MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY AND TRADE

HANOI UNIVERSITY OF INDUSTRY

PHAM THUY QUYNH

ALIGNMENT BETWEEN COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES AND ASSESSMENTS: AN ANALYSIS WITHIN LINGUISTIC PROGRAMS AT A UNIVERSITY IN VIETNAM

MASTER THESIS IN ENGLISH LINGUISTICS

Hanoi, 2024

MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY AND TRADE

HANOI UNIVERSITY OF INDUSTRY

PHAM THUY QUYNH

ALIGNMENT BETWEEN COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES AND ASSESSMENTS: AN ANALYSIS WITHIN LINGUISTIC PROGRAMS AT A UNIVERSITY IN VIETNAM

Major: English Linguistics

Code: 8220201

MASTER THESIS IN ENGLISH LINGUISTICS

SUPERVISOR:

Dr. Dang Thi Minh Tam

Hanoi, 2024

DECLARATION BY THE AUTHOR

It is sincerely declared that the work presented in this document is entirely my original creation, except where otherwise indicated or acknowledged. Any assistance received in the preparation of this work has been duly acknowledged. I confirm that this manuscript has not been submitted for any degree or examination at any other institution. All sources used in this work are appropriately cited and referenced. I take full responsibility for any errors or omissions present in this document. Furthermore, I affirm that this work does not violate upon the intellectual property rights of any individual or organization. I understand the consequences of academic dishonesty and plagiarism and assert that this work upholds the highest standards of academic integrity.

Date: _____

Author's signature

Phạm Thúy Quỳnh

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Embarking on the journey of academic research and thesis writing is not merely an individual attempt; it is a collective effort encompassing the support, guidance, and encouragement of numerous individuals and institutions. From the deepest of my heart, I wish to express my gratitude to those who have played irreplaceable roles in the realization of this thesis.

I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to Dr. Dang Thi Minh Tam for her invaluable guidance, encouragement, and unwavering support throughout the completion of this thesis. Dr. Tam's helpful insights, constructive feedback, and scholarly knowledge not only influenced the content of my study but also helped me improve my critical thinking abilities and academic professionalism. Her expertise and mentorship have been instrumental in shaping the direction and quality of this research.

I am deeply appreciative of the esteemed Rector of School, dedicated staff and the entire institution for providing a conducive academic environment and resources essential for undertaking this scholarly endeavor.

My profound thanks go to my family for their unconditional love, understanding, and endless encouragement. Their wholehearted support has been my pillar of strength throughout this journey.

Lastly, I would like to express my gratitude to myself for the perseverance, determination, and hard work invested in completing this thesis. This journey has been challenging yet rewarding, shaping me into a better scholar and individual.

ABSTRACT

This thesis investigates the enhancement of course design methodologies through an examination of the application of Bloom's taxonomy in creating learning outcomes (LOs) and the analysis of alignment between assessment strategies and LOs. Focused on the domains of linguistics and English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI), the study scrutinizes 33 test specifications and syllabi from relevant courses. Employing rigorous data analysis techniques, the research uncovers prevalent patterns in LO formulation, revealing a tendency within the institution to incorporate numerous requisites within individual LOs. Furthermore, the analysis highlights both areas of alignment and instances of misalignment between assessment methodologies and LOs. By illuminating these strengths and weaknesses, this study contributes valuable insights for refining course design paradigms, fostering more coherent alignment between intended learning outcomes and assessment strategies, and ultimately enhancing the educational experience.

Keywords: alignment, learning outcomes, assessment, linguistics programs

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION BY THE AUTHOR i

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ii

ABSTRACT iii

TABLE OF CONTENTS iv

INTRODUCTION 1

1. Rationale for the study 1

2. Aim and objectives of the study 2

3. Research question 3

4. Scope of the study 3

5. Significance of the study 3

6. Research methods 4

7. Structure of the thesis 5

CHAPTER 1: LITERATURE REVIEW 7

1.1. Course learning outcomes 7

1.2. Assessment 9

1.2.1. Definition of assessment 9

1.2.2. Assessment methods 10

1.2.2.1. Formative assessment 11

1.2.2.2. Summative assessment 12
1.2.3. Types of test methods 13
1.3. Alignment and Constructive alignment 13
1.3.1. Constructive alignment 13
1.3.2. The importance of alignment 15
1.4. Outcome-based approach 16
1.4.1. Outcome-based teaching and learning 16
1.4.2. Advantages of outcome-based approach 18
1.4.3. Outcome-based assessment 19
1.5. English as medium instruction 23
1.6. Theoretical framework: Bloom's Taxonomy 24
1.6.1. Bloom's Taxonomy in writing learning outcomes 26
1.6.2. Bloom's Taxonomy in assessment 28
1.7. Previous studies 29
CHAPTER 2: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 31
2.1. Research context 31
2.3. Data collection procedures 32
2.3. Data analysis methods 33
CHAPTER 3: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION 36
3.1. Findings 36
3.1.1. The clarity of verbs in learning outcomes 36

3.1.2. The quantities of requirements within a single LO 40

3.1.3. Alignment between stated LOs and actual assessment 44

3.1.3.1. Alignment between stated LOs and actual assessment 44

3.1.3.2. Misalignment between stated LOs and actual assessment in linguistics program 51

3.2. Discussion 53

3.2.1. The balance quantities of requirements within a learning outcome statement 54

3.2.2. The importance of clarity in learning goals for enhancing the educational experience 56

3.2.3. Answering the research question 57

CONCLUSION 59

1. Recapitulation 59

2. Limitations and Recommendations 60

2.1. Limitations 60

2.2. Recommendations 60

3. Implications 62

4. Concluding remark 64

REFERENCES I

APPENDIX 1: List of English-major courses XI

APPENDIX 2: List of EMI courses XII

APPENDIX 3: Examples of evaluation of alignment between assessment and learning outcomes in English-major courses..... XIII

APPENDIX 4: Examples of evaluation of alignment between assessment and learning outcomes in EMI courses..... XVIII

APPENDIX 5: Letter of consent..... XX

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1. Types of Written Tests 20
Table 1.2. Skills related to higher level thinking 24
Table 1.3. Guidelines and experience in writing learning outcomes 27
Table 3.1. The clarity of verbs in learning outcomes 36
Table 3.2. Learning outcomes of linguistics courses 41
Table 3.3. Learning outcomes of EMI courses 43
Table 3.4. Alignment between stated LOs and actual assessment in linguistics courses 45
Table 3.5. Alignment between stated LOs and actual assessment in EMI courses 49
Table 3.6.
Misalignment between stated LOs and actual assessment in linguistics program . 51

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

EMI: English as a Medium Instruction

OBE: Outcome-Based Education

LOs/ILOs: Learning outcomes/Intended Learning Outcomes

OBTL: Outcome-Based Teaching & Learning

TLAs: Teaching and Learning Activities

AMs: assessment methods

OBA: Outcome-Based Approach

INTRODUCTION

1. Rationale for the study

The globalized world's dominance of the English language in various spheres such as socio-economic development, technology, art and culture, and international relations has accentuated the need for career-oriented education to equip university students with language proficiency for effective exchange and integration. In this educational context, considering the alignment between assessment and learning outcomes in improving educational practices and fostering student learning represents a significant focus in higher education globally, particularly with the shift from a teacher-centered to a student-centered approach (El-Maaddawy & Deneen, 2017; Kennedy et al., 2007; Ngatia, 2022). A major concern in developing learning outcomes is their measurability, as they must lend themselves to assessment procedures that successfully evaluate what students have obtained after learning the courses.

Theoretically, the critical requirement is to develop evaluation methods and assessment tasks that can determine the extent to which these established learning outcomes are satisfied. This cohesive connection between assessment strategies, and intended learning outcomes serves as a crucial factor in enhancing the transparency of the overall learning experience (Coates, 2014). However, teachers may confront the difficult challenge of selecting and designing suitable assessments to guarantee a smooth alignment with the specified learning objectives. As a result, the difficulty is not only in articulating precise and measurable learning goals but also in integrating them into a framework that improves the learning experience. Curriculum alignment becomes a crucial process for evaluating educational courses or programs, enabling

them to effectively respond to the evolving demands of society and the labor market. Through consistent understanding of course objectives and assessment methods, successful comprehension and application of knowledge are fostered, promoting active engagement and self-discovery among students.

To contribute to this endeavor, the present study aims to analyze the alignment between course learning outcomes and assessments within linguistic programs at a Vietnamese university, sheds light on potential discrepancies or congruence between what is intended to be taught and what is being evaluated. It is hoped that the findings of this research will promote a more positive and effective learning and provide valuable insights into enhancing language education and its relevance to the demands of the contemporary world. Furthermore, the insights gained from this study are also expected to aid teachers and curriculum development teams in designing more efficient and targeted courses, ultimately enhancing students' language proficiency and overall learning experience in linguistic programs at the university.

2. Aim and objectives of the study

The primary aim of this study is to investigate the alignment between course learning outcomes and assessments within linguistic programs at a Vietnamese university. The overarching objectives are:

- To examine how Bloom Taxonomy applied in writing and delivering learning outcome statements to students
- To analyze the extent to which the stated learning objectives of linguistic courses correspond with the actual assessment methods employed to evaluate students' knowledge and skills.

- To make recommendations with a view to enhancing the alignment between assessment and learning outcomes in the researched institution.

3. Research question

In pursuit of the research aim and objectives outlined above, an overarching research question has been put forward:

- To what extent do the assessment methods employed in linguistic courses align with the stated learning objectives at a Vietnamese university?

4. Scope of the study

The scope of this research focuses on analyzing 33 different sets of documents including syllabi and test specifications for assessing learning outcomes. These documents represent a purposive selection from both linguistic courses and courses from EMI group (English as a Medium Instruction) offered within the linguistic programs. The inclusion of major language courses and courses from EMI group ensures a holistic representation of the diverse educational offerings within the linguistic curriculum. The examination of these 33 sets of documents allows for an investigation into the alignment dynamics between course learning outcomes and assessment methods. This scope enables an in-depth exploration of current alignment and possible challenges across the linguistic programs, while also facilitating the identification of patterns specific English-majored and EMI courses.

5. Significance of the study

The extensive literature on utilizing Bloom's Taxonomy to align assessments with learning outcomes reveals a research gap, particularly within the context of Vietnamese higher education. While global studies highlight the taxonomy's

importance in shaping educational practices, few focus on its application in Vietnam. This gap emphasizes the necessity for the present study, which aims to investigate how Vietnamese higher education teachers employ Bloom's Taxonomy in writing learning outcomes and aligning assessments with stated learning outcomes. By examining this alignment, the research can uncover disparities and areas of misalignment, informing suggestions to enhance instructional design and assessment strategies.

This study holds promise for improving course design within linguistic programs. By identifying alignment strengths and weaknesses, educators can refine educational offerings to better support students' cognitive development and knowledge acquisition. Additionally, the findings could guide the development of courses aligned with the goals of linguistic programs, creating a more cohesive learning experience. Ultimately, this research has the potential to drive meaningful improvements in pedagogical practices, educational quality, and student success within linguistic programs within the institution context.

6. Research methods

The research methodology for this study involves a combination of document analysis and qualitative content analysis methods to investigate the alignment between learning outcomes and assessment methods within linguistic courses. Over 30 sets of documents, including test specifications and assessment guidelines, are collected from a diverse range of linguistic courses to serve as primary data sources. Through a systematic coding process based on Bloom's Taxonomy levels, learning outcomes and assessment methods are categorized to provide a structured framework for evaluating alignment. The alignment assessment is conducted using the

predefined coding scheme, focusing on assessing the extent to which learning outcomes align with the cognitive demands implied by assessment methods.

Qualitative content analysis will further facilitate the identification of emerging patterns, and misalignments within linguistic programs, leading to a comprehensive interpretation of the data. The results will be discussed in light of pedagogical practices and curriculum design, with implications drawn for enhancing educational quality within linguistic programs.

7. Structure of the thesis

The thesis structure commences with an Introduction, providing an overview of the study. Subsequently, the paper unfolds as follows:

Chapter 1, the Literature Review, provides updating research theories concerning learning outcomes, assessments, types of assessment, constructive alignment, and outcome-based approaches. It furnishes a comprehensive review of prior studies conducted both in Vietnam and abroad.

Chapter 2, Research Methodology, delineates the research framework by presenting a descriptive account of the institutional setting and the document selection process for analysis. It also outlines the research methods, data collection procedures, and data analysis techniques employed.

Chapter 3 is the Findings and Discussion section. The author presents the findings pertaining to the formulation of learning outcomes using Bloom's taxonomy and assesses the current alignment and misalignment between learning outcomes and assessments. A thorough discussion of these findings is provided.

Finally, the Conclusion serves as a succinct summary of the thesis, encapsulating the key points emphasized in the preceding chapters. It also provides the implications and limitations of the study for future research.

