



I / A / L / F
EDUCATION FOR DEVELOPMENT



ISBN 978-979-8559-80-8

NCOLLT 4 | **The 4th**
2 0 1 8 | **National Conference on Language**
and Language Teaching

“Creativity and Innovation in English Language Teaching toward Industrial Revolution 4.0”

CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

English Education Department
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education
UNIVERSITAS PGRI ADI BUANA SURABAYA
Surabaya, 25 August 2018





Unipa Surabaya

I / A / L / F
EDUCATION FOR DEVELOPMENT



ISBN 978-979-8559-80-8

NCOLLT 4 | **The 4th**
2 0 1 8 | **National Conference on Language**
and Language Teaching

“Creativity and Innovation in English Language Teaching toward Industrial Revolution 4.0”

CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

English Education Department
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education
UNIVERSITAS PGRI ADI BUANA SURABAYA
Surabaya, 25 August 2018



The 4th National Conference on Language and Language Teaching (NCOLLT) 2018 is annual conference organized by English Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas PGRI Adi Buana Surabaya. The conference provides the opportunity to all EFL experts, practitioners, researchers, and students to get together to share ideas, experiences, aspirations, and research findings.

The theme of today's conference is "Creativity and Innovation in English Language Teaching toward Industrial Revolution 4.0". This conference covers several sub topics relating to 1). Teaching Methodology 2) English for Specific Purposes 3) English for Academic Purposes 4) English for Vocational Purposes 5) English for Young Learners 6) Blended Learning 7) Language Assessment 8) Curriculum & Materials Development 9) ICT in ELT 10) Second Language Acquisition 11) Linguistics 12) Translation 13) Cross Cultural Understanding 14) Literacies in ELT 15) Teaching Literature 16) Character Education through ELT 17) English for Students with Special Needs, and 18) Action Research.

More importantly, this conference will proudly present two keynote speakers. The first speaker is Mr. Francis O'Brien, RSA Dip, M.Ed, MBA., Manager of Indonesia Australia Language Foundation Surabaya. He will be presenting the topic: Technology and English Language Learning: Blended Learning-and Beyond?. The second speaker is Mr. Yanuar Dwi Prastyo, M.A., Ph.D., Director of Teaching Learning Center and the Dean of Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Bandar Lampung, Indonesia. His topic is about English Language Teacher Education in Industrial Revolution 4.0: Opportunities and Challenges.

This conference will not have been successfully conducted without the support from some parties which we will not possibly mention one by one. However, let us take this opportunity to extend our sincere and highest appreciation to Rector of Universitas PGRI Adi Buana Surabaya, Dean of Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Head of English Education Department, invited speakers, all the reviewers, the presenters, participants and all members of the organizing committee who have been expending a tremendous time and energy to make this even possible.

Thank you and happy conferencing

Surabaya, 25 August

The Editor

The 4th National Conference on Language and Language Teaching (NCOLLT 4)

**“Creativity and Innovation in English Language Teaching towards Industrial
Revolution 4.0”**

**© 2018 English Language Education Department
Universitas PGRI Adi Buana Surabaya
ISBN: 978-979-8559-80-8**

Editors:

Prof. Dr. Agustinus Ngadiman, M.Pd.
(Universitas Katolik Widya Mandala Surabaya, Indonesia)

External Reviewers:

Ooi Choon Meng, M.Ed.
(Institut Pendidikan Guru Kampus Bahasa Antarabangsa, Malaysia)

Mohamad Razak Abdul Karim, B.Ed (TESL)., M.Sc.
(Open University Malaysia)

Dr. Suparmi, M.Pd.
(Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang)

Internal Reviewer:

Irfan Rifai, Ph.D.
(Universitas PGRI Adi Buana Surabaya, Indonesia)

Dyah Rochmawati, M.Pd.
(Universitas PGRI Adi Buana Surabaya, Indonesia)

**ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Universitas PGRI Adi Buana Surabaya, Indonesia
Jl. Dukuh Menanggal XII/4 Surabaya 60234 Indonesia**

THE LIST OF COMMITTEE

THE 4TH NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON LANGUAGE AND LANGUAGE TEACHING

NCOLLT 4
2018

Advisor : Head of English Education Department
Chairperson : Salim Nabhan, S.Pd., M.A.
Secretary : Fajar Susanto, S.S., M.Pd.
Treasurer : Maslakhatin, S.Pd., M.Pd.
Student's Coordinator : Ovan Priasmi Ganda Sundawa
Divisions :

