

How to Cite (APA Style):

Prastikawati, E.F., Adeoye, M.A., Toncelli, R., Lestari, Y.W.L., & Silitonga, L.M. (2026). Digital assessment literacy and feedback in writing classrooms among undergraduate EFL learners. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature, and Culture*, 11 (2), 722-736. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30659/e.11.2.722-736>

Digital assessment literacy and feedback in writing classrooms among undergraduate EFL learners

¹Entika Fani Prastikawati*, ²Moses Adeleke Adeoye, ³Rachel Toncelli,
¹Maria Yosephin Widarti Lestari, ¹Lusia Maryani Silitonga

¹English Education Department, Faculty of Language and Art Education, Universitas Persatuan Guru Republik Indonesia Semarang, Indonesia

²Department of Educational Management and Counseling, Faculty of Education, Al-Hikmah University Ilorin, Nigeria

³Center for Advancing Teaching & Learning Through Research, Northeastern University, United States

*Corresponding Author

entikafani@upgris.ac.id

Received:
09 May 2026

Revised:
17 August 2026

Accepted:
22 August 2026

Published:
23 August 2026

Abstract

Digital technology in higher education has altered the assessment and feedback processes, specifically in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) writing classroom. Although digital tools are widely used, feedback is still not as effective as it could. This study examined the level of DAL, the level of effective feedback practices (EFP), and whether DAL predicts EFP in EFL writing classrooms at Universitas Persatuan Guru Republik Indonesia Semarang, Indonesia. This study used a quantitative, cross-sectional survey design. The researcher administered a structured questionnaire to gather data from 95 undergraduate students and analyzed the data using descriptive statistics and simple linear regression. The findings reveal that both DAL ($M = 3.83$) and EFP ($M \text{ range} = 3.63\text{--}3.82$) are at high levels. More crucially, as it turned out, DAL was a powerful and statistically significant predictor of EFP ($R = .74$; $R^2 = .54$; $p < .001$), which implies that 54.4% of the variance in feedback effectiveness is attributable to lecturers being digitally assessment literate. The paper concludes that the competence of lecturers when it comes to digital assessment is essential in improving the quality of feedback in EFL writing contexts. The study not only provides empirical evidence of the relationship between DAL and EFP but also demonstrates the importance of student perceptions in assessing instructional practices and offers suggestions to enhance digitally mediated feedback in higher education. Future scholars are encouraged to build on these findings by exploring the long-term impact of lecturers' improved digital assessment literacy on EFL learners' writing. Additionally, further research is needed to explore the DAL-EFP relationship to gain an understanding of this within the diversity of educational contexts.

Keywords: Digital assessment literacy; feedback practice; writing classroom

INTRODUCTION

The sudden implementation of digital technologies in the higher education process has altered the teaching, assessment and feedback process, particularly

in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) writing class. To deliver assessments and feedback and track student performance, digital solutions are gaining popularity in colleges worldwide. The digitalization of the education sector is on the rise, as the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development suggests, over two-thirds of institutions of higher learning have already adopted technology-based assessment in the past 10 years (Brown, 2024; Shabunina et al., 2024; Yu & Dlamini, 2024). The good side of this development is also the post-COVID-19 educational condition, as it compelled schools all over the world to transition to online and hybrid classes (Bashir et al., 2021). Digital assessment literacy (DAL) is one of the greatest skills that teachers must possess during this digital transformation. The educators will be able to organize, deliver, and analyze the tests with the assistance of digital tools, which are suggested by DAL (Benali & Mak, 2022). Empirical studies have discovered that the quality of the evaluation of activity and the quality of feedback provided to learners by teachers are strongly related to their effectiveness in digital assessment (Raeisi et al., 2024; Timmis et al., 2016). This is of particular significance with EFLs as the acquisition of writing is contingent on the immediate, direct, and positive feedback (Fatima et al., 2024). Research has demonstrated many times that quality feedback can improve the performance of writing, self-regulation and motivation among students (Brown et al., 2016).

However, despite the value of feedback being established, studies have revealed that there are still problems in regard to the utilization of feedback. Indicatively, Cheung and Slavin (2016) found that feedback is the most promising in terms of potential effect size and feedback implementation is incredibly manifold. The next problems which disrupt the usefulness of feedback in the virtual world are the lack of responsiveness, inadequate understanding, and interactivity (Maier & Klotz, 2022; Utari et al., 2026). These issues tend to be linked with the inefficiency of teachers in assessing digitally. In multiple studies, the past literature on EFL classrooms that teach writing has taken into account practices that involve feedback (e.g., written corrective feedback, peer feedback, automated feedback system) or practice alone that involves the use of digital tools. Using an example, the effectiveness of the online feedback, i.e., learning management systems and automated writing assessment programs, has been studied (Yildiz & Kuru Gonen, 2024). On the individual level, the study of the digital competence framework has encompassed general technological competence of educators (Falloon, 2020). However, student view is also considered one of the main gaps in the perception of the direct relationship between the digital assessment literacy of the lecturers and the success of the feedback practice, in particular. This is a gap that is not an empirical gap but a theoretical gap. Much of the research is focused on teacher-reported teacher competencies, rather than student competencies (Dignath, 2016; Schneider & Bodensohn, 2017; Venetz et al., 2019). Therefore, we lack the amount of evidence that would inform us of whether and to what extent the capacity of lecturers to employ digital assessment tools is actually an appropriate measure of quality and effectiveness of feedback in EFL writing contexts.

