

ISBN : 978-602-61535-0-0

# Prosiding

KONFERENSI NASIONAL SASTRA, BAHASA DAN BUDAYA 2017

“SASTRA, BAHASA, BUDAYA, DAN PENGAJARANNYA  
DI ERADIGITAL”



Fakultas Bahasa dan Sastra  
Universitas Kanjuruhan Malang

Malang, 6 Mei 2017



The Multicultural University  
**unikama**  
Universitas Kanjuruhan Malang



**KONFERENSI NASIONAL SASTRA, BAHASA, DAN BUDAYA (KS2B) 2017**  
**“Sastra, Bahasa, Budaya, dan Pengajarannya di Era Digital”**

**Malang, 6 Mei 2017**

**PROSIDING**

Penanggung Jawab : Dr. Mujiono, M.Pd  
Ketua : Ayu Liskinasih, SS., M.Pd  
Sekretaris : Siti Mafulah, S.Pd., M.Pd  
Editor : Prof. Dr. Soedjidjono, M.Hum  
Rusfandi, M.A., Ph.D  
Umi Tursini, M.Pd., Ph.D  
Ayu Liskinasih, SS., M.Pd  
Uun Muhaji, S.Pd., M.Pd  
Setting dan Layout : Eko Urip Mulyanto, S.Pd., M.M

**ISBN : 978-602-61535-0-0**

**Dipublikasikan Oleh:**

**FAKULTAS BAHASA DAN SASTRA**  
**UNIVERSITAS KANJURUHAN MALANG**

**Jl. S. Supriadi No. 48 Malang**

**Telp: (0341) 801488 (ext. 341)**

**Fax: (0341) 831532**

## KATA PENGANTAR

Puji syukur kehadiran Allah SWT atas terselenggarakannya **Konferensi Nasional Sastra, Bahasa, dan Budaya (KS2B) 2017** dengan tema “**Sastra, Bahasa, Budaya, dan Pengajarannya di Era Digital**” yang diselenggarakan oleh Fakultas Bahasa dan Sastra (FBS) Universitas Kanjuruhan Malang pada hari Sabtu, 6 Mei 2017 bertempat di Auditorium Multikultural Universitas Kanjuruhan Malang (UNIKAMA).

KS2B merupakan konferensi tahunan yang diselenggarakan oleh FBS UNIKAMA dengan tujuan untuk mengembangkan ilmu di bidang bahasa, sastra, dan budaya. Melalui KS2B ini, berbagai berbagai hasil penelitian dengan berbagai sub tema akan dipresentasikan dan didiskusikan diantara peserta yang hadir dari berbagai kalangan seperti akademisi dari perguruan tinggi, peneliti, praktisi, tenaga pengajar, dan pemerhati dibidang ilmu bahasa, sastra, dan budaya.

Pada kesempatan ini saya menyampaikan terima kasih kepada nara sumber; Prof. Dr. M. Kamarul Kabilan dari Universiti Sains Malaysia, Prof. Dr. Gunadi H. Sulisty, M.A dari Universitas Negeri Malang, Prof. Dr. Djoko Saryono, M.Pd dari Universitas Negeri Malang, dan Christopher Foertsch, M.A dari Oregon State University.

Besar harapan saya penyelenggaraan KS2B yang kedua ini akan diteruskan dengan penyelenggaraan pada tahun-tahun berikutnya sehingga dapat terus memberikan manfaat yang sebesar-besarnya untuk perkembangan dan pengajaran ilmu Bahasa, Sastra, dan Budaya di Indonesia.

Malang, 6 Mei 2017  
Dekan Fakultas Bahasa dan Sastra  
Universitas Kanjuruhan Malang

Dr. Mujiono, M.Pd

## DAFTAR ISI

<b>Kata Pengantar.....</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>Daftar Isi.....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Pengenalan Film Pendek Dalam Pengajaran Sastra bagi Pembelajar Bahasa Inggris: Sebuah Media Pembelajaran Alternatif di Era Internet.....</b>	<b>1</b>
(Adityas Nirmala)	
<b>The Memes Fandom: Magnifying Memes as an Agent of Change.....</b>	<b>11</b>
(Agnes Dian Purnama)	
<b>Pengintegrasian Teori <i>SIBERNETIK</i> dalam Sastra, Bahasa dan Pengajarannya di Era Digital.....</b>	<b>23</b>
(Agus Hermawan)	
<b>Kontribusi Pengetahuan Tokoh Fahmi pada Penerapan Nilai-nilai Dakwah dalam Novel <i>Api Tuhid</i> Karya Habiburrahman El Shirazy .....</b>	<b>29</b>
(Ahmad Husin, Wahyudi Siswanto)	
<b>Pengembangan Teknologi Digital melalui Media Massa dalam Pengajaran Bahasa dan Budaya kepada Siswa pada Atraktif TV (ATV) di SDI Ma'arif Plosokerep Kota Blitar.....</b>	<b>37</b>
(Andiwi Meifilina)	
<b>Modifikasi Seni Wayang Topeng Malangan pada Era Digital.....</b>	<b>45</b>
(Arining Wibowo, Aquarini Priyatna)	
<b>Pengaruh Pemanfaatan LCD dan Audio pada Mata Kuliah <i>HISTORY OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE</i> terhadap Peningkatan Pemahaman Mahasiswa UNIPDU Jombang.....</b>	<b>51</b>
(Binti Qani'ah)	

