

THE AUTHENTIC AND NON-AUTHENTIC ASSESSMENTS USED BY ENGLISH TEACHERS IN REFERENCE TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2013 CURRICULUM

Nashriati Saini, Agus Widyantoro

nashriatisaini@yahoo.com

Graduate Program

Yogyakarta State University, Karangmalang, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Abstract

This study was aimed to reveal the authentic and non-authentic assessments used by English teachers in reference to the Implementation of the 2013 curriculum. This study belonging to the descriptive qualitative study involved 6 senior high schools in Padang. The schools which had implemented the 2013 curriculum were chosen purposively. The data were collected by the observations, interviews, and documentation. The findings showed that teachers used tests, quizzes, daily exercises, performance testing, projects, and portfolios.

Keywords: authentic, non-authentic, assessments, 2013 curriculum

Introduction

The assessment becomes one of the important parts in the teaching and learning process. Teaching and assessing the students are an interrelated process. It means that teaching and assessment should be intertwined. The assessment process conducted by the teachers includes the process of collecting documentation of students' performance as part of the instructional cycle. Teaching is a process to deliver some information and knowledge, from the teacher to his/her students. What a teacher expects from the process of teaching is that the students learn what she/he has taught. The only way for the teacher to know whether or not the students have learnt what the teacher has taught is by assessing them.

The data collected from the assessment is essential for the teachers and the students. It gives the information about what the students have successfully learned and tells the students about their learning. Brown (2004:271) asserts that the assessment helps the teachers to diagnose the students, is able to motivate the students to learn, increases students' engagement and involvement (Wiggins, 1994 in Rudner and Schafer, 2002:13) and it provides the teachers with information of the program progress to make the judgment of the program and to make an instructional decision (Arends, 2007:211).

There are many types of assessment which can be used by teachers. It ranges from the traditional assessment; paper and pencil tests, to the use of the alternative assessment, such as conducting an observation, having portfolio assessment, performance assessment and journals. It is suggested for teachers to use various assessments so that they can have more accurate information, for each student will perform differently based on what assessment techniques that the teachers use.

Considering the importance of using various types of assessment, the newest Indonesian curriculum, the 2013 curriculum, on Regulation of Education and Culture Ministry No 66/2013, recommends the use of the authentic assessment in assessing students. The authentic assessment is an assessment of learning referring to the situation or context of the real world.

In the process of learning, the authentic assessment measures, monitors, and evaluates three aspects of learning achievements (cognitive, affective and psychomotor), both of which appear to be the end result of the process of learning, as well as the form of change and development activities, and the acquisition of learning during the learning process in the classroom and outside the classroom.

The use of the authentic assessment instead of the use of the non-authentic assessment (paper-pencil tests or traditional assessment) is based on the requirement to assess students as stated in the 2013 Curriculum. As stated in the regulation of the education and culture minister No 104 year 2014 article 2, to assess the students' learning, the assessment used is authentic and non-authentic assessments, in which the authentic assessment becomes the main approach used to assess students' learning.

The authentic assessment which can be used by teachers includes performance assessments, project assessments, portfolio assessments, self and peer assessments and observations and journal writing. The non-authentic assessment covers the tests; teacher-made tests, final tests, and daily quizzes.

Methodology

The current study is a descriptive qualitative study. It was conducted to find out the authentic and the non-authentic assessment carried out by the teachers in reference to the 2013 Curriculum. There were six schools used as the setting of the research, which were chosen because they are the pilot project schools of the 2013 curriculum. Based on the decree of the head of the Ministry of education and culture office No 022/H/KR/2015 *Tentang Satuan Pendidikan yang Melaksanakan Kurikulum 2013*, this research was conducted in the following schools:

Table 1: the Pilot Project Schools of the 2013 Curriculum

School	Address
SMAN 1 PADANG	Jl. Belanti Raya, no.11 Kecamatan Padang Utara
SMAN 2 PADANG	Jl. Musi No. 2 Kecamatan Padang Barat, Rimbo Kaluang
SMAN 3 PADANG	Jl. Gajah Mada Kecamatan Padang Utara, Gunung Pangilun
SMAN 4 PADANG	Jl. Linggar Jati no. 1 Kecamatan Lubuk Begalung
SMAN 7 PADANG	Jl. Bunga Tanjung Kecamatan Koto Tangah, Lubuk Buaya
SMAN 10 PADANG	Jl. Situjuh kecamatan Padang Timur, Jati Baru

The data collection method utilized was interviews, observations and a document study. The participants of the research were the English teachers and the students at the schools. The participants were chosen purposively to be able to provide data for the research purpose.

Technique of data analysis in this research uses the data analysis proposed by Johnson and Christensen (2008). It includes Memoing, data entry and storage, segmenting and coding, and corroborating and validating the result.

In order to get the valid data, the researcher used the triangulation. The triangulation used in this research was triangulation of methods, in which the researcher had various data collection methods.

