PROCEEDINGS

ISSN 2303-1417

universitas bandar lampung
SOLUTION FOR PRESENT AND FUTURE
INDONESIA

IN COOPERATION WITH

CHINA

THE HONG KONG POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY
香港理工大學
HONGKONG

INTERNATIONAL ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY MALAYSIA
MALAYSIA

THAILAND

4th ICEL 2016

THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION AND LANGUAGE

20-21 May 2016
Bandar Lampung University, Indonesia

PROCEEDINGS

THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION AND LANGUAGE

4th ICEL 2016

20 -21 MAY 2016

Organized by:
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education (FKIP),
English Education Study Program of Bandar Lampung University
Zainal Abidin Pagar Alam street No.89 Labuhan Ratu, Bandar Lampung, Indonesia
Phone: +62 721 36 666 25, Fax: +62 721 701 467
www.ubl.ac.id

PREFACE

The activities of the International Conference are in line and very appropriate with the vision and mission of Bandar Lampung University (UBL) to promote training and education as well as research in these areas.

On behalf of the Fourth International Conference of Education and Language (4th ICEL 2016) organizing committee, we are very pleased with the very good responses especially from the keynote speakers and from the participants. It is noteworthy to point out that about 80 technical papers were received for this conference

The participants of the conference come from many well known universities, among others: International Islamic University Malaysia (IIUM), Malaysia, Hongkong Polytechnic University, Hongkong, Shanghai Jiao Tong University (SJTU), China, Shinawatra Univesity, Thailand, University of Texas, Austin, USA, University Phitsanulok Thailand, STIBA Bumigora Mataram, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, STKIP-PGRI Lubuklinggau, Indonesia University of Education (UPI), Universitas Sanata Dharma, State Islamic College (STAIN) of Jurai Siwo Metro Lampung, State University of Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa and Universitas Lampung.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to the International Advisory Board members, sponsors and also to all keynote speakers and all participants. I am also grateful to all organizing committee and all of the reviewers who contribute to the high standard of the conference. Also I would like to express my deepest gratitude to the Rector of Bandar Lampung University (UBL) who gives us endless support to these activities, so that the conference can be administrated on time.

Bandar Lampung, 20 May 2016

Drs. Harpain, M.A.T., M.M
4th lCEL 2016 Chairman

PROCEEDINGS

The Fourth International Conference on
Education and Language (4th ICEL 2016)
BANDAR LAMPUNG UNIVERSITY
Bandar Lampung, Indonesia
May 20,21 2016

STEERING COMMITTEE

Executive Advisory

Dr. Ir. M. Yusuf S. Barusman, MBA
Dr. Hery Riyanto
Dr. Lintje Anna Marpaung, S.H.,M.H
Dr. Thontowie, M.S

General Chairman

Mustafa Usman, Ph.D

Chairman

Drs. Harpain, M.A.T., M.M

Co-Chairman

Helta Anggia, S.Pd., M.A

Secretary

Yanuarius Y. Dharmawan, S.S., M.Hum

Treasurer

Samsul Bahri, S.E.
Dian Agustina, S.E.

Technical Committee

Susanto, S.S., M.Hum., M.A., Ph.D.
Deri Sis Nanda, S.S., M.Hum., M.A., Ph.D.

International Advisory Board

Organizing Committee

Chair Person

Dra. Yulfriwini, M.T.

Secretary

Bery Salatar, S.Pd.

Treasure

Samsul Bahri, S.E.

Proceeding and Certificate Distribution

Yanuarius Y. Dharmawan, S.S., M.Hum
Helta Anggia, S.Pd., M.A
Bery Salatar, S.Pd.
Dina Ika Wahyuningsih, S.Kom

Documentation

Noning Verawati, S.Sos., M.A.
UBL Production

Sponsorship & Public

Ir. Indriarti Gultom, MM.
Yulia Hesti, S.H., M.H.

Transportation and Accommodation

Irawati, S.E.
Zainal Abidin, S.E.
Desi Puspitasari, S.H.
Tissa Zadya, S.E., M.M.

Special Events

Dameria Magdalena, S.Pd., M.Hum
Yanuarius Y. Dharmawan, S.S., M.Hum
Helta Anggia, S.Pd., M.A
Kartini Adam, S.E.

Consumption

Siti Rahmawati, S.E.
Aminah, S.E., M.Akt.

Table Of Content

Preface ii
Steering Committee iii
International Advisory Board iv
Organizing Committee iv
Table of Content vi

Keynote Speakers :

1. A New Voice in ELT: Planning Intensive Workplace Curriculum - Amporn Sa-mgiamwibool I-1
2. Fostering The Use of Drama For English Language Learners in The EFL Classroom - Deri Sis Nanda I-7
3. The Cultural Compatibility of Saudi EFL University Students in The UT Austin ESL Program - Lobat Asadi I-11
4. Challenges For 21st Century Learning In Indonesia – Hendarman I-20

Paper Presenters :