CHAPTER 1: LITERATURE REVIEW

In recent years, education has seen a significant shift towards prioritizing measurable learning outcomes and effective assessment methods. Outcome-Based Education (OBE) has emerged as a guiding framework for educators and policymakers, emphasizing the alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment with predetermined learning objectives. Bloom's Taxonomy, within this framework, serves as a foundational tool for categorizing educational objectives and evaluating cognitive complexity.

This literature review aims to explore the multifaceted aspects of learning outcomes, assessment practices, and OBE implementation. By synthesizing existing research and practical insights, it seeks to provide an understanding of the interaction between learning outcomes, assessment strategies, and OBE principles. Additionally, the review investigates the effectiveness of Bloom's Taxonomy as a conceptual framework for designing assessments aligned with desired learning outcomes, thereby facilitating the evaluation of student learning across various cognitive domains.

1.1. Course learning outcomes

In recent decades, 'learning outcomes' has gained widespread usage in educational literature and among higher education practitioners (Hussey & Smith, 2008). In terms of curriculum studies scholarship, Pollard (2014) and other authors remark that writing learning outcomes is essential to excellent lesson design. In general, learning outcomes, also known as intended learning outcomes, learning objectives, or student-focused goals, are classified as week- or lesson-long planning (Butt, 2006; Fautley & Savage, 2013). An educational outcome refers to the abilities or skills that a student

should possess upon successfully completing an academic program, course, or instructional unit (Rao, 2020). All these terms include the idea of intention and maintain an emphasis on the students' educational objectives. Consequently, formulating learning outcomes necessitates instructors to accurately predict what they intend their students to acquire, demonstrating the expected interaction between teaching and learning during sessions.

Learning outcomes are statements outlining the achievements of learning and describing what a learner is supposed to demonstrate an understanding or apply knowledge at the end of a period of learning (Adams, 2006). A successful learning outcome should be measurable, necessitating careful consideration of summative assessment at the beginning of the planning stages (Kibble, 2017). These outcomes must delineate the specific behaviors of learners to be assessed and emphasize the content of knowledge acquired by students, rather than detailing the instructional methods the educator will employ in shaping their learning experience (McNeill et al., 2012). An outcome denotes the output or resultant effect of a particular action or process and encompasses action verbs that are both observable and measurable describing the capabilities of students' acquiring upon concluding a designated learning encounter. Therefore, the essential principle for creating well-designed courses hinges on ensuring harmony between the content that students are intended to master and the strategies employed to assess their grasp of that content (Abu-Hamdan & Khader, 2014; Kibble, 2017).

In the context of this study, a suitable operational interpretation is as follows: "Learning outcomes are statements of what a student is expected to know, understand and/or be able to demonstrate after completion of a process of learning" (European Commission, 2015, p.10). In essence, learning outcomes establish a connection

between anticipations, instructional methods, and evaluation. These outcomes play a pivotal role in enhancing clarity and understanding in:

1. what kinds of knowledge, skills, and abilities students should develop as a result of taking part in the unit or course.
2. what students will be expected to demonstrate in assessment activities.

By emphasizing the importance of coherence between learning outcomes, instructional methods, and evaluation, this research underscores the significance of thoughtful curriculum design in promoting meaningful learning experiences. Moving forward, continued attention to these principles will be essential for fostering educational excellence and ensuring the success of students in their academic endeavors.

1.2. Assessment

Assessment stands as a cornerstone of education, serving as a vital tool for evaluating students' learning progress and achievement. Its significance is underscored by its integral role in shaping instructional practices, guiding curriculum development, and informing educational policies. In the context of this study, assessment assumes particular importance as it intersects with the formulation and alignment of learning outcomes—a critical aspect of effective course design.

1.2.1. Definition of assessment

Assessment is a complex and dynamic process that goes beyond just measuring how well students perform in school. It serves as a comprehensive and continuous approach to measure, monitor, and enhance the learning experiences of individuals while simultaneously evaluating the attainment of educational objectives (Fernandes

et al., 2012; Parker et al., 2001; Taylor, 2009). In Yambi's opinion, assessment is a term that refers to a procedure aimed at gathering information utilized to make decisions concerning students, as well as curricula, programs, schools, and educational policies (Yambi, 2018). As outlined by Chapelle and Brindley (2020), "assessment refers to the act of collecting information and making 'judgments' about a language learner's knowledge of a language and ability to use it" (p. 294).

Assessing educational outcomes is gaining significance in higher education as accreditation organizations emphasize the significance of measuring student academic learning (Allen, 2006; Bers, 2008). This highlights the necessity of appropriately documenting student academic achievements through the assessment process (Praslova, 2010). A study was conducted on two types of assessments, namely:

1) assessments designed to track students' progress (referred to as assessment for learning)

2) assessments conducted to verify outcomes at the conclusion of a study period or program (referred to as assessment of learning) (Stiggins, 2005).

1.2.2. Assessment methods

The literature review has highlighted several theories associated with assessment in the teaching and learning context. Cheng & Fox (2017) emphasize assessment as an overarching concept including both classroom assessment practices and larger-scale testing administered externally to students. Cheng & Fox (2017) propose two terms that best cover the dimensions of assessment:

a. Assessment for learning pertains to the process of seeking and interpreting evidence for use by students and teachers to determine students' current learning status, identify areas for improvement, and strategize on the most effective path forward.

b. Assessment of learning refers to evaluations conducted after the learning process to ascertain its occurrence. These assessments provide insights into a student's learning status at a specific juncture.

Additionally, assessment is defined using other terms such as Formative Assessment and Summative Assessment. These terms collectively highlight the multifaceted nature of assessment practices in educational settings.

1.2.2.1. Formative assessment

Grant Wiggins (1998) states that "the aim of formative assessment is primarily to educate and improve student performance, not merely to audit it" (p.7). Unlike traditional assessments that primarily focus on measuring and auditing student performance, formative assessment aims to enhance learning by providing ongoing feedback and opportunities for improvement. According to Black and Wiliam (2010), formative assessment is defined as "activities undertaken by teachers—and by their students in assessing themselves—that provide information to be used as feedback to modify teaching and learning activities" (p.82). This definition emphasizes the collaborative nature of formative assessment, involving both teachers and students in the assessment process. The primary goal is to gather feedback that informs instructional decisions, allowing teachers to adjust their teaching methods and students to adapt their learning strategies in real-time. Hence, formative

assessment is not just about evaluating student performance; it is about using assessment as a tool for educational growth and improvement.

1.2.2.2. Summative assessment

In contrast to formative assessments, which primarily serve the purpose of providing feedback to both students and teachers, summative assessments are considered "high stakes" evaluations aimed at gauging the overall extent of learning achieved. According to Gardner (2010), these assessments are used to determine the level of knowledge a student has acquired. Summative assessments are typically graded, less frequent, and conducted at the culmination of instructional segments. Apart from assessing a student's current level of proficiency, they also play a crucial role in determining eligibility for specialized programs such as gifted and talented education, evaluating readiness for grade-level advancement, offering career guidance, and assessing qualifications for awards. This perspective is supported by (Harlen & Gardner, 2010), who highlight the multifaceted role of summative assessments beyond mere evaluation.

Previous research has shown that university lecturers tend to prefer formative assessments, reflecting a global trend towards prioritizing formative over summative evaluation methods in higher education (Dixson & Worrell, 2016; Konopasek et al., 2016). However, in this study, the emphasis has been placed on summative assessment rather than formative assessment. The Assessment of Learning approach has been adopted, aiming to measure and quantify the level of learning achievement that students have attained at a particular point in time (Stiggins, 2001). The analysis primarily revolves around examining the test specifications to ascertain how well the course learning outcomes align with the assessment process. This approach involves evaluating students' performance against predefined criteria or standards, ultimately

generating statistical information in the form of test scores (Ahmad, 2020). By prioritizing summative assessment, the study is expected to gain insights into the overall effectiveness of the educational process and the extent to which students have mastered the intended learning outcomes.

1.2.3. Types of test methods

In the educational process, testing serves as a means to assess the extent to which students have achieved their learning objectives (Halimah, 2018). Test methods can be defined as the systematic procedures set out for collecting information and making judgements for a particular assessment event (Carol et al., 2020). However, there are instances where the quality of teaching may not align with the outcomes of tests, leading to discrepancies in student performance. If the items fail to sufficiently reflect the subject area outlined in the corresponding standards, the outcomes might convey a meaning different from what is intended (Martineau et al., 2007). Ensuring the extent of agreement or alignment is crucial in providing evidence of content validity for accurately interpreting assessment results (Martone & Sireci, 2009). Therefore, it is crucial that tests are meticulously designed to meet specific criteria and accurately reflect students' true abilities.

1.3. Alignment and Constructive alignment

1.3.1. Constructive alignment

The curriculum should be created so that teaching activities, learning activities, and assessment tasks are all aligned with the learning goals. Biggs (2003) describes this sort of approach as constructive alignment. The constructive component refers to the type of learning and what the learner performs. The alignment section relates to what

the teacher performs. According to Biggs, in an effective teaching system, the style of instruction, learning activities, and evaluation are all coordinated to facilitate student learning. According to Biggs & Tang (2015), constructive alignment refers to an outcomes-centered approach to education in which both instructional methods and evaluation strategies are harmonized with the Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs). These ILOs describe the anticipated student actions and interactions with the conveyed content. Implicit within this seemingly self-evident assertion lies a potent instructional blueprint that is founded upon two pivotal concepts:

- Knowledge is not conveyed by an instructor; rather, it is formed within students as a result of their individual learning endeavors.
- The intended learning outcomes should be explicitly articulated from the outset, and instructional techniques and evaluations must be harmonized with the requisites of these objectives in order for them to be achieved.

These principles constitute the fundamental framework of constructive alignment (Biggs, 1996).

In the context of this investigation, the focus is exclusively directed towards the exploration of constructive alignment in relation to intended learning outcomes and assessment. The study confines its inquiry to the intricate interplay between the stipulated educational objectives and the evaluative mechanisms employed to gauge students' attainment of those objectives. Examining this alignment, the research seeks to unravel the intricate congruence between what is intended for students to acquire and the means through which their comprehension and mastery are measured. By delimiting the investigation to this specific aspect of educational design and evaluation, the study aims to contribute insights that elucidate the pivotal

relationship between intended learning outcomes and the corresponding assessment methodologies.

1.3.2. The importance of alignment

Alignment pertains to the degree of concordance between objectives and assessments, ensuring their harmonious correlation, and thereby guiding the educational framework towards the intended outcomes for student learning (Webb, 2002). Alignment focuses on "the degree to which expectations and assessments are in accord and function in combination with one another to lead the system toward students learning what they are expected to know and accomplish" in addition to curricular alignment (Webb, 1997).

Alignment entails an analysis of how explicit criteria are constructed hierarchically within a specific educational pathway. This process requires a close correlation among intended learning outcomes, instructional methods, and assessment procedures, ensuring their harmonious reinforcement. Essentially, alignment serves as a mechanism to gauge the extent to which various elements within an educational system collaboratively contribute to a common objective (Martone & Sireci, 2009). As advocated by Biggs (2011), a sequential approach is recommended, prioritizing intended learning outcomes, followed by learning activities, and then assessment practices. This sequence not only enhances transparency and significance in the overall learning experience for students but also guarantees that assessment practices are purposefully designed to evaluate the achievement of learning outcomes. Furthermore, this approach functions as a guiding principle, directing a wide array of deliberate actions (Ambrose et al., 2016). Neglecting such alignment could result in a failure to impart the essential skills that are the intended learning outcomes.

The concept of alignment is often associated with "excellent teaching" (Biggs, 1996) and students' educational attainment has been anticipated to enhance thanks to the alignment (Antes 2014).

1.4. Outcome-based approach

Outcome-based education is an approach to education that focuses on defining specific learning outcomes or competencies that students should achieve by the end of a course or program (Harden, 2007; Lorenzen, 2021; Schalock, 2001; Yen et al., 2023). These outcomes serve as the foundation for designing curriculum, instructional activities, and assessments. In the context of aligning course learning outcomes with assessments, the mention of "outcome-based" signifies the importance of ensuring that assessments are directly linked to the intended learning outcomes.

1.4.1. Outcome-based teaching and learning

OBA serves as a method for guaranteeing excellence within the American education system. OBA has also been implemented in higher education. It prioritizes objectives, aims, achievements, and outcomes in education. This pragmatic approach is now widely embraced globally as a component of quality assurance strategies. In OBA, curriculum and instructional decisions are guided by the desired learning outcomes that students should demonstrate upon completing a program or course (Japee & Oza, 2021).

Numerous educators have endeavored to implement outcome-based education into their course instruction and have observed specific outcomes (Zhang et al., 2021). Liang Qiang 2020) employed the principles of outcome-based education in designing a business English curriculum, investigating a reverse design approach to curriculum

development focusing on optimizing curriculum objectives, designing curriculum practices, and evaluating curriculum instruction. Custodio et al. (2019) conducted a study centered on the execution of OBE, revealing notable disparities between faculty members and students regarding the achievement and importance of desired student outcomes, instructional methods, and assessment practices.

