



# ELT in Asia in the Digital Era: Global Citizenship and Identity

## Editors

Suwarni Madya  
Fuad Abdul Hamied  
Willy A. Renandya  
Christine Coombe  
Yazid Basthomi

ROUTLEDGE

PRINTED BY: masda.simatupang@uki.ac.id. Printing is for personal, private use only. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted without publisher's prior permission. Violators will be prosecuted.

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business*

© 2018 Taylor & Francis Group, London, UK

Typeset by V Publishing Solutions Pvt Ltd., Chennai, India

All rights reserved. No part of this publication or the information contained herein may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, by photocopying, recording or otherwise, without written prior permission from the publisher.

Although all care is taken to ensure integrity and the quality of this publication and the information herein, no responsibility is assumed by the publishers nor the author for any damage to the property or persons as a result of operation or use of this publication and/or the information contained herein.

Published by: CRC Press/Balkema  
Schipholweg 107C, 2316 XC Leiden, The Netherlands  
e-mail: Pub.NL@taylorandfrancis.com  
www.crcpress.com – www.taylorandfrancis.com

ISBN: 978-0-8153-7900-3 (Hardback)

ISBN: 978-1-351-21706-4 (eBook)

PROCEEDINGS OF THE 15<sup>TH</sup> ASIA TEFL AND 64<sup>TH</sup> TEFLIN INTERNATIONAL  
CONFERENCE ON ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING, JULY 13–15, 2017, YOGYAKARTA,  
INDONESIA

# ELT in Asia in the Digital Era: Global Citizenship and Identity

## *Editors*

Suwarsih Madya

*Yogyakarta State University, Indonesia*

Fuad Abdul Hamied

*Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Indonesia*

Willy A. Renandya

*Nanyang Technological University, Singapore*

Christine Coombe

*Dubai Men's College, the United Arab Emirates*

Yazid Basthomi

*Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia*

Jointly Organized by

*Teaching English as a Foreign Language in Asia (Asia TEFL), The Association  
for the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language in Indonesia (TEFLIN), and  
English Language Education Department, Yogyakarta State University, Indonesia*

 **Routledge**  
Taylor & Francis Group

LONDON AND NEW YORK



PRINTED BY: masda.simatupang@uki.ac.id. Printing is for personal, private use only. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted without publisher's prior permission. Violators will be prosecuted.

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business*

© 2018 Taylor & Francis Group, London, UK

Typeset by V Publishing Solutions Pvt Ltd., Chennai, India

All rights reserved. No part of this publication or the information contained herein may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, by photocopying, recording or otherwise, without written prior permission from the publisher.

Although all care is taken to ensure integrity and the quality of this publication and the information herein, no responsibility is assumed by the publishers nor the author for any damage to the property or persons as a result of operation or use of this publication and/or the information contained herein.

Published by: CRC Press/Balkema  
Schipholweg 107C, 2316 XC Leiden, The Netherlands  
e-mail: Pub.NL@taylorandfrancis.com  
www.crcpress.com – www.taylorandfrancis.com

ISBN: 978-0-8153-7900-3 (Hardback)

ISBN: 978-1-351-21706-4 (eBook)

*ELT in Asia in the Digital Era: Global Citizenship and Identity – Madya et al. (Eds)*  
© 2018 Taylor & Francis Group, London, ISBN 978-0-8153-7900-3

## Table of contents

Preface	xi
Acknowledgement	xiii
Organizing committee	xv
 <i>Part I: English language teaching and learning developments – what do they mean in different contexts with different paradigms?</i>	
Teacher development for content-based instruction <i>D.J. Tedick</i>	3
Sustainable professional development programs for English teachers: A case study in South Sulawesi, Indonesia <i>A. Abduh &amp; R. Rosmaladewi</i>	15
Teacher efficacy in instructional strategies in classroom among tertiary teachers in Central Java, Indonesia <i>Muamaroh</i>	21
Sex-based grouping in English language teaching <i>M. Mahmud &amp; Sahril</i>	29
The relationship of English proficiency and socioeconomic status with the choice of language learning strategies among EFL students of Cenderawasih University Papua <i>R.D.B. Rambet</i>	37
Learners' native language interference in learning English pronunciation: A case study of Indonesian regional dialects <i>M.N. Jannah, K.H. Hidayati &amp; S. Setiawan</i>	45
English Language Teaching (ELT) learners' communication strategies in exclusive and task-based learning <i>B. Kadaryanto, T.H. Febiani &amp; D. Utaminingsih</i>	49
Exploring English lexical inferencing strategies performed by EFL university students <i>I. Hermagustiana</i>	57
Digital collaboration and the impact on motivation and identity <i>S. Healy</i>	65
Interpreting the demand of the curriculum creatively <i>A. Widyantoro</i>	73
The effectiveness of an ELT model using Curriculum 13 to SMA students in Surakarta <i>Ngadiso</i>	79
Compromising between the general and specific skills in EAP syllabus development in Indonesian context <i>Jamilah</i>	87

