STUDENT ASSESSMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF RUSSIA AND INDONESIA

RESEARCH ARTICLE

DIMITRUK ELENA
Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia
Corresponding author:kanzenna.kurnia.2207128@students.um.ac.id

SRI UNTARI AND A ROSYID AL-ATOK
Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia

FITROTUN NAFSIYAH
Sekolah Menengah Atas Negeri 1 Tumpang, Malang, Indonesia

Abstract

This paper presents a comparative study of student assessment approaches in higher education institutions in Russia and Indonesia. The purpose of the study is to explore the methods, criteria, and frameworks used to evaluate student performance in both countries. The research methods used in this article include a descriptive qualitative approach and library research. The study employed a combination of document analysis and thematic coding to analyze the data, focusing on how educational policies, cultural contexts, and institutional practices shape assessment approaches. In Russia, the centralized governance system and long-standing academic traditions significantly influence assessment methods, while Indonesia's decentralized educational structure and diverse cultural heritage lead to varied and flexible evaluation practices. The findings highlight both the strengths and weaknesses of each country's assessment systems, emphasizing areas such as standardization, student engagement, and fairness in evaluations. The study concludes that while the two countries have distinct approaches, there are valuable insights each can gain from the other's experiences. This research contributes to the global dialogue on improving student assessment practices by demonstrating how cultural and contextual factors must be considered to develop more effective and equitable evaluation systems.

Introduction

Education is the foundation for the progress of a nation and a big responsibility of a country, with all components and factors that play a role in its success having a close relationship. One of the fundamental elements in the education system is assessment, which provides guidance for determining

the achievement of educational goals based on student learning outcomes. Previous studies have highlighted the multifaceted role of assessment in education. Rakhimova (2020) underscores the importance of formative assessment, arguing that it is just as essential as summative assessment in providing timely feedback to guide student learning. Similarly, Suprananto (2012) defines assessment as a process of gathering, analyzing, and interpreting data to evaluate the characteristics and achievements of students. Sumintono and Widhiarso (2015) further assert that effective assessment practices are not only useful for determining student progress but are also reflective of the broader success of the education system, serving to align students with opportunities according to their abilities. Uno and Koni (2012) add that assessment involves both a subject (the assessor) and an object (the student or educational component), emphasizing that the assessor must possess the necessary expertise to ensure reliable and valid evaluations.

While significant research has been conducted on the role of assessment in education, most studies tend to focus on either formative or summative assessment without considering the broader comparative context of assessment practices across different educational systems. Still there are few researches regarding how cultural and institutional factors influence assessment methods in varying national contexts, such as Russia and Indonesia. Although both countries have well-developed higher education systems, their assessment frameworks differ due to distinct cultural, political, and educational policies. Therefore, this study aims to fill this gap by providing a comprehensive comparative analysis of student assessment approaches in higher education institutions in Russia and Indonesia.

The development of educational evaluation systems in Russia and Indonesia presents unique challenges and opportunities due to the distinct cultural and historical contexts of each country. Russia, with its deep-rooted educational traditions, has undergone significant transformations since the Soviet era. The country's educational reforms have responded to profound political, social, and economic changes, particularly during the 1990s when the Ministry of Education introduced the State Program for the Development and Stabilization of Russian Education. This program focused on democratizing the education system, de-ideologizing and humanizing the learning process, and promoting diversity in teaching methods (Meshchangina, 2013). These reforms laid the foundation for Russia's National Doctrine of Education, approved in 2000, which set long-term goals for the education system and guided its modernization until 2010 and beyond. Meanwhile, Indonesia, as a diverse archipelago with a variety of ethnicities and languages, faces the challenge of creating an inclusive and equitable evaluation system that addresses the needs of all segments of its population. Since 2009, the Indonesian government has allocated 20% of the national budget to education, yet concerns remain about teacher competency, prompting the enactment of Law Document Number 14 of 2005. This law regulates the professional standards of teachers and lecturers, including qualifications, certifications, and ethical codes (Siryanto et al., 2018). Both Russia and Indonesia continue to evolve their educational evaluation systems, each confronting unique challenges while sharing a commitment to improving education outcomes.

