

DIALOGIC DIGITAL FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT AND FEEDBACK LITERACY IN THE S2 PAI PROGRAM AT UNZAH

Muhammad Hafil Mangkudilaga¹, Ainur Rofiq Sofa², Muhammad Ichsan³

^{1,2}Universitas Islam Zainul Hasan Genggong Probolinggo

³Universitas Hafshawaty Zainul Hasan

Email: ¹hanyamaha703@gmail.com, ²bungaaklirik@gmail.com, ³ichsan29061997@gmail.com

Keywords:

Formative Assessment, Feedback Literacy, Digital Learning, Self-Regulated Learning, Islamic Religious Education

Abstract

This article develops a dialogic digital formative assessment framework for the Master's Program in Islamic Religious Education (S2 PAI) at Universitas Islam Zainul Hasan Genggong. The central problem is that digital assessment is often limited to online quizzes and rapid scoring, while graduate learning requires sustained interpretation, revision, scholarly dialogue, and self-regulation. Through qualitative descriptive library research, the study integrates formative assessment, feedback literacy, evaluative judgement, peer assessment, and digital learning literature. The findings show that effective digital formative assessment should operate as a recurring cycle of eliciting evidence, interpreting learning gaps, conducting feedback dialogue, revising work, and documenting improvement. Appropriate practices include diagnostic concept maps, annotated reading responses, micro-arguments, peer review, audio feedback, rubric-based self-assessment, and feedforward plans. Digital platforms are valuable when they make learning visible and support timely interaction, but they may produce superficial participation if tasks, criteria, and follow-up are weak. The proposed framework assigns active roles to lecturers and students: lecturers design evidence-rich tasks and feedback environments, while students learn to appreciate, interpret, judge, and act on feedback. The study contributes a graduate PAI assessment model that combines technology with dialogic academic culture and reflective responsibility.

INTRODUCTION

Formative assessment is not simply an assessment conducted before the final examination. It is a process of collecting and using evidence to improve learning while learning is still taking place. In graduate PAI education, this process is crucial because students develop complex abilities through reading, interpretation, argumentation, research, and revision. A final score cannot show how misconceptions were corrected, how arguments became more rigorous, or how students learned to evaluate the quality of their own work.

Digital platforms can support rapid evidence collection, flexible communication, multimedia feedback, peer interaction, and documentation of revisions. However, technology does not automatically make assessment formative. An online quiz that only reports a score may remain summative in function. Formative value emerges when

evidence is interpreted, feedback is understood, and students take action to improve subsequent work (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006).

Feedback literacy refers to the understandings, capacities, and dispositions needed to make productive use of feedback. Students need to appreciate feedback, make judgements about quality, manage emotional responses, and take action (Carless & Boud, 2018). These capabilities are especially important in S2 PAI because academic dialogue may involve differences in interpretation, methodological critique, and revision of strongly held assumptions. Feedback therefore requires adab, intellectual openness, and responsibility.

This article aims to formulate a dialogic digital formative assessment framework for S2 PAI UNZAH. It analyses the assessment cycle, digital practices, student and lecturer roles, and safeguards needed to make feedback consequential for learning.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Formative assessment and self-regulation

Formative assessment supports self-regulated learning when it clarifies goals, generates evidence of current performance, provides information about gaps, and enables students to plan improvement (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006). It is therefore better understood as a learning architecture than as a category of test.

Feedback as dialogue

Transmission models assume that lecturers deliver information and students receive it. Learning-centred models emphasize interaction, interpretation, and action (Boud & Molloy, 2013). Feedback dialogue may occur between lecturer and student, among peers, or through structured self-assessment. The quality of dialogue depends on shared criteria and opportunities to use the information in a later task.

Digital assessment and feedback literacy

Digital environments can make feedback more timely and varied through annotations, audio comments, discussion threads, quizzes, and revision histories. Yet students may ignore feedback when it is too general, arrives after the course has moved on, or is disconnected from a subsequent task. Developing feedback literacy requires repeated practice in comparing work with criteria and making justified decisions (Carless & Boud, 2018).

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employed qualitative descriptive library research. The literature corpus covered formative assessment, online assessment, self-regulated learning, peer and self-assessment, evaluative judgement, and feedback literacy. Regulatory literature concerning Indonesian higher education quality assurance was also included to maintain alignment with program accountability.