The literature review also shows that Outcome-Based Teaching & Learning (OBTL) prioritizes the learner's outcomes rather than the instructor's pedagogical intentions. The fundamental principle of OBTL is that Teaching and Learning Activities (TLAs) and assessment methods (AMs) are aligned with the intended learning outcomes (ILOs) for the course (A. Rabuya, Jr., 2023). In essence, the outcomes drive the curriculum content, teaching approaches, and assessment procedures. These outcomes also serve as a framework for evaluating the curriculum. OBTL emphasizes curriculum design to ensure that the content, teaching strategies, learning activities, and assessments are appropriately matched to assist students in achieving the desired learning objectives (Biggs & Tang, 2010, 2011; Ortega-Dela Cruz, 2022; Pang et al., 2009). At the course level, OBTL aims for constructive alignment among the ILOs, TLAs, and AMs, ensuring that learners understand the expected outcomes (ILOs), are supported in achieving them through well-structured TLAs, and are adequately assessed for competency in meeting those ILOs through appropriate AMs. OBTL outlines the learning goals and describes the activities or abilities that students are expected to demonstrate upon completion of a course (Loreto, 2018). Moreover, Donald (2015) emphasizes ensuring alignment between the learning outcomes for a specific degree attainment and individual learning activities.

1.4.2. Advantages of outcome-based approach

Applying OBÂ is beneficial for both teachers and learners in various ways including providing several advantages as Davis (2003) noted:

- Relevance: Outcome-based education emphasizes the importance of aligning educational objectives with real-world practice, ensuring graduates are equipped with the necessary skills and capabilities for their future professions.
- Discourse (Controversy): The process of identifying outcomes sparks crucial discussions within institutions about the fundamental goals of education, including the types of graduates being prepared and the key issues to be addressed.
- Clarity: Clearly defined educational outcomes provide both students and teachers with a transparent understanding of what is expected, thereby sharpening the focus on teaching and learning activities.
- Provision of a Framework: Outcome-based education furnishes a robust framework for curriculum integration, with outcomes serving as benchmarks against which the curriculum's effectiveness can be assessed.
- Accountability: By explicitly stating the desired curriculum outcomes, outcome-based education emphasizes accountability, enabling the measurement of graduates' performance against established standards and facilitating quality assurance processes.
- Self-Directed Learning: With clear expectations of what needs to be achieved, students are empowered to take greater responsibility for their learning journey, fostering a student-centered approach to education.

- Flexibility: Outcome-based education prioritizes outcomes over specific teaching methods, allowing for innovation and flexibility in instructional strategies to accommodate diverse learning styles and preferences.
- Guide for Assessment: By focusing on assessing outcomes, outcome-based education streamlines the planning and execution of examinations, ensuring assessments align closely with desired educational objectives.

OBÂ has emerged as a significant pedagogical approach aimed at fostering a clear and coherent focus on desired achievement outcomes within educational settings. Through OBA both teachers and learners maintain a clear and consistent focus on desired achievement outcomes, fostering predictability and transparency in assessment criteria (Killen & Hattingh, 2004; Killen, 2004). This clarity of focus, as highlighted by Joshi et al. (2023), empowers teachers and learners alike, providing a shared understanding of expectations and assessment criteria. As a result, instructional delivery aligns closely with predetermined outcomes, enhancing not only the quality of instruction but also its effectiveness across all levels and disciplines (Bond et al., 2017; Gurukkal, 2020; Laguador & Dotong, 2014; Patra et al., 2021). Such alignment not only enhances instructional quality but also promotes shared responsibility between teachers and learners for achieving desired outcomes.

1.4.3. Outcome-based assessment

OBA is an educational approach that prioritizes the ultimate learning outcomes achieved by students. There are different viewpoints in selecting suitable assessment methods for the learning process. Joshi et al. (2023) mentions that traditional paper-and-pencil tests may not effectively assess OBE outcomes. Instead, a diverse range of assessment methods, including individual essays and group presentations, are

necessary. One example is the use of portfolios. However, analyzing outcome-based assessment generally plays a critical role for understanding how assessments may assist to quantifying student progress within a program while providing clear insights into the extent to which students gain information and skills in accomplishing course goals (Didin Sonmez et al., 2021). Outcome-based assessment involves evaluating student learning by focusing on specific learning outcomes or objectives, which can vary based on the type of test items used. Other types of tests are presented in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1

Types of Written Tests

Type of Written Test	Description
Verbal	Emphasizes reading, writing, or speaking. Most tests in education are verbal tests.
Nonverbal	Does not require reading, writing, or speaking ability. Tests composed of numerals or drawings are examples.
Objective	Refers to the scoring of tests. When two or more scorers can easily agree on whether an answer is correct or incorrect, the test is an objective one. True-false, multiple-choice, and matching tests are the best examples.

Subjective	Also refers to scoring. When it is difficult for two scorers to agree on whether an item is correct or incorrect, the test is a subjective one. Essay tests are examples.
Teacher-made	Tests constructed entirely by teachers for use in the teachers' classrooms.
Standardized	Tests constructed by measurement experts over a period of years. They are designed to measure broad, national objectives and have a uniform set of instructions that are adhered to during each administration. Most also have tables of norms, to which a student's performance may be compared to determine where the student stands in relation to a national sample of students at the same grade or age level.
Power	Tests with liberal time limits that allow each student to attempt each item. Items tend to be difficult. Speed Tests with time limits so strict that no one is expected to complete all items. Items tend to be easy.

Adapted from “Testing and educational decision making” by Tom, K., & Gary D. Borich, 2011, *Educational Testing and Measurement: Classroom Application and Practice* (11th ed.), Wiley, Hoboken.

Assessments featuring item response formats allowing for consistent and objective scoring are termed objective tests. These tests, such as multiple-choice, true-false, and matching formats, usually require students to indicate their answers by marking or selecting options on electronically scanned answer sheets or test booklets. While objective test items have the potential to assess higher-order learning and thinking skills, they frequently focus solely on assessing factual knowledge (Tom & Gary D. Borich, 2011).

Assessment within OBE represents a fundamental departure from traditional educational evaluation methods. It transcends mere measurement of students' knowledge to encompass evaluation of their ability to apply that knowledge effectively (Biggs & Tang, 2011). In OBE, assessments are closely aligned with learning outcomes and encompass various methods, including formative assessments, summative assessments, authentic assessments, peer and self-assessments, and e-assessments. Formative assessments, such as quizzes and informal observations, provide continuous feedback to both educators and learners (Japee & Oza, 2021), while summative assessments, like final exams and capstone projects, offer comprehensive evaluations typically conducted at the conclusion of a course or program (Asim et al., 2021). Authentic assessments, requiring students to apply their skills in real-world scenarios, are effective for evaluating higher-order cognitive abilities (Khanna & Mehrotra, 2019). Peer and self-assessments foster metacognitive skills by engaging students in evaluating their own or their peers' performances (Raupach et al., 2011; Thirumoorthy, 2021). With the advancement of

technology, online assessments have gained prominence (Sapawi, 2021). In OBE, assessment serves not only as a means of grading students but also as a tool for continuous enhancement of the learning process.

1.5. English as medium instruction

The English language has established itself as the global lingua franca (Mauranen, 2003; Tsou & Kao, 2017). Initially, the study only focuses on linguistic courses; however, since EMI courses involve teaching content in a language that is not the students' first language, there may be unique pedagogical challenges and considerations regarding the alignment of learning outcomes and assessments. EMI distinguishes itself from other frequent models in bilingual education by the reason of choosing English as the instructional medium (Tsou & Kao, 2017). By including EMI courses in the study, the author can explore how these challenges are addressed and whether alignment practices differ in this context. Including EMI courses expands the scope of the study beyond just linguistic programs, providing a broader context for analysis. This allows for a more comprehensive understanding of how alignment between learning outcomes and assessments is managed across different types of courses within the university. After analyzing both linguistic programs and EMI courses, the author can potentially compare and contrast the alignment practices between these two types of courses. This comparison may yield insights into any differences or similarities in how learning outcomes are formulated and assessed in courses that use English as the medium of instruction versus courses taught in the local language.

1.6. Theoretical framework: Bloom’s Taxonomy

Bloom’s taxonomy has been widely employed across many disciplines to align course objectives and curriculum to level of skills achieved (Dettmer, 2005; Green, 2010; Manton et al., 2004; Su et al., 2005). Bloom's Taxonomy is a logically organized framework that illustrates the cognitive abilities needed for students to gain a deep and meaningful understanding of knowledge (Nurmatova & Altun, 2023). It is also a well-established cognitive hierarchy of learning objectives, and a broadly accepted tool for categorizing types of thinking including remember, understand, apply, analyze, evaluate and create (Lau et al., 2018). The framework offers a structured approach to categorizing educational goals based on their cognitive complexity in which the upper levels of Bloom's taxonomy embrace lower levels—for example, an analysis-level inquiry necessitates mastery of application, understanding, and knowledge (Momsen et al., 2010). However, inexperienced educators encounter challenges when it comes to incorporating Bloom's Taxonomy into language instruction because it necessitates a comprehensive understanding of their students' language proficiency levels (Nurmatova & Altun, 2023).

Bloom's Taxonomy suggests that both teaching and assessment methods should progress from lower levels to higher levels of learning domains (Chandio et al., 2021). Remembering, understanding, and applying are categorized within the lower domains, whereas analyzing, evaluating, and creating are classified within the higher domains. These domains are better described in the following table:

Table 1.2

Skills related to higher level thinking

Skill	Sample Prompts	Purpose	Level

Creating	Design, construct, plan	Combine elements into a new pattern	Higher
Evaluating	Check, review, conclude, explain	Decide according to a set of criteria	Higher
Analyzing	Compare, organize, deconstruct	Examine information	Higher
Applying	Implement, carry out, use, apply, show, solve	Apply knowledge	Lower
Understand	Describe, estimate, predict	Understand meaning	Lower
Remembering	Recognize, list, identify	Memorize and recall facts	Lower

Note: Adopted from “The Impact of Assessment on Students Learning” by Jimaa (2011).

Blooms taxonomy can be applied in the following specific areas according to Sivaraman and Krishna (2015):

1. Writing and revising learning objectives
2. Planning curriculum
3. Identifying simple to most difficult skills
4. Effectively aligning objectives to assessment techniques and standards
5. Incorporating knowledge to be learned
6. Facilitating questioning

In this research, Bloom's taxonomy is employed to classify the cognitive processing levels that learning objectives and assessments aim to address. Also, analyzing LOs within the context of Bloom's Taxonomy allows one to establish if the results provide student exposure to different stages of cognitive development (Swart & Daneti, 2019).

1.6.1. Bloom’s Taxonomy in writing learning outcomes

Bloom's taxonomy is widely employed for writing learning outcomes since it gives a pre-built structure and collection of verbs (Kennedy et al., 2007). It might be claimed that using the proper verbs is essential for successfully writing learning outcomes. As learning outcomes concern what students can accomplish at the end of the learning session, all of these verbs used to write are action (active) verbs. Action verbs are a core feature of the revised version of Bloom’s taxonomy (Krathwohl, 2002). Course learning outcomes should specify the minimum acceptable (threshold level) standard for a student to be able to pass a course. This means that it is important to express learning outcomes in terms of the essential learning for a module or course, so a small number of learning outcomes of central importance should be developed rather than a large number of superficial outcomes.

Learning outcomes should be written using action verbs so that students are able to demonstrate that they have learned or achieved the outcome (Reichgelt et al., 2002). Course designers should consider guidelines and experience in writing learning outcomes (Table 1.3) for ensuring clarity, alignment with educational objectives, and consistency in assessment practices. They provide a structured approach to articulating the intended outcomes of educational interventions, facilitating effective teaching and learning strategies.

Table 1.3

Guidelines and experience in writing learning outcomes

i.	Action verbs from Bloom's Taxonomy with an emphasis on higher-order thinking skills should be used.
ii.	To facilitate the assessing of outcomes, one verb per learning outcome should be used.
iii.	There should be between 4-8 learning outcomes for each course, in fact the fewer the better.
iv.	Course learning outcomes should describe what a student should be able to DO at the end of a course rather than what the instructor teaches.
v.	Course learning outcomes should be written in language that students (and those outside the field) are able to understand.
vi.	Course learning outcomes are typically not content-specific.
vii.	Ideally, each course or program should include learning outcomes from more than one domain (cognitive, psychomotor, and affective).
viii.	Each course learning outcome should be measurable and can be assessed, preferably using more than one assessment tool.
ix.	Weak verbs such as ""be aware," "appreciate," "identify," "read," and "recognize," are to be avoided in general. For example, recognizing a phenomenon is weak compared to understanding that phenomena.