<b>Accommodating Cognitive Presence in Teaching English as a Foreign Language in The IMOOC (Indonesian Massive Open Online Course).....</b>	<b>55</b>
(Daniel Ginting)	
<b>Tantangan Sastra Lisan ditengah Era Digital.....</b>	<b>65</b>
(Dedy Setyawan)	
<b>Teaching Literary Appreciation based on School Curriculum.....</b>	<b>71</b>
(Dian Arsitades Wiranegara)	
<b>Fenomena Makian di Era Digital: Selayang Pandang .....</b>	<b>77</b>
(Eli Rustinar, Cece Sobarna, Wahya, Fatimah Djajasudarma)	
<b>Mencari Jejak Tautan Historis Cerita Rakyat di Jawa Timur (Sebuah Pelacakan Legenda di Kabupaten Malang, Pasuruan, Probolinggo, Biltar, Tulungagung, Kediri, dan Trenggalek).....</b>	<b>87</b>
(Gatot Sarmidi)	
<b>Ideologi Perempuan dalam Film <i>Perempuan Berkalung Sorban</i>.....</b>	<b>95</b>
(Liastuti Ustianingsih)	
<b>Student Teachers' Beliefs on Teaching English as Foreign Language on Digital Era.....</b>	<b>103</b>
(Noor Aida Aflahah)	
<b>Eksistensi Sastra Online dalam Kesusastraan Indonesia dengan Tinjauan Sosiologi Sastra.....</b>	<b>111</b>
(Nursalam)	
<b>Pemanfaatan Media Sosial untuk Pengajaran Sastra di Era Digital.....</b>	<b>119</b>
(Purbarani Jatining Panglipur, Eka Listiyaningsih)	
<b>Pengaruh Film Animasi Upin dan Ipin terhadap Pemerolehan Bahasa Kedua Anak.....</b>	<b>129</b>

(Reza Fahlevi)

**Improving Students' Vocabulary Mastery by Translating Comic.....139**

(Rizky Lutviana)

**Problematik Nilai Moral Media Online Komik Manga terhadap Revolusi Mental**

**Anak.....147**

(Saptono Hadi)

**Penggunaan Aplikasi EDMODO pada Kelas Vocabulary.....157**

(Siti Mafulah)

**Pemanfaatan *Blended Learning* dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia di Sekolah**

**Dasar.....163**

(Suhardini Nurhayati)

**The Correlation between Students' Learning Motivation and Vocabulary Mastery**

**toward Listening Comprehension of the Second Grade Students of MAN Klaten in**

**Academic Year of 2015/2016.....177**

(Sujito, Yunia Fitriana)

**Kestabilan Eksistensi Novel Cetak ditengah Kemajuan Era Digital dengan**

**Beredarnya Novel E-book.....187**

(Suryani, Hawin Nurhayati)

**Why Does Instructional Objective Matter in the Implementation of School Reform in**

**Indonesian Schools?.....193**

(Umiati Jawas)

**Membaca Fenomena-fenomena Sastra di Media Sosial.....205**

(Yunita Noorfitriana)

**Kajian Penggunaan Keigo dalam E-mail yang Ditulis oleh Penutur Jepang dan Penutur Indonesia dalam Bahasa Jepang.....217**

(Zaenab Munqidzah)

**Pengembangan Modul Pembelajaran Sastra Anak pada Program Studi PGSD FKIP Universitas Kanjuruhan .....225**

(Ahmad Husin, Darmanto, Ali Ismail, Andriani Rosita)

**ICT-Based Authentic Assessment in the Context of Language Teaching in the Indonesian (Lower and Upper) Secondary Levels of Education: Potential Areas for Real-world Development.....238**

(Gunadi Harry Sulistyono)

**ICT-BASED (AUTHENTIC) ASSESSMENT IN THE CONTEXT OF  
LANGUAGE TEACHING IN THE INDONESIAN (LOWER AND UPPER)  
SECONDARY LEVELS OF EDUCATION:  
POTENTIAL AREAS FOR REAL-WORLD DEVELOPMENT<sup>1</sup>**

**Gunadi Harry Sulisty**  
Universitas Negeri Malang

**ABSTRACT**

Global advances in assessment of language learning along with technological advances in information and communication have touched down far and wide on language teaching fast and vastly. This has been without any exception in the assessment enterprise that the government has introduced recently to practitioners in the context of the national new curriculum – K-13, also known as authentic assessment. On one side, challenges then appear as a result. On another side, these imply that there are potential areas for real-world development of assessment practices in the context of K-13. This paper aims to address these issues from several points of discussion. It then offers recommendations for further classroom practices on ICT-based (authentic) assessment of language learning in the Indonesian (lower and upper) secondary levels of education.

**Key words:** language, authentic, ICT, assessment, learning

Advances in information and communication technology (ICT) in the early years of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century – the technological century - have begun to colonize most spheres of life and colored important sectors in them, including teaching of English. In the realm of English teaching, use of ICT has been obvious and ubiquitous, starting from now daily „cannot-do without“ class routines such as using word processors to utilizing smart phones for m-learning (cf. Dudeney and Hockly, 2007). A number of ICT-based learning platforms such as Acapela, Booktrack, Edmodo, Ivona, Jing, Padlet, Quipper School, Socrative, Vacaroo, and others, and even more popular applications such as Facebook, and Instagram, just to mention a few, are also available out there, making it possible for students to practice a language, teachers and students to have virtual interactions one another, or students and teachers to make the most of learning resources any time and any place. In another side of teaching considered important, that is assessing language learning, however, the use of ICT is probably one step behind the language teaching and learning enterprise. Although its use in a global scale begins to gain grounds as seen in a number of school practices (for instance, Morris, 2011, Kuloheri, 2013) and research conducts (for instance, Rahimi and Yadollahi, 2011), ICT-based language assessment at least in the national context is still considered random and embryonic in its development as there is a vast area of concern in it unexplored and undeveloped. Nationally its

---

<sup>1</sup> A paper presented at *Konferensi Nasional Sastra, Bahasa dan Budaya*, Fakultas Bahasa dan Sastra 2017, 6<sup>th</sup> May 2017 at Universitas Kanjuruhan, Malang



coverage of work accomplished in its current emergence is probably analogous to a surface of an iceberg seen floating in the sea. Why is it so? The business of assessment inexorably contains a host of factors and involves a number of interrelated phases in which several activities need exerting with accuracy for assessment outcome to be useful, meaningful, and informative.

