Exploring the Nexus between Assessment and Final Exam Scores in an Advanced Grammar Course among Undergraduate English Majors

Asha Latha Bala Subramaniam
Tel:+6012-679-3770
Email: ashalatha@uitm.edu.my
Laura Christ Dass
Tel:+6017-246-9936
Email: laura404@uitm.edu.my

Faizah Mohamad
Tel: +6013-981-8809
Email: fareema@uitm.edu.my

Akademi Pengajian Bahasa
Universiti Teknologi MARA
UiTM Shah Alam, Shah Alam, Selangor, Malaysia, 40450

Abstract: This quantitative research study aims to investigate the correlation between the assessment scores and final test scores of first year undergraduates from two different English language programs (LG240 and LG243) who were taking a similar grammar course. The study was conducted across 2 cohorts of undergraduates (20232 and 20224) involving a total of 296 participants where various formative and summative assessments were looked at to determine the relationships among them. The formative assessments conducted throughout the semester involved an oral presentation on a given grammar component, eight sets of portfolio entries conducted online, four reflective writings and a grammar quiz. The summative assessment that tested students grasp of the various grammar components taught was conducted at the end of semester. This study set out to find the relationships between each formative assessment and the final scores of the 2 cohorts of undergraduates. The findings revealed that there was correlation between each of the assessments and the final scores in both programmes for cohort 20224, however, one assessment which was the oral presentation was discovered to be not significantly related to the final scores for cohort 20232 for both programmes. The other assessments had significant correlations with the final scores. In terms of mean differences, LG240 students outperformed their counterparts in all assessments except for the test in cohort 20224, however, they did better than LG243 students in only oral presentation and portfolio in cohort 20232.

Keywords: summative assessment, formative assessments, advanced grammar course, undergraduate English majors

Introduction

This is a quantitative research study aimed at investigating the correlation between the assessment scores and final test scores of two groups of first year undergraduates from two different English language programs who were taking a similar grammar course. The participants of this study were undergraduate students of an advanced English grammar course. These students undertook this course in the first semester of their studies as a requirement for the completion of their bachelor's degree in Applied Language Studies (Hons.) The 2 programmes under the study are Bachelor of Applied Language Studies (Hons.) English for Professional Communication (LG240) which is designed to equip students with the language and communication skills required to compete in a globalised workplace and Bachelor of Applied Language Studies (Hons.) English for Intercultural Communication (LG243) designed to equip students with language and communication skills required to work in diverse cultural backgrounds both locally and abroad. The assessment of students' performance in this course is multifaceted, encompassing a range of formative and summative evaluations throughout the semester. The culmination of this assessment journey is the final exam, which serves as a comprehensive measure of students' understanding and application of advanced grammatical concepts. This research paper embarked on an exploratory study to understand the relationship between students' performance in one assessment conducted in mid semester and their subsequent scores on the exam itself. Learning about this relationship is necessary in enhancing pedagogical practices and optimizing student learning outcomes as according to Ganajova et al. (2021), formative assessment is a powerful tool to enhance student learning.

The investigation sought to uncover not only the correlation between the assessment and final exam scores but also the underlying factors that may influence this relationship. This study is expected to provide critical insights on how factors such as assessment methods, feedback, and formative evaluations interplay with the final exam scores which can be leveraged by both educators and students alike. The findings of the study have the potential to help refine instructional strategies, tailor assessment practices to current needs, and ultimately cultivate a deeper understanding of English grammar and usage among aspiring English professionals. However, as the total scores were limited to 296 participants, the findings of this study cannot be generalised beyond the two programmes under study in the university. A similar research with a bigger sample size across various universities in the country would be needed to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the trends in students' grammar competence across different educational contexts.

The research objectives are:

1. To identify the correlation between class assessments and the final scores in an advanced grammar course for two groups of first year undergraduate students majoring in English language in the 20224 cohort.
2. To identify the correlation between class assessments and the final scores in an advanced grammar course for two groups of first year undergraduate students majoring in English language in the 20232 cohort.
3. To identify the mean differences in the scores of the two groups of students in the 20224 cohort.
4. To identify the mean differences in the scores of the two groups of students in the 20232 cohort.