A. Programme

1. Wahyu Bandjarjani, Dra., M.Pd.
2. Ferra Dian Andanty, S.S., M.Pd.
3. Dr. Endang Mastuti Rahayu, M.Pd.
4. Mochammad Ndaru Purwaning Laduni
5. Risni Dwi Wahyuni
6. Triana Mei Linda
7. Anisatul Fitri Lubis
8. Ubaidullah Al-Mahdi
9. Gabriel Ia Visca Ratnaningtyas
10. Devi Elavia Bikovif

B. Secretariat

1. Hertiki, S.Pd., M.Pd.
2. Samsul Khabib, S.Pd. M.Pd (Cand)
3. Verawati
4. Tyas Karina Dewi Hariani
5. Muhammad Ra'adu Afribri

C. Proceeding and Publication

1. Irfan Rifai, Ph.D.
2. Dyah Rochmawati, S.Pd., M.Pd.
3. Nabila Nur Annisa

D. Accomodation, Transportation, and Documentation

1. Rikat Eka Prastyawan, S.Pd., M.Pd.
2. Lambang Erwanto, S.S., M.Pd.
3. Abdul Ghoni
4. Ahmad Azzam Ridhoi
5. Fandi Achmad Nur Rachman
6. Lutfi Prahara

E. Food and Beverages

1. Nukmatus Syahria, S.Pd., M.Pd.
2. Armelia Nungki Nurbani, S.Pd., M.Pd.
3. Dra. Joesasono Oediarti, M.Pd.
4. Isma Hidayati
5. Galuh Ervina Ratman

F. Promotion and Public Relation

1. Dra.Ec., Nunung Nurjati, M.Pd.
2. Endah Yulia Rahayu, S.Pd., M.Pd.
3. Aprilianti Dwi Alen Suyono
4. Dinda Dwiki Prasista

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD	ii
LIST OF REVIEWERS	iii
LIST OF COMMITTEE	iv
TABLE OF CONTENT	v
IMPROVING STUDENTS' VOCABULARY MASTERY THROUGH TEAM GAME TOURNAMENT (TGT) METHOD AT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS	1
Abdullah Farih.....	1
THE STUDY OF THE LANGUAGE ACQUISITION OF THE YOUNG LEARNER STUDENTS OF PRIMARY SCHOOL THROUGH THE BRAIN BASED TEACHING METHODOLOGY TO TEACH ENGLISH	8
Abu Bakar Assidiq	8
SYNTACTIC CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN MICRO TEACHING INTERACTION.	16
Achmad Faizal Abdullah.....	16
Nunung Nurjati.....	16
COLLABORATIVE STRATEGIC READING (CSR) IN IMPROVING THE ENGLISH DEPARTMENT STUDENTS' READING COMPREHENSION ACHIEVEMENT	24
Ahmad Ridho Rojabi.....	24
SPEED-READING CHALLENGE TO ENHANCE STUDENTS' ABILITY IN ACADEMIC READING CLASS.	34
Aisyah Ririn Perwikasih Utari	34
SOCIAL CONFLICTS OF HANNAH BAKER OF "13 REASON WHY" MOVIE SCRIPT (2017)	38
Aisyah Syavitri.....	38
Dyah Rochmawati.....	38
Joesasono Oediarti S.	38
EXPLORING EFL TEACHER REACTIONS TO STUDENTS ANSWER IN FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT: A CASE STUDY	46
Andri Suherman	46
ECORITICISM IN <i>CLOUDY WITH A CHANCE OF MEATBALL</i> FIRST SERIES MOVIE (2009)	55
Anggun Dwi Putri Pratiwi.....	55
Dyah Rochmawati.....	55
Joesasono Oediarti S.	55
THE EFFECT OF USING CUE CARD MATCHING GAMES ON THE STUDENTS PRONUNCIATION ACHIEVEMENT OF THE 8TH GRADE STUDENTS IN SMPN 32 SURABAYA	63
Arum Dwi Wulansari	63