### **Several Theories and Practices in Language Learning Assessment: Global Evolutionary States**

Language learning assessment has undergone significant changes. Even, some have shifted in levels and changed directions, in that concepts and practices in language learning assessment have naturally been evolving dramatically shaping the present theoretic as well as applied states of assessment affairs. Several areas of development be they conceptual or practical, are evident (Sulistyo, 2015) as the part that follows discusses.

In the first place, language learning assessment, including language testing, and the conceptualization of what language is are closely linked. Departing from traditional views about the nature of language, once there was a long period in which language was that more on form than meaning. In traditional grammar, for instance, the form of language considered smallest is word. Words and words make up a larger construction, the so-called phrases, or maybe clauses. These building blocks further constitute sentences, which combine one another to comprise paragraphs. Testing the mastery of language is then no other than testing one's knowledge of the language's grammar – being rules in combining language forms (Sulistyo, 2015) which will be a basis for translating. Testing language is a kind of mental exercise on language knowledge.

Another instance of language as form is the idea that language is separable into divisible parts, going smaller beyond words, the smallest of which is what it is technically termed as phonemes – the smallest meaningful and distinctive units of language. These units form a larger piece called morphemes, and further constitute syntactic constructions. Testing the mastery of language is again no other than testing one's knowledge of the language's divisible components (Sulistyo, 1994; 1997), one by one in isolation from language use in real life (Sulistyo, 2015). Testing language is in a way still a kind of mental exercise, this time however, for accuracy mastery of language form like a native speaker's.

The first and the second concepts of language described previously share almost similar ideas on learning language as form mastery. To these two, knowing more about how language components work is fundamental in language learning. Testing and teaching language conducts are not clear with the former; but they are separate with the later.

The second concept of language is, however, then challenged by the idea that in practice language components – being language form – are not divisible. They are integrative in nature. For instance, when someone is listening, he/she pays his/her attention to neither separate sounds, words, nor sentences one by one. It is the message created that the listener is concerned with as a result from integrating individual components of language in verbal communication.

Language is but one, not separable. Although this idea is in opposite directions different from the other two approaches described previously, in that meaning begins to be considered, it has not gone far enough in testing one's mastery of language. The meaning of a message has not yet reached context use of language in real life.

Conceptual explorations as well as empirical studies begin to flourish in response to the idea that language is but unitary, which provide more evidence and arguments that favor divisible nature of language, not in terms of components of language – which constitute one – but in terms of competences. Thus, there is a shift in the conceptualization of language: not only is it not singular, but also it is linked to language skills. Furthermore, it is oriented to meaning, no longer to form of language. This new conceptualization may be considered as the hallmark of the emergence of the concept „competence“.

On the conceptual level, the term competence may be traced back to Chomsky's competence-performance dichotomy. The concept competence which was enhanced further by studies among other things by Savignon (1972; 1974; 1983) since then has evolved to be an umbrella term embracing other sub-competences as proposed by Hymes (1972), Canale (1983), Canale and Swain (1980), Bachman (1990), Celce-Murcia, Thurrell, and Dornyei (1995), Celce-Murcia (2007). Since then the concept of competence has evolved to constitute what is now known as “communicative competence”, which essentially becomes the target of any assessment process in the context of not only ESL but also EFL. Students' communicative competence should become the concern of any language teacher to reveal using assessment tools and procedures that enable students' communicative competence, which is abstract in nature, to become observable in the form of students' language performance.

Interpretation of scores resulting from assessment also constitutes a part of the shift in testing practices. In the context of learning output scores are no longer interpreted as an indication of one's relative standing compared to others' position in a group in which one is considered better or worse in terms of capability. Rather, scores reflect one's position towards the predetermined standard of a competence. The former is known also as norm-referenced score interpretation; the latter criterion-referenced one.

Next, elicitation practices of students' communicative competence have also witnessed a dramatic shift globally from conventional testing to authentic assessment (Sulistyo, 2015). Testing procedures from the traditional use have begun to be left, replaced by assessment practices that are more real life in orientation. The testing tasks in the conventional paradigm that are more on pedagogical in values have been less popular than the newer ones that are more target tasks (Nunan (2004). Also, testing items that are decontextualized of real-life language use are gradually replaced by authentic or real-life tasks.

On the teaching side, also integration of instruction and assessment has begun to gain ground. The term assessment for learning as well as assessment of learning and assessment as learning (Earl, 2003), is now more common among practitioners in the classroom. Rather than separated, assessment is integral and aligned to teaching. Data collected from assessment of students' learning play an

important role as information sources from which teaching to facilitate students' learning will be directed. Assessment of students' learning is not a judgement; rather it is a guide. It is not summative but formative. It informs teachers about learning progress made by the students towards the goals as a standard. As a result, information is not collected over a period of time as it happens in testing context; rather it begins when teaching as facilitation of students' learning begins to take place.

Last but not least, a shift from paper-based testing to computer-based practices is obvious and begins to be omnipresent. Computer-based testing has been exercised world-wide in the TOEFL, or other standardized tests. Not just migrating in terms of using a computer as the medium of test-item delivery, computer-based testing with the TOEFL even has reached beyond test-item delivery in which adaptive (Sulistyo, 2009) test-item delivery with a more realistic score interpretation.

In brief, global trends in testing language abilities have moved towards more sophisticated assessment with a more real-life view. These trends take place not only in the theories about language abilities but also in how assessment about language competences should be carried out using more sophisticated means. The trends as they are global come to pass across nations in which Indonesia is without exception. However, how these trends partially or wholly touch assessment practices nationally is an interesting topic to take a look at.