Finding(s) and Discussion

The Authentic Assessment Used by the Teachers

The authentic assessment techniques primarily utilized by the teachers were performance assessments, project assessments, observations, and journal writing. The self-assessment, peer assessment and portfolio assessments were rarely conducted. All teachers informed that they used the authentic assessment to assess the students' affective and psychomotor aspects. In SMAN 1, Teacher WI and Teacher SH had the performance assessment such as having students tell stories, do speech performance and read poetry and do role-play. However, they did not have portfolio assessments, yet they confessed that they always made the students collect all their worksheets. The project assessment was mainly done in groups, completed at the end of semester. The project assessment mostly assigned was making a mini drama. In addition, Teacher SH admitted that he also had the students assess their friends while they were having group and individual work. It was conducted using a rubric and without a rubric. When the teacher did not prepare the rubric for the peer assessment, the students were assigned to give comments and suggestions for the performance and to write the report about the performance.

In SMAN 2, the teachers organized the performance assessment, project assessment and portfolio assessments. Teacher ER argued that she always asked the students to have performance in every meeting. The observation conducted by the researcher showed that the teacher ER had the students to carry out the performance assessment; retell a short story she has told before to them. For the project assessment, Teacher ER and Teacher MY assigned the students to make a mini drama which was then recorded and the students to give the report about the project they completed. The teacher also required the students to collect all their daily reports, writing products, worksheets, paper in a folder to be handed out to the teachers at the end of the semester.

The teachers in SMAN 3 primarily used performance assessments and project assessments to assess the students. In addition, the teachers also supported the assessment process by having observations and journal writing. Furthermore, Teacher UR assigned the students to have the portfolio assessment. The content of the portfolio covered the students' writing draft, notes, the reading report, paper and worksheets. This content was kept in a folder and then collected to the teacher twice in a semester.

In SMAN 4, the authentic assessments used were project and performance assessments. The project assessment was given to be finished at the end of semester. For example, Teacher LS asked the students to deliver a speech about a famous figure. The students were asked to record their speech. They were also required to write a paper to report the process of making and performing the speech. The performance assessment was carried out to perform the

students' use of functional and monologue texts. For example, the students practised a dialogue and recited poetry.

The teachers in SMAN 7 generally used project and performance assessments. Teacher SM assigned students to prepare an advertisement in groups, and then the process for making the advertisement was reported in a paper. Teacher NJ required students to make a video about how to make something, in which the students also needed to record the process and reported the process in a paper. For the performance assessment, most teachers had individual and group practice after the teachers delivered the instructional content. The teacher in SMAN 7 did not have the portfolio assessment because they did not know much about how to use it in the classroom and according to teacher SM, she did not think the portfolio assessment useful to assess the students' language ability, so she preferred to have project and performance assessments.

In SMAN 10, the tests and daily assignments were tended to be employed by the teachers. They often gave the students teacher made tests in writing form. Moreover, the teachers provided the students with some assignments to strengthen the concepts they have given for the students.

The Non-Authentic Assessment Used by the Teachers

The teachers in SMAN 1, SMAN 2, SMAN 3, SMAN 4, SMAN 7, and SMAN 10 Padang, West Sumatera used non-authentic assessment mostly to measure the students' cognitive aspect. It included the paper and pencil tests, quizzes and daily exercises. The tests given by teachers were usually teacher-made tests administered after one basic competence was completely taught, while for the final semester test, it was developed by a team of the teachers. The test was generally given in the written form, though there were some teachers who had the students have the oral test. For example, Teacher WI from SMAN 1 told that he held the oral test if he had extra time when the teaching and learning was in progress spontaneously. In addition, Teacher SH from SMAN 1 stated that he gave the oral test to find out the students' deeper understanding about a topic.

The quizzes given by the teachers were organized before and after the teaching and learning process. If the quizzes were administered before the teaching learning process, the teachers intended to find out the students' self-concept about the topic which would be discussed, whereas the quizzes after delivering the topic to the students were to know whether they have learned properly.

Conclusions

Most of the teachers in the study conducted the authentic assessments by having the project and performance assessments. The project assessment was usually given once in a semester in which the students had longer time to finish it while the performance assessment was always assigned in every meeting. For the portfolio assessment, there were only some teachers who used it to assess the students' progress over a period of the instructional process.

The non-authentic assessment used was tests; quizzes, and daily exercises. There were many tests the teachers provided for the students, yet the teacher-made test was used the most to

assess students' cognitive aspect. The tests were in the written form. However, some teachers also administered an oral test although it took a lot of time.

REFERENCES

- Arends, I. Richard. (2009). *Learning to teach*. New York: McGraw Hill
- Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices*. New York: Pearson Education
- Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2008). *Educational research: quantitative, qualitative and mixed approaches*. New York: Sage Publication
- Kemendiknas (2013). Surat Keputusan Kepala Badan Penelitian dan Pengembangan Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. 2013. Nomor 022/H/KR/2015 Tentang Satuan Pendidikan yang Melaksanakan Kurikulum 2013
- Kemendiknas (2014) Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia Nomor 104 Tahun 2014. *Tentang Penilaian Hasil Belajar Oleh Pendidik Pada Pendidikan Dasar Dan Pendidikan Menengah*.
- Rudner, M. L. and Schafer, D. W. (2002). *What Teachers Need to Know about Assessment*. New York: National Education Association.