THE ROLE OF INTERNET ON STUDENTS' TRANSLATION ABILITY.....	67
Ayu Rizki Septiana.....	67
Moh. Hanafi.....	67
PRODUCTIVE READING TECHNIQUE TO REDUCE INEFFECTIVE READERS.....	76
Caltira Rosiana.....	76
Sujono.....	76
USING WHISPERING GAME ON TEACHING WRITING FOR SEVENTH GRADE AT SMPN 2 KRIAN.....	86
Dian Deviana.....	86
THE ANXIETY OF PERCY JACKSON IN THE "PERCY JACKSON: SEA OF MONSTER" MOVIE.....	94
Doni Susanto.....	94
Siyaswati.....	94
THE SIGNIFICANCE OF ASSESSING STUDENTS' WRITING PERFORMANCE FOR TEACHERS.....	100
Endah Yulia Rahayu.....	100
Endang Mastuti Rahayu.....	100
TEACHER STRATEGIES TO TEACH READING TO DYSLEXIC STUDENT.....	108
Evi Maghfiroh.....	108
Wahju Bandjarjani.....	108
THE INFLUENCE OF USING FLASHCARD MEDIA ON STUDENTS' SPEAKING ACHIEVEMENT FOR EIGHTH GRADE IN SMPN 9 SURABAYA.....	113
Faidatuz Zahroini Hasyim.....	113
APPLYING COMMUNICATIVE APPROACH IN TEACHING GRAMMAR USING FILM.....	118
Ferra Dian Andanty.....	118
AN ANALYSIS OF SIGN LANGUAGE USED BY THE MAIN CHARACTER AS SEEN IN "AND YOUR NAME IS JONAH" MOVIE.....	125
Florentina Wona.....	125
Wahju Bandjarjani.....	125
CREATIVE WRITING ACTIVITIES FOR ENGLISH LEARNERS.....	131
Hertiki.....	131
Maslakhatin.....	131

THE EFFECT OF USING VIDEO ON STUDENTS' SPEAKING ACHIEVEMENT ON EIGHTH GRADE AT SMP HANG TUAH 1 SURABAYA	140
Hilda Dwi Kartika Sari.....	140
Siyaswati	140
FLOUTING MAXIMS ON <i>THE ELLEN DEGENERES SHOW</i> IN 2017.....	147
In Maria Ulfa	147
Nunung Nurjati	147
THE INFLUENCE OF USING SNAKE AND LADDER GAME ON THE STUDENTS SPEAKING ACHIEVEMENT FOR THE TENTH GRADE AT SMA ITP SURABAYA.....	154
Izah Qusniyatin	154
THE ANALYSIS OF THE INTRINSIC ELEMENTS IN "ROOM" MOVIE (2015).....	159
Kristin Dwitayana	159
Dyah Rochmawati	159
Fajar Susanto.....	159
OUTLINING TECHNIQUE TO FOSTER STUDENTS' ABILITY TO WRITE DESCRIPTIVE PARAGRAPH	165
Moh. Hanafi	165
Ayu Rizki Septiana	165
CHARACTER ANALYSIS PETER KAVINSKY "TO ALL THE BOYS I'VE LOVED BEFORE" IN JENNY HAN'S NOVEL (2014).....	172
Novita Rossalia Indah.....	172
Dyah Rochmawati	172
Joesasono Oediarti S.	172
CODE-MIXING IN THE <i>ENTERTAINMENT NEWS</i> ON NET TV PROGRAM.....	181
Novita Sari Hidayat.....	181
Dyah Rochmawati.....	181
Fajar Susanto.....	181
EXPLORING STUDENTS' PERCEPTION OF ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE IN UNIVERSITY: AN ECOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE.....	189
Nur Karimah	189
Wahju Bandjarjani	189
IMPROVING STUDENTS' WRITING SKILL USING COOPERATIVE VARIATION IN THINK-PAIR-SHARE (TPS) TECHNIQUE	195
Piping Rahadianto	195
DESIGNING LOCAL WISDOM-BASED COMIC STRIPS TO TEACH WRITING FOR JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS	204
Puput Zuli Ekorini.....	204
Caltira Rosiana.....	204

FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE IN JON FAVREAU'S <i>THE JUNGLE BOOK</i> MOVIE SCRIPT	219
Ria Puspitasari.....	219
Siyaswati	219
<i>PENYULUH BAHASA BALI: A LANGUAGE POLICY OF BALI PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT ON BALINESE MOTHER TONGUE (A CASE STUDY)</i>	221
Sang Ayu Putu Ari Purniawati	221
Ni Made Ivana Swastiana	221
Kadek Susnawati.....	221
THE EFFECT OF USING BOARD GAMES ON STUDENTS' SPEAKING ACHIEVEMENT FOR TENTH GRADE AT SMKN 6 SURABAYA	231
Siti Maryam.....	231
Titah Kinasih.....	231
IDEATIONAL MEANING IN HEALTH ADVERTORIAL: A SYSTEMIC FUNCTIONAL LINGUISTIC APPROACH	237
Siti Nurjanah Hadiati.....	237
Eva Tuckyta Sari Sujatna	237
Sutiono Mahdi.....	237
THE EFFECT OF USING LINE WEBTOON MEDIA ON 7TH GRADE STUDENTS' SPEAKING ACHIEVEMENT IN PGRI 1 JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL SURABAYA	245
Tiur Sri Lestari Butar Butar	245
TRANSLATION ANALYSIS OF CIRCUMSTANCES IN THE NOVEL THE OLD MAN AND THE SEA BY EARNEST HEMINGWAY AND ITS INDONESIAN TRANSLATION	251
Tri Purwaningsih	251
M. R. Nababan	251
Riyadi Santosa.....	251
THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COLLABORATIVE STRATEGY IN TEACHING READING	262
Yasinta Fitri Wulandari	262
Wahju Bandjarjani	262
THE EFFECTIVENESS OF ENGLISH GRAMMAR TEST APPLICATION TO TEST GRAMMAR TOWARD STUDENTS IN FIRST GRADE OF ISLAMIC SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL KOTA BLITAR	267
Yunevika Mughti	267
Nursamsu	267

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF ASSESSING STUDENTS' WRITING PERFORMANCE FOR TEACHERS

Endah Yulia Rahayu

Universitas PGRI Adibuana Surabaya

Indahr_99@yahoo.com

Endang Mastuti Rahayu

Universitas PGRI Adibuana Surabaya

endangmrahayu63@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The major weakness of junior high school students' test is generally not in the form and type of questions, but the teacher competence to construct the test items well. The factors influencing the teacher competence to measure the student achievement include teachers' writing test literacy, belief of scoring accuracy, belief of writing assessment method, belief of writing assessment issues, feeling when rating assessment, education background, and teaching experience. Also, the tests are often considered as a part of the educational process only, not as measuring tool of learning process result. The main function of the test results of learning is to measure the students' learning outcomes and to improve the upcoming instructional design. Thus, there are two common types of tests, namely subjective and objective tests. The objective test has several types, including true-false, match matching, and multiple choice which each has advantages and limitations. Other significant things in constructing a proper test include sampling and selection of test items, types of tests to be used, aspects to be tested, the item format, the number of test items and the distribution of the item range.

Keywords: *Writing assessment literacy, Teachers' belief in assessing writing, Teachers' background in assessing writing*

INTRODUCTION

Writing assessment competence is very important for teachers, but many of them do not literate well in writing assessment. As a result, they use their intuition to appraise their students' writing competence (Khatib et al., 2016) In the field, there are many English teachers in both Junior, and Senior high schools still have difficulty to mark, assess and give feedback, although they have teaching experience for more than ten years. (Kementrian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 2016) This is possible due to the lack of writing assessment training. Besides, their linguistic and writing technique achievement are not sufficient. Thus, they cannot give proper feedback and marking and their students' work. Meanwhile, it is very much imperative for students because teachers feedback and assessment will improve students' academic and professional writing competence. (White, 2009)

Since assessing writing competence is generally subjective during the process, teacher writing literacy and teacher factors are the primary keys to assessing writing. (Kim et al., 2017; Gonzales et al., 2017; Goodwin, 2016) Therefore English teachers have to comprehend how to assess their students' competence as part of their assessment literacy. Their assessment practice has to be incorporated as the total quality of their

teaching and learning as part of their instructional design. (Borg, 2003; Crusan et al., 2016; Cheng, 2017)

Therefore, English teachers who always assess their students' writing in their day to day classroom, have to comprehend assessment components, particularly valid, objective and fair students' writing evaluation. (Taylor, 2010) They also need to know how to develop an assessment rubric specially tailored for their students' needs and writing genre. If they fail to make a special rubric for their students, their students' evaluation and assessment will be disturbed. Students' motivation, belief, time and money will be disdained, and then their academic writing progress is slacking down, and they may not be interested in learning English writing anymore. (Crusan et al., 2016). English teachers are considered fail in assessing their students' writing if they cannot admin valid and reliable assessment and evaluation. (Moss, 1994)

