



Learning-Oriented Reading Assessment: A Design for EFL Students

Rinthip Chongsomboon

Chulalongkorn University, Thailand, 6388510427@student.chula.ac.th

Apasara Chinwonno

Chulalongkorn University, Thailand, Apasara.C@chula.ac.th

Learning-oriented reading assessment (LORA) has expanded multiple views of assessment for learning reading. Most EFL reading assessment contexts tended not to utilise feedback and self-assessment for the redesign of authentic tasks and tests. This mixed-methods study investigated how LORA enhanced EFL students' reading after the implementation of LORA. Participants consist of sixty-seven tenth Grade Thai students from the urban public school. They were divided into two groups, including 32 students for the LORA group and 35 students for the control group. The reading test was designed to compare post-test scores of both groups and was analyzed using Mann-Whitney U-test. In addition to perceptions on assessment, only those in the LORA group responded to the LORA questionnaire to give their perceptions of the assessment, and the three highest-ranking and the three lowest-ranking students were selected for the semi-structured interviews to explore five aspects of the design, including task, test, teacher's observation, feedback, and redesign. Findings from the questionnaire were analyzed using descriptive statistics whereas the semi-structured interview was categorized through thematic analysis. Although there was no statistically significant difference between groups, students in the LORA group tended to gain higher scores on reading after participating in the study. They perceived positively on the implementation. Implications indicated connecting reading assessment and feedback for learning with authentic tasks and tests.

Keywords: learning-oriented reading assessment, reading, reading assessment, perception, EFL

INTRODUCTION

In the realm of education, assessment played a crucial role in providing valuable insights and guidance to educators, students, and other stakeholders, aiding them in enhancing the effectiveness of teaching, learning, and educational policies. Within the context of reading assessment, Grabe (2021) proposed that the focus on how reading was assessed had gained considerable significance, with a renewed emphasis on task authenticity and the reflection of students' reading processes. This shift in reading assessment had not only centered on the assessment itself but had also extended to the

Citation: Chongsomboon, R., & Chinwonno, A. (2024). Learning-oriented reading assessment: A design for EFL students. *International Journal of Instruction*, 17(3), 565-580. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2024.17331a>

methodologies employed to improve reading instruction and comprehension (Cervetti, 2019). Grabe and Jiang's study (2013) highlighted the prevalent use of standardized assessment tests and classroom-based assessments in educational settings. Classroom-based assessment was found to be particularly advantageous for students, offering them valuable feedback and fostering an awareness of their learning progress beyond merely focusing on academic outcomes. Additionally, Grabe (2009) posited that classroom-based assessment created opportunities for teachers to employ diverse tasks and observe their students' progress more effectively. In alignment with this approach, Todd et al. (2021) endorsed the promotion of authentic language usage through continuous assessment methods, further empowering students to engage in self-assessment practices that have been proven effective in enhancing their learning outcomes. As such, Todd et al. recommended continuous assessment as an effective strategy. In the same way, De Costa, Coss, and Leung (2022) mentioned the need to broaden the scope of assessment in foreign language learning.

The prevailing reading assessment practices in most EFL context have limited engagement with feedback provision and self-assessment, resulting in a lack of emphasis on the learning processes and restricted opportunities to explore students' reading proficiency. Prior studies on learning-oriented reading assessment (LORA) as an assessment approach that placed paramount importance on the effective learning processes of students have been conducted (Kim, 2022; Viengsang & Wasanasomsithi, 2022). Nonetheless, there remains a research gap concerning the application of LORA in EFL reading classroom, and students' perceptions of this method.

This study implemented the learning-oriented reading assessment as an alternative reading assessment with an emphasis on learning processes. The implementation highlighted lessons design based on learning-oriented reading assessment (LORA) that connected authentic task, test, teacher's observation, feedback, and redesign. This study aimed to investigate how EFL students' reading improved after the implementation of LORA, and what their perceptions towards this method were.

Context and Review of Literature

Learning-oriented Reading Assessment (LORA)

Learning-oriented reading assessment (LORA) was proposed by Jones and Saville (2016) who used the term 'Learning Oriented Assessment' to refer to the assessment that enhanced learning, and the key features proposed included equipping learners with feedback, engaging learners in learning, using assessment results to adapt teaching, paying attention to learners' motivation as a result of assessment, and learners being able to assess themselves. It was stated that LOA showed the connection between large-scale assessment and classroom assessment by having learning evidence conveyed to students. LOA was perceived as the combination of assessment as learning (AaL), assessment for learning (AfL), and assessment of learning (AoL). Similarly, Grabe and Stoller (2020) postulated that both AoL and AfL were pivotal benchmarks of an effective reading curriculum. This was also supported by Duda et al. (2023) that AfL promoted self-assessment of students and promoted engagement in learning. The basic principle of LOA was provided in Farhady (2021) which shared some similarities with

the aforementioned studies. According to Farhady (2021), LOA allowed teachers to use data gathered from feedback or what they gained from observing students, and LOA combined both summative and formative assessments. To clarify, summative assessment was implemented to investigate whether students achieved the learning goals, whereas formative assessment helped inform students about the area to improve. Saville (2021) stated that the objectives of the tasks, scaffolding, observation, and feedback were frequently mentioned in LOA. LOA was established from the assessment that gave importance to learning processes and learning outcomes as cited in Gebril (2021). According to De Costa, Coss, and Leung (2022), LOA not only promoted learning but also contributed to teaching effectiveness.

