



EFL Lecturers' Grading Practices in Islamic and General Higher Education Institutions

Sri Mulyani, Ahmad Ardillah Rahman, Fatmawati Akhmad, Hardiani Ardin

Institut Parahikma Indonesia, Indonesia

Abstract: *This study investigates EFL lecturers' grading practices, focusing on the beliefs underlying these practices, the types of assessment they implement to determine students' final grades, and multiple factors influencing them in deciding students' final grades. Applying interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA), two EFL lecturers, one from an Islamic higher education institution and the other from a general higher education institution, were interviewed to reveal their grading practices. The findings of the research reveal that both lecturers believe that grades should reflect students' learning outcomes. They serve as an instrument to measure the achievement of learning objectives and to identify which items from the course need to be improved. Both lecturers also believe that assigning final grades should involve multiple aspects related to moral character development. Furthermore, they apply various types of assessment. They employ formal and informal assessment types to obtain students' scores before deciding their final grades. In addition, they consider academic factors, such as scores derived from formal and informal assessments, and non-academic factors, such as students' efforts, attitude, and attendance, should be employed in their grading practices.*

Keywords: *Grading practices; Assessment; Academic Factors; Non-academic Factors*

INTRODUCTION

Grading is a matter of great importance in education, as an academic mark is expected to reflect students' performance in their learning process. Grades play an essential role in students' future lives, since they are one of determinant factors in getting scholarships and opportunities, determining learning paths, and influencing career choices (Tierney, 2015). Therefore, grades should reflect students' attainment for stakeholders (Cheng & Sun, 2015). The question of what elements should comprise grades is still the focus of ongoing debate. Many education experts suggest that a grade should reflect only students' achievement; therefore, teachers should focus solely on academic factors in assigning grades (Cheng & Sun, 2015; Pollio & Hochbein, 2015). Many experts recommend that grades should represent students' attainment (Zulaiha, 2017). One of the functions of grades is to inform stakeholders about the level of students' accomplishment in their learning, so arguably should include achievement factors. The inclusion of non-achievement factors would possibly lead to misinterpretation of the principle of grades as evidence of students' achievement (Gronlund, 1998, in Zulaiha, 2017).

Allen (2005) states that numerous teachers regard grading as a troublesome and dilemmatic task in terms of the inclusion of non-academic factors, such as students' effort and motivation. Furthermore, he asserts that teachers appear to be bewildered when conditioned to transfer multiple details about students in a single score. Considering this, he recommends two major steps in grading to improve the accuracy and meaningfulness of grading practices. The first step is to decide students' grades based solely on achievement, without non-academic factors, such as effort, attitude, responsibility or behaviour. Secondly, he suggests that teachers should direct more concern towards their professional practices in constructing practical assessment, rather than towards quantifying students' achievement precisely and impartially.

In fact, many teachers still involve non-academic factors in their grading practices. They are required to include such factors for the sake of boosting students' improvement, and teachers' accountability with the school organisation, parents, and for their own integrity (Zoeckler, 2005, cited in Isnawati & Saukah, 2017). Some researchers report that teachers' decision-making in grading is influenced by multiple factors. Cheng & Sun (2015), for example, argue that teachers' grading decision-making involves internal factors, such as the teacher's values and beliefs, and external factors, including parental influences and state accountability testing pressures.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Related Studies on Teachers' Grading Practices

Extensive studies investigating teachers' grading practices have been carried out in various contexts. Liu et al. (2015) examine the grading policies of mainland China, Hong Kong, South Korea and Japan through document analysis. The study finds that grading in the East Asian context relies on guidelines that are not explicitly defined. This study also highlights how grading policies in the Eastern Asian regions emphasise the assessment of both accomplishment and non-accomplishment factors like effort and attendance. Another study, conducted in China by Cheng and Sun (2015), reveals that English teachers consider achievement and non-achievement factors to be their grading criteria; noteworthily, they put great emphasis on non-achievement factors, such as students' endeavours, assignment, and study routines.

Involving 516 American public school teachers, Randall and Engelhard (2010) carried out research to explore the grades' meanings and what aspects teachers take into account in giving final grades. They found that teachers take local grading policy as a reference for their grading practices, and tend to apply non-achievement factors for a few borderline cases. In an earlier study, Randall and Engelhard (2009) investigated the variation in grading practices between elementary and middle-school teachers. In this study, 234 school teachers were asked to respond to 53 outlines representing a variety of student characteristics affecting teachers' grading decisions. The findings reveal that higher grades are given by elementary school teachers. Randall and Engelhard further highlight that grade-level discrepancies in grading practices are probably associated with students' attitude and attempt .