In the sections that follow, relevant literature was reviewed, the research methodology employed was outlined, outcome of the findings deliberated and implications as well as suggestions were put forward.

Literature Review

Grammar and Language Competence in the 21st Century

The study of grammar and its implications for language learning has become increasingly relevant in the 21st century. Communicating effectively in a globalized world requires a high level of language proficiency, which is largely dependent on grammatical knowledge. To master complex language forms and excel in various communication domains, students need to develop analytical and creative skills that are enhanced by diverse pedagogical approaches and assessment methods in the field of grammar. Assessments are essential for teachers to observe student-progress in attaining the set objectives, and for students to reflect on the learning experience. Different types of assessments, such as diagnostic assessment, formative assessment, and summative assessment, provide different types of information on the students' progress and performance (Black, 2013). The developments that have taken place over the past decades in L2 curriculums and pedagogy, have increased emphasis on innovative as well as alternative assessment practices. According to Abrar-ul-Hassan et al. (2021), portfolios among others has emerged as a more congruent and valid assessment option. He adds that a shift to remote learning during the COVID-19 pandemic has permanently altered assessment practices from the traditional tests or examinations to online assessments.

Formative Assessments in Language Education

Formative assessments are beneficial tools to measure students' understanding or knowledge of course material in language education as they help to assess students' performance and progress in pedagogical grammar through quizzes, homework, and participation, with the intention of providing feedback and supporting learners' development. (Buyukkarchi & Sahinkarakas, 2021; Alahmadi et al., 2019). Formative assessments allow educators to continuously adjust and improve their teaching based on students' needs. By keeping detailed records of the learning process, educators can use formative evaluations as evidence for summative judgments (Machin et al., 2016; Dixson & Worell, 2016; William, 2011).

Summative Assessments in Language Education

Summative assessments, on the other hand, are conducted at the end of a course or module to determine students' overall or final proficiency and achievement, and readiness to meet the language expectations of the professional world (Qu & Zhang, 2013). Although they provide students a numerical score, summative assessments offer limited feedback (Glazer, 2014). Summative assessments may include tests, final exams, reports, and projects that demonstrate the cumulative knowledge a student has acquired over the course of study or during a specific lesson or unit. The current study investigates the role and impact of formative assessments such as class quizzes, oral presentations and portfolios on summative test scores and advanced English language grammar proficiency.

Formative and Summative Test Scores: A Complex and Multifaceted Relationship

The relationship between formative and summative test scores in language learning is neither straightforward nor simple. Although formative assessments provide ongoing feedback, help identify areas of improvement and foster learner autonomy in the learning process, their impact on summative test scores and language proficiency is still under investigation (Ismail et al., 2022). Previous literature elucidates mixed results concerning the correlation between formative and summative assessments. Some studies reveal a positive relationship, indicating that students who perform well in formative assessments are more likely to excel in summative tests and improve

academic achievement (Gezer et al., 2021; Black & William, 1998). According to Morris et al. (2021), who reviewed causal evidence from trials of feedback and formative assessment in higher education, low stakes-quizzing is an effective method for students to make and learn from their mistakes. However, feedback and implementation factors play a crucial role to support their efficacy. Other studies also acknowledge that the strength of this correlation can vary and is influenced by the specific assessment methods used and the assessment criteria specified (Ashdale, 2020). The nature of the formative assessments, their alignment with the summative test content, and the students' study habits and motivation all contribute to the differences in the findings (Mohamad et al., 2023). Woods (2015) argued that instructors should use formative assessments to promote learner autonomy and enhance motivation to help them succeed in achieving their learning goals. In a study by Hamedi et al. (2022) on the effects of formative assessment through Kahoot application on 60 Iranian EFL students' vocabulary knowledge and their burnout levels, the results indicated that using formative assessment had significant effects on Iranian EFL students' vocabulary knowledge. Hossein et al. (2019) reported positive results using formative assessments (quizzes). Post-test results revealed better performance among the participants in language learning. Qu and Zhang (2013) argued that the use of one type of assessment method for a long period is likely to cause negative effects. They stressed the importance of formative evaluation and summative evaluation of a varied range complementing each other in language learning to enable teachers to gather a comprehensive understanding of students' ability. In addition, high-quality formative assessment and feedback improve the overall quality of learning. Teachers who make a more nuanced explanation of subject - verb agreement tendencies by factoring elements that are of relevance such as context, register, and genre will make a difference (Morallo, 2022). Ngor et al. (2022) also reiterated the importance of effective feedback in formative assessment practices in the overall development of student learning language courses.