How to Cite (APA Style):

Prastikawati, E.F., Adeoye, M.A., Toncelli, R., Lestari, Y.W.L., & Silitonga, L.M. (2026). Digital assessment literacy and feedback in writing classrooms among undergraduate EFL learners. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature, and Culture*, 11 (2), 722-736. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30659/e.11.2.722-736>

Besides this, literature gaps exist regarding context. Most of the literature on this has been conducted in a Western or highly-resourced learning environment (Alsowat, 2022), and a comparatively smaller number of studies have been conducted in Southeast Asian EFL environments, e.g. Indonesia. It cannot be assumed that any other findings in the region can be directly generalizable, as there is a difference in the technological infrastructure, practice and expectations of students. Although the use of digital assessment and feedback in EFL writing classroom is prevalent, the current study gap is the absence of empirical evidence on whether or not there is a predictive relationship between or among the digital assessment literacy of lecturers and the successful feedback practice as perceived by students in the Indonesian higher education context. This gap is significant because, without such evidence, institutions lack an empirical basis for designing targeted DAL training or for understanding which competencies most meaningfully shape students' feedback experiences in digitally mediated learning environments. To address this gap, the present study examines the perceptions of undergraduate students at *Universitas Persatuan Guru Republik Indonesia Semarang*, offering empirical evidence on the predictive relationship between lecturers' DAL and effective feedback practices. In doing so, this study contributes context-specific insight into how digital assessment competence shapes feedback quality in EFL writing instruction, an area that has received limited empirical attention to date.

Meanwhile, the growing application of digital technology in higher learning has contributed greatly to assessment and feedback on writing courses in the EFL study, such as at *Universitas Persatuan Guru Republik Indonesia Semarang* in Indonesia. In this instance, lecturers on average rate student writing with the help of digital tools (i.e., learning management systems, online submissions, electronic feedback systems) and provide feedback (Febriyanti et al., 2022; Laflen & Smith, 2017). The potential of timely, accessible and multimodal feedback is present; however, the empirical research shows that not all digital feedback is as efficient as possible and that the effectiveness of digital feedback can be different based on design and implementation. One of them is that the average effect size of feedback ($d = 0.70$) is large, as per the evidence of a meta-analysis by Wisniewski et al. (2020), but the effect of feedback differs considerably based on the quality of the feedback provided and in which context feedback is provided. This kind of discrepancy is an indicator of a quantifiable issue: any digitally-mediated feedback will not cause any significant writing-related change in students. A digital assessment literacy (DAL) is one of the empirically testable reasons behind such disparity since it is the capacity of lecturers to effectively use digital tools to design assessments, measure learning, and provide feedback (Asamoah et al., 2023). Research has discovered that, as there is a correlation between assessment literacy, the greater the systematic and practical feedback practices (Prastikawati et al., 2024; Timmis et al., 2016). Later studies, however, tend to perceive digital competence as a complex of generic competences and have little to do with the DAL as a more concrete and quantifiable occurrence in its correlation to the process of feedback in the EFL writing lessons. For that reason, there is a relative deficiency of sets of empirical data that can be called to demonstrate that the differences in the DAL of lecturers cause the differences in the effectiveness of the feedback.

In the meantime, the construct of the well-defined and measurable writing pedagogy is the effective feedback practices (EFP), which involve being clear, timely, specific, and useful in revision (Chong, 2022; Zhang et al., 2026). These dimensions can be applied to an EFL setting, where the students need a high percentage of feedback, so that they can form correct and effective writing. The above studies, however, were inclined towards research on the quality of feedback but had not empirically equated the feedback with the online assessment ability of the instructors. What this disconnect entails is a monumental disconnect in the research: two quantifiable constructs (DAL and EFP) that are normally studied independently of one another, without taking them as two variables to be measured within the same empirical research. This is one of the gaps that can be identified in the context of *Universitas Persatuan Guru Republik Indonesia Semarang*. The case of the study in question is to rationalize the implementation of digital assessments and feedback to EFL writing classes in the institution. Moreover, the above studies are based primarily on self-reported abilities of lecturers that may not be applicable to a real classroom environment or on the learners (Alsowat, 2022). Conversely, the immediate level consumers and users of the feedback will generate measurable information, which can be considered as the quality of the feedback and the effectiveness of the delivery of the feedback in digital form. Nevertheless, there is a lack of empirical studies that have taken advantage of the perceptions of the students to simultaneously test DAL and EFP and determine their predictive power, especially within the context of higher education in Indonesia.

Building on the identified theoretical, empirical, and contextual gaps, this study seeks to provide a more integrated understanding of how digital assessment literacy (DAL) relates to effective feedback practices (EFP) in EFL writing classrooms. Unlike prior studies that examine these constructs in isolation or rely primarily on lecturer self-reports, the present study adopts a student-centered perspective to capture how these practices are experienced in authentic classroom contexts.