IMPORTANCE OF WRITING ASSESSMENT

Assessment is a universal element in writing classrooms since it is vitally important to the academic development of students. (White, 2009) However, assessing writing performance necessarily involves subjective judgment since the process, in facts, emphasizes human rater in the central place. (Kim et al., 2017; Gonzales et al., 2017; Goodwin, 2016) Therefore, teachers or lecturers should understand a good assessment practice as part of their assessment literacy, which is defined as an understanding the principles of sound assessment as the central to achieve and maintain the total quality of teaching and learning. (Borg, 2003; Crusan et al., 2016; Cheng et al., 2017).

Especially for SLA writing lecturers or teachers as raters, they are demanded to comprehend the assessment components comprising scoring, grading and making a judgment about the students' responses in a reliable, valid and fair assessment. (Taylor, 2010) They also need to know how to develop suitable scoring rubrics and assessment criteria to meet their students' response types. As a result, the consequences of bad assessment not only negatively affect their students' motivation, confidence, time and money (Crusan et al., 2016) but also distract the concept of assessment reliability and validity. (Moss, 1994)

WRITING ASSESSMENT LITERACY

English language writing lecturer today are required to literate ESL writing assessment, besides focusing students learning to write. (Hirvela et al., 2007) It is obvious that assessing students written works constitutes the major portion of SLA/EFL writing teachers and lecturers' workloads and quantifies their knowledge. Some teachers who have been teaching for more than ten years may complain about this. (Hirvela et al., 2007; Ghanbari et al., 2012) Duijm et al (2017) assert that their knowledge also influences their teaching practice and scoring quality by varying their focus on different aspects of language components and paying more attention to lexical accuracy when rating essay. (Fritz et al., 2013)

American Federation of teachers, the National Council on Measurement in Education, and the National Education Association (1990) mention seven standards for teachers' professional development in assessment, comprising choosing appropriate assessment method for instructional design; developing appropriate assessment method for instructional design; administering, scoring and interpreting the result of teacher-made and externally-made assessment; using assessment result to make decision about individual students, planning teaching, developing curriculum, and improving school; developing valid grading procedure for students' assessment; communicating

assessment result to students, parents, other stakeholders; recognizing and using ethical and legal assessment.

TEACHERS' BELIEF IN ASSESSING WRITING

What and how to assess students' language performance, indeed depends on lecturers' or teachers' belief, besides their knowledge and value. Their common ground on assessment in their writing course starts from here (Cheng et al., 2017) because belief about L2 writing evaluation is influenced by their behavior and in term of raters' consistency and judgment, (Kuiken et al., 2014a) in term of assessment literacy. (Crusan et al., 2016; In'nami et al., 2015) Their belief determines the variation of their accuracy when rating certain texts based on the assessment method they select (Jeong, 2017). As a result, when evaluating students' responses, they also view the errors on the responses differently, and they can be not fair in judging their students' works. (Johnson et al., 2012)

Teachers or lecturers with different levels of accuracy show different patterns of cognitive and meta-cognitive behaviors. The more accurate teachers or lecturers are, the more self-conscious they have about their rating accuracy. These strategies explain to some extent why some raters are effective in decision-making and generate more accurate ratings. Their practice and experience of scoring accuracy finally make them believe they can score accurately. (Zhang, 2016) Thus in scoring accuracy, their belief at least includes scoring accuracy according to their cognition, agreement in writing assessment among raters, the effectiveness of rater training, focus in rating writing assessment, peer assessment, and confidence of good writing rater. (Crusan et al., 2016; Borg, 2003)

In addition, inaccuracy rating by new raters can be anticipated by double marking, because the process of becoming experienced raters can be relatively short. (Lim, 2009) In certain condition, these beliefs of scoring accuracy may not always be practiced in the reality if the teachers are under pressure from situational constraint. (Basturkmen., 2012)

A critical feature of cognition, lecturers' or teachers' belief (Eckes, 2012) is often based on their previous language learning experience. However, Johnson (1999) mentions that their cognition is a socially constructed activity that needs broad interpretation and negotiation of meaning existing in the classroom and campus where they teach. Meanwhile, Johnson et al (2009; 2011) argue that teachers need to socially practice the existing assessment methods in their writing classroom to learn the complexity of teaching and assessing.

