

ESRU Model in ESP Context: Insight from EFL Teacher's Practice

Milawati^{1*}, Nurir Rohmah², Helmy Sahirul Alim³

^{1,2,3}English Language Unit, Politeknik Negeri Madura

Jl Raya Taddan Km 4, Camplong, Sampang, East Jawa, 69281, Indonesia

*Corresponding author

e-mail address : milawati@poltera.ac.id¹, nurir@poltera.ac.id²,

hsahirul86@gmail.com³

DOI : 10.21107/prosodi.v16i1.13373

Received 19 January 2022; Received in revised form 24 March 2022; Accepted 31 March 2022; Published 11 April 2022.

ABSTRAK

Untuk melakukan penilaian formatif, model ESRU digunakan untuk menganalisis semua pernyataan yang diindikasikan sebagai strategi guru dalam melaksanakan penilaian formatif informal. Model ESRU diawali dengan inisiasi guru dalam mengajukan pertanyaan untuk membangkitkan pemikiran siswa, kemudian siswa memberikan respon terhadap pertanyaan inisiasi guru. Selanjutnya respon siswa dapat dikenali oleh guru dan guru memberikan umpan balik terhadap respon siswa. Sebuah studi kasus pada kelas ESP diamati untuk menyelidiki informasi mendalam yang berhubungan dengan implementasi Model ESRU. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa interaksi guru-siswa lebih dominan terjadi, guru dapat menggunakan informasi untuk mendukung pembelajaran dan memodifikasi pembelajarannya untuk membantu siswa mencapai tujuan pembelajaran yang telah ditentukan bersama. Dengan demikian kesenjangan yang ada dapat diminimalisir, baik siswa maupun guru dapat memperoleh manfaat dari informasi yang diperoleh dari penilaian formatif informal.

Kata-kata kunci: model ESRU, penilaian formatif informal, konteks ESP

ABSTRACT

To carry out formative assessments, the ESRU model is used to analyze all utterances indicated as teachers' strategies in implementing informal formative assessments. The ESRU model begins with the initiation of the teacher in asking questions to generate student thoughts, then the students provide responses to the teacher's initiation questions. Furthermore, student responses can be recognized by teachers and teachers provide feedback on student responses. A case study on ESP classes was observed to investigate in depth information dealing with the ESRU Model implementation. It revealed that teacher-students interaction was dominantly occurred, teacher can use information to support learning and modify their learning to help students achieve Learning objectivess that are determined together. Thus the existing gap can be minimized, both students and teachers can benefit from the information obtained from informal formative assessments.

Keywords: ESRU model, informal formative assessment, ESP context

BACKGROUND

In the context of EFL, research focuses on the techniques used in formative assessment, which are often neglected due to practical problems in the classroom such as assessment problems, unrealistic practice, lack of negotiation between teachers and students, and lack of concern for students' previous performance in class (Ketabi, et.al, 2015). In addition, the application of formative assessment for novice teachers is not easy. Some of the problems faced by novice teachers in the classroom are the limited ability to formulate questions that bring out more declarative knowledge from students, because the questions are more on clarifying questions to find out student understanding, while questions that cause students' reasoning are still not optimal. In addition, sometimes novice teachers do not pay attention to student ideas and do not even involve students in reflecting and revising their own thoughts, and do not know how to adjust based on student responses (Gotwals & Birmingham, 2016).

The same problem as mentioned above, is still found in the context of ESP learning lately where English is a compulsory subject for vocational majors. Some experienced teachers focus almost entirely on various forms of summative assessment, which place assessment as a Learning objectives. This may be due to pressure from superiors to train students to obtain high academic results. As in the conduct of high-stakes exams, which is very prominent in many countries. At times, many educators will offer awards to students who succeed in such tests academically. Curriculum planning, where teachers mainly focus on knowledge, concepts and skills as measured by summative exams. Thus, the time that teachers have in learning in class is only limited to delivering material, while for the teaching and learning process they are together in class it cannot be reflected. So inevitably, if the teacher cannot know the strengths and weaknesses of students in detail. If this happens, it will clearly create a gap, where teachers do not know the current state of student knowledge and how far they have to go to achieve their Learning objectivess. This gap will later have the potential for discrepancies in the feedback given by teachers to students.

