

Promoting Alternative Assessment in Vietnamese Higher Education: Overcoming Challenges in Language Education.

Ngo Nguyen Thien Duyen, Vo Trong Nghia*



Use your smartphone to scan this QR code and download this article

ABSTRACT

Growing dissatisfaction with traditional assessment methods has prompted a global shift towards alternative assessment (AA) in language education. Within the EFL context, AA promises comprehensive evaluation and holistic learning. However, regional contexts shape its adoption. Nations like Vietnam, steeped in Confucian heritage, face unique challenges integrating AA due to institutional barriers. This literature review explores AA practices and perceptions among Vietnamese university-level EFL stakeholders. It aims to identify barriers to AA adoption, investigate strategies for overcoming them, and offer recommendations to advance assessment practices in Vietnamese higher education. This study contributes to assessment reform discussions within the region, providing insights for educators, policymakers, and researchers.

Key words: alternative assessment, English as a Foreign Language (EFL), Vietnam, higher education, institutional barriers, stakeholders

1 INTRODUCTION

2 The pursuit of meaningful and effective assessment
3 practices has been a central concern in language ed-
4 ucation for decades. The limitations of traditional as-
5 sessment methods, often criticized for their emphasis
6 on rote memorization and standardized testing, have
7 spurred a global shift towards alternative assessment
8 (AA). AA, with its focus on real-world application,
9 critical thinking, and communication skills, promises
10 a more comprehensive and holistic evaluation of stu-
11 dent learning (Ahmad et al., 2020; Brown & Hud-
12 son, 1998)^{1,2}. The transformative potential of AA in
13 fostering holistic language learning experiences has
14 been underscored by numerous studies (Abedi, 2010;
15 Nguyen & Truong, 2021; Cheng et al., 2016)³⁻⁵.
16 However, the adoption of AA is not without its chal-
17 lenges. The implementation of these innovative ap-
18 proaches varies across different regions, shaped by
19 unique contextual factors. In East Asian nations
20 like Vietnam, deeply rooted in Confucian heritage
21 culture, the integration of AA faces particular hur-
22 dles. The traditional teacher-student hierarchy and
23 institutional barriers, despite efforts since Vietnam's
24 Doi Moi (Reform) policy in 1986, continue to pose
25 obstacles to the widespread adoption of AA (Ngo,
26 2024; Nguyen & Burns, 2017; Tran & Tran, 2021)⁶⁻⁸.
27 The persistence of conventional assessment meth-
28 ods, often prioritizing lower-order cognitive skills
29 over higher-order thinking and creativity, has created
30 a pressing need to understand the perceptions and

practices of AA among university-level EFL stake- 31
holders in Vietnam. 32

33 With conventional assessment methods often taking
34 precedence, there exists a pressing gap in the local re-
35 search landscape: a deep understanding of alternative
36 assessment practices and literacy among university-
37 level EFL stakeholders. This literature review ad-
38 dresses this gap by examining the language assess-
39 ment landscape and how stakeholders namely ad-
40 ministrators and lecturers perceive it in Vietnamese
41 higher education, thereby exploring the way these el-
42 ements influence actual assessment practices. 42

43 Thus, the specific objectives of this literature review
44 are as follows: 44

- 45 1. To identify and analyze the institutional barriers
46 to the adoption of alternative assessment methods in
47 Vietnamese universities. 47
- 48 2. To explore strategies for overcoming these chal-
49 lenges and promoting the effective implementation of
50 alternative assessment. 50
- 51 3. To provide recommendations for policy, practice,
52 and future research to facilitate the integration of al-
53 ternative assessment in Vietnamese higher education.
54 By achieving these objectives, this literature review
55 seeks to contribute to the ongoing discourse on assess-
56 ment practices in Vietnamese higher education and
57 provide insights for educators, policymakers, and re-
58 searchers striving to advance assessment practices in
59 the region. 59

Ho Chi Minh City University of
Economics and Finance

Correspondence

Vo Trong Nghia, Ho Chi Minh City
University of Economics and Finance
Email: nghiavt@uef.edu.vn

History

- Received:
- Accepted:
- Published Online:

DOI :



Copyright

© VNUHCM Press. This is an open-
access article distributed under the
terms of the Creative Commons
Attribution 4.0 International license.



Cite this article : Duyen N N T, Nghia V T. Promoting Alternative Assessment in Vietnamese Higher Education: Overcoming Challenges in Language Education.. *Sci. Tech. Dev. J.* 2025; 26(SI):1-15.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Language Assessment in Education

Assessment encompasses the systematic process of documenting and evaluating knowledge, skills, dispositions, or beliefs acquired during instructional sequences (Koç et al., 2015)⁹. Assessment plays a pivotal role in every educational system, serving as a method to ascertain educational achievements and students' successes (Lutsenko et al., 2023)¹⁰.

In the realm of language assessment, two main varieties have emerged: traditional assessment and alternative assessment (AA) (Brown & Hudson, 1998)². The distinctions between the two varieties are shown in table 1 below, which are accompanied by an elaborated analysis of their characteristics.

As shown in Table 1, traditional language assessment refers to methods employing conventional techniques, typically formal and standardized, such as tests and examinations. Alternative assessment methods, as defined by Topping (1998)¹¹, encompass both individual and group work, collaboration, self-assessment, and peer assessment.

Feature-wise, traditional language assessment and AA are distinct in various aspects. Traditional assessments typically emphasize the recall of facts, content knowledge, and the application of procedures and formulas (Darling-Hammond et al., 1995). However, traditional assessment is often limited in terms of feedback. It instead provides absolute grading (Black & William, 1998)¹² and primarily focuses on measuring and ranking students based on their knowledge and skills, often through tests, quizzes, and multiple-choice questions (Glaser et al., 2001)¹³. Therefore, it may not always reflect real-world abilities, can induce anxiety, and often pay little attention to higher-order thinking skills (Linn, 2000)¹⁴.

Alternative language assessment, on the other hand, employs a wider range of formats, including essays, projects, portfolios, presentations, and performances (Herman et al, 1992)¹⁵. Under such evaluations, students are required to showcase their application of knowledge in real-world contexts, critical thinking, problem-solving, creativity, communication, and collaboration (Stiggins; 2005)¹⁶. This broader scope allows for a more holistic view of student abilities and promotes their active role in learning.

Also unlike traditional language assessments, AA focuses on continuous data collection and situational contingencies. Results from AA provide specific and descriptive feedback of learners' strengths, weaknesses, progress and areas for improvement (Brown &

Abeywickrama, 2003)¹⁷. Terms like authentic assessment, performance assessment, and continuous or ongoing assessment are therefore used interchangeably with AA (Brown & Abeywickrama, 2010; Bachman & Palmer, 2011)^{18,19}. For consistency, the term 'alternative assessment' will be used throughout this paper.

As AA allows varied informal or formal assessment techniques, it enables students to demonstrate their abilities in contexts beyond traditional test rooms, aligning with the principles of student-centered learning (Sandford & Hsu, 2013)²⁰. This is important, as assessment is widely acknowledged and empirically proven to be an inherent, impactful part of teaching and learning. In fact, students often prioritize preparation for assessments over broader curriculum goals (Brown & Abeywickrama, 2010)¹⁸. By utilizing AA, instructors can flexibly adapt assessment to students' needs, and assume the roles of not only a supervisor but also partner and collaborator in language learning, practice and performance (Sandford & Hsu, 2013)²⁰.

A reason why integrating AA into language programs have garnered endorsement is due to its pivotal role in providing decision-making information. When it comes to assessing students' work, traditional assessment primarily evaluates individual performance (Chappuis et al., 2012)²¹. In contrast, AA offers language teachers a deeper comprehension of their students' development. To explain, AA may be influenced by either the product or process methods (Brown & Abeywickrama, 2010)¹⁸. The process approach places a focal point on assessing the manner in which the learner engages with and comprehends the learning material. As AA is cultivated inside such formative frameworks, gradually, the instructor is capable of evaluating the proficiency and limitations of pupils in various subject areas and circumstances (Brown & Abeywickrama, 2010)¹⁸. AA results can therefore be used to satisfy the goal of providing a more comprehensive understanding of student learning, growth, and progress (Nasab, 2015; Quansah, 2018)^{22,23}. Students thus perceive alternative methods as fairer, more effective, and participatory than conventional methods (Pereira et al., 2022)²⁴.