1. A Sociolinguistic Study of English And Javanese Kinship Terminology – Andrias Yulianto II-1
2. Adapting Meg Cabot's Princes Diaries in Teaching Writing – Pramugara Robby Yana & Zahara Ramadani II-6
3. Analysis of Students' Communication Strategies in ESP Class of Mathematic Study Program – Rizky Ayuningtyas & Hery Yufrizal II-13
4. Authentic Literature and Technology Involvement in EFL Reading – Bastian Sugandi II-18
5. Blog As Alternatif Media In Teaching Literature – Y. Satinem II-24
6. Communication Theory: Ritual Constraints Used in English Classroom Interaction at Tenth Grade Students of SMK Yadika Lubuk Linggau – Maria Ramasari II-29
7. Designing Instructional Materials For Blended Learning By Using Schoology For Speaking Class Of English Education Study Program Of Teacher Training And Education Faculty Of Bandar Lampung University – Margaretha Audrey S.C. & Dameria Magdalena S II-34
8. Designing Lesson Activities Through Maluku Folklore For Character Education – Mansye Sekewael, Frida Pentury and Welma Noija II-46
9. EFL Teachers' Belief On Classroom Management And Behavior As The Key Success Of English Language Teaching – Reti Wahyuni II-52
10. English For Maritime – Lucia Tri Natalia Sudarmo, Heidy Wulandari, Marita Safitri, and Fransiscus Widya Kiswara II-64

11. Error Analysis Of Aspirated And Unaspirated Consonant Sounds Produced By Students At English Club Senior High School Of Tri Sukses Natar South Lampung – Fitri Anggraini II-68
12. ICT and Vocabulary Building - Bastian Sugandi & Eko Saputra II-72
13. Improving Students' Pronunciation By Using Audio-Visual-Assisted Text – Yanuarius Yanu Dharmawan & Mutiatus Saniyati II-75
14. Informal Assessment for Language Skills: The Leaners' Perspective – Apsus Grumilah & Irfan Nur Aji II-81
15. Learner Autonomy In Blended Learning Speaking Class – Ida Nahdaleni & Yanuarius Yanu Dharmawan II-91
16. Learning Interaction In Web Based Learning In Speaking Ii Class Of English Education Study Program Of Teacher Training And Education Faculty Of Bandar Lampung University – Upeka Mendis & Arnes Yuli Vandika II-98
17. Letter Tiles To Teach Spelling: How Does It Work? – Elita Elva Lintang Femila & Arliva Ristiningrum II-105
18. Looking at English National Examination 2016 in Indonesia: A Prospect of Bloom's Revised Taxonomy – Candra Jaya II-108
19. Quipper School: How Do Teachers Bring it in the Classroom? – Asep Idin & M. Syahrul Z. Romadhoni II-118
20. Scanning Of Students' Learning Style At SMA Negri 7 Lubuklinggau In Academic Years 2015/2016 – Agus Triyogo II-125
21. Society'S Attitudes Toward Indonesia And Perspective In Facing The Asean Economic Community – Nur Nisai Muslihah II-131
22. Students' Critical Thinking In Online Discussion Forum – Sela Fitriana & Helta Anggia II-136
23. Students' Perception In A Blended Learning Speaking Class – Desi Ike Sari II-144
24. Teaching Reading Comprehension By Using Creative Thinking Reading Activities (CTRA) To The Eleventh Grade Students Of SMA Negeri 8 Lubuklinggau – Syaprizal & Yayuk Handira II-152
25. The Application Of Cards In Teaching Grammar To Improve Students Writing Skill: A Teaching Strategy Development - Eroh Muniroh II-157
26. The Application Of Problem Based Learning To Increase Critical Thinking And Metacognitive Grade XII Students At Senior High School (SMA) "XYZ" Makasar - Hildegardis Retno Harsanti, Khaterine & Niko Sudibjo II-160
27. The Application Of Web Based Learning By Using A Blended Learning Approach In Speaking Ii Class Of English Education Study Program Of Teacher Training And Education Faculty Of Bandar Lampung University - Thea Marisca Marbun B.N & Arnes Yuli Vandika II-170
28. The Critical Discourse Analysis On The Fame Of Oreo Wonderfilled Advertisement - Alfriani Ndandara & Frederika Mei Anggraeni II-178
29. The Effect Of Using Pair Taping Technique Toward Speaking Ability In Descriptive Text Of The Second Year Students At A Private Secondary School In Pekanbaru - Intan Septia Latifa II-186

30. The Effectiveness Of Scaffolded Reading Experience In Teaching Reading Viewed From Students' Intelligence - Aksendro Maximilian II-191
31. The Implementation Of Flipped Classroom By Using Schoology In Speaking II Class Of English Education Study Program Of Teacher Training And Education Faculty Of Bandar Lampung University - David Ginola & Dameria Magdalena S II-199
32. The Implementation Of Using Online Application In Increasing Students' Motivation - Dhia Hasanah II-208
33. The Possible Causes Of Indonesian EFL Students' Anxiety In Speaking Impromptu Speech - Galuh Dwi Ajeng II-216
34. The Use Of Authentic Materials In Speaking Class At The Second Semester Students Of English Education Study Program Of Teacher Training And Education Faculty Of Bandar Lampung University - Helta Anggia & Randi Setyadi II-222
35. The Use Of Card Trick To Build Students' Vocabulary - Eny Dwi Marcela II-229
36. The Use Of Hot Potatoes For Teaching Vocabulary At The Eleventh Grade Of SMA Bodhisattva - Ezra Setiawan II-232
37. The Use Of Interactive White Board In EYL Motivation – Munjiana II-242
38. The Use Of Podcast And Interpretive Tasks For Peer Assessment In The Extensive Listening Class - Delsa Miranty II-248
39. Translation Shift Of Verb And Sentence Style From English Into Bahasa Indonesian - Diah Supatmiwati II-257
40. Using Mnemonic Techniques In Vocabulary Learning - Ita Purnama II-261

INFORMAL ASSESSMENT FOR LANGUAGE SKILLS: THE LEANERS' PERSPECTIVE

Apsus Grumilah[1]* and Irfan Nur Aji[1]

[1]Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Indonesia
*Corresponding email: apsusgrumilah@gmail.com

Abstract

Assessment is one of the important components in language teaching and learning. Through assessment, the learners' learning achievement will be known. However, learners' achievement cannot be accurately measured only through formal assessment which is conducted in a certain period of time with the purpose to judge of whether learners are successful or fail. In order to have accurate measurement, there should be an alternative for assessment which is conducted in ongoing process of learning. Wiggins (1998: xi) asserted that assessment should be designed to improve and educate student performance, not merely to audit as most school test currently do. Therefore, this research tried to reveal the learners' perception as well as their preference in informal assessment. For teachers, it provides the evidence of informal assessment as an essential part in teaching and learning process.