### **A Shift in Assessment Practice: Indonesian Norms**

The new reform the government has been trying to realize is about reviewing the national curriculum known as K-13. The policy to improve the quality of the national education is geared to not only strategies to deliver the instruction among other things through the so-called the scientific approach, but also assessment orientation known as authentic assessment. To some, this policy is still new as the government is still in its endeavour to introduce the policy to teachers. Meanwhile, global innovations in language learning assessment are also beginning to reach the local policy, including that of assessment concerns in our national curriculum, K-13. The section that follows deals more with (authentic) assessment in the context of K-13 seen from these sub-topics: areas of assessment, expectations, challenges, and potentials of areas of development.

Unlike previous curricula once in operation in our school, which put more emphases on the cognitive domain of learning and language form, assessment matters in K-13 have expanded its areas of learning domains and types of assessment. In the first place, advances in the conceptualization of „competence“ that deals with not only knowledge, but also affection, and psychomotor domains, characterize the concept of competences contained there in K-13. These are known as core competences (KI-1, KI-2, KI-3, and KI-4) as well as their corresponding basic competences (KD-1, KD-2, KD-3, and KD-4). These competences meet the competence standards of graduates and contents respectively. With this expanded area of teaching targets, students' learning is geared to the achievement of those standards accordingly. While assessment of students' learning is inseparable from the standards to be achieved – what to

teach (Sulistyo, 2015), assessment of students' learning is consequently also addressed to these standards. In other words, learning assessment is also concerned with these three domains: cognition, affection, psychomotor. This implies that as these domains differ substantially in their nature, assessment tools and procedures to disclose competences in these domains necessarily vary in forms. Thus, assessment devices such as tests and non-tests are employed for the purpose.

Secondly, language forms no longer occupy teaching materials, rather the ability to communicate – which essentially means the ability to listen, to speak, to read, and to write – comes to be the orientation in students' learning. Language components support the fluent mastery of language skills. Thus, the current focus in students' learning is language skills and meaning negotiation through language skills, notwithstanding inaccuracy in language forms such as grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation. Assessment of students' learning then is parallel in direction. Therefore, how meaning is negotiated through language skills constitutes the concern of current assessment practices according to K-13.

Along with the change in direction in assessing communication skills, a shift in types of assessing students' learning is also evident. Based on norms in K-13, authentic assessment embraces several procedures, four of which are primary: performance assessment, project-based assessment, portfolio-based assessment, and extended response assessment. What follows is a brief account of each.

As its name suggests, performance assessment requires students to perform, to do things, and/or to participate actively, involving the real-life use of language. Teachers set up tasks and at the same time design data-collection tools. Thus, there are real-life, or "target" tasks that students should accomplish in response to their own teacher-led curiosity. For instance, students collect information by observing hot spots in the school vicinity, browsing the Internet, and/or interviewing a resource expert in response to a question: how can a kite fly? They may work in pairs, in groups, or individually in finding the answer to such a question. The tools to collect information on students' learning process may be checklists, anecdotal records, narrative records, or rating scales.

Project-based assessment is the one in which a teacher-made task requires the students to complete a project in which students explore, examine, or investigate real-life cases within a specified period of time. To that end of project completion, students necessarily manage activities comprising project completion planning, data collection, data analysis, and data presentation. As such, there are aspects used to determine students' success in a project completion. Successful project completion may be defined in terms of several points, three of which are essential: topic selection and its related activities: designing the activity to collect data, data collection, data analysis, interpreting meaningfully the data and information, and reporting; relevance of the topic with necessary knowledge, affection, skill development; and originality of the project.

Portfolio-based assessment is the other type of assessment as a norm in K-13. It is a kind of assessment in which students should perform these things: collecting best works conducted on the basis of self-assessment or reflection against clear standards/criteria; and making progress along the way to higher

standards. In the words of Paulson, Paulson, Meyer (1991:60-63), portfolio is defined as “a purposeful collection of student work that exhibits the student’s efforts, progress and achievements in one or more areas. The collection must include student participation in selecting contents, the criteria for selection, the criteria for judging merit and evidence of student self-reflection.”

The final assessment type as a standard in K-13 is what may be appropriately termed as extended response written assessment. An extended response task is sometimes also called an essay question, or an open question. This kind of question does not require students to answer a question using facts previously remembered or understood only. Rather, an extended response question challenges the students to construct their response to the question that involves a complex process of not only lower-order thinking such as remembering and understanding, but also higher-order thinking such as applying, analyzing, evaluating, and creating in Bloom’s revised terms on the cognitive domain. In language assessment, although the focus is written language, the process to arrive at the end-product may involve integrated skills: listening, speaking, and reading as well as content or messages.

There are certainly more important points in K-13 as a norm that deal with assessment matters. For the purpose of the present discussion, several points discussed above are considered sufficient. One important point to remember when using authentic assessment is that tasks in it should be authentic reflecting real-life issues that are worth addressing. Another point is that in responding to the real-life tasks, students construct language also in an authentic vein while performing real-life things. In addition, not just language, content of the message conveyed through language skills is also of primary importance. It is believed that the fifth language skills – critical thinking skills – are also appropriately used by students when performing things. The role of a teacher in authentic assessment is to assure that assessment atmospheres meet these points. To guarantee that teachers play a scaffolding role appropriately in authentic assessment classes, a genuine task completion guideline needs establishing on which students base their real-life activities. The guideline encompasses these: what to do, how to do it, how long to do it, what to submit, and how to submit it (Sulistyo, 2015). In e-authentic assessment, further, students should be able to make and access optimum use of multimedia data: textual, auditory, and graphical sources in the Internet as well as off-line ones. Finally, “If [authentic] assessment is to be integral to learning, feedback must be at the heart of the process” (Brown, 2004: 83).

### **Merits? What to Expect?**

The government policy to set norms in the authentic assessment of language learning as standards of evaluation is an endeavour to improve the quality of education nationally, the ultimate objective of which is to impact positively on building the Indonesian human resource comprehensively in verbal behaviour terms. On one level, the inclusion of all domains - knowledge, affection, and skills - as the target of assessment of students’ communicative competences is to enhance the balanced building of students’ complete

communicative proficiency in language use as life skills. Not only do students have a strong and accurate ground of knowledge in the use of language skills, but also they are competently communicative in their conveying their ideas through listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Not only this, with their knowledge and language skills, they can also behave appropriately across situations involving audiences of a different status.

