

DIALOGIC PEER AND SELF-ASSESSMENT FOR FEEDBACK LITERACY IN S2 PAI UNZAH

Lasiatul Qomariah¹, Ainur Rofiq Sofa², Muhammad Ichsan³

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

³Universitas Hafshawaty Zainul Hasan

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

Keywords:

Peer Assessment, Self-Assessment, Feedback Literacy, Reflective Learning, Graduate Islamic Education

Abstract

This study analyzes dialogic peer and self-assessment as a strategy for developing feedback literacy in the S2 PAI Program at Universitas Islam Zainul Hasan Genggong. Graduate students are expected to judge the quality of scholarly arguments, pedagogical designs, and research products, yet assessment often positions them only as recipients of lecturer comments. A qualitative descriptive library-research approach was used to synthesize literature on peer assessment, self-assessment, formative feedback, evaluative judgment, and Islamic educational ethics. The findings show that peer and self-assessment can strengthen criteria understanding, critical reading, reflective revision, and responsibility for learning when implemented as a structured dialogue. Effective design includes rubric orientation, analysis of exemplars, anonymous or accountable review according to task sensitivity, feedback-response plans, and lecturer moderation. Ethical principles of honesty, respect, confidentiality, and constructive advice are required to prevent personal judgment, bias, and unproductive praise. The study concludes that peer and self-assessment should not merely redistribute marking work; they should train students to recognize quality, justify judgments, receive criticism, and improve subsequent performance.

INTRODUCTION

Feedback is often treated as information delivered by lecturers after an assignment has been completed. This transmission model underestimates the active work required from students: understanding criteria, interpreting comments, comparing alternatives, regulating emotion, and deciding how to revise. Graduate students need these capacities because scholarly and professional work depends on continuous evaluation of one's own and others' products (Carless & Boud, 2018).

Peer assessment invites students to examine the quality of a colleague's work using explicit criteria, while self-assessment requires them to judge their own performance. Both practices can develop evaluative judgment, critical reading, and metacognition. Their value does not primarily come from producing grades, but from the cognitive activity of identifying strengths, diagnosing problems, and proposing improvement (Topping, 2009).

In S2 PAI, dialogue about quality has an ethical dimension. Students review interpretations of Islamic texts, educational arguments, field-research plans, and learning designs that may involve sensitive beliefs and institutional contexts. Honest criticism

must therefore be combined with respect, confidentiality, and responsibility. Islamic educational ethics can strengthen feedback as *nasihah* that seeks improvement rather than humiliation (Ramadani & Sofa, 2025).

This article aims to formulate a dialogic peer and self-assessment model for feedback literacy in S2 PAI UNZAH. The study is conceptual and does not claim to describe current classroom practice. It focuses on design stages, learning contributions, ethical safeguards, lecturer roles, and the use of feedback in revision (Parawansah & Sofa, 2024).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Peer and self-assessment

Peer assessment is an arrangement in which learners consider and specify the quality of another learner's product or performance. It can involve written comments, oral dialogue, rating, or co-review. Self-assessment uses comparable criteria to examine one's own work and identify discrepancies between current and desired quality (Topping, 2009).

These practices are strongest when students are trained rather than immediately asked to score classmates. Training includes unpacking criteria, comparing exemplars, practicing comments, and discussing disagreements. Without preparation, peer feedback may remain vague, overly positive, or focused on surface features (Andrade, 2009).

Feedback literacy and evaluative judgment

Feedback literacy refers to the understandings, capacities, and dispositions needed to make sense of feedback and use it to improve learning. It includes appreciating feedback, making judgments, managing affect, and taking action. Peer review provides repeated opportunities to exercise these capacities rather than waiting passively for lecturer comments (Carless & Boud, 2018).

Evaluative judgment develops when students compare work against standards and explain why one response is stronger than another. The act of reviewing can improve the reviewer's own work because criteria become more concrete and alternative strategies become visible. Self-assessment then connects external observation with personal revision (Nicol, 2021).

Dialogue, ethics, and reflective learning

Dialogic feedback treats assessment as an interaction in which meanings and quality standards are negotiated through evidence. Students should be able to ask questions, clarify intentions, challenge comments respectfully, and explain which suggestions they will adopt. Such dialogue is especially important for complex PAI arguments that allow multiple defensible perspectives.

Ethical safeguards include confidentiality, evidence-based language, avoidance of personal labels, and recognition of power relations. Reviewers should distinguish disagreement with an argument from judgment of the author. Lecturer modeling is needed to show how rigorous criticism can remain respectful and oriented toward learning (Husnia & Sofa, 2026).

RESEARCH METHODS

This study used qualitative descriptive library research and conceptual analysis. Academic literature on peer assessment, self-assessment, feedback literacy, self-regulated learning, and Islamic educational ethics was selected and analyzed. Coding focused on preparation, review processes, dialogue, feedback uptake, grading, moderation, and ethical risk. The resulting themes were synthesized into a model suitable for graduate PAI tasks.

The analysis was strengthened through comparison of theoretical reviews, empirical studies, and contextual Islamic education literature. No student participants or institutional performance data were used. The proposed model should therefore be understood as a pedagogical design that requires empirical validation through classroom observation, analysis of feedback quality, student interviews, and comparison of draft-to-revision improvement.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Co-constructing criteria and standards

The first finding is that peer and self-assessment should begin before submission. Lecturers introduce criteria through sample papers, research proposals, or lesson designs representing different quality levels. Students identify evidence of quality, compare their interpretations, and connect observations to the rubric. This process makes standards more usable than simply distributing a scoring sheet.