Zoeckler (2007) conducted a case study involving the English department of Mellmax High School, a rural high school in upstate New York. The participants were certified English teachers with experience ranging from two to 30 years. This study investigates teachers' considerations in giving grades, and the purpose of those grades (how and what the teacher intends to communicate through grades). The results indicate that all of the teachers use grading systems that make use of points and weights. All admit that some particular characteristics, such as diligence, persistence, negligence, laziness, willingness to help others, and so forth, influence grades. Teachers participating in this research attempt to communicate many different things through their grades.

A similar study was conducted by McMillan (2005), who investigated factors underlying teachers' grading decisions, the types of assessment used, the cognitive level of assessments conducted, and grades assigned. This study involved 213 secondary school teachers and represented urban, suburban, and rural schools. The results suggest that the teachers employ a variety of factors, such as academic achievement, effort, participation, and extra credit work. The teachers in this research consider academic performance to have the most importance.

In the Indonesian context, Isnawati and Saukah (2017) examined teachers' grading decision-making at the junior high school level. The focus of the research was on the teachers' beliefs underlying their grading, assessment forms, and factors considered in making grading decisions. This study involved two English teachers from two junior high schools. The results of this study show that the teachers believe that grades are not given only in order to measure students' ability, but also to make them practise the language, to provide them with life skills, and to motivate them. They utilise both formal and informal assessments. Besides giving remedial tests, providing more tasks and grade adjustment are considered necessary for the students to reach passing grade criteria. In addition, the teachers recognise scores from formal and informal assessment as achievement factors, and scores for students' effort and behaviour, as well as curriculum and school policy, as non-achievement factors. Both factors underlie their grading decision-making.

Grade Variables

A grade is a representation of students' progress in achieving learning goals after a certain period (Brookhart, 1994; Frisbie & Waltman, 2005). Meanwhile, Randal and Engelhard (2010) highlight that grades should reflect students' academic performance towards learning goals. It is expected to be a clear picture of students' proficiency of their course material. Under the umbrella of measurement theory, O'Connor (2017) recommends educators assign grades that consistently and accurately measure students' understanding of the course materials, and reflect school content standards and desired learning outcomes. Furthermore, Allen (2005, p. 218) states that "the most fundamental measurement principle related to meaningful assessment and grading is the principle of validity". Validity in grading is indispensable, as it communicates students' level of understanding and knowledge of the subject's content. Validity ensures the accuracy of the assessment and grading procedures employed by teachers (Gallagher, 1998; Gredler, 1999; Linn & Gronlund, 2000 in Allen, 2005).

Stiggins et al. (1989) conducted a case study to investigate 15 secondary teachers' grading practices in regard to 19 dimensions of grading practice framework. This study finds that the teachers' grading practices were in line with eight out of 19 recommendations: (1) teachers should communicate the method of grading to the students; (2) teachers should not include students' attitude in grading consideration; (3) the level of students' interest in the subject matter should not be incorporated as a grading component; (4) students' personality is not recommended to be included in grading; (5) the teachers confirmed the use of written tests as a principal means to measure achievement; (6) oral tests are effective for monitoring learning, but should not be included in grading; (7) performance assessments are suitable for use as a grading method; and (8) class size should be a part of a consideration in terms of the suitability of grades distribution.

Gamson (1991), on the other hand, states that grading serves four roles: (1) grades assess the quality of students' work; (2) grades inform students' learning results to the students and other stakeholders, such as employers, graduate schools, and parents; (3) grades encourage students in ways of studying, focus, and active participation in the course; and (4) grades are regulated to mark development, bring closure, and attempt to bring focus to both students and teachers.

Zoeckler (2007) uses three elements of moral dimension to assess teacher grading practices in his study framework. They are truthfulness, worthwhileness, and trust. Truthfulness includes what the teachers deliver in class, what students submit as assignments, what grading policies are implemented, and the nature of the communication between students and teachers, as well as between the parents and the community. Worthwhileness reflects the purpose of grading. Trust should be built among the involved members, such as students, parents and teachers. The issues of trust involve the exercise of teachers' discretionary power in giving grades.