Case studies of Russia and Indonesia are important in understanding the dynamics of educational evaluation systems in various contexts. Through comparative analysis between these two countries, we can identify best practices, key challenges and opportunities that exist in improving the quality of education and developing more effective and accurate evaluation systems. According to Yusuf (2015),

the integration of assessment in the educational context can be carried out at the initial stage, during the learning process, and at the end of educational activities. The initial assessment aims to assess students' abilities before the learning process begins. Assessments during learning are carried out to improve the quality of learning periodically. As an example, formative assessment, including diagnostic testing, is a range of formal and informal assessment procedures conducted by teachers during the learning process in order to modify teaching and learning activities to improve student attainment (Rakhimova, 2020). Meanwhile, the assessment at the end of educational activities aims to evaluate students' achievement or success in learning. Assessment is considered an integral part of the educational process because it is closely connected to the learning process. For example, when teachers plan a Learning Implementation Plan (RPP), they also consider assessment techniques that are in accordance with the competencies described in the RPP. Implementation of assessment in education starts from the local level and includes national assessment. Educational assessment must be based on clear standards that can be applied operationally.

In Russia, educational assessment standards are regulated by the Federal Law "On Education in the Russian Federation" of December 29, 2012 №273-FZ. This law is the main regulation that defines the basic principles and structure of the education system in Russia. It also establishes general requirements for standards for assessing educational outcomes. In addition, regulations, such as decrees of the Government of the Russian Federation and orders of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation, may contain additional guidelines and instructions for assessing educational results. Schools that run curriculum changes are required to innovate in implementing the curriculum developed provincial government (Macdonald, 2003).

Education assessment standards in Indonesia are regulated in Minister of Education and Culture Regulation Number 23 of 2016 which consists of 8 chapters and 15 articles. Educational assessment standards are usually set within the framework of various laws, regulations and directives issued by the Ministry of Education and Culture. These documents may include regulations and guidelines for conducting assessment procedures in educational institutions at various levels, from preschool education to higher education. According to Primasari, education policy analysis is important in determining the direction and guidelines for the implementation of education in a country. In the implementation of education, it is impossible to separate from the policies made by the government or parties who have authority where the educational institutions (state and private) exist (Primasari et al., 2021). The basic standards and provisions for educational assessment in Indonesia can be established through various legal documents, such as education laws, education authority regulations, as well as guidelines developed by the Ministry of Education and Culture and other relevant authorities. The 2013 curriculum changes, for instance, were accompanied by changes in the way of assessing student competency. Sani (2014) mentions that the competency question is the ability to perform work with appropriate knowledge, skills and attitudes. Learning in the 2013 curriculum uses authentic assessment which is used to assess students' knowledge and skills in terms of the application of that knowledge and skills (Sani, 2014). According to Subali (2012), the practice of assessment for learning by utilizing the results of formative assessments can be carried out in various ways, and if this strategy is applied then student learning outcomes will automatically can increase. Assessment standards refer to criteria that include scope, objectives, benefits, principles, mechanisms, procedures and tools for evaluating

student learning outcomes which are the basis for conducting assessments in primary and secondary education. Prior to the enactment of Minister of Education and Culture Regulation Number 23 of 2016, provisions regarding assessment standards were regulated in Minister of Education and Culture Regulation Number 104 of 2014 concerning assessment of learning outcomes by educators at the primary and secondary education levels.

Educational assessment standards serve as a guide for educators, educational institutions and the government in assessing student learning outcomes. Educational assessment standards must be interpreted and applied in accordance with established provisions. The approach in developing learning outcome assessment instruments by educators in each educational institution must also refer to applicable assessment standards. In the current context of technology-assisted learning, it is increasingly important to base the implementation of educational technology, regardless of its nature and format, on sound pedagogical principles and criteria, if we want to take full advantage of its educational potential (Seiz-Ortiz, 2011). Assessment activities, such as data collection, analysis and interpretation, must pay attention to various aspects in accordance with applicable assessment standards.

