Gerasi in Language Studies
E-ISSN: xxxx-xxxx
Volume 1, Issue 1, 2026, pp. 14-24
https://jurnal.gerakanedukasi.com/index.php/GILS/index

From Product to Process: Rethinking EFL Assessment in the Age of Generative AI

Ahmad Asron Mundofi [1*]
[1] Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Kalijaga Yogyakarta, Indonesia; ahmadasronmundofi@gmail.com
* *Corresponding Author*

ABSTRACT

The emergence of generative artificial intelligence has challenged established assumptions about how English as a Foreign Language writing and language performance should be assessed. Traditional assessment practices have predominantly emphasized the quality of students' final products, such as written texts, completed assignments, and examination responses, while giving comparatively limited attention to the processes through which those products are developed. The increasing availability of generative AI tools, however, makes the distinction between student-generated and AI-assisted products increasingly difficult to establish and raises fundamental questions concerning authorship, validity, fairness, and the interpretation of learning evidence. This library research critically examines how generative AI is reshaping conceptualizations of assessment in EFL contexts, with particular attention to the relationship between final products, learning processes, revision practices, feedback engagement, reflection, and learner agency. Relevant scholarly literature was examined and thematically synthesized to identify emerging patterns, conceptual tensions, and pedagogical implications. The synthesis indicates that generative AI requires EFL assessment to move beyond exclusive reliance on final textual products toward greater consideration of students' learning processes, including how they formulate ideas, interact with feedback, evaluate AI-generated suggestions, revise their work, justify decisions, and reflect on their learning. The study argues that process-oriented assessment does not imply abandoning product evaluation but repositioning the final product as one component of a broader body of evidence. Such a shift can strengthen assessment validity by making students' intellectual engagement and decision-making more visible. The findings further suggest that the educational value of generative AI depends substantially on assessment designs that preserve learner responsibility, encourage critical engagement, and distinguish meaningful AI-supported learning from the unreflective outsourcing of academic work.
***Keywords**: Generative AI, Assessment for Learning, Process-Oriented Assessment*

INTRODUCTION

Assessment has traditionally occupied a central position in English as a Foreign Language education because it provides evidence of learners' linguistic development, academic achievement, and ability to use English for particular communicative purposes (Goodwin, 2020). In many educational contexts, however, assessment remains strongly oriented toward the final product. Students submit essays, reports, presentations, or examination responses, and teachers subsequently evaluate the quality of these outputs according to predetermined linguistic, organizational, and content-related criteria (Nurhikmah, 2024). Although product-based assessment can provide useful evidence of achievement, it does not always reveal how learners arrived at their final responses, what difficulties they encountered, how they responded to feedback, or what decisions they made during the learning process. This limitation becomes increasingly significant when language learning involves complex processes of planning, drafting, revising, evaluating, and reflecting. In EFL writing in particular, the final text represents only the visible outcome of a much broader cognitive and metacognitive process.

The rapid development of generative artificial intelligence has intensified this longstanding tension between product and process (Rosyidah et al., 2024). Tools based on generative AI can produce grammatically sophisticated sentences, construct paragraphs, reorganize arguments, suggest vocabulary, summarize information, and generate complete texts within seconds (Roy et al., 2020). These capabilities provide learners with unprecedented access to linguistic and textual support, but they simultaneously complicate conventional assumptions about what a submitted product represents. A polished essay may no longer provide sufficient evidence of the learner's independent linguistic competence, writing ability, or reasoning because the text may have been produced through varying degrees of interaction with an AI system. Consequently, the central assessment question is gradually shifting from whether a final product appears correct to how that product was developed and what the learner actually learned through the process. Generative AI therefore does not merely introduce another digital tool into EFL assessment; it challenges the epistemological foundations through which learning has traditionally been inferred from completed products.