Kim (2022) adapted Carless' (2007) LOA framework in Korean EFL reading class including three components: learning task, students' involvement, and feedback. Students were investigated their perception through semi-structured interview. The findings from Kim's (2022) study revealed that students were able to reach the class objectives after the implementation of LORA. Peer feedback and self-evaluation played an important role in promoting learning by evaluating themselves. Viengsang and Wasanasomsithi (2022) revealed positive findings of LORA towards reading, and other skills, namely, communication and collaboration. It was stated that students encountered the type of assessment that they had never seen before. As a result, they were not assessed by only the summative tests, rather they realized their learning progresses constantly. Significantly, LORA allowed students to see the connection between what they learned and what to assess with its ability to adapt to both the learning environment and students' characteristics (Leung, 2020).

Reading was characterized as a cognitive process that involved the integration of background knowledge and textual information to construct meaning. Anderson (2014) contended that skilled readers exhibited fluency by employing effective reading strategies. Richards (2015) further defined reading as a meaning-making activity, wherein grammatical, vocabulary, and prior knowledge were pivotal. Upon performing the reading task, students employed various skills and strategies. Grabe (2014, 2017) posited that reading comprehension necessitated word recall, understanding of vocabulary, sentence comprehension, and the integration of cognitive skills such as goal setting and monitoring comprehension. Notably, background knowledge significantly contributed to meaning making in reading. This comprehensive definition encompassed word recognition, vocabulary, morphology, syntax, clause and text meaning formation, discourse structure processing, main idea recognition, and strategic comprehension processing. Grabe and Stoller (2020) categorized reading into two levels: lower and higher. Lower-level processes involved understanding individual words in the text, which could be facilitated through phonological awareness and letter-sound connections, sight word recognition, and vocabulary development. Higher-level processes, on the other hand, pertained to grasping the overall meaning of the text, including background knowledge, making inferences, and developing positive attitudes toward reading. Skilled readers naturally established connections between ideas and offered their own interpretations. A comprehensive definition of reading should not be confined to mere interpretation of printed text, but must encompass the reader's engagement, reading purpose, and employ skills and strategies. Additionally, contextual

factors and time constraints must be considered. The multifaceted nature of reading involves purposes, reading comprehension fluency, and cognitive processes.

Considering L1 and L2 reading, Grabe and Jiang (2018) emphasized that exposing to texts, expanded world and social knowledge, enhanced reading fluency, and a positive attitude towards reading could enhance L2 reading. However, L1 reading and literacies could also influence L2 reading, and how L2 readers carried out reading tasks, especially with complex texts, was still unclear. Bernhardt and Leffell (2019) mentioned the underlying factors such as a level of background knowledge or some differences within the texts for each individual. Sarab and Rad (2022) stated that students' attitudes toward reading in L1 impacted their L2 reading. Considering students' different interests and preparing reading materials that suited their levels enabled L2 readers to improve their reading further.

Perceptions on Learning-oriented Reading Assessment

Students' perception towards assessment affected their performance and learning (Sambell & McDowell, 1998; Craddock & Mathias, 2009) as cited in Pereira et al. (2016). The perception on LOA was conducted by Wicking (2018) with EFL university students to investigate their beliefs towards assessment using surveys and case studies. The findings showed that students thought that peer feedback and teacher feedback were important to their learning. Students also benefited from group work and made use of the teacher's feedback. Regarding the perceptions towards LOA, seven aspects that encouraged its success were proposed which were streamed classes, clear objectives of the curriculum, rational task and assessment, authority to manage learning and teaching, implementation of technology, peer assessment, and cutting-edge assessment tasks.

Qian and Lau (2022) conducted a study on how achievement goals and students' perceptions on reading instruction affected students' reading performance. The 4-point Likert scale was used for students' perception on six aspects. First, students were asked to assess the climate of the class disciplinary, then how much support they received from the teacher was rated as the second aspect. Third, how direct the instruction was in reading class was rated. Fourth, students rated how the feedback by the teacher in their reading class was. Fifth, students determined how reading instruction was adapted. Lastly, students revealed how engaged they were to the instruction. The finding of the study was that disciplinary climate, instruction adaptation, and teacher enforced engagement played a crucial role in reading performance enhancement.

In summary, LORA was originally introduced as an assessment approach that enhances learning by providing feedback and engaging learners in the learning process. It combined assessment as learning, assessment for learning, and assessment of learning. LORA focused on both learning processes and outcomes, bridging the gap between large-scale and classroom assessments by conveying learning evidence to students. LORA and a comprehensive understanding of reading processes, together with EFL students' perception of this method could contribute to effective reading instruction and assessment which its procedures will be mentioned in the next section.