Adopted from "Measuring course learning outcomes" by Keshavarz, M., 2011, *Journal of Learning Design*, 4(4)

1.6.2. Bloom’s Taxonomy in assessment

A shift from the conventional approach is evident in the student-centered method, which prioritizes the abilities students are expected to possess by the end of their learning journey. This approach, also known as outcomes-based, utilizes statements to articulate the knowledge gained and skills developed by students (Lawrence, 2019). Unlike the traditional model, the outcomes are defined first, emphasizing the desired results rather than the content to be imparted. Subsequently, delivery and assessment methods are tailored to facilitate individual learners in attaining these predetermined learning outcomes. Bloom's taxonomy used in assessment directs the generation of test questions to measure higher-level thinking abilities by emphasizing what test questions and assessment prompts need students to accomplish (find facts, apply knowledge, make a prediction, solve a problem, or evaluate a theory) (Stanny & Albright, 2016). Hence, Bloom's taxonomy has affected how instructors plan their courses, identify learning goals, and develop learning evaluations.

A significant challenge confronting educators who aim to utilize a hierarchical skills model such as Bloom’s taxonomy is the necessity to establish dependable and valid methods for evaluating skills across various levels of cognitive complexity, particularly those involving more intricate cognitive processes (Airasian & Miranda, 2002; Crowe et al., 2008). Numerous assessment formats are available for appraising different skill levels, including multiple-choice exams, essay exams, observational techniques, writing assignments, portfolios, and work products (B. G. Davis, 2009; Zepeda, 2007).

1.7. Previous studies

While research on outcomes-based evaluation and alignment between course learning outcomes and assessment remains relatively limited, noteworthy domestic and international studies have made significant contributions.

Based on the levels of cognitive domains that bloom suggests, the author indicates that designed assessment methods are well-aligned with course learning outcomes (CLOs) and program learning outcomes (Trinh, 2022). A set of Key Performance Indicators was introduced to aim at assisting managers in effectively overseeing and managing learning outcomes over time, thereby facilitating data-driven decision-making (Le Ngoc Quynh Lam et al., 2017). Anaee (2017) proposed a solution for developing Key Performance Indicators tailored to program learning outcomes, discussing their implications for the conceptual assessment of student achievement. Sharma (2019) presented a mathematical model for evaluating program learning outcomes and specific modules through a Key Performance Indicator system. Lastly, Ayadat (2020) shared research findings on the integration of Key Performance Indicators and rubrics to assess learners' attainment of training program learning outcomes.

The synthesis of the literature reviewed illuminates the intricate dynamics of learning outcomes, assessment practices, and the implementation of OBE. Through a comprehensive analysis, it becomes evident that the alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment to predetermined learning objectives is fundamental in fostering meaningful educational experiences and facilitating the demonstration of knowledge, skills, and competencies by learners. Moreover, Bloom's Taxonomy emerges as a pivotal tool in this process; therefore, the author decided to employed

Bloom's Taxonomy (Krathwohl, 2002) with a view to offering a structured approach to curriculum design and assessment development. This literature review serves as a foundation for this research study, guiding stakeholders in their endeavors to elevate educational quality and relevance in an ever-evolving landscape.

CHAPTER 2: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The methodology section of this study mainly focuses on the research context, data collection procedures, and data analysis methods employed to investigate the alignment between assessment methods and learning outcomes in linguistic courses at a Vietnamese university.

Situated within the Faculty of English Language, which offers a diverse array of programs catering to linguistics and non-linguistics disciplines, this study explores the alignment between learning outcomes and assessments in English-major and EMI courses. This dual focus provides a unique academic backdrop for examining the effectiveness of alignment across varied educational contexts within the same faculty.

2.1. Research context

The study is situated within a dynamic academic environment, specifically in the Faculty of English Language which administers a diverse range of programs catering to both linguistics and non-linguistics disciplines. Within the linguistics programs, the focus is on providing a comprehensive educational experience for English-majored students. Simultaneously, the faculty offers English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) courses tailored to non-English-majored students of Tourism, Tourism & Travel Service Management and Hotel Management program, who engage in content-driven studies entirely in English. This dual focus on linguistic and non-linguistic programs, with a specialized emphasis on English proficiency through EMI courses, creates a distinctive academic backdrop for the study, presenting an opportunity to explore the effectiveness of alignment between learning

outcomes and assessments across varied educational contexts within the same academic institution.

As part of the research methodology, 33 sets of syllabi and test specifications were collected and analyzed, providing a robust foundation for understanding the nuances of outcome formulation and assessment alignment within linguistic programs. This deliberate sampling ensures a representative examination of the university's pedagogical approach, shedding light on the difficulties of course development employed by the Faculty of English language and EMI group.

2.3. Data collection procedures

In the initial phase of the research procedure, data collection serves as the foundational step towards systematically analyzing the alignment between course learning outcomes and assessment methods within linguistic programs at a Vietnamese university. This phase occurs within one month (August, 2022 – September, 2022) and entails the acquisition of 33 sets of syllabi and corresponding assessment guidelines from a diverse range of linguistic courses (See Appendix 1, 2). These documents serve as the primary data sources for the subsequent analysis. The selection of documents from various linguistic courses ensures a comprehensive representation of the curriculum landscape within the university's linguistic programs.

Each set of syllabi and assessment guidelines is carefully selected to encompass both linguistics courses and EMI courses, providing a holistic view of the assessment practices across different linguistic disciplines. The diversity in course offerings ensures that the data collected reflect the breadth and depth of the linguistic programs at a university. Moreover, the collection process adheres to rigorous standards to

ensure the integrity and reliability of the data. A systematic approach is employed to gather the required documents, considering factors such as course popularity, instructor expertise, and academic department representation. This meticulous approach enhances the validity of the data collected and ensures that the subsequent analysis accurately reflects the assessment landscape within the linguistic programs.

The data collection phase lays the groundwork for the comprehensive analysis of alignment between learning outcomes and assessment methods. It establishes a robust dataset that forms the basis for further exploration and interpretation in subsequent phases of the research procedure.

2.3. Data analysis methods

In this study, qualitative data collection and content analysis approach were employed to investigate the alignment between learning outcomes and assessments.

Content analysis

In qualitative research, academic scholars employ content analysis to deepen their comprehension of individual, organizational, and institutional phenomena. Content analysis, as described by Bowen (2009), is a systematic approach to evaluating documents. Like other qualitative analytical methods, its aim is to scrutinize and interpret data in order to derive significance, comprehension, and empirical insights (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). This method is particularly relevant for examining documents, which are social artifacts produced, shared, and utilized by society, containing text or language pre-existing the researcher's involvement (Bowen, 2009). Documents are an important source of information in qualitative researches (Creswell, 2005, p.219). Document analysis is a systematic approach used to scrutinize and assess various types of documents, including both printed materials

and electronic resources such as computer-based and internet-transmitted content. Similar to other qualitative research methods, document analysis involves carefully examining and interpreting data to extract meaning, deepen comprehension, and cultivate empirical knowledge (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Rapley, 2007). In this particular study, content analysis is utilized to extract data from course syllabi and test specification.

Through a purposive sampling method, data was collected from two main sources of Faculty of English language and EMI group, including 18 sets of syllabi and test specifications from English-majored courses and other 15 sets from EMI courses. The data collection process focused on distinguishing and evaluating how learning outcomes were written, emphasizing the use of verbs and their association with specific levels of Bloom's taxonomy. Besides, the data assists to figure out how the assessments align with the learning outcomes.

Emphasizing the equality and fairness in the sampling process, a balanced approach was adopted, ensuring no significant discrepancy in the quantities sampled. Specifically, 18 sets of syllabi and test specifications were collected from English-majored courses, alongside 15 sets from EMI courses, underscoring a deliberate effort to maintain impartiality and avoid bias.

The focus was on distinguishing and evaluating how learning outcomes were articulated within these documents. This involved a detailed examination of the language used, particularly the verbs employed, and their alignment with specific levels of Bloom's taxonomy. Verbs play a crucial role in indicating the cognitive complexity expected of students in achieving the stated learning outcomes. By

analyzing the verbs used in the learning outcomes, researchers could assess the intended cognitive processes, such as remembering, understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating, and creating, as outlined in Bloom's taxonomy.

The collected data enabled researchers to assess how assessments were aligned with the identified learning outcomes. This examination sought to determine whether the assessments adequately measured the intended learning objectives and whether there was coherence between what was taught and how it was assessed. This method allowed for a comprehensive understanding of how learning outcomes were formulated and assessed within the context of English language and EMI courses, emphasizing fairness, thoroughness, and alignment with established educational frameworks such as Bloom's taxonomy.

In brief, the methodology chapter of this study has outlined a systematic approach to investigating the alignment between assessment methods and learning outcomes in linguistic courses at a Vietnamese university. Through rigorous data collection procedures and qualitative analysis methods, this study aims to provide valuable insights into the intricacies of alignment within diverse educational contexts. By employing a balanced and thorough approach, this research strives for contributing to the enhancement of assessment practices and the promotion of student learning and achievement in linguistic programs.

CHAPTER 3: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Findings

In considering the critical relationship between learning outcomes and assessment, two essential facets emerge in crafting learning objectives. Another crucial finding involves examining the alignment between the stated learning outcomes and the actual assessments conducted, ensuring a seamless integration that accurately reflects the intended educational goals and effectively measures students' achievement of those objectives.

3.1.1. The clarity of verbs in learning outcomes

Effective writing of learning outcomes requires careful consideration of the clarity of action verbs to ensure precision and comprehensibility. Ambiguity in the choice of verbs can lead to confusion among readers and learners, hindering their ability to envision the intended outcomes of assessments. Furthermore, an unclear assessment environment exacerbates this difficulty by making it harder for individuals to understand the exact objectives and aims of the testing procedure.

Table 3.1

The clarity of verbs in learning outcomes

Course name	Intended learning outcomes	Assessment purpose	Test methods
English Translation and Interpreting Theory	L2: Be able to search for information relevant to lesson	- Ability to search for information relevant to lesson content from different sources of	Presentation

	content from different sources of translation and interpretation documents	translation and interpretation documents	
Cross-cultural Communication, English Translation and Interpreting Theory	G1: Able to describe, explain and analyze intercultural knowledge G2: Have skills to effectively search and synthesize information, be able to solve communication situations and demonstrate adaptation to changes in new cultural environments	- Ability to describe, explain and analyze students' intercultural knowledge - Students' ability to effectively search and synthesize information related to cross-cultural communication - Some concepts related to culture include | communication strategies, verbal and nonverbal communication, culture shock phenomenon	- Group presentation - Speaking test

		- Solve communication situations through knowledge learned about cross-cultural communication such as communication strategies, sign language, politeness, direct/indirect speech.	
English Listening Skills 2	L1: Ability to remember and recognize vocabulary in context to serve listening comprehension on familiar topics such as personality, time, family, work, life, and some social events. L2: Ability to listen and understand the	L1: Ability to remember and recognize vocabulary in context to serve listening comprehension on familiar topics such as personality, time, family, work, life, and some social events. L2: Ability to listen and understand the main ideas and	- Written test (matching, true/false, gap-fill, short answer, quiz)

main ideas and important details of speech and simple conversations about areas such as society, personality, time, family, work, life, and Fields equivalent to levels A2, B1-	important details of speech and simple conversations about areas such as society, personality, time, family, work, life, and Fields equivalent to levels A2, B1-

The analysis of documents from linguistics courses reveals a significant observation regarding the utilization of verbs from Bloom's taxonomy in learning outcomes (LOs). It is noted that the some of these LOs do not incorporate verbs from Bloom's taxonomy. Instead of writing *"Demonstrate the ability…"*, the course designers started the requirement for the LO by *"Be able to …"* or *"Have skills to …"* (Cross cultural Communication, English Translation and Interpreting Theory) or *"Ability to…"* (English Listening Skills 2). Therefore, some LOs employed language that cannot be easily measured, such as terms like *"effectively", "be aware of", "be able to"* and *"have the ability to"*, etc.

Effective writing of learning outcomes requires careful consideration of the clarity of action verbs to ensure precision and comprehensibility. Ambiguity in the choice of verbs can lead to confusion among learners or test designers, hindering their ability to envision the intended outcomes of assessments. In addition to the challenge of effectively measuring students' ability to search for and synthesize information (in

Cross-cultural Communication, English Translation and Interpreting Theory and English Translation and Interpreting Theory), the suitability of the presentation format as an assessment method warrants examination regarding its efficacy in evaluating the aforementioned skills. While presentations offer students the opportunity to showcase their understanding and communication abilities in a dynamic and interactive manner, their effectiveness in accurately assessing the depth of research and critical thinking skills remains debatable. The presentation format may favor students who excel in oral communication and presentation delivery, potentially overshadowing deficiencies in substantive content or research depth. Moreover, factors such as stage fright or language barriers may disproportionately impact students' performance, leading to skewed assessments of their information retrieval and synthesis capabilities. Thus, while presentations offer certain benefits as an assessment tool, their ability to truly gauge students' proficiency in information searching and synthesis warrants careful consideration and supplementary evaluation measures. Additionally, an unclear context of assessment further exacerbates this challenge, making it difficult for individuals to grasp the specific expectations and goals of the testing process.

3.1.2. The quantities of requirements within a single LO

The examination of learning outcomes (LO) often encompasses various dimensions, including the quantitative aspect of requirements embedded within a single LO. This investigation studies the abundance or scarcity of requirements stated within individual learning outcomes, shedding light on the depth and specificity of expectations set forth for students' achievement. By analyzing the number of requirements within individual learning outcomes, the author can gain insights into educators' expectations and how well they guide students' learning journeys.