Thus, the progress of assessment literacy and their cognitive are intertwined to create an opportunity to reflect what they have done during teaching and assessing activities (In'nami et al., 2015) in achieving the required standards of education (21st century). Their existing standard is raised if they believe what they do positively affect their classrooms. For example in formative assessment, they give a multiple choice for indirect writing assessment, give essay for direct writing assessment, integrate writing assessment with other skills for more practical learning, conduct effectiveness teacher-made test, and administer alternative assessment like a portfolio, writing self-assessment, writing peer-assessment. As a result, the achievement standard of the classroom through effective formative assessment is essential can be raised.

Based on the previous studies, the relationship between teachers belief and assessment issues around them may vary in different contexts. They reveal that EFL teachers believe to several factors related to assessment issues such as feedback of

writing assessment for writing instruction, the importance of writing assessment, the competence to administer the assessment, time-consuming writing assessment, confidence of good writing instructor, poor student's competence on writing exams and many more. (Borg, S., 2003) These beliefs indicate the real practice of teachers, particularly the experienced ones since the experienced teachers mostly plan and do their assessment based on what they believe about the assessment. Borg (2003) suggest the beliefs of experienced language teachers may relate to their practice than less experienced teachers. The experienced teachers become more embedded with their experience, and thus they might apply the principles more consistently than new teachers.

Besides cognitive or objective factor, affective factors comprises motivation, attitude, anxiety, and self-confidence that can influence ESL assessment by varying individual variation scoring, Therefore, successful assessing student writing not only constitutes the significant portion of second language writing teachers' workloads but also quantifies teachers' knowledge, beliefs, practices, and affective factors. (Ghanbari et al., 2012) As a result, in administering assessments, teachers as raters need to care their students' and their affectiveness, so students will value what they learn and teachers will pay attention more to their students' learning. Crusan et al (2016) show a relatively positive impact of affective factors on teachers' writing assessment.

TEACHERS' PRACTICE IN ASSESSING WRITING

In writing assessment practice, there are several ways, which teachers or raters can do. Either experienced or novice raters can mark their students' essay using a holistic and analytical rubric to qualify their students' essay and also see the effects of inter-rater agreement, and raters' severity and self-consistency across marking method (holistic vs. analytic). (Barkaoui, 2011) When some teachers or raters rating the same responses and facing scoring discrepancies, they also make some efforts to resolve the score disagreement, like Monte Carlo method of score resolution (Penny et al., 2011), rater discussion (Kim et al., 2015) and rater negotiation (Trace et al., 2016; 2017).

Kim et al (2015) reveal that the agreed scoring decision can be resolved a scoring discrepancy in raters' discussion and negotiation. Teachers can comment on their students' response to show which features mostly influencing the scoring decision. How strong the comments also illustrate textual features external to the scoring rubric which have to be addressed by teachers during a scoring time. (Hall et al., 2013) Rater's comment can be useful when there is disagreement among raters.

The differences among raters to the same response can revise scoring rubric because it reveals areas outside the scoring rubric that raters attend. Adversely, raters' evaluation criteria tend to shift from a focus on content to form (linguistic accuracy) which is often a weak aspect of ESL essays, or vice versa. The experienced raters are more likely to comment the features on student's response which are not listed on the rating scale. (Barkaoui, 2010a) Since there are several practices of writing assessment, the existing surveys still do not cover the major practices. (Jianlin, 2017; Crusan et al., 2016)

TEACHERS' EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE IN ASSESSING WRITING

Raters background and expertise contribute to rater expectations and influence scoring criteria used in rating writing assessment. The think-aloud protocol might explain individual differences in the application of the performance criteria of the essays rubrics. The results further suggest that raters engagement with the text and self-monitoring behavior can mitigate rater severity. (Wiseman, 2012) Duijm et al (2017) assert that raters' knowledge and experience influence their rating leniency and vary the

focus on different aspects of linguistic features. For example, raters are also sensitive to lexical accuracy when rating essay and they do not always follow the Lexis scale described in the rating scale. (Fritz et al., 2013)

However, Lim (2011) states that experience and expertise are raters' temporal dimension because novice raters can learn to rate appropriately and quickly. Raters can maintain their rating quality over time depending on rating volume. However Lim's (2011), In a standardized writing test, the score from the newly-trained raters can exhibit a similar measurement to experienced raters, due to initial raters' training and screening. (Attali, 2016).