This paper is written on the basis of research which described the learners' perception toward the use of alternative assessment in PBI UAD Yogyakarta. There were 211 randomly selected of 600 learners in language skills classes. They were asked to fill in the questionnaire to express their perception in informal assessment and to perceive the best appropriate informal assessment type for language skill.

The result of the research was that learners had good perception toward the use of informal assessment. There were 67% of learners had good perception, and 26% of learners had very good perception, so there were 93% in overall of learners had good perception. In addition, about 65% of learners in all skills classes preferred the use portfolio assessment. Lastly, it was unexpectedly that learners preferred the performance assessment for listening (63.27%) and observation assessment reading (63.80%), and portfolio for speaking (70.59%) and writing (67.92%). Thus, the findings showed the high demand of learners to the practice of informal assessment for language skills.

Keywords: informal assessment, language skills, perception

1. INTRODUCTION

Assessment takes an important role in education. Assessment on students' learning is an essential part of education, in which it takes several roles (Harlen, 2007: 1). Murray & Christison (2011: 15) state that assessment is the ultimate planning and evaluation tool. A research found that students had perceived that assessment significantly influences their approaches to learning and studying (Struyven, Dochy and Janssens (2005: 331). Thus, assessment as an evaluation tool that influences students' learning should be procedurally correct in practice.

Assessment refers to a process of inquiry that integrates multiple sources of evidence, whether the test-based or not, to support an interpretation, decision, or action (Moss, Girard, & Haniford, 2006: 152). There are two kinds of assessment: formal and informal assessment (Brown, 2001: 402; Murray & Christison, 2011: 180). Brown (2001: 402) asserts that formal assessments are exercises or experiences specifically designed to tap into storehouse of skills and knowledge, usually within a relatively short time limit. Most formal assessments are what we ordinary call tests (p. 403). Informal assessment, on the other hand, is involved in all incidental, unplanned evaluative coaching and feedback on tasks designed to elicit performance, but not for the purpose of recording result and making fixed judgments about a student' competence (p. 402). The both assessments, then, it is constructed into three pairs of guidelines: informal-formal, formative-summative, process-product (p. 403).

Assessment does not mean to judge whether students are fail or successful. Assessment should be designed to improve and educate student performance, not merely to audit as most school test currently do (Wiggins, 1998: xi). Assessment should be educative in two basic senses. First, assessment should be deliberately designed to teach (not just measure) by revealing students what worthy adult work looks like (offering them authentic tasks).

Second, assessment should provide rich and useful feedback to all students and to their teachers, and it should indeed be designed to assess the use of feedback by both students and teachers (Wiggins, 1998: 12). Unfortunately, the implementation of informal assessment is rarely conducted as much as formal assessment. Daugherty and Ecclestone (2006) in Harlen (2007: 3) states that "the formative purpose was absent from the arrangements that were put in place; the main focus was on formal, time-limited, external tests whose result could be aggregated as indicators of the performance of teachers, schools, local education authorities and the system and a whole". Yet, today, the current curriculum has a new idea of implementing assessment system which is more authentic. "The main point of both regulations is found on the authentic assessment. There are four competencies that will be measured in the authentic assessment and the four competencies are as follows: spiritual and social attitude, knowledge, and skill" (Retnawati, Hadi, and Nugraha, 2016). Driven to the concern of the recent paradigm of assessment, this study seeks to find out the students' perception toward the use of informal assessment as the answer of the current curriculum policy in term of assessment system.

2. MATERIALS AND METHOD

2.1 Curriculum, Evaluation, and Assessment

Curriculum is the central part of education which includes in it the evaluation and assessment. The components in a curriculum are objectives, content, instruction and evaluation (Ornstein & Hunkins, 2009: 182). Some define evaluation as the similar term with assessment: "evaluation and assessment are synonymous which involves judgment as to merit and worth" (Ornstein & Hunkins, (2009: 274); and some just say that the both terms are related: assessment and evaluation are often linked, because assessment is one of the most valuable sources of information about what is happening in a learning environment. However, the term of evaluation seems differently defined from assessment. Evaluation is a process whereby people gather data in order to make decisions (Ornstein & Hunkins, 2009: 274). It refers to a broader notion than assessment, and refers to a process of systematically collecting information in order to make a judgment which concerns a whole range of issues in and beyond language education: lessons, courses, programs, and skills can all be evaluated (Rea-Dickins and Germanie, 1982: 22 in Cameron, 2001: 222). Nunan (1999: 85) defines evaluation is the collection and interpretation of information about aspects of the curriculum (including learners, teachers, materials, learning arrangement, etc.), while assessment is a subcomponent of evaluation which refers to the tools, techniques, and procedures for collecting and interpreting information about what learners can do and cannot do. "Evaluation involves looking at all the factors that influence the learning process, such as syllabus objectives, course design, materials, methodology, teacher performance, and assessment" (Harris & McCann, 1994: 2). Thus, evaluation and assessment are parts of curriculum which are distinctive that assessment is a subcomponent of evaluation.