The incorporation of Facebook in language pedagogy: Merits, defects, and implications <i>T.N.T. Dung &amp; L.T.N. Quynh</i>	513
Reading enjoyment in the digital age: How does it differ by parents' education, self-expected education, and socio-economic status? <i>N.H.P.S. Putro &amp; J. Lee</i>	521
'Read-to-Me' story books: Parent-child home English reading activities <i>D.R. Meisani</i>	531
Utilizing iBooks in teaching EFL reading comprehension <i>D.S. Suharti</i>	537
The effectiveness of online brain-writing compared to brainstorming as prewriting strategies in teaching writing to students with high frequency and low frequency of Language Learning Strategies (LLS) <i>D. Hermasari</i>	555
Gallery Walk for teaching a content course <i>I. Maharsi</i>	563
Assessing speaking by f2f or using a developed application: Are there any differences? <i>M.S. Simatupang, M. Wiannastiti &amp; R. Peter</i>	571
Author index	577



*ELT in Asia in the Digital Era: Global Citizenship and Identity – Madya et al. (Eds)*  
© 2018 Taylor & Francis Group, London, ISBN 978-0-8153-7900-3

## Assessing speaking by f2f or using a developed application: Are there any differences?

M.S. Simatupang

*Universitas Kristen Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia*

M. Wiannastiti & R. Peter

*Bina Nusantara University, Jakarta, Indonesia*

**ABSTRACT:** To assess students' ability in speaking, lecturers normally ask questions in face to face (f2f) mode and the students answer them directly. In class consisting of 40 students or more, it takes time to ask them the same questions one by one. Is there any faster way to do so? This study explored the differences between assessing speaking f2f and using a developed application, i.e. the Bingar Application. The participants of this study were 40 students. They were tested twice with the same questions. The first f2f test was taken in class about 1.5 hours and the second using the Bingar application in the computer lab, lasting only for about 15 minutes. The results showed that 80% of the students answered the questions with no significant differences either by the above testing modes. This indicates that using the Bingar application is more efficient in assessing speaking than by f2f.

### 1 INTRODUCTION

Teaching English especially speaking with more than 40 students needs special skills to ensure that the process of learning and teaching runs well. Speaking means the verbal use of language to communicate with others (Fulcher 2003). Consequently, it takes several minutes for a student to sufficiently speak his/her ideas with or without preparation so that his/her ideas can be understood fully. In a class with 40 students or more and the time allocation is 2 x 50 minutes per session, mostly not all students will have their turn to speak adequately. In such a class, a lecturer requires hours in order that the 40 students have sufficient time to speak. In other words, it certainly takes much time for students to present their thoughts orally one by one, especially in big classes. Furthermore, in one assessment, a lecturer needs not only more time to evaluate the students' speaking ability, but also more energy to concentrate to listen to their utterances to evaluate the accuracy, the vocabulary, and the pronunciation. The worst can happen when the lecturer asks the students one by one. It means that the lecturer needs to raise the same questions many times so that all students do not misunderstand them, and they are able to express their thoughts to match with the questions being asked.