As for its empowerment capacity, alternative assessment grants instructors greater autonomy over evaluation topics, assessment methods, and evaluated skills compared to conventional approaches (Sandford & Hsu, 2013; Sulaiman et al., 2019)^{20,25}. As students are better "seen" through these AA formats, they are better engaged and motivated to learn (O'Neil & Padden, 2022; Pereira et al., 2022)^{24,26}.

Table 1: Differences Between the Traditional and Alternative Assessment Approaches in Language Learning

Feature	Traditional Assessment	Alternative Assessment
Purpose	Measure and rank students	Understand learning, growth, progress; foster holistic learning
Format	Standardized tests, quizzes, multiple-choice, essays	Essays, projects, portfolios, presentations, performances
Focus	Recall of facts, content knowledge, procedures	Real-world application, critical thinking, problem-solving, creativity
Feedback	Limited, absolute grading	Descriptive, focused on strengths, weaknesses, improvement
Assessment of	Individual performance	Individual and group work, collaboration, self/peer assessment
Student roles	Passive recipient	Active participant
Strengths	Objective, efficient, easy to administer	Authentic, engaging, promotes deeper learning
Weaknesses	May not reflect real-world skills, anxiety-inducing	Time-consuming, less standardized

164 However, AA, while being more authentic, engaging,
 165 and promoting deeper learning (Wiggins, 1998; Bar-
 166 ret, 2005)^{27,28}, can be time-consuming to develop and
 167 assess, may lack standardization, and can be chal-
 168 lenging to implement in large class sizes (Parandekar
 169 et al., 2017)²⁹. In contrast, the strengths of tradi-
 170 tional assessment lie in its objectivity, efficiency, ease
 171 of administration and grading, and the ability to pro-
 172 vide comparable data between students (McMillan,
 173 2019)³⁰.

174 Language Assessment in Vietnamese 175 Higher Education

176 Traditional language assessment practices have been
 177 deeply embedded in Vietnam’s education landscape
 178 for decades, largely due to the influence of Confu-
 179 cian principles. Before the economic and social re-
 180 forms of Doi Moi, Vietnam’s education system em-
 181 phasized standardized examinations and rote mem-
 182 orization. These practices were centered around the
 183 preparation for and use of summative exams, focusing
 184 on the memorization of factual knowledge and per-
 185 formance under time constraints. Such assessments
 186 were primarily used to sort and certify students’ learn-
 187 ing rather than to foster their academic growth (Tran,
 188 2015)³¹. The long-standing influence of Confucian
 189 values reinforced this preference for high-stakes ex-
 190 ams as the primary means of evaluating academic per-
 191 formance (Ngo, 2020; Tran, 2015)^{31,32}.

192 The Doi Moi reforms, initiated in the mid-1980s,
 193 marked a significant turning point in Vietnamese
 194 higher education. As the country began opening up

to international influences and modernizing its econ- 195
 omy, the limitations of traditional assessment meth- 196
 ods became increasingly apparent. During this peri- 197
 od, educational policies started to recognize the 198
 need for more comprehensive evaluation methods, 199
 though traditional practices remained deeply en- 200
 trenching (Ngo, 2020; Pham & Renshaw, 2015)^{32,33}. 201
 With the turn of the millennium, educational reform 202
 efforts in Vietnam intensified. The Ministry of Ed- 203
 ucation and Training (MOET) introduced policies 204
 aimed at shifting from knowledge-based education to 205
 competency-based learning. This shift led to the grad- 206
 ual introduction of alternative assessment methods, 207
 such as portfolios, projects, and presentations. How- 208
 ever, despite these policy changes, the implementa- 209
 tion of alternative assessments has been inconsistent, 210
 with traditional assessments continuing to dominate 211
 in many institutions (Nguyen & Burns, 2017; Tran,
 2017; Nguyen & Pham, 2019)^{7,34,35}. 212
 213

The persistent emphasis on rote memorization and 214
 high-stakes exams has resulted in a critical short- 215
 age of opportunities for self-assessment and mean- 216
 ingful feedback, both of which are essential for linking 217
 student performance to learning progress and effec- 218
 tive teaching practices (Vu, 2017)³⁶. This preference 219
 for traditional assessments also sidelines the develop- 220
 ment of critical thinking, creativity, problem-solving, 221
 and communication skills—abilities crucial for suc- 222
 cess in the modern, global workforce (Tran, 2018;
 Nguyen & Pham, 2019)^{34,37}. 223
 224

Recognizing these shortcomings, there has been 225
 a growing momentum in the past decade toward 226

227 adopting alternative assessment methods in Viet- 281
 228 namese higher education. Methods such as portfo- 282
 229 lios, projects, and presentations are believed to in- 283
 230 trinsically engage, empower, and motivate students. 284
 231 These methods promote better, self-directed learn- 285
 232 ing and provide platforms for students to demon- 286
 233 strate their understanding and abilities in real-world 287
 234 contexts, beyond the limitations of traditional ex- 288
 235 ams (Luong, 2015; Nguyen & Pham, 2019; Dang & 289
 236 Nguyen, 2020; O'Neill & Padden, 2022; Pereira et al., 290
 237 2022)^{5,24,26,34,38}.

238 The shift towards competency-based assessment has 292
 239 been integral to modernizing general education in 293
 240 Vietnam. For instance, with Decision 43 in 2007, 294
 241 MOET began supporting a variety of assessment 295
 242 forms at the university level. In language learning, au- 296
 243 thorities have consistently advocated for instructional 297
 244 methods that prepare students for English communi- 298
 245 cation. This includes a shift from knowledge-based 299
 246 to competency-based assessment, as outlined in sev- 300
 247 eral MOET guidelines, such as Circular 30/2014/TT- 301
 248 BGDDT and Circular 22/2016/TT-BGDDT, which 302
 249 endorse "assessment for learning" and "assessment 303
 250 as learning" principles. These policies require in- 304
 251 structors to prioritize both formative and summative 305
 252 assessments to inform decisions related to curricu- 306
 253 lum design and overall pedagogical practices (MOET, 307
 254 2014a; MOET, 2014b).

255 Despite these compelling motivations and a grow- 308
 256 ing emphasis on communicative competence for both 309
 257 academic and professional success, the adoption of 310
 258 formative and alternative language assessments has 311
 259 been limited. Various factors, including the sup- 312
 260 port system, instructors' readiness, and practical 313
 261 challenges, have posed significant barriers to their 314
 262 widespread implementation at the tertiary level (Tran, 315
 263 2015; Pham, 2017; Vu, 2017; Ngo, 2018; Nguyen & 316
 264 Gu, 2020)^{31,36,39-41}.

265 Innovations in formative and alternative language as- 317
 266 sessments have been introduced in some local uni- 318
 267 versities, such as the use of writing portfolios and 319
 268 classroom-based assessments. However, these meth- 320
 269 ods remain unfocused and are often sidelined in favor 321
 270 of more traditional, discrete-point tests that empha- 322
 271 size lexical and grammatical knowledge (Tran, 2015; 323
 272 Vu, 2017)^{31,36}. Additionally, these unconventional 324
 273 approaches are primarily implemented in English ma- 325
 274 jor programs, where students are assessed directly on 326
 275 their language skills (Ngo, 2018; Lam N., 2019; Ngo, 327
 276 2021)^{40,42}. For students in non-English major pro- 328
 277 grams, formative and communicative language as- 329
 278 sessments are often offered as optional activities, lead- 330
 279 ing to a lukewarm reception and limited integration 331
 280 into the curriculum (Lam T.L., 2019; Ngo, 2024)⁴².

Institutionally, high-stakes tests remain dominant in 281
 Vietnamese higher education, used to sort students 282
 into language courses, periodically measure profi- 283
 ciency, and determine eligibility for graduation (Viet- 284
 namese Government, 2008)⁴³. The prominence of 285
 these exams has led to a significant washback effect 286
 on teaching methodologies, creating a feedback loop 287
 that reinforces traditional assessment practices (Tran, 288
 2015; Ngo, 2018; Nguyen & Gu, 2020)^{31,40,41}. While 289
 digital platforms have the potential to offer more flex- 290
 ible and comprehensive evaluation methods for stu- 291
 dent language abilities, their effective implementa- 292
 tion requires further teacher training and professional 293
 development. Unfortunately, opportunities for such 294
 professional development, particularly in the area of 295
 alternative assessment, remain scarce (Luong, 2015; 296
 Nguyen et al., 2020)^{38,41}.