Meanwhile, Hansen (1997, in Zoeckler, 2007, p. 98) elucidates the moral dimension of grading and instruction by combining two essential concepts: moral attentiveness and intellectual attentiveness. Intellectual attentiveness requires teachers to concentrate their students' intellectual process when they are being taught. It covers the assessment of students' comprehension, an exploration of the depth of their understanding, and an awareness of students' conduct that affects their dealings with the subject matter. Moral attentiveness, on the other hand, consists of two aspects: "alertness to the students' character and awareness of one's regard and treatment of students".

RESEARCH METHOD

Interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) is adopted in this study to obtain further in-depth information on EFL lecturers' beliefs regarding attributes and factors influencing their grading. IPA is seen as best suited to this research because it allows the researcher to go beyond statistical results and get as close as possible to the participants' views – understanding grading concepts from lecturers' perspectives within specific contexts (Larkin, Watts & Clifron, 2006). This research employs the forms of multiple-case designs (Yin, 2017) as it attempts to investigate two different cases from two EFL lecturers. It examines how the lecturers think

about grading, how they perceive themselves in their particular contexts, and how they make sense of their experiences.

The researchers are also teachers, so the IPA approach was adopted in order to help them to call on their personal experience in reflecting on the lecturers' thoughts while making sense of the notion and the attributes of grading. This notion coheres with Yin's idea (2017) that emphasizes how it is essential for the researcher to ensure that the paradigm of the research fits the design and the purpose of the study.

Considerations in selecting the two lecturers included their educational background, teaching experience and professionalism. One lecturer was from a general state university (henceforth identified as lecturer 1), while the other was from an Islamic state university (henceforth identified as lecturer 2). Each has a master's degree in English language education. Lecturer 1 had been teaching English for more than ten years, while lecturer 2 had more than five years of English teaching experience. During their teaching years, they also attended lecturer professional training and workshops related to learning assessment, evaluation and curriculum implementation. Both taught at least three to five courses or handled between seven and nine classes. Specifically, over a week, lecturer 1 had to teach for 24 hours and lecturer 2 had to teach for 14 to 16 hours.

The two lecturers were from universities under two different ministries. The Ministry of Education and Culture is responsible for general universities, while The Ministry of Religious Affairs is responsible for the Islamic universities. Despite this, both universities applied the Indonesian National Qualification Framework (KKNI) Curriculum (Sukirman, 2022b) which was issued by the Directorate of Higher Education. According to the Regulation of the Minister of Research, Technology, and Higher Education of Republik Indonesia (PERMENRISTEKDIKTI) Number 44 of 2015 about the National Standard of Higher Education, the Indonesian National Qualification Framework (KKNI) is a framework competence level integrating education and job training (Sukirman, 2022a). More specifically, the regulation stipulates that the criteria regarding graduate qualifications and capabilities include attitudes, knowledge and skills.

Table 1. *The participants in the research*

Participants	Lecturer 1	Lecturer 2
Sex	Female	Male
Educational background	A master's degree in English education	A master's degree in English education
Teaching experience	More than ten years	More than five years
Professional training & workshop	Workshop on evaluation and curriculum design	American-English teacher programme – critical thinking to classroom assessment.
Institution of origin	A general state university	An Islamic state university

In this research, the lecturer participants received information about the nature of the research and were informed that they should contact the researchers if they were interested in participating. When these two EFL lecturers contacted the

researchers, they were given an explanatory statement about the research and asked to confirm whether or not they agreed to be participants. All information concerning the participants' identities was kept confidential by using pseudonyms (Bryman, 2016). Although the respondents' consent to participate in the research had been obtained, the researchers were aware that the respondents had the right to control any information about themselves. Therefore, before releasing any information regarding the respondents, the researchers requested permission from the participants (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007).