To fulfil the needs of reducing time in assessing speaking ability of big class students, this study suggested the use of technology in order that to help us doing the task easily. Technology has been used in all aspect of life, including teaching, learning and assessing. With the advance of technology nowadays, it is possible to save time in evaluating students' speaking skills. This study explores the use of a developed application, called the Bingar application to be used in assessing students' performance in speaking. This study was worth conducting due to the fact that it is time consuming to conduct speaking tests for more than 40 students (f2f). We focus on three ideas to discuss:

1. Technology in teaching English
2. Bingar application
3. Differences between assessing speaking by f2f and using a developed application, that is using Bingar application



## 2 TECHNOLOGY IN TEACHING ENGLISH

Some studies have been accomplished to use technology in teaching and learning process (See, for instance, Mayora 2006, Sad 2008, Simatupang 2004, Wang 2015). The practical one used in many classes is using computer or laptop with LCD as the means of delivering the materials in the teaching and learning process. The computer also helps lecturers obtain information easily to prepare materials properly before the class (Simatupang 2004). Using power point in delivering the teaching materials is also popular with the intention that the teaching materials are well prepared, interesting, and focus (Simatupang 2005). Wang (2015: 593) explains multimedia technology improves the teaching quality and effect of English linguistics course in universities. Not far difference, Dewi (2005) explained in her paper that online learning is useful to learn a language as a whole or to learn a skill of language. It indicates that the use of technology like computers (hardware) and internet (software) enhances the teaching quality. Technology indeed is needed in almost all aspects of education, including teaching English. Mayora (2006) experienced to the application of Technologically Enhanced Language Learning (TELL) to implement a program that seeks to raise in the students an autonomous attitude toward learning a language and the integration of multimedia technology as a reinforcement of in-classroom activities. The use of technology in teaching English has been developed in many places. The most advanced technology is stated by Sad (2008) who found that using mobile phone technology helped students to communicate better by producing drama activities with mobile phones.

The use of technology has been applied widely in education, starting from gathering the information and materials, preparing the syllabus, delivering the materials to the students, and finally assessing the students. This study was focused on assessing the students' speaking ability. Why should we demand an application to teach English, especially speaking? In this technological era, where everything needs to be done efficiently and practically, an application is compulsory to help lecturers save the time allotted to evaluate students' performance. Moreover, technology supports lecturers to minimize asking the same questions many times to students since the application replaces the lecturers' roles. In traditional classes, a lecturer carries out speaking assessment by ordering the students to deliver their talk one by one until everybody gets their performance. A lecturer carefully does observation while students are involved in speaking activities which can provide useful information of their progress (Nation & Newton 2009). As a consequence, a lecturer needs to fully concentrate to get his/her students ideas.

## 3 RESEARCH METHOD

This research concerns to find out whether or not there are differences if the students use the Bingar application in their speaking test compared to face to face (f2f) test. In doing the research, there are 40 students of Bina Nusantara University majoring in *Game Application and Technology* who get involved in the speaking test. Firstly they do the test (f2f) by answering two questions:

1. What is your favorite place to visit on weekends? Describe it and explain why it is your favorite place to go.
2. Do you agree or disagree that it is more important for students to study history and literature than to study science and mathematics? Give specific reasons and examples to support your opinion.

The students' responses were recorded to find out exactly what they said. The next week, they had to answer the same questions using the Bingar application and recorded. They did not expect that they would be given the same questions. Consequently, they did not prepare to give answers to similar questions. It was possible that their answers might be better for the second time as long as their speaking abilities were good enough. If their speaking abilities are bad, their answers would not get better. The results were compared to find out the differences between two testing types.



#### 4 FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The Bingar application is a desktop application consisting of three types of content and several questions which are played sequentially. The questions vary and depend on the order or the set (Wiannastiti 2016). When this application is used, the students are doing the test together in the lab. Some lab assistants are available to check if there are problems faced during the test. One of the lab assistants explains what to do and how to use the application to make sure that the students understand and are capable to use the application. First of all, they are doing the prerequisite sample question that should be answered after the beep signal and then, they listen to their recorded voice to make sure that the application runs well. Next, the lab assistant told them to listen to the questions of the speaking test and after about 20 seconds they answer the questions orally and at the same time, their voices are recorded. The test takes only 15–20 minutes since all students do the test at the same time. This indicates the efficient time to have one test for all students (depending on the quantity of the computers provided for the speaking test). The results of the tests are evaluated by the lecturers later on, at home or anywhere and at their convenient time. This denotes the flexible time to give scores even though it takes a longer time to get the results for all students.

Results of the analysis of the data obtained from the questionnaires distributed to the students about the Bingar application showed some information about the application. Figure 1 shows the ease with which the students used the Bingar application. It indicates that more than 90 percent of the students agreed that it is easy to start, more than 80 percent agree it is easy to use, more than 80 percent agree it is easy to record voice, more than 80 percent agree it is helpful, and more than 80 percent agree it is easy to check the sound. This implies that students can use the Bingar application with ease.

