DOKUZ EYLÜL ÜNİVERSİTESİ
EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ

Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Derleme Makale / Review Paper

A Comparative Analysis of Traditional and Modern Approaches to Assessment and Evaluation in Education

Eğitimde Geleneksel ve Modern Ölçme ve Değerlendirme Yaklaşımlarının Karşılaştırmalı Bir Analizi

Rusen MEYLANI, Asst.Prof.Dr., Dicle University, rusen.meylani@dicle.edu.tr

Geliş tarihi - *Received:* 6 November 2023
Kabul tarihi - *Accepted*: 22 April 2024
Yayın tarihi - *Published*: 28 April 2024

Meylani, R. (2024). A comparative analysis of traditional and modern approaches to assessment and evaluation in education. *Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, 15*(1), 520-555.
DOI. 10.51460/baebd.1386737

Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Derleme Makale / Review Paper

Abstract. Assessment and evaluation are critical to tracking student progress and designing educational programs. Assessment is data collection to monitor students' development, while evaluation analyzes this data to make informed educational choices. Practical and effective assessment and evaluation techniques must be applied to enhance educational results. These strategies enable instructors to discover and customize instruction by identifying each student's strengths and limitations. This article compares classic and modern assessment and evaluation methodologies to draw implications for educational policies and practices. The research employs a systematic literature review to analyze data gathered from diverse fields. Efficiency, appropriateness, scalability, inclusivity, technology integration, and stakeholder acceptability are critical factors in comparing assessment and evaluation approaches. These parameters were used to analyze the benefits and drawbacks of each strategy. Traditional approaches, for example, have been proven insufficient in expressing individual characteristics since they are ubiquitous and uniform. Modern approaches stand out for their ability to meet student demands and adapt to diverse circumstances. However, the broad use of these modern procedures is much more complicated than the simply adaptable traditional methods. According to the study's results, current and traditional assessment and evaluation methods have common themes: purpose, quality assurance, involvement, ethics, and continual development. Traditional approaches, on the other hand, remain more summative, but novel methods concentrate more on student growth via formative strategies and ongoing feedback. Furthermore, novel methods provide flexibility, technology integration, and inclusion, while conventional methods may be restricted to a specific format. Modern methodologies reflect technology's growing importance in education and provide substantial opportunities to build engaging and attractive learning environments. Traditional techniques, on the other hand, emphasize academic knowledge and memory abilities while ignoring practical applications. Assessments that involve problem and project-based learning, as well as real-world situations, are prioritized in modern techniques. Consequently, integrating traditional and contemporary assessment and evaluation methodologies is recommended and will result in a more effective and inclusive educational assessment system. This research on the applicability and efficacy of assessment and evaluation methodologies explores new educational approaches and techniques assessing current practices and making suggestions for implementation, all in one scholarly work.

Keywords. Educational assessment and evaluation methods, traditional vs. contemporary assessment, summative vs. Formative assessment, standardized testing, game virtualization, reflective practices, portfolio assessment, adaptive testing.

Öz. Ölçme ve değerlendirme, eğitim sürecinde öğrenci başarısını anlamak ve eğitim programlarını şekillendirmek açısından merkezi bir öneme sahiptir. Ölçme, öğrencilerin ilerlemesini izlemek için veri toplama işlemi iken, değerlendirme bu verilerin analiz edilerek eğitimde bilinçli kararlar alınmasını içerir. Eğitim sonuçlarını iyileştirmek için etkili ölçme ve değerlendirme yöntemlerinin kullanılması gerekmektedir. Bu yöntemler eğitimcilerin her öğrencinin güçlü ve zayıf yönlerini belirlemesine ve eğitimi kişiselleştirmesine olanak tanır. Bu makale, geleneksel ve modern ölçme ve değerlendirme tekniklerini karşılaştırarak eğitim politikaları ve uygulamaları için sonuçlar çıkarmayı amaçlamaktadır. Çalışmanın yöntemi, sistematik bir literatür taraması olup, çeşitli disiplinlerden veriler toplanarak analiz edilmiştir. Ölçme ve değerlendirme tekniklerinin karşılaştırmalı analizinde belirlenen anahtar kriterler arasında verimlilik, uygunluk, ölçeklenebilirlik, kapsayıcılık, teknolojik entegrasyon ve paydaşların kabulü yer almaktadır. Her iki yöntemin avantajları ve dezavantajları bu kriterlere göre

Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Derleme Makale / Review Paper

belirlenmiştir. Örneğin, geleneksel yöntemler yaygın ve standartlaşmış olmaları sebebiyle kolay uygulanabilirken, bireysel farklılıkları yansıtmada yetersiz bulunmuşlardır. Çağdaş yöntemler ise farklı öğrenci ihtiyaçlarını karşılayabilme ve farklı koşullara uyum sağlama kapasitesiyle ön plana çıkmıştır ancak bu yöntemlerin yaygın uygulamaları kolay geleneksel yöntemlere nazaran çok daha zordur. Çalışmanın bulguları, modern ve geleneksel ölçme ve değerlendirme tekniklerinin, amaç, kalite güvencesi, katılımcılık, etik ve sürekli gelişim gibi temalar etrafında benzerliklere sahip olduğunu göstermiştir. Ancak, modern teknikler, formatif stratejiler kullanarak ve sürekli geri bildirim sağlayarak öğrencilerin gelişimine daha fazla odaklanırken, geleneksel yöntemler daha summatif yani özetleyici nitelikte kalmaktadır. Ayrıca, modern teknikler esnekliği, teknolojik entegrasyonu ve kapsayıcılığı artırırken, geleneksel yöntemler belirli bir format içinde sınırlı kalabilmektedir. Modern teknikler, eğitimde teknolojinin artan rolünü yansıtır ve interaktif, heyecan verici öğrenme ortamları oluşturmada önemli olanaklar sunar. Buna karşın, geleneksel yöntemler akademik bilgiye ve hafıza becerilerine odaklanır ve genellikle pratik uygulamaları dikkate almazlar. Modern yaklaşımlar, problem ve proje tabanlı öğrenme ve gerçek dünya senaryolarını içeren değerlendirmelerle güncel uygulamalara öncelik verir. Sonuç olarak, geleneksel ve modern ölçme ve değerlendirme tekniklerinin birleştirilerek, daha etkili ve kapsayıcı bir eğitim değerlendirme sistemi meydana getirilmesi önerilmektedir. Ölçme ve değerlendirme tekniklerinin uygulanabilirliği ve etkinliği üzerine yapılan bu çalışma, eğitimde yeni yönler ve metodolojilerin keşfedilmesine olanak tanırken, var olan uygulamaların da değerlendirilmesine ve uygulamaya ilişkin öneriler sunmaya da olanak tanımaktadır.
Anahtar Kelimeler. Eğitimde Geleneksel ve Modern Ölçme ve Değerlendirme Yöntemleri, Formatif ve Summatif Değerlendirme, Standardize Testler, Oyun Sanallaştırması, Yansıtıcı Uygulamalar, Portfolyo Değerlendirmeleri, Uyarlanabilir Testler.

Meylani, R. (2024). A comparative analysis of traditional and modern approaches to assessment and evaluation in education. *Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, 15*(1), 520-555.
DOI. 10.51460/baebd.1386737

Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Derleme Makale / Review Paper

Genişletilmiş Özet

Giriş. Ölçme ve değerlendirme eğitim alanında önemli unsurlardır. Öğrencinin öğrenmedeki ilerlemesini ve başarılarını anlamak için veri elde etme süreci ölçme olarak bilinir. Öte yandan, değerlendirme, ders programı değişiklikleri ve derecelendirme gibi eğitim hakkında bilinçli yargılar yapmak için ölçme verilerini analiz etmeyi gerektirir. Eğitim sonuçlarının iyileştirilmesi, verimli ölçme ve değerlendirme prosedürlerinin kullanılmasını gerektirir. Ölçme ve değerlendirme, eğitimcilerin, her öğrencinin güçlü ve zayıf yönlerini belirlemelerine, eğitimi her öğrenciye uygun şekilde özelleştirmelerine ve gelecekteki eğitimi yapılandıran geri bildirim sağlamasını desteklerler. Bu makale geleneksel ve çağdaş ölçme ve değerlendirme yöntemlerini karşılaştırmaktadır. Bu karşılaştırma, her iki yöntemin avantajlarını, dezavantajlarını ve sorunlarını vurgulayarak eğitim politikası ve uygulaması için sonuçlar çıkarmaya çalışmaktadır. Bu analiz ile, geleneksel ve çağdaş eğitim, ölçme ve değerlendirme yöntemlerinin etkinliği, uygulanabilirliği ve paydaş bakış açısını nasıl karşılaştırır temel sorusunu yanıtlamaya çalışmaktadır.

Yöntem. Bu çalışmanın yöntemi sistematik alan yazın taramasıdır. Elde edilen veriler benzerlik ve farklılıkları bakımından karşılaştırmalı olarak analize edilmiştir. Bu çalışmada psikoloji, eğitim ve eğitim teknolojisi de dahil olmak üzere çeşitli akademik alanlardan veriler toplanmıştır. Araştırma raporları, makale, bildiri, tezler ve benzeri basılı ve elektronik ortamdaki yayınlara ulaşılmıştır. "Geleneksel ölçme ve değerlendirme yöntemleri", "modern ölçme ve değerlendirme metodları", "öğretimin değerlendirmesi" ve "eğitimin değerlendirmesi" gibi anahtar kelimeler aranmıştır. Taramada, ilgili çalışmalar ve makaleler konu başlığı dışında kalan belirli katılım ve dışlama kriterleri kullanılarak filtrelenmiştir. Verilerin analizinde tematik içerik analizi kullanılmıştır. Etkinlik, ölçeklenebilirlik, katılımcılık ve paydaş bakış açıları da dahil olmak üzere alt temalar oluşturulmuştur. Sonuçlar, hem geleneksel hem de çağdaş ölçme ve değerlendirme yöntemlerinin avantajlarını ve dezavantajlarını belirlemek için karşılaştırılarak ortaya konmuştur.

Bulgular. Elde edilen veriler sonucunda, modern ve geleneksel ölçme ve değerlendirme tekniklerini etkin bir şekilde karşılaştırmak için açık bir kriter kümesi oluşturulmuştur. Bu kriterler, öğrenme sonuçlarının ölçülmesinde verimlilik, uygunluk ve ölçeklenebilirlik, kapsayıcılık, teknolojik entegrasyon, ve ilgili tarafların kabulü olarak belirlenmiştir. Bu kriterlere göre, geleneksel ve modern ölçme ve değerlendirme teknikleri arasındaki benzerlikler incelendiğinde; değerlendirme amacı, kalite güvencesi, ilgili tarafların katılımı, etik konular, devam eden gelişim temaları belirlenerek sırasıyla bu temalarda şu ortak yönler bulunmuştur: Her ne kadar farklı yöntemler ve stiller kullanılsa da, her iki yöntem de öğrenme sonuçlarını ölçmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Kalitenin korunması ve geliştirilmesi üzerine tasarlanmış süreçler her iki yaklaşıma da uygulanabilir. Hem geleneksel hem de modern değerlendirmelerin uygulanması ve yorumlanmasında, eğitimciler, öğrenciler ve yasama

Meylani, R. (2024). A comparative analysis of traditional and modern approaches to assessment and evaluation in education. *Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, 15*(1), 520-555.
DOI. 10.51460/baebd.1386737

Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Derleme Makale / Review Paper

yetkililerinin hepsinin katılımı gerekmektedir. Etik ilkeler ve veri gizliliği gibi konmuları kontrol eden normlar her ikisi yöntemi de kapsamaktadır. Geleneksel ve modern teknikler pedagojik araştırmalara, teknolojik yeniliklere ve eğitim taleplerine yanıt olarak sürekli gelişmektedir. Geleneksel ölçme ve değerlendirme yöntemleri, yaygın ve standartlaşmış oldukları için daha kolay uygulanabilmektedirler. Ancak kişisel faklılıkları ortaya çıkarmada etkin değildirler. Öte yandan farklı öğrencilerin farklı ihtiyaçlarını karşılayabişlmek adına çağdaş yöntemler ön plana çıkmaktadır. Ayrıca bu yöntemler farklı koşullara uyarlanabilir niteliktedirler. Çağdaş yöntemlerden oyun sanallaştırması ve portfolyo değerlendirilmesi gibi yöntemler daha uygulanabilir olsa da, uygun şekilde kullanılması önemli mali kaynaklar ve uzmanlık gerektirir. Çalışmadaki kriterlere göre, geleneksel ve modern ölçme ve değerlendirme teknikleri arasındaki farklılıklar incelendiğinde ise, yöntemler, esneklik, teknolojik entegrasyon, ölçülebilirlik, ilgili tarafların algısı, erişilebilirlik ve kapsayıcılık, güvenirlik, teknolojinin rolü, öğrenci merkezli öğrenmeye odaklı, gerçek dünya uygulamalarını merkeze alan, değerlendirme stratejilerinin çeşitliliği gibi ortak temalar oluşturulmuştur. Bu temalara göre sırasıyla şu farklılıklar ortaya çıkmıştır: Geleneksel değerlendirme teknikleri çoğunlukla bir birim veya ders sonrasında uygulanan sınavlar ve standart testler gibi özetleyici (summative) prosedürleri kullanır; öte yandan, modern yaklaşımlar düzey belirleyici-biçimlendirici (formative) stratejiler kullanır ve öğrencilere sürekli geri bildirim sağlar. Geleneksel yaklaşımlar genellikle esnek değildir, belirli özelliklere sahiptir ve özel eğitim gereksinimlerini karşılamak için çok az esneklik sağlar; modern öğretim teknikleri daha fazla uyum ve esneklik sunar. Modern yaklaşımlar çoğunlukla sayısaldır ve çeşitli eğitim araçlarıyla düzgün bir entegrasyon sağlar; geleneksel yöntemler yeni teknolojileri kabul etmede oldukça yavaştır. Standartlaşmış oldukları için, geleneksel tekniklerin büyük ölçekte uygulanması daha kolaydır; modern teknikler, verimli olsalar da, çok fazla ek kaynak gerektirebilir ve yaygın olarak kullanılmaları zor olabilir. Modern yaklaşımlar yaratıcı olarak kabul edilir, ancak çoğu zaman deneysel doğrulama olmadan kullanılır; geleneksel yöntemler sıklıkla denenmiştir ancak güncel değildir. Modern yaklaşımlar daha kapsamlıdır ve öğrencilere yeteneklerini ve uzmanlıklarını gösterme fırsatı sunar; geleneksel yöntemler sınavlarda yüksek performans gösteremeyen öğrencileri olumsuz olarak etkiler. Geleneksel değerlendirmeler soyut akademik bilgiye odaklanırken çağdaş teknikler, öğrencileri gerçek dünyadaki durumlarda test etmeyi amaçlar. Modern teknikler, anlık geri bildirim, etkileşimli katılım ve daha heyecan verici bir öğrenme ortamı sağlamak için teknolojiyi kullanırlar. Geleneksel değerlendirme teknikleri ise standart sınavlar aracılığıyla ölçülüp değerlendirilen özelliklerin sınırlı olması bakımından eleştirilmektedir. Geleneksel değerlendirme teknikleri teorik veya büyük oranda hafıza becerisine odaklanır ve pratik uygulamaları görmezden gelir. Modern yaklaşımlar, proje tabanlı öğrenme, gerçekçi değerlendirmeler ve gerçek dünya senaryolarını taklit eden problem çözme faaliyetlerini kullanarak güncel uygulamalara öncelik vermektedir. Geleneksel yaklaşımlar genellikle kolayca ölçülebilen veriler sağlayan sınavlar ve özet (summative) değerlendirmelere bağlıdır; modern yaklaşımlar ise, formatif değerlendirmeler, dijital portfolyolar, sözlü sunumlar ve grup projeleri

Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Derleme Makale / Review Paper

gibi, öğrencinin becerilerini daha kapsamlı ve nüanslı bir şekilde inceleyen durumlarda kullanılabilmektedir.

Tartışma ve Sonuç. Geleneksel ve modern yaklaşımlar arasında seçim yapmak eğitimde başarıyı önemli ölçüde etkiler ve bu sadece kişisel bir tercih meselesi değildir. Geleneksel yöntemler genellikle sınırlı olmaları ve farklı öğrenme tercihlerini karşılama konusunda yetersiz kalmaları nedeniyle eleştirilmektedirler. Öte yandan, sınırlı kaynaklar ve teknoloji entegrasyonu ile ilgili sorunlar da dahil olmak üzere kendi zorlukları olsa da, modern yaklaşımlar daha özelleştirilmiş ve dinamik bir öğrenme ortamı sağlamaya çalışmaktadır. Yöntem seçimi, öğrencilerin gereksinim ve isteklerini, eğitim ortamını ve mevcut kaynakları dikkate almalıdır. Eğitimciler ve yasa yapıcıları, ahlaki ve pratik açıdan uygun bir ölçme ve değerlendirme planı geliştirmede her bir yaklaşımın avantajlarını ve dezavantajlarını dikkate almalıdır. Hem geleneksel hem de modern ölçme ve değerlendirme tekniklerinin avantajları ve dezavantajları vardır. Geleneksel yaklaşımlar denenmiştir, kullanımı kolay ve tutarlı veri sağlar, ancak farklı öğrenme tercihlerini dikkate almazlar. Yenilikçi ve esnek olmalarına rağmen, modern çözümler genellikle katılımcıların kabul edebilirliği ve teknolojik kısıtlamalarla ilgili engellerle karşı karşıyadır. Değerlendirme sonuçları, eğitimde ölçme ve değerlendirme için en iyi stratejinin, çağdaş tekniklerin esnekliğini geleneksel yöntemlerin güvenilirliğiyle birleştirerek, çok yönlü bir yaklaşım olduğunu göstermektedir. Gelecekteki araştırmalar, her iki stratejinin en avantajlı yönlerini birleştiren karma modeller oluşturmaya odaklanmalıdır.

Meylani, R. (2024). A comparative analysis of traditional and modern approaches to assessment and evaluation in education. *Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, 15*(1), 520-555.
DOI. 10.51460/baebd.1386737

Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Derleme Makale / Review Paper

Introduction

Definition of assessment and evaluation in education

The foundation of education consists of two interconnected principles: assessment and evaluation. Despite their frequent interchangeability, the phrases have different meanings. According to Stiggins and Chappuis (2005), assessment is the methodical process of obtaining, analyzing, and using data to understand and improve student learning. It consists of various methods to discover and enhance individuals' or groups' learning experiences, such as tests, surveys, portfolios, and observations (Popham, 2010a; Popham, 2010b). They show students' performance in critical subjects like math, science, and language arts and identify specific strengths and weaknesses (Guskey & Jung, 2016). This data helps educators improve teaching methods and student understanding.

However, "evaluation" is broader and describes assessing the merits, value, or effectiveness of an approach, course, or educational outcome (Scriven, 1991). Evaluations often employ assessments as data points but include other factors, such as curriculum, teacher effectiveness, and organizational objectives, to reach comprehensive findings (Berk, 2013). Curricular evaluations check if the curriculum meets educational standards and prepares students with critical thinking and problem-solving skills, leading to curriculum adjustments (Marzano & Toth, 2013). Teacher effectiveness is assessed to highlight good practices and areas needing growth, which informs the need for professional development and new teaching techniques (Danielson, 2013). Evaluations also determine how well educational organizations meet their goals, such as increasing graduation rates and college readiness, suggesting areas for improvement like better student support or more effective technology use (Bryk et al., 2010); these comprehensive evaluations guide schools in making informed improvements to enhance educational outcomes.

Significance of assessment and evaluation in educational outcomes

The importance of assessment and evaluation of learning outcomes cannot be overstated. For various stakeholders, including lawmakers, educators, administrators, and students, they are essential resources. Sound feedback systems, including well-crafted examinations, enable teachers to assess the effectiveness of their pedagogical techniques and adjust them as needed (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Black & Wiliam, 2010). This aligns with the concept of formative assessment, which seeks to provide prompt, ongoing feedback to instructors so they improve their lessons and help students learn more effectively (Sadler, 1989).

Evaluations help identify opportunities for policy development and guide resource allocation within educational institutions (Levin & Datnow, 2012). They help with more broad questions like whether professional development programs for teachers are required or whether a new curriculum is sufficient (Kellaghan & Stufflebeam, 2012). Furthermore, accountability is ensured through a methodical approach to assessment and evaluation, a trait increasingly required in educational contexts (Linn, 2000). Ultimately, this improves academic results by fostering a culture of accountability and openness among all stakeholders (Elwood & Klenowski, 2002). Assessment and evaluation are essential in improving educational quality and promoting academic fairness because

Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Derleme Makale / Review Paper

they provide insightful information about individual and group educational experiences (Stobart, 2014).

Objective and purpose of the research paper

This research paper conducts a comprehensive comparison between traditional and modern methods of educational assessment and evaluation. It employs a broad methodology that incorporates perspectives from educators, policymakers, and students to deepen our understanding of these methods' advantages, limitations, and controversies. The paper also aims to provide empirical evidence to support these assessment and evaluation approaches.

However, the purpose of this study extends beyond mere academic inquiry; it seeks to offer practical insights and recommendations that the educational community can utilize. Specifically, the paper aims to equip practitioners, policymakers, and academic researchers with actionable advice while contributing theoretically to educational assessment and evaluation frameworks. By identifying the most effective methods for assessment and evaluation, the study provides stakeholders with guidance to facilitate enhanced educational experiences and outcomes.

Historical context of assessment and evaluation approaches

Assessment and evaluation in education have a long and rich history with the development of technology, social norms, and educational ideas. The industrial teaching style, which valued efficiency and uniformity, led to a concentration on standardized testing in the early 20th century (Tyack & Cuban, 1997). Exams such as the SAT, which debuted in 1926, were intended to assess knowledge and ability quantitatively (Lemann, 2000).

Constructivist learning theories, which emphasize the learner's active role in creating knowledge, have spurred the adoption of holistic educational methods since the mid-20th century (Piaget & Cook, 1952; Vygotsky & Cole, 1978). This shift led to developing new evaluation techniques that accommodate individual learning processes, such as project-based evaluations and portfolios (Wiggins, 2011). These methods aim to assess a broader spectrum of student skills and competencies in a more integrative and practical manner.

In addition, technology has significantly impacted assessment and evaluation in recent years. Technology has made assessments more interactive and personalized, such as computer-based testing, adaptive assessments, and game-based evaluations (Shute & Rahimi, 2017). Thus, based on educational theories, societal changes, and technology improvements, the historical setting progresses from one-size-fits-all procedures to more customized, student-centric approaches (Stiggins, 2002).

Statement of research question and hypothesis

The main research question guiding this literature review asks, "How do traditional and modern educational assessment and evaluation methods compare effectiveness, limitations, and stakeholder perspectives?" This inquiry explores their effectiveness and considers their broader impact and

Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Derleme Makale / Review Paper

reception among stakeholders, such as educators, legislators, and students. Building on this, the hypothesis to be tested is, "Modern educational assessment and evaluation methods, compared to traditional ones, provide more effective and individualized measures of learning outcomes." This hypothesis is based on the premise that recent advancements in technology and educational theory have led to assessment techniques that better align with current learning paradigms and educational goals.

