LLT Journal, e-ISSN 2579-9533, p-ISSN 1410-7201, Vol. 29, No. 1, April 2026, pp. 169-191

LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching
http://ejournal.usd.ac.id/index.php/LLT
Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

EFL TEACHERS' ROLES IN MEDIATING ETHICAL DISCOURSES ON ASSESSMENT IN INDONESIAN PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES

Truly Almendo Pasaribu[1*], I Raqib Chowdhury[2], and Ilana Finefter-Rosenbluh[3]
[1]La Trobe University, Australia
[2,3]Monash University, Australia
t.pasaribu@latrobe.edu.au[1], raqib.chowdhury@monash.edu[2], ilana.finefter-rosenbluh@monash.edu[3]
*correspondence: t.pasaribu@latrobe.edu.au
https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v29i1.599
received 10 December 2025; accepted 01 April 2026

Abstract
This study explores how Indonesian national and institutional policies shape EFL (English as a foreign language) teachers' roles in mediating ethical discourses on assessment practices in private universities. Using Foucauldian discourse analysis, this paper analysed how the national and institutional English Language Education policies frame EFL teachers' roles in terms of who the agents in assessment are, what the perceived ethical duties are, and what standards are taken into consideration in assessment processes and practices. The findings demonstrate how EFL teachers are expected to be ethical guides, foregrounding institutional social and religious values. Findings also reveal the various roles framing teachers as assessment designers, communicative assessors, assessment motivators, data analysts and student surveillants. Specifically, this study examines how assessment policies frame teachers as responsible subjects to enact assessment mechanisms ethically and perform accountability through data and monitoring. This paper argues that tensions can emerge when ethical expectations are outlined without professional resources to support teachers.

Keywords: assessment, ethics, discourse analysis, EFL teachers' roles

Introduction
This research aims to investigate how Indonesian national and institutional policies shape EFL (English as a foreign language) teachers' roles in mediating ethical discourses on assessment practices in private universities. Being part of social institutions, ethical discourses have historically been an important part of Indonesian education. They have been soundly articulated since Indonesian independence in 1945 through Pancasila or the 'five principles' acting as a socio-pedagogic tool for Indonesian identity and ethical actions (Ministry of Education, 2019). The need to enact ethical procedures in Indonesian education is further regulated through public policies. Presidential Regulation 8/2012 emphasises the centrality of ethical domains as the embodiment of Indonesia through *Kerangka Kualifikasi Nasional Indonesia* (KKNI) or the Indonesian qualification framework

This work is licensed under CC BY-SA.
Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

(IQF) (Presidential Regulation 8/2012 on Indonesian National Qualification Framework, 2012). Although the Indonesian government expects teachers to facilitate learning and assessment that enables students not only to improve knowledge and skills, but also to act ethically, there remains insufficient attention to how policies frame teachers' roles in mediating ethical discourses in assessment processes in private universities. This study addresses this gap by examining how national and institutional assessment policies construct EFL teachers' roles in relation to ethical expectations in assessment.

This study views policy not merely as a technical instrument for guiding EFL teachers' assessment practice, but perceives it as a mechanism that shapes expectations, responsibilities, and forms of professional conduct (Ball, 1993; Hellström & Jacob, 2017). Previous studies have noted how policies can promote ethical behaviour (Madani et al., 2020; Sofyan et al., 2025; Walshaw, 2007) and serve as discourse or sets of rules informing ethically accepted ways of behaving (Ball, 1993; Walshaw, 2007). Assessment policies, hence, may frame teachers as ethically responsible for enacting assessment practices and demonstrating effectiveness through data, monitoring, and reporting. Analysing this framing enables in-depth understanding how power operates in education, specifically through assessment mechanisms within higher education systems.

The research question in this study is then formulated: How are the national and institutional policies frame the teachers' roles in mediating ethical discourses on assessment in Indonesian private universities? Drawing upon Foucauldian discourse analysis (1985), the study focuses on how policy as a discourse is positioned as a dominant truth that controls power relations and ethical roles in the realm of assessment as an instrumental practice in higher education.

Educational policy in mediating ethical discourses

Policies have been encoded and decoded in complex ways as they are formulated through "struggles, compromises, authoritative public interpretation and reinterpretation" (Ball, 1993, p. 11). They are also translated, interpreted, and enacted by individual in multifaceted ways, shaped by social, cultural and economic resources available to them (Scanlon et al., 2023). Collections of policies as discourse, then, "contain the power to say something other than what it actually says, and thus to embrace a plurality of meanings" (Foucault, 1972, p. 118). The process of recording and decoding policy among agents is governed and bounded by individuals' resources, philosophies and context (Alfrey et al., 2017; Barnes et al., 2025).

Further, Stephen Ball (1993, p.12) distinguishes policy as text and policy as discourse. The former positions policies as "textual interventions into practice." Policies, in this sense, exist in context, giving available options for the actors. The enactment of these policy texts depends on how these actors translate them into practice, depending on their resources, capability and commitment (Ball, 1993). Policy as discourse, on the other hand, refers to collections of related statements exercising power through a production of "truth" and "knowledge" (p. 14). In this way, policies organise power relations and distribution of voice. Ball (1993, p 14) further theorises that policies may have "the effect of redistributing "voice", with regard to determining which values and voices are included or excluded as ethical or meaningful.

In terms of assessment, two studies (Finefter-Rosenbluh & Perrotta, 2023; Raaper, 2016) explore how universities' policies shape academics and students' assessment practices. Raaper (2016), for example, focuses on how institutional policies in neoliberalised universities are constantly developed for accountability (see also, Kabir & Chowdhury, 2021). She argued that neoliberalisation of universities (transformation from a public place for democratic empowerment to a place for economic pursuit) is possible through policy development in Europe. Raaper (2016) further argued that assessment in a highly neoliberalised university made both academics and students feel controlled, yet they tended to accommodate it, while in another university, in an early stage of neoliberalisation, academics and students found more opportunities to be proactive and resist the assessment policies. Raaper's study (2016) remains situated in European contexts, raising questions about how such policy dynamics translate to a different socio-cultural environment in Global South contexts, such as Indonesia. Finefter-Rosenbluh and Perrotta (2023) shows how teachers were enacting procedures in the policy aimed at carrying out an ethical assessment culture. Working within an ambiguous environment with conflicting ethical obligations, teachers contested the policies through voicing their concerns, narrating or interpreting the assessment procedures. Finefter-Rosenbluh and Perrotta's study implies that assessment policies are continuously contested, pointing out the need to analyse the policy itself in how it constructs the conditions and subject positions within assessment practices.

Assessment in higher education institutions

Two key types of assessment are commonly used in many higher education institutions: summative assessment and formative assessment, which are often contrasted. Summative assessment, or assessment of learning, is delivered to measure students' learning achievement to inform the "basis of classroom work or learning" (Rea-Dickins, 2000, p. 376). This type of assessment is often used by teachers and institutions to gather evidence on learning by focusing on outcomes at the end of a teaching period (Brady & Kennedy, 2019). This kind of assessment facilitates students' learning achievement of certification (Boud & Falchikov, 2007). Formative assessment, on the other hand, seeks to support students in their learning by providing feedback throughout the teaching and learning period so they know what and how to improve (Brady & Kennedy, 2019). Black and Wiliam (1998, p. 8) further define formative assessment as activities that "provide information to be used as feedback to modify the teaching and learning activities". While summative assessment is usually referred to as assessment *of* learning, formative assessment is often considered as assessment *for* learning, as it supports students by identifying zone of actual development (Griffin, 2017) and providing targeted learning.