Furthermore, an in-depth interview was used to uncover the two lecturers' grading practices. The interview guide consisted of three main sections, namely lecturers' beliefs in grading practices, assessment types to arrive at final grades, and factors considered in grading practices. Smith (2004) states that "IPA researchers employ techniques which are flexible enough to all unanticipated topics or themes to emerge during analysis" (p. 43). The conversations and lecturers' responses during interview were recorded and transcribed. Analysis was then conducted by dissecting the recordings and the transcripts for meaning units to be catalogued, thereby construing the key features of participants' experiences and viewpoints (Larkin, Watts & Clifron, 2006). The meaning units were then synthesised to give the whole description of the text. Further analysis involved reading and re-reading, to provide the researchers with a familiarity with the flow of the conversations. Once this was completed, a second reading phase was initiated in which the researchers compared the constructs of the first and the second reading. When the constructs were deemed exhaustive, the data were labelled into categories. The categories were then examined for overlap and redundancy, and divided into broad themes (Creswell, 2012).

FINDINGS

The findings of this study are presented in line with the problem statements outlined in the introductory section. They are lecturers' beliefs underlying their decisions in grading, types of assessment in determining students' final grades, and lecturers' considered factors in assigning grades.

Lecturers' Beliefs Underlying their Grading Decision Making

The Nature and the Purposes of Grading

Both of the lecturers expressed similar points of view when asked about their beliefs in their decisions to grade. Lecturer 1 stated that grades refer to students' learning outcomes or performance after completing a learning experience in the given course. Furthermore, she explained that the purposes of grading was to measure the achievement of the learning objectives in terms of how students, through their learning experience, possess the intended capability that is listed as an indicator of the learning objectives.

"For me a grade is a score that refers to students' learning outcomes or performance after completing a learning experience in the given course"
(lecturer 1).

Lecturer 2 also defined grades as a representation of students' understanding of particular topics or courses, and students' attention in the classroom. He further

explained that grading is essential for teaching and learning evaluation. It serves as an anchor for teachers to identify which items from the course students were failing or excelling at, so that the lecturer can prepare better steps or strategies for their teaching.

“Grades depict students’ focus on the classroom track and their understanding on particular topics. They serve as anchors for teachers to identify which item from the course the students were failing at or excelling on” (lecturer 2).

Principles in Giving Grades

Lecturer 1 highlighted that grading should cover four main competences: cognitive, psycho-motoric, affective, and metacognitive. In relation to grade alteration, the lecturer confirmed that she sometimes alters, raises or lowers students’ scores by considering students’ motivation, classroom participation, behaviour, and other moral or ethical issues.

Lecturer 2, on the other hand, highlighted that his main principles in giving grades are the originality and creativity of students’ work. In contrast to lecturer 1, he maintained that grade alteration can be given to students for their final grades only if they have a commitment to preserve originality and apply creativity in their works. He added that those two aspects can reveal the character of some good students. Students’ honesty, for example, can be assessed from their efforts to produce original work. Meanwhile, students’ perseverance can be identified from their intentions to gather, analyse, and develop any sources to produce creative works. However, he also asserted that students’ attitude is a factor that cannot be neglected in grading.

“I hold firmly my principle on originality and creativity as a basis for grading. I can upgrade the final grade if from the very beginning the student is consistent with his original work or offers creative ideas as the application of concepts have been discussed in the class” (lecturer 2).

From the lecturers’ responses, it can be inferred that the lecturers in this study share some common beliefs related to grading. They believe that grades should reflect students’ learning outcomes; they serve as an instrument to measure the achievement of learning objectives and to identify which parts or items from the course need improvement. Both lecturers maintain that determining grades should involve multiple aspects related to moral issues or moral character development. This can be seen from their consideration in assigning final grades and from their consideration in applying grade alteration. Even though they hold slightly different principles in their grading practices, both view grading as an integral part of students’ learning process. It also serves as an evaluation tool for teachers or lecturers.

Types of Assessment to Determine Students’ Final Grades

Types of Assessment

Based on the interviews with the two English lecturers, it was revealed that they use different types of assessment to determine students’ final grades. Lecturer 1 employs various types of assessment to gather more insight into students’

performance, giving them opportunities to obtain scores from those assessments. She uses triangulation of multiple assessments, namely examinations, assignments and lecturer's observation. These three elements of interconnected assessment are conducted periodically. Formal examinations, in the form of mid-term and final tests, are conducted once a semester. Informal examinations such as quizzes and in-class exercises are conducted periodically after finishing particular topics. Assignments are given in the form of homework and individual or group projects. Lecturer's observations are aimed at gauging students' active participation during the learning process; they are carried out throughout every encounter.