Focusing on undergraduate students at *Universitas Persatuan Guru Republik Indonesia Semarang*, this research aims not only to measure the perceived level of lecturers' digital assessment literacy and the effectiveness of feedback practices, but also to examine the extent to which DAL predicts EFP within a digitally mediated learning environment. By doing so, the study contributes empirical evidence to clarify whether lecturers' digital assessment competence translates into meaningful feedback that supports students' writing development. To address these objectives, the study is guided by the following research questions: (1) What is the perceived level of digital assessment literacy of lecturers in EFL writing classrooms by undergraduate students?, (2) How well do EFL writing classrooms practice effective feedback practices as perceived by undergraduate students?, and (3) How important is the digital assessment literacy of lecturers in predicting good feedback practices in EFL writing classrooms?

How to Cite (APA Style):

Prastikawati, E.F., Adeoye, M.A., Toncelli, R., Lestari, Y.W.L., & Silitonga, L.M. (2026). Digital assessment literacy and feedback in writing classrooms among undergraduate EFL learners. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature, and Culture*, 11 (2), 722-736. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30659/e.11.2.722-736>

METHOD

Research Design

The research employed quantitative design using a cross-sectional survey. The design was considered appropriate because the study was to explore the correlation between the digital assessment literacy of the lecturers and effective feedback practices as perceived by the students at a single point in time. Quantitative survey designs are well-liked in the quantification of attitudes, perceptions and relationships among variables that utilize numerical data and statistical analysis (Cohen et al., 2005). Specifically, the research design employed a correlational research design and predictive analysis since the study was meant to determine the predictability of the digital assessment literacy (as an independent variable) on the effective feedback practices (as a dependent variable) in the EFL writing classrooms.

Respondents

This study was conducted in *Universitas Persatuan Guru Republik Indonesia Semarang*, Indonesia, as part of the English Language Education program. The choice of this location was based on the fact that the EFL writing courses in the institution are proactive in terms of using digital tools to teach, assess, and provide feedback, and this is why it was selected as a suitable place to investigate the problem of digital assessment literacy and feedback practices. All the undergraduate students enrolled in EFL writing courses of the English Language Education program at *Universitas Persatuan Guru Republik Indonesia Semarang* were the target population. The study had a sample population of 95 undergraduate students. The participants were selected based on the concept of purposive sampling. According to the latter, the participants were selected based on the following criteria: they had completed at least one EFL writing course, they received digital feedback delivered by the lecturers, and they were used to the digital platforms applied in writing assessment. This was done to ensure the participants had the relevant experience to be in a position to provide valid responses with regard to the variables under study.

Instruments

Data were collected on the basis of a structured questionnaire, the Digital Assessment Literacy (DAL) and Feedback Practices Questionnaire. The tool was broken into two sections. Part A gauged the views of students on the competence of lecturers when using digital tools to conduct assessment, the use of digital platforms, the design and delivery of assessment tasks, and monitoring student performance using technology. The second part B was dedicated to the quality and the effectiveness of the feedback given in the form of digital sources that was be measured in terms of feedback timeliness, feedback clarity, feedback constructiveness and feedback contribution to student writing. Both questions have answers collected on a 5-point Likert scale of Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. The specialists in applied linguistics and educational technology conducted the expert review of the content to ascertain content validity, which encompasses the relevance, clarity and compatibility of items to the study constructs. Construct validity was also established by comparing the items of questionnaires with the already existing theoretical frameworks of digital

assessment literacy and the feedback practices in the EFL context. The internal consistency of the instrument was determined using the Cronbach alpha coefficient. The 0.70 reliability coefficient was taken as satisfactory, implying that the items can give consistent measurements of the intended constructs. The data were gathered with the help of an online questionnaire (Google Forms).

Data analysis

The data was automatically captured and exported to a spreadsheet form that was to be analyzed. The data was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. The subsequent values were calculated as answers to Research Questions 1 and 2: Mean (M) and Standard Deviation (SD). These statistics were used to establish the level of Digital Assessment Literacy (DAL) and Effective Feedback Practices (EFP). In order to answer Research Question 3, a simple linear regression was conducted to examine whether digital assessment literacy is a predictor of effective feedback practices. The study was done with the ethical principles of research, and all the participants agreed and knew they would participate. Data collection was anonymous, and a high level of privacy of answers was assured. It was mentioned to the participants that data could be used only for academic purposes.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The level of lecturers' digital assessment literacy (DAL) in EFL writing classrooms as perceived by undergraduate students

The first finding centers on undergraduate students' perceptions of lecturers' DAL in EFL writing classrooms. DAL represents a core aspect of educational assessment involving the lecturer designing, implementing and evaluating assessments in ways that leverage digitally enabled tools for pedagogically meaningful outcomes. Results across the board show students feel their lecturers to be highly digitally literate when it comes to assessment, implying that digital technologies might be being successfully integrated into writing assessment practices. That pattern echoes a more general shift towards digitally mediated assessment environments, with the result that not only are lecturers expected to embrace technological tools; they also need to integrate them with relevant assessment objectives and student learning requirements. The data presentation in Table 1 illustrates how the competencies manifest in classroom practice across specific DAL indicators.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Students' Perceptions of Lecturers' Digital Assessment Literacy (DAL)

