

Evaluating Assessment Practices in a Language Teaching Sequence: The Role of Policy and Continuous Review in Enhancing Formative Assessment

Imad Nasr, Al Jinan University, Lebanon

The Paris Conference on Education 2025
Official Conference Proceedings

Abstract

This small-scale qualitative study explores the assessment practices in Arabic language instruction within the International Baccalaureate (IB) Middle Years Programme (MYP), focusing on the balance between formative (Assessment for Learning – AfL) and summative (Assessment of Learning – AoL) approaches. Drawing on literature that emphasizes the evolving purpose of assessment in language learning, the research examines how formative strategies, such as questioning, peer collaboration, and self-assessment, can enhance student engagement, reduce anxiety, and support deeper learning. Semi-structured interviews with teachers of Arabic as a foreign language (Arabic B), classroom observations, and a student interview were conducted to provide a rich, contextual understanding of current practices and perceptions. Findings reveal that while teachers value formative assessment for its role in facilitating feedback and promoting autonomy, institutional pressures tied to grading and reporting often prioritize summative evaluations. This tension hinders the consistent implementation of AfL strategies, despite their pedagogical benefits. Observations demonstrated effective use of interactive techniques; however, a more strategic and policy-aligned integration of formative assessment is needed. The study highlights the importance of professional development and clear assessment frameworks that empower teachers to make informed instructional decisions. Ultimately, the research calls for a more balanced and integrated approach to assessment in MFL and Arabic language classrooms, one that aligns pedagogical intentions with institutional expectations and places student learning and well-being at the centre.

Keywords: formative assessment, summative assessment, language acquisition, IB MYP, pedagogical approaches, student engagement

iafor

The International Academic Forum
www.iafor.org

Introduction

Assessment plays an essential role in shaping both teaching strategies and student learning outcomes, serving multiple functions: it helps evaluate students' understanding and progress, informs instructional decisions, and supports the development of effective pedagogy (Brooks, 2002; Scarino, 2013). Garrison and Ehringhaus (2007) and Mertler (2009) argue that assessment impacts every stage of educational planning and delivery, while Eckhout et al. (2005, p. 3) state that "effective teaching cannot exist without effective assessment." Despite this consensus, there remains an ongoing debate about the purposes of assessment, particularly the balance between formative (assessment for learning) and summative (assessment of learning) approaches, and how they are applied in real classroom settings.

This study investigates assessment practices within a language teaching sequence in the International Baccalaureate (IB) Middle Years Programme (MYP), with a particular focus on Arabic B, a foreign language course offered in an international secondary school. While the IB framework promotes a holistic, student-centred approach to assessment that emphasizes inquiry, conceptual understanding, and critical thinking (International Baccalaureate Organization [IBO], 2014) the practical implementation of these principles often reveals tensions between formative ideals and summative priorities.

To explore these dynamics, I conducted a small-scale qualitative case study in the school setting. The research involved two primary methods: a review of assessment-related documents (e.g., unit plans, marking criteria, and student work samples) and a series of informal, semi-structured interviews with Arabic language teachers, coordinators, and one student. The aim was to evaluate how assessment policies and practices are interpreted and applied at the classroom level, and to what extent continuous review supports the development of formative assessment strategies.

This paper highlights the challenges teachers face in embedding formative assessment meaningfully within a system that places considerable weight on summative outcomes. It also examines how policy directives and school-level expectations shape assessment practices and teacher agency. By critically evaluating these factors, the research offers insights that enrich the wider scholarly dialogue on improving language assessment in international school contexts. In a nutshell, the research seeks to contribute to the ongoing conversation around improving assessment in language education by examining the alignment or misalignment between policy, practice, and pedagogy.

Review of Relevant Literature

The understanding of assessment has evolved over time, reflecting broader shifts in educational priorities and pedagogy (Sumner, 2002). Traditionally, it was seen as a way to evaluate students' strengths and weaknesses, enabling teachers to monitor progress and tailor instruction (Heaton, 1990). Stiggins (1992) and Garrison and Ehringhaus (2007) further position assessment as a feedback mechanism that informs teaching and supports instructional decisions based on student growth.

