36	0.71	84	Very High	6
	Total	3.29	0.46	82.25	Very High	

3. Results
RQ1-What are teachers' practices of AfL?

Table 1 depicts the findings of the EFL teachers' practices of AfL. As shown in Table 2, EFL teachers reported a very high level of these practices in their classrooms. The overall mean of these practices was 3.29 (82.25%), and the items ranged from 2.75 (68.75%) to 3.52 (88 %). Item 8 (M=3.76, 83.5%), item 3 (M=3.52, 86.25%), and item 2 (M=3.50, 87.5%) scored the highest level of practice. On the contrary, item 10 (M=2.75, 68.75%), item 7 (M=2.97, 74.25%), and item 1 (M=3.19, 79.75%) obtained the lowest practice among EFL teachers regarding AfL.

RQ2- What are teachers' practices of assessment as learning

(AaL)

Table 2

EFL Teachers' Practices of AaL

N	Statement	M	SD	(%)	Practice frequency	Order
15	I encourage my students to self-reflect upon their learning. e.g., using the learning table (KWL) strategy.	2.97	0.92	74.25	High	3
16	I encourage my students to decide on their objectives in learning English.	3.10	0.94	77.5	High	2
17	I encourage my students to select their preferred English learning strategies.	2.96	0.94	74	High	4
18	I encourage students to raise questions in English.	3.57	0.63	89.25	Very High	1
	Total	3.15	0.64	78.75	High	

Based on Table 2, EFL teachers' practices of AaL were high (M=3.15, 78.75%). The items of their practices ranged from 2.96 (74%) to 3.57 (89.25%). Item 4 (M=3.57, 89.25%) had the highest score. Besides, item 2 (M=3.10, 77.5%) was highly employed by teachers. On the other hand, item 1 (M=2.97, 74.25%) and item 3 (M=2.96, 74%), were the lowest levels of practice by EFL teachers, indicating the weakness of EFL teachers in encouraging their students to self-reflect upon their learning and select their preferred English learning strategies.

RQ3- What are teachers' practices of formative feedback?

Table 3

EFL Teachers' Practices of Formative Feedback

N	Statement	M	SD	(%)	Practice Frequency	Order
19	I provide oral feedback on students' assignments based on success criteria.	3.38	0.74	84.5	Very High	1
20	I provide written feedback on students' assignments based on success criteria.	3.12	0.84	78	High	3
21	I use a rubric to assess students' productive skills, e.g., writing and speaking.	2.98	0.91	74.5	High	6
22	I comment on students' assignments right after submission.	3.27	0.81	81.75	Very High	2
23	I provide descriptive feedback on students' assignments instead of grades.	2.98	0.91	74.5	High	5
24	I use the Madrasati platform and Microsoft Office Apps to provide feedback.	3.05	0.93	76.25	High	4
25	I let students self-assess their writing assignments based on success criteria.	2.84	0.93	71	High	7
26	I let students assess the writing assignment of their peers based on success criteria.	2.80	0.94	70	High	8
	Total	3.05	0.60	76.25	High	

Table 3 depicts the results of teachers' practices of engaging students in different forms of formative feedback. Obviously, EFL teachers practised formative feedback at a high level (M=3.05, 76.25%). Their practices ranged from 2.80 (70%) to 3.38 (84.5%). The results showed that item 1 (M=3.38, 84.5%) was highly practised by EFL teachers, indicating their preference for the use of oral feedback. The second highest level is item 4 (M=3.27, 81.75%), suggesting that EFL teachers provide timely feedback. Item 2 (M=3.12, 78%), item 6 (M=3.12, 76.25%), item 5 (M=2.98, 74.5%), and item 3 (M=2.98, 74.5%), were frequently practised by EFL teachers. Expectedly, teachers' practice of peer assessment (M=2.80, 70%) and self-assessment (M=2.84, 71%) had the lowest level.

RQ4- What are the Influential Factors on EFL teachers' practices of AfL and AaL?