Literature (e.g., Boud & Falchikov, 2007; Gikandi et al., 2011; Joughin, 2009) points out that assessment is an integral part of teaching and learning in higher education contexts. Assessment is characterised as a driving force of students' learning as it involves their work demonstrating learning, the evaluation of this work and the inference of what they can do (Joughin, 2009). Furthermore, in higher education contexts, assessment process is used to improve teaching and learning strategies (Gikandi et al., 2011). Assessment feedback given to students also encourages students to develop learning strategies (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Besides acting as a tool for learning certification, Boud and Falchikov (2007)

stressed that assessment needs to engage students not only within institutionalised learning requirements, but also toward long-term learning.

Although assessment is perceived as an instrumental aspect in higher education, it can also be the source of systemic dissatisfaction among students and teachers across various national contexts, such as in the UK (Deeley et al., 2019), Australia (Henderson et al., 2019), Indonesia (Sofyan et al., 2024) and the US (Finefter-Rosenbluh & Levinson, 2015). Students in different contexts may perceive unfair experiences in terms of assessment. Rasooli et al., (2019, p. 597) conceptualises fairness from different aspects in classroom assessment: classroom distributive justice (fairness in the "distribution of the outcome"), procedural justice (fairness of "the classroom procedures"), and classroom interactional justice (fairness related to how students behave and how assessment is communicated). In Indonesian vocational education contexts, Sofyan et al. (2024) point out that students perceived unfair assessment experience due to inconsistencies between the subject learning guides and the assessment practice. This brings up questions on what kind of assessment is expected to be delivered and implemented in Indonesian private higher education contexts, which is the focus of this study.

Foucauldian discourse analysis

This paper is informed by Foucauldian concepts of discourse, which is defined as a "group of statements that belong to a single system of formation" (Foucault, 1972, p. 107), enabling actors or individuals to speak of discourses such as educational discourse. Doherty (2007, p. 193) further defines discourse as "a body of ideas, concepts and beliefs that have become established as knowledge." This formulation of discourse is subtantive in this study, as it argues that statements, through educational policies in this context, structure the order of knowledge forming power relations and regulated practices. Walshaw (2007) also added that these statements serve as sets of rules informing individuals about accepted and ethical ways of thinking, speaking or doing. The premises offered by these scholars (Doherty, 2007; Foucault, 1972; Walshaw, 2007) are relevant to this study, which focuses on how ethical discourses throughout assessment policies constitute individuals regarding what they are expected to do and what they actually do. These discourses impose certain values and ideals which are evaluated as good or bad (right or wrong) on individuals or subjects (see Walshaw, 2007).

A key consideration for this study is that Foucault (1972) argued that discourses, including ethical ones, can be used as a tool of control, exerting power on individuals. Foucault focuses on ethical subjects in his later work, highlighting the formation of subjective individuals and their ethical practices (Bright et al., 2024). Further, Bright et al. (2024) explains three aspects of ethics: prescriptive ethical codes, individual acts in relation to the code, and the manner of acting upon the codes. For Foucault, ethics is not only code or behaviour but the individuals' attitudes that cause one to respect the codes and their application. Foucault (1985, p. 28) highlighted how ethics require practices of self-formation for individuals "to act upon (themselves), to monitor, test, improve, and transform (themselves)."

In this study, these ethical concepts are used to analyse how policy statements construct ethical roles and expectations of EFL teachers in assessment. Specifically, policy texts are examined to identify ethical principles of assessment, the responsibilities assigned to teachers and how teachers are positioned as subjects to

align their practices within national and institutional assessment ethical expectations. Policy, then, is treated as mechanisms that shape how teachers perform their ethical duties (Foucault, 1972).

Foucault sees the importance of analysing the "truth", in this case, reflected in the forms of policies produced by body regulators such as policymakers in the national or institutional levels. The concept of truth in policies is central in this study to understand how ethical discourses frame teachers' roles in assessment processes in three private universities. This framework enables this study to analyse how educational policies foreground certain ethical values that may shape teachers' roles within assessment processes across these three higher education institutes.

Method

To develop an in-depth understanding of how ethical discourses are understood in Indonesian private universities, we adopted a research paradigm guided by constructivist beliefs. White (2004) discusses how Discourse Analysis (DA) is guided by constructivist orientation as texts are open to multiple reading. The authors of this study employed an interpretive approach through qualitative document analysis using Foucauldian discourse analysis, in that, instead of being distant, we deeply engaged with the meaning-making process in interpreting how power relation and subject positioning are embedded in language, in this study, the policies (Chowdhury, 2008; Spencer & Bussi, 2020; van Hulst et al., 2025).

Data collection

This study, which was a part of a larger research project, analysed a number of selected national and institutional artefacts collected in 2022 from three institutions to understand how ethical discourses are understood in assessment practices through Foucauldian discourse analysis. These three institutions are established by non-state foundations, which means that they can develop their own internal regulations to achieve their social, religious or humanistic purposes. The selected institutions operate under diverse value systems, i.e. *Jesuit, Islamic*, and *Tamansiswa*, which inform their ethical orientations towards teaching and learning. This may shape expectations in the policy on how teachers teach and assess students. In addition, private institutions receive less funds from the government compared to public universities (Ngo & Meek, 2019), and thus rely much on students' tuition and external funding, which can intensify pressures for accountability and performance.

As documents can be useful to provide information and find questions about an organisation (Yin, 2009), this study included data from public policies and institutional documents. Although this study mainly investigated assessment policies that were found in the National HE Curriculum Guidelines (2020), the collected data from the national level also includes laws, regulations and national guidelines for higher education in Indonesia. As the assessment processes in the three private universities (all in pseudonyms) may also be shaped by different policies such as academic guidelines, codes of ethics, and institutional curriculum documents, this study also traced policies and documents at the institutional levels to understand the multifaceted nature of the assessment processes. The collected documents from the national and institutional level are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Collected data

Document Name	Contents
Public Policies	Law 14/2005 Law on teachers and lecturers
	Law 12/2012 Law on Higher Education
	Presidential Regulation 8/2012 Indonesian National Qualification Framework in Higher Education
	The Ministry of Education and Culture Regulations 73/2013 Implementation of the Indonesian National Qualification Framework in Higher Education
	The Ministry of Education and Culture Regulations 49/2014 Higher Education National Standard
	The Ministry of Research, Technology and Higher Education Regulation 44 2015 Higher Education National Standard
	National HE Curriculum Guidelines (2020) HE Academic Guidelines
Institutional Policies	Universitas Guru Academic Guidelines
	Universitas Guru Lecturer Guidelines
	Universitas Merdeka Codes of Ethics for Lecturer
	Universitas Merdeka Academic Guidelines
	Universitas Merdeka Strategic plan 2020-2024
	Universitas Belajar Study Program Curriculum
	Universitas Belajar Academic Guidelines
	Universitas Belajar Content Writing Modules

Following Yin's (2009) second principle of case study data collection on having database for a case study, the documents were stored in NVivo for further analysis using Foucauldian discourse analysis.