Comparative Analysis of Formative and Summative Assessments in Advanced Grammar and Usage

Previous studies indicate mixed correlation between formative and summative assessments in language learning in general with limited research conducted in the assessment of advanced grammar at a higher learning institution. This study aims to conduct a comparative analysis to gain a comprehensive understanding of the relationship between formative and summative assessments in advanced grammar and usage among undergraduates. The study compares the performance of two groups of students who were assessed via quizzes, oral presentations and portfolios. The research carried out among eighth graders in a school in   Turkey, found that the use of a portfolio had positive effects on students' achievement in areas such as reading, writing and listening, however it had no effect on their speaking nor their attitudes towards the English language (Demirel & Duman, 2015). Portfolio assessment where self and peer assessment is allowed, students experienced a sense of empowerment and community engagement (Abrar et al., 2021). Portfolio has a distinguished attribute of learner inclusion (Gunderson et al., 2014; Kirkpatrick & Zang, 2011). Portfolio as an alternative assessment practice is favoured by educators and learners for its capability to inform the learning process over time (Abrar-ul-Hassan & Douglas, 2020; Baume & Yorke, 2002; Davison & Leung, 2009; Turner & Purpura, 2015). Portfolio assessment in this study is carried out as summative assessment over 8 weeks where students receive immediate feedback and are able to monitor their progress.

The findings of the study combine traditional assessments, such as tests and quizzes, with alternative assessments, such as oral presentations and portfolio. It is hoped to provide an understanding of the effects and mediators of different types of formative assessments on the relationship between formative and summative assessments in students' advanced grammar and usage proficiency.

Methodology

This study employed quantitative research by using correlational study design to see the relationships between the assessment scores (independent variables) and the final scores (dependent variable) obtained from an advanced English grammar course for two consecutive semesters which were the 20224 cohort (129 ESL students from LG240 and 32 ESL students from LG243) and the 20232 cohort (95 ESL students from LG240 and 40 students from LG243). Causal comparative design was also applied to see the mean differences between the groups under study which were LG240 and LG243 in both of the cohorts. Since this study examined the relationships and the cause and effect between variables without any control or manipulation from the researchers, correlational and causal comparative designs were appropriate to be employed (Cao et al., 2024). Comparing students' scores across two different programmes and two different cohorts will reveal the consistencies and differences in the performance of the groups under study, this will enhance the reliability of the conclusions drawn on students' performance. There were four (4) assessments for the course. The first assessment was an oral presentation (10%) in which the students were assigned a grammar topic each by their class lecturers. They would research the topic and present the information gained in 8 minutes. The second assessment was a quiz (20%) where the students were tested on grammar applications and error identifications at sentence level with 20 sentences and passage level with two passages (250 words each) respectively. The third assessment was a portfolio (30%) which covered eight (8) entries with graded assignments based on stimulus given, compilation of relevant references and four (4) reflection writing tasks. The fourth assessment was the test (40%) which had three parts, grammar applications at sentence level with 10 sentences, 10 error identifications in 1 passage (300-350 words), and a written essay in 350-400 words based on a stimulus given. At the end of each semester, the results for each assessment and the final scores were compiled for analysis. All questions for formative and summative assessments administered are similar across the two programmes, to minimise potential biases while final test is a standardised test that is conducted at the same time for all groups of students.