To avoid this gap, it is important to implement an informal formative assessment. This assessment can be used as an alternative to identify the strengths and weaknesses of students. In addition, informal formative assessments are more practical and attached to routine learning that occurs in the classroom. Informal formative assessments can occur through utterances spoken by both teachers and students in learning interactions in class. This can allow teachers to find out excess information, not just grades. But teachers can analyze the reasons behind the gaps that exist in their students.

To make it easier to analyze the formative assessment of teachers' informal speech, the ESRU model developed by Ruiz-Primo, M. A. (2011). is used as a protocol for observing speech that occurs in the classroom. The ESRU model is considered very appropriate to be carried out in the context of EFL Formative assessment because the series of activities that exist in the ESRU Model can reflect the steps in the application of formative assessment including Eliciting question, Students' response, Teacher Recognize and Using the information gained (Ruiz-Primo, M. A, 2011; Ruiz-Primo, M. A., &Furtak, E. M, 2006). Thus, it is hoped that the synchronization of what teachers analyzed related to the implementation of research can go hand in hand with students' abilities, so that the selection of feedback given by the teacher will be right on target with the students' needs.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study uses a qualitative approach, with a case study method. It was aimed to investigate in more detail the application of ESRU model in English for specific purposes. A teacher with approximately 4 years of teaching experience along with students in English 2 course was chosen as the subject of this research. With the consideration that the teacher applies more two-way interaction with students. In addition, the teacher often provides guidance to students. The data taken in this study, in the form of utterances spoken by the subject.

Class observations were used as a data collection technique. In this case, the researcher acted as a non-participant observer, without having to be directly involved in classroom learning. A video recording was used to record the occurrence as well as fieldnote was used to record some findings that were uncovered by video recording. Class observations were carried out in several meetings to obtain sufficient data.

The data, then, was analyzed qualitatively by sorting out data that was only related to ESRU Model, by making transcripts of conversations between teachers and students. More detailed data was analyzed by using the method proposed by Miles, M.B, and Huberman, A.M. (2014). The stages, in general, include, data reduction, displaying data and making conclusions. In particular, several steps were taken in analyzing the data which include the following activities. (1) Combining the data collected, involving all information from the field. In this case, the data obtained is processed by copying the teacher's speech obtained from the video recording during the English class 2 takes place. (2) Classification of data obtained from transcription recordings. Then it was classified based on the type of teacher's question and the teacher's follow-up action on the student's response is each coded according to typology Ruiz-Primo & Furtak (2006). (3) Displaying data selected and simplified to make it clearer and easier to interpret (4) Interpreting the analyzed data descriptively. (5) Validating data, data analysis results from transcription were cross-checked with other participants to validate findings; (6) Reporting the results, making conclusions, derived in connection with the findings and discussions to answer research questions.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

A. Result

The research data were analyzed by using ESRU Model as a protocol proposed by Furtak (2011) which consists of four sequences. They were eliciting, students' response, recognizing students' response and using the information gathered. However, before coming to the ESRU model, the findings were preceded by clarifying the learning purpose/ activity from all participants.

1. Clarifying the learning objective

Clarifying the learning objective had to do with teacher explanation about the learning objective as well as the success criteria to the students. This was the initiating step of informal formative assessment, before the participant starting the ESRU sequence. Furthermore, it was aimed to guide the interactive dialogue on the right track based on the learning purpose. It could be done by reminding students and connecting the discussion to the learning objective. Particularly, it was explicitly uttered by all

participants, at the beginning of the meeting and in the middle of the teaching learning process.

The first strategy in clarifying learning objective was reminding students about the purposes of an activity. This strategy was employed by T on line and offline classroom discussion. To clarify the objective, T was involving students to guess the purposes of the learning activities. It happened in T class which was conducted through students' group presentation. It aimed to take students' notification and focus to the topic being discussed. The following excerpts are presented as the example of how T2 clarified his learning purposes.