METHODOLOGY 298

This literature review examines research on percep- 299
 tions towards implementing alternative assessment 300
 practices in the context of Vietnamese higher edu- 301
 cation. Data collection began with a comprehensive 302
 search across multiple academic databases, including 303
 Google Scholar, ERIC, ProQuest, and Web of Science. 304
 Search terms included various combinations of the 305
 following keywords: "alternative assessment," "higher 306
 education," "Vietnam," "EFL assessment," "language 307
 assessment," and "Vietnamese universities." 308

- To ensure relevance, the resulting publications 309
 were carefully screened using the below criteria: 310
- Focus: Focused on alternative assessment meth- 311
 ods within the Vietnamese higher education 312
 context. 313
- Publication Type: Peer-reviewed journal arti- 314
 cles, book chapters, conference proceedings, 315
 and credible reports from recognized organiza- 316
 tions. 317
- Publication Date: Priority was given to studies 318
 published within the last ten years to prioritize 319
 recent trends, but seminal works were also con- 320
 sidered. 321

After screening, the remaining studies were ana- 322
 lyzed using thematic analysis. This involved a thor- 323
 ough reading to identify recurring themes, patterns, 324
 and key insights relevant to the research objectives. 325
 Through this iterative process, the following core 326
 themes emerged: 327

- Institutional and Practical Barriers: Examines 328
 factors such as lack of resources, policy con- 329
 straints, and resistance to change that hinder the 330
 adoption of alternative assessment. 331

- 332 • Strategies for Overcoming Challenges: Explores 383
- 333 solutions and best practices to address barriers. 384
- 334 Includes topics like professional development, 385
- 335 technology use, and collaborative initiatives. 386
- 336 • Impact on Learning Outcomes: Investigates 387
- 337 how AA affect student learning, motivation, and 388
- 338 skill development in Vietnamese universities. 389
- 339 • Cultural and Contextual Factors: Analyzes the 390
- 340 interplay between Vietnamese culture, educa- 391
- 341 tional traditions, and the implementation of al- 392
- 342 ternative assessment methods. 393

343 This methodology ensures a rigorous and systematic 394

344 approach to analyzing the existing literature on al- 395

345 ternative assessment in Vietnamese higher education. 396

346 It facilitates the identification of key insights, chal- 397

347 lenges, and potential solutions, ultimately contribut- 398

348 ing to a deeper understanding of this crucial aspect of 399

349 language education. 400

350 FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

351 Institutional Barriers to the Adoption of Al- 402

352 ternative Assessment 403

353 The integration of alternative assessment methods 404

354 into Vietnamese higher education, while transforma- 405

355 tive and having guiding policies from the government, 406

356 faces several institutional barriers still. 407

357 Resistance to change poses as the first barrier to AA 408

358 adoption. Transitioning from traditional to alter- 409

359 native language assessment necessitates a shift from 410

360 the concept of "assessment of learning" toward "as- 411

361 sessment for learning" (Brown & Abeywickrama, 412

362 2010)¹⁸. This requires a reevaluation of pedagogical 413

363 practices and a deep commitment to fostering criti- 414

364 cal thinking, problem-solving, and creativity. Nguyen 415

365 and Tran's (2018)⁴⁴ research underscored this point, 416

366 revealing that while EFL instructors in Vietnam gen- 417

367 erally demonstrate favorable views towards in-class 418

368 speaking evaluation, they lack sufficient understand- 419

369 ing of the complexity of certain speaking assessment 420

370 tasks. Thai et al., (2023)'s study on classroom assess- 421

371 ment practices highlights a potential misalignment 422

372 between the perceptions of students and instructors 423

373 regarding various assessment types. This indicates 424

374 that pushbacks may stem from unfamiliarity with AA 425

375 methodology rather than outright opposition. 426

376 Besides educators individually, deeply entrenched ed- 427

377 ucational norms in Vietnamese landscapes contribute 428

378 to hesitance among educators and administrators to 429

379 deviate from familiar methods (Dang & Nguyen, 430

380 2020)⁵. Confucian values, a cornerstone of the Viet- 431

381 namese educational culture, emphasize rote memo- 432

382 rization and high-stakes examinations as markers of 433

academic achievement (Tran, 2018)³⁷. The Confu- 383

384 cian exam-oriented education puts desirable social, 384

385 political, and economic rewards upon the success of 385

386 intensive preparation and memorisation of knowl- 386

387 edge (Ngo, 2020)³². This ingrained value system re- 387

388 inforces the dominance of familiar assessment prac- 388

389 tices and perpetuates a priority of lower-order cog- 389

390 nitive skills over higher-order thinking and creativity 390

391 (Dang & Nguyen, 2020)⁵. Also, formative assessment 391

392 demands a more balanced dynamic between teachers 392

393 and students, something not easily embraced by the 393

394 strict hierarchy within Confucian heritage education 394

395 (Pham & Renshaw, 2015)³³. 395

396 Specifically in terms of tertiary-level English assess- 396

397 ments in the country, summative practices are held 397

398 strongly in place by the shared pressure between Con- 398

399 fucianism's priority of exams, the neoliberalist's idea 399

400 of making teachers and administrators accountable 400

401 for students' standardised test results (Vu, 2017; Ngo, 401

402 2020)^{32,36} and the socialist's requirement towards in- 402

403 stitutions to show their achievement of state's goals. 403

404 Such complementary influences directly hinder ef- 404

405 forts to foster innovation and diversify assessment 405

406 practices, particularly of skills not easily measured by 406

407 conventional evaluation forms (Ngo, 2023)⁶. 407

408 In regards to regulatory and administrative con- 408

409 straint, a lack of familiarity among statemens, policy- 409

410 makers, administrators and academic managers with 410

411 alternative of summative examinations and their ben- 411

412 efits also makes securing its stance in the local land- 412

413 scape challenging (Dang & Nguyen, 2020)⁵. As a 413

414 manifestation of this, directives from the Ministry 414

415 of Education and Training (MoET) further stipulate 415

416 specific assessment requirements, often emphasizing 416

417 high-stakes examinations that place significant weight 417

418 on final language evaluations (Nguyen & Truong, 418

419 2021)⁴⁵. 419

420 Ironically, while there are imposed regulations of 420

421 English assessment in tertiary Vietnam, as evi- 421

422 denced from all assessments following MOET de- 422

423 mands (Pham, 2017; Vu, 2017)^{36,39}, states' efforts to 423

424 supervise and follow through these requirements have 424

425 been lax (Ngo, 2024)⁶. In some cases, they have 425

426 been complied with in contrastingly different man- 426

427 ners from universities (Lam T.L., 2019; Ngo, 2018)⁴⁰. 427

428 Institutions' internal tests can have unensured qual- 428

429 ity (Ngo, 2018; Nguyen, 2020; Vu, 2017)^{36,40,41} or 429

430 students' results taken from international standard- 430

431 ised tests are filtered under greatly different accep- 431

432 tance criteria among schools (Ngo, 2024)⁶. This gives 432

433 little confidence for stakeholders when it comes to in- 433

434 tergrating alternative assessments in tertiary levels. 434

435 **Practical Challenges to the Adoption of Al-**
 436 **ternative Assessment**

437 Another critical impediment is the lack of supportive
 438 resources. Many Vietnamese universities face limita-
 439 tions in funding and infrastructure, hindering their
 440 investment in the training, materials and updated
 441 digital technology essential for AA implementation
 442 (Nguyen & Pham, 2019). This creates two direct im-
 443 pacts. One is on the availability of crucial profes-
 444 sional development opportunities for in-service edu-
 445 cators on AA design and evaluation, including sem-
 446 inars, workshops, conferences, and training courses
 447 (Tran, 2018)³⁷. This can reinforce a preference for
 448 traditional assessment methods as educators may feel
 449 insecure about designing and evaluating novel assess-
 450 ment methodologies (Tran, 2017)³⁵.

451 A secondary impact is on the implementation of as-
 452 sessments involving online portfolios, digital presen-
 453 tations, or multimedia projects against almost insur-
 454 mountable logistical difficulties in assessing large stu-
 455 dent populations across education levels (Tran, 2017;
 456 Dang & Nguyen, 2020)^{5,35}. Vietnam's growing youth
 457 population results in consistently large class sizes,
 458 averaging 38 students per class in upper secondary
 459 schools, or 45-50 students per classroom in major ur-
 460 ban centers (Parandekar et al., 2017)²⁹. Educators
 461 face significant difficulties in delivering lessons, con-
 462 ducting engaging learning activities, and effectively
 463 assessing students in such large classes. AA methods
 464 like project-based learning, performance assessments,
 465 and portfolios demand significantly more time, effort,
 466 and resources. Individualized feedback, a cornerstone
 467 of many AA approaches, becomes logistically diffi-
 468 cult with large numbers of students (O'Neill & Pad-
 469 den, 2022)²⁶. As the Vietnamese lecturers lack prac-
 470 tical skills, time (Nguyen, 2011)⁴⁶, and compensation
 471 (Luong, 2015)³⁸, this may hinder their commitments
 472 to design and implementation of effective CBA prac-
 473 tices (Anh, 2017; Giang, 2017)^{47,48}. This reality of-
 474 ten leads to the continued reliance on traditional as-
 475 sessment practices, such as multiple-choice examina-
 476 tions, favored for their efficiency in evaluating large
 477 student groups (Tran, 2017)³⁵. Teachers may also feel
 478 pressured to keep to test preparation over the devel-
 479 opment of broader language skills essential for real-
 480 world application (Truong & Wang, 2019)⁴⁹.