Another side of expectation is that orientation to real-life tasks in language assessment sets the students in meaningful learning. Learning language becomes real in which students deal with real-life issues. Not only are students skillful in functioning their listening, speaking, reading, and writing as these occur in real-life, be they in isolation or in combination, the content of the message conveyed through language is not artificial. Language use during assessment is genuine. Language assessment behaviour is authentic as the message delivered is purposeful, real, and integrated in language skills. This idea in assessing language learning is in line with the so-called content and language integration learning (CLIL) (Marsh, 2000; Coyle, Hood, and Marsh, 2010).

Integration of all domains of competences and that of language skills and messages conveyed as content as described previously will not be sufficient to be catered by thinking skills that only deal with remembering and understanding of language components. Authentic assessment of language learning, furthermore, requires students' use of higher-order thinking skills. When thus far language skills in authentic assessment have been associated with only listening, speaking, reading, and writing, higher-order thinking skills may be considered to constitute the fifth skill in language behaviour. Ultimately, authentic assessment of language learning impacts on students' critical thinking in the use of language – an essential component of language competences that is relevant to be possessed by students in today's era of communication and information technology in which verbal data become available readily in ubiquity and abundance in multi-modal forms: printed, visual, and aural. Authentic assessment of language use should impact significantly students' empowerment in processing ubiquitous and abundant data. Authentic assessment should have significant washback impacts on equipping the students with powerful communication tools that enable them to screen incoming information critically and to convey messages honestly and responsibly. When it is posited that there exists the so-called LAD, being Language Acquisition Devices, that enable anyone to learn and acquire language, it is also high time that in learning contents students be provided with CTC – Critical Thinking Competences– through authentic assessment, that without which, students live their language competences in chaotic states.

### **Current-State Challenges**

Nowadays ICT has entered the world of language learning assessment both globally and nationally. The government's policy in the context of K-13 by authentic assessment is an innovation in English learning context. These two sides of movement inevitably would meet, and adaptation, adoption, or creation in authentic assessment practices ultimately will need to take place. However, there are several points of concern that need considering when ICT-based (authentic)

assessment is really implemented in the K-13 context at present. These come from the features of traditional testing practices as well as those of authentic assessment itself as well as ICT matters.

Practically the first and the critical concern is infra structures that are needed to support the system to run the assessment on the move are necessarily stable for long hours during test or assessment administration. For instance, reliable connections with sufficient bandwidth need to be securely provided. When this requirement to meet the need fails to be fulfilled, inefficiency will have effect consequently. With a conventional testing for instance, approximately two straight hours' testing time is needed. E-portfolio assessment may take longer time as test takers should be assured that they can surf on-line sources continuously.

On theoretical sides, several aspects are potentially a challenge. First, if computer-based language assessment is meant merely to be migrating „paper-based tests“ to computer platforms, there is a superficial conception about ICT-based assessment. There is a naïve interpretation in understanding elicitation procedures here. ICT-based assessment should make it possible for elicitation procedures to explore fully the power of not only printed verbal materials, but also video and audio features, possibly in combination. Internet-based assessment for instance should enable the test takers to make full use of the Internet elements such as browsing abundance of sources. Secondly, traditional processing of test takers' response is performed by normally assigning number 1 for a correct response and 0 for an incorrect response. ICT-based assessment makes use of more sophisticated algorithms that involve complicated statistical analyses such as data mining and modern item response models of analyses. Also, score interpretation into meaningful figures also undergoes almost similar processes.

Quality assessment procedures and tools require the assurance of reliability and validity features in order for the result of assessment measurement to be dependable and accurate. However, as with authentic assessment, these very features are often times questionable (Linn, Baker and Dunbar, 1991; Aiken, 1996; Schurr, 1999). This was understandable as greater unpredictability in performing language behaviours in response to target tasks – which generally require constructed responses rather than selected ones – may occur. For instance, a target task requires that students perform an observation on the life of ants. Students' language behaviour during observations may vary, involving not just one language skill. This can be a challenge for accuracy as well as dependability in what to specifically measure. Unless a rigid definition is made upon what to measure, these prerequisite measures may not be satisfactorily met and as a result, garbage effects of the information thus collected using assessment procedures are prone to come about.

Last but not least, the area of concern is the administration of the National Examination (NE henceforth). The impact of testing towards teaching and learning has long been documented as a phenomenon known as washback (Buck, 1988) or backwash (Spolsky, 1994). In a narrow scope it is essentially the effect of testing administration on teachers' teaching and students' learning the materials contained in the test. In the event of washback teachers and students will

adjust their teaching and their learning to possibly the focus, test format, delivery, and the test material scope of a test administered. Test washback may influence positively on one side, or negatively (Alderson and Wall, 1993) on another side teachers' teaching and students' learning behaviours. Positive washback is desirable, but not negative one. When NE is still administered with a view to judge students' learning achievement, i.e. as a high-stake test, such a phenomenon will still happen. Teachers, albeit their teaching conduct under authentic assessment context, will exercise teaching to the test; in a similar vein, students learn not for competences but passing the NE.

### **Potential Areas for Development**

When testing or assessment is associated with assessment procedures of delivery, ICT- based testing in Indonesia currently may be considered as a phenomenon surfacing still at the emerging phase. Several practices of such a phenomenon are observable. For instance, at the national scale, in selected areas, thus far the National Examination has been computer-based. Also a requirement of evidence for English mastery of lecturers in Indonesia's lecturer certification program can be met through a computer-based English test known as the Test of English Proficiency (TOEP). Several universities have also conducted computer-based admission tests. These events evidently mark the computerization of testing in Indonesia in terms of procedures of delivery. Nevertheless, when examined further more closely, these computerized testing practices are still at the migration stage. Namely, the testing mode of delivery is essentially paper-and-pencil based; only the medium is made computerized. While assessment affairs deal with a host of interrelated aspects, thus, other areas of development are open. What follows deals with those areas to be potentially developed at the national scale in conjunction with advances in ICT.