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|----------------|
| 1 | T | yeah and today we are going to have inflectional, and the presenters are? | CC.
1 |
| 2 | S | 21:47 responding) thank you Mr, ok next so, directly I want to anwer mister andi's question. As we know, our topic today gesture as a (incomprehensible noise) for children language (class laughing) so, why you asked to us about your question, It , uh, apaya I think itu ranah untuk orang dewasa, ga mungkin kita kan anak like, like we know ya guys ya, kan anak tidak langsung diajarkan bahasa yang (incomprehensible noise) (loud laughing) langsung banyak ya kasian otaknya mereka tidak bisa langsung mencerna kalimat. | SI.77
/E(S) |

The excerpt 1 showed the situation in which a group of students presented their topics discussion in front of class. T has mentioned or explained his learning objective at the start of the class before the group presentation started. Meanwhile excerpt 2 was presented one of the member of the group presenter responded to Andi's question. One group member considered Andi's questions as oit of the topic. Therefore, she had to remind Andi that the topic is discussion was a gesture for children. From this interaction, I learn that students can as well clarify the learning objective.

2. Eliciting

Eliciting was teacher initiated questions to promote students' thinking. The teacher can ask their students' idea, conception, opinion and intrepertation. The strategies implemented consists of procedural, convergent and divergent question. Particularly, the procedural questions had to do with what was going on in the classroom. While convergent question was used to encourage student response to the question on the recall information. Last, divergent question was used to answer the questions in the higher level thinking.

The situation showed the procedural question that was firstly used by T to check students' assignment, but then, it was functioned to find difficulties which were faced by the students.

- | | | |
|----|--|------|
| T | I have given you the material and I gave you one week to read it, so there is no excuse that you haven't read this one. Okey...Have you read? All of you...? | EP.1 |
| Ss | Yes, Ma'am... | SC.1 |
| T | Do you think is it difficult? | EC.1 |
| Ss | Yes...Ma'am... | SC.2 |
| T | What made it difficult? Because of the words? | ED.1 |
| Ss | Yes...Ma'am... | SC.3 |

The extract above showed certain condition where T4 wanted to identify students' difficulties in comprehending reading material which was shared in the previous meeting. This condition happened during her American Study classroom when she started asking her class "have you read the reading material that I given to you last week?". Most of her students answer was "not yet", that is why here, she asked "in what way you got difficulties in reading this one?" to identify students' difficulties so that she could give an alternative solution about students' difficulties.

3. Students' response

The response produced by students as result of teacher initiates questions including individual response, choral answer, no response, teacher- answer.

Generally, it occurred mostly when teacher asked convergent and divergent questions. T's practice, for example, presented the occurrence of individual response which could encourage peer assessment in group discussion. In this case, individual student initiated question about 'children gestures'. T was let his students and their peers to comment on question raised by the student. In particular, individual students' response raised in T's practice that was to engage students involve in classroom discussion.

- S2** Ris nanya, (02:46-02:52) because as we know that gesture EC.5
 misal bayi ya mengajarkan bayi bilang stop tuh namanya
 dengan kita menggunakan gesture terus pakai tangan stop itu
 artinya berhenti[...]
 Jadi itu gesture, iya kan, jadi apakah dia pelan-pelan berhenti?
- Ss** Yeah nggak gitu hahhahahahah SC.18
- S2** Berhenti berhenti, tapi malah dia ngebut gitu SI.63
- S3** Saya mau bantu menjelaskan SI.63
- T** Iya iya silahkan EP.22
- S3** Jadi di sini guys kalau dua-duanya maksudnya poinnya kalian SI.64
 gak ngerti kalian tidak mengerti itu prakteknya gimana,
 masak masak ya anak anak gitu ya diajarin ini lim a ini tujuh
 kan gak mungkin [...] Pasti cuman nunjuk oh ini mama ini
 papa maem maem nak ya susu susunah gitu kan
 hahhahahahah
- S4** Gini gini, (show the movement) SC.19
- S1** gak seperti itu SI.66
- S3** maksudnya kontex susah tidaknya itu eh bagaimana itu SI.67
 konteks mengerti dan tidak mengertinya anak-anak itu
 poinnya dimana.