Figure 2 shows the interface of the application. The interface means the program of the computer that controls the display for the user. More than 70 percent of the students agreed that the Bingar application is simple to operate; 16 percent say neutral because it was just the first time for them to use the application. More than 80 percent of the students agreed and strongly agreed that the application has clear instruction, provides supportive picture, has easy button click, and overall is it easy to use.




Figure 1. The use.




Figure 2. The interface.

The information in Figure 3 shows the sound system of the Bingar application. Since the test was speaking, the sound system should be of the high quality. The students listened to the questions and directly answered them after the notification. The result shows that in all questions concerning the sound, more than 80 percent students agree that they can hear the instruction clearly, they could hear the questions easily, they could hear their voice clearly, they can hear the pronunciation clearly, and the sound in the application was clear.

The last questions were regarding the time allotted in accomplishing the speaking test using the application. This is essential to figure out since it shows how effective and how efficient is the time to do the test. The information in Figure 4 demonstrates in all questions, more than 85 percent of the students agreed that it is easy to see the preparation time; it is easy to see the respond time; it is easy to see the time allotment; it is easy to see the idle time; and the overall time is clearly seen.

In this research study, each student answered the questions for the speaking test twice: firstly, in the class f2f with the lecturer (recorded); secondly in the lab using Bingar application (recorded). The questions for both tests were the same. The purpose of this research is to identify if there are differences between assessing speaking test by using an f2f (face to face) method and by using the Bingar application.

Assessing speaking through an f2f tests implies taking a great deal of time. If one student needs one minute to listen to the questions from the lecturer, one minute to prepare, and 2 minutes to answer, it requires four minutes for each student. Forty students need 160 minutes or more than 2 hours, plus interrupted time like waiting for the students to approach the front or repeating the instruction. Furthermore, the lecturer requires energy to concentrate in order that s/he can give similar judgment to every student. This can create unfairness to value the students' performance if the lecturer is already tired.

Using the Bingar application in assessing speaking does not require plenty of time. Each student performs the test together in the lab. They listen to the questions and answer the questions all together at the same time without disrupting one another since each of them is using the headset provided in the lab; thus their answers can be recorded all at once. It is enormously practical and easy to use.

The scoring for f2f and Bingar application is formulated based on the Speaking Rubric (see the appendix). The scores are categorized into excellent, good, average, and poor. After the




Figure 3. The sound.




Figure 4. The time.



entire students got their scores, the grades were compared for each student to see if there are differences in both tests based on the category. For instance, if student A's score for f2f is 75 and for Bingar is 80, the score category is 75–84 (good). It means no different score category for student A. On the other hand, if B's score for f2f is 70 (average) and for Bingar is 80 (good), B's scores of Bingar is higher than of f2f test due to the different category. The results show that 80 percent or 32 students answered the questions with no significant difference category either by using Bingar application or by face to face test. There are 5 students or 12.5 percent answer the questions with better scores by using Bingar application than by f2f. This is probably because they have heard the questions before. Nevertheless, they did not expect to have the same questions since they are informed to have the second speaking test. Their answers are better possibly due to their high English proficiency. The rest 8 percent or 3 students answered the questions with worse scores by using the Bingar application than by f2f. This indicates that using Bingar application is more efficient in assessing speaking than by f2f. Furthermore, this application is excellent to apply for big classes since one test can be applied to a lot of students.

## 5 CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Assessing speaking for more than 40 students in a class can require a lot of time and energy. To solve the problem, an application is designed so that the speaking test can be completed in fewer tempos. To see if it is applicable, this study is conducted as whether or not the application contributes to the process of speaking assessment. The result reveals that the use of the Bingar application was found to be more efficient since the time used for the speaking test was about fifteen to twenty minutes for all 40 students, and the lecturer could give scores later at his/her convenient time. It is also effective since the result of this research study shows that there were no significant differences between assessing speaking face to face and using the Bingar application.

The use of technology proves that it assists lecturers to enlighten his/her work. The Bingar application is one of the technologies that support speaking tests. It is suggested that the Bingar application or other similar technology should be applied in assessing students' oral communication, especially for big classes. Indeed technology makes assessment easier and efficient.