METHOD

Participants and Context

Sixty-seven Thai secondary school students participated in this study. Their English abilities varied due to different backgrounds in terms of the schools they had attended in the previous academic year. The study had a total of 70 participants, with 35 students from the Japanese major and 35 students from the Chinese major, selected through purposive sampling. All 70 participants took part in both the pretest and post-test, but three students were absent, leaving 32 students for the questionnaire analysis. For the semi-structured interview, six participants were chosen based on their questionnaire mean scores. Specifically, three students were purposive sampling selected from those who scored higher in the questionnaire, and another three students were chosen from those who scored lower in the questionnaire. The mixed-method design was applied to complement the quantitative results of the reading test with the qualitative data from the semi-structured interviews to gain greater information (Brown, 2014).

Research Instruments

Reading Test

The reading test was created to evaluate various aspects of students' reading skills, such as understanding vocabulary meanings, identifying main ideas, interpreting texts, making inferences, and recognizing the author's purpose. It served as both a pretest and posttest to measure the impact of the LORA treatment. The pretest and posttest were identical in content. The test consisted of 30 multiple-choice items, following the reading assessment framework by Grabe and Jiang (2013). Students were given 45 minutes to complete the test. The findings from this reading test provided answers to the first research question, which focused on the extent of improvement in English reading among EFL students after the implementation of the learning-oriented reading assessment (LORA). In the context of this study, reading is defined as the capacity to comprehend vocabulary meanings, identify main ideas, interpret texts, make inferences, and discern the author's purpose (Grabe and Jiang, 2013; Afflerbach et al., 2018). Reading proficiency was assessed through a reading test.

Learning-oriented Reading Assessment Questionnaire

The questionnaire collected quantitative data on how students in the LORA group perceived LORA in their reading class. Each questionnaire comprised five sections: task, test, teacher's observation, feedback, and redesign. The students used a 5-point Likert scale to rate their level of agreement with each statement in these sections. There was a total of 30 items in the questionnaire, with six items for each section. These questionnaires were completed by the participants during the post-implementation phase, providing insights into how EFL students perceived the implementation of LORA.

Semi-structured Interview

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with six participants from the LORA groups to gain deeper insights into their agreement or disagreement with the statements in the questionnaire. These interviews aimed to address the second research question, exploring the students' perceptions during the implementation of LORA. Five interview

questions were created to investigate the participants' views on five specific aspects of LORA, including the task, test, teacher's observation, feedback, and redesign.

Procedure

Learning-oriented Reading Assessment (LORA) Intervention

The development of the LORA used in this study was adapted from Jone and Saville's (2016) framework. The intervention was implemented following five aspects of the LORA proposed model. First, a task refers to a reading task that engages EFL students' real-world language usage. Each task was designed to allow students to assess themselves as they learned. Self-evaluation and peer evaluation were incorporated into the task so that students could track their own progress. Next, test was served as a means to inform learners of their progress and were administered during in-class task performance (Jones and Saville, 2016). The test in this study was adapted from this approach and aimed to assess students' vocabulary knowledge, main idea identification, text structure recognition, meaning interpretation or inference-making, and author's purpose identification. There are two types of tests in this study which are end-of-lesson tests and end-of-unit tests. The findings from the test allowed students to track their progress, and also reflect on how the next lessons should be designed. Third, teacher's observation is used as the basis of classroom investigation on students' progress to provide feedback. It involved classroom observation, using questions to check comprehension, and taking notes by the teacher. The fourth aspect is feedback which allows students to track their learning progress through receiving comments from both peers and teacher. It was revealed that students' responses to feedback provided by the teachers were highlighted as the key factor contributing to the effectiveness of LOA. Apart from the concreteness of feedback from teachers, students mentioned that feedback from their peers was also beneficial. However, it was stated that how individuals took feedback to revise their work affected their improvement (Kim & Kim, 2021). Last, redesign is the adjustment of reading lessons based on students' performance.

Data Analysis

The reading pretest and post-test, the questionnaire, and the semi-structured interviews were the data-gathering methods implemented in this study. Both participants in the LORA group and controlled group participated in the tests. After the treatment was implemented for the LORA group for nine weeks, the questionnaire focused on each aspect of LORA was allotted. Then, six students selected from the questionnaire result participated in the semi-structured interviews. The interview participants were three students who scored highest and another three students who scored lowest in their questionnaire findings.