The purpose of this article is exploring the educational standards and student assessment approaches in higher education institutions in Russia and Indonesia. In particular it is important to conduct a comparative analysis of the methods and criteria used to evaluate student performance in these two countries. By examining the factors influencing the assessment systems in Russia and Indonesia, the research seeks to identify the strengths and weaknesses of each approach.

Methodology

The research methods used in this article include a descriptive qualitative approach and library research. A descriptive qualitative approach is used to describe and analyze in depth the challenges and opportunities in developing student assessment systems in higher education in Russia and Indonesia. According to Sujdarwo (2011), the characteristics of descriptive research are as follows:

- Descriptive research is research that creates a narrative of data with all matters relating to data display.
- Because descriptive research only describes things may not have to put forward a hypothesis, make a prediction or predictions. For these reasons, this research must be detailed and predictive (Sujdarwo, 2011).

This approach allows to understand the context and nuances in the higher education systems of both countries. The research process involved collecting qualitative data through a variety of sources, including scientific literature, official government documents, research reports, and education-related publications. This qualitative data was then analysed in depth to identify patterns, trends, and themes that emerged regarding challenges and opportunities in developing student assessment systems in higher education. This approach provides a detailed and nuanced understanding of the educational standards and assessment methods in both Russia and Indonesia.

Apart from the descriptive qualitative approach, this research also relies on library research methods. This method allows researchers to investigate various sources of relevant and reliable

information regarding the topic under study. Through library research, researchers can collect secondary data from previous studies, educational theories, and the views of experts in the field of higher education from the two countries. By analysing using this method the research gains a comprehensive perspective on the existing assessment practices and educational standards.

By combining a descriptive qualitative approach and library research, this article aims to present a comprehensive understanding of the challenges and opportunities in the development of student assessment systems in higher education in Russia and Indonesia. This integrated methodological approach ensures a thorough exploration of the subject, contributing valuable insights into how both countries can enhance their educational evaluation practices.

Findings and Discussion

Grading system in Russia

Different regions in Russian Federation may have different grading systems. The five-point grading system was established as a uniform system for all schools in 1937. And in the 70s of the last century this meant (Shchukina, 1971). A mark of "5" ("excellent") is given for a deep understanding of the program material, for the ability to independently explain the studied principles, for a logical and correctly structured answer, for persuasiveness and clarity of answers, when students don't make mistakes. The mark "4" ("good") is given for the correct and thorough assimilation of the program material, however, the answer may contain inaccuracies and minor errors both in the content and in the form of the answer construction. A score of "3" ("mediocre") indicates that the student knows the basic and essential provisions of educational material, but does not know how to explain them, makes individual mistakes and inaccuracies in the content of knowledge and forms of construction the answer. A grade of "2" ("poor") is given due to poor mastery of the material. The answer indicates that the student is familiar with the educational material, but does not highlight the main points and makes significant mistakes thereby distorting the meaning of what has been learned. He conveys information that he remembers from the words of a teacher or from a textbook, but which is not processed logically in his mind, and is not brought into a system of scientific propositions and arguments. A grade of "1" ("very bad") is given if the student has not mastered the educational material.

According to the current legislation, Article 28 of the Law "On Education in the Russian Federation", the system is assessed by schools independently. Some schools conduct tests using a 100-point scoring system, similar to the Unified State Exam in high school. However, after graduating from school, to include grades in the certificate, each school must recalculate to a five-point system. "Ds" and "1" are not included in the certificate, because they indicate failure to master the material, resulting in not having received general education in which case the certificate cannot be issued.

At the same time, in recent years there has been discussion about allowing schools to grade "poor" or "unsatisfactory" on final certificates, in one or more subjects. With the introduction of the Unified State Exam and subsequent admission to universities, this has become less important. According to other experts, this should not be allowed, because general education in this case is not considered acceptable. In Russia the assessment of students in higher education is a structured and multifaceted

process that directly influences their academic trajectory and future opportunities. The scores from the Unified State Exam and the high school certificate are crucial determinants for university admissions. These standardized tests ensure a level playing field for all students aspiring to enter higher education institutions. Once admitted to a university, students encounter a comprehensive assessment system. Russian universities nowadays more and more seldom use a five-point grading scale. For vast majority of works, papers, tests and assignments a 100-point scale may be utilized to provide more detailed feedback on student performance.