S/N	Item	M	SD
1	Lecturer uses various digital platforms effectively	3.92	0.66
2	Lecturer is proficient in using digital assessment tools	3.79	0.70
3	Lecturer utilizes diverse digital formats for assessment	3.77	0.63
4	Lecturer demonstrates high technical skill	3.83	0.66
5	Lecturer clearly explains digital grading procedures	3.92	0.63
6	Lecturer troubleshoots technical issues effectively	3.83	0.60
7	Lecturer uses digital rubrics effectively	3.75	0.64
	Grand Mean	3.83	

How to Cite (APA Style):

Prastikawati, E.F., Adeoye, M.A., Toncelli, R., Lestari, Y.W.L., & Silitonga, L.M. (2026). Digital assessment literacy and feedback in writing classrooms among undergraduate EFL learners. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature, and Culture*, 11 (2), 722-736. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30659/e.11.2.722-736>

The results indicate that the overall level of digital assessment literacy of lecturers is high (Grand Mean = 3.83). Since the mean falls within the Agreement (3.504.49), it can be contended that the students think that their lecturers can impart the introduction of digital tools in EFL writing classes in the context of assessment. Using digital platform well and explaining digital grading procedures were the most competencies rated in the digital assessment tools, with an average score of 3.92, which is a strong organizational and communicative competency. The lowest score was the use of digital rubrics, with a mean score of 3.75, which shows relatively less emphasis on the systematic standards of digital assessment. The mean standard deviations (0.60-0.70) show that there are consistent responses among the respondents and a consensus on the perceptions. The descriptive analysis demonstrates that the extent of digital assessment literacy of lecturers in *Universitas Persatuan Guru Republik Indonesia Semarang* could be considered quite high. However, it can be slightly improved in such areas as the use of digital rubrics and other types of assessment.

How Effectively are Feedback Practices Implemented in EFL Writing Classrooms as Perceived by Undergraduate Students?

The second finding investigates students perceived effective feedback practices (EFP) in EFL writing classrooms with respect to digitally mediated feedback. In this context, effective feedback refers to feedback that allows students to grow as writers, which is timely, clear and actionable. The finding shows that feedback practices are generally perceived highly effective by students, in other words lecturers regularly provide feedback and have developed it in a way to enable meaningful revision and learning. This indicates that feedback has evolved from a purely correcting role to one that is more formative and dialogical, which helps students consider their strengths relative to areas in need of growth. Additionally, the use of digital tools seems to improve the availability and timeliness of feedback. Table 2 illustrates how this feedback practices is distributed among the different dimensions, alongside detailed statistical results

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Effective Feedback Practices (EFP) in EFL Writing Classrooms

Item	M	SD	Interpretation
I receive feedback on my writing assignments promptly through digital platforms	3.63	0.68	High
The digital feedback provided is clear and easy to understand	3.79	0.62	High
My lecturer uses digital tools to provide specific suggestions	3.72	0.60	High
The feedback helps me identify strengths and weaknesses	3.76	0.60	High
My lecturer uses various digital features to enhance feedback	3.66	0.61	High
Digital feedback encourages me to revise and improve drafts	3.82	0.65	High
Digital platforms allow helpful interaction/dialogue	3.75	0.60	High
Digital feedback improves my EFL writing skills	3.77	0.71	High

The descriptive analysis shows that the undergraduate learners are likely to believe the scope of the effective feedback practice (EFP) in EFL writing classrooms in *Universitas Persatuan Guru Republik Indonesia Semarang* is high. The mean scores are 3.63 to 3.82, high-range, with two items having slightly

lower mean scores, but within the high threshold. The one with the highest rating ($M = 3.82$) reveals that the digital feedback can have a strong influence on the students to revise and polish their writing drafts, and provides an impression that the feedback is practical and results in learning. The items with high scores on the feedback suggest that it is clear and understandable (mean score of 3.79), useful in the context of knowing the strengths and weaknesses (mean score of 3.76), and helpful communication between students and lecturers (mean score of 3.75). On the other hand, feedback timeliness (mean score of 3.63) and application of various features of digital feedback (mean score of 3.66) had lower mean scores. They demonstrate that feedback quality is positive, but the digital feedback instruments might be enhanced in the aspects of promptness and diversity. The values of the standard deviation (0.59-0.71) are small, and this indicates that the responses of the participants are not that varied. The results have indicated that the most effective feedback practices in EFL writing classrooms are usually well realized, and the students are positive about the same. Digital feedback is considered easy, positive, and helpful to enhance writing. Nevertheless, the timeliness and the scope of the digital feedback practices can be increased to make the practices even more robust.