481 In summary, multifaceted institutional and practi-
 482 cality issues impede the adoption of alternative as-
 483 sessment in Vietnamese higher education. Over-
 484 coming these barriers requires concerted efforts from
 485 stakeholders to promote a culture of innovation and
 486 flexibility. Studies examining similar challenges in
 487 other educational contexts offer insights into poten-
 488 tial strategies.

489 **Strategies for Overcoming Challenges in Al-**
 490 **ternative Assessment**

491 Therefore, the process of extending the AA approach
 492 in Vietnamese higher education calls for a measured,
 493 stepwise approach that targets and takes advantage
 494 of the deeply rooted obstacles and opportunities for
 495 change. The following strategic approaches suggested
 496 below while following potential ability to affect the
 497 chronological schedule of AA's implementation can
 498 provide directions on how to address these challenges.

499 **Professional Development and Teacher**
 500 **Training Initiatives**

501 The key to effective implementation of new assess-
 502 ment arrangements in an AA context is in endowing
 503 educators with the knowledge, skills, and confidence
 504 to engage with new ways of assessment. As for contin-
 505 uing education, solid content knowledge in AA, prac-
 506 tical training focused on design and implementation
 507 of AA tasks, and communities of practice must be of-
 508 fered. They can also create a positive culture for inno-
 509 vation and experimentation by addressing educators'
 510 concerns of subjectivity and offering clear assessment
 511 standards.

512 Consequently, robust professional development (PD)
 513 is fundamental to the successful adoption of alter-
 514 native assessment in Vietnamese higher education.
 515 A key element of effective PD is providing a strong
 516 grounding in the principles of AA, its rationale, and
 517 the benefits it offers for student learning. It's essen-
 518 tial to explicitly address how AA aligns with student-
 519 centered pedagogy and promotes the development of
 520 higher-order thinking skills (Maclellan, 2004)⁵⁰. PD
 521 programs should also consider a variety of delivery
 522 formats to cater to diverse learning styles, time con-
 523 straints, and institutional capabilities.

524 Additionally, these programs must go beyond theoret-
 525 ical introductions, offering a multi-pronged approach
 526 or intensive "hands-on" workshops that equip educa-
 527 tors with the skills to design and execute various AA
 528 tasks in their classrooms. If technology is an integral
 529 part of an institution's AA strategy, dedicated train-
 530 ing on relevant digital tools and platforms is essen-
 531 tial. Since educators may have concerns about the
 532 subjective nature of AA scoring, PD programs should
 533 include guidance on creating clear criteria and pro-
 534 viding exemplars of different quality levels, and en-
 535 gage faculty in "calibration" exercises to develop a
 536 shared understanding of expectations as well as effec-
 537 tive feedback strategies (Maclellan, 2004)⁵⁰.

538 To ensure the lasting impact of PD efforts, it's impor-
 539 tant to foster ongoing support. This can be achieved

540 by creating communities of practice where faculty can
541 collaborate, share experiences, problem-solve chal-
542 lenges, and refine their AA practices. Peer mentor-
543 ing, and partnering with external consultants are all
544 viable options. PD programs should also have a built-
545 in evaluation mechanism. Surveys, interviews, and
546 analysis of AA implementation data can help track the
547 effectiveness of PD efforts and inform future improve-
548 ments.

549 **Curriculum Integration and Assessment** 550 **Alignment**

551 The next logical step is to incorporate AA into the
552 learning process and to make sure it is fully compat-
553 ible with learning objectives and outcomes. This en-
554 tails redesigning of syllabus and instruction to include
555 appropriate authentic assessment tasks, which reflect
556 higher-order thinking skills and post secondary uses
557 of knowledge. Thus, when links are made between as-
558 sessment and purposeful learning objectives, a logi-
559 cal framework for student learning can be developed.
560 This integration emphasizes the importance of AA
561 and provides students with regular opportunities to
562 develop and demonstrate their skills in meaningful
563 ways (Nguyen & Pham, 2019)³⁴.

564 Strategic curriculum design should include careful
565 consideration of what constitutes evidence of higher-
566 order thinking within a specific discipline, as well
567 as how acquired knowledge is best demonstrated
568 through AA tasks (MacLellan, 2004)⁵⁰. For instance,
569 a biology course's alternative assessments might ask
570 students to create detailed models illustrating com-
571 plex biological processes, while in a literature course,
572 students could engage in in-depth analysis and inter-
573 pretation of texts through critical essays. Addition-
574 ally, curriculum planning needs to address choices
575 around the suitability of AA for individual or collab-
576 orative outcomes, the role of feedback in the learning
577 process, and how to capture multiple facets of student
578 performance (Brown & Hudson, 1998)².

579 Ensuring clear alignment between AA tasks and
580 learning objectives ensures the validity, reliability,
581 and overall meaningfulness of assessment results. A
582 well-aligned curriculum creates a cohesive learning
583 experience for students, where they understand that
584 assessment directly measures the skills and knowl-
585 edge that the course aims to develop (Wiggins,
586 1998)²⁷. To achieve this alignment, educators may
587 benefit from using strategies such as "backward de-
588 sign," where they begin with identifying desired learn-
589 ing goals and subsequently select appropriate AA
590 tasks to measure whether students have successfully
591 met those goals.

623 **Collaborative Approaches to Assessment De-** 624 **sign and Implementation**

625 Students, faculty members, administrators, and other
626 professionals who work with students, and other
627 stakeholders collaborate to make the assessment pro-
628 cess an institution-wide priority. It is suggested that
629 the formation of assessment committees, peer review
630 and calibration activities, and students' involvement
631 in assessment development will improve assessment
632 discussion, mutual understanding, and create inclu-
633 sive and effective assessment practices (Tran, 2017)³⁵.
634 One effective collaborative strategy is the forma-
635 tion of assessment committees or working groups.
636 These cross-functional teams should include a diverse
637 representation of students, faculty, administrators,
638 and, where relevant, external experts with specialized
639 knowledge of assessment design. These committees
640 can facilitate dialogue, consensus-building, and the
641 creation of assessment policies, procedures, and prac-
642 tices that are responsive to the needs and perspectives
643 of the entire educational community.

644 Peer review and calibration activities offer another
645 powerful way to implement collaborative assessment.
646 Within these activities, faculty members share their
647 AA materials, provide constructive feedback to one
648 another, and engage in discussions to align their un-
649 derstanding of quality standards. This process fos-
650 ters consistency, addresses concerns about potential
651 subjectivity within AA practices, and builds educa-
652 tors' confidence in their ability to assess student work
653 fairly (O'Neil & Padden, 2022)²⁶. Where a committee
654 forms to evaluate a student's work once or over time,
655 resembling that of a doctoral thesis defense, the out-
656 come is a less biased consensus on its quality, ensur-
657 ing reliability and fairness while effectively and more
658 accurately measures the intended learning outcomes
659 (Brown & Hudson, 1998; MacLellan, 2004)^{2,50}.

660 **Utilization of Technology for Assessment In-** 661 **novation**

662 Technology plays a significant role in eradicating bar-
663 riers and fostering innovation in assessment. Elec-
664 tronic portfolios, discussion boards, multimedia ac-
665 tivities, and DIDSTs can complement the flexibility,
666 reality, and efficiency of AA. Therefore, it becomes
667 pertinent that through embracing technology in the
668 classroom, educators come up with an effective and
669 efficient form of assessment that is appealing to the
670 students and at the same time addresses the strict aca-
671 demic requirement of the institution while also ad-
672 dressing the learning needs of the students by cus-
673 tomizing the assessment tools in respect to the student
674 capabilities and needs (Tran, 2018)³⁷.