The problem is particularly evident in writing assessment (Liu, 2024). A conventional writing assignment often assumes that the submitted text provides relatively direct evidence of a learner's ability to formulate ideas, organize arguments, select language, construct sentences, revise errors, and communicate meaning. Generative AI disrupts this assumption because these activities can now be distributed between the learner and the technological system. A student may independently generate an initial argument, ask AI to improve its organization, reject several suggestions, revise selected passages, and subsequently explain the reasons for those decisions. Another student may simply provide a prompt and submit the resulting text with minimal intellectual engagement. Although the two students may produce similarly polished products, the educational processes underlying those products are fundamentally different. Product-oriented assessment may fail to distinguish these differences, thereby creating difficulties for assessment validity and potentially rewarding technological dependence rather than learning.

This situation also raises important questions concerning the meaning of fairness and academic integrity in contemporary EFL assessment. Restricting or prohibiting generative AI may appear to offer a straightforward response, but such approaches may be increasingly difficult to sustain as AI becomes integrated into everyday academic and professional communication. At the same time, unrestricted AI use can create inequities because students may differ considerably in their access to technology, familiarity with AI systems, prompting abilities, and capacity to evaluate generated content critically (Al Ayyubi et al., 2024; Al Ayyubi, Prayetno, et al., 2025; Dvir et al., 2024; Farias-Gaytan et al., 2022; Kulkov et al., 2024). The issue, therefore, cannot be reduced to whether students should or should not use generative AI. A more fundamental question concerns how assessment can be designed so that AI use does not obscure evidence of learning. This requires assessment practices capable of capturing the learner's contribution, reasoning, revision decisions, interaction with feedback, and reflection alongside the quality of the final product.

The concept of learner agency becomes particularly important within this emerging assessment environment. Learner agency refers to students' capacity to make purposeful decisions, exercise control over their learning, regulate their actions, and assume responsibility for the consequences of those actions. In AI-mediated learning, agency includes decisions about when and why to use generative AI, what kind of assistance to request, how to assess the reliability and relevance of AI-generated information, which suggestions to accept or reject, and how to transform technological assistance into personally meaningful learning. From this perspective, AI literacy cannot be separated from assessment literacy and language learning. A learner who can generate sophisticated prompts but cannot evaluate the resulting output critically may possess technological competence without demonstrating strong learning agency. Conversely, a learner who uses AI selectively, verifies its suggestions, and explains the reasoning behind revisions may demonstrate substantial cognitive and metacognitive engagement even when the final text has been technologically supported.

Existing scholarship on artificial intelligence in language education has expanded rapidly, covering areas such as automated feedback, writing quality, learner perceptions, academic integrity, AI literacy, language development, and technology acceptance. However, these strands of research are frequently examined separately. Research on writing quality tends to focus on the final product, whereas studies of learner perceptions often emphasize attitudes and acceptance. Other studies examine the accuracy or usefulness of AI-generated feedback without sufficiently considering how learners act upon that feedback. Consequently, an important conceptual gap remains concerning how EFL assessment should respond when the final product is increasingly co-constructed through interactions between learners and generative AI. The challenge is not simply to determine whether AI improves writing performance, but to reconsider what constitutes valid evidence of learning when technological systems participate in the production and revision of language.

This study addresses that gap by critically examining the implications of generative AI for the relationship between product-oriented and process-oriented EFL assessment. Rather than treating AI primarily as a threat to assessment, the study conceptualizes its emergence as an opportunity to reconsider what assessment should measure and how evidence of learning should be constructed. The central argument

is that the growing accessibility of generative AI makes it increasingly necessary for EFL assessment to attend to the processes through which learners develop, evaluate, revise, and justify their work. The novelty of this perspective lies in positioning process visibility and learner agency as central principles for rethinking assessment validity in AI-mediated EFL learning. The study therefore explores how assessment can move beyond judging what learners submit toward understanding how they learn, make decisions, engage with feedback, use technological assistance, and demonstrate ownership of their learning.