Table 3.2

Learning outcomes of linguistics courses

Course name	**Intended learning outcomes**
English Reading Skills 4	L1: Memorize and use vocabulary… Apply reading comprehension strategies to determine the meaning of polysemous words…, synthesize detailed information…, identify detailed information…, identify summary information…, determine the author's attitudes…, determine the causes of the event…
English Translation and Interpreting Theory	L1: Describe and explain … and apply necessary strategies before translating and interpreting...
English Interpreting practice 2	L1: Describe, explain and apply interpretation skills …
English Listening Skills 1	L1: Apply vocabulary and listening strategies… to determine detailed information…, to determine reasons, instructions, quantity, time of events/ events…
English Reading skill 2	L1: Memorize and use vocabulary … and apply some reading comprehension strategies; understand the main ideas…; distinguish between practical and theoretical information; understand complex sentence structure; understand cause-effect relationships; understand different expressions; identify participle clauses; understand the implications of the reading; determine the

	author's views and attitudes; summarize reading information

The analysis exposes another noteworthy issue in the construction of linguistics course LOs. There is a consistent trend where many LOs tend to include numerous demands or objectives within a single statement. A wide range of requirement could be mentioned Table 3.2 as *"Memorize and use vocabulary… Apply reading comprehension strategies…, distinguish…, determine…, identify detailed information…"* (English Reading Skills 4). L1 of English Translation and Interpreting Theory shows the expected outcomes to *"Describe and explain…, identify and apply…".* This tendency could lead to information overload for students enrolled in these courses, and makes it challenging for students to focus on the core objectives of the course and can result in confusion. This observation raises concerns about the clarity and manageability of LOs within linguistics courses.

Apart from utilizing one or two action verbs to describe learning outcomes, it is essential for learning outcomes (LO) to integrate a learning taxonomy framework such as Bloom's or Biggs' SOLO taxonomy to specify instructional objectives (Biggs, 2014). These taxonomies provide a structured approach to defining the desired learning outcomes by categorizing them according to cognitive levels of understanding. By incorporating such taxonomies into the formulation of LOs, educators can ensure that the objectives are aligned with the intended level of cognitive complexity and the desired depth of student learning. However, it is observed that in EMI courses, learning outcomes are often characterized by the use of only one specific requirement in each statement. This minimalist approach to crafting LOs may limit the breadth and depth of the intended learning objectives,

potentially overlooking important aspects of student learning and development. Therefore, there is a need to reevaluate the formulation of LOs in EMI courses to ensure that they adequately reflect the complexity and diversity of learning outcomes desired in higher education settings.

In contrast to the issues identified in linguistics courses, the analysis of LOs in courses delivered in EMI reveals a positive trend.

Table 3.3

Learning outcomes of EMI courses

Course name	**Intended learning outcomes**
Basic Economics	L1: Demonstrate understanding of… L2: Apply obtained knowledge…
Communication in Tourism	L1: Demonstrate an understanding of… L2: Suggest solutions for…
Introduction to Tourism	L1: Demonstrate the understanding of… L2: Identify…
Visiting accommodation models	L1: Analyze the characteristics of… L2: Formulate a startup idea…
Travel Business 1	L1: Demonstrate understanding of… L2: Analyze fundamental knowledge…

One key principle is to use a single, action-oriented verb in each learning outcome, ensuring precision and focus. For example, instead of using a phrase like "understand the principles of," a more specific verb like "analyze" or "evaluate" can be employed.

This specificity helps in clearly defining the intended outcome and provides a basis for designing assessments that align with these outcomes. Each LO in EMI courses focuses on only one certain request which contributes to exceptional clarity, making it easy for both students and educators to follow and assess progress. By incorporating a single, well-defined requirement in each LO, EMI courses succeed in eliminating ambiguity and ensuring that students' learning objectives are clear.

Learning outcomes should be designed to encourage higher-order thinking skills in addition to language proficiency. Verbs such as "analyze", "formulate", and "suggest" prompt critical thinking and problem-solving, contributing to a more enhanced learning experience. Assessments corresponding to these outcomes can then include tasks that require students to demonstrate their ability to think critically and apply language skills in complex situations. This approach not only enhances language proficiency but also fosters the development of cognitive skills essential for academic and professional success.

3.1.3. Alignment between stated LOs and actual assessment

3.1.3.1. Alignment between stated LOs and actual assessment

The alignment between stated learning outcomes (LOs) and actual assessments is a critical aspect of ensuring the effectiveness and validity of educational practices. In the context of linguistics courses, the analysis of test specifications reveals interesting patterns regarding the correspondence between the verbs used to describe LOs and the types of assessments employed.

Table 3.4

Alignment between stated LOs and actual assessment in linguistics courses

Course name	Intended learning outcomes	Test methods
English-speaking country	L3: Analyze information from books, newspapers, the Internet... about many aspects of social life in the UK, America and some English-speaking countries (Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Singapore)	Writing test
English Reading skill 1	L1: Memorize and use vocabulary on familiar topics … and some basic reading comprehension strategies … L2: Read and understand texts of 300-400 words in length with clear language on topics related to majors or fields of interest and interest.	Gap-filling, short answers, choosing definition/synonym, portfolio
English Reading skill 2	L1: Memorize and use vocabulary on topics related to majors or fields of interest and love … and apply some reading comprehension strategies: … L2: Can read and understand texts of 400-500 words in length …	- Portfolio - Written test (Short answer, gap-filling, word form, definition/synonym)

English Reading Skills 4	L1: Memorize and use vocabulary on topics such as …; Apply reading comprehension strategies … L2: Read and understand relatively long and relatively complex texts (equivalent to B2-CEFR level) on topics such as … L3: Demonstrate the ability to work independently, research and search for information effectively	- Presentation (Book review poster + present) - Written test + MCQs
Employability Skills (for English major)	L1: Apply knowledge of soft skills such as communication, negotiation, time management, meetings, customer service, innovation in the working environment L2: Solve work situations such as first day of work, time management, negotiations, meetings, customer service, innovation. L3: Organize and operate groups effectively.	- Group presentation (role play, analyze situation) - Oral test
English Writing Skills 1	L1: Memorize accurate basic vocabulary abbreviated … L2: Use basic grammatical structures correctly …	- Portfolio (Journal - Writing) - Written test

	L3: Write notes, messages, comments on social networks, informal emails, paragraphs describing processes and paragraphs describing people/places (100-120 words) …	
English Writing Skills 4	L1: Apply accurate, relatively diverse and complex vocabulary … L2: Apply accurate, relatively diverse and complex grammatical structures … L3: Write an essay (200-250 words) in the form of comparison, cause and effect and present opinions on …	- Written test (essay) - Written test - Written test (Portfolio)

At the lower levels of learning, characterized by remembering, understanding, and applying, the stated LOs often utilize verbs such as "memorize and use," "apply," "demonstrate," and "read and understand." These verbs suggest a focus on foundational knowledge acquisition and basic skill application. Interestingly, the types of assessments employed for these LOs align closely with their cognitive demands. Multiple-choice questions (MCQs), gap-filling exercises, and short-answer questions are frequently utilized assessment methods for these lower-level LOs. These assessment formats are well-suited for evaluating students' recall of factual information, comprehension of concepts, and ability to apply learned principles in specific contexts. The close alignment between the stated LOs and the assessment methods employed indicates a coherent approach to evaluating student learning at these cognitive levels.

Conversely, at the higher levels of learning, characterized by analyzing, organizing, solving, and writing, the stated LOs often incorporate verbs such as "organize," "solve," and "write." These verbs indicate a higher level of cognitive complexity, requiring students to engage in critical thinking, problem-solving, and synthesis of information. Interestingly, the assessments employed for these higher-level LOs diverge from traditional formats and instead emphasize authentic assessment methods. Portfolios, essays, journal writing, group presentations (including role-play and situation analysis), oral tests, and creating book review posters are among the common assessment formats used for these LOs. Authentic assessments allow students to demonstrate their understanding and application of knowledge in real-world contexts, fostering deeper learning and skill development.

The analysis highlights a strong alignment between the stated LOs and the types of assessments employed in linguistics courses. The choice of assessment methods reflects the cognitive demands associated with each level of learning, ensuring that students are adequately evaluated in accordance with the intended learning objectives. However, it is essential for educators to continuously review and refine their assessment practices to ensure that they effectively capture the breadth and depth of student learning across all cognitive levels.

The alignment between stated learning outcomes (LOs) and actual assessments is also crucial for ensuring the effectiveness and validity of educational practices, particularly in EMI courses.

Table 3.5

Alignment between stated LOs and actual assessment in EMI courses

Course name	**Intended learning outcomes**	**Test methods**
Basic Economics	L1: Demonstrate understanding of… L2: Apply obtained knowledge…	MCQs Presentation
Communication in Tourism	L1: Demonstrate an understanding of… L2: Suggest solutions for…	MCQs Presentation Oral test
Introduction to Tourism	L1: Demonstrate the understanding of… L2: Identify…	Presentation MCQs MCQs + short answers
Visiting accommodation models	L1: Analyze the characteristics of… L2: Formulate a startup idea…	Assignment Report
Travel Business 1	L1: Demonstrate understanding of… L2: Analyze fundamental knowledge…	MCQs Presentation Oral test
International Payments in Tourism	L1: Demonstrate comprehension of … L2: Analyze payment methods, payment instruments, and international payment transactions in the tourism industry	MCQs + short answer Presentation

Timeline of Vietnam history	L1: Identify the basic features of … L2: Analyse some impacts/visibility of some historical-cultural relics related to …	MCQs Presentation
World Civilizations	L1: Identify the basic features and achievements of … L2: Analyse some basic characteristics and influences of …	MCQs Presentation

In EMI courses, it is undeniable that LOs are written to be clear, concise, measurable, and easily visualized. These LOs typically describe clear learning objectives, facilitating both student understanding and instructor guidance. Moreover, they often categorize LOs into lower levels of learning, focusing on foundational knowledge and skills, and higher levels of thinking, emphasizing critical thinking and application.

Despite the clarity and specificity of LOs, there is a notable discrepancy between the breadth of learning objectives and the diversity of assessment methods employed. While the LOs are well-segmented to cater to different cognitive levels, the assessment methods remain relatively limited. Students are primarily evaluated through a narrow range of assessment formats, namely multiple-choice questions (MCQs), written tests, and presentations. This lack of diversity in assessment methods may hinder the comprehensive evaluation of student learning. While MCQs and written tests are effective for assessing lower-level cognitive skills such as recall and comprehension, they may not adequately capture the full spectrum of higher-order thinking skills emphasized in the LOs. For instance, critical thinking, problem-

solving, and analytical skills, which are integral to higher-level learning objectives, may not be effectively evaluated through traditional written assessments alone.

3.1.3.2. Misalignment between stated LOs and actual assessment in linguistics program

According to the data, the examination of course discovers a concerning pattern in matching LOs with assessment. It is evident that in many instances, there was a misalignment between the stated LOs and the actual requirements of the assessments. In such cases, the assessments demand more from students than what was originally stated in the LOs. This misalignment poses a significant challenge for both educators and students, as it can lead to confusion regarding what students are expected to achieve and be evaluated on.

Table 3.6

Misalignment between stated LOs and actual assessment in linguistics program

Course name	Learning outcomes	Assessment
English-speaking country	L1: Present knowledge about many different aspects of social life in England, America and some English-speaking countries	L1: Describe, explain and analyze knowledge about many different aspects of life social life in English-speaking countries
	L2: Effectively apply information search skills to collect information about many aspects of social life in the UK,	L2: Work independently, research and search for information about many different aspects of social life in the UK, America

	America and some English-speaking countries	and some English-speaking countries.
Employability Skills (for English major)	L2: Solve work-related situations such as first day of work, time management, negotiations, meetings, customer service, innovation.	L2: Proactively solve different situations at work; instruct and supervise others in performing defined tasks; Demonstrate a sense of respect for organizational culture.
	L3: Organize and operate groups effectively.	L3: Establish, organize, manage and operate effective group activities.
English Interpreting practice 2	L3: Demonstrate confidence when communicating in translation practice activities; demonstrate adaptability when performing different translation tasks; Demonstrate professionalism in translation tasks	L3: Organize and manage appropriate translation activities; Demonstrate professional ethics and take responsibility for assigned translation tasks

An interesting finding is the differences between the specific requirements outlined in the assessments and the language used in the LOs. The requirements in the

assessments were often phrased differently or included additional criteria not mentioned in the LOs.

The first misalignment lies in English-speaking country course. The discrepancy exists between the relatively passive action of presenting knowledge and the more active requirements of describing, explaining, and analyzing that knowledge. Presenting knowledge might involve a straightforward demonstration or presentation, whereas describing, explaining, and analyzing require a deeper understanding and engagement with the material. Another case is the expanding of requirements in assessment compared to stated learning outcome in Employability Skills (for English major) course. While the learning outcome emphasizes the application of information search skills, the assessment introduces additional elements such as working independently and conducting research. While independence and research skills are valuable, they may not directly align with the initial learning outcome. This incongruity between LOs and assessments can hinder the transparent communication of expectations, making it crucial for educators to harmonize the language and content between these two components.