Additionally, a pass/fail system is employed primarily for courses where continuous assessment rather than final exams determines success. An «automatic» grade refers to the automatic passing of a course without a final exam, achievable through consistent high performance during the semester. The final grade for each course, recorded in the student's grade book, is typically a composite of various assessments, including mid-term exams, final exams, coursework, and class participation. This integrated approach ensures a thorough evaluation of a student's understanding and engagement with the course material. Beyond traditional exams and coursework, practical work, seminars, and professional practice form significant components of the assessment process. For instance, language students participate in practical sessions such as language lab and translation workshops and agencies to assess their proficiency and practical skills in real-world scenarios. Pedagogical students undergo teaching practice in schools and universities, where they are evaluated on their ability to plan, execute, and reflect on their teaching sessions. This practical experience is crucial for their professional development and is assessed through observation, feedback from mentor teachers, and reflective reports. Student Teaching is the most important experience in teacher education programme and is generally based on a country's National Education policy (Aglazor, 2017). Law students may be engaging in internships at legal firms, courts, or public institutions, providing hands-on experience in legal procedures and client interactions, with their performance evaluated through practical assignments, supervisor evaluations, and case study analyses. Furthermore, Russian universities incorporate continuous assessment methods, such as regular quizzes, project work, and group assignments, to maintain student engagement and provide ongoing feedback. This approach helps in identifying students' strengths and areas for improvement, encouraging consistent effort throughout the semester.

Overall, the Russian higher education system employs a comprehensive and multi-dimensional approach to student assessment, encompassing traditional exams, practical work, and continuous evaluation, ensuring that students are academically proficient and equipped with the necessary practical skills for their professional fields. In Russian universities, several distinctions are awarded to students for their high academic achievements. These distinctions are a significant part of the educational system and serve as motivation for students to excel in their studies.

One of the most prestigious honours that graduates of Russian universities can receive is the Red Diploma. To be awarded a Red Diploma, students must meet several requirements. The student must have at least 75-80% of their grades as "excellent" ("5") and the rest as "good" ("4"). In some universities, the criteria can be stricter, requiring almost all grades to be "excellent". Additionally, the diploma thesis or final qualifying work must be defended with an "excellent" grade. Generally, having any "satisfactory" ("3") grades is unacceptable.

In some universities, particularly in technical and engineering schools, students can be awarded gold medals for outstanding achievements. The criteria for receiving a gold medal include having all grades throughout the entire period of study as "excellent" ("5"). Active participation in research work and having publications may also be considered. Active involvement in the university's social life, volunteer activities, and other contributions can result in awards for social activities. Volunteering can foster interpersonal trust, toleration and empathy for others, and respect for the common good, thus making students less likely to engage in socially pathological behaviour (Mustafa et al., 2020). For outstanding academic performance, students may receive commendation certificates. Participation and victories in scientific conferences, competitions, and Olympiads can also lead to awards for research activities. Many universities develop their own systems of awards to encourage students. These can include named scholarships awarded to students for high academic achievements or special merits. Honorary badges and medals are given for achievements in academics, sports, and community activities. Grants and prizes provide financial rewards for outstanding achievements in academics and research.

Academic distinctions in Russian universities play a crucial role in motivating students to achieve high results, recognizing their efforts and successes in their studies and other activities. These awards not only enhance the resumes of graduates but also serve as acknowledgment of their hard work and talent.

Grading system in Indonesia

Currently, Indonesia has a national education structure consisting of three levels, namely primary, secondary and higher education. Education management in Indonesia is carried out by three different ministries. The Ministry of Education and Culture (Kemendikbud) is responsible for primary and secondary education, while the Ministry of Research, Technology and Higher Education (Menristekdikti) oversees higher education. Religion-based education, at primary, secondary and tertiary levels, is regulated by the Ministry of Religion (Kemenag). These three ministries are the foundation of the education system in Indonesia.