The excerpt above showed the individual student response occurred in T's practice. In this case, it was a long sequence classroom interaction. S2 initiated question about baby's gesture in a group classroom discussion. Another student (S3) from group presenter responded to S2's question. However, S3's answer seemed partially correct, and then S4 tried to add S3's answer by practicing baby gesture. S3's response called out other students' response (S1).

4. Recognizing students' response

Recognizing students' responses were a teacher strategy in making sense of students' responses. It was aimed to indicate that student(s) response had been heard and accepted in on going classroom discussion. There were four teacher strategies to recognize students' responses namely repeating, rephrasing, displaying students' responses and using wait time. Those activities could occur quickly, spontaneously, flexibly, in, and through daily classroom interaction when students often gave wrong or silly answers. Merely, those were happened because students did not understand the question, lack of vocabularies and inaudible pronunciation. By recognizing students' response, teacher had opportunity to act on them and evaluate the correctness of teacher's interpretation of their contribution.

Repeating was used by all participants to recognize students' response. Teacher repeated his/ her question after the teacher waited for students' response and teacher also repeated students' responses immediately.

- | | | |
|-----------|---|-----------------|
| T | The first one, what did you get from your reading in your house from debating handbook that I asked you to read? Okay..Luluk...what do you know about debate? | EC.11 |
| S1 | Clash of argument | SI.35 |
| T | Clash of argument...how do you explain it?
Anyone can explain? or Luluk still wanna try to explain it? | Rre.5
/ED.11 |
| Ss | #Silent | SN.3 |
| T | So we clash our argument or opinion with other. Anything else about the requirements of debate? | Rre.6
/UC. 3 |
| S1 | a number of reasons | SI.37 |

The above excerpt described how T employed repeating strategy. There were two occurrences of repeating strategy occurred in T's practice. First, repeating was done by the teacher when the teacher ensured students' answer. Basically, it was happened when there was individual student answer which seemed superficial or partially correct. Hence, the teacher need to encourage the student to clarify their superficial answer by asking divergent question, 'what do you know about debate?'. In that way, T repeated the students' answer to promote students to have a higher level of thinking in order they supported their previous superficial answer. Second occurrence was the teacher repeated his/ her questions after wait time or no answer. It was indicated when there was silent or student ignored teacher question. Usually, it happened because the question itself was considered as higher level question. As a result, the students needed time to think about the acquired answer. In order to keep students still focusing on the topic being discussed, the teacher repeated his/her question 'So we clash our argument or opinion with other?', and added some more information to encourage students' engagement on the classroom discussion, 'anything else?'

5. Using information gathered

Using information gathered was the last sequence of informal formative assessment activities. After all participants gained the information in previous sequences such as eliciting, students' response and recognizing students' response, they could decide an action properly based on the information gained. Particularly, in this sequence, teacher immediately made a use of the previous information gained by elaborating, relating, comparing and contrasting student(s) ideas, modelling and

debugging. It was aimed the teacher could give and decide appropriate feedback to follow up the information gained.

Providing feedback was one of the teacher strategies in using information gathered. It was indicated by the teacher provided explanation toward students' response. In general, it was aimed in order to promote students' thinking.

The example of providing feedback strategies was employed by T4's practice.

T	Okay, in what way you got difficulties in reading this one? How was it Diego?	E	ED.3
S1	Maybe...there many difficult words, so I got difficulty to understand the content.	S	SI.2
T	To understand the content... but you got something a little bit...	(R)U	UP.1
S1	Yes, Ma'am.	S	SI.3
T	Okay...How about the others? What's your difficulties? Okay, Salma...	E	ED.4
S2sejarawan (the voice of the student was not clear)	S	SI.4
T	Okay..So you ask me the way to know the difficult words that you don't understand? Okay...Okay...I got it. What else is your difficulties? you raise your hand? (appoint one student). Okay, what do you want to say?	U	UD.1
S4	Because since elementary school I hate history so I don't understand this text.	S	SI.11
T	Because you not really like with history, You don't really want to read this one.	U	UP.3
S5	Eventhough I don't like it, I. I read it but I don't understand.	S	SI.13
T	Okay..okay...So...I can assume that everyone got difficulties about understanding the content of the material that we will review today. So, please discuss with your friend first, share the information that you can get from this one with your friend before later I give the review, I give the explanation about this one. Share your information, everything that you get from this one! Clear my instruction?	U	UP.4
Ss	Yes..yes...	S	SC.7