Experts have talked much about assessment in English language teaching. Harris & McCann (1994: 2) define assessment "a way to measure student's performance and the progress they make". Brown (2004: 4) defines assessment is "ongoing process that encompasses a much wider domain". O'Malley & Pierce (1996: 237) defines assessment as "a systematic approach for collecting information on students learning or performance usually based on various sources of evidence". Cameron (2001: 222) says that "assessment is concerned with pupils' learning or performance, and thus provides one type of information that might be used in evaluation". Referring to the definitions of assessment, it is concluded that assessment is ongoing process which has a purpose to collect information of students' learning through various ways and done continuously in the teaching and learning process.

2.2 Formal and Informal Assessment

Assessment actually is not a matter of scoring students competence. There is assessment which functions to improve students' learning, and also assessment to judge whether students are success or fail. It should be made as clear as possible of those both functions belong to which one of the assessments. To distinguish the different kinds of assessment, some experts (Brown, 2001: 402-403; Cameron, 2001: 222; Murray & Christison (2011: 180) use formal and informal assessment. Brown (2001: 403) defines that "formal assessments are exercises or experiences specifically designed to tap into storehouse of skills and knowledge, usually within a relatively short time limit". Formal assessment "typically means using a test that involves standardized administration and that has norms and a formal interpretive procedure" (Dunlap, 2008). On the other hand, informal assessment is "a way of collecting information about our students' performance in normal classroom condition" (Harris & McCann, 1994: 5). It is formative and process oriented which means "to evaluate students in the process of forming their competence is and skills with the goal of helping them to continue that growth process" (Brown, 2004: 6). Formative assessment is "ongoing, usually informal, assessment during teaching gives teachers information about

how well the student is doing" (McKay, 2006: 21). According to (Hughes, 2003: 5), assessment is formative when teachers use it to check on the progress of their students, to see how far they have mastered what they should have learn, and then use this information to modify their future teaching-plans. Then, Brown (2001: 401) constructs the both assessment into three pairs of terms: informal-formal, formative-summative, process and product. Thus, formal assessment is summative and product oriented, while informal assessment is formative and process oriented which functions to help and to make better of students learning, rather than judging students fail or succeed.

2.3 Types of Informal Assessment

Some terms have been used which refers to informal assessment. There are at least three terms: alternative assessment (Brown, 2004: 251; Genesee & Upshur, 1996: 76; Murray & Christison, 2011: 190), classroom assessment (Mckay, 2006: 20), and authentic (O'Malley & Pierce, 1996: 4). Richards & Renandya (2002: 336) state that in recent year the traditional assessment forms has come to be termed as alternative assessment, assessment authentic assessment, or informal assessment. Therefore, the terms seem different in meaning, but the forms or types and the practice in each term are similar such as performance-based, portfolios, and observation. Richards & Renandya (2002: 336) mention portfolio, protocol analysis, learning logs, journal entries, dialogue journals, self-response, peer response, and teacher response as the alternative assessment. Brown (2004: 5) says informal assessment can take a number of forms, starting with incidental, unplanned comments and responses, along with coaching and other impromptu feedback to the student. Genesee & Upshur (1996: 76) states the alternative assessment methods including observation, portfolios, conferences, dialogue journals, interviews and questionnaires. O'Malley & Pierce (1996: 12) mentions the authentic assessment ;1) oral interviews, 2) story or text retelling, 3) writing samples, 4) projects/exhibitions, 5) experiments/demonstrations, 6) constructed-response items, 7) teacher observations, 8) portfolios. The types mentioned by several experts are similar with the types that mentioned by Brown (2004: 254-270). He mentions 8 alternatives assessment which this study prefers to use informal assessment as the term to be discussed. Those informal assessment types are 1) performance based-assessment, 2) portfolios, 3) journals, 4) conferences and interviews, 5) observations, 6) self and peer assessment.

Performance assessment

Performance assessment is "an assessment tasks that require students to construct a response, create a product, or demonstrate application of knowledge" (O' Malley & Pierce, 1996: 239). He gives some examples of performance assessment: oral reports, writing samples, individual and group project, exhibitions, and demonstration. Performance assessment requires students to accomplish complex tasks, while bringing a bear prior knowledge, recent learning, and relevant skills to solve realistic or authentic problem (Herman, Aschbacher, and Winter in O' Malley & Pierce, 1996: 5). While Popham (1995: 139) defines performance assessment as "an approach to measuring a student' status based on the way that student completes a specified task". In this type, students complete the experiment or demonstrate the use of materials (Murray & Christison (2011: 190). Based on the explanation, performance assessment can be used to assess the four language skills.

Portfolio

Portfolio is "a purposeful collection of students' work that demonstrates...their efforts, progress, and achievements in given areas". Brown (2004: 256). It is a systematic collection on students' work (Popham, 1995: 166). Portfolios have must be associated with written language, but they can also be used effectively with oral language such as audio recording of speaking samples (Genesee & Upshur (1996: 101). According to Richards & Renandya (2002: 347), this type of informal assessment as well as journal is relevance to assess students' writing skill. It contains the overall of students' work from the beginning to the end or to a certain course period.