The Extent Lecturers' Digital Assessment Literacy Significantly Predict Effective Feedback Practices in EFL Writing Classrooms

The third result examines the degree to which lecturers' digital assessment literacy (DAL) is a predictor of effectiveness of feedback practices (EFP) in EFL writing classrooms. This relationship is key in providing evidence that technological literacy does lead to enhancement in pedagogy because This reflects a strong positive significant association DAL and EFP: the more lecturers are digitally literate in assessment, the better they do in feedback. It emphasizes the nexus of assessment competence and quality feedback, and indicates that those lecturers who are more adept in using digital assessment tools are relatively better able to provide feedback that can support student learning. Table 3 provides detailed statistics support for this relation through the regression results.

Table 3. Linear Regression Analysis Predicting Effective Feedback Practices (EFP) from Digital Assessment Literacy (DAL)

Predictor	B	SE B	β	T	p
Constant	0.99	0.26	-	3.78	< .001
DAL	0.72	0.07	.74	10.53	< .001

According to Table 3, the correlation coefficient ($R = .74$) indicates that the relationship between digital assessment literacy of lecturers and the effective feedback practices is strong and positive. The coefficient of determination ($R^2 = .54$) reveals that 54.4 per cent of the change in EFP can be attributed to DAL. It is a huge research effect size in education. The regression model is statistically significant, $F(1, 93) = 111.00$, $p < .001$. The predictor (DAL) is also significant, $t = 10.53$, $p < .001$. The outcome is very statistically significant as $p < .001$. The regression coefficient ($B = 0.72$) indicates that the change in EFP is 0.72 units as DAL is increased by 1 unit. The digital assessment literacy of lecturers, as

How to Cite (APA Style):

Prastikawati, E.F., Adeoye, M.A., Toncelli, R., Lestari, Y.W.L., & Silitonga, L.M. (2026). Digital assessment literacy and feedback in writing classrooms among undergraduate EFL learners. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature, and Culture*, 11 (2), 722-736. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30659/e.11.2.722-736>

demonstrated in the analysis, is a strong and statistically significant indicator of effective feedback practices in the EFL writing classroom at *Universitas Persatuan Guru Republik Indonesia Semarang*. The findings suggest that improvement in the degree of feedback practices will tend to improve the quality and effectiveness of feedback provided to students, particularly when the percentage of the variance explained by the dependent variables is greater than half ($R^2 = .54$).

The research studies explore the level of digital assessment literacy (DAL) of the lecturers, the level of effective feedback practices (EFP) and the predictive relationship between the DAL and EFP in EFL writing lessons in the *Universitas Persatuan Guru Republik Indonesia Semarang*. The results are generalised and put into context by the discussion, and allusions to the existing literature occur in the reference list. The results reveal three significant findings. Firstly, lecturers were digitally assessment literate. The students rated lecturers highly on the use of digital tools, regarding their application by the lecturer on the use of platforms and in explaining the processes of grading. However, digital rubrics and different formats have lower scores, which means that they need improvement. Second, the mean scores were also high, and the feedback generation practice was also rated highly. The students found that digital feedback was informative, positive, and simple to understand, to enhance writing. It is also interesting to note that feedback was the most useful in the revision process, and the low scores were received on timeliness and the type of tools to be used to create the feedback. Third, the regression model showed that the statistically significant predictive relation between DAL and EFP was strong. This means that digitally assessment-literate lecturers have the ability to articulate the difference in effective practices of feedback. The fact that the enhancement of DAL is linked to the significant increase in the effectiveness of feedback practices is also supported by the regression coefficient. Overall, it can be inferred that although the current level of DAL and EFP is not the lowest, the quality and efficiency of feedback could be much better if the digital assessment competencies of lecturers are established.

Moreover, the results of this study are largely consistent with the other studies, although with new findings. The lecturer's digital literacy is high, as evidenced by the increased use of digital technologies in higher education. Practically, as Brown (2024) and Shabunina et al. (2024) explain, the massive use of digital assessment systems is already being experienced, which adds to the fact that lecturers are already considered to be generally competent to use digital tools. Similarly, the emphasis on the fact that the educators could plan and introduce digital tests successfully is intertwined with Benali and Mak (2022), who report that digital competence frameworks are the hotspot of contemporary education.

The literature is also consistent with the results of the successful feedback practices. The perceived efficacy of feedback, in particular in relation to writing students and their desire to revise their work, can be compared to that of Brown et al. (2016), who found that the feedback might have a significant impact on the self-regulation and academic performance. Other than that, the importance of the feedback clarity and utility that will be established in the present paper aligns with Chong (2022) and Zhang et al. (2026), who refer to

such issues as the key elements of effective feedback under EFL writing conditions.

However, most importantly, the predictive relationship found between DAL and EFP not only supports past theoretical and empirical arguments but also extends them by offering statistical evidence from a context and perspective that previous studies have not directly captured. While Timmis et al. (2016) argue that the quality of feedback is directly related to teachers' assessment literacy, their claim was largely conceptual rather than empirically tested through students' own evaluations of feedback effectiveness. The current study addresses this by quantifying the relationship through student perception data, demonstrating that DAL is not only theoretically linked to feedback quality but is also a statistically significant predictor of it, as perceived directly by the students who experience that feedback. Similarly, although Asamoah et al. (2023) suggest that greater assessment literacy corresponds to richer and better-structured feedback practices, their findings were situated in a different educational and cultural context. The present study extends this line of inquiry by confirming a comparable pattern within Indonesian EFL higher education, a setting in which the DAL–EFP relationship had not previously been empirically established, thereby providing context-specific evidence that broadens the generalizability of these earlier claims.