The above showed providing feedback strategy occurred in T's practice. It was preceded by T's question asking about the task which was announced in previous meeting. However, the teacher recognized that the students found difficulties in understanding the reading materials. T investigated the difficulties found by students. By eliciting question, T could get the information of students' difficulties, while the students got a chance to share their difficulties in a classroom discussion. After, the teacher has gained the information, and then T ended by giving more information and concluded the gap faced by the students. It was found some reasons which made the students unable to understand the materials. There were unfamiliar words, uninteresting reading material, and uninteresting field of reading material. Though T had already known about their reason, T did not directly respond on every comment. She preferred to collect all comments, noted each student comment and ended by

giving a chance for peers to solve the problems. It means that T had employed peer feedback in her classroom.

B. Discussion

Particularly, this study reveals some key features of formative assessments. First, there is an instruction which means that there should be combination of teaching and learning. In this sense, instruction refers to any activity that is intended to create learning. It is carried out by the teachers during their teaching and learning processes (Widiastuti and Saukah, 2017). Next, decision deals with how the information related to students' strengths and weaknesses are collected. It is, then, used by the teacher and students as a feedback to guide and follow up the teaching and learning process (Gattulo, 2000; Black and William, 2009; Carless, 2011; Jiang, 2014). Other feature is the agents of assessment involve teacher, students and peers (Black and William, 2009; Lee, 2011). This involvement distinguishes formative assessment to other assessment, they can negotiate learning objectives with the teachers, and engage in self-and/ peer assesment (Box, et al., 2015).

Additionally, in the view of informal formative assessment in classroom practice, it could happen spontaneous and planned. WIDA (2009) describes spontaneous formative assessment when it is immediate and unplanned. It is given when the teacher recognizes that the students do not understand material given. Immediately, the teacher directs the question to the whole class or answers by him/her self. It includes a question and answer session during a lesson, observing students during an activity, listening to students' impromptu conversations or asking students to provide examples. In the same view to this point, the informal formative assessment occur more occasional and unplanned comments and feedback (Brown, 2004; Gotwals and Birmingham, 2016). Regardless of whether it is spontaneous or planned, the objective of formative assessment is to provide feedback, not to assign score or grade.

In relation to the value of the implementation of formative assessment, this study has employed the informal formative assessment to determine and modify learning activities and to choose the most strategies to improve students' learning achievement (Widiastuti and Saukah, 2017). Particularly, it is mentioned that formative assessment could also make students more responsive to the idea of cooperating with different students in their assessment (Clark, 2012), provide information to the teacher or student and which can be used to modify teaching and improve learning (Cizek, 2010:24), observe the strategy used by students when solving problems and considered how students might solve other problems (William, 2011), and foster student's autonomy, promote more student-centered pedagogy and encourages peer collaboration (Carless, 2011).

In the same sense, Black and William (2009) develop effective formative assessment framework which consists of three components; the agent of assessment, the stages where teaching learning process are conducted and the activities done among the agents of assessments.

The agent of assessment involves the teacher, student and peer. Each of them take their own responsibilities (Black & William, 2009; Lee, 2011; Gotwals and Birmingham, 2016). Teacher is responsible for designing and implementing an effective learning environment, and the learner is responsible for the learning within the environment. Furthermore, since they have their own responsibilities, it is hard to

notice whether both teacher and student has already achieved their objectives. Therefore, the role of peer is needed to mitigate any impact of any failure of each other.