3.2. Discussion

The discussion section provides a deeper analysis of the alignment between learning outcomes and actual assessments within linguistics programs at a university in Vietnam. Through the examination of findings and relevant literature, this section delves into the implications of misalignment between stated LOs and assessment methods. By addressing the discrepancies uncovered in the research, this discussion aims to shed light on the factors contributing to this misalignment and explore potential strategies for enhancing alignment between LOs and assessments.

Additionally, this section evaluates the significance of clear and actionable LOs in guiding effective assessment practices and facilitating student learning. Through critical analysis and reflection, the discussion seeks to inform educators, curriculum designers, and policymakers about the importance of aligning LOs with assessment methods to optimize the educational experience and promote student success in linguistics programs.

3.2.1. The balance quantities of requirements within a learning outcome statement

The alignment between course learning outcomes and assessments is a critical aspect of effective educational practices, especially within linguistic programs at Vietnamese universities.

The finding from experience in writing LOs for linguistic courses contrasts with the perspective presented by (Keshavarz, 2011), which emphasizes the need for LOs to specify the minimum acceptable standard for students to pass a course. According to Keshavarz's perspective, LOs should articulate the essential learning objectives for a module or course, prioritizing a concise set of central outcomes over a multitude of superficial ones. Furthermore, the findings underscore the significance of using action verbs in formulating LOs, as advocated by Reichgelt and Yaverbaum (2002). Employing action verbs ensures that LOs are actionable and measurable, enabling students to demonstrate their learning effectively. By aligning LOs with clear assessment criteria and focusing on essential learning objectives, educators can foster a more coherent and meaningful learning experience for students in linguistics programs.

As highlighted in Table 1.3 and mentioned by Savage (2015), the challenge of maintaining a balance between the number of learning outcomes and their effectiveness in a lesson is an important consideration. Savage recommends a streamlined approach, suggesting that one or two outcomes per lesson suffice. This insight raises questions about the optimal number of outcomes that enhance rather than weaken the educational impact. After looking back the finding of using only one action verb in writing learning outcomes for EMI courses, it can be seen that the experience is more professional and similar to that mentioned in Table 1.3 (Keshavarz, 2011). By employing Bloom's taxonomy verbs, these imprecise expressions in LOs could provide the clear communication of the cognitive level of skills or knowledge that students are expected to achieve.

Gronlund and Brookhart (2009) contribute valuable perspectives on addressing the issue of overloading outcomes with multiple statements of learning. They emphasize the importance of using action verbs as the primary defining “key element” in restricting learning outcomes (p.25). To be more specific, they contend that each outcome statement should center around a single action verb, ensuring a clear focus on what students are expected to learn. This emphasis on precision aligns with the broader goal of communicating instructional intent without becoming overly tied to specific topics. The implication is that outcomes should be practical and transferable, fostering students’ understanding of the subject matter. Educators must strive to select action verbs that clearly delineate the desired actions or behaviors students are expected to demonstrate. Furthermore, providing a clear and contextualized framework for assessments can enhance learners' understanding of the assessment criteria and facilitate their ability to align their efforts with the intended learning outcomes.

3.2.2. The importance of clarity in learning goals for enhancing the educational experience

Failure to adhere to guidelines when drafting learning outcomes could lead to confusion among both students and staff (Kennedy et al., 2007). The implications of how learning outcomes are written and implemented extend beyond mere formulation, significantly influencing the clarity of expectations for both students and educators. The finding supports the idea that consistent association of verbs with specific levels of Bloom's taxonomy can substantially reduce ambiguity in articulating expertise levels within learning outcomes (Stanny & Albright, 2016). This approach not only facilitates a more straightforward understanding for students but also simplifies the assessment process for instructors, allowing them to more easily monitor progress against well-defined and distinct objectives. The link between clarity in language and improved educational outcomes emerges as a crucial factor in enhancing the educational experience for both learners and educators.

The analysis of alignment between course learning outcomes and assessments within linguistic programs this university emphasizes the importance of thoughtful outcome formulation. Balancing the number of outcomes, employing action verbs, and ensuring specificity contribute to a clearer understanding of instructional intent. This clarity not only aids students in fulfilling their expectations but also facilitates more effective assessment practices for educators. The implications extend to the broader pedagogical landscape, emphasizing the crucial role that language precision plays in optimizing the educational experience.

3.2.3. Answering the research question

Based on the findings, the assessment methods employed in linguistic courses at the Vietnamese university generally demonstrate alignment with the stated learning objectives to a considerable extent. Researching the alignment between assessment and learning outcomes reveals both strengths and weaknesses coexisting simultaneously.

In English-major courses, while assessments effectively measure recall, comprehension, and application of learned principles, there are instances where certain learning outcomes lack verbs from Bloom's taxonomy. Additionally, the presence of multiple demands within single statements may divert students' focus from core objectives. Despite these challenges, higher-level outcomes in English-major courses prioritize authentic assessment methods, indicating a strong alignment with stated objectives.

Conversely, in EMI courses, while learning objectives are well-segmented, assessment methods remain relatively limited, primarily consisting of multiple-choice questions, written tests, and presentations. This lack of diversity in assessment methods may hinder comprehensive student evaluation and suggests room for improvement in aligning assessment practices with learning objectives.

The identification of misalignment between assessment requirements and learning outcomes in specific subjects emphasizes the necessity for more thorough examination and improvement in the alignment process. While there is generally favorable alignment between assessment methods and learning objectives in linguistic courses at the Vietnamese university, there are clear opportunities for improvement. Enhancements in articulating objectives, diversifying assessment

methods, and ensuring alignment across all subjects can further strengthen the effectiveness of linguistic course assessments in facilitating student learning and achievement of intended outcomes.

CONCLUSION

1. Recapitulation

In recapitulating the key findings of this study on the alignment between learning outcomes (LOs) and assessment within a Vietnamese university, three main findings emerge. One of the points indicates that the clarity of verbs used in learning outcomes significantly impacts their effectiveness. Clearly, action-oriented verbs enhance the understanding of what students are expected to achieve, thereby facilitating better alignment between instructional objectives and assessment methods. Another important consideration is the quantity of requirements within a single LO plays a crucial role in determining the comprehensiveness and focus of educational goals. Ensuring a balance between specificity and generality in LOs is essential to avoid overwhelming students and instructors while maintaining the potential for transferability of learning. Additionally, the alignment between stated LOs and actual assessment practices is paramount for ensuring the validity and reliability of educational evaluation. Identifying discrepancies or misalignments between LOs and assessment methods is crucial for optimizing the educational experience and promoting meaningful learning outcomes.

These findings emphasize the importance of careful consideration and strategic alignment between LOs and assessment practices to enhance educational effectiveness within Vietnamese university contexts.

2. Limitations and Recommendations

2.1. Limitations

While this study provides valuable insights into the alignment between learning outcomes and assessment practices within a Vietnamese university, several limitations should be acknowledged. The scope of the study focused primarily on the alignment between stated learning outcomes and actual assessment methods; however, it overlooked the horizontal and vertical alignment across different courses and educational levels. Future research should investigate these dimensions to provide a more comprehensive understanding of alignment within the educational framework. The current study was also limited because it did not thoroughly investigate scoring methods employed in test specifications, such as criteria for scoring, procedures for scoring, and selection of responses. Therefore, numerous facets in this area should be investigated to elucidate the nuances of scoring mechanisms and their impact on assessment outcomes. Moreover, the study should have extensively explored the characteristics of good evaluation tools, including their objective-based nature, reliability, validity, objectivity, and practicality. Due to time limitation, investigating these characteristics is expected to conduct in future research to offer valuable insights into the effectiveness of assessment tools and inform recommendations for improving assessment practices within the university context.

2.2. Recommendations

Based on the findings, several recommendations can be made to address the identified limitations and enhance the alignment between learning outcomes and

assessment practices within English-major and EMI courses at the Vietnamese university.

To address the issue of learning outcomes in English-major courses not incorporating verbs from Bloom's taxonomy, it is recommended to provide training and guidance to educators on how to formulate clear and actionable learning objectives. Workshops or professional development sessions focusing on Bloom's taxonomy can help educators understand the importance of using specific verbs to delineate cognitive levels and ensure alignment between learning objectives and assessments.

Regarding the challenge posed by numerous demands within a single statement in English-major courses, educators should be encouraged to streamline learning objectives to focus on core concepts. This could involve revising course materials and assessments to ensure that each learning objective is clearly defined and assessable. Furthermore, collaboration between educators and curriculum designers may be beneficial to ensure coherence and consistency in course structure and content.

In terms of EMI courses, where assessment methods remain relatively limited, there is a need to broaden the range of assessment formats to provide a more comprehensive evaluation of student learning. Educators should explore incorporating more authentic assessment methods, such as projects, portfolios, or case studies, to assess students' ability to apply learned principles in real-world contexts. Additionally, professional development opportunities focusing on innovative assessment strategies can support educators in effectively implementing these methods.

To address instances of misalignment between assessment requirements and learning outcomes, ongoing monitoring and review of course materials and assessments are essential. Educators should regularly evaluate the alignment between learning objectives, instructional activities, and assessment tasks to identify and rectify any discrepancies. Collaboration between educators, curriculum designers, and assessment specialists can facilitate this process and ensure that assessment practices effectively support the achievement of learning outcomes.

By implementing these recommendations, educators can enhance the alignment between learning outcomes and assessment practices, ultimately improving the quality of education and supporting student learning and achievement within English-major and EMI courses at the Vietnamese university.

3. Implications

The implications of this study on the alignment of course objectives and assessments within linguistics programs provide useful insights for educational practitioners. With a view to avoiding ambiguous understanding about ILOs, educators should prioritize careful verb selection when developing learning objectives to guarantee clarity and accuracy, hence improving the efficacy of learning and assessment. Furthermore, the findings emphasize the significance of maintaining a balance in the quantities of requirements within a single learning outcome, thereby promoting realistic and achievable educational goals.

The analysis of the alignment between stated learning outcomes and actual assessments revealed areas of congruence and misalignment. This aspect of the study highlights the need for continuous evaluation and refinement of assessment methods to ensure they accurately measure the intended learning outcomes. The findings

suggest that regular reviews of both LOs and assessments can contribute to a more coherent and effective curriculum, ultimately enhancing the quality of education within linguistic programs.

Based on the identified limitations, several recommendations can be proposed for future research and practice.

Future studies should prioritize investigating horizontal and vertical alignment across different courses and educational levels to ensure coherence and consistency in educational objectives and assessment practices. This could involve conducting comparative analyses between courses and longitudinal studies to track alignment trends over time. Another suggestion is that researchers should focus on the intricacies of scoring methods employed in test specifications, including establishing clear criteria for scoring, outlining procedures for scoring, and examining the selection of responses. Apart from conducting qualitative analyses of assessment documents, researchers could interview instructors to gain insights into scoring practices. Furthermore, efforts should be made to evaluate the characteristics of good evaluation tools, emphasizing their objective-based nature, comprehensiveness, discriminating power, reliability, validity, objectivity, and practicality. Developing assessment rubrics and guidelines based on best practices and engaging stakeholders in the evaluation process could be taken into consideration to ensure alignment with educational objectives and student needs. Addressing these recommendations could contribute to enhancing the quality and effectiveness of assessment practices within the university context.

4. Concluding remark

As a researcher invested in the field of language education, I have witnessed the increasing importance placed on aligning assessments with learning outcomes, particularly within the context of Vietnamese higher education. The global dominance of the English language across various sectors emphasizes the urgency for educational institutions to equip students with language proficiency aligned with real-world demands. This imperative has led to a heightened focus on ensuring that what students learn aligns closely with how their knowledge and skills are evaluated.

Through my observations and examinations within the academic community, it has become apparent that while the significance of alignment is widely acknowledged, there remains a dearth of research specifically addressing its application within Vietnamese linguistic programs. Therefore, I embarked on this study with the aim of investigating the alignment between course learning outcomes and assessments within linguistic programs at a Vietnamese university.

By exploring this alignment, I hope to uncover insights into the effectiveness of current educational practices and provide evidences and personal recommendations for enhancing language education in alignment within the institution context I have studied. As an educator myself, I truly desire to contribute to the improvement of instructional design and assessment strategies so that teachers and institution can support students' language proficiency development and overall learning experience.

This study has been a journey of exploration and discovery into the alignment between learning outcomes and assessments within linguistic programs at a Vietnamese university. Through examination and analysis, I have gained valuable insights into both the strengths and hurdles associated with alignment in language

education. Analyzing how learning outcomes are written by applying Bloom’s taxonomy helps me to evaluate their measurability, deliverability, and achievability for both teachers and students. Additionally, I have evaluated the appropriateness of assessment requirements and methods, gauging their suitability for effectively evaluating students' knowledge and skills.