In more detailed scoring criteria, rating or teaching experience may not be necessary for raters' selection criteria because it can be relatively easy to be assigned by non-teachers. (Royal-Dawson et al., 2009; Kuiken et al., 2016) On the other hand, both experienced and novice raters may not use a rating rubric consistently, but experienced raters' quality is better than the novice. Besides, experienced raters still have idiosyncratic practice on the explicit rating scale, due to time constraints, mandated curriculum pacing, language learning, and classroom management issues. (Mostofee et al., 2016)

To mitigate these barriers and to maximize the impact of professional teacher development, teachers' professional development reform should be prioritized. Specifically, the reform deals with teacher performance licensing and certification, which can reflect and predict teachers' success with their students. Thus, they can show their best teaching and assessing their students' language performance and also improve their preparation, mentor, and professional development. Although in certain standardized writing test, teaching experiences are not necessary (Attali, 2016; Royal-Dawson et al., 2009; Kuiken et al., 2016), the students cannot value that they learn because their teachers cannot supply with appropriate feedback. (Du, 2009)

Relating to the issue of teacher's or lecturer's first language should be linked with their teaching experience and competence, Cruzan et al (2016) native English speaking teachers (NESTs) are not usually categorized as more competent raters than non-native English speaking teachers (NNESTs). (Cruzan et al., 2016) In the previous study, using the holistic rating rubric, NESTs respond more positively in their criteria to the content and language, whereas the Chinese teachers attended more negatively to the organization and the length of the essays. Meanwhile using the analytical rubric, both NESTs and NNESTs rate the written responses at relatively the same quality. The same idea is also suggested by Johnson (2009) that both NESTs and NNESTs can rate equally the same quality in an SLA writing assessment.

CONCLUSION

In assessing writing, English teachers need to comprehend the construct, content, and purpose of the assessment. How well they administer the assessment or evaluation, the basic concept of teaching, learning and assessing writing have to be acquired well. Once they fail to design the proper assessment for the students, their student affective and cognitive in learning writing will be distracted. Besides that, other factors also contribute to the teachers' assessment quality such as knowledge of basic writing assessment, beliefs of scoring accuracy, beliefs of writing assessment method, beliefs of writing assessment issues, feeling when writing assessment, practice of writing assessment, education background, and teaching experience. Finally, all these factors need to be comprehended by English teachers. These factors shed the light of how to be an excellent rater to be able to rate effectively and practically better and give

information of the required preparation of being a good rater for teachers, educators, teacher training colleges and many more.

References

- AERA, APA, NCME. (2014). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. Washington, DC: American Education Research Association, American Psychological Association, National Council on Measurement in Education.
- Attali, Y. (2016). A comparison a newly-trained and experienced raters on a standardized writing assessment. *Language Testing*, 33(1), 99-115.
- Barkaoui, K. (2011). Do ESL essay raters' evaluation criteria change with experience? A mixed-method, cross-sectional study. *Tesol Quarterly*, 44, 310-357.
- Barkaoui, K. (2010). Variability in ESL essay rating processes: the role of the rating scale and rater experience. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 7(1), 54-74.
- Basturkmen, H. (2012). Review of research into the correspondence between language teachers' state beliefs and practices. *System*, 40, 282-295.
- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, 36, 81-109.
- Cheng, L., Fox, J. (2017). *Assessment in the language classroom*. London: Palgrave.
- Crusan, D., Plakans, L., Gebril, A. (2016). Writing assessment literacy: Surveying second language teachers' knowledge, belief, and practice. *Assessing Writing*, 28, 43-56.
- Duijm, K., Schoonen, R., Hulstijn, J.H. (2017). Professional and non-professional raters' responsiveness to fluency and accuracy in L2 speech: an experimental approach. *Language Testing*, 1-27. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532217712553>
- Eckes, T. (2012). Operational Rater Types in Writing Assessment: Linking Rater Cognition to Rater Behavior. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 9, 270-292.
- Fritz, E., Ruegg, R. (2013). Rater sensitivity to lexical accuracy, sophistication and range when assessing writing. *Assessing Writing*, 18(2), 173-181.
- Ghanbari, B., Barati, H., Moinzadeh, A. (2012). Problematizing rating scales in EFL academic writing assessment: voices from Iranian context. *English Language Teaching*, 5(8), 76-90.
- Gonzales, E.F., Trejo, N.P., Roux, R. (2017). Assessing EFL university students' writing: a study of score reliability. *Redie (Revista Electronica de Investigacion Educativa)*, 19(2), 91-103.
- Goodwin, S. (2016, October). A many-facet Rasch analysis comparing essay rater behavior on an academic English reading/writing test used for two purposes. *Assessing Writing*, 30(2), 21-31.
- Hall, C., Sheyholislami, J. (2013). Using appraisal theory to understand rater values: an examination of rater comments on ESL Test Essays. *Journal of Writing Assessment*, 6(1), 1-17.
- Hirvela, A., Belcher, D. (2007). Writing scholar as teacher educator: exploring writing teacher education. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(3), 125-128.