METHOD

This study employed a library research approach with a qualitative and interpretive orientation (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Library research was considered appropriate because the primary purpose of the study was to examine and synthesize existing scholarly discussions concerning generative AI and the changing nature of EFL assessment rather than to measure the effectiveness of a particular instructional intervention in a specific educational setting. Academic publications were treated as the principal sources of data, allowing the study to identify emerging concepts, theoretical perspectives, empirical findings, methodological concerns, and pedagogical debates surrounding AI-mediated language assessment. The analysis focused particularly on scholarship addressing generative AI, EFL or ESL assessment, writing assessment, formative assessment, assessment for learning, automated feedback, learner agency, academic integrity, AI literacy, and process-oriented approaches to language learning.

Relevant literature was identified through scholarly databases and academic search platforms using combinations of keywords related to generative artificial intelligence and language assessment. Search terms included "generative AI," "ChatGPT," "EFL assessment," "ESL assessment," "AI-assisted writing," "AI-mediated assessment," "writing assessment," "process-oriented assessment," "assessment for learning," "learner agency," "AI literacy," "academic integrity," and "writing revision." Greater attention was given to recent publications because developments in generative AI and its educational applications have occurred rapidly. Nevertheless, foundational literature concerning assessment validity, formative assessment, learner autonomy, writing processes, feedback, and assessment for learning was also considered where it provided essential conceptual foundations for interpreting recent developments.

The literature was selected according to its relevance to the research focus, scholarly credibility, conceptual contribution, and contextual suitability. Publications were considered particularly relevant when they addressed the implications of generative AI for language learning, writing development, assessment practices, feedback, learner decision-making, or academic integrity. Studies that discussed artificial intelligence exclusively from technical or computational perspectives without meaningful implications for language education and assessment were given limited attention. The review also distinguished between literature that examined the quality of AI-generated products and literature that investigated learners' processes of interaction, evaluation, revision, and reflection. This distinction was necessary because the central concern of the study was not merely whether generative AI can

produce high-quality language but whether assessment can continue to provide valid evidence of learning when such technology participates in the production process.

The selected literature was analyzed thematically. The analysis first identified recurring discussions concerning the limitations of product-oriented assessment in AI-mediated environments. The literature was subsequently examined for evidence concerning process visibility, AI-supported feedback, revision practices, learner agency, assessment validity, authenticity, fairness, and academic integrity. Relationships among these themes were then interpreted to develop a broader conceptual understanding of how EFL assessment may need to change in response to generative AI. Particular attention was given to tensions between technological assistance and learner ownership, efficiency and cognitive engagement, final-product quality and process evidence, and assessment control and learner autonomy. Rather than treating individual studies as isolated findings, the synthesis sought to identify broader patterns and unresolved questions that can inform the development of more sustainable EFL assessment practices.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

RESULT

The literature indicates that generative AI is fundamentally challenging the assumption that a final written product can serve as sufficient evidence of individual language learning. Traditional assessment systems frequently rely on submitted texts because they are observable, relatively easy to score, and can be compared against explicit criteria. However, generative AI can substantially influence the production of these texts by supporting idea generation, language selection, organization, translation, revision, and stylistic refinement. As a result, the quality of a final text may increasingly reflect an interaction between learner competence and technological assistance. This does not make product assessment irrelevant, but it reduces the extent to which the final product alone can explain what a learner knows or can independently do. The literature consequently points toward the need for assessment practices that provide additional evidence of the learner's contribution and engagement throughout the development of the assessed work.

A second major finding concerns the increasing importance of process evidence. Process-oriented assessment provides opportunities to examine how learners develop their work through successive stages rather than evaluating only the completed outcome. In an EFL writing context, relevant evidence may include initial ideas, drafts, feedback received, revisions, explanations of changes, reflections on difficulties, and decisions concerning the use of AI. Such evidence can make learners' cognitive and metacognitive activities more visible and can help teachers distinguish between meaningful technological support and the simple outsourcing of writing tasks. The process does not need to be documented in an excessively burdensome manner. Short reflective statements, revision histories, annotated drafts, AI interaction records, oral explanations, and brief decision-making notes may provide useful evidence of how learners engaged with the writing task and technological assistance.