Lecturer 2, on the other hand, confirmed that he emphasises the use of performance-based or authentic activities for informal assessment. The performance-based assessments are conducted in the form of oral tests. Each student is assigned to perform a seven-minute presentation related to the topic that has been delivered by the lecturer and discussed in the class. The assessment is aimed at checking students' attention to and understanding of the given topic. For informal assessment, he also gives the students quizzes, homework, and group or individual tasks. To examine students' mastery of the given topics or materials the lecturer usually uses online quizzes after class through the Google Forms or Telegram applications. Another authentic assessment is also administered in the form of individual projects that reflect students' real knowledge on the provided topic. In terms of formal assessment, mid-term and final tests are given once in a semester.

Table 2. *Types of assessment*

Participants	Types of assessment	
	Informal	Formal
Lecturer 1	Quizzes, in-class exercises, homework, individual/group projects, lecturer's observation	Mid-semester and final tests
Lecturer 2	Quizzes, homework, individual/group tasks	Mid-semester and final tests

Institutional Grading System for Final Grades

When asked about their institution's policy related to grading, lecturer 1 stated that her institution have a clear grading system completed with the instrument and assessment rubric in each course, reviewed every semester by a group of lecturers who teach the same courses. The instruments and rubrics are used as guidance to give scores to students' work or assignments. The final grade that refers to the learning outcome should comprise four main aspects: mid-terms, final test, assignments and lecturers' observations.

Related to the institution's policy on grading systems, lecturer 2 stated that whatever grading system the lecturer adopts must include four aspects: attendance, assignments, mid-term assessment, and final term assessment. Interestingly, lecturer 2 confirmed that before assigning final grades, he calls his students one by one to show them their real final scores. In this session, the lecturer explains to the

students where the scores are derived from and whether or not those who fail the course can take remedial tests. He added that this discussion session was purposed to instil democratic values.

Both of the lecturers agreed to give students the opportunity to take remedial tests when the students fail their mid or final tests. The opportunities for remedial tests are granted for particular considerations; lecturer 1 considers factors such as students' attendance, motivation and attitude, while lecturer 2 cites originality and creative aspects as the main foundation in his assessment and grading. Remedial tests are given mainly in the form of retests, tasks, or learning projects.

Table 3. *Institutional Policy for Final Grades*

Respondents	Institutional policy	Remedial test opportunity
Lecturer 1	A final grade should consist of four main aspects: mid-terms, final test, assignments, and lecturers' observations.	Considered factors, such as students' attendance, motivation, and attitude.
Lecturer 2	A final grade should consist of four main aspects: attendance, assignments, mid-term assessment, and final term assessment.	Asserted originality and creativity aspects in their test results .

Factors Considered in Assigning Final Grades

Both lecturers indicated that the process of deciding final grades of students involve several factors. Lecturer 1 and lecturer 2 agreed that the main factor considered in assigning final grades is students' achievement. Lecturer 1 involves some non-academic factors in deciding final grades, such as students' attitudes in the classroom with their friends and the lecturer, attendance – including tardiness – and classroom participation. Likewise, lecturer 2 involves non-academic factors, such as students' attitude and perseverance. Students' perseverance can be seen from the students' hard work and effort in carrying out tasks assigned. At the end of the accumulation, all factors are adjusted to meet the institution's policy in terms of grading system. The final score in the grading system should cover four aspects: attendance, assignments, mid-term assessment and final term assessment. Lecturer 1, on the other hand, also refers to the institutions' grading system policy, stipulating that it should cover four main elements: mid-term assessment, final assessment, assignments and lecturers' observation.

For both lecturers, the inclusion of non-academic factors in assigning grades is based on logical reasons. Lecturer 1 believes that grading should not reflect only student learning outcomes in the cognitive domain, but also in the affective, psychomotor, and metacognitive areas. For example, some may deserve an A in cognitive achievement, but from his/her attitude, she/he deserves a B. According to lecturer 2, students are complex human beings; there are too many aspects to consider before coming to a judgmental conclusion. For that reason, non-academic factors, such as students' attitude and perseverance, need to be included. To finalise

grading for this aspect, he monitors students' attitude whenever they engage in a classroom session, and their perseverance in dealing with any task assigned.

Table 4. *Factors considered in assigning grades*

Respondents	Institutional policy	Remedial test opportunity
Lecturer 1	Students' achievement based on the results of formal and informal assessments.	Students' attitudes in the classroom with their friends and lecturers, attendance (including tardiness), and classroom participation.
Lecturer 2	Students' achievement based on the results of formal and informal assessments.	Students' attitude and perseverance. Students' perseverance can be seen from the students' hard work and efforts in doing the tasks.