- In'nami, Y., Koizumi, R. (2015). Task and rater effects in L2 speaking and writing: A synthesis of generalizability studies. *Language testing*, 33(3), 341-366.
- Jeong, H. (2017). Narrative and expository genre effects on students, raters, and performance criteria. *Assessing writing*, 31, 113-125.
- Johnson, D., Brackle, L.V. (2012). Linguistic discrimination in writing assessment: How rater react to Arican American "errors", ESL errors, and standard English Errors on a state-mandated writing exam. *Assessing Writing*, 17(1), 35-54.
- Johnson, K.E., Gobelek, P. R.,. (2011). *Research on second language education: a sociocultural perspective on professional development*. New York: Routledge.
- Johson, K. E. (2009). *Second language teacher education: a sociocultural perspective*. New York: Routledge.
- Kementrian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. (2016). *PERMENDIKBUD: Standar penilaian pendidikan*. Departemen Pendidikan Dan Kebudayaan.
- Khatib, M., Mirzaii, M. (2016). Developing an analytical scale for scoring EFL descriptive writing. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 17(3), 49-73.
- Kim, S., Lee, H.K. (2015). Exploring rater behaviors during a writing assessment discussion. *English Teaching*, 70(1), 97-121.
- Kim, Y.G., Schatschneider, C., Wanzek, J., Gatlin, B., Otaiba S.L. (2017). Writing evaluation: rater and task effects on the reliability of writing scores for children in Grades 3 and 4. *Reading and Writing*, 30(6), 1287-1310.
- Kuiken, F., Vedder, I. (2014a). Raters' decisions, rating procedures and rating scales. *Language Testing*, 31(3), 279-284.
- Lim, G.S. (2009). Prompt and rater effect in second language writing performance assessment. *Dissertation of Phd*. Michigan: University of Michigan.
- Lim, G.S. (2011). The development and maintenance of rating quality in performance writing assessment: A longitudinal study of new and experienced raters. *Language Testing*, 28(4), 543-560.
- Moss, P.A. (1994). Can there be validity without reliability? *Educational Researcher*, 23, 5-12.
- Mostofee, S., Ghanbari, N., Nemati, N. (2016). Examining five behavior conducted by two groups of novice and experienced raters in two rating processes. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 5(4), 199-211.
- Penny, J.A., Johnson, R.L. (2011). The accuracy of performance task scores after resolution of rater disagreement: A Monte Cartlo study. *Assessing Writing*, 16(4), 221-236.
- Royal-Dawson, L, Baird, J. (2009). Is teaching experience necessary for reliable scoring of extended English question? *Educational Measurement: Issue and Practice*, 28, 2-8.

- Taylor, L. (2010). Developing assessment literacy. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 29, 21-36.
- Trace, J., Janssen, G., Meier, V. (2017). Measuring the impact of rater negotiation in writing performance assessment. *Language Testing*, 34, 3-22.
- Trace, J., Meier, V., Janssen, G. (2016, October). "I can see that": developing shared rubric category interpretation through score negotiation. *Assessing Writing*, 30(3), 32-43.
- White, E. (2009). Are you assessment literate? Some fundamental questions regarding effective classroom-based assessment. *OnCUE Journal*, 3(1), 3-25.
- Wiseman, C.S. (2012). Rater effects: Ego engagement in rater decision-making. *Assessing Writing*, 17(3), 150-173.

Biodata

Endah Yulia Rahayu & Endang Mastuti Rahayu are lecturers at PGRI Adi Buana Surabaya University and are teacher trainers in the Indonesian's teacher development program.