Journal

Journal, which is known as dialogue journal, is a log (or "account") of one' thought, feelings, reactions, assessment, ideas, or progress toward goals, usually written with little attention to structure, form, or correctness (Brown, 2004: 260). In short, journal is written conversation between students and teachers (Genesee & Upshur (1996: 119). He adds (p. 120) that through journal, students will write freely without feeling that their writing should be correct or perfect, and it conducted regularly, it will provide a continuous record of students' writing development. According to Richards & Renandya (2002: 347), this type of informal assessment as well as portfolio is relevance to assess students' writing skill.

Conferences & Interviews

These types of informal assessment are the similar types. The different is only the number of students that are assessed. Conferences is assessment which can be used more widely as part of evaluation, and generally take the form of conversation or discussion between teachers and students about school work. It can include individual students, several students, or even a whole class (Genesee & Upshur, 1996: 108). He also states that it can be used to assess reading, writing, and oral language skills. Interviews and questionnaires are a set of questions or statement the student is expected to respond to (Genesee & Upshur, 1996: 127). Teacher asks students questions about personal background, readings, and interest (Murray & Christison, 2011: 191). Interviews are done orally, and questionnaires are for who are literate or in written form. According to Genesee & Upshur (1996: 108) these types of informal assessment are not authentic although it can be used to collect samples of students' writing and speaking skills.

Observation

Observation is "assessment where a teacher observes student attention, response to instructional material, or interactions with other students" (O' Malley & Pierce, 1996:12). Conducting observation can be done by three ways; anecdotal records, checklists, and rating scale (Genesee & Upshur, 1996: 81, 86). One of the objectives of such observation is to assess students without their awareness, so that the naturalness of their linguistic performance is maximized (Brown, 2004: 267). This type of informal assessment can be used to assess all language skills. Observation is conducted in the classroom of teaching and learning process. Teacher may observe how students' attitude towards the class, the material, etc.

Self & Peer Assessment

Self-Assessment is "appraisal by student of his or her own work or learning processes" (O' Malley & Pierce, 1996: 240). Peer-assessment is "assessment of student' work, products, or learning processes, by classmates" (O' Malley & Pierce, 1996: 239). These types of assessment may be assumed to be inappropriate as the question such as how can students assess themselves objectively? The fact of experts offering these types as an assessment technique is the answer. According to Brown (2001: 415-416), self and peer assessment can be implemented in language classroom such as oral production, listening comprehension, writing, and reading.

2.4 Informal Assessment for Language Skills

Assessing students' languages skills require several steps. The two included steps are developing rubric and/ or scoring and setting standards (O'Melly & Pierce (1996: 63, 93, 135). Setting criteria is a crucial part of assessment; without criteria or standard of performance, performance task remain simply a collection of instructional activities (Herman, Aschbacher, & Winter, 1992 in O'Melly & Pierce (1996: 65). Assessment is a must to have certain standard as the basis to assess students, as well as assessing informally. Informal assessment criteria can be described in terms of what a teacher expects to what students to be able to do. An alternative stated by McNamara (2000: 43) is grade students' performance in all language areas into a number of bands; "holistic and/ or analytic scale". Linse & Nunan (2005: 148) gives definition that holistic rubric provides one overall score, and analytic rubric provides information broken down into different categories.

There are two areas of students that can be assessed informally; non-linguistic area and linguistic area Non-linguistic area is related to students' attitude toward learning, toward language, different culture and different people. Non-linguistic area consists of attitude, co-cooperativeness, independence, creativity and presentation. Whereas, linguistic area consists of English language learning, that is language components and language skills. Language component or language aspect consists are 1) phonetics and phonology, 2) morphology, 3) syntax, and 4) semantics (Rahman, 2010: 2); while language skills are receptive skills (listening and reading), and productive skills (speaking and writing) (Harris & McCann (1994).

Learning language skills need process and more practices in which their skills competence can be seen in progress. Classroom, in where the information of students is available, is a place where students spending time more than other learning places. Harris & McCann (1994: 5, 7) state that informal assessment is "a way of collecting information about our students' performance in normal classroom condition". Therefore, language skills cannot be assessed only through formal assessment. Unfortunately, the most common assessment in most educational practice is formal assessment, which is widely known as test. Genesee & Upshur (1996: 4) state that "tests help to collect information of students learning, but it is relatively limited because the information got only from certain aspect of students' achievement". Moreover, the Assessment Reform Group (ARG) reviewed

research that there are strong evidence of negative impact of testing to students' motivation for leaning" (Harlen, 2007: 2). Wiggins (1998: xi) adds that "audit test (typically indirect multiple-choice or short answer test, be they national or teacher designed) cannot serve the chief "clients" of assessment, the students, because these test do not provide feedback for students". A considerable suggestion comes by Reasner (2009: 1) that "formal and informal assessments are two separate methods that are available and should be used together in order to fully assess students". Hence, using test as merely assessment does not reflect the students' learning achievement.