Research, most notably by Black and Wiliam (1998), highlights the power of formative assessment, or what's called Assessment for Learning (AfL), in enhancing student achievement. AfL is characterized by its ongoing, informal nature and its focus on guiding future learning rather than merely recording past performance. Black and Wiliam (2003) note

that formative assessment, occurring throughout a lesson, offers real-time insights into student understanding, while Garrison and Ehringhaus (2007) argue that it enables teachers to adjust instruction responsively for deeper learning and equity.

Despite growing support for formative methods, many systems still prioritize summative assessment (AoL) as the main measure of achievement. Black and Wiliam (2003) acknowledge the need for formal assessments in high-stakes contexts. Dixon and Worrell (2016) define summative assessments as evaluations at the end of an instructional period, typically via formal tests, yet Harlen (2007) notes they offer few opportunities for reflection or immediate improvement.

The dominance of summative assessment poses challenges, especially in language education where continuous feedback is crucial. Scholars like Maki (2002) and Boud (2006) warn that overreliance on summative measures can undermine motivation, increase stress, and harm lower-performing students. Harlen (2007) argues that assessment should be sensitive to student well-being. In contrast, Miller and Lavin (2007) suggest that integrating formative practices into daily instruction better supports development, while Bennett (2011) finds that well-designed formative assessments boost achievement, self-esteem, and engagement.

Finally, assessment policy and continuous review are vital in shaping effective classroom practices. Clear policies that prioritize formative assessment create balanced, inclusive learning environments (Black & Wiliam, 1998) by reducing ambiguity and alleviating student anxiety, enabling teachers to refine their strategies through ongoing reflection.

Overall, this literature underscores the need for a deliberate, policy-driven approach to assessment that values formative processes alongside summative measures and ensures regular review to meet the evolving needs of learners and educators.

Modern Foreign Language Learning

Over the past two decades, language learning has undergone significant transformation. This evolution has been shaped by three main factors: teachers' knowledge of assessment, the impact of teacher training, and assessment literacy (Vahid & Nasreen, 2019). Inbar-Lourie (2008) suggests that assessment literacy, when used as a reflective practice, enables language teachers to critically analyse the aims, available resources, and situational conditions of assessment practices, and explore how the findings can be effectively put to use.

In the British curriculum's Key Stage 3, current language teaching practices aim to improve students' abilities in all language skills while supporting them with key grammar and vocabulary. This approach encourages learners to communicate effectively and express themselves beyond their immediate needs (Department for Education [DfE], n.d.). The IB curriculum likewise promotes multilingualism and intercultural understanding. In the IB MYP language acquisition framework, the focus is on developing competency in language skills, rather than strict grammatical learning, while supporting students' mother tongues.

Assessment in IB MYP language acquisition centres on student progression in language skills, with a strong emphasis on formative assessments. Summative assessments also play a crucial role, taking place multiple times throughout the academic year. Following clear objectives and assessment criteria is essential. Rubric-based assessments outline learning expectations across the three phases of language acquisition: emergent, capable, and

proficient. To address the diverse needs of all students, assessments are designed in various formats and ensure accessibility for all students. Multimodality in teaching, learning, and assessment is a significant advancement introduced in 2020 to align with modern educational practices (IB MYP Language Acquisition Guide, 2020). Furthermore, IB MYP requires collaborative assessment planning prior to teaching each unit, as the curriculum is inquiry-based and conceptual in nature, covering all subjects (IBO, 2020).

In the UAE, the Ministry of Education (MoE) has established a framework for teaching and assessing Arabic as an additional language. This framework aligns with the assessment practices of schools offering various curricula, including IB MYP. The MYP language acquisition assessment aligns with the MoE framework in its emphasis on summative assessment of the four language skills. However, the MoE framework uses language proficiency levels determined by how many years non-Arab learners have been exposed to Arabic instruction, rather than their actual abilities, making it challenging for teachers and students to meet these expectations (Ministry of Education [MoE], 2017).

Questioning as a Formative Assessment Tool

Questioning is a central aspect of formative assessment, allowing teachers to gauge students' understanding and performance, which in turn informs future teaching strategies aimed at improving language skills. It plays a dual role not only as a diagnostic tool but also as an instructional strategy that actively shapes learning. Black and Wiliam (2003) argue that questioning is not merely a method of checking knowledge but a key element of effective teaching, contributing significantly to student engagement and the creation of an interactive classroom environment. Through thoughtful questioning, teachers can challenge students to reflect, elaborate on their answers, and clarify misconceptions. Chin (2007) emphasizes that well-crafted questions promote higher-order thinking, helping learners develop deeper comprehension and the ability to make connections across different linguistic concepts.