A thematic synthesis was conducted around five questions: what evidence should be elicited, how evidence should be interpreted, how dialogue should occur, how students should act, and how improvement should be documented. The resulting framework was contextualized for graduate Islamic Religious Education without claiming that the practices had already been implemented or empirically evaluated at UNZAH.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Eliciting small but meaningful evidence

Frequent low-stakes activities can reveal student thinking before major assignments. Examples include a one-page concept map, a 200-word response to a scholarly controversy, an annotated Qur'anic or educational text, and a short methodological justification. These tasks should sample reasoning, not merely factual recall. Their small scale enables timely feedback and reduces the risk that misconceptions become embedded in final work.

Interpreting evidence against shared criteria

Evidence becomes formative only when it is interpreted. Lecturers can use concise rubrics or success criteria that show the difference between description, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. Students should apply the same criteria to exemplars and peer work. This practice strengthens evaluative judgement and reduces dependence on lecturer correction.

Creating dialogic feedback

Digital comments should invite response rather than close the conversation. A lecturer may ask which evidence supports a claim, which concept has been overlooked, or how a recommendation would change in another context. Audio feedback is useful for explaining priorities and tone, while written annotations are effective for locating specific issues. Peer dialogue should be guided by prompts to prevent praise-only or correction-only responses.

Requiring action and feedforward

Students need a structured mechanism for acting on feedback. Each major task can include a revision log with three columns: feedback received, action taken, and justification. Where feedback is not accepted, the student should explain the academic reason. Feedforward asks students to identify one or two principles that will be applied to the next assignment, creating continuity across the course.

Documenting learning trajectories

Digital platforms can store drafts, comments, self-assessments, and revisions. This evidence allows lecturers to see whether students are becoming more independent and whether recurring problems require instructional intervention. Program-level analysis can identify common difficulties in academic writing, research methods, source use, or theoretical synthesis and inform curriculum improvement.

Table 1. Dialogic digital formative assessment cycle

Assessment stage	Digital practice	Learning function
Elicit evidence	Concept map, micro-argument, diagnostic quiz	Makes current understanding visible
Interpret quality	Rubric, exemplar comparison, self-rating	Develops evaluative judgement
Dialogue	Annotation, audio feedback, peer discussion	Clarifies gaps and priorities
Act and document	Revision log and feedforward plan	Converts feedback into improvement

The distinctive contribution of this framework is the integration of digital evidence, feedback literacy, academic dialogue, and adab. Technology is positioned as an infrastructure for interpretation and revision rather than a mechanism for accelerating scores.

CONCLUSION

Dialogic digital formative assessment can strengthen graduate PAI learning when it creates a recurring cycle of evidence, interpretation, dialogue, action, and documentation. Its success depends less on the number of applications used than on the quality of tasks, criteria, feedback questions, revision requirements, and student participation in judging quality.

S2 PAI UNZAH can operationalize the framework by embedding at least two feedback cycles before each major assessment and by requiring revision evidence. Future empirical research should examine student feedback literacy, patterns of feedback uptake, lecturer workload, and the contribution of digital formative practices to academic writing and research competence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Boud, D., & Molloy, E. (2013). Rethinking models of feedback for learning: The challenge of design. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(6), 698–712. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2012.691462>
- Carless, D., & Boud, D. (2018). The development of student feedback literacy: Enabling uptake of feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(8), 1315–1325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354>
- Gikandi, J. W., Morrow, D., & Davis, N. E. (2011). Online formative assessment in higher education: A review of the literature. *Computers & Education*, 57(4), 2333–2351. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2011.06.004>
- Molloy, E., Boud, D., & Henderson, M. (2020). Developing a learning-centred framework for feedback literacy. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 45(4), 527–540. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1667955>
- Nicol, D. J., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(2), 199–218. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572090>
- Panadero, E., Jonsson, A., & Botella, J. (2017). Effects of self-assessment on self-regulated learning and self-efficacy: Four meta-analyses. *Educational Research Review*, 22, 74–98. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2017.08.004>
- Republic of Indonesia, Ministry of Higher Education, Science, and Technology. (2025). Regulation of the Minister of Higher Education, Science, and Technology Number 39 of 2025 concerning Quality Assurance in Higher Education.
- Sadler, D. R. (1989). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. *Instructional Science*, 18, 119–144. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00117714>

- Tai, J., Ajjawi, R., Boud, D., Dawson, P., & Panadero, E. (2018). Developing evaluative judgement: Enabling students to make decisions about the quality of work. *Higher Education*, 76, 467–481. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-017-0220-3>
- Zhan, Y., Dawson, P., Yan, Z., Henderson, M., & Boud, D. (2022). Developing and validating a student feedback literacy scale. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 47(7), 1087–1100. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.2001430>