Data for the first research question was collected from reading test scores. Participants from both groups took part in the tests, and their posttest scores were analyzed using descriptive statistics (Z-score). Due to the non-normal distribution of the collected data, the Wilcoxon Sign Ranks Test was employed to compare posttest scores. Regarding the second research question, students' perceptions of LORA in their reading class were collected through both a questionnaire and semi-structured interviews. The

questionnaire data was analyzed using descriptive statistics, specifically means and standard deviations, to report the findings. On the other hand, thematic analysis was applied to the qualitative data obtained from the semi-structured interviews. This analysis method allowed for a deeper exploration and understanding of the students' perspectives on various aspects of LORA. By combining the questionnaire findings with the insights gained from the thematic analysis of the interviews, a comprehensive and detailed picture of how students from the LORA group perceived LORA was obtained.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 presents findings on the performance of the LORA group after the implementation of the treatment. Several factors showed similarities in terms of the posttest scores being higher than the pretest scores. These factors were vocabulary knowledge, identifying main ideas, recognizing text structure, and identifying author's purpose. For vocabulary knowledge, the students' posttest score ($M = 3.69$, $SD = 1.77$) was higher than their pretest score ($M = 3.19$, $SD = 1.71$), which was the highest improvement among the five factors. Turning to identifying main ideas, the posttest score ($M = 3.19$, $SD = 1.53$) was higher than the pretest score ($M = 2.72$, $SD = 1.33$). For recognizing text structure, the posttest score ($M = 2.91$, $SD = 1.12$) was higher than the pretest score ($M = 2.56$, $SD = 1.39$), though this factor had the lowest improvement compared to the others. Similarly, for identifying author's purpose, the posttest score ($M = 3.03$, $SD = 1.53$) was higher than the pretest score ($M = 2.78$, $SD = 1.72$). However, interpreting text meanings or inference making showed a different trend, as the posttest score ($M = 3.00$, $SD = 1.52$) was lower than the pretest score ($M = 3.13$, $SD = 1.41$). Nonetheless, only vocabulary knowledge and identifying main ideas exhibited statistically significant differences at .01 ($z = -2.50$, $p = .012$) and .05 ($z = -2.13$, $p = .033$), respectively. Considering the overall score, the students' posttest score ($M = 15.81$, $SD = 6.05$) was lower than their pretest score ($M = 14.41$, $SD = 5.88$). However, there was a statistically significant improvement among the students after the treatment ($z = -2.24$, $p = .025$).

Table 1
English reading ability of LORA group

| Test | | N | M | SD | Z | p | Effect Size (r) |
|--|----------|----|-------|------|-------|-------|-----------------|
| Overall | Pretest | 32 | 14.41 | 5.88 | -2.24 | .025* | .40 |
| | Posttest | 32 | 15.81 | 6.05 | | | |
| Vocabulary knowledge | Pretest | 32 | 3.19 | 1.77 | -2.50 | .012* | .44 |
| | Posttest | 32 | 3.69 | 1.77 | | | |
| Identify main idea | Pretest | 32 | 2.72 | 1.33 | -2.13 | .033* | .38 |
| | Posttest | 32 | 3.19 | 1.53 | | | |
| Recognize text structure | Pretest | 32 | 2.91 | 1.39 | -1.17 | .242 | |
| | Posttest | 32 | 2.91 | 1.12 | | | |
| Interpret text meaning (make inference) | Pretest | 32 | 3.13 | 1.41 | -0.64 | .521 | |
| | Posttest | 32 | 2.91 | 1.52 | | | |
| Identify author's purpose | Pretest | 32 | 2.78 | 1.72 | -1.08 | .279 | |
| | Posttest | 32 | 3.03 | 1.53 | | | |

* $p < .05$

Data gathered from the posttests from both LORA group and controlled group was demonstrated in Table 2. Students in the LORA group achieved higher scores in their posttest ($M = 3.69$, $SD = 1.77$) comparing to the controlled group ($M = 3.43$, $SD = 1.67$) for vocabulary knowledge. Turning to recognizing text structure, students received higher score in their posttest ($M = 2.91$, $SD = 1.12$) comparing to the controlled group ($M = 2.57$, $SD = 1.12$). However, for identifying main idea, students in the LORA group received lower posttest score ($M = 3.19$, $SD = 1.53$) than the controlled group ($M = 3.63$, $SD = 1.37$). The LORA group tendered to receive lower posttest score ($M = 3.00$, $SD = 1.52$) than the controlled group ($M = 3.51$, $SD = 1.52$) in interpret text meaning. The LORA group received lower posttest score for interpreting author's purpose ($M = 3.03$, $SD = 1.53$) than the controlled group ($M = 3.17$, $SD = 1.81$) as well. Regarding the overall, posttest score of the LORA group ($M = 15.81$, $SD = 6.05$) was lower than the controlled group ($M = 16.31$, $SD = 5.47$) for identifying the author's purpose. However, this difference was not statistically significant ($z = -0.30$, $p = .76$). Similarly, there was no statistically significant difference for vocabulary knowledge and interpretation of text meaning in both groups.