The thematic analysis showed three main themes representing influential factors for EFL teachers' assessment practices. Two themes were found to support their implementation of AfL strategies, while one theme appeared to hinder their implementation of agency-based assessment strategies. The first theme that was found to be a factor supporting teachers' high-level implementation of AfL practices was years of experience. The questionnaire results showed that 65.4% of EFL teachers had more than 11 years of experience and this trend was also reflected in the interview sample. Three of the five EFL teachers interviewed had extensive teaching experience: T1 with 21 years, T2 with 12 years, and T4 with 17 years. The other two interviewees had comparatively less experience: T3 with 9 years and T5 with 5 years of teaching experience.

Another supporting theme we identified was EFL teachers' professional development. Three interviewed EFL teachers highlighted the benefits of participation in Khebrat, a year-long international observational program offered by the Ministry of Education. Through this program, teachers observed classes conducted by educators in English-speaking countries. The three participants reported that this experience enhanced various aspects of their classroom assessment strategies, e.g., questioning, providing feedback, designing rubrics, implementing peer assessments, and using differentiated instruction, stating:

before Khebrat I was [..] was an assistant teacher [..] but after Khebrat in Australia ..I could say that I'm rich I reached the highest level of being a teacher a real teacher. [..] by using questioning at the beginning of the class to the end of the class from beginning to ask some warm-up questions to the feedback I give to the students (T2).

I observed some strategies and some procedures like [..] their use of rubrics for assessment [..] Feedback I use it as a group or individually and also I let them evaluate each other [..] also I let them exchange their sheets between each other as a group so if they need my feedback discuss with them (T4).

I try to incorporate differentiated instruction into my evaluation as well [..] my assessment depends on the learning style of the student himself [..] because if you evaluate him in any other way, he's going to get a lower score. That doesn't mean he had a lower skill; he just needs to be evaluated in a different way (T1).

The thematic analysis has also revealed several institutional limitations that negatively influence certain assessment practices.

These barriers were limited class time, class size and heavy workload. Notably, all interviewed teachers identified class time as a major constraint preventing the full implementation of AfL and AaL strategies. These concerns are evident in the following quotes:

'I think because of the time we only have 45 minutes, there is no time actually to do a lot of written feedback' (T3).
'It's time for me. It's time consuming' (T5).
'Teachers don't use them because there isn't enough time' (T1)
'Most of the teachers don't have enough time' (T2).
'They take long time' (T4).

EFL teachers have also identified class size and workload as other barriers besides time constraints. These concerns were articulated in the following statements: 'It's a big challenge actually for the teachers to deal with 40 or sometimes more than 40 students in the class' (T3). This was also echoed by T2, who has also identified the workload as another major challenge, stating: 'for me I have 24 classes. Each day I have five classes [..] we have small classes with up to around 32 students in a class [..] I teach three textbooks'.

4. Discussion

This current study aimed to explore the frequency with which EFL teachers in Saudi Arabian public schools employed AfL and AaL in their classroom assessments. Besides, the study aimed to determine the main factors perceived by EFL teachers to influence their assessment practices. In line with findings from previous studies (Nasr et al., 2019; Oz, 2014; Saito & Inoi, 2017) results of the questionnaire revealed that EFL teachers tend to apply AfL at very high levels. More particularly, they integrate AfL primarily through sharing learning goals, addressing students' needs, fostering student

participation, delivering timely and oral feedback, and modifying instruction based on assessments. Nonetheless, monitoring strategies, including frequent quizzes, assessing prior learning, developing criteria checklists, and writing descriptive feedback, were found to be practised slightly less than scaffolding strategies.

The semi-structured interviews have also provided valuable insights into how EFL teachers' years of teaching experience and professional development have positively influenced their use of AfL. Sach (2012) reported a comparable finding, indicating a connection between EFL teachers' years of experience and their positive perception of FA, i.e., teachers with 11 to 20 years of experience tended to view FA positively as an aid for student learning. Sach (2012) interpreted this connection that experienced teachers often hold supervisory positions and provide school-based training to their colleagues. Likewise, James and Pedder (2006) pointed out that teachers with more experience had access to numerous professional development programs and conferences that helped them develop their assessment knowledge and skills. As evidenced in our study, the majority of EFL teachers had over 11 years of experience and engaged in extensive practical professional development, i.e. Khebrat. Such participation in a prolonged professional development program was found to be a contributing factor in EFL teachers' understanding of AfL and their desirable assessment practices (Li & Yongqi Gu, 2023).