Data analysis: Foucauldian discourse analysis

Author 1 coded national and institutional policies and documents into different initial codes. National or institutional documents that focus only on assessment in higher education are not available, as assessment policies are scattered in different regulations and guidelines. These policy documents were imported into NVivo and analysed to initial coding to identify recurring terms, phrases and statements related to ethics, teacher responsibilities and assessment. Author 1 identified any relevant codes from different perspectives from the policy documents and the literature to be clustered together (Saldaña, 2009), and then classified recurring statements into labels related to assessment practices expected from teachers, such as "assessment principles", "feedback" or "grade". The data were further analysed in terms of how policy texts frame teachers' roles as actors who are expected to perform their ethical duties in certain standards to measure the prescribed learning outcomes through assessment.

In the final stage, all authors interpreted these focus codes through the lens of Foucauldian discourse analysis to answer the research questions as seen in Table 2.

Table 2. Examples of coding

Statements	Initial coding	Focus coding	Link to Foucauldian Discourse Analysis
The material that was raised as a concern is valid; the grade has been adjusted upward in accordance with the lecturer's correction.	Grade	Assessment communicator	Position teachers as authority to define what counts as valid
The assessment mechanism consists of: developing, communicating, and agreeing on the stages, techniques, instruments, criteria, indicators, and weighting of the assessment.	Assessment mechanism	Assessment designer	Teachers as accountable agents to with assessment responsibilities
In this case, the lecturer or test invigilator has the authority to take action if a student demonstrates behaviours that can be categorised as academic misconduct during an examination.	Academic integrity	Assessment surveillants	Teachers have the power to supervise students and act on misconduct
Assessment/evaluation encompasses the three aspects of competence, conscience, compassion, and commitment. The weighting of these aspects is determined by the lecturer in accordance with the learning objectives.	Assessment principles	Assessment designer	Teachers as ethical agents to shape students' learning and development

Statements from the policy documents highlighting what the teachers are expected to know and do to deliver assessment were clustered in the focus codes in NVivo teachers as ethical guides, assessment designers (15), assessment communicators (14), assessment motivators (4), assessment data analysts (5), and assessment surveillants (5).

Findings and Discussion

Findings

Higher education teachers' roles as ethical guides

To understand how national and institutional ethical discourses in English as a foreign language (EFL) writing programs shape EFL teachers' roles in assessment practices in Indonesian private universities, it is crucial, firstly, to investigate how such discourses define EFL teachers' roles and guide them to perform to certain standards that align with the state's philosophical and ethical values. This first section of the findings thus explores expectations regarding how teachers as ethical guides are constructed in public and institutional policies.

Pancasila, meaning five (*panca*) principles (*sila*), has served as the philosophical foundation of the country since its Independence in 1945. Regulation 60/1999 mandates that university teachers are required to have a Pancasila-oriented mindset. To this end, the principles are expected to be enacted in educational practices to unite citizens from different religious, cultural, and language backgrounds. These ethical principles explicitly claim the state's ideology on religions (the first sila), humanity (the second sila), political unity (the third sila), democratic participation (the fourth sila) and social justice (the fifth sila).

These Pancasila principles clearly inform Indonesian education objectives, aiming at developing learners' potentials to be pious citizens who believe in God, have good morals, health, knowledge, intelligence, creativity, independence, democratic values and responsibility (Law 12/2012 on Higher Education). The implications of Pancasila in education for teachers are, then, clear: to educate students to foster national and humanity values for the sake of the Indonesian nation. This is in Article 6, Law 14/2005: that teachers and university teachers as professional staff are to implement the national education system to achieve the goal of national education: "the development of students' potential as individuals who believe and have faith in God, have a noble character, [to] be healthy, knowledgeable, capable, creative, independent and be democratic and responsible citizens" (p. 5). These ethical values are also reflected in regulations; MoEC Regulations 73 2013 requires the higher education curriculum to embed ethical learning outcomes. Specifically, this policy asserts that the study program needs to espouse these IQF outcomes in developing, implementing and evaluating the curriculum. This requirement positions teachers as agents responsible for translating the national ideals into observable practices in assessment.

While these above-mentioned national policies point out the expectations regarding the enactment of ethical principles in higher education and the role of the teachers as ethical exemplars, they are further expanded in private universities. These private providers are independent and exercise a degree of control over their regulations, including what religious, ethical or social values to include in their vision. At the same time, teachers become subjects of this power (Foucault, 1972), as they are required to align their judgement with the guidelines, illustrating how power operates through external control into how teachers regulate themselves.

Universitas Guru's vision and mission statement accentuates ethical values of seeking the truth and being humanistic (Universitas Guru Academic Guidelines, 2021). Although religiously affiliated, the word 'Catholic' is not explicitly mentioned by Universitas Guru, but becomes evident through terms such as *cura personalis, pedagogi Ignasian* (Ignatian Pedagogy), and *spiritualitas Ignasian* (Ignatian spirituality) (Universitas Guru Academic Guidelines, 2021, p. 2). Academic excellence and humanistic values are further translated in the English department into four ethical areas: competence, conscience, compassion and commitment. Teachers, as ethical guides, are expected to integrate these ethical values in the learning and assessment processes.

The word 'Islam' is articulated in the Universitas Belajar's vision and mission statements and conveyed in the English Language Education department's own vision and mission statement and in the syllabus (Universitas Belajar Academic Guidelines, 2020). The metaphor used as their vision is *dijiwai nilai-nilai* Islam, translated as "inspired by Islamic values". Jiwa, a metaphor literally translated as

soul, shows that Islamic values guide institutional activities. Further, in their curriculum policy, the English Language Education program aims at equipping the students with local and international cultural knowledge to develop their openness to and acceptance of foreign culture without leaving their own local culture.

Finally, Universitas Merdeka prides itself on its historical context as it was established by one of the the founding father of Indonesian education, Ki Hajar Dewatara. In this case, Dewantara's teachings on education, *Ajaran Tamansiswa*, are explicitly reflected in the university's vision and mission statements and curriculum. Teachers' practices are described using spatial metaphors: in front (*ing ngarso*) to give examples, in the middle (*ing madya*) to give motivation, and in the back (*tut wuri*) to give freedom (Universitas Merdeka Strategic Plan 2020-2024, p. 5). The use of metaphors indicates teachers' on-going presence as exemplars and motivators for students to achieve their optimal potentials. Furthermore, the Tamansiswa philosophy - *niteni* (observing), *niroke* (imitating), *nambahi* (adding), as stated in the strategic plan, must be manifested in the learning and assessment process. The Universitas Merdeka Strategic Plan also notes that teachers need to develop educational activities that cover "cognitive development, affective development and their implementation in real life" (p. 5).

The policy then positions teachers as expected to care not only about the cognitive development of the students but also about their ethical development, by being ethical exemplars in teaching and learning processes. In the English Language Education contexts, the teachers are expected to integrate these ethical values in different kinds of assessment tasks and feedback processes, transforming assessment into an ethical site where *both* academic and moral expectations are monitored.