Virtually, assessment is one of the important skills that a teacher should have. Effective instructors come in many forms, but they generally possess four essential teaching skills: people skills, subject matter expertise, management skills, and assessment skills" (FAA, 1999). Yet, researches reports that teachers' assessment skills are generally weak (Campell, Murphy, & Holt, 2002; Black & Wiliam, 2009; Brown, Lake, & Matters, 2009; Herman, Osmundson, & Silver, 2010; S. Brookhart & E. Brookhart, 2011; Fan et al., 2011 in Al-Nouh, Taqi, & Karem, 2014); vocational school teachers found difficulties in implementing the authentic assessment (Retnawati, Hadi, and Nugraha, 2016); some reported the need for workshops and training courses on alternative assessment. Teachers further expressed their preference for traditional written tests over alternative assessment. Teachers' attitudes were at a medium level. They reported that alternative assessment is time-consuming and ignores pupil writing skills Al-Nouh, A. Taqi, & Abdul-Karem, 2014). Those evidences show that teachers still need training on alternative assessment. It is cause by "sometimes of the misunderstood term in recent educational practice of assessment" (Brown, 2004: 4). The term of assessment seems familiar, but there is "a mismatch between the rhetoric of official document and what happens in classroom" (Harlen, 2007: 3). This state of teacher assessment skills effects to students' learning achievement. A research found that "the dominant factor affecting academic achievement is teachers" (Wright, Horn, and Sanders (1997: 57). Therefore, this study seeks to expand the similar research on assessment by investigating the students' perception toward the use of informal assessment through the following questions

1. What is students' perception toward the use of informal assessment in language skills classes?
2. Which type of informal assessment that is perceived best by students?

2.5 Method

Participants

Samples of 211 students were randomly selected from 600 students of 20 English language skills classes in PBI UAD during the second semester of the academic year 2013-2014.

Instrument

Questionnaires were used in collecting the data. The questionnaire set was the theoretical content of five informal assessments used in language skills classes. It consisted 50 items composed in Likert scale form. The responses were obtained in the range from strongly agree, agree, doubtful, disagree, and strongly disagree. The alternative option of each statement is valued by rating scale: 5, 4, 3, 2, 1, for the positive statements; and 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 for the negative statement. To get the content and construct validity, the questionnaire was given checked by experts, then made use of their feedback for refinement of the questionnaire. Table 1 provides the distribution of questionnaire.

Table 1 The distribution of questionnaire

No	Indicator	Items		Total
		Positive (+)	Negative (-)	
1	**Performance assessment**			14
	Students make a constructed response	1	2	
	They engage in higher-order thinking, with open-ended tasks	3	4	
	Tasks are meaningful, engaging, and authentic	5,7,9,	6,8,10,	
	Tasks call for the integration of language skills, and	11	12	
	Both process and product are assessed	13	14	
2	**Portfolio assessment**			
	Foster intrinsic motivation, responsibility, and ownership	33	34	
	Promote student-teacher interaction with the teacher as facilitator			
	Provide tangible evidence of student' work			
	Facilitate critical thinking, self-assessment, and revision processes			
	Offer opportunities for collaborative work with peer			
3	**Conference assessment**			4
	To collaborativelly set individual learning goals	33	34	
	To communicate orally in one-to-one conversations with their teachers about school work in ways that are important to them	35	36	
4	**Observation assessment**			8
	Ease of recording of student performance characteristics	37	38	
	Structured means of providing feedback to students	39	40	
	Clarification of the desired learning outcomes to guide learning	41	42	
	Focus on the desired learning outcomes to guide teaching	43	44	
5	**Peer assessment**			6
	Direct involvement of students, encouragement of autonomy, and increased motivation	45,47,49	46,48,50	
Total		**50**		

Procedure

Permission was granted to collect data in English Department Universitas Ahmad Dahlan. Then, to obtain the reliability of the instrument, trial of the questionnaire was conducted to 32 students in the same level which not belong to the sample. The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of more than 0, 6 indicated that the questionnaire set was reliable. Accordingly, questionnaire was distributed during the even semester of the academic year 2013-2014.

Statistical Analysis

Descriptive statistics were employed to analyze the collected data. There was conversion criterion as the basis to interpret the students' perception. The below provides the conversion criterion of students' perception.

Table 2 The conversion criterion of students' perception

No	Sigma Scale	Scale Number	Category
1.	1.5	Mi + 1.5 (SDi)	Very good
2.	0.5	Mi + 0.5 (SDi)	Good
3.	- 0.5	Mi – 0.5 (SDi)	Fair
4.	- 1.5	Mi – 1.5 (SDi)	Poor
5.	< - 1.5	< Mi – 1.5 (SDi)	Very poor

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study intended to answer two questions. The first question was set to find the students' perception to the informal assessment, while the second question was set to know the students' preferences of informal assessment type that best appropriate to assess language skills.

3.1 Students' Perception toward the Use of Informal Assessment

The Table 3 shows that students had good perception toward informal assessment which indicated that their perception was in high level.

Table 3. The Frequency Distribution of Students' Perception toward the Use of Informal Assessment

Interval Score	Frequency	Percentage	Category
$x \geq 200$	55	26%	Very good
$167 \leq x < 200$	141	67%	Good
$133 \leq x < 167$	15	7%	Fair
$100 \leq x < 167$	0	0%	Poor
$x < 100$	0	0%	Very Poor
Total	**211**	**100%**	

According to Table 3, 26% or 55 students had very good perception toward the use of informal assessment. Meanwhile, the largest number of students, there were 67& or 141 students had good perception in informal assessment. There were only 7% or 15 among 211 students who perceived in poor category. Moreover, there were no students who perceived badly which it is shown on the table with 0% of the students. Result shows that most of students perceived positively to the use of informal assessment. It is indicated by the 93% or 196 of 211 students were in good and very good category of perception. This means that most students prefer to the use of informal assessment in learning language skills for which the assessment should be conducted formatively in learning process which functions to enhance learning rather than judge students' ability. Therefore, informal assessment ought to be considered by teacher to use in teaching, especially in teaching the language skills.

3.2 The Informal Assessment Type that is Perceived Best by Students

Regarding to the second question, it was to investigate the types of informal assessment that was perceived best by students. Results were seen from the perception of students in all classes and from the perception of students in each of the four language classes. The Table 4 and Table 5 describe the results of this second question.