DISCUSSIONS

In terms of lecturers' beliefs in their grading practices, the results of this present study confirm that both of the lecturers hold similar beliefs in grading practices. They agree that grading plays a significant part in the learning and teaching process. It informs the lecturers and other stakeholders about students' learning outcomes. It also functions as an instrument to measure the achievement of learning objectives established at the beginning of every semester. However, both lecturers also indicated that giving final grades is not as simple as writing a single score. It needs a long process and thoughtful consideration to make it meaningful for both the lecturers and the students.

Grading does not function only as a measurement for academic achievement, but it also becomes one of the ways to instil moral character. Lecturer 1 includes attitude, motivation, attendance and class participation in her grading in order to motivate students to not only focus on cognitive accomplishment but also on various moral dimensions. Lecturer 2 affirms originality and creativity in students' work to be the main considerations in his grading. Those two aspects are intended to stimulate students to have good character, such as honesty and responsibility. The lecturers' belief in bringing moral dimensions to grading practices is in line with Hansen (1997), as cited in Zoeckler (2007), who states that grading and moral dimensions are formed by the combination of moral attentiveness and intellectual attentiveness. Moral attentiveness deals with students' intellectual process when they are being taught. It covers students' comprehension of and conduct around subject matters. Moral attentiveness, on the other hand, refers to alertness to the students' characters. Tierney (2015) finds in his study moral reasons underlying grading alteration, such as the need for compassion, the desire to provide students with opportunities, and the intent to teach life lessons. Such beliefs on grading practices are supported by Gamson (1991), who states that grading serves four roles, namely assessing the quality of students' work; informing students' learning results to the students and others stakeholders; encouraging

students' in ways to study – their focus, and their active participation in the course – and regulating to mark development, bring closure, and attempt focus for both students and teachers. In addition, the participating lecturers' belief in including moral factors in grading is in line with the earlier study of Isnawati and Saukah (2017) on teachers' grading decision-making in the Indonesian junior high schools context.

Relating to assessment practices, the lecturers have undergone various types of assessment. They employ both formal and informal assessment types to obtain students' scores in an attempt to gain better understanding of students' achievement before they decide students' final grades in learning report cards. Their use of multiple assessment types is in line with the recommendation of educational assessment experts Stiggin, Frisbie and Grisworld (1989). In addition, O'Malley (1997) states that various informal assessments or authentic assessments are believed to provide a comprehensive picture of students' growth and achievements; more so when they are combined with illustrative samples of student work and informative scoring rubrics.

Dealing with factors considered in grading decision-making, it is clear that the lecturers in this study consider academic factors involving scores derived from formal and informal assessments in their grading practices. Besides, they also take into account some non-achievement or non-academic factors, such as students' efforts, attitudes, and attendance. This contradicts the recommendation from measurement theory that grades should reflect only students' achievement (Allen, 2005; Randall & Engelhard, 2010; O'Connor, 2017). However, numerous studies on teachers' grading practices report similar grading practices involving non-academic factors (Liu & Yan, 2015; Cheng & Sun, 2015; Randall & Engelhard, 2010; Zoeckler, 2007; McMillan, 2005; Isnawati & Saukah, 2017).

CONCLUSION

It can be concluded that both lecturers believe that grades should reflect students' learning outcomes. This serves as an instrument to measure the achievement of learning objectives and to identify which items from the course need to improve. Both lecturers also believe that assigning final grades should involve multiple aspects related to moral issues or moral characters development.

They conduct diverse grading practices and types of assessment in their classrooms. Both academic and non-academic factors significantly contribute to their decisions for students' final grades. When students do not reach the criteria for passing grades, they are given opportunities to take remedial tests and carry out more tasks or projects to make up for their low grades. Although they come from different universities, their institutions apply similar curriculums, with slight differences in grading system policy. Lecturer 1 has to convert the grading into four main aspects, namely mid-terms, a final test, assignments and lecturers' observations. Lecturer 2 must also include four main points in the grading, covering attendance, assignments, mid-term assessment and final term assessment.