Method

Methodology for the review

A methodical strategy for data gathering was used in this literature review to guarantee a thorough and objective analysis of the body of accessible academic literature. Peer-reviewed publications, conference papers, theses, dissertations, and books from various academic fields, including psychology, education, and educational technology, were used as data sources. Searches were conducted using specified keywords such as "traditional assessment methods," "modern assessment methods," "educational assessment," and "educational evaluation" across several electronic databases, including PubMed, ERIC, Web of Science, Scopus, and Google Scholar. Supplementary information was acquired through manual exploration of pertinent literature, citation lists, and specialized scholarly publications centered on educational assessment and evaluation.

Specific inclusion and exclusion criteria were established to filter the gathered data. Studies and articles written in English, published within the past 30 years, with more than 50% published within the last 15 years, and pertinent to educational assessment and evaluation met the inclusion requirements. Papers, opinion pieces, and research unrelated to the educational context were excluded from consideration.

After the data-gathering process, the results were interpreted and summarized using a thematic content analysis. The gathered papers were first divided into categories according to whether they focused on conventional or new assessment and evaluation methods. The review's framework identified several sub-themes: Efficacy, scalability, inclusivity, and stakeholder viewpoints. These sub-themes served as examination criteria for each article, and the results were compared to identify the advantages and disadvantages of traditional and modern evaluation techniques.

Scope and limitations of the study

Scope

This literature study aims to address a wide range of aspects related to educational assessment and evaluation techniques. In addition to more modern methods like game virtualization, reflective practices, and adaptive testing, the study covers more conventional methods, including formative assessments, summative assessments, and standardized examinations. This study also considers the opinions of several stakeholder groups, including educators, legislators, and students. The study is similarly global in scope to provide a worldwide viewpoint, looking at studies and reports from other nations.

Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Derleme Makale / Review Paper

Limitations

Notwithstanding the study's intent to be exhaustive, it is critical to recognize its limits. Firstly, only English-language, publicly available publications, papers, and reports are included in the scope. This might result in a language and accessibility bias, leaving out potentially insightful information from sources not in English or from publications protected by paywalls. Secondly, since the review concentrates primarily on the past 30 years of the research literature, with 50% conducted within the last 15 years, it may have excluded essential works or historical patterns that could help provide a more profound knowledge of the topic. However, this requirement was implemented to ensure the review is still applicable and current. Thirdly, even though the study attempts to incorporate a range of stakeholder views, it is probable that certain groups—such as educators over students—are overrepresented in the literature that is currently accessible, which would bias the results overall. Finally, since this is a review of the literature rather than an original research project, it is dependent on data that has already been published. This indicates that the study is impacted by the constraints and prejudices present in the primary research.

Timeliness and relevance of the study

Educational methods are changing worldwide, and the importance and timeliness of this research cannot be emphasized enough. The COVID-19 epidemic, which forced a quick switch to online assessment tools and remote learning, has contributed to the increased use of technology in education (Daniel, 2020; Hodges et al., 2020). Due to the rapid change that has brought to light the benefits and drawbacks of various assessment techniques, educational stakeholders urgently need to conduct comparison research (Dhawan, 2020).

Furthermore, a growing knowledge of global competencies and 21st-century abilities is being incorporated into educational policy (NRC, 2012). It is crucial to analyze the efficacy of both modern and conventional evaluation techniques in gauging these competencies. Several international organizations and educational boards focus on revising assessment frameworks to conform to contemporary educational aims (Griffin et al., 2018).

An increasing amount of scholarly literature highlights the need to use various assessment techniques to accommodate students' learning styles and demands (Felder & Brent, 2005; Saravia-Shore & Garcia, 2008). In light of this, this study aims to provide an exhaustive and timely comparative analysis to help academics, educators, and policymakers make defensible judgments on the direction of educational assessment and evaluation in the future.

Stakeholder Perspectives

Educators' views on assessment and evaluation

Educators are essential when adopting assessment and evaluation techniques in educational settings. They often operate as the intermediaries between classroom procedures and policy

Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Derleme Makale / Review Paper

regulations. Teachers typically see conventional assessment techniques—like summative and standardized testing—as crucial for comparing student performance to expectations. However, they also fault these techniques for failing to fully capture a learner's range of talents and skills (Stiggins, 2002).

Formative assessments, which provide continuous feedback and are seen to be more in line with instructional procedures, are gaining popularity among educators (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Black & Wiliam, 2010). Because formative assessment techniques allow for in-the-moment modifications to educational tactics, they are increasingly seen as instruments for enhancing teaching and learning (Brookhart, 2011).

Nonetheless, some instructors continue to be wary of contemporary evaluation techniques like portfolio assessments and game virtualization because of doubts over their validity and reliability (Pellegrino et al., 2001). Despite these reservations, instructors who have adopted these innovative techniques often emphasize how well they engage students and provide them with a more comprehensive understanding of their talents (Shute & Rahimi, 2017).

Policymakers' roles and opinions

Through the creation and execution of educational policies, policymakers significantly impact assessing and evaluating education. Standardizing assessment techniques is a common task for them to guarantee accountability and comparability across educational systems (Fuhrman, 1999). Because of their apparent impartiality and convenience of data collection for extensive assessments, traditional approaches such as standardized testing are often valued in policy circles (Linn, 2000). Nonetheless, there is a slow movement toward more adaptable, learner-centric assessment techniques, partly due to lobbying from educators and academic research (Hargreaves, 2003).

Furthermore, policymakers are becoming increasingly interested in using technology and data analytics in assessments because they see them as ways to improve the efficiency and affordability of educational evaluations (Williamson, 2018). Notwithstanding their potential benefits, data-driven evaluations raise ethical questions due to issues with data privacy and possible biases in automated scoring systems (O'Neil, 2017).

Policymakers play a critical role in shaping educational assessment and evaluation through policy development, often standardizing assessment techniques to ensure accountability and uniformity across systems. Traditional methods like standardized testing are favored for their perceived objectivity and ease of data collection. However, there is a growing shift towards more flexible, learner-centered approaches due to advocacy from educators and insights from academic research. Additionally, the increasing integration of technology and data analytics aims to enhance the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of evaluations. However, these data-driven methods bring ethical concerns regarding privacy and potential biases in automated scoring.

Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Derleme Makale / Review Paper

Attitudes and perceptions of learners

The learner, or pupils, is the group most immediately touched by modifications or new approaches to assessment and evaluation. Their viewpoints are essential for a thorough comprehension of these techniques' efficacy. Pupils often complain about conventional means of assessment, such as standardized testing, claiming that they do not accurately represent their skills or learning preferences (Kohn, 2000). Many students believe these examinations create a "teaching to the test" atmosphere, damaging proper comprehension and critical thinking (Nichols & Berliner, 2007).

On the other hand, students often find that more contemporary assessment methods, including portfolios and game-based assessments, are more entertaining and allow them to demonstrate a broader range of abilities (Ifenthaler et al., 2007). According to students, these evaluations provide a more genuine experience because of their interactive features and instantaneous responses (Erwin & Rieppi, 1999).

However, it should be mentioned that students have different preferences for different evaluation methodologies. This depends on students' ages, cultural backgrounds, and other demographic characteristics (Brown & Harris, 2013). As a result, no one evaluation technique can meet the needs of every student, underscoring the need to use various assessment methodologies.

Recap of stakeholder perspectives

In educational settings, stakeholders, including educators, policymakers, and learners, have distinct perspectives on assessment and evaluation techniques. Educators view traditional assessments like standardized tests as essential for measuring student performance against expectations but criticize them for not capturing the full spectrum of student abilities. They prefer formative assessments, which align more closely with instructional needs and allow for immediate adjustments in teaching. However, some remain skeptical of the reliability of newer methods like portfolio assessments and game virtualization.

Policymakers influence the implementation of these assessments by standardizing methods to ensure accountability across educational systems. They increasingly favor incorporating technology and data analytics to improve assessment efficiency and affordability despite concerns about data privacy and the potential biases of automated systems. This shift towards more adaptable, learner-centric assessments reflects ongoing advocacy from educational professionals and research insights.

Learners themselves are most directly affected by these methods and often express dissatisfaction with traditional assessments that emphasize "teaching to the test," which they believe hinders understanding and critical thinking. They tend to favor more engaging and interactive methods like portfolios and game-based assessments, which better showcase their diverse skills and provide more relevant feedback. However, students' preferences can vary widely based on demographic factors, suggesting a need for a multifaceted approach to assessment that accommodates diverse learner needs. This diverse stakeholder input highlights the evolving landscape of educational

Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Derleme Makale / Review Paper

assessment, underscoring the move towards more dynamic and inclusive methods that cater to a broader range of learning styles and outcomes.

Traditional Methods of Assessment and Evaluation

Defining traditional methods of assessment

Formative, summative, and standardized evaluations make up the majority of traditional techniques of assessment and evaluation. These methods are distinguished by their emphasis on quantitative indicators, often leading to a single grade or score that sums up a student's performance (Popham, 2010a; Popham, 2010b). Standardized assessments are intended to assess pupils according to a shared set of standards and are often used for comparison across a sizable student body (Phelps, 2005). Summative assessments determine if learning goals have been completed after a unit or course (Black et al., 2004). In contrast, formative assessments are continuous evaluations that aim to provide instructors and students with quick feedback so they can make necessary instructional modifications (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Black & Wiliam, 2010).

Historical evolution and significance

The origins of traditional assessment methods in education trace back to the early stages of formal education, primarily focusing on written tests and oral exams to evaluate a student's knowledge of the subject matter (Spolsky, 2014). Over time, as schooling became more industrialized, these methods evolved into more uniform assessments, including large-scale standardized exams like the SAT and ACT, initially designed to categorize and select students for college (Lemann, 2000). These traditional methods, such as written tests and multiple-choice questionnaires, have long been integral in educational decision-making, serving as tools for institutions to assess curriculum delivery and learning objectives (Linn, 2000).

However, these conventional approaches have been criticized for promoting a narrow conception of intelligence and failing to accommodate diverse learning styles and cultural backgrounds (Gardner, 2011; Ladson-Billings, 2006). Further, research has shown limitations in these traditional methods; for instance, students in problem-based learning environments often achieve higher knowledge scores than those in traditional settings (Wang et al., 2016). This has prompted a reevaluation of assessment practices and a shift towards integrating more effective, alternative methods.

While paper-and-pencil tests remain common in higher education, there is an increasing openness to new assessment techniques influenced by technological enhancements and educational innovations (Alquraan, 2012; Saher et al., 2022). The adoption of technology-enhanced learning (TEL) methods, such as virtual cadaveric teaching spurred by the COVID-19 pandemic, has been shown to improve educational outcomes significantly over traditional methods (Nagendrababu et al., 2018; Berry et al., 2020; Le et al., 2023). Similarly, in the medical field, blending traditional and e-learning

Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Derleme Makale / Review Paper

methods has enhanced learning outcomes, as evidenced by studies in nursing education (Sheikhaboumasoudi et al., 2018).

Types of traditional assessment methods

Summative assessments

Summative assessments are evaluations conducted to ascertain if the learning goals have been accomplished after an educational session, such as a semester (Black et al., 2004). A grade or score reflecting the student's overall comprehension of the subject content is often the outcome of these exams. Summative evaluations often include final examinations, projects, and presentations.

There is conflicting empirical data about the usefulness of summative evaluations. Summative tests, on the one hand, have been shown to provide an organized and consistent method of assessing student achievement, guaranteeing responsibility within educational institutions (Linn, 2000). Summative evaluations attest to students' proficiency levels and are often used as a starting point for choices about advancement, graduation, and even admission to graduate school (Stiggins, 2002).

Summative evaluations have been criticized for their shortcomings in fully capturing the range of students' knowledge and competencies. One significant criticism is that they might increase anxiety, leading to performance below actual ability (Zeidner, 2007). Furthermore, summative evaluations are sometimes blamed for promoting "teaching to the test," in which instructors emphasize assisting students in meeting exam requirements rather than fostering a thorough comprehension of the material (Popham, 2001a; Popham, 2001b).