Assessment matters in general involve these three essential stages: designing and developing, administering, and analyzing and interpreting scores, each of which requires a number of a series of activities. Of these three stages, the first phase is crucial as this will determine the next activities conducted in the second and the third phases. Considering this, therefore, for our present discussion, the focus is placed in the first phase only.

In the designing and developing phase, these critical activities among other things are inevitable: determining the objectives, defining the scope of the target of competences, specifying the areas and the level of the competences of interest, selecting procedures for task delivery that prompts and elicits test takers' appropriate responses, determining scoring procedures, setting the standards of cutoff scores, expert validation, informal tryout, data analyses and interpretation. Of these activities, several may merely require non technological involvement; while others seriously cannot do without utilization of technologies. It is in this vein that ICT-based assessment is relevant to be discussed with a view to K-13.

Selecting task delivery that prompts and elicits test takers' appropriate responses is one crucial step that is potentially developed in K-13 context. As has been discussed previously, performance assessment, project-based assessment, portfolio-based assessment, and extended response assessment constitute main



assessment platforms in K-13. What follows discusses briefly how ICT may be used to play a role as task delivery.

As has been touched upon a bit in the previous section, in performance assessment students are required to perform, to do things, and/or to participate actively, involving the real-life use of language. In ICT-based performance assessment, similar requirements are applicable. However, this time technology is involved. This has been echoing Darling-Hammond (2006:655) who asserts that „...performance assessments [...]require students to evaluate and solve complex problems, conduct research, write extensively, and demonstrate their learning in projects, papers, and exhibitions...” [as these] have proven key to motivating students and attaining high levels of learning in redesigned high schools.”

E-prompts or non e-prompts are presented to students where they are posed with real-life issues. Any real-life themes will do as a basis for problem posing, preferably negotiated with the students. The prompts should provide students with ample opportunities for them to exhibit their potentials to explore not only sources off-line, but also more importantly relevant hot spots in the Internet: textual, auditory, and graphical. Task completion guidelines accompany them along the way in responding to the task. A simple example of e-performance assessment would be the use a theme „ant” with a K-W-L-H framework. In such a scheme, if the Internet is used, it functions as the medium from which necessary information is drawn.

An approach used in performance assessment may take problem solution schemes. If such an approach is considered, under the guidance of a teacher, students will carry out these activities accordingly: Posing a problem, defining the problem, collecting empirical evidence, identifying causes, evaluate a strategy, develop strategies for solutions, select the best solution, performing actions, and reporting. Another type of authentic assessment in K-13 framework is project-based assessment. According to Chrysafidis (2005), the idea of project-based learning the pedagogical root of which may be traced back to the ideas of experiential learning as envisioned by reformists in education. In the project-based learning, physical activities, rather than memorization of facts and verbalism of abstraction of concepts, are highly encouraged. Also, in accomplishing the project under project-based assessment, students actively participate during the learning process. Finally, facts pertaining to the surrounding reality are exploited as a source for learning. These principles are applicable in project-based assessment. It should be kept in mind however that project-based assessment is not project. While process and learning are more important in project-based assessment; product and project completion are more important in a project.

In K-13, project based assessment holds a platform with three main activities, namely planning, implementing the plan, and reporting. More detailed activities are however possible as outlined by Stix and Hrbekas (2006) as follows: providing the context of the project to accomplished by showing a real-life project case; assigning student to assume a role as project designers; allowing students to collect data/information relevant to the design; setting up criteria of successful a project preferably by having negotiation with the students; preparing the materials

needed; building the project; presenting the project; and reflecting on the project.

The themes for project completion as it is commonly used in all authentic assessment types include those encompassing not only real-life issues but also topics across curriculum. Thus, there may be topics pertaining to natural sciences, biological sciences, social sciences, and humanities. A class may touch on a topic like kites where math and physics are dealt with as popular ones; animal or flora conservations with biology; traffic jams with social issues; and human rights with humanity, for instance.

E-portfolio-based assessment is the other type of authentic assessment in K-13. The portfolio is commonly understood inappropriately among teachers. For instance, portfolios are when students collect their work as a class assignment. While the process of collecting is one characteristic of portfolios, there are several important points that characterize portfolios.

Crystal clear steps to conduct classroom based portfolio assessment in EFL have been proposed by Kemp and Toperoff (1998). These steps are as follows: identifying instructional goals through which the portfolio will be assessed; determining what content to put as collection, providing unambiguous and complete portfolio completion guidelines for portfolio presentation, informing stakeholders interested in the portfolio work under consideration, planning and developing the portfolios, evaluating students' portfolio works and providing feedback, holding student-teacher conferences, having follow-up activities.

Areas of language skills to be involved in portfolio works vary. As commonly authentic assessment involves integrated skills, a focus of language skill to be demonstrated by students in portfolio assessment however may be considered. Thus, a portfolio work may be focused on collection of work demonstrating spoken language competences or written ones.

The last type of authentic assessment endorsed to be implemented in the EFL classroom according to K-13 is the so-called extended-response assessment. Extended response as a type of authentic assessment is characterized by the following features. It is a writing prompt that requires students to write in depth an account in response to a real life –issue. Another term used to refer to an extended response item is an essay question. As such, it necessarily requires students to provide in-depth and open details of written work. In addition, an extended response item takes time and thinking.

An extended response question item in the authentic assessment scheme needs to meet the requirements, or the principles of authentic assessment. Therefore, the question posed to students should be based on real-life and meaningful purposes. It challenges students to employ their critical thinking skills. Students should construct, rather than recognize on selection bases, language.