644 E-portfolios serve as an excellent example of
 645 technology-enabled AA. These digital repositories
 646 allow students to curate evidence of their work,
 647 showcasing skill and progress (Barrett, 2005)²⁸.
 648 E-portfolios encourage self-assessment, and a deeper
 649 understanding of one’s own learning journey.
 650 Additionally, online discussion forums facilitate
 651 asynchronous, peer-reviewed reflection, and collabor-
 652 ative problem-solving activities (Barrett, 2005)²⁸.
 653 Such platforms promote critical thinking, communi-
 654 cation, and the ability to engage constructively with
 655 the ideas of others.

656 Multimedia projects are another promising option,
 657 enabling displays of learning through a diverse range
 658 of formats, including videos, infographics, podcasts,
 659 or interactive presentations. Students get to tap into
 660 their individual strengths while demonstrating their
 661 knowledge, creativity, and communication skills in
 662 engaging ways. Furthermore, by incorporating data
 663 analytics tools, educators can gain valuable insights
 664 from assessment data. These tools assist in visualizing
 665 student learning patterns, identifying areas requiring
 666 additional support, and making evidence-based deci-
 667 sions to improve both instructional practices and stu-
 668 dent outcomes (Yancey, 2009)⁵¹.

669 Implementing technology-driven AA requires
 670 thoughtful planning and careful integration with
 671 overall pedagogical approaches. Educators need
 672 training and support to effectively use various digital
 673 tools, and consideration should be given to issues of
 674 digital equity and access to ensure that technology
 675 does not create new barriers to inclusion.

676 In summary, strategies for overcoming challenges in
 677 alternative assessment include providing professional
 678 development and teacher training, integrating alter-
 679 native assessment into the curriculum, adopting col-
 680 laborative approaches to assessment design and im-
 681 plementation, and leveraging technology for assess-
 682 ment innovation. By implementing these strategies,
 683 Vietnamese universities can enhance the quality and
 684 effectiveness of assessment practices and promote
 685 more meaningful learning outcomes for students.

686 **Implications for Policy and Practice**

687 The process of bringing about the culture of using
 688 AA in Vietnamese higher education requires under-
 689 standing the compatibility of conventional assess-
 690 ment practices, which need to be changed, with the
 691 opportunities that must be exploited for promoting
 692 the use of this kind of assessment.

Policy level

693 At the policy level, several recommendations can be
 694 made to facilitate the integration of alternative assess-
 695 ment (AA) in Vietnamese language education. Pol-
 696 icymakers bear great potential in designing a sound
 697 strategy with clear directives and guidance, which
 698 specifically state that AA should occur with clear ex-
 699 planations as to why this process is mandatory and
 700 how it is helpful to students (Luong, 2015)³⁸.
 701

702 These frameworks should also help in integrating the
 703 specific AA approaches proposed and the general lan-
 704 guage learning goals to support a coherent and mean-
 705 ingful assessment. Hence, resource allocation to sup-
 706 port professional learning should always be a priority
 707 since AA success depends on knowledge and skills of
 708 educators (Nguyen & Pham, 2019)³⁴.

709 Leaders should commit to applying large-scale pro-
 710 fessional development programs that enhance under-
 711 standing on how to design, implement, and evalu-
 712 ate AA. Next, providing educators with incentives in
 713 terms of extra funds, award, or to share their prac-
 714 tices in applying AA, would be a significant catalyst
 715 for change and culture of reflecting on and changing
 716 current practices of assessment (Darling-Hammond
 717 & Gardner, 2017)⁵².

718 Policymakers need to allocate resources for large-
 719 scale professional development programs that equip
 720 language educators with the necessary knowledge and
 721 skills to design, implement, and evaluate AA effec-
 722 tively. These programs should be tailored to the spe-
 723 cific needs of the Vietnamese language classroom, ad-
 724 dressing cultural nuances and practical challenges.
 725 Last, an accountability system that extends beyond
 726 the mere distribution of report cards to evaluate the
 727 implementation of such approaches effectively would
 728 help guarantee that they benefit students’ learning and
 729 personal growth as intended (Luong, 2015)³⁸.

730 This system should go beyond traditional report cards
 731 and focus on evaluating the impact of AA on stu-
 732 dent learning and growth, ensuring that the intended
 733 benefits are realized (Luong, 2015)³⁸. By holding ed-
 734 ucators and institutions accountable for implement-
 735 ing AA effectively, policymakers can promote a more
 736 student-centered and equitable approach to language
 737 assessment in Vietnam.

Institutional level

738 At the institutional level, the successful adoption of
 739 AA in language education hinges on fostering collabor-
 740 ation and engagement among various stakeholders.
 741 It is crucial to establish open channels of communica-
 742 tion and create opportunities for stakeholder engage-
 743 ment, involving language educators, administrators,
 744

745 students, and even parents in discussions about the
746 transition to AA (Luong 2015)³⁸. This inclusive ap-
747 proach allows for addressing concerns, building con-
748 sensus, and ensuring that the shift towards AA is sup-
749 ported by the entire educational community.

750 The formation of professional learning communities
751 is another key strategy at the institutional level. These
752 communities provide a platform for language edu-
753 cators to share their experiences, collaborate on the
754 design and implementation of AA tasks, and receive
755 peer support. By fostering a collaborative environ-
756 ment, institutions can empower educators to embrace
757 AA and navigate the challenges associated with its im-
758 plementation. It is crucial for educators to dedicate
759 time and effort to professional learning that may oc-
760 cur as institutions and through other sources to im-
761 prove their knowledge and practices concerning AA
762 (Nguyen & Pham, 2019)³⁴.

763 Student involvement is also crucial in promoting
764 ownership and motivation in the learning process. In-
765 stitutions should actively involve students in the de-
766 sign and evaluation of AA tasks, allowing them to
767 contribute their perspectives and gain a deeper un-
768 derstanding of their learning journey (Cheng & Chau,
769 2013)⁵³. This approach not only enhances student en-
770 gagement but also empowers them to take an active
771 role in their education.

772 Finally, institutions should leverage technology inte-
773 gration to enhance AA practices in language educa-
774 tion. The use of e-portfolios can provide a platform
775 for students to showcase their language skills devel-
776 opment over time, while online discussion forums
777 can facilitate collaborative language practice and peer
778 feedback. Encouraging the creation of multimedia
779 language projects can further tap into students' cre-
780 ativity and digital literacy skills. By embracing tech-
781 nology, institutions can create a more dynamic and
782 engaging learning environment that supports the ef-
783 fective implementation of AA.

784 **Classroom level**

785 The implementation of AA at the classroom level
786 in Vietnamese language education necessitates a
787 thoughtful and contextually relevant approach. The
788 design of AA tasks should prioritize the development
789 of communicative competence by incorporating real-
790 world scenarios, cultural contexts, and opportunities
791 for interaction and collaboration. As the literature
792 suggests, AA's strength lies in its ability to provide
793 "authentic, engaging, and promote deeper learning"
794 (Brown & Hudson, 1998)². By grounding assessment

795 in practical, culturally relevant contexts and encour-
796 aging collaboration, educators can ensure that stu-
797 dents can effectively apply their language skills in di-
798 verse social and professional settings.

799 The use of formative assessment strategies is equally
800 crucial. Employing a variety of formative AA tech-
801 niques, such as oral presentations, written reflections,
802 and peer feedback, allows educators to provide on-
803 going, descriptive feedback that focuses on students'
804 strengths, weaknesses, and areas for improvement
805 (Brown & Abeywickrama, 2010)¹⁸. This approach
806 fosters a more interactive and responsive learning
807 environment, enabling students to actively partici-
808 pate in their language development and track their
809 progress. The implementation of performance-based
810 assessment tasks further enhances the authenticity
811 and relevance of language assessment. Activities such
812 as role-plays, simulations, and debates offer students
813 the opportunity to demonstrate their ability to apply
814 language skills in real-world contexts, promoting crit-
815 ical thinking, problem-solving, and effective commu-
816 nication (Stiggins, 2005)¹⁶.

817 Finally, encouraging self- and peer-assessment can
818 foster metacognitive skills and promote student au-
819 tonomy in language learning. By reflecting on their
820 own performance and providing constructive feed-
821 back to their peers, students develop a deeper under-
822 standing of their strengths and weaknesses, enabling
823 them to take ownership of their learning and make in-
824 formed decisions about their language development
825 journey (Cheng & Chau, 2013)⁵³. By implementing
826 these strategies at the classroom level, educators can
827 create a more engaging, student-centered, and effec-
828 tive learning environment that supports the successful
829 adoption of AA in Vietnamese language education. It
830 is through such a multifaceted approach that AA can
831 truly transform language assessment practices in Viet-
832 nam, fostering communicative competence, promot-
833 ing active learning, and empowering students to reach
834 their full potential.