Table 2
English reading ability of LORA group and controlled group

| Test | Groups | N | M | SD | Z | p |
|---|------------|----|-------|------|-------|-----|
| Overall | LORA | 32 | 15.81 | 6.05 | -0.30 | .76 |
| | Controlled | 35 | 16.31 | 5.47 | | |
| Vocabulary knowledge | LORA | 32 | 3.69 | 1.77 | -0.60 | .55 |
| | Controlled | 35 | 3.43 | 1.67 | | |
| Identify main idea | LORA | 32 | 3.19 | 1.53 | -0.87 | .38 |
| | Controlled | 35 | 3.63 | 1.37 | | |
| Recognize text structure | LORA | 32 | 2.91 | 1.12 | -1.20 | .23 |
| | Controlled | 35 | 2.57 | 1.12 | | |
| Interpret text meaning (make inference) | LORA | 32 | 3.00 | 1.52 | -1.24 | .21 |
| | Controlled | 35 | 3.51 | 1.52 | | |
| Identify author's purpose | LORA | 32 | 3.03 | 1.43 | -0.33 | .74 |
| | Controlled | 35 | 3.17 | 1.81 | | |

Considering the factors contributing to reading comprehension, such as word recognition, vocabulary knowledge, text structure understanding, and L1 reading comprehension (Grabe & Stoller, 2020). Table 2 demonstrates that only vocabulary knowledge and text structure recognition showed higher scores in the LORA group, but without statistical significance. The findings were supported by Jeon and Yamashita (2014) as cited in Grabe and Stoller (2020) in a sense that individual's differences in terms of various students' individual abilities to recognize words, knowledge of vocabulary, knowledge of text structure, and L1 reading comprehension could affect their performance on the test. In Torabi and Maleki (2022), it was mentioned that vocabulary and grammar affected comprehension in reading.

Turning to the second research question, it delved into students' perceptions of LORA. This comprehensive investigation aimed to gain a deeper understanding of various

aspects of LORA, which were categorized as task, test, teacher's observation, feedback, and redesign. The findings are presented in Table 3 thoroughly discussed in the subsequent sections.

Table 3
Students' perceptions on LORA

| Items | LORA Group (n=32) | | Level of Agreement |
|------------------------|-------------------|------|--------------------|
| | M | SD | |
| Tasks | 4.04 | 0.73 | Agree |
| Tests | 4.16 | 0.75 | Agree |
| Teacher's Observations | 4.16 | 0.73 | Agree |
| Feedbacks | 4.03 | 0.73 | Agree |
| Redesigns | 4.09 | 0.73 | Agree |

The data gained from the questionnaire showed that the level of agreement on task is at "Agree" (M = 4.04, SD = 0.73). In the interviews, students reported significant improvement in their vocabulary knowledge after engaging in the reading tasks, positively impacting their overall reading. LOA goals emphasized student development and goal setting, allowing students to track their progress and identify areas for improvement through these tasks. Similar to Navaie's (2018) implementation in a pronunciation class, the reading tasks in this study were meaningful and engaging, fostering student interaction and discussions. Grabe and Stoller (2020) stressed the importance of incorporating classroom discussions in reading lessons. The teachers were able to observe students' performance and provide beneficial feedback to enhance their reading abilities. Students found the tasks helpful as they provided ample practice, aligning with Grabe's (2020) principle of using purposeful reading texts to develop strong readers. The LORA tasks' key characteristics were their meaningfulness and authenticity, allowing students to integrate various reading skills and strategies crucial for improving reading. Turner and Purpura (2016) observed that students' interactions with tasks served as evidence of learning, which paralleled the students' perception that these tasks helped them monitor their progress, as indicated by the questionnaire findings.

To gain more insights of students' perceptions and elaborate each aspect of LORA with qualitative data, the semi-structured interview was conducted. The excerpts below provided further details on the implementation of LORA.

Excerpt 1 (Student's perception towards task)

Tasks helped us to read and gain more knowledge of vocabulary words. The task itself was interesting because I got to learn about topics I had never heard of before. Sometimes, it matched with my interest, but sometimes it did not, it depended. I felt that what I read would be presented in the examination so the more I read, the better I could perform in the exam.

In terms of test, the level of agreement is at agree (M = 4.16, SD = 0.75) which was higher than other aspects, except teacher's observation that is equally rated. The LORA framework's test serves two purposes: to assess learning progress (End-of-Unit) and to support ongoing learning (End-of-Lesson). Students in the study found reading tests

between lessons helpful for tracking progress and revising which is in concordance with Widiastuti et al. (2020) in terms of using assessment as a tool to set goals in learning. Grabe (2018) suggests assessing reading skills informally, in addition to summative assessment. Students perceived the tests as meaningful for their learning. However, some non-multiple-choice formats confused students, so test arrays should consider students' language proficiency levels.

Excerpt 2 (Student's perception towards test)

It was good having the tests as we could finally learn from our mistakes. However, the open-ended questions could make me lack confidence with my answers. So I would like the test to have a certain answer otherwise I would wonder if I got the correct one or not.

Students' level of agreement toward teacher's observations was at "Agree" with the highest score similar to test ($M = 4.16$, $SD = 0.73$). Teacher's observation was a crucial element in the early LOA cycle, as stated in Turner and Purpura (2016) and Jones and Saville (2016). It served as internal assessment, allowing teachers to provide feedback and made task or test adjustments for future lessons. Observations also provided an opportunity for teachers to ask questions to help students reflect on their thoughts, a practical skill for LOA (Hamp-Lyons, 2017). According to students' perception, teacher's observation is beneficial as it offers immediate support and clarification of questions. Clear instructions and effective communication contribute to the success of the task (Almaki, 2019). The teacher-based techniques used for observing students' performance include using task and test evidence to inform progress, providing sufficient time for completion, checking comprehension, and asking questions. Students appreciated these practices as they guided their learning, especially when accompanied by feedback on their progress. Fulcher (2010) explained that using observation to offer feedback helps scaffold students' awareness of their abilities and areas for improvement.