The literature further suggests that generative AI changes the nature of feedback within EFL assessment. Conventional feedback generally occurs after students have produced a draft or completed an assignment, whereas generative AI can provide feedback continuously during writing. Learners can request explanations

of grammatical problems, alternative expressions, suggestions for organization, or clarification of particular language choices at different stages of the writing process. This potentially transforms feedback from an external evaluation into an interactive resource that learners can access while making decisions. However, the availability of immediate feedback does not automatically produce learning. AI-generated suggestions can contain inaccuracies, oversimplifications, inappropriate stylistic choices, or interpretations that do not correspond with the learner's intended meaning. The educational value of AI feedback therefore depends heavily on learners' ability to evaluate, interpret, and selectively apply the suggestions they receive.

Another important finding concerns the relationship between AI-supported revision and learner agency. Generative AI can create multiple alternatives for sentences, paragraphs, arguments, and organizational structures, thereby expanding the range of possibilities available to learners. This can be particularly beneficial for EFL students who may struggle to identify alternative ways of expressing meaning in English. Nevertheless, the literature indicates that the existence of alternatives does not necessarily mean that learners are exercising meaningful choice. If students routinely accept AI-generated revisions without considering their accuracy, relevance, rhetorical purpose, or relationship to their original ideas, revision may become an act of substitution rather than learning. Process-oriented assessment therefore needs to distinguish between revision that reflects learner judgment and revision that simply reflects technological replacement.

The findings also reveal that academic integrity is becoming increasingly connected to assessment design rather than solely to student compliance. Conventional approaches often frame AI use primarily as a potential violation of academic rules. However, the growing integration of generative AI suggests that assessment systems may need to differentiate between appropriate assistance and inappropriate delegation of intellectual work. Using AI to identify grammatical problems, generate alternative vocabulary, or provide feedback can represent a different learning activity from asking AI to produce an entire essay and submitting the result as independent work. Consequently, assessment criteria need to focus not only on whether AI was used but also on how it was used, what decisions remained with the learner, and whether the learner can demonstrate understanding of the submitted work.

The literature further identifies an important transformation in the role of teachers. Generative AI may reduce the amount of routine linguistic feedback that teachers need to provide, but it does not eliminate the need for professional judgment. Instead, teachers increasingly need to interpret AI-mediated learning processes, establish appropriate boundaries for AI use, design meaningful assessment tasks, and help students evaluate technological output critically. Teachers can also use process evidence to understand where students struggle and whether AI assistance is supporting or replacing learning. This suggests that the teacher's role is shifting from being the sole provider of feedback toward becoming a designer and facilitator of learning environments in which human judgment, technological assistance, and learner responsibility are appropriately balanced.

DISCUSSION

The findings suggest that the emergence of generative AI requires EFL assessment to reconsider what counts as valid evidence of learning (Rosyidah et al., 2024). Product quality remains important because language education ultimately seeks to develop learners' capacity to communicate effectively through spoken and written English. Nevertheless, a high-quality product can no longer automatically be interpreted as evidence of independent competence when learners have access to systems capable of generating and transforming sophisticated language. Assessment validity therefore increasingly depends on understanding the relationship between the final product and the processes through which it was developed. A process-oriented perspective does not reject product assessment; instead, it places the product within a broader evidential framework that includes learner decisions, revisions, reflections, and interactions with technological resources.

This shift has important implications for the conceptualization of authenticity in EFL assessment. Authentic assessment has often been associated with tasks that resemble meaningful communication outside the classroom (Al Ayyubi, Nurhikmah, et al., 2025). In an environment where generative AI is increasingly available in academic and professional contexts, completely excluding AI from every assessment task may itself create an artificial learning environment. At the same time, unrestricted technological assistance can undermine the authenticity of assessment if students are not required to demonstrate their own understanding and decision-making. Authenticity should therefore be understood not simply in terms of whether AI is present or absent, but in terms of whether the assessment task requires learners to perform meaningful intellectual and communicative activities. An authentic AI-era assessment should make students responsible for interpreting information, making language choices, evaluating alternatives, revising meaningfully, and explaining their decisions.