The next section specifically investigates teachers' roles in mediating ethical expectations throughout the assessment processes in the examined national and institutional policies. It examines how policy texts prescribe that teachers act and perform transparently across their roles in assessment. In this sense, policy operates as a form of governance, where power is exercised through policy statements by positioning teachers as accountable agents whose actions are regulated.

Teachers as assessment designers

In addition to ethical guides, both national and institutional documents position EFL teachers as assessment designers regarding how they are expected to design and communicate the assessment tasks in alignment with the state's and institutions' ethical expectations and responsibilities to help students achieve learning outcomes to the best of their ability. In this sense, power operates through policy-driven expectations that shape how assessment is planned and enacted in teaching and learning.

Assessment formulation and mechanisms are conceptualised as a part of Pendidikan or teaching duty in the *Tridharma Perguruan Tinggi* (MoRTHE Regulation 44/2015 on Higher Education National Standard). University teachers play an instrumental role as assessment designers throughout these assessment processes, as they have an ethical responsibility to formulate assessment that accurately measure students' knowledge, skills and attitudes. The National HE Curriculum Guidelines and MoRTHE Regulation 44/2015 require teachers to develop assessment instruments that measure and deliver them to the students.

The National HE Curriculum Guidelines (2020) further expect teachers to design and deliver assessment in alignment with assessment principles (educative, authentic, objective, accountable, transparent). This study characterises these assessment principles as ethical principles as they guide teachers to enact assessment practices that benefit the students in multiple holistic ways. Firstly, teachers as assessment designers need to be educative. The core aspect of assessment based on this first principle is to motivate students. This indicates that teachers are expected to consider student motivation, not only when designing assessment, but also when judging their work and giving. Secondly, teachers are responsible to give assessment that is authentic or reflect students' performance throughout the learning process. The emphasis of the second principle (authentic) is for a continuous learning process, stressing the centrality of formative assessment and feedback on the learning process. Thirdly, assessment needs to be objective, highlighting that the assessment standards should be agreed between the teachers and the students, to accurately reflect the students' demonstration of learning. The word 'agreed' indicates a space for dialogue between teachers and students. Fourth, assessment needs to be accountable, describing that teachers need to explicitly explain the procedures and criteria of assessment. The final principle of assessment is transparency, which means teachers need to make sure that the procedures and results are accessible to the stakeholders, including administrators and students.

In addition to these ethical discourses in the national guidelines, institutional documents from all three studied universities frame teachers as assessment designers, specifying what actions and principles are expected within assessment processes. First, Universitas Guru expects teachers to provide objective, reliable and accurate assessments reflecting students' skills, knowledge and attitude, in alignment with their institutional academic guidelines serving as a policy document elaborating on learning and assessment practice standards. Universitas Guru academic guidelines point out the role of teachers as assessment designers who develop and carry out "assessments/evaluations including the four aspects of competence, conscience, compassion and commitment" (Universitas Guru Academic Guidelines, 2021, p. 11). When considering these aspects in assessment, teachers are positioned to interpret how to enact these ethical values in their assessment designs. To integrate these values in the writing assessment, for example, teachers need to explicitly state how students demonstrate these four aspects in their writing processes and products.

Secondly, Universitas Merdeka replicates the exact wording, stating the mechanisms of assessment from the aforementioned National HE Curriculum Guidelines that emphasise the importance of designing "the techniques, instruments, criteria, indicators and assessment weights" in accountable and transparent manner" (Universitas Merdeka Academic Guidelines, 2021, p. 10). Replicating assessment policies from the National HE Curriculum Guidelines may indicate that the institution, unlike Universitas Guru, does not explicitly require teachers to consider any specific institutional Tamansiswa values in the assessment processes. It may, however, also indicate that the assessment policy is not contextualised institutionally. EFL teachers, then, are given the responsibility to justify how accountable and transparent their assessment task design through the use of rubrics.

Thirdly, Universitas Belajar academic guidelines point out the centrality of a "learning contract" (p. 26). Specifically, the policy describes how the assessment

system "applies the principle of complete learning with the provisions of the assessment following the learning contract that has been agreed at the beginning of the lecture between the lecturer and the student" (Universitas Belajar Academic Guidelines, 2020, p. 26). Here, as designers, teachers need to adhere to the learning contract, ensuring accountability from the start of the course. The use of the term learning contract here also shows the importance of mutual agreement between the teachers and the students and refers to the subject learning guides. The word agreement, interestingly, is found in both national and institutional assessment policy texts, indicating the essence of communication and accountability in the assessment process.

The policies from all three institutions expect teachers to act as caring and accountable subjects, indicating that teachers have been responsibilised (See Torrance, 2017) in the assessment space. This responsibilisation reflects a broader neoliberal logic, where teachers are granted apparent autonomy, while being governed through ethical expectations to exercise their agency in interpreting what is ethical in the assessment processes.

Teachers as communicative assessors

As a continuation of their roles as assessment designers, teachers are expected to assess and evaluate student works. Interestingly, the National HE Curriculum Guidelines (2020) use the word *penilaian* (assessment) and *evaluasi* (evaluation) interchangeably. In fact, the words *penilaian* and *evaluasi* are used together five times in the document, which shows how these two activities are strongly linked. These two words are used in MoRTHE Regulation 44/2015 on Higher Education National Standards to describe the duty of teachers as assessors in terms of marking and giving feedback. Also, the National HE Curriculum Guidelines (2020) mentions the need for learning evaluation, including formative and summative assessment.

The aims of formative and summative assessment are presented briefly in the National HE Curriculum Guidelines (2020). Although teachers are expected to incorporate both formative and summative procedures in their classes, the document only explains the difference of these two kinds of assessment based on their purposes, without offering substantive information. Specifically, formative assessment is intended to "make improvements in the learning process" and the latter "to determine students' learning outcomes" (National HE Curriculum Guidelines, 2020, p. 35). However, national and institutional policy texts lack explicit procedural explanation outlining how both types of assessment should be enacted in higher education contexts.

The lack of comprehensive guides detailing formative and summative assessment in higher education institutions can be interpreted, then, as a position where the government gives higher education teachers a degree of autonomy to exercise their agency in translating formative and summative assessment into practice. However, without proper resources to improve assessment literacy, teachers may have a wide range of interpretations of these assessment types which may in turn problematically influence their decision when assessing the students.

The need to incorporate formative feedback is noted in the National HE Curriculum Guidelines which state the essence not only of grading, but also of providing responses to students' work. the National HE Curriculum Guidelines

describe teachers' role as communicative assessors to "give fast and accurate feedback" (National HE Curriculum Guidelines, 2020, p. 54), although it does not explicitly set a timeframe for how fast feedback should be given.