I am optimistic about the impact that the findings of this research can have on educational practices within linguistic programs. By bridging the gap in existing literature and offering practical recommendations, I believe we can enhance the quality of language education and better prepare students for success in the globalized world.

As I reflect on this research journey, I am reminded of the importance of continual improvement and innovation in educational practices. By remaining committed to the principles of alignment and student-centered learning, we can strive towards creating more meaningful and effective learning experiences for students within linguistic programs and beyond.

REFERENCES

A. Rabuya, Jr., C. (2023). Four Cs of Outcomes-Based Teaching and Learning: A Literature Review. *International Journal of Research Publications*, *122*(1). https://doi.org/10.47119/IJRP1001221420234604

Abu-Hamdan, T., & Khader, F. (2014). Alignment of Intended Learning Outcomes with Quellmalz Taxonomy and Assessment Practices in Early Childhood Education Courses. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *5*(29). https://www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/JEP/article/view/16188

Adams, S. (2006). An introduction to learning outcomes: A consideration of the nature, function and position of learning outcomes in the creation of the European Higher Education Area. *EUA Bologna Handbook: Making Bologna Work*, *4*, 2–22.

Ahmad, Z. (2020). Summative Assessment, Test Scores and Text Quality: A Study of Cohesion as an Unspecified Descriptor in the Assessment Scale. *European Journal of Educational Research*, *9*(2), 523–535. https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.9.2.523

Airasian, P. W., & Miranda, H. (2002). The role of assessment in the revised taxonomy. In *Theory into Practice* (Vol. 41, pp. 249–254).

Allen, M. J. (2006). Assessing General Education Programs. *Jossey-Bass, An Imprint of Wiley*, 269.

Ambrose, S. A., Bridges, M. W., Dipietro, M., Lovett, M. C., Norman, M. K., & Mayer, R. E. (2016). *7 Research-Based Principles for Smart Teaching* (1st ed.). Jossey-Bass. https://firstliteracy.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/How-Learning-Works.pdf

Anaee, R. A., Ali, A. H., & Hassan, A. R. (2017). DEPOSITION OF NICRMO NANOWIRES USING ANODIC ALUMINUM OXIDE TEMPLATE. *ISERD International Conference*.

Antes, A. L., & DuBois, J. M. (2014). Aligning Objectives and Assessment in Responsible Conduct of Research Instruction. *Journal of Microbiology & Biology Education*, *15*(2), 108–116. https://doi.org/10.1128/JMBE.V15I2.852

Asim, H. M., Vaz, A., Ahmed, A., & Sadiq, S. (2021). A Review on Outcome Based Education and Factors That Impact Student Learning Outcomes in Tertiary Education System. *International Education Studies*, *14*(2), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v14n2p1

Ayadat, T., Ahmed, D., Chowdhury, S., & Asiz, A. (2020). Measurable performance indicators of student learning outcomes: A case study. *Global Journal of Engineering Education*, *22*(1), 40–50.

Bers, T. H. (2008). The role of institutional assessment in assessing student learning outcomes. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *2008*(141), 31–39. https://doi.org/10.1002/HE.291

Biggs, J. (1996). Enhancing teaching through constructive alignment. *Higher Education*, *32*(3), 347–364. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00138871

Biggs, J. (2014). Constructive alignment in university teaching. *HERDSA Review of Higher Education*, *1*. www.herdsa.org.au

Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2010). Applying constructive alignment to outcomes-based teaching and learning. *Training Material for "Quality Teaching for Learning in Higher Education" Workshop for Master Trainers, Ministry of Higher Education, Kuala Lumpur*, *53*(9), 23–25.

Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2011). Train-the-Trainers: Implementing Outcomes-based Teaching and Learning in Malaysian Higher Education. *Malaysian Journal of Learning and Instruction*, *8*. https://doi.org/10.32890/mjli.8.2011.7624

Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2015). Constructive Alignment: An Outcomes-Based Approach to Teaching Anatomy. *Teaching Anatomy*, 31–38. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-08930-0_4

Biggs, John, Tang, & Catherine. (2011). *Teaching For Quality Learning at University* (4th ed., Vol. 2011). McGraw-Hill Education (UK), 2011.

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

Bond, C. H., Spronken-Smith, R., McLean, A., Smith, N., Frielick, S., Jenkins, M., & Marshall, S. (2017). A framework for enabling graduate outcomes in undergraduate programmes. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *36*(1), 43–58. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2016.1170767

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, *9*(2), 27.

Butt, G. (2006). *Lesson planning* (2nd ed.). London, England: Continuum.

Chandio, M. T., Nishat Zafar, & Solangi, G. M. (2021). Bloom's Taxonomy: Reforming Pedagogy Through Assessment. *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, *8*(1). https://doi.org/10.22555/joeed.v8i1.308

Chapelle, C. A., Kremmel, B., & Brindley, G. (2020). Assessment. In *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics* (3rd ed., pp. 294–316). Routledge.

Cheng, L., & Fox, J. (2017). *Assessment in the language classroom: Teachers supporting student learning*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Coates, H. (2014). *Higher Education Learning Outcomes Assessment: International Perspectives*. Peter Lang.

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, Conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (2nd ed.). USA: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Crowe, A., Dirks, C., & Wenderoth, M. P. (2008). Biology in bloom: Implementing Bloom's taxonomy to enhance student learning in biology. . In *CBE—Life Sciences Education* (2nd ed., Vol. 7, pp. 368–381).

Custodio, P. C., Espita, G. N., & Siy, L. C. (2019). The Implementation of Outcome-Based Education at a Philippine University. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, *7*(4), 37–49.

Davis, B. G. (2009). *Tools for teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Davis, M. H. (2003). Outcome-based education. *Journal of Veterinary Medical Education*, *30*(3), 258–263.

Dettmer, P. (2005). New blooms in established fields: *Four domains of learning and doing*. *Roeper Review*, *28*(2), 70–78. https://doi.org/10.1080/02783190609554341

Didin Sonmez, F., Cuhadar, S., & Kahvecioglu, M. K. (2021). Successes, challenges, and next steps in implementing outcome-based assessment: The case of Istanbul Bilgi University Library. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *47*(1), 102249. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2020.102249

Dixson, D. D., & Worrell, F. C. (2016). Formative and Summative Assessment in the Classroom. *Theory Into Practice*, *55*(2), 153–159. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2016.1148989

Donald, J., Wolf, P., & Moore, M. (2015). Course Embedded Learning Outcome Assessment Based on Authentic Student Submission at the University of Guelph. *Proceedings of the Canadian Engineering Education Association (CEEA)*. https://doi.org/10.24908/pceea.v0i0.5943

El-Maaddawy, T., & Deneen, C. (2017). Outcomes-Based Assessment and Learning: Trialling Change in a Postgraduate Civil Engineering Course. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, *14*(1), 10. https://doi.org/10.53761/1.14.1.3

European Commission. (2015). *ECTS Users' Guide*. Brussels: Directorate General for Education and Culture. https://education.ec.europa.eu/sites/default/files/document-library-docs/ects-users-guide_en.pdf

Fautley, M., & Savage, J. (2013). *Lesson planning for effective learning*. Maidenhead, Berkshire: Open University Press.

Fernandes, S., Flores, M. A., & Lima, R. M. (2012). Students' views of assessment in project-led engineering education: Findings from a case study in Portugal. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, *37*(2), 163–178. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2010.515015

Gardner, J. (2010). *Developing teacher assessments: An introduction* (J. Gardner, W. Harlen, L. Hayward, G. Stobart, & M. Montgomery, Eds.). New York, NY: Open University Press.

Green, K. H. (2010). Matching Functions and Graphs at Multiple Levels of Bloom's Revised Taxonomy. *PRIMUS*, *20*(3), 204–216. https://doi.org/10.1080/10511970802207212

Gronlund, N. E., & Brookhart, S. M. (2009). Gronlund's writing instructional objectives. *(No Title)*.

Gurukkal, R. (2020). Outcome-Based Education: An Open Framework. *Higher Education for the Future*, *7*(1), 1–4. https://doi.org/10.1177/2347631119886402

Halimah, H. (2018). *Item Analysis of English Mid Semester Test for the Second Grade Students at MAN 2 Model Pekanbaru in 2017/2018 Academic Year*.

Harden, R. M. (2007). Outcome-based education: the future is today. *Medical Teacher*, *29*(7), 625–629.

Harlen, W., & Gardner, J. (2010). *Assessment to support learning* (J. Gardner, W. Harlen, L. Hayward, G. Stobart, & M. Montgomery, Eds.). New York, NY: Open University Press.

Hussey, T., & Smith, P. (2008). Learning outcomes: a conceptual analysis. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *13*(1), 107–115. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510701794159

Japee, G., & Oza, P. (2021). Curriculum and Evaluation in Outcome-Based Education. *Psychology and Education Journal*, *58*(2), 5620–5625. https://doi.org/10.17762/pae.v58i2.2982

Jimaa, S. (2011). The impact of assessment on students learning. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *28*, 718–721. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.133

Joshi, I., Jain, P., & Shrivastava, D. (2023). Outcome-Based Education: A Learner-Centric Approach. *European Economic Letters (EEL)*, *13*(5), 920–925.

Kennedy, D., Hyland, Á., & Ryan, N. (2007). *Implementing Bologna in your institution C 3.4-1 Using learning outcomes and competences Planning and implementing key Bologna features Writing and Using Learning Outcomes: a Practical Guide*. http://www.eua.be

Keshavarz, M. (2011). Measuring course learning outcomes. *Journal of Learning Design*, *4*(4). https://doi.org/10.5204/JLD.V4I4.84

Khanna, R., & Mehrotra, D. (2019). The roadmap for quality improvement from traditional through competency based (CBE) towards outcome based education (OBE) in dentistry. *Journal of Oral Biology and Craniofacial Research*, *9*(2), 139–142. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jobcr.2019.02.004

Kibble, J. D. (2017). Best practices in summative assessment. *Adv Physiol Educ*, *41*, 110–119. https://doi.org/10.1152/advan.00116.2016.-The

Killen, L. R., & Hattingh, S. A. (2004). A theoretical framework for measuring the quality of student learning in outcomes-based education. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, *18*(1), 72–86.

Killen, R. (2004). Writing outcomes, performance indicators and assessment criteria. *Outcomes-Based Assessment*.

Konopasek, L., Norcini, J., & Krupat, E. (2016). Focusing on the Formative: Building an Assessment System Aimed at Student Growth and Development. *Academic Medicine*, *91*(11), 1492–1497. https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000001171

Krathwohl, D. R. (2002). A revision of Bloom's taxonomy: An overview. *Theory into Practice*, *41*(4), 212–218.

Laguador, Dr. J. M., & Dotong, Dr. C. I. (2014). Knowledge versus Practice on the Outcomes-Based Education Implementation of the Engineering Faculty Members in LPU. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, *3*(1). https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v3-i1/640

Lau, K. H., Lam, T. K., Kam, B. H., Nkhoma, M., & Richardson, J. (2018). Benchmarking higher education programs through alignment analysis based on the revised Bloom's taxonomy. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, *25*(8), 2828–2849. https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-10-2017-0286

Lawrence, J. E. (2019). Designing a unit assessment using constructive alignment. *International Journal of Teacher Education and Professional Development (IJTEPD)*, *2*(1), 30–51.

Le Ngoc Quynh Lam, Vu The Dung, Do Ngoc Hien, Lam Tuong Thoai, Vu Thi Thuy Trang, & Dinh Ngoc Anh. (2017). Developing a set of indicators to evaluate the effectiveness of university training programs in the fields of engineering and technology. *Science and Technology Development Journal*, *20*(3), 44–50.

Liang Qiang. (2020). Reverse Design Method of Business English Course Based on OBE Theory. *Journal of Heihe University*, *11*(8).

Lorenzen, M. (2021). Using outcome-based education in the planning and teaching of new information technologies. *Information Technology Planning*, 141–152.

Loreto, M. M. (2018). *Outcomes Based Teaching and Learning Practices in the Hotel and Resort Management Program of Dusit ThaniCollege*.

Manton, E., Turner, C. T., & English, D. (2004). Testing the Level of Student Knowledge. *Education*, *124*(4), 682.

Martineau, J., Paek, P., Keene, J., & Hirsch, T. (2007). Integrated, comprehensive alignment as a foundation for measuring student progress. In *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice* (pp. 28–35).

Martone, A., & Sireci, S. G. (2009). Evaluating alignment between curriculum, assessment, and instruction. *Review of Educational Research*, *79*(4), 1332–1361. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654309341375

Mauranen, A. (2003). The corpus of English as lingua franca in academic settings. *TESOL Quarterly*, *37*(3), 513–527.