Surprisingly, despite having reported overall high levels of AfL, they showed less inclination for practices encouraging students' agency, such as allowing them to reflect on their learning, set their learning goals, select their preferred assessments, and assess their own and peers' work. This finding is in agreement with Lee and Coniam's (2013) conclusion that EFL teachers tend to incorporate

AfL strategies, while not as likely to integrate AaL strategies that promote the voice of students in assessment. Likewise, this result incorporates the study of Yildirim and Bilican Demir (2022) revealing how AaL practices are not fully employed for assessing EFL in K-12 settings. A possible interpretation of this finding was offered by Wu et al. (2021) that EFL teachers lack trust in students to assess their performance while some teachers may lack the necessary assessment literacy skills, which is essential for effective AFL implementation (Xu & Brown, 2016). As Lee and Conaim (2013) have also explained, the emphasis placed on summative assessments, which is predominant in Saudi Arabian public schools (OECD, 2020), may have also influenced the disinclination of EFL teachers to implement AaL, given that teachers and students in the summative assessments are primarily focused more on grading than AaL practices that promote learning. It is also worth mentioning that EFL teachers have reported experiencing constraining factors, e.g., class time and size and heavy workload, which might have also influenced their limited use of student-centred assessments. Research (e.g., Al-Nouh et al., 2014; Han & Kaya, 2014; Nasr et al., 2019; Sulaiman et al., 2020) has frequently highlighted similar constraints, supporting the notion that instructional resources play an important role in the effective and varied assessment practices.

5. Conclusion

This study aimed to explore how frequently AFL and AaL are currently employed by EFL teachers working in Saudi Arabian intermediate and secondary public schools and identify factors that seemed to influence their employment as reported by EFL teachers. The overall quantitative data revealed that Saudi EFL teachers tend to practise AfL and AaL from high to very high levels, with more emphasis being paid to advancing students' learning of English than

supporting their voices in the assessment process. The qualitative findings have also provided more insights into how EFL teachers' teaching experience, additional qualifications and long-standing practical professional development programs such as Khebrat positively influenced their assessment practices. Yet, certain institutional limitations have challenged the optimal implementation of AaL strategies. Such limitations should be addressed directly by the MOE with sustained hands-on training programs that equip EFL teachers with the necessary skills to implement more student-centred assessments. Examples include engaging EFL teachers in more model lessons and field trips that show how student-led assessments could be applied in EFL classrooms. It is also necessary that the MOE review the regulations related the class time, the number of students per class and more importantly the teaching load allotted for each teacher, as this step would allow teachers more time and motivation to apply the AfL and AaL procedures. It is also recommended that EFL teachers optimise the Madrasati platform features to strengthen the implementation of AfL and AaL and develop a relationship of trust with students to encourage them to take responsibility for their learning in virtual environments.

This study has contributed to FA literature, specifically on how frequently AfL and AaL are employed in EFL classrooms in K-12 education; nevertheless, it has certain limitations that need to be addressed by future research. Firstly, this research is based on self-reported data, which may differ from real classroom practices. Thus, future research could employ classroom observations to ensure more accurate results. In addition, the current findings focus on the practices of EFL teachers for intermediate and secondary levels; therefore, researchers need to explore the incorporation of AfL and AaL approaches into the assessment practices of EFL teachers working with younger students. These would enrich the literature on

AfL and AaL in the EFL context and provide valuable insights for reducing the gap between theoretical frameworks and practical applications.

References

−Al-Nouh, N., Taqi, H., & Abdul-Kareem, M. (2014). EFL primary school teachers' attitudes, knowledge and skills in alternative assessment. *International Education Studies*, *7*(5), 68-84.

−Ali, H. D., & Mjenda, M. (2024). Teachers' understanding of classroom assessment: Insights from English language teachers in Dodoma municipality, Tanzania. *Cogent Education*, *11*(1), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2380627

−Bartlett, J. (2015). *Outstanding assessment for learning in the classroom*. Routledge.