Excerpt 3 (Student's perception towards teacher's observation)

When I knew that someone was observing, I felt like I had to pay more attention. It also made me want to read a little bit more. When it came to asking questions, I did not have the courage to ask sometimes because I was not sure if my questions were correct or not.

Considering the feedback aspect, students' level of agreement was "Agree" ($M = 4.03$, $SD = 0.73$). Questionnaire responses indicated that it was the lowest-ranked aspect of the implementation. Feedback is a significant aspect of the LORA framework. In Almaki (2019), it was shown that LOA implementation improved critical thinking, peer feedback, and English language skills in speaking and writing classes. Students appreciated the opportunity to reflect on their learning and evaluated themselves and their peers, raising awareness of their performance. However, some students expressed concerns about unreliable peer feedback, as they tended to help one another by inflating the scores they gave on another rather than providing objective evaluations. This was inconsistent with Jalilzadeh and Coombe's (2023) study that students might be reluctant

to give peer feedback due to discomfort. Grabe (2020) emphasized that feedback in LOA should lead to class discussions among students and teachers. In this study, time limitations within one lesson hindered comprehensive training for providing objective-oriented peer feedback. Despite some negative themes arising, students generally had a positive opinion about the feedback process.

Excerpt 4 (Student's perception towards feedback)

Comments from friends were beneficial by making me realize my friends' strength and weakness. When the teacher provided comments, I knew where I should improve. However, when evaluating friends, we tended to help one another by giving high scores. That made me think it might be better if the teacher was the one who scored the tasks. But still, this part helped for reading improvement, and I could take feedback for more revision.

Students had the level of "Agree" with the statements about redesign aspect of LORA ($M = 4.09$, $SD = 0.73$). Redesign, the final step in the cycle, allowed teachers to adjust their lesson plan for the next lessons based on students' performance. While Jones and Saville (2016) linked redesign to macro-level implementation, this study focused on the classroom level and explored students' perceptions of this aspect. The findings showed that most students agreed that redesigning tasks helped them better understand reading texts and improved reading comprehension. For instance, when students struggled to come up with topics independently, the redesigned task offered options for them to choose and match topics with paragraphs. Simplified or less complex tasks played a crucial role in enhancing comprehension. Students found redesign beneficial as it provided alternatives to gain scores and deepen their understanding of the lessons. While the previous frameworks perceived redesign as part of the process, this study focused on it as a distinct task. Students' positive response to redesign stemmed from its adaptability to their levels, benefiting those with varying backgrounds, interests, and knowledge (Grabe and Jiang, 2013). However, some opinions also highlighted challenges with the redesign aspect in LORA.

Excerpt 5 (Student's perception towards redesign)

I thought the redesign work was useful because every piece of work had its own benefits. Personally, I would try my best to finish the assigned task or test first. If I could not do it, I would change to the redesigned ones. Normally, in reading class, I struggled with vocabulary. Reading to find the main ideas was fine for me but if there were difficult vocabulary, I could not do it well.

In conclusion, these insights revealed that students agreed LORA had positively impacted their reading. Specifically, it offered them opportunities to learn and utilize new vocabulary, practice reading, and reflect on their reading progress. However, some students mentioned that the difficulty of vocabulary and unfamiliar task formats posed obstacles in achieving their learning goals. The findings and implications will be discussed in the upcoming section, and suggestions for future research will be provided.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This study explored the implementation of learning-oriented reading assessment (LORA) to English reading of EFL students. The lessons were redesigned according to the LOA framework by Jones and Saville (2016) and reading factors by Grabe and Jiang (2013). During the 9-week reading lessons, the participants completed pretest and posttest assessments to evaluate the effects of the LORA treatments on their reading. Both quantitative and qualitative data were gathered through questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. Mann-Whitney U-test was used to analyze the data, considering the non-normal distribution of the scores. The findings revealed that there was no significant difference observed between the two groups when comparing their reading abilities after the implementation of LORA as there is not enough statistic information. Students' perceptions toward LORA were positive, as revealed in the qualitative data.

The implications indicated designing a lesson based on LORA to connect tasks, tests, teacher's observations, feedback, and redesigns. LORA, with these core elements, offered a comprehensive approach to enhancing student learning in reading and broadened assessment methods that made alignment with ever-changing use of language (De Costa, Coss, & Leung, 2022).