Formative assessments

Formative assessments are ongoing evaluations meant to assist teachers in modifying their methods and better-supporting students in achieving their learning goals. They occur throughout the learning process and serve diagnostic purposes, in contrast to summative assessments, which evaluate the learner after the conclusion of an educational session (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Black & Wiliam, 2010). They use various techniques, including discussion boards, project drafts, and quizzes.

Formative assessments have much empirical backing, typically indicating that they help promote student learning. According to seminal research by Black and Wiliam (1998), formative evaluations considerably raise student success when used appropriately. According to the study, this kind of evaluation makes students more conscious of the areas they still need to learn, providing them with specific topics to work on to grow better.

Similarly, high-quality feedback—a crucial part of formative assessments—has one of the most substantial impacts on student progress, according to Hattie and Timperley's (2007) meta-analysis. Formative assessments are successful when they provide a cohesive educational experience by aligning with learning goals and teaching approaches (Shute, 2008).

Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Derleme Makale / Review Paper

Formative evaluations can provide specific difficulties, however. These tests are labor-intensive for educators since they must be carefully designed, and interpreting the findings requires expertise and time (Bennett, 2011). Particular academics warn that formative evaluations that are not well-designed can be deceptive and may not provide the necessary educational modifications (Volante & Beckett, 2011).

Standardized testing

Standardized exams are given and graded consistently. They aim to provide a standard gauge of pupils' performance, often for cross-population and cross-school comparisons (Phelps, 2005). The SAT, ACT, and other state-administered achievement examinations are examples of standardized assessments in the United States; the LGS, TYT, AYT, and KPSS are examples of standardized assessments in Turkiye.

There is conflicting empirical data about the value of standardized testing. On the one hand, it has been discovered that standardized examinations are trustworthy instruments for evaluating students' general knowledge and abilities (Koretz, 2008). Standardized tests are often connected with other performance measures, such as grade point averages and future employment. According to a meta-analysis by Hill et al. (2008), they are reliable markers of student progress.

Standardized test effectiveness, however, has been hotly contested. Opponents contend that by encouraging "teaching to the test," these exams restrict the curriculum and impede students' ability to think critically and creatively (Au, 2007). Furthermore, research has shown that since standardized examinations disproportionately harm kids from lower socioeconomic backgrounds, they contribute to continuing educational disparities (Darling Hammond, 2007).

In addition, there has been criticism of the moral issues raised by high-stakes standardized testing, which determines student promotions, teacher ratings, and school financing (Popham, 2001a; Popham, 2001b). These methods have drawn criticism for their ability to undercut the larger objectives of education and for putting teachers and students under unnecessary stress (Nichols et al., 2006).

Advantages and limitations of traditional methods

Traditional assessment techniques have benefits and drawbacks, including standardized testing, formative evaluations, and summative assessments. Traditional methods have undergone thorough testing and are often standardized, making them more reliable and providing a more objective evaluation of student achievement (Koretz, 2008). These techniques are a practical approach to assessing pupils since they are relatively simple (Stiggins, 2002).

There are restrictions, however. Conventional approaches are often criticized for failing to represent the complexity of growth and learning adequately. Typically, they are restricted to evaluating specific knowledge categories and must gauge other crucial elements like creativity, teamwork, and critical thinking (Wiliam, 2011). Furthermore, since they often overlook pupils'

Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Derleme Makale / Review Paper

socioeconomic, cultural, and linguistic variety, conventional methods—particularly standardized tests— perpetuate educational disparities (Darling Hammond, 2007).

Criticism and controversies surrounding traditional methods

Conventional approaches to assessment and evaluation have been at the core of many discussions and disputes. The main issue is that they often encourage a fixed attitude, which causes instructors and students to place more emphasis on grades than on the process of learning (Dweck, 2006). "Teaching to the test" has also drawn much criticism since it limits the scope of education by having teachers concentrate only on material that will be evaluated (Au, 2007). High-stakes testing also raises ethical concerns as it often determines students' future academic and employment prospects, which increases stress and anxiety (Popham, 2001a; Popham, 2001b).

It has also been said that the emphasis on quantitative measurements compromises the qualitative components of education. It might result in disregarding abilities and proficiencies that are difficult to measure but essential to pupils' overall development (Wiliam, 2011). Due to these difficulties, some educators and decision-makers promote a more balanced strategy incorporating conventional and contemporary evaluation techniques (Shepard, 2000).

Recap of traditional methods

Traditional assessment and evaluation methods, such as formative, summative, and standardized tests, are foundational to educational measurement, focusing on quantitative metrics to summarize student performance. These methods range from continuous formative assessments that provide immediate feedback for instructional adjustments to summative assessments, which evaluate comprehension at the end of a learning period, and standardized tests that compare students against uniform standards. Historically, these methods have evolved from straightforward written and oral exams to complex, large-scale tests designed for broad-based evaluation.

However, traditional assessments have been critiqued for their narrow focus, often failing to capture diverse intellectual capabilities and learning styles. They are seen to emphasize rote memory and specific knowledge sets at the expense of critical thinking, creativity, and teamwork. Such limitations have spurred interest in more holistic and flexible evaluation strategies incorporating contemporary methods like digital portfolios and adaptive testing, which can provide a more comprehensive view of student skills and growth.

Standardized testing, in particular, has drawn significant criticism for promoting a "teaching to the test" culture, increasing student anxiety, and perpetuating educational inequities. These high-stakes tests are often consequential, influencing future academic and career opportunities, and have been implicated in ethical controversies regarding fairness and the validity of measuring student achievement. In response to these challenges, there is growing advocacy for integrating traditional and modern assessment techniques to support the multifaceted development of all learners better, ensuring that assessments are reliable, practical, inclusive, and indicative of a student's total

Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Derleme Makale / Review Paper

capabilities. This balanced approach seeks to mitigate traditional methods' biases and pressures while harnessing innovation's benefits in educational evaluation.

Contemporary Methods of Assessment and Evaluation

Defining contemporary methods of assessment

Modern assessment methods are varied and often include technology and cutting-edge techniques to examine various abilities and competencies. Modern techniques seek to assess higher-order thinking abilities like problem-solving, critical thinking, and teamwork, as opposed to conventional approaches, which often concentrate on cognitive skills and information memory (Gulikers et al., 2004). These approaches often include realistic assessment strategies that demand pupils' actions relevant to the actual world instead of rote memorization. They also emphasize formative assessment, which gives students continuous feedback on their performance so they improve (Black & Wiliam, 2009).

Some examples of modern approaches include portfolio assessments, game-based assessments, and reflective practices (Ifenthaler et al., 2012). These methods often use technology to provide dynamic, interactive evaluation spaces. For instance, students highlight more than only their academic accomplishments and skill set through digital portfolios (Barrett, 2007). The main characteristic of these approaches is that they give a more comprehensive approach to assessment by emphasizing both the learning process and the outcome (Shavelson, 2003).

Famous examples of contemporary methods

Game virtualization in education

The term "game virtualization" in education describes using gamified platforms and virtual reality environments to test students' knowledge and involve them in learning (Eseryel et al., 2012). Through these interactive digital platforms, learners apply their knowledge and abilities in various scenarios modeled after real-world circumstances (Gee, 2003). According to recent research, game virtualization is a reliable assessment method for gauging multiple abilities, including critical thinking, problem-solving, and teamwork (All, 2016). Furthermore, this method facilitates personalized learning pathways by giving students immediate feedback that helps them recognize their areas of strength and growth (Ifenthaler, 2012).

Reflective practices

When assessing, contemplative practices force students to reflect critically on their education—often via journaling, group discussions, and self-evaluations. This evaluation is beneficial in professional education fields like nursing and teaching, where comprehension of the motivation behind acts is essential (Schön, 1987). The idea that reflective activities improve academic performance and personal growth by encouraging self-regulated learning and metacognitive skills is supported by empirical data (Kember et al., 2008). According to Dart et al. (2000), several research

Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Derleme Makale / Review Paper

studies have shown that students who participate in reflective activities do better on conventional examinations, suggesting that these techniques help enhance overall academic achievement.

Interprofessional education assessment

Interprofessional Education Assessment (IPEA) aims to assess students' collaborative capability in professions such as health care, where cross-disciplinary collaboration is essential. IPEA looks at how effectively students from various professional paths collaborate to find solutions to challenging issues (Olenick et al., 2010). Simulation-based assessments are a well-liked approach to interprofessional education and assessment (IPEA) because they provide a safe setting where interprofessional teams exhibit their collaboration abilities (Reeves et al., 2015). According to empirical data, IPEA improves students' preparedness for collaborative practice in their future employment and assists in identifying the skill sets that each profession provides to the collective endeavor (Oandasan et al., 2004).

Portfolio assessment

Students create a portfolio of their work, which might contain projects, written assignments, and other learning proof, as part of the portfolio assessment evaluation approach. This technique makes a more comprehensive understanding of a student's academic accomplishments and talents possible (Paulson, 1991). When students choose what to put in their portfolios, they can reflect and evaluate themselves (Gadbury-Amyot et al., 2012; Prihandoko et al., 2020). Using portfolio assessment in formative and summative assessments is supported by empirical research. In particular, studies show that portfolio evaluation effectively tracks a student's growth over time and motivates them to assume more responsibility for their education (Wade & Yarbrough, 1996).

Adaptive testing

A technique for assessment known as "adaptive testing" modifies the level of questions according to the test taker's performance in real time. By customizing the evaluation for each student, this method seeks to test talents more correctly (Wainer et al., 2000). Using computer algorithms makes it possible to create test questions dynamically, improving the assessment's validity and reliability (Van der Linden & Glas, 2000). Adaptive testing is shown to be effective based on empirical data. According to research, adaptive exams are more effective and often have more measurement accuracy than regular standardized examinations (Thompson & Weiss, 2011). Additionally, research suggests that adaptive testing might lessen test anxiety by exposing test-takers to items more appropriate for their level of proficiency, which makes the testing process more enjoyable (Wang & Kolen, 2001). One drawback, however, is the need for high-tech resources, which might be problematic for schools with little access to cutting-edge computer systems (Rezaie, 2015).

Advantages and limitations of contemporary methods

There are many benefits to using modern assessment techniques over more conventional ones, such as portfolio evaluation, game virtualization, and adaptive testing. The ability for these approaches to be customized and personalized to provide a more accurate depiction of a learner's skills and

Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Derleme Makale / Review Paper

abilities is one of their most essential advantages (Shute & Ke, 2012; Van der Linden & Glas, 2000). Many of these techniques promote student participation and active learning, making education more dynamic and less rote memorization-focused (Ifenthaler et al., 2007).

These modern approaches, meanwhile, have their drawbacks. The most urgent is the technical one; sophisticated computer systems and software are necessary to implement these techniques successfully (Rezaie, 2015). Educators must also be adequately trained to utilize these new technologies successfully (Gikandi et al., 2011). Since some of these novel techniques differ significantly from conventional evaluation criteria, concerns have been raised about their validity and reliability (Bennett, 2015).

Criticism and controversies surrounding contemporary methods

There are debates and complaints about the use of modern evaluation techniques. The high expense of the technology infrastructure needed to implement these strategies is one primary source of worry (Pellegrino et al., 2001). Additionally, equity is criticized since pupils need equal access to cutting-edge technology, exacerbating educational disparities (Warschauer & Matuchniak, 2010).

The applicability of these techniques in accurately evaluating educational achievements is also a topic of discussion. Although they could be entertaining, others contend that practices such as game virtualization put user involvement ahead of proper evaluation (Ifenthaler et al., 2012). The continuous discussion around these novel approaches is also influenced by ethical issues like algorithmic bias and data privacy (Williamson, 2016).