Findings and Discussions

The Relationship between the Class Assessments and Final Scores for LG240 and LG243 in the 20224 Cohort

In order to find the relationship between the class assessment scores and final scores, a series of Pearson's correlation tests were run. The interpretation of the Pearson correlation coefficient (r-value) follows the range outlined by Mukaka (2012). Based on the range, an *r*-value that is above 0.70 indicates a strong relationship, values between 0.50 and 0.69 represent a moderate relationship, and values below 0.05 indicate a weak relationship. The correlation results were reported based on the significance level at 0.01 level.

The Relationship between the Oral Presentation and Final Scores for LG240 and LG243

Table 1 below shows that there was a significant weak positive relationship between the oral presentation and final scores in grammar for LG240 (r=.348, p < 0.01) and also for LG243 (r=.399, p<0.01). This indicates that the higher the students scored in their oral presentation, the higher their final scores were in both programmes.

Table 1
The Relationship between the Oral Presentation and Final Scores for LG240 and LG 243

		LG240 Final Scores	LG243 Final Scores
Oral Presentation	Pearson Correlation	.348**	.399**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001
	N	129	32

Note. ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The Relationship between the Quiz and Final Scores for LG240 and LG243

Table 2 below shows that there was a significant strong positive relationship between the quiz and the final scores for LG240 (r=.829, p < 0.01) and for LG243 (r=.793, p<0.01). This indicates that students, who scored better in their quiz, also did better in their final scores in both programmes.

Table 2
The Relationship between the Quiz and Final Scores for LG240 and LG 243

		LG240 Final Scores	LG243 Final Scores
Quiz	Pearson Correlation	.829**	.793**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001
	N	129	32

Note. ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The Relationship between the Portfolio and Final Scores for LG240 and LG243

Table 3 below shows that there was a significant moderate positive relationship between the portfolio and final scores in grammar for LG240 (r=.649, p < 0.01) and for LG243 (r=.556, p <0.01). This indicates that students, who did well in their portfolio, also did well in their final scores in both programmes.

Table 3
The Relationship between the Portfolio and Final Scores for LG240 and LG 243

		LG240 Final Scores	LG243 Final Scores
Portfolio	Pearson Correlation	.649**	.556**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001
	N	129	32

Note. ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The Relationship between the Test and Final Scores for LG240 and LG243

Table 4 below shows that there was a significant strong positive relationship between the test and final scores in grammar for LG240 (r=.777, p < 0.01) and for LG243 (r=.734, p < 0.01). This indicates that the higher the students scored in their test, the higher they scored in their final scores in both programmes.

Table 4
The Relationship between the Test and Final Scores for LG240 and LG 243

		LG240 Final Scores	LG243 Final Scores
Test	Pearson Correlation	.777**	.734**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001
	N	129	32

Note. ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The results show that there is a consistency in the trends of significant correlations between the assessment scores and final scores in both programmes. This is in line with literature which suggests that students who perform well in formative assessments generally also do well in summative tests (Gezer et al., 2021; Black & William, 1998), providing an apt conclusion that despite differences in mean scores, the specific formative assessment practices played a significant role in determining summative test outcomes.

The Relationship between the Class Assessments and Final Scores for LG240 and LG 243 in the 20232 Cohort

In order to find the relationship between the class assessment scores and final scores, a series of Pearson's correlation tests were run. The significance level was set at 0.01 in interpreting the results.

The Relationship between the Oral Presentation and Final Scores for LG240 and LG243

Table 5 below shows that there was no significant relationship between the oral presentation and final scores in grammar for LG240 (r=.201, p > 0.01) and also for LG243 (r=.299, p > 0.01). This indicates that the oral presentation scores did not tend to increase or decrease the final scores in grammar in both programmes.

Table 5
The Relationship between the Oral Presentation and Final Scores for LG240 and LG 243

		LG240 Final Scores	LG243 Final Scores
Oral Presentation	Pearson Correlation	.201	.299
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.051	.061
	N	95	40

Note. ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The Relationship between the Quiz and Final Scores for LG240 and LG243

Table 6 shows that there was a significant strong positive relationship between the quiz and the final scores for LG240 (r=.779, p < 0.01) and for LG243 (r=.823, p<0.01). This indicates that students, who did well in their quiz, also scored better in their final scores in both programmes.