Across the three institutions, policies highlight teachers' roles as communicative assessors in providing grades and feedback, extending the ethical responsibilities. For example, Universitas Guru's Curriculum Academic Guidelines (p. 49) point out that teachers need to include "competence, conscience, compassion, and commitment" in evaluating assessment tasks. The policy further states that the evaluation or assessment of these dimensions is tasked with the teachers of the subject. It shows that teachers are subjected to interpret what is meant by these aspects, and to enact their interpretations when giving feedback and grading the students. This could be problematic when assessing students' grades, as teachers' different interpretations of these values could influence them. Regarding feedback, the Universitas Guru's academic guidelines mention the role of feedback to expose, give input and support students in learning to write correct sentences in different text genres in EFL contexts (such as expository, narrative or argumentative). It further sets a deadline for two weeks to give feedback. While such a time frame can be useful for teachers to navigate their workload to be able to give timely feedback, it also operates as a regulatory mechanism that defines what counts as "timely".

The Universitas Merdeka's Academic Guidelines elaborate on different techniques and instruments of assessment, including observation, participation, written and oral tests and surveys. This is interesting to note, as teachers need to make decisions on what techniques and instruments they would use as assessors. Regarding feedback, the institution copies from the National Policy to give feedback and opportunity for students to question the grading. However, the mechanism to discuss grading and feedback is not found in the document. Compared to Universitas Guru, Universitas Merdeka does not state contextual, institutional values to be enacted in assessing the students.

Like the other two universities, the Universitas Belajar's policy document also emphasises that teachers are responsible for the grades for assessment. The Universitas Belajar's Academic Guidelines (2020) use the word "systematic" to describe the assessment process to achieve educational goals. However, it does not further explain what the word "systematic" means in practical assessment terms. The document further highlights the importance of a "learning contract" as the frame of reference in designing and assessing students' work. Unlike Universitas Guru and Universitas Merdeka, Universitas Belajar does not mention feedback in the guidelines, but specifies the process of complaining about the assessment grades. After receiving the grades, the document specifies that students can make a complaint and appeal for better grades.

This means grades can be changed based on the university teacher's revaluation, including by penalising or lowering the mark "by 1 (one) interval" (Universitas Belajar Academic Guidelines, 2020, p. 29). However, the Universitas Belajar document specifies the consequences of submitting the complaints, saying that if the complaint is reasonable, the teacher will adjust the score; however, if the complaint is made up or not genuine, the consequence is getting lower grades. It is not clear, however, how the complaint is fairly evaluated, which can put students at a disadvantage with a fear of getting lower grades.

As noted earlier, although the National HE Curriculum Guidelines mentions the importance of giving feedback for learning, institutional policies do not provide extensive, practical mechanisms or procedures on this, which can lead to different interpretations on how teachers should give feedback. While the English Language Education study program policy in Universitas Guru mentions its importance and the timeframe of giving grades and feedback, Universitas Merdeka reproduces content from the National Document, and Universitas Belajar does not mention it in the academic guidelines at all. Although feedback is seen as an integral part of learning, the universities seem not to be much invested in the matter as reflected in the policies.

Teachers as assessment motivators

The national curriculum guidelines also frame teachers as motivators, emphasising a culture of care throughout the assessment process. National education has long stated that learning and assessment should include both cognitive and affective realms of learning (Sugiharto, 2021). The National HE Curriculum Guidelines document points out the importance of this caring dimension in assessment, requiring teachers to design assessment, thus: "Assessments must contain motivational content, bringing up self-confidence to contribute to life path choices as lifelong learners" (National HE Curriculum Guidelines, 2020, p. 10). The phrase 'motivational content' here foregrounds the importance of facilitating assessment that is motivating so students are supported to achieve the learning outcomes.

While not directly situated within the assessment process, the three institutional documents in the universities also point out these prominent duties of teachers as motivators in educational activities, including in conducting assessment. Universitas Guru, influenced by Jesuit values, emphasises the importance of *cura personalis* (a Catholic ideal, meaning caring for the whole person) in its mission statements. Universitas Merdeka also foregrounds Javanese values from Dewantara by stating the concept *Ing Madyo Mangun Karso* in such a system (Universitas Merdeka Code of Ethics, 2015, p. 6) literally is translated as "in the middle, build or raise spirit", emphasising teachers' prominent role in motivating the students. Finally, the Universitas Belajar policy document expects learning to internalise *semangat*, the passion/spirit of autonomy, resilience and entrepreneurship in students (Universitas Belajar Academic Guidelines, 2020, p. 6).

Unlike the HE Curriculum guidelines, the importance of building students' motivation through assessment is not explicitly stated in these assessment policies, unlike the National HE Curriculum Guidelines (2020). This shows that teachers are positioned to support and care for students without clear recognition of the motivational dimension of assessment works in institutional policy.

As literature has emphasised the power of formative assessment and feedback for motivation (Black & Wiliam, 2009; Cauley & McMillan, 2010; Nolen, 2011), it is arguable that it would have been beneficial to recognise and strengthen the value of giving feedback to teachers in the policies. After all, explicitly recognising the importance of feedback as a shared value alongside providing resources to support its enactment can encourage teachers to motivate students better through feedback in the assessment tasks. In English Language Education, this is

particularly helpful as feedback process can serve as a modelling when the EFL pre-service teachers are teaching in their professional placement experience.

Teachers as data analysts

Indonesian National HE Curriculum Guidelines state that teachers have duties to identify, collect, and prepare "data to evaluate the achievement of learning outcome" (National HE Curriculum Guidelines, 2020, p. 49). The Higher Education National Standard policy document also states that assessment involves "documenting the assessment of student learning processes and outcomes in an accountable and transparent manner" (Higher Education National Standard, Ministry Regulation 44 2015, p. 22). It further suggests that assessment is a process of gathering and interpreting data as evidence throughout the assessment process. The action words used to describe the assessment mechanisms are explicitly mentioned in the document, including identifying, collecting, preparing, interpreting and documenting data with evidence. The national document positions data as an integral part of assessment and thus university teachers have an ethical duty to analyse them for accountability.

However, the National Higher Education Curriculum policy does not clarify what data is referred to, which can be ethically problematic for teachers, particularly in a digital space. Data may exist in various formats in virtual settings, such as users' activities, texts, visuals, and audio-visuals (Ndukwe & Daniel, 2020). The national document encourages institutions to implement and include assessment in blended learning, conceptualised as a combination of in-person learning and online learning and assessment. With the implementation of digital technologies, institutions and teachers are able to collect digital data from digital footprints (Pascual-Miguel et al., 2011; Ramos & Yudko, 2008). However, without training to improve digital literacy to interpret data ethically, it would be challenging to make sense of the data as evidence of learning. It would have been more beneficial if the policy specified or exemplified the use of data in different formats to "evaluate the achievement of learning outcomes". It would also have been more useful for teachers if the policy resources explained how the data can be utilised *ethically* as evidence to analyse students' needs, get diagnostic analysis, monitor learning, or demonstrate the achievement of the learning outcomes in EFL contexts.

Unlike other assessment roles, which also appear in the institutional curriculum documents, the term 'data' in the context of assessment processes does not appear in either Universitas Guru or Universitas Belajar curriculum and policy documents. Both documents use the word *nilai* or 'value' instead of data, which may indicate that the data is converted into value. This word also appears once in Universitas Merdeka curriculum guidelines with the exact wording from the National HE Curriculum Guidelines document. This may indicate that the institutions are not ready - yet - to work with data analytics in learning and assessment. To prepare EFL teachers as data analysts, institutions thus need to develop clear guidelines on ethical use of data in assessment and how EFL teachers can use data as evidence of learning to promote effective and targeted learning.