Recap of contemporary methods

Contemporary assessment and evaluation methods utilize technology and innovative techniques to measure a broad spectrum of skills, including critical thinking, problem-solving, and teamwork, moving beyond the traditional focus on rote memorization. These methods range from portfolio and game-based assessments to adaptive testing, all offering more dynamic, interactive, and realistic evaluation scenarios. For example, portfolios comprehensively view a student's abilities by including various works. At the same time, adaptive testing adjusts the difficulty of questions based on the student's previous answers, improving measurement accuracy and reducing test anxiety.

Modern assessment strategies include reflective practices and interprofessional education assessments (IPEA), particularly effective in fields requiring teamwork and critical reflection, such as healthcare. These practices encourage students to reflect on their learning processes critically and demonstrate their collaborative skills in simulated environments. However, despite their benefits, these contemporary methods require significant technological resources and can raise issues of equity and access, particularly if students do not have equal access to necessary technologies.

The shift towards these innovative assessment methods also involves challenges in reliability and validity, with criticisms focusing on the potential for these methods to prioritize engagement over accurate evaluation. Moreover, ethical concerns such as data privacy and algorithmic bias further

Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Derleme Makale / Review Paper

complicate the adoption of technologically driven assessments. Despite these challenges, the evolving landscape of education increasingly favors approaches that assess traditional academic achievements and equip students with the skills necessary for modern collaborative and dynamic environments. These methods strive to make education more personalized and reflective of individual student needs, enhancing learning outcomes and the educational experience.

Results

Comparative analysis of traditional and contemporary methods

Criteria for comparison

A clear set of criteria is necessary to compare modern and conventional assessment and evaluation techniques efficiently. The research uses the following standards in its comparative analysis, as shown in Table 1. The criteria for comparison are explained, and associated resources are provided.

Table 1.
The criteria for comparing traditional and modern assessment and evaluation techniques.

Criteria for comparison	**Explanation**	**Resource**
Effectiveness in measuring learning outcomes	This measure assesses each method's fairness and correctness in measuring learning goals.	(Wiliam, 2011)
Feasibility and scalability	The usefulness of assessment techniques in many educational contexts and their scalability are evaluated.	(Joint Information Systems Committee, 2007)
Inclusiveness	This aspect looks into the capacity to adapt to various learning requirements and styles, lowering evaluation bias.	(Abaya, 2009).
Technological ıntegration	This criterion examines how well every approach works with instructional technology.	(Means et al., 2013)
Stakeholder acceptance	The purpose of considering this facet is to understand the opinions of instructors, decision-makers, and students on the legitimacy and acceptability of the techniques.	(Fautley & Savage, 2008)

Similarities between traditional and contemporary approaches

After a cursory examination, classic and modern evaluation techniques are sometimes seen as different or antagonistic. However, Table 2 shows they have a few characteristics in common. The similarities between traditional and modern assessment and evaluation techniques are presented in this table.

Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Derleme Makale / Review Paper

Table 2.
Similarities between traditional and modern assessment and evaluation techniques.

Criteria for comparison	**Explanation**	**Source**
Purpose of assessment	Though they employ distinct methods and styles, both strategies seek to quantify learning outcomes.	(Chappuis et al., 2012)
Quality assurance	Processes intended to preserve and enhance the quality of both approaches apply to both.	(Black & Wiliam, 1998; Black & Wiliam, 2010)
Stakeholder ınvolvement	Educators, students, and legislators all have a role in executing and interpreting conventional and modern assessments.	(Harlen & Deakin Crick, 2003)
Ethical considerations	Ethical norms that control things like justice, fairness, and data privacy surround both.	(Joint Council for Qualifications, 2023)
Ongoing evolution	Conventional and modern techniques continually evolve in response to pedagogical research, technology breakthroughs, and educational demands.	(Russell et al., 2009)

Differences and divergences

While conventional and modern approaches to assessment and evaluation share some similarities, key differences significantly influence student performance. These two diverge at the following points, as shown in Tables 3a and 3b. Both tables present the divergences between traditional and modern assessment and evaluation techniques.

Table 3a.
Differences between traditional and modern assessment and evaluation techniques.

Criteria for comparison	**Explanation**	**Source**
Methodology	Conventional evaluation techniques mostly use summative procedures, such as examinations and standardized tests, administered after a unit or course.	(Popham, 2010a; Popham, 2010b)
	On the other hand, modern approaches use formative strategies and provide students with ongoing feedback.	(Wiliam, 2011)
Flexibility	Conventional approaches are usually inflexible, possess set characteristics, and provide little flexibility to cater to particular educational requirements.	(Airasian, 2001)
	Modern teaching techniques provide more adaptability and flexibility	(Darling Hammond et al., 1995)
Technological integration	Modern approaches are often digital and allow smooth integration with various educational tools.	(Means et al., 2013)
	Conventional methods have typically been sluggish to accept new technologies.	
Scalability	Because they are standardized, traditional techniques are often more straightforward to implement on a big scale.	(Airasian, 2001)
	Modern techniques, although efficient, might require many additional resources and be challenging to use broadly.	(Ismail et al., 2021)

Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Derleme Makale / Review Paper

Stakeholder perception	Modern approaches are considered inventive but often devoid of empirical validation.	(Fautley & Savage, 2008; Harlen & Deakin Crick, 2003)
	Traditional methods are frequently recognized as tried-and-true but outdated.	
Accessibility and inclusivity	Modern approaches are more inclusive and offer learners opportunities to showcase their abilities and expertise.	(Gulikers et al., 2004)
	Traditional methods disfavor students who do poorly on tests	(Abaya, 2009)
Authenticity	Conventional evaluations concentrate on abstract academic information.	(Wiggins, 1998; Gulikers et al., 2004)
	Contemporary techniques aim to test learners in actual, real-world situations.	

Table 3b.
Differences between traditional and modern assessment and evaluation techniques.

Criteria for comparison	**Explanation**	**Source**
Role of technology	Technology is mainly restricted to computerizing multiple-choice examinations and standardized assessments in conventional assessment techniques.	(Chapman & King, 2005)
	Modern approaches use technology more heavily, including digital portfolios, virtual reality simulations, and sophisticated teaching tools.	(Means et al., 2013)
	Modern techniques use technology to provide instant feedback, interactive engagement, and a more exciting learning environment.	(Koedinger et al., 2016)
Student-centered learning focus	Conventional assessment techniques are sometimes criticized for emphasizing the instructor, in which the teacher imparts knowledge that is assessed via standardized examinations.	(Schwartz & Arena, 2013)
	Modern approaches seek to be more student-centered by allowing students to participate in interactive exercises, peer and self-assessments, and evaluations.	(Hattie & Timperley, 2007)
	This change of emphasis to the learner promotes motivation, self-control, and a deeper comprehension of the subject matter.	(Deci et al., 1991)
Emphasis on real-world applications	Conventional evaluation techniques sometimes ignore practical applications in favor of theoretical or rote memorizing abilities.	(Wiggins, 1998)
	Modern approaches prioritize real-world applications using project-based learning, realistic assessments, and problem-solving activities that mimic real-world scenarios.	(Emelyanova et al., 2019)
Diversity of assessment strategies	Conventional approaches usually depend on various evaluation forms, including examinations and summative assessments that provide readily measurable data.	(Popham, 2010a; Popham, 2010b)
	Formative assessments, digital portfolios, oral presentations, and group projects are a few of the evaluation methodologies available in modern approaches that provide a more thorough and nuanced examination of a student's skills.	(Ismail et al., 2021)

Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Derleme Makale / Review Paper

Cross-case analysis highlighting specific scenarios or cases

Cross-case studies provide light on the efficacy and suitability of various approaches in many contexts, contributing to a more profound knowledge of assessment and evaluation. Standardized testing, for example, has shown promise in extensive system-level checks, but it needs to be better adapted for formative feedback in the classroom (Popham, 2010a; Popham, 2010b). On the other hand, while portfolio evaluations have been praised for representing the richness of student learning, their administration can be laborious and time-consuming (Lam, 2015).

Simulation-based assessments successfully assess complicated clinical skills in a specialized learning context, such as medical education, when standard techniques fall short (Cook et al., 2011). Furthermore, due to its accuracy and efficiency, adaptive testing is becoming increasingly popular in professional certification contexts (Wainer et al., 2000). These examples show that there is no best approach for all situations; instead, the suitability of a technique relies on the assessment's goals and environment.

Implications for educational policy

The distinctions between modern and traditional approaches significantly impact educational policy. A one-size-fits-all approach would miss opportunities to improve and balance the advantages and disadvantages of different evaluation techniques as educational environments change (Schwartz & Arena, 2013). To suit various learning contexts, curriculum goals, and student requirements, policymakers should take a varied approach to assessment and evaluation (Means et al., 2013). In addition, policies need to support ongoing research and professional development to provide teachers with the tools they need to conduct efficient assessments (Darling Hammond et al., 2010).

Challenges and considerations in assessment and evaluation

Obstacles in traditional methods

- ***Lack of individualized feedback:*** Conventional evaluation techniques, including standardized testing, often need more detail to provide personalized feedback that might promote student development (Phelps, 2005). For example, standardized examinations are less effective at pinpointing the precise areas a particular student needs to develop since they are intended to assess against a consistent set of criteria (Popham, 2010a; Popham, 2010b). Instructors cannot customize education to meet the requirements of each student because they often get aggregate scores rather than insights into unique learning paths (Chappuis & Stiggins, 2002).
- ***Limited focus on learner growth:*** Another issue is the narrow emphasis that conventional evaluation techniques place on learners' long-term improvement. These approaches are summative, assessing the student's knowledge at a given moment rather than their development (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Black & Wiliam, 2010). Because of this, they do not provide a whole picture of a student's educational path and do not influence current teaching methods (Stiggins, 2005). These restrictions are especially harmful during the early years, when

Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Derleme Makale / Review Paper

monitoring development and offering prompt interventions are essential (Hattie & Timperley, 2007).

Obstacles in contemporary methods

- ***Technology integration issues:*** Modern evaluation techniques, especially digital platforms, present unique difficulties. Incorporating technology into current educational infrastructures is among the most critical challenges. The smooth incorporation of electronic resources into educational environments is not always guaranteed, even when readily accessible (Bebell et al., 2004). For instance, there are issues with cybersecurity, lack of technical support, and software incompatibilities when using adaptive testing platforms or game virtualization (Clarke-Midura & Dede, 2010). As a result, sometimes, the technology is meant to improve the assessment experience, but it works against it (Puentedura, 2010).
- ***Training and resource constraints:*** The necessity for specific training and resources is another barrier to adopting modern approaches. Instructors must be experts in their subject area and technology or assessment techniques (Ertmer, 2005). The efficacy of these contemporary evaluation techniques might be jeopardized without sufficient training (Rienties et al., 2013). Moreover, not all educational environments have the funding to purchase new equipment or training courses, which might increase the gap between rich and poor students (Warschauer, 2007).
- ***Best practices for practical assessment and evaluation:*** Selecting the appropriate instruments and using them to support learning objectives is just half what makes assessment and evaluation in education practical. According to recent research, best practices are crucial for a more relevant review process (McMillan, 2014). Table 4 shows several examples of best practices where best practices are explained, and associated resources consulted are provided.

Table 4.
Examples of best practices for practical assessment and evaluation.

Best practice	Explanation	Resource(s)
Authentic assessments	In recent years, authentic assessments have been a potent method for assessing various abilities and competencies.	(Wiggins, 1998)
	Authentic assessments are designed to test skills and competencies that closely resemble the difficulties of activities in the actual world.	(Gulikers et al., 2004)
Formative feedback	For students to improve, they must get timely, formative feedback. This practice teaches students about their skills and limitations, giving them time to improve.	(Hattie & Timperley, 2007)
Diverse methods and tools	Instructors use several assessment instruments to capture a range of student skills and learning styles. These might include more contemporary methods like portfolio evaluation, game virtualization, and conventional exams.	(Brookhart, 2010)

Global perspectives on challenges and considerations

Global perspectives on challenges and considerations vary, as depicted in Table 5. Perspectives are clearly explained, and associated resources are provided.

Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Derleme Makale / Review Paper

Table 5.
Examples of best practices for practical assessment and evaluation.

Perspective	Explanation	Resource(s)
Educational policies vary	International viewpoints on appraisal and assessment are as varied as the nations they come from. For example, unlike the US, Finland's educational system prioritizes formative evaluations over summative examinations.	(Sahlberg, 2021)
Cultural sensitivities	Assessment methods must consider the cultural setting in which they are used. Due to language or cultural quirks, an evaluation method that works well in one culture may not transfer well to another.	(Duarte & Rossier, 2008; Tanaka-Matsumi, 2022)
Resource constraint	Globally speaking, the available resources significantly influence the selection and efficacy of evaluation techniques. Schools in less developed nations lack the resources—such as technology or qualified teachers—needed to use modern evaluation techniques.	(Mundy et al., 2016)

Ethical considerations and responsibilities

Evaluating traditional and modern assessment and evaluation methods involves critical ethical considerations and responsibilities. These are presented in Table 6 below. Considerations are clearly explained, and associated resources are provided.

Table 6. Examples of best practices for practical assessment and evaluation.

Consideration	Explanation	Resource(s)
Importance of ethical practices	Ethical concerns are crucial to guarantee that the educational assessment and evaluation process is just, equal, and legitimate. The reliability of educational assessments and the judgments made after that might be jeopardized without ethical concerns.	(AERA, APA & NCME, 2014)
Informed consent	One of your first ethical obligations is obtaining participants' informed permission, especially if the evaluation involves sensitive or private information. This involves ensuring that the participants know the assessment's goal and the intended use of the data.	Dillman et al., 2014)
Confidentiality and anonymity	Preserving the participants' identity and privacy is crucial to maintaining the study's integrity. This guarantees that the information gathered is authentic and that any possible negative consequences do not sway the participants.	(Sieber & Tolich, 2012)
Fairness and equitability	Another ethical concern is ensuring the tests are fair to all pupils and devoid of prejudice. This entails providing reasonable accommodations for kids with special needs and using culturally sensitive evaluation techniques.	(Kunnan, 2004)
Data ıntegrity and reporting	Researchers must maintain the highest levels of data integrity. This entails being open about the study's methods and results and refraining from altering data to support preconceived notions.	(Onwuegbuzie & Daniel, 1999)
Ethical dilemmas in technology-aided assessments	New ethical issues arise in the digital age, such as gathering and using big data in educational environments. Researchers and educators must be watchful in their duties toward just and ethical practices in light of these emerging moral quandaries.	(Slade & Prinsloo, 2013)

Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Derleme Makale / Review Paper

Recap of results

The research establishes criteria for comparing traditional and modern assessment methods based on effectiveness, feasibility, inclusiveness, technological integration, and stakeholder acceptance. Both methods measure learning outcomes and ensure quality assurance through stakeholder involvement and ethical standards while continuously adapting to educational advancements. However, traditional methods primarily utilize summative techniques like exams and standardized tests, focusing on quantitative metrics and often failing to accommodate diverse learner needs, promoting a rigid, "teaching to the test" environment.

In contrast, modern methods embrace formative assessments with continuous feedback, prioritizing flexibility, technological integration, and real-world applications, thus offering a more inclusive and adaptive educational approach. These contemporary methods, which include portfolios and adaptive testing, are designed to engage students more interactively and personally, addressing individual strengths and areas for improvement. While traditional assessments are straightforward and widely accepted due to their long-standing use, modern approaches provide a richer, more nuanced understanding of student abilities. However, they require significant resources and technology, which may limit their scalability.

The comparative analysis indicates that no single method suffices in all contexts; the choice depends on specific educational goals, resources, and the intended impact on student learning. Policymakers are urged to consider a balanced approach that integrates the reliability of traditional methods with the innovativeness of modern techniques to effectively cater to diverse educational needs. This integration challenges educational policies to support continual research and development, ensuring assessments are comprehensive, equitable, practical, and relevant to various learning environments.

Conclusion, Discussion, and Recommendations

Summary of traditional and contemporary assessment methods

There are many different approaches used in the field of educational assessment and evaluation, including both conventional and modern techniques. Standardized testing and summative evaluations are established methods for assessing student achievement (Popham, 2010a; Popham, 2010b). However, as they adjust to new educational philosophies and technological breakthroughs, modern techniques like game virtualization, adaptive testing, and portfolio evaluations are gaining popularity (Shute & Rahimi, 2017).

Significance of choice in assessment and evaluation methods

Selecting old and modern approaches significantly affects educational achievements and is not just a question of personal taste. Conventional methods are often criticized for their limited scope and inability to accommodate different learning preferences (Wiliam, 2011). On the other hand, while they have their own set of difficulties, including resource limitations and problems with technology

Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Derleme Makale / Review Paper

integration, modern approaches seek to provide a more customized and dynamic learning environment (Ifenthaler & Widanapathirana, 2014).

A method's selection should consider the demands of the students, the educational environment, and the available resources. Educators and legislators must consider each approach's benefits and drawbacks to developing a morally and practically sound assessment and evaluation plan (Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 2010).

Future research opportunities

There are many exciting possibilities for future study because of how rapidly education and technology are developing. The long-term effects of modern evaluation techniques on student performance and engagement are a critical topic of concern (Shute & Rahimi, 2017). Although several research studies have started to investigate the immediate consequences, there are few long-term investigations. Furthermore, we have just begun to scratch the surface in terms of our understanding of how cultural circumstances influence the efficacy of various assessment and evaluation techniques (Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 2010). Future studies benefit from examining how these techniques might be altered or adjusted to match other cultural contexts. Finally, additional empirical data are required to assess the ethical issues associated with conventional and modern approaches (Ifenthaler & Widanapathirana, 2014).

Theoretical contributions to the field

This study compares old and modern methodologies, contributing to the expanding body of knowledge in educational assessment and evaluation. The creation of criteria for assessing these strategies' efficiency is a noteworthy theoretical addition that addresses a deficiency in the current body of research (Wiliam, 2011). Additionally, the study enhances already-existing educational ideas by critically analyzing the function of technology and learner-centered approaches in contemporary assessment methodologies. Additionally, the study offers a more comprehensive picture of the assessment environment by integrating social and cultural factors into a conversation that is often technically focused by concentrating on stakeholder viewpoints (Popham, 2010a; Popham, 2010b).

Practical implications for stakeholders

The conclusions of this research broadly impact various stakeholders, including parents, students, legislators, and educators. To help educators make better-informed judgments about curriculum design and assessment technique, comparative analysis offers a comprehensive knowledge of the trade-offs between conventional and current methodologies (Wiliam, 2011). This study serves as a basis for policymakers to assess current educational policies' effectiveness and create more focused and efficient frameworks (Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 2010). The study provides parents and students with information on the evaluation techniques most likely to provide a supportive learning environment. It is possible to improve educational results by assisting stakeholders in making better choices and understanding these ramifications (Shute & Rahimi, 2017).

Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Derleme Makale / Review Paper

Final summary

In conclusion, this research study has thoroughly reviewed conventional and modern educational assessment and evaluation approaches. It has investigated their historical development, examined their benefits and drawbacks, and examined essential stakeholders' points of view. Additionally, by providing critical insights into the following studies, the creation of policies, and educational practice, the study advances our theoretical and practical knowledge of educational evaluation (Popham, 2010a; Popham, 2010b).

The results show that while conventional approaches are more accessible to administer and provide uniformity, they often cannot effectively meet the needs of students with different learning styles. On the other hand, although contemporary approaches such as portfolio evaluations are flexible, they encounter obstacles with technology needs and stakeholder buy-in. The study's conclusion makes a case for a balanced strategy combining modern and old methodologies to provide a more thorough and successful assessment strategy for educational settings.

In addition to providing a present picture of educational evaluation, the comparative study also acts as a roadmap for future advancements. Continuous research and analysis are necessary to sustain fair and effective assessment and evaluation procedures in light of the fast changes in educational technology and pedagogical practices (Ifenthaler & Widanapathirana, 2014). As a result, the study's importance and timeliness transcend beyond its immediate conclusions and provide a framework for further research into one of the most essential facets of educational theory and practice.

Concluding remarks

The study presents a comparative analysis of traditional and contemporary educational assessment and evaluation methods. It establishes criteria such as effectiveness, feasibility, inclusiveness, technological integration, and stakeholder acceptance to assess their merits and limitations. Traditional methods like standardized and summative assessments are noted for their simplicity and wide acceptance, providing consistent metrics for measuring student achievement. However, they often fail to accommodate diverse learning styles and do not foster critical skills such as creativity and teamwork, which contemporary methods aim to address.

Modern techniques, such as adaptive testing, game virtualization, and portfolio evaluations, are increasingly favored for their dynamic and flexible nature, allowing for a more personalized assessment of students' abilities and ongoing feedback. These methods are designed to integrate seamlessly with innovative technologies and cater to various learning scenarios, making learning more engaging and comprehensive. Despite their potential, modern methods face challenges like higher resource demands, technological integration complexities, and variable stakeholder confidence.

The synthesis of findings advocates for a balanced approach that combines the reliability of traditional methods with the adaptiveness of modern techniques to better meet educational demands in varied learning environments. Future research is encouraged to explore these methods' long-term effects, cultural adaptability, and ethical considerations to refine assessment practices further.

Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Derleme Makale / Review Paper

Practice recommendations emphasize diversifying assessment strategies, including traditional and modern methods tailored to diverse learner needs. It also calls for enhanced professional development for educators, policy revisions to support innovative and fair assessment practices, active stakeholder engagement in the assessment process, and regular reviews to ensure the relevance and effectiveness of assessment methods. This comprehensive approach aims to equip stakeholders with the knowledge and tools to optimize educational outcomes through informed and thoughtful evaluation practices.

Recommendations for future practice

This research makes many suggestions for future practice based on its thorough analysis of classic and modern approaches to assessment and evaluation in education. Table 7 depicts these suggestions. Recommendations are clearly explained, and associated resources are provided.

Table 7.
Several recommendations for future practice regarding classical and modern assessment and evaluation methods.

Recommendation	Explanation	Resource(s)
Diversification of assessment methods	Educators should consider combining classic and modern evaluation techniques to accommodate their students' learning styles and demands.	(Popham, 2010a; Popham, 2010b)
	To guarantee the best possible learning results, the proportion of formative and summative evaluations should be routinely reevaluated.	(Wiliam, 2011)
Professional development	Academic institutions must provide resources for educators' ongoing professional growth, focusing on proficiently utilizing modern evaluation instruments and methodologies.	(Shute & Rahimi, 2017)
Policy revisions	Policymakers should strive to create rules supporting various assessment and evaluation techniques, allowing for creative approaches without sacrificing validity and reliability.	(Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 2010)
Stakeholder engagement	Given their critical role in the evaluation process, active measures should involve educators, parents, and students in discussion and decision-making.	(Popham, 2010a; Popham, 2010b)
Ethical conduct	Since technology and data analytics are often employed in modern approaches, designing and following moral principles is essential to ensure student data is handled fairly and ethically.	(Ifenthaler & Widanapathirana, 2014)
Regular reviews	Periodic evaluations should be carried out to guarantee that assessment techniques stay applicable and efficient. These reviews should consider input from all relevant parties and make any required modifications.	(Wiliam, 2011)

Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Derleme Makale / Review Paper

References

Abaya, J. (2009). Inclusive assessment and accountability: A guide to accommodations for students with diverse needs. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *47*(5), 680–684. https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230910981152

AERA, APA & NCME. (2014). *Standards for educational and psychological testing.* New York: American Educational Research Association.