In the context of Modern Foreign Language (MFL) classes, questioning serves a particularly important function. It is routinely employed to support the development of core language skills (Pronunciation, writing, reading, and listening) by drawing attention to patterns, structures, and usage. Teachers use questioning to clarify complex grammar rules, expand vocabulary, and prompt students to construct more sophisticated responses. According to (Department for Education [DfE], 2003), strategic questioning can significantly enhance linguistic accuracy and fluency, making it a cornerstone of effective MFL instruction.

Self and Peer Assessments

Self- and peer-assessment are vital components of formative assessment, fostering greater student autonomy and ownership of learning. Self-assessment encourages learners to reflect critically on their own work, set personal goals, and identify areas for improvement, thus cultivating independent learning skills (Spendlove, 2009). According to Black and Wiliam (2018), honest and structured self-assessment contributes to the development of metacognitive skills, enabling students to monitor their progress and adjust their learning strategies accordingly. Andrade and Du (2007) also highlight the importance of clearly defined rubrics and criteria in supporting effective self-assessment, as they provide learners with concrete benchmarks for evaluating their work.

Peer assessment, meanwhile, allows students to engage in collaborative learning by evaluating and providing constructive feedback on each other's performance. Gielen et al. (2010) emphasize that peer assessment develops critical thinking and communication skills while promoting accountability and active engagement. However, the success of peer assessment largely depends on clear guidance and the establishment of transparent learning objectives and criteria (Black et al., 2003). Some students, as noted by Butt (2010), may initially view peer assessment as a teacher's duty, leading to hesitation or lack of confidence in giving feedback. Therefore, training and gradual implementation are essential to ensure effectiveness and student buy-in.

Research Methodology

This small-scale qualitative study employed three primary research methods: a semi-structured teacher interview, a lesson observation, and a student interview. All data collection took place face-to-face within the school environment to ensure contextual relevance and capture a deeper understanding of classroom interactions, teacher perspectives, and the student experience.

A purposive sampling strategy (a form of non-probability sampling) was used to select participants, focusing on two Arabic B teachers from the Middle Years Programme (MYP). For confidentiality and ethical integrity, the teachers are referred to as "A" and "B", the student as "S", and the school as "T". School T follows the International Baccalaureate (IB) curriculum and serves around 1450 students across its 4 programmes: Primary Years Programme (PYP), Middle Years Programme (MYP), Diploma Programme (DP), and Career-related Programme (CP).

The study adhered to British Educational Research Association (BERA) ethical guidelines (2018). Written approval was obtained from school leadership, and informed consent was secured from all participants, including parental consent for the student interview.

The semi-structured teacher interview lasted 30 minutes and was audio-recorded for accuracy, as recommended by Robson and McCartan (2016). Recordings were transcribed verbatim, securely stored on an encrypted laptop, and deleted post-transcription in line with General Data Protection Regulation [GDPR], 2018.

A live, in-person observation was conducted in a Grade 9 Arabic B class taught by Teacher B, providing insights into classroom practice and assessment use. A brief student interview followed to explore learner perceptions, triangulating the findings.

Research Questions

This research was structured around the following key questions:

1. How do Arabic B teachers perceive and implement formative assessment practices within their classrooms?
2. What formative assessment strategies are most commonly used in the teaching of Arabic as an additional language, and how are these integrated alongside summative assessments?
3. How do students experience and perceive formative assessment practices in Arabic B classes?

4. What institutional or structural factors influence the implementation and balance of formative and summative assessment in Arabic B instruction?

Data Collection

Three qualitative data collection methods were employed in this study: a semi-structured teacher interview, a lesson observation, and a student interview. This multimethod approach enhanced data triangulation and provided a comprehensive understanding of assessment practices within the Arabic B classroom.

A semi-structured interview was conducted with Teacher A, chosen for its flexibility and capacity to generate rich, in-depth insights into educators' lived experiences and professional perspectives. Unlike structured interviews, this format allows for follow-up and probing questions, leading to more nuanced responses (Robson & McCartan, 2016). One limitation, however, is the potential for bias—both from the interviewer and interviewee (Cohen et al., 2018). In this case, the prior professional relationship between the researcher and Teacher A may have contributed to unintentionally socially desirable or overly positive responses. Nonetheless, the interview yielded valuable insights that might have been inaccessible through more rigid or quantitative methods.