Table 6
The Relationship between the Quiz and Final Scores for LG240 and LG 243

		LG240 Final Scores	LG243 Final Scores
Quiz	Pearson Correlation	.779**	.833**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001
	N	95	40

Note. ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The Relationship between the Portfolio and Final Scores for LG240 and LG243

Table 7 below shows that there was a significant moderate positive relationship between the portfolio and final scores in grammar for LG240 (r=.670, p < 0.01) and for LG243 (r=.511, p <0.01). This indicates that students, who got high marks in their portfolio, also scored in their final scores in both programmes.

Table 7
The Relationship between the Portfolio and Final Scores for LG240 and LG 243

		LG240 Final Scores	LG243 Final Scores
Portfolio	Pearson Correlation	.670**	.511**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001
	N	95	40

Note. ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The Relationship between the Test and Final Scores for LG240 and LG243.

Table 8 below shows a significant strong positive relationship between the test and final scores in grammar for LG240 (r=.903, p < 0.01) and for LG243 (r=.826, p < 0.01). This indicates that the higher the students scored in their test, the higher they scored in their final scores in both programmes.

Table 8
The Relationship between the Test and Final Scores for LG240 and LG 243

		LG240 Final Scores	LG243 Final Scores
Test	Pearson Correlation	.903**	.826**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001
	N	95	40

Note. ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The results show that there is a consistency in the trends of relationships between the assessment scores and final scores in both programmes. The summary of the trends based on the interpretation of the Pearson correlation coefficient is shown in Table 9 below.

Table 9
The Trends of the Relationships between Assessments and Final Scores Across Cohorts

	Cohort 20224		Cohort 20232	
Programme	LG240	LG243	LG240	LG240
	Final Scores		Final Score	
Oral Presentation	Weak (s)	Weak (s)	(ns)	(ns)
Quiz	Strong (s)	Strong (s)	Strong (s)	Strong (s)
Portfolio	Moderate (s)	Moderate (s)	Moderate (s)	Moderate (s)
Test	Strong (s)	Strong (s)	Strong (s)	Strong (s)

Note. s-significant, ns-not significant

These trends in Table 9 indicate that quiz and test assessments demonstrated strong relationships with the final scores in both programmes for cohorts 20224 and 20232. On the contrary, portfolio assessments exhibited moderate relationships with final scores across both cohorts. Oral presentation scores showed weak but statistically significant relationships with final scores in both programmes for cohort 20224. However, the relationships were not statistically significant for cohort 20232. These trends were supported by Bhati (2012) who suggested that students usually did better in the written assignments than oral presentation, thus there was a possibility for quiz and test assessments to have stronger relationships with the final scores. Meanwhile, Aldoseri (2014) who investigated the relationship between portfolio assessment and national exam scores also discovered a moderate relationship between the two. Although this study indicates similar trends in the types of assessments, yet the relationship between two types of assessments might not be straightforward and simple as many factors could have come into play. For example, Mohamad et al. (2023) indicate that factors such as study habits and motivation have a role to play in determining the relationship between formative and summative assessments.

The Mean differences in the Assessment Scores and Final Scores of the Two Groups of Students in the 20224 Cohort

Table 10
The Mean of Assessment and Final Scores for LG240 and LG243

	PROGRAMME	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
QUIZ (20%)	LG240	129	17.3682	4.16154	.36640
	LG243	32	15.2031	2.95083	.52164
OP (10%)	LG240	129	7.8411	.96620	.08507
	LG243	32	7.4750	.56910	.10060
PORTFOLIO (30%)	LG240	129	15.4868	2.03052	.17878
	LG243	32	12.9969	3.04138	.53765
TEST (40%)	LG240	129	23.1171	4.70334	.41411
	LG243	32	22.9688	3.61435	.63893
FINAL SCORES (100%)	LG240	129	63.8132	8.75863	.77115
	LG243	32	58.6438	6.90960	1.22146

Table 10 above shows that the means for all assessments and final scores of LG240 students were higher than those of LG243 students. However, in order to determine the significant differences, *t*-Test results were referred to. The significance level was set at 0.05 in interpreting the results.