The findings also reinforce the argument that learner agency should become a central construct in contemporary EFL assessment. When students use generative AI, agency is expressed through the decisions they make before, during, and after interaction with the technology. A learner demonstrates agency by identifying a learning need, requesting appropriate assistance, evaluating the response, determining whether the recommendation is suitable, modifying the suggestion according to communicative intentions, and reflecting on the consequences of the decision. Assessment can make these dimensions visible by asking students to explain selected AI-supported revisions or document the reasoning behind important textual changes. Such practices move assessment away from merely determining whether an answer is correct and toward examining whether learners can make informed decisions about their learning.

This perspective also changes how revision should be understood. In traditional writing assessment, revision may be visible primarily through differences between drafts (Goodwin, 2020), while the reasoning behind those differences remains hidden. Generative AI makes this limitation more significant because a large number of textual changes can be generated rapidly without necessarily reflecting deep engagement. A process-oriented approach should therefore evaluate not only the extent of textual improvement but also the learner's ability to identify problems, consider alternatives, justify revisions, and recognize the effects of changes on

meaning and communication. Revision becomes valuable as assessment evidence when it demonstrates learning rather than merely producing a more polished text. This distinction is particularly important for EFL writing because improvements in grammatical accuracy may conceal limited development in argumentation, organization, rhetorical awareness, or independent language decision-making.

The implications extend to the design of assessment tasks. Rather than relying exclusively on a single final submission, teachers may incorporate multiple forms of evidence collected throughout the learning process. Students could submit an initial draft, a revised version, a brief explanation of major changes, and a reflection on how feedback or AI assistance influenced their decisions (de Carvalho-Filho et al., 2020; Hays & Reinders, 2020; Svendsen, 2020). Oral discussions or short conferences can also provide opportunities for students to demonstrate ownership of their ideas and explain their textual choices. Such assessment designs do not necessarily require teachers to monitor every interaction with AI. Instead, they make the learner's intellectual contribution sufficiently visible that the final product can be interpreted in relation to the process that produced it.

Another important implication concerns assessment literacy and AI literacy. Students need to understand not only how to operate generative AI tools but also how to use them responsibly within academic learning (Hamsiah et al., 2022; Prokopiv & Stynska, 2023; Syukkur & Fauzan, 2021). This includes recognizing that AI-generated information may be inaccurate, understanding that stylistically sophisticated language may not necessarily be appropriate, and recognizing that AI suggestions may unintentionally change the intended meaning or personal voice of a text. Assessment can contribute to this literacy by explicitly evaluating students' ability to critique AI output, verify information, and explain their decisions. In this sense, assessment itself becomes a mechanism through which students develop responsible technological practices rather than simply a mechanism for controlling technology use.

The transformation of assessment also has implications for fairness. A process-oriented model can potentially reduce some disadvantages associated with AI because it places greater emphasis on the learner's intellectual contribution rather than the surface quality of the final product. However, process-oriented assessment must itself be designed carefully. Students differ in their access to technology, digital literacy, linguistic competence, and familiarity with generative AI. If teachers assess sophisticated AI use without providing adequate guidance, assessment may inadvertently reward students who already possess greater technological resources. Fairness therefore requires transparent expectations concerning acceptable AI use, equitable access to technological resources, and assessment criteria that prioritize learning rather than technological sophistication (Ökmen et al., 2020).

From a broader pedagogical perspective, the movement from product to process represents a deeper reconsideration of the purpose of assessment. Assessment should not simply determine what students have produced at the end of instruction; it should also provide insight into how they learn, how they respond to challenges, and how they develop increasingly independent capacities. Generative AI makes this principle more urgent because technological systems can now produce outputs that resemble the outcomes of human learning. The most meaningful assessment evidence may therefore lie increasingly in activities that AI cannot legitimately replace,

including personal decision-making, critical evaluation, explanation, reflection, contextual interpretation, and responsibility for learning. The future of EFL assessment consequently depends less on attempts to identify whether a text "looks AI-generated" and more on designing assessment systems in which meaningful learning remains visible.