835 Consequently, there should be a concerted effort from
836 various stakeholders for AA to become popular across
837 the landscape of higher education. Following the
838 characteristics of the Vietnamese higher education
839 context, it is necessary to prevent a focus on only the
840 external and emerging opportunities that can rethink
841 the assessment culture of higher education to focus
842 on developing a multi-faceted approach that not only
843 targets the deeply rooted difficulties, but also takes ad-
844 vantage of the emerging possibilities. This shift will
845 in the long run, contribute positively to improvement
846 of student learning outcomes, positive growth and
847 the ability of the graduates to succeed in the modern

848 world. The enactment of AA in the context of Viet- 901
 849 namese education can indeed be described as a radical 902
 850 cultural and educational change, that entails beliefs 903
 851 and practices that are more equitable and student- 904
 852 centered 905

853 **CONCLUSION**

854 The adoption of alternative assessment (AA) in Viet- 906
 855 namese higher education, particularly in language ed- 907
 856 ucation, has the potential to revolutionize assessment 908
 857 practices, fostering a more student-centered, authen- 909
 858 tic, and holistic learning experience. The literature 910
 859 underscores the numerous benefits of AA, including 911
 860 increased student motivation, engagement, and em- 912
 861 powerment. However, the transition to AA is not 913
 862 without its challenges. Deeply rooted cultural pref- 914
 863 erences for traditional assessment methods, coupled 915
 864 with institutional barriers and practical limitations, 916
 865 necessitate a strategic and concerted effort from all 917
 866 stakeholders. 918

867 Research strongly indicates that AA fosters intrinsic 919
 868 motivation, engagement, and empowerment among 920
 869 students (Sandford & Hsu, 2013; O’Neill & Padden, 921
 870 2022; Pereira et al., 2022)^{20,24,26}. Students perceive 922
 871 alternative methods as fair, effective, and conducive 923
 872 to active participation, facilitating the demonstra- 924
 873 tion of their abilities beyond traditional exam set- 925
 874 tings (Pereira et al., 2022)²⁴. Moreover, AA aligns 926
 875 with student-centered learning by giving educators 927
 876 greater control over assessment content, techniques, 928
 877 and the specific skills being evaluated (Sandford & 929
 878 Hsu, 2013; Sulaiman et al., 2019)^{20,25}. Empirical evi- 930
 879 dence further supports the positive impact of AA on 931
 880 learning performance. Studies demonstrate how AA 932
 881 can simultaneously improve various primary and sec- 933
 882 ondary skills, particularly through the use of portfo- 934
 883 lios (Sandford & Hsu, 2013; Tabatabaei & Assefi, 2012; 935
 884 Tabatabaei & Assefi, 2020)^{20,54,55}. 936

885 The insights gleaned from this literature review high- 937
 886 light the need for a multi-pronged approach to pro- 938
 887 moting AA in Vietnamese language education. Pol- 939
 888 icymakers, educational institutions, and educators 940
 889 must collaborate to create a supportive environment 941
 890 that fosters innovation and embraces change. The 942
 891 development of clear policies, comprehensive profes- 943
 892 sional development programs, and the integration of 944
 893 technology are crucial steps in this process. 945

894 While critical stakeholders such as teachers and stu- 946
 895 dents have expressed visible supports towards alter- 947
 896 native forms of assessment, how institutional lead- 948
 897 ership and administrators regard their adoption re- 949
 898 mains largely ambiguous. There is indeed a notewor- 950
 899 thy gap in research regarding the successes and bar- 951
 900 riers of implementing non-conventional assessments

901 on a wide scale across academic faculties. Addition- 902
 903 ally, there’s a need for investigations into the integra- 904
 905 tion of alternative assessments as an inherent compo- 906
 907 nent of comprehensive teaching and learning mod- 908
 909 els. Thus, additional insights are warranted from 910
 911 those in executive positions on diversifying evalua- 912
 913 tive approaches within their tertiary institutions, even 914
 915 to an extent of transitioning entire departments to- 916
 917 wards more innovative assessment approaches. Valu- 918
 919 able lessons taken from these may guide other institu- 920
 921 tions considering similar reforms. 921

922 Future research should focus on investigating the 923
 924 long-term impact of AA on student learning out- 925
 926 comes in the Vietnamese context. Longitudinal stud- 926
 927 ies can provide valuable insights into the effectiveness 927
 928 of AA in promoting communicative competence, crit- 928
 929 ical thinking, and other desired learning outcomes. 929
 930 Additionally, research exploring the role of technol- 930
 931 ogy in facilitating AA, particularly in addressing chal- 931
 932 lenges related to large class sizes and resource con- 932
 933 straints, is warranted. 933

934 In summary, the successful integration of alternative 934
 935 assessment methods in Vietnamese higher education 935
 936 requires insights on the challenges and potential path- 936
 937 ways for stakeholders. In examining the institutional 937
 938 barriers and strategies for overcoming them, this liter- 938
 939 ature review aims to inform policymakers, educators, 939
 940 and administrators about the dimensions needed to 940
 941 promote its effective implementation. By developing 941
 942 supportive policies, implementing practical strategies 942
 943 for overcoming institutional barriers, conducting fur- 943
 944 ther research and evaluation, and fostering collabora- 944
 945 tion among stakeholders at all levels, Vietnamese uni- 945
 946 versities can enhance the quality and effectiveness of 946
 947 assessment practices, leading to more meaningful and 947
 948 transformative learning outcomes for students. 948

937 **APPENDIX**

938 Table 2

Table 2: Differences Between the Traditional and Alternative Assessment Approaches in Language Learning and Original Sources

Feature	Traditional assessment	Alternative Assessment	References
Purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Primarily to measure and rank students based on their knowledge and skills. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To provide a comprehensive understanding of student learning, growth, and progress; - To foster holistic language learning experiences. 	<p>(a) Nguyen, T. H. H., & Truong, A. T. (2021). EFL teachers' perceptions of classroom writing assessment at high schools in central Vietnam. <i>Theory and Practice in Language Studies</i>, 11(10), 1187-1196.</p> <p>(b) Stiggins, R. (2005). From formative assessment to assessment for learning: A path to success in standards-based schools. <i>Phi Delta Kappan</i>, 87(4), 324-328.</p> <p>(c) Cheng, L., Selamat, A., Puteh, F., & Mohamed, F. (2016). A Review of Recent Methodologies, Technologies And Usability in English Language Content Delivery. <i>Jurnal Teknologi</i>, 78, 1-11.</p>
Format	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Standardized tests quizzes; - multiple-choice questions; - true/false questions; - short-answer tests; - written essays. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Essays; - Projects, multimedia projects; - Portfolios, online portfolios; - Presentations, performances; - performance-based tasks; - demonstrations; - Observations. 	<p>(a) Herman, J. L., Aschbacher, P. R., & Winters, L. (1992). A practical guide to alternative assessment. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.</p> <p>(b) Glaser, R., Chudowsky, N., & Pellegrino, J. W. (Eds.). (2001). <i>Knowing what students know: The science and design of educational assessment</i>. National Academies Press.</p> <p>(c) Nguyen, T. T. H, Diep, N. D., & Hang, D. T. T. (2020). Testing the performance of Vietnamese Expats Learning Vietnamese Language on Digital Platforms. <i>Vietnam Journal of Science, Technology and Engineering</i>, 62(4).</p>
Focus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recall of facts; - Content knowledge; - Application of procedures and formulas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Application of knowledge in real-world contexts; - critical thinking; - problem-solving; - creativity; - communication; - collaboration. 	<p>(a) Nasab, F. G. (2015). Alternative versus Traditional Assessment. <i>Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research</i>, 2(6), 165-178.</p> <p>(b) Quansah, F. (2018). Traditional or performance assessment: What is the right way to assessing learners. <i>Research on Humanities and Social Sciences</i>, 8(1), 21-24.</p> <p>(c) Darling-Hammond, L., Ancess, J., & Falk, B. (1995). <i>Authentic assessment in action: Studies of schools and students at work</i>. Teachers College Press.</p>