Table 11
T-Test Based on LG240 and LG243 Programmes

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances				
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2 tailed)
QUIZ (20%)	Equal variances assumed	3.963	.048	2.772	159	.006
	Equal variances not assumed			3.396	65.287	.001
OP (10%)	Equal variances assumed	1.221	.271	2.054	159	.042
	Equal variances not assumed			2.779	81.134	.007
PORTFOLIO (30%)	Equal variances assumed	.677	.412	5.571	159	<.001
	Equal variances not assumed			4.395	38.121	<.001
TEST (40%)	Equal variances assumed	5.752	.018	.166	159	.868
	Equal variances not assumed			.195	59.952	.846
FINAL SCORES (100%)	Equal variances assumed	2.666	.104	3.105	159	.002
	Equal variances not assumed			3.579	58.391	<.001

The results of the *t*-Test in Table117 show that there were significant mean differences in quiz and portfolio scores (p<0.01) and oral presentation scores (p<0.05). However, no significant mean difference was observed in the test scores (p>0.05). The significant difference was also found in the final scores (p<0.01). In conclusion, students from the LG240 programme achieved better results than those from LG243 in three assessments and the final scores.

The Mean Differences in the Assessment Scores and Final Scores of the Two Groups of Students in the 20232 Cohort

Table 12
The Mean of Assessment and Final Scores for LG240 and LG243

	PROGRAMME	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
QUIZ (20%)	LG240	95	15.7842	3.90965	.40112
	LG243	40	16.1625	2.93167	.46354
OP (10%)	LG240	95	7.8579	1.03827	.10652
	LG243	40	7.1750	.92369	.14605
PORTFOLIO (30%)	LG240	95	15.2718	1.97579	.20271
	LG243	40	13.6800	2.21570	.35033
TEST (40%)	LG240	95	24.0474	5.32161	.54599
	LG243	40	24.2250	4.09495	.64747
FINAL SCORES (100%)	LG240	95	62.9613	9.38384	.96276
	LG243	40	61.2425	7.20142	1.13864

Table 12 above shows that the means for oral presentation, portfolio and final scores of LG240 students were higher than those of LG243 students. However, LG243 students scored slightly higher in quiz and test scores. In order to determine the significant differences, T-Test results were referred to. The significance level was set at 0.05 in interpreting the results.

Table 13
T-Test Based on LG240 and LG243 Programmes

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances				
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2 tailed)
QUIZ (20%)	Equal variances assumed	4.680	.032	-.550	133	.583
	Equal variances not assumed			-.617	96.765	.539
OP (10%)	Equal variances assumed	1.152	.285	3.601	133	<.001
	Equal variances not assumed			3.778	81.914	<.001
PORTFOLIO (30%)	Equal variances assumed	1.077	.301	4.122	133	<.001
	Equal variances not assumed			3.933	66.399	<.001
TEST (40%)	Equal variances assumed	1.485	.225	-.189	133	.851
	Equal variances not assumed			-.210	94.385	.834
FINAL SCORES (100%)	Equal variances assumed	3.223	.075	1.036	133	.302
	Equal variances not assumed			1.153	94.631	.252

The results of the T-Test in Table 13 show that there were significant mean differences in oral presentation and portfolio scores (p<0.01). However, no significant mean differences were found in the quiz, test and final scores (>0.05). In conclusion, students from the LG240 programme outperformed those from LG243 in only two assessments. The findings showed that the grammar performance of LG240 students was better than LG243 students in the 20224 cohort, but not so in the 20232 cohort. The differences in performance can occur due to the sample size and similarity of the groups (Singaram, et al., 2008). Apart from that, issues pertaining to learner attitude, language proficiency, confidence level as well as the types of feedback provided by the instructors play a role in enabling learning objectives to be achieved (Soo, 2023).