Airasian, P. W. (2001). *Classroom assessment: Concepts and applications*. McGraw-Hill.

All, A. (2016). Assessing the effectiveness of digital game-based learning: Best practices. Castellar, E.P.N., and Van Looy. *Journal of Computers in Education*, *92*, 90–103.

Alquraan, M. (2012). Methods of assessing students' learning in higher education. Education Business and Society Contemporary Middle Eastern Issues, 5(2), 124–133. https://doi.org/10.1108/17537981211251160

Au, W. (2007). High-Stakes Testing and Curricular Control: A Qualitative Meta-Synthesis. *Educational Researcher*, *36*(5), 258–267. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X07306523

Barrett, H. C. (2007). Researching electronic portfolios and learner engagement: The REFLECT initiative. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, *50*(6), 436–449. https://doi.org/10.1598/JAAL.50.6.2

Bebell, D., Russell, M., & O'Dwyer, L. (2004). Measuring teachers' technology uses: Why multiple-measures are more revealing. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, *37*(1), 45–63. https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2004.10782425

Bennett, R. E. (2011). Formative assessment: A critical review. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy and Practice*, *18*(1), 5–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2010.513678

Bennett, R. E. (2015). The changing nature of educational assessment. *Review of Research in Education*, *39*(1), 370–407. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X14554179

Berk, R. A. (2013). Top five flashpoints in the assessment of teaching effectiveness. *Medical Teacher*, *35*(1), 15–26. https://doi.org/10.3109/0142159X.2012.732247

Berry, M., Mello-Neto, J., Souza, M., Figueredo, C., Reher, V., & Evans, J. (2020). Effectiveness of technology-enhanced learning to improve periodontics educational outcomes: a systematic review. Journal of Dental Education, 84(7), 830-839. https://doi.org/10.1002/jdd.12179

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy and 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*(1), 5–31. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-008-9068-5

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2010). Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *92*(1), 81–90. https://doi.org/10.1177/003172171009200119

Black, P., Daugherty, R., Ecclestone, K., Gardner, J., Harlen, W., James, M., Sebba, J. C., & Stobart, G. (2004). A systematic review of the evidence of the impact on students, teachers, and the curriculum of the process of using assessment by teachers for summative purposes. EPPI-Centre. University of London.

Brookhart, S. M. (2010). How to assess higher-order thinking skills in your classroom. *ASCD*.

Brookhart, S. M. (2011). Educational assessment knowledge and skills for teachers. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, *30*(1), 3–12. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-3992.2010.00195.x

Brown, G. T. L., & Harris, L. R. (2013). Student self-assessment. In J. H. McMillan (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of research on classroom assessment* (pp. 367–393). https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452218649.n21

Bryk, A. S., Sebring, P. B., Allensworth, E., Luppescu, S., & Easton, J. Q. (2010). Organizing schools for improvement: Lessons from Chicago. University of Chicago Press.

Chapman, C., & King, R. (2005). *Differentiated assessment strategies: One tool doesn't fit all*. Corwin Press.

Chappuis, J., Stiggins, R. J., Chappuis, S., & Arter, J. (2012). *Classroom assessment for student learning: Doing it right-using it well* (p. 432). Pearson.

Chappuis, S., & Stiggins, R. J. (2002). Classroom assessment for learning. *Educational Leadership*, *60*(1), 40–44.

Meylani, R. (2024). A comparative analysis of traditional and modern approaches to assessment and evaluation in education. *Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, 15*(1), 520-555.
DOI. 10.51460/baebd.1386737

Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Derleme Makale / Review Paper

Clarke-Midura, J., & Dede, C. (2010). Assessment, technology, and change. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, *42*(3), 309–328. https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2010.10782553

Cook, D. A., Hatala, R., Brydges, R., Zendejas, B., Szostek, J. H., Wang, A. T., Erwin, P. J., & Hamstra, S. J. (2011). Technology-enhanced simulation for health professions education: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA*, *306*(9), 978–988. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2011.1234

Daniel, S. J. (2020). Education and the COVID-19 pandemic. *Prospects*, *49*(1–2), 91–96. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-020-09464-3

Danielson, C. (2013). The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument. Princeton, NJ: The Danielson Group.

Darling Hammond, L. (2007). Race, inequality and educational accountability: The irony of "No Child Left Behind". *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *10*(3), 245–260. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613320701503207

Darling Hammond, L., Adamson, F., & Abedi, J. (2010). *Beyond basic skills: The role of performance assessment in achieving 21st-century standards of learning* (p. 52). Stanford Center for Opportunity Pollcy in Education.

Darling Hammond, L., Ancess, J., & Falk, B. (1995). *Authentic assessment in action: Studies of schools and students at work*. Teacher's College Press.

Dart, B. C., Burnett, P. C., Purdie, N., Boulton-Lewis, G., Campbell, J., & Smith, D. (2000). Students' conceptions of learning, the classroom environment, and approaches to learning. *Journal of Educational Research*, *93*(4), 262–270. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220670009598715

Deci, E. L., Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., & Ryan, R. M. (1991). Motivation and education: The self-determination perspective. *Educational Psychologist*, *26*(3–4), 325–346. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.1991.9653137

Dhawan, S. (2020). Online learning: A panacea in the time of COVID-19 crisis. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, *49*(1), 5–22. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047239520934018

Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2014). *Internet, phone, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method*. John Wiley & Sons.

Duarte, M. E., & Rossier, J. (2008). Testing and assessment in an international context: Cross- and multi-cultural issues. In J. A. Athanasou & R. Van Esbroeck (Eds.), *International handbook of career guidance*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-6230-8_24

Dweck, C. S. (2006). *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. Random House.

Elwood, J., & Klenowski, V. (2002). Creating communities of shared practice: The challenges of assessment use in learning and teaching. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, *27*(3), 243–256. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930220138606

Emelyanova, I. N., Teplyakova, O. A., & Efimova, G. Z. (2019). Modern evaluation methods at various levels of education. *Education and Science Journal*, *21*(6), 9–28. https://doi.org/10.17853/1994-5639-2019-6-9-28

Ertmer, P. A. (2005). Teacher pedagogical beliefs: The final frontier in our quest for technology integration? *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *53*(4), 25–39. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02504683

Erwin, T. D., & Rieppi, R. (1999). Comparing multimedia and traditional approaches in undergraduate psychology classes. *Teaching of Psychology*, *26*(1), 58–61. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15328023top2601_18

Eseryel, D., Guo, Y., & Law, V. (2012). Interactivity 3 design and assessment framework for educational games to promote motivation and complex problem-solving skills. *Assessment in game-based learning: Foundations, innovations, and perspectives*, 257–285.

Fautley, M., & Savage, J. (2008). Assessment for learning and teaching in secondary schools. *Learning matters*.

Felder, R. M., & Brent, R. (2005). Understanding student differences. *Journal of Engineering Education*, *94*(1), 57–72. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2005.tb00829.x

Fuhrman, S. H. (1999). *The new accountability*. Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

Gadbury-Amyot, C. C., McCracken, M. S., Woldt, J. L., & Brennan, R. W. (2012). Implementation of portfolio assessment of student competence in two dental school populations. *Journal of Dental Education*, *76*(12), 1559–1571. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.0022-0337.2012.76.12.tb05419.x

Gardner, H. E. (2011). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. Basic Books.

Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Derleme Makale / Review Paper

Gee, J. P. (2003). What video games have to teach us about learning and literacy. *Computers in Entertainment*, *1*(1), 20–20. https://doi.org/10.1145/950566.950595

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., Wilson, M., & Care, E. (Eds.). (2018). *Assessment and teaching of 21st century skills: Research and applications*. Springer International Publishing.

Gulikers, J. T. M., Bastiaens, T. J., & Kirschner, P. A. (2004). A five-dimensional framework for authentic assessment. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *52*(3), 67–86. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02504676

Guskey, T. R., & Jung, L. A. (2016). Practical solutions for severe problems in standards-based grading. Corwin Press.

Hargreaves, A. (2003). *Teaching in the knowledge society: Education in the age of insecurity*. Teacher's College Press.

Harlen, W., & Deakin Crick, R. (2003). Testing and motivation for learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy and Practice*, *10*(2), 169–207. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594032000121270

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

Hill, C. J., Bloom, H. S., Black, A. R., & Lipsey, M. W. (2008). Empirical benchmarks for interpreting effect sizes in research. *Child Development Perspectives*, *2*(3), 172–177. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1750-8606.2008.00061.x

Hodges, C. B., Moore, S., Lockee, B. B., Trust, T., & Bond, M. A. (2020). *The difference between emergency remote teaching and online learning*.

Ifenthaler, D. (2012). Determining the effectiveness of prompts for self-regulated learning in problem-solving scenarios. *Journal of Educational Technology and Society*, *15*(1), 38–52.

Ifenthaler, D., & Widanapathirana, C. (2014). Development and validation of a learning analytics framework: Two case studies using support vector machines. *Technology, Knowledge and Learning*, *19*(1–2), 221–240. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10758-014-9226-4

Ifenthaler, D., Eseryel, D., & Ge, X. (2012). Assessment for game-based learning. In *Assessment in game-based learning: Foundations, innovations, and perspectives* (pp. 1–8). Springer.

Ifenthaler, D., Eseryel, D., & Ge, X. (2012). *Assessment in game-based learning*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-3546-4

Ifenthaler, D., Pirnay-Dummer, P., & Seel, N. M. (2007). The role of cognitive learning strategies and intellectual abilities in mental model building processes. *Technology, Instruction, Cognition & Learning*, *5*(4).

Ismail, A., Rakovshik, S., & Abdelrahim, S. (2021). A randomised controlled study of face-to-face versus internet-based teaching of cbt skills for healthcare professionals in sudan. *BJPsych International*, *18*(2), E7. https://doi.org/10.1192/bji.2020.60

Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (JCSEE). (2010). *The program evaluation standards: A guide for evaluators and evaluation users*. SAGE Publications.

Joint Council for Qualifications (JCQ). (2023). *Instructions for conducting examinations*.

Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC). (2007). *Effective practice with e-assessment*. Joint Information Systems Committee.

Kellaghan, T., & Stufflebeam, D. L. (Eds.). (2012). *International handbook of educational evaluation: Part One: Perspectives/part two: Practice, 9*. Springer Science+Business Media.

Kember, D., McKay, J., Sinclair, K., & Wong, F. K. Y. (2008). A four-category scheme for coding and assessing the level of reflection in written work. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, *33*(4), 369–379. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930701293355

Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Derleme Makale / Review Paper

Killam, L. and Camargo-Plazas, P. (2021). Revisioning assessment and evaluation in nursing education through critical caring pedagogy. Advances in Nursing Science, 45(1), E15-E30. https://doi.org/10.1097/ans.0000000000000382

Kingston, N., & Nash, B. (2011). Formative assessment: A meta-analysis and a call for research. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, *30*(4), 28–37. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-3992.2011.00220.x

Koedinger, K. R., McLaughlin, E. A., Jia, J. Z., & Bier, N. L. (2016, April). Is the doer effect a causal relationship? How can we tell and why it's important. In *Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Learning Analytics and Knowledge* (pp. 388–397).

Kohn, A. (2000). *The case against standardized testing: Raising the scores, ruining the schools* (pp. 1–25). Heinemann.

Koretz, D. M. (2008). *Measuring up: What educational testing really tells us*. Harvard University Press.

Kunnan, A. J. (2004). Test fairness. *European Language Testing in a Global Context*, *18*, 27–48.