From a learning perspective, the Ministry of Education and Culture and the Minister of Research, Technology and Higher Education have a similar focus on improving students' abilities through a common curriculum, but with different levels of education. The Ministry of Religion, on the other hand, emphasizes a learning approach that is rooted in religious values and science. In addition, the transformation of the education system through a decentralized policy commissioned local governments to develop regional-level curricula. The objective of this policy is for local governments to improve their regions and the economy of the regional culture (Setiawan, et al, 2023).

In Indonesia the transition from high school to university involves a series of standardized exams known as the *Ujian Nasional* (UN), or National Examinations. These exams are critical as they determine students' eligibility for higher education. After successfully passing the UN and obtaining their high school diploma (SMA/SMK), students can apply to universities, where a distinct grading system is used to evaluate their academic performance.

Indonesian universities typically use a grading system that combines letter grades with numerical equivalents. This system is designed to evaluate students' academic performance comprehensively. The letter grades and their corresponding numerical equivalents are as follows:

1) A (Excellent): 4.0
2) B (Good): 3.0
3) C (Satisfactory): 2.0
4) D (Poor): 1.0
5) E/F (Fail): 0.0

The Grade Point Average (GPA), known in Indonesia as *Indeks Prestasi* (IP), is a crucial metric in this system. It is the average score of all courses taken by a student in one semester. Essentially, the IP functions like a report card, detailing academic achievements and obtained every semester. This is calculated by dividing the total weighted grade points earned in a semester by the total credit hours attempted in that semester. Meanwhile, the Cumulative Grade Point Average (CGPA), known as *Indeks Prestasi Kumulatif* (IPK), is the average score from all semesters completed. This CGPA is later documented as a transcript, listing all grades throughout the university studies. Once a student has IPK, it determines the number of credit hours (*Sistem Kredit Semester*, SKS) he or she can take in the following semester.

Assessment in Indonesian universities is typically conducted through a combination of continuous assessment and final examinations. Continuous assessment may include quizzes, assignments, presentations, and class participation, which contribute to the final grade along with the mid-term and final exams. Summative assessments can be applied here. Summative assessments are made to summarize what the students have learned, to determine whether they understand the subject matter well (Khaknazarova, 2021). The final examination often carries significant weight in determining the overall grade for a course.

To pass a course, students generally need to achieve a grade of "C" (2.0) or above, though some programs may set higher minimum passing grades for specific courses. IPK not only affects the number of SKS but also influences graduation honours. Each university may have different rules regarding this. For instance, to graduate with honours, additional criteria might include not having any C grades, graduating on time, and other requirements. Universities may also award degrees with honours or distinctions based on the CGPA. Common distinctions include:

- Cum Laude: awarded for CGPAs between 3.50 and 3.74.
- Magna Cum Laude: awarded for CGPAs between 3.75 and 3.89.
- Summa Cum Laude: awarded for CGPAs of 3.90 and above.

Academic policies in Indonesian universities often include provisions for retakes and re-examinations. Students who fail a course may be allowed to retake it in subsequent semesters. Additionally, students whose GPA falls below a certain threshold (e.g., 2.0) may be placed on academic probation and required to improve their performance to avoid dismissal.

While the grading system outlined above is common, specific practices can vary between universities and programs. Some institutions might use different scales or have additional grading components. Each university has its own grading policies. Even within the same university, different

professors might have different grading criteria. However, to provide a general idea of the grading system in Indonesian universities, here is an example:

1) Mid-Semester Exam (UTS): 35%, consisting of 20% from exam scores and 15% from practical exam scores.
2) Final Semester Exam (UAS): 35%, consisting of 20% from exam scores and 15% from practical exam scores.
3) Independent Assignments: 15%.
4) Structured Assignments: 15%.

This comprehensive grading system aims to motivate students to achieve the best academic results each semester. It also provides a clear measure of students' academic achievements throughout their university studies.