Co-construction does not require students to determine all criteria. Core academic and ethical standards remain the lecturer's responsibility, while students help clarify descriptors and examples. The discussion reveals ambiguous wording and prepares students to justify later judgments using evidence rather than preference.

Structured peer review cycles

A productive review cycle includes individual analysis, written feedback, dialogue, author response, and revision. Comments should identify a strength, explain a priority problem, and propose an actionable direction. Questions can be more useful than corrections when reviewers need the author to clarify assumptions, evidence, or implications.

For sensitive tasks, anonymity may reduce relational pressure; for collaborative seminars, named dialogue may strengthen accountability. The choice should reflect task purpose and cohort culture. Lecturer moderation is essential when comments are inaccurate, ethically problematic, or inconsistent with the agreed criteria (Topping, 2009).

Self-assessment and feedback uptake

After receiving peer and lecturer feedback, students complete a response plan indicating which comments they accept, adapt, or reject and why. They then self-assess the revised work against the same rubric. This requirement transforms feedback from a message into an accountable learning action.

Self-assessment should be judged for the quality of reflection rather than for matching the lecturer's score exactly. Students may legitimately interpret performance differently, but they must support their judgment with textual or performance evidence.

Repeated cycles help them internalize standards and regulate future work (Panadero, 2017).

Bias, trust, and grading limitations

Peer assessment can be distorted by friendship, conflict, status, language confidence, and fear of offending others. Students may also provide inflated ratings when peer scores directly affect final grades. These risks are greater in small cohorts where anonymity is difficult.

The proposed model therefore uses peer assessment primarily for formative feedback. When peer ratings contribute to grades, their weight should be limited and moderated. Clear appeal routes, multiple reviewers, calibration, and lecturer oversight protect fairness. Ethical orientation must be reinforced through concrete feedback behaviors, not general moral appeals (Ramadani & Sofa, 2025).

Synthesis of discussion

Dialogic peer and self-assessment develops feedback literacy through a sequence of criteria interpretation, evidence-based judgment, respectful dialogue, author decision making, revision, and reflection. Students learn both to give and to use feedback. The lecturer remains designer, model, moderator, and final academic authority while gradually transferring evaluative responsibility to learners.

Table 1. Dialogic peer and self-assessment cycle

Learning Stage	Assessment Practice	Learning Contribution
Criteria orientation	Exemplar and rubric analysis	Clarifies standards
Peer review	Evidence-based comments	Develops evaluative judgment
Author dialogue	Questions and response plan	Builds feedback literacy
Self-assessment	Revision and reflection	Strengthens self-regulation

The novelty of this article lies in integrating feedback literacy with Islamic ethical principles at the level of concrete assessment procedures. Honesty, respect, confidentiality, and constructive advice are translated into reviewer behaviors, moderation rules, and response requirements. The model therefore avoids treating ethics as a separate affective score and embeds it within scholarly dialogue.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that dialogic peer and self-assessment can strengthen feedback literacy in S2 PAI UNZAH. Its educational value lies in helping students understand criteria, make evidence-based judgments, manage criticism, and revise work. The approach is most effective when peer review is formative, structured, moderated, and connected to self-assessment.

Lecturers should provide exemplars, reviewer training, ethical protocols, feedback-response plans, and opportunities for revision. The study is limited by its conceptual design. Future research should analyze the accuracy and usefulness of student feedback, investigate emotional and cultural factors, and measure whether repeated review cycles improve academic writing, research planning, and pedagogical design.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andrade, H. (2009). Promoting learning and achievement through self-assessment.

- Theory Into Practice, 48(1), 12-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405840802577544>
- 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>
- 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>
- Husnia, S., & Sofa, A. R. (2026). Religious moderation in the Ahlussunnah wal Jamaah perspective: Relevance for S1 PIAUD and S2 Islamic Education. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Global and Multidisciplinary*, 2(2), 434-445.
- Nicol, D. (2021). The power of internal feedback: Exploiting natural comparison processes. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 46(5), 756-778. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1823314>
- 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. (2017). A review of self-regulated learning: Six models and four directions for research. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 422. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00422>
- Parawansah, S. H., & Sofa, A. R. (2024). Pendekatan komprehensif berbasis Al-Qur'an dan Hadits dalam pengembangan pendidikan Islam: Integrasi nilai, metode, evaluasi, sosio-kultural, dan kompetensi pendidik. *Karakter: Jurnal Riset Ilmu Pendidikan Islam*, 2(1), 187-205.
- Ramadani, S., & Sofa, A. R. (2025). Kejujuran dalam perspektif pendidikan Islam: Nilai fundamental, strategi implementasi, dan dampaknya terhadap pembentukan karakter santri di pesantren. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Pendidikan Agama Islam*, 3(1), 193-210.
- Sadler, D. R. (1989). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. *Instructional Science*, 18, 119-144. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00117714>
- Topping, K. J. (2009). Peer assessment. *Theory Into Practice*, 48(1), 20-27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405840802577569>
- Woitt, S., Weidlich, J., et al. (2025). Students' feedback literacy in higher education: An initial scale development study. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 30(1), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2023.2263838>
- Zhan, Y., Wan, Z. H., & Sun, 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>