Continued on next page

Table 2 continued

Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Absolute grading, lack of feedback to the progress of students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive feedback focused on strengths, weaknesses, and areas for improvement of students' performance and progress; - Can be adapted to cultural context to avoid negative emotional responses. 	<p>(a) Brown, H. D., & Abeywickrama, P. (2003). <i>Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices</i>.</p> <p>(b) Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). <i>Assessment and classroom learning</i>. <i>Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice</i>, 5(1), 7-74;</p>
Assessment of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Primarily individual performance; - Mostly lower-order thinking abilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Individual performance; - group work; - collaboration; - self-assessment; - peer assessment. 	<p>(a) Chappuis, J., Stiggins, R., Chappuis, S., & Arter, J. (2012). <i>Classroom assessment for student learning: Doing it right—using it well</i>. Pearson.</p> <p>(b) Topping, K. J. (1998). <i>Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities</i>. <i>Review of Educational Research</i>, 68(3), 249-276.</p>
Student roles	<p>Passive recipient of information and assessment.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Active participant in learning and assessment; - Taking ownership of their progress. 	<p>Shepard, L. A. (2000). <i>The role of assessment in a learning culture</i>. <i>Educational Researcher</i>, 29(7), 4-14.</p>
Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Objective; - Efficient; - Easy to administer and grade; - Provides comparable data; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Authentic, deemed as fair, more effective, more comprehensive and participatory; - Engaging and motivating; - Promotes deeper learning, thinking, reflection and self-regulation; - Relevant to real-world skills; - Allows for diverse formats (e.g., e-portfolios, multimedia projects). 	<p>(a) McMillan, J. H., & Hellsten, L. (2010). <i>Classroom assessment: Principles and practice for effective standards-based instruction</i>. Pearson Education Canada.</p> <p>(b) Wiggins, G. (1998). <i>Educative assessment: Designing assessments to inform and improve student performance</i>. Jossey-Bass Publishers.</p> <p>(c) Barrett, H. C. (2005). <i>Electronic portfolios as digital stories of deep learning</i>. <i>On the Horizon</i>, 13(2), 45-52</p> <p>(d) Yancey, K. B. (2009). <i>Reflection and electronic portfolios: Inventing the self and reinventing the university</i>. In <i>Electronic Portfolios 2.0</i> (pp. 5-16). Routledge.</p>

Continued on next page

Table 2 continued

Weaknesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May not reflect real-world skills; - Can induce anxiety; - Limited focus on higher-order thinking skills; - Lack of resources and training for implementation in Vietnam. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Time-consuming to develop and assess; - Less institutionally standardized; - May lack objectivity in terms of exact evaluative criteria; - Can be challenging with large class sizes. 	<p>(a) Linn, R. L. (2000). Assessments and accountability. <i>Educational Researcher</i>, 29(2), 4-16.</p> <p>(b) Duncan, N. (2012). Beyond testing: towards a theory of educational assessment.</p> <p>(c) Parandekar, S. D., Yamauchi, F., Ragatz, A. B., Sedmik, E. K., & Sawamoto, A. (2017). Enhancing school quality in Vietnam through participative and collaborative learning.</p> <p>(d) Tran, H. T. (2017). Exploring alternative assessment practices in Vietnamese higher education: Opportunities and challenges. <i>Vietnamese Educational Review</i>, 14(2), 45-58.</p>
Examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Standardized achievement tests; - SAT, ACT; - Final exams; - Quizzes, multiple-choice tests. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Research projects; - Design challenges, portfolios, E-portfolios, multimedia projects; - Presentations, performances, exhibitions; - Debates, online discussions; - Simulations; - Peer reviews, self-reflections. 	<p>(a) Airasian, P. W. (2001). <i>Classroom assessment: Concepts and applications</i>. McGraw-Hill.</p> <p>(b) Mueller, J. (2005). The authentic assessment toolbox: enhancing student learning through online faculty development. <i>Journal of Online Learning and Teaching</i>, 1(1), 1-7.</p> <p>(c) Barrett, H. C. (2005). Electronic portfolios as digital stories of deep learning. <i>On the Horizon</i>, 13(2), 45-52</p>

939 **BIODATA AND AFFILIATIONS**

940 Ms. Ngo Nguyen Thien Duyen completed her MA
 941 in Applied Linguistics and TESOL at Macquarie Uni-
 942 versity, Australia. She has published articles in lo-
 943 cal and international journals. She is currently a lec-
 944 turer at Ho Chi Minh University of Economics and Fi-
 945 nance. Her research interests include but are not lim-
 946 ited to TESOL, teacher professional development, as-
 947 sessment practice, and intercultural communication.
 948 Mr. Vo Trong Nghia completed his Master Degree in
 949 TESOL at Monash University, Australia. He is cur-
 950 rently a lecturer at Ho Chi Minh University of Eco-
 951 nomics and Finance. His interests include but are not
 952 limited to effective English classroom practices and
 953 integration of technology in teaching and learning.

954 **REFERENCES**

955 1. Ahmad S, Sultana N, Jamil S. Behaviorism vs constructivism:
 956 A paradigm shift from traditional to alternative assessment
 957 techniques. 2020;7(2):19-33;
 958 2. Brown JD, Hudson T. The alternatives in language assessment.
 959 TESOL quarterly. 1998;32(4):653-675;Available from: <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587999>.
 960 3. Abedi J. Performance assessments for English language teach-
 961 ers. Stanford, CA: Stanford University, Stanford Center for Op-
 962 portunity Policy in Education; 2010;
 963 4. Cheng L, Selamat A, Puteh F, Mohamed F. A review of
 964 recent methodologies, technologies and usability in En-
 965 glish language content delivery. Jurnal Teknologi. 2016;78:1-
 966 11;Available from: <https://doi.org/10.11113/JT.V78.10017>.
 967 5. Dang TM, Nguyen TH. Challenges in implementing alterna-
 968 tive assessment methods in Vietnamese higher education: A
 969 case study. Journal of Educational Research and Evaluation.
 970 2020;7(2):87-102;
 971 6. Ngo XM. English assessment in Vietnam: status quo, ma-
 972 jor tensions, and underlying ideological conflicts. Asian En-
 973 glishes, 2024 26(1), 280-292,;
 974 7. Nguyen HTM, Burns A. Teacher language proficiency and re-
 975 form of English language education in Vietnam, 2008-2020.
 976 Phnom Penh; 2017,;
 977 8. Tran NG, Tran NH. Teachers' beliefs and practices regarding as-
 978 sessment in English as a foreign language classrooms in Viet-
 979 nam. Qual Rep. 2021;26(11):3457-3475,;
 980 9. Koç S, Liu X, Wachira P. Assessment in online and blended
 981 learning environments. IAP; 2015;Available from: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315814605-1>.
 982 10. Lutsenko O, Seminikhyna N, Svyrydiuk T. Challenges of stu-
 983 dent assessment in online learning. Innovate Pedagogy.
 984 2023;2(56):210-213;Available from: <https://doi.org/10.32782/2663-6085/2023/56.2.45>.
 985 11. Topping KJ. Peer assessment between students in colleges
 986 and universities. Rev Educ Res. 1998;68(3):249-276;
 987 12. Black P, Wiliam D. Assessment and classroom learning. Assess-
 988 ment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice. 1998;5(1):7-
 989 74;Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102>.
 990 13. Glaser R, Chudowsky N, Pellegrino JW, editors. Knowing what
 991 students know: The science and design of educational assess-
 992 ment. National Academies Press; 2001,;
 993 14. Linn RL. Assessments and accountability. Educational Re-
 994 searcher. 2000;29(2):4-16;Available from: <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X029002004>.
 995 15. Herman JL, Aschbacher PR, Winters L. A practical guide to
 996 alternative assessment. Association for Supervision and Cur-
 997 riculum Development; 1992,;