The second method was a lesson observation of a Grade 9 Arabic B class taught by Teacher B. Conducted face-to-face, it enabled the researcher to take detailed notes on instructional strategies, teacher-student interactions, and classroom dynamics. Observations are often considered more objective than interviews, as they capture teaching practices as they naturally occur (Wellington, 2015). Yet, observational data remain open to interpretation, introducing subjectivity. To minimise this, the researcher maintained a non-intrusive presence and focused on descriptive field notes. The existing rapport with staff also helped ensure a typical lesson structure, reducing the risk of the Hawthorne effect (Thomas, 2017).

The third method involved a brief semi-structured interview with a Grade 9 student (Student S) who participated in the observed lesson. It explored the learner's perspective on assessment practices, particularly formative feedback and summative evaluation. While student interviews offer valuable insights, they are influenced by confidence, language proficiency, and willingness to speak openly. To address this, the interview was conducted in a supportive environment and adapted to suit the student's comfort and comprehension. This interview served as a crucial triangulation point, adding context to teacher input and classroom observation.

Together, these three methods offered a holistic view of assessment practice and experience in the Arabic B classroom, reflecting multiple stakeholder perspectives.

Data Analysis and Findings

When asked to define assessment for learning, Teacher A articulated a view closely aligned with established academic definitions. He described it as an ongoing, informal process aimed at supporting student learning rather than assigning grades. According to him, it serves to monitor progress, adjust instruction, and provide timely feedback that fosters improvement. Contrasting this with summative assessment, typically linked to end-of-term evaluations, he emphasized the distinctive, developmental nature of formative practices. His perspective reflects the definitions offered by (Bennett, 2011; Black & Wiliam, 2003; Dixon & Worrell,

2016; Gardner, 2012), and his recognition of the complementary relationship between formative and summative assessments echoes Garrison and Ehringhaus (2007), who advocate for a balanced approach.

On preferred assessment methods, Teacher A highlighted the value of questioning techniques, particularly in language instruction, for promoting engagement and comprehension. He noted the consistent implementation of both self- and peer-assessment practices, especially for spelling and vocabulary tasks, where students check work against answer keys. This, he explained, fosters reflective learning and reinforces correct usage, aligning with (DfE, 2003)sted. Notably, he reported no significant challenges with peer assessment, a finding that contrasts with Butt's (2010) concerns, though time constraints limited further exploration of this point.

When asked whether formative assessment could replace summative tasks, Teacher A offered a balanced view. He supported Miller and Lavin's (2007) argument that reducing summative pressure can alleviate student stress but maintained that summative assessments serve necessary functions, such as communicating progress to stakeholders and meeting accountability requirements. This reflects Harlen (2007) and Looney's (2011) view of summative assessment's institutional role.

The lesson observation reinforced these findings. In a Grade 9 Arabic B class, Teacher B employed several formative strategies, including differentiated questioning, immediate verbal feedback, and guided written exercises. However, the class concluded with a written comprehension task used for grading, illustrating a dual focus: supporting learning while meeting summative requirements. Despite integrating AfL strategies, summative goals remained central to planning and delivery.

Additional insights came from a student interview. The student, enrolled in Arabic B for four years, preferred interactive, feedback-rich activities like vocabulary games, group discussions, and peer assessments. She remarked, "I like when we correct each other's work because it helps me remember the words better." Yet, she noted these methods were less frequent than test preparation: "A lot of the time we are just getting ready for tests." This highlights students' appreciation for formative practices, though they appear overshadowed by the emphasis on summative tasks.

Both teacher and student accounts reveal a shared understanding of formative assessment's value while exposing structural constraints, particularly national policy expectations, that compel teachers to prioritize summative outcomes in curriculum delivery.

Observation

The observed lesson, delivered by Teacher B, focused on the theme of careers and future aspirations and was designed to build students' vocabulary and conversational skills in Arabic through real-world application. The session began with a review of prior learning, during which the teacher used targeted questioning to activate students' recall of job-related vocabulary. Correct responses were visually reinforced through a shared slide, which highlighted key terms and provided immediate feedback—an effective Assessment for Learning (AfL) strategy.