Nevertheless, this study is also comparable to the extent that they also share several differences. Firstly, the given study is based on the perception of students as the primary source of information compared to the other studies (Dignath, 2016; Schneider & Bodensohn, 2017; Venetz et al., 2019), where the self-reported competencies of the teachers serve as the primary source of data. This is more of a practice-based perspective in which the experience of digital assessment literacy is ascertained in the environment of the experience of a real-life classroom set up, in contrast to how it has been recorded by the lecturers. Second, Maier and Klotz (2022) have discovered what goes wrong with digital feedback, e.g., the impossibility of being clear and slow response, the existing findings indicate that feedback is perceived as being clear and effective. However, the rather low score in the sense of timeliness and variety of the tools partially proves the above-mentioned concerns, supposing that the overall quality is high, yet some of the aspects of the digital feedback still require enhancement. Third, as indicated in earlier meta-analyses (Lailiyah et al., 2022; Wisniewski et al., 2020), the impact of feedback may vary greatly depending on the circumstances under which it is provided. The present paper also goes ahead to describe this variability as explained by the digital assessment literacy as an explanatory variable. In other words, rather than assuming the effectiveness of feedback to be heterogeneous and there exists no visible, clear-cut explanation, a recent research article suggests that the variation in DAL may explain a sizeable portion of the instances of the heterogeneity.

Finally, unlike the study conducted in a well-endowed or Western-based study (Baghit, 2026; Mirsanjari, 2025; Tayyebi et al., 2022), the study at hand offers research evidence in one of the institutions of higher learning in Indonesia. The findings indicate that, even here, lecturers are very digitally competent with good practices in feedback, thereby refuting the assumptions

How to Cite (APA Style):

Prastikawati, E.F., Adeoye, M.A., Toncelli, R., Lestari, Y.W.L., & Silitonga, L.M. (2026). Digital assessment literacy and feedback in writing classrooms among undergraduate EFL learners. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature, and Culture*, 11 (2), 722-736. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30659/e.11.2.722-736>

regarding the low competency of those competencies in more technologically advanced environments. All these findings support the theoretical hypothesis according to which digital assessment literacy is a determining factor of a successful feedback practice in EFL writing classes (Nguyen, 2022; Polakova & Ivenz, 2024; Teng, 2025). The constructs have been utilized in previous research, where there is a tendency to test them separately, but the present research provides the empirical validation that they are directly related to each other. At the same time, the results indicate that some additional improvements in some aspects of DAL, namely, the use of digital rubrics and other feedback types, would help to make the latter even more effective, particularly in terms of timeliness and interactivity.

CONCLUSION

The paper has examined the digital assessment literacy (DAL) and effective feedback practices (EFP) and the predictive relationship of the two variables in EFL writing classes in *Universitas Persatuan Guru Republik Indonesia Semarang*. In the results, three significant consequences are apparent. Firstly, the students believed that lecturers were very digitally literate, which implies that lecturers are very successful in the application of digital tools in assessment. Second, feedback practices were also rated as highly, and the digital feedback was seen to be understandable, helpful and shaping students. Third and most importantly, the research has given a very good predictive relationship, which is statistically significant between DAL and EFP. This implies that lecturers' digital assessment literacy is associated with, and may help explain, a significant portion of the variance in feedback effectiveness, although the cross-sectional predictive design does not permit causal claims. These findings support the reality that the increased level of DAL is related to the enhanced feedback in the EFL writing lessons.

The results of this study are different from previously published studies that showed weak or inconsistent relationships between lecturers' technological competence and feedback quality (e.g., studies that considered barriers of infrastructure or institutions the most important). Potentially, reasons for this may lie in the use of self-reported assessment of technological competence in earlier studies. This may have captured the perceived, real-world impact of digital assessment used by lecturers, rather than the impact of digital assessment on their perceived competence. The deeply integrated use of digital tools for assessment within the current study's institutional context may also have created a more precise and consistent relationship compared to the use of digital tools within more contexts where they are either dominated or not used at all.

The research makes several valuable contributions to the literature. It is empirically based and gives quantitative data to support the existence of a strong correlation between digital assessment literacy and feedback effectiveness, a disjuncture between the two constructs that has been examined in many studies. It is empirically based and gives quantitative data to support the existence of a strong correlation between digital assessment literacy and feedback effectiveness, a disjuncture between the two constructs that has been examined in many studies. The methodological contribution of the study is that

the students are used as the main source of data, and the study is more practice-oriented than the other studies, which use the self-reports of the teachers. Contextually, the study addresses the gap of existing evidence on the contexts of higher education EFL in Indonesia that has been historically underrepresented in the literature, which has largely been founded on Western contexts. In practice, the results indicate that the quality of lecturer digital assessment can be enhanced with a significant increase in lecturer digital assessment capabilities, which in turn can lead to an improvement in the quality of feedback and, consequently, student writing performance.