−Beekman, K., Joosten-Ten Brinke, D., & Boshuizen, E. (2021). Sustainability of developed self-regulation by means of formative assessment among young adolescents: A longitudinal study. *Frontiers in Education*, 6, 746819, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.746819

−Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy, and Practice*, *5*(1), 7–73. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102

−Black, P., Harrison, C., Lee, C., Marshall, B., & Wiliam, D. (2004). Working inside the black box: Assessment for learning in the classroom. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *86*(1), 8-21. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F003172170408600105

−Black, P., and Wiliam, D. (2009). Advancing the concept of formative assessment. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Accountability*, *21*(1), 5–31. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-008-9068-5.

−Bol, L., Stephenson, P. L., O'Connell, A. A., & Nunnery, J. A. (1998). Influence of experience, grade level, and subject area on teachers' assessment practices. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *91*, 323 –330.

−Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). Routledge.

−Dann, R. (2014). Assessment as learning: Blurring the boundaries of assessment and learning for theory, policy and practice. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, *21*(2), 149-166. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2014.898128

−Davies, A., Pantzopoulos, K., & Gray, K. (2011). Emphasising assessment 'as' learning by assessing wiki writing assignments collaboratively and publicly online. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, *27*(5). 798-812. https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.932

−Earl, L. (2013). *Assessment as learning: Using classroom assessment to maximize student learning*. Corwin Press.

−Education and Training Evaluation Commission (ETEC). (2022). الإطار الوطني لمعايير مناهج التعليم العام في المملكة العربية السعودية [*National framework of curriculum standards for general education in Saudi Arabia*] (2ⁿᵈ ed.). Retrieved from https://spapi.etec.gov.sa:2443/ar/MediaAssets/NCSEE/%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A5%D8%B7%D8%A7%D8%B1%20%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%88%D8%B7%D9%86%D9%8A%20%D9%84%D9%85%D8%B9%D8%A7%D9%8A%D9%8A%D8%B1%20%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%85%D9%86%D8%A7%D9%87%D8%AC.pdf?csf=1&e=AWKyt3
−Fulmer, G. W., Tan, K. H. K., & Lee, C. H. I. (2017): Relationships among Singaporean secondary teachers' conceptions of assessment and school and policy contextual factors. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 1* – 17.
−http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2017.1336427
−Gonzales, R. D., & Aliponga, J. (2012). Classroom assessment preferences of Japanese language teachers in the Philippines and English language teachers in Japan. *MEXTESOL Journal*, *36*, 1–19. http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2746287
−Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, *77*(1), 81–112. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487
−Han, T., & Kaya, H. İ. (2014). Turkish EFL teachers' assessment preferences and practices in the context of constructivist instruction. *Journal of Studies in Education*, *4*(1), 77–93. http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/jse.v4i1.4873
−Koloi-Keaikitse, S. (2012). Classroom assessment practices: A survey of Botswana primary and secondary school teachers (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ball State University, Indiana).
−Lam, R. (2020). Investigating assessment as learning in second language writing: A qualitative research perspective. *International Journal of Qualitative Method*s, 19, 1609406920938572. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406920938572
−Lee, I. (2016). Putting students at the center of classroom L2 writing assessment. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, *72*(2), 258–280. http://dx.doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.2802.
−Lee, I. (2017). *Classroom writing assessment and feedback in L2 school contexts*. Springer
−Lee, I., & Coniam, D. (2013). Introducing assessment for learning for EFL writing in an assessment of learning examination-driven system in Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 22*(1), 34-50.

−Lee, I., Mak, P., & Yuan, R. E. (2019). Assessment as learning in primary writing classrooms: An exploratory study. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 62, 72-81. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2019.04.012

−Laveault, D., Allal, L. (2016). Implementing Assessment for Learning: Theoretical and Practical Issues. In: Laveault, D., Allal, L. (eds) *Assessment for Learning: Meeting the Challenge of Implementation. The Enabling Power of Assessment* (Vol 4, pp. 1-18). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-39211-0_1

−Lewkowicz, J., & Zawadowska-Kittel, E. (2011). Classroom-based assessment: The Polish case. In D. Tsagari & I. Csepes (Eds.), *Classroom-based language assessmen*t (pp. 147–167). Peter Lang.