16. Stiggins R. From formative assessment to assessment for
 1002 learning: A path to success in standards-based schools. Phi
 1003 Delta Kappan. 2005;87(4):324-328,;
 1004 17. Brown HD, Abeywickrama P. Language Assessment: Principles
 1005 and Classroom Practices. 2003,;
 1006 18. Brown JD, Abeywickrama P. Language assessment: Principles
 1007 and classroom practices. Pearson Education; 2010,;
 1008 19. Bachman LF, Palmer AS. Language assessment in practice. Ox-
 1009 ford University Press; 2010,;
 1010 20. Sandford BA, Hsu C-C. Alternative assessment and portfo-
 1011 lios: review, reconsider, and revitalize. Int J Soc Sci Stud.
 1012 2013;1(1):215-221,;
 1013 21. Chappuis J, Stiggins R, Chappuis S, Arter J. Classroom assess-
 1014 ment for student learning: Doing it right-using it well. Pear-
 1015 son; 2012,;
 1016 22. Nasab FG. Alternative versus traditional assessment. J Appl
 1017 Linguist Lang Res. 2015;2(6):165-178,;
 1018 23. Quansah F. Traditional or performance assessment: What is
 1019 the right way to assessing learners. Res Humanit Soc Sci.
 1020 2018;8(1):21-24,;
 1021 24. Pereira D, Cadime I, Brown G, Flores MA. How do undergrad-
 1022 uates perceive the use of assessment? A study in higher edu-
 1023 cation. Eur J High Educ. 2022;12(1):1-17;Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2020.1871393>.
 1024 25. Sulaiman T, Syrene Abdul Rahim S, Nazrul Hakim M, Omar
 1025 R. Teachers' perspectives of assessment and alternative as-
 1026 sessment in the classroom. Blue Eyes Intell Eng Sci Publ.
 1027 2019;8(752):426-31,;
 1028 26. O'Neill G, Padden L. Diversifying assessment meth-
 1029 ods: Barriers, benefits and enablers. Innov Educ
 1030 Teach Int. 2022;59(4):398-409;Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2021.1880462>.
 1031 27. Wiggins G. Educative assessment: Designing assessments
 1032 to inform and improve student performance. San Francisco:
 1033 Jossey-Bass Publishers; 1998,;
 1034 28. Barrett HC. Electronic portfolios as digital stories of deep
 1035 learning. On the Horizon. 2005;13(2):45-52,;
 1036 29. Parandekar SD, Yamauchi F, Ragatz AB, Sedmik EK, Sawamoto
 1037 A. Enhancing school quality in Vietnam through participative
 1038 and collaborative learning. 2017,;
 1039 30. McMillan JH. Discussion of part I: Assessment information in
 1040 context. In: Classroom assessment and educational measure-
 1041 ment. Routledge; 2019. p. 79-94;Available from: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429507533-6>.
 1042 31. Tran TD. An exploratory study of current assessment practices
 1043 for improving the learning of English as a foreign language
 1044 (EFL) in two Vietnamese universities [dissertation]. Queens-
 1045 land University of Technology; 2015,;
 1046 32. Ngo TH. 'Standing between the flows': Interactions among
 1047 neoliberalism, socialism and Confucianism in Vietnamese
 1048 higher education. In: Phan LH, Doan BN, editors. Higher
 1049 education in market-oriented socialist Vietnam. Singapore:
 1050 Springer; 2020. p. 41-62,;
 1051 33. Pham THT, Renshaw P. Formative assessment in Confucian
 1052 heritage culture classrooms: Activity theory analysis of ten-
 1053 sions, contradictions and hybrid practices. Assess Eval High
 1054 Educ. 2015;40(1):45-59,;
 1055 34. Nguyen HT, Pham TT. Institutional barriers to the adoption of
 1056 alternative assessment methods in Vietnamese universities.
 1057 Asia Pac J Educ. 2019;39(3):346-359,;
 1058 35. Tran HT. Exploring alternative assessment practices in Viet-
 1059 namese higher education: opportunities and challenges. Viet-
 1060 namese Educ Rev. 2017;14(2):45-58,;
 1061 36. Vu TPA. Classroom-based assessment in Vietnam: an investi-
 1062 gation into teachers' beliefs and practices. Paper presented at:
 1063 First Vietnam Language Assessment Symposium (VLAS) 2017;
 1064 2017 May 23; Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam,;
 1065 37. Tran TK. Traditional assessment practices and their impact on
 1066 student learning in Vietnamese universities. J High Educ Viet-
 1067 nam. 2018;25(1):31-45,;
 1068 1069
 1070
 1071

- 1072 38. Luong GTH. Achieving change in student assessment in Viet-
1073 namese teacher training institutions [dissertation]. Southern
1074 Cross University; 2015;.
- 1075 39. Pham THN. English language classroom assessment in Viet-
1076 nam: from policy to practice. Paper presented at: First Viet-
1077 nam Language Assessment Symposium (VLAS) 2017; 2017
1078 May 23; Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam;.
- 1079 40. Ngo XM. Sociopolitical contexts of EFL writing assessment in
1080 Vietnam: impact of a national project. In: Ruecker T, Crusan
1081 D, editors. The politics of English second language writing as-
1082 sessment in global contexts. New York, NY: Routledge; 2018.
1083 p. 47-59;.
- 1084 41. Nguyen H, Gu Y. Impact of TOEIC listening and reading as a
1085 university exit test in Vietnam. *Lang Assess Q.* 2020;17(2):147-
1086 167;.
- 1087 42. Ngo XM. Vietnam's trillion-dong attempt to reform English ed-
1088 ucation: a laudable reform or a costly failure? *Engl Today.*
1089 2021;37(2):115-119;.
- 1090 43. Vietnamese Government. Decision 1400/QĐ-TTg on the
1091 approval of the national foreign language project for the
1092 2008-2020 period. 2008 Sep 30; Available from: [http://www.
1093 chinhphu.vn/portal/page/portal/chinhphu/hethongvanban?
1094 class_id=1&_page=18&mode=detail&document_id=78437](http://www.chinhphu.vn/portal/page/portal/chinhphu/hethongvanban?class_id=1&_page=18&mode=detail&document_id=78437).
- 1095 44. Nguyen HHT, Tran TTN. An investigation into EFL teachers'
1096 perceptions of in-class English speaking assessment. *VNU J*
1097 *Foreign Stud.* 2018;34(2); Available from: [https://doi.org/10.
1098 25073/2525-2445/vnufs.4251](https://doi.org/10.25073/2525-2445/vnufs.4251).
- 1099 45. Nguyen THH, Truong AT. EFL teachers' perceptions of class-
1100 room writing assessment at high schools in central Vietnam.
1101 *Theory Pract Lang Stud.* 2021;11(10):1187-1196;.
- 1102 46. Nguyen MH. Challenges to higher education reform—A uni-
1103 versity management perspective. In: *Education in Vietnam.*
1104 2011. p. 237-258;.
- 1105 47. Anh VTP. Classroom-based assessment in Vietnam: An inves-
1106 tigation into teachers' beliefs and practices [presentation].
1107 Vietnam Language Assessment Symposium 2017, British
1108 Council; 2017; Available from: [https://www.britishcouncil.vn/
1109 en/exam/assessment-advocacy/vietnam-language-assessment-
1110 symposium-2017/presentations](https://www.britishcouncil.vn/en/exam/assessment-advocacy/vietnam-language-assessment-symposium-2017/presentations).
- 1111 48. Giang DN. Teachers' perceptions and descriptions of
1112 classroom-based assessment practices in Vietnam [pre-
1113 sentation]. Vietnam Language Assessment Symposium
1114 2017, British Council; 2017; Available from: [https://www.
1115 britishcouncil.vn/en/exam/assessment-advocacy/vietnam-
1116 language-assessment-symposium-2017/presentations](https://www.britishcouncil.vn/en/exam/assessment-advocacy/vietnam-language-assessment-symposium-2017/presentations).
- 1117 49. Truong KN, Wang C. Examining the quality of English lan-
1118 guage learning of university students in Vietnam: the moder-
1119 ating role of competition factor. *Educ Res Int.* 2019; Available
1120 from: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1321463.pdf>.
- 1121 50. Maclellan E. How convincing is alternative assessment for use
1122 in higher education? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Edu-
1123 cation.* 2004;29(3):311-321; Available from: [https://doi.org/10.
1124 1080/0260293042000188267](https://doi.org/10.1080/0260293042000188267).
- 1125 51. Yancey KB. Reflection and electronic portfolios: inventing the
1126 self and reinventing the university. In: *Electronic Portfolios 2.0.*
1127 Routledge; 2009. p. 5-16;.
- 1128 52. Darling-Hammond L, Hyler ME, Gardner M. Effective teacher
1129 professional development. Palo Alto: Learning Policy Insti-
1130 tute; 2017; Available from: <https://doi.org/10.54300/122.311>.
- 1131 53. Cheng G, Chau J. Exploring the relationship between stu-
1132 dents' self-regulated learning ability and their ePortfolio
1133 achievement. *The Internet and Higher Education.* 2013;17:9-
1134 15; Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2012.09.
1135 005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2012.09.005).
- 1136 54. Tabatabaei O, Assefi F. The effect of portfolio assessment tech-
1137 nique on writing performance of EFL learners. *English Lang*
1138 *Teach.* 2012;5(5):138; Available from: [https://doi.org/10.5539/
1139 elt.v5n5p138](https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n5p138).
- 1140 55. Tabatabaei O, Assefi F. Effects of alternative assessment in EFL
1141 classroom: a systematic review. *Am Int J Educ Linguist Res.*
1142 2020;7-18; Available from: <https://doi.org/10.46545/aijeler.v3i2>.