Formative assessment techniques were consistently embedded throughout the lesson. Teacher B employed both open and closed questions, ensuring sufficient wait time after open-ended prompts, a strategy endorsed by Bartlett (2015) for encouraging critical thinking and meaningful student engagement. These dialogic interactions enabled learners to articulate their understanding, revise misconceptions, and participate more actively in classroom discourse.

A key strength of the session was its emphasis on oral communication. Students read model sentences aloud and responded to personalized questions, such as “What would you like to be in the future, and why?” This transitioned into a paired speaking activity in which one student assumed the role of a job applicant and the other acted as an employer, conducting mock interviews. This task demonstrated meaningful use of the target language in context, fostering peer interaction and reinforcing vocabulary through authentic communication.

Additionally, digital self-assessment was integrated Microsoft Forms using. Students independently reviewed vocabulary items and corrected their responses, promoting autonomous learning. Teacher B supported this process by circulating around the room, providing feedback and clarification, and prompting learners to reflect on their progress. This aligns with Office for Standards in Education [Ofsted], 2003, assertion that active student involvement in assessment enhances motivation and contributes to learning clarity.

However, despite the rich use of formative strategies, the lesson concluded with a worksheet-style task that resembled a summative assessment format, to be collected and marked later. The content and structure of the task echoed standard exam-style questioning, indicating that even within a formative-rich environment, summative requirements continue to shape the lesson’s pacing and endpoint. This reflects a broader systemic constraint, where the expectations of the local curriculum framework, particularly for Arabic as a second language, guide teachers to deliver lessons that align with end-of-term exam structures, even when formative practices are embedded throughout.

Discussion

The findings of this study reinforce the complex and often conflicting realities that teachers face when implementing assessment practices in the context of Arabic as a second language within the IB Middle Years Programme (MYP). Both teacher and student perspectives revealed a strong awareness of the value and purpose of formative assessment, yet their experiences also highlighted systemic constraints that hinder its effective implementation.

Teacher A’s conceptualization of assessment aligns closely with the literature, viewing AfL as a continuous, student-centred process aimed at guiding instruction and monitoring progress (Bennett, 2011; Black & Wiliam, 2003). His reliance on questioning, peer correction, and self-assessment techniques reflects a thoughtful effort to engage learners in reflective and interactive learning experiences. Similarly, the classroom observation of Teacher B demonstrated how formative strategies, such as speaking tasks, digital self-assessment tools, and dialogic questioning, can be embedded within language instruction to enhance learner engagement and promote deeper understanding.

Despite these efforts, the interviews and observation also revealed a persistent tension between formative intentions and summative demands. Teacher A acknowledged that his formative practices were often shaped by school and policy-level expectations that prioritize

measurable outcomes. This mirrors Harlen's (2007) assertion that assessment policies can inadvertently encourage a focus on Assessment of Learning (AoL), thereby limiting opportunities for innovation and personalization in classroom assessment.

The student interview supported this view. The student appreciated interactive, feedback-rich activities but felt that assessments "count" only when tied to grades. This reflects the influence of a school culture dominated by summative evaluation and indicates a potential misalignment between students' experiences of learning and the pedagogical aims of AfL. Garrison and Ehringhaus (2007) warn that such misalignments may cause formative assessment to be undervalued or misunderstood unless institutional support is in place to embed AfL meaningfully into the school culture.

Furthermore, the observation revealed that although AfL strategies were present, they were frequently positioned within a framework designed to prepare students for summative assessments. For example, speaking and vocabulary activities were effectively implemented but framed as preparation for a formal written task. This indicates that while formative practices are being used, they often function in service of summative benchmarks, a situation that underscores the dominance of external assessment frameworks in shaping classroom practice.

These findings suggest that while teachers may be well-versed in the principles of AfL and demonstrate good practice, their ability to fully realize these methods is often limited by institutional and policy-driven expectations. As Boud (2006) and Looney (2011) argue, for formative assessment to truly support learning, it must be embedded within a school-wide culture that values growth over performance.

To move toward a more balanced and developmentally appropriate assessment environment, schools must empower educators with the flexibility, resources, and policy support necessary to prioritize formative learning experiences. Professional development, clearer alignment between IB assessment philosophy and national curricular expectations, and greater adaptability in assessment design are crucial—particularly in the context of Arabic as a second language, where learners' confidence and motivation are highly sensitive to the nature of classroom assessment.