The conceptual contribution of this study lies in positioning product and process not as competing alternatives but as complementary dimensions of assessment evidence. The final product remains relevant because it demonstrates the quality of learners' communicative performance. The process, however, provides essential information about how that performance was constructed and what forms of learning occurred along the way. In the age of generative AI, the strongest assessment approach may therefore be one that combines evaluation of the final product with evidence of development, decision-making, feedback engagement, revision, and reflection. Such an approach recognizes technological realities without surrendering the educational principle that learners must remain responsible for their intellectual work.

CONCLUSION

Generative AI is fundamentally challenging conventional approaches to EFL assessment because it weakens the assumption that a final language product can independently represent the learning that produced it. The increasing ability of AI systems to generate, revise, organize, and refine English texts means that assessment practices based exclusively on completed products may provide incomplete evidence of learners' linguistic competence and intellectual engagement. The central challenge is therefore not simply how to detect AI-generated texts but how to redesign assessment so that meaningful learning remains visible. A process-oriented approach offers an important response by examining learners' development across drafting, feedback engagement, revision, evaluation, decision-making, and reflection while continuing to recognize the importance of the final communicative product. The study further demonstrates that learner agency should occupy a central position in AI-mediated EFL assessment. The educational consequences of generative AI depend less on the mere presence of the technology than on how learners use, evaluate, and regulate it. When students retain responsibility for decisions and critically engage with AI-generated suggestions, technology can provide valuable opportunities for experimentation, feedback, revision, and independent learning. When students delegate these processes entirely to AI, however, the resulting product may conceal limited cognitive engagement and weakened ownership. Assessment must therefore create opportunities for learners to demonstrate not only what they have produced but also why they made particular decisions and what they learned from the process.

The broader implication is that rethinking EFL assessment in the age of generative AI requires a shift from judging products in isolation toward interpreting products as evidence embedded within learning processes. This does not mean abandoning grades, rubrics, or final-product evaluation. Rather, it requires expanding the evidential basis of assessment so that final texts are considered alongside drafts, revisions, feedback interactions, reflective explanations, and demonstrations of learner decision-making. Such a model can strengthen assessment validity, support learner agency, and promote more responsible forms of AI use. Generative AI should

consequently be treated neither simply as a threat to assessment nor as an automatic solution to assessment challenges, but as a catalyst for reconsidering what EFL educators mean by learning, performance, authorship, and evidence. Future research should empirically examine process-oriented assessment models across different EFL educational contexts, proficiency levels, and institutional settings. Particular attention should be given to how assessment practices can reliably evaluate learner agency, AI literacy, critical engagement, revision quality, and metacognitive development. Further studies could also investigate how teachers can balance process documentation with manageable assessment workloads and how students perceive transparency, fairness, and responsibility in AI-supported assessment. Because generative AI continues to develop rapidly, assessment research will need to remain adaptive and theoretically grounded. The long-term challenge is not to preserve assessment systems designed for a pre-AI environment, but to develop assessment practices capable of recognizing meaningful human learning in an educational landscape where intelligent technological assistance has become increasingly embedded in the production of language.

REFERENCES

Al Ayyubi, I. I., Nurhikmah, N., Prayetno, E., Noerzanah, F., & Musaldin, L. O. (2025). Determination of Prayer Times Through Islamic Astronomy Applications: Repositioning Traditional Authority in the Digital Era. *Borneo International Journal of Islamic Studies*, *7*(1), 1–18.