An example of such a task would be as follows:

*Many young learners learn a foreign language relatively easily; others find it hard to do. Why do you think this is so? Provide three or more important benefits and drawbacks of learning a*

*foreign language at a younger age, and explain why each benefit and drawback is important. Give examples. Also, to what extent do you agree that young learners should learn a foreign language.*

In a more sophisticated form, an extended response question item may have an academic basis in which in constructing the answer to the question posed, the students should follow scientific stages. Thus, students are challenged with questions whose answers can be provided impromptu. Students need to provide not only theoretical but also empirical bases, most probably normasi ones, before they construct their response. Not only this, students should also design steps to answer the questions, develop instruments, and collect information using the instrument already developed. Even they are to analyze and present the result of the analyses in written reports made according to guidelines already agreed.

With all these types of authentic assessment under K-13 context described previously, to start a simple e-authentic assessment, use of available popular applications such as facebook, snapchat, twitter, instagram, google-related applications, or many others. With a more sophisticated one, more sophisticated platforms such as Edmodo or Quipper School can be used to provide students with a learning corridor for them to develop authentic language.

In addition to the delivery procedures of authentic assessment in K-13 context described above, of the activities conducted in the designing and developing phase, standard setting is worth more discussing. Test scores should inform stakeholders about the test takers' level of competences under interest. Scores should be indicative of the test takers' competences. If someone is admitted in a selection test, for instance, this implies that he/she has met the minimum score that is required to pass the test. The procedure that is used to determine the score that "cuts" the borderline of test takers considered able from those not able set by the test at a particular level is called standard setting (cf. Tannenbaum, 2011). Based on a test performance, using the cut score as the borderline in a scale, then a test taker may be classified into a particular category of language ability as elementary, intermediate, advanced, or special advanced (cf. Zikey and Perie, 2006).

Standard setting is an important process in assessment context (cf. Pitoniak, Hambleton, and Biskin, 2003). According to Kane (2001), "... setting a standard is, in effect, setting a policy" (Tannenbaum, 2011:3), the consequence of making decision based on the categorization of which, let alone of high stakes tests, determines one's future. Bejar (2008:1) asserts that "...unless the cutscores are appropriately set, the results of the assessment could come into question." Considering this, therefore, standard setting needs to be performed with precision. One procedure that may be used for standard setting involves item response theory (IRT), in which computerized programs may be utilized as the estimation of the parameters involves complicated processes for precise results.

What about standard setting in our K-13 context? Attempts have yet been made, such as setting up criteria for minimum mastery learning. However, this has been arbitrarily carried out with unclear bases and categorization of competence levels across language skills. One reason for such unclarity is

probably due to two possibilities: basic competences that are not operationally definable into indicators, or inaccurate interpretation of basic competences to be derived into measurable indicators.

Another area of development is determining scoring procedures. Scoring may be defined as procedures of assigning numbers to characterize test takers' size of competences. The outcome of scoring is then meaningful information about the characteristics of the test takers' competences. This area becomes more open due to progress made in item analysis and computer programs. Advances in item response theory (IRT) allow scoring to be made more appropriately and fairly. Also, the role of computer programs such as Bilog or Multilog, for instance, makes it possible for scoring to be realized more accurately and efficiently. For instance, in adaptive testing such as adaptive TOEFL, items that are arranged based on synchronizing parameters of the test and the test takers will adapt to test takers' ability. So, for instance, two students doing any 5 items correctly on different items will not have a different score. Also, computer programming with right algorithms allows assessment of writing and speaking, the two skills that tend to pose technical challenges with administration, thus leading to impracticality in administration and scoring, to be performed with the results to be reported real time. When this is realized, testing language skills can be carried out comprehensively involving all skills.

### **Concluding Remarks and Recommendations**

This paper has addressed several issues in the global level pertaining to approaches to test theories, new directions in assessment practice in Indonesia context, expectations in the government's policy, challenges in the implementation of the policy, and potential areas of development using ICT platforms. What has been in practice with ICT application in the national testing enterprise has been an initial stage of migrating from paper-and-pencil assessment formats to computer-based platforms. Most of the areas of development under ICT have been limited to in item delivery. While there are areas of development in the making of assessment tools, advances in testing theories, and multi modal areas of task delivery under authentic assessment which comprises mainly verbal, visual, and aural channels, potential areas of authentic assessment development based on K-13 are therefore widely open.

Challenges are obvious though. Supporting facilities need to be adequate to implement ICT-based authentic assessment. Also, inherent challenges concerning assessment tool attributes – reliability and validity – are evident. The very gravest threat comes from the National Examination, which contradicts the format of authentic assessment. Washback effect of the National Examination therefore needs to be positive.

Considering these, therefore, several recommendations are offered. The roles and the function of the National Examination needs to be proportionately reviewed so as to have a more desirable washback impacts in the teacher teaching and student learning if the class activities are conducted under the platform of authentic assessment. Rather than judgmental in the decision, the National Examination should function diagnostically to map out areas of strengths and

weaknesses in the teacher work and student learning. Secondly, adequate infrastructures to conduct ICT –based assessment need to be fulfilled across areas. When this happens, not only the National Examination can be conducted nationally involving four skills with a proper role, but also classroom-based authentic assessment practice can be enhanced more fruitfully. In addition to this, better establishment of ICT infrastructures will have an impact on teachers’ professionalism and effort to be more ICT literate nationally. Teachers will eventually be ICT literate. Further accompanying effects would be teachers will readily take risks in developing e- authentic assessment in their class. More importantly, more research on authentic assessment practices will be conducted and shared worldwide online.