Regarding the stage where formative assessment could implement into teaching learning process, there are three key processes potentially used to conduct effective formative assessment (WIDA, 2009; Gattulo, 2010, Clark, 2012, Ketabi & Ketabi, 2014; Gotwals and Birmingham, 2016) namely; (1) establishing where the learners are in their learning, both teacher and student negotiate their language learning objective or standards or criteria for success, (2) establishing where they are going- it is stage where teacher could gather information about students' learning, and check whether their learning has already met the target or not. It can be done in the form of classroom discussion and other learning tasks that could elicit student's understanding, and (3) establishing what need to be done to get the learners achieved. At this process, teacher could provide feedback that can adjust the teaching learning process, while peer could activate themselves as instructional resources for one another, and student could activate themselves as the owners of their own learning.

Dealing with the activities carried out in informal formative assessment practice, there are five strategies namely clarifying the objective, eliciting response, students' response, recognizing students' response and using the information gained. First, clarifying the objective allows the teacher and the students to clarify the objective by reminding the objective in each session or connecting through conversation ongoing classroom instruction. Second, eliciting response is initiates sequence which could be done by the teacher or the students as the initiator to start the sequence. It is done as the starting activities to gain the students' actual knowledge. Teacher could employ procedural, convergent and divergent questions to elicit students' response. Third, students' responses aim to acknowledge the students that his/her contribution has been heard and accepted into the ongoing classroom discussion. The students' responses are interpreted into individual answer, choral answer, no answer, and teacher answer. Fourth, recognizing students' responses provide the teachers opportunities to act on students' responses include repeating, rephrasing, displaying and wait time. In vice versa, it also enables the students to evaluate teacher's interpretation of their contribution. Fifth, the stage of using information gathered enables the teacher to provide a specific act based on the need of students' response in order they can reach the learning objective. In this stage the teacher could employ providing feedback, comparing and contrasting, modeling and debugging.

To carry out those informal formative assessments practice, teacher needs to ask questions in order that they can diagnose where the learners are, where the learners are going to, and how the learners could achieve their objectives. However, not all teacher questions are considered to be formative, even when teacher questions are aimed at diagnosing learning. It is only considered as formative, if it could provide follow-up actions by the teacher (Black et al., 2003). Hence, from the follow up action, both teacher and students could take the benefit of it. The teacher could use the follow up action to improve their instruction, while the learners could use the information of the follow up action to modify or to improve their learning. In addition, Burns and Myhill (2004) states that questioning in the context of formative assessment practice, may also help students to be more actively participate in their assessment and learning.

Shortly, the classroom discussion is able to run smoothly, if the teacher could deliver a various types of question in a hierarchy from simple to complex level as it is supported by Bloom's taxonomy level revised in Krathwohl (2002). However, in

employing questioning strategies, the teacher sometimes fails in delivering her question. It could happen just because the teacher more frequently asks many high levels of questions at the same time. Basically, the teacher should consider the amount of time which the students' needed to answer such question. In fact, the teacher did not give a sufficient time for students to answer the questions. As a result, the students get confused because of the amount of questions which she delivers at same time, and indeed, they keep silent because they fully do not understand and needed time to think about the answer (Wragg and Brown, 2001: 28).

CONCLUSION

This study has presented and described how teachers' question used as a informal formative assessment strategy. Generally, this study has adapted three stages of formative assessment, eliciting, recognizing and using. To cover the gap found in some previous formative studies in EFL context at higher education level, the stages are then developed into five stages of informal formative assessment. They are clarifying the objective, eliciting response, students' response, recognizing students' response and using the information gained. The five stages of informal formative assessment strategies have been employed by all participants involved in this study. To get detail information about the nature of teachers' question as informal formative assessment strategy, the use of ESRU cycle (Eliciting, Students' response, Recognizing students' response and Using the information gained) is considered appropriate to analyze every detail activities done during the teacher-students utterances in EFL informal formative classroom context within the higher education level. Finally the findings turn into conclusion that teachers' questioning during the instruction context could bridge the language assessment and classroom interaction. It happens naturally, unplanned, spontaneous which is embedded on teacher-students interaction in daily teaching activities. It supports a fact that assessment cannot be separated from teaching learning activities.