This study is limited in several ways, but it contributes to it. To begin with, a cross-sectional survey design cannot establish any causation links; DAL is a statistically significant predictor of EFP, but causation cannot be established. Second, the research is based on the perception of students, which is self-reported and can be subject to subjective bias and might not provide a complete picture of classroom activity. Third, the study was also done in one institutional environment and with a small sample, which could undermine the extrapolation of the results to other environments. To overcome these weaknesses, longitudinal or experimental research ought to be used in future research that would more objectively determine causal relations between DAL and EFP. In addition, the use of alternative data sources, including classroom observations, lecturer ratings, and analysis of the real artefacts of feedback, would allow presenting a more detailed picture of the digital assessment practices. It will also be desirable to expand the study to other institutions or cross-country settings to carry out generalizability as well as to compare and contrast. Lastly, future research can consider other factors, like the literacy of the learners in feedback or technology infrastructure, to elaborate on the variations in feedback efficacy. Overall, this paper has shown that digital assessment literacy is crucial in the development of effective feedback practices in EFL writing classrooms, and that enhancing the digital literacy of lecturers is needed to enhance teaching and learning in digitally mediated classrooms.

AUTHOR STATEMENTS

All authors contributed equally to this study. **Entika Fani Prastikawati** was responsible for data collection, participated in the analytical process, and drafted the findings and discussion sections. Additionally, **Moses Adeleke Adeoye** formatted the manuscript in accordance with the journal's submission guidelines and, in collaboration with all co-authors, systematically reviewed and proofread successive drafts to ensure clarity, coherence, and scholarly rigor. **Rachel Toncelli, Maria Yosephin Widarti Lestari, and Lusya Maryani Silitonga** were actively involved in the data analysis process, contributed to the co-authorship of the findings section, and undertook verification of data accuracy and the validity of the conclusions drawn.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

How to Cite (APA Style):

Prastikawati, E.F., Adeoye, M.A., Toncelli, R., Lestari, Y.W.L., & Silitonga, L.M. (2026). Digital assessment literacy and feedback in writing classrooms among undergraduate EFL learners. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature, and Culture*, 11 (2), 722-736. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30659/e.11.2.722-736>

The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to all research participants and *Universitas Persatuan Guru Republik Indonesia Semarang* which financially supported the completion of this research.

REFERENCES

- Alsowat, H. H. (2022). Hybrid learning or virtual learning? Effects on students' essay writing and digital literacy. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 13(4), 872–883. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1304.20>
- Asamoah, D., Shahrill, M., & Abdul Latif, S. N. (2023). Towards developing classroom assessment literacy: Exploring teachers' approaches to assessment across cultures. *Cogent Education*, 10(2), 2280301. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2280301>
- Baghit, R. (2026). Leveraging digital feedback to advance assessment for learning. *European Journal of Open Education and E-Learning Studies*. 11(1), 114-126.
- Bashir, A., Bashir, S., Rana, K., Lambert, P., & Vernallis, A. (2021). Post-COVID-19 adaptations; the shifts towards online learning, hybrid course delivery and the implications for biosciences courses in the higher education setting. *Frontiers in Education* (Vol. 6, p. 711619). Frontiers Media SA. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.711619>
- Benali, M., & Mak, J. (2022). A comparative analysis of international frameworks for Teachers' Digital Competences. *International Journal of Education and Development Using Information and Communication Technology*, 18(3), 122-138.
- Brown, G. T. L. (2024). Insights in assessment, testing, and applied measurement: 2022. *Frontiers in Education* (Vol. 9, p. 1488012). Frontiers Media SA. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1488012>
- Brown, G. T. L., Peterson, E. R., & Yao, E. S. (2016). Student conceptions of feedback: Impact on self-regulation, self-efficacy, and academic achievement. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 86(4), 606–629. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12126>
- Cheung, A., & Slavin, R. (2016). How methodological features affect effect sizes in education. *Educational Researcher*. 45(5), 283-292. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X16656615>
- Chong, S. W. (2022). The role of feedback literacy in written corrective feedback research: From feedback information to feedback ecology. *Cogent Education*, 9(1), 2082120. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2022.2082120>
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2005). *Research methods in education*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203224342>
- Dignath, C. (2016). What determines whether teachers enhance self-regulated learning? Predicting teachers' reported promotion of self-regulated learning by teacher beliefs, knowledge, and self-efficacy. *Frontline Learning Research*, 4(5), 83–105. <https://doi.org/10.14786/flr.v4i5.247>
- Falloon, G. (2020). From digital literacy to digital competence: The teacher digital competency (TDC) framework. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 68(5), 2449–2472. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-020-09767-4>