McNeill, M., Gosper, M., & Xu, J. (2012). Assessment choices to target higher order learning outcomes: The power of academic empowerment. *Research in Learning Technology*, *20*(3), 283–296. https://doi.org/10.3402/RLT.V20I0.17595

Momsen, J. L., Long, T. M., Wyse, S. A., & Ebert-May, D. (2010). Just the facts? introductory undergraduate biology courses focus on low-level cognitive skills. *CBE Life Sciences Education*, *9*(4), 435–440. https://doi.org/10.1187/CBE.10-01-0001

Ngatia, L. W. (2022). Student-centered learning: Constructive alignment of student learning outcomes with activity and assessment. *Experiences and Research on Enhanced Professional Development Through Faculty Learning Communities*, 72–92. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-5332-2.CH004

Nurmatova, S., & Altun, M. (2023). A Comprehensive Review of Bloom's Taxonomy Integration to Enhancing Novice EFL Educators' Pedagogical Impact. *Arab World English Journal*, *14*(3), 380–388. https://doi.org/10.24093/AWEJ/VOL14NO3.24

Ortega-Dela Cruz, R. A. (2022). Learners' attitude towards outcomes-based teaching and learning in higher education. *Tuning Journal for Higher Education*, *9*(2), 99–119. https://doi.org/10.18543/tjhe.1965

Pang, M., Ho, T. M., & Man, R. (2009). Learning Approaches and Outcome-Based Teaching and Learning: A Case Study in Hong Kong, China. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, *20*(2), 106–122. https://doi.org/10.1080/08975930902827825

Parker, P. E., Fleming, P. D., Beyerlein, S., Apple, D., & Krumsieg, K. (2001). Differentiating assessment from evaluation as continuous improvement tools [for engineering education]. *31st Annual Frontiers in Education Conference. Impact on Engineering and Science Education. Conference Proceedings (Cat. No.01CH37193)*, T3A-1–6. https://doi.org/10.1109/FIE.2001.963901

Patra, S. M., Kumar P, R., & Subramanya, K. N. (2021). DESIGNING QUESTION PAPER MARKS DISTRIBUTION BASED ON BLOOM'S TAXONOMY LEVEL FOR COURSE OUTCOMES MEASUREMENT. *International Journal on Recent Trends in Business and Tourism*, *5*(2). https://doi.org/10.31674/ijrtbt.2021.v05i02.001

Pollard, A. (2014). *Reflective teaching in schools* (4th ed.). London, England: Bloomsbury.

Praslova, L. (2010). Adaptation of Kirkpatrick's four level model of training criteria to assessment of learning outcomes and program evaluation in Higher Education.

Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, *22*(3), 215–225. https://doi.org/10.1007/S11092-010-9098-7

Rao, N. J. (2020). Outcome-based Education: An Outline. *Higher Education for the Future*, *7*(1), 5–21. https://doi.org/10.1177/2347631119886418

Rapley, T. (2007). *Doing conversation, discourse and document analysis*. London: Sage.

Raupach, T., Münscher, C., Beißbarth, T., Burckhardt, G., & Pukrop, T. (2011). Towards outcome-based programme evaluation: Using student comparative self-assessments to determine teaching effectiveness. *Medical Teacher*, *33*(8), e446–e453. https://doi.org/10.3109/0142159X.2011.586751

Reichgelt, H., & Yaverbaum, G. (2002). Designing an information technology curriculum: The Georgian Southern experience. *Journal of Information Technology Education*, *1*(4), 213–221.

Reichgelt, H., Zhang, A., & Price, B. (2002). Designing an Information Technology Curriculum: The Georgia Southern University Experience. *Journal of Information Technology Education: Research*, *1*, 213–221. https://doi.org/10.28945/357

Sapaw, R. (2021). Alternative and Online Assessment in the Context of Outcome Based Education: A Practical Guide. *Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education (TURCOMAT)*, *12*(3), 2376–2385. https://doi.org/10.17762/turcomat.v12i3.1227

Savage, J. (2015). *Lesson planning: Key concepts and skills for teachers.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Schalock, R. L. (2001). *Outcome-based evaluation*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Sharma, S. K., Tirumalai, S. V, & Alhamdan, A. A. (2019). Mathematical models for evaluating program and course learning outcomes in higher education. *International Transaction Journal of Engineering, Management, & Applied Sciences & Technologies*, *10*(3), 283–297.

Sivaraman, S. I., & Krishna, D. (2015). Blooms Taxonomy-Application in Exam Papers Assessment. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING*, *6*(9). www.ijmse.org

Stanny, C. J., & Albright, J. (2016). Reevaluating Bloom's Taxonomy: What Measurable Verbs Can and Cannot Say about Student Learning. *Education Sciences 2016*, *6*(4), 37. https://doi.org/10.3390/EDUCSCI6040037

Stiggins, R. J. (2001). *Student-involved classroom assessment* (3rd ed.). Pearson College Div.

Stiggins, R. J. (2005). *Student-involved assessment for learning* (3rd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Su, M., Osisek, P. J., & Starnes, B. (2005). Using the Revised Bloom's Taxonomy in the Clinical Laboratory. *Nurse Educator*, *30*(3), 117–122. https://doi.org/10.1097/00006223-200505000-00014

Swart, A. J., & Daneti, M. (2019). Analyzing Learning Outcomes for Electronic Fundamentals Using Bloom's Taxonomy. *2019 IEEE Global Engineering Education Conference (EDUCON)*, 39–44. https://doi.org/10.1109/EDUCON.2019.8725137

Taylor, R. M. (2009). Defining, constructing and assessing learning outcomes. *Rev. Sci. Tech. Off. Int. Epiz*, *28*(2), 779–788.

Thirumoorthy, G. (2021). Outcome Based Education (OBE) is Need of the Hour. *Educational Quest- International Journal of Education and Applied Social Sciences*, *12*(1). https://doi.org/10.30954/2230-7311.1.2021.6

Tom, K., & Gary D. Borich. (2011). TESTING AND EDUCATIONAL DECISION MAKING. In *Educational Testing and Measurement: Classroom Application and Practice* (11th ed.). Wiley, Hoboken.

Trinh, N. T. T. (2022). Assessment at program-level in higher education: A case study in the University of Da Nang. *Australian Journal of Science and Technology*, *6*(2).

Tsou, W., & Kao, S.-M. (2017). *Overview of EMI Development* (pp. 3–18). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-4645-2_1

Webb, N. L. (1997). *Criteria for Alignment of Expectations and Assessments in Mathematics and Science Education. Research Monograph No. 6.* Council of Chief State School Officers, Attn: Publications, One Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Ste. 700, Washington, DC 20001-1431 ($7).

Webb, N. L. (2002). *An Analysis of the Alignment Between Mathematics Standards and Assessments for Three States*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/252605969_An_Analysis_of_the_Alignment_Between_Mathematics_Standards_and_Assessments_for_Three_States

Wiggins, G. (1998). *Educative assessment: Designing assessments to inform and improve student performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Yambi, T. (2018). Assessment and evaluation in education. *University Federal Do Rio de Janeiro, Brazil*.

Yen, P. H., Thi, N. A., Thao, L. T., Thuy, P. T., Tra, N. H., & Thu, H. T. A. (2023). Assessment Strategies in Outcome-Based Education: Preferences and Practices Among University Lecturers in Vietnam. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, *22*(10), 416–432. https://doi.org/10.26803/IJLTER.22.10.23

Zepeda, S. J. (2007). *Instructional supervision: Applying tools and concepts* (2nd ed.). Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education. .

Zhang, X., Ma, Y., Jiang, Z., Chandrasekaran, S., Wang, Y., & Fofou, R. F. (2021). Application of Design-Based Learning and Outcome-Based Education in Basic Industrial Engineering Teaching: A New Teaching Method. *Sustainability 2021, Vol. 13, Page 2632*, *13*(5), 2632. https://doi.org/10.3390/SU13052632

APPENDIX 1: List of English-major courses

No.	Name course
1	English-speaking country
2	Cross cultural Communication
3	English Reading skill 1
4	English Reading skill 2
5	English Reading skill 4
6	Employability Skills (for English major)
7	English Listening Skills 1
8	English Listening Skills 2
9	English Writing Skills 1
10	English Writing Skills 2
11	English Writing Skills 4
12	English Translation Practice 2
13	English Interpreting practice 1
14	English Interpreting practice 2
15	English Translation and Interpreting Theory
16	English Pronunciation
17	English Phonetics and Phonology
18	English Semantics

APPENDIX 2: List of EMI courses

No.	Name course
1	Basic Economics
2	Communication in Tourism
3	Environment and Development
4	Independent working skills
5	Introduction to Tourism
6	Tertiary Study Skills
7	Timelines in Vietnam History
8	Tourism Economics
9	Tourism Marketing
10	Travel Business 1
11	Vietnam tourist routes and destinations
12	Visiting accommodation models
13	Visiting tourist attraction
14	Working skills
15	World civilizations

APPENDIX 3: Examples of evaluation of alignment between assessment and learning outcomes in English-major courses

No.	**Course name**	**Learning outcomes**	**Assessment content**	**Assessment methods**
1	English-speaking country	L1: Present knowledge about many different aspects of social life in England, America and some English-speaking countries (Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Singapore) such as history, geography, politics, law, education, economics, media, transportation, social welfare, etc.	knowledge about many different aspects of social life in England, America and some English-speaking countries (Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Singapore) such as history, geography, politics, law, education, economics, culture.	Group presentation
		L2: Effectively apply information search skills to collect information about many aspects	L2: Work independently, self-study, search for information about many different	Report designed on Microsoft Sway

		of social life in the UK, America and some English-speaking countries (Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Singapore)	aspects of social life in the UK, America and some English-speaking countries (Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Singapore) through books, newspapers, the Internet...	
		L3: Analyze information from books, newspapers, the Internet... about many aspects of social life in the UK, America and some English-speaking countries (Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Singapore)	L3: Analyze and synthesize information about many different aspects of social life in the UK, America and some English-speaking countries (Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Singapore) from books, newspapers, and the Internet.	Writing test
2	English Translation Practice 2	L1: Apply knowledge of translation theory to	L1: Apply knowledge of translation theory to translate texts on	Written test

		translate texts on the topics of Education, Tourism, Information Technology and Electronic Engineering Technology	the topics of Education, Tourism, Information Technology and Electronic Engineering Technology	
		L2: Demonstrate positivity, initiative in individual and group work, and professional ethics when translating documents and presenting to the class.	L2: Demonstrate positivity, initiative in individual and group work, and professional ethics when translating documents and presenting to the class.	Presentation
		L3: Plan effective translation projects	L3: Plan effective translation projects	Written test
		L4: Carry out translation projects effectively according to plan	L4: Carry out translation projects effectively according to plan	Presentation

3	English Reading skill 1	L1: Memorize and use vocabulary on familiar topics (animals, travel, space, city life, small organisms/cells, fairy tales, strange work, sea legends, history history...) and some basic reading comprehension strategies (skimming for main ideas, skimming for specific information, identifying references, guessing vocabulary meaning through context, identifying information on tables, identifying	L1: Read and understand texts of 300-400 words in clear language on topics such as animals, travel, space, and urban life	Gap-filling, short answers, vocabulary

		sequence of events and summarize text to understand short, simple texts (300-400 words))		
		L2: Read and understand texts of 300-400 words in length with clear language on topics related to majors or fields of interest and interest.	L2: Read comprehension through summarizing and writing comments on readings in the textbook, length of 300-400 words	Word form, matching (word vs definition), matching (multiple choice), mcqs

APPENDIX 4: Examples of evaluation of alignment between assessment and learning outcomes in EMI courses

Course name	Intended learning outcomes	Test methods
Basic Economics	L1: Demonstrate understanding of… L2: Apply obtained knowledge…	MCQs Presentation
Communication in Tourism	L1: Demonstrate an understanding of… L2: Suggest solutions for…	MCQs Presentation Oral test
Introduction to Tourism	L1: Demonstrate the understanding of… L2: Identify…	
Visiting accommodation models	L1: Analyze the characteristics of… L2: Formulate a startup idea…	Assignment Report
Travel Business 1	L1: Demonstrate understanding of… L2: Analyze fundamental knowledge…	MCQs Presentation Oral test
International Payments in Tourism	L1: Demonstrate comprehension of … L2: Analyze payment methods, payment instruments, and international payment transactions in the tourism industry	MCQs + short answer Presentation
Timeline of Vietnam history	L1: Identify the basic features of …	MCQs Presentation

	L2: Analyse some impacts/visibility of some historical-cultural relics related to …	
World Civilizations	L1: Identify the basic features and achievements of … L2: Analyse some basic characteristics and influences of …	MCQs Presentation

APPENDIX 5: Letter of consent

LETTER OF CONSENT

To whom it may concern,

As the , I hereby extend my approval for Ms. Thuy Quynh Pham, an MA student at Hanoi University of Industry, to have access to our Test Specifications documents within linguistic programs for her master's research. The study is entitled “Alignment between course learning outcomes and assessments: An analysis within linguistic programs at a university in Vietnam”.

I kindly request leaders of Center of Quality Assurance, Testing & Assessment and Faculty of English Language to extend full support to Ms. Pham throughout the duration of her research project. I trust that Ms. Pham's project will not only enrich her own academic journey but also contribute to the overall academic discourse within our university.

Best regards