Al Ayyubi, I. I., Prayetno, E., Muhaemin, A., & Permatasari, I. (2025). Technology Utilisation for Tax Acceleration: Training on the Use of PBB Application for Lempangang Village Residents. *Dinamis: Jurnal Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat*, *5*(1), 9–19. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.33752/dinamis.v5i1.8696

Al Ayyubi, I. I., Widiani, E., Suryana, I., Andriani, A., & Sari, D. W. (2024). Application of the Model-Eliciting Activities (MEAs) Learning Model on Mathematics Learning Based on higher-order thinking Skills (HOTS). *Noumerico: Journal of Technology in Mathematics Education*, *2*(2), 82–95. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.33367/jtme.v2i2.5181

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.

de Carvalho-Filho, M. A., Tio, R. A., & Steinert, Y. (2020). Twelve tips for implementing a community of practice for faculty development. *Medical Teacher*, *42*(2), 143–149. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2018.1552782

Dvir, M., Almhanni, G., Qaisar, H., Calvin, A. D., & Tallarita, T. (2024). When Occipital Artery Biopsy is Preferred to temporal biopsy for giant cell arteritis: a Step-By-Step description of the Surgical technique. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings: Innovations, Quality & Outcomes*, *8*(1), 53–57. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mayocpiqo.2023.12.005

Farias-Gaytan, S., Aguaded, I., & Ramirez-Montoya, M.-S. (2022). Transformation and digital literacy: Systematic literature mapping. *Education and Information Technologies*, *27*(2), 1417–1437. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10624-x

Goodwin, A. L. (2020). Globalization, global mindsets and teacher education. *Action in Teacher Education*, *42*(1), 6–18.

https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2019.1700848
Hamsiah, A., Muzakki, A., Nuramila, N., & Fauzi, Z. A. (2022). The Role of the Professional Teacher as the Agent of Change for Students. *Al-Ishlah: Jurnal Pendidikan*, *14*(4), 6887–6896. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v14i4.1372
Hays, J., & Reinders, H. (2020). Sustainable learning and education: A curriculum for the future. *International Review of Education*, *66*(1), 29–52. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-020-09820-7
Kulkov, I., Kulkova, J., Rohrbeck, R., Menvielle, L., Kaartemo, V., & Makkonen, H. (2024). Artificial intelligence-driven sustainable development: Examining organizational, technical, and processing approaches to achieving global goals. *Sustainable Development*, *32*(3), 2253–2267. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.2773
Liu, B. (2024). Strategic Planning and Resource Allocation in Higher Education Institutions. *The Educational Review, USA*, *8*(11). https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.26855/er.2024.11.014
Nurhikmah, N. (2024). Educational management functions: Planning, organizing, actuating, controlling. *INTIHA: Islamic Education Journal*, *1*(2), 82–91. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.58988/intiha.v1i2.293
Ökmen, B., Şahin, Ş., & Kılıç, A. (2020). A critical view to the primary school teaching. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research*, *7*(1), 54–70. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.33200/ijcer.633051
Prokopiv, L. M., & Stynska, V. V. (2023). Higher Education Digitalization in the Context of Globalization Changes. *Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Skłodowska, Sectio J–Paedagogia-Psychologia*, *36*(3), 7–18. https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=1220573
Rosyidah, A. N., Sassi, K., & Al Ayyubi, I. I. (2024). Comparative Studies: Education Systems in Germany and Turkey. *Studi Multidisipliner: Jurnal Kajian Keislaman*, *11*(2), 71–86. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24952/multidisipliner.v11i2.12533
Roy, S., Huq, S., & Rob, A. B. A. (2020). Faith and education in Bangladesh: A review of the contemporary landscape and challenges. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *79*, 102290.
Svendsen, B. (2020). Inquiries into teacher professional development—what matters? *Education*, *140*(3), 111–130. https://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/prin/ed/2020/00000140/00000003/art00001
Syukkur, A., & Fauzan, F. (2021). Improving The Quality of Education Through The Principal's Strategy to Develop Teacher Competence. *Nazhruna: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, *4*(3), 563–574. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31538/nzh.v3i1.402