Conclusion and Recommendations

In conclusion, summative assessments reflect the formative assessment as the analysis revealed consistent relationships between most assessments and final scores across both cohorts and programmes. Performance comparisons indicate that generally LG240 did better than LG243 students in cohort 20224, but their advantage was only confined to two assessments in cohort 20232, suggesting a shift in grammar performance between the two groups over time. Studies have shown that summative assessments while necessary offer limited feedback in terms of students' learning needs in various areas of subject. The findings of this study support literature that formative assessments indeed have a role in student learning by providing ongoing information on the student performance in various tasks such as help identify areas of improvement and foster learner autonomy in the learning process. Future studies could include other demographic information such as students' socioeconomic background, geographic context, as well as students' general performance in other subjects to look at the relationship of these factors on grammar scores.

These findings suggest that formative assessments, when carefully aligned with summative goals, play a critical role in supporting student achievement in grammar courses. Curriculum improvements should prioritize the integration of reflective writing, portfolio work, and quizzes, while revisiting the design of oral presentations to better align with final assessment objectives. Instructionally, teachers should use formative assessment results to adjust teaching strategies throughout the semester, ensuring targeted support where needed. Ultimately, a strategic focus on formative assessments can create a more feedback-driven, effective learning environment that promotes consistent academic growth.

References

Abrar-ul-Hassan S., & Douglas D. (2020). Assessment and good language teachers. In: C. Griffiths & Z. Tajeddin (Eds.), *Lessons from good language teachers* (pp. 107-120). Cambridge University Press.

Abrar-ul-Hassan, S., Douglas, D., & Turner, J. (2021). Revisiting second language portfolio assessment in a new age. *System, 103*(1), 1-12.

Alahmadi, A., Alzahrani, A., Alzahrani, M., & Alzahrani, S. (2019). The impact of formative assessment on students' achievement in English language courses. *English Language Teaching, 12*(5), 1-11.

Aldoseri, R.H. (2014). Investigating the validity of student's portfolio in classroom assessment at the first secondary class in the Kingdom of Bahrain. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Studies. 8*(1). https://doi.org/10.53543/jeps.vol8iss1pp85-104.

Ashdale, R. (2020). Formative assessment and summative test scores: A meta-analysis. Educational Measurement: *Issues and Practice, 39*(1), 27-42.

Baume, D., & Yorke, M. (2002). The reliability of assessment by portfolio on a course to develop and accredit teachers in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, *27*(1), 7–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070120099340

Bhati, S.S. (2012). The effectiveness of oral presentation assessment in a finance subject: An empirical examination. *Journal of Teaching and Learning Practice. 9*(2). http://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol9/iss2/6

Black, P. (2013). Pedagogy in theory and in practice: Formative and summative assessments in classrooms and in systems. In D. Corrigan, R. Gunstone, & A. Jones (Eds.), *Valuing assessment in science education: Pedagogy, curriculum, policy* (pp. 207 – 229). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-6668-6_11

Black, P., & William, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 5*(1), 7-74.

Buyukkarchi, S., & Sahinkarakas, S. (2021). The effect of formative assessment on EFL learners' writing achievement and self-regulation skills. *International Journal of Instruction, 14*(1), 15-32.

Cao, L., Shamsudin, M. F., & Abu Hassim, A. (2024). Understanding the key types of quantitative research and their impact. *Journal of Postgraduate Current Business Research*, *9*(1), 54-68. https://abrn.asia/ojs/index.php/jpcbr/article/view/159

Davison, C., & Leung, C. (2009). Current issues in English language teacher-based assessment. *TESOL Quarterly, 43,* 393-415. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2009.tb00242.x

Demirel, M., & Duman, H. (2015). The use of portfolio in English language teaching and its effects on achievement and attitude. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 191*, 2634-2640. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.598 [2]

Dixson, D.D., & Worrell, F.C. (2016). Formative and summative assessment in the classroom. *Theory into practice, 55*(2), 153–159.