## REFERENCES

- Dewi, I.I. 2005. The implementation of information technology in language teaching. *Teflin International Conference* (Proceeding). <https://lib.atmajaya.ac.id/Uploads/Fulltext/84146/artikel/ien-ncke%20Indra%20Dewi-The%20Implementation%20of%20IT.pdf>
- Fulcher, G. 1997. The testing of speaking in a second language. In C. Clapham & D. Corson (eds.): *Encyclopedia of Language and Education 7: Language testing and assessment*. The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers. 75–85.
- Mayora, C.A. 2006. Integrating multimedia technology in a high school EFL program. *English Teaching Forum* 3: 14–21. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1107903.pdf>
- Nation, I.S.P. & Newton, J. 2009. *Teaching EFL/ESL Listening and Speaking*. Routledge: New York.
- Sad, S.N. 2008. Using mobile phone technology in EFL Classes. *English Teaching Forum* 4: 34–40. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1096315.pdf>
- Simatupang, M.S. 2004. The role of computer technology in English teaching. *TEFLIN International Conference 52nd: Cross-cultural communication: TEFL Concerns and Contribution*. <https://lib.atmajaya.ac.id/default.aspx?tabID=61&src=a&id=93978>
- Simatupang, M.S. 2005. Power Point and Creative English Teaching. *International Seminar of Information Technology and English Language Studies (ICELS 3)*: 106–113.
- Wang, Y. 2015. Study of application of multimedia technology in English teaching. *7th International Conference on Information Technology in Medicine and Education*: 593–597. <https://lib.atmajaya.ac.id/Uploads/Fulltext/204300/Study%20of%20Application%20of%20Multimedia%20Technology%20in%20English%20Language%20Teaching.pdf>
- Wiannastiti, M. 2016. Assessing speaking for a large number of students by Using Bingar Application. *The 5th English Language Teaching, Literature, and Translation: International Conference* (Proceeding).

## APPENDIX

<sup>a</sup>Speaking Rubric.

Indicators	Proficiency level			
	Excellent (E) (85–100)	Good (G) (75–84)	Average (A) (65–74)	Poor (P) (0–64)
Ability to perform fluency when talking in English for general topics	Almost fully able to explain in English about a general topic with very few pauses and/or fillers	Mostly able to explain in English about a general topic with few pauses and/or fillers	Generally able to explain in English about a general topic with some pauses and/or fillers	Moderately able to explain in English about a general topic with many pauses and/or fillers
Ability to demonstrate intelligibility when talking in English for general topics	Other people almost fully recognize the speech, & the speech is generally clear in pronunciation	Other people mostly recognize the speech, & the speech is moderately clear in pronunciation	Other people generally recognize the speech, & the speech is somewhat clear in pronunciation	Other people moderately recognize the speech, & the speech is limitedly clear in pronunciation
Ability to demonstrate language use when talking in English for general topics	Almost fully apply varied & appropriate grammar and vocabulary	Mostly apply varied & appropriate grammar and vocabulary	Generally apply varied & appropriate grammar and vocabulary	Moderately apply varied & appropriate grammar and vocabulary

<sup>a</sup>Speaking score of f2f and Bingar Application

Student	F2F	Bingar	Student	F2F	Bingar
1	75/G	85/E	21	70/A	70/A
2	80/G	90/E	22	75/G	75/G
3	75/G	85/E	23	60/P	60/P
4	70/A	80/G	24	78/G	75/G
5	80/G	90/E	25	90/E	90/E
6	80/G	80/G	26	85/E	85/E
7	70/A	70/A	27	85/E	90/E
8	60/P	62/P	28	95/E	90/E
9	95/E	90/E	29	65/A	65/A
10	90/E	90/E	30	78/G	78/G
11	90/E	85/E	31	75/G	75/G
12	85/E	85/E	32	90/E	88/E
13	75/G	75/G	33	90/E	90/E
14	85/E	85/E	34	85/E	85/E
15	78/G	80/G	35	70/A	70/A
16	78/G	80/G	36	75/G	80/G
17	80/G	80/G	37	80/G	75/G
18	90/E	88/E	38	70/A	60/P
19	90/E	85/E	39	80/G	70/A
20	85/E	85/E	40	70/A	60/P