Finally, this study has some limitations in terms of the data collection method and the number of participants; therefore, it is recommended that future

studies on grading practices should involve the triangulation of the data collection method, and a greater number of participants to reveal grading practices of EFL lecturers in different educational contexts. Involving lecturers from some state and private universities with diverse teaching experience might also offer valuable insights

REFERENCES

- Allen, J. D. (2005). Grades as valid measures of academic achievement of classroom learning. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 78(5), 218–223. <https://doi.org/10.3200/TCHS.78.5.218-223>
- Brookhart, S. M. (1994). Teachers' grading: Practice and theory. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 7(4), 279–201. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15324818ame0704_2
- Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods* (5th edition). Oxford University Press.
- Cheng, L., & Sun, Y. (2015). Teachers' grading decision making: Multiple influencing factors and methods. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 12(2), 213–233. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2015.1010726>
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th edition). Pearson.
- Frisbie, D. A., & Waltman, K. K. (2005). Developing a personal grading plan. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 11(3), 35–42. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-3992.1992.tb00251.x>
- Gallagher, J. D. (1998). *Classroom assessment for teachers*. Prentice Hall.
- Gredler, M. E. (1999). *Classroom Assessment and Learning*. Addison Wesley Longman.
- Gamson, Z. F. (1991). A brief history of the seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 1991(47), 5–12. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.37219914703>
- Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (2007). *Ethnography: Principles in practice* (3rd edition). Routledge.
- Isnawati, I., & Saukah, A. (2017). Teachers' grading decision making. *TEFLIN Journal - A Publication on the Teaching and Learning of English*, 28(2), 155. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v28i2/155-169>
- Larkin, M., Watts, S., & Clifton, E. (2006). Giving voice and making sense in interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 102-120. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp062oa>

- Liu, X., Yan, W., Coombs, A., Maccormack, J., & Soleas, E. (2015). *Graduate student symposium grading in East Asia: An examination of government policies*. <https://qspace.library.queensu.ca/>
- McMillan, J. H. (2005). Secondary teachers' classroom assessment and grading practices. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 20(1), 20–32. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-3992.2001.tb00055.x>
- O'Connor, K. (2017). *How to grade for learning: Linking grades to standards*. Corwin Press.
- O'Malley, J. M. . & P. L. V. (1997). *Authentic asesment for English language learners: Practical approach for teachers*. Addison-wesley Publishing Company.
- Pollio, M., & Hochbein, C. (2015). The association between standards-based grading and standardized test scores as an element of a high school reform model. *Teachers College Record*, 117(11), 1-28. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811511701106>
- Randall, J., & Engelhard, G. (2009). Examining teacher grades using rasch measurement theory. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 46(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-3984.2009.01066.x>
- Randall, J., & Engelhard, G. (2010). Examining the grading practices of teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(7), 1372–1380. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.03.008>
- Smith, J. A. (2004). Reflecting on the development of interpretative phenomenological analysis and its contribution to qualitative research in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 1(1), 39-54. DOI: 10.1191/1478088704qp004oa
- Sukirman, S. (2022a). The KKNi-based ELT curriculum applied in Islamic higher education in Indonesia: Global curriculum ideology perspectives. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*, 43(2), 311-322. <https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/kjss/article/view/258488>
- Sukirman, S. (2022b). The concept of “Kampus Merdeka” in the current policy of Indonesian higher education: ELT lecturers' perspectives. *Indonesian TESOL Journal*, 4(1), 31-47. <http://ejournal.iainpalopo.ac.id/index.php/ITJ/article/view/2440>
- Stiggins, R. J., Frisbie, D. A., & Griswold, P. A. (1989). Inside high school grading practices: Building a research agenda. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 8(2), 5–14. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-3992.1989.tb00315.x>
- Tierney, R. D. (2015). Altered grades: A grey zone in the ethics of classroom assessment. *Assessment Matters*, 8, 5–30. <https://doi.org/10.18296/am.0002>

Yin, R. K. (2017). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods*. Sage publications.

Zoeckler, L. G. (2007). Moral aspects of grading: A study of high school English teachers' perceptions. *American Secondary Education*. 35(2), 83–102. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41406291>.

Zulaiha, S. (2017). Teachers' grading practices: In search for clear grading criteria. *Journal of ELT Research: The Academic Journal of Studies in English Language Teaching and Learning*, 2(1), 15–23. <https://journal.uhamka.ac.id/index.php/jer/article/view/157>