Table 4The Tendency of Students' Perception Toward The Use of Each of Informal Assessment Types

Informal Assessment	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor
Performance	81	121	9	0	0
	38.39%	57.34%	4.27%	0%	0%
Portfolio	44	137	29	1	0
	20.85%	64.93%	13.74%	0.48%	0%
Conference	94	95	19	3	0
	44.55%	45.02%	9.00%	1.42%	0%
Observation	109	86	16	0	0
	51.66%	40.76%	7.58%	0%	0%
Peer	109	77	22	3	0
	51.66%	36.49%	10.43%	1.42%	0%

As shown in the Table 4, portfolio assessment was perceived in good category by 64, 93% or ~ 65% of the research sample. It means that 137 of 211 students prefer to the use portfolio assessment in learning language skills. Although theoretically it is appropriate for writing class, but a large number of the perception were also obtained from other language classes. This result was probably obtained by the factor of the benefit of portfolio assessment. The use of portfolio assessment helps students much to learn language skills. By using portfolio assessment, students are motivated, responsible, and foster their ownership the subjects they learn. It also provides interaction to teacher to discuss students' work as the proof they have done the task. Besides that, portfolio encourages students to be critical thinking, doing self-assessment, doing revising, and get chance to work with peer. Those benefits are in line with the characteristics of college students or adolescence learners.

Next, performance assessment was perceived in good category by 57, 34% of the research sample. This means that 121 of 211 students prefer to the use performance assessment in learning language skills. Theoretically, this type of assessment can be used in four language skills, but it was perceived lower than portfolio assessment.

However, the good perception obtained by students indicated that this type of informal assessment helps them in learning language skills. Some factors influencing the students' good perception in performance assessment are students can make their own construct response; engage higher-order thinking, the tasks are meaningful, engaging, and authentic; tasks call for the integration of language skills: and both process and product are assessed.

In addition, there were two types of informal assessment which were perceived in very good category with the same percentage, 51, 66% of the research sample. It shows that the 109 of 211 students chose observation and peer assessment to be used in language skills classes. This very good perception was probably influenced by some benefits of the both informal assessment types. By using observation assessment, students are told the learning objective, the learning process focuses on the learning objective, and students are given feedback as the assessment result. Meanwhile, there are some benefits of using peer assessment such as students involves in doing assessment, encouraging learning autonomy, and motivate them to learn as students are always motivated when there is a friend with them. Lastly, conference assessment was perceived in good category with the lowest percentage. It obtained 45, 02% or ~ 45% of the research sample. This percentage indicated the 95 of 211 students perceived that conference assessment helps them in learning the language skills. The result can be influenced by the benefits of conference assessment that students have opportunity to communicate orally in one-to-one conversations with their teachers about school work in ways that are important to them.

In accordance with the purpose of this study, the best perception can be indicated from the highest percentage of students' perception. The result showed that highest percentage among the five types of informal assessment belongs to portfolio assessment. It was perceived the 64, 93% or 137 of 211 students. The rank of students' perception toward the use of each of informal assessment types from the first to last is portfolio, performance, observation and peer, then conference assessment. This finding indicated that students in all the languages skills classes prefer much more to the use of portfolio assessment.

Continue to answer the second research question is the result of informal assessment type that is perceived best by students in each of language skill classes. As shown in the Table 5, students in each of language skills classes perceived differently toward each of informal assessment types. Based on the obtained percentage, it can be seen to which the students' best perception belong to. It shows that students in listening skill class perceived best to the use of performance assessment; students in speaking skill class perceived best to the use of portfolio assessment; students in reading skill class perceived best to the use of observation assessment; and students of writing skill class perceived best to the use of portfolio assessment. The result gives information that in learning listening, students prefer to be assessed informally by using performance assessment; in learning speaking, students prefer to portfolio assessment; in learning reading, students prefer to the use of observation assessment; and students prefer to portfolio in learning writing. By this result of students' perception, it can be reference for teachers to use the suitable informal assessment types to teach language skills. As the different class, students had difference perception toward the use of each of informal assessment types. It shows the suitable assessment technique to be used in each of language skills in order that students can learn in the best way, so that the goal of learning language skills can be achieved.

Table 5 The Rank of Students in Each of Language Skills Classes' Perception Toward The Use of Each of Informal Assessment Types

Language Skills	Rank 1	Rank 2	Rank 3	Rank 4	Rank 5
Listening	**Performance**	**Portfolio**	**Conference**	**Observation**	**Peer**
	63.27%	59.18%	55.10%	46.94%	46.94%
	Good	**Good**	**Good**	**Good Very Good**	**Good**
Speaking	**Portfolio**	**Performanc e**	**Peer Conference**	**Observation**	**-**
	70.59%	62.75%	50.98%	47.05%	-
	Good	**Good**	**Very Good Good**	**Very Good**	**-**
Reading	**Observation**	**Portfolio**	**Conference**	**Peer Performance**	**-**
	63.80%	62.07%	55.17%	50.00%	-
	Very Good	**Good**	**Very Good**	**Very Good Good**	**-**
Writing	**Portfolio**	**Peer**	**Conference**	**Performance**	**Observation**
	67.92%	62.26%	56.60%	54.72%	47.17%
	Good	**Very Good**	**Very Good**	**Good**	**Good Very Good**

4. CONCLUSION

This study tried to answer two questions. The first question investigated the students' perception toward the use of informal assessment. Result showed that students had good perception toward the use of informal assessment. The total number of percentage of very good and good categories is 93% which indicated the high demand of students to the use of informal assessment. This result obtained the information that informal assessment has helped students much to reach the goal of learning language skills.