## REFERENCES

- Aiken, L. R., 1996. *Rating Scale & Cheklits: Evaluating Behavior, Personality, and Attitude*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Alderson, J.C. & Wall, D. 1993. Does washback exist? , *Applied Linguistics*, 14 (1993) pp.115- 129.
- Bachman, L. F. 1990. *Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bejar, I. 2008. Standard Setting: What Is It? Why Is It Important? R&D Connections. No. 7 • October 2008. Accessed on May 5, 2017 from [https://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/RD\\_Connections17.pdf](https://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/RD_Connections17.pdf).
- Brown, S. 2004 *Assessment for Learning: Learning and Teaching in Higher Education*, Issue 1, p. 81.
- Buck, G. 1988 Testing listening comprehension in Japanese university entrance examinations. *JALT* (10).
- Canale, M.1983. 'From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy' in.J.C. Richards and R.W.Schmidt (eds.) *Language and Communication*. London: Longman.
- Canale, M. and Swain, M.1980. 'Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing.' *Applied Linguistics* 1/1:1-47.
- Crisafidis, K. 2005. *Experiential-communicative teaching. Implementing the project method in school*. Athens: Gutenberg.
- Coyle, D; Hood. P; and Marsh. D. 2010. *CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Darling-Hammond, L. 2006. No Child Left Behind and high school reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 76(4), 642–667.
- Earl, L. 2003. *Assessment As Learning: Using Classroom Assessment to Maximize Student Learning*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin, 2003.
- Hymes, D.H. 1972. “On Communicative Competence” In: J.B. Pride and J. Holmes (eds) *Sociolinguistics*. Selected Readings. Harmondsworth: Penguin, pp. 269-293.
- Kemp, J & Toperoff, D. 1998. *Guidelines for Portfolio Assessment in Teaching English*. Accessed on April, 5, 2017 from [cms.education.gov.il](http://cms.education.gov.il)
- Kane, M. T. 2001. So much remains the same: Conception and status of validation in setting standards. In G. J. Cizek (Ed.), *Setting performance standards: Concepts, Methods, and Perspectives*. pp. 53–88. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Kuloheri, F-V. 2013. *The Use of ICTs in the A/B Primary School EFL Classes: A Useful Teacher’s Guide*. Athens, Greece. Accessed on February, 28, 2017 from [http://attik.pde.sch.gr/sym06-gath/DATA/Yliko/e-book\\_A\\_B\\_Primary\\_Grades\\_and ICTs\\_Kouloxeri.pdf](http://attik.pde.sch.gr/sym06-gath/DATA/Yliko/e-book_A_B_Primary_Grades_and ICTs_Kouloxeri.pdf).
- Linn, R. L., Baker, E., & Dunbar, S. 1991. Complex, performance-based assessment: Expectations and validation criteria. *Educational Researchers*, 20 (8), 15-21.
- Mary J. Pitoniak, Ronald K. Hambleton, & Bruce H. Biskin. 2003. *Setting Standards on Tests Containing Computerized Performance Tasks*. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education, Chicago, IL, April, 2003.
- Marsh, D. 2000. Using languages to learn and learning to use languages. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.
- Morris, N.O. 2011. Using technology in the EFL classroom in Saudi Arabia. *MA TESOL Collection*. Paper 511.
- Nunan, D. 2004. *Task-Based Language Teaching*. Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Paulson F.L., P.R. Paulson, & C.A. Meyer. 1991. What makes a portfolio a portfolio? *Educational Leadership*. 48 (5), (pp. 60-63)
- Rahimi, M. & Yadollahi, S. 2011. ICT Use in EFL Classes: A Focus on EFL Teachers’ Characteristics. *World Journal of English Language*, Vol. 1,

No. 2; October 2011. pp. 17-29.

Savignon, S. J. 1972. *Communicative competence: An experiment in foreign language teaching*. Philadelphia, PA: The Center for Curriculum Development.

Savignon, S. J. 1974. Teaching for communication. In R. Coulombe (Ed.), *Voix et visages de la France: Level I (teachers' guide)*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally. (Reprinted in *English Teaching Forum*, 1978, 16, 2–5, 9.)

Savignon, S. J. 1983. *Communicative competence: Theory and Classroom Practice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Schurr, S. 1999. *Authentic Assessment From A to Z*. USA: National Middle School Association. Spolsky, B. 1994. *The examination-classroom backwash cycle: some historical cases*. In

Bringing about change in language education: proceedings of the International Language in Education Conference 1994. University of Hong Kong.

Stix, A and Hrbek, F. 2006. *Teachers as Classroom Coaches*. Accessed on May, 5, 2017 from [http://www.ascd.org/publications/books/106031/chapters/The\\_Nine\\_Steps\\_of\\_Project-Based\\_Learning.aspx](http://www.ascd.org/publications/books/106031/chapters/The_Nine_Steps_of_Project-Based_Learning.aspx).

Sulistyo, G.H. 1994. 'Is Unitary Competence Hypothesis Tenable?' *Bahasa dan Seni*, 2, pp. 151-163.

Sulistyo, G.H. 1997. 'Language Testing: From Psychometric Structural to Communicative', in E. Sadtono (ed.), *The Development of TEFL in Indonesia*, Malang: Penerbit IKIP Malang, pp. 66-91.

Sulistyo, G.H. 2009. TOEFL in a Brief Historical Overview from pBT to iBT. *Bahasa dan Seni*, Tahun 37, Nomor 2. pp. 116-127.

Sulistyo, G.H. 2015. *EFL Learning Assessment at Schools. An Introduction to its Concepts and Principles*. Malang: Universitas Negeri Malang.

Tannenbaum, R.J. 2011. Setting Standards on The Praxis Series™ Tests: A Multistate Approach. *R&D Connections*. No. 17. November 2011. Accessed on May, 5, 2017 from [https://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/RD\\_Connections17.pdf](https://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/RD_Connections17.pdf).

Zieky, M. & Perie, M. 2006. *A Primer on Setting Cut Scores on Tests of Educational Achievement*. Accessed on May, 5, 2017 from [https://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/Cut\\_Scores\\_Primer.pdf](https://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/Cut_Scores_Primer.pdf).