Teachers as assessment surveillants

Building on the previous section that discusses the national expectations for teachers to work with data in the assessment, this finding section shows teachers'

ethical duties related to the need to maintain orderly assessment processes. The National HE Curriculum Guidelines (2020) foreground the importance of ethical conduct in the assessment process through this statement: "Assessments should be able to cover important indicators related to honesty, discipline, communication, firmness (decisiveness) and self-confidence (confidence) that must be possessed by students" (National HE Curriculum Guidelines, 2020, p. 49). With such expectations, teachers need to ensure these ethical manners in their students throughout the assessment process. While there may be complex psychological and pedagogical measures for such aspects (e.g. Marco-fondevila & Rueda-tom, 2022; Strauss et al., 2016), the guidelines do not define these terms and do not explain how to measure and validate them. Teachers are merely expected to observe students' ethical conduct in learning and assessment through observation and notes, showing their ethical role as students' surveillants.

Similar expectations regarding supervising students' ethical conduct in the assessment process is seen in Universitas Guru's Academic English Language Education Guidelines (2021). It elaborates on the importance of honesty (*kejujuran*) in its academic guidelines, stating, "Universitas Guru always emphasises honesty to its students" (p. 20). The Universitas Guru's Academic Guidelines (2021) further elucidate concrete examples of dishonesty, which include "cheating, asking friends in exams, plagiarising or falsifying data for thesis purposes, and others" (p. 20). Since this role expects teachers to explain expected behaviour during assessment/ethical conduct, identify misconduct and ensure academic integrity, Universitas Guru teachers who discipline students throughout the assessment processes are given the moral right to take action if the students are cheating. Students can be given sanctions, including verbal or written warnings. The teachers can also give academic sanctions, including no grades, study suspension and revocation of the right to study at the institution.

Universitas Merdeka presents similar ethical standards in their Codes of Ethics for Students. Students must not commit plagiarism in the writing assessment tasks. Students have to be aware and responsible in implementing virtuous core values, including "honesty, intellectual integrity, openness and respect for individual rights and self-esteem as a student" (Universitas Merdeka Codes of Ethics for teachers and students, 2015, p. 5). Throughout the assessment processes, teachers need to ensure that students comply with these codes of ethics. Along similar lines, Universitas Belajar students are required to abide by the academic codes of conduct and not cheat during assessment. Neither document from these two institutions, however, present ethical principles as the foundation for identifying misconduct and ensuring academic integrity practices in assessment. This could create ethical tensions as teachers may have diverse interpretation and practices of what characterises academic integrity.

Discussion

Foucauldian discourse analysis provides a lens for investigating how dominant discourses embedded in - and legitimised through - such policies can normalise and shape individuals' behaviours and actions (Foucault, 1981) to the extent where these texts are unquestioned and taken for granted. In this study, ethical discourses embedded in formal statements in national and institutional policy documents thus serve as regimes of truth that decide which knowledge, voice,

or truth is privileged, legitimate, dominant and significant (Foucault, 1981; Walshaw, 2007). Such discourses, then, as further argued by Foucault, facilitate the process of subjectification that normalises how to think, talk or/and behave.

In this study, several roles were identified in these policies that were attributed to EFL teachers. This study discusses how teachers are expected to think/behave/perform as ethical guides, assessment designers, communicative assessors, assessment motivators, data analysts, and student surveillants in EFL teaching contexts. These roles reveal that teachers are positioned within institutionalised governance that shape their conduct in assessment. Teachers are expected to operationalise each of these roles by considering both national principles (fairness, transparency, accountability) as well as institutional principles (e.g. Ignatian, Tamansiswa and Muhammadiyah (AIK) values). First, this illustrates how power operates through complex expectations of what constitutes good or ethical assessment, which may shape how teachers regulate their practices (See Walshaw, 2007). Second, their roles as assessment motivator and communicative assessors suggest that there are relational aspects expected throughout assessment processes (Griffin, 2017), yet these aspects are not explicitly recognised and supported within the institutional policy as indicated in the findings. At the same time, roles such as data analysts and surveillants position teachers within the system of monitoring and accountability. In this paper, we have argued how power works by shifting responsibilities to teachers to enact caring and accountable roles in the assessment process as a part of teaching, while being offered limited professional resources, which can be ethically complex and demanding for teachers.

Regarding professional resources, both national and institutional policy documents in the findings contain ambiguous and vague terms and concepts that make it difficult to enact the expected roles into practice. As indicated in the findings, the national policy expects teachers to be data analysts who identify, collect and prepare "data to evaluate the achievement of learning outcome" (National HE Curriculum Guidelines, 2020, p. 49). This statement indicates the importance of data-based decision making as evidence, especially in the context of technology-mediated environments. Literature highlights the importance of enabling teachers to engage with data analytics as evidence to make better learning decisions (De Freitas et al., 2015; Herodotou et al., 2019). Griffin (2017) also noted the importance of using data in assessment as evidence for targeted teaching. However, there is no clarity or reference as to which data is considered valid and relevant, or how such data is ethically identified, collected and prepared at the national policy level. Such ambiguity or lack of clarity can lead to confusion when teachers make ethical decisions regarding collecting and using students' data in language learning. While, arguably, a single meaning of the term "data" in the policies may be counterproductive, it would have been more useful to provide clear examples, guidance and framework on using data as evidence of learning as assessment foundations for administrators, EFL teachers and EFL students. For example, EFL teachers need to be supported to formulate learning intentions and look for data serving evidence of learning through quality criteria in developmental rubrics. Professional development workshops or peer review activities to help EFL teachers align learning intentions and rubrics are needed. In this professional development, teachers can be supported to design quality rubrics (Griffin, 2017) that capture expected national and institutional values in the assessment.

This ambiguity is further intensified by the lack of necessary support mechanisms in the form of material resources (such as procedures or guidelines), leaving multiple roles to teachers as responsible individuals throughout assessment processes. Assessment policies as a powerful tool for learning can only be productive when they are "considered as a productive network through the whole social body, much more than as a negative instance whose function is repression" (Foucault, 1981, p. 119). Support mechanisms, as described by Hudson et al. (2019), refer to units to support effective implementation of policies. To help teachers and students understand and exercise academic integrity in EFL writing assessment, as identified in the findings, the institutions can facilitate support mechanisms in the form of material resources such as comprehensive assessment instructions or policies, such as academic integrity policy or GenAI policy. Support mechanisms can also be provided by enhancing human resources, such as by having professional development workshops and learning support team supporting both teachers and students on academic integrity. Vague regulations of these policies may result in concerns related to unfair assessment (Cotton et al., 2024; Luo, 2024).