The second research question explored the students' preference to the use of each type of informal assessment. Result showed that 51, 66% or 109 of 211 students perceived best to observation and peer assessment; portfolio assessment is perceived by 64, 93% or 137 of 211 students, performance assessment is perceived by 57, 34% or 121 of 211 students, and conference assessment is perceived by 45, 02% or 95 of 211 students. Comparing the percentage obtained by each of those five types of informal assessment types, portfolio is perceived best by students with the percentage up to 64, 93% or 137 of students.

This present study only represented a small number of samples of the whole population of students, so that the results cannot be generalized to other level of students such as high school or primary school students.

REFERENCES

[1] Wynne Harlen, 2007. *Assessment of Learning*. New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2007.
[2] Denise E. Murray & Mary Aan Christison, *What English Language Teacher Need To Know*. New York: Routledge, 2011.
[3] Katrien Struyven, Filip Dochy and Steven Janssens, *Students' perceptions about evaluation and assessment in higher education: a review.* Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education Vol. 30, No. 4, August 2005, pp. 331–347.
[4] https://perswww.kuleuven.be/~u0015308/Publications/Proof%20CAEH300401.pdf
[5] Moss, P., Girard, B., & Haniford, L. (2006). Validity in educational assessment. Review of Research in Education, 30, 109-162. http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0091732X030001109
[6] H. Douglas Brown, *Teaching by Principles: An Alternative Approach To Language Pedagogy*. San Fransisco: Longman, 2001.
[7] Grant P. Wiggins, *Educative Assessment: Designing Assessment to Inform and Improve Student Performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1998.
[8] Heri Retnawati, Samsul Hadi, & Ariadie Chandra Nugraha. *Vocational High School Teachers' Difficulties in Implementing the Assessment in Curriculum 2013 in Yogyakarta Province of Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: State University of Yogyakarta, 2016. International Journal of Instruction Vol. 9, No.1e-ISSN: 1308-1470● www.e-iji.netp-ISSN: 1694-609X
[9] Allan C. Ornstein & Francis P. Hunkkins. *Curriculum: Foundation, Principles, and Issues*. New York: Pearson, 2009.
[10] Lynne Cameron, *Teaching Languages To Young Learners*. UK: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
[11] David Nunan, *Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers, 1999.
[12] Michael Harris and Paul McCann, *Assessment "Handbooks for the English Classroom"*. Scotland: Macmillan Publisher Ltd, 1994.
[13] H. Douglas Brown, *Language Assessment :Principles and Classroom Practices*. San Fransisco: Longman, 2004.
[14] J.Michael O'Melly & Lorraine Valdez Pierce, Authentic Assessment for English Language Learners.US: Longman, 1996.
[15] Kate Dunlap, *How to compare formal and informal students assessments*. 2008. http://voices.yahoo.com/how-compare-formal-informal-student assessments-1745703.html?cat=4
[16] Penny Mckay, *Assessing Young Language Learners*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
[17] Arthur Hughes, *Testing for Language Teacher*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
[18] Jack C Richards & Willy A. Renandya, *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Onthology of Current Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
[19] Fred Genesee & John A. Upshur, *Classroom-Based Evaluation in Second Language Education*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
[20] W. James Popham, *Classroom Assessment: What Teachers Need To Know. California*: Allyn & Bacon, 1995.
[21] Caroline T Linse & David Nunan, *Practical English Language Teaching Young Learners*. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc, 2005.

[22] Tim McNamara, *Language Testing*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
[23] Tariq Rahman, *Linguistics for Beginner: Basic Concepts*. Pakistan: Ameena Saiyid, Oxford University Press, 2010.
[24] Katherine Nye Renae Reasner, *How Teachers Assess and Evaluate Their Student' Learning*. Department of Teacher Education: Shippenburg University, 2009. http://webspace.ship.edu/ejournal/contents/fall09/fall09final/How%20Teachers%20Assess.pdf
[25] FAA/Federal Aviation Administration.1999. *Aviation Instructor' Handbook*. Aviation Online Magazine. http://avstop.com/ac/instructors_handbook/4-1.html (retrieved on Tuesday, December 17, 2013 at 10.08)
[26] Nowreyah A. Al-Nouh, Hanan A. Taqi, & Muneera M.Abdul-Karem, *EFL Primary School Teachers' Attitudes, Knowledge and Skills in Alternative Assessment*. Kuwait: Kuwait University, International Education Studies; Vol. 7, No. 5; 2014 ISSN 1913-9020 E-ISSN 1913-9039 Published by Canadian Center of Science and Education, 2014. http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1069285.pdf
[27] S. Paul Wright, Sandra P. Horn, & William L. Sanders, *Teacher and Classroom Context Effects on Student Achievement: Implications for Teacher Evaluation*. University of Tennessee, Value-Added Research and Assessment Center, 225 Morgan Hall, P.O. Box 1071, Knoxville, Tennessee 37901-1071, Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education 11: 57±67, 1997#1997 Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston ± Manufactured in The Netherlands .http://pdf-release.net/external/3185578/pdf-release-dot-net-teacher_eval.pdf

universitas
bandar lampung
SOLUTION FOR PRESENT AND FUTURE

9 772303 141001

Bandar Lampung University
Zainal Abidin Pagar Alam Street No. 26 Labuhan Ratu
Bandar Lampung, Indonesia | www.ubl.ac.id | Phone +62 721 773 847