Ganajova, M., Sotakova, I., Lukac, S., Ješková, Z., Jurkova, V., & Orosova, R. (2021). Formative assessment as a tool to enhance the development of inquiry skills in Science education. *Journal of Baltic Science Education, 20*(2), 204-222.

Gezer, M., Yildirim, K., & Ozkan, Y. (2021). The effect of formative assessment on students' academic achievement: A meta-analysis study. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education, 10*(1), 13-23.

Glazer, N. (2014). Formative plus summative assessment in large undergraduate courses: Why both? *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 26*(2), 276-286.

Gunderson, L., D'Silva, R., & Murphy Odo, D. (2014). *ESL (ELL) literacy instruction: A guidebook to theory and practice* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Hamedi, A., Fakhraee Faruji, L., & Amiri Kordestani, L. (2022). The effectiveness of using formative assessment by Kahoot application on Iranian intermediate EFL learners' vocabulary knowledge and burnout level. *Journal of New Advances in English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics, 4*(1), 768-786.

Hossein, S., Shirin, I., Masoumeh, K. R. & Sahar, L. (2019). The effect of formative quizzes versus summative exams on vocabulary knowledge of intermediate Iranian EFL learners. *Speciality Journal of Language Studies and Literature, 3*(4), 18-33.

Ismail, S.M., Rahul, D.R., Patra, I. & Rezvani, E. (2022). Formative vs. summative assessment: Impacts on academic motivation, attitude toward learning, test anxiety, and self-regulation skill. *Language Testing in Asia, 12*(40), 1 – 23. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-022-00191-4

Kirkpatrick, R., & Zang, Y. (2011). The negative influences of exam-oriented education on Chinese high school students: Backwash from classroom to child. *Language Testing in Asia, 1*(36). https://doi.org/10.1186/2229-0443-1-3-36

Machin, L., Hindmarch, D., Murray, S., & Richardson, T. (2016). *A complete guide to the level 5 Diploma in Education & Training* (2nd ed.). St Albans.

Mohamad, F.N., Mohd Noor, N., & Mohd Yusof, N. (2023). The relationship between formative assessment and summative assessment in advanced grammar and usage course. *International Journal of Language Education and Applied Linguistics, 10(1)*, 1-15.

Morallo, A.B. (2022). Corpus - based investigation of S-V concord patterns of nouns with Latin plural endings. *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research, 19* (2), 97 - 116. https://doi.org/10.52696/IMVD5398

Morris, R., Perry, T., & Wardle, L. (2021). Formative assessment and feedback for learning in higher education: A systematic review. *Review of Education, 9*(3), e3292.

Mukaka, M. M. (2012). A guide to appropriate use of correlation coefficient in medical research. *Malawi Medical Journal, 24*(3), 69–71. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3576830/

Ngor, R., Pang, S. & Em, S. (2022). Teachers' and learners' perceptions of formative assessment practice in enhancing learning in EFL courses. *Jurnal As-Salam*, 6(2), 18-201.

Qu, W., & Zhang, L. (2013). The impact of formative assessment on student achievement in English reading. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 3*(11), 1979-1986.

Singaram, V., Dolmans, D., Lachman, N., & Van der Vleuten, C. (2008). Perceptions of problem-based learning (PBL) group effectiveness in a socially-culturally diverse medical student population. *Education for Health Change in Learning & Practice, 21*(2), 116.

Soo, K.Y. (2023). The significance of online verbal and written corrective feedback in ESL report writing among tertiary students. *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research, 20*(1), 21-38. https://doi.org/10.52696/RWXL5360

Turner, C. E., & Purpura, J. E. (2015). Learning-oriented assessment in the classroom. In D. Tsagari & J. Banerjee (Eds.). *Handbook of second language assessment* (pp. 255 – 272). DeGruyter Mouton.

Wiliam, D. (2011). What is assessment for learning? *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 37*(1), 3-14. doi:10.1016/j.stueduc.2011.03.001

Woods, C. (2015). Formative assessment: A key to deep learning? *Medical Teacher, 37*(7), 643-648.