REFERENCES

- Black P & Wiliam D. (2009). Developing The Theory Of Formative Assessment. *Educ Asse Eval Acc* Vol 21:5–31DOI 10.1007/s11092-008-9068-5.
- Box, C, Skoog, G, and Dabbs, J, M. (2015). A case study of teacher personal practice assessment theories and complexities of implementing formative assessment. *American Educational Research Journal*, 52(5), 956–983 DOI: 10.3102/0002831215587754
- Cân Daskin Nileur and Hatipoglu Ciller. (2019). Reference to a Past Learning Event as a Practice of Informal Formative Assessment in L2 Interaction. *Language Testing* 142 Pp 16-30 DOI:10.177/0265532219857066
- Carless, D. (2011). From Testing To Productive Student Learning: Implementing Formative Assessment In Confucian-Heritage Settings. *Journal of Second Language Teaching and Research*. Volume 1 Issue 2 pages 155 – 158
- Cizek, G. (2010). 'An Introduction To Formative Assessment: History, Characteristics, And Challenges' in H. L. Andrade and G. J. Cizek (eds.).
- Clark, L. (2010). Formative Assessment: 'There Is Nothing So Practical As a Good Theory'. *Australian Journal of Education*, Vol. 54, No. 3, 2010, 341–352

- Debora, T R. (2009). Questions and Questioning Techniques: A view of Indonesian Students' Preferences. *Kata* Volume 11 (2). 155-170
- Furtak, E.M., Swanson, R, Kiemer, K, Leon, V, Morison, D, and Heredia, S.C. (2016). Teacher's formative assessment abilities and their relationship to student learning: Findings from a four-year intervention study. *Instr Sci*, 44. 267-291 CrossMark @Springer DOI 10.1007/s11252-016-9371-3
- Gattullo F. (2000). Formative Assessment In ELT Primary (Elementary) Classrooms: An Italian Case Study. *Language Testing* Vol. 17 (2) 278–288
- Gotwals, A.W & Birmingham, D. (2016). Eliciting, Interpreting, and responding to Students' Ideas: Teacher candidates' Growth in Formative Assessment Practices. *Res Sci Educ* Vol. 46 p. 365-388 DOI 10.1007/s11165-015-9461-2
- Harris, L. (2007). Employing Formative Assessment in the Classroom. *Improving Schools* Vol. 10 (3). Pp. 249-260
- Hill K, McNamara T. (2012). Developing a Comprehensive, Empirically Based Research Framework For Classroom-Based Assessment. *Language Testing* Vol. 29(3): 395–420
- Jiang, Y. (2014). Exploring Teacher Questioning As a Formative Assessment Strategy. *RELC Journal* Vol. 45 (3). 287-304
- Ketabi, Somaye&Ketabi, Saeed. (2015). Classroom and Formative Assessment in Second/Foreign Language Teaching and Learning. *Theory and Practice in Language Study* Vol 4 (2), pp. 435-440 DOI:10.4303/tpls.4.2.435-440
- Miles, M.B, and Huberman, A.M. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis, A Methods Sourcebook, Edition 3*. USA: Sage Publications.
- Ruiz-Primo, M. A. (2011). Informal Formative Assessment: The role of Instructional Dialogues in Assessing Students' Learning. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 37(1), 15–24.
- Ruiz-Primo, M. A., &Furtak, E. M. (2006). Informal Formative Assessment and Scientific Inquiry: Exploring Teachers' Practices and Student Learning. *Educational Assessment*, 11(3–4), 205–235.
- Parsons, D. (2017). Formative Assessment in Discussion Tasks. *ELT Journal* Vol 71 (1). 24-36
- Widiastuti, I. A. M. S. and Saukah A. (2017). Formative Assessment in Efl Classroom Practices. *Bahasadan Seni, Vol 45, Nomor 1*.pp 50-63
- William, D. (2011). What Is Assessment for Learning?. *Studies in Educational Evaluation* Vol. 37 (1) pp.3-14