Merits and limitations

Both assessment systems in Russia and Indonesia have their own set of advantages and disadvantages. In Russia the use of standardized testing, such as the Unified State Exam (USE), provides a relatively objective and uniform measure of students' academic performance across the country. This allows for fair comparison of students from different regions and schools. Additionally, the emphasis on high-stakes exams like the USE can motivate students to strive for academic excellence and ensure a certain level of rigor in the education system. Furthermore, the prestige associated with achieving high scores on standardized exams can provide students with opportunities for admission to top universities and scholarships.

In Indonesia, the assessment system's flexibility allows for a more holistic evaluation of students' capabilities. While there are standardized exams like the National Examination (UN), other assessment methods such as projects, presentations, and portfolios are also commonly used. This diversity in assessment methods enables educators to assess students' critical thinking, creativity, and problem-solving skills more effectively. Additionally, the emphasis on continuous assessment throughout the academic year provides students with regular feedback on their progress and allows for timely intervention when needed. Moreover, the cultural values embedded in the assessment system, such as respect for authority and communal harmony, can foster a supportive learning environment conducive to holistic development.

But at the same time the assessment systems in Russia and Indonesia exhibit imperfections stemming from various factors. In Russia the heavy reliance on standardized testing, such as the Unified State Exam, often leads to a narrow focus on memorization and test-taking strategies, rather than fostering critical thinking and deep understanding. This system may not accurately gauge students' overall abilities and readiness for higher education or the workforce. Additionally, in Indonesia, cultural influences and disparities in resources contribute to inconsistencies in assessment practices across regions, affecting the fairness and reliability of evaluations.

To address these imperfections, both countries can implement reforms to create more robust and equitable assessment systems. This could involve diversifying assessment methods to include project-based tasks, portfolios, and performance assessments that measure a wider range of skills and

knowledge. By incorporating these approaches, educators can better evaluate students' critical thinking, creativity, and problem-solving abilities, providing a more comprehensive picture of their academic achievement. Furthermore, investing in professional development opportunities for teachers to enhance their assessment literacy and skills can improve the consistency and fairness of evaluations. Additionally, efforts to address disparities in resources and access to educational opportunities can help ensure that assessment systems are more equitable and inclusive for all students.

In Indonesia the imperfections in the assessment system are influenced by cultural factors and resource disparities, leading to inconsistencies in evaluation practices across regions. Cultural values emphasizing respect for authority and communal harmony can impact assessment methods, sometimes prioritizing rote memorization over critical thinking and creativity. Moreover, variations in resources between urban and rural areas affect the availability of educational tools and infrastructure, further exacerbating disparities in assessment quality and fairness.

To address these imperfections, it is possible can undertake several measures. As an example, implementing professional development programs for educators to enhance their assessment literacy and skills would improve the quality and consistency of evaluations. These programs could focus on promoting diverse assessment methods that encourage critical thinking and problem-solving skills. Additionally, efforts to standardize assessment practices across regions and ensure equitable access to educational resources would help create a more fair and reliable assessment system. Investing in technology infrastructure and digital learning platforms could also enhance assessment capabilities, particularly in remote areas with limited resources. Overall, addressing these issues would contribute to a more effective and equitable assessment system in Indonesia.

Conclusion

Both Russian and Indonesian universities employ a blend of letter grades and numerical equivalents to evaluate student performance, with Indonesia using a 0-4 scale (e.g., A = 4.0, B = 3.0) and Russia utilizing a 5-point scale where 5 signifies Excellent, 4 Good, 3 Satisfactory, and 2 Fail. Both educational systems calculate a Grade Point Average (GPA) to provide an overall measure of academic performance, which is essential for determining eligibility for academic honours and tracking cumulative achievements over time. Continuous assessment is integral to both systems, incorporating quizzes, assignments, and class participation into the final grade. Final examinations also significantly influence the final course grade in both countries. Also, academic honours are awarded based on GPA or equivalent metrics, with distinctions such as Cum Laude in Indonesia and the Red Diploma in Russia recognizing outstanding academic achievements. Meanwhile, cumulative GPA (known as *IPK* in Indonesia) impacts the number of credit hours a student can take in subsequent semesters, whereas in Russia, while GPA is calculated similarly, its direct impact on credit hours is absent, instead affecting scholarship eligibility and honours. Graduation requirements also diverge. In Indonesia additional criteria for honours may include timely graduation and avoidance of C grades, while in Russia achieving mostly 5s and sometimes defending a thesis with distinction are necessary for honours like the Red Diploma. Moreover, examination weight varies, with Indonesia outlining specific weights for mid-term and final exams, whereas Russia's exam weight can vary widely. Lastly, flexibility in course selection