- Fatima, D. N., Ehsan, M., Darazi, D. M. A., Majeed, A., & Chaudhary, A. A. (2024). The role of feedback in enhancing creative writing skills in ELT contexts. *Remittances Review*, 9(3), 350-368.
- Febriyanti, R. H., Usman, H., Lustyantje, N., Iasha, V., & Setiawan, B. (2022). Utilizing learning management system in online writing instruction in higher education: Indonesian faculty member perspectives. *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice*, 22(10). <https://doi.org/10.33423/jhetp.v22i10.5388>
- Laflen, A., & Smith, M. (2017). Responding to student writing online: Tracking student interactions with instructor feedback in a Learning Management System. *Assessing Writing*, 31, 39–52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2016.07.003>
- Lailiyah, L., Ratminingsih, N. M., Utami, I. L. P., Artini, L. P., Padmadewi, N. N., & Marsakawati, N. P. E. (2022). Peer assessment-based digital literacy, EFL students' reading competency, and engagement. *Journal of Education Research and Evaluation*, 6(4), 678–687. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jere.v6i4.53012>
- Maier, U., & Klotz, C. (2022). Personalized feedback in digital learning environments: Classification framework and literature review. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 3, 100080. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100080>
- Mirsanjari, Z. (2025). Enhancing assessment literacy in EAP instruction: The role of teacher development courses in overcoming systemic barriers. *Language Testing in Asia*, 15(1), 30. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-025-00368-7>
- Nguyen, T. H. (2022). The effects of peer feedback on EFL students' writing performance. *Vietnam Journal of Education*, 6(2), 123-136. <https://doi.org/10.52296/vje.2022.185>
- Polakova, P., & Ivenz, P. (2024). The impact of ChatGPT feedback on the development of EFL students' writing skills. *Cogent Education*, 11(1), 2410101. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2410101>
- Prastikawati, E. F., Mujiyanto, Y., Saleh, M., & Fitriati, S. W. (2024). Teaching practicum: Does it impact to pre-service EFL teachers' language assessment literacy? *World Journal of English Language*, 14(3), 242. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v14n3p242>
- Raeisi, M. R., Heidari, D. M., & Khodareza, M. (2024). Digital literacy in an EFL classroom: Does dynamic assessment benefit from the literacy?. *Journal of Applied Linguistics Studies*, 3(1), 37-53.
- Schneider, C., & Bodensohn, R. (2017). Student teachers' appraisal of the importance of assessment in teacher education and self-reports on the development of assessment competence. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 24(2), 127–146. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2017.1293002>
- Shabunina, V., Labenko, O., Horbachenko, A., Tsuprun, T., & Sydorenko, O. (2024). Technologies and Innovations in the Educational Process: Experience of the University of the Future. *Futurity Education*, 4(3), 145-168. <https://doi.org/10.57125/FED.2024.09.25.09>
- Tayyebi, M., Abbasabady, M. M., & Abbassian, G.-R. (2022). Examining classroom writing assessment literacy: A focus on in-service EFL teachers in Iran. *Language Testing in Asia*, 12(1), 12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-022-00161-w>

How to Cite (APA Style):

Prastikawati, E.F., Adeoye, M.A., Toncelli, R., Lestari, Y.W.L., & Silitonga, L.M. (2026). Digital assessment literacy and feedback in writing classrooms among undergraduate EFL learners. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature, and Culture*, 11 (2), 722-736. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30659/e.11.2.722-736>

- Teng, M. F. (2025). Metacognitive awareness and EFL learners' perceptions and experiences in utilising ChatGPT for writing feedback. *European Journal of Education*, 60(1), e12811. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12811>
- Timmis, S., Broadfoot, P., Sutherland, R., & Oldfield, A. (2016). Rethinking assessment in a digital age: Opportunities, challenges and risks. *British Educational Research Journal*, 42(3), 454–476. <https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3215>
- Utari, Z., Sesmiarni, Z., & Syafitri, W. (2026). AI-mediated digital formative assessment, EFL writing: Validity, teacher digital literacy, ethical implications. *Journal of English Language and Education*, 11(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.31004/jele.v11i1.1775>
- Venetz, M., Zurbriggen, C. L. A., & Schwab, S. (2019). What do teachers think about their students' inclusion? Consistency of students' self-reports and teacher ratings. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1637. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01637>
- Wisniewski, B., Zierer, K., & Hattie, J. (2020). The power of feedback revisited: A meta-analysis of educational feedback research. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 487662. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.03087>
- Yildiz, H., & Kuru Gonen, S. I. (2024). Automated writing evaluation system for feedback in the digital world: An online learning opportunity for English as a foreign language students. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 25(3), 183–206. <https://doi.org/10.17718/tojde.1169727>
- Yu, K., & Dlamini, R. (Eds.). (2024). *Higher education ICT integration in Africa: Readiness, implementation and trajectory*. Taylor & Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003394877>
- Zhang, X., Cui, Y., Jin, H., & Gao, Y. (2026). Developing a feedback framework for English for Research and Publication Purposes (ERPP) in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 71, 101265. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2025.101265>

Conflict of Interest Statement: The authors declare that the research was conducted without any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Copyright©2026. **Prastikawati, Adeoye, Toncelli, Lestari and Silitonga**. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution, or reproduction is permitted that does not comply with these terms.