The absence of mechanism to support EFL teachers' understanding of academic integrity is also evident in teachers' current role in dealing with assessment and AI, where teachers are positioned as surveillants expected to monitor student behaviour. At the end of 2024, the Ministry of Education launched guidelines for GenAI use in Higher Education (Ministry of Education, 2024). The guidelines link academic integrity with relevant ethical values: "honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage" (p. 39) instead of conceptualising what academic integrity is. Accordingly, the concept of academic integrity remains ambiguous, as the term and other related terms are not explicitly defined, leaving space for widespread misinterpretation or abuse, as outlined in the findings. The concept "fairness", for example, as conceptualised by Rasooli et al. (2019) is a multilayered variable consisting of multiple dimensions (distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice and overall fairness), indicating teachers need to be provided with a more well-rounded concept of academic integrity in relation to other terms. This unclarity places greater responsibility on EFL teachers in to translate and enact their surveillant roles in assessment practices.

Conclusion

This study has examined national and institutional polices from Indonesia in mediating ethical roles of higher education teachers. At the national level, Pancasila serves as the quintessential ethical reference for Indonesian teachers in nearly all their teaching and assessment practices. The national and institutional policy texts position teachers as responsible for enacting multiple roles across assessment process, while also holding them accountable for meeting ethical standards and care. However, as indicated in this study, these expectations are not aligned with adequate professional resources, indicating the need to involve practitioner consultations in both the development and implementation of policy. While teachers are positioned as responsible subjects, national and local institutions must also contribute by providing adequate structural supports in assessment practices.

This study implies that policy makers and institutions should recognise the increasing complexity of teachers' multiple roles in assessment in practice. Providing recognition and support in terms of workload management and time

allocation is essential to support teachers in managing assessment responsibilities. Secondly, the study highlights the need to align policy expectations with available resources. Without such alignment, there is a risk that responsibilities are unfairly placed on teachers. Theoretically, this study contributes to assessment scholarship by showing how ethical expectations are constructed in policy texts and how they shape teachers' roles in assessment practices.

This article is limited by its focus on policy documents, which means that this study does not capture how teachers negotiate these policies in classroom practices. While this study provides insights into how teachers are positioned within assessment policy discourse, investigation on teachers lived experiences to these expectations is needed. Future research incorporating interview with different stakeholders would provide thought-provoking insights on how policy texts are enacted in practice. Secondly, this study is limited regarding the case selection as this study investigates three private higher education institutions in Indonesia. Future researchers could adopt a comparative approach by investigating how policies in different countries policies frame teachers' roles throughout assessment practices and how support is made explicit for them. In this sense, future researchers could include a more diverse policies selection from different international institutions.

Acknowledgements

This paper is adapted from a part of Author 1's doctoral study which is funded by Monash University.

References

Alfrey, L., O'Connor, J., & Jeanes, R. (2017). Teachers as policy actors: Co-creating and enacting critical inquiry in secondary health and physical education. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 22*(2), 107-120. https://doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2015.1123237

Ball, S. J. (1993). What is policy? Texts, trajectories and toolboxes. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 13*(2), 10-17. https://doi.org/10.1080/0159630930130203

Barnes, M., Finefter-Rosenbluh, I., & Brown, T. D. (2025). Teachers' positionality as policy actors and assessors: Assessment policy enactment in Victorian secondary schools. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society, 34*(1), 199-218. https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2025.2475394

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 5*(1), 7-74. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 21*, 5-31. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-008-9068-5

Boud, D., & Falchikov, N. (2007). *Rethinking assessment in higher education: Learning for the longer term* (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203964309

Brady, L., & Kennedy, K. (2019). Assessment and learning. In K. Kennedy & L. Brady (Eds.), *Assessment and reporting: Celebrating student achievement* (5th ed.). Pearson.

Bright, D., Mckay, A., & Firth, K. (2024). How to be reflexive: Foucault, ethics and writing qualitative research as a technology of the self. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education, 47*(4), 408-420. https://doi.org/10.1080/1743727X.2023.2290185

Cauley, K. M., & McMillan, J. H. (2010). Formative assessment techniques to support student motivation and achievement. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas, 83*(1), 1-6. https://doi.org/10.1080/00098650903267784

Chowdhury, R. (2008). *Globalisation, international education and the marketing of TESOL: Student identity as a site of conflicting forces* [Doctoral dissertation, Monash University]. https://bridges.monash.edu/articles/thesis/Globalisation_international_education_and_the_marketing_of_TESOL_student_identity_as_a_site_of_conflicting_forces/4534436/1

Cotton, D. R. E., Cotton, P. A., & Shipway, J. R. (2024). Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 61*(2), 228-239. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2190148

De Freitas, S., Gibson, D., Du Plessis, C., Halloran, P., Williams, E., Ambrose, M., Dunwell, I., & Arnab, S. (2015). Foundations of dynamic learning analytics: Using university student data to increase retention. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 46*(6), 1175-1188. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12212

Deeley, S. J., Fischbacher-Smith, M., Karadzhov, D., & Koristashevskaya, E. (2019). Exploring the 'wicked' problem of student dissatisfaction with assessment and feedback in higher education. *Higher Education Pedagogies, 4*(1), 385-405. https://doi.org/10.1080/23752696.2019.1644659

Doherty, R. (2007). Critically framing education policy: Foucault, discourse and governmentality. In M. A. Peters & T. Besley (Eds.), *Why Foucault? New directions in educational research* (pp. 193-204). Peter Lang.

Finefter-Rosenbluh, I., & Levinson, M. (2015). What is wrong with grade inflation (if anything)? *Philosophical Inquiry in Education, 23*(1), 3-21. https://doi.org/10.7202/1070362ar

Finefter-Rosenbluh, I., & Perrotta, C. (2023). How do teachers enact assessment policies as they navigate critical ethical incidents in digital spaces? *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 44*(2), 220-238. https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2022.2145934

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. Tavistock Publications.

Foucault, M. (1981). *The order of discourse*. Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1985). *The history of sexuality: The use of pleasure.* Vintage Books.

Gikandi, J. W., Morrow, D., & Davis, N. E. (2011). Online formative assessment in higher education: A review of the literature. *Computers and Education, 57*(4), 2333-2351. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2011.06.004

Griffin, P. (2017). *Assessment for teaching*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108116053

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research, 77*(1), 81-112. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487

Hellström, T., & Jacob, M. (2017). Policy instrument affordances: A framework for analysis. *Policy Studies, 38*(6), 604-621. https://doi.org/10.1080/01442872.2017.1386442

Henderson, M., Ryan, T., & Phillips, M. (2019). The challenges of feedback in higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 44*(8), 1237-1252. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1599815

Herodotou, C., Hlosta, M., Boroowa, A., Rienties, B., Zdrahal, Z., & Mangafa, C. (2019). Empowering online teachers through predictive learning analytics. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 50*(6), 3064-3079. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12853

Hudson, B., Hunter, D., & Peckham, S. (2019). Policy failure and the policy-implementation gap: Can policy support programs help? *Policy Design and Practice, 2*(1), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1080/25741292.2018.1540378

Joughin, G. (2009). Assessment, learning and judgement in higher education: A critical review. In G. Joughin (Ed.), *Assessment, learning and judgement in higher education (*pp. 1-15). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-8905-3_2

Kabir, A. H. & Chowdhury, R., (2021). *The privatisation of higher education in postcolonial Bangladesh: The politics of intervention and control.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429266607

Luo, J. (2024). A critical review of GenAI policies in higher education assessment: A call to reconsider the "originality" of students' work. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 49*(5), 651-664. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2024.2309963

Madani, M., Ghasemzadeh, N., Dizani, A., Gharamaleki, A. F., & Larijani, B. (2020). Policy considerations to achieve practical ethics: Closing the gap between ethical theory and practice. *Journal of Medical Ethics and History of Medicine, 13*(8), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.18502/jmehm.v13i8.4075

Marco-fondevila, M., & Rueda-tom, M. (2022). Active participation and interaction, key performance factors of face-to-face learning. *Education Sciences, 12,* Article 429. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci12070429

Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia. (2013). *Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia Nomor 73 Tahun 2013 tentang Penerapan Kerangka Kualifikasi Nasional Indonesia Bidang Pendidikan Tinggi* [Minister of Education and Culture Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 73 of 2013 on the implementation of the Indonesian National Qualifications Framework in higher education].

Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia. (2014). *Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia Nomor 49 Tahun 2014 tentang Standar Nasional Pendidikan Tinggi* [Minister of Education and Culture Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 49 of 2014 on National Standards for Higher Education]. https://peraturan.go.id/id/permendikbud-no-49-tahun-2014

Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia. (2019). *Penguatan pembelajaran nilai dan moral Pancasila* [Strengthening the teaching of Pancasila values and morals]. Directorate General of Higher Education. http://repositori.kemdikbud.go.id/18252/

Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia. (2020). *Panduan penyusunan kurikulum pendidikan tinggi di era industri 4.0 untuk mendukung Merdeka Belajar–Kampus Merdeka* [Guidelines for developing higher education curriculum in the Industry 4.0 era to support Merdeka Belajar–Kampus Merdeka]. https://repositori.kemendikdasmen.go.id/19527/1/PANDUAN%20PENYUSUNAN%20KPT%2015%20Okt%202020%20-%20PDF.pdf

Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology of the Republic of Indonesia. (2024). *Panduan penggunaan generative artificial intelligence pada pembelajaran di perguruan tinggi* [Guidelines for the use of generative artificial intelligence in higher education learning]. https://kemdiktisaintek.go.id/api/file/humas-production/2024/10/Panduan-Penggunaan-Generative-Artificial-Intelligence-pada-Pembelajaran-di-Perguruan-Tinggi.pdf

Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education of the Republic of Indonesia. (2015). *Peraturan Menteri Riset, Teknologi, dan Pendidikan Tinggi Republik Indonesia Nomor 44 Tahun 2015 tentang Standar Nasional Pendidikan Tinggi* [Minister of Research, Technology, and Higher Education Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 44 of 2015 on National Standards for Higher Education]. https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/140595/permen-ristekdikti-no-44-tahun-2015

Ndukwe, I. G., & Daniel, B. K. (2020). Teaching analytics, value and tools for teacher data literacy: a systematic and tripartite approach. International *Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 17*(1), Article 22. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-020-00201-6

Ngo, J., & Meek, L. (2019). Higher Education governance and reforms in Indonesia: Are the matrices of autonomy appropriate? *Journal of International and Comparative Education, 8*(1), 17-26. https://doi.org/10.14425/jice.2019.8.1.17

Nolen, S. B. (2011). The role of educational systems in the link between formative assessment and motivation. *Theory Into Practice, 50*(4), 319-326. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2011.607399

Pascual-Miguel, F., Chaparro-Peláez, J., Hernández-García, Á., & Iglesias-Pradas, S. (2011). A characterisation of passive and active interactions and their influence on students' achievement using Moodle LMS logs. International *Journal of Technology Enhanced Learning, 3*(4), 403-414. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJTEL.2011.041283

Peraturan Presiden Republik Indonesia Nomor 8 Tahun 2012 tentang Kerangka Kualifikasi Nasional Indonesia [Presidential Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 8 of 2012 on the Indonesian National Qualifications Framework]. (2012). https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/41251/perpres-no-8-tahun-2012

Raaper, R. (2016). *Student assessment in neoliberalised universities: Issues of discipline and governmentality* [Doctoral Dissertation]. University of Glasgow.

Ramos, C., & Yudko, E. (2008). "Hits" (not "Discussion Posts") predict student success in online courses: A double cross-validation study. *Computers and Education, 50*(4), 1174-1182. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2006.11.003

Rasooli, A., Zandi, H., & DeLuca, C. (2019). Conceptualising fairness in classroom assessment: exploring the value of organisational justice theory. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 26*(5), 584-611. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2019.1593105

Rea-Dickins, P. (2000). Classroom assessment. In T. Hedge (Ed.), *Teaching and learning in the language classroom* (pp. 375 - 401). Oxford University Press.

Saldaña, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Sage Publications.

Scanlon, D., MacPhail, A., & Calderón, A. (2023). A figurational viewpoint of the complexity of policy enactment: An opportunity for agonistic dialogue? *The Curriculum Journal, 34*(2), 265-283. https://doi.org/10.1002/CURJ.179

Sofyan, M., Barnes, M., & Finefter-Rosenbluh, I. (2024). Fair assessment as an aspect of effective teaching: Teachers' and students' perceptions of and positioning within assessment practices in Indonesian vocational higher education. *Journal of Vocational Education & Training, 76*(4), 795-817. https://doi.org/10.1080/13636820.2022.2098170

Sofyan, M., Finefter-Rosenbluh, I., & Barnes, M. (2025). Unpacking the ethics of care and safe learning environments in Indonesian vocational higher education settings: A contested space of power and (teaching) effectiveness. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society, 33*(1), 49-68. https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2023.2187437

Spencer, A., & Bussi, A. (2020). The university language centre as an open-badge issuer: New directions in ESP assessment and accreditation. *Language Learning in Higher Education, 10*(2), 421-444. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/cercles-2020-2028/html

Strauss, C., Lever, B., Gu, J., Kuyken, W., Baer, R., Jones, F., & Cavanagh, K. (2016). What is compassion and how can we measure it? A review of definitions and measures. *Clinical Psychology Review, 47*, 15-27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2016.05.004

Sugiharto, S. (2021). Explicating and framing Dewantara's conduct pragmatism as a pragmatist philosophy of education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education, 55*(4-5), 793-806. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9752.12574

Torrance, H. (2017). Blaming the victim: Assessment, examinations, and the responsibilisation of students and teachers in neo-liberal governance. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 38*(1), 83-96. https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2015.1104854

Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 12 Tahun 2012 tentang Pendidikan Tinggi [Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 12 of 2012 on Higher Education]. (2012). https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/39063/uu-no-12-tahun-2012

Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 14 Tahun 2005 tentang Guru dan Dosen [Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 14 of 2005 on Teachers and Lecturers]. (2005). https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/40266/uu-no-14-tahun-2005

van Hulst, M., Metze, T., Dewulf, A., de Vries, J., van Bommel, S., & van Ostaijen, M. (2025). Discourse, framing and narrative: Three ways of doing critical, interpretive policy analysis. *Critical Policy Studies, 19*(1), 74-96. https://doi.org/10.1080/19460171.2024.2326936

Walshaw, M. (2007). *Working with Foucault in education*. Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789087903145

White, R. (2004). Discourse analysis and social constructionism. *Nurse Researcher, 12*(2), 7-16. https://doi.org/10.7748/nr.12.2.7.s3

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Sage Publications.