differs, with Indonesia's flexibility depending on *IPK*, whereas Russian students typically follow a fixed curriculum with less flexibility. Based on the results of the study, the researcher provides the following suggestions: 1) Educators in both Russia and Indonesia can explore the integration of diverse assessment methods, such as combining continuous assessments with high-stakes exams, to enhance student engagement and address varied cultural learning styles. 2) Educational policymakers in both countries should consider addressing urban-rural disparities by investing in infrastructure and teacher training in rural areas to improve access to quality education and equitable assessment outcomes. 3) Future researchers can use this study as a reference to further investigate how cultural and socioeconomic factors influence the effectiveness of assessment systems and student motivation in higher education contexts across different countries.

Cultural and contextual factors play significant roles in shaping effective educational practices and assessment systems in Russia and Indonesia. In Russia a historically strong emphasis on academic rigor and achievement is deeply ingrained in the culture, reflecting in the educational system's focus on high-stakes exams like the Unified State Exam and the stringent criteria for academic honours like the Red Diploma. This emphasis on standardized testing and academic excellence can be traced back to the Soviet era and persists as a cultural value today. Additionally, Russia's vast geographical size and diverse population contribute to variations in educational practices and resources across regions, influencing assessment methods and the implementation of educational policies. In Indonesia cultural factors such as respect for authority and communal values often influence educational practices. Traditional values of collectivism and deference to authority figures can shape teaching methods, classroom dynamics, and assessment approaches. The diverse cultural landscape of Indonesia, with its numerous ethnic groups and languages, also affects education, leading to challenges in standardizing assessment practices and curriculum delivery. Moreover, Indonesia's historical context, including periods of colonization and efforts to promote national identity through education, has influenced the development of its educational system and assessment practices. Economic factors play a significant role in both countries as well, with disparities in wealth and resources affecting access to quality education and shaping educational priorities. Economic factors may influence the availability of resources for educational infrastructure and teacher training, impacting the implementation of effective assessment systems. Similarly, according to Arman (2020), skilful and competitive human resources are a source of basic capital to create religious industrial technological innovation in order to support quality economic growth.

The conclusion provides the implication that the integration of diverse assessment methods, considering cultural and socioeconomic contexts, can improve the overall effectiveness of educational systems in Russia and Indonesia. Implementing a combination of continuous assessments and high-stakes exams can better engage students and cater to different learning preferences shaped by cultural factors, such as collectivism in Indonesia and academic rigor in Russia. Addressing urban-rural disparities through improved infrastructure and resource allocation will contribute to more equitable learning conditions and outcomes. Enhancing assessment practices in this way may positively influence students' academic success and motivation across both education systems.

Future research should explore how assessment systems in rural and urban areas of Russia and Indonesia differ in terms of resources and outcomes, particularly focusing on the challenges faced by

rural institutions. Studies on how the cultural values and historical legacies of each country influence student perceptions of fairness and effectiveness in assessment methods would provide deeper insights. Longitudinal studies tracking the career trajectories and academic achievements of students who graduate under these different systems could offer a better understanding of the long-term impact of the current assessment models. Finally, examining the potential for greater flexibility in Russia's course selection and the role of continuous assessment in improving academic outcomes in both countries could inform future educational reforms. Understanding the cultural, historical, and economic contexts of Russia and Indonesia is essential for developing effective educational practices and assessment systems that meet the needs of diverse learners and promote equitable outcomes.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

References

Aglazor, G. (2017). The Role of Teaching Practice in Teacher Education Programmes: Designing Framework for Best Practice. *Global Journal of Educational Research*, 16(2), 101-110. https://www.ajol.info/index.php/gjedr/article/view/162436