Conclusion and Recommendations

This study examined assessment practices in Arabic B within an IB MYP framework, focusing on the balance between formative and summative assessments. It highlighted the influence of institutional policies, teacher strategies, and student engagement in shaping assessment approaches. Findings indicate that while formative assessments, such as questioning, peer collaboration, and self-assessment, are effectively implemented, particularly by Teacher B, these practices are constrained by the dominant emphasis on summative assessments.

The observed lesson on careers and future aspirations showcased a highly effective application of Assessment for Learning (AfL) strategies. Teacher B successfully embedded real-world contexts to engage students, foster independence, and support language development, aligning with the pedagogical aims of the IB framework. However, the interview with Teacher A revealed a key tension: the institutional over-reliance on summative assessments for grading and reporting. This systemic dependence limits the full integration of

formative assessment and reflects a broader challenge in aligning educational practices with contemporary pedagogy.

The study suggests schools should reevaluate assessment policies to better support the development of formative assessment while maintaining accountability through summative assessments. It underscores the need for a school culture where formative assessment is not just an expectation but a consistent, supported practice, reinforced by professional development and cross-departmental collaboration. Aligning assessment frameworks with both student and educator needs will improve teaching effectiveness and deepen learning outcomes.

Limitations

As a small-scale qualitative inquiry, this study's findings are based on data from two teachers and one student within a single IB school, limiting their generalizability to other educational settings. Additionally, the researcher's existing professional relationship with the participants may have influenced the openness and framing of their responses. These factors should be considered when interpreting the results.

This study suggests that schools need to reevaluate their assessment policies to better support the development of formative assessment practices while maintaining the necessary accountability for summative assessments. The findings underscore the importance of creating a school culture where formative assessment is not just a principle but a consistent practice, supported by professional development and cross-departmental collaboration. Furthermore, aligning assessment frameworks with the needs of both students and educators will enhance the effectiveness of teaching and foster deeper learning outcomes.

Recommendations arising from this research include:

- **Policy Alignment:** Revise school assessment policies to foster a balanced approach between formative and summative assessments, especially in language programs like Arabic B.
- **Professional Development:** Provide ongoing training in formative assessment strategies, emphasizing practical, easily applicable techniques.
- **Student Engagement:** Prioritize active student involvement in the assessment process through peer and self-assessment, promoting reflective, learner-centred practices.
- **Future Research:** Explore how schools can reconcile administrative accountability demands with the pedagogical benefits of flexible, student-centred learning, particularly in diverse educational contexts.

Ultimately, for formative assessment to reach its full potential, it must be systematically supported by both policy and classroom practice, enabling teachers and students to fully leverage its benefits for meaningful learning.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Mr. Richard Jhon Drew, JBS School Principal and my Professor, Dr. Jean Touma for their valuable guidance, encouragement, and feedback throughout this research journey. I am also deeply thankful to the school leadership for granting permission to conduct the study and to the Arabic B teachers who participated in the

interviews and classroom observations for their openness and support. Their contributions were essential to the completion of this work. I also extend my appreciation to my colleagues and peers for their insights and encouragement during the research process.

Declaration of Generative AI and AI-Assisted Technologies in the Writing Process

ChatGPT was used during the preparation of this manuscript to support language refinement, enhance clarity, and paraphrase selected sections. All research ideas, theoretical concepts, data interpretations, and discussions presented in this work are entirely the author's own. The content has been thoroughly reviewed and edited by the author to ensure accuracy, originality, and academic integrity.

References

- Andrade, H. L., & Du, Y. (2007). Student responses to criteria-referenced self-assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 32(2), 159–181.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930600801928>
- Bartlett, S. (2015). *Introduction to education studies* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Bennett, R. E. (2011). Formative assessment: A critical review. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 18(1), 5–25.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2010.513678>
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 5(1), 7–74.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102>
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2003). Involvement and autonomy in assessment: An alternative to the summative/ formative dichotomy. In M. Segers, F. Dochy, & E. Cascallar (Eds.), *Optimising new modes of assessment: In search of qualities and standards* (pp. 33–54). Springer.
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2018). Classroom assessment and pedagogy. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 25(6), 551–575.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2018.1441807>
- Boud, D. (2006). Implementing student self-assessment. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 25(3), 339–354. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360600891886>
- British Educational Research Association. (2018). *Ethical guidelines for educational research* (4th ed.). <https://www.bera.ac.uk/publication/ethical-guidelines-for-educational-research-2018>
- Brooks, V. (2002). *Assessment in secondary schools: The new teacher's guide to monitoring, assessment, recording, reporting, and accountability*. Open University Press.
- Butt, G. (2010). *Making assessment matter*. Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Chin, C. (2007). Teacher questioning in science classrooms: Approaches that stimulate productive thinking. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 44(6), 815–843.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20171>
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education* (8th ed.). Routledge.
- Department for Education. (2003). *Good practice in modern foreign languages assessment at Key Stage 3*. Department for Education and Skills.
<https://dera.ioe.ac.uk/id/eprint/4976>