Tasks should be designed based on students' reading levels; therefore, teachers should put a variety of tasks, together with students' interests into consideration (Jalilzadeh & Coombe's, 2023) which was also mentioned in Zulkefly and Razali (2019) that matching levels to students' proficiency by checking students' prior knowledge through asking questions about the texts or predicting vocabulary using images. LORA bridged the gap between how students tackled reading tasks and developed their reading by generating background knowledge and providing different levels of texts. Tests, striking a balance between formative and summative assessment was recommended to encourage students to notify their learning progresses along the way of reaching learning goals (Ma, 2023). For instance, the tests were designed to evaluate what students had learned in each unit and inform students their progresses and what to improve and used the test results to redesign the next lessons. LORA advocated for the usage of authentic tasks and tests that aligned with students' interests, backgrounds, and cultures, making reading lessons more engaging and meaningful. Likewise, as mentioned in Supakorn and Panplum (2022), the design of instruction should put cultural dimension into consideration. By incorporating these principles, teachers can create a more effective and student-centered reading curriculum. Teacher's observation provided valuable insights into student progress and enabled timely interventions to address challenges or adapt to future lessons. Regular monitoring of progress through diverse tasks and tests, reflecting real-world language use were key aspects (Bernhardt & Leffell, 2019). During students completing the reading tasks and the tests, the teacher had a role to observe and take both informal records (e.g., mental record or note taking) and formal record (i.e., teacher observation checklist) of students' performance. LORA emphasized the importance of providing timely and constructive feedback to students, allowing them to identify areas for improvement and fostering mutual understanding of assessment criteria. For clarification, students checked themselves whether they reached the goal of the lesson through self and peer evaluation forms. In Kunnan and Liao (2019), there was a notably strong and positive correlation between the self-assessment

of young learners and their performance in English language tests. Students who could assess themselves well possessed a clear understanding of their knowledge and areas of unfamiliarity. This approach also encouraged self-reflection and peer feedback among students. Redesigning tasks and tests, for example, teachers redesign the next reading lessons using information gained from the teacher's observation checklist, students' self-evaluation, and test scores. To elaborate, if students could not find the topics or main ideas of the passage, additional worksheet, and revision about finding topics and main ideas was provided in the next lesson. This required teacher's well understanding of students' interest (Jalilzadeh & Coombe's, 2023) and making lessons more engaging (Zhao & Qi, 2023).

While this study presented compelling evidence supporting the positive impact of LORA, there are several areas for future research, as further investigations should focus on understanding students' reading concerning their prior knowledge of grammar, L1 reading, and word-level meaning recognition, as these factors significantly influenced reading (Bernhardt & Leffell, 2019). Identifying students' specific needs in these areas can assist teachers in better planning for the redesign process and preparing tailored materials or resources. Moreover, future studies should explore the autonomy of the students as it played crucial role in the success of LOA implementation (Zhao & Qi, 2022). Considering students' motivation was also essential for future research. Understanding students' needs and interests can enhance their engagement and motivation to read. Surveys or questionnaires can be conducted before or between reading lessons to gather students' preferences and adjust lesson plans accordingly. Lastly, future studies could explore the integration of reading with other skills (Kim & Kim, 2021), using the learning-oriented reading assessment framework as a foundation. As suggested by Grabe (2020) reading and writing skills are closely connected, and incorporating writing tasks can serve as a form of reflection on what students read. This holistic approach can lead to a more comprehensive understanding of students' language abilities.

REFERENCES

- Afflerbach, P., Cho, B.Y., Crassas, M.E., & Kim, J.Y. (2018). Best practices in reading Assessment. *Best practices in literacy instruction* (pp. 309-333). Guilford. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326760482_Best_practices_in_reading_assessment/citations
- Anderson, N.J. (2014). Reading instruction. In A. Burns & J.C. Richards (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to pedagogy and practice in language teaching* (pp. 218-235). Cambridge University Press. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/229182902_Reading_instruction
- Bernhardt, E., & Leffell, C. (2019). Contemporary Perspectives on L2 Upper-Register Text Processing. In J. Schwieter & A. Benati (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Learning (Cambridge Handbooks in Language and Linguistics)* (pp. 320-340). Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/9781108333603.014
- Brown, J. (2014). *Mixed methods research for TESOL*. Edinburgh University Press

- Cambridge English. (2013, September 12). *How can assessment support learning? A Learning Oriented Approach* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UtSeNH9PvHw&t=75s>
- Carless, D. (2007). Learning-oriented assessment: conceptual bases and practical implications. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 44(1), 57-66, doi: 10.1080/14703290601081332
- Cervetti, G. (2019). Five decades of comprehension research: Informing the future. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 51(1), 123-131. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X18823835>
- De Costa, P.I., Coss, M.D., & Leung, C. (2022). Looking back and forward: Language assessment insights from Constant Leung. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 19(5), 538-546. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2022.2104722>
- Duda, H. J., Syafruddin, D., & Parida, L. (2023). Study of the use of assessment for learning and creative thinking skills of high school students. *Anatolian Journal of Education*, 8(2), 69-84. <https://doi.org/10.29333/aje.2023.825a>
- Farhady, H. (2021). Learning-oriented assessment in virtual classroom contexts. *Journal of Language and Communication*, 8(2), 121-132. <https://journalfbmk.upm.edu.my/ojs3/index.php/jlc/article/view/439>
- Gebril, A. (Ed.). (2021). *Learning-oriented language assessment: Putting theory into practice (1st ed.)*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003014102>
- Grabe, W. (2009). *Reading in a second language: Moving from theory to practice*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139150484>
- Grabe, W. (2014). *Key issues in L2 reading development*. In Proceedings of the 4th CELC Symposium for English Language Teachers-Selected Papers (pp. 8-18)
- Grabe, W. (2017). L2 reading comprehension and development. In Hinkel, E. (Ed.) *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning: Volume III* (1st ed., pp.299-311). Routledge.
- Grabe, W., & Jiang, X.. (2013). *Assessing Reading*. 185–200. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118411360.wbcla060>
- Grabe, W., & Jiang, X. (2018). *First language and second language reading*. 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0476>
- Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. L. (2020). *Teaching and researching reading* (3rd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315726274>
- Jalilzadeh, K. & Coombe, C. (2023). Constraints in employing learning-oriented assessment in EFL classrooms: teachers' perceptions. *Language Testing in Asia*, 13(1), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-023-00222-8>