−Li, J., & Yongqi GU, P. (2023). Developing classroom-based formative assessment literacy: An EFL teacher's journey. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *46*(2), 198-218. https://doi.org/10.1515/CJAL-2023-0204

−Matovu, M., & Zubairi, A. (2014). Factors influencing assessment practices among university academic staff: A multiple regression analysis. *Mevlana International Journal of Education, 4*(1), 176-188.

−Nasr, M., Bagheri, M. S., Sadighi, F., Rassaei, E., & van de Weijer, J. (2019). Iranian EFL teachers' assessment for learning practices and barriers: Do textbooks taught and teaching context matter? *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, *6*(1). 1-28. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2019.1646691

−Öz, H. (2014). Turkish teachers' practices of assessment for learning in the English as a foreign language classroom. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *5*(4). 775-785. http://dx.doi.org/10.4304/jltr.5.4.775-785

−Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2020). *Education in Saudi Arabia*. https://www.oecdilibrary.org/sites/3440245aen/index.html?itemId=/content/component/3440245a-en.

−Panadero, E., Jonsson, A., and Strijbos, J.W. (2016). Scaffolding self-regulated learning through self-assessment and peer assessment: Guidelines for classroom implementation. In D. Laveault & L. Allal (Eds.), *Assessment for learning: Meeting the challenge of implementation. The enabling power of assessment* (pp. 311-326). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-39211-0_18

−Ross, J. A. (2019). The reliability, validity, and utility of self-assessment. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, *11*(1), 10. https://doi.org/10.7275/9wph-vv65

−https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2017.1351975

- Saito, H., & Inoi, S. I. (2017). Junior and senior high school EFL teachers' use of formative assessment: A mixed-methods study. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, *14*(3), 213-233. https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2017.1351975

- Schildkamp, K., van der Kleij, F. M., Heitink, M. C., Kippers, W. B., & Veldkamp, B. P. (2020). Formative assessment: A systematic review of critical teacher prerequisites for classroom practice. *International Journal of Educational Research, 103*, 101602. 1-16 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2020.101602

- Sulaiman, T., Kotamjani, S. S., Rahim, S. S. A., & Hakim, M. N. (2020). Malaysian public university lecturers' perceptions and practices of formative and alternative assessments. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 19*(5), 379-394. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.19.5.23

- Suah, S. L., & Ong, S. L. (2012). Investigating assessment practices of in-service teachers. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences, 4*(1), 91–106.

- Suah, S. L., & Ong, S. L. (2012). An investigation into teachers' perceptions of formative assessment. *Educational Studies*, *38*(3), 261-276. https://doi.org/10.1080/03055698.2011.598684

- Topping, K. (2018). *Using peer assessment to inspire reflection and learning*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2011.03.001

- Wiliam, D. (2011). What is assessment for learning?. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, *37*(1), 3–14.

- Widiastuti, I. A. M. S., Mukminatien, N., Prayogo, J. A., & Irawati, E. (2020). Dissonances between teachers' beliefs and practices of formative assessment in EFL classes. *International Journal of Instruction*, *13*(1), 71-84. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2020.1315a

- Wu, X. M., Zhang, L. J., & Liu, Q. (2021). Using assessment for learning: Multi-case studies of three Chinese University English as a foreign language (EFL) teachers engaging students in learning and assessment. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 725132. 1-15. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.725132

- Yıldırım, Ö., & Demir, S. B. (2022). Inside the black box: do teachers practice assessment as learning?. *International Journal of Assessment Tools in Education*, *9*(Special Issue), 46-71. https://doi.org/10.21449/ijate.1132923

- Yin, S., Chen, F., & Chang, H. (2022). Assessment as Learning: How Does Peer Assessment Function in Students' Learning?. *Frontiers in psychology*, 13, 912568. 1-14. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.912568