Kyaw, B., Posadzki, P., Dunleavy, G., Semwal, M., Divakar, U., Hervatis, V., … & Car, L. (2019). Offline digital education for medical students: systematic review and meta-analysis by the digital health education collaboration. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 21(3), e13165. https://doi.org/10.2196/13165

Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). From the Achievement Gap to the Education Debt: Understanding Achievement in US Schools. *Educational Researcher*, *35*(7), 3–12. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X035007003

Lam, R. (2015). Language assessment training in Hong Kong: Implications for language assessment literacy. *Language Testing*, *32*(2), 169–197. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532214554321

Le, A., Satkunam, L., & Yu, J. (2023). Residents' perceptions of a novel virtual livestream cadaveric teaching series for musculoskeletal anatomy education. American Journal of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, 102(12), e165-e168. https://doi.org/10.1097/phm.0000000000002284

Lemann, N. (2000). *The big test: The secret history of the American meritocracy*. Macmillan.

Levin, J. A., & Datnow, A. (2012). The principal role in data-driven decision making: Using case-study data to develop multi-mediator models of educational reform. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, *23*(2), 179–201. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2011.599394

Linn, R. L. (2000). Assessments and accountability. *Educational Researcher*, *29*(2), 4–16. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X029002004

Marzano, R. J., & Toth, M. D. (2013). Teacher evaluation that makes a difference: A new model for teacher growth and student achievement. ASCD.

McMillan, J. H. (2014). *Classroom assessment: Principles and practice for effective standards-based instruction*. Pearson.

Means, B., Toyama, Y., Murphy, R., & Baki, M. (2013). The effectiveness of online and blended learning: A meta-analysis of the empirical literature. *Teachers College Record: The Voice of Scholarship In Education*, *115*(3), 1–47. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811311500307

Mundy, K., Green, A., Lingard, B., & Verger, A. (Eds.). (2016). *Handbook of global education policy*. John Wiley & Sons.

Nagendrababu, V., Pulikkotil, S., Sultan, O., Jayaraman, J., Soh, J., & Dummer, P. (2018). Effectiveness of technology-enhanced learning in endodontic education: a systematic review and meta-analysis. International Endodontic Journal, 52(2), 181-192. https://doi.org/10.1111/iej.12995

Nichols, S. L., & Berliner, D. C. (2007). *Collateral damage: How high-stakes testing corrupts America's schools*. Harvard Education Press.

Nichols, S. L., Glass, G. V., & Berliner, D. C. (2006). High-stakes testing and student achievement: Does accountability pressure increase student learning? *Education Policy Analysis Archives/Archivos Analíticos de Políticas Educativas*, *14*, 1–175. https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v14n1.2006

NRC. (2012). *Education for Life and Work: Developing Transferable Knowledge and Skills in the 21st*. Century. National Research Council. https://doi.org/10.17226/13398

O'Neil, C. (2017). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. Crown Publishing Group.

Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Derleme Makale / Review Paper

Oandasan, I., D'Amour, D., Zwarenstein, M., Barker, K., Purden, M., Beaulieu, M. D., . . . & Tregunno, D. (2004). *Interdisciplinary education for collaborative, patient-centred practice: Research and findings report* (pp. 41–99). Health Canada.

Olenick, M., Allen, L. R., & Smego, Jr., R. A. (2010). Interprofessional education: A concept analysis. *Advances in Medical Education and Practice*, *1*, 75–84. https://doi.org/10.2147/AMEP.S13207

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Daniel, L. G. (1999). *Uses and misuses of the correlation coefficient*.

Paulson, F. L. (1991). What makes a portfolio a portfolio? *Educational Leadership*, *48*(5), 60–63.

Pellegrino, J., Chudowsky, N., & Glaser, R. (2001). *Knowing what students know: The science and design of educational assessment*. National Research Council.

Phelps, R. P. (2005). The rich, robust research literature on testing's achievement benefits. *Defending standardized testing*.

Piaget, J., & Cook, M. (1952). *The origins of intelligence in children*. International Universities Press (*8*, *5*. 1952, 18).

Popham, W. J. (2001a). Teaching to the test? *Educational Leadership*, *58*(6), 16–21.

Popham, W. J. (2001b). The truth about testing: An educator's call to action. *ASCD*.

Popham, W. J. (2010a). Classroom assessment: What teachers need to know. *Education Review*.

Popham, W. J. (2010b). *Everything school leaders need to know about assessment*. Corwin Press.

Prihandoko, Y., Wahab, R., Wilujeng, I., & Kartowagiran, B. (2020). How is the perception of teachers in indonesia about portfolio assessment for elementary school? *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, *8*(12B), 8294–8303. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.082634

Puentedura, R. (2010). SAMR and TPCK: Intro to advanced practice. http://www.hippasus.com/rrpweblog/archives/000073.html

Reeves, S., Boet, S., Zierler, B., & Kitto, S. (2015). Interprofessional education and practice guide no. 3: Evaluating interprofessional education. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, *29*(4), 305–312. https://doi.org/10.3109/13561820.2014.1003637

Rezaie, M. (2015). Computer Adaptive Test (CAT): Advantages and limitations. *International Journal of Educational Investigations*, *2*, 128–137.

Rienties, B., Brouwer, N., & Lygo-Baker, S. (2013). The effects of online professional development on higher education teachers' beliefs and intentions towards learning facilitation and technology. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *29*, 122–131. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.09.002

Russell, M., Madaus, G., & Higgins, J. (2009). *The paradoxes of high stakes testing: How they affect students, their parents, teachers, principals, schools, and society*. IAP.

Sadler, D. R. (1989). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. *Instructional Science*, *18*(2), 119–144. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00117714

Saher, A. S., Ali, A. M. J., Amani, D., & Najwan, F. (2022). Traditional Versus Authentic Assessments in Higher Education. Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction, 12(1), 283-291. https://doi.org/10.47750/pegegog.12.01.29

Sahlberg, P. (2021). *Finnish lessons*. 3.0: What can the world learn from educational change in Finland? Teacher's College Press.

Santos, G., Leite, A., Figueiredo, P., Pimentel, N., Flores-Mir, C., Melo, N., … & Canto, G. (2016). Effectiveness of e-learning in oral radiology education: a systematic review. Journal of Dental Education, 80(9), 1126-1139. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.0022-0337.2016.80.9.tb06195.x

Saravia-Shore, M., & Garcia, E. (2008). Diverse teaching strategies for diverse learners. *Educating everybody's children: Diverse teaching strategies for diverse learners*, 41–97.

Schön, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions*. Jossey-Bass.

Schwartz, D. L., & Arena, D. (2013). *Measuring what matters most: Choice-based assessments for the digital age* (p. 192). The MIT Press.

Scriven, M. (1991). *Evaluation thesaurus*. SAGE.

Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Derleme Makale / Review Paper

Shavelson, R. J. (2003). On the integration of formative assessment in teaching and learning with implications for teacher education. Paper presented at Biannual Meeting of the European Association for Research on Learning and Instruction. In *2003*. Padova.

Sheikhaboumasoudi, R., Bagheri, M., Hosseini, S., Ashouri, E., & Elahi, N. (2018). Improving nursing students' learning outcomes in fundamentals of nursing course through combination of traditional and e-learning methods. Iranian Journal of Nursing and Midwifery Research, 23(3), 217. https://doi.org/10.4103/ijnmr.ijnmr_79_17

Shepard, L. A. (2000). The role of assessment in a learning culture. *Educational Researcher*, *29*(7), 4–14. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X029007004

Shute, V. J. (2008). Focus on formative feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, *78*(1), 153–189. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654307313795

Shute, V. J., & Ke, F. (2012). Games, learning, and assessment. In *Assessment in game-based learning: Foundations, innovations, and perspectives* (pp. 43–58). Springer.

Shute, V. J., & Rahimi, S. (2017). Review of computer-based assessment for learning in elementary and secondary education. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, *33*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12172

Sieber, J. E., & Tolich, M. B. (2012). *Planning ethically responsible research*, *31*. Sage Publications.

Slade, S., & Prinsloo, P. (2013). Learning analytics: Ethical issues and dilemmas. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *57*(10), 1510–1529. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764213479366

Spolsky, B. (2014). *The languages of the Jews: A sociolinguistic history*. Cambridge University Press.

Stiggins, R. (2005). From formative assessment to assessment for learning: A path to success in standards-based schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *87*(4), 324–328. https://doi.org/10.1177/003172170508700414

Stiggins, R. J. (2002). Assessment crisis: The absence of assessment for learning. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *83*(10), 758–765. https://doi.org/10.1177/003172170208301010

Stiggins, R., & Chappuis, J. (2005). Using student-involved classroom assessment to close achievement gaps. *Theory into Practice*, *44*(1), 11–18. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4401_3

Stobart, G. (2014). *The Expert Learner: Challenging the myth of ability* (p. 184). Open University Press. https://doi.org/10.1036/9780335247318

Tanaka-Matsumi, J. (2022). Counseling across cultures: A half-century assessment. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *53*(7–8), 957–975. https://doi.org/10.1177/00220221221111810

Thompson, N. A., & Weiss, D. A. (2011). A framework for the development of computerized adaptive tests. *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation*, *16*(1), 1.

Tyack, D. B., & Cuban, L. (1997). *Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform*. Harvard University Press.

Van der Linden, W. J., & Glas, C. A. W. (2000). *Computer adaptive testing: Theory and practice*. Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Volante, L., & Beckett, D. (2011). Formative assessment and the contemporary classroom: Synergies and tensions between research and practice. *Canadian Journal of Education/Revue canadienne de l'éducation*, *34*(2), 239–255.

Vygotsky, L. S., & Cole, M. (1978). *Mind in society: Development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Wade, R. C., & Yarbrough, D. B. (1996). Portfolios: A tool for reflective thinking in teacher education? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *12*(1), 63–79. https://doi.org/10.1016/0742-051X(95)00022-C

Wainer, H., Dorans, N. J., Flaugher, R., Green, B. F., & Mislevy, R. J. (2000). *Computerized adaptive testing: A primer*. Routledge.

Wang, J., Xu, Y., Liu, X., Xiong, W., Xie, J., & Zhao, J. (2016). Assessing the effectiveness of problem-based learning in physical diagnostics education in china: a meta-analysis. Scientific Reports, 6(1). https://doi.org/10.1038/srep36279

Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, (2024), 15 (1), 520-555.
Derleme Makale / Review Paper

Wang, T., & Kolen, M. J. (2001). Evaluating comparability in computerized adaptive testing: Issues, criteria and an example. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, *38*(1), 19–49. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-3984.2001.tb01115.x

Warschauer, M. (2007). The paradoxical future of digital learning. *Learning Inquiry*, *1*(1), 41–49. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11519-007-0001-5

Warschauer, M., & Matuchniak, T. (2010). New technology and digital worlds: Analyzing evidence of equity in access, use, and outcomes. *Review of Research in Education*, *34*(1), 179–225. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X09349791

Weller, J., Naik, V., & Diego, R. (2020). Systematic review and narrative synthesis of competency-based medical education in anaesthesia. British Journal of Anaesthesia, 124(6), 748-760. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bja.2019.10.025

Wiggins, G. (1998). *Educative assessment. Designing assessments to inform and improve student performance* p. 94104. Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Wiggins, G. (2011). A true test: Toward more authentic and equitable assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *92*(7), 81–93. https://doi.org/10.1177/003172171109200721

Wiliam, D. (2011). What is assessment for learning? *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, *37*(1), 3–14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2011.03.001

Wiliam, D. (2011). *Embedded formative assessment*. Solution Tree Press.

Williamson, B. (2016). Digital education governance: Data visualization, predictive analytics, and "real-time policy instruments. *Journal of Education Policy*, *31*(2), 123–141. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2015.1035758

Williamson, B. (2018). The hidden architecture of higher education: Building a big data infrastructure for the "smarter university". *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *15*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-018-0094-1

Zeidner, M. (2007). Test anxiety in educational contexts: Concepts, findings, and future directions. In *Emotion in education* (pp. 165–184). Academic Press.