Arman, A., Purwandaya, B., & Saefuddin, A. (2020). The Impact of Quality of Education and Higher Education on Economic Growth. *Journal of Economic Education*, 9 (1), 64-70. https://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/jeec/article/view/36774

Khaknazarova, Z. (2021) Classification of Assessment. *Problems of pedagogy*, 5 (56), 25-26. https://problemspedagogy.ru/images/PDF/2021/56/Problemy-pedagogiki-5-56-.pdf

Macdonald, D. (2003). Curriculum Change and The Post-Modern World: Is the School Curriculum-Reform Movement an Anachronism? *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 35(2), 139–149. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00220270210157605

Meshchangina, E. (2013). *Reforms in the Higher Education System (1990-2000).* Theory and practice of social development, 1, 236-238. https://sciup.org/reformy-v-sisteme-vysshego-obrazovanija-1990-2000-gg-14939191

Mustafa, S. M. S., Radzi, F. A. M., & Hamzah, K. H. J. K. (2020). Participation in and Benefits of Volunteering Activities Among University Students. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 10(14), 31-37. http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v10-i14/7360

National doctrine of education in the Russian Federation. Bulletin of the Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation. 2001, 1.

Primasari, I.F.N.D., Marini, A., & Sumantri, M.S. (2021). Analisis Kebijakan dan Pengelolaan Pendidikan Terkait Standar Penilaian di Sekolah Dasar. *Jurnal Basicedu*, 5(3), 1479-1491. http://jbasic.org/index.php/basicedu/article/view/956.

Rakhimova, S. (2020) Types of Assessment: Formative Assessment. *Oriental Art and Culture*, 3, 25-26. https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/types-of-assessment-formative-assessment

Sani, R. A. (2014). *Pembelajaran Saintifik untuk Implementasi Kurikulum 2013*. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara.

Shchukina, G. (1971). *The Problem of Cognitive Interest In Pedagogy.* Moscow: Pedagogy.

Seiz-Ortiz, R., Gimeno-Sanz, A., & De Siqueira, J. M., (2011). APPRAISALWEB: An Online Platform for The Pedagogical Evaluation of Web-Based Language Learning Resources. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 667–671. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.03.161

Setiawan, A., Andrian, D., Dardjito, H., Yuldashev, A. A., Murlianti, S., Khairas, E. E., Handoko, L., & As'ad, I. (2023). The Impact of Indonesia's Decentralized Education on Vocational Skills and Economic Improvement of Students. *Jurnal Pendidikan Vokasi,* 13(3), 246-261. https://journal.uny.ac.id/index.php/jpv/article/view/68026

Siryanto, T., Bondarenko, V., & Kaznacheeva, S. (2018). Issues of developing the social competence of a teacher based on media education (on the example of Indonesia). *Bulletin of Minin University*, 3 (24). http://dx.doi.org/10.26795/2307-1281-2018-6-3-4

Stern, J. (2015). *Enhancing Learning Through Differentiated Technology.* https://www.edutopia.org/blog/enhanced-learning-through-differentiated-technology-julie-stern

Subali, B. (2012). *Prinsip Assessment and Evaluasi Pembelajaran.* Yogyakarta: UNY Press.

Sudaryono. (2014). *Pengantar Evaluasi Pendidikan*. Jakarta Pusat: Lentera Ilmu Cendekia.

Sujdarwo, H. (2011). *Metodologi Penelitian Sosial.* Bandung: Mandar Maju.

Sumintono, B., & Widhiarso, W. (2015). *Aplikasi Pemodelan Rasch Pada Assessment Pendidikan*. Cimahi: Trim Komunikata Publishing House.

Suprananto. (2012). *Pengukuran dan Penilaian Pendidikan.* Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.

The concept of modernization of Russian education for the period until 2010. Bulletin of the Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation. 2000, 2.

Uno, H., & Koni, S. (2012). *Assessment Pembelajaran.* Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Yusuf, A. M. (2015). *Asesmen dan Evaluasi Pendidikan: Pilar Penyedia Informasi dan Pengendalian Mutu Pendidikan.* Jakarta: Prenada Media Group.