- Jones, N. & Saville, N. (2016). *Learning oriented assessment: A systemic approach*. *Studies in language testing*, 45. <https://www.cambridgeenglish.org/research-and-validation/published-research/silt/>
- Kim, G. J. (2022). Korean secondary EFL learners' reading comprehension development through the student-generated reading comprehension test development: From the learning-oriented assessment approach. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 19(2), 414-430. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2022.19.2.2.414>
- Kim, A.A., & Kim, H. J. (2021). Examining the effectiveness of learning-oriented language assessment in second language reading-to-write tasks: Focusing on instructor feedback and self-assessment. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 18(4), 1250-1265. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2021.18.4.11.1250>
- Kunnan, A.J. & Liao, C.L. (2019). Modeling relationships among young learners' self-assessment, learning attitude, and language test performance. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 16(2), 701-710. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2019.16.2.18.701>
- Leung, C. (2020). Learning-oriented assessment: More than the chalkface. In M. E. Poehner & O. Inbar-Lourie (Eds.), *Towards a reconceptualization of second language classroom assessment* (pp. 85-106). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-35081-9_5
- Ma, M. (2023). Exploring learning-oriented assessment in EAP writing classrooms: teacher and student perspectives. *Language Testing in Asia*, 13(33), 1-28. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-023-00249-x>
- Pereira, D., Niklasson, L., & Flores, M.A. (2016). Students' perceptions of assessment: a comparative analysis between Portugal and Sweden. *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education Research*, 73(1), 153-173. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-016-0005-0>
- Qian, Q., & Lau, K. (2022). The effects of achievement goals and perceived reading instruction on Chinese student reading performance: Evidence from PISA 2018. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 45(1), 137-156. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9817.12388>
- Richards, J.C. (2015). *Key issues in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press
- Sarab, M.R.A., & Rad, H.M. (2022). The Effect of reading strategies and L1 reading attitudes on L2 reading comprehension: Investigating the intermediary role of L2 reading Attitudes. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 19(4), 1267-1282. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2022.19.4.8.1267>
- Supakorn, P., & Panplum, S. (2022). EFL reading: Learning-to-read and test-taking strategies. *International Journal of Instruction*, 15(3), 989-1006. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2022.15353a>
- Todd, R.W., Duangjaichanok P., Jaturapitakkul, N., Chanchula, N., Pojanapunya, P., Tepsuriwong, S., Towns, S.G., Trakulkasemsuk, W. (2021). Assessment in Thai ELT: What do teachers do, why, and how can practices be improved? *LEARN Journal*:

Language Education and Acquisition Research Network, 14(2), 627-649. <https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/index>

Torabi, S., & Maleki, R. (2022). An investigation into Iranian EFL learners' reading comprehension problems and the tentative solutions: Learners' perceptions in focus. *Anatolian Journal of Education*, 7(1), 123-138. <https://doi.org/10.29333/aje.2022.7110a>

Viengsang, R. & Wasanasomsithi, P. (2022). Effects of a learning-oriented reading assessment model on Thai undergraduate students' reading ability. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 15(1), 709-747. <https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/index>

Wicking, P.D. (2018). Learning-oriented assessment as contextually grounded practice in Japanese higher education: The case of EFL [Doctoral dissertation, Nagoya University]. Nagoya Repository. <http://hdl.handle.net/2237/00027740>

Widiastuti, I. A. M. S., Mukminatien, N., Prayogo, J. A., & Irawati, E. (2020). Dissonances between teachers' beliefs and practices of formative assessment in EFL classes. *International Journal of Instruction*, 13(1), 71-84. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2020.1315a>

Zhao, C.G. & Qi, Q. (2022). Implementing learning-oriented assessment (LOA) among limited-proficiency EFL students: challenges, strategies, and students' reactions. *TESOL Quarterly*, 57(2), 320-340. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3167>

Zulkefly, F., & Razali, A. B. (2019). Malaysian rural secondary school students' attitudes towards learning English as a second language. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(1), 1141- 1156. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12173a>