- Department of Education. (n.d.). *Languages programmes of study: Key Stage 3. National curriculum in England*. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-curriculum-in-england-languages-programmes-of-study>
- Dixon, D., & Worrell, F. C. (2016). Formative and summative assessment in the classroom. *Theory Into Practice*, 55(2), 153–159. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2016.1148989>
- Eckhout, T., Davis, S., Mickelson, K., & Goodburn, A. (2005, January). A method for providing assessment training to in-service and pre-service teachers. Paper presented at the *Southwestern Educational Research Association*, New Orleans, LA.
- Gardner, J. (2012). *Assessment and learning* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Garrison, C., & Ehringhaus, M. (2007). *Formative and summative assessments in the classroom*. https://www.nmsa.org/portals/0/pdf/publications/On_Target/formative_assessment/On_Target_Assessment.pdf
- Gielen, S., Tops, L., Dochy, F., Onghena, P., & Smeets, S. (2010). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback and of various peer feedback forms in a secondary school writing curriculum. *British Educational Research Journal*, 36(1), 143–162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01411920802042370>
- Good assessment practice in modern foreign languages (MFL). (2003). Ofsted. <https://dera.ioe.ac.uk/id/eprint/4976>
- Harlen, W. (2007). Teachers' summative practices and assessment for learning – Tensions and synergies. *The Curriculum Journal*, 16(2), 207–223. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585170500136093>
- Heaton, J. B. (1990). *Writing English language tests* (New ed.). Longman.
- Inbar-Lourie, O. (2008). Constructing a language assessment knowledge base: A focus on language assessment courses. *Language Testing*, 25(3), 385–402. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532208090158>
- International Baccalaureate. (2014). *MYP: From principles into practice*. International Baccalaureate Organization.
- International Baccalaureate. (2020). *Language acquisition guide*. International Baccalaureate Organization.
- Looney, J. W. (2011). Integrating formative and summative assessment: Progress toward a seamless system? OECD Education Working Papers, No. 58. <https://doi.org/10.1787/5kghx3kbl734-en>
- Maki, P. L. (2002). Developing an assessment plan to learn about student learning. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 28(1–2), 8–13. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0099-1333\(01\)00295-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0099-1333(01)00295-2)

- Mertler, C. A. (2009). *Action research: Teachers as researchers in the classroom* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Miller, D., & Lavin, F. (2007). But now I feel I want to give it a try: Formative assessment, self-esteem and a sense of competence. *The Curriculum Journal*, 18(1), 3–25.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09585170701292109>
- Robson, C., & McCartan, K. (2016). *Real world research* (4th ed.). Wiley.
- Scarino, A. (2013). Language assessment literacy as self-awareness: Understanding the role of interpretation in assessment and in teacher learning. *Language Testing*, 30(3), 309–327. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532213480128>
- Spendlove, D. (2009). *Putting assessment for learning into practice*. Continuum.
- Stiggins, R. J. (1992). Assessment literacy. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 74(7), 534–539.
- Sumner, R. (2002). *The role of assessment in school*. NFER Nelson Publishing Company.
- Thomas, G. (2017). *How to do your research project: A guide for students in education and applied social sciences* (3rd ed.). SAGE.
- United Arab Emirates Ministry of Education. (2017). *Framework for learning Arabic as an additional language*. Ministry of Education.
- Vahid, N., & Nasrin, B. (2019). A review of literature on language assessment literacy in the last two decades (1999–2018). *Assessment*, 8(11), 1–16.
- Wellington, J. (2015). *Educational research: Contemporary issues and practical approaches* (2nd ed.). Bloomsbury Publishing.